

Anna Jagiełło-Szostak

Yugoslavs – vanished national group?

Wschodnioznawstwo 7, 131-144

2013

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Anna Jagiełło-Szostak

Yugoslavs – vanished national group?

Introduction

The aim of this article is to thoroughly present the Yugoslavs during the period of the existence of Yugoslavia and shortly after its disintegration. It is very important to stress that author try to analyze the phenomenon of Yugoslavs understood as an national or ethnic group, not as nationality affiliated to the state. taking into account the definition of nation (by Oxford Dictionary): a large group of people united by common descent, history, culture, or language, inhabiting a particular state or territory, we can see that Yugoslavs would be a separate nation. In this sense the author seeks to describe shortly a historical background of the first mention of names of Yugoslavs or Yugoslavia. Then, in the light of censuses describes a group of Yugoslavs in the second Yugoslavia. Other significant points are: the criteria for recognition as Yugoslav (such as language, age and the number of mixed marriages), also why the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina is where most Yugoslavs have tended to live. Furthermore an Author try to illustrate that Yugoslavs could have a split identity or divided loyalty to state.

The entire process of developing the term „Yugoslav” was connected with ideas originating from the unification of Southern Slavs. The first such idea, called the *Illirian* movement, was brought to life in the 1830s by Ljudevit Gaj in Croatia. It was an idea aimed at the liberation of the Southern Slavs. The other was a Yugoslav idea developed by Josip Juraj Strossmayer in the 1860s, which aimed for the emancipation of Slavs under the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman powers. It also appeared in Croatia, but was devoted to attempts at unifying Yugoslavs, being mainly Serbs, Croats and Slovenians. Both initiatives were based primarily on culture (common language and history) and both were entirely utopian. These ideas gave origin to the appearance of the term the „Yugoslav”.

According to the Croatian historian Ferdo Šišić the question of the term Yugoslav first appeared among the Serbs of Vojvodina because they wanted to replace the term – *Ilirian*. As he wrote, „The truth is that the term ‘Yugoslav’ is an equivalent of ‘Ilirian’ and that it first appeared in Serbian literary circles, not in Croatian.” – He quoted the words of the politician Jovan Subotić who, in 1839 in

Letopis of Serbian Matica, claimed that the word *Ilir* should be replaced by the word *Yugoslav*, and in the place of Ilirian literature should be the literature of the Southern Slavs. In the same year, another activist Teodor Pavlović (editor of the *Letopis Matice*), claimed that Croats and Serbs should have one name – „Yugoslavs” (*Jugosloveni*) or „Yugosloven” (*Jugoslav*). What is more, in 1844 Matije Ban in the song *Karađorđe*¹ used the word Yugoslavia (*Jugoslavija*) to describe the territory of the Southern Slavs. Four years later, during the Slavic Congress in Prague, the Southslavic section (*jugoslovenska sekcija*) was established, and one of the representatives of the congress, Pavel Šafarik, used the name Yugoslavs, instead of *Iliri*².

Significantly, the first attempt to depict the Yugoslav idea as a political idea was an article by Franjo Rački, *Jugoslavojeinstvo*, published in Zagreb in 1860. This article explained the name which embraced Slavic nations inhabiting the territory called *Jugoslovenija*. This territory stretched between the Soča river and the Marica river, and between the Adriatic Sea and the Black Sea. The first step to unite the Southern Slavic Nations was the acceptance of the Serbo–Croatian language with equal use of two alphabets: Cyrillic and Latin. There was also a plan to establish a Yugoslav Academy. The Polish historian, Piotr Żurek, wrote that,

according to Rački, the Southern Slavs should unite themselves in the territory of Austria within the Crown of Saint Stephen, and in this way they could influence their brothers on the opposite banks of the Sava River until unity is attained. In other words, *Jugoslavenstvo* was shown here as a creation of the Southern Slavs, a political and administrative element within the Habsburg monarchy, which would counterbalance the Hungarian element. The second phase was to spread this *jugoslavenstvo* to other Southern Slavic lands³.

Thus, the issue of the unity of Southern Slavs was pursued by Croats, Serbs and Slovenians. Likewise important was the grandson of Nikola Petrović Njegoš⁴, Aleksander Karađorđević, who was possibly the first person to formulate the words: „our Yugoslav nation”⁵ in London in 1915. The regent was acknowledged by a newspaper *Jugosloven* as the first Yugoslav⁶.

¹ F. Šišić, *Nešto o imenu jugoslovenskom*, „Jugosloven” [Decembar] 1931, no. 12, s. 100.

² *Ibidem*, s. 101.

³ P. Żurek, *Kontrowersje, implikacje i megalomanie związane z genezą idei jugosłowiańskiej*, „Balcanica Posnaniensia. Acta et studia” 2009, XV, s. 137.

⁴ Nikoli Petrović Njegoš (1840-1921) – a duke of Montenegro in the period of 1860-1910, and then the King in the years of 1910-1918.

⁵ H. and Ch. Seton-Watson, *Making of a New Europe*, R.W. Seton-Watson and the last years of Austria-Hungary, London 1981, s. 157, cited for: N. Davies, *Zaginione królestwa*, Kraków 2010, s. 522-523, 534.

⁶ B. Vošnjak, *Zajednica Ideje, Źrtava i Ujedinjenja*, „Jugosloven” [Decembar] 1930, no. 12, s. 8.

Yugoslavs

Who are the Yugoslavs? It is very difficult to answer this question in a straightforward manner. It should be stressed that in the history of Yugoslavia, no official term for the Yugoslav nationality or nation ever even existed. It is thought that creating a Yugoslav national identity was a question of faith and personal will of the citizens of Yugoslavia. Additionally, there is strong feeling that the Yugoslavs were treated in certain periods (i.e. at the end of '80 of 20th century) as an enemy who would destroy „common Yugoslav nationalism” (affiliated to the state), weaken an ethnicity and compromise specific local character. Perhaps it was for this reason they did not come forth as an official nationality and that the Yugoslavs were neither featured in the first Constitution of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians (SHS) (as with the preambles of the American constitution which open with: „We the People of the United States...”) nor in the censuses of 1921 and 1931.

In the censuses of the interwar period and of the *Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia* (FPRY) in 1948, the Yugoslavs were also not to appear. *Lašlo Sekelj* claims that after World War II the idea of creating a Yugoslav nation⁷ did not exist. However, in the census of 31 III 1953 two categories appeared: „ethnically declared” and „ethnically undeclared”. Yugoslavs in the ‘ethnically undeclared’ group were recognised as people who did not specify their ethnic affiliation, but they admitted that they were Yugoslavs. Also in this category were people who used territorial affiliation instead of nationality, such as Bosnians and the dwellers of Istria or Dalmatia (thus similar to the situation in the 19th century USA where people were identifying as e.g. Pennsylvanian, rather than American). In addition, Muslims were able to acknowledge themselves as either an „ethnically declared” group with Serbian, Croatian, Albanian ethnicity, or as an „ethnically undeclared” group – without Yugoslav or other regional ethnicity⁸.

In the census of 1961, a group of Yugoslavs appeared in the „ethnically undeclared” category. In this year they accounted for 1,7% of the population. But the term Yugoslav still did not infer separate nationality, but instead was used in the context of geopolitical and state membership⁹. An apt example of the discourse on Yugoslavs appeared in a questionnaire carried out by the weekly *NiN* in Serbia, in 1969. The magazine asked the question: „a Yugoslav – who is it?” (*Jugosloven – ko je to?*). The author observed that in the Statistical Yearbook of 1968, the column for the designation of Yugoslav was empty; which had a huge impact

⁷ L. Sekelj, *SFRJ: U potrazi za političkom zajednicom 1968-1988*, [w:] *Identitet: Srbi i/ili Jugosloveni*, L. Sekelj (ed.), Beograd 2001, s. 166.

⁸ *Rasprave o nacionalnom identitetu Bošnjaka*, H. Kamberović (ed.), Sarajevo 2009, s. 61.

⁹ P. J. Marković, *Odnos partije i Tita prema jugoslovenskom i nacionalnom identitetu*, [w:] *Identitet...*, s. 22.

on the creating of the questionnaire. This may suggest that the phenomenon of a Yugoslav people did not exist. The survey ran for a few months¹⁰. Meanwhile, the editorial office of *NiN* and the newspaper *Odjek* from Sarajevo, organised a series of debates entitled: „How is the Yugoslav identity perceived in Sarajevo?” The editorial office received letters mainly from Serbia, Croatia, and Macedonia. The reaction of Yugoslav citizens to the surveys was varied. Some did not see the point of such surveys, others were interested in developing a common market and economy and teaching two languages in school: mainly Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian. As one of the readers said, „it is easier to understand the French than the Slovenians”¹¹. These words could be evidence of the insufficient integration of the state and nation and of the process of forming a Yugoslav identity. The results of the questionnaire were nothing new, because they corresponded to official state policy¹². Furthermore, after 1968 (the survey being an exception) the problem of Yugoslav identity and its concept was considered taboo for politicians, as was treating the idea of Yugoslavia as a unitary entity, even more so when it came to nationalism among „ethnically declared” citizens of the Yugoslav state¹³.

The next census of 1971 concentrated on three categories: forming a Muslim nationality, forming Yugoslav affiliation or agreeing on local identities. That year Yugoslavs were in a group (formed for the first time) called „ethnic origin not declared” (*Nisu se nacionalno izjasnili*). This group also contained a category „regional affiliation” (*regionalna pripadnost*) and „unknown” (*nepoznato*) – in practice it was these people who declared themselves Yugoslavs¹⁴. At that time there were 273 077 (1,3%) Yugoslavs living in the country and 87% of them (275 883) were inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Demonstrating that at this point there were two „ethnically undeclared” categories (Muslims and Yugoslavs) who were mixed. However, Muslims had been treated in a different manner in previous statistics: in 1948 as an „ethnically undeclared” group, in 1953 as „ethnically undeclared” Yugoslavs, in 1961 as Muslims with ethnic affiliation and in 1971 as Muslims within the context of a nationality¹⁵. It should be stressed that Josip B. Tito¹⁶ made the decision to create a new Muslim nationality in order to tone down misunderstandings between Serbs and Croats. Additionally, as Francine.

¹⁰ L. Sekelj, *op.cit.*, s. 67.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, s. 68-69.

¹² S. Ljuboja, *Štampa o jugoslovenskom i srpskom identitetu*, *op.cit.*, p. 71.

¹³ L. Sekelj, *op.cit.*, s. 171.

¹⁴ *Statistički godišnjak Jugoslavije*, Beograd 1973, s. 123.

¹⁵ *Statistički godišnjak SFRJ*, Beograd 1963, s. 21; D. Džošić, *Jugosloveni u popisu 1981 r.*, Beograd 1988; Arhiv Srbije i Crne Gore, fond no. 406, fas. no. 93, jedinica opisa no. 345-346, s. 3-4.

¹⁶ Josip Broz Tito (1892-1980) – Chairman of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia 1936-1980, 1st President of Yugoslavia 1953-1963, 1st Secretary-General of the Non-Aligned Movement 1961-1964.

Friedman stated, Muslims are the only national group wanting to unite Bosnia, while others seek to promote the idea of a Greater Serbia or Greater Croatia¹⁷. In the 1970s, the number of Yugoslavs in the republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina dropped from 275 883 (8,4%) to 43 796 (1,2%)¹⁸, which was with a result of new divisions in the census.

Table 1. Yugoslavs in the period of 1953-1981 (according to former Yugoslav republic and states established after collapse of Yugoslavia)

	1953		1961		1971		1981	
	population	%	population	%	population	%	population	%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	891 000	5,3	275 883	8,4	43 796	1,2	326 316	7,9
Croatia	12 000	0,07	15 560	0,4	84 118	1,9	379 057	8,2
Montenegro	6000	0,04	1559	0,3	10 943	2,1	31 243	5,35
Macedonia	1000	0,006	1260	0,1	3652	0,2	14 240	0,7
Serbia with regions	81 000	0,5	20 079	0,3	123 824	1,5	441 941	4,7
Serbia without regions	65 000	0,4	11 699	0,2	75 976	1,4	272 050	4,8
Slovenia	1000	0,006	2784	0,2	6744	0,4	26 263	1,4
Vojvodina	11 000	0,06	3174	0,2	46 928	2,4	167 215	8,2
Kosovo	6000	0,04	5206	0,6	920	0,1	2676	0,2
Yugoslavia	992 000	5,8	317 125	1,7	273 077	1,3	1 219 024	5,4
Total population	16 927 000	-		-	20 522 972	-		-

Source: From data given in: D. Džošić, *Jugoslaveni u popisu 1981*, Beograd 1988; Arhiv Srbije i Crne Gore, fond br. 406, fas. br. 93, jedinica opisa br. 345-346, s. 14, 1-21; Đ. Borozan, *Demografski identitet Srba i Hrvata u Jugoslaviji prema popisima stanovništva od 1921. do 1991. Godine, „Dijalog povjesničara – istoričara”* 2003, no. 7, s. 165; *Statistički godišnjak SFRJ*, Beograd 1963, s. 336; *Statistički godišnjak Jugoslavije*, Beograd 1973, s. 83; *Statistički godišnjak FNRJ*, Beograd 1955, s. 54.

In the autonomous part of Serbia, the Vojvodina, the growth in the number of Yugoslavs was high – from 3174 in 1961 to 46 928 in 1971 (from 0,2% to 2,4%). A similar situation took place in Montenegro – in 1961 the population was 1559, but in 1971 it was 10 943, an increase from 0,3% to 2,1%. Such results were possible

¹⁷ F. Friedman, *Bosna and Herzegovina. A polity on the brink*, New York 2004, s. 123.

¹⁸ D. Džošić, *op.cit.*, s. 4.

due to a new classification (there appeared two groups: an 'ethnically declared' and an 'ethnically undeclared', with Yugoslavs in the latter group) which was used in the census of 1981¹⁹. It is in fact hard to explain why they acknowledged themselves as Yugoslavs and why their number increased.

The period between 1971-1981 was characterised by a virtual lack of discussion on Yugoslavs and the Yugoslav idea. A situation strongly related to the intensification of nationalism and a lack of agreement on a common national policy. This problem was taken into consideration at the beginning of 1980s and was strictly related to the death of Marshal Tito and the new census. In 1981 the Yugoslavs in Yugoslavia constituted 5,4%²⁰ of the society. It was the seventh „national” group mentioned in the census which amounted to 1 219 024 (a number which had increased five fold from 1971). The 1981 census proved to be a culmination – Yugoslavs made up 8,2% of the declared population in Croatia and Vojvodina, 7,9% in BiH, 5,3% in Montenegro and 4,8% in Serbia proper (without autonomous regions). The lowest numbers were 1,4% in Slovenia, 0,7% in Macedonia and 0,2% in Kosovo. According to research done by Dragan Pantić from 1986, the number of young Yugoslavs in Serbia was 22% (70% of them were Serbs)²¹.

In the period between 1971-1981, despite the lack of interest in the Yugoslav question, their numbers increased from 270 000 to 1 200 000 which was an effect of rising nationalism and the emergence of political and ethnic differences. In the period between 1981-1989, there was an almost certainty that the federation would collapse, hence the number of Yugoslavs radically decreased to about one third by 1991²². Svetlana Ljuboja claims that this period could be described as „only about community” (ZAJEDNIŠTVO – stressed by Ljuboja) and that Yugoslav socialist patriotism had been transformed into the cliché: 'Yugoslav patriotism'. As the newspaper *Komunist* explained, this phenomenon was not a love for the state, but for the community²³. The huge drop in the number of Yugoslavs in Serbia and Croatia in 1991, was impacted by spontaneous or premeditated ethnic homogenisation within the national groups and rising Serbian and Croatian nationalism. Thus, the number of people not responding to national affiliation increased in this period. In the opinion of Đorđe Borozan this was related to the prevailing direction of ethnic relations, nationalism, and a vanishing „state” identity²⁴.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, s. 4-5.

²⁰ *Jugoslavija 1918-1989. Statistički Godišnjak*, Beograd 1989, s. 149.

²¹ D. Pantić, *Nacionalna svest mladih u SR Srbije bez SAP*, Beograd 1987, s. 51.

²² Đ. Brozan, *Demografski identitet Srba i Hrvata u Jugoslaviji prema popisima stanovništva od 1921. do 1991. Godine*, „Dijalog povjesničara – istoričara” 2003, no. 7, s. 167.

²³ S. Ljuboja, *op.cit.*, s. 73-74.

²⁴ Đ. Brozan, *op.cit.*, s. 166.

Table 2. Yugoslavs in 1991, 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2011

State	1991		2001, 2002 and 2003		2011	
		%		%		
Bosnia and Herzegovina	242 682	5,6	–	–	–	–
Croatia	104 728	2,2	21 801 ^{*)}	0,49	331	–
Montenegro	26 159	4,25	1860	0,3	1154	0,19
Macedonia	–	–	–	–	–	–
Serbia with regions	317 739	3,2	–	–	23 303	0,32
Serbia without regions	312 595	2,5	80 721	1,8		
Slovenia	–	–	–	–	–	–
Vojvodina	–	8,7	49 881	2,45		
Kosovo	–	1,8	–	–	–	–
Yugoslavia	–	3,4	–	–	–	–

Key: 2001 is related to Croatia, 2002 to Serbia without the Vojvodina regions and, 2003 Montenegro; *) In the population census in Croatia, Yugoslavs and Muslims were in the group called ‘others’. In this census Bosnians appeared the first time: 20755 (0,47%); **) With Vojvodina.

Source: data given in: *Statistički Godišnjak/Ljetopis Federacije Bosne i Hercegovine* [2009], <http://www.fys.ba/statistickigodisnjak2009.pdf> (5 X 2013); *Državni zavod za statistiku* [2009]. *Statistički ljetopis*, http://www.dys.hr/hrv_Eng/ljetopis/2009/PDF/00-im (5 X 2013); *Statistički godišnjak Crne Gore*, Podgorica 2009; *Statistički godišnjak Srbije* [2009]; Đ. Borozan, *Demografski identitet Srba i Hrvata u Jugoslaviji prema popisima stanovništva od 1921. do 1991. Godine*, „Dijalog povjesničara – istoričara” 2003, no. 7, s. 165; L. Sekelj, *SFRJ: U potrazi za političkom zajednicom 1968-1988*, [w:] L. Sekelj (red.), *Identitet: Srbi i/ili Jugosloveni*, Beograd 2001, s. 174; *Popis stanovništva, domaćinstava i stanova u Crnoj Gori 2011. Godine*, s. 7; *Statistički ljetopis Republike Hrvatske*, Zagreb 2011, s. 107; *Nacionalna pripadnost*, <http://webzrzs.stat.gov.rs/WebSite/public/PublicationView.aspx?pKey=41&pLevel=1&pubType=2&pubKey=1454> (15 XII 2013).

According to the 1991 census, after the disintegration of Yugoslavia, the largest numbers of Yugoslavs appeared in Bosnia and Herzegovina at 5,6%, followed by Montenegro – 4,25%, in Serbia with her provinces – 3,2%, in Serbia proper – 2,5%, in Croatia – 2,2% and in Kosovo – 1,8%. The autonomous region of Vojvodina again became a place where the number of Yugoslavs was greatest and constituted 8,7% of the society. The next censuses from 2001 in Croatia, and 2002 in Slovenia and Macedonia, did not include the social groups described. Yugoslavs were only taken into account in Serbia in 2001 – 1,8%, and in 2003 in Montenegro – 0,3%. The above data shows that the Yugoslav idea and the Yugoslav nation were highly linked to Serbia, which claimed the right to the heritage of

Yugoslavia and Montenegro. The latter could almost be considered „Little Yugoslavia” due to the diversity of nationalities revealed in the most recent census (such as: Montenegrin, Serb, Yugoslav, Albanian, Bosniak, Bosnian, Muslim, Bosniaks-Muslim, Montenegrin-Muslim, Montenegrin-Serb, Muslim-Bosniak, Muslim-Montenegrin, Serb-Montenegrin and others). In the last census of 2011, only 0,19% of the population of Montenegro considered themselves Yugoslavs²⁵. Generally, the strongest Yugoslav identity, occurred in both of these republics – i.e. Serbia and Montenegro.

Yugoslavs in Vojvodina

The Autonomous Province of Vojvodina is an example of an area where Yugoslav identity was the strongest. In 1961 there were 3147 Yugoslavs, which was 0,2% of the population of Vojvodina, but their number (as was previously mentioned) increased to 46 928 (2,4%) in 1971. Ten years later there were 167 215 (8,2%) then, in 1991, 174 225 (8,7%) people claimed to be Yugoslavs. Hence, the largest number of Yugoslavs in Yugoslavia were in Vojvodina. Likewise, during the census in 1981, 154 407 Yugoslavs from Vojvodina declared that 90% of them used the Serbo-Croatian language as mother tongue, while 12 272 (7,3%) of were using the Hungarian language²⁶. In 1991, the majority of Yugoslavs were living in the town of Bački Monoštor. It is worth recalling that this was the year, in the beginning of 1990s, which saw the zenith of nationalistic campaigns in Serbia, and in which war was about to break out. Thus, national minorities tried to advocate Yugoslav affiliation, so as to manifest their antinationalism and to hide their true ethnic origin, as well as for protection against hatred²⁷.

Reasons for being Yugoslav

Why do people acknowledge themselves as Yugoslavs? There have been a wide range of reasons for being Yugoslav in the period from 1918 to the present. One of the most significant was opposition to a national/ethnic identity in order to avoid potential conflict or appease a specific group nationalism. The crucial effect was perhaps the existence of double identity, which gave the possibility

²⁵ *Popis stanovništva, domaćinstava i stanova u Crnoj Gori 2011. Godine*, Podgorica b.r.w., s. 8-9.

²⁶ In Vojvodina the largest national minority is Hungarians, which constitutes 15% of the two-million population of Vojvodina.

²⁷ M. Samaradžić, *Tranzicija i manjine u Vojvodini, Zrenjanin 2002*, <http://www.kczzr.org> (20 III 2011).

of being Yugoslav while simultaneously a Croat, Serb, Slovenian, Macedonian, Montenegrin or Muslim. The threat of such a double identity was the simple possibility to transform identity from Yugoslav to Serb or Croat²⁸, which brought about further religious and national conflicts. The creation of the Yugoslavs was also a process of assigning supporters of greater state and national unity under the guise of a new political identity²⁹ and creates *Homo Yugoslavicus*. Being a Yugoslav was to demonstrate a class-based identification with Yugoslavia and the creation of a socialist state with one prevailing nationality. Between 1971-1981, there occurred the largest number of people who claimed themselves as Yugoslavs, and this was a time of regime change within the functions of the federation³⁰. Yugoslavs were also located in urban centres – over 20% in several Bosnian cities³¹. This was strictly related to their living in multinational regions such as Vojvodina and Bosnia and Herzegovina and to their participation in the political life of the country³². It was also an escape from discriminatory national realities and the huge results of nationalistic pressures³³. Therefore, the main cause of Yugoslav affiliation was almost certainly a sense of territorial affiliation, as well as an emotional relation to the state. The final phase of Tito's regime did not create a new Yugoslav identity, as a new ethnic group but consolidated just the state identity.

Who declared Yugoslav identity?

Thanks to research and analyses it is possible to show what kind of social groups the proponents of Yugoslav identity belonged to in the period from the 1950s to the 1980s. Self-determination was affected by a vast number of factors, such as: language, age and mixed marriages. The research is undoubtedly open to some question owing to the limited field of study, including inconsistent measures of geographic, temporal and age factors.

The claim of Serbo-Croatian (or Croatia-Serbian or Yugoslavian) as native language was unquestionably the strongest factor affecting Yugoslav affiliation.

²⁸ N. Dugandžija, *Diskurs o jugoslavenima*, Beograd 1988; Arhiv Srbije i Crne Gore, fond no. 406, fas. no. 93, jedinica opisa no. 345-346, s. 6.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, s. 4-5.

³⁰ D. Djošić, *op.cit.*, s. 2.

³¹ S. Jansen, *Antinacionalizam. Etnografija otpora u Beogradu i Zagrabu*, Beograd 2005, s. 206; G. Schopflin, *The rise and fall of Yugoslavia*, [w:] *The politics of ethnic conflict regulation*, J. McGarry, B. O'Leary (eds.), London 1993, cited for: S. Jansen, *op.cit.*, s. 186-187.

³² L. Sekelj, *op.cit.*, s. 177.

³³ N. Dugandžija, *op.cit.*, s. 4.

Table 3. Population Census according to native language from 1953 (in thousands)

Language	Republics and autonomous regions									
	FLRY	Serbia	Serbia without regions	Vojvodina	Kosovo	Croatia	Slovenia	BIH	Macedonia	Montenegro
Serbo-Croatian	12 390	5390	4095	1047	248	3735	25	2813	37	390
Slovenian	1483	19	13	5	–	36	1420	8	1	1
Macedonian	931	26	10	11	4	2	–	1	902	–
Albanian	780	561	40	2	519	1	–	1	188	28

Source: *Statistički godišnjak FNRJ*, Beograd 1955, s. 55.

With reference to the research from 1981, among the citizens of Serbia (proper), 93,1% stated that they used the Serbo-Croatian language (also known as the Yugoslavian language), with 92,9% among Yugoslavs and 97,7% among Serbs. In Vojvodina, this language was used by 73,9% of the society, with 90,5% among Yugoslavs and 99,7% among Serbs. While in Kosovo just 19% of the society were using Serbo-Croatian, of which 62% were Yugoslavs and 99,8% Serbs³⁴. Based upon the census of 1953, the Serbo-Croatian language was predominantly used in the area of Serbia, followed by Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro, with the lowest usage in Macedonia and Slovenia. This was connected with use of separate languages within the homogenous territories of these republics.

In terms of age indicators, research from 1981 revealed that over 71,58% of declared Yugoslavs were under forty years old. Also in 1982, Yugoslavs constituted 17% of the students at the University of Novi Sad (8,2% of the entire population of Vojvodina)³⁵. In the light of an opinion poll from 1990, before the total disintegration of the state, young people were putting Yugoslav interests before national ones (59% of those examined). They also displayed a strong identification with Yugoslavia as a political community but, in the researchers' opinion, it was not possible to call them „Yugoslav youth”. Further research confirmed that Yugoslav youth identified strongly with the state (not with separate national group). The degree of identification varied for each republic and was dependent on national affiliation – with Albanians and Slovenians having the weakest levels³⁶.

³⁴ D. Djošić, *op.cit.*, s. 15-17.

³⁵ L. Sekelj, *op.cit.*, s. 176-178.

³⁶ M. Vasović, *Socijalno-psihološki aspekti formiranja jugoslovensk g identiteta*, [w:] *Identitet...*, s. 116.

To conclude, the majority of Yugoslavs used the Serbo-Croatian language. As S. Jansen says, a national identity was a presence in everyday life; however its degree of importance varied throughout the individual republics. He also stated that national affiliation was not so important in Belgrade and that society there tried to overcome nationalism. In Zagreb however, nationality and nationalism were much more significant and identity was recognised as „private nationality”³⁷ as opposed to Vojvodnia and BiH where Yugoslavs had greater numbers.

It is worth devoting more than a few words to the category of mixed marriages which, in the period between 1977-1981, constituted 13% of all marriages in Yugoslavia. The overwhelming amount of them were relationships between people of Serbian and Croatian affiliation (undoubtedly a result of linguistic and cultural proximity) with the fewest occurring between Slovenians and Albanians. This was also connected with the policy of Marshal Tito who, through secularisation and the resettlement of citizens from republic to republic, contributed to the amount of mixed marriages³⁸.

According to Jansen, in 1981, 7,8% of marriages in Yugoslavia were mixed. Likewise Nikolai Botev, after analysing statistics, claimed that in the period from 1987-1989, 13,1% of marriages were exogenous. In Croatia mixed marriages numbered 17,4%, in Serbia – 12,9%, in Kosovo – 4,7%, and in Vojvodina – 28,4%³⁹. This meant that approximately 3 million people (at that time Yugoslavia had over 20 million inhabitants) were living in families with mixed national affiliation⁴⁰. Similarly, according to Ruža Petrović, the total percentage of mixed marriages in Yugoslavia in 1981 was as follows (see table 4).

In Vojvodina, the percentage of mixed marriages in 1971 was 27%, thus a great many people identified themselves as Yugoslav. Ruža Petrović indicated that Vojvodina was the most heterogeneous part of Yugoslavia and the strongest assimilation of ethnic groups was perceived there. She also claimed that Vojvodina is a region of Yugoslavia, and even of Europe as a whole, with the greatest percentage of mixed marriages. As she demonstrated, the census of 1981 showed a much greater lack of correlation between nationality and language in Vojvodina, than in comparison to other republics (Vojvodina 5,6%, Yugoslavia 3,3%, Serbia proper 2,8%, Kosovo 1,8%)⁴¹. What is more, the number of mixed marriages at the end of the 1980s increased by 1,1%.

³⁷ S. Jansen, *op.cit.*, s. 173-175, 176, 185.

³⁸ D. Ćosić, *Jugonostalgia*, <http://www.wprost.pl/ar/14162/Jugonostalgia/> (22 IV 2011).

³⁹ S. Jansen, *op.cit.*, s. 193; N. Botev, *Where East Meets West: Ethnic Inter-marriage in the Former Yugoslavia 1962-1989*, „American Sociological Review” 1994, vol. 59, no. 3, s. 469, cited for S. Jansen, *op.cit.*

⁴⁰ S. Jansen, *op.cit.*, s. 193.

⁴¹ *Ibidem*; R. Petrović, *Etnički mešoviti brakovi u Jugoslaviji*, Beograd 1987, s. 60, cited for M. Samaradžić, *Tranzicija i manjine u Vojvodini*, Zrenjanin 2002, s. 60, <http://www.kczr.org> (20 III 2011).

Table 4. Mixed marriages in Yugoslavia in 1981

Republics of Yugoslavia	Percent of Mixed marriages in 1981
Yugoslavia	13.0
BiH	12.0
Montenegro	13.8
Croatia	17.0
Macedonia	8.2
Slovenia	10.9
Serbia	13.0
Serbia without regions	9.7
SAP Kosovo	6.1
SAP Vojvodina	27.3

Source: R. Petrović, *Etnički mešoviti brakovi u Jugoslaviji*, Beograd 1987, s. 60, cited for: M. Samardžić, *Tranzicija i manjine u Vojvodini*, Zrenjanin 2002, s. 7, <http://www.kczr.org> (20 III 2011).

Summarising the Petrović research, the largest number of intermarriages was in Vojvodina, and the lowest in Kosovo. In general, Serbia was the place where mixed marriages were most popular. This level of intermarriage undoubtedly shows the nature of ethnic relations in the country. In accordance with Jensen's observation, individuals of Serbian affiliation and from mixed nationally families, more frequently described themselves as Yugoslavs than those of Croatian affiliation, even if the latter had a positive attitude towards Yugoslavia⁴².

In summation, during the history of Yugoslavia there was no referendum, plebiscite or vote of any sort in which the citizens could express their opinion about the future of the Yugoslavs or Yugoslavia. Over the years there were fewer and fewer Yugoslavs as more and more people acknowledged their traditional ethnic identity. The disintegration of Yugoslavia removed the option of having a Yugoslav identity, and maybe even the Yugoslav nationality itself. Gone with them were the possibilities of bringing Yugoslavia, and the Yugoslavs, back to life.

Divided loyalty and split identity

All arguments described above are focused on the existence of split identity among the nations of Yugoslavia. In 1973, Nikola Rot and Nenad Havelka conducted research which showed that Yugoslav society (respondents were mainly

⁴² S. Jansen, *op.cit.*, s. 212-213.

from Serbian secondary schools) displayed a „divided loyalty”⁴³. The authors wrote that „divided or multinational bonds function simultaneously with personal bonds to ethnic group and social community”. This could be expressed through the assertion that people feel an affiliation to a given nation, but that this in no way distances them from other nations and political communities. Interestingly, research conducted in secondary schools in the 1970s in Vojvodina, revealed that 90% of that society showed a bond to the split nation⁴⁴. Then in the mid-1980s a project entitled „Problems of social structure and social awareness” (*Problemi društvene strukture i društvene svesti*) was conducted. In this case adults from various levels of society were examined. It confirmed the previous research that a number of national ties existed in Vojvodina, and that 85% of adults showed „divided loyalty”⁴⁵.

In 1973, Nenad Rot and Nenad Havelka distinguished three types of identity appearing throughout Yugoslavia. The first one was a „split enhanced Yugoslav bond” which manifested itself in a stronger loyalty towards Yugoslavia than to the respondent’s own nationality. The second type of „split Yugoslav bond” was characterised by the same approach to Yugoslavia and to a given nationality. The third one was the „limited Yugoslav bond” where personal bonds with one’s own nationality are much more significant than with the Yugoslav community⁴⁶.

Summary

The ethnic structure of the first, second and third Yugoslavia was complicated. The dominant nationalities were Serb, Croat, Slovenian, Bosnian, Montenegrin and Macedonian. The Yugoslavs as separate national group did not appear in censuses between the Great War and World War II. They were not mentioned after the war in the first census of the SFRY in 1948. There were two groups in the 1953 census – specified and unspecified. Yugoslavs as a group of people (shown in censuses in 1953 and 1961) appeared in the unspecified group. The term „Yugoslav” was not used as a separate nationality but was rather seen as a state affiliation. In the culminating moment in 1981 the share of Yugoslavs, as to the population at large, was 5,5% in Yugoslavia.

According to statistics, in 1991 the Yugoslavs constituted a larger number of people in BiH – 5,6%, than in Montenegro – 4,25%, or in Serbia proper and Croatia – 3,2% and 2,2% respectively. Likewise interesting are the censuses from

⁴³ N. Rot, N. Havelka, *Nacionalna Vežanost i vrednosti kod srednjoškolske omladine*, Beograd 1973, s. 245.

⁴⁴ M. Vasović, *op.cit.*, s. 118.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, s. 119.

⁴⁶ N. Rot, N. Havelka, *op.cit.*, s. 197-200.

2002 in Serbia and 2003 in Montenegro which took into account Yugoslavs. Additionally, in the 2001 census conducted in Croatia, Yugoslavs existed together with Muslims in a group called – „others” and they constituted 21 801 (0,49%)⁴⁷. In the newest 2011 censuses of post-Yugoslav countries in Montenegro the number of Yugoslavs stands at 0,19%, in Croatia is just 331 people and in Serbia 23 303 (0,32%)⁴⁸.

It is worth mentioning that in 2009, the internet organisation „Our Yugoslavia” (*Naša Jugoslavija*) was established in Pula, whose main purpose was to stabilise relations among the peoples of the areas mentioned, as well as to keep alive the memory of the SFRY. As part of „Our Yugoslavia”, the Yugoslav Assotiation (*Savez Jugoslovena*) sought to perform activities that would allow introduction of the Yugoslav nationality to the census. The main reason was the conviction that all Yugoslavs had the right to participate in social organisations, show their Yugoslav nationality in censuses and preserve their cultural identity and historical, artistic and literary heritage. The Yugoslav Association would like to begin a public debate on Yugoslav’s rights and their role in a democratic society. The website also provides the „Declaration on the Yugoslav nation” (*Deklaracija o Jugoslovenskoj naciji*) in several languages⁴⁹. Undoubtedly initiatives such as Our Yugoslavia have positive aspects that could help preserve the memory of a common Yugoslav consciousness. I would venture to say that a united Europe, and the wide range of integrative initiatives posited by it, may eventually build a common consciousness of another dimension – just not a Yugoslav one.

Anna Jagiełło-Szostak – dr nauk społecznych w zakresie nauk o polityce, adiunkt w Zakładzie Badań Wschodnich w Instytucie Studiów Międzynarodowych Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego

⁴⁷ *Statistički ljetopis Republike Hrvatske*, Zagreb 2012, s. 107.

⁴⁸ *Popis stanovništva, kućanstva i stanova 2011. Stanovništvo prema državljanstvu, narodnosti, vjeri i materinskom jeziku*, „Statistička izvješća” 2013, s. 13; <http://webrzs.stat.gov.rs/WebSite/public/PublicationView.aspx?pKey=41&pLevel=1&pubType=2&pubKey=1454> (15 XII 2013).

⁴⁹ *Naša Jugoslavija*, <http://www.nasa-jugoslavija.org> (15 VII 2011).