

## ETHNOLOGY OF SOCIALISM: NEW AND OLD PARADIGMS OF INSTITUTE OF ETHNOGRAPHY SASA

MIROSLAVA LUKIĆ KRSTANOVIĆ, Beograd

**Abstract:** *Etnologija Srbije u socijalističkoj eri razmatra se kroz (re)interpretaciju markiranih koncepata, strategija i paradigmi koji su oblikovali svojevrzne naučne politike. Cilj ovog rada je da se istorizacija etnologije razbije u određene problemske jedinice, koje su se odvijale kroz procese normativizacije, institucionalizacije i konceptualizacije etnologije. Etnološke politike se analiziraju na primeru Etnografskog instituta Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti u periodu 1947 – 1980. godine. Konstituisanje Instituta, rukovodjenje, sprovođenje institutskih zadataka i ciljeva, kao i istraživačka i izdavačka produkcija ukazuju na slojevitost i ambivalentnost faza naučnih politika.*

**Key words:** *etnologija, socijalizam, nacionalna nauka, studije promena*

### Introduction

Specific scientific policies of continuity and discontinuity, old and new paradigms, indoctrinated and independent strategies, rigid and flexible concepts were shaped throughout the history of ethnology. From the present day position of investigating the past one could say that this had been a long road of consolidation of science in achieving legitimacy and status that did not withstand either the conservative, or transformationary or innovative experience. Hence, this paper,<sup>1</sup> is not intended to regulate or order the desirable scientific history towards historization of ethnology, on the contrary, it is intended to break down the science into problem units, which will indicate the turmoil, stratification, contradictions or ambivalence of scientific temporal strategies. Historization of ethnology usually tends to a routinized path of manifest markings of the scientific past that creates a map of institutions, trends, personalities, works as unchangeable artifacts. A unified picture and cliché of a guaranteed common history based on constants of

---

<sup>1</sup> This is an integral version of a paper within the panel *Ethnology and the Communist State Ideology in the Second Half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*, presented at the International Conference of the Institute of Ethnology Slovak Academy of Science held on June 1-3, 2010, Bratislava.

scientific past is produced for representative needs. However, history of ethnology may be considered also in the form of interpretative initiatives, critical debates, reflections and various approaches, which launches, to a great degree, the analytical individualism ready to face the unmasked and demystified past. Today, the analytical studies of history of ethnological science present a critical interpretation towards confrontation of science – society – policy *now* and *as once was*. The *sobriety* of science becomes the measure of dialogue and reinterpretation of history of ethnology, generating an activist impulse of the scientific (self)criticism and, as such, the chance of emerging in the trans-scientific market of recent developments and trends.

A number of questions were imposed from the very beginning: Is development of ethnology studied as a process and consequence of the impact of social and political circumstances and have its actors and institutional settings taken over the scientific strategies *outside* and *inside* the ideological frameworks? What are the actual points in time and crucial moments when the science is reexamined by *going backwards*? Let's take the last question. These are crucial moments in science in the confrontation of old and new paradigms, namely, approaches, or, crucial moment of social and political changes entailing also scientific strategy and its positioning in the society. The interpretation of ethnologies under socialist circumstances as case studies through post-socialist retrospection brings to the fore their actors – interpreters/the interpreted, making it known that the anthropologist make both subjects and objects of creating histories of their discipline (v. Mihăilescu, Iliev, Naumović, 2008: 14). The socialist countries had similar just as different historical paths, which was reflected in the authentic metamorphoses of ethnology/ies in discursive, ideological and bureaucratic makeup. This is why I refer to Verdery's statement according to which *no single* socialist country was "typical". Each had its own specific character and each had certain common points with some other, but not with all of the countries of that block (Verdery, 2005: 27). In order to understand how ethnology was produced and presented in socialism it is necessary to introduce the historical trends that had become servers in the service of creating scientific policy.

### **Establishing and institutionalization of ethnology as a national science**

The history of Serbian ethnology may be observed through the following phases of development: 1. normatization as a para-scientific orientation based on collecting of "national culture"; 2. institutionalization of ethnological science in the direction of its nationalization; 3. contextualization of ethnology in the direction of theoretical and methodological diversity.

The humanities tend to ensure the long-standing positions – the same applies to ethnology. Ethnology is usually linked to markers of Enlightenment and Romanticism which have established it as a "science about the peoples" with predisposition of research of folklore heritage and folk culture. The link between

the Enlightenment and Romanticism was exhibited in the confrontation of two principles – *general* and *specific*, which provided the foundations of ethnology primarily as a national science, with the moral task of constituting the “idea of peoples”, namely the “idea of nation” as a nationwide achievement of the profiled tradition. Establishing of ethnology in Serbia is associated with two names, Dositej Obradović and Vuk St. Karadžić.<sup>2</sup> The romanticist principles of epic qualities, creating of national mythology and idealization of entities with all the ingredients of found traditionalism were particularly pronounced in forming of ethnology as a “science about peoples” (*Volkskunde*). Various travelogues with temporal indications of the 18<sup>th</sup> and beginning of 19<sup>th</sup> century, manuals and instructions for the use of national customs “popular calendars”, collections of folk lore, verbal poetry etc. represented the cognitive potentials, didactic guidelines, but also much more, ideal type models in forming the awareness of a common origin and belonging. Or, as emphasized by Skerlić “everything is occasional, moral and educational”, because the study of the past, the antiquities, monuments, folk customs, particularly folk poetry, became the quintessence of “folk spirit” (*Volksseele*), a sort of cult and model in the reconstruction of the past (Skerlić, 1925: 49, 244). These are “normative principles” of Romanticism, of collecting based on “natural, i.e. organic” *raison d'être*. The nation is a suitable medium for this purpose of national proving, “rejuvenation” (Bausinger, 2002: 23, 31).

In the late 19<sup>th</sup> century the concept of “popular spirit”, the characterological – typological construct, historical genetic guidelines of the Slavic and Balkan origin (inceptions of ethnogenesis) represented the framework in promoting the “awareness” of territorial and national boundaries, which generated the social and political role to the emerging science. Whereas the ethnographic-collection activities are still not showing signs of scientific shaping, in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century also appeared first monographs with research instructions which marked the way for ethnology (Kovačević 2001: 18). They include works by Bogišić in the area of customary law, monographic mapping of *life and customs of a nation* in the works of Karić and Miličević, as well as anthropogeographic concepts and ethnopsychological characteristics in the works of Cvijić, and ethnogenesis of Erdeljanović. The study of a nation and customs, namely, peasantry and folklore were recognized in the traditional cultures and are marked by permanent “historical-comparative and genetic approach with main points of reliance on Romanticism” (Pavković, Bandić, Kovačević, 1983: 111-112).

In the course of forming the vertical hierarchy of scientific authority, ethnology began developing its constitutive positions in the institutional – national setting such as establishing the Royal Serbian Academy (1886.), forming of the Serbian Ethnographic Committee (1894) and Serbian Ethnographic Collection of Papers (1895); Cvijić delivered his first lectures on ethnology in 1895 at the Higher

---

<sup>2</sup> The Enlightenment principles of ethnicity and humanity represented for Dositej Obradović (1742 – 1811) the voice of education, whereas Vuk St. Karadžić (1787 – 1864) based the reformatory principles of the folk language and culture on the systemic collection of folk creations prompted by the romanticist movement and revolutionary inspiration of national awakening.

School. The mentioned personalities and events also represent constitutive units of scientific foundation, i.e. historical parameters of scientific verification.<sup>3</sup> Ethnology could, thus, be classified in the niche of national science, historical and humanistic discipline with already traced tasks of studying the “Serbian nation” and with a scientific apparatus which implied certain scientific and research guidelines based on the current world scientific trends – cultural historicism and diffusionism. The policy of temporality became the unit of measure for traditionalism and historicism, which subsumed ethnology under historical sciences. The establishing of Serbian ethnology ran parallel with the social and political orders and hegemonistic policy of the Serbian dynastic rule<sup>4</sup> establishing “ethnocentric premises” suitable for setting the national options in the ethnological strategies (Gorunović, 2008: 314). No wonder, therefore, that ethnology as a national science retained its particularistic position, remaining consistent to its own histories and protection of own identity also at the time of the socialist Yugoslavia, when the new ideological paradigms constituted the “supranational science” (Prošić-Dvornić, 2008: 354-355).<sup>5</sup> The Serbian ethnology was thus set in the national scientific family.<sup>6</sup>

### **Institute of Ethnography SASA: new/old paradigms**

The first and the main evaluation of ethnology in socialism on the example of the Institute of Ethnography of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Art is its ambivalent character “between the old and the new” (Prelić, 2008: 11). This ambivalence is exhibited in the formation and content-related strategy, which determined the position of ethnology in the society. Based on analysis of generation and production of ethnology during the socialist period I am singling out the following phases of building the scientific and political and scientific strategy for the requirements of modified institutional identity: First phase covers the period 1947 – 1961.: anthropogeographization process and areal research; Second phase covers the period 1961 – 1974.: ethnographization process and empirical absolutization; Third phase covers the period 1974 – 1980.: ethnologization process and studies of social changes; Fourth phase covers the period 1980 – 1990: anthropologization process and differentiated theoretical – methodological approaches.

---

<sup>3</sup> A department was formed within the Serbian Ethnographic Collection of Papers – *Settlement and Origin of Population*; in 1906 began the lectures on ethnology at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade.

<sup>4</sup> Kingdom of Serbia 1881, later Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, 1918 and Kingdom of Yugoslavia 1929.

<sup>5</sup> The Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia was divided into republic units which were nationally positioned territorial units: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia with Autonomous Provinces of Kosovo and Metohija and Vojvodina, Croatia, Slovenia, Macedonia and Montenegro.

<sup>6</sup> Prica presents the piece of data that in striving to create a unique international terminology the concept of *national ethnology* was adopted in Arnhem in 1955, denoting the discipline researching the folk culture (according to Hultkrantz, 1960 in: Prica, 2001: 17).

### *Anthropogeographization: 1947 – 1964*

The main task of the communist ideology was dealing with and liquidation of “bourgeois, pre-war and national heritage” in structuring the ideological historicism and regeneration of scientific cadre and intelligence.<sup>7</sup> During the initial post-war years of communist indoctrination and Sovietization, suffered the scientific disciplines that were most pronounced in the zone of intellectual and academic (un)suitability – sociology, philosophy or history.<sup>8</sup> “The early 1960s were a period of intense agitation in the political and intellectual life of the Yugoslav society”. (Spasić, 2008: 338). On the other hand, the institutions based on cultural and historical programs and national paradigm such as the Serbian Academy of Sciences, insisted on the continuity of heritage as the last defense of the “national cause”. This is where the said ambivalent process and ideological mimicry of nation-state begins. Considering such aspect the state required ethnology, even in the Academy’s version of intellectual property as a specific reserve of national identity, whereas the Academy required the state, even in the form of a state verified communist paradigm.

Ethnology – ethnography entered the socialist era with a developed paradigm of “national science” with profiled programs and significant scientists, namely, authorities in ethnology such as Cvijić, Đorđević, Erdeljanović, Čajkanović, Bogišić. It is a fact that in the forthcoming decades these well-known ethnologists will represent a paternalistic referential hegemony in numerous ethnological papers. The cultural historical trend based on ethnogenesis, “organicistic” approach based on a peasant society and anthropogeographic mapping, set ethnology in the first phase within historical and geographic framework. It will turn out that the institutional policy of ethnology followed for a long time this anthropogeographic-ethnographic course of “self-sufficient description” i.e. national promotion (Prošić, Dvornić, 2003: 386-387; Kovačević, 2006: 51).

After World War II ethnology gained a new form, but not also completely new substance. The form is reflected in establishing of the Institute of Ethnography SAS in 1947, which takes over the entire program and collections of the existing Ethnographic Department and Ethnographic Commission of the Serbian Academy of Sciences. Establishing of the Institute of Ethnography within the Serbian Academy of Sciences was prompted in two ways: through programs of state policies, and academic and university initiatives. The Institute of Ethnography became a scientific unit with recognizable features and forms. The name “ethnographic” reconciled two options: the first, the inherited name “Serbian Ethnographic Collection of Papers” or “Ethnographic Commission” and the other, the Soviet

---

<sup>7</sup> In the communist speeches the capitalistic Yugoslavia is criticized, where the intellectuals were educated in the West and thus became the “bounty of the capitalistic stronger countries”, solution in developing of scientific new generation (shorthand transcript of discussion Savić 1949: 465).

<sup>8</sup> These sciences were bearing the brunt, because full surrender and shift of orientation to “Marxist-Leninist theory and practice” was expected from them. Dealing away with the “Western imperialism” and achievements of capitalism is particularly emphasized V. (shorthand transcript of paper, Đilas 1949: 225).

model in the name ethnography. The first paragraph of the Statute states that the main task of the Institute is completion of study of settlements and origin of the population in Serbia with Kosmet and Vojvodina, in Montenegro with Boka and other Montenegrin coastal areas, and then in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Finally, to create a scientific synthesis only based on such systematically studied settlements, origin of the population and other anthropogeographic properties of Serbia and other regions inhabited by the Serbian people (Yearbook LV, 1948; 251). The disputable moment is that the term “Serbian people” and “our people” is extended in the following program formulations also to “development of socialism in our country and the society”, which establishes a metaphoric equivalent of “our collectivity” (Zečević, 1952: 579; Radovanović, 1952: XV). Balancing with the options of “our peoples” and “our customs” on the line Serbian and Yugoslav, Romanticist and Communist populism, the institutional ethnology succeeded in calculating with the term “peoples” and remained on the position of existing paradigm of the “science about nations”.

In the early post-war years the regional research continued, however, research was also made in the unresearched parts of the regional units in Serbia, the so called “covering of white areas” such as Aleksinačko pomoravlje, Vranjsko pomoravlje, Tamnava, Toplica. The first period of institutional research is called by some the “golden era of fieldwork” in the search for undiscovered and authentic tradition (Nikolić, 1997: 32). The results of this research were published in the ethnological publications as late as the 70s. The institutional publications (particularly the Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnography SASA) are dominated by papers on anthropogeographic topics, followed by demographic surveys, historical topics based on ethnogenetic processes or folklore heritage. One of the institutional novelties in the fifties of the nineteenth century is the creation of a folklore section, i.e. collection of folk poetry – partisan folklore, socialist development. Fifteen thousand poems were collected and partially published in the Anthology of works of the Institute of Ethnography, Volume 3, in 1960, devoted to the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Communist Union of Yugoslavia, as well as in the Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnography SASA from 1962. Furthermore, the Bulletin of the Ethnographic Institute from 1969 was devoted to the centennial of Vuk St. Karadžić and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the war for liberation and the socialist revolution of the peoples of Yugoslavia.<sup>9</sup> These examples clearly show the ideological maneuver in the mutual convergence of national paradigms and socialist and class attainments, and all in the semblance of folklorism as a basic ethnological paradigm and ideal type model of folk culture.

---

<sup>9</sup> I am referring to two articles by Dušan Nedeljković: “The role of the folk poem in Vuk’s cultural revolution and methodological question of differentiating the rational, revolutionary core of the folk art and culture” (Nedeljković 1952); “Supplement to the study of pattern of development of our folk singing in the period of Peoples’ Revolution” (Nedeljković 1960). *People and Revolution* is a representative emblem and designation of superior category standardized for the requirements of ideological order of nation and the state. On the analysis of the role of Dušan Nedeljković in designing the institute’s policy see (Naumović 2008: 222-223).

### ***Ethnogeographization: 1964 – 1973***

The change of the course of foreign policy towards the West after severing ties with the Stalinist policy<sup>10</sup> and introduction of the patent of *workers' self-management*, which was designated as a new form of policy of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, reflected in the academic – scientific profile. The historical analysts emphasize today that the workers' self-management was a utopia which was required by the authoritarian state to create a semblance of a democratic state system. (Gudac and Đorđević, 2000: 260). From the position of organization of the institution this is, first of all, formal fulfillment of the systemic rules and coordination with the state administration structures (Ministry of Science) and authorities of the Academy of Sciences (Academy's departments and committees). Therefore, the Institute included such bodies as "scientific council and assembly of workers" in which all the employees participated and discussed the current issues and programs. The Institute collective and the management bodies operated on the principle of workers' self-management, namely, common discipline of management *from above*, but, above all, on a strong underlying concept of social and ethnological collectivity and professional authority embodied in the figure of the director and project leader. The institutional and scientific programs had their fixed set plans (five-year) and personnel – wage uniformity, which left the impression of security of scientific work and scientific existence under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences and Arts and guaranteed routinization of the project tasks. During the 60s the research institute organization implied work in sections which extended, in addition to anthropogeographic, ethnological, folklore sections also to the sociological section (launched in 1953 as Department of Sociology of Settlement).

The emphasis in the new cycle of institute's tasks was placed on further anthropogeographic study of folk life with cultural and historical indicators of reconstruction of tradition. However, "vertical research" is increasingly giving way to the horizontal study of the process of industrialization and urbanization, becoming a polygon for testing the strength between the research reconstructions of traditional survivals and research marking of contemporary changes. Systemic research was conducted during the period 1962 – 1965: periurban settlements of the Belgrade area, Serbian towns of Užice and Mladenovac, research of the migration movements (Jovanović, 1973: 144). The direction of change – population – village established a new form of ethnographic empirical model with the programmed seasonal work and collective routes. The field strategy implied work in the respective locations where the processes were most transparent: settlements in the Kolubara – mining basin, settlements endangered by the construction of the hydro power plant Đerdap I and II, or sections of the Belgrade-Bar railway line (Radovanović, 1973: 13-14). Such projects of the Institute were given a green light by the state administration (Republic Scientific Community of SR

---

<sup>10</sup> Change of foreign policy by internal reckoning with the persons of different views regarding Tito's one-party policy and severing ties with the Stalinist policy and the Eastern Block, known as the Resolution of the Information Bureau 1948.

Serbia), providing a utilitarian contribution to the “development of the socialist society” and evaluation of the project in the positive direction. The jubilee papers on the Institute’s work emphasized the research of the change of the course of “development of the socialist society and development of the self-management society”, parallel with the study of the tradition culture of Serbs (Radovanović, 1973: 14-15). While the researches had standard dynamics of execution, the publishing activity marks a specific drop – the Bulletin was not published for full eight years from 1961 – 1969.

There was a growing presence and Yugoslavization of ethnology in the course of the sixties which also implies a greater cooperation between the ethnological institutions between Serbia, Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and other former Yugoslav republics. With the activity of the Yugoslav Ethnological Society, the international projects, particularly with the Eastern European countries, meant a more frequent and interactive communication, putting the national representatives in the position of Republic representatives in the name of nation-building posting of Yugoslavia in the international ethnological stage. Accordingly, a book was published in 1964 by the USSR Academy of Sciences “Народы Зарубежной Европы” which included a part about the nations of Yugoslavia.<sup>11</sup> Since 1966 the representatives of the Yugoslav ethnological centers took part in the activities of the international editorial board DEMOS, which included the countries of the Eastern Block. Until the disintegration of Yugoslavia the DEMOS association operated on the principle of representatives of ethnologists from the republic ethnological institutions, whereas upon forming of separate states since the nineties, the representatives of Croatia, Serbia<sup>12</sup>, Slovenia etc. (Emmrich, 2002: 13-27) have participated in the DEMOS conferences. Cooperation was established also with the institutions and ethnologists from Western countries (guest appearances by prominent experts from USA and France), as well as participation of associates from the Institute of Ethnography on the congresses in Brussels (1958), Moscow (1964), Sofia (1965), Athens (1970) (Divac, 1997: 133-134).

During the period 1947 – 1974 ethnology remained more at the level of ethnographic description, and much less as theoretical-methodological and analytical synthesis and analysis. Theoretical and methodological discussions in the sphere of folkloristics were singled out, relying on the Russian folkloristic theory.<sup>13</sup> From the present day analytical angle, the union between ethnology and Marxism in case of production of the Ethnographic Institute, as well as in the cases of the other ethnological institutions, proved weak, least dogmatically incorporated. Gorunović considers that it was mostly the question of a “clumsy simulation” and “ma-

---

<sup>11</sup> Published later in a special SASA publication, CCCLXXXV, Belgrade 1965.

<sup>12</sup> From 1997 until 2002 Miljana Radovanović and Miroslava Lukić Krstanović were members of the Editorial Board of DEMOS and representatives at the DEMOS conferences.

<sup>13</sup> On review of the papers published in the Heralds and Bulletins of the Institute of Ethnography it may be concluded that there were less papers treating theoretical-methodological review of the Marxist literature, which was more the task of sociological and philosophical discussions. An exception is the paper by Antonijević D. IV-V “Marx’s and Engels’ letter on ethnological issues,” Bulletin of EI SASA 1957.

nipulation with nothing” (Gorunović, 2007: 331). This was mostly aided by the “atheoretic quality” of the domestic ethnology and its consistency with the empirical absolutism.<sup>14</sup> Prošić-Dvornić also presents a similar position whereby ethnology did not “carry the weight of obligation” to fulfill the research tasks according to Marxist principles and Soviet model (Prošić-Dvornić, 2003: 387). It could be said that the Marxist labeling was just a screen for a consistent and in no way altered sequence of research of traditional phenomena which was suited by the treatment of well tread paths of the predecessors.

### ***Ethnologization: 1974 – 1980***

During the period of the seventies of the twentieth century the anthropographic programs of research of regional units are increasingly giving way to the cycle projects and topics focused on dynamic processes of cultural changes and acculturation of standard coordinates like *village, folklore culture and suburban settlements*.<sup>15</sup> The shift from the collection tradition to the altered tradition does not go beyond the framework of ensured land areas *village – suburbia*, which still represents the ethnological property, contrary to the urban zones which are more in the hands of the sociological research. The research in this period moves in two directions: The first group of research includes the study of migration processes, i.e. fluctuation of labor on the line village – city, processes of immigration to Serbia from other parts of Yugoslavia and the national minorities.<sup>16</sup> The other group of research follows the contemporary changes in the folk cultures, particularly the study of suburban settlements, such as the vicinity of Belgrade (Bandić, 1979: 1-107). However, the horizontal axis of these researches still remains historically serviced in the over-extended reconstructions based on centuries-old parameters of tradition culture. At the same time, the comparative studies and international character of ethnology is also becoming a visible prime mover of scientific transformations. For example, the papers published from the symposium *Ethnological Study of Changes in the Folk Culture*. The participants and the authors of the papers were, among others, Kremenšek, Burszta, Cuisenier, Halpern, Marković etc.

The field configuration and field perception in the seventies of the twentieth century is changing in the gradual professionalization and suppression of the amateur egalitarianism, everyone-for-everything. Field specialization and adequate work conditions are slowly gaining priority. The researches did not have the financial ability to stay longer in the field, and the integration of amateur collections of material, namely local chroniclers was growing smaller (D. Drljača, Personal

---

<sup>14</sup> For example, on the basis of bibliography of papers in the period 1952 – 1972 it is possible to compose a quantitative review of the papers of EI SANU: Methodology and theory – 22; Settlements and origin of population – 131; Folk architecture – 41; Economy – 51; Social life and social customs – 25; Customs – 31; Spiritual culture – 33; Ethnology of other nations 58. (Cerović 1972: 25-70).

<sup>15</sup> Project 1971 – 1975. *Continuous following of changes in the folk culture in the village*.

<sup>16</sup> V. Buletin of the Institute of Ethnography 1973 (about the Czechs, Slovaks in Vojvodina, about the Romanies in Yugoslavia).

Communication, May 20, 2010.) From 1971 began the research of new indicated regional locations in order to work on monograph studies (Lužnica, Budžak, Šabačka Posavina and Pocerina). If the original fields had indications of romantic collectors of ethnographic antiquities, the “ethnographic realism” became a methodological mode, the ABC and grammar of empirical strategy: collection, classification, systematizing and description. The ethnography of regional units – monographs were preoccupied more with the systematizing and sequence of field inventory in creating a holistic impression, which did not go beyond the observation of causative and evolutive factors, but establishing the analytical procedure in interpretation. The frequent coined words in the names of the papers *approach to study* (...) or *some important problems* indicate the uncertainty, vagueness or distancing from the analytical center.

### ***Anthropologization 1980 – 1990***

In the early eighties of the twentieth century ethnology and ethnographic works – science policies maintain and extend its field acceptance and institutional networking owing still to the policy of state cooperation and activity between the associates from Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia etc. – for example, the conferences of the Ethnological Society of Yugoslavia, work on an ethnological atlas and participation in international conferences. No matter that the Yugoslav – federal underlying concept was still maintained in its mechanical form, the national ethnologies nevertheless remained the recognizable modes in their hermetic movement. The Institute launched a cycle of new projects. A part of these projects follows the already well tread path of study of “ethnodemographic phenomena and processes, segments of the rural culture within the standard typology of material, spiritual culture and social life. The project “Ethnic and ethnological characteristics of the population of Serbia”: The emphasis is now placed on the confrontation of the process of continuity and discontinuity. At the Institute of Ethnography SASA 1981 research of ethnicity was commenced within the project “Ethnological research of the Serbian Emigration and Ethnic Minorities”. For the first time the ethnological research goes beyond the state, but not the national boundaries. Study of emigration is started, albeit, the Serbian emigration. The pioneer quest of the emigration locations (some research of emigration in Europe was also included) represented an innovation in the field of social and humanities, as well as a shift in the theoretical and methodological approach based on Barth concepts of “ethnic boundaries”, especially when studying ethnicity and emigration. Those were the years when the ethnographic research focused, instead of on the native positioning, on the new areas in Chicago or Canada, just several months old. These were costly projects which were financed, mainly by the state.<sup>17</sup> Although the results of studying the emigration are customary in the form of monographs<sup>18</sup>,

---

<sup>17</sup> Thus, for example, in 1983, the Republic of Serbia earmarked 2000 Can. Dollars for a two month research of the Serbian emigrants to Canada, and the Institute of Ethnography covered the travel costs.

<sup>18</sup> Pavlović 1990; Lukić Krstanović 1992.

due to the ensuing financial difficulties (political and economic sanctions) they were discontinued.

The eighties represented a crucial period of establishing of a new discursive course and process of anthropologization (Kovačević, 2006: 59). Ethnological education based on structuralist references – Levi-Strauss, Leach, Barthes, Merton started a research wave of semiologization on the domestic grounds. Younger generations of ethnologists were trained on structuralist models of reading the phenomena such as *rites of passage*, structural models or interpretation of manifest and latent functions. The first papers were presented and published within the Ethnological Society which became a center of new ideas. The penetration of this anthropological *new wave* into the institutional framework was somewhat slower, still restrained for intensive interpretative changes and disturbance of routinized ethnographic registers. The traditional customs, rituals, legends, myths, but also rituals from the mundane and rural and urban culture such as radio messages, retirement, going to the army, subcultural styles, factory rituals, just some of the research topics which have completely overturned the institute's research and publishing production. Nothing is as it was before. Study of traditional phenomena received a new discursive angle of observation, entering the world of liminal and latent meanings and functions of the phenomena; new projects were conceived such as study of urban environments and ethnological study of symbolical communication. This turn finally gave priority to the theoretical and methodological space. Ethnology *live* has broken away from its realistic and naturalistic perception, giving priority to a profound and logistic treatment of processing various topics as a specific scientific emancipation.<sup>19</sup>

## Conclusion

In the first decades of the socialist order, ethnology was sufficiently distanced from the current social scene, engrossed with the scientific self-reflectivity based on folklore – rural – anthropogeographic parameters and remaining consistent in its usual descriptions void of criticism and revision. Save for the exceptions (study of communist – partisan folklore), the research remained extratemporal, adhering to the traditional totality and spatial domination as the most significant verifier of “folk culture”. Distancing from the current phenomena and collection-related work in the sphere of folk culture made ethnology an invisible science in the public life and scientifically huddled under the auspices of the Academy within the national, namely, state boundaries. In the late socialism, namely, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> phase of ethnological production, on the example of the Institute of Ethnography SASA, the national ethnography was confronted with the ethnology of modernism as an emancipated area of anthropologization. There was nothing accidental, even less uncontrolled. The order was established – layer of ethnicity, layer of tradition, layer of modernism. This fits into the conclusion that the “na-

---

<sup>19</sup> Papers and monographs see Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnography SASA XXXIII, 1984; Malešević, 1982; Prica, 1991; Antonijević, 1991.

tional continental European ethnologies” in the second half of the twentieth century were diagnosed in their “double-headedness” – with differentiated anthropological concepts and research of own folk culture (Prica, 2001: 17). The prevailing of the national signs in the majority of ethnological papers showed, if I may use Bausinger’s coined phrase, “consequential extremeness – of national science”. Moreover, the studies of social changes were present in following the long-lasting transformations which entered the cliché of binary option *tradition – contemporariness* or *before* and *after* the war, without visible decade cuts. Nevertheless, the studies of social changes, particularly in the eighties, reached the threshold of global topics such as popular culture, ritual and symbolic universalism etc. Everything that had taken place from 1947 until 1990 verified ethnologies in three ways – through discipline, convention and emancipation. From the present day positions, the study of the review of the socialist period yields indications that all the anomalies or shifts of the science of socialism are seen from a distance. As a well certified national science, ethnography of socialism has left us with a great legacy of material, which is still waiting to be critically processed in order to understand the scientific and intellectual misapprehensions and reaches. At the same time, the scientific policy between conservatism and modernization sometimes created a provocative and flexible, and sometimes static and rigid ethnological picture, which did not depend only on the socialist social and political order, but also on the model of the man of socialism, which some inclined to and some withstood creating their own worlds of science.

#### LITERATURE

- ANTONIJEVIĆ, Dragosl: Marksova i Engelsova pisma, o etnološkim pitanjima, In: *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU, IV – V*, Beograd, 1957, p. 303-309.
- ANTONIJEVIĆ, D.: *Značenje srpskih bajki* Posebna izdanja Etnografskog instituta SANU 33, Beograd : Etnografski institut SANU, 1991.
- BANDIĆ, D.: Neke novije promene u životu i kulturi stanovništva okoline Beograda. In: *Zbornik radova Etnografskog instituta*, knj. 9, Beograd, 1979.
- BAUSINGER, H.: *Etnologija*. Beograd : Biblioteka XX vek, 2002.
- CEROVIĆ, E.: Bibliografija izdanja Etnografskog instituta i radova objavljenih u njima. In: *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU, XXI*, Beograd, 1972, p. 21-104.
- DIVAC, Z.: Međunarodna saradnja. In: *Spomenica Etnografskog instituta 1947 – 1997*, Beograd : Etnografski institute SANU, 1997.
- EMMRICH, B.: Abschied vom DEMOS. In: *Europäische Ethnologien im neuen Millennium, Osteuropäische Ethnologien auf neuen Wegen – Abschied vom Referatenorgan DEMOS*. (Eds. Emmrich, B., Moser, J), Dresden : Thelem, 2002, p. 12-27.
- GORUNOVIĆ, G.: *Srpska etnologija i marksizam. Naučno delo Špire Kulišića*. Beograd : Srpski genealoški centar, 2007.
- GORUNOVIĆ, G.: On a Not So Well tempered Marxism: Ideological Criticism, Historical Reconstructions, and a Late Return to Ethnogenesis in the work Špiro Kulišić. Socialism. In: Mihăilescu, V., Iliev, I, Naumović, S (Eds.): *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies I. Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*. Berlin : LIT VERLAG Dr. W. Hopf, 2008.
- GUDAC, Ž. – ĐORĐEVIĆ, M.: *Politička istorija XIX i XX veka, svetska i nacionalna*. Fakultet političkih nauka, Beograd : Čigoja štampa, 2000.
- JOVANOVIĆ, M.: Rad Etnografskog instituta SANU na proučavanju savremenih promena u narodnoj kulturi. In: *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU*, knj. XXII, 1973, p. 144-150.

- KOVAČEVIĆ, I.: *Istorija srpske etnologije II. Pravci i odlomci*. Beograd : Srpski genealoški centar, 2001.
- LUKIĆ KRSTANOVIĆ, M.: *Srbi u Kanadi, Život i simboli identiteta*. Posebna izdanja Etnografskog instituta SANU, knj.36, Beograd : Etnografski institut SANU, 1992.
- MALEŠEVIĆ, M.: *Porodični rituali oko prve menstruacije*. Posebna izdanja Etnografskog instituta SANU, 25, Beograd : Etnografski institut SANU, 1982.
- Mihăilescu, V., Iliev, I., Naumović, S (Eds.): *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies I. Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*. Berlin : LIT VERLAG Dr. W. Hopf, 2008.
- MILENKOVIĆ, M.: *Istorija postmoderne antropologije. Intertemporalna heterarhija*. Beograd: Srpski genealoški centar, 2010.
- NAUMOVIĆ, S.: Brief Encounters, Dangerous Liaisons and Never-ending Stories: The Politics of Serbian Ethnology and Anthropology in the Interesting Times of Yugoslav Socialism In: Mihăilescu, V., Iliev, I., Naumović, S. (Eds.). (2008). *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies I. Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*. Berlin : LIT VERLAG Dr. W. Hopf, 2008.
- NEDELJKOVIĆ, D.: Uloga narodne pesme u Vukovoj kulturnoj revoluciji i metodološko pitanje razlikovanja racionalnog, revolucionarnog jezgra narodne umetnosti i kulture. In: *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SAN*; 1 – 2, 1952.
- NEDELJKOVIĆ, D.: Prilog proučavanja zakonitosti razvitka našeg narodnog pevanja u periodu Narodne revolucije, Oslobođilačkog rata i izgradnje socijalizma Jugoslavije. In: *Zbornik radova SAN LXVIII*, 1960, p. 39-167.
- NIKOLIĆ, D.: Terenski rad. In: *Spomenica Etnografskog instituta 1947 – 1997*. Beograd, 1997, p. 31-40.
- PAVKOVIĆ, N. – BANDIĆ, D. – KOVAČEVIĆ, I.: Težnje i pravci razvoja etnologije u SR Srbiji (1945-1983) In: *Zbornik 1. Kongresa Jugoslovenskih etnologov in folkloristov*. Rogaška Slatina. Ljubljana : Knjižnica Glasnika Slovenskega etnološkega društva 10/1, 1983..
- PAVLOVIĆ, M.: *Srbi u Čikagu. Problem etničkog identiteta*, Posebna izdanja Etnografskog instituta SANU, knj. 32, Beograd : Etnografski institut SANU i Izdavačka zadruga idea, 1990.
- PRELIĆ, M.: Ethnographical Institute of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SASA) in Search of the Lost Subject of Serbian Ethnology: From Ethnos to Ethnic Identity In: Mihăilescu, V., Iliev, I., Naumović, S. (Eds.): *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies I. Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*. Berlin : LIT VERLAG Dr. W. Hopf, 2008.
- PRELIĆ, M.: Prvih šezdeset godina Etnografskog instituta (1947 – 2007) In: *Slike kulture nekad i sad, 60 godina Etnografskog instituta*, Zbornik 24. Etnografski institut SANU, Beograd : Etnografski institut SANU, 2008, p. 9-25.
- PRICA, I.: *Omladinska potkultura u Beogradu – simbolička praksa*, Posebna izdanja Etnografskog instituta SANU. Beograd : Etnografski institut SANU, 1991 .
- PRICA, I.: *Mala europska etnologija*. Zagreb : Golden marketing, 2001.
- PROŠIĆ-DVORNIĆ, M.: Pogovor In: Petrović Đ., *Od pusta do zlatoveza*, Beograd : Srpski genealoški centar, 2003.
- PROŠIĆ-DVORNIĆ, M.: Serbian village Culture: The Meeting Point of American Anthropology and Serbian Ethnology In: Mihăilescu, V., Iliev, I., Naumović, S. (Eds.): *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies I. Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*. Berlin : LIT VERLAG Dr. W. Hopf, 2008.
- RADOVANOVIĆ, V.: Etnografski institut Srpske akademije nauka i njegov Glasnik, In: *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SAN I*, 1 – 2, 1952.
- RADOVANOVIĆ, M.: Perspektive rada u Etnografskom institutu. In: *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta XXI*, 1973.
- SKERLIĆ, J.: *Omladina i njena književnost (1848 – 1871), izučavanje o nacionalnom i književnom romantizmu kod Srba*. Beograd : Izdavačka knjižarnica Napredak, 1925.
- SPASIĆ, I.: The Art of Mutual Neglect: Zagorka Golubović's Sociocultural Anthropology and Serbian Ethnology In: Mihăilescu, V., Iliev, I., Naumović, S. (Eds.): *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies I. Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*. Berlin : LIT VERLAG Dr. W. Hopf, 2008.
- ZEČEVIĆ, D.: Letopis Etnografskog instituta Srpske akademije nauka (1947 – 1950). In: *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SAN I*, 1 – 2, 1952.

UROŠEVIĆ, A.: Razvoj i rad Etnografskog instituta Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti (1947 – 1972). In: *Glasnik etnografskog instituta SANU, XXI*, 1972.

VERDERI, K.: *Šta je bio socijalizam i šta dolazi posle njega*. (Veselin Kostić, Trans.). Beograd : Fabrika knjiga, 2005.

#### **SOURCES**

*V Kongres komunističke partije Jugoslavije 1948*. Stenografske beleške. Beograd : Kultura, 1949.