

TOURISM EXHIBITIONISM OF A SOCIALIST DESTINATION: A GAZE AT SOCIALIST YUGOSLAVIA

Abstract. In this article we propose a new approach to exploring the political system of socialist Yugoslavia. Using interdisciplinary methods of research, both political science and tourism enable us to understand better our present and past social environment in a specific historical moment, i.e. the period from 1945 to 1991. We argue that by borrowing some of the concepts from tourism we can shed new light on the specifics of Yugoslavia's socialist political systems. In this article we use tourism theory to explain the positioning and self-perception of Yugoslavia's socialist self-management assembly system by its leading politicians.

Keywords: *real socialism, parliamentarianism, tourist attraction, Yugoslav Communist Party*

Introduction

The research so far into international and domestic perspectives of socialist parliamentarism has resulted in two judgements: one, it is not democratic, and two, in such systems, parliamentary institutions are mere façades of proper parliaments (Vanneman, 1977; Nelson, 1982; Seroka, 1984). Researchers have not associated socialist legislatures with a major role in the formation of public opinion and in the process of making political decisions, although some of them mention the Yugoslav Federal Assembly as an exception to the rule (Mezey, 1979; Nelson, 1982).

When exploring the socialist parliamentarism or parliamentary practices, we thus encounter issues with conceptual investigation of systems because ideologically socialism in its real version – i.e. real socialism – and bourgeois Western democracy stand on opposing sides. For the purpose of this analysis we have assumed the position that their entirely different roles in various political systems and societies prevent all such bodies to be referred to using the single term “parliament”. That is to say, contemporary parliament in modern democratic countries stands for a space of discussing diverse views freely, and for an institution representing in the widest sense the

* Marjetka Rangus, PhD, Teaching assistant, Faculty of Tourism, University of Maribor; Bojan Kurež, M.Sc., Secretary general and lecturer, Faculty of Tourism, University of Maribor.

interests of people not participating directly in the decision-making process (Pitamic, 1996). This, however, cannot be said for legislative bodies in autocratic and totalitarian societies. In his comparative study, Mezey uses the term legislature, which he defines as a predominantly elected body of people that acts collegially and that has at least the formal but not necessarily the exclusive power to enact laws binding on all members of a specific geopolitical entity (Mezey, 1979: 6). From this point of view it seems the least problematic to use this term – *legislature* – *a legislative body* – as it can refer to any assembly or parliament, regardless of the (un-) democratic nature of the political system they pertain to. Legislature can therefore also refer to e.g. the former supreme soviet or the Yugoslav assembly, but not to the British House of Lords.

From the functionalist position, the role of the parliament in various political systems is based on its legislative function, which in the development of political systems corresponds to the democratic principle of people's sovereignty. It is its placement within the political system that emphasises the primacy of the relation between the legislative and the executive function. Being a derivative of the parliamentary legitimacy and sovereignty, the government is a necessary element of the operative and democratic structure of the society. On the one hand, the executive apparatus draws support for its agenda from the parliament, which on the other hand acts as supervisor to the former, and this completes the democratic loop of people's sovereignty (Polsby, 1975; Mezey, 1979; Norton, 1993; Olson, 1994; Many and Knapp, 1998; Copeland and Patterson, 1997; Hague and Harrop, 2007).

The parliament, therefore, is a representative body, and the very principle of representation is the substance that can, although not necessarily, keep introducing the democratic nature of parliamentarism. This democratic nature is defined by a set of electoral institutions, the relation between the representative and the represented, as well as personal perception of own position and functions of representatives as such (Linz, 1975; Pizzorno, 1990; Mansbridge, 1999; Martin and Vanberg, 2004). However, (democratic) representation as such does not suffice for a democratic political system. Rather, it requires broad participation, asserting the institution of competitive opposition, pluralist reporting and freedom of opinion, a set of democratic norms and democratic political culture, as well as social acceptance of this frame (Dahl, 1971; Mezey, 1979; Sartori, 1987 and 2005; Fishkin, 1991; Lijphart, 1999; Lipset, 2002; Birch, 2007). It then follows that the systems where parliamentarism is observed can be labelled democratic, and that they contain an assembly, i.e. the parliament of all people rather than the chosen elite exclusively.

The following five dimensions:

1. Forming and adopting policies,
2. Basis for control over the executive branch of power,
3. Pluralism of parties,
4. Democratic representation, and
5. Broader democratic social framework,

are the conditions for a contemporary type of managing the representative political system that after World War II developed all over the world to be labelled parliamentarism.

In this regard, it is particularly interesting to study the Yugoslav post-war political system. Wishing to find its own path that would differ from the Western capitalist as well as Soviet model, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (CPY) completely restructured the political system of socialist Yugoslavia several times, as is evident in the attached table (Table 1).

Particularly because of its representative dimension, the liberal parliamentary political system as defined above was the main target of Marxist criticism. According to Marx, the democratic parliamentary republic is the best shell for capitalism (Lenin, 1949: 183) and therefore cannot serve as the form of a new order. Marx and Engels understand political authority as organised rule of one class aimed at suppressing another, which means that in liberal capitalist state representatives of the people are merely advocates of strong economic groups financing their campaigns and giving them bribes. Through his criticism of Hegel's concept of the state, Marx claims that the state with its institutions can thus generate its own interest existing outside of control of the ruling class. But on the other hand, the state cannot be neutral: sooner or later it will start acting for the benefit of those who are the owners of property (see Marx, 1977a: 477-574). It will then serve as a tool for exploiting the suppressed class, thus positioning itself above the society and becoming increasingly alienated from it (Lenin, 1949: 177).

This is because the liberal capitalist state differentiates between man in the private sphere (*homme*) and in the public sphere (*citoyen*), which results in alienation occurring at three different levels: first they are alienated from their society, which makes them an imaginary member of an invented society, considering the political life as a remote activity far from their actual individuality; this reflects and also sanctions the fight of man against man in the civil society, thus maintaining the situation *bellum omnia contra omnes*; while also encouraging the separation of a personality into private interests and community duties or obligations (Femia, 1993: 20). Relying solely on the intellectual development of the working class, such a situation will necessarily lead to a workers' revolution, which will result in raising the proletariat to the position of the ruling class, thus establishing greater democracy (Marx and Engels, 1976: 611).

Table 1: CHARACTERISTICS OF THE YUGOSLAV ASSEMBLY (1 STRAN)

Legislature	Period	Name	No. of houses	Type of MPs	No. Of MPs	No. Of Sessions	No. of items on the agenda	Laws passed	No of MP's questions
	7.8.1945– 26.8.1945	Začasna narodna skupščina (III. avno)	Undivided	Delegates of liberation committees and some MPs elected in 1938	316+118 ⁱ	NA	NA	NA	NA
	29.11.1945– 31.1.1946	Ustavodajna skupščina	Zvezna skupščina	Representative	348	13 (+ 4 comon)	NA	NA	NA
			Skupščina narodov	Representative	175	13			
I. in II.	1.2.1946– 23.4.1950 in 24.4.1950– 23.12.1953	Ljudska skupščina FLRJ ⁱⁱ	Zvezni zbor	Representative with possible recall	I: 348 (+ 13) ⁱⁱⁱ / II: 405	II: 30 + 30 common	II: 9 + 77 common	II: 68	I: 10 / II: 11
			Zbor narodov	Representative with possible recall	I: 175 / II: 215	II: 30	II: 87		
III. in IV	24.12.1953– 17.4.1958 in 18.4.1958– 29.6.1963 ^{iv}	Zvezna ljudska skupščina	Zvezni zbor (+Zbor narodov)	Representative (ZN: delegate) with possible recall	II: 282 + 70 (ZN) / IV: 301 + 70 (ZN)	III: 70 + 49 common / IV: 53 + 31 common	III: 317 + 143 common / IV: 513 + 127 common	III: 148 + cca 100 of other bills / IV: 368 + cca 140 of other bills + Constitution	III: 56 / IV: 243
			Zbor proizvajalcev	Delegate	II: 202 / IV: 216	III: 61 / IV: 53	III: 238 / IV: 429		
V.	29.6.1963 – 16.5.1969	Zvezna skupščina	Zvezni zbor (+ Zbor narodov ^v do 1968) / Družbenopolitični zbor (od 1968)	Delegate ^{vi} – direct elections	120 + 70 (ZN)	87 (+ 37 ZN)	1343 (+220 ZN after 1968)	860 + cca 260 of other bills + 19 amendments to the Constitution	498 (Dec. 1967)
			Gospodarski zbor	Delegate	120	77	567		
			Prosvetno-kulturni zbor	Delegate	120	40	202		
			Socialno-zdravstveni zbor	Delegate	120	51	249		
			Organizacijsko-politični zbor (do 1968)	Delegate	120	52	310		
VI.	16.5.1969 – 15.5.1974	Zvezna skupščina	Zbor narodov	Delegate	140	65	1393	NA	NA
			Gospodarski zbor	Delegate	120	64	1011		
			Družbenopolitični zbor	Representative	120	60	925		
			Prosvetno-kulturni zbor	Delegate	120	35	268		
			Socialno-zdravstveni zbor	Delegate	120	51	472		
VII	15.5.1974 – 15.5.1978	Skupščina SFRJ	Zvezni zbor	Delegate	220	43	710	570 laws and cca 270 of other bills;	149 (ZZ: 107 + ZRP: 42)
			Zbor republik in pokrajin	Delegate	88	43	430		

Source: Ilić et al. (1984), Cohen (1977), Nikolić (1973), Federal Assembly Information Bulletin

ⁱ There were 316 delegates of AVNOJ and 124 seats were reserved for MPs elected in 1938.ⁱⁱ The mandate was prolonged due to the procedures of constitutional changes.ⁱⁱⁱ After annexation of parts of Primorska to Yugoslavia, additional elections took place on November 30th 1947. There were 8 (Croatia) and 5 (Slovenia) new members elected.^{iv} The mandate was prolonged due to the procedures of constitutional changes.^v With changes of constitution in 1968, the Zbor narodov became independent house of Federal Assembly.^{vi} The mandate was indicated as delegated if indirect election took place. Recall of MPs was introduced by law in 1950.

According to Marxist beliefs, the dilemma of bourgeois theories and the issue of parliamentarism can only be solved by reaching beyond political representation based on the dualism of an actual and a political man, i.e. by merging the political (authority) and social (production) components. The communist theory derives from the assumption on the cessation of political authority as an alienated sphere, the realisation of which is the aim of its theoretical views and practical attempts at creating a delegate system (Djukić-Veljović, 1988: 26). According to Marx, the parliamentary machinery of a liberal state should be replaced with the structure of a commune that would ensure the total responsibility of representatives, i.e. delegates. In such a system, the smallest communities would run their own matters and elect delegates into larger administrative units, and so it would be repeated to the very top of the pyramid-structured direct democracy, in which any delegate can be recalled if not following the instructions from their voters (Marx, 1977b: 297–299).

Several conflicting interpretations originate in Marx' theoretical speculations on the democratic nature of the future order. He imagined the post-capitalist future to bring unification of all workers, when freedom and equality would be expressed as democratic regulation of society, "the end of politics", planned use of resources, efficient production and ease (Held, 1996: 147). Three diverse models of how the society is organised politically were formed in Marxist theory: participatory democracy, parliamentary democracy and the avant-garde model (Femia, 1993; see also Held, 1996).

The history of Yugoslavia shows clearly that after World War II the communist authorities tried several recipes to introduce Marxist theory into everyday life. The question then rises which of the models mentioned did the Yugoslav Communist Party seek to put into effect, or what were its views regarding individual models. Research shows (Rangus, 2011) that all three models were tested in the territory of socialist Yugoslavia: first the avant-garde model, then a variation of the participatory model in the socialist framework, whereas the democratic parliamentary model was introduced in all the republics soon after the disintegration, in some cases even with the consent of communist parties.

Discussion

Looking at the attitude of communist authorities towards parliamentarism in western liberal form, we can say that outwardly Yugoslavia acted quite exhibitionistically both towards liberal capitalist countries as well as the socialist block, paying special attention to its supposed democratic nature and higher level of socialism. Since concepts from the sphere of tourism were being transferred to the political sphere, this exhibitionistic attitude

of the Yugoslav Communist Party towards parliamentarism and its self-positioning in the polarised world will be explained by applying tourism theory.

One of the core concepts of tourism activities are tourist attractions as focal points of tourism industry. There are many different forms of attractions, but we wish to refer mostly to the theoretical definition, where attraction is understood as the ultimate symbol of modern society and as an object of modern pilgrimage, i.e. modern tourist experience (MacCannell, 1999: 15). Using Foucault's concept of gaze, Urry argues that at least a part of the tourist experience is to gaze upon or view a set of different scenes, of landscapes or townscapes which are out of the ordinary (Urry, 2002: 1). The tourist gaze is defined as a form of knowledge, the power of which is in interpreting the sight, and not a universal experience that is true for all at all times. It is rather constructed in any historical period in relationship to its opposites, to non-tourist forms of social experience and consciousness (Urry, 2002: 1). In his study, MacCannell (1999) argues for a holistic approach to modern and post-modern society from the tourist point of view. By using the concept of structural differentiation he is setting a new theory of leisure class, suggesting that modern society is a tourist society, where "tourism is an alternate strategy for conserving and prolonging the modern and protecting it from its own tendencies toward self-destruction" (MacCannell, 1999: xix). He argues that modern society is revolutionary in itself and sightseeing is a ritual preformed according to the differentiations of society (MacCannell, 1999: 13) so as to prevent its destruction and to assure its renewal. MacCannell explains tourism as a form of modern pilgrimage where sacralisation of sights takes place.

In the modern world, societies as a whole are tourist attractions, including their public behaviour and other visible public parts of society (MacCannell, 1999: 39). When considering the case of socialist Yugoslavia and its positioning in international society we can connect many dots by arguing that Yugoslav polity and politics were in a way tourism exhibitionism of a socialist destination.

Just after World War II Yugoslavia proclaimed a socialist republic and became the chosen destination for many seekers of an ideal political system. Although in the 19th century the political reality of the time could rarely be named as a motive for travelling to a particular country, modern and especially post-modern tourism is marked by different trends (see Political Tours, May 4th 2014). It is no secret that the United States, France and the Soviet Union at a certain historical moment were all destinations par excellence for many young democrats and revolutionists (See Davies, 1997; Furet, 1999). And so too was communist Yugoslavia after World War II.

It is important to emphasise that in theory and in academic research, communism and totalitarianism in all forms are frequently compared to modern

religion (Gurian, 1954; Femia, 1993; Davies, 1997). In Gurian's theorising, totalitarianism is understood as a form of secular religion which replaced and exceeded the traditional role of religion in a secular state (Gurian, 1954: 122–123). Both totalitarianisms, Nazism and Marxism, deny the existence of God and are changing the transcendent religion to immanent. In a totalitarian state God and religious institutions are replaced by the power of totalitarianism; communities and leaders are deified; mass meetings are consecrated actions (Gurian, 1954: 122; Brzezinski, 1993: 32–35).

Because of its Messianic content, communism was compared to Judaism and Christianity. In his book, Davies makes a comparison to Judaism: Marx is a prophet, the proletariat is the Chosen People, the socialist movement is its Church, the revolution is his second coming and communism is the Promised Land (Davies, 1997: 837). Femia on the other hand makes a comparison to Christianity: Marx is Jesus; the proletariat is God; the capitalist class is the Devil; communism is Heaven and capitalism is Hell (Femia, 1993: 155). Socialist Yugoslavia had both of the two religious components mentioned above: it was a socialist country with its saints (Tito, Kardelj, Bakarić) and shrines (Kumrovac, Dedinje), and it was acting like a tourist destination trying to attract the seekers of the Promised Land for the Chosen People – a paradise socialist destination, which was the aim of more or less all socialist regimes in the Soviet Block (Metro-Rolland, 2008: 76).

Analysing Yugoslavia from the tourism point of view, there were organised summer camps, social tourism and Youth Labour Actions which on the one hand all fit into the story of a healthy and happy worker, and on the other hand they were used to promote the principle of »Brotherhood and Unity«. This way "holidays and tourism could be utilised to create a new Yugoslav awareness of the population and thus transcend the national, political and religious enmities so viciously played out during the Second World War" (Taylor and Grandits, 2010: 6). K. Taylor and H. Grandits argue that it was a state-driven plan in the socialist Yugoslavia to turn the workers into tourist even before tourism was recognised as a sector worthy of investment (Taylor and Grandits, 2010: 5). Although in their book, Taylor and Grandits are primarily concerned with inbound tourism and they only occasionally pay attention to international incoming tourists, they have noticed the fact that Yugoslavia was interesting as a tourist destination in great part because of its specific political experiment of worker's self-management.

On the outside, Yugoslavia was trying to establish itself as the only correct interpretation of Marx' idea of a socialist country, inviting everybody to experience it for themselves. On the other hand, Yugoslavia was eagerly denying any sympathy or similarity to parliamentarianism. The opinions and statements expressed by Yugoslavia's communist leaders were rather severe with regard to both political poles, thus shaping a room for themselves, for

their own interpretation and for their own attraction. Although in some points their statements are pretty clear, it is evident that there was no single opinion on what target group of visitors to attract.

Research has shown that in post-war Yugoslavia communists were unanimous neither with regard to the future order in Yugoslavia nor with regard to a uniform opinion on the liberal parliamentary system. They were only in agreement about wanting something different. At the first post-war session of the constitutional commission on 15 September 1945, the minister for constituent assembly, Kardelj, who had otherwise labelled parliamentarism as “a backward form of bourgeois democracy” (Kardelj, 1979a: 31), informed the gathered crowd that something new and different was about to emerge, something that the opposition would object to. At the same time he explained the solution to overcome disagreements: as he believed, Yugoslav opposition could not be considered proper opposition, e.g. such as in the British parliament, because there all political parties agree to the same social system. Being opposed to the social system that emerged during the war and revolution, the bourgeois opposition was therefore unfit to assume such a role.¹ Although there were no doubts about following the Soviet example, the Yugoslav communists never concealed their pretensions: the new system was to be a people’s democracy that was neither liberally-bourgeois nor proletarian democracy, rather, it was to be a new type that was yet to be constructed.²

On the other hand it seemed at the time that to some major co-creators of the new system parliamentarism was to remain the ideal, and it was therefore necessary to exercise caution in order not to drive anybody away: upon adopting the Rules of Procedure of the new Yugoslav Assembly, Slovenian delegate and lawyer Dr Maks Šnuderl emphasised that, “The Rules of Procedure of our parliament should express the principles of modern parliamentarism that were created according to the nature of this institution and comply with generally accepted customs. At the same time, the Rules should reflect the democracy in which the assembly has been elected, and adopt its principles of operation.” According to him, the Rules had embraced all the principles of modern, democratic and free parliamentarism that “enables free discussions on matters of state order.”³

Although it was clear that the so-called “Western-type” democracy would not be established in Yugoslavia, communists were still afraid to introduce

¹ Archives of Yugoslavia, Ministarstvo za konstituantu, Fond No 3, Folder No 5, Records of the meeting of the Constitutional Commission, Ministry of constituent assembly, 15/09/1945.

² Archives of Yugoslavia, Ministarstvo za konstituantu, Fond No 3, Folder No 5, Records of the meeting of the Constitutional Commission, 20/09/1945.

³ 3rd joint session of the Federal Assembly and the Assembly of Nations, 2/12/1945, stenographic records, published in Nešović (1977: 62). This view is opposed by Kardelj’s assessment labelling parliamentarism as “a backward form of bourgeois democracy” (Kardelj, 1979a: 31).

overly overt socialist measures. When discussing the first constitution Kardelj emphasised that nationalisation was not to be mentioned in the constitution directly as it would frighten the people, yet it was to be enabled through other constitutional provisions.⁴ Similar scruples were expressed by Yugoslav leaders in the continued process of adopting the fundamental social legislation.⁵

The dispute with the Soviet Union led to an increasingly apparent retreat from the Soviet example, which was also obvious in public appearances of leading communists and in decreased adverseness towards parliamentary type of democracy. When adopting the organic law on people's committees on 1 April 1952, Kardelj tarred the eastern and western attempts with the same brush, stressing once more that the pluralist parliamentary model fails to conform to the socialist vision. He stressed the danger "from the outside", which obviously no longer originated in the west as much as in the east. Namely, Kardelj emphasised the positive achievements of bourgeois revolutions, particularly human rights as a component part of socialism, as well as some outward forms of the political system. However, the danger from the outside was posing a growing threat to the independence of Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia (FPRY), up to the point that party plurality could not be permitted within the republic, otherwise any party outside People's Front of Yugoslavia would quickly become the source of bad things, thus also susceptible to outside influences that would surely attempt to threaten the Yugoslav independence. According to him, Yugoslavia at the time was facing such great pressure from the outside, and also the burden of internal economic issues, that under the circumstances any efforts to introduce the multiparty system would primarily signify adversity towards the national independence and freedom of nations, as well as obvious misunderstanding of the global situation (Kardelj, 1979b: 84-85).

Following the dispute with the Soviet Union, the attitude towards parliamentarism was becoming increasingly strained, and so was the attitude towards the Soviet type of the socialist system. Outwardly, Yugoslavia was seeking at all times to display its peculiarity, i.e. greater development with regard to other socialist countries. In its internal and outward political communication, Yugoslavia was using tourism discourse, such as the motif of travelling used in the caricature. It displays the final railway station – the socialist destination. The timetable hanging there states that the train from Yugoslavia has arrived already, whereas those from other proclaimed socialist countries are running late (Figure 1).

⁴ 3rd regular session of the Federal Assembly Constituent Committee (UO ZS), 12/12/1945, stenographic records, in Nešović (1977: 151).

⁵ 7th regular session of UO ZS, 18/12/1945, stenographic records, p 195.

Figure 1: ON THE WAY TO SOCIALISM



1157

Having also introduced political self-management with the new constitution, Yugoslavia began openly inviting visitors to inspect the results of its self-managing socialist experiment: even the advertising slogan “Come and see the truth,” which FPRY began introducing after 1949, i.e. following the dispute with the Soviet Union, was propagating openly the Yugoslav

peculiarity and inviting visitors to taste the political and tourist experience in Yugoslavia (Taylor and Grandits, 2010: 5). Again, architects of the new system were deriving from Marx, Engels, and particularly Lenin in realising the principle of the unity of authority, which was supposed to mean “the destruction of parliamentarism (in the sense of separating the legislative from the executive part), integration of the legislative and the executive part, integration of the administration with the legislation.”⁶ Again it had become relevant to stress the distinctive developments of Yugoslav assembly activity vs. the parliamentary practice of the western type,⁷ which was further reinforced by individuals assessing that multiparty parliamentary democracy was no longer fit even for capitalism.⁸ Although the desire for success was not met in the following years and the economic and political trouble began to accumulate, the communist authorities would not relinquish their assessments. The troubles and disadvantages that the assembly had been facing in its development so far were seen merely as “certain remnants and elements of class parliamentarism and political representation.”⁹ It was their opinion that practice has justified the assembly as a working body growing out of the self-managed basis, and confirmed that the traditional parliamentary system was not fit for self-management relations.¹⁰ Nevertheless, “classical terminology”, words such as “parliament”, “government”, “minister”, began to be used in the public again, which confirmed the split, but it was not part of the image of a socialist destination.¹¹ After 10 years, 1 constitution and an immeasurable list of constitutional changes, the blame for the non-optimal operation of the self-management system was still being put on the remnants of traditional parliamentary practices¹². For this reason in early 1970s the communist authorities again took up the path of constitutional changes.

If we only take as an example the legacy of the major architect of the Yugoslav political experiment, Edvard Kardelj, his fighting spirit in relation to parliamentarism seemed to have subsided a little over the years. However, he still denounced it explicitly in his final major theoretical work *Smeri*

⁶ Joint session of the Federal People's Assembly and the federal committee of the Socialist Alliance of Working People of Yugoslavia (SZDLJ), 20–21/09/1962, stenographic records, pp 718–720.

⁷ Vida Tomšič at the joint session of the Federal People's Assembly and the federal committee of SZDLJ, 20–21/09/1962, stenographic records, pp 803–804.

⁸ Krste Crvenkovski at the joint session of the Federal People's Assembly and the federal committee of SZDLJ, 20–21/09/1962, stenographic records, p 766.

⁹ Archives of Yugoslavia, Savezno izvršno veće, Fond No 130, Folder No 529, Obrazloženje za pojedine ustavne amandmane, pp 1–2.

¹⁰ Milentije Popović at the 10th joint session of the Federal Committee and the Committee of Nations, 25/11/1968, stenographic records, p 4.

¹¹ Archives of Yugoslavia, Savezno izvršno veće, Fond No 130, Folder No 531, Teze o ostvarivanju saradnje savezne skupštine i saveznog izvršnog veća, pp 10–13.

¹² Federal Assembly Information Bulletin, Year IV, No 78, 1972, p 2.

razvoja političnega sistema socialističnega samoupravljanja (Trends of the political system of social self-management).

Indeed he acknowledged parliamentarism's merit for the historical development, particularly with regard to promoting democratic and human rights, but also condemned it for achieving this development in the name of the leading authorities fighting to preserve the exploitative relations. According to Kardelj, political pluralism as the cornerstone of parliamentarism actually shows in the form of suppressing man's authentic interests, and particularly class interests of workers, and is thus inappropriate for socialist self-managed societies (Kardelj, 1977: 30).

Further on Kardelj develops the hypothesis that capitalist parliamentarism is also merely a transitional stage in the way to socialist democracy – one of the instruments to make the working class realise their objective as the socialist self-management will slowly penetrate the traditional parliament. He considers western parliamentarism as a phase in the development, which, due to historical urgency would lead to a self-managed socialist community. This is also why he expressed his support for Euro-communism, which was fighting to preserve the institutions of political pluralism (Kardelj, 1977: 35). In his opinion, the parliamentary system ensures citizens far more freedom than any other political system within the capitalist society, yet it cannot suit all phases in the development of socialism (Kardelj, 1977: 46–47).

Kardelj also stresses distinction with regard to the Soviet model of social self-management. In principle he rejects the single-party system for being “incompatible with the socioeconomic and democratic relations in socialist self-management and its democratic pluralism of self-managing interests (Kardelj, 1977: 49). Future was to bring new, more advanced forms of the democratic system, and also new differentiated forms of conceptual and political organisations. Kardelj acknowledged a difference of opinions, but rejected the type of political pluralism based on parties. Rather than political parties, the new forms were supposed to be a type of organisation reflecting the changes of social perception and the development of creative forces (Kardelj, 1977: 84). Their position in society was supposed to be similar to scientific, cultural and similar organisations, rather than the position of a monopolistic holder of political power as can be encountered in bourgeois democracies. That is to say, self-managing democracy equates general social interests to the self-managing interests of a working man, whereas the pluralism of political parties equates the interests of the ruling class to general social interests (Kardelj, 1977: 85).

Kardelj acknowledged that apart from class conflicts there were other conceptual and political differences and conflicts in society, but only at the level of socialist relations. According to him, the starting point for further development of the self-managing political system would therefore have to

be to overcome the pluralism of political monopolies with true self-managing political pluralism (Kardelj, 1977: 89). Kardelj supposed that there would be further development of the delegate and assembly system.

This way, with a considerable role played by Kardelj, Yugoslavia was formed into a special socialist tourist attraction, i.e. society as a whole, which attracted a number of believers in socialism from around the world, who came to encounter the socialist experiment live.

Conclusions

In the total of forty-five years of existence, a certain socialist self-managing assembly system formed in Yugoslavia, which preserved some fundamental features despite frequent constitutional changes. Among the most pronounced ones was the idea of uniform authority, i.e. efforts to concentrate the political power in the assembly as much as possible in line with Marxist political theory that rejects the division of power as a way of separating and alienating the political sphere from the private one.

Another feature of the Yugoslav socialist self-managing assembly system is consistent negation of pluralism. The political leadership kept rejecting explicitly the introduction of party pluralism. Even in final years, they supported the introduction of a "non-party" system rather than the multi-party one. The real-socialist political system also renounced the concept of delegation, although in its final phase the organisation could not cope without certain representative institutions. Mistrust of indirect democratic methods led to gradual introduction of the delegate mandate and to the final abolition of direct election in the 1974 constitution. The principle of anti-representation was thus introduced in the Yugoslav political system. It was the great ideological commitment of the political elite to the assembly system that was of key importance for the relatively important position of the assembly in the socialist Yugoslavia, which kept it different from legislative chambers in other communist countries. Eventually, however, the demands for democratisation and parliamentarisation emerged in the civil society and broader political culture. Such favourable position in the political culture towards a strong role of parliament in the political system is also obvious in the Slovenian constitution, which has preserved many elements of the assembly system in its modern democratic parliamentary organisation (Grad, 2008: 191).

Among the most prominent elements of Marxism in Yugoslav socialist self-managing system, the first to be mentioned is the definition that each form of government reflected the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e. the transitory stage before the final demise of the state and the true perfect direct democracy. This is also related to the socialisation and thereby nationalisation of private property, regarding which the authorities were soon forced to make

compromises and also allow private initiatives and being open for market laws in order to pursue efficiency and market operations. The second feature was the insistence on the monolith authority of a unified ideology and one party, within which the principle of democratic centralism was in force. Having been renamed, the Yugoslav Communist Party still preserved as their example the Bolshevik avant-garde party, which was primarily by Tito's merit.¹³ After his and Kardelj's death, however, the role of ideology and thereby the role of the party began to dwindle. Another feature to be mentioned is promoting the practices of direct democracy in the form of self-management, and a public utilities system following the example of the Paris commune.

The Yugoslav assembly failed to obtain in full the central position in the political system. It was being controlled by the Communist party all the time, and freedom in the assembly was a reflection of the disintegration of the monolith Yugoslav Communist Party. Politicians and delegates intentionally sought to distance themselves from the western parliamentary system on ideological grounds, which they used to reject party plurality and legal organisation of opposition. Being a system with separated functions of authority and some direct democratic practices, operating in an increasingly plural society, yet kept controlled by the communist party until the very final years, the Yugoslav socialist self-managing assembly system sought to position itself between the bourgeois parliamentarism and the Soviet system, and succeeded in doing so (Prunk and Rangus, 2014).

The analysis has shown that in its internal and outward political communication the Yugoslav communist party was using tourism discourse, such as the motif of travelling in the presented caricature. Another example of the kind is the advertising tourism slogan that was inviting visitors to observe the political experiment rather than natural and cultural sights. Through its attitude towards parliamentarism, which is typical of western democratic countries, and towards the Soviet model of society, Yugoslavia positioned itself as a social tourist attraction seeking to attract modern pilgrims – both socialists and tourists. The creation of a particular social and socio-political system assumed the function of creating a new target destination for workers from around the world, and the ideals that were proclaimed surely attracted many visitors. By integrating both views, the political analysis and tourism theory it becomes clear that the understanding and interpretation of the world around us through tourist experience, as well as the perception and positioning of own contents through religious elements can explain the connection between political philosophy and the actions of Yugoslav communists after World War II.

¹³ More on the topic in *Diskusija o projektu (prednacrtu) ustavnog zakona. Peti plenum CK, 27/05/1952, in Petranović in Zečević (1987: 343–345).*

The image of this tourist attraction is provided an additional framework by its external non-alignment policy and its attempt at overcoming the bipolar division of the world, i.e. seeking potential partner countries in the group of those not opting distinctly for any of the directions. It is the Yugoslav non-alignment policy and the diplomatic activity of the socialist country that poses a great challenge in additional research of self-perception and outward positioning of the country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brzezinski, Zbigniew (1993): *Out of Control. Global Turmoil on the Eve of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Charles Scribner's Book.
- Birch, Anthony (2007): *The Concepts and Theories of Modern Democracy*. 3. ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Cohen, Lenard J. (1977): *Conflict Management and Political Institutionalization in Socialist Yugoslavia: A Case study of the Parliamentary System*. In Albert F. Eldridge (ed.), *Legislatures in Plural Societies: The Search of National Cohesion and Development*, 122–163. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Copeland, Gary W. in Samuel C. Patterson (1997): *Parliaments in the Twenty-first Century*. In Gary W. Copeland and Samuel C. Patterson (eds.), *Parliaments in the Modern World. Changing Institutions*, 1–11. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Čepič, Zdenko (2005): *Delavsko samoupravljanje*. In Jasna Fischer et al. (eds.), *Slovenska novejša zgodovina 1848–1992*, 961–963. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga and Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino.
- Dahl, Robert A. (1971): *Polyarchy. Participation and Opposition*. New Haven in London: Yale University Press.
- Davies, Norman (1997): *Europe. A History*. London: Pimlico.
- Djukić-Veljović, Zlatija (1988): *Delegatstvo i demokratija*. Beograd: Naučna knjiga.
- Femia, Joseph V. (1993): *Marxism and Democracy*. Accessible online at <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com> (June 30th 2009).
- Fishkin, James S. (1991): *Democracy and Deliberation. New Directions for Democratic Reform*. New Haven in London: Yale University Press.
- Furet, Francois (1999): *The passing of an illusion: The idea of communism in the twentieth century*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Grad, Franc (2008): *Organizacija državne oblasti*. V Igor Kaučič and Franc Grad (eds.), *Ustavna ureditev Slovenije*, 179–193. Ljubljana: Založba GV.
- Gurian, Waldemar (1954): *Totalitarianism as Political Religion*. In Carl J. Friedrich (ed.), *Totalitarianism*, 119–129. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hague, Rot and Martin Harrop (2007): *Comparative Government and Politics*. An Introduction. 7. izd. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Held, David (1996): *Models of Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Ilić, Branislav, Ljubinka Šuković in Liljana Janjetović (ed.) (1984): *Od Avnoja do delegatske skupštine. Većnici, poslanici, delegati, dokumenta*. Beograd: Radnička štampa.
- Kardelj, Edvard (1977): *Smeri razvoja političnega sistema socialističnega samoupravljanja*. Ljubljana: ČZP Komunist.

- (1979a): O narodnoj demokratiji. In *Politički sistem socialističkog samupravljanja*. Izbor iz dela III, 23–63. Beograd: Izdavački centar Komunist.
- (1979b): Socijalizam i demokratija. In *Politički sistem socialističkog samupravljanja*. Izbor iz dela III, 69–99. Beograd: Izdavački centar Komunist.
- Lenin, Vladimir Ilič (1949): *Država in revolucija*. In *Izbrana dela*. III. Zvezek, 182–287. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- Lijphart, Arend (1999): *Patterns of Democracy. Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven in London: Yale University Press.
- Linz, Juan J. (1975): *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*. In Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby (eds.), *Handbook of Political Science, Macropolitical Theory* (Vol. 3), 175–441. Reading idr.: Addison – Wesley Publishing Company.
- Lipset, Marin Seymour (1960): *Political Man. The Social Bases of Politics*. Bombay: Vakils, Feffer and Simons Private Ltd.
- MacCannell, Dean (1999): *The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Mansbridge, Jane (1999): Should Blacks Represent Black and Women Represent Women? A Contingnet »Yes«. *The Journal of Politics* 61 (3): 628–657.
- Martin W. Lanny in Georg Vanberg (2004): *Policing the Bargain: Coalition Government and Parliamentary Scrutiny*. *American Journal of Political Science* 2004 (1): 13–27.
- Marx, Karl (1976): *Komunistični manifest*. In Boris Žiherl (ed.), *Karl Marx in Friedrich Engels, Izbrana dela v petih zvezkih*. II. zvezek, 567–631. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- (1977a): *Osemnajsti brumaire Ludvika Bonaparta*. In Boris Žiherl (ed.), *Karl Marx in Friedrich Engels, Izbrana dela v petih zvezkih*. III. Zvezek, 447–574. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- (1977b): *Državljanska vojna v Franciji*. In Boris Žiherl (ed.), *Karl Marx in Friedrich Engels, Izbrana dela v petih zvezkih*. IV. zvezek, 234–335. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- Mény, Yves in Andrew Knapp (1998): *Government and Politics in Western Europe. Britain, France, Italy, Germany*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Metro-Rolland, Michelle M. (2008): *A Nostalgia for Terror*. In Daniel C. Knudsen, Michelle M. Metro-Roland, Anne K. Soper and Charles E. Greer (eds.), *Landscape, Tourism and Meaning*, 75–94. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Mezey, Michael L. (1979): *Comparative Legislatures*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Nikolić, Pavle S. (1973): *Skupštinski sistem*. Beograd: Savremena administracija.
- Nelson, Daniel (1982): *Communist Legislatures and Communist Politics*. In Daniel Nelson in Stephan White (eds.), *Communist Legislatures in Comparative Perspective*, 1–13. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Nešović, Slobodan (1977): *Zasedanje Ustavodajne skupščine*. 19. november 1945–1. februar 1946. Ljubljana: Komunist.
- Norton, Philip (1993): *Does Parliament Matter?* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Olson, David M. (1994): *Democratic Legislative Institutions. A Comparative View*. Armonk, London: M. E. Sharpe.

- Petranović, Branislav and Momčilo Zečević (eds.) (1987): *Jugoslovenski federalizam. Ideje i stvarnosti. Drugi tom 1943–1986*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Pitamic, Leonid (1996): *Država*. Ljubljana: Pravna obzorja.
- Pizzorno, Alessandro (1990): *Parties in Pluralism*. In Peter Mair (ed.), *The West European Party System*, 61–71. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Polsby, Nelson W. (1975): *Legislatures*. In Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby (eds.), *Handbook of Political Science. Governmental Institutions and Processes* (Vol. 5), 257–320. Reading et al: Addison-Wesely Publishing Company.
- Prunk, Janko and Rangus, Marjetka (2014): *100 let življenja slovenskih političnih strank 1890–1990*. Ljubljana: Založba FDV.
- Rangus, Marjetka (2011): *Parlamentarizem v državah realnega socializma: prispevek Slovencev k razvoju druge Jugoslavije 1945–1991*. Doktorska disertacija. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede Univerze v Ljubljani.
- Sartori, Giovanni (1987): *The Theory of Democracy Revisited. Part One: The Contemporary Debate*. Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc.
- (2005): *Parties and Party Systems. A Framework for analysis*. Colchester: ECPR.
- Taylor, K. and Grandits, H. (2010): *Tourism and Making of Socialist Yugoslavia: An Introduction*. In K. Taylor and H. Grandits (eds.), *Yugoslavia's Sunny Side: a History of Tourism in Socialism (1950s–1980s)*, 1–32. Budapest, New York: Central European University Press.
- Urry, John (2002): *The Tourist Gaze*. London et al: Sage Publications Ltd.

SOURCES

- 7th regular session of UO ZS, 18/12/1945, stenographic records.
- 10th joint session of the Federal Committee and the Committee of Nations, 25/11/1968, stenographic records.
- Archives of Yugoslavia, Ministarstvo za konstituantu, Fond No 3, Folder No 5, Records of the meeting of the Constitutional Commission, Ministry of constituent assembly, 15/09/1945.
- Archives of Yugoslavia, Ministarstvo za konstituantu, Fond No 3, Folder No 5, Records of the meeting of the Constitutional Commission, 20/09/1945.
- Archives of Yugoslavia, Savezno izvršno veće, Fond No 130, Folder No 531, Teze o ostvarivanju saradnje savezne skupštine i saveznog izvršnog veća, pp 10–13.
- Archives of Yugoslavia, Savezno izvršno veće, Fond No 130, Folder No 529, Obrazloženje za pojedine ustavne amandmane.
- Federal Assembly Information Bulletin, Year II–IV, No 37–134, 1970–1974.
- Joint session of the Federal People's Assembly and the federal committee of the Socialist Alliance of Working People of Yugoslavia (SZDLJ), 20–21/09/1962, stenographic records.
- Joint session of the Federal People's Assembly and the federal committee of SZDLJ, 20–21/09/1962, stenographic records.
- Joint session of the Federal People's Assembly and the federal committee of SZDLJ, 20–21/09/1962, stenographic records.
- Political Tours, accessible online at <http://www.politicaltours.com/> (May 4th, 2014).