

JOSIP BROZ TITO: HERO OF THE NATION OR TRAITOR

LADA STEVANOVIĆ

Focusing on the death of Josip Broz Tito, his spectacular funeral, the destiny of his mausoleum (a memorial that was built for him while he was actually still alive), and his hero cult, I study the change in the attitude toward him that occurred with the national awakening that took place throughout Yugoslavia several years after his death, although I limit this case study to Serbia.

Keywords: Tito, hero cult, traitor, collective memory, individual memory

Prispevek se osredotoča na smrti Josipa Broza Tita, njegov veličasten pogreb, usodo njegovega mavzoleja (spomenika, ki so mu ga postavili, ko je bil že živ) in kult heroja, ki so ga vzpostavili ob njem. Avtorica analizira spremembe, ki so se zgodile med različnimi nacionalnimi prebujenji na območju Jugoslavije nekaj let po Titovi smrti, pri čemer se najbolj posveti dogodkom v Srbiji.

Ključne besede: Tito, kult heroja, izdajalec, kolektivni spomin, individualni spomin

INTRODUCTION

Focusing on the death of Josip Broz Tito, his spectacular funeral, and the destiny of his mausoleum (a memorial that was built for him while he was actually still alive), I study¹ the change in the attitude toward him that occurred with the national awakening that took place throughout Yugoslavia several years after his death, although I limit this case study to Serbia. Researchers of death long ago emphasized the importance and specific impact that public funerals of distinguished people have in the political sphere. Apart from this, monuments as a part of public space are one of the crucial components in shaping collective memory. With this in mind, this article shows how the destiny of Tito's Mausoleum (the House of Flowers) and Tito's Museum (the May 25th Museum) reflected the needs and moves of the political elites of the time, and how the hero and the father of the nation become an enemy and a traitor. Particular focus is placed on the heroization process that started when Tito was still alive. After his death, this cult changed its character: it first disappeared and then reappeared again, but transformed itself and gained a new modality of existence.

There is no doubt that Josip Broz Tito was a very interesting, fascinating, and controversial politician, and people's attitudes towards him have never been lukewarm. As the president of Yugoslavia, he was either glorified, praised, and adored, or was despised and

¹ The paper is a result of the project *Cultural Heritage and Identity*, no. 177026, financed by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

hated. There are many ways in which one can discuss and study the perception of Tito among people, focusing on his status as a hero in one period, and as a traitor in another. I focus on the official attitudes towards him, reflected in the construction of collective memory, based on the example of the mausoleum built for Tito while he was still alive. Studying the official attitudes towards Tito is also crucial for understanding the process in which the cult of his personality was constructed and cherished.² However, before addressing this topic, it is important to say something about the concept of collective memory.

THE CONCEPT OF MEMORY

First of all, the concept of memory was regarded as an individual phenomenon for a long time. The term *collective memory* was used for the first time in 1902 by Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Only twenty years later, Maurice Halbwachs refuted the position of Freud and Bergson that memory is an individual phenomenon (Brkljačić & Prlenda 2006: 1), concluding that homogenization of collective memory is characteristic for modern, developed societies that possess strong mechanisms that create ideology (Kirin Jambrešić 2008: 26). However, at least half a century was needed for this concept to timidly enter studies of the past. Thus, as a regulated and ideologically shaped phenomenon (which stands in opposition to individual memory), I regard it important in relation to the personality cult that is inevitably a reflection of ideological domination. However, I also discuss the decline of Tito's personality cult, which, in the complex history of Yugoslavia, opens the space for discussion of individual memory, or even "counter-memory" as a phenomenon that Foucault defines as a resistance and opposition to dominant narratives.

THE CULT OF THE DEAD AS A PART OF THE PERSONALITY CULT

According to Todor Kuljić, in order to provide relatively permanent political power, it is necessary to constantly develop the charisma of the leader, which constantly repeats and confirms itself (2004: 156). In this context, it is not unexpected that the story of Tito's grave begins even before his death in order to add another puzzle to the grandiose construction of his cult. Namely, in 1975, the House of Flowers was built as a winter garden, which Tito used for leisure and work. However, already a year later, in 1976, Tito met officials of the

² A complex analysis of Tito's personality cult regarding the construction of Tito's identity and the grounds on which certain characters were particularly appreciated and important for his fame was provided by Todor Kuljić in his book *Tito, sociološkoistorijska studija* (2004: 156–179). According to Kuljić, it is important to differentiate three levels of approach to Tito's cult, charisma, and authority: 1) glorifying the political leader, 2) the specific aspect of communist glorification of the Bolshevik type of leader, and 3) specific Yugoslav features of the personality cult (2004: 156).

Yugoslav republic of Serbia, and set forth the idea of being buried in this place (namely, near the White Palace, where he lived and where his ex-lover and secretary from the Second World War Davorjanka “Zdenka” Paunović and his dog were already buried; Miloradović 2007: 91). He also suggested at this meeting that Belgrade should have some historical center and monumental area devoted to his life and work. The idea might have occurred to him in 1960, when Tito visited Franklin Roosevelt’s grave, which is actually located inside a residential complex. The two graves are not very different, and even have similar names: one is called the Rose Garden, and the other the House of Flowers. The House of Flowers was first built as a winter garden that had a fountain in the middle, surrounded by luxurious salons. The only difference compared to the Roosevelt grave, which is located totally in the open, is that the House of Flowers has a roof made of glass. The House of Flowers became part of the Josip Broz Tito Memorial Center in 1982, and after Tito’s death the fountain was replaced by a heavy marble slab weighing several tons.

In 1962, the House of Flowers and other structures in the complex (the Residence, the Hunting House, the Old Museum, the Billiard House, and a little later the Collection of Memory) were joined into the May 25th Museum, which was founded in 1962 to keep the gifts that Tito received. After his death, the entire complex was named Josip Broz Tito Memorial Center. Today this complex has another name and function. Together with the Museum of the Revolution, it belongs to the Museum of Yugoslav History with the aim of collecting and archiving materials connected with Yugoslavia for the entire period of its existence. The importance of having such a museum is related to the fact that this state no longer exists. Thus, the institution that was once founded by the state in order to promote the dominant politics and ideology that created it continued to function after the breakup of Yugoslavia as the institution with the task of maintaining the memory of a state that no longer exists and, as shown below, it is exactly this memory that was meant to be left to oblivion. Appearing as a dominant institution of Yugoslavia, its primary function was to support dominant narratives and to maintain the memory of Tito and everything that this politician symbolized; the antifascist struggle, social justice, and the fraternity and unity of the nation and its nationalities. Immediately after Tito’s death, the same politics of memory was dominant and was embodied in the words *I posle Tita Tito* ‘Tito even after Tito’. However, with the change of social climate, and with the shift of dominant narratives, the personality cult of Tito came to an end. Consequently, the Museum of Yugoslav History became a marginalized place, which to some extent succeeded in using its marginal position, also being open to alternative content (but not exclusively to it). In this way, the Museum of Yugoslav History was participating the creation of counter-memory, as Foucault defines it, which appears when an individual expresses resistance towards official versions of historical narratives (Brkljačić & Prlenda 2006: 3). In the 1990s, the Museum of Yugoslav History was a state institution that sometimes functioned in accordance with state ideology, much more often openly resisting it, working independently and offering its space to artistic projects critical towards the dominant politics (these projects were of course not

funded by the state). Thus, recalling Konerton's position that ideas about the past legitimate the social order (2002: 11) and that the role of museums is to fix these images and ideas (not only through the choice of displays, but also through their organization in the space, and generally through contextualization), the question that arises is to what extent the Museum of Yugoslav History and the House of Flowers really improve the social order, and which kind of interaction they function in. The key question for understanding this is that national ideology during the 1990s in Serbia (as well as in some other Yugoslav republics) was created with the aim of devaluing all ideas and values of Yugoslavia, as a consequence of which the interaction is full of contradictions and difficulties.

Returning to the House of Flowers and the hero cult that was related to it: the House of Flowers is a kind of mausoleum (although President Tito used it while still alive) that was the "house" of a distinguished politician, which differs from other graves in its proportions and the space that it occupies. Mausoleums are usually built in cemeteries (although even graveyards have specially defined areas for burying distinguished people, such as the Alley of the Famous in Belgrade's Central Cemetery). Precisely their position in a "free" inhabited area, and the ways in which mausoleums dominate it, increases the symbolic power of such a grave (the word *mausoleum* itself was used for the first time in relation to the monumental grave of the Persian Satrap Mausolus in Halicarnassus, and was one of the seven wonders of the ancient world). The majesty and splendor of such a grave undoubtedly has the function of maintaining the fame and immortality related to it. Thus, a mausoleum is a special type of grave monument, even a temple, a house of the divinized deceased with its origin in the ancient world. This fits into concepts of the totalitarian regimes in the twentieth century, which, according to Olga Manojlović Pintar, always insisted on breaking the continuity of time, trying to establish a past that begins in remote times "in order to represent themselves as the demiurges of the new world, and not those that continue the one before" (Manojlović Pintar 2004: 86).

What one may recognize here, in the detailed planning of his own funeral and even creating his mausoleum before his own death, is an agenda for the construction of a personality cult. This is exactly the point from which I study Josip Broz Tito as a hero with a posthumous cult.

Namely, the word *hero* itself originates from Ancient Greek, where it had a double meaning (some researchers regard those two meanings separately, and some find connections). One meaning refers to brave warriors from epic poetry, who made a choice to reject a boring and long life and chose a short but famous one. Due to their brave *heroic* deeds in the peak of their youth, these heroes obtained eternal glory. The other category that is important here is the cult of the hero as a demigod, whose cult was cherished at his tomb, after his death. Traces of these cults appeared in post-Homeric times, from the tenth century BC, but they became widespread starting in the last quarter of the eighth century BC, which coincides with the flourishing of the city-state (*polis*), when the tribal societal system was replaced by the state organization (Freidenberg 1997: 44). During the

previous period, the cult of dead ancestors played a very important role for a society that was organized on the basis of blood relations and family organizations. In the new era, when this was put aside and the state was promoted as the main organizer of the social life, it was important to establish another death cult that would connect the members of the community. It is here that one encounters the hero cult because heroes were people important for establishing the community and famous for their deeds. Their graves were turned into a kind of altar that served to keep the community together (Stevanović 2009: 72–75). How do the political heroes of the twentieth century fit in?

This involves important figures with a remarkable role in political life. These cults refer not only to politicians, but also to poets or other distinguished men important for the nation, which then has to be related to the nineteenth-century flourishing of national identity. What these modern heroes have in common with the ancient Greek heroes is importance in the cohesion of the state organization. The hero is proclaimed *officially* and, in the case of Tito, like in the case of Greek heroes, the tomb appears as an important place for the ritual performance, also bearing the power of death, which is absurdly marked with immortality. The difference is that Tito was not chosen for his heroic role after his death. His death cult was integrated in the cult of personality that was cherished during his life. Concerning the planning of Tito's posthumous "home" in advance, this might also be related to the self-perception of the hero—or, as Thomas Carlyle says, "A Hero is a Hero at all points; in the soul and thought of him first of all" (Carlyle 1888: 31).

Josip Broz Tito died on May 4th, 1980, and his funeral was an impressive event attended by numerous foreign delegations and high-profile politicians (209 delegations from 127 countries, including Leonid Brezhnev, Indira Gandhi, and Margaret Thatcher). The entire country was paralyzed—the body of the deceased president was laid out in Yugoslavia's parliament, and people waited in long lines to bid a last farewell to the president. Everything was directly broadcast on TV, and it is estimated that half a million people visited the deceased. After his funeral, every day many visitors from all over Yugoslavia went on pilgrimages to the House of Flowers: individuals, groups of workers, and school excursions, as well as numerous foreign delegations. The grave was maintained by an honor guard, and the ceremony of paying respects was always preformed in silence. Konerton's thesis that ceremonies and body practices represent one of the most important factors in the construction of collective memory, making it possible to save and remember past images through a ritual act (2002: 57), leads to the conclusion about the importance and function that were planned for Tito's grave and for the rituals related to the cult of the dead president. Group visits by schools and labor organizations from all over Yugoslavia were often organized, and a ritual bow in front of Tito's grave had the function of maintaining the collective memory of Tito and legitimizing and continuing the politics that he led and symbolized: the politics of "fraternity and unity," socialism and self-management. Visits by prominent Yugoslav and foreign politicians on the anniversary of Tito's death (and also on Youth Day, or May 25th, which was fictitiously celebrated as Tito's birthday)

were especially ceremonial. These ritual visits by many well-known people from all over the world, their notes in the “Book of Sorrow,” and placing flowers on Tito’s grave (always according to a strict protocol) had to make strong public impression in order to imprint important traces in the collective memory, and so the media were always present. All of this had one important function: “not to turn from Tito’s path” (*da se sa Titovog puta ne skrene*), to continue the politics that was led during his time, and to reaffirm the existing dominant political narratives.

It would be interesting to make another parallel and to “close the circle” opened by mentioning Franklin D. Roosevelt’s grave as Tito’s model for the House of Flowers. The question that arises is whether it is possible to compare Tito’s mausoleum with special type of communist mausoleum as an institutionalized memory site, the prototype of which is Lenin’s mausoleum in Moscow (which was the model for similar mausoleums, such as that of Georgi Dimitrov in Sofia). Lenin’s famous mausoleum is actually extremely similar to the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus. It was built in 1930 in Red Square, a few years after Lenin’s death in 1924. Lenin’s coffin was first placed in the wooden mausoleum on Red Square, after which it was placed in a sarcophagus. After embalming the body, it became clear that it needed special circumstances to be kept embalmed and the decision was made to create a mausoleum built of marble and other precious materials. The body was guarded by an honor guard, and the traditional guard ceremony came to an end in 1993 with the collapse of communism. Interesting facts about this mausoleum are its grandiosity, its usage of Russian popular religious beliefs, and also the importance that this mausoleum had in the construction of the personality cult of Stalin as Lenin’s successor (Stanoeva 2011). Unlike this mausoleum, Tito’s House of Flowers was not built in the city’s main square, was not built after Tito’s death, but before, and did not display the body of the leader. In comparison to Lenin’s Mausoleum, Tito’s project was much more modest. Choosing an American model of tomb might also point to Tito’s political position of balancing between East and West, with the radical distancing from the USSR and Stalin, especially during the Informbiro period from 1948 to 1955.

DEATH AND THE AFTERLIFE OF TITO’S CULT

The *inflation of the past* (a term coined by Todor Kuljić) began in the late 1980s. Narratives shifted and the past that was focused on was the pre-Yugoslav one. All of a sudden, the history that was related to Yugoslavia was not only consigned to oblivion, but was marked as something that was suffocating and destroying the “authentic” awakening of individual nationalistic values. The megalomaniac funeral of the dead “marshal” of Yugoslavia and the tears that were once shed for him were impossible to imagine anymore. However, megalomania and turbulent emotions did not disappear. They were redirected for finding “lost” national identities. These were the emotions of hatred towards others, between

those that, until recently, had been bonded in fraternity and unity. In this atmosphere it was logical that Josip Broz Tito and his often-visited grave were forgotten. And not only that: in the atmosphere of war and nationalism in which Yugoslavia fell apart, at a meeting that was held on May 4th, 1991 (eleven years after Tito's death), Vojislav Šešelj, as the leader of the Serbian Radical Party, called Tito "the biggest enemy and the villain of the Serbian people" and he suggested transporting his corpse to Kumrovec, Croatia (Tito's birthplace). Although this did not happen, the House of Flowers was abandoned and forgotten, by both citizens and institutions. The only interested people were representatives of the Veterans Associations of the People's Liberation War of Yugoslavia (SUBNOR) and some rare visitors from abroad.

During the 1990s, the grave of the ex-president, as well as the entire complex, was shabby and neglected. At one time, already by the end of the 1980s, there was an initiative in the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts to change the aim of this museum and to turn it into a museum of science and technology. Mileta Prodanović answered with the suggestion to open a museum devoted to the cult of personality, which would focus not only on the cult of Tito, but on the phenomenon itself. After this comment, the initiative was stopped. By a decree of the federal government, the Josip Broz Tito Memorial Center was renamed the Museum of Yugoslav History, united with the Museum of the Revolution.

The cult of personality was definitely dead, which once more confirms what Todor Kuljić wrote about Josip Broz Tito's charisma and cult as important integrative factors of different national orientations in Yugoslavia. Namely, his argument is that this cult was too strong and rigid, not allowing alternative practices with the same meaning to take place, which is why the entire concept of Yugoslavia left without Tito became fragile, indirectly making it possible for Yugoslavia to fall apart (Kuljić 2004: 215).

Analyzing the fate of the House of Flowers and the entire museum complex in connection with the production of narratives and the construction of collective memory in the 1990s, the picture is filled with contradictions and inconsistencies. It is interesting that, as a memorial, this place was neglected. Nevertheless, it was attractive in another sense: as a residence. Namely, the Yugoslav parliament made a decision in 1996 according to which the House of Flowers, the May 25th Museum, and the Ethnographic Collection stayed within the museum complex, and the rest of the buildings regained a residential function: the Hunting House, the Collection of Memory, the Billiard House, and the residence where Tito had lived were used by the president of Yugoslavia: thus, Slobodan Milošević moved in. The residence was damaged during the NATO bombing in 1999, and so Milošević moved into the oval building of the Collection of Memory. On the one hand, the collective memory of Tito and his cult was falling into oblivion together with his memorial, but undoubtedly there were ambitions to take his place, in both the physical and symbolic sense. There is no doubt that Tito represented an idol for Milošević, whose cult of personality was also cherished.

However, there are many differences, mainly with regard to the values that the cults of these leaders symbolized. I will not go into a detailed analysis of this, only mentioning what is most striking. Milošević was unlike Tito, who used his charisma to integrate the Yugoslav nations. Apart from that, Tito's cult and influence were largely built not only through his "divinized" presentations (portraits and sometimes statues in all workplaces and public places), but also through his travels and direct contact with people, whereas Milošević met and addressed people rarely and laconically.³ Tito was mainly present among people, whereas Milošević was absent.

TOURISM ICON

Dragi Tito, k srečo so ti naredili dovolj velik grob, da se lahko v njem obračaš.

Uroš in Nikol iz Slovenije

(Dear Tito, it's a good thing they made your grave big enough so you could roll over in it. Uroš and Nikol from Slovenia)

Visitors' book, House of Flowers, August 10th, 2012

The year 2000 represents a kind of shift in the position of the House of Flowers. It was a time of democratic changes in Serbia, after which the number of visitors increased tenfold (until 2000 it was twenty thousand, and after that more than two hundred thousand). Today the May 25th Museum and the House of Flowers are the most frequently visited cultural institutions and tourism destinations in Belgrade. According to the popular international website TripAdvisor, the Josip Broz Tito Mausoleum (as it is termed on the website), ranks eleventh out of seventy-seven sites in Belgrade (www.tripadvisor.com, April 12th, 2012). According to the employees of the Museum of Yugoslav History, tourist visits, especially to the House of Flowers, are very frequent. People come from all over the world (from the United States, Australia, all over Europe, China, and so on), but Slovenians are especially frequent visitors. One employee told me that it seems that all of Slovenia has visited the House of Flowers three times in two years. Of course this is not really true, and not all Slovenians are interested in or have a positive attitude towards Tito. However, according to the people that work there, and according to the visitors' books, people from the former Yugoslavia, especially Slovenians, frequently visit the House of Flowers (although not necessarily the other parts of the museum). They come on their own or in groups (I encountered four busses one Friday morning that came as part of a package tour with tourists from Slovenia, and two busses with Macedonian tourists) and they often leave their impressions in the book. Those inscriptions vary; they may be nostalgic or humorous, sometimes long and

³ For a comparison of Tito's funeral with that of Slobodan Milošević, see Kuljić (2012).

emotional, and sometimes very short. Some women from Celje told me that they wanted to visit Tito's grave "Kjer ga spoštujemo. Spoštujemo kakšen je bil. To absolutno mora bit. Bili smo že leta 1982" (We respect him, no matter what he was like. It absolutely has to be. We were also here in 1982). The same ambivalent tone is seen in a note from April 8th, 2001, by Slovenian veterans: "Bilo je lepo dokler je trajalo" (It was nice while it lasted; Vets from Slovenia). There are also many humorous inscriptions in Slovenian, such as the one that I quoted at the beginning of this section, or "Bravo Tito in vrni nam Brione!" (Bravo, Tito! And give us back Brijuni!; Žil, January 20th, 2000), or "Druže Tito! Tvoje ime mi još uvek omogućava besplatni taksi I nargile od Halba do Amona. Slava nesvrstanim! (Comrade Tito! Your name still lets me have free taxis and hookahs from Halba to Amman. Long live the non-aligned movement!; Peter, Ljubljana, May 1st, 2004). Very nostalgic messages with a more serious tone are usually also written by people from other parts of Yugoslavia that survived war. I came across many notes in which people long for the time of Tito as a time of peace and happiness. One of those is from March 24th, 2001:

Druže Tito, od kad si otišao nastao je kaos u našoj ljepoj domovini. Nije ko imao da sačuva tratstvo I jedinstvo naših naroda! Hvala ti što sin am poklonio tako zlatnu zemlju u koju smo živeli u slobodi, miru i jedinstvu. Neka ti je večna slava. Druže Tito mi ti se kunemo ada sa tvoga puta neskrenemo."

Comrade Tito, since you left, chaos has arisen in our beautiful country. There was nobody that could maintain the fraternity and unity of our nations! Thank you for giving us such a golden country in which we lived in freedom, peace, and equality. Let you rest in eternal glory. Comrade Tito, we vow not to leave your path!; Esad, Mirjana, Elvir, Kenad Melunović.

Such emotional messages in the visitors' book at the House of Flowers written by people whose lives changed for the worse after Tito's death, often radically, are not rare examples of individual memories that stand in total opposition to the official ones that mark Tito as a traitor. From this point of view, these messages are understandable. More difficult to understand are messages in the visitors' books written by young people that were born after Tito's death. Their existence might indicate another type of Tito cult emerging in the alternative space often growing into some kind of fashion and popular culture, especially among young people. Mitja Velikonja has termed the phenomenon of nostalgia towards Tito *titostalgia*, which is also the name of his brilliant book on that theme in which he studies nostalgia for Tito as a type of Yugonostalgia, and certainly as a phenomenon that has appeared as a counterpoint to the dictated official amnesia toward this period (Velikonja 2008: 24).

IN PLACE OF A CONCLUSION
PERSONALITY CULT VERSUS POP ICON, MEMORY VERSUS
COUNTER-MEMORY

In my conclusion, I first turn my attention once more to the destiny of Tito's cult after 2000, and also analyze the destiny of the House of Flowers and the Youth Museum in this period. Namely, apart from the understanding of *titostalgia* that Mitja Velikonja offers, the possible reading of new interest in Tito as a pop icon should be regarded in the framework of Adorno's conceptualization of the *industry of culture* and especially his argumentation of the *standardization* process. Namely, in 2010, the entire issue of the fashion magazine *FAAR* (*Fashion Art Magazine*, published in Belgrade) was devoted to Tito and titled *Tito Pop Icon*. This was followed by a fashion and art show with the same theme. Namely, fashion designers made their creations inspired by Tito and his wife Jovanka. Although not without criticism and irony, in this journal Tito is treated as an icon of popular culture in all the area of what was once Yugoslavia, as the "Elvis Presley of the Communist Eldorado." Young models dressed and posing like Tito (or as Young Pioneers), and skinny girls with haircuts and dresses as Jovanka, point to Tito as a pop icon, recalling Adorno's theory of *standardization* in the *industry of culture*, which is the process that equates all goods; this happens through the process of individualization of goods, which is merely the disguise through which everything—from thoughts and ideas, to materialistic things—loses individuality, being equated (Đurić 2011: 39). In the light of this theory, such a pop icon is emptied of meaning. This the personality cult of Tito, which, like any other cult of this type divinized and idealized, yields a cult of the pop icon that is divinized in the new context again, being sometimes a symbol of disapproval with contemporary ideological models, but also often an icon emptied of its concrete meanings.

In the context of this reflective attitude toward Tito, I also turn my attention once more to the way in which the former memorial to Josip Broz Tito works today. Namely, the May 25th Museum, which is located immediately next to the House of Flowers, has been used not only to present the Tito collection, but also as a space for various exhibitions, such as the October Salon, a yearly exhibition of visual arts, which has had an international character since 2004 (as well as many other exhibitions and musical festivals). In 2001 the museum was also used for the first time as a space for a theatre play. In cooperation with the Center for Cultural Decontamination, the play *The Warrior's Brothel* was performed twice. This theatre spectacle directed by Ana Miljanić is based on the texts of Miroslav Krleža (*Zastave* 'The Banners') and Ivan Čolović (the title of the play is also borrowed from his book), crucial for understanding war propaganda and ideology in Serbia during the 1990s. Raising the question of responsibility, this play combines elements of laughter, farce, and horror in a sense that corresponds to the idea of nostalgia by Svetlana Slapšak, who claims that if nostalgia lasts too long it becomes useless, and so it is necessary to displace it into the culture of laughter because it is the only way to give it constructiveness (2008).

However, in spite of all the efforts, the museum did not succeed in remaining independent after 2000. Against the will of the director of the Museum of Yugoslav History (who even made an official public announcement about her disagreement on it), the May 25th Museum served as the chapel in which the body of Slobodan Milošević (Pavičević 2008) was laid out for three days (March 16th–18th, 2006). In fact, this place was chosen for this purpose only after two other institutions refused their space: the Sava Center and the Museum of the Revolution, which at that time was located in the center of the city, near the parliament where Tito's body had been laid out after his death.



Fashion Show *Tito pop ikona*, held in Belgrade in 2010. Duška Jovanić, *FAAR* editor, and “Tito's Pioneers.”

In 2008 there was another attempt to turn the Museum of Yugoslav History into the Museum of Science. Fortunately, this initiative also failed. The May 25th Museum has continued to operate and hold various exhibitions related to Tito's life, striving to maintain critical position towards the Yugoslav past, and encouraging necessary further study of the period. Thus, the institution that once appeared as part of the state machinery for the production of memory fell apart and opened its space for the reconstruction and performance of different memories—not only a collective one, but also individual ones. Devoted once to cherishing the Tito cult, the May 25th Museum nowadays makes an effort to address this hero cult and Tito's time critically, holding not only exhibitions, but also seminars, conferences, and film programs not exclusively related to Tito, but opening its space to alternative cultural contents. By facing obstacles, the people that have been working in this institution used the space that was opened when its status was changed from central to marginal, and they succeeded in maintaining vitality and critical thinking. Hopefully, they will keep it so.

REFERENCES

- Brkljačić, Maja, & Sandra Prlenda (eds.). 2006. *Kultura pamćenja i historija*. Zagreb: Golden Marketing, Tehnička knjiga.
- Carlyle, Thomas. 1888. *On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes & Brothers.
- Đurić, Dubravka. 2011. *Diskursi popularne culture*. Belgrade: FMK.
- Freidenberg, Olga. 1997. *Poëtika syuzheta i zhanra*. Moscow: Labirint.
- Kirin Jambrešić, Renata. 2008. *Dom i svijet: o ženskoj kulturi pamćenja*, Zagreb: Centar za ženske studije.
- Konerton, Pol. 2002. *Kako društva pamte*. Belgrade: Samizdat B92.

- Kuljić, Todor. 2004. *Tito, sociološkoistorijska studija*. 2nd expanded ed. Zrenjanin: Gradska narodna biblioteka "Žarko Zrenjanin."
- Kuljić, Todor. 2012. Grob i moć – tanatosociološka analiza sahrana Tita, F. Tuđmana i S. Miloševića. *Sociologija, časopis za sociologiju, socijalnu psihologiju i socijalnu antropologiju* 54(4): 595–606.
- Manojlović Pintar, Olga. 2004. "Tito je stena." (Dis)kontinuitet vladarskih predstavljanja u Jugoslaviji i Srbiji XX veka. *Godišnjak za društvenu istoriju* 11(2–3): 85–100.
- Miloradović, Goran. 2007. Prah prahu: staljinistički pogrebni rituali – u socijalističkoj jugoslaviji. *Godišnjak za društvenu istoriju* 14(1–3): 83–106. Available at http://www.udi.rs/articles/g_miloradovic_2007.pdf, accessed April 20th, 2012.
- Pavićević, Aleksandra. 2008. "Sveta smrt" Slobodana Miloševića. In: Zorica Divac (ed.), *Kulturne paralele, svakodnevnna kultura u postsocijalističkom periodu*, pp. 147–156. Belgrade: EI SANU.
- Slapšak, Svetlana. 2008. *Jugonostalgija i smeh*. Available at <http://pecanik.net/2008/12/jugonostalgija-i-smeh>, accessed May 18th, 2012.
- Stanoeva, Elitzta. 2011. The Dead Body of the Leader as an Organizing Principle of Socialist Public Space: The Mausoleum of Georgi Dimitrov in Sofia. In Maren Behrensens, Lois Lee, and Ahmet S. Tekelioglu (eds.), *Modernities Revisited (= Junior Visiting Fellows' Conferences 29)*. Vienna: IWM. Online publication.
- Stevanović, Lada. 2009. *Laughing at the Funeral: Gender and Anthropology in the Greek Funerary Rites*. Belgrade: EI SANU.
- Velikonja, Mitja. 2008. *Titostalgija. Študija nostalgije po Josipu Brozu*. Ljubljana: Media Watch, Mirovni inštitut.

JOSIP BROZ TITO – NARODNI HEROJ ALI IZDAJALEC?

Prispevek se osredotoča na Josipa Broza Tita, na njegovo smrt in veličastni pogreb, na usodo njegovega mavzoleja, torej spomenika, ki so mu ga postavili, ko je bil še živ, ter na kult heroja, ki se je oblikoval ob njem. Avtorica analizira spremembe, ki so se zgodile v času nacionalnega prebujanja in trenj v jugoslovanskih republikah nekaj let po Titovi smrti, pri čemer se najbolj posveti dogodkom v Srbiji. Ugotavlja, da so raziskovalci pogosto obravnavali politični pomen in vpliv, ki ga imajo javni pogrebi vplivnih posameznikov. Znano je tudi, da so spomeniki kot del javnega prostora ena izmed ključnih komponent pri oblikovanju kolektivnega spomina. S povezovanjem teh dveh tem avtorica razišče, kakšna je bila usoda Titovega mavzoleja, tj. Hiše cvetja in Muzeja 25 maj. Ugotavlja, da se v stanju teh spomenikov in muzejev odražajo potrebe in poteze političnih elit v času, ko se je heroj in oče naroda prelevil v sovraznika in izdajalca. Poseben poudarek prispevka je na procesu heroizacije, ki se je začela še v času Titovega življenja. Po njegovi smrti se je kult heroja najprej preobrazil, kasneje je skoraj povsem izginil, nazadnje pa se je njegov lik spet pojavil v novi pojavnosti in to v obliki pop ikone.

Dr. Lada Stevanović. Institute of Ethnography, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Knez Mihailova 36, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia, da.stevanovic@ei.sanu.ac.rs