

DOI 10.51558/2490-3647.2025.10.1.291

UDK 32(497.6):070(497.6)"1987/1990"
94(497.6):070(497.6)"1987/1990"

Primljeno: 10. 12. 2024.

Izvorni naučni rad
Original scientific paper

Sabina Veladžić

ON THE CONTROVERSIES OF DEMOCRATIC PLURALISM: DISCURSIVE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE SOCIALIST SYSTEM CRISIS IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA'S YOUTH PRESS AT THE END OF THE 1980s

The paper examines so-called democratization period in Bosnia and Herzegovina at the end of the 1980s, during which the outbreak of the Agrokomerc affair and a series of other scandals led to political delegitimization of both the Bosnian and Herzegovinian communist leadership and the existing discursive regime of truth, paving the way for the affirmation of a new political and ideological paradigm as well as the emergence of new social and political power structures. The focus of this paper is on critiques in the youth press in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1987 to 1990 directed toward the socialist political elite, which had already been experiencing disintegration and decline, as well as on interpretations of the Yugoslav and Bosnian crisis portrayed by the aforementioned press, becoming an integral part of that critique. The author, on one hand, shows that the identity and conceptual political platform of the analysed youth press was and remained Bosnian and civic. On the other hand, she points out that the ideological pluralism promoted by the Bosnian youth press as a value of democratization actually provided media space and legitimacy to the victims (in some cases self-declared), i.e. enemies of the socialist regime, being mostly nationalists, for their interpretations of national and past realities. In this sense, it partially aided the affirmation of national exclusivity as the new dominant ideological paradigm, which ultimately, through wartime violence, led to the disintegration of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian society into three closed national entities. All of this occurred within an underdeveloped civil society with insufficient recognition of the value of civic political projects, in addition to a discredited political left, an advanced process of national

homogenization as well as the political mobilization of the largest Yugoslav nation.

Keywords: youth press; *Naši dani*; *Valter*; *Književna revija*; Bosnia and Herzegovina; crisis of socialism; interpretations; interpreters; criticism; Bosnian & Herzegovinian political leadership; rehabilitation; democratization; ideological pluralism; (Serbian) nationalism; Bosnian Karakazan; Dark Eyalet

1. INSTEAD OF INTRODUCTION

The topic of the youth press and its merciless criticism of the so-called *middle generation* of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian (hereinafter: Bosnian) political and party leadership,¹ caused by the growing crisis and a series of huge and small affairs that shook society and economy of the Republic at the end of the 1980s, I first opened in my master's thesis followed by a published article (S. Veladžić 2011a; S. Veladžić 2011b). My conclusion then was that the youth press in Bosnia and Herzegovina used the outbreak of the Agrokomerc affair in the summer of 1987² – which caused the widespread confusion created in the ranks of the political and party leadership discredited by the affair – and intensively encouraged the process of democratization and pluralistic expansion of the public and political space in that republic.³ At the same time, with its relentless criticism, youth press contributed the process of delegitimization of the Bosnian political leadership, which since the 1960s was creating a discourse on Bosnia and Herzegovina as the unique political, economic, historical and cultural entity and worked on its stabilization, but then at the end of the 1980s fell into a state of decadent alienation. The consequence of this alienation, which led

1 It concerns a generation of Bosnian politicians who consolidated their leadership in the government of the Republic in the early 1970s, during the decentralization of socialist Yugoslavia, the redefinition of Yugoslavism as an identitarian concept, and the affirmation of national and republican social and cultural distinctiveness. Their political efforts were focused on the economic and social integration of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the affirmation of its historical, political, and cultural identity. The most prominent representatives of this generation were Branko Mikulić, Hamdija Pozderac, Todo Kurtović, Hrvoje Ištuk, Cvijetin Mijatović, Hasan Grabčanović, Džemal Bijedić, etc. These individuals rotated at the helm of the state and party bodies in Bosnia and Herzegovina throughout the 1970s and 1980s. On this see: Kamberović (2013, 2011), S. Veladžić (2021).

2 On the Agrokomerc affair, which was, due to the socio-political repercussions it caused in Bosnia in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the subject of various interpretations, see: Dodik (2003), Anđelić (2005), Mulaosmanović (2010, 2013); Dupanović (2021).

3 On public and political space created by the existence of the “interspace between people in all their diversity”, see: Arendt (2019). My intention is to question this thesis by Hannah Arendt and point out that the plurality of ideas in the public and political space does not in itself improve democratic and humanistic dimension of the society if the civil society is insufficiently developed and if the ideas spread within it encourage xenophobic and hostile closing towards the defined *Otherness*.

to the dissatisfaction of young people, was a growing gap between the hegemonic ideology, official discursive mottos, the ruling and lifestyle of the *avant-garde* and the depressive social reality, which was increasingly moving away from the never-reached socialist essence. Contributing the process of delegitimization of the Bosnian communist political elite and providing various *interpreters* with a youth media platform to express different (ideological and critical) interpretations of the Yugoslav crisis went hand in hand with the delegitimization of discursive knowledge that maintained and supported the *regime of truth*⁴ and the Bosnian *national* and cultural politics in socialist time. Therefore, the youth press in a way supported the destruction of the socialist system in Bosnia and Herzegovina and prepared the ground for the so-called democratization, but in fact the ethnocratization and division of the integrated Bosnian society into three exclusive, national societies.

In this work, which is a continuation and upgrade of the aforementioned initial research of this broad and complex topic that is approachable in several different ways and which cannot be thoroughly absolved in one short text, I try to focus on the accounts of those interpreters in the Bosnian youth press during the late 1980s who in most cases were (self)presented as victims of the socialist regime and the Bosnian ruling elite, as well as on the discursive analysis of their narratives about the socialist political and cultural reality in the Republic. Through their *stories* they were actually transforming public perception and memory on lived and recent socialist past. The very fact that at the end of the 1980s their interpretations could be presented within the media of institutionalized socialist youth speaks of democratization and criticism that came first from within the regime's institutional structures, admittedly, as a consequence of a type of credibility collapse of the so-called second generation of Bosnian politicians, and about the ideological pluralization of the political and public space within which different discursive knowledge on reality was presented, and new structures of socio-political power were being slowly legitimized, i.e. within which the process of radical ideological transformation of part of the *old* structures of socio-political power began. The narratives of *the interpreters*, which are in my analytical focus, were expressed as ideologically structured, composed of the same argumentative theses and accusations, stigmas and stereotypes related to the Bosnian political elite and the social atmosphere that it created in the Republic since the beginning of the 1970s.

However, since historical reality is complex phenomenon, in addition to the hypothesis that the promoted ideological pluralism in the Bosnian youth press actually

4 Concept taken from: Foucault (1994).

helped legitimizing national exclusivity as the new dominant ideological paradigm, it should be added that the identitarian basis from which the journalists of the Bosnian youth media embarked on the articulation of criticism, the attempt to shape a better social reality, and the promotion of new *heroes* of the Republic's political scene was, nevertheless, conceptually *Bosnian*. Namely, with the escalation of the Yugoslav interethnic crisis, the appearance of Milošević and the growth of the Serbian national and populist movement – anti-bureaucratic and “*Happening of the People*” – which began to spread to Bosnia and Herzegovina and further endangered its already damaged stability, the youth press intensified its demand for defining a clear, loud, resolute and above all recognisable *Bosnian* politics, and in this sense they sought and gave support to those public and political figures whom they considered to possess moral integrity, determination and immediacy, the courage to shape criticism of the key protagonists of Serbian nationalism, to clearly articulate attitudes towards the ongoing socio-political crisis processes and to offer democratic, civil and political solutions.⁵

⁵ Journalists of the Bosnian youth press, as early as during the spread of *The Solidarity Rallies* to Vojvodina and Montenegro in 1988, were already pointing out the authoritarian and nationalist nature of Milošević's *socialist* regime and the movement he led. Fahrudin Đapo, „Državu, dajte mi državu (Vruće ljeto u Srbiji)“, *Naši Dani*, July 22, 1988, 6, 7; Vlastimir Mijović, „Vožd je stigao (Milošević *ante portas*)“, *Naši Dani*, July 22, 1988, 10, 11; Vlastimir Mijović, „Lideri i agresori“, *Naši Dani*, August 8, 1988, 7-9; Consequently, the youth media focused on (young) Bosnian intellectuals and politicians who had the courage to publicly speak out and oppose this politics and the anti-Albanian hysteria. Fahrudin Đapo, „Diferencijaciju treba dovesti do kraja (Intervju: dr Fuad Muhić)“, *Naši Dani*, January 22, 1988, 10-13; Vlastimir Mijović, „Nisam nikoga otjerao (Javni intervju: dr Fuad Muhić)“, *Valter*, April 7, 1989, 4-5; Fahrudin Đapo, „Nisam htio da se dopadnem (Razgovor: Nijaz Skenderagić)“, *Naši Dani*, September 30, 1988, 18-20; Tihomir Loza, Fahrudin Đapo, „Zašto šute moji drugovi?! (Intervju: Muhamed Abadžić)“, *Naši Dani*, September 1, 1989, 10-13; Medina Delalić, „Ja sam bh. nacionalista (Intervju: dr Zdravko Grebo)“, *Valter*, November 8, 1990, 5-7; Vlastimir Mijović, „Smutna vremena (Javni intervju: Zdravko Grebo)“, *Naši Dani*, April 14, 1989, 10-13; Zoran O. Milanović, „Oni treniraju »građanski rat« Mirko i Slavko se i dalje tuku“, *Naši Dani*, September 15, 1989, 3; This triggered a brutal reaction from readers, showing that the process of national homogenization of Serbs had already progressed significantly. „Kampanja protiv Srba !!!!! (Jedan Vaš čitalac)“, *Naši Dani*, February 17, 1989, 6; With the radicalization of the Serbian populist and nationalist movement during 1989, and especially with the appearance of the SDB Serbia report about the emigration of Serbs from Bratunac and Srebrenica, which in the late 1980s represented perhaps the strongest in a series of propaganda attacks on Bosnia from Belgrade, the demands of youth press journalists for the defense of Bosnia's political integrity grew, along with their emphasis on Bosnia's historical continuity in political and cultural terms (S. Veladžić 2011). The hysteria produced around the celebration of the 600th anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo in 1989 was met in the Bosnian youth press with articles highlighting the neglect of the 800th anniversary of the Charter of Ban Kulin as a testament to Bosnian statehood. In the summer of the same year, Zilhad Ključanin, the editor of *Književna revija*, launched a column titled “Unknown Bosnia” through which he affirmed Bosnia's and the Muslim community's neglected cultural heritage. Fahrudin Đapo, „Kompas u šake drugovi!!!!“, *Naši Dani*, October 27, 1989, 3; Zilhad Ključanin, „Disput o Kulinu banu (Nepoznata Bosna II)“, *Naši Dani*, August 4, 1989, 46-49; „Sedamsto godina istorije (Uz zahtjev za promjenu bosanskog grba)“, Nedim Sarač, „I Bosna može da se otcepi!“, *Naši Dani*, March 30, 1990, 12,13,14; Manojlo Tomić, „Zašto ćute Bosanci“, *Naši Dani*, September 2, 1988, 24-25; Fahrudin Đapo, „Pitanje bh identiteta (Tavorenje u fusnoti šeme S-H-S““, *Naši Dani*, September 15, 1989, 6-7, etc, etc.

Their criticism, addressed in different ways to the *old guard*, led by Branko Mikulić, was not initially aimed at the overthrow of the self-governing socialist order, but was provoked by the fact that the old political line-up had abandoned its own ideological and development concept. This is precisely why their demands were initially focused on personnel differentiation, and on giving the chance to the younger, uncompromised political generation that would define a clearer political stance towards an increasingly complex reality in times of crisis. Since this was not happening, the youth press was slowly beginning to give up on the system that did not show the possibility of democratic transformation from within.⁶ At the end of the 1980s, the youth were tired of dogmatism,⁷ empty rhetoric, and the arrogance of the bureaucratized powerful who, from the local to the republican and federal levels, built, as the youth claimed, a closed structure of personnel power and their own social privileges, tired of oppression and repression of *state security*, and politically dependent judiciary, fed up with economic scarcity and the impossibility of realizing *fundamental rights*,⁸ dissatisfied with the

⁶ In fact, it is in the summer of 1989 that more decisive calls began for the Party to democratize from within, to recognize and institutionalize different fractions within itself, and to renounce the principle of democratic centralism, which would also allow the democratization of society. Along with these demands, very bold conclusions were made: "The history of communist parties is also the history of persecution, purges, gulags (...), the history of unique confrontations with members of the same movement (...) the manner in which communist parties (in power) are organized as Bolshevik-Stalinist-conspiratorial organizations inevitably caused such processes" (Manojlo Tomić, „Kako rehabilitirati demokratiju“, *Naši dani*, September 15, 1989, 8-9.). The youth's demands for democratization and political pluralism reached their peak with the Political Manifesto of the League of Socialist Youth of Bosnia and Herzegovina (LSY B&H), from November 1989. *Naši dani*, December 8, 1989, 1-8. Following the 14th Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY), the lethal journalist pen of *Naši dani*, Vlastimir Mijović, wrote an article in which he publicly renounced the Party, stating that the ideas of humanism "are much more embodied in a great deal of 'rotten' capitalism than with us and in the so-called socialist world. The man here is at a low price since long time." His message to the readers was: "I don't believe (...) that this country will be better off with the League of Communists." Vlastimir Mijović, „Kako sam izdao komunističku stvar“, *Naši dani*, February 2, 1990, 5.

⁷ One of the expressions of this tiredness and oversaturation was the public media protest by the youth against the teaching of Marxism at the faculties because of "incompatibility with reality, lack of dialogue, dogmatic approach", and in that name it was stated that Marx "is a historical figure to be forgotten as soon as possible." „Akcija No. 1: Spalimo loše udžbenike“, „Valterovo« ispitivanje javnog mnjenja“, *Valter*, February 24, 1989, 9. The cover page of the same issue of *Valter* portrayed a man's head with a hammer and sickle stuck into it with inscription above: "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought and expression"; Ironical reference to false ideological content and false depiction of reality in textbooks was also present in *Naši dani*. On the inside of the April 15, 1988 issue cover, under the heading "DRESSAGE", there was a paragraph from the elementary school 3rd grade textbook for social and natural studies on "1st of May - Labor Day", which read: "(...) Employees and workers in our country now have all the rights and manage their own work organizations. The longgone wish of the workers has come true – 'Factories for workers and land for the peasants!' (...)" ; Also see: „DRESURA Radnička su prava pregolema“, *Naši dani*, January 22, 1988, the inner cover page. Above the quoted paragraph from 2nd year of Economic Faculty textbook – Momir Čečez, *Privredni sistem i privredni razvoj Jugoslavije* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1984) – which theoretically built the image of nonexistent reality, there was a caricature of a man falling into the black hole of THEORY.

⁸ Inside of the cover of *Naši dani*, October 14, 1988. there is text "The message to the youth of Yugoslavia" by

false ideological image of social reality being revealed in the marginalization and poverty of the so-called *ruling* (working) *class*.⁹ Nevertheless, journalists of the Bosnian youth press were socialized on the ideas of the socialist concept of Bosnian multinational society with all its specificities, and this, in the time of overthrowing the hegemonic ideology and re-examining its symbols through revisions of meanings and official narrative, greatly defined the stance of the youth press towards the sublimating symbolic strongholds of socialist Yugoslavia, primarily towards Tito.¹⁰

the Presidency of the Republic conference of LSY B&H: "In the moment of history in making, concerned about the destiny of Yugoslavia, we address the youth of our country: Going to school has become futile, because getting a job after graduation is the most beautiful, but for many, unattainable dream... having your own roof over your head borders with the unreachable ... starting a family today is courageous... and all that together makes life. We want a life worthy of a man, we will not fight for it with slogans, fancy speeches and 'street promenades'. We will not even fight for it by swearing to the working class from comfortable armchairs and luxurious villas. And that's why, you the worker, and you the student, and you the young man, speak up! (...) about everything you wish to change. (...) Your organization needs such a person (...) in the battles for a school, for a workplace, for a roof over your head, for your family, for life, for Yugoslavia.", "Poruka mladima Jugoslavije", *Naši dani*, October 14, 1988.

⁹ The divergence of the ruling ideology and social reality was in a peculiar way portrayed through the column of *Naši Dani*, ironically titled "Inserts from the life of the ruling class". With photographs and texts it showed gloomy everyday life of the poor, as well as the difficult living conditions of the *working class* and various groups on the social margins: "Spavaonica na kraju grada", *Naši dani*, January 22, 1988; Mustafa Topčagić, „Kost u grlu“, *Naši dani*, February 5, 1988; Veso Đorem, Juso Prelo, "Ugalj zvani čežnja", *Naši dani*, April 17, 1987, 10; Juso Prelo, "Stanovi puni kiše", *Naši dani*, March 4, 1988, 22, 23. All of these texts were dedicated to the miserable conditions that prevailed in the workers' home in Sarajevo; users of the Red Cross kitchen; the hard life of hired workers; slum housing ghettos in the city center where the *working class* – retired, socially disadvantaged people – lived, located in the immediate vicinity of institutions of authority and power, etc. In contrast to these pictures of society, there were also those dedicated to the criticism of the so-called *red bourgeoisie* in Bosnia and Herzegovina and their socially privileged way of life: Mirjana Pobrić, "110 ruža za druga Branka", *Naši dani*, December 9, 1988, 6-8. The text was a criticism addressing Branko Mikulić, at that time federal Prime Minister, and the authorities at local level in Bosnia who had declared the construction of his "copper villa" in the center of Sarajevo to be of "social interest". It was emphasized that for the price of constructing such *functionary's castle*, a purchase of thirty average Yugoslav apartments of 50 sqm could be made.

¹⁰ The Bosnian youth press, following the footsteps of the youth press models in politically and culturally dominant urban centers of SFRY, at the end of the 1980s, questioned the opinion of the youth on the relay race (ceremony on the occasion of the Youth Day), the Party, and to a lesser extent on the Yugoslav National Army, noting that certain rituals had been overcome and that the stance towards the key institutions of the Yugoslav unity had been derogated: Snježana Mulić, Mustafa Topčagić, Adisa Busuladžić, "Štafeta da ili ne, hvala!", "Nemam ništa protiv ali nisam ni za (Anketa)", *Naši dani*, January 22, 1988, 6, 7; Manojlo Tomić, "SK i mladi"; Karim Zaimović, "(Ne) računajte na nas (Anketa)", *Naši dani*, March 18, 1988, 14, 15; Bojan Miroslavljev, "Neko je rekao bauk (Naša tema: mladi i JNA)", *Naši dani*, March 4, 1988, 6-9; The personality of Tito, on the other hand, at least in the Bosnian youth press, and as far as journalistic articles were concerned, was spared of the sharp ideological review; but quite the contrary, the ideological origins of the discursive attacks of Serbian nationalists on Tito since the beginning of the 1980s were critically questioned: Vlastimir Mijović, "Od kulta do blata (Feljton »Naših dana«: Najnoviji prilozi za biografiju Josipa Broza Tita (I))", *Naši dani*, February 17, 1989, 28-33; Vlastimir Mijović, "Izlivi mržnje i kičasta obogotvorenja (Feljton »Naših dana«: Najnoviji prilozi za biografiju Josipa Broza Tita Od kulta do blata (II))", *Naši dani*, March 3, 1989, 28-31; Vlastimir Mijović, "Srpsko pitanje (Najnoviji prilozi za biografiju Josipa Broza Tita Od kulta do blata (III))", *Naši dani*, March

For all the aforementioned claims, hereinafter I shall provide narrative elaboration and argumentation based on sources, aiming to detect different types of controversies, or even better, discursive layers of interaction within the *communication circuit*¹¹ which included the Bosnian youth press and the press of other republics of the Socialist Yugoslavia, especially those in the so called *Serbocroatian cultural area*,¹² along with Bosnian and Yugoslav *imagined* society, or more precisely, the national societies that were being created at the end of 1980s on the basis of new, but in fact the old, and as shown by the cultural discussions during the socialist Yugoslavia, structural ideological foundations.¹³ It should be noted that the theoretical premise with which I started the analysis of the Bosnian youth press is that media do not reflect but rather discursively produce social reality and the *social relational context*,¹⁴ and that the media space in socialist Yugoslavia, especially since the 1970s, was characterized by a strong and tense interaction of republican socio-political realities, produced by republican press, closely linked to the republican centers of political power and shaped in mutual conditioning. Also, it is important to stress that the Bosnian youth press in its democratizing and pluralistic conception was neither original nor new, but followed the models of printed (youth) media in Zagreb, Ljubljana, Bel-

31, 1989, 34-37; »Valterova« grupa za ispitivanje javnog mnijenja, "Između krajnosti (Ispitivanje javnog mnijenja: Tito – 9 godina poslije)", *Valter*, May 5, 1989, 11; Brought on pages 12-13 of the same issue of *Valter* was a "poster" of Tito in his general's uniform with his left fist raised in a display of unimpaired authority. The poem *Requiem* by Đorđe Balašević, famous Yugoslav songwriter, created at the moment of the collapse of one political system and creation of another, and the new symbols and discursive meanings to which the author cannot and does not want to adapt was printed over Tito's photo; Predrag Matvejević, "Ono što doista vrijedi oni ne mogu obezvrjediti (Odlomci iz jednog pisma Titu)", *Valter*, May 5, 1989, 14.

- 11 On the communication circuit covering media production of messages embedded with ideas and meanings, their circulation, distribution, "consumption" by recipients and reproduction as evidence that the sent message has become part of social consciousness and practice, all of which, as Hall notes, builds a "complex structure of dominance", see: Hol (2013: 7, 8, 11).
- 12 The so called Serbo-Croatian cultural area, encompassing the republics of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, and Croatia, was primarily defined by the boundaries of the Serbo-Croatian language/literature, a designation that carried connotations of cultural colonialism for Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro, whose distinctive cultural identities remained unrecognized within this discursive and cultural concept.
- 13 As cultural debates – which intensified as a form of resistance with the decentralization of socialist Yugoslavia and the attempt to affirm the republican entities as socially, culturally and economically integrated – show, national prejudices and stereotypes of the traditional national ideologies were not overcome in socialism. In this context, there was also resistance toward the defining of the Bosnian, including Bosniak, culture, language, and literature as artificial constructs, and the image of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a national, Serbian and Croatian historical and cultural area was disseminated through the public discourse of cultural intellectuals. (Veladžić 2021).
- 14 On the media that reinforced hegemonic cultural beliefs and created a social relational context as "situations where individuals define themselves in relation to others in order to actively engage in developmental social processes", see: Moranjak-Bamburać (2007: 19).

grade,¹⁵ and that the ideological motive of democratization conception was not the same in those centers, which is precisely the key controversy of the entire process.

The sources used for the reconstruction of the defined theme were three magazines published by the institutionalized socialist youth in Bosnia and Herzegovina – *Naši dani*, *Valter* and *Književna revija*. *Naši dani*, the paper of the LSY B&H, whose concept was “determined by the philosophy and spirit of the student revolt”, played a significant role during the student riots in Sarajevo in 1968.¹⁶ The magazine reached its peak, in terms of accomplishing the aforementioned conception, circulation and influence on Bosnian society, at the twilight of the socialist *avant-garde*, at the end of the 1980s.¹⁷ *Valter* was also a biweekly magazine, launched in 1988 by students of the Faculty of Political Sciences under the mentorship and sponsorship of then Dean of the Faculty, Gajo Sekulić, and Professor Nenad Kecmanović.¹⁸ The founder and publisher of *Književna revija* was the Republic Conference of Literary Youth, and the editor-in-chief since 1988 was the writer Zilhad Ključanin. Behind the so-

¹⁵ Senad Avdić, the editor of the Belgrade's *Mladost* and collaborator of *Naši dani* at the end of 1980s, in the series on Bosnian journalism, speaks about *Naši dani* at the beginning of 1980s as a *gray, uncreative, bureaucratic-official and party newsletter*, and how for young Bosnian journalists the Slovenian *Mladina* and especially the Zagreb's *Polet* were conceptual role models against which a “slightly larger inferiority complex was felt” (Historija BH novinarstva: Senad Avdić 1.dio - 12. 03. 2023. (youtube.com), accessed June 16, 2024).

¹⁶ That assessment was given by Stevan Tontić, the writer and, in 1968, the editor-in-chief of *Naši dani*, in an interview with the paper, in January 1989. Tihomir Loza, “Da nas ne pojede stid i da se ne ošugamo”, *Naši dani*, January 20, 1989, 10-13. On the topic of *Naši dani* in the second half of 1960s and their ban in 1969 also see: Midhat Ajanović, “Naše su vještice od krvi i mesa (Intervju: Abdulah Sidran)”, *Naši dani*, December 23, 1988, 30-33; (Kontić 2022: 46).

¹⁷ From November 1987, therefore immediately following the Agrokomerc scandal, a new series of *Naši dani* was beginning to be published (*Naši dani*, November 6, 1987) and the paper took on a new visual form and was profiled by the editors as a serious political media that was no longer primarily dedicated to the depiction of student life and student issues. At the beginning of 1989, on the wave of the so-called democratization, *Dani* was renamed in an independent paper and was finally shut down in 1991.

¹⁸ Interview with Neven Andelić, realized on May 14, 2024 in Sarajevo, the interview record is in the archive of the author. For the sake of the attempt to better understand the conceptual differences between the analyzed youth media, we should also mention the indicative claims in *Naši dani* that Gajo Sekulić, professor of Marxism and the Dean of the Faculty of Political Sciences in Sarajevo, and later president of the Sarajevo branch of Yugoslav Democratic Initiative Association (UJDI), and Nenad Kecmanović, first a professor at Faculty of Political Sciences and later Rector at the University of Sarajevo, for whom it was written to be of “unitarian or even Greater Serbian” orientation, tailor the magazine's concept and actually even write *Valter*. Tihomir Loza, “Šta je šta i... ko je ko u BiH”, *Naši dani*, February 16 1990, 15, 16. *Valter* responded to those claims with counter-accusations about *Naši dani* as a media of the CC LC B&H. Jasmin Duraković, “Ko je ko u sarajevskoj mahali”, *Valter*, February 24, 1990, 6; Editors in chief of *Valter* were Rasim Kadić, the head of the LSY B&H, and Enver Čaušević, who came from Belgrade at the end of 1980s and took over editing. At the end of 1989 Čaušević claimed in *Mladina* that Sekulić and Kecmanović belong to the “different branch of the Serb lobby sitting at the University of Sarajevo”. Tihomir Loza, “Svijetom još uvijek vladaju banditi (Interview: Gajo Sekulić), *Naši dani*, January 5, 1990, 10-13. In 1989 *Valter* grew into the University of Sarajevo Student paper with editor Goran Todorović. In November 1990 it became the magazine of independent journalists.

cialist youth press in Bosnia and Herzegovina stood the urban youth who, as the former journalist of *Valter*, Neven Anđelić, pointed out to me in the interview, did not have a full idea of the complex social and ideological stratification of the society which it addressed. On the other hand, the former editor of *Naši dani*, Fahrudin Đapo, asserted, thus creating a type of differentiation, that young journalists of different social origins stood behind *Dani* and *Valter*; meaning mostly working-class children were behind *Dani*, while *Valter*, as he noted, was written by the youth of social and political elites of the City.¹⁹

The most notable monographs regarding the subject of the youth press in socialist Yugoslavia, (alternative) youth movements and (sub)culture were written by Marko Zubak²⁰ and Ljubica Spaskovska.²¹ As a part of the Educational and Scientific Program, Radiotelevision of Serbia recorded a series titled *Youth Press in Yugoslavia*, in which the Bosnian youth press was mentioned only once.²² The series of the Radiotelevision of Bosnia and Herzegovina on Bosnian journalism, in which conversations were recorded with the protagonists of the youth press and which is much more strongly focused on the circumstances in that Republic but less on the topic of the youth press, was still helpful for achieving a deeper understanding of the historical time of the 1980s where, despite the economic depression and growing political crisis, the alternative youth cultural and media scene flourished.²³ In fact, that series, together with the interviews I conducted²⁴, led me to the fact – which perhaps I had overlooked due to the intensity of criticism in the youth press directed at the Bosnian political and party elite – of the complete networking of journalists and collaborators

¹⁹ Interview with Neven Anđelić; Interview with Fahrudin Đapo, realized on May 12, 2024 in Sarajevo, the interview record is in the archive of the author.

²⁰ Zubak (2018). This book is dealing with the Yugoslav youth movement during slightly earlier period, ending in 1980, when, in the true sense of the word, the depth of Yugoslav crisis was actually revealed. Unfortunately, I have not been able to find it.

²¹ Spaskovska (2020). For the needs of this paper I used the manuscript of a PhD dissertation by Spaskovska (2014).

²² Episodes 3, 4 and 5 are relevant for the period and the topic in focus of this paper. Bosnian youth press was mentioned in the context of the exchange of journalistic contributions between the youth press in Yugoslavia in the 1980s. In addition, Ljubica Spaskovska mentions in these series Vlastimir Mijović, one of the most prominent journalists of *Naši dani* and his *flammable* editing of Belgrade's *Mladost* (Omladinska štampa u Jugoslaviji, 3. emisija (youtube.com); Omladinska štampa u Jugoslaviji, 4. emisija (youtube.com); Omladinska štampa u Jugoslaviji, 5. emisija (youtube.com)).

²³ Historija BH novinarstva - Boro Kontić, 26.02.2023. (youtube.com); Historija bh. novinarstva: Fahrudin Đapo - 01.10.2023. (youtube.com); Historija BH novinarstva: Senad Avdić 1.dio - 12.03.2023. (youtube.com).

²⁴ Interview with Fahrudin Đapo. Fahrudin Đapo was a member of the steady journalism team of *Naši dani* in the 1980s, and from November 1989 (*Naši dani*, November 10, 1989) until October 1990 (*Naši dani*, October 12, 1990) was the editor in chief of the magazine. Interview with Neven Anđelić.

of the youth press in Bosnia and Herzegovina with the structures of socio-political power in the Republic which were not ideologically homogenous, from the university professors who intellectually raised those young journalists, to the politicians, especially the younger generation, who were their sponsors.

2. "OUR GOAL: TO MAKE PUBLIC ONE INCREASINGLY LOUD, BUT »UNOFFICIAL POLYPHONY«"²⁵

In February 1989 *Naši dani* published an interview with Džemaludin Latić, Bosnian writer, accused, convicted and imprisoned in 1983 throughout and following the Sarajevo trial, together with Alija Izetbegović and other members of the so-called Young-Muslims group that in 1990 formed the dominant core of the Bosniak national party, the Party of Democratic Action (SDA).²⁶ As stated in the text, Latić was released from prison in July 1986 after his sentence was reduced from 6.5 to 3.5 years under the "pressure of our and foreign democratic public", while the reason for the interview with *Dani* was "a recent decision" of the Presidency of the SFRY to amnesty the convicts punished under the hated Article 133 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code of the SFRY.²⁷ Thus, Džemaludin Latić²⁸ gained the opportunity in early 1989 to tell the

²⁵ This subtitle was a response of the editorial board of *Naši dani* to the reactions of Rizah Hadžić and Amir Salihagić to the interview published in this magazine with Džemaludin Latić, Bosnian poet convicted in 1983 and the Sarajevo trial. Hadžić and Salihagić were at the time performing duties of the Chairman of the Grand Criminal Panel of the District Court and of the Senior Public Prosecutor. Rizah Hadžić, "To je bilo uobičajeno..."; Viši javni tužilac, Amir Salihagić, "Pismo javnog tužioca", *Naši Dani*, February 17, 1989, 13. The reaction by Hadžić represented a denial of claims made by Latić that Sarajevo process was a politically staged, and Salihagić asked the Council of *Dani* to consider the interview with Latić, because, according to him, it was an "editorial failure which causes harmful consequences and creates doubts among readers and calls into question the regularity of the functioning of judicial bodies." All in all, even at the times of accelerated deterioration of the system and democratization, the power structures in Bosnia and Herzegovina still followed the old patterns of behavior – denial, intimidation and prohibitions.

²⁶ Midhat Ajanović, Tihomir Loza, "Vjernici nisu fundamentalisti" (Intervju: Džemaludin Latić), *Naši dani*, February 3, 1990, 38-43. In the verdict to twelve intellectuals from Sarajevo, and more specifically, in its part that referred to Latić, was stated: "The accused Džemal Latić (...) with his speech before the witnesses (...) encouraged and strengthened their belief about the need to undertake hostile activity through the request that Islam should not only be treated as a religion, but to be practiced and carried out in life as a form of politics, economics, science and some kind of revolution, whereby he advocated the need to Islamize Bosnia and Herzegovina by bringing in the original Islam, while by claiming that imams must first be preachers and then the striking force of the revolution, he also advocated an open "jihad" toward a changing social and political conditions in the country." *Presuda*, Okružni sud u Sarajevu, Broj K: 212/83, Sarajevo, August 20, 1983, 175. I thank to my colleague, dr. Edin Omerčić, who allowed me access to this document.

²⁷ *The regime of truth* in socialist Yugoslavia, produced and supported by discursive knowledge, used the legislation to protect itself from ideological and political enemies, as well as from the different, and freedom of opinion. In that sense, Art. 133, Par. 1 of the Criminal Code of the SFRY (the so-called *Verbal Delict*), incorporated into the legislation of the federal units, was particularly functional: "Whoever, by writing, with a leaflet, drawing

public his side of the story, to assert that the trial in which he was convicted was rigged, to express his opinion about the socialist regime and its key political and “intellectual” protagonists in Bosnia and Herzegovina, to highlight the brave individuals who raised their voices “in the times of darkness”, and to promote his ideological stands and desirable conceptions of future Bosnian and Yugoslav society.²⁹ In short, to begin his legitimation as a victim within the emerging Bosniak culture of remembrance and the Bosnian public and political space, along with his ideological and political affirmation.

or in any other way, calls or incites the overthrow of the government of the working class and working people, to the unconstitutional change of the socialist self-governing social order, to the breaking of the brotherhood and unity and equality of peoples and nationalities, to the overthrow of the organs of social self-management and government or their executive bodies, to resistance to the decisions of competent authorities and self-management that are of importance for the protection and development of socialist self-governing relations, the security or defense of the country, or maliciously and untruthfully portrays the socio-political conditions in the country, shall be punished by imprisonment from one to ten years” (Tompson 2000: 10). Therefore, initiation of the process of transformation of discursive knowledge that legitimized the Yugoslav socialist regime and which started in Ljubljana and Belgrade on different ideological foundations, was followed, from the beginning and throughout the 1980s, by the struggle of democrats and “democrats”, along with the press, against this legislative guardian of the discursive order. On the front page of *Naši dani* of February 19, 1988 issue, there was an announcement of the text “Article 133 of the Criminal Code: Is thinking dangerous?”, and, within the issue, the text of Radmilo Milovanović under the provocative title “I think, therefore I hang”. As an introduction to the topic, there was a quote from Rosa Luxemburg: “Freedom is right only if it is the freedom for those who think differently”, and a question: “Does Article 133 of the Criminal Code of the SFRY allow such freedom?”

²⁸ About the same time Latić took over the editorship of *Preporod*, the newspaper of the Islamic community, which he transformed into a discursive platform for national homogenization of Bosniaks, and later launched *Muslimanski glas* and *Ljiljan*, as ideological apparatuses of the Party of Democratic Action (SDA). Through these papers the propaganda efforts of creating the exclusive, national Bosniak society in Bosnia and Herzegovina continued in the early 1990s. More on this see in: S. Veladžić (2009).

²⁹ In his interview, Latić stated that the process “deeply compromises both our judicial system and its alleged mentors, including a good number of Yugoslav and especially Bosnian intellectuals,” and that it represents “the culmination of aggressively atheistic hatred towards everything that is religious, in this case Islamic.” He also spoke about the terrible pressure and violence that members of the State Security Service (SDB) exerted on the witnesses. In fact, already at that time, the youth press published testimonies of individuals who were forced by the SDB to give ordered court statements against the accused ones. Sead Seljubac (Gornja Tuzla), “Vuk samotnjak (Sjećanja na 1983. godinu)”, *Valter*, March 24, 1989, 14; Latić also asserted about Bosnian political protagonists and their manner of safekeeping Republic peace and stability: “They believe that peace in our multinational and multiconfessional Republic (...) can only be maintained if the religious factor is suppressed and if our other differences are suppressed.” He then continued to explain the essence of *Islamic fundamentalism*, trying to respond to what he considered to be unfounded prejudices against Islam and Muslims, and he spoke about Bosnian Muslims (Bosniaks) as an “authentically Slavic people”, representing a minority, geographically and politically separated from the rest of the Islamic world. Finally, he expressed his anticipation of a desirable society that he would later, at the peak of the so-called democratization process, shape into the concept of the so-called *natural social and political order*: “(...) I believe in the coexistence of different confessions and humane atheism in B&H and beyond. Such a course would not lead Yugoslavia to a new Lebanon, as they often scare us, nor would it lead to anti-communism, but to a reality in which our differences would be lived naturally and without trauma and only thus enable the strong roots for the Yugoslav unity.” Ajanović, Loza, “Vjernici nisu fundamentalisti”, 43.

Latić was not the only victim of the Bosnian socialist regime who in the late 1980s obtained the opportunity to give his assessment of the declining socio-political and ideological system and thereby contribute to its delegitimization and discredit, and ultimately its disintegration. On the contrary, there was a whole gallery of public figures marching through the Yugoslav, i.e. Bosnian youth press, during and especially at the end 1980s, differently positioned in the crumbling structure of socio-political power, with different ideological stands and views on socialist period, but also on the growing ethno-national paradigm, who offered their interpretations of crisis reality through interviews.³⁰

³⁰ *Dani* and *Valter* brought interviews with: **1. representatives of the political authorities that they severely criticized:** Radmilo Milanović, Zoran O. Milanović, "Branko Mikulić: Kako sam »vladao Bosnom« I", *Naši dani*, June 23, 1989, 36-39; Radmilo Milanović, „Branko Mikulić: Kako sam »vladao Bosnom« II", *Naši dani*, July 7, 1989, 28-31; Zoran O. Milanović, Fahrudin Đapo, "Ja se ne stidim" (Intervju: Edina Rešidović, predsjednica RKSSRNBiH), *Naši dani*, June 24, 1988, 10-13. (During the Sarajevo trial in 1983, the most familiar staged process in socialist Bosnia, Rešidović held the position of Public Prosecutor.); **2. with intellectuals who criticized the political powerful, but also those who along with criticism of the alienated and bureaucratized centers of the Republic power, called for national unification** – Nerzuk Ćurak, "Sloboda je potreba duše (Intervju: Mirko Kovač)", *Valter*, January 12, 1990, 20, 21; Srđan Kisić, "Ja sam malo drukčiji Srbin (Intervju: Bogdan Bogdanović)", *Valter*, December 15, 1989, 4-5, 20-21; Dejan Mastilović, Saša Leskovac, "Don Kihot sa Legijom časti (Intervju: Predrag Matvejević)", *Valter*, March 24, 1989, 4-5; **3. with the representatives of cultural intelligentsia that, in the context of the system crisis, was undergoing a radical ideological transformation and asserted itself as the creator of a new knowledge about the past and present of the national collective** – Saša Adam, Marko D. Kosijer, "Njogoš je jeretik (Intervju: Vuk Drašković)", *Valter*, April 7, 1989, 12-14; Mensur Čamo, "Da, ja sam četnički vojvoda (Intervju: Vojislav Šešelj)", *Naši dani*, February 16, 1990, 29-31; **4. with representatives of the new left that was turning to the right:** Dejan Mastilović, Goran Todorović, "Kritika nije napad (Intervju: Ljuba Tadić, filozof)", *Valter*, March 24, 1989, 16-17; **5. with representatives of political emigration:** Fahrudin Đapo, Tihomir Loza, "Ustaše su me osudile na smrt (Intervju: Adil Zulfikarpašić I)", *Naši dani*, March 16, 1990, 6-11; Fahrudin Đapo, Tihomir Loza, "Svi bosanski apsurdni (Intervju: Adil Zulfikarpašić II)", *Naši dani*, March 30, 1990, 6-11; **6. with the victims of Bosnian socialism who at the end of the 1980s underwent a process of rehabilitation and also of the political legitimation:** Nadežda Gaće, "Montirani proces (Intervju: Alija Izetbegović)", *Valter*, December 15, 1989, 10-12; **7. with the victims of the Milošević anti-bureaucratic revolution:** Svetlan Vasović, Igor Mekina, "Nadira Vlasi (Intervju)", *Naši dani*, November 24, 1989, 22-25; **8. with controversial and less controversial protagonists of the Yugoslav and Bosnian cultural scene:** Midhat Ajanović, Fahrudin Đapo, "Nisam se nikom prodao (Intervju: Emir Kusturica)", *Naši dani*, September 15, 1989, 10-13; **9. with editors of youth magazines in Yugoslavia who were on the front line of the struggle for democratization and questioning the symbols, values, institutions and authority of the socialist system:** M. Tomić, F. Đapo, "Nismo povezani s emigracijom (Razgovor: Robert Botteri, glavni urednik *Mladine*)", *Naši dani*, April 1, 1988, 19-21; **10. with the first ladies of the deceased red monarchs:** Senad Hadžifežović, "Kardelj je ostao neshvaćen (Intervju: Pepca Kardelj)", *Naši dani*, February 3, 1989, 8-10; Velizar Zečević, "Jovanka Broz (Intervju)", *Naši dani*, January 20, 1989, 30-35, etc. It is important to note that, in the late 1980s, the same public and political figures and their stories and interpretations were presented in the various Republics' media. It seems that the readers recognized the interpretative Rashomon that flooded the pages of the youth press in Bosnia and Herzegovina at the end of the 1980s as democratic value. At the beginning of 1990, in the column "Reactions" of *Dani*, a reader from Sarajevo wrote: "(...) I would like to pay tribute to "Naši dani" (...) Nowhere else (...) can one read so many diametrically opposed opinions, and still manage to masterfully "get through" one's thought (...) humane and democratic (...) there are very few of those who were ready to face the real

However, I want to pay special attention to one discursive line which dominated in that *polyphony*, and was created by intellectuals, mostly writers (or their loved ones), and professors of social sciences and humanities, who, as they claimed, under the pressure of *dogmatic* and *bureaucratic* political structures and their repression, left Bosnia and Herzegovina and, indignant, went to live and work in other republic and cultural centers, continuing to publicly and intensively produce a (stigmatic) picture of the socialist reality in Bosnia. For example, Darka Selimović, the wife of the late writer Meša Selimović – on the basis of whose literary work the structure of modern and until 1970s formally non-existent Bosniak literature was narratively built, but who nationally declared himself to be Serb, and who in the early 1970s, due to a series of inconveniences, as he claimed, had to leave Sarajevo and move to Belgrade – on several occasions spoke in this manner for the youth press. By naming individuals, Darka Selimović spoke about the ideological rigidity of the representatives of the Bosnian party and political leadership, who enjoyed privileges and entitlements and were not obliged by the social norms they were imposing on the rest of the society; about their control over individual and public speech; intrusion of privacy; disciplining and marginalizing those who did not blindly follow Party directives and who dared to challenge established *truth*; and about denying formally recognized right to national self-determination.³¹ In short, Bosnian and Sarajevo cultural environment was described as a dictatorial dominion of the *powerful*³² who created an in-

problems of real people in these territories (...) to define them with inexorable precision (...) propose action or at least "make us think". "Naši dani" set themselves such a task (...). Dragan Milović, Sarajevo, "Bosna zaslužuje više", *Naši dani*, March 2, 1990, 35.

³¹ Radmilo Milovanović, "Zašto je Meša morao otići (Monovju: Darka Selimović)", *Naši Dani*, February 17, 1989, 18-20; Zehrudin Isaković, Nerzuk Ćurak, "Muslimani su najbolji muževi (Intervju: Darka Selimović)", *Valter*, November 3, 1989, 22; *Književna revija* in January 1989 published "Unanswered letters" that Meša Selimović at the beginning of 1970s sent to the various levels of authorities in Bosnia, Croatia, Serbia, Yugoslavia, and to media representatives. In these letters he was informing about the campaign being carried out against him by CL of B&H, because he declared himself to be Serb by nationality, because he was a member of the Serbian Literary Cooperative, which was slandered for cooperation with emigration, and because he allegedly refused to receive mail from the CC LC B&H at his private address. Also, it was due to the fact that he agreed to be included in Serbian national anthologies. Due to all of this, the TV educational programme, of which he was the editor and which he recorded at the invitation of TV Zagreb, was removed from the broadcast program because, allegedly, TV Sarajevo threatened to disconnect itself from the joint Yugoslav network.

³² Darka, noting that the entire campaign against Meša originated from Branko Mikulić, but "that he worked perfidiously and left no traces", asserted: "They (...) often behaved like some kind of emperors, kings (...) as if they lived in a pure medieval feudal system." Milovanović, "Zašto je Meša morao otići", 20. All of the above, and more, was mentioned by writer Stevan Tontić in an interview with *Dani*: "They could not forgive Selimović for going to Belgrade and declaring to belong to the Serbian national literature at the time of affirming the national individuality of Muslims. (...) Thus, those "in charge" reduced this city down to the level of a second-rate center, to a province which, despite everything, it was not. Many intellectuals were suspected, (...) even interrogated, they were obstructed. (...) the fiercest and nastiest things happened here, and we must finally talk about it, because shame will devour us (...) Firm-handed politics thus caused great damage to this city, and cast

tolerant and unfriendly environment for free-thinking intellectuals, thus forcing them to leave. The same way – on his *case*, Bosnian political climate and his departure, coupled with his and the effort of *non-conformist intellectuals* to take off the mortgage of dogmatism from Bosnia, spoke Esad Ćimić, professor of sociology of religion, in *Naši dani* in April 1989.³³

The blade of his criticism was particularly directed at the intellectuals that served the dogmatic system in Bosnia and Herzegovina – the “tail benders”, “panderers”, “pathologized forms of conformism” – and the fact that the “rigidity of politics” in the Republic, along with the “distrust towards the thinking individuals, prevention of everything innovative, creative” was “shrouded in the draperies of a simulated socialist democracy” under which flourished bureaucratic methods, at the base of which lay an “insatiable desire for authority and power” and its maintenance.³⁴ It should be

a stain on it throughout the country. Many of us have washed it off on many occasions, sometimes even not wanting to admit the true state of affairs and rejecting the labels of *Karakazan* and *Dark vilayet*.” Loza, “Da nas ne pojede stid”, 11-12. It is important to note that Mladen Oljača, Bosnian writer, revolutionary, and once a critic of every nationalism, at the beginning of 1989, carried away by the *anti-bureaucratic revolution and the happening of the people*, in *Duga* harshly criticized the *power-holders* in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Mikulić, Pozderac, Ištuk, as “little Napoleons” who “refuse to accept dialogue, an opposing thought, a different position, another approach, another argument, especially resistance.” Ivan Miladinović, “Lijeva, nanu li mu njegovu (Intervju: Mladen Oljača)”, *Duga*, April 29 – May 5, 1989, 16-19, 71.

³³ “The intellectuals who wished to change something (...) to remove from Bosnia the mortgage of being dogmatic (...) that it does not have its intellectual potential (...) were prevented: by grace or by force. (...) We were constantly troubled by the problem of why the gifted people who were sprout, born and formed here (...) leave their homeland. There are, we thought, some obstacles that are inherent to this environment and narrow down the creative expression, take away intellectual and moral support, create a cultural climate of certain discomfort for all those who want and can spiritually enrich the environment. (...) As soon as one was different – in attitude, behavior, reasoning – many politically oriented people assessed you as dangerous.” And that assessment, noted Ćimić, very quickly led to endangering the existence of a “problematic” intellectuals. Fahrudin Đapo, “Esad Ćimić (Intervju)”, *Naši dani*, April 14, 1989, 28-31; Fahrudin Đapo, “Da pravda bude silna a sila pravična (Intervju: Esad Ćimić II)”, *Naši dani*, April 28, 1989, 28-33. In the 1960s, as the editor of *Odjek*, Journal of Arts, Science and Social Affairs, Ćimić opened up sensitive issues and let controversial texts be published through that paper. His final split with the Bosnian political establishment came when he publicly opposed the official policy of national recognition of Muslims and opened possibilities of different theoretical approaches to that *phenomena*. With the political and “intellectual” creators of his case and the described socio-political climate in Bosnia Ćimić dealt through his book (Ćimić 1981).

³⁴ Đapo, “Ćimić I”, 31; The same attitude toward representatives of the *middle* generation of Bosnian politicians lead by Mikulić – Hamdija Pozderac, Hasan Grabčanović, Hrvoje Ištuk, Todo Kurtović, and others – was also announced by Osman Karabegović, revolutionary and partisan, member of the older generation of Bosnian politicians who, together with Avdo Humo, Hajro Kapetanović and Čedo Kapor, ended as the political case in 1972: “What caused the misunderstanding? Well, because of the functions and armchairs that they got a hold of and grabbed onto ever so tightly thinking (...) that they are theirs until the end of times. They took every criticism personally, as an attack on them, instead of being a warning for failings in their work. (...) At that time, the political bureaucracy had tremendous power. Authority and power were shared in the cabinets in closed and narrow circles of people, many of whom were, to say the least, strange, vain and dangerous in case anyone crossed their path in any way.” Radmilo Milanović, Fahrudin Đapo, “Nisu me uspjeli slomiti (Intervju: Osman Karabegović)”, *Naši dani*, November 25, 16-17; Writer Mladen Oljača initiated a “polemical discussion”

noted that back in the fall of 1988, the editorial board of *Književna revija* devoted an entire issue to the topic of “Bosnian cultural migrations” opened with the poem by Aleksa Šantić “Stay here (Ostajte ovde)”, as well as recalling the same discussion that, at the initiative of Ćimić as the editor of *Odjek*, was held in 1965, which all directly indicated the structural character of the disputes on cultural migrations from Bosnia and Herzegovina, which, as a specific type of its contestation, began approximately at the same time when the *Bosnian* socio-cultural policy was conceived.³⁵ Although this featured article, as was noted, aimed to establish a civilized dialogue between “migrants” and “our cultural environment”, still the text “Migrated tradition”, signed by the editorial board and collaborators, made a differentiation among the intellectuals and *cultural workers* that in previous decades had left Bosnia and Sarajevo. From such categorization, which revealed a type of critical opinion of the youth press about the phenomenon of the Bosnian cultural migration and the fame that was built around it, I single out those cultural creators who, according to the editors, due to their own “unsettled spirituality” forced a conflict with their surroundings and therefore their attitude towards it was extremely negative and was characterized by “inventing the common spirit of the environment”, or its fierce stigmatization.³⁶

on the case of the mentioned four at the 18th, 19th and 21st session of the Central Committee of the B&H Communist League, and ultimately that body tasked its Presidency with preparing a proposal of their stands on the events of 1972, which ultimately, in September 1989, resulted in the recognition of a mistake – “there was no reason to impose measures of ideological and political responsibility and remove individuals from political life”. ABiH, CK SKBiH, “Predsjedništvo CK SKBiH, Prijedlog stavova o pokrenutim pitanjima koje se tiču događaja iz 1972. godine”, September, 1989 (undedited archival materials); The entire process was followed by the pressure from the media, including the youth press, which wrote about the case, building a negative image of the Bosnian political leadership led by Mikulić. Radmilo Milanović, Fahrudin Đapo, “Kritika uzurpatorske politike (Jesen ’72. u Bosni I)”, *Naši dani*, November 11, 1988, 14-17; Radmilo Milanović, Fahrudin Đapo, “CK je zbio redove (Jesen ’72. u Bosni II)”, *Naši dani*, November 25, 14-15. Čedo Kapor spoke in *Duga* about the campaign against him in 1972, during which persons of *suspicious origin* were used – the descendants of *Chetniks* and *Ustashas*, who tried proving themselves to the authorities. In his interview he gave support to Milošević and his “democratic and revolutionary” political orientation and his efforts to “constitute the Republic of Serbia”. Zoran Marković, “Teško je biti na stazi slonova (Intervju: Čedo Kapor)”, *Duga*, January 7 – January 20, 1989, 32-34.

³⁵ The public discussion on the topic “Sarajevo cultural climate. Problem or mystification” was in 1965 encouraged by the editorial board of *Odjek*, and then, in cooperation with the Commission for Ideological Issues and Cultural-Educational Work of the Main Board of the Socialist Union of Working People B&H, on November 26, 1965, a discussion on the topic “Cultural situation of Sarajevo” was held with participation of representatives of the cultural and political life of Sarajevo and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as intellectuals who lived in the centers of other Republics in SFRY. The authorized transcript of that discussion was published in: *Odjek*, December 15, 1965, 1-15.

³⁶ In addition to this category, those “who had everything, but had to leave because of the feeling of belonging to the national motherland, thus creating a problem” were also mentioned. Uredništvo i saradnici, “Migrirana tradicija”, *Književna revija*, September - October, 1988, 1, 2. On the second to last and the last page of the paper, a list of 144 “cultural workers, migrants” who left Bosnia and Herzegovina was published.

This included the writer Vojislav Lubarda, who, due to his (historical) interpretations of the Second World War and the period of socialism in Bosnia and Herzegovina in his literary work, and because of the public polemics in which he engaged at the beginning of the 1970s with claims about the endangerment of the Serb national culture and being in the Republic, came into conflict with the Bosnian political leadership as early as the late 1960s (S. Veladžić 2016). Then there was the poet Rajko Petrov Nogo, an ambitious member of the younger literary generation that in the 1970s resolutely demanded their own positioning within the social structures of power and cultural institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in that name led disputes with older colleagues that took on connotations of national conflict (S. Veladžić 2017). Finally, there was the politologist Vojislav Šešelj, who in the first half of the 1980s became the Bosnian political “case” through his conflict with the *corrupted* socio-political power structures in the Republic and who, as some authors believe, precisely because of the manner in which he was dealt with, rapidly ideologically radicalized during the 1980s.³⁷ All three of them, along with some other representatives of the Serbian cultural intelligentsia in and from Bosnia, in the late 1980s, using the youth press of both Belgrade and Sarajevo openly attacked the social and cultural circumstances, as well as the political and intellectual elite in Bosnia, and upgraded analyzed discourse on the Republic with *Orientalisms* and *Balkanisms*³⁸, which, within the Serbian national culture of remembrance, redesigned by the new elites or the old ones in a new ideological guise and in accordance with the Svetosava ideological foundations, had a strong symbolic negative charge.

They described *Bosnia* as the land of darkness, a *karakazan*, and a place of historical hatred of various religious, and later national, groups, of horrible violence that

³⁷ About how the Šešelj case was created in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the early 1980s, but also about the stigma built over the Bosnian social and cultural environment and political elite by Nenad Kecmanović and Vojislav Šešelj in the Belgrade press, see: D. Veladžić (2015). An interesting view of Šešelj's “developmental” path as a product of the brutal (socio-political) repression he experienced in Bosnia can also be seen in: Jergović, Basara (2015).

³⁸ This is how the writer Momo Kapor spoke for *Dani* about the reasons of his *Bosnian exile*: “In the case of my voluntary exile from Sarajevo, the key role was played by the members of an (...) arrogant and primitive mentality and education. (...) a combination of feudalism and socialism (...) these are the people surrounded by their retinues, their squires (...) they have their own police officers (...) state airplanes that they use as their private (...) an enormous power which, combined with all the subtleties of the mentality of the Orient, is very dangerous (...) faced with such lack of authority, many sensitive intellectuals and artists fled the city. (...) And just like that, for years I have not been able to visit the graves of my family who perished in the last war and were buried in Sarajevo, because until now my visit was prevented by people, including even those who in 1942 worked in the NDH (The Independent State of Croatia) civil service, with the Ustashes.” Radmilo Milanović, “Zašto ne dolazim u Sarajevo (Ispovijest: Momo Kapor)”, *Naši dani*, April 29, 1988, 26, 27.

left deep traumas, primarily on the Serbian people whom they had declared a victim.³⁹ The socialist system and its protagonists, they claimed, used repression to curb that inter-ethnic hatred, which at the end of the 1980s and the decline of the system, was stronger than in the Second World War.⁴⁰ For the Bosnian political elite and its *middle generation* with Mikulić at its head, they claimed to be the patrons of Muslim/Bosniak nationalism and Bosnian cultural unitarism,⁴¹ and supporters of cultural projects that promoted individuals of suspicious ideological orientation and the past. In fact, Lubarda described the period of socialism as a period of cooperation between *Islamic*

³⁹ "The *Karakazan* of Bosnia is so deep, heavy and insurmountable that it has not yet been born (...) a writer who will have the strength to read it himself (...) The darkness of Bosnia is elusive (untouchable, insurmountable) also because its muffled call (...) primeval (...) beckons and enchants. (...) hatred – both religious and national – and what I called irrational – first investigated us (...) because the entire environment (...) nursed us with it from birth, from the first song, the scream of the *mahala* and lightning of a knife before our eyes." Milo Gligorijević, "Pisac u tamnom vilajetu", *NIN*, January 21, 1990, 20. Interview with Vojislav Lubarda on the occasion of the awarding of the 35th Prize for Literature of *NIN* for his novel *Vaznesenje*. In the interview, Lubarda spoke about his conflict with the "feudalized political bureaucracy that wanted to rule Bosnia in the same way the Ottoman vizier and pashas did", about his obsession with the Bosnian darkness that dates back to the Ottoman era, the deep personal trauma he suffered as a child during World War II and about writing as a way of overcoming that trauma: "The centuries-old Ottoman burden that fell onto the shoulders of the people to whom I belong, thus of course, fell also onto my shoulders, and consumed my blood and thoughts (...) and until the age of thirty-one (...) I used to scream all night long, groan and cry in my sleep: there was not a night without me dreaming of a bloody knife and the black Ustasha hand, or watching other children and women heads being crushed with a handspike, girls' breasts being cut off, all the while I was waiting in line for slaughter." Ibidem, 21, 25. Compare with the feuilleton published in *NIN* magazine in ten installments from February 18 to April 22 1990: Vojislav Lubarda, "Svileni gajtan ili mani zemlju koja Bosne nema (Feljton)", *NIN*, February 18, 1990, 64-68... Vojislav Lubarda, "Drugu Špiri Galoviću ('Svileni gajtan' 10)", *NIN*, April 22, 1990, 57-59. A critical review of Lubarda's literature, his public activities and attacks on Bosnia, from which, as he claimed, intellectuals run, was also written by the journalist of *Naši dani*, Senad Avdić, in the text "Lubarda ili papci na vlasti", *Naši dani*, March 2, 1990, 19.

⁴⁰ "Is Bosnia the country of hatred? And does there, at the root of even the most noble things – which seemingly could have risen only from love (...) in fact lie hatred? This newly composed period of ours has only superficially covered up those roots and camouflaged that hatred (...) and now everything is bursting at the seams.", Ivan Miladinović, "Unri unrino, udbi Udbino (Intervju: Rajko Petrov Nogo)", *Duga*, September 30 – October 14, 1989, 74; Writer Gojko Đogo, the author of *Vunena vremena*, a critic of Tito, the Belgrade *democrat*, protagonist of Šušar's *Bijela knjiga* and the hero of the protest literary evenings at Francuska 7 spoke for *Naši dani* about Bosnia and Herzegovina in the early 1990s: "I believe that for the last twenty years Bosnia and Herzegovina has been Katanga, and we know who Čombe was (S.V. this was allusion to Branko Mikulić). That reign of terror left serious consequences. One of the most terrible of which is inter-ethnic strife. I would say that this hatred is no smaller today than in the year forty-one." Tihomir Loza, "Činjenice su optužujuće (Intervju: Gojko Đogo)", *Naši dani*, February 2, 1990, 38.

⁴¹ The theoretical basis which was given by Muhamed Filipović, Bosnian philosopher and the Party intellectual but also Bosnian and Muslim nationalist, with his essay "Bosanski duh u književnosti – šta je to?" (Filipović, 1967); In the early 1980s, when the Serbian cultural intelligentsia and political elite intensified their attack on the discursively, *artificially* created republican and national identities in the SFRY and the 1974 Constitution, Filipović was also the editor of the contested encyclopedic separate *Socialist Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina* (Jugoslovenski leksikografski zavod 1983).

fundamentalists “at the top of the party and government” and *Maspokovs*.⁴² Ultimately, they claimed, all this happened to the detriment of the Serbs in Bosnia and their cultural heritage that was neglected, denied and banished from the public space, especially the Cyrillic script, which led intellectuals and Serbian people in general to leave Bosnia and Herzegovina in an ever-increasing number.⁴³ The described discourse, with a recognizable structure, had a clear ideological and political role at the end of the 1980s and was aimed at the tighter interbinding of the Serbian national society within Yugoslavia and at the demolition of the Bosnian society built, or at least *imagined*, in socialism, and at delegitimization of its creators, even at delegitimization and ideological condemnation of the *Bosnian glasnost* led by the youth press.⁴⁴ In

⁴² “(...) the efforts of Islamic fundamentalists, whose main leaders were at the top of the party and the government – to cleanse Bosnia and Herzegovina of everything spoiling the so-called Bosnian ‘self-importance’ and the right of the ‘natives’ (...) Muslims, to govern Bosnia and Herzegovina on their own (...) Those are the times when the Maspokovs support the Islamic fundamentalists, and the fundamentalists support the Maspokovs, when the Pozderac brothers, Hasan Grapčanović and Džemal Bijedić create interbond with Branko Mikulić, when Mikulić suddenly emerged on the political surface and for a long time, for many years, holds onto the keys of all movements in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Muslim fundamentalists then, just like in the times of the NDH, united with the Croat clerics and exclaimed that they were ‘the most beautiful Croat flowers’.” Gligorijević, “Pisac u tamnom vilajetu”, 22.

⁴³ “Even now, twenty years later, there are no books, magazines and newspapers, anything that could at least be compared with the state under the Turkish administration. Everything else that reminds of the spiritual past of the Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, from heroic to *hajduk* songs to baptismal glory, the name of the Serb enlightener St. Sava. (...) Pressures (S.V. on Serbs to move out of Bosnia and Herzegovina) are not visible (...) because even today, people flee across Drina river secretly, without publicizing it, just like during the *dahis*. If in two years (...) there are not over 600,000 Serb defectors across rivers Drina and Sava, I am ready to return to Bosnia and stand before the sharia court.”, Gligorijević, “Pisac u tamnom vilajetu”, 23; Nogo also stressed: “(...) in Bosnia, the Cyrillic letters could only be found on obituaries. The use of the *ekavica* dialect was frowned upon.” Miladinović, „Nogo“, 74. In the fall of 1989 *Naši dani* published an interview with writer Vladimir Srebrov on the occasion of his controversial speech at the “session of the Board of Communist League Branch of the City of Sarajevo”, during which he spoke about the threat to Serbs in Sarajevo and “their spiritual, mental and moral castration” and about the “Shiptar invasion of the city of Sarajevo”. According to him, the neglect of the Cyrillics in the public and cultural life of the Republic, the alleged lack of Orthodox churches in the City, bans imposed on books and literary evenings of Serbian writers, and even attacks onto them, all testified in support of his thesis. Majo Otan, “Ugrožen sam kao Srbin i kao čovek (Intervju: Vladimir Srebrov, književnik)”, *Naši dani*, October 27, 1989, 38-41. The aggressiveness of the Serbian populist movement that spilled over into Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1989 *Đogo justified* by long-term suffering of injustice, and in anti-Serbian politics searched for the causes of the so-called migration of Serbs from Bosnia and Herzegovina: “(...) one should not be surprised if in certain places, especially where Serbs are the majority, that religious or national charge and feelings which were suppressed, now begin to manifest in a somewhat more violent way. It is primarily the result of a dark time. (...) I think that the Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina have been walking with their noses down for too long, looking down at the ground. Well, they have now begun straightening their spine and that bothers some. (...) It is no accident that there is a massive emigration of the Serbs from B&H, the intellectuals are not the only ones fleeing. Loza, „Đogo“, 39.

⁴⁴ Srebrov claimed in *Naši dani* that *Bosnian Glasnost* represented a false democratization of Bosnian media, which were still under the control of the Party, and that it was aimed against the Serbs and at promoting the ideas of integral Bosniakism. Otan, “Srebrov”, 40.

addition to the portrayal of the *Bosnian darkness*, that discourse also showed its structural and ideological commonality in relation to the communists and the socialist period in Yugoslavia in general,⁴⁵ to the “Kosovo issue”, Tito,⁴⁶ the Constitution of 1974 and Milošević⁴⁷. What is important to note is that – as the so-called process of democratization progressed – this narrative became additionally and openly radicalized⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Vuk Drašković, the autor of the controversial *Nož*, a book that constructs historical guilt of Bosnian Muslim Converts (*Poturice*) as the origin of the pathogenic character of that collective, spoke for *Valter* in 1989, about the communists who brought the country down to the “lowest, most miserable branches since its inception,” and how they created the rift and hatred between the people, set back the civilization and “*Africanized*” Yugoslavia, and how they “cut off the smartest heads of Serbian people”, sold off Serbian national territories, Kosovo and Metohija, creating on them “another Albanian state”. Saša Adam, Marko D. Kosijer, “Njegoš je jeretik (Intervju: Vuk Drašković)”, *Valter*, April 7, 1989, 12-14; Accusing the Comintern for its policy towards the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, Drašković referred to the historian from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Milorad Ekmečić, who received the Prize of *NIN* in 1989 for historiographical work and his book “*Stvaranje Jugoslavije (1790-1918)*”, in which he presented theses that the ideological roots of the socialist self-governing system lay in “Italian fascism”. Therefore, that book served the radical revision of knowledge at the end of 1980s about the Yugoslav communist movement, its key protagonists and ideological foundations. For more details on this, see: S.Veladžić (2023). Also see: Milorad Vučelić, „Polemika o Jugoslaviji“, *NIN*, January 14, 1990, 31-38; „Kritika titoizma“, *NIN*, January 14, 1990, 32-35.

⁴⁶ “(...) I think that Broz was one of the greatest tyrants that communism birthed, a true son of his father Stalin, perhaps the most capable one. (...) This awareness has long prevailed in the Belgrade intellectual circle.” Loza, “*Đogo*”, 38; “The communist politics (...) was to destroy everything what was Serbian, and the main proponent of that destruction was Broz. (...) During the World War I, he was the one who shot sons of Serb mothers; there are documents and photos of this, with Broz in a foreign uniform, with a rifle in his hand, fighting against us. (...) Through forty years of his tyranny, he wanted to erase every trace of us. (...) He was the Hitler after Hitler, Stalin’s student. (...) While the people had no bread to eat, they built luxurious mansions, travelled and whored around.” Avdić, “*Šešelji*”, 8-9; “If the Croatian and Slovenian communists are really loyal to Tito (...) they cannot be for a multi-party system and for Europe because the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, created by Josip Broz, was formed using all the recipes of the Bolshevik, monolithic party that did not tolerate the opposing opinions, nor the opposite party.” Adam, Kosijer, “*Drašković*”, 14.

⁴⁷ “The eighth session brought many changes in Serbia, and with Milošević coming to power largely liberalized and democratized life in Serbia. Since he is in power, no one in Serbia has been arrested for a verbal offense.” Mensur Čamo, “Da, ja sam četnički vojvoda (Intervju: Vojislav Šešelji)”, *Naši dani*, February 16, 1990, 30; Gojko Đogo spoke about Milošević: “(...) one more truth about Milošević. He does not prohibit, he does not investigate, he does not arrest. He was the first to open to the public the sessions of the highest party and state bodies (...) the spontaneous movement of the people began before Milošević, it was a true movement of resistance to anarchy and tyranny. The Serb leadership quickly realized that this spontaneous movement cannot be resisted (...) Thus, for the first time since the existence of the communist government, it won the trust of the Serbian people.” Loza, “*Đogo*”, 37; “Slobodan Milošević (...) is a man who is essentially the leader of all Serbs in Serbia, and I think in Yugoslavia as well. And I believe in the world as well (...) extremely smart, educated, brave, nationally aware.” Adam, Kosijer, “*Drašković*”, 13.

⁴⁸ In Šešelji’s discourse, the Serbs thus became centuries-old victims with terror over them reaching its peak during the “artificial socialist creation” which was the “nest of murderers and thieves”, further declaring that the knowledge about the Chetniks built in socialism was a “heinous lie”. The manner of publicly challenging the Bosnian and Herzegovinian national politics and the politics of recognition of the so-called peripheral nations in Yugoslavia in general is also radicalized: “Who are Muslims? A mere product of heated Communist nonsense. The Turk-oppressed Serbs (...) In Bosnia, the streets bear the names of Turkish heroes who impaled Serbs. (...) Macedonian who? (...) They all are, for the most part, Serbs. (...) Montenegrins are our twins and they desire

and its dominance was gradually established in the public and political space of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Yugoslavia, leading to a complete change of ideological and political paradigm.

3. CONCLUSION

The process of democratization and ideological pluralization of the media space in Bosnia and Herzegovina gained momentum with the outbreak of the Agrokomerc scandal, which caused turmoil and division within the Bosnian and Herzegovinian party and political leadership, suddenly placing them under the sharp critical scrutiny of the media and the public. In this context, the youth press in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the late 1980s, particularly *Naši Dani*, played an important social role in shaping public perception and interpreting the causes of the crisis of the socialist system in Yugoslavia and Bosnia. It identified key issues that hindered the proper functioning of society and the state, along with articulating dissatisfaction and directing criticism at the Bosnian and Herzegovinian socialist elite, which, through its social and political practices, betrayed the ideology it imposed as a norm on the rest of society, reducing it to empty and dogmatic rhetoric. Although highly critical of the middle generation of the Bosnian political leadership, the youth press at the end of the 1980s did not abandon its Bosnian or even socialist orientation. On the contrary, this pro-Bosnian stance grew stronger as the interethnic crisis in Yugoslavia deepened and the pressure from Serbian nationalism and its political and cultural protagonists on the Republic intensified.

However, at the historical moment when the Bosnian *glasnost* began, the official *regime of truth* in socialist Yugoslavia was already undermined, primarily by the actions of the Serbian cultural intelligentsia and the Serbian communist political elite, which, since the early 1980s, had been raising the issue of reconceptualizing the 1974 state constitution and the Kosovo crisis, through which Serbian national homogenization and mobilization on the foundations of traditional Serbian nationalism were actively encouraged. In this sense, the Agrokomerc scandal and the rise of Milošević to power almost coincide, and the discourse of the anti-bureaucratic revolution – as a formal rhetorical cover for the program of national consolidation of Serbs across Yugoslavia – bears some resemblance to the democratizing and critical discourse that

to come under the auspices of Great Serbia (...).” Edin Avdić, „Ako treba i uz pomoć kame (Intervju: Vojislav Šešelji, četnik)“, *Valter*, September 19, 1990, 13; Compare with: Duška Jovanić, „Baš čelik iz bosanskog lonca (Intervju: Vojislav Šešelji“, *Duga*, February 17 – March 2, 1990, 27-29, 69.

dominated the youth press in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the late 1980s and which contributed to the delegitimization of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian political leadership. That leadership, since the 1970s, had maintained the stability of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a unified society, carried out the economic integration of the Republic, and sought to build a cultural discourse about Bosnia and Herzegovina as a historical entity. Its subsequent discrediting during the democratization process also led to a forced re-evaluation and public devaluation of what was considered the cultural, ideological, and political heritage of its rule. All the more so because the media, particularly the youth press, in the late 1980s, opened their pages to ideological pluralism as a democratic value, thus allowing interpreters of questionable ideological profiles, in conflict with the socialist system, the opportunity to offer their assessment of socialist reality, i.e., to disseminate victimized and ideologically structured image of the reality of the national collective to which they belonged. In a situation of advanced national homogenization of the Serbian collective, along with the Serbian populist movement and media campaign that, by the late 1980s, began to deeply destabilize Yugoslav society and further encouraged other national collectives to homogenize, this very narrow and impoverished ideological plurality, within which the dominant alternative to the discredited political left was traditional nationalism, only further fuelled the already initiated process of political and ideological gathering of subjects around the narratives, myths, and symbols of exclusive ethno-nationalism.

Ultimately, it can be concluded that the Bosnian and Herzegovinian youth press, although motivated by democratic ideals and liberal principles, had an ambivalent impact. On the one hand, it undermined the dogmatic structures of the communist government, forcing them into critical self-reflection and contributing to the internal but late reform of the Party. On the other hand, by providing a platform for nationalist voices, it inadvertently supported dissemination of a nationalist discourse that destabilized Bosnian society and the institutions that were crucial in its defence against nationalism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Archival sources:

1. ABiH, CK SKBiH, „Predsjedništvo CK SKBiH, Prijedlog stavova o pokrenutim pitanjima koje se tiču događaja iz 1972. godine“, September, 1989 (undedited archival materials).
2. *Presuda*, Okružni sud u Sarajevu, Broj K: 212/83, Sarajevo, August 20, 1983.

Magazine articles:

1. Adam, Saša, Marko D. Kosijer, „Njegaš je jeretik (Interview: Vuk Drašković), *Valter*, April 7, 1989, p. 12-14.
2. Ajanović, Midhat, „Naše su vještice od krvi i mesa (Interview: Abdulah Sidran)“, *Naši dani*, December 23, 1988, p. 30-33.
3. Ajanović, Midhat, Fahrudin Đapo, „Nisam se nikom prodao (Interview: Emir Kusturica)“, *Naši dani*, September 15, 1989, p. 10-13.
4. Ajanović, Midhat, Tihomir Loza, „Vjernici nisu fundamentalisti“ (Interview: Džemaludin Latić), *Naši dani*, February 3, 1990, p. 38-43.
5. „Akcija No. 1: Spalimo loše udžbenike“, „»Valterovo« ispitivanje javnog mnjenja“, *Valter*, February 24, 1989, p. 9.
6. Autorizovani stenogram diskusije „Kulturna situacija Sarajeva“, *Odjek*, December 15, 1965.
7. Avdić, Edin, „Ako treba i uz pomoć kame (Interview: Vojislav Šešelj, četnik)“, *Valter*, September 19, 1990, p. 13.
8. Avdić, Senad, „Lubarda ili papci na vlasti“, *Naši dani*, March 2, 1990, p. 19.
9. Čamo, Mensur, „Da, ja sam četnički vojvoda (Interview: Vojislav Šešelj)“, *Naši dani*, February 16, 1990, p. 29-31.
10. Ćurak, Nerzuk, „Sloboda je potreba duše (Interview: Mirko Kovač, književnik)“, *Valter*, January 12, 1990, p. 20-21.
11. Delalić, Medina, „Ja sam bh. nacionalista (Interview: dr Zdravko Grebo), *Valter*, November 8, 1990, p. 5-7.
12. „DRESURA“, *Naši dani*, April 15, 1988, the inner cover page.
13. „DRESURA Radnička su prava pregolema“, *Naši dani*, January 22, 1988, the inner cover page.
14. Duraković, Jasmin, „Ko je ko u sarajevskoj mahali“, *Valter*, February 24, 1990, p. 6.

15. Đapo, Fahrudin, „Diferencijaciju treba dovesti do kraja (Interview: dr Fuad Muhić), *Naši Dani*, January 22, 1988, p. 10-13.
16. Đapo, Fahrudin, „Državu, dajte mi državu (Vruće ljeto u Srbiji)“, *Naši Dani*, July 22, 1988, p. 6-7.
17. Đapo, Fahrudin, „Nisam htio da se dopadnem (Interview: Nijaz Skenderagić), *Naši Dani*, September 30, 1988, p. 18-20.
18. Đapo, Fahrudin, „Esad Ćimić (Interview)“, *Naši dani*, April 14, 1989, p. 28-31.
19. Đapo, Fahrudin, „Da pravda bude silna a sila pravična (Interview: Esad Ćimić II), *Naši dani*, April 28, 1989, p. 28-33.
20. Đapo, Fahrudin, „Pitanje bh identiteta (Tavorenje u fusnoti šeme S-H-S)“, *Naši Dani*, September 15, 1989, p. 6-7.
21. Đapo, Fahrudin, „Kompas u šake drugovi!!!“, *Naši Dani*, October 27, 1989, p. 3.
22. Đapo, Fahrudin, Tihomir Loza, „Ustaše su me osudile na smrt (Interview: Adil Zulfikarpašić, najpoznatiji bosanski emigrant I), *Naši dani*, March 16, 1990, p. 6-11.
23. Đapo, Fahrudin, Tihomir Loza, „Svi bosanski apsurdni (Interview: Adil Zulfikarpašić, najpoznatiji bosanski emigrant II), *Naši dani*, March 30, 1990, p. 6-11.
24. Đorem, Veso, Jusko Prelo, „Ugalj zvani čežnja“, *Naši dani*, April 17, 1987, p. 10.
25. Gaće, Nadežda, „Montirani proces (Interview: Alija Izetbegović)“, *Valter*, December 15, 1989, p. 10-12.
26. Hadžić, Rizah, „To je bilo uobičajeno ...“, *Naši Dani*, February 17, 1989, p. 13.
27. Gligorijević, Milo, „Pisac u tamnom vilajetu“, *Nin*, January 21, 1990, p. 19-25.
28. Hadžifejzović, Senad, „Kardelj je ostao neshvaćen (Interview: Pepca Kardelj), *Naši dani*, February 3, 1989, p. 8-10.
29. Isaković, Zehrudin, Nerzuk Ćurak, „Muslimani su najbolji muževi (Interview: Darka Selimović)“, *Valter*, November 3, 1989, p. 22.
30. Jovanić, Duška, „Baš čelik iz bosanskog lonca (Interview: Vojislav Šešeljić)“, *Duga*, February 17 – March 2, 1990, p. 27-29, 69.
31. „Kampanja protiv Srba !!! (Jedan Vaš čitalac)“, *Naši Dani*, February 17, 1989, p. 6.
32. Kisić, Srđan, „Ja sam malo drukčiji Srbin (Interview: Bogdan Bogdanović)“, *Valter*, December 15, 1989, p. 4-5, 20-21.

33. Ključanin, Zilhad, „Disput o Kulinu banu (Nepoznata Bosna II)“, *Naši Dani*, August 4, 1989, p. 46-49.
34. Loza, Tihomir, „Da nas ne pojede stid i da se ne ošugamo“, *Naši dani*, January 20, 1989, p. 10-13.
35. Loza, Tihomir, Fahrudin Đapo, „Zašto šute moji drugovi?! (Interview: Muhamed Abadžić)“, *Naši Dani*, September 1, 1989, p. 10-13.
36. Loza, Tihomir, „Svijetom još uvijek vladaju banditi (Interview: Gajo Sekulić)“, *Naši dani*, January 5, 1990, p. 10-13.
37. Loza, Tihomir, „Činjenice su optužujuće (Interview: Gojko Đogo)“, *Naši dani*, February 2, 1990, p. 37-39.
38. Loza, Tihomir, „Šta je šta i ... ko je ko u BiH“, *Naši dani*, February 16, 1990, p. 15-16.
39. Lubarda, Vojislav, „Svileni gajtan ili mani zemlju koja Bosne nema (Feljton)“, *NIN*, February 18, 1990, 64-68.
40. Lubarda, Vojislav, „Drugu Špiri Galoviću (‘Svileni gajtan’ 10)“, *NIN*, April 22, 1990, 57-59.
41. Marković, Zoran, „Teško je biti na stazi slonova (Interview: Čedo Kapor)“, *Duga*, January 7 – January 20, 1989, p. 32-34.
42. Mastilović, Dejan, Saša Leskovac, „Don Kihot sa Legijom časti (Interview: Predrag Matvejević)“, *Valter*, March 24, 1989, p. 4-5.
43. Mastilović, Dejan, Goran Todorović, „Kritika nije napad (Interview: Ljuba Tadić, filozof)“, *Valter*, March 24, 1989, p. 16-17.
44. Matvejević, Predrag, „Ono što doista vrijedi oni ne mogu obezvrijediti (Odlomci iz jednog pisma Titu)“, *Valter*, May 5, 1989, p. 14.
45. Mijović, Vlastimir, „Vožd je stigao (Milošević ante portas)“, *Naši Dani*, July 22, 1988, p. 10-11.
46. Mijović, Vlastimir, „Lideri i agresori“, *Naši Dani*, August 8, 1988, p. 7-9.
47. Mijović, Vlastimir, „Od kulta do blata (Feljton »Naših dana«: Najnoviji prilozi za biografiju Josipa Broza Tita (I))“, *Naši dani*, February 17, 1989, p. 28-33.
48. Mijović, Vlastimir, „Izlivi mržnje i kičasta obogotvorenja (Feljton »Naših dana«: Najnoviji prilozi za biografiju Josipa Broza Tita Od kulta do blata (II))“, *Naši dani*, March 3, 1989, p. 28-31.
49. Mijović, Vlastimir, „Srpsko pitanje (Najnoviji prilozi za biografiju Josipa Broza Tita Od kulta do blata (III))“, *Naši dani*, March 31, 1989, p. 34-37.
50. Mijović, Vlastimir, „Nisam nikoga otjerao (Public Interview: dr Fuad Muhić)“, *Valter*, April 7, 1989, p. 4-5.

51. Mijović, Vlastimir, „Smutna vremena (Public Interview: Zdravko Grebo)“, *Naši Dani*, April 14, 1989, p. 10-13.
52. Mijović, Vlastimir, „Kako sam izdao komunističku stvar“, *Naši dani*, February 2, 1990, p. 5.
53. Miladinović, Ivan, „Lijeva, nanu li mu njegovu (Interview: Mladen Oljača)“, *Duga*, April 29 – May 5, 1989, p. 16-19, 71.
54. Miladinović, Ivan, „Unri unrino, udbi Udbino (Interview: Rajko Petrov Nogo), *Duga*, September 30 – October 14, 1989, p. 72-76.
55. Milanović, Zoran O., Fahrudin Đapo, „Ja se ne stidim (Interview: Edina Rešidović, predsjednica RKSSRNBiH), *Naši dani*, June 24, 1988, p. 10-13.
56. Milanović, Zoran O., „Oni treniraju »građanski rat«: Mirko i Slavko se i dalje tuku“, *Naši Dani*, September 15, 1989, p. 3.
57. Milovanović, Radmilo, „Mislim, dakle visim (Umjesto dosjea: član 133 Krivičnog zakona)“, *Naši dani*, February 19, 1988, p. 16-18.
58. Milovanović, Radmilo, „Zašto ne dolazim u Sarajevo (Interview: Momo Kapor)“, *Naši dani*, April 29, 1988, p. 26-27.
59. Milovanović, Radmilo, „Zašto je Meša morao otići (Monoview: Darka Selimović)“, *Naši Dani*, February 17, 1989, p. 18-20.
60. Milovanović, Radmilo, Zoran O. Milanović, „Branko Mikulić: Kako sam »vladao Bosnom« I, *Naši dani*, June 23, 1989, p. 36-39.
61. Milovanović, Radmilo, „Branko Mikulić: Kako sam »vladao Bosnom« II, *Naši dani*, July 7, 1989, p. 28-31.
62. Milovanović, Radmilo, Fahrudin Đapo, „Kritika uzurpatorske politike (Jesen '72. u Bosni I)“, *Naši dani*, November 11, 1988, p. 14-17.
63. Milovanović, Radmilo, Fahrudin Đapo, „CK je zbio redove (Jesen '72. u Bosni II)“, *Naši dani*, November 25, 1989, p. 14-15.
64. Milovanović, Radmilo, Fahrudin Đapo, „Nisu me uspjeli slomiti (Interview: Osman Karabegović)“, *Naši dani*, November 25, 1988, p. 16-17.
65. Milović, Dragan, „Bosna zaslužuje više“, *Naši dani*, March 2, 1990, p. 35.
66. Mirosavljev, Bojan, „Neko je rekao bauk (Naša tema: mladi i JNA)“, *Naši dani*, March 4, 1988, p. 6-9.
67. Mulić, Snježana, Mustafa Topčagić, Adisa Busuladžić, „Štafeta da ili ne, hvala“, *Naši dani*, January 22, 1988, p. 6.
68. „Nemam ništa protiv ali nisam ni za (Anketa)“, *Naši dani*, January 22, 1988, p. 7.
69. Odbor za pripremu XII kongresa SSOBiH, „Politički manifest SSO BiH (Nacrt)“, *Naši dani*, December 8, 1989, p. 1-8.

70. Otan, Majo, „Ugrožen sam kao Srbin i kao čovek (Interview: Vladimir Srebrov, književnik), *Naši dani*, October 27, 1989, p. 38-41.
71. „Pisma bez odgovora“, *Književna revija*, January 1989, p. 1(cover page)-3.
72. Pobrić, Mirjana, „110 ruža za druga Branka (Nesuđena kuća Mikulića)“, *Naši dani*, December 9, 1988, p. 6-8.
73. „Poruka mladima Jugoslavije“, *Naši dani*, October 14, 1988, the inner cover page.
74. Prelo, Juso, „Stanovi puni kiše“, *Naši dani*, March 4, 1988, p. 22-23.
75. Salihagić, Amir, „Pismo javnog tužioca“, *Naši Dani*, February 17, 1989, p. 13.
76. Sarač, Nedim, „I Bosna može da se otcepi!“, *Naši Dani*, March 30, 1990, p. 13-14.
77. „Sedamsto godina istorije (Uz zahtjev za promjenu bosanskog grba)“, *Naši Dani*, March 30, 1990, p. 12.
78. Seljubac, Sead (Gornja Tuzla), „Vuk samotnjak (Sjećanja na 1983. godinu)“, *Valter*, March 24, 1989, p. 14.
79. „Spavaonica na kraju grada“, *Naši dani*, January 22, 1988.
80. Tomić, Manojlo, „SK i mladi“, *Naši dani*, March 18, 1988, p. 14.
81. Tomić, Manojlo, Fahrudin Đapo, „Nismo povezani s emigracijom (Interview: Robert Botteri, glavni urednik *Mladine*)“, *Naši dani*, April 1, 1988, p. 19-21.
82. Tomić, Manojlo, „Zašto ćute Bosanci“, *Naši Dani*, September 2, 1988, p. 24-25.
83. Tomić, Manojlo, „Kako rehabilitirati demokratiju“, *Naši dani*, September 15, 1989, p. 8-9.
84. Topčagić, Mustafa, „Kost u grlu“, *Naši dani*, February 5, 1988.
85. Uredništvo i saradnici, „Migrirana tradicija“, *Književna revija*, September – October, 1988, p. 1-2.
86. „»Valterovo« ispitivanje javnog mnjenja“, *Valter*, February 24, 1989, p. 9.
87. »Valterova« grupa za ispitivanje javnog mnjenja, „Između krajnosti (Ispitivanje javnog mnjenja: Tito – 9 godina poslije)“, *Valter*, May 5, 1989, p. 11.
88. Vasović, Svetlan, Igor Mekina, „Nadira Vlasi (Interview)“, *Naši dani*, November 24, 1989, p. 22-25.
89. Vučelić, Milorad, „Polemika o Jugoslaviji“, „Kritika titoizma“, *Nin*, January 14, 1990, p. 32-35.
90. Zaimović, Karim, „(Ne) računajte na nas (Anketa)“, *Naši dani*, March 18, 1988, p. 15.
91. Zečević, Velizar, „Jovanka Broz (Interview)“, *Naši dani*, January 20, 1989, p. 30-35.

LITERATURE:

1. Anđelić, Neven (2005), *Bosna i Hercegovina - Između Tita i rata*. Samizdat B92, Beograd.
2. Arendt, Hannah (2019), "O ljudskosti u mračnim vremenima: Misli o Lessingu", in: Hannah Arendt, *Ljudi u mračnim vremenima* (translated by: Srđan Dvornik), TIM press, Zagreb, 11-38. (Arendt, Hannah (1968), "On Humanity in Dark Times: Thoughts about Lessing", in: Hannah Arendt, *Men in dark times*, Harcourt, Brace & Company, New York)
3. Ćimić, Esad (1981), *Politika kao sudbina. Prilog fenomenologiji političkog stradalništva*, NIRO »Mladost«, Beograd
4. Dodik, Petar (2003), *Uspon i pad „Agrokomerca“*, DES, Sarajevo
5. Dupanović, Dino (2021), "Mjesto i uloga medija u aferi Agrokomerc – od nacionalizma do oslobođenja", *Historia Moderna Bosnia & Herzegovina*, 2, 39-86.
6. Filipović, Muhamed (1967), "Bosanski duh u književnosti – šta je to?", *Život*, 3, 3-18.
7. Foucault, Michel (1994), *Znanje i moć* (translated by Rade Kalanj), Globus, Zagreb
8. Hol, Stjuart (2013), *Mediji i moć* (translated by Vera Vukelić, Svetlana Samurović, Dušan Maljković) Karpos, Beograd
9. Jergović, Miljenko, Svetislav Basara (2015), „*Drugi krug*“, Laguna, Beograd
10. Kamberović, Husnija (2013), "Between Muslimdom, Bosniandom, Yugoslavdom and Bosniakdom: The Political Elite in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the late 1960s and early 1970s", in: Ulf Brunnbauer, Hannes Grandits Oldenbourg (eds.), *The Ambiguous Nation Case Studies from Southeastern Europe in the 20th Century*, edited, Südosteuropäische Arbeiten Verlag, München, 57-76.
11. Kamberović, Husnija, "Mostarsko savjetovanje 1966. godine", in: Husnija Kamberović (2011), *Hod po trnju Iz bosanskohercegovačke historije 20. stoljeća*. Institut za istoriju u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, p. 150-179.
12. Kontić, Boro (2022), *Grebo Kratka biografija*, Buybook, Sarajevo/Zagreb
13. Moranjak-Bamburać, Nirman (2007), "Nepodnošljiva lakoća stereotipa", in: Nirman Moranjak-Bamburać, Tarik Jusić, Adila Isanović (eds.), *Stereotipizacija: Predstavljanje žena u štampanim medijima u jugoistočnoj Evropi*, Mediacentar, Sarajevo, 15-47.
14. Mulaosmanović, Admir (2010), *Bihaćka krajina 1971.-1991. (utjecaj politike i političkih elita na privredni razvoj*, Institut za istoriju, Sarajevo

15. Mulaosmanović, Admir (2013), "The Identity Factory Agrokomerc and the Population of the Bihačka Krajina", in: Ulf Brunnbauer, Hannes Grandits (eds.), *The Ambiguous Nation Case Studies from Southeastern Europe in the 20th Century*, Südsteuropäische Arbeiten, Oldenbourg, Verlag, München, 77-102.
16. Spaskovska, Ljubica (2014), *The Last Yugoslav Generation – Youth Cultures and Politics in Late Socialism*, PhD diss., University of Exeter, accessed May 16, 2024.
17. Spaskovska, Ljubica (2020), *The Last Yugoslav Generation: The Rethinking of Youth Politics and Cultures in Late Socialism*, Manchester University Press, Manchester
18. Thompson, Mark (2000), *Proizvodnja rata: Mediji u Srbiji, Hrvatskoj i Bosni i Hercegovini (II dopunjeno izdanje)* (translated by Vera Vukelić), Medija centar, Free B92, Beograd (Thompson, Mark (1999), *Forging War: The Media in Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina*, University of Luton Press)
19. Veladžić, Denis (2015), *Bosna i Hercegovina u srbijanskim sredstvima javnog informiranja i izdavačko-publicističkoj djelatnosti od 1980. do 1984*, Master thesis, University of Sarajevo, Sarajevo
20. Veladžić, Sabina (2009), "Homogenizacija Bošnjaka kroz *Preporod* 1990.", in: Husnija Kamberović (ed.), *Rasprave o nacionalnom identitetu Bošnjaka*, Institut za istoriju u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 185-217.
21. Veladžić, Sabina (2011a), *Bošnjaci u Bosni i Hercegovini od 1990. do 1992. godine: Uzroci i sredstva nacionalne homogenizacije*, Master thesis, University of Sarajevo, Sarajevo
22. Veladžić, Sabina (2011b), "Destabilizacija Bosne i Hercegovine krajem osamdesetih godina 20. stoljeća – 'stvaranje preduslova' za tronacionalnu dezintegraciju", *Historical searches*, 7, 201-229.
23. Veladžić, Sabina (2016), "Slučaj 'Gordog posrtanja' 1969. godine – društveno-politički odjeci i rasprave". *Prilozi*, 45, 201-229.
24. Veladžić, Sabina (2017), "Udruženje književnika Bosne i Hercegovine u jugoslovenskim i bosanskohercegovačkim društveno-političkim i idejnim previranjima od sredine 1960-ih do početka 1970-ih", *Pilar*, XII, 24 (2), 71-103.
25. Veladžić, Sabina (2021), "Kultiviranje socio-kulturnog identiteta Bosne i Hercegovine kroz jezičnu politiku 1965.-1973.", *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, 53(3), 989-1021.

26. Veladžić, Sabina (2023), "Povijesni i (proto)nacionalni razvoj Bošnjaka i (stigmatizacija) bošnjaštva u diskurzivnim praksama kulturne inteligencije u Bosni i Hercegovini 1960/1970ih i početkom 1990-ih", in: Safet Bandžović (ed.), *Bošnjaci u emigraciji: Adil Zulfikarpašić i nacionalno-politički vidokrug časopisa Bosanski pogledi*, Bošnjački institut – Fondacija Adila Zulfikarpašića, Sarajevo, 165-195.
27. Zubak, Marko (2018), *The Yugoslav Youth Press (1968-1980): Student Movements, Youth Subcultures and Alternative Communist Media*, Srednja Europa, Zagreb

You Tube:

1. Historija BH novinarstva: Senad Avdić 1.dio - 12. 03. 2023. (youtube.com), accessed June 16, 2024.
2. Historija BH novinarstva: Boro Kontić, 26. 02. 2023. (youtube.com), accessed June 17, 2024.
3. Historija bh. novinarstva: Fahrudin Đapo - 01. 10. 2023. (youtube.com), accessed June 17, 2024.
4. Omladinska štampa u Jugoslaviji, 3. emisija (youtube.com), accessed June 5, 2024.
5. Omladinska štampa u Jugoslaviji, 4. emisija (youtube.com), accessed June 5, 2024.
6. Omladinska štampa u Jugoslaviji, 5. emisija (youtube.com), accessed June 5, 2024.

INTERVIEWS:

1. Interview with Fahrudin Đapo, realized on May 12, 2024 in Sarajevo, interview record is in the archive of the author.
2. Interview with Neven Anđelić, realized on May 14, 2024 in Sarajevo, interview record is in the archive of the author.

O KONTROVERZAMA DEMOKRATSKOG PLURALIZMA: DISKURZIVNA TUMAČENJA KRIZE SOCIJALISTIČKOG SISTEMA POTKRAJ 1980-ih U OMLADINSKOJ ŠTAMPI U BOSNI I HERCEGOVINI

Sažetak:

Potkraj 1980-ih, omladinska štampa u Bosni i Hercegovini odigrala je važnu društvenu ulogu u javnoj artikulaciji nezadovoljstva i upućivanju kritike bosanskohercegovačkoj socijalističkoj eliti koja je svojim društvenim i političkim praksama iznevjerila idejnost koju je nametala kao normu ostatku društva čime ju je svela na praznu i dogmatsku retoriku. Bosanskohercegovačka omladinska štampa ipak u to vrijeme nije gubila svoju probosansku usmjerenost koja je štaviše jačala kako se produbljivala međunacionalna kriza u Jugoslaviji i kako se pojačavao pritisak srpskog nacionalizma i njegovih političkih i kulturnih protagonista na Republiku. U povijesnom trenutku u kojem počinje *bosanska glasnost* zvanični režim istine u socijalističkoj Jugoslaviji već je bio narušen, afera Agrokomerc i dolazak Miloševića na vlast gotovo da koincidiraju, a diskurs tzv. antibirokratske revolucije nalikovao je demokratizacijskom i kritičkom diskursu koji je dominirao omladinskom štampom u Bosni i Hercegovini krajem 1980-ih i koji je potpomogao proces potpune delegitimacije bosanskohercegovačkog političkog rukovodstva koje je od 1970-ih održavalo stabilnost Bosne i Hercegovine kao jedinstvenog društva, provodilo privrednu integraciju Republike i nastojalo graditi kulturni diskurs o Bosni i Hercegovini kao povijesnom entitetu. Njegovim diskreditiranjem došlo je i do preispitivanja i javnog devalviranja onoga što je smatrano kulturnom, idejnom i političkom baštinom njegove vladavine. Tim više, jer su stranice omladinske štampe, krajem 1980-ih, bile otvorene idejnom pluralizmu kao demokratizacijskoj vrijednosti te su na taj način, sa humanističkog stanovišta, tumači upitnih ideoloških profila i u sukobu sa socijalističkim sistemom dobili priliku dati svoju ocjenu socijalističke stvarnosti, tj. diseminirati viktimizacijsku i ideološki strukturiranu sliku stvarnosti nacionalnog kolektiva kojem su pripadali.

Ključne riječi: omladinska štampa; *Naši dani*; *Valter*; *Književna revija*; Bosna i Hercegovina; kriza socijalizma; diskurzivne interpretacije; tumači; kritika; bosanskohercegovačko političko rukovodstvo; rehabilitacije; demokratizacija; idejni pluralizam; (srpski) nacionalizam; *Bosanski karakazan*; *tamni vilajet*

Author's address

Adresa autorice

Sabina Veladžić

University of Sarajevo

Institute for History

sabina.veladzic@iis.unsa.ba