

Class in Yugoslav Socialism and in the Post-Yugoslav Societies: Toward a Bourdieuan Repositioning of the Issue (Part 1)

Inga TOMIĆ-KOLUDROVIĆ

Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar – Regional Centre Split, Croatia
inga.tomic-koludrovic@pilar.hr

Mirko PETRIĆ

Department of Sociology, University of Zadar, Croatia
mpetric@unizd.hr

This article attempts to outline what its authors see as a potentially productive methodological approach for studying the connection between the notion of class in socialist Yugoslavia and class-related developments in its successor countries. The first part of the text consists of an extended elaboration of the ideological and social theoretical conceptions of class during the socialist period in Yugoslavia (1945–1990). This elaboration puts forth an interpretation that diagnoses an implicit and hitherto little noted interpretive move from Marx's dual to Weber's multidimensional model in the pre-empirical explanations of class in Yugoslav social theory. Following this, an account is given of the 1970s and 1980s class-centred empirical research in Yugoslavia, vacillating between Marxism and structural functionalism, and eventually aiming at an analytical reconciliation of the notions of class and stratum. In the second part of the article, a repositioning of the issue in terms of Bourdieu's class theory is discussed as a potential contribution to explaining many of the blind spots of the socialist theorizing of class. This part of the article also contains a brief commentary of class-related research in post-Yugoslav societies, i.e. in the period of post-socialist transition. With references made to empirical studies carried out in two post-Yugoslav countries (Serbia and Croatia), the authors conclude that the concepts of methodologically cross-fertilized Bourdieuan class theory prove to be useful in this context as well, and can serve as a potent interpretive span between the socialist and post-socialist social spaces.

Key words: class, Yugoslav socialism, post-Yugoslav societies, Bourdieu's class theory, historical sociology

Introduction

Recent years have seen a renewed interest in issues of social class.¹ The late 20th century focus on individualism and pluralization of optative lifestyles in affluent societies seems to have been replaced with a focus on social stratification and new guises of social exclusion. In other words, one could say that a theoretical and empirical interest in the study of individual strategies of social differentiation has been replaced with an increased interest in the study of collective mechanisms of social structuring. Empirical research carried out in the wake of this new interest has proved that we are indeed dealing with new social realities, as evidenced – among many other texts – by the recent *Great British Class Survey* (Savage et al., 2013) or by the results of the European Union Seventh Framework Programme SPHERE (Revilla, Jefferys and Tovar Martínez, 2013). However, in social contexts and research traditions in which traditional class distinctions have not been so firmly established as in the quoted examples, it is much more difficult to analyze the emerging stratification configurations.

In spite of that, this article starts from the premise that discussions of class distinctions can be productively used in the study of the societies of the former Yugoslavia and its successor states. The subject matter at stake is under-researched and has so far been conceptually detached from the mainstream interpretations of past (political and armed) conflicts and the subsequent dissolution of the social order across the post-Yugoslav region.

In hindsight, various subtle notions of social distinction could even be said to have been more important during the socialist period than is the case in the present-day post-socialist context. However, the existence of these distinctions has gone largely unnoticed in academic discourse for a number of reasons of political, theoretical and methodological nature. To begin with, a serious obstacle to analysis is the fact that, in the Yugoslav context, the theoretical discourse on the issues of social class was mixed with the as-

¹ A first version of this text, entitled “The Dissolution of Class Differences: The Socialist Roots of the Postsocialist Anomia”, was distributed to the participants of the workshop *Bringing Class Back in: The Dynamics of Social Change in (Post) Yugoslavia*, organized by the Centre for Southeast European Studies, University of Graz and the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Zagreb, in Marija Bistrica from 7th to 9th of December 2012. Additional theoretical research for the current version of the text was carried out as part of the project *Life-Strategies and Survival Strategies of Households and Individuals in South-East European Societies in the Times of Crisis*, supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF).

sumptions of the prevalent political ideology of “self-managing socialism”. Consequently, particularly from a present-day perspective, it is by no means easy to disentangle ideological premises from theoretical concepts in the accounts of the social realities of the period. A further complication is a conspicuous lack of empirical data related to social class until late in the socialist period. Finally, the post-socialist social research in the post-Yugoslav region has largely also tended to avoid a direct confrontation with the issue, substituting class-related notions with the discussions centred on the notions of employability related to educational status, inclusion and exclusion based on poverty, and other similar topics emphasized in the currently dominant discourse of the supranational financial and political organizations.

Bearing all this in mind, this article attempts to outline what its authors see as a potentially productive methodological approach for studying the connection between the notion of class in socialist Yugoslavia and the class-related developments in its successor countries. Needless to say, a first step in this task is to ground the discussion into the literature from the socialist period. In this case, however, this grounding transcends the usual role of a “literature review” in that it also serves to fine-tune the reader’s perception of the characteristics of the strongly ideologized terminological substitutes for the concepts of class used in the socialist Yugoslavia between 1945 and 1991.²

Understanding the semantic scope and connotations of these terms, different to those used in the West to describe the stratification of the contemporaneous “bourgeois” (i.e., at that time, predominantly welfare state)

² The exact dates of existence of socialist Yugoslavia are still a matter of discussion, since there exist approaches that consider the establishment of the socialist Yugoslavia already at the second session of the AVNOJ (Anti-Fascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia) in 1943, when this organization, created to administer the territories under the control of the Partisans adopted the resolution to create a federal Yugoslavia, based on the right of self-determination of nations. However, the peace treaties by means of which the newly created state regained the territories which the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes lost in the 1920s were concluded in 1945. Similarly, although the former constituent socialist republics of Slovenia and Croatia declared independence from Yugoslavia in 1990, they were internationally recognized only in 1992. Following this, the name of the state was preserved until 2003 as the name of the common state (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) of the former socialist republics of Serbia and Montenegro. For our purpose of reference to class-related issues in socialism and post-socialism, we consider it appropriate to refer to the mentioned 1945–1990 framework as the period of existence of the “socialist” Yugoslavia. Namely, the multi-party elections effectively ending the period of the socialist one-party rule took place in all the constituent republics of Yugoslavia already in 1990.

societies, is also necessary if one wants to understand the nuances of the sociological interpretations of the rare empirical studies of class carried out in the late socialist period. However imperfect the interpretations of these studies must perforce remain in the historical sociology context, the analysis of the tenets that informed the data collection and offered interpretive keys in the context of late Yugoslav socialism makes it possible for us to understand the differences between the normative ideological and social realities of the period. This in turn enables the establishment of a connection between the idiosyncrasies of the Yugoslav socialist stratification and class-related developments in the post-Yugoslav societies.

In this article, we attempt to reformulate the discussion of class in the post-socialist context starting from the postulates of Bourdieuan class theory, arguing that it can serve as a potent interpretive span between the socialist and post-socialist social spaces. But to understand the nature of this span as well as the similarities and differences between the two spaces in question, we first need to understand what happened to the notion of class in the socialist period.

To this end, the first part of the article is devoted to an extended elaboration of the ideological and social theoretical conceptions of class during the socialist period of existence of the state of Yugoslavia (1945–1990). In addition to original works, this overview relies on the syntheses of the subject matter prepared at the very end of the socialist period by Vuković (1990) and Sekulić (1991). In this part of the text, we put forth an interpretation that diagnoses an implicit and previously little noted interpretive move from Marx's dual to Weber's multidimensional model in the pre-empirical explanations of class in Yugoslav social theory.

Following this, an account is given of the 1970s and 1980s class-centred empirical research in Yugoslavia, vacillating between Marxism and structural functionalism, and eventually aiming at an analytical reconciliation of the notions of class and stratum. This part of the article concludes with the discussion of the views of the contemporaneous authors on the nature of society in the late socialist Yugoslavia, who were wondering whether it was a "closed" or "class" society and whether it contained one or several parallel stratifications.

In the second part of the article, the ambiguous and tentative conclusions of the socialist authors will be reinterpreted from the viewpoint of a theory that was not applied to the subject in the socialist period. In this

part of the text, we claim that Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, capitals and social field can help explain many of the blind spots of the socialist theorizing of class. This part of the text also contains an attempt at a theoretical contextualization of class-related developments in the period "after the deluge" (Županov, 1995), i.e. in the period of post-socialist "transition". Here we argue that the atypical class relations in the socialist Yugoslavia have contributed to an anomic profile of the contemporary post-socialist societies in the post-Yugoslav countries. In the absence of targeted empirical research, specifically suited to our needs, we base our conclusions on the interpretations of the existing quantitative and qualitative class-related empirical research in Serbia and Croatia. We also try to explain briefly why we believe that the application of the concepts of Bourdieu's class theory is revealing of some important aspects of the transformations of the notion of class in both the socialist and post-socialist contexts. As such, it can not only serve as an interpretive span between these two social spaces in the further research on the subject, but can also prove useful in strategic planning emphasized in the current public policy context.

Political ideology and theoretical discourse: reflections on class in Yugoslav socialism

The issue of class in socialist Yugoslavia is not an easy one to discuss. One of the reasons for this is that, throughout the existence of that country, constant intrusions of the prevailing political ideology into theoretical discourse made it difficult to employ theoretical terminology in quite the same way as it was used in the social sciences in the non-socialist countries. This holds true even for the standard theoretical apparatus of Marxism, which was officially sanctioned in socialist Yugoslavia.

Namely, in socialist Yugoslavia, particularly in the period after the 1974 Constitution, the standard Marxist terminology was interwoven with – and has to be reconstructed now from – a set of atypical designations for social actors, organizations and practices, introduced by the vocabulary of a socialist system particular to Yugoslavia that went under the name of "self-managing socialism".³ This lingo of "self-management", especially at

³ "Workers' self-management" as a distinctive feature of the Yugoslav socialist system was introduced in the early 1950s, following the split with the Soviet Union in 1948. The system reached its fullest form after the 1974 Constitution and 1976 Act on Associated Labour were adopted. The 1974 Constitution, which was the fourth and final constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, can be seen as an attempt to decentral-

a historical distance, makes it very challenging for outsiders to grasp the social realities behind the terms such as “immediate producer” (manual worker), “organization of associated labour” (company) or “immediate exchange of labour” (taxation and redistribution). On top of that, standard sociological terms, such as the “middle class”, were simply not used over a long period in the analyses of stratification of Yugoslav society, as they were perceived as part of the vocabulary of what was labeled as “bourgeois sociology” and were consequently thought not to correspond to the new realities of the socialist society.⁴

A further complication in any attempt to “look back over one’s shoulder” on the issues of class in socialist Yugoslavia is that one is never certain to which degree ideology intervenes into what is presented as theoretical reflection. Even when it comes to (late and rare) attempts at theoretical interpretation of empirical data, it is hard to tell whether one is dealing with the nuances of an author’s interpretation of a non-standard stratification or with a result of self-censorship. To put it differently, it is hard to establish whether the authors were in some way forced to see the social realities through the lenses of the officially governing ideology, or if they had already adopted its tenets to such a degree that they did not feel this as an imposition on their work.

In any case, it is easy to agree with Sekulić (2011: 39) when he states that “we should be aware that every model of value orientations carries the imprint of time and is inseparable from the prevailing ideological schemes”.

ize the system in response to the nationalist and liberalization pressures in the constituent republics. It was one of the longest constitutions in the world, prescribing complex election procedures throughout the political and economic sphere, using highly elaborate “self-management” terminology, almost impenetrable for outsiders approaching it from historical distance.

⁴ In his book on *Classes and Class Structure of the Contemporary Society*, Cvjetičanin (1974: 131) states explicitly that “[n]o extant theory of the class structure – that is of social stratification – can completely explain the changes that came about in the class and social stratification of the socialist societies”. The term “bourgeois sociology” was used in the sociology of the period to denote non-Marxist theories of society. For example, Chapter 2 of the quoted book is entitled “An overview of the bourgeois theories of class and social stratification”. The absence of the term “middle class” is conspicuous even in the works of social theory of the late socialist period, in spite of the fact that they discussed stratification aspects that could have been easily and appropriately described by the use of this term. Interestingly enough, the term “middle class” began to dominate the public discourse of the post-Yugoslav countries only in the post-socialist period, especially in the contexts lamenting its “disappearance” in relation to the socialist period.

Given the centrality of the issue of class in the prevailing ideology of Yugoslav socialism, as well as its specific and ever increasingly convoluted terminology developing the idea of “self-management”, it is hardly surprising that the degree of “inseparability” mentioned by Sekulić is particularly visible in this case.

However, to understand what exactly is being argued in the socialist literature on the issue of class is a different matter. Although the context under discussion is still not historically distant, to make sense of what is communicated in the studies of class from the socialist period requires a painstaking, almost philological, reconstruction of the texts and of their relation to the social realities in which they came about. The first step one should make in an attempt at gaining an operational understanding of the implications of various guises of the issue of class in Yugoslav socialism is to ground the discussion into the literature from the socialist period. The following two subsections of the text are therefore devoted to an overview of the tenets of pre-empirical conceptions of class in Yugoslav social theory.

From Marx to Weber: pre-empirical conceptions of class in Yugoslav social theory

The specificities of the Yugoslav ideological and then social theoretical elaboration of the notion of class were established already in the initial period of the post-World War II introduction of the socialist political order in Yugoslavia. It is worth remembering that Yugoslav society at that time was predominantly agrarian and that Communist Party ideologues therefore had difficulties in affirming the class of workers as a historical actor whose interests should be dominant in society. Peasants, who made up the majority of the population in various constituent parts of the new, socialist Yugoslavia,⁵ were not a class subject in Marx’s sense of the word, as they

⁵ According to an account written three years after the establishment of the socialist Yugoslavia (Draper, 1948), Yugoslavia was seen as “the most agrarian country of all Europe, the most thoroughly peasant land on the continent”, where “77–80 per cent of the population [was] engaged in agriculture”. Moreover, Yugoslavia before the Second World War was seen as “a land of small peasants” in which “[a]mong its 15½–16 million people (10½ million on the land) there [were] two million separate peasant holdings”, in which “92.5 per cent of the area under cultivation belong[ed] to the peasants who till it”, i.e. in which “[t]here [were] few large estates and still fewer ‘great landowners’”. According to the same source (Draper, 1948), “[a]mong the Serbians, fully 80 per cent [were] peasants”, while “Croatia and Slovenia [were] the most industrialized sections, but still mainly village, farm, forest and countryside”. This was seen by Draper (1948) as different from pre-1917

did not possess class consciousness. A huge theoretical effort ensued to translate these political subjects into the categories that would make it possible to declare the existence of the working class in socialist Yugoslavia, to a degree more pronounced than was actually the case. These theoretical efforts went hand in hand with the real-world “production of the proletariat”, by means of accelerated industrialization and urbanization of the country.

Another set of terminological specificities of Yugoslav socialist ideology and social theory relates to the attempts to account for an atypical system of worker participation in industrial and political decision-making instituted after Tito’s break with Stalin in order to legitimate the special characteristics of the “Yugoslav way”.

According to Vuković (1990: 4),⁶ the key ideological terms in the initial period of Yugoslav socialism were “working people” and “one-class” or “classless society”. In addition to what was known as the “working class” in the pre-socialist times, the newly coined term “working people” also referred to what was labelled as “other workers” and “working peasantry” (Gredelj, 1986: 41).

In contemporary Communist Party documents, the term “working people” functioned as an umbrella term encompassing all those employed in what was referred to as the “socially owned” establishments,⁷ while all

Russia, which was also a predominantly peasant land, but – according to this author – “it would be deceptive to equate the two”, since “Russia had its sector of big industry, its giant plants, in which the revolution incubated. Yugoslavia [did] not.” According to estimates quoted by Draper, in interwar Yugoslavia “there [were] only 475,000 industrial and transport workers, a majority of whom [were] in Croatia and Slovenia”. What manufacturing industries there existed engaged in producing mainly consumer goods, but 75 % of the manufactured products were imported. In 1940, of the “less than a half million industrial and transport workers – constituting less than 8 percent of the population – perhaps 63,000 belong[ed] to trade unions. [...] And of this number a large proportion work[ed] in small family shops, or at handicrafts; others [were] semi-proletarians eking out miserable peasant incomes with miserable factory wages”. The information on the share of agricultural products in the national product in interwar Yugoslavia, as well as some more recent views on the issue of Southeast European “peasant societies”, is quoted in Kopsidis (2012).

⁶ Our discussion of the treatment of the term “class” in the socialist ideology and social theory is largely based on the comments of the subject-matter provided by Vuković (1990), Sekulić (1991), Lazić (1987), and Golubović (1988). Vuković’s literature review (Vuković, 1990: 1–17) proved helpful in the attempt to provide a brief yet reliable overview of the topic. Sekulić’s, Lazić’s and Golubović’s analyses provided inputs of more theoretical nature, which are expounded upon and occasionally contradicted in our analysis.

⁷ For an overview of the interpretations of the term in the documents of the Communist Party (officially renamed into the League of Communists in 1952) cf. Kuljić (1981).

those not covered by the term (i.e. not working in the “socially owned” establishments) were thought of as “remnants of the bourgeois and other formations”. According to Gredelj (1986), these people were labelled as “enemies” in the post-war communist propaganda. Also in circulation in the period were the semantically rather indeterminate terms such as “people’s masses”, “wide people’s masses” and “progressive forces” (Vuković, 1990: 5).

Owing to a very wide definition of the “working people” and the understanding of this term as relating to a “homogeneous social whole” (Marković, 1968: 90), the official stance in this period was that the society was either “one-class” or “classless”. The cases of obvious discrepancy with this conception were written off as “deformations of the classless society”, and described as “characteristic manifestations of the process of transformation of one-class structure to a classless [structure]” (Kardelj, 1968: 8).

It was conceded by the Communist Party ideologues that the mentioned “homogenous social whole” was composed of several subgroups, but bureaucracy – as one of these subgroups – was appropriated as “our bureaucracy”, and it was held that “state and party work have productive character” (Marković, 1968). Pečuljić (1963) also mentions the “transitional work strata” such as “private owners” (of small businesses), since they were themselves engaged in productive work and were therefore not seen as exploiting other workers, peasants, and peasants-industrial workers.

The only explicit mentioning of new class divisions in this period was Đilas’s conception of the “new class” (Đilas, 1957), which referred to the privileged party bureaucracy, deriving material benefits from their positions and adopting lifestyles inconsistent with the premises of the socialist revolution. In Đilas’s view, this “new class” had established a specific relationship with the means of production, in which its property form was collective political control.

Ironically enough, as argued convincingly by Sekulić (1991: 91), although Đilas’s pamphlet was rejected as harmful to Party interest, the theory of a new class based on collective ownership was actually developed by the political leadership of Yugoslavia, “which at that time had a monopoly over the ideological, but also theoretical thought”. In the wake of Tito’s break

Vuković (1990: 4) states that the formulations originating in party documents for propaganda purposes were elaborated upon later in the works of the “leading politicians” (Kardelj, 1968; Bakarić, 1968; Marković, 1968) and “some sociologists” (Pečuljić, 1963).

with Stalin, criticism similar to Đilas's would probably have been acceptable had it been directed at Soviet bureaucracy, i.e. a bureaucracy considered as a part of the form of socialism that "went astray", but it was obviously totally unacceptable when applied to the local Yugoslav circumstances.

At the beginning of the 1960s, the ideologically produced term "working people" received a sociological elaboration. Goričar (1962) claimed that the introduction of "worker's self-management" brought about the end of exploitation of the working class and consequently suggested that the Yugoslav society was actually classless. This also meant that there was no room for the middle class to mediate between previously antagonistic classes of the exploited workers and owners of the means of production. However, the author conceded that in addition to the "socialist economic structure" there was also a "class of small-scale producers", which included peasants as well as craftsmen and small shopkeepers,⁸ who were seen as the "remnants of the capitalist past".

Close to Goričar's conception of Yugoslav socialism as essentially "classless" was Vidaković's theory of Yugoslav society as "class society in disappearance" (Vidaković, 1966). According to this theory, socialism was a "transitional period" in which certain elements of class society were reproduced, which in turn resulted in certain economical and social differences. Vidaković occasionally referred to "certain groups" as "social strata" with "differentiated elements of a class position". Although mentioned, the terms "social stratum", "class" as well as "working class" itself were never clearly defined in Vidaković's work (1966, 1967, 1972). However, in spite of this, Vidaković claimed that the working class "gradually integrated" all social groups and acted as an intermediary between the class and classless structures of the society.

Opposed to Goričar's and Vidaković's conceptions of an all-inclusive society that was seen as "classless" or on the way to the "disappearance of class", were the conceptions of Yugoslav society as composed of the "working class" and the "counter-class", most famously elaborated by Stipe Šušar.⁹

⁸ The expression "craftsmen and small shopkeepers" is used here to denote what is essentially the same stratum it describes in Richard Nice's English translation of Bourdieu's *Distinction* (1984). The literal translation of the original would limit the scope of reference to the "craftsmen", which would not do justice to the social reality to which the expression relates.

⁹ Vuković (1990: 6) reminds us that in his later works Goričar changed his initial position and also used the concept of "counter-class". Pečujlić, who initially accepted and elabo-

In his works published at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s (Šuvar, 1968, 1970, 1972), this author included into his notion of the working class “all those creating surplus value” except for peasants and private owners. Members of “technical intelligentsia” were also included in the definition, provided that they worked in “productive work organizations”. Members of the counter-class, on the contrary, “d[id] not realize surplus work and live[d] off other people’s surplus work”. They included the intelligentsia not engaged in the “production process”, administrative personnel, professional managers and the governing political elite. According to Šuvar (1972), the members of the counter-class could also be designated as “middle class”, because they were in a privileged position in relation to the working class.

Another representative of the counter-class theory was Adolf Dragičević (1968). His contribution to the discussion is worthwhile mentioning because of his view that there were no fixed boundaries between the strata of the counter-class, whose members easily mixed and migrated from one stratum to another. This author saw the solution for exiting from class society in “all the members of the counter-class [...] obligatorily enter[ing] into class membership, all of them [...] becom[ing] immediate producers in material production” (Dragičević, 1968: 1279).

The increasingly visible presence of the middle class in all the aspects of social life was also noted by Kuvačić (1972). This author saw it as a “heterogeneous” entity placed between the managerial elite and the workers. It is important to note that Kuvačić distinguished the members of the middle class from the members of the working class in terms of their position and role in the organization of work, mode of gaining income and its size, as well as on the grounds of their lifestyle and aspirations. In other words, Kuvačić’s interpretation introduced into the discussion the Weberian dimensions of class structure, although this has not so far been recognized by the interpreters of the socialist discussions of class.¹⁰

rated upon the notion of an all-encompassing “working people”, in the second half of the 1960s also changed his views and described Yugoslav society as a “quasi-class” society in transition from the class structure to the non-class structure. According to this author, the path that the mentioned transition would follow was described as starting at the “class” social grouping, passing through a “bureaucratic (quasi-class)” grouping and eventually reaching “social professional (self-managing)” grouping (Pečujlić, 1966: 20).

¹⁰ Malenica (2007: 119) mentions in passing that Weber’s distinction between the components of social prestige, power and property was used in some socialist theorizing of class. However, he does not make reference to the quoted Kuvačić’s work.

In hindsight, it is clear that in his description of the position of peasants and small proprietors, Kuvačić applied the Marxist criterion of ownership of the means of production. But when discussing the distinction between the working class and the middle class, he resorted to the Weberian dimensions of position in the labour market, status and lifestyle. To be sure, Kuvačić's analysis did not explicitly invoke Weber, nor has it so far been interpreted in this way, but – upon reflection – his explanations unmistakably associate the Weberian multi-dimensional class model.

Social reality vs. ideology: the re-emergence of class in a “classless society”

The implicit move from Marx to Weber in Kuvačić's attempts to provide a theoretical explanation of the nature of class relations in the socialist Yugoslavia can be interpreted in two ways.

(1) To begin with, this move shows – even more graphically than previous elaborations did – that the social realities of class in the former Yugoslavia simply could not fit into the ideologically imposed idea of a “one class” or “classless” society. From whichever aspect of Marxist theory the question of class was approached, there always seemed to have been “remnants” and “loose ends” that could not be placed within the ideologically desired outcome.

(2) Likewise, the mentioned (implicit) introduction of Weberian dimension into the discussion of class indicates the increased visibility of new “social groups” in Yugoslav society at the time of Kuvačić's analysis.¹¹ The author speaks about the emergence of the middle class, which “grows very rapidly and its influence is ever larger in all the domains of social life” (Kuvačić, 1972: 75). This is no longer just “bureaucracy” as conceptualized by authors such as Cvjetičanin (1969, 1974), but a more heterogeneous social group for which Kuvačić explicitly uses the label of “class”.¹²

It should be remarked here that the appearance on the scene of a more heterogeneous social group that could be described as the “middle class”

¹¹ Kuvačić (1972) distinguished between four basic social groups in Yugoslav society: the bureaucracy, the middle class, craftsmen and small shopkeepers, and peasants. As has already been mentioned, he distinguished the latter two from the working class in terms of ownership of the means of production, and the former two in terms of a more refined, Weberian-like analysis of several elements of class position.

¹² In the Yugoslav context, Cvjetičanin stated, the bureaucracy “cannot be a class” because that “would verify the theory of the immanence of class in all future societies” (Cvjetičanin, 1974: 155).

was by no means a result of a possibly presupposed ideological thaw. On the contrary, the increased visibility of this group provoked ideological rigidity and led to the attempts of increased “political control” and “work-erization” of the entire society.¹³

However, no attempt at ideological control of society could obviously overturn the growing trend of “bourgeoisisation”. Speaking for it, among other things, were sheer statistical data. We should remember that, according to Cvjetičanin (1974: 162), “prior to the outbreak of the revolution”, peasantry made about 80% of the population of the “old” Yugoslavia, and that only 7.2% of the population of that country could be described as “working class”. At the time of writing of the quoted book, the relations had changed significantly: in 1972, only 36% of the population of Yugoslavia (3.57 million) could be classified as “peasantry” (Cvjetičanin, 1974: 169), while 4.67 million of inhabitants of Yugoslavia were classified as workers, out of which number 60% related to industrial workers proper (Cvjetičanin, 1974: 165–166).

But the accelerated process of urbanization that took place in socialist Yugoslavia did not only result in the unprecedented expansion of the working class. Sekulić, Massey and Hodson (1991: 193) remind us that – in addition to the jobs for manual workers – the establishment and development of the state apparatus and the industrial system created thousands of jobs for office workers, managers and political leaders. This kind of upward mobility was especially pronounced during the first decade following World War II, after which its growth rates decreased significantly (Zukin, 1978: 398).

Nevertheless, a source quoted by Sekulić, Massey and Hodson (1991: 194) claims that in 1960 “almost a third” of all the office workers was made up of those who were still peasants in 1946, while “almost three fourths” came from the families of peasants or workers (Kluck, 1982: 86).

¹³ We have already mentioned Dragičević’s idea (Dragičević, 1968) that the members of the counter-class should be integrated into the working class by means of becoming “immediate producers” (i.e. manual workers). Such ideas were partly put into practice by Stipe Šuvar, the foremost ideologist of the larger part of the 1970s and 1980s in Croatia, who through his educational reform realized the idea that workers’ children should receive better general education and those who previously attended the bourgeois gymnasium should also get a first-hand experience of technical manual work through the school system. Such practice was consistent with Šuvar’s thesis of the “necessity” of “workerization” of all the strata of society, elaborated as late as the mid-1980s (Šuvar, 1985).

These people and their children formed the backbone of what Golubović (1988) eventually labelled as the “new middle class” in Yugoslav society.

One should not forget to mention here that in Yugoslavia, just as in other socialist countries, the educational system played a key role in securing upward mobility (Connor, 1979). As a rule, the higher the level of attained education the better the job one could secure (Connor, 1979: 139). In the period between World War II and the late 1970s, Yugoslavia had achieved staggering increases in the literacy and educational levels (Kluck, 1982: 106–107), and at the end of that period a reference to an “expert” almost automatically brought to mind the notion of a “person with a university diploma” (Sekulić, Massey and Hodson, 1991: 194). In this respect, Yugoslavia can be said to have been markedly similar to other socialist countries.

However, what should be mentioned here as well is that in an important aspect Yugoslavia was by no stretch of imagination a typical “real-socialist” country. Although we agree with Allcock (2000: 7–8) when he claims that the “generic characteristics of the model of ‘really existing socialism’ [...] were thoroughly present in the Yugoslav system”, notwithstanding “all its idiosyncracies”, it is hard to deny that there was a number of significant differences between everyday life in socialist Yugoslavia and in the Soviet-dominated Eastern bloc countries.

Namely, due to its geopolitical position between the two dominant blocks of the Cold War era and the feud between Stalin and Tito that took place in 1948, socialist Yugoslavia was open from very early on to Western influences in the symbolic and media sphere. These influences ranged from high art forms such as abstract expressionism to popular music, films, and television shows. Furthermore, Yugoslav borders were widely opened in the 1960s both to Western tourists and to the local migrant workers who found employment in Western Europe (initially mostly in West Germany), from where they sent home Western consumer goods and money. Shopping trips to border towns in Italy and Austria became a mass preoccupation in the 1970s, and there was also a significant increase in financially more demanding tourist trips abroad.

In short, the overall position of the Yugoslav population in terms of its openness to Western influences was very far from that of the isolated, almost hermetically sealed Eastern bloc “real-socialist countries”. Likewise, the general standard of living in socialist Yugoslavia was significantly higher from that in the “real-socialist” countries during the entire socialist period (Golubović, 1988).

Having said all this, one could conclude that the social realities of socialist Yugoslavia were shaped by a constant confrontation of the rigid conceptions of the Communist Party ideologues and an ever-increasing lure of the nascent consumer society. Social fragmentation resulting from the ever-increasing consumption practices,¹⁴ as well as from a relatively long period of abrupt upward mobility of peasants and workers, could have neither been successfully contained at the level of “party struggle” nor theoretically explained utilizing the tenets of classical sociological approaches.

Namely, new social constellations, which included an emerging idiosyncratic stratification, simply did not fit into the tenets of the ideologically imposed Marxist approach. Likewise, they could not be successfully absorbed by the mentioned Weberian class model, implicitly invoked by the authors such as Kuvačić (1972).

From class to stratum: empirical research between Marxism and structural functionalism

Until the beginning of the 1970s, the discussions of class-related issues in socialist Yugoslavia were most frequently neither purely ideological nor theoretical, but represented the mixture of these two general approaches. Allcock (2000: 170) states that “[t]he work done by Yugoslav sociologists [was] often of a high technical standard and clearly in touch with intellectual developments in the discipline”, but claims that there exists a need “to disengage [this] sociological analysis from the primarily ideological concepts in which it [had] become encased”. Furthermore, this author explains that “the dominant position of the League of Communists in Yugoslav cultural life between 1945 and 1990 had an impact upon [the] area of sociology [dealing with stratification] more than any other”, since “[the] question of class [was] so close to the heart of Marxist orthodoxy that the agenda of social science has often been constrained to accommodate to a political definition of the nature of social reality and the course of its transformation” (Allcock, 2000: 170).

In such circumstances, according to Sekulić (1991: 26), “ideological analysis” unfolded “parallelly” with “theoretical analysis” and was also

¹⁴ A reliable account of the gradual increase in consumption practices in socialist Yugoslavia is provided by Duda (2005). Although the author takes his examples from the everyday realities of the Yugoslav constituent socialist republic of Croatia, they can be taken to be indicative of the trends in the entire country.

“mixed with it”. But regardless of the constantly shifting ratio of the two poles in the contributions of individual authors, one thing was certain: in the close to three initial decades of Yugoslav socialism, the discussions of class were never backed by empirical data. In the initial post-war era, the notion of the “working class” was ideologically imposed from above onto a social reality of a dominantly agrarian society. In the same way, the ensuing ideological and theoretical discussions also took place in a space never directly correlated to the real-world stratification of Yugoslav society.

Sekulić (1991) informs us that the first research creating an empirical base for conclusions on socio-professional mobility in the former Yugoslavia was carried out in 1968 by a team of U.S. researchers, primarily interested in the connection between the communist party and the opinion-making elites (Barton, Denitch and Kadushin, 1973).

The first interpretations of empirical data on stratification issues by Yugoslav researchers were published in the 1970s, by Janićijević (1972),¹⁵ Saksida, Ceserman and Petrović (1977) and Popović et al. (1977). Saksida’s team employed factor analysis to research the educational-professional, political and consumer hierarchies, while Popović’s hypothesis was that there existed differences in the various strata of the Yugoslav society with regard to their interests, lifestyles, class-stratum consciousness and value orientations.

In hindsight, what seems more important than the interpretation of the findings of these studies is an interpretation of the way in which they were formed. Saksida and collaborators “did not start from presupposed social groups and testing of differences between them, but the other way round, tried to reconstruct groups from a large number of variables characterizing individuals” (Sekulić, 1991: 62). The effort of these researchers can without doubt be described as an instance of what Golubović (1988: 293) labelled as “a tacit rejection of class analysis”.

Regardless of how consistent or convincing their findings were later found to be, the work of Saksida’s team can be seen as an important attempt at the analysis of social stratification of socialist Yugoslavia from a structural-functionalist perspective. Following the dominant and legitimate Marxist analysis of the subject of class, interspersed at the beginning of

¹⁵ Lazić (1987: 10) mentions that, apart from the quoted article, “wider data and analysis” resulting from Janićijević’s empirical research were still not made accessible to the public at the time of his (Lazić’s) writing.

the 1970s with implicit Weberian overtones, there also appeared now a report on research not pretending to be consistent or translatable into the framework of the Marxist paradigm (Sekulić, 1991: 65–66). The novelty was that Saksida and his collaborators undertook stratification analysis in a “‘purely’ empirical way” (Vuković, 1990: 14), completely neglecting previous theoretical groundings of the subject matter.

Unlike this, Popović’s analysis is interesting exactly because it is the fruit of the author’s previous theoretical elaboration of how to study the stratification structure of a socialist society (Popović, 1966). In his work, extending from the early treatment of the “problems of structure of the socialist society” (Popović, 1962) to the late contribution to the study of social inequalities (Popović et al., 1987), this author proved to be the most consequent advocate of the conception of stratum differentiation of Yugoslav society (Vuković, 1990: 13). In spite of that, according to Sekulić (1991: 66), Popović’s empirical work can be seen as marked by an “explicit effort to stay within the framework of the Marxist paradigm”.

The effort Sekulić speaks about is visible already in Popović’s mentioned “theoretical-hypothetical framework for the study of stratification structure of a socialist society”. Departing from Lenin’s conceptions, he rejected the idea of Yugoslav society as a class one, since in Yugoslavia private ownership of the means of production had been abolished. However, Popović understood that there existed “groupings with special places in the system of distribution of social power, material wealth and social values and especially of prestige” (Popović, 1966: 37). His way out of the predicament was to equate the “meaning of class” with the notion of the stratum.

According to Popović, these were the “strata of the new type”, because they had lost their class attributes, and the whole Yugoslav society was seen (although the notion was not theoretically elaborated further) as a society of “transitional-class character” (Sekulić, 1991: 67).

Popović’s work in the 1970s can itself be seen as a sort of “transition” towards the interpretations of social stratification in socialist Yugoslavia, purposely avoiding the notion of “class”. It is interesting to note that in his pre-empirical theoretical elaboration, Popović in actuality operated with Weberian attributes of the social class applied to what he calls “groupings” in his equation of “class” with “stratum”.

Obviously, it was important for the researchers of the time to be able to diagnose the existence of differences between various social groups

avoiding an interpretation of these as “class differences”. Namely, in the dominant Marxist paradigm, the notion of class automatically carried the connotation of conflictuality, and to have claimed that there existed different classes in the Yugoslav society would have implied that there also existed a conflict potential in what was ideologically described either as “one class” or “classless” society.

The wish to avoid such an implication can be said to have led the research of the subject matter in the 1970s away from the notion of “class”, and to the eventual substitution of this previously central term by the more neutral notion of “stratum”. It can also be said to have led the research of stratification of Yugoslav society away from ideologically permeated theory to empirical research.

Towards a reconciliation of class and stratum?

The work of the next generation of empirical researches also vacillates between the poles of “class” and “stratum”, but in a different socio-political context, and with more individuality in the treatment of these two poles. Issues connected with individual social mobility figure more prominently in the work of these researchers, published in the monographs on *The Middle Strata in Yugoslavia* (Mrkšić, 1987) and *Towards a Closed Society* (Lazić, 1987).

According to Vuković (1990: 15–16) these works represent important attempts to “‘reconcile’ stratification and class analyses”. They both start from the premise that Yugoslav society “represents a special form” of socialist society (Lazić, 1987:15), but deal with this “specialty” in somewhat different ways.

Mrkšić (1987: 4) claimed that Yugoslav society underwent an evolution from an initial “etatistic-mass model of the social structure” to a “special pattern of social structure, in which the elements of class division of labour [were] present as potentials obstructed in their development”. This process resulted in social forms which exhibited some class distinctions, but were in effect of stratum nature. According to Mrkšić, on the basis of division of labour, and different social positions and positions in the power structure, four fundamental social strata had formed in Yugoslav society: the elitist stratum (party and state functionaries, as well as higher officials in management positions), the middle strata, the workers and peasantry. The author saw such stratification as “realistic”, emphasizing repeatedly

that strata into which the society was divided exhibited class attributes to a greater or lesser degree.

Lazić's attempt to "reconcile" stratification and class analyses" took a somewhat different form. In theoretical elaborations, this author stuck to the notion of class, as well as to the "critical" and "dialectical" (i.e. Marxist) approaches. He criticized the empirical work of previous researchers of the topic (Saksida) as overly concentrated on individual mobility and in general "analytically diluting the society into *individuals* (and their groupings), and not into a system of relations" (Lazić, 1987: 12). Lazić insisted exactly on this latter aspect and was primarily interested within it in class reproduction, i.e. in showing how "reproduction of a group in a given class relation" results from the "general laws of reproduction of the dominant system of relations" (Lazić, 1987: 14).

On the other hand, however, this author relied heavily on the results of his empirical work and employed the notion of stratum to describe various subdivisions found within the four classes that he concluded that Yugoslav society¹⁶ was composed of: the class of "collective owners",¹⁷ the class of "mediators", the class of "workers" and the class of "private [owners]". Such an account of the stratification of Yugoslav society is actually quite similar to the conclusions arrived at by Mrkšić (1987) and to a theoretical positioning of the principles of classification subsequently proposed by Golubović (1988). But Lazić's eventually rather unsuccessful attempts at establishing generalities in the descriptions of the strata of the class of "mediators" and "private owners"¹⁸ reveal both the intensity of his effort

¹⁶ It should be noted that Lazić carried out his empirical research in the then Socialist Republic of Croatia. However, it was obviously taken as indicative for wider trends in Yugoslav society. This is also evidenced by the fact that, in the theoretical part of his study, the author writes about the class evolution of Yugoslav society and refers to empirical research carried out in that framework.

¹⁷ Lazić's class of "collective owners" corresponds to what Mrkšić labels as the "elitist stratum" of party and state functionaries. However, given the historical distance, it is perhaps more difficult to understand the connotations of the term used by Lazić. Namely, technically speaking, the concept of "social property", typical for "self-managing socialism", would imply that citizens in general could be seen as "collective owners" of the national resources. This is clearly what Lazić did not have in mind with this category: we are dealing here – so to speak – with the "real owners of collective ownership", i.e. those disposing with the power to influence processes.

¹⁸ By way of example, some of the convoluted explanations of the differences between the "stratum of needed work" and "stratum of system work" in Lazić's account of the subdivisions of the "mediating" class were unconvincing to the author himself, to the

and the contradictions of the chosen path of “reconciliation” of the two types of stratification analysis.

In spite of these contradictions, Lazić’s analysis remains an extremely valuable guide to the social topography of Yugoslav society in the last decade of its existence, and its general conclusions regarding the nature of the social trends at that time were doubtlessly sound. Among other things, this can be said to be confirmed by the mentioned isotopy of the basic elements of his classification with those arrived at by means of an empirical stratum-centred analysis (Mrkšić, 1987) and a theoretically inspired Marxist analysis (Golubović, 1988).

As regards the latter, in a book published one year after Lazić’s, Zagorka Golubović (1988) claimed that a “new class society” had formed in Yugoslavia. In the final phase of the system which started out desiring a “one-class” society and then aspired at achieving a “classless” society, this author concluded that class relations had emerged as “constitutive for the existing order” (Golubović, 1988: 325). The latter was falsely labelled as “self-managing socialism”, while in actuality it represented a “hybrid mixture of etatism and limited ‘market socialism’” (Golubović, 1988: 325). According to Golubović, the class society that came about in such a hybrid system could be explained neither by analogy with capitalism nor with pre-capitalist society.

Based on the data provided by the previous empirical work of other researchers, to which she applied the criteria of division of labour and distribution of social power, Golubović distinguished between the following four classes of Yugoslav society: (1) peasantry (with the interclass position of peasant-worker); (2) the working class; (3) the middle class, which according to this author included the strata of “old” and “new” middle class, as well as the stratum of intellectuals; and (4) the class of “functionaries”.

point of concluding that “[f]orming of the absolutely ‘pure’ empirical groups [was] here [...] completely impossible” (Lazić, 1987: 79). One had to “to depart from the dominant content of work”, which was “estimated by the respondents and the sociologist who had formed the sample”, (Lazić, 1987: 79). Likewise, the strata of “peasants” and “small owners” were said to make up the class of “private [owners]”, based on the Marxist criterion of possession of the means of production. But, again according to Lazić (1987: 80–81), in the sociological sense, these strata were again “themselves divided into classes!” Namely, the interests of all those encompassed by this designation were judged to be “different to the point of becoming opposed”. In addition to this, they constituted “a false generality” in that the unity of the group – in addition to its members’ private ownership – also lay in their social grounding “outside of the dominant relation”.

She also mentioned the relatively large social groups of “retired persons” and “unemployed”, a closer analysis of which could in her opinion reveal “the depth of the process of social differentiation at work in Yugoslav society, in terms of marginalization of certain social groups and strata” (Golubović, 1988: 324).

It is important to note that Golubović underlined that the classification she suggested did not automatically mean that she claimed that Yugoslav society was “closed and immobile”. According to her, classes in Yugoslav society were “not completely closed groupings”, but she conceded that “increasingly difficult social mobility towards classes/strata in a higher social position suggests a tendency toward closure” (Golubović, 1988: 322). In this, Golubović obviously concurs with the conclusions of Lazić’s book.

Class society or “closed society”?

A general conclusion to Lazić’s study, reflected in its title (*Towards a Closed Society*), was that there came about an increased homogenization of the elite class of “collective owners” at the time when his empirical research was carried out, and that social mobility in Yugoslav society was in general significantly lower than in the early periods of socialism. The trend towards a “closed society”, diagnosed by Lazić, manifested itself in increasingly difficult upward mobility for young people (unless they were children of members of the political elite), in the fact that workers were generally much less upwardly mobile than they once had been, and also in that there existed social groups (peasants and small owners) positioned completely “outside of the system”, with weak chances of upward mobility in the legitimate culture. However, in spite of such conclusions, the notion of “class reproduction” figures prominently in Lazić’s analysis and he labels as “classes” the different social groups he describes as existing in Yugoslav society.

One is faced here with a theoretical problem: to speak about a class-based society as “closed” is obviously a contradiction in terms. Class societies are, namely, by definition “open”, i.e. they enable upward and downward mobility of their members, unlike “closed”, caste or feudal societies. Since Lazić’s empirical evidence indeed suggested the trend towards “closedness”, one is forced to conclude that his use of the term “class” in the social stratification analysis he undertook was not completely justifiable. At any rate, the extremely closed social group of political leaders that Lazić

labeled as “collective owners” would certainly not be called a “class” in the terminology employed in comparable analyses of the politically pluralist societies.

What kind of a society, then, can be said to have emerged in the late period of Yugoslav socialism? According to Ule (1989: 30), the system of one-party rule had created specific forms of feudalization of society. In spite of the proclaimed modernization ideals and some technological standards compatible with industrial societies, the Yugoslav “self-managing” system was essentially premodern in that every social position in that system was dependent on a set of formal and informal privileges and decisions of the ruling party elite. This resulted in an elaborate ritualization of social relations, and totalizing tendencies in which the whole of social and political life appeared to be “politically produced” (Puhovski, 1990: 38).

The question is: if society was as closed as the quoted political analyses suggest, how come that this was not as obvious as in the “real-socialist” countries? Why was Yugoslav “self-managing socialism” generally perceived as “more open” and “more human”? And furthermore: how come that in the 1970s and 1980s there appeared signs of an ever-increasing convergence with cultural practices in pluralist societies?

When answering this question, one should not forget that – as we have already mentioned – socialist Yugoslavia was literally positioned between the two worlds: that of the Western welfare state capitalism and that of the Eastern-bloc type of “real socialism”. The ingredients characteristic of these two worlds were constantly mixing and this became especially visible in the Yugoslav socialism of the 1970s and 1980s.

On one hand, at that time, there was an ever-increasing convergence with consumer, media and cultural practices in the West, especially among young people. This gave rise to the processes of individualization and to acceptance of post-materialist values among the urban and educated youth population in Yugoslavia, as well as to an unprecedented openness of youth in the northwestern Socialist Republic of Slovenia to political pluralism and entrepreneurial values (Ule, 1989).

On the other hand, in the sphere of official politics, a specific form of “etatization of society” and “pseudo-politicization of everyday life” continued (Ule, 1989: 30). Offering a higher standard of living to its citizens in a less repressive model of socialism, and creating the impression of wide participation in an innovative political project, Yugoslav “self-managing so-

cialism” secured a much higher level of popular acceptance than the hard-line regimes in the East. But this ideological project, which required obligatory participation of all the social actors in political decision-making, can be said to have in actuality institutionalized political monism more successfully than was the case in the “real-socialist” countries (Tomić-Koludrović, 1992: 48).

Namely, in spite of the proclaimed inclusion of the entire citizenry in the process of political decision-making, the real distribution of power depended on whether one was perceived as an “insider” or “outsider” to the system (Tomić-Koludrović, 1992: 24).¹⁹ The differentiation was based on the level of expressed support to and participation in the realization of the official ideological programme, which was the only one allowed by the authorities.²⁰

Even if the outward signs of “westernization” in the 1970s and 1980s suggested otherwise, vertical mobility was increasingly restricted in the Yugoslav society of the period, not only as seen in standard Western sociological terms but also within what Lazić (1987) and Golubović (1988) labelled as “classes” in the context of late Yugoslav socialism. For instance, speaking about the “mediating” class, Lazić (1987: 110) stated that it was not completely closed to the intra-generational vertical mobility of manual workers, but also added that their chances in this respect were several times lower from those of the individuals with office work background.

Likewise, mobility can be said to have been restricted within the “mediating class” itself, when it related to the positions in which what Lazić defined as “needed work” represented at the same time “a form of imposition of the dominant ideology” (Lazić, 1987: 79). In short, mobility was

¹⁹ The term originally used in the quoted text (Tomić-Koludrović, 1992: 24) is “pripadnik”. This Croatian word connotes both “membership” and a sense of “belonging”. Since the membership in question was not necessarily formal (i.e. shown by being a card-carrying member of the Communist Party) we have decided to use the term “insider” here.

²⁰ It should be said in this regard that the criterion of differentiation did not depend solely on the formal membership in the Communist Party (officially renamed The League of Communists in 1952), nor on the certificates of “moral-political aptitude” needed for employment or higher political offices in the “system of delegates”. There were also more informal ways of “checking” one’s political outlook, which included assessing the political background of one’s family, as well as whether family members’ observed religious holidays and attended religious ceremonies. Finally, the “checking” practices included assessment of one’s political loyalty based on expressions made in everyday interactions, both on a verbal and non-verbal level.

“significantly relativized by narrowing the circle of potential climbers”, as well as by “selection criteria” imposed by the “authoritarian social command structure” and based on “conformism” and “loyalty” rather than on independent educational achievement (Lazić, 1987: 110).

What is more, it should also be remembered that Lazić explicitly stated that one whole “class” (that of “private [owners]”) was positioned “outside of the system” (Lazić, 1987: 80). In practice, this meant that those workers who managed to become small “private owners” were in actuality not upwardly mobile, but placed themselves even further on the margins of the legitimate society. Finally, let us not forget that, according to Lazić (1987: 149), “entry into the class of collective owners was under the absolute control of its members”.

Given the wealth of Lazić’s empirical data and the level of detail in his analysis, it is safe to conclude that the society he described was indeed “closed” or – as the title of his book indicated – moving towards an ever-larger “closure”.

To be sure, less empirically backed suggestions of closure can be found in social theory before and after Lazić’s analysis. Vuković (1990: 10) mentions that Dragičević (1968), “operat[ing] with undifferentiated terms occasionally speak[s] about castes in Yugoslav society”. Such uses of the term were also found in colloquial exchanges in the socialist period, in which, without exception, they denoted the “upper crust” of the ruling communist “elite”.²¹ On the other hand, the already mentioned analysis by Mirjana Ule (1989) convincingly elaborated on the trends of “feudalization” of society in the late socialist period, but was primarily theoretically informed.

Class distinctions in a “classless society”?

In addition to the empirical aspect of his work, the value of Lazić’s analysis of the “closure” of the late socialist society in Yugoslavia lay in his attempt to compare the characteristics of the channels of upward mobility in the so-

²¹ It is interesting to note that uses of the term “caste” in this period, whether in essayistic or colloquial use, predominantly referred to the closed circle of the “rulers” of society. Such uses never presupposed the existence of “castes” at the other end of the spectrum, i.e. the existence of those excluded from power and denied social prestige as a “caste” of their own. Lazić’s analysis, specifically mentioning those positioned “outside of the system” in late socialism, sets the ground for this other – exclusionary – perspective on the modes of “closure” of the socialist system, although the metaphorical use of the term “caste” certainly cannot do justice to the phenomenon it attempts to describe.

cialist context with those at work in “classical, ‘liberal’ capitalism” (Lazić, 1987: 150).²² In contrast with what Lazić describes as the “objectivized” and “depersonalized” criteria of “selection” of the “climbers” in the capitalist societies, where they need to prove their entrepreneurial capability on an “autonomous market”, the criteria of selection in the socialist context were based on “loyalty” to the “personalized representatives” of the “established hierarchy”.

Interpreting Lazić’s analyses, one could say that in the late Yugoslav socialist period an expected general acceptance of the ruling socialist system still “need[ed] to be complemented” by manifestations of individual loyalty. This was due to the “individualized control” of upward mobility, “always mediated by a concrete parallelogram of relations within the individual subgroups of the hierarchy” (Lazić, 1987: 151). In practice, this meant that this “outward (manifest) criterion” was as important as its “empirical operationalization” in the form of the “category of ‘moral-political’ aptitude, which in principle boiled down to the membership of the ‘candidate’ in the LC [League of Communists]” (Lazić, 1987: 150).²³

This empirically backed description of the intricate mechanism by which hierarchical power was mediated in the late socialist society suggests that Ule’s theoretical intimations of “feudalization” were indeed in place: the system that can be reconstructed on the basis of Lazić’s analyses is indeed remindful of the system of personalized “reciprocal obligations” and loyal-

²² Lazić’s invocation of “classical, ‘liberal’ capitalism” may appear somewhat idealized, in view of the trends of closure also at work in contemporary capitalist societies. However, one should bear in mind that such “idealized” invocations of the classical accounts of social and political developments in the Western world were frequent in the last decade of the socialist system in Yugoslavia. Just as in Lazić’s account, they served to delineate a “counter-world” to the social and political realities of the late “self-managing socialism”, which were increasingly being found to be unsatisfactory.

²³ With regard to this formal criterion of upward mobility in socialist Yugoslavia, and Lazić’s conclusions regarding the trends of decreased mobility in its final years, it is interesting to quote his findings on the distribution of party membership in the four main “classes” of which his stratification description consists. Lazić claimed that “the ‘density’ of LC membership [...] precisely reflect[ed] the social position of a group” (Lazić, 1987: 153). In the sample his findings were based on, over 90% of “collective owners” were LC members (98% in the case of political leaders). In the “mediating class”, there were 52% of LC members, and among the “workers” about 21%, with significantly decreasing levels corresponding closely to the decreasing levels of qualification (every third secondary school graduate among office workers, every fifth skilled worker, and every twelfth or thirteenth unskilled worker). In the class of “private [owners]” there were less than 4% of LC members.

ties characteristic of feudal vassalage. Another similarity to that system is the “inherited” social position of the descendants of “collective owners”.

However, we have also learned from Lazić’s analysis that within the ever more detached brackets of what he termed as “classes” in an increasingly “closed” society, some upward mobility was possible based on what he – in his idealized description of the mobility channels in “liberal capitalism” – calls “individual accumulation of capital”. We have also already quoted much earlier Dragičević’s statement (1968: 1279) according to which members of the “counter-class” “easily mixed and migrated from one stratum to another”.

Twenty years later, writing in the period in which Lazić’s analysis was fresh, Golubović (1988: 322) stated that, in spite of the “tendency towards closure”, “classes in Yugoslav society [were] not completely closed groupings”. It is easy to agree with such a statement, if we accept the author’s claim that the Yugoslav system at that time was a “hybrid mixture of etatism and limited ‘market socialism’” (Golubović, 1988: 325). In a context that can be described in this way, it is logical to assume that – within the “limited” market portion of the created hybrid system – some mechanisms characteristic of “liberal capitalism” could be at play.

In spite of all this, the problem – that has not been solved to this day – is how (i.e. through the lenses of which theoretical model) to approach the stratification intricacies of a society without a “one-linear power structure”, in which criteria for the explanation of the social structure were “very complex and not always clear” (Golubović, 1988: 299) and in which the analysis of various indicators confirmed that there existed “not one homogeneous” (Golubović, 1988: 311) but “several parallel stratifications” (Sekulić, 1984: 12). In the second part of this article, we will try to explain in which way the notions associated with Bourdieu’s class theory can be utilized as instruments of analysis of class relations both in socialist Yugoslavia and in the social contexts of the post-Yugoslav states.

REFERENCES

- Allcock, John B. (2000). *Explaining Yugoslavia*. London: Hurst.
Bakarić, Vladimir (1968). “Etatizam – samoupravljanje” [Etatism – self-management], *Socijalizam*, 11 (1-2): 57–70.
Barton, Allen H., Denitch, Bogdan and Kadushin, Charles (eds) (1973). *Opinion-Making Elites in Yugoslavia*. New York: Praeger.

- Bourdieu, Pierre (1984 [1979]). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (translated by Richard Nice). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Connor, Walter D. (1979). *Socialism, Politics and Equality: Hierarchy and Change in Eastern Europe and the USSR*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cvjetičanin, Veljko (1969). "Prilog raspravi o društvenoj slojevitosti u socijalizmu" [A contribution to the discussion of social stratification in socialism], *Naše teme*, 13 (7): 1238–1252.
- Cvjetičanin, Veljko (1974). *Klase i klasna struktura suvremenog društva* [Classes and class structure of contemporary society]. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Dragičević, Adolf (1968). "Radnička klasa u socijalističkom preobražaju društva" [Working class in the socialist transformation of society], *Naše teme*, 12 (9-10): 1255–1288.
- Draper, Hal (1948). "Economic Drive Behind Tito: Issues in the Break Within the Stalin Empire", <https://www.marxists.org/archive/draper/1948/10/econtito.html> (29. 02. 2014).
- Duda, Igor (2005). *U potrazi za blagostanjem: o povijesti dokolice i potrošačkog društva u Hrvatskoj 1950-ih i 1960-ih* [In search of prosperity: on the history of leisure and consumer society in Croatia in the 1950s and 1960s]. Zagreb: Srednja Europa.
- [Đilas, Milovan] Djilas, Milovan (1957). *The New Class: An Analysis of the Communist System*. New York: Praeger.
- Golubović, Zagorka (1988). *Kriza identiteta savremenog jugoslovenskog društva; jugoslovenski put u socijalizam viđen iz različitih uglova* [Identity crisis of the contemporary Yugoslav society: the Yugoslav way to socialism seen from different angles]. Beograd: Filip Višnjić.
- Goričar, Jože (1962). "Neke promene u društvenim strukturama Jugoslavije i novi ustav" [Some changes in the social structures of Yugoslavia and the new constitution], *Naša stvarnost*, 16 (11): 460–479.
- Gredelj, Stjepan (1986). *S onu stranu ogledala: istraživanje promena modela komunikacije u jugoslovenskom društvu na osnovu analize sadržaja pisanja listova Borbe i Politike u periodu od 1945. do 1975. god.* [From the other side of the mirror: an inquiry into the changes of the communication models in Yugoslav society based on the content analysis of writing of the dailies *Borba* and *Politika* in the period between 1945 and 1975]. Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije.
- Janićijević, Milosav (1972). "Međugeneracijska društvena pokretljivost u SR Srbiji" [Intergenerational social mobility in the Socialist Republic of Serbia], *Marksističke sveske*, 1 (1-2): 157–187.
- Kardelj, Edvard (1968). "Radnička klasa, birokratizam i SKJ" [The working class, bureaucracy and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia], *Socijalizam*, 11 (1-2): 4–56.
- Kluck, Patricia A. (1982). "The Society and its Environment", in: Richard F. Nyrop (ed.), *Yugoslavia: A Country Study*. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, pp. 51–111.

- Kopsidis, Michael (2012). "Peasant Agriculture and Economic Growth: The Case of Southeast Europe c. 1870–1940 Reinterpreted", EHES Working Papers in Economic History, No. 28, http://ehes.org/EHES_No28.pdf.
- Kuljić, Todor (1981). "Evolucija shvatanja o klasnoj strukturi socijalističkog društva u glavnim političkim dokumentima SKJ od 1945. do 1975. g." [The evolution of understanding of the class structure of the socialist society in the major political documents of the League of Communists between 1945 and 1975], in: Mihailo V. Popović, Danilo Mrkšić and Todor Kuljić. *Politika raspodele i ideologija* [Distribution policy and ideology]. Beograd: Institut za sociološka istraživanja Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu, pp. 73–135.
- Kuvačić, Ivan (1972). *Sukobi* [Conflicts]. Zagreb: Studentski centar Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Lazić, Mladen (1987). *U susret zatvorenom društvu? Klasna reprodukcija u socijalizmu* [Toward a closed society? Class reproduction in socialism]. Zagreb: Naprijed.
- Malenica, Zoran (2007). *Ogledi o hrvatskom društvu: prilog sociologiji hrvatskog društva* [Essays on Croatian society: a contribution to the sociology of Croatian society]. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga.
- Marković, Ljubisav (1968). "Promene u društvenoj strukturi i transformacija uloge SK" [Changes in the social structure and the transformation of the role of the League of Communists], *Socijalizam*, 11 (1-2): 80–92.
- Mrkšić, Danilo (1987). *Srednji slojevi u Jugoslaviji* [The middle strata in Yugoslavia]. Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije.
- Pečujlić, Miroslav (1963). "Društvena struktura Jugoslavije" [Social structure of Yugoslavia], in: Miroslav Pečujlić (ed.). *Osnovi nauke o društvu* [Basics of science of society]. Beograd: Rad, pp. 529–563.
- Pečujlić, Miroslav (1966). "Teorijski okvir za proučavanje klasnih promena u društvu" [A theoretical framework for studying class changes in society], *Sociologija*, 8 (1-2): 5–25.
- Popović, Mihailo (1962). "Problemi strukture socijalističkog društva" [Problems of structure of the socialist society], *Sociološki pregled*, [1]: 5–17.
- Popović, Mihailo V. (1966). "Jedan teorijsko-hipotetički okvir za proučavanje stratifikacione strukture socijalističkog društva" [A theoretical-hypothetical framework for the study of the stratification structure of the socialist society], *Sociologija*, 8 (1-2): 27–44.
- Popović, Mihailo, Bogdanović, Marija, Vujović, Sreten, Džuverović, Borisav, Petrović, Jelica, Davidović, Milena, Mrkšić, Danilo, Goati, Vladimir and Krneta, Milorad (1987). *Društvene nejednakosti: sociološko istraživanje u Beogradu* [Social inequalities: a sociological survey in Belgrade]. Beograd: Institut za sociološka istraživanja Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu.
- Popović, Mihailo V., Bolčić, Silvano, Pešić, Vesna, Janićijević, Milosav and Pantić, Dragomir (1977). *Društveni slojevi i društvena svest: sociološko istraživanje interesa, stilova života, klasne svesti i vrednosno-ideoloških orijentacija društvenih slojeva* [Social strata and social consciousness: a sociological sur-

- vey of interests, lifestyles, class consciousness and value-ideological orientations of the social strata]. Beograd: Centar za sociološka istraživanja, Institut društvenih nauka.
- Puhovski, Žarko (1990). *Socijalistička konstrukcija zbilje* [Socialist construction of reality]. Zagreb: RS SOH and Školska knjiga.
- Revilla, Juan Carlos, Jefferys, Steve and Tovar Martínez, Francisco José (2013). "Collective identities in the age of restructuring: Old and new class, space and community-based identities in six European regions", *International Sociology*, 28 (4): 391–408. doi: 10.1177/0268580913490001
- Saksida, Stane, Caserman, Andrej and Petrović, Krešo (1977). "Društvena stratifikacija i pokretljivost u jugoslavenskom društvu" [Social stratification and mobility in Yugoslav society], in: Rudi Supek (ed.). *Klase i slojevi: prilozi izučavanju društvenog sistema. Elementi strukture jugoslavenskog društva* [Classes and strata: contributions to the study of the social system. Elements of structure of Yugoslav society]. Zagreb: Odsjek za sociologiju, Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, pp. 53–92.
- Savage, Mike, Devine, Fiona, Cunningham, Niall, Taylor, Mark, Li, Yaojun, Hjellbrekke, Johs., Le Roux, Brigitte, Friedman, Sam and Miles, Andrew (2013). "A New Model of Social Class? Findings from the BBC's Great British Class Survey Experiment", *Sociology*, 47 (2): 219–250. doi: 10.1177/0038038513481128
- Sekulić, Duško (1984). "Socio-profesionalna mobilnost u Jugoslaviji" [Socio-professional mobility in Yugoslavia], *Sociologija*, 26 (1-2): 69–86.
- Sekulić, Duško (1991). *Strukture na izmaku: klase, sukobi i socijalna mobilnost* [Structures withering away: classes, conflicts and social mobility]. Zagreb: Sociološko društvo Hrvatske.
- Sekulić, Duško (2011). "Vrijednosno-ideološke orijentacije kao predznak i posljedica društvenih promjena" [Value-ideological orientations as indication and consequence of social change], *Politička misao*, 48 (3): 35–64.
- Sekulić, Duško, Massey, Garth and Hodson, Randy (1991). "Članstvo u SK i intergeneracijska mobilnost" [League of Communists membership and intergenerational mobility], in: Duško Sekulić. *Strukture na izmaku: klase, sukobi i socijalna mobilnost* [Structures withering away: classes, conflicts and social mobility]. Zagreb: Sociološko društvo Hrvatske, pp. 191–211.
- Šušar, Stipe (1968). "Radnička klasa i njeno sudjelovanje u upravljanju socijalističkim društvom" [The working class and its participation in the governing of the socialist society], *Naše teme*, 12 (9-10): 1363–1388.
- Šušar, Stipe (1970). *Sociološki presjek jugoslavenskog društva* [A sociological cross-section of Yugoslav society]. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Šušar, Stipe (1972). "'Srednji slojevi' ili 'srednja klasa' u jugoslavenskom socijalističkom društvu" ["Middle strata" or "middle class" in Yugoslav socialist society], *Marksističke sveske*, 1 (1-2): 77–95.
- Šušar, Stipe (1985). "Radnička klasa i razvoj jugoslavenskog društva" [The working class and the development of Yugoslav society], in: Stipe Pojatina (ed.). *Klasna borba i socijalna diferencijacija: prilog istraživanju socijalne strukture*

- jugoslavenskog društva* [Class struggle and social differentiation: a contribution to researching the social structure of the Yugoslav society]. Zagreb: Centar CK SKH za idejno-teorijski rad "Vladimir Bakarić" and Globus, pp. 23–65.
- Tomić-Koludrović, Inga (1992). *Alternativne inicijative in nova društvena gibanja na Hrvatskem (1974.–1988.)* Magistrska naloga [Alternative initiatives and new social movements in Croatia (1974–1988). Master's thesis]. Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta.
- Ule, Mirjana (1989). *Mladina – za modernizaciju slovenske družbe* [Youth – for the modernization of Slovenian society]. Ljubljana: Marksistični center CK ZKS.
- Vidaković, Zoran (1966). "Prilog teorijskom pristupu istraživanju odnosa između podele rada i klasne strukture u savremenom jugoslovenskom društvu" [A contribution to the theoretical approach to researching the relationship between the division of labour and class structure in the contemporary Yugoslav society], *Sociologija*, 8 (1-2): 57–72.
- Vidaković, Zoran (1967). "Klasne promene u socijalizmu: razvitak radničke klase i revolucionarni prelaz iz klasne u besklasnu strukturu" [Class changes in socialism: the development of the working class and the revolutionary transition from class to classless structure], *Sociologija*, 9 (3-4): 13–22.
- Vidaković, Zoran (1972). "Teorijsko-metodološki pristup istraživanju strukturnih promena u jugoslovenskom društvu" [A theoretical-methodological approach to researching the structural changes in Yugoslav society], *Marksističke sveske*, 1 (1-2): 17–33.
- Vuković, Slobodan (1990). *Radništvo u strukturi jugoslovenskog društva*. Doktorska disertacija [Workers in the structure of Yugoslav society. Doctoral dissertation]. Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet.
- Zukin, Sharon (1978). "The Problem of Social Class under Socialism", *Theory and Society*, 6 (3): 391–427. doi: 10.1007/BF01715456
- Županov, Josip (1995). *Poslije potopa* [After the deluge]. Zagreb: Globus.

Klasa u jugoslavenskom socijalizmu i u postjugoslavenskim društvima: prema bourdieuovskom repozicioniranju problema (Prvi dio)

Inga TOMIĆ-KOLUDROVIĆ

Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar – Područni centar Split, Hrvatska

inga.tomic-koludrovic@pilar.hr

Mirko PETRIĆ

Odjel za sociologiju, Sveučilište u Zadru, Hrvatska

mpetric@unizd.hr

Članak pokušava u glavnim crtama prikazati ono što njegova autorica i autor vide kao potencijalno produktivan metodološki pristup proučavanju veze između pojma klase u socijalističkoj Jugoslaviji i razvoja događaja povezanih s klasom u zemljama koje su joj sljednice. Prvi dio teksta sastoji se od dulje rasprave o ideološkim i društveno-teorijskim koncepcijama klase tijekom socijalističkog razdoblja u Jugoslaviji (1945.–1990.). U ovoj se raspravi predlaže interpretacija koja dijagnosticira implicitan i prethodno malo zamijećen interpretativni pomak od Marxova dualnoga prema Weberovu multidimenzionalnom modelu u predempirijskim objašnjenjima klase u jugoslavenskoj društvenoj teoriji. Nakon toga, donosi se prikaz empirijskih istraživanja usredotočenih na klasu iz sedamdesetih i osamdesetih godina 20. stoljeća, koja se kolebaju između marksizma i strukturalnog funkcionalizma te u konačnici teže analitičkom pomirenju pojmova klase i sloja. U drugom dijelu članka, raspravlja se o repozicioniranju problematike u smislu Bourdieuove teorije klase, što se vidi kao mogući doprinos objašnjavanju brojnih slijepih točaka socijalističkog teoretiziranja o klasi. Taj dio članka također sadržava sažet komentar istraživanja povezanih s klasom u postjugoslavenskim društvima, odnosno u razdoblju postsocijalističke tranzicije. Pozivajući se na empirijska istraživanja provedena u dvjema postjugoslavenskim zemljama (Srbiji i Hrvatskoj), autorica i autor zaključuju da se Bourdieuova teorija klase, obogaćena križanjem s drugim metodologijama, ponovno pokazuje korisnom u tom kontekstu i da može poslužiti kao uvjerljiva interpretativna poveznica između socijalističkih i postsocijalističkih društvenih prostora.

Ključne riječi: klasa, jugoslavenski socijalizam, postjugoslavenska društva, Bourdieuova teorija klase, historijska sociologija