

Yugoslav Documents exhibition(s)

Bojana Piškur

The *Yugoslav Documents* exhibition held in 1989 in Sarajevo was one of the last large-scale “Yugoslav exhibitions” before the dissolution of the country. To understand the socio-political context of that decade better, and to answer the question how and why such an exhibition was possible in 1989, we should explain with a handful of events and contextual factors of the late 1980s, including the political climate, the cultural politics of the time, and give a brief overview of postmodernism as the leading artistic style of the day in Yugoslavia.

Skenderija

The *Yugoslav Documents* exhibitions were held in Skenderija, which has a particular meaning for Sarajevo. The name means “Skender’s place” and comes from the Bosnian bey Skender-paša, who built a mosque there in the early 16th century. In 1969 the “modern” Skenderija was constructed in the same place, and was later expanded in 1984 for the Winter Olympic Games. During that time it was a well-known and widely used center for cultural, sports, and political events in Sarajevo. In 1978, the exhibition *Art in Yugoslavia 1970–1978* was staged in Skenderija, and was described as the most important exhibition of the year by the magazine *NIN*. During the war, in 1992, Skenderija sustained some damage and the French Battalion was stationed there. Today it is a rather run-down shopping mall with three gallery spaces: the Ars Aevi international collection, the Collegium Artisticum (opened in 1975), and the Charlama contemporary art space run by artist Jusuf Hadžifejzović, one of the founders of *Yugoslav Documents*.

The *Yugoslav Documents* genealogy. The art scene in Yugoslavia in the mid-1980s

The genealogy of the *Yugoslav Documents* goes back to 1984, when three artists/friends from Sarajevo, Jusuf Hadžifejzović, Saša Bukvić, and Rade Tadić, decided to organize a series of solo exhibitions of contemporary artists they thought particularly important, in an attempt to give the Sarajevo public the unique opportunity of seeing the work of their fellow artists from across Yugoslavia. The title “documents” was a response to Kassel documenta, but an ironic one, as Hadžifejzović¹ put it: “While the German government dedicated 17 million deutschmarks to the event in Kassel, demonstrating how much they valued contemporary art, the Yugoslav Ministry of Culture did not grant the Sarajevo exhibition a single dinar.” The art scene in Sarajevo started to gain some flair and status after the Winter Olympic Games in 1984. Hadžifejzović mentioned that the artists had a feeling that anything was possible during that decade, and that some large-scale art event, possibly one of international dimensions, should be organized in the rather sleepy art circles of Sarajevo.

According to Hadžifejzović, the selection concept for the *Yugoslav Documents* series was based on *druga linija*, “the other line”, a term coined by art historian and critic Ješa Denegri in the 1970s. In the broadest sense, the term denotes a direction, i.e., accepting the most topical and up-to-date principles in art and radically rejecting the mainstream system of art thinking. *Druga linija* also signifies a different “historical line in local art based on the avant-garde” via various expressions such as the dada *Zenit* magazine, the Bauhaus schooled constructivist Avgust Černigoj from the 1920s, with EXAT 51, the “New Tendencies” movement in the 1950s, the 1960s with Gorgona and OHO, and the 1970s with Goran Trbuljak, Mladen Stilinović, Sanja Iveković, Dalibor Martinis, Marina Abramović, and others. But the term proved problematic and even the author himself realized that with the emergence of the new art of the 1980s the term required some reconsideration. Denegri² actually remarked that the term did not signify an art expression per se, but rather expressed a certain mentality.

¹ Interview with Jusuf Hadžifejzović, 10 May 2016, 5 January 2017, Sarajevo.

² Interview with Ješa Denegri, Moderna galerija Ljubljana, 25 November 2016.

In any case, the three organizers were given a 25 m² wall for their use in the club of the Collegium Artisticum, located in the underground Skenderija, to exhibit works by invited artists. The self-organized exhibitions were staged between 1984 and 1987, without a budget (Saša Bukvić was also a kind of “sponsor” of these events, as his father owned a pastry shop in Sarajevo), and with exhibitions generally lasting a week. Hadžifejzović said that they wrote a list of 120 names of artists from all over Yugoslavia and simply started inviting them to Sarajevo. There were neither catalogues nor invitation cards to accompany or announce the exhibitions. Instead they produced simple leaflets in a do-it-yourself manner. Unfortunately, no images or photo archives remain from those exhibitions. But what Saša Bukvić kept from that time is a typed manifesto from 1984. The manifesto describes the artistic directions of *Yugoslav Documents* and the future intentions of the organizers. The first exhibition featured Boris Demur from Zagreb, followed by Raša Todosijević, Sven Stilinović, and many others. In total there were almost 80 such exhibitions.

To better understand the *Yugoslav Documents* exhibitions, we must make mention of the concept of a “common Yugoslav cultural space.” In light of the events of the late 1980s, such discourse was becoming anachronistic across Yugoslavia, except perhaps in Bosnia and Herzegovina. After the Second World War, Yugoslavia was not a homogenous cultural space, and each republic had its own national culture. As Josip Vidmar³ said: “Each of our cultures is burdened with its past.”⁴ Moreover, nationalisms of any kind were considered dangerous in Yugoslavia, and for this reason more emphasis was put on Yugoslav cultural unity than on individual national cultures. However, the issue of Yugoslav culture was not considered an alternative to national cultures; according to Predrag Matvejević,⁵ Yugoslavism was more a feeling of commonness than nationality. Slavko Timotijević⁶ was critical of the concept, saying that the Yugoslav cultural space existed as a “political intention” since the 1950s, when a model of Yugoslav cultural policy was conceived. When new forms of art began appearing in the 1960s, in particular the alternative practices, independent artistic initiatives, and various student cultural centers, this concept became obsolete. Discussions like this evolved also around the *Yugoslav Documents*. Thus Željko Kipke⁷ sees the problem of *Yugoslav Documents* in that it was underpinned by a political idea: the idea of a common space, which, according to Kipke, gave the exhibition the “character of an art fair.” Journalist Branko Sosič⁸ wrote in the newspaper *Delo* that the *Documents* were conceived with the idea of an all-Yugoslav program in mind. This is probably true, at least to some extent, since “Yugoslav art” and “Yugoslav cultural space” were also emphasized in Muhamed Karamehmedović’s introductory essay for the exhibition catalogue.

The 1980s brought a different global politics than the previous decade; the Left lost power, and there was a turn toward conservative, right-wing politics, both in the United States and Europe. After President Tito’s death in 1980, the weakened system of federal government in Yugoslavia was unable to cope with the emerging acute economic and political challenges, which in turn brought crises in all spheres of public life.

Art in the 1980s was a reaction to the 1970s – to conceptualism, historical avant-gardes, “the iconoclasm of minimalism” (Tomaž Brejč). Zagreb-based art historian Davor Matičević noted: “The artists in the 1980s... are a generation, but they don’t offer any clear programs... no declarations of aspirations.”⁹ Andrej Medved, an art critic from Koper, was more rigorous: “The 1970s are forever

³ Josip Vidmar was a prominent Slovene literary and theater critic, dramaturge, translator, essayist and politician, and one of the founders of the Liberation Front.

⁴ Quoted in Predrag Matvejević, “Jugoslavenstvo danas: pitanja kulture”, *Globus* (Zagreb) (1982): p. 47.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁶ Slavko Timotijević, “Jeli bilo jugoslovenskog kulturnog prostora”, *Danas* (Belgrade) (31 October 2014).

⁷ Željko Kipke, “Klimaks sajmišne politike”, *OKO* (Zagreb) no. 454 (1989): pp. 16-17.

⁸ Branko Sosič, “Velika zbirka likovnih dogodivščin”, *Delo* (Ljubljana) (15 July 1989).

⁹ Davor Matičević, “Videnje desetljeća. Osamdesete i kakvim ih upamtiti”, in *Jugoslovenska dokumenta ‘89* (Sarajevo: ZOI ‘84 Olimpijski centar Skenderija, 1989), p. 22.

buried, and with them conceptualism and the post-analytical approach in painting.”¹⁰ The *genius loci*, according to Matičević, was no longer just one of the features of this (new) art, but was becoming a convention, a criterion for its evaluation.¹¹ At the same time, questions arose whether art in Yugoslavia in the 1980s even had its own specific characteristics, or whether it was just a response to international developments in art, and to what extent the term “nomadism”¹² even was applicable.

The year 1980 saw the emergence of the “New Image” in art. As critic Igor Zabel writes, “abstraction acquired a new, different role in the context of the 1980s.”¹³ Postmodernism renounced project-oriented thinking; “new forms can only establish themselves as quotations or a recycling of a certain tradition.”¹⁴ The *American Painting of the 1970s* exhibition, curated by Marcia Tucker and presenting works from the collections of The New Museum in New York, had a significant impact on Yugoslav artists. It was staged at the Moderna galerija in Ljubljana, as well as in Zagreb and Belgrade. Another pivotal event was the *Aperto* section of the Venice Biennale in 1980, curated by Achille Bonito Oliva and Harald Szeemann. Roughly speaking, the development of postmodernism was underpinned by initiatives in European and American art, like the trans-avant-garde and Neo-Expressionism. This brought in its wake new critical methods, approaches in writing, and generally a different language of art. In his influential book from the late 1970s entitled *Postmodern Condition*, Jean-François Lyotard writes about the end of master narratives and the time of small stories; taking center stage are now “individual mythologies” and the above-mentioned concept of “nomadism”. Igor Zabel also stresses the loosening of the relationship between the center and the periphery, leading to an “interest in the marginal and the local.”¹⁵ An example of this kind is the town of Koper and its Coastal Galleries, which was one of the main art centers in Yugoslavia at the time.

The mid-1980s saw a change, even a crisis in such art. According to Igor Zabel, “the time of autopoetics had arrived.”¹⁶ Tomaž Brejc, on the other hand, writes about a turning back, to “modernism after postmodernism.”¹⁷ In the second half of the 1980s, the new Art Informel was the predominant style, and sculpture gained prominence in many parts of Yugoslavia. Generally speaking, the art scenes in Yugoslavia were very heterogeneous; the Belgrade scene differed from those in Ljubljana and Zagreb. The Slovene scene in particular “adhered to” the trans-avant-garde matrix (Andrej Medved) and to “the American post-Greenberg critical experience” as described by Tomaž Brejc in various of his texts.¹⁸ There are two main lines of development: artists who came from the figurative art of the 1970s or started out in the context of figurative art in the 1980s, and artists who entered the field of the New Image from modernist painting. On the other hand, the art of the mid-1980s was also Neue Slowenische Kunst and the entire Ljubljana subculture scene. Matičević pointed out that the main feature of the Zagreb art circle “has always been a rational application to the art work, revealed in a ‘constructive’ approach”¹⁹ relying heavily on “geometric symbolism.” The art of the mid-1980s in Zagreb also consisted, as Branka Stipančić²⁰ writes, in artists who began to work in the 1970s and shared a “conceptual past”, such as Trbuljak, Stilinović,

¹⁰ “Podaci o umetnosti osamdesetih u jugoslovenskom kulturnom prostoru”, Ješa Denegri’s lecture at Moderna galerija on 24 November 2016.

¹¹ Matičević, p. 23.

¹² A term coined by Achille Bonito Oliva.

¹³ Igor Zabel, “Slovenska umetnost 1975 – 85: koncepti in konteksti”, in *Do roba in naprej. Slovenska umetnost 1975–85*, eds. Igor Španjol, Igor Zabel (Ljubljana: Moderna galerija, 2003), p. 20.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

¹⁷ Tomaž Brejc, *Modernizem po postmodernizmu?* (Piran: Obalne galerije, 2000) (Edicija Artes).

¹⁸ Zoran Božović, “Jerko Denegri”, in *Razgovori o umetnosti* (Beograd, Remont / Beopolis, 2001), p. 19.

¹⁹ Davor Matičević, “Jedan zagrebački krug”, in *Umjetnost – kritika usred osamdesetih* (Sarajevo: Collegium artisticum, 1986), p. 63.

²⁰ Branka Stipančić, in *Umjetnost – kritika usred osamdesetih* (Sarajevo: Collegium artisticum, 1986), p. 73.

Martek, and Kipke. Also in Belgrade some artists were still influenced by practices typical of the 1970s, from installations to environments. Denegri, on the other hand, describes the Belgrade scene in the 1980s as a scene of “high polycentrism” and almost “chaotic pluralism.”²¹ Macedonia²² developed its own very particular models in art, full of “ritual pathos”, with visible ethnographic elements and a distinctive atmosphere. In Bosnia there were no art traditions similar to those in Zagreb, Ljubljana or Belgrade. The Sarajevo postmodernism of the 1980s had a mentality of “new-primitivism”,²³ which was a kind of “eclectic experience” using music along with comedy on radio and television as well as visual arts as its forms of expression.

In 1986 there was an important exhibition held in Collegium Artisticum called *The Criticism and Art in the Mid-Eighties* organized by the Yugoslav section of AICA. The exhibition showcased the most up-to-date selection of artists from Yugoslavia. Upon Ješa Denegri’s suggestion, art critics Branka Stipančić, Bojana Pejić, Marina Gržinić, Nermina Zildžo, Tomaž Brejc, Davor Matičević, Lidija Merenik made the selection, together with Zoran Petrovski, who also contributed the accompanying texts for the catalogue – including the introduction which announced that “Postmodernism is not a shift from Modernism.” Today we have the impression that the authors ignored political topics, which was likely a consequence of “art’s withdrawal from the sphere of social focus.”²⁴ Marina Gržinić was the only one who was both openly political and critical of this new art, saying that “aesthetic production in the West has finally been integrated into the production of goods,”²⁵ and later broaching the question of the “ideological consequences of postmodernism in the East, in a socialist society.”²⁶

Yugoslav Documents 1989

As for the *Yugoslav Documents*, a significant change came about in 1987, perhaps also encouraged by the *The Criticism and Art in the Mid-Eighties* exhibition, as *Yugoslav Documents* were transformed into a biennial event. While the underlying aim of the exhibition was to present only “the most authentic representatives of new artistic phenomena,” the organizers of *Yugoslav Documents* wanted to provide “actual insight into the current developments in Yugoslav art.”²⁷

Yugoslav Documents were initiated and curated by Hadžifejzović in collaboration with Tadić under the organizational auspices of the ZOI’84 Olimpijski centar Skenderija.²⁸ Participating artists were selected in a sort of “natural selection” process, and the selection of 140 artists included those 80 artists who had already exhibited in the Collegium Artisticum in previous years.

The second biennial *Documents*, in 1989, grew more ambitious in terms of organization and financial support, the selection of works and concepts, and the number of invited artists and foreign guests. It had a clear vision of positioning itself and Yugoslav art in the wider international context.

The *Večernje novine* newspaper wrote that by the year 2000, the *Yugoslav Documents* should be as important as the Kassel documenta or the Venice Biennale. Enrico Comi, the editor of the Italian *Spazio Umano* magazine, was also a guest in Sarajevo, and he dedicated an entire issue of his

²¹ Božović, p. 19.

²² See Zoran Petrovski in *Umjetnost-kritika usred osamdesetih* (Sarajevo: Collegium artisticum, 1986).

²³ Ljiljana Domić writes in her article “Osamdesete se prerusavaju” in *Vjesnik* (Zagreb) (8 March 1986): “[...] this ‘new primitivism’ manifests through specific eclectic experiences that have sublimated various other experiences from conceptual to trans-avant-garde. But it also manifests a certain self-irony with regard to local color.”

²⁴ Tomaž Brejc, “Postmodernizem: Kaj je to in v čem ga vidimo. Teorija modernizma, praksa postmodernizma”, *Sodobnost* (Ljubljana) no. 11 (1982): p. 1041.

²⁵ Marina Gržinić, “Slikati jedno da bi se odrazilo drugo”, in *Umjetnost – kritika usred osamdesetih* (Sarajevo: Collegium artisticum, 1986), p. 35.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 37.

²⁷ Barbara Borčić, “Jugoslovska dokumenta. Strategija predstavljanja II”, *Telex* (Ljubljana) (27 July 1989): p. 47.

²⁸ At the time, the Skenderija Cultural Center was run by Enver Hadžiomerspahić, while Mladen Jeličić-Troka was event organizer. They both played an important part in organizing the *Yugoslav Documents* in 1987 and 1989.

magazine to the exhibition. There were ideas to make the next *Yugoslav Documents* exhibition, which should have been held in 1991, more international – and even to have a parallel event in Milan. Among the guests at the opening in Sarajevo were the curators involved in the IX Kassel Documenta.

At the same time, the *Yugoslav Documents* exhibition was also an attempt to make Sarajevo the fourth artistic center in Yugoslavia, alongside Ljubljana, Zagreb and Belgrade. This idea reflects the new postmodernist approach: the end of master narratives, the emphasis on *genius loci*, and loosening the ties between the center and the periphery. The exhibition was held in Skenderija over 8000 square meters and was sponsored by cultural organizations from the republics and various companies. The opening on 1 July 1989 was attended by more than 6,000 people, including politicians from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and was broadcast live on Yugoslav television. French television also made a short program about it. The exhibition featured 189 artists, almost 600 works selected by 16 selectors²⁹ from all of the republics and an organizing committee, and selectors were free to propose any kind of art for consideration. Davor Matičević was responsible for the overall exhibition design, which was largely organized around generational groupings and to some degree similarity of artistic expression.

The strategies of representation were rather unfortunate: the large basement trade-fair-type halls and corridors were equipped and divided by imprecisely constructed display panels and dividing walls; in view of the absence of natural light the lighting was inadequate, as no appropriate spotlights were used, and the desire to create a white cube which would allow total focus on the exhibits backfired, as it would have made more sense to incorporate the architecture of the place as a constitutive element of the art.³⁰

A year previous, Tomaž Brejc published a text entitled *Modernism after Postmodernism?*, in which he analyzed the changes that developed in art in the late 1980s, when artists began turning back to modernism. “Modernism became a historical field in which nomadism is possible.”³¹ Certain changes in this direction are discernible also at the second *Yugoslav Documents* exhibition: the selected works represented a greater variety of styles and techniques than before, including extended media and performance, still in the spirit of the typical postmodernist pluralism of the late 1980s, when “pluralism is the only ism”. However, more emphasis was given to current contemporary works and artists that were influenced by older avant-garde movements³² or involved in reviving the ideals of historical modernity. There were accompanying exhibitions of older generation artists (Avgust Černigoj, Marij Pregelj, Ivo Gattin, Ivan Tabaković, Vojo Dimitrijević and more) that, according to Denegri, had a strong influence on the Yugoslav art scene and were among the forerunners of the *druga linija*, “the other line”. Many artists from the previous *Documents* exhibited, but it is quite evident that artistic expressions had begun to change significantly in the late 1980s.

Lidija Merenik³³ wrote about three parallel directions of the late 1980s in art in Yugoslavia that could also be identified at the second *Documents* exhibition: there were young artists from the 1980s who had no experience of the 1970s and conceptualism; artists who had come to be formed under the influence of conceptual art and then modified their artistic positions in the 1980s in the spirit and art of the time (this group includes the “orthodox” and the “transmuted” artists); and

²⁹ Petar Ćuković, Zoran Furunović, Marina Gržinić, Jusuf Hadžifejzović, Željko Kipke, Mladen Lucić, Antun Maričić, Lidja Merenik, Bojana Pejić, Zoran Petrovski, Sava Stepanov, Radoslav Tadić, Viktorija Vaseva Dimeska, Nebojša Vilić, Igor Zabel, Nermina Zildžo.

³⁰ Borčić, p. 49.

³¹ Brejc, “Postmodernizem: Kaj je to”, p. 1041.

³² Interestingly, none of the reviewers explicitly mentions the retro-avant-garde, although quite a few artists practicing or part of this genre were featured in the exhibition.

³³ Lidija Merenik, “Svakoj epohi njena umetnost...”, *Moment* no. 16 (1989): pp. 58-59.

middle- and older-generation artists with considerable experience from the 1950s and the 1960s, who never radically changed their stands.

Branko Cerovac³⁴ summed up the selection of artists as having a strong presence of *druga linija* artists, as well as a series of younger representatives of post-conceptual, new sculptural and new “media” practices. He also emphasized the visible connections between Gorgona, Todosijević, Stilinović, and the IRWIN group, with the works falling within the framework of a new poetics and methodology in Buadrillard’s world of simulation and simulacra, a string of researchers and thinkers of painting from Slovenia, video art, early Art Informel works, and sculptors from the second half of the 1980s from all over Yugoslavia.

In the newspaper *OKO*, Željko Kipke talked about the artists’ great interest in the tradition of Art Informel, the geometrization of pictorial space, the representatives of *druga linija*, conceptualists (new linguists) and “excessively large ruins giving off a whiff of trans-avant-garde or a romantic delusion of a kitsch-poetic hungry for space and material.”³⁵

Tomaž Brejc³⁶ wrote that echoes of virtually all leading global trends were represented, e.g. the “eccentric objects” of the semi-industrial trend as seen at the 8th Kassel documenta, or the so-called Simulationism in works now produced also in Yugoslavia by Zagreb-based artists. Additionally, art that underscored the mundaneness of the used materials flourished; this group included Bosnian and Macedonian artists. Intuitively conceived geometric art, almost like some personal decoration, Neo-Informel, and the art of “the other line” were all likewise present.

Meta Gabršek Prosenč³⁷ noted that only the sculptors still showed some of the new figurative art. In Croatian art, the leading styles were neo-geometric art and the art of simulation; in Slovene art, a line of expressionism with the older generations, and intellectualism with the younger generations. *Genius loci* was only discernible with the work of the Macedonians and Bosnians, with the latter group representing the “new primitivism”.

And Barbara Borčić³⁸ wondered: hasn’t more than half of the *druga linija* artists crossed over to the “first line” at this year’s *Documents* exhibition?

Questions such as “What is contemporary Yugoslav art?” were raised at the accompanying conference. And an extensive catalogue³⁹ was published on the occasion, with texts by various theoreticians together with color reproductions of the artworks.

Unfortunately, no archive of the exhibition is preserved. The photographs, video, film tapes, and similar materials were burnt during the war in Bosnia. The press clippings folder was preserved in the documentation department of the Art Gallery of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Many artworks shown at the *Yugoslav Documents* 1989 were destroyed, lost or stolen during the war. Just a handful of artists have photos of their works from the exhibition, and photographer Jane Štravs has the most complete photo record/archive of the event.

The Yugoslav press covered the exhibition extensively. The reviewers generally agreed that an exhibition like *Yugoslav Documents* was only possible in Sarajevo, owing to the political circumstances in the country at the time. In addition to the positive reviews there were also some criticisms concerning the exhibition’s lack of selectiveness, partiality, the art-fair character, the

³⁴ Email correspondence with the author, 24 November 2016.

³⁵ Kipke, pp. 16-17.

³⁶ Tomaž Brejc, “Jugoslovanska dokumenta 89”, *Naši razgledi* (Ljubljana) no. 14 (28 July 1989): p. 429.

³⁷ Meta Gabršek-Prosenč, “Jugoslovanska dokumenta '89”, *Večer* (Maribor) (5 August 1989).

³⁸ Borčić, p. 48.

³⁹ The catalogue was designed by Radoslav Tadić, and the exhibition poster by Jusuf Hadžifejzović.

inappropriate display or arrangement of works in the available spaces, the muscle flexing between republics, and so on. Tomaž Brejc was almost prophetic in his words: “Isn’t there a crisis of inventions reminiscent of another, yet similar time in 1939?”⁴⁰

Although some of the works⁴¹ referred to the social and political context of the 1980s in some way, the exhibition was in general emphatically apolitical, with the organizers trying to avoid any kind of political debate. This is even more significant in view of the fact that Yugoslavia had already started to break up in 1989. Also, during that same year there were other “Yugoslav” exhibitions organized around the country, for example the *Triennial of Modern Art* in Belgrade, where almost all invited artists from Slovenia and Croatia declined to participate, likely due to political reasons; and the polemical, political *Art For and Against* exhibition held in Banja Luka, the *Biennale of Young Artists* in Rijeka and more.

From today’s perspective and in the light of the subsequent events of the 1990s, the exhibition was perhaps the last attempt to preserve a common Yugoslav art space – however polemical this concept proved to be – as well as the many artistic friendships, cultural networks, and the feeling of *raja*⁴² that was so specific to pre-war Sarajevo.

At the time of the formation of new states in the 1990s and later, “Yugoslav art” and “Yugoslav heritage” ceased to be self-evident terms. Only this past decade has seen some reawakening of the awareness of our common heritage – this time based, of course, on different (conceptual) foundations. Our exhibition “Heritage of 1989” is an attempt at precisely that.

⁴⁰ Brejc, “Jugoslovenska dokumenta 89”, p. 429.

⁴¹ Such were the works by Sven and Mladen Stilinović, Narcis Kantardžić, and Jadran Adamović.

⁴² *Raja* signifies a community based on acceptance, comradeship and hospitality.