Milena Dragićević Šešić

Cultural policies, cultural identities and monument building - new memory policies of Balkan countries

In the new Balkan democracies – countries in transition, in the last fifteen years, a reflection on values in cultural policy making has rarely entered theoretical and research field. It was usually left to artists, media and politicians (usually of opposition) to express their dissatisfaction with policy solutions and recommendations. It is only recently that important research had been undertaken regarding value orientations of citizens and its relations with implicit and explicit cultural policies (Golubović, Jarić, 2010).

The substantial debate among researchers, cultural community and policy makers didn't happen even during the processes of evaluation of national cultural policies, when the cultural policy as a system was evaluated and the extent of its transition toward transparent and democratic model, etc. However, in the times of value changes, it is exactly the ethics of cultural policy which should be the main point of an evaluative research and debates. Focusing the attention in new democracies on the issues of "democratization, de-etatisation and decentralization processes" (Dragićević Šešić 2004; Đukić, V. 2003) considered mostly as packages of cultural policy measures and as the unquestionable primary task of cultural policy – the debate and the research emphasized formal problems of power transfer, privatization in culture, capacity building and organizational development, while the basic postulates of the cultural policies and the values it is conceived upon were left outside of the cultural policy field (as they are already known, adopted and consensually accepted and "practiced" within society). Memory politics was left mostly to Government or to other ministries, such as ministries of education (national curricula) or ministries dealing with soldiers, wars and "national heroes" (in every Balkan country those are usually secretariats belonging to different ministries).

However, the development of cultural studies contributed to the development of the research in the cultural field mostly focusing on arts, on artistic and media "texts" as forms of representation or construction of different identities: national, regional, racial, gender, generational. Choosing specific cultural phenomena considered as signifying practices, such as Eurovision song contest, Balkan as a film genre (Dakovic[1]), music folk tradition, telenovelas etc. cultural study research produced a large body of texts read mostly within academic conferences. Culture of memory as a research field was developed mostly outside cultural studies, within sociology (T. Kuljić) or anthropology research (G. Djerić) – but entering finally cultural study research and teaching.

As Oliver Bennett remarks (Bennett, 2004:237), those two absolutely different worlds, although constituting the field of cultural policy, do not inform and stimulate each other. Those two research paths are rarely crossing each other, leaving the decision making process supported by mostly statistical data (mapping exercises), while cultural studies[2] produced critics and theoreticians for whom employability as such is questionable in all the countries of new democracies.

---

[1] Numerous textes published in *Proceedings of Faculty of Drama Arts* (Belgrade), or in *Culturelink* (Zagreb), see: http://www.komunikacija.org.rs/komunikacija/casopisi/zbornikfdu/ and www.culturelink.org

[2] New departments in Cultural studies were created on the basis of already existing departments for sociology and theory of culture (Ljubljana, Belgrade) and comparative literature (Zagreb, Tuzla), but also as the new interdisciplinary programs (Rijeka, Belgrade), or within cultural anthropology and cultural history departments (Sofia, Zagreb, Belgrade…)

Cultural policy processes in all Balkan countries were relatively similar, as well as debates which revolved more around re-transmission of European ideas in spite of the fact that they were not rooted in the real cultural practices (intercultural dialogue, creative cities, creative industries, mobility). Analyzing evaluation reports it was obvious that cultural policies were preoccupied with so-called Europeanization process, mostly centered on following topics: creation of a new (arm's length) model of cultural policies, a converting of a culture to a market economy, a decentralization of culture through "re-allocation of the responsibilities to the municipalities" , reform of the system of financing culture, boosting sponsorship through the involvement of the corporate world, institutional reform …

Cultural policy perspectives: ethnic vs. transcultural
Limitations of the national frame (Robins K. 2006: 257)

Rarely do texts, such as Alexander Kiossev's (1995), put on the agenda the issue of "self-colonization" as one of the problematic issues within the dynamics of globalization and national identity protection (seen even today as the major aim of cultural policy especially in post-soviet and post-Yugoslavian independent countries).

As it happened during XIX centuries, when specific national cultural identities were constructed throughout the continent, Balkan nations, without the big foreign pressure (as it might be the case only for Greece), had selected "the joint European heritage" as pillars for their cultural identity, besides folklore and national language: Antique Greek heritage and heritage of Renaissance – which was totally foreign to their people, especially those belonging to orthodox Christianity (Bulgarians, Serbians, Romanians). Byzantium heritage in the newly created educational and cultural institutional system was not on the agenda, and the need to re-take, at least partially, the elements from medieval cultures (in Serbia it was "Svetosavlje", in Bulgaria – St Cyril and Method…) – came only later in history, as part of the task to endorse the sense of the nationhood by introducing in collective consciousness the (lost) memory on independent medieval Balkan states.

Paradoxically, although created looking upon Western models, Balkan cultures (but also Baltic, as well as central European) emphasized its ethnic cultural differences using culture as the principal tool for self-recognition. That is the reason why culture and artists were seen as "fathers of the nations" (Dragicevic Sesic, 2009), which was reinforced during communism (special status of arts and artists due to ideological reasons). Still today, cultural policy is "ethnically-centered", while research policy within humanities often emphasizes the national cultural identity as its main priority (Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia…). Cultural diversity policies and policies to support ethnic minorities exist – as policies of folklorization, not as policies of the integration of minorities within the mainstream art scenes.

So, although Europeization is officially on the agenda – the issues within public policies such as real support to cultural diversity, transnationalism or transculturalism (Robins, K. 2006: 254-283) are missing. But, on the other hand, legacy of the "world culture" education, as it was instituted in XIX century, still forms (educate) very "informed" cultural practitioners, but general public is also more open to both East and West and North and South (than in the "old" EU countries whose cultural policies put emphasis on transculturalism, inclusivity etc. while school system and universities are based on the "national knowledge" or combined with "Anglo-American" knowledge[3] as codified in academic journals).

---

[3] It is difficult to see curricula the writers or painters outside of Western world in Western countries primary or secondary school (music might be partially the exception with Chopin or Tchaikovsky).

In this respect it can be said that Eastern cultural policies are Ianus faced policies – turned to the national identity and European cultural values in the same time – homophobic and antidiscriminatory in the same time. To differ from cultural policy of socialism, which had, besides it ideological, also explicit ethical and esthetical platforms, cultural policy of contemporary liberal societies tries to distance itself from any kind of explicit aesthetical platform – wanting to prove that freedom of creative expression is the fundamental principle and value, while support to diversities should be, in the same time, the starting point and the policy outcome.

However, in the new democracies, the clear platform for supporting contemporary art production is linked to identity politics, both centred toward inner situation and toward outside world. It is clear in the relation toward international manifestations on all levels: from Venice biennials toward Euro song. It is not only about representation of the arts and artists, it is more about "national" (ethnic) representation through arts. "Venice Biennial seems to reinforce the idea of nomadism, but its structure supports the contrary" (Egrikavuk I. & Kotretsos G. 2007: 2).

The fate of First Roma Pavilion in Venice (http://www.romapavilion.org/, accessed 2.02 2010) is significant in this respect. The Art and Culture network program of the Open Society Institute had funded the Roma Pavilion (selection of 16 artists from throughout the Europe) hoping that the ministries of culture of the countries from where the selected artists were coming would contribute. It did not happen and it was significant to see to what extent was a lack of interest to re-present participation of Roma artists from both public administration and media from Romania, Serbia, and Bosnia. No reception for Roma artists by public officials of their countries (what is a norm for artists participating in Biennial in "national" pavilions). The following Biennial, there was no Roma pavilion as none of the countries, even of those participating in The Decade of Roma inclusion, showed any intent to re-consider the importance of such a project for real Roma inclusion in contemporary art processes.

The next Roma pavilion will happen in 2011, also financed by Open Society Institute, but this time with support of UNESCO Venice office[4]. Again, the cultural representation of Roma within Venice biennial framework is solely civil society endeavour, as this does not correspond to the public vision of the national cultural representation.

---

[4] As the organizers of the Pavilion are the two NGOs from Macedonia and Serbia which included artists from other Central and Eastern European countries in their selection, UNESCO demanded for its support at least official endorsement letters from respective Governments. This was obtained through the long process of negotiation, mostly from ministries for social affairs, human rights etc., and less from the ministries of culture. (Interview with organizers of Roma pavilion 2011, Budapest, 1st May 2010).

Cultural policy perspectives2: Memory policies

The interest for the politics of memory & musealisation in European art practices (Huyssen, A. 2001), humanities and social sciences has been raised in last twenty years. The Balkans – as the territory where new states were created and both majority and minority ethnic groups are mobilized in search of identity (Appadurai, 2006) those issues are of major concerns. In humanities and social sciences, culture of memory (Kuljić) had been explored from different perspectives, as the form of memorization of social practices to forms of constructions of social, political and cultural identities. Proliferation of the research within contemporary anthropology, sociology, cultural studies, peace studies etc, brought in focus of attention the places of memories or methods of remembrance (media construction of memories) and, in a far less extent, policies of memory and oblivion as part of a cultural policy of states, regions and cities.

However, in societies traumatized by long term politics of oblivion and historical taboos, where private memories, collective memories and recorded, normative memories where not in accordance, social conflicts and wars, ethnic hatred and polarization within public opinion and official opinion, brought very specific interest for the memory studies. In this sense memory was studied as a key element in a construction of national, ethnic or any other group identity which is opposed to other group identities sharing same cultural or political (geographical and historical) space. In Balkan cultural studies[5] construction and representation of the past, and reinterpretation of the historical facts (events, historical figures, notions etc.) within different group identities, in educational system and in the media, was one of the most studied phenomena (Djerić, G., Stojanović, D., etc.), but it was not properly documented and researched within cultural policies (memory policies are often developed without having specific "departments" within ministries, embedded in different instruments and measures, without clear statements, strategies or budgetary lines).

Cultural policies of countries in transition have not dare to touch the issues of memory politics directly. Even when intention to contribute toward reinforcing national cultural identity was expressed openly, usually this part of national cultural strategy was not defined (neither in law or in priorities nor through instruments). It was not clear whether it meant destruction and removal of the "memory of the other", or just negligence, or conservation but without support to make this heritage living... Those are three extremely different strategies regarding "dissonant heritage" (Tunbridge J.E. and G.J. Ashworth,1996), and when applied, they might provoke resistance or fear and further exodus (like in case of Bosnia and Herzegovina, where throughout the territories the monuments representing historical figures or culture of "other" had been destroyed or removed).

The major instruments of memory policy as a part of a national cultural policy which intend to change (re-shape) collective identity (through changing collective memories) are:

---

[5] The first Balkan Cultural studies conference was held at Bilgi university in Istanbul in December 2005.

a) A creation or a representation of certain types of narratives (through financing of film production, repertory theatres, translations, or "capital" book projects, museum collections, etc.)
b) Renaming of institutions, streets and squares, parks and bridges...
c) Creation of new types of festivities, awards, celebrations, "homage" policies...
d) Re-appropriation of the institutions, sites or even destruction of "dangerous" memories
e) Policy toward memory spaces, burial sites (mausoleums, graveyards, etc.)[6] and monument building (or removing)
f) And all other governmental and interministerial decisions where Ministry of culture has influential role, like in case where the national anthem is decided, flag or other insignia to represent the country and its national identity.

Within policies of memories in the Balkan countries, which intend to underline the new values, to influence collective consciousness, "monument" policies are most often used for multiple reasons: with monument erected on public space, the message is easily transferred to the community; it gives easy possibility for political promotion (political PR); it gives "face" to new values; it demonstrates power; it gives illusion of creating something for eternity; it facilitates representation; provokes "the other"; controls the other, etc.

This paper will deal with monument policies in the Balkans (focusing ex-Yugoslavian countries) in the period of transition (last 20 years) which is period of nationalistic upraises, wars and reconciliations. Exploring re-construction of memories through official and populist monument projects: from Kosovo polje in 1989 till Alexander the Great Monument Skopje in 2010, the research will try to prove the mis-use of memories and historical representations as a form of hate speech, and to deconstruct the manipulation with memories in order to create a new "national", ethnic construct using monument as a strategic tool.

In the same time, research will deal with art and artists challenging official policies of "monumentalisation" of historical memories (Monument Group Belgrade, Nebojsa Seric Soba & Dunja Blazevic Sarajevo, Sanja Ivekovic, Andrea Kulundzic) creating their own "monuments" to "international community", to the national resurrection, or even to forgotten working class (billboards of Andrea Kulundzic as monuments to annihilated working class etc.). Monuments as artistic projects, permanent and ephemeral, are part of carnivalization of the protest (Dragicevic Sesic, 2001), as there are no legal platforms for debating or presenting the major cultural policy issues and specifically intercultural issues linked to major state projects in public space. (Contemporary Balkan societies, as

---

[6] Burial policies and commemorative (repetitive) policies are also extremely important part of memory policies: from collective burial places (after war massacres in battles (Monument to Sremski front) or genocide (Jasenovac); memorial places of concentration camps (Jasenovac) or areas of (Kozara); to individual burial places in mausoleums (Flower house of Tito), or in Alley of the Great man, rarely in family graveyards to the ashes dispersed above rivers or sea to reinforce the link with this personality and the territory.

societies of spectacle and of media saturation, demand spectacular and entertaining projects, even when they want to deal with most serious and problematic social, historical or political issues. The quickly changing governments want to use monuments as spectacular traces of their existence and achievements).

Method of the research will be based on categories and models identified by Jasenka Kodrnja (2010) and Svetlana Slapšak (2009:17) – re-adapted and further developed for the needs of this research, identifying three different models (with several submodels) of behaving toward culture(s) within certain territory:

Models of anticulture:
- destroying traces of previous culture
- Model of appropriation (through renaming and re-contextualization)
- Model of ignoring the other and creating the new SELF
- Model of creating monument in spite of the other (to provoke the other

Models of "culturalization"
- Model of de-contextualization and univerzalization (from church and mosque to museum)
- Model of respect of the heritage of other[7] - recently German culture in Vojvodina

Model of dissent – creative dialogue
- Model of counter-culture, opposing within its own culture – intending to overcome the frames and canons, limits of its own culture (avanguarde art, alternative and countercultural art movements, progressive civil society movements, etc.)
- Model of subcultures (subcultures making safe heaven, ghetto for themselves, but not questioning, or even wishing to communicate with dominant culture).

The research will take in account all major (state) monument projects in countries of the ex Yugoslavia, but also all the destructions of the major monuments (classified), cultural and religious institutions, as well as those actions of civil society (constructive and destructive) which are supported or clearly opposed by public policies. We would like to show how cultural policies, aiming to reinforce national identity as a "new state project", try to represent their new crucial values through monument building strategy as one of the key instruments, but also through allowing populist movements to organize monument removal strategy as their key "spontaneous" practice, not pursued by law.

However, some aspects of the monument policies we will leave for the future research. As topography of the nation is mapped with monuments which are contributing toward characterization of the nation, it would be very important to analyze monument policy as gender policy within national identity policy, as nation and gender are both social constructions and are embedded in each other (Julie Mostov). It will be also important to

---

[7] Better examples for this can be found outside the Balkans: Jewish culture in contemporary Poland, or Liiv culture in Latvia...

link research of ceremonies as part of public policies of memories, as well as social practices linked to monuments in public space, as well as contrasting national to international policies regarding European and Balkan memories (from Day of Europe to Hague tribunal judgement to war criminals and its public media broadcasting). But in this research we will just tackle those issues.

I phase: Yugoslav socialist monument policy (From divided memories to colonized subconsciousness)

In the socialist tradition, monument building throughout Yugoslavia had to make a clear statement about joint effort of all Yugoslav nations in antifascist battle and in a creation of a community of people based on joint values such as solidarity, brotherhood and unity, equality, etc. **Yugoslav socialist monument policy** was a part of a cultural policy and many memorials had been created after public competitions where all the best sculptors and architects of former Yugoslavia participated. Memorials of Bogdan Bogdanović[8], Dušan Džamonja[9] and Miodrag Živković monuments to battles or war victims,[10] etc., or numerous projects of Vojin Bakić[11] constructed throughout Croatia had multiple roles, commemorating battles and achievements of partisan movement, but also representing socialist ideology of brotherhood and unity (partisans, more than victims represented all the faiths and all the nations). In the same time those monuments celebrated an artistic freedom and creative liberties achieved in the former Yugoslavia. This monument policy was part of a larger attempt of activities of historical reconstruction (Connerton, P. 1989: 25) and social memorization: production of official history. Those two had been developed in accordance through archiving, documenting, exhibiting and celebrating only certain moments in social history (from peasant riots in medieval times to history of working class movements, antifascist movements, but mostly World War II events etc.)

---

[8] Such as Kameni cvet (Flower in Stone), Memorial area Jasenovac Croatia, Memorial complex Dudik, Vukovar Croatia; Monument to Jewish victims of fascists terror, Belgrade, Jewish cemetery, 1952), Memorial to victims in occupied Belgrade, 1959.), memorials in Prilep, Mostar, Kruševac, etc.

[9] Monument to unknown political prisoner, Zagreb 1953; Monument to war victims, Jajinci 1957. i 1980; Monument to December victims, Zagreb 1961; Commemorative graveyard, camp Dahau 1959. i Dahau 2 1964; Monument to revolution, Moslavina, Podgarić 1967 ; Monument to fascism victims Podhum, Rijeka, 1968; Monument to battle of Stubica (1573). 1969; Monument to revolution Kozara-Mrakovica 1972.; Monument to victory and victims of Srem front 1974;

[10] Battle of Sutjeska Monument (Miodrag Živković) and Memorial house (architect Ranko Radović, painter Krsto Hegedušić) opened in 1974 in Valley of the Heroes, Tjentište, National Park Sutjeska. The same author had realized several monumental projects: Kadinjača battle, Kragujevac shooting memorial, etc. http://miodrag-zivkovic.com/biografija.htm

[11] At the beginning of 1990' a big part of Bakić works in Croatia had been destroyed: monument to fallen soldiers in Čazma blown-up in 1991; monument to Bilogora partisans in Bačkovica (near Bjelovar), ruined and melted in 1992; the buste of great partisan poet Ivan Goran Kovačić in Karlovac; Bjelovar citizen, honouring fallen soldiers and victims of fascism, dynamited and melted; Gudovčan, monument raised in memory to the Serbs shooted in april 1941, in the courtyard of the ortodox church in Gudovac, dynamited in 1991; Monument to the Victory of the People of Slavonia, Kamensko, dynamited and sold to the otpad in 1991; Monument Petrova Gora 1992.

Consequently, the monuments from the previous (royal) periods of history had been slowly removed from collective consciousness, by urban rehabilitation projects marginalizing their positions[12], by neglect[13] or even by removal, as it was the case with Monument to Ban Jelačić in Zagreb. The monuments destroyed by enemy armies or in bombardments during World War II had disappeared even from history books, postcards and thus from collective memory (such as monuments to different Serbian kings in cities like Zrenjanin[14], Negotin, etc.).

This practices and methods of organized oblivion (Connerton P. 1989: 26) contributed to withdrawal of private memories in "opposition memory practices". Part of this "organized oblivion" was developed due to a wish of a society "to remove from its memory everything what could divide individuals" (Halbwachs, M. 1925: 39), such as massive killings of Serbian peasants in Hercegovina during World War II[15]) and, to connect with new values, and consequently to link "with other traditions which suits better its needs and aspirations in that moment" (Hallbwachs, M. 1925: 358).

Limits of socialist monument policy as part of memory policy in Yugoslavia are best represented in an avoidance of a trauma – conflictual memory, which was an essential part of the monument policy in socialist period. The late decision to create monument to Sremski front, had shown only very late confidence of socialist power to enter in dialogue with most hidden trauma of Belgrade society – private memory on "useless killings" – "deliberate sending to death" of Belgrade bourgeois youth to fight Germans on the open front in the plane, just to secure Tito's position against Red Army so that it could not appear as liberator.

So, Yugoslav nations, regions and cities had lived throughout socialism with **divided memories:** private memories which kept alive "dissonant memories and heritage" – sometimes even taboozied (certain religious events, royal histories of different dynasties, inter-ethnic conflicts and mass graves, etc.) making them present in collective sub consciousness, and, on the other side: collective "official" memories, stimulated through

---

[12] Monument to the dead soldiers in World War I – both German and Serbian, raised by General Meckenzie in 1915, was difficult to incorporate in mainstream history (why and how ennemy had praise Serbian soldiers), so it stays besides main roads to the forest of Košutnjak, not integrated in the urbanistic plan of the area in adequate manner.

[13] The most significant monument for such a policy is Monument of four faith, erected in 1933 by womens organisations in Čačak, in honour to soldiers of World War One, belonging to all four faiths, killed fighting for freedom of Slavonic nations from Austro-hungarian empire. The four faith symbols (Christian ortodoh, Christian catholic, Jewish and Islam) had been put on four sides of monument. Two of them removed during the occupation period in World War II (Jewish and Muslim), but never restored during socialism, although, as monument, extremely compatible with ideas of socialist state. It was only in 2007 that artists had restored this within the framework of art manifestation: Biennial of Nadežda Petrović in Čačak.

[14] This was connected also to a process and politics of oblivion, already started in Yugoslavian kingdom – city of Zrenjanin was again renamed, as previous name was given by king (Petrovgrad) to replace hungarian name of the city (Becskerek). So monument to king Peter would not have a sense in a socialist city which does not carry his name any more, but name of socialist revolutionary: Žarko Zrenjanin.

[15] It was only in 1989 when remains of Serbian civilians killed in 1942 had been excavated from the caves and properly buried. Those ceremonies had raised nationalistic emotions – as those ceremonies had been organized as ultimate proof that „communits", or „Tito regime" deliberately was hiding „Croatian crimes committed on Serbs", and even prevented Serbs to bury properly its victims.

educational system, public representation events, ceremonies, historical research (memories of revolutionaries) and monument building policies.

In 80's, after the death of Tito and further federalisation, Yugoslavian "idea" - concept, although having a specific, autonomously developed socialist system, was not supported by national political and cultural elites. The last ones "grabbed" the idea of Central Europe as a cultural space[16], developed by Central European dissidents and Western scholars to support Czech, Polish and Slovak efforts to distant themselves from Soviet (Eastern) cultural sphere. This idea had found a fertile ground among intelligentsia in Croatia, Slovenia, Vojvodina and Belgrade, as they, belonging to "elite cultural model" (western cultural canon with socialist consumerism as a life-style), felt different from Southern and Eastern parts – Balkans, where different life style had prevailed, based more on social, communal gatherings and popular (folk) culture, connected with general lower life standard! Marketing agencies started developing two types of marketing campaigns for commodities, for zone A (Western parts) and Zone B (Eastern parts), *Mladina,* Slovenian youth journal made a famous map, cutting Yugoslavia in two parts already in 1987 (when 97 % of Slovenian population were still expressing pro-yugoslavian feelings)...

The revision of views on history and ways of its celebrations, developed throughout former Yugoslavia[17], as opening of media was immediately misused for nationalistic purposes. The debates linked to the medieval ethnic histories, but specifically to the World War II as historical period and way of its remembrance in national/republic histories and school manuals started dominating in new "public spaces" – mostly youth print media: *Polet, Vreme* and *Start* in Zagreb, *NON, Duga, NIN* in Belgrade, *Nova revija* and *Mladina* in Ljubljana, etc. First thing to enter in this relatively free press, had been tabooized historical moments of World War II, moments kept in private family memories ("whispering memories") where usually its own group was represented as a victim. Those parallel histories, such as about Draža Mihajlović chetniks movement, or Bleiberg massacre of Croatian ustacha (collaborationist) army, together with numerous chetniks (royal, nationalist Serbian) squads, succeeding to reach Austrian territory together with German withdrawing army[18].

Feuilletons, memory books and belletristics exploring history started flooding cultural space (Dragićević Šešić, ...) and **colonizing the collective subconscousness** with half-truths, or whispering facts which were impossible to verify... Vuk Drašković novels in Serbia (together with D. Ćosić, even S. Selenić), created a space where book with simple

---

[16] M. Kundera, C. Magris, and in Yugoslavia Laszlo Vegel,

[17] The book of Franjo Tuđman (Bespuća povijesne zbiljnosti), in that moment nationalistic dissident, questioned the official number of victims in Croatian State concentration camp Jasenovac during World War II. Official data was 700 000 victims, most of it Serbs, Jews and Gypsies, while Tuđman brought the chiffre of 30 000. Todays official Croatian data is 70 000, while in Serbian manuals the chiffre of 700 000 remained.

[18] Thinking they found safe heaven with British troops controlling the Austrian territory, they been surprised and easily massacred by Yugoslav partisans who were invited by British to take over those "war prisoners".

name: Book about Milutin[19] could be absolute bestseller of any time in Serbia, while, on the other side, in Croatia, books of Ivan Aralica had same meaning and significance.

Then, after 1989, and after first multiparty elections held in 1990, in many republics of former Yugoslavia (especially Slovenia and Croatia), the attempt to join processes of westernization/democratization and distancing from Yugoslavia and Yugoslavian common heritage, first was expressed through relations toward socialist past. So, a process of renaming of the schools, streets, squares and institutions which kept memory on antifascist movements and heroes of World War II had quickly started.

The major significant event was a change of the name of the Square of fascists' victims in Zagreb. On 10th December 1990 (Human rights day) The Square got a new name: the Square of Croatian great persons19 (Sinovčić, 2000). That was seen in other parts of Yugoslavia as a sign of Croatian nationalism, which denies the importance of antifascists battles, and minimizes victims of the fascism (mostly of Jewish, Serbian and Gypsy origin).

This was just a paradigm for all what will happen later in the 90's, when colonized collective sub consciousness through media war and hatred speech, supported by irresponsible academics and media (Dragićević Šešić M. 1994) had found its politicians to create abrupt and violent decisions and soldiers to execute them. Policy of memory quickly was transferred (materialized) in present national identity policy within whom monument policy had one of the most important places.

II phase - Post-socialist transition – re-creation of national identities

The dissolving of the country had brought instability, as spatial frame started to change not only by secession of different republics, but also by wars which changed their frontiers, at least temporarily. The war destruction and destruction due to economic transition changed the urban spaces, which further destabilized communities for whom relationship to space and its objects – tangible, non-movable heritage (buildings, especially churches, city walls, apartment buildings, factories, shops etc.) enabled collective memory, gave confidence and comfort – feeling of identity.   Partition of the country, with destruction of both temporal and spatial framework, questioned values and collective memories, physical destruction of cities, monuments and all other tangible objects which connected people with environment, destructed even possibility to keep the memory alive (Connerton:54).

The new nationalistic ideologies have contributed that most of the monuments and memory sites defined in previous socialist system became "dissonant heritage", as well as the buildings and sacral objects linked to the "memory of other". Even the bridge in

---

[19] A book about Serbian peasant speaking „universal truths" about Sebianhood such as: we are losing in peace what we have gained in wars, Serbia is the main loser in Yugoslavia, We gave up our identity for Yugoslavianhood, etc.

Mostar, built in Ottoman time – once pride of the city community regardless of ethnicity, in the war situation became just a symbol of one group and then destroyed by other.

There were several methods and approaches in re-constructing the new social, cultural and national identities in newly created nation-states of the former Yugoslavia, through implementing "monument policy" as a main state cultural policy.

The first model (approach) – *anti-culture* (Kodrnja:), wanting to destroy all traces of the common (socialist, antifascist, communist...) past – had two major strategies: appropriation strategy and annihilation strategy.

Appropriation strategy was characterized by the disappearance of red stars from monuments (repainted in yellow as in case of Slovenian Route of friendship[20]..., or covered with catholic crosses in Croatia)[21], covering of antifascists slogans with slogans representing homage to Croatian people (that had often preceded visits of recently elected Franjo Tuđman to a certain city).
Through all those activities re-contextualization of the monuments was happening, so that original meaning of the monument was lost – and instead to memorize the antifascist battle, it became monument to memorize glorious Croatian past…

Annihilation strategy. The second way of dealing with a past and its monuments was a "spontaneous" cleansing of the territory by destruction of all the elements which might seem non-Croatian, non-Slovenian and non-Serbian. With exception of Istria, this was happening throughout Croatia, where even in the Serb populated areas population have seen in socialist time monuments symbols of "de-nationalization", "yugoslavization" and atheisation, the three major issues which were threatening and nearly "destroying Serbian identity and Serbian presence in Croatia".

Those battles for new identities, done mostly through monument policies, have taken two different paths: Serbian identity in Croatia asked protection from Serbian orthodox church and intellectuals from "motherland" Serbia (mostly from Academy of Science), while Croatian identity had a state framework to be developed, as it was the case in Serbia also. The difference was that Serbian state officially proclaimed continuity with Yugoslavia, that party on the power throughout 90's was a "symbol of continuity" of both Communist Party and Union of Socialist People of Serbia – so there was no official clarity that policy toward socialist past should be changed. However, monument to Boris

---

[20] Slovenian cultural and memory policies, should not be connected easily with policies in another Balkan countries, as it has been shown in the research of Hanno Hardt, where he presented street photographies whose images should construct an image of Slovenes lives through their cultural or social practices.
The photographs show Socialist leaders whose monuments survived the political change (4, 5, 6), the presence of Yugo culture (8, 9) and religion (10, 11, 12, 13), local traditions with socio-cultural implications (14, 15, 16, 17, 18), which tie many Slovenes to their respective communities (19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24). This text negates the war-torn landscapes that typify Western mass media imagery of 'the Balkans'.
[21] This same events happened only later in Serbia, as Milošević officially had kept socialist traditions (as Head of Socialist Party of Serbia), when opposition had taken city of Belgrade in 1997, and when Vuk Drašković organized taking down of a red star from City parliament as a public event

Kidrič (Slovenian) communist and statesman was removed from its place, and, due to efforts of Museum of Contemporary Arts, placed among sculptures in the park surrounding museum, till that moment exclusively park of abstract modernist sculptures. In municipalities in Serbia, the monument to Tito had been removed from main squares, as the street named by Tito returned to their previous names (except in Sarajevo and Skopje), while all eight cities in each republic and region of Yugoslavia which added Tito's name (Titovo Velenje, Titova Korenica, Titov Drvar, Titov Vrbas, Titovo Užice, Titova Mitrovica, Titograd and Titovo Velenje, had droped the prefix, or returned the old name as in case of Titograd – Podgorica).

Situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina was and is still complex, but in cities and regions where only one ethnic army had dominated, the codes and symbols of "mother-nation" had been taken and local historical figures if from minority ethnic group, removed from their pedestals, as it had happen to Aleksa Šantić monument in Mostar. Paradox was that Aleksa Šantić was poet who already in XIX century had celebrated multiculturalism, and whose poems: Emina and Stay here! (Ostajte ovdje) have been celebrated throughout socialist period as promoting intercultural sensitivity and understanding.

The names of the streets in Banja Luka, are taking the citizen in medieval and heroic Serbian history, while traces of Croatian or Bosnian (Muslim) presence had disappeared from the city[22].

In Serbia, schizophrenic Milošević policies, praising in the same time socialism and nationalism, made resemblance of continuity, while in reality, conquered and colonized collective subconsciousness with idealized past, and started to search for a new roots of Serbianhood and new features of identity. So, although Milošević government have not created any memory or monument policy, liberating the field for nationalism, and "giving wings" to nationalist in cultural institutions, created platform for anticultural behaviour (Slapšak and Kodrnja), where local politicians or opinion-makers celebrated even fascist (like Ljotić in Smederevo) or controversial soldiers-politicians, as antifascists judged and killed just for being Serbian patriots (Draža Mihajlović).

The cities wanting to join the search for Serbianess, and to show their patriotism, started "ordering" monuments from the sculptor Drinka Radovanović, whose name was in artistic circles unknown (and still is), but known among nationalist as a good (meaning realistic) sculptor for historical figures such as Vožd Karadjordje, leader of the First Serbian resurrection (upraise) against Turks in 1804. So, monuments to "people's heroes" from World War II have disappeared, replaced by sculptures of heroes from First and Second Serbian Uprising against the Turks, especially as the schools having (bearing) their names started quickly – without any outside pressure to change names[23].

---

[22] Irfan Horozović *Prognani grad (Exiled city), stories*. Antibarbarus, Zagreb 1994.
[23] Both primary schools in new Belgrade attended by my children had changed their names: the first one, having name „25th May", what was the Day of the Youth and celebration of Tito's birthday became „Duško Radović" (famous Belgrade poet and literary figure), while the second one kept the name Vladimir Ilich Lenin for a long time, as we, as parents, refused to participate in extra expenses linked to a name

Consequently, through annihilation and appropriation strategies, the topos, the landscapes in cities and regions throughout former Yugoslavia had changed – new types of monuments, colors (as representing the sign of a nation26), flags and names of the streets, squares and institutions27 had appeared and colonized the collective consciousness and collective memory thus contributing to ethnicization in community memories and behavior.

II Models of "culturalization" in heritage and monument policy

The other (more rare) type of memory policy and the relationship toward heritage and history could be called as a model of "culturalization", which in fact represented: decontextualization through univerzalization or muzealization.

One of these attempts was a move of the Boris Kidrič Belgrade statue (work of a sculptor Nikola Janković) from the centre of the city toward Sculpture Park of the Museum of contemporary arts, or the removal of Tito monumental sculpture from the Main Square in Užice toward back side of Užice City Museum. In this sense sculpture lost its political and ideological meaning, and became a "piece of art" – outside of any context, and thus emptied of any sense.

Relationship to Meštrović monuments might be a good example of those policies and practices – how monuments created to represent Yugoslavian idea and Yugoslavian unity, were turned in "national" symbols. Today in Serbia, Meštrović monuments are standing for the representation of the State – official culture, as they are used within ritual ceremonies (President of the State of Serbia every 15th of February is honouring fallen soldiers from all the Serbian wars at the Monument of Unknown Soldier at Avala)[24]...

The Meštrović Victor monument, as Kristina Lavrence was saying, is the monument to all wars and no concrete war (Lavrence, 2007) but in today Serbia it is just a sign for a Belgrade, without specific meaning, and majority of its inhabitants cannot link it to any historical moment.

The other possible "culturalization" strategy: model of respect of the heritage of other – is one of models for whom yet time had not come on the Balkans. In modern cultural policies we can see today efforts of Polish cultural operators to integrate lost and forgotten Jewish culture in contemporary cultural life, mostly through festivals. In Latvia

change – especially as school was not willing to introduce, besides English and Russian, another (German and French language as an option). Later, that school (out of four in the area) was selected by a Ministry for a closure as a primary school due to the diminishing of the number of children. So, it was efficient way of annihilating Lenin's name from public space, as it was previously done from the nearby public boulevard.

[24] It is interesting to say that this „Mausoleum" – was created in 1932, in presence of the king, when the old medieval city ruins (huge walls) had been dynamited, and Meštrović monument opened.

there are attempts to safeguard Liiv culture. In both cases, the culture of other has long ago stopped to represent any threat to national culture and cultural identity. In the Balkans, it is usually under investigation of international community or international donors, that monuments "of others" are re-constructed or protected.

III phase – Nation (re)building – creation of new monuments

The next phase in monument building strategy as part of a memory and an identity policy was a phase of creation of new monuments, which have to express the changes in national identity and values. In countries which celebrated their independence and freedom it was clear that monuments of those who are pillars of national identity or of those who contributed to the achievement of independence had to be erected.

With a lot of private efforts monuments to ustashi leaders such as Mile Budak and Jura Francetić had been created in their native villages, but in 2004 Croatian Government decided to destroy them, not to put in question its antifascist and democratic image[25]. Monuments to Tudjman started quickly to be created in both Croatia (Selce, Kaštel Lukšić, Pitomača, Škabrnja, Slavonski brod 2006, Bibinje 2007[26], Benkovac 2008, Podbablje 2009, Pleternica 2009) and Bosnia (Široki brijeg 2003[27],) where also a lot of memorial plaques are erected (i.e. Čapljina, 2007). During presidential campaign in 2009 Croatia, it was the major promise of (non-elected) presidential candidate of HDZ (A. Hebrang) to erect monument to Tudjman in Zagreb. Split city Major Kerum promised to erect Tudjman monument in Split (on Riva/Seafront promenade, although city urbanists prefer Square of Croatian brotherhood community). Bust of Tudjman had been placed within Croatian Parliament in 2008, while bridge in Osjek keeps his name…

The press informed about all those efforts of local communities to create bigger and bigger monuments, but underlying that however investment was big, the monument to Tudjman in Kaštel Lukšić was only 2nd in Croatia – after the famous Meštrović monument[28] to Grgur Ninski in Split, erected in 1929 in vain attempt of Meštrović to unite Serbian and Croatian "pantheon" with his sculptures – creating both Serbian and Croatian "cultural heroes" (priest Grgur Ninski, fighting for Slavic language in church service, could have been a good balance to Serbian more soldier-heroes).

The present importance of monument policy can be seen by the decision of Split city Council (October 2007) to erect 21 monument to the important figures of Croatian and

---

[25] http://forum.b92.net/index.php?showtopic=13861&st=90

[26] High 2,70 meters, with pedestal 4 meters, donated by State and Municipality. http://www.ezadar.hr/clanak/bibinjci-otkrili-spomenik-franji-tudmanu, accessed 12 April 2010.

[27] High 3,20 meters, donated by Diaspora.

[28] As for Serbia, Meštrović was creating a lot of monuments for Croatia, offering them to relevant cities (Grgur Ninski in Varaždin, Split); Marko Marulić – Split; Runer Bošković, History of Croats, Josip Juraj Strossmayer & Nikola Tesla – Zagreb, etc.)

Split history, which provoked huge debate around Miljenko Smoje, deceased humorist writer accused for his pro-yugoslavian and leftist statements as non-dignified to have a monument in Split[29].

In what extent monument policy was linked to ethnic identity building could be seen through demands for "ethnic purity" in constructing the monument. When Monument to the Defenders of Makarska (Croatia) was created, but the rumor was spread that the grass around monument was brought from Republic of Srpska. The Major had to address media and to guarantee with personal honor that it was not the case. On the other side, Serbian Church on Kosovo argued that in the reconstruction (renewal) of the sacral objects destroyed after riots in 2004 the participation of non-orthodox workers should not be allowed.

In the same time in Serbia monuments had been created on many levels wanting to fulfill different tasks:

- Monuments to Nikola Pašić wanting to contribute to the Serbization of our own history, as Pašić was Serbian statesman, opposing Yugoslavian idea – statesman which nationalist wanted to promote as a role-model for today's politicians, accused to think more about party than state interests. He also had to be a link (to ensure continuity) toward "glorious" Serbian history, erased from history book and collective memory of the people.
- Draža Mihajlović as a monument for confrontation with official history, with communist antifascist partisan movement ("which divided Serbia") – it is monument bringing completely new narrative in collective memory, questioning values on whom previous national identity was based - Saint Sava[30], Karadjordje, Nikola Tesla monuments – on the first sight it might be strange why those personalities had been regarded as one and a same category. But, it is important to underline that monument building policy behind them was the same. This policy endorsed Serbianhood /Serbianess, wanting to inscribe Serbianess in the face of the city, (up to that moment cities were usually without any of the symbols of Serbian national identity as the monuments to partisans, even if they were Serbs, were not considered as Serbian, but Yugoslavian monuments), and previous (old) Tesla monuments celebrated sciences and not his Serbianess, his ethnic Serbian genius[31].

The changes in monument policies can be seen clearly from the biography of Miodrag Živković. From the beginning of his career he has participating in public competitions for the memorials and monuments devoted to the World War Two – memory sites, graveyards etc. all of them praising victims regardless of ethnicity. Since 1990 he has realized following projects: Monument to 1st Serbian resurrection in 1804; Serbian

---

[29] http://www.glasdalmacije.hr/?show=0&article=4777, 15/10/2007 accessed 27th May 2010.

[30] De-secularization process was followed by the return of Saint Sava as a religious figure (celebrated for the creation of an autonomous Serbian orthodox church) what was followed with great number of monuments erected in his memory in 90s.

[31] In Croatia appropriation of Tesla as a part of national canon is even more complex (see Buden B. 2006)

Warriors in the World War I, Kruševac; Pilots fallen in a defence of Belgrade in 1941 (1992[32]); Voivoda Petar Bojović Nova varoš; Knez Lazar, Gnjilane, Kosovo, 1994; Saint Sava, Prijepolje 1995; Braća Nedić 2004., as well in Montenegro (King Nikola I Petrović Njegoš, 2000). Majority of the projects in this period were developed for competitions in Republika Srpska (Bosnia and Herzegovina), such as: Monument to Serbian defenders in Brčko (**1996);** Fighters of Bjeljina and Semberija, Bjeljina (**1997**); Fighters in War for Homeland, Derventa (**2001);** Defenders of Homeland Mrkonjić Grad (2003). This represents a clear change in memory policies who find its base in celebrating historical narratives important for only one ethnic group.

The only monument defined by Milošević Government, *Monument to eternal fire*, erected as a very general monument to remember the NATO bombing in 1999 is a sign of incapacity of Milošević policy to create monument which might mobilize the feelings and become symbol of his "independence" policy. Instead, it became "invisible monument" in Belgrade urban landscape (Lavrence), object of irony and vandalizing – ignored[33], marginalized and disappeared from public attention.

The most important changes after 2000, regarding monument policy, had happen in Macedonia. As the last European nation liberated from the Turkish rule only in 1912, but then occupied by Bulgarian army during World War I, and being treated in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia as a south Serbian province, Macedonia had not have a time to create national identity together with other Balkan nations. In XIX century, Balkan Slavic countries usually had taken four pillars for the creation of their national identities: national (Slavic) language, folklore, cultural legacy of antique Greece, and Humanism and Renaissance (even if they "belonged" to the Eastern world of Byzantium culture...).

This tradition of the acceptance of the antique (Greek) culture as a model has been incorporated in European culture since medieval times reinforced with renaissance and humanism and elaborated and codified with enlightenment and romanticism (Asman A. 1993). In ex-Yugoslav countries it was done according to German model transferred mostly by scholars who returned back home from University education (Trgovčević, Lj.).

Macedonia got its chance only since 1945 to develop its distinctive south Slavic identity, and it had been enhanced mostly rooted in its Slavic origins and folkloric traditions. Disputed by its neighbors (Serbians not accepting the autonomy of Macedonian church, Bulgarians are disputing the specificity of the language and Greeks even the name), the Macedonian state, in this very moment of nation-building, decided to claim the succession rights from antique Macedonian state – considering that contemporary

---

[32] It might seem that this monument do not belong to this group, as it is for heroism in the World War Two.

[33] Ignoring (boycotting) cultural and media institutions was a common practice among intelligentsia in Belgrade since 1992, when new Law on culture abolished autonomy and self government of cultural institutions. Some of the institutions, although now with proper programs and ideas, had been marginalized and isolated by cultural community, that it is very difficult to re-gain that audience, or to attract the new one. The same goes for this monument, which was deliberately ignored, but now people lost habit to use this part of the park at all.

Macedonian nation had been developed in encounter of antique Macedonians and Slavic people who settled on this territory. That empowered them to use the antique Macedonian heritage – wanting to incorporate that in collective consciousness and subconsciousness.

It started with a flag – where for the main symbol was taken sun from Vergina (archaeological site on the territory of Northern Greece), to be continued today with numerous monuments to Philip and Alexander the Great throughout Macedonia (Monument to Philip II in Bitola in 2008, Monument to Philip II in Prilep, Monument to Alexander the Great in Skopje). Making monuments of Alexander and Philip Macedonian, is part of a policy of memory, but also policy of provocation of the neighboring country (Greece) – kind of "fighting" cultural diplomacy.

However, before that, two things in Skopje monument policy had been important. The creation of the huge cross on the top of the hill rising behind Skopje (to celebrate 2 000 years of Christianity), and monument to Skenderbeg (on the horse) in Stara Čaršija[34], Albanian part of the city, turned with his back to Albanians, but facing Macedonian part of the city and Christian cross. In a certain sense, it can be concluded that both monuments are "facing the other"…

Making monuments to mutually irritate Greece and Albanian community from Macedonian, and Macedonian community from Albanian side, is an example of a monument policy as an anti-culture. Ministry of culture answered that they have NO statement, as well as the Agency for the Protection of Cultural Monuments: "Regarding Skenderbeg, I will not give any statement", said Pasko Kuzman[35], director; while city Major Trifun Kostovski said that for him this object is just illegitimate construction. (*Australian Macedonian Weekly*, 2006)

However, there is a personality from Skopje acceptable for both communities, to whom several monuments and a house were built – Mother Theresa, which devoted her life to poor people in India. However, even this figure was not used adequately as a collective, common hero of both Macedonian constitutional communities, as the monument and the house do not have adequate inscriptions in Albanian language (as situated in center of Skopje, considered being a Macedonian part of the city).

But, memory policy in Macedonia had chosen far away past to confront Greece in Diplomatic battle (Alagjozovski R. 2010), creating cultural wars both inside and outside Country.

---

[34] Erected in 2006, work of Albanian artist Toma Tomai Damo.

[35] Now Pasko Kuzman became the ideologist of antiquization of Macedonian nation, saying that if Macedonians fail to prove their direct links with antique Macedonians, they will lose the diplomatic battle with Greece, and lost their right to Macedonian identity. On the blogs the number of Macedonians claiming rights to succession and links with Philip the Second and Alexander is raising from month to month, due to propaganda efforts which started with monument policy.

This policy demands exploration of a Diachronical side of national identity, which all the countries of the Balkans are developing in different manners. In monument policy, Macedonians went the farthest way back in history – in antique Macedonia, Serbs and Croats in medieval history, but Serbs also had emphasized first half of XIX century as a birth of a modern Serbian state; Croats explored taboos and "heroes" of the World War Two, while Montenegrins have seen in the XIX century rule of Njegoš and especially of King Nikola the real roots of their independence, autonomy and national specificity. Accordingly, the monument policies had found new "heroes" and new memory sites.

Two phenomena in cultural policies of beginning of century are important for the understanding of monument policy as instrument of cultural policy: new concepts of public arts policies and politics of memory (within identity policies and politics of representation); and hybridization of concepts & uses of public spaces within urban policies and practices for the sake of re-monumentalization of the urban space...

The autonomous, independent entrance of artists in this space (till now highly controlled) have raised many dilemmas and controversies, as much as re-nationalization of cultural policies through monumentalization of often invented memories. The territories and cultures in post-conflict situation are continuing fight with monuments and religious symbols which are now covering the hills above multicultural cities.

IV Politics of gratitude vs. politics of (collective) amnesia

Specific part of monument policy was policy of gratitude, which has tradition in South Slavonic countries as part of "civil society policies[36]" even in the time where there were no debates about civil society.

First monument to Tolstoy outside Russia had been erected in a village of Selce (island of Brač, Croatia) in 1907 – as a sign of Slavonic identity and resistance toward efforts of Italianization ... It is specific gratitude to the great names of Slavonic culture, to keep it alive under pressure of that time historiography, calling Slavonic nations non-historical, thus claiming that they have no rights for independence and autonomous development.

The other type of "gratitude" monuments had been part of a state monument policy, like Monument of the Gratitude toward France in Belgrade or monuments to different French generals (Franche d'Esperey), or naming the streets with personalities who had helped Serbia in World War I to be recognized as country-winner (as a Swiss Archibald Reiss, Greek prime Minister Venizelos) or had helped in war efforts (Scottish nurses such as dr Elsie Inglis, Beatrice McGregor, Flora Sandes) etc.

This tradition had continued in newly created countries of former Yugoslavia. In the same village where monument to Tolstoy was erected in 1907, now lays the monuments

---

[36] The monuments errected on the territories under foreign occupation, have been created with huge philanthropic tradition of merchants and relatively rich citizens in Slavonic countries in pre-socialist period. All city theaters had been built with support of dons of local community, as well as the monuments, like the one we have mentioned already: Monument of the Four Feith.

to Tuđman, Austrian premier Mock and German Ministry of Foreign Affairs Hans Dietrich Genscher. With a popular song "Danke Deutschland" those efforts are seen in other parts of the Balkans as ultimate truth of the Western biased policies, foreign policies which before negotiations and war took a stand clearly for one side.

Monument to Clinton in Priština reflects perfectly the perception of population of the Balkans about importance of foreign factor. The film Fuse/Gori vatra, by Pjer Žalica, Bosna and Herzegovina 2004, had described those feelings (with ironic distance toward "gratitude").

There is also one new way to create "gratitude monument" of today. In the mechanisms of post-communist and post-yugoslavian normalization (Boris Buden), all new political and economical elites had accepted neo-liberalism as a norm – so the main investment policy now is going toward shopping-malls as festivity public spaces of consumerist culture.

Political economy of cultural representation has now turned toward globalisation and representation of global cultural phenomena and shopping malls are now new monuments of societies which are now sure in their different language – identity and specific culture.

V The Culture of resistance – virtual and performative monuments

The only who had a courage to redefine the relations toward cultural heritage of SFRJ, besides efforts of yugo-nostalgic Diaspora (those who emigrated refusing to participate in the split of the country), were artistic circles. To the anachronistic monument policy of the Balkans, conservative and retrograde, neglecting heritage of modernism, they confronted their concepts and visions.

In this spirit Mrdjan Bajic created a serial of virtual monuments for Yugomuseum. Inspired by different artifacts, events and myths which created but also destroyed Yugoslavia, Mrdjan Bajic had explored hidden memories (political memories of both Tito's and Milosevic's time). Each art work was a collage sculpture and photography in negative, with description, like:
 "000016: Memorandum – ready-made sculpture comprising part of working table of Ilija Garašanin, typewriting machine (on whom Memorandum of Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, on national problems of Serbs in Yugoslavia had been written in 1986), relief map of Yugoslavia done by pupils of VII 3 from primary school Gavrilo Princip, given as a present to President Tito when he was elected by acclamation honorary Member of Serbian Academy. Donor: Serbian Academy of Art and Sciences. Size: 90x130x70cm, 1999."

Each Bajić virtual sculpture is a monument – monument which memorizes crucial events which led toward civil (ethnic) war and dissolution of the country. This Memorandum monument starts with XIX century memory of Ilija Garašanin National Program, then memory on Gavrilo Princip famous assassinator of Franc Joseph in Sarajevo, which

started the World War I, (and whose memory was nicely kept as a freedom fighter in a socialist Yugoslavia also), ironizing the role of Academy of Science during Tito's time (when lost credibility by giving Tito an academic title without even proper voting), and especially after his death, when Academy was obsessed with research regarding status of Serbians in other republics of Yugoslavia – creating Memorandum…

Hundreds of "monuments" had created Mrdjan Bajić for Yugomuseum. Rambouillet castle, as a symbol of absolute incapacity of negotiation and persuasion, as well as of lack of foreseeing the consequences of broken talks; *Flower*, as a symbol of kitsch personality of Milošević wife: Mirjana Marković; *Lathe*, monument to working class, through most famous machine which Tito knew how to use, *Poljud* – solidarity, friendship, brotherhood and unity, etc. All these monuments had shown how quickly Serbian (and other Yugoslavian) society had passed from "the rule of the working class", to "the rule of the (ethnic) nation"! But, this project can also have a title of another Mrdjan Bajić art project: I did it!, in whom artist is not just showing, but taking responsibility for all what was happening on the territory of former Yugoslavia – war crimes, refugees, burned houses, ethnic cleansing…

Centre for Contemporary Arts, Sarajevo, had developed a project De/Construction of Monument (2004 –2006)[37] with aim to create art works which contribute toward deconstruction of myths and de-ideologizing and decoding of recent and distant history. Main tools in the project had been: monuments, symbols, icons – as the three major forms of representation of different societies and historical periods. Organizing several debates on crucial issues such as: Monuments and memory, Monuments and Violence, Working Out The Past and Arts as a Social Corrective, they regrouped both artists and curators who for a long time had dealt with "monumentalization" of public spaces, such as Braco Dimitrijević (*Anti-Monuments*, monuments of unknown passers-by), or Sanja Iveković (*Lady Rosa of Luxembourg*, provoking Luxembourg community with her interpretation of World War One Memorial). But crucial debate was around artist who are dealing with more contemporary Balkan issues daring to confront major monument narratives, such as Milica Tomić (Belgrade group Spomenik/Monument), Siniša Labrović (Croatia), Sokol Beqiri (Peja, Kosovo), and those who are ironizing and making sarcastic comments on our contemporary memory and monument practices, such as *Bruce Lee Monument Project* in Mostar, Kurt and Plasto, Sokol Beqiri etc.

Group Spomenik (Monument)[38] comprises Milica Tomić, Darinka Pop-Mitić, Nebojsa Milekić, but also theoreticians such as Jasmina Husanović and Branimir Stojanović. Each participant of the group in its previous individual artistic or theoretical work, is extremely engaged in practice of intercultural dialogue, without making trendy or "politically correct" projects. Working in "difficult territories", such as Kosovo, or

---

[37] http://www.projekt-relations.de/en/explore/deconstruction/module/overcoming.php accessed 10th May 2010.

[38] The Group Monument enables artists, theorists and activists from Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia to collaborate outside of dominant protocols of international organisations, European cultural policies, interstate cooperation and cooperation on how to enact emancipatory gestures in the fields of arts and theory to impact productively on everyday lives under the post-genocide condition.

bringing Kosovo artists in Belgrade, dealing with state terrorism (i.e. the work of Milica Tomic *XY or reconstruction of the crime*) – they are living and experiencing cultural diversity from its dangerous side in a xenophobic environment. Re-investigating history, participating within Center for Cultural Decontamination in the program *Politics of memory*, they are contributing in large extent to the self-perception of different Balkan societies on their embedded multiculturalism, and historical and contemporary considerations. Also, this group of artists and theoreticians is involved in dialogue within different cultural stratums of society, dialoguing with different "social cultures" (of suburbia for example) based on different ethics, involving much larger number of theoreticians and artists.

Several of their public events had happened within visual art manifestation such as: **Politics of Memory***,* installation at the 24th Nadezda Petrovic Memorial 'Transformation of Memory' Politics of Image, Čačak and ***Politics of memory***, Prague Biennale, Monument of Transformation, Prague (both in 2007). The Monument group had produced participatory monuments made of distributive objects – publications with transcript of the *Talk about an Artwork* group under title Politics of Memory.

Symbolical performance: *Bandaging of the wounds of partisan fighter in Sinj*, was realized by Croatian artist Siniša Labrović (2008). It was an intervention on the typical socrealistic sculpture of the soldier, partially ruined in the explosion aiming to destroy monument (by anonymous nationalists). This explosion has not raised any debate or reaction of the public, as it is usually the case when the monument heritage of the World War II is devastated. Labrović approached the sculpture as we would approach the living wounded human being, using a lot of bandages and other first aid material. With this performance Labrović is questioning social acceptance (A. Gramsci, 1971) of the new proposed identities, which demand the deletion (erasure) of the previous ones, especially those considered not enough "national", "Croatian". The question: how easily we are accepting violence and violent acts (like this violence against monument), even when they are executed on a central public space (like in this case it was in the main central park in the city) is showing political potential of this performance (Lubina M.).

The example of the third group of questioning monuments, better than Bruce Lee example, represents the Monument to International Community of Nebojša Šerić Shoba, erected in Sarajevo[39] (steel, marble 2007), "by the grateful citizens of Sarajevo", thus referring to official "policy of gratitude", but in a sarcastic manner. Unfortunately, the levels of message understanding had shown this Reuters report: "Sarajevo artists raised a monument to canned beef on Friday in a gesture ridiculing donors for providing such an **unpopular food** as humanitarian aid during the Bosnian capital's 1992-95 siege[40]". It was not about unpopular food, but about concept of humanitarian aid during siege – international community acting as voyeur of gladiator fight – sending food to keep fighters longer alive, but not preventing atrocities.

---

[39] http://balkansnet.org/zamir-chat-list/transfer/nss/eng.html accessed 12th June 2010.
[40] http://uk.reuters.com/article/idUKL0657786020070406 accessed 12 June 2010.

In what extent monument culture is a source of "inspiration" for contemporary artists we can see from the project of Jelena Miletic (In)visible dialogue. This "research" project, consisted of mapping monument culture in Southeast Serbia, since XIX century till today. The research ended with exhibition and public presentation in Bor, while territory had covered usually municipalities absolutely out of any contemporary cultural debate (Bor, Zajecar, Prokuplje, Zlot, Gornja Bela reka, Lenovac…). The author Jelena Miletic had treated monuments as artifacts where gather together different ideologies, memory politics, esthetics and narratives of collective and individual memories). This project is one of the many in which throughout the Balkans young artists are questioning official policies and practices of memory, insisting that those, crucial questions in forming public opinion, should be openly and publicly debated.

Conclusion: Re-nationalization and monument policies
Monument – Guardian of Chosen Memory

The process of re-nationalization in ex Yugoslav countries had extensively used monument policies within culture of memory, as an essential pillar of identity building. Monument policy and practices are acts of mediation which enables collective memory to be created and then to be safeguarded. It gives stability to the representation of the value system of society, and gives benchmark for socialisation practices... They are a joint venture of national political and cultural elites, often created in a synergy which neglects the real interest of communities... Like in case of Macedonia, where political elites wishing to prove continuity and never existing links with Antique Macedonia, created an atmosphere in which political and cultural elites of different Macedonian cities wanting to proof their willingness to share common efforts in creating "lost" collective cultural memory, as part of a new constructed national identity.

As everywhere in history, but especially in the moments of nation-building, inventing the traditions demands high symbolical, cultural but also financial investments. The fact that rarely the events from recent history had been taken as reasons for monument building, is showing the uncertainty of national elites in "justness" of contemporary events – preferring to take from far away histories the events and leaders (Alexander the Great vs. Skenderbeg in Skopje) and re-appropriating them for today use.[41]

National identity (memory) policies through monument policies aim to achieve:

1. Continuity of present with a past
2. Symbolic representation of the country identity or collective narrative

---

[41] However, in case of Croatia the monuments to contemporary „heroes", such as monument to Franjo Tuđman , or even fascist nationalist leader from World War II are speading throughout Croatia. In Serbia, the parallel goes to monumentalization of the personality of draža Mihajlović, World War II serbian royal army leader, caught, trialed and killed in 1946.

3. Mediation of the values – representing the ethos of collective cultural identity (national, city, ethnic group...)
4. Control of the social behaviour (giving official versions of historical events, explaining importance of personalities or of their acts...) – explaining historical (geographical) position...

Thus, cultural policies were "asked" to contribute by defining key "formative" events in the community construction, but also finding the ways of its memorization...

The new cultural policy European "standards", that multicultural societies have to develop new policies of memories, and consequently, new monument policies, policies which are not dividing, but informing communities, fostering and stabilizing intercultural dialogue – have not been implemented in Southeast Europe.

However, some new trends in monument policies as part of memory policy are starting to appear: there are preparations for building monuments to the coming of the Slovak community to the Balkans and to the exodus of German population. Those monuments should not be constructed to divide, but, on opposite, monuments to mutually inform communities and to start sharing group histories as common histories. Still, this recent conflictual example who aimed to be a "bridging monument" - monument to the forgotten German minority in Vršac - Serbia, provoked new divisions, as the Jewish minority considered the statements linked to the erection of the monument as inappropriate ("the life in Vršac was calm and mutual relations good till 1945", the statement which had forgotten that all the Jewish population was killed in 1942). This is showing that still in Europe there is a need for a "joint histories", and that responsibility of EU should be to solve burning issues, such as exodus and extinction of Slavic Macedonian population during Greek civil war (politics of oblivion in Greece) which still nourish Macedonian nationalism.

The fact that there are no monuments, buildings and memorials devoted to Roma communities, who also suffered genocide in World War II, is clearly showing double standards throughout Balkans (same in Europe) about policies of memorizing as expressed in monument policies. That could be solved by democratic cultural policies which should develop platforms for enabling private memories to enter the public sphere – which histories and life of common persons enter the public discourse – especially those coming from marginal groups of societies.

Another issue which this research had shown is that to formalism of ritual language (Connerton: 83), corresponds a formalism of visual language for monument use (expressions). Conventions in representations are limiting severely possibilities of expression. As in the language of rituals, where certain pairs of words are reappearing, or gestures are repeating, especially to enable better mnemonic function, the same with monument practices: certain visual codes, details, or way of constructing, are immediately giving significance to a monument. Decision to create "a horseman" – or a

standing or a sitting figure[42], is giving a different message to the population – as well as a chosen gesture or a lack of a gesture.

A crucial decision of policy makers: should monument represent a person, an event, or contemporary social values was solved through a return to realistic representation in the 90's showing insecurity of newly created states in their own values, and showing their wish to create widely understandable, readable message to its own society, but also to the "other".

However, the language of official sculptural representation exists as such – demanding respect of certain number of conventions regardless of the event, personality... Repetitivity in visual formulas seems not to disturb contemporary "elites", au contrary, it is reassuring that the message they want to mediate will be understood and accepted.

As a conclusion, the National (ethnic based) dimension in Balkan Cultural Policies is still predominant, in spite of the fact that the majority of countries have signed Convention on cultural diversity and are participating in the programs of intercultural dialogues. Monument policies in the new created Balkan countries were part *of those re-nationalization policies*, re-created (invented) specific identities, based on certain past traditions and chosen "memories", creating conditions that the message is widespread among both community members and members of other communities – focusing on dividing memories, values and practices. So they developed a plurality of narratives, still relying on a major one and the same historical narrative, narrative of independence through glorious heroic past. In this sense it is obvious that cultural policies are still identity policies, ethnic-based policies, policies which neglect citizen, individual and right to culture as individual human right.

References:

Alagjozovski, Robert (2010). Our roots: Macedonia in cultural War (Koreni naši nasušni – Makedonija u kulturnom ratu), *Danas* (Belgrade), 29. June 2010.

Anderson, B., 1983. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and spread of Nationalism. London: Verso

Assmann, Aleida , ARBEIT AM NATIONALEN GEDACHTNIS, Campus Verlag, Frankfurt-New York, 1993

Appadurai, Arjun. Fear of small numbers, Duke University Press, 2006,

Australian Macedonian Weekly. Edition No. 950, 5 December 2006
http://www.australianmacedonianweekly.com/edition/0950_05122006/002_macedonia_001.html

---

[42] Authority is „coreohgraphed" by position of the body (Connerton, 2002:101)

Bajrushi Robert, Beck Boris, Tudjmanov kip bit ce pred Lisinskim
http://www.nacional.hr/clanak/27422/tudmanov-kip-bit-ce-pred-lisinskim

Bennett, O. 2004 *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 2004 (pp.237 – 248)
Bennett T. 1998, *Culture: a reformer's science,* Sydney: Allen &Unwin

Buden, Boris. The post-Yugoslavian Condition of Institutional Critique: An Introduction On Critique as Countercultural Translation, 11 2007,
http://transform.eipcp.net/transversal/0208/buden/en#redir, accessed 1st June 2010.

Buden Boris text on the exhibition "Normalization", 25.08.2006
http://www.nikolatesla.hr/news.aspx?newsID=127&pageID=23 accessed 24th April 2010.

Connerton, Paul. How societies remember, Cambridge University press, 1989. Serbian edition: Kako društva pamte, Samizdat B92, Belgrade, 2002.

Daković, N. (2008) *Balkan kao (filmski) žanr*, Institut za pozorište, film, radio i televiziju, Fakultet dramskih umetnosti, Beograd

Djerić G. Ed. *Intima javnosti*, Fabrika knjiga, Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju, Belgrade, 2008.

Dragićević Šešić M. Media War and Hate, *Kultura, Culture, journal for culture, cultural studies and cultural policy* (Belgrade), n. 1994

Dragićević Šešić, Milena (2001): **Carnivalization of protest**, *New Theatre Quarterly*, Cambridge, no. 6

Đukić V. (2003). Sedam uzroka tranzicione konfuzije (Seven causes of transitional confusion), Zbornik Fakulteta dramskih umetnosti (Proceedings of the Faculty of Drama Arts), n. 6-7 Belgrade

Egrikavuk I. & G. Kotretsos. 2007. RE-THINKING ARTISTS IN TRANSIT,
http://www.tru.ca/cicac/media/Egrikavuk_2007.pdf. accessed 10 May 2010.

Finkel, Andrew. Truth and artistic memory in Istanbul: an attempt to define a new Balkan Cultural Studies, Accessed 15. April 2010.
http://www.glocaltimes.k3.mah.se/viewarticle.aspx?articleID=46&issueID=5

Golubović Z. & Jarić I. (2010) Kultura i preobražaj Srbije (Culture and transformation of Serbia), Res publica, Službeni glasnik, Beograd

Gramsci, A. Selections from the Prison Notebooks, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1971

Halbwachs, Maurice. Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire. Paris: F. Alcan, 1925

Hardt, Hanno. Images of Slovenia Today, http://www.fifth-estateonline.co.uk/gallery/slovenia1.html

Huyssen Andreas. Present Pasts: Media, Politics, Amnesia (2001) in Globalization, special issue of *Public Culture*, (ed. A. Appadurai), Duke University Press.

Karačić, Darko & Slávka Otčenášová, Remembering and Forgetting World War II within Changing Political Contexts from 1945 to the Present – Public Usage of WWII Monuments in Slovakia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, Project No. 090 47, Budapest 2010 http://www.geschichtswerkstatt-europa.org/media/projekte/Project%2009047%20I%20Part.pdf

KIOSSEV, A., (1995), The SelfColonizing Cultures, in: D. Ginev, Fr. Sejersted i K. Simeonova (eds.) *Cultural Aspects of the Modernization Process*, Oslo: TMVSenteret, pp. 73-81

Kodrnja J., Savić S. and Slapšak S., eds. 2010, Kultura, rod, identitet (Culture, gender, identity), Zagreb.

Kuljić T. 2006, Kultura sećanja, Čigoja, Belgrade

Lavrence, Christine, 2007 Remembering and Forgetting War in Belgrade, Between Monumental History and Experience / Entre histoire monumentale et expérience. Le souvenir et l'oubli de la guerre à Belgrade, Ethnologie française 2007/3 (Vol. 37) http://www.cairn.info/revue-ethnologie-francaise-2007-3-p-441.htm

Lubina, M. Previjanje rana partizanskom borcu kao odgovor na politiku zaborava, paper, University of Arts Belgrade, doctoral studies seminar, 2010.

Maalouf, Amin. Les identities meurtieres, 1998. / In the name of identity : violence and the need to belong, 2000. ISBN 0-14-200257-7

Maalouf Amin. Le dereglement du monde, /Poremećenost sveta, Laguna, Beograd, 2010. Monument=Discussion, 2002-2010, Grupa Spomenik http://milicatomic.wordpress.com/works/monumentdiscussion/

Mostov Julie: Sexing the Nation / desexing the body (politics of national identity in the former Yugoslavia), in: Gender ironies of nationalism: sexing the nation, ed. By Tamar Mayer, Taylor and Francis, 2007.

Political practices of (post)yugoslav art: retrospective 01, Guide through exhibition, Museum of Yugoslav History, November 29th – December 31st 2009. Prelom kolektive, Belgrade, 2009.

Santino, Jack ed. *Spontaneous Shrines and the Public Memorialization of Death*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. http://www.cjsonline.ca/reviews/shrines.html

Sinovčić Dejan, Trg žrtava fašizma vraća se u središte Zagreba odakle je prije deset godina izbrisan? http://www.monitor.hr/clanci/trg-zrtava-fasizma-vraca-se-u-srediste-zagrebaodakle-je-prije-deset-godina-izbrisan/6168/ accessed 20 April 2010.

Slapšak Svetlana Antikultura protiv kontrakulture: kulturna politika tranzicije?, Republika n.460-461, 1-30 September 2009.

Stojanović, Dubravka. Konstrukcija prošlosti – slučaj srpskih udžbenika istorije, http://www.cpi.hr/download/links/hr/7008.pdf, accessed 20 April 2010.

Toalet Aleksandra Makedonskog, RTS, news, 27. maj 2009. http://www.rts.rs/page/stories/sr/story/11/Region/64123/Toalet+Aleksandra+Makedonsk og.html
Tunbridge J.E. and G.J. Ashworth. (1996) *Dissonant heritage, the management of the past as a resource in conflict,* J. Wiley in Chichester, New York.

'Transformation of Memory' Politics of Image, 24th Nadezda Petrovic Memorial Čačak, catalogue, 2007
Vežić Goran Za Franju Tunmana pregršt počasti, Pred licem pravde, program 11.01.2010, Radio Slobodna Evropa, http://www.danas.org/content/spomen__obelezja_hrvatska/1926361.html

Key words:

Memory politics, cultural policy, monument policy, artist-activist