In this chapter we focus on the residual materiality of socialism and its ambivalent status in Croatia today. We observe that relicts from the socialist period have the power to affect people and produce affective stirrings in the social realm by, for example, arousing emotions or making people act or remember episodes that have been silenced. Objects that have a particularly strong effect are those bearing the image of the ex-Yugoslav president, Josip Broz Tito (1892–1980). Our study of this topic began in 2004 with the project ‘Political Places in Change’, which focused on unofficial contemporary celebrations of Tito’s birthday in his birthplace (cf. Hjemdahl and Škrbić Alempijević 2006). During our research we noted that for the majority of actors – including researchers – artefacts bearing Tito’s image, name or reference to him triggered a strong emotionally charged reaction. This ranged from the holding of one’s breath to a desire to express one’s opinion; reactions that we in this essay refer to as the Titoaffect. A wide variety of objects bearing Tito’s image or name have emerged in various contexts, many of which are mentioned in Mitja Velikonja’s book Titostalgia – A study of Nostalgia for Josip Broz (2008). Sculptures, paintings, drawings, photographs, postcards, banknotes, books, textbooks, newspapers, comics, badges, plaques, decorative plates, gramophone records, tapestries, gobelins, cigars, wine and other Tito products are all scattered in today’s new affective landscapes.
When analysing the affective dynamics of the material remnants of socialism we do not only observe the objects themselves, but also people in actual social contexts, i.e. their emotional, bodily and intellectual involvement, their sensory perceptions and the narrative expressions and social practices triggered by the presence of Tito in their everyday lives. In this sense we follow Sara Ahmed, who states that: ‘to experience an object as being affective or sensational is to be directed not only toward an object, but to “whatever” is around that object, which includes what is behind the object, the conditions of its arrival’ (Ahmed 2010: 33). In other words, we need to look at what the symbolic power of objects reflecting Tito's personality cult was like in the past and how it affects people now. How do these objects trigger people into action and trigger experiences before they even begin to deliberate on the meanings inscribed in them? We also analyse how people circulate these objects today: what they do with them, what they say about them and how they experience them in the afterlife of socialism.

We use the notion of the afterlife of socialism to situate the temporal layer of our research. When we look at the flow of objects over time and the simultaneous changes in social memory, we are able to follow their ‘cultural afterlife’ (Rigney 2004: 383) and understand how they reflect people’s perceptions of socialism and postsocialism. The afterlife of socialism is an interpretative horizon – an analytical playground in which we see the potentiality of socialism to resonate beyond its historical existence. We approach the afterlife of socialism as a dimension that influences present-day social practices and creates new affective worlds. In that sense, our aim is to produce a record of attunement and disattunement to the socialist legacy. Here we point to ‘rifts’ in affective responses and practices that stand out against the contemporary horizon of values. Given Ahmed’s claim (2010) that objects are dependent on sociability and the cultural and political environment in which they affect people, the Titoaffect that is set in motion by Tito artefacts can only be studied in the full understanding of post-Yugoslav memory shifts and political turns.

In addressing the Titoaffect we build on recent research on postsocialism and memory in post-Yugoslav countries. The number of studies of socialism from the postsocialist perspective has increased in recent years. Some researchers, such as Dunja Rihtman Auguštin (2000), analyse changes in everyday practices caused by changes in the political
system, discuss interventions in the urban toponymy and follow the fate of socialist monuments in postsocialist times. Others deal with the politics of memory in Croatian socialist culture, or examine textbooks and popular culture as vectors of memory (Čale Feldman and Prica 2006; Jambrešić Kirin 2004; Žanić 2002). Several studies focus more closely on the imaginary, on places and practices directly related to Tito (Škrbić Alempijević and Hjemdahl 2006; Velikonja 2008). However, because of a lack of consensus about his role in Croatian history, Tito remains a problematic topic in Croatian academic circles. Our aim is to address this uneasiness by using the Titoaffect concept. There are certain points of contact between this concept and the previously discussed Titostalgia, which also raises the question of how and for what purpose Tito is still present more than thirty years after his death. In comparison to the concept of Titostalgia, related to the sunny side of memory (Velikonja 2008), Titoaffect encompasses a whole span of differently charged reactions to Tito objects.

‘Tito’s bodies in word and image’ (Brkljačić 2003) were omnipresent in all the spheres of political and everyday life in the former Yugoslavia. From the 1950s until the end of the 1980s the figure of Tito served as the core of political mythology and a personification of the country itself (ibid. 99). That was one of the reasons why Tito ‘in word and image’ vanished from public sites in the 1990s, after the break-up of Yugoslavia and during the Croatian War of Independence. Negative connotations have been attached to Tito’s figure, such as the political system he represented being both backwards and harmful to Croats, and that ‘Tito’s Army’, which is what the Yugoslav People’s Army was frequently called, turned against the Croatian people. Memory shift, or a sharp cut in the politics of memory, was both an element and a symptom of the nation-building process. The historic imaginary of the Croatian state has been constructed anew. Some collective memories have been deliberately ‘forgotten’, especially those connected to the Second World War and life under socialism and Tito, and subdued by the discourse of the suffering of Croats in the aftermath of the war and ‘in the chains’ of the former Yugoslavia (Jambrešić Kirin 2004: 140). Other episodes, motifs and figures have been placed in the front line, such as those referring to the historical periods preceding socialism, and especially those which in popular discourse have the status of ‘eras of Croatian independence’, in which the Croats established some sort of autonomous political for-
information, as in medieval times (see Biti and Blagaić 2009; Potkonjak et al. 2006; Škrbić Alempijević 2012: 185–202). In those periods Tito monuments and other artefacts created in his image went underground and disappeared from public sight. Tito objects were stored in galleries and basements, forgotten in the landscape or reserved for the private sphere. In other cases they were violently destroyed, altered, thrown away or blown up with explosives. On the other hand, Tito’s name can still be heard or stumbled across in the public sphere. For instance, one of the central squares in Zagreb, where the National Theatre stands, still bears the name of Marshall Tito, notwithstanding numerous protests and initiatives to choose a more politically correct name. In contemporary Croatia, even in the mainstream political discourse, there is no consensus on Tito’s role in Croatian history, and both present and past usages of his name reflect this. Sometimes he is called a communist villain, a butcher of Croats, an anti-Croat, a Yugoslav dictator. Here Tito is an ugly word, but at the same time it is a means of creating and mobilising cohesion in right-wing political circles. This also applied in the presidential campaign in 2014, in which one of the candidates was criticised by her own party, the Croatian Democratic Union, for failing to refer to Tito as a criminal in her public speeches (Lovrić 2014). In other cases, Tito is defined as a supreme leader of antifascism and a fighter for freedom. For some people he is primarily ‘a very cool guy’, both good and bad, and a truly impressive historical figure. For others, the appearance of his figure is kitsch, due to the overflowing sentimentality it implies.

In the examples of how objects can become more than remnants, relicts and dead artefacts upon which to gaze, we show how they trigger wonder and memories and foster affective engagement. Given the materiality that constitutes them and the political symbolism inscribed in them, such objects are ‘affective before they are encountered’ (Ahmed 2010: 40). In other words, there is an anticipation, potential and intensity about them that ‘compels a response’ (Stewart 2007: 14). In order to address the response to the ‘potential stored in ordinary things’ (ibid. 23) we elaborate on three affective realms of the Titoaffect. They do not exhaust all the possible realms, or function as affects that are ‘emerging discharged by … objects’ (Navaro-Yashin 2009: 1). Rather, they are accidental, snatched and partial images of what constitutes the post-Yugoslav affective zone. There we find three predominant affects: one is indignation, shock and repugnance; the other is introspective silence; and the
third is drive to share memories of individual pasts in a reflexive and positively connoted manner.

To illustrate the range of Titoaffects we present three scenes, or contexts, in which we intentionally or accidentally encountered Tito objects. The first two scenes evoke a personal rapport with Tito artefacts, which are narrated as stories and encapsulated in the third person. Pseudonyms are used for the stories’ principal characters. This translation to a third person narrative has also enabled us to observe the stories from a different perspective. In addition to reconciling our own personal reflections this process helped make us more attuned to the narratives of our interlocutors. By becoming other people’s stories, our own stories began to resonate with the Titoaffect we wanted to convey.

Helena’s story – Tito at the birthday party
It was a mild winter’s night in 2006. A friend of Helena’s husband from high-school days was celebrating his 35th birthday in the indoor space of what had previously been the neighbourhood’s public gathering point in the western part of Zagreb’s outskirts. As soon as Helena received the invitation she knew that it was going to be a wild, drunken night. The birthday boy had a reputation for throwing the craziest parties wherever he was and regardless of the company he kept. He was a funny, noisy, sociable person who laughed at everyone and himself. Also, he was an official at the Civil Court and a supporter of the right-wing Croatian Democratic Union, with a rich family history of engagement with that political party at the highest governmental level.

Helena and her husband went to the party with another couple, the man being the birthday boy closest high-school friend. They took a bottle of wine with them from Helena’s home island, knowing that it would be well received. Once at the party they placed it on the long table, which was already groaning with drinks and snacks.

The large room was packed with people: the host’s colleagues from work, his neighbours, members of the mountaineering club and old mates from his home town. They were dancing, drinking, smoking, laughing, shouting and trying to hear what was being said over the loud rock-and-roll music vibrating from the hi-fi. The birthday boy was in charge. The venue was dark, sweaty and pulsating.
Around midnight Helena became aware of some commotion at the door and moved towards it, expecting some kind of birthday surprise. A few of the man’s colleagues were manoeuvring a big, flat rectangular object through the doorway. Helena took a closer look. What she saw was a familiar black-and-white picture of Tito in his presidential pose, in a black suit, his serious face photographed in half-profile. This familiar picture, along with images depicting Tito as the Marshall, a chief commander of the Yugoslav People’s Army, and in the company of cheerful pioneers, had previously hung in offices, schools and other institutions all over former Yugoslavia. It had a thick, dark, heavy frame. It was covered in dust, but otherwise was in a perfect shape.

‘We thought it would be more authentic if we left the dust on it’, explained the initiator of this unusual birthday performance. It was not the finding of the object – an extraordinary birthday gift – that was the bottom line of his quest through remnants of a forgotten past. The main motivation was to do something with the object, stir up the sweating crowd, change the usual course of the party and make a difference. Helena asked where he had found it. ‘In some basement’, he responded. Helena had the impression that he did not want to reveal whose basement it was. The gift-giver asked for some kind of confirmation of the greatness of his idea. Some of the participants saw it as a good joke, an original provocation. But the high-school friend in Helena’s company was furious. He couldn’t believe that he was seeing Tito again, ‘after we finally got rid of all of it’; it meaning all sorts of things – Tito, socialism, the war. A chair was placed at the edge of the dance floor. Everyone gathered around the chair in a half-circle. The music stopped and the lights were dimmed. The host was invited to approach the chair. Then the treasure hunter entered with the birthday gift, its subject hidden from view. ‘For your birthday present we decided to give you something that you can decorate the walls of your office with’, he said. With a ta-dah gesture he turned the picture towards his expectant audience. Everything froze. For several long seconds there was a deathly silence. Some eyes were fixed on Tito, and some on their host, awaiting his reaction. A few of the participants giggled nervously, or made a silly remark about the size and subject of the picture. Most of the sentences were incomplete: ‘I remember we had one of those in our…’ But these attempts did not hide the fact that the birthday boy did not like his present at all. His face showed disappointment and distaste. He mumbled something about hanging the picture
in his office and then turned, slowly, to face the table laden with drinks. The partygoers followed suit and the picture was ignored. Nobody talked about Tito, or at least if they did it was drowned by the music, and it was a while before people’s party spirits were again raised. But after a
while people ‘forgot’ about the awkward situation and began to dance and shout as before. The chair with Tito perched on it was dragged into the nearest corner out of the way. In the morning it was still there. The birthday gift had been forgotten.

Sara’s story – Tito’s name is written in the park

Sara and her husband moved into a residential block in Zagreb’s city centre in the middle of 2000. They purchased a flat on the 9th floor with a panoramic view over the old town. In time they learned that the building held a secret more striking than the view. Sara did not remember who noticed the lettering in the park first – the name of Tito in yellow rose bushes – but once her attention was drawn to it, she started to chase ‘the Tito ghost’. She even learned from the neighbours that ‘they live in an old commie street’.

Sara approached her immediate neighbour first; a woman in her fifties who turned out to be a poet. The poet told her, in hushed voice, that she should not disturb the memory of Tito. Sara was amazed. If you start ‘chasing the story’ – the poet told her – someone may alert the authorities and then the lettering will be removed, ‘someone might dig it out’. The poet was distressed at Sara’s curiosity, so Sara dropped the subject. She did not want to tarnish the treasure the poet’s family held dear. The poet’s words resonated strangely: ‘There is no more socialism. What is left is social inequality’. The poet was bitter: ‘They promised us a better future. It looks as though they secured a better present for themselves’. Sara understood that the poet did not want her to do anything – but just let Tito be. Sara should simply keep quiet. It was as though the keeping of the Tito lettering a secret was their private prank on the society. In Sara’s building, silenced rebellion went hand in hand with silenced pride. After all, as one of neighbours announced, ‘they themselves planted the rose bushes after Tito’s death’.

Talking to another neighbour, a woman in her seventies, in a lazy Sunday conversation helped Sara to find out more about the history of the building: ‘I shouldn’t be talking to you about that. I don’t dare. I am not sure if you know that a multinational group of people lived here before. They were a colourful group’. The elderly woman was a retired literature professor, an intellectual, tactful and not very happy about being labelled a ‘military widow’. At the same time as pointing to the fact
that many different nationalities once lived in the building, she warned Sarah that some people were still ‘under the impression of war’ and that ‘everything changed in the 90s’. What changed was not just how neighbours looked at one another when they learned the importance of being a Croat, a Serb or a Muslim. More than anything else, the world they knew changed. They were trapped and had to refashion themselves, and be careful about what they said in public. The elderly woman said: ‘A few days ago I was standing there facing the lettering – the rose bushes haven’t started to bloom yet. I wonder each year whether they will still be there in the spring. Shaped in Tito’s name!’ She thought that it was ‘peculiar’ that even during the war (in the 1990s) she never saw the bushes looking unkempt. She had expected someone to come in the night and pull everything out, to ‘clean away’ the ‘annoying memory’.

‘Do you think that the gardeners who look after the public gardens know what they are trimming and pruning?’ Sarah asked the elderly neighbour. ‘Yes’, was the answer. ‘What about the corner shop employees who sneak out for a smoke and sit on the wall and turn their backs to Tito – do they know?’ ‘They all know’, said the elderly woman. It was their small and silent victory; the spirit of rebellion was there.
Sara was amused at the thought of Tito’s ghost. Her first impression was that other people also regarded the lettering as comical. But no matter who Sara talked to she met the same reaction – awkwardness and silence. Some praised the silence for preventing harm being done ‘to Tito’, some did not want to get involved, while others cherished the silence, even though they felt threatened by it.

How well does Tito sell?

‘Where can we find Tito?’ That was our starting question when we discussed, at the beginning of 2014, which public contexts to approach in order to trace Tito objects and the affects they create. Strolling and shopping in Zagreb’s open-air markets seemed like a reasonable option. After all, at one time selling Tito was a profitable business. In our search for Tito we decided to visit two such markets: Hrelić, the biggest flea-market on the outskirts of Zagreb, and Britanac, branded as an open-air antiques fair in the city centre. What unites these two markets is the way the past, including the socialist past, is transformed into a commodity. However, they also differ in many ways – in the goods sold, in their esteemed economic value, in the way trading objects function and in the types of vendors and buyers they attract. But they are still interconnected. ‘Merchants selling at Britanac go to Hrelić early in the morning and pick up anything of value, including Tito statues’, explained one of the vendors at Hrelić.

Situated next to the city’s drop-off depot – a rubbish dump marking the southern entrance to Zagreb and blocking the view of the city’s skyline for motorists, Hrelić is the Mecca for petty trade. There you can buy anything from used cars to cheap low quality clothing produced in China, second-hand and well-worn clothes, once fashionable now vintage accessories, spare parts for household appliances, books, old journals and all kinds of memorabilia. Anything that can be sold, traded or exchanged and that might tickle someone’s imagination or meet one’s needs has a price at Hrelić. ‘How much do you ask for Tito? Does he sell well?’ We asked our questions every time we saw anything resembling Tito displayed there. We saw several busts, a book about Tito’s life, paper money from the socialist period and a lot of badges. Those are ‘Tito’s badges and those with the red star sell the best’, we were told. The first Tito objects passed from hand to hand because they had to be touched by the person buying them to see if they felt right. It took us a few hours
to pick our way through the neat lines of piled goods on the ground. Our search for Tito had limited success. The traces of him at Hrelić were few and far between. We commented how odd it was that he was gone. ‘The thing sells better at Britanac’, a vendor explained, commenting that he kept Tito busts and other valuable items at home, in his garage, because they were too pricy for Hrelić. He only took them to the market if they had been ordered in advance. However, from time to time, Tito and the ideological industry that had made him ever-present surfaced in different ways. At the very end of our Hrelić tour we found Tito at his very best. ‘I see you are interested…’ was the vendor’s cheerful response as he turned to us. ‘He [Tito] knew how to deal with kids. He was a leader!’ He seemed to have to explain this in order to sell the picture. But there was no mystique surrounding Tito’s name at Hrelić. One sells things, Tito objects included, because someone wants to buy them. There were no witty comments about Tito and no special sentimentality around him – as we had heard on other occasions. There was just a glimpse of happiness – that faded the moment we declined an offer to ‘buy Tito’ for 50 kunas.
Britanac was a different story. Tourists and celebrities, people in their Sunday best carrying their groceries home moved slowly past the neatly arranged stands. We could hear the buzz of the town centre – trams passing by, car horns blending with the morning chatter over coffee in street cafés. Under red market umbrellas, vendors displayed statues, paintings, books, antique furniture, old uniforms, traditional irons and coffee grinders. On several occasions we stumbled across Tito: the bust in his image, monographs and banknotes bearing his picture and name, photographs, postcards and stamps, Tito badges and key holders, an elementary textbook from the forties teaching children their first letters of alphabet – I, O, T – and how to write their first word: TITO. We took photographs of the objects and commented on them to the vendors. Our interest in Tito objects triggered reactions from merchants and from passers-by. ‘The girls are interested in Tito’, said one vendor to another and they both smiled at us, obviously amused. An elderly lady with a dog on a leash asked the vendor how much Tito cost when she saw us fingering a small metal bust of the former leader. ‘70 kunas, Madam’, was the reply. ‘Do you have any better ones than that?’ As soon as she had said this, she added: ‘Although the best one of all is gone’. We met a distinguished professor from our faculty. He caught us browsing through a book entitled *Tito and the Diaspora*. ‘The author had to formulate his work like that’, he said to justify the writer putting Tito and the diaspora together. ‘He had to connect the emigrants with the system because in those days being a member of diaspora meant being Ustasha.’ Our interest in Tito objects resonated like a wave in the social space around us. The objects and their trading offered an opportunity to state one’s opinion, to excuse someone else’s writings and to evoke personal memories. They became the focal point of interaction.

Tito’s coming out

Nowadays, objects bearing Tito’s image or name appear when you least expect them, as both a means and a hindrance to social interaction. They propel markets, inspire artistic and social interventions and create various kinds of affects. People act differently in such an encounter: they draw back from the object that reminds them of the forgotten past (as in the case of the unsuccessful birthday present), are drawn into a conspirational silence protecting a secret rose bush lettering or share
knowledge and memories when faced with Tito imagery, as shown in the open-air markets in Zagreb. Uprooted from their thriving historical environment, Tito artefacts are diverted from their previously expected, albeit heterogeneous, meanings and collective support. However, their potential to produce suspense and create an immediate and object-related affective cohesion and interaction around themselves makes every Tito object an extraordinary artefact that provokes people into expressing their feelings of appreciation or utter irritation and disgust.

The groups we met around the Tito objects were not made up of like-minded individuals or supported the same, or indeed any, ideology. They were not clearly bound up in time and space. They did not recognise sharp distinctions. They were sometimes private and at other times not, for example the residents of the ‘old commie street’ guarding the secret of the Tito lettering. Groups like this can also appear in public spaces and in public contexts, although do not necessarily give an impression of collectiveness. We noticed this when searching for Tito objects in Zagreb’s open-air markets, where the people who participated in the actions and dialogues provoked by their presence expressed quite different and
sometimes even opposing opinions and sentiments. These groups were temporarily joined together in affective practices triggered by the ‘proximity’ of the Tito object, in relation to it, or in attachment or detachment. They were simply circumstantial, dependant on the reappearance of the Tito object. Provoked by the sudden recognition of a Tito artefact, their emotions peaked and vanished. This was what was witnessed when Tito appeared suddenly and unexpectedly at the birthday party.

If we return to the aim of this essay, to the affective power of an object, we need to ponder on the affects and relational nature of the material existence of the Tito object. In our study we have tried to discern how an object like this buzzes, vibrates and prompts affects. We saw how it provoked and served as a stimulus to express something that would otherwise have remained concealed. Nowadays, these objects seem to utter something unexpected, despite having been ordinary, common and almost typical parts of a popular culture in socialist times. This is also the case for those objects that, at the moment of their production, did not serve any practical purpose. The same can be said about the institutional use of Tito pictures, which were meant to turn a public space into an arena in which the power of the state was seen and felt. However, those objects became so omnipresent and expected that they became part of the everyday scenography. Back then, in the heyday of Tito objects, they may not have been recognised as profound ethnographic treats. What would be noticed at that time was their absence rather than their appearance. Nowadays, their absence is taken for granted. When they do reappear, they trigger unaccounted affective practices and unexpected ethnographic situations. In our study, the Tito objects we encountered made people turn their backs and move on as though nothing had happened; they created an embarrassing silence, made invisible things visible as in the ethnography of the unwanted birthday present, made neighbours reconsider the rose bush manifestation of Tito’s name and made buyers and bystanders engage in brief interactions and share experiences and historical lessons on Tito and socialism, as in the Hrelić and Britanac markets.

What makes these objects unexpected and extraordinary in the present is the fact that they have changed from being obligatory in socialism to being unwelcome and stigmatised in the dominant politics of remembering in postsocialism. For a while many Tito objects went underground and were suspended from the public sphere. When they re-emerged
they echoed the uneasiness of that process. In the present their everyday usages are marked with ambiguity and ambivalence. It seems to us that the Titoaffect largely relies on the interplay of the objects’ ordinariness and extraordinariness, and their simultaneous familiarity and estrangement. Such stirrings in the social space can hardly be verbalised, but are nonetheless widely felt, experienced and acted upon.

Ahmed describes affects as a challenge to how we think of emotions that encapsulate our being in the world. The affective turn ‘[is] bringing forth ghosted bodies and the traumatized remains of erased histories’ (Ticineto Clough 2007: 3). It allows us to research affects that creates some sort of span between the present encounter with the objects and the past they evoke, even if that past functions as a temporal stratum that is intentionally forgotten in the present moment. By recognising the power of a Titoaffect to shape, i.e. to disturb and inspire reactions, we approach its manifestations as graspable affective accounts. In our use of the idea of Tito objects we have pointed to their capacity to weave a meaningful affective web for the generations experiencing and sharing Tito’s charisma. We have also acknowledged its transgenerational translation into a sign that provokes pain, discomfort and disturbance.

Ahmed (2010) calls the impression that is attached to objects their ‘affective value’. When explaining the social life of objects she holds that there are a wide range of experiences, sensations and relations to the affective value of the particular object. The fact that Tito artefacts stimulate political and personal affects ranging from adoration to abhorrence shows Tito’s affective power over people. They are indicators of societal battles, encounters with a changing world and help people to reflect on a meaningful existence. They all come to us as Titoaffect-at-work.

Our decision to confront the powerful memory of Tito and the Titoaffect emerged from something deeply disturbing within us. It emanated from a society we were not only observing but living in, and that is reflected in the stories told here. It also struck us that at some point our ethnography could not grasp the emotion of the underlying narratives, the mockery and contempt, we were confronted with.

With these stories we have tried to point to the existence of different affective communities and their relationship with the socialist past (ibid. 37). These communities also differ in how they relate to Tito’s heritage. Some still celebrate the images and memories of Tito’s cult, while others do not. They follow what could be called a Croatian emancipatory
national cult, based on dissociation from Tito’s ideology and indignation at his enduring cult. But the vast majority of people we encountered did not act according to this binary distinction. Their narratives, reactions and practices situate them in a heterogeneous and multilayered zone of Titoaffect. Some of these communities seem to be more private, while others are more public. However, they coexist, produce affects and link a relationship to the past with one created for present needs. What brings them together in the zone of Titoaffect is that they are affected in multiple ways by the same objects.
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Note

1. All the mentioned publications can be viewed as a part of a wider discussion about the postsocialist condition in the post-Yugoslav countries. Studies of postsocialism represent an emerging field in Croatian ethnology and cultural anthropology, but also in other humanities and social sciences (see Kolanović 2013; Prica and Škokić 2011).

References


