

THE MAKING OF HISTORY: DISCOURSES OF DEMOCRACY AND NATION IN SLOVENIA¹

Tatiana Bajuk Senčar

Slovene history is a puzzle to the Englishman, who finds it hard to understand a struggle for liberty lasting over a thousand years in which scarcely a single incident of historical importance occurs. In fact, the most wonderful thing about the Slovenes is that they exist at all as a nation, after so many centuries of foreign rule.²

Slovenia can claim the dubious honor of being one of the first countries not eagerly welcomed by the West when, in declaring its independence from Yugoslavia, it joined the nations making a leap of faith from the wrong (i.e., East) side of the then disintegrating Iron Curtain. Some Western observers greeted preparations for independence with dismay and the fear that Slovenia would disrupt the Cold-War construct of geopolitical “stability” that Yugoslavia represented for the West.³ Given the implications of Yugoslavia’s violent disintegration, it is not surprising that the majority of the existing literature situates Slovenia within the context of Yugoslavia’s break-up and the ethnic strife that escalated into full-blown war. In effect there exist few book-length analyses that focus on Slovenia itself during this uncertain period. Slovenia is usually mentioned briefly as one of the Yugoslav republics in accounts depicting the factors and

¹ This work is based on research supported by the Research Support Scheme of the Open Society Support Foundation. Personal interviews were conducted during field research in Slovenia in 1996 and 1999; all translations of the interviews into English are mine.

² Lovett F. Edwards, *Introducing Yugoslavia* (London: Methuen, 1954) 229.

³ See, for example, Paula Franklin Lytle, “US Policy Toward the Demise of Yugoslavia: The ‘Virus of Nationalism’” *East European Politics and Societies* 6.3 (Fall 1992): 303–18 on the use of the term “the virus of nationalism” applied to the Yugoslav context, a “virus” which threatened the stability of the Balkan region.

events leading to Yugoslavia's demise; it is also the subject of a small number of edited volumes or anthologies whose authors deal with individual aspects of the transition process in Slovenia.⁴

The analytical danger involved in viewing the events that occurred in Slovenia solely in terms of the broader, Yugoslav, context is that such events may be evaluated in terms of criteria that may not apply as accurately at the level of individual Yugoslav republics. Furthermore, the violence of Yugoslavia's demise has also led to theories that do not apply either at the Yugoslav level nor the republic level. Sabrina Petra Ramet refers to one such prominent theory as the "ancient hatreds

⁴ Most of the existing edited volumes or anthologies on Slovenia bridge both the pre- and post-independence periods. These include Jill Benderly and Evan Kraft, eds., *Independent Slovenia: Origins, Movements, Prospects* (New York: St. Martin's, 1994) and Danica Fink-Hafner and John R. Robbins eds., *Making a New Nation: The Formation of Slovenia* (Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1997). See works such as Carole Rogel, *The Slovenes and Yugoslavism* (Boulder: East European Quarterly, 1977) for a history of Slovene nationalism, albeit during an earlier period. James Gow and Cathie Carmichael, *Slovenia and the Slovenes: A Small State and the New Europe* (London: Hurst, 2000) is a concise, informative book-length introductory monograph on Slovenia. One can also turn to Leopoldina Plut-Pregelj and Carole Rogel *Historical Dictionary of Slovenia* (Lanham and London: Scarecrow, 1996) for a historical dictionary of Slovenia. A select list of works that includes an interpretation (either positive or negative) of Slovenia's role in Yugoslavia's disintegration include Christopher Bennet, *Yugoslavia's Bloody Collapse: Causes, Course and Consequences* (New York: New York UP, 1995); Lenard J. Cohen, *Broken Bonds: Yugoslavia's Disintegration and Balkan Politics in Transition*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview, 1995); Branka Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-Up 1980-1992* (London: Verso, 1993); Sabrina Petra Ramet and Ljubica S. Adamovich, eds., *Beyond Yugoslavia: Politics, Economics, and Culture in a Shattered Community* (Boulder: Westview, 1995); Sabrina Petra Ramet, *Balkan Babel: The Disintegration of Yugoslavia from the Death of Tito to the War for Kosovo*, 3rd ed. (Boulder: Westview, 1999); Gale Stokes, *Three Eras of Political Change in Eastern Europe* (New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997); and Susan Woodward, *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution After the Cold War* (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1995).

thesis": that Yugoslavia was torn apart by extreme nationalisms fed by primitive, ancient ethnic hatreds suppressed by a totalitarian regime.⁵

On the one hand, it would be ridiculous to argue that nationalism did not play a central role in what occurred in Yugoslavia. On the other hand, recognizing the dangers of extreme forms of nationalism does not imply that the nationalisms in question have roots in timeless ethnic animosities nor that all national sentiments that developed in Yugoslavia's republics were violently exclusive. Numerous respected analysts have taken a public stand against popular works that in disseminating the ancient hatreds thesis propagate a historically inaccurate view on nationalism and national identity in Yugoslavia. The very severity of Yugoslavia's situation requires ever more thorough and objective analyses that do not simplify a complex issue with inherently limited concepts which do not coincide with the reality that they are intended to represent.⁶

In addition to Slovenia being often addressed predominantly in terms of the greater Yugoslav context as outlined above, Slovenia also lacks the traditional set of attributes that nations or communities that aspire to statehood are assumed to possess. Such a list includes, as Lovett F. Edwards implies in the opening citation, a "proper" history, a history that includes particular sorts of events and, preferably, a period of statehood or self-rule. Edwards was impressed with the perseverance of Slovenes as a community despite their lacking what he considered to be the crucial elements of national identity.⁷ Yet Slovenia's not possessing a "proper" history may also be, in light of the predominant approach to nationalisms in Yugoslavia, interpreted in a different light: Slovenia's efforts could have seemed to lack foundation, thus fueling theories that consider the Yugoslav republics' nationalist ambitions to be illegitimate.

⁵ For Ramet's discussion of the ancient hatreds thesis, see Ramet, *Balkan Babel* 343–56.

⁶ Numerous experts on the Yugoslav situation have called for even-handed and balanced analyses of Yugoslav nationalisms, including Ivo Banac, "Misreading the Balkans," *Foreign Policy* 93 (Winter 1993/1994): 173–82; Gale Stokes, John Lampe, Dennison Rusinow with Julie Mostow, "Instant History: Understanding the Wars of Yugoslav Succession," *Slavic Review* 55.1 (Spring 1996): 136–60; and Ramet, *Balkan Babel*.

⁷ Gow and Carmichael have noted that many analysts have admired the survival of Slovene culture, including historians Fred Singleton and Ivo Banac. See Gow and Carmichael, *Slovenia and the Slovenes* 9–10.

In light of these difficulties and analytical obstacles it is logical to ask how one is to conduct a study of the events of the 1980s that culminated in Slovenian independence. Unfortunately, the field of nationality studies offers few conclusive leads in this regard, as experts have yet to agree on a single definition of national identity. Furthermore, nationalism has been interpreted very differently over the years. For example, Anthony Smith notes in his work entitled *Nationalism and Modernism* that nationalism was initially considered to be an inclusive and liberating force that transcended differences of region, dialect, and clan. Through the nineteenth and well into the twentieth centuries, nationalism was also linked to nation-building projects launched by native elites that sought to overthrow foreign imperial or colonial rule.⁸ In effect, one can argue that Walker Connor's assessment of the terminological and analytical confusion reigning in the field of nationality studies, initially written in 1978, to a great extent still holds true today:

Where today is the study of nationalism? In this Alice-in-Wonderland world in which nation usually means state, in which nation-state usually means multination state, in which nationalism means loyalty to the state, and in which ethnicity, primordialism, pluralism, tribalism, regionalism, communalism, parochialism, and subnationalism usually mean loyalty to the nation, it should come as no surprise that the nature of nationalism remains essentially unprobed.⁹

One of the main reasons for this confusion, according to Connor, is that researchers of nationalism and national identity tend to analyze nationalism in terms of its manifestations or components (including, for example, a "proper" history) instead of addressing its essence, which is not tangible, but psychological. Connor argues, as does analyst Hugh Seton-Watson, that one must understand that nations

⁸ Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism and Modernism* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998) 1–2.

⁹ Walker Connor, *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994) 111–12.

are self-defining groups, groups whose members are linked by a common feeling of belonging to a particular nation.¹⁰

Addressing nations as self-defining groups requires shifting one's analytical approach from operating with a set of objective criteria according to which one evaluates particular expressions of national sentiment to trying to understand how a feeling of belonging develops within a particular community, within a particular social context. Emphasizing the latter, social approach to the study of nations does not imply assuming that individual nations are not comparable; instead, analyzing particular expressions of national awareness as social constructions may provide a more solid foundation for later comparisons among different nations.

My intention here is not to address the origins of Slovene identity, national or otherwise, the roots of which extend far beyond the scope of this essay. Instead, this essay will present an account of the events and processes that led to Slovenian independence as they are articulated by key Slovene social actors, actors who were involved in the different liberalizing movements that emerged in the Slovene social sphere during the 1980s including particular expressions of nationalism. In limiting the essay's focus on Slovene social actors and their narratives, I do not mean to imply that the processes that marked Slovenia can be understood simply by addressing Slovenia's internal events and by ignoring the greater Yugoslav context. Instead, the account that will unfold in the following pages will provide particular Slovene understandings of the events in Yugoslavia and of Yugoslavia's future. Such an account will provide a useful counterpart to existing interpretations of Yugoslavia's demise.

What follows is a presentation and contextualization of the different liberalizing movements that emerged in Slovenia during the 1980s. In the interests of coherence, the histories of the two most influential publications in the Slovene public sphere during this period—*Nova Revija* and *Mladina*—will provide the framework for the presentation. These two publications served as social centers for the majority of social actors who played key roles in Slovenia's liberalization movements.

¹⁰ Connor, *Ethnonationalism* 42; Hugh Seton-Watson, *Nations and States* (London: Methuen, 1977) 5.

Nova Revija

On 10 June 1980, sixty writers, poets, historians, and sociologists signed an open letter to government officials outlining the need for a new literary journal to expand and enliven literary and scholarly journalism. The authors argued that existing journals did not allow room for constructive cultural dialogue, and concluded with a petition for a state subsidy for a new journal to revitalize the realm of culture in the Slovene social sphere.¹¹

Government subsidy for *Nova Revija* was interpreted as a victory by its proponents, who considered this subsidy to be an opportunity to continue a particular sort of dissident intellectual practice that had been continually censored by the Party establishment. According to Rudi Šeligo, one of the original members of *Nova Revija*, the establishment of a new journal allowed for the perpetuation of a critical line of thinking that had been suppressed to a great degree since the mid-1960s:

Rudi Šeligo: In 1964, the journal *Perspektive* was definitely suppressed, banned. With this, a certain enthusiasm of spirit—though I will not get into this now—was blocked to a certain degree. It was partly present in the generation around *Perspektive* and the liberal thinking at *Problemi* ... yet only partially. It was not there in its totality because it was a line of thinking that required its very own journal.¹²

The banning of journals was a characteristic reaction on the part of the Party in the face of negative critiques. Journals which experienced such a fate included *Beseda* (1951–57) and *Revija 57* (1957), which scarcely lasted a year. *Revija 57* defined the group that would in 1960 establish *Perspektive*. The circle around *Perspektive* included Rudi Šeligo, Jože Pučnik, and Veljko Rus, among others. They began writing as college students and young professional writers in their mid-twenties and represented the critical core of the younger generation. However, in 1958 the Party establishment banned the journal and one of its contributors, Jože Pučnik, was imprisoned on charges of propagating hostile propaganda against the state. While *Revija 57* worked within a Marxist framework, *Perspektive* was influenced by French

¹¹ *Nova Revija* 1 (1982).

¹² Personal interview with Rudi Šeligo.

existentialists, whose works were not banned in Yugoslavia as they were elsewhere in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet bloc. The era of *Perspektive* marked a creative period for this circle of intellectuals, who wrote ever more explicit critiques of the political system and called for reforms. These critiques, however, ultimately brought about the journal's end and sanctions against its contributors.¹³

Many of those from *Perspektive* later joined the journal *Problemi*, which published more oblique strategies of socio-political critique, particularly parody and satire. However, by the end of the 1970s, the atmosphere at *Problemi* was such that a group of contributors decided to petition for a new journal, which would be characterized by a different understanding of the role of the intellectual. Niko Grafenauer, poet and editor-in-chief of *Nova Revija*, defines this philosophy as Heideggerian to some degree: one that compels the intellectual not to separate the literary, artistic, and intellectual spheres from the social one:

Grafenauer: The essential issue which we emphasized was that our position was based upon reflection and self-reflection, meaning that the very status of the intellectual was to be continually questioned, maintained in crisis so that he would remain open. So as not to become ideologized, and so on. Yet reflection, if it is real reflection, should not stop when confronted with taboos. And here of course we came up against a whole series of problems that were taboo until then. Given the logic of the position of the intellectual—if it is to be this way—then certain things had to happen, such as questioning the revolution, and in turn the role of the *NOB* as well.¹⁴

The editors of *Nova Revija* would publish the works of artists and intellectuals who were deemed politically suspect in their home republics and who were refused access to the public sphere. These artists and intellectuals came from all the Yugoslav republics. They

¹³ Personal interview with Marjan Dolgan, researcher at the Scientific Research Center of the Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts.

¹⁴ Personal interview with Niko Grafenauer. *NOB* stands for *Narodna Osvobodilna Borba* (National Liberation Struggle), the conflict waged by the Liberation Front against the occupying forces during WW II. The *NOB* still remains mythologized to a great extent, more so now than in the 1980s.

included writers from Serbia, such as Gojko Djoga and Dobrica Ćosić, who would later form part of the leading circle of Serbian nationalist intellectuals; Vlado Gotovac, who has played an important role in Croatian politics; and Alija Izetbegović, one of the seven Bosnian intellectuals arrested in Sarajevo in 1981. While the works of these intellectuals embodied a range of political positions, *Nova Revija* strove to become a forum for all Yugoslav intellectuals and even sold outside Slovenia despite the fact that the journal was published in Slovene.

This strategy of openness also applied to Slovenes. Given the heterogeneity of the contributions to the journal and the policy of open dialogue, a number of intellectual projects appeared in *Nova Revija*. The group of traditionally dissident intellectuals most often identified with *Nova Revija* was also joined by a slightly younger group of liberal communists who were committed to questioning the operations of the Party in order to develop a more democratic, albeit socialist society. They included Tine Hribar, Dimitrij Rupel, and Spomenka Hribar, among others. Of these Spomenka Hribar played by far the most polemical role in her crusade for national reconciliation in light of the atrocities committed by the Slovene Communist Party during and after World War II, public knowledge of which was suppressed until the mid-1970s.¹⁵ Although she shifted her position significantly after Slovenia's independence, at that time her work spearheaded a public critique of moral discourse. This was one of the key achievements of the contributors to *Nova Revija* because it allowed, at least on the pages of the journal, a democratization of access to the public spheres as well as the beginning of a pluralization of histories. A public dialogue was established in one of Slovenia's foremost journals among what used to be mutually exclusive intellectual groups. Drago Jančar, a renowned author and playwright who had been a contributor to *Nova Revija*, described the atmosphere at *Nova Revija* in the mid-1980s in this fashion:

Jančar: An interesting series of people published in *Nova Revija*, so that it was a strange mixture from dissatisfied Party

¹⁵ Given the role of the state in the public sphere and the lack of a samizdat tradition in Slovenia, a comment on public knowledge is in order. Knowledge of inter-war and post-war violence existed in anti-communist circles, but given the constructedness of social life in the society, these people were rendered virtually invisible.

members to Christians, theologians. We slowly began to form a sort of resistance. At the same time resistance was emerging elsewhere, including the youth movements, around punk and rock groups. At the weekly *Mladina* something also began to take shape. Yet it was most clearly articulated in *Nova Revija* at that time.¹⁶

The implications of *Nova Revija*'s openness and the extent to which this openness undermined official ideology are brought into sharper focus when situated among events occurring in other Yugoslav republics. The most significant events of this kind included the perennial tensions between proponents of federalism and centralism; typical of this tension was the conflict between Serbs and Kosovo Albanians concerning the latter's wish for a more autonomous existence.

Many Slovenes recount that the Serbian reaction to the Kosovo Albanian protests¹⁷ signaled the beginning of a shift in policy towards centralism in Yugoslavia and authoritarian centralism within Serbia itself, which included the sanctioning of critical intellectuals. In April 1984, twenty-six Serbian intellectuals were arrested in Belgrade and six were tried for counter-revolutionary hostile propaganda. Policy shifts also included attempts at re-centralizing education at the federal level. Serbia proposed to unify the country's educational system by turning school curricula over to the federation. This meant that the federation would design a uniform school curriculum, and that the amount of material allotted to each republic in this curriculum would depend on its proportion of the federal population. Slovenes represented little more than ten percent of Yugoslavia's population, and many Slovenes interpreted the imposition of *skupna jedra*, or a common core program, as an attempt to serbianize Slovenia. Growing nationalist sentiment among an influential circle of Serbian intellectuals, who

¹⁶ Personal interview with Drago Jančar.

¹⁷ This included a series of month-long, province-wide demonstrations initially sparked by Albanian students. Serb reaction to these protests included the imposition of martial law, abolition of Kosovo's status as an autonomous province, and the imprisonment of over 3,000 Albanians for "nationalist offenses." For more on this conflict, see Ivo Banac, "Post-Communism as Post-Yugoslavism: The Yugoslav Non-Revolutions of 1989–1990," ed. Ivo Banac, *Eastern Europe in Revolution* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1992) 168–97.

authored the famous 1987 memorandum, only added to the tensions surrounding the issue of educational reform. This memorandum emphasized the economic, political, and cultural suffering of the Serb nation, particularly after the 1974 constitution, which according to the memorandum's authors was backed by an "anti-Serb coalition of Slovenes and Croats and which provided the grounds for separating Kosovo from Serbia."¹⁸

The rising nationalist sentiment in Serbia reconfigured the relationships among Yugoslav intellectuals from different republics. This shift also affected the contributors to *Nova Revija*, who began to deliberate upon Slovenia's place in present-day Yugoslavia, particularly in light of possible Yugoslav recentralization. The result of these deliberations was *Nova Revija*'s famous issue number 57, which outlined contributions to a Slovene national program:

Grafenauer: This all happened in the shadow of what was going on in Belgrade. From issue to issue we reflected upon the situation in Yugoslavia and of Slovenia within this larger context. We critically examined the situation, and slowly realized that if we looked mainly at these aspects the crisis was deepening, not only the economic crisis but the cultural one... And in this framework it became clear that the Serbs were trying to establish their domination in Yugoslavia with these constitutional amendments because they were not able to do this under Kardelj's constitution... In short, in light of these events, we had to rethink our own situation in Yugoslavia. The idea to write the pieces that would contribute to a national program was the end product of these reflections. In these pieces we would try to detect our national interests and options from different points of view, and figure out what our position was in relation, above all, to the Balkans, to Yugoslavia and to all that was going on in this country.¹⁹

¹⁸ For a translation of the memorandum see Dennison Rusinow, trans., "Memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Sciences," ed. Gale Stokes, *From Stalinism to Pluralism: A Documentary History of Eastern Europe since 1945*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford UP, 1996) 275–80.

¹⁹ Personal interview with Niko Grafenauer.

That intellectuals should write about questions of nation and nationhood was not a novelty in Slovenia. In *Nova Revija*'s issue 57, the editors explicitly pointed out that they were participating in what was presently occurring in Slovenia and that they saw themselves as continuing a discussion published in part in a special issue of *Problemi* in 1970.²⁰

Issue 57 comprised sixteen articles about Slovenia's position within Yugoslavia at that time. What is striking is the issue's heterogeneity in terms of how the different authors defined the issue of Slovene nationhood as well as Slovenia's position in relation to Yugoslavia. The topics that were addressed ranged from the disturbing issue of high suicide rates among Slovenes to the role of the Yugoslav National Army, from the question of Slovenes in exile to the legal status of Slovenia as a nation. In many ways the issue accurately represents the diverse mixture of groups that constituted *Nova Revija* in dialogue on the issue of Slovenia's identity. However, public reaction to issue 57 did not focus on the diversity of the positions taken in the articles. Instead all attention was centered on a particular group of articles that argued that the legitimate basis of Slovene nationhood and democracy lay outside socialism, drawing a clear distinction between nationhood and democracy on the one hand and self-managed socialism on the other.

The tone of the Party establishment's reactions to issue 57 was very much in line with the statement made by Jože Smole, then president of *Socialistična zveza delovnega ljudstva* (the Socialist Alliance of the Working People):

In its recently published fifty-seventh issue, *Nova Revija* presents contributions to a national program in a manner such that individual writers in different places reject or question the legitimacy of the national liberation struggle and the social order that emerged from it, its institutions and its leaders; they portray the position and role of the Slovene nation and socialist self-management and federal Yugoslavia in an historically inaccurate and highly tendentious manner.²¹

²⁰ *Nova Revija*, 57 (1987): 1–2.

²¹ Press conference of the SAWP, 12 February 1987, in *Ampak: Zadeva 57* (January–February 1994): 38.

Despite the public opposition expressed at virtually every level of the Slovene Party establishment and in virtually every public medium, the authorities imposed no legal sanctions on the writers of *Nova Revija*. This inaction, interpreted at the time as a sign of liberalization on the part of the Slovene establishment, was not shared by the federal government, which also criticized the issue for its threateningly “nationalistic” overtones. Furthermore, federal prosecutors drew up warrants for the arrest of three of the authors, including veteran dissident Jože Pučnik. Given the popularity of the issue and the controversy that it created, issue 57 became a political position that identified those who contributed to *Nova Revija*, notwithstanding its heterogeneous composition.

Events began to accelerate after the publication of issue 57. On the basis of arguments set forth in the issue, a working group of writers, lawyers and sociologists under the aegis of the Writers’ Association put together a draft of a constitution for Slovenia entitled *Pisateljska ustava*, or Writers’ Constitution. When this constitution was made public in April 1987, on the heels of issue 57, it became an explicit statement about the sort of society to which groups around *Nova Revija* and the Writers’ Association were continually referring:

Šeligo: I think that there were two acts that were decisive for the transition. They were, of course, issue 57 of *Nova Revija* and the constitution published a few months later, a booklet entitled “Material for a Slovene Constitution”; it was a constitution broken down into articles... If issue 57 introduced and defined a broad national Slovene interest in democratization, a plural society and a nation-state, this was translated into constitutional articles in the Writers’ Constitution.²²

However, the writers’ constitution did not outline the kind of social order all Slovenes working towards political liberalization would have necessarily agreed with. In an interview published in *New Left Review*, Miha Kovač, a *Mladina* journalist, gave his appraisal of the writers’ constitution, identifying common ground and disjunctures between the constitution and the characteristic positions associated with *Nova Revija* or *Mladina*.

²² Personal interview with Rudi Šeligo.

A couple of months ago Slovene writers, together with some sociologists, drafted their own proposal for a new Slovene constitution. As far as I know, this text is a kind of a copy of the Bavarian constitution, and its central emphasis on the notion of human rights is in my view absolutely correct. But it also has a preamble which describes this constitution as establishing a distinct Slovene state, which must have its own national army, relying on a specifically Slovene military tradition and on the peasant uprisings of the sixteenth century. Its authors put in things as well about the sanctity of life and the family. Furthermore, Yugoslavia is not mentioned at all—they do not care much for it! Nor do they refer to socialism on the grounds that it would mean inserting ideology into the constitution. As if omitting it were not also an ideological convention! They have produced, in other words, a very murky ideological document, and the trouble is that, if you buy the constitution, you also buy the ideological framework. In fact, they are just copying a West European constitution based on bourgeois ideology, so their “anti-ideological” statement cannot be taken seriously.²³

*Mladina*²⁴

By 1987, *Mladina* was almost at the height of its influence. It had a formidable group of journalists and editorial columnists who contributed to the weekly. Its circulation was almost 80,000 copies per week, a considerable number given that Slovenia's population at that time totalled a little over 1.7 million. *Mladina* was established during WWII as a publication of the *Zveza socialistične mladine Slovenije* (ZSMS, Association of Socialist Youth of Slovenia). During the 1980s, the weekly slowly became more mainstream and developed into a focal

²³ Miha Kovač, “The Slovene Spring,” *New Left Review* 171 (1988): 121.

²⁴ For an alternative view of the political role of the weekly *Mladina*, see Patrick H. Patterson, “The East is Read: The End of Communism, Slovene Exceptionalism, and the Independent Journalism of *Mladina*” *East European Politics and Societies* 14.2 (Spring 2000): 411–59.

point for a younger generation of intellectuals and activists involved in so-called alternative or new social movements.

To understand the configuration of different circles around *Mladina*, one must trace them back to the late 1960s and 1970s. After the banning of *Perspektive* in 1964, other liberal political movements emerged, most noticeably (in Slovenia) among students. These movements were subsequently suppressed with the onset of the *svinčena leta* ("leaden years"), which brought an end to the more liberal period of the 1960s. The imposition of a more repressive, conservative period was realized in the academic sphere with university purges and a depoliticization of these critical circles. Kovač describes the shift in thinking which depoliticization implied in the following terms:

Three imperatives then emerged from this work, shaping the thinking of a whole generation. If you wanted to change socialism, you should (1) not act as a dissident, (2) not act as a nationalist, (3) critically examine the claims made about the scientific status of the socialist bureaucracy's theory and practice. These young intellectuals, in other words, could not identify with any mainstream ideology in Slovene political life: neither with the Party, which was very rigid, nor with the traditional intellectuals associated with the journal *Nova Revija*, who see themselves as defenders of the Slovene nation and its cultural heritage.²⁵

The members of one group that contributed to *Mladina* included persons such as Rastko Močnik and Slavoy Žižek, who were influenced by Lacanian psychoanalysis; this group also defined the central line of thinking at the journal *Problemi*. Another group included those who were associated with the review *Časopis za kritiko znanosti* (ČKZ, Review for the Critique of Knowledge); they were neo-Marxists whose main interest was political economy. Many of those who wrote for ČKZ in the 1980s had studied at the Faculty of Social Sciences during the 1970s, after the purges of liberal professors. They were trained within a framework of orthodox Marxism. In short, the contributors to *Mladina* included Marxists of all stripes.

²⁵ Kovač, "The Slovene Spring" 115.

In addition to these circles, whose intellectual trajectories can be traced to the mid-1960s, *Mladina* was also defined by its interaction with emerging alternative or new social movements at the grassroots level. According to Tomaž Mastnak, one of the main advocates of the new social movements, the aim of these movements was to fortify a civil society that would be an alternative and not an opposition to state socialism. Initial state reaction was to suppress these movements, particularly that of an emergent punk subculture in the early 1980s.²⁶ However, the state measures against the punk subculture rallied a number of otherwise depoliticized intellectuals who considered the members of this movement to be victims of the state.

In 1980 or 1981, four youngsters were arrested and accused of forming a fascist political organization... This produced a sudden politicization of the youth media, especially of *Radio Študent*, and the intellectual current described above started to articulate its position through defending its youngsters. At this time, too, some of its most prominent members ... were elected to leading positions in the Slovene Socialist Youth Alliance, and very quickly started to transform this organization.²⁷

The mobilization of previously depoliticized circles in this fashion precipitated a state decision to engage the representatives of these alternative groups through the ZSMS, which happened to be *Mladina*'s sponsor; furthermore, leading positions in the ZSMS had been recently occupied by persons who supported the new social movements.

Alternative movements flourished in the following years; most often mentioned are the pacifists, environmentalists, feminists, and gay rights activists. These movements were relatively small in size, but their members, often young intellectuals deemed unworthy of university employment, were very outspoken.

During this period, *Mladina* became one of the more provocative weeklies throughout Yugoslavia. Its circulation tripled

²⁶ For more on the punk movement, see Gregor Tomc, "The Politics of Punk," ed. Benderly and Kraft, *Independent Slovenia* 113–24.

²⁷ Tomaž Mastnak, "Civil Society in Slovenia: From Opposition to Power," *Studies in Comparative Communism* 23.4: 305.

between 1984 and 1987. *Mladina* columnists dealt with issues sensitive in Slovenia but virtually taboo in the rest of Yugoslavia—particularly in Serbia, where the shift towards authoritarianism was well underway. The magazine made the Yugoslav National Army one of its main targets, writing about its violation of human rights and its autocratic power structure. It provided a forum for debates concerning civilian alternatives to military service. Furthermore, *Mladina* was one of the mediums that broached and dared ridicule Tito's personality cult. For example, *Mladina* journalists turned their attention to reforming the *štafeta mladosti*, or youth relay race held every year in Tito's honor. It was run all over Yugoslavia and ended in Tito's hometown, with the last relay runner presenting the baton to Tito on his birthday.²⁸

1988 became a crucial year for *Mladina* as well as all for those involved in the political liberalization process, as their actions led them into a confrontation with the federal government. The weekly's first contentious issue was published on 12 February 1988. It contained protests against Yugoslav Defense Minister Branko Mamula's visit to Ethiopia at a time when Ethiopia was fighting a civil war and when Yugoslavia's foreign trade was becoming more dependent upon the sale of arms to other nonaligned countries.²⁹ *Mladina* ran a series of articles concerning the privileges Branko Mamula enjoyed as one of the highest ranking members of the Yugoslav National Army. Publication of these privileges—which included the use of army officers to construct Mamula's villa—caused quite a scandal. The federal government took measures against the weekly, as it had in the case of other provocative *Mladina* issues. On 8 March 1988, when Franci Zavrl, then *Mladina*'s editor-in-chief, was being questioned in court concerning his alleged cultivation of “a counter-revolutionary atmosphere” in Slovenia against the Yugoslav National Army, a group of demonstrators gathered outside the courthouse to read and sign a document entitled “For Democracy.”³⁰ While this small protest was eclipsed by mass demonstrations held later that same year, the document itself was crucial in that it was the product of a collaborative effort among all the different groups so far mentioned.

²⁸ Dušan Nečak, “A Chronology of the Decay of Tito's Yugoslavia: 1980–1991,” in *The Case of Slovenia* (Ljubljana: Nova Revija, 1991) 194.

²⁹ Ali Žerdin. *Generali brez kape: Čas Odbora za varstvo človekovih pravic* (Ljubljana: Krtina, 1997) 36.

³⁰ Personal interview with *Mladina* journalist Ali Žerdin.

Until this point, most of these groups operated separately and were linked to one of the major journals that provided them with a means of communication with the public. People would identify journals in connection with issues that their columnists advocated: *Nova Revija* dealt with questions of national identity and interwar history, *ČKZ* covered issues linked to neo-Marxist analyses of political economy and the environment, and *Mladina* covered the peace or anti-military movement and human rights issues. However, many found common ground in opposition to the Serbian proposal to change the federal constitution:

Žerdin: First, there were some people who could move in all different spheres, who were not close-minded ... and who didn't have problems communicating with anyone. During this time a debate began about reforming the federal constitution, and this became a joint platform, one with which everyone agreed and to which they could also contribute. The circles around *Nova Revija* were interested in protecting Slovenia's sovereignty, and the circles around *Mladina* ... that the principle of *ugovor vesti* (conscientious objection) be recognized in the constitution... Around February 1988 very different circles began to work together in a group entitled "For Democracy"... It is interesting because about fifty different organizations, a varied group, signed the same document. The text itself was not all that important. The fact that all these groups signed the same document meant that a very broad network of social movements, journals, editors, and associations found themselves on the same "front" at a particular moment in time. In the next few weeks, the rumors began about the dangers of a state coup...³¹

According to Žerdin, "For Democracy" was the product of a sort of political cooperation that only increased with time. It was the first time that the Institute of Marxist Studies and the Roman Catholic Church signed the same document, or, for that matter, the first time that a church organization signed a document jointly with secular organizations. In 1985, the Catholic Church had established the Commission for Justice and Peace (*Komisija za pravičnost in mir*), which

³¹ Personal interview with Ali Žerdin.

issued public statements on social issues, particularly on the condition of human rights in Slovenia and across Yugoslavia. The commission often supported efforts to call attention to particular issues in other media. For example, the commission's first public statement supported those (who happened to work with *Mladina*) who advocated civil service as an option to military service, citing Papal doctrine validating the refusal to bear arms.³² This same declaration encouraged Catholics to participate in peaceful efforts at social change based on humanitarian motives. When *Nova Revija*'s issue 57 was published, the commission issued a statement defending the right of its authors to express their views without sanction.³³ Until 1988, the commission expressed its views independently of those published elsewhere, thus forming part of public discourse, yet remaining outside the official-line media.

The federal government, the Serbian government, and the Yugoslav National Army disapproved of the emergent cooperation among these different groups and the nature of their individual and joint action. These three organizations thought that the actions of these Slovene groups fed separatist leanings and as such were subversive. The atmosphere became so polarized at the federal level that almost every proposition was reduced to a conflict of national interest, and dialogue on common issues became virtually impossible among increasingly more estranged republics.

When the Slovene delegates proposed at the federal youth congress and in the Federal Assembly that the article [133] be removed from the penal code, they were attacked in Belgrade. And they were attacked not because of the intrinsic content of their ideas but as *Slovenes*, as people offering unacceptable *Slovene* ideas. Their concern with freedom of speech or writing was attacked as an expression of their particular national identity. Hence, we have the paradox of Serb dogmatists agreeing with those Slovenes who considered a desire for democracy to be part of the Slovene national identity. Moreover, relying on a vulgar interpretation of history, they also argue that the current

³² *Komisija za pravičnost in mir pri Slovenski konferenci: Izjave* (Ljubljana: Družina, 1995) 9.

³³ *Komisija za pravičnost in mir pri Slovenski konferenci: Izjave* 10–11.

agitation of the Serbian leadership for “unity” and re-centralization is part of the Serb national identity.³⁴

The Committee for the Defense of Human Rights

It was not long before the federal government acted upon its assessment of the situation in Slovenia. On 31 May 1988, Janez Janša, one of *Mladina*’s journalists,³⁵ was arrested for allegedly having in his possession a confidential military document, 5044-3, which purportedly outlined the execution of “political security assessments” on the developments in Slovenia. This supposedly included registering and analyzing all “possible forms of enemy activity and all demonstrations, peaceful or otherwise.”³⁶

Public reaction was immediate. As Tine Hribar, one of the central figures at *Nova Revija* recounts, the editorial board met the following day and drafted a public statement:

We met at the office of *Nova Revija* (they were having a similar sort of meeting at the offices of *Mladina*) and formulated a declaration with three basic demands... In the declaration we wrote that we were outraged at the treatment of Janez Janša and that we were justifiably worried—on both the human and civic level—for our constitutional order and freedom of public speech. Thus we demanded “1) that Janez Janša be immediately released; 2) that if he will be accused on the basis of confiscated documents, he be allowed to defend himself as a free man; 3) that a public explanation be provided of the actions that have been carried out.”³⁷

More importantly, representatives of these main groups met that evening and drafted a joint petition. When official sources provided

³⁴ Kovač, “The Slovene Spring” 121.

³⁵ Janez Janša did not write exclusively for *Mladina* but was also on the editorial board of *Časopis za kritiko znanosti*. He was trained in defense studies, and his articles often criticized the Yugoslav National Army. He was to become a candidate for president of the ZSMS.

³⁶ Žerdin, *Generali brez kape* 22.

³⁷ Tine Hribar, “Post-Demosovska Slovenija II,” *Nova Revija* 121/122 (1992): v.

no information about the arrest and allowed no contact with Janša, this same group met on 3 June 1988 at the offices of *Mladina* and founded the Committee for the Protection of the Rights of Janez Janša. This organization was renamed the Committee for the Protection of Human Rights (CDHR) when two other persons were detained along with Janša for military trial: David Tašič, a *Mladina* journalist, and Ivan Borštner, a Slovene military officer.³⁸ Igor Bavčar, one of Janša's close colleagues at the time, was in charge of the committee.

Representatives from fifty-two organizations signed the founding petition of the committee: editorial boards, intellectual and academic associations, social movements, student and other political organizations, publishing houses, religious groups, as well as others. At the height of its influence the committee had 100,000 individual members and over 500 collective ones, by far the largest social movement formed independently of the state (though one must note here that many of the collective members were socialist organizations). The committee's capacity for mobilization was massive, given that the core group of individuals and organizations were very well coordinated and spoke from positions they had built in recent years.

The first tasks of the committee included issuing public statements and petitions in which they provided a constant source of information on the condition of the arrested. They also continually posed questions to the federal, republic, and military authorities: why the detainees were being held without being formally accused; why they were not allowed contact with family or friends; why they were to be tried in a military court that would be closed to the public; and why they were not allowed civil legal counsel. The questions and demands focused on the violation of the basic rights of the persons arrested as well as the violation of legal norms. Finally, although the four were being held and were to be tried in Ljubljana, the language of the military courts was (at the time) Serbo-Croatian. The four were not granted a trial in Slovene, and this was broadly considered to be an attack on Slovenes in general and on the liberalization processes cast as "subversive" in particular.

³⁸ Though not incarcerated, Franci Zavrl, *Mladina*'s editor-in-chief, was on trial with them.

In evaluating the efficacy of the committee in terms of its goals, one could argue that on one level it was unsuccessful. The four prisoners stood trial in Serbo-Croatian without recourse to civil legal counsel or the protection of civil law. They were found guilty and received sentences ranging from five months to four years, though some of the sentences were shortened.

On a different level, the effect of the committee was massive; in the two months following the initial arrests, Slovenia's political and social atmosphere changed dramatically. Tomaž Mastnak argued that the committee's success in these terms was due to the fact that it was able to mobilize an enormous segment of the population around one common topic: the protection of human rights of those being tried by the Yugoslav National Army.³⁹

Committee members organized parallel activities. For example, writers and intellectuals around *Nova Revija* mounted a series of protests through the Slovene Writers' Association, which held nightly meetings on its premises from 7 June to 27 July, when the four were freed after their trial. In addition, other literary and artistic associations which normally did not stray from the strictly literary and artistic spheres made public petitions of support: the Slavic Society of Koper, the Symphony Orchestra of RTV Slovenia, the Society of Slovene Composers, the Ivan Cankar Club of Cultural Workers from Celje, the Dance Theater of Ljubljana, and many others. The intensive activities of these associations were examples of analogous reactions in other spheres, particularly the academic one.⁴⁰

Catholic circles were active as well. People gathered every Friday at the Franciscan Church in Ljubljana's center for evenings of meditation and prayer for the prisoners. On 17 July, the night before the trial began, an all-night "vigil for justice and peace" was held. Religious lay organizations participated in the work of the committee as well as representatives from the church's Commission for Justice and Peace.

Many believed that the protection of human rights also extended to the issue of Sloveneness. During the trial, demonstrations were held every day outside the military barracks on Roška Street in the hopes that those inside could hear the public's vocal support, as only

³⁹ Mastnak, "Civil Society in Slovenia: From Opposition to Power" 312.

⁴⁰ Žerdin, *Generali brez kape* 127.

close relatives of the prisoners were allowed into the prison. People would parade in front of the barracks, sing Slovene songs, wave flags and banners, and give flowers to the armed soldiers guarding the entrance. There was even an honor guard that paraded before the barracks. As Žerdin recounts, the demonstrations had a logic of their own.

The movement on Roška Street had its own characteristics. In the last month and a half the committee had based its strategy upon the dry and tedious legal aspects of the situation. The idea that the movement can destroy the base of the system by naively appealing to the rule of law and the constitution had been sufficient only up to a point. But things became too complicated. The mass of people gathered at Roška Street was interested in something different. The language, the flag, the linden leaf. Symbols. Even the most restrained of liberals, skeptical of the discussion about threats to the language and to the Slovene nation, would feel a lump in their throat as they walked down Roška Street. "I am sad. I think that these boys became victims only because they are Slovenes," one of the protesters explained.⁴¹

The work of the committee did not end with the trial; on the contrary, it entered a new phase, shifting its focus to investigating the background and legality of the army's interventions in the civil sphere. Some of its members wished to expand committee activities even further to include a political platform. Here for the first time disagreements emerged as to whether or not the committee should remain "apolitical" and dedicate itself solely to the universal issue of human rights. It is interesting to note that despite a common desire by all those involved in the committee to improve the state of human rights in Yugoslavia, a difference of views emerged between the circles of *Nova Revija* and *Mladina* as far as developing the role the committee in more political directions was concerned.

Persons and groups associated with *Nova Revija* established Slovenia's first political associations (which later became political

⁴¹ Žerdin, *Generalni brez kape* 215.

parties).⁴² Among them were the *Slovenska demokratična zveza* (Slovene Democratic Alliance), formed 12 January 1989, and the *Socialdemokratska zveza Slovenije* (Social Democratic Alliance of Slovenia), formed 1 February 1989. According to Tomaž Mastnak, the formation of political associations (at that time parties were still illegal) was a natural result of differing interests: once the committee achieved its immediate goals, the emergence of a variety of political positions was to be expected.

Because of the mass mobilization structured around CDHR, the democratization process in Slovenia was saved. As this became clear, the structural tensions created inside the CDHR were set free: political identities were gradually articulated. In autumn 1988, the process of formation of political parties began. Its background was the growing autonomy and strength of the civil society as well as its inner differentiation and pluralization which created the need for political representation.⁴³

This political differentiation took place against the backdrop of increasing tension between the committee and the Slovene Party establishment. Rumors circulated about the complicity of the Slovene government with the federal army in monitoring the “alternative” and intellectual circles over the years, as well as in the process that led to the arrest and trial of the four.

These tensions culminated when Janez Janša was arrested again to fulfill his prison sentence. The government, fearing demonstrations, forbade the use of public buildings for meetings. However, ZSMS, in its capacity as a state-recognized body, called an “open meeting” on Congress Square in downtown Ljubljana. Over 10,000 people gathered to protest Janša’s second arrest. At this meeting a group of political organizations, including the Writers’ Association, the Slovene Democratic Alliance, the Social Democratic Alliance, the Slovene Farmers’ Alliance and the newly established Christian

⁴² The first political organization established was *Slovenska kmečka zveza* (Slovene Farmers’ Alliance), on 12 May 1988, under the aegis of the Socialist Alliance of Working People. The Farmers’ Alliance operated basically as a trade union for farmers, and was renamed *Slovenska ljudska stranka* (Slovene People’s Party).

⁴³ Mastnak, “Civil Society in Slovenia” 313.

Democratic Movement, signed and presented a joint petition entitled the May Declaration, in which they demanded a sovereign, democratic Slovene state.⁴⁴ The committee and ZSMS did not sign the declaration, evidence of the distinction in priorities for reform. While these groups had a common working objective in forming a democratic pluralistic government, they did not agree as to whether this was necessarily connected to Slovenia's sovereignty.

During this period, the Slovene Party establishment began to distance itself from the federal policies dictated by the Yugoslav League of Communists and, more importantly, the centralizing reforms of the federal constitution. This distancing continued when the Slovene Assembly passed amendments to Slovenia's constitution (as a republic), which fortified Slovenia's rights within Yugoslavia, including the right to call a state of emergency and the right to secession. The law on political organizations was passed soon thereafter (27 December 1989), permitting the existence of other political parties.

The definitive rupture came at the Fourteenth Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists in Belgrade, at which the Serbian and Slovene delegations could not come to a compromise concerning a common federal constitution; as a result, the Slovene delegation left in protest. That very same month the Slovene Assembly passed a law calling for parliamentary elections. The "runaway train," as writer Drago Jančar referred to the process of change, was picking up speed; the first Slovene multi-party elections were called for 8 April and 22 April, a scant three months later.

The DEMOS coalition was composed of five parties, most of which signed the 1989 May Declaration: the Slovene Democratic Alliance, the Social Democratic Party, the Slovene Christian Democrats, the Slovene Farmers' Alliance/People's Party, and the Greens of Slovenia. The other main groups of the committee, ZSMS and the new social movements, became the Liberal Party and the Independent List of New Social Movements, respectively. The Slovene League of Communists renamed itself the Party of Democratic Renewal,

⁴⁴ A previous May declaration was presented to parliament in Vienna in May 1917 by Slovene Anton Korošec. In this declaration a group of delegates demanded the formation of an autonomous South Slav state within the Austro-Hungarian Empire. For more on the 1917 May Declaration see Rogel, *The Slovenes and Yugoslavism*.

and the Socialist Alliance of Working People also transformed itself into a political party, forming a socialist bloc with the Party of Democratic Renewal.

The DEMOS coalition won the parliamentary elections, and Milan Kučan, head of the Slovene League of Communists, then the Party of Democratic Renewal, became the head of Slovenia's presidency. The newly-elected assembly passed legislation that further fortified Slovenia's position in Yugoslavia. When negotiations with the federal government remained at a stalemate, and after a protracted public debate, the Slovenian government held a plebiscite in December 1990, in which Slovenes voted overwhelmingly for independence. The outcome marked the beginning of a nation-building process that culminated in the declaration of Slovenia's independence on 25 June 1991.

In the referendum almost 90% of all Slovene citizens voted for Slovenia's independence from Yugoslavia, provided that no reasonable solution to the Slovene-Yugoslav tensions could be found during a period of six months. My intention in this essay has been to shed light on the events and processes that defined the Slovene public sphere during that time, the social context in terms of which one could better understand the outcome of the referendum. Presenting the positions of certain key social actors in the processes of political liberalization was not an attempt to reduce these processes to the work of a handful of people but to trace the development of certain social positions that constituted the Slovene social sphere. Furthermore, these positions and discourses received explicit political legitimacy and support through Slovenia's multi-party elections. Sketching out these different positions and pointing out their overlaps and disjunctures in social practice should allow one to better appreciate how expressions of Slovene national identity operated socially: situated in relation to often overlapping discourses of democracy, human rights, political reform and political practice. This sort of analytical frame of the Slovene public sphere can provide a grounded basis for further investigations concerning nation and national identity in Slovenia as well as for a history of Slovenia's nation-building process.

Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti

Works Cited

- Ampak: Zadeva* 57. January–February 1994: 38–40.
- Banac, Ivo. "Misreading the Balkans." *Foreign Policy* 93 (Winter 1993/1994): 173–82.
- . "Post-Communism as Post-Yugoslavism: The Yugoslav Non-Revolution of 1989–1990." Ed. Ivo Banac. *Eastern Europe in Revolution*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1992. 168–97.
- , ed. *Eastern Europe in Revolution*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1992.
- Benderly, Jill and Evan Kraft, eds. *Independent Slovenia: Origins, Movements, Prospects*. New York: St. Martin's, 1994.
- Bennet, Christopher. *Yugoslavia's Bloody Collapse: Causes, Course and Consequences*. New York: New York UP, 1995.
- Cohen, Leonard J. *Broken Bonds: The Disintegration of Yugoslavia*. 2nd ed. Boulder: Westview, 1995.
- Connor, Walker. *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.
- Dolgan, Marjan. Personal interview.
- Edwards, Lovett F. *Introducing Yugoslavia*. London: Methuen, 1954.
- Fink-Hafner, Danica and John R. Robbins, eds. *Making a New Nation: The Formation of Slovenia*. Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1997.
- Gow, James and Cathie Carmichael. *Slovenia and the Slovenes: A Small State and the New Europe*. London: Hurst, 2000.
- Grafenauer, Niko. Personal interview.
- Hribar, Tine. "Post-Demosovska Slovenija II." *Nova Revija* 121/122 (1992): i–ix.
- Jančar, Drago. personal interview.
- Komisija za pravičnost in mir pri Slovenski konferenci: Izjave*. (Cerkveni dokument št. 61). Ljubljana: Družina, 1995.
- Kovač, Miha. "The Slovene Spring." *New Left Review* 171 (1988): 113–28.
- Lytle, Paula Franklin. "U.S. Policy Toward the Demise of Yugoslavia: The 'Virus of Nationalism.'" *East European Politics and Societies*. 6.3 (Fall 1992): 303–18.
- Magaš, Branka. *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up 1980-1992*. London: Verso, 1993.
- Mastnak, Tomaž. "Civil Society in Slovenia: From Opposition to Power." *Studies in Comparative Communism*. 23.3–4: 305–17.

- Nečak, Dušan. "A Chronology of the Decay of Tito's Yugoslavia: 1980–1991." In *The Case of Slovenia*. Ljubljana: Nova Revija (1991) 191–99.
- Nova Revija*. 1 (1982).
- Nova Revija*. Introduction. 57 (1987): 1–2.
- Patterson, Patrick H. "The East is Read: The End of Communism, Slovenian Exceptionalism, and the Independent Journalism of Mladina." *East European Politics and Societies* 14.2 (Spring 2000): 411–59.
- Plut-Pregelj, Leopoldina and Carole Rogel. *Historical Dictionary of Slovenia*. Lanham, Maryland and London: Scarecrow, 1996.
- Ramet, Sabrina Petra. *Balkan Babel: The Disintegration of Yugoslavia from the Death of Tito to the War for Kosovo*. 3rd ed. Boulder: Westview, 1999.
- and Ljubica S. Adamovich, eds. *Beyond Yugoslavia: Politics, Economics, and Culture in a Shattered Community*. Boulder: Westview, 1995.
- Rogel, Carole. *The Slovenes and Yugoslavism: 1890–1918*. Boulder: East European Quarterly, 1977.
- Rusinow, Dennison, trans. "Memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Sciences." In ed. Gale Stokes. *From Stalinism to Pluralism: A Documentary History of Eastern Europe Since 1945*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford UP, 1996. 275–80.
- Seton-Watson, Hugh. *Nations and States*. London: Methuen, 1977.
- Smith, Anthony D. *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Stokes, Gale. *Three Eras of Political Change in Eastern Europe*. New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.
- , ed. *From Stalinism to Pluralism: A Documentary History of Eastern Europe since 1945*. 2nd ed. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 1996.
- , John Lampe, and Dennison Rusinow with Julie Mostov. "Instant History: Understanding the Wars of Yugoslav Succession." *Slavic Review* 55.1 (Spring 1996): 136–60.
- Šeligo, Rudi. Personal interview.
- Tomc, Gregor. "The Politics of Punk." Ed. Jill Benderly and Evan Kraft. *Independent Slovenia: Origins, Movements, Prospects*. New York: St. Martin's, 1994. 113–34.
- Woodward, Susan. *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution after the Cold War*. Washington: Brookings Institution, 1995.

Žerdin, Ali. *Generali brez kape: Čas Odbora za varstvo človekovih pravic*.

Ljubljana: Krtina, 1997.

---. personal interview.

---. "Revija Politike." *Mladina* 37 (1991): 26–28.

POVZETEK

USTVARJANJE ZGODOVINE: DISKURZI O DEMOKRACIJI IN NARODU V SLOVENIJI

Članek predstavlja glavne dogodke in procese, ki so zaznamovali slovensko javno sfero v osemdesetih letih z namenom, da na tak način obravnava dejavnike, ki sestavljajo družbeni kontekst, v katerem so se razvijali izrazi slovenske nacionalne identitete. Tovrstni pristop predpostavlja, da sta slovenska nacionalna identiteta in slovenski nacionalizem družbena fenomena, ki ju oblikujejo tisti družbeni akterji, ki se s tema fenomenoma poistovetijo. Družbena konceptualizacija nacionalne identitete lahko zagotovi potrebno alternativo k prevladujočim teorijam o naravi nacionalizmov in nacionalnih identitet v bivših jugoslovanskih republikah. Čeprav avtorica ne podcenjuje nevarnosti, ki jih predstavljajo izrazito izključevalne oblike nacionalizma (zlasti na območju bivše Jugoslavije), trdi, da lahko analiza nacionalne identitete v slovenskem javnem prostoru v odnosu z (delno) prekrivajočimi se diskurzi o demokraciji, človekovih pravicah in političnih reformah zagotovi boljšo osnovo za nadaljne analize o naciji in nacionalni identiteti na Slovenskem.