

Črtomir Lorber

*Department of Archaeology
Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana
crtomir@t-2.net*

Predrag Novaković

*Department of Archaeology
Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana
predrag.novakovic@ff.uni-lj.si*

Internationalisation as a long-term strategic project of the post-war renewal of the Yugoslav archaeology (1950–1971)*

Abstract: Archaeology in the countries which belonged to Yugoslavia (1918–1991) was mosaic of different traditions. The development of archaeology was greatly affected by political changes in the last 150 years; all of them required significant re-contextualisation of the discipline and its practice. The renewal of archaeology after the Second World War, in the context of Socialist Yugoslavia, acted on both levels, in building-up the existing national (republican) archaeological disciplinary frameworks, and in forging ‘new’ common Yugoslav archaeology. Key role in this process played the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia, established in 1950 as the principal coordinating scholarly organisation in the country. The Society’s immediate task was to create conditions for the cooperation of all archaeologists in the country, including the international promotion of the (new) Yugoslav archaeology. Despite having less than 100 archaeologists in the 1950s, the Society designed very ambitious program of ‘internationalisation’ (e.g. exchange of publications, participation at the international conferences, grants, invitation to foreign scholars, special publications published exclusively in foreign languages etc.) which proved highly successful in a very short time. The peak of these endeavours was participation at the 1st International Congress of Slavic Archaeology in Warsaw (1965) and organisation of the 8th Congress of the UISPP in Belgrade (1971); the event which could not be organised without intensive promotion and networking of the Yugoslav archaeologists in the international academic arena in the 1950s and 1960s.

Keywords: internationalisation, archaeology, Yugoslavia, Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia, international cooperation, renewal of archaeology

* We want to thank Rajna Šošić Klindžić and Darko Periša for helping us with some hard-to-find but valuable information. This paper is based on the paper entitled *Internationalisation of the Yugoslav archaeology after the Second World War* presented at the EAA 2020 Virtual Annual Meeting (session: *Archaeologists, Sites and Methodologies: professional and personal networks in mid-20th century Europe*).

Introduction

In this paper, we will focus on international communication and collaboration as strategically planned and implemented activity. We are fully aware of many possible perspectives in studying the internationalisation, which itself could develop in many different forms, from spontaneous and ad hoc personal communication to highly programmed and coordinated projects. However, there are always some pre-existing conditions which act upon various forms of internationalisation from the background, and to a certain degree determine its principal pathways and patterns. Concerning the latter, we find the case of Yugoslav archaeology especially interesting. In the first half of the 20th century, the people and nations united in Yugoslavia went through three wars (Balkan wars 1912–1913, First World War 1914–1918, Second World War (1941–1945)). Each of them radically changed the states, their political regimes, and, last but not least, also the relationships between the nations within Yugoslavia¹ and with neighbouring nations. Each time considerable adaptation and re-contextualisation of new political and social realities were needed. In the Yugoslav national archaeologies, these political and social changes were well reflected; however, in their development, these archaeologies sometimes took other, maybe unexpected turns. The ways how the internationalisation of archaeology developed reveal some of them, and supplement our understanding of not solely the nature of the project of the post-war renewal of the Yugoslav archaeology (and its national/republican archaeologies), but also to our understanding of the larger-scale processes and trajectories in post-war Yugoslavia.

Background

Archaeology in Yugoslavia did not have a single disciplinary tradition prior 1918; the first programmatic texts which defined the structure and disciplinary goals of the united ‘Yugoslav’ archaeology emerged in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Elsewhere we have remarked that ‘Yugoslav’ archaeology ultimately did not develop as ‘distinct’ national archaeological school but, instead, it developed as a well-organised network of national archaeologies that retained many of their specificities within the former Yugoslav federation (Novaković 2008).

¹ In the period of the Yugoslav Kingdom (1918–1941) three nations, Serbs, Croats and Slovenes were officially recognized. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (1945–1991) was composed of six republics (Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro and Macedonia). There were also two autonomous provinces within Serbia – Vojvodina and Kosovo.

Before the First World War, around 1900, the archaeology was far more developed in Slovenia and Croatia, which both belonged to the Austrian-Hungarian Empire. In this time, archaeology in Serbia was making its initial steps, despite having the National Museum and Serbian archeological society, while countries, such as Montenegro, Northern Macedonia and Kosovo, had practically no local archaeological traditions. Bosnia and Herzegovina is a particular case. There, archaeology was introduced as an Austrian colonial project in the process of 'Europeanization' of this, mostly Muslim country, annexed to Austria after the Berlin Congress in 1878. In general, archaeology in the former Ottoman-ruled countries started to develop systematically only after the end of the Ottoman rule in the process of a massive 'modernisation' aimed at radical social and cultural transformation pursuing the 'European' (i.e. western) political, cultural and economic models. Despite a rather rich tradition of various travellers of the 18th and 19th centuries, some of them were also interested in antiquities of the Balkans, the first attempts of local antiquarian research emerged in the context of national liberation, as 'antiquarian/archaeological' contributions to the developing national histories. In Serbia (today Vojvodina excluded), Bosnia and Herzegovina, and partially in Montenegro, the systematic establishment of archaeological discipline and its institutionalisation started in the last decades of the 19th century, while in Northern Macedonia and Kosovo only after 1918, or even later, after 1945, if we look at their 'national' frameworks. (Novaković 2014). In contrast, Slovenia and Croatia had a centuries-long tradition of the antiquarian, archaeological and art history activities, which uninterrupted existed from the Renaissance period onwards. The regions of Dalmatia and Istria, being well culturally integrated into Venetian state for more than three centuries, had one of the richest antiquarian traditions in Europe (see in Novaković 2014). In the continental regions of Slovenia and Croatia, the 'Italian-type' of antiquarian research was mixed with equally rich Central European 'Landeskunde' tradition which developed in the Enlightenment period. These longstanding traditions and relatively well developed middle class and urban life led to an early formation of the museums already in the first half of the 19th century, and soon also to the introduction of archaeology in the university curricula (e.g. in Zagreb in the 1870s), and relatively effective heritage protection organisation established in 1850 – The Imperial and Royal Central Commission for Research and Conservation of Art and Historical Monuments (*Kaiserlich-königliche Zentral-Kommission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Kunst- und Historische Denkmale*).

Archaeology in the Austro-Hungarian context was well institutionalised. In general, each province had its provincial museum and provincial office for heritage protection and scholarly networks and societies associated with them. These networks further boosted the development of local institutions (i.e. municipal museums and collections). As Austro-Hungarian Empire was by far the

most ethnically mixed state in Europe, the ‘international cooperation’ existed already within the same state – in local and provincial ‘archaeological’ institutions worked Slovenes, Croats, Czechs, Austrians, Germans, Italians, Slovaks, Serbs, Jews... They were citizens of one state, but the conditions for communication and cooperation between provinces were not that much different from the true international collaboration. In addition to this, there also existed strong networks of different scholarly societies, with those from Vienna (e.g. imperial societies) positioned at the top, acting as centres of excellence and bringing together scholars from different parts of the Dual Monarchy and other countries in Europe.

With the establishment of Yugoslavia in 1918, archaeology did not become ‘Yugoslav’ yet. The formation of a new, unified state, was undoubtedly conducive for the creation of some fundamentals, e.g. common legislation related to culture, science, education, etc., structuring so the scientific work, responsibilities and activities of museums, university studies and the protection of archaeological heritage. But this process was slow and, as it turned out, also of very limited range and effects. In the new state ultimately lacked adequate organisation capable of implementing an efficient institutional structure, for example, similar to that which proved efficient in Austrian-Hungarian state. In addition to this, in economic, financial, industrial and many other developmental aspects, the new Yugoslav Kingdom, was very much behind the former Austro-Hungary.

Nevertheless, despite unfavourable conditions, already in the early 1920s emerged the first attempts of overcoming fragmented situation in archaeology with the initiative for a professional society of archaeologists in Yugoslavia. Three meetings of the most prominent archaeologists, art historians, classical philologists and historians were held in 1922 (Dobrna, Belgrade) and 1923 (Ptuj) to discuss the possibilities of joint archaeological society and further collaboration (Lorber 2019, 916–918). But, again, the initiative soon faded away.² In the whole period between 1918 and 1941 not one ‘Yugoslav’ archaeological institution was founded, no joint archaeological journal established, nor did develop any archaeological ‘centre of excellence’ which could attract scientists from different parts of the country. In addition to this, scientific meetings, national or international, which could provide bases for the development of collaboration, were very few.

In contrast to such a situation within the country, a relatively large number of the Yugoslav scholars were members of the international scholarly societies or networks. They mostly came from the ranks of university professors and leading archaeologists in the largest museums in the country (Ljubljana, Zagreb,

² There was also another initiative, by M. Vasić (1927), who proposed the establishment of the Yugoslav institute of archaeology (*Arheološki institut Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca*) but this was more his personal view and not an official proposal.

Ptuj, Belgrade, Sarajevo), who also frequently published their works abroad. Concerning this, it is important to note, that large majority of the archaeologists in Yugoslavia, active between 1918 and 1941, graduated outside the country, mostly in Vienna, Prague, and Munich, and retain their ties with their Alma mater and colleagues from the student times (Novaković 2012). Such cooperation was, obviously, most developed with traditional Austrian (and German) partners. Another important 'channel' of international collaboration were those scholars who, before 1918, worked in Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, but continued their careers after 1918 outside Yugoslavia (e.g. Anton Premerstein, Carl Patsch). And, last but not least, some extraordinary archaeological sites also attracted foreign scholars such were the cases of Salona in Croatia (Einar Dyggve, Denmark); Starčevo, Serbia (Vladimir Fewkes, USA); Ptuj, Slovenia (Rudolf Egger, Austria); Sarvaš and Vučedol in Croatia (Rudolf Schmidt, Germany); Ohrid area, N. Macedonia (Johann von Reiszitz and Wilhelm Unverzagt, Germany, Bogdan Filov, Bulgaria). The Yugoslav sites were also regularly on the program of several Excursions of the Danubian Archaeologists, organised by the German Archaeological Institute in the 1930s (see more in Schnurbein 2001). However, for much of the international cooperation for the period between 1918 and 1941, it can be said that it stemmed from personal initiatives and networks, and not from frameworks institutionalised in Yugoslavia.

The Second World War and transformation of Yugoslavia into a Socialist state, again in its own way, determined further pathways of development of both, the national frameworks of archaeology and the Yugoslav archaeology as such. The period between 1945 and 1950 was crucial in many respects since it was in these five years when the basis for 'new' Yugoslav archaeology was paved. The first, and by all means, the most important fact is that archaeology was established as a 'home' discipline in N. Macedonia, Montenegro and Kosovo with their 'national' museums as pivotal institutions which boosted also research, education and establishment of local museums. This transformative process, especially in terms of institutional and conceptual development, was fully synchronised with the process of a general modernisation of the state, itself renewed after 1945 on radically different (i.e. Socialist) basis, and ruled by the Communist party. However, in 1948, a rupture with the Soviet bloc triggered substantial societal and political changes in Yugoslavia in the next few decades. The country was gradually opening to the west, introducing a more liberal political and economic system. And indeed, the reforms since 1965 transformed the economy into a sort of 'market socialism' (Curtis 1992, 129) while the state itself became highly federalised.

In archaeology, very indicative of a new 'progressive' era were the changes in 'archaeological demography'. For various reasons, very few scholars who were active in the 1920s and 1930s continued their careers after 1945 (one

third approximately) and they, generally did not occupy the leading positions. It was the new generation which took the role of revitalising and reforming the discipline and creating ‘new’ Yugoslav archaeology as well. Probably the best illustration of the magnitude of changes can be seen in the number of new institutions established in the first decade after the war (61), out of which 52 were regional and local museums.³ In other words, while in 1941 there were some 43–45 institutions in all Yugoslavia, in 1956, their number reached 98–100. It is hard to estimate all the effects of this infrastructural ‘boom’, but one thing was sure, archaeology was about to make a giant leap in the next couple of decades.

Strong attempts were also made in forging the ‘Yugoslav’ archaeology where the principal role played the newly established Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia (*Arheološko društvo Jugoslavije*), as the only official and representative scholarly society of archaeologists in the country. According to that time Yugoslav governance, the ‘scientific’ societies were considered bodies to which certain governmental powers were transmitted for coordinating the distribution of funds, developing medium- and long-term plans, monitoring the outcome of programs, etc. For this reason, these societies were funded mainly by the federal government and had quite considerable executive powers in the organisation of disciplines and their working plans. These societies were also the principal ‘*gesprächpartners*’ with governmental bodies responsible for culture and science.

The number of participants at the Inaugural Meeting of the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia in 1950 was very high for the time – about 110 (Novaković 2014, 229), clearly showing the unprecedented weight given to archaeology and to the urgent task of reforming it. At this meeting, the principal programmatic documents adopted were the Resolution on the state of archaeology in the country and Program (see in Korošec 1950). Detailed presentation of these documents exceeds the scope of this paper; what primarily interests us here is internationalisation to which this meeting paid substantial attention.

Programmed internationalisation

However, concerning the ‘internationalisation’ one thing needs to be shortly addressed first – the issue of the ‘internal internationalisation’. We should not ignore the fact that the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia was established only three decades after the First World War and five years after the Second World War. In those wars, the nations united in Yugoslavia either fought on the opposite sides (WW I) or experienced ferocious civil war and inter-ethnic cleansing (WW II). One should not ignore the burden of personal biographies,

³ Figures reported for the individual republics are taken from Novaković (2014).

experiences and political choices of archaeologists during these wars when reflecting the conditions of the revitalisation of archaeology in Yugoslavia after 1945. This aspect requires a particular study, and we would not open this issue here. However, it is essential to bear it in mind when speaking about the renewal of archaeology in Yugoslavia, its international collaboration included.

Stitching-back the integrity of Yugoslavia after the Second World War was a giant task. It was made possible not only by the strong authoritarian rule of the Communist Party but also by its large symbolic capital of leading what was virtually the only non-nationalist liberation movement during the war. Moreover, due to considerable poverty and developmental lag of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, most of the population genuinely hoped for better economic and social perspectives, the new social order planned to build. On the other hand, also the principal creators of the new world order (USA, UK, USSR) did not want further disintegration of the Balkans immediately after the war, what was the goal of the Central Axis.

Until 1948, Yugoslavia, in international relations, very much followed the politics of the Soviet Union, not only because of ideological reasons but also because the Soviet Union was a strong ally concerning the disputed borders with Italy and Austria. The relationships with western countries were much weaker and frequently confronting. Regarding these initial post-war years, there is not much to be said about international cooperation in archaeology. The only case we have found is recorded in the interview with Milutin Garašanin who remembered the visit of the Soviet scholars (Boris Rybakov, Sergei Tokarev and Archikhovskiy) to Miloje Vasić in Belgrade in 1946 (Babić and Tomović 1996, 22). The Soviet archaeologists were probably members of a larger Soviet state delegation to discuss the cooperation of these two states, and this visit yielded no particular results. After the Yugoslav rupture with the Eastern countries in 1948, it took almost two decades to renew the cooperation with the Soviet Union.

At that time, other tasks were simply more urgent – the revitalisation of archaeology in the existing institutions, the establishment of new institutions, restoration of monuments destroyed in the war, education of the sufficient number of archaeologists etc. Another impediment to the development of international collaboration in these years were the experiences with German and Italian archaeology during the war. In Serbia and Slovenia, the German *Ahnenerbe* was quite actively engaged in searching for proves of the ‘Indo-Germanic theories’, in Germanizing certain territories planned to be annexed to the Third Reich (eastern Slovenia) or simply plundering the heritage and shipping it to the Reich (see more in Dow 2018). Similarly, the Italian archaeology, markedly fascist, promoted their own chauvinist and racist attitudes towards Slavic population living in Istria and Dalmatia (Novaković 1999).

The rupture with Stalin in 1948 radically changed the situation. After being virtually isolated by the Soviet bloc, Yugoslavia, still in large economic crisis and with much of its public infrastructure destroyed, turned to the west, to the individual countries and international organisations.⁴ However, by 1950, the first consolidation of archaeological infrastructure was completed, and that year the newly established Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia held its inaugural meeting in Niška Banja in Serbia. Internationalisation was among the Society's priorities. The immediate measures included the re-engagement in the projects which existed from before 1941 (e.g. *Corpus vasorum antiquorum*, corpora of Greek and Roman inscriptions, *Tabula Imperii Romani* etc.).

The most crucial step with long-lasting effects was the decision to publish monographs, catalogues and papers with extensive summaries in foreign languages, to invest more resources for the acquisition of foreign literature, and to intensify the exchange of publications with foreign institutions. In 1953 a journal *Archaeologia Iugoslavica* was established with the explicit aim to publish papers in foreign languages exclusively (in German, French, later in English) about the current achievements in the archaeology of Yugoslavia. Another important decision was to set up a system of grants for international conferences, study visits and specialisations abroad, what was necessary regarding the poor state of the academic institutions in the country and significant lack of experts. One should not ignore the fact, that until mid-1960 travelling to foreign countries required various permissions and recommendations (and similarly for those travelling to Yugoslavia). The society, very early, also issued regulations for the participation of foreign archaeologists in research in Yugoslavia.⁵

Today, one may wonder how such great executive powers were given to the Yugoslav Archaeological Society. The fact is, that Yugoslavia, in the period between the late 1940s and early 1960s was, ideology leaving aside, governed in a pretty bureaucratised way. All parts of the system, scholarly societies included, were given tasks and responsibilities in such a system of governance and were also given executive powers and funds accordingly. In other words, such transmission of 'governmental' powers to scholarly societies was effective of governing in such system; acknowledged societies were the exclusive and representative organisations responsible for inter-institutional coordination. To this, one should also add, that the Communist party also 'filtered' the nominations for leading functions in institutions or acknowledged societies. The early post-war years were also the period of the state-planned economy, and the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia was one of the organisations responsible for the 'archaeological' plan on the federal level.

⁴ For example, it is in this context when Yugoslavia joined the UNESCO in 1950.

⁵ Zaključki 1. zasedanja Arheološkega sveta FLRJ, 19. in 20. december 1952; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, ARHIV ZADJ, TE 17.

The internationalisation in science and culture was, according to that time, top-to-bottom process. Most frequently, a general framework, developed at high governmental levels, was required for planning the international activities. There was not much, if at all, space for the initiatives of individuals or individual institutions. Most often, such general frameworks were provided by bilateral agreements between Yugoslavia and other countries, signed by the Yugoslav Council for Science and Culture (*Savet FNRJ za nauku i kulturu*).⁶ By 1953 such agreements were signed with ministries of science or foreign ministries, and academies and science councils from Austria, Western Germany, Switzerland, Italy, UK, and the USA. Agreement with France was signed in 1957, with Poland in 1958. In early 1960 followed the agreements with Czechoslovakia and German Democratic Republic. The agreement with the Soviet Union was signed in 1965. The reasons for the 'late' signing of the agreements with countries from the Soviet bloc were obvious. It took some time after the Stalin death, to gradually re-establish the political relationships between Yugoslavia and the 'Eastern' countries.

For the implementation of these agreements, the (Yugoslav) Council for Science and Culture normally authorised several academic institutions in the country. In the domain of archaeology, these were the principal archaeological institutions in the individual republics (archaeological institutes at the academies of sciences and arts, national museums), and the Yugoslav Association of Archaeologists. The Society, indeed, soon signed additional international agreements and issued regulations for exchange of experts and their selection. In the plans of the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia, special attention was paid to the attendance at what was perceived at the time as crucial archaeological conferences (e.g. Seminars of Slavic archaeology; Congresses of the Slavic archaeology, Moscow 1961, Permanent Council for Prehistoric Archaeology, Prague 1959 etc.).⁷

⁶ The full name of this body was Council for Science and Culture of the Government of the Federative Popular Republic of Yugoslavia (*Savet za nauku i kulturu FNRJ*). The Council was established in 1950 and the Council's President was ranked as minister. Other members of the Council included the President of the Committee for Cinematography of the Government of FNRJ and the Republican Ministers for Education and Culture. In 1953 the Council was dissolved and its tasks transferred to the to the Secretariate for Education of the Federal Executive Council (i.e. government) (Hofman 2006, 22–23).

⁷ Poročilo o delu Koordinacijskega odbora arheologov FLRJ in Arheološkega sveta FLRJ od maja 1950 do oktobra 1953; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, ARHIV ZADJ, TE 17; Zaključki s sestanka Uprave Arheološkega društva Jugoslavije, Sarajevo 1955, SI AS 1175, Arhiv republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 17; Zaključki s sestanka Uprave Arheološkega društva Jugoslavije – Split 1956, SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 17; Zaključki Sestanka srednjeveške sekcije – Celje 1957, SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 17.

In such a system, the degree of 'freedom' in international cooperation was much larger on higher levels of the system. Despite that some 100 archaeological institutions were established in the first two post-war decades, the access to grants and funds for international cooperation was rather limited. It was mostly the scholars from the archaeological institutes, universities and national museums who had priority. Archaeologists in regional and local institutions were not excluded, but it was much more difficult for them to get funding. Besides the limited resources, there was also another reason – hierarchical structure of the organisation of archaeology, copied to some extent from the Soviet model. At the top of the pyramid were research institutes to whom the principal responsibility and resources for the strategic development of their scientific fields were delegated, these institutes also conducted major research projects, employed 'top' researchers, and published the principal scientific journals and series etc. Other institutions were seen as 'auxiliary' – the universities were mostly responsible for the education of future scientists, museums for keeping the objects and assisting in heritage protection on their 'territories', and institutes for heritage protection for protecting it.⁸ This hierarchy reflected very well in the distribution of grants and other resources needed for international cooperation and, later, also when joint international projects started to emerge. Until the 1960s, it rarely happened, if at all, that foreign partners collaborated directly with local archaeological institutions. The latter may have been incorporated in such projects, but mostly as partners of the principal national institutions. Such a hierarchical organisation and distribution of tasks and responsibilities undoubtedly promoted the seniority in terms of 'weight' of the sending institution. Since the available grants were not that many, the priority was given to the scholars working on themes, project or programs which were considered of higher importance for national archaeologies; in practice, the regional or local research agendas could not compete.

Considerable changes appeared in 1961 when the Yugoslav Council for Science and Culture was transformed into monitoring body, and a great deal of the international activities became financed from the republican budgets and not from the federal one. The new way of financing, generally speaking, increased

⁸ With regard to the institutes for heritage protection it should be noted that until 1960s they usually did not have regional branches, just republican, and that archaeological staff there was limited to few people. There existed also the Federal Institute for the Protection of Monuments, between 1950 and late 1970s, which was not a typical institute for the protection of cultural heritage but more an institution connecting the principal scholars and professionals in conservation practice from all republics. After 1945, the public service in heritage protection was effectively organized on the level of individual republics.

resources for internationalisation, and opened more opportunities for a broader spectrum of institutions within the individual republics and, not to be forgotten, this happened in the time when restrictions to free travel to and from abroad were lifted (1962).

However, parallel with this 'state-coordinated' international cooperation, through time, increased also more spontaneous forms and activities, which significantly supplemented the 'official' programs. Again, being in a more favourable position, it was the academic archaeologists who were the first to be engaged in this kind of collaboration. Many of them had their works published in foreign journals, and they worked on topics which were interested in the wider scholarly community, they were receiving foreign scholars at home etc. Again, the archaeologists from the non-academic domains, who were much more embedded in their local environments, generally, could not so easily develop their personal international networks. For them, the situation started to change in the 1960s, with the already mentioned transfer of funding for international cooperation to republican levels, and with a gradually increased presence of foreign teams in different parts of Yugoslavia.

Who were the partners?

Taking into account the political circumstances in the 1950s it is hardly a surprise that the major 'archaeological' partners and contacts in the 1950s were coming from the west, from Western Germany in particular. Despite the negative experiences with German archaeology during the Second World War (as such they were explicitly characterised in the official documents of the Inaugural Congress of the Yugoslav Archaeological Society), Western Germany, already from the early 1950s became the principal destination for exchange of publications and scholars. There are several reasons for this, and also for certain 'amnesia' concerning the German archaeology.

In the first place, the conceptual model for the future development of the Yugoslav archaeology, as envisaged by the leading post-war Yugoslav archaeologists was, to put it colloquially, the 'German' way (i.e. highly positivist model of cultural history). All previous traditions of archaeology in Yugoslavia were deeply rooted in the ways the archaeology was done in Central Europe in the first half of the 20th century where several German and, before 1918, also Austrian institutions were considered as centres of excellence. In such 'landscape of knowledge' the national archaeologies in South-Eastern Europe, pre-Yugoslav and Yugoslav, traditionally acted as disciplinary periphery (Novaković 2012, 51–54) which followed or emulated the conceptual

developments in centres of excellence. Despite the bitter experiences with the abuses of German Nazi archaeology before and during the Second World War, the principal conceptual apparatus after 1945, although being somewhat 'purified' of the most speculative nationalist and racists concepts, largely remained the same in almost all European national archaeological schools, 'Eastern' and 'Western'.

Almost a century-long tradition of the conceptual dominance of German archaeology, and generally shared perception of cultural history as the only 'obvious' or 'natural' way of archaeological interpretation of past, were simply too strong to look for the matching alternatives. There was no other model available at the time in European archaeology. The Marxist approach would have been desired by the principal ideologists and politicians of that time in Yugoslavia. Still, it was far from being developed and operative enough to compete with the cultural history approach. In addition to this, there were no Marxist-educated archaeologists in the field of archaeology; all of them were raised in culture history and continued promoting it. It is here, where one should also look for the reasons for the 'amnesia' mentioned above, and which in many cases turned into 'amnesty'. As far as we are aware of, in the 1950s and 1960s, the Yugoslav archaeologists were not engaged in any polemic at the international conferences over abuses of archaeology during the war. In fact, the amnesia was a general European phenomenon, probably much larger in the domain of natural and technical sciences. Still, also archaeologists carefully avoided such discussions on the international scene almost until the 1990s.

To illustrate the 'landscape of partners' of the Yugoslav archaeology in the 1950s, we will present three cases for which we have collected enough empirical data: exchange of publications, grants for studying abroad and participation of Yugoslavia in the international organisations and conferences.

Exchange of publications

If we look at the exchange of publications, the figures reveal a very symptomatic situation. In the Figures 1 and 2, we have summarised the 'exchange geography' of the journal of *Arheološki vestnik* (published by the Institute of Archaeology at the Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts), which was established in 1950 as the central scientific journal in archaeology in Slovenia. After seven years only, the journal was exchanged with more than 150 institutions from 38 countries worldwide. Though this is an example limited to one institution only, it illustrates well not only the trend but the magnitude as well.

If we had considered other principal archaeological journals from Belgrade, Zagreb, and Sarajevo, for which we do not have empirical data at present, there would be additional growth in the number of partner institutions. Still the geographic distribution of the exchanged publications would remain very similar.



Figure 1. The countries exchanging their archaeological publications for *Arheološki vestnik* (1950–1957)

The effects of such an exchange were many and long-lasting. Not only that in nearly 150 institutions worldwide the Slovene (and Yugoslav) archaeology was promoted, but also the Library of the Archaeological Institute in Ljubljana, received annually more than 100 volumes of foreign journals and monographs what significantly contributed to the development of the archaeological discipline. About the importance of this aspect, speaks the fact that in the early years the Yugoslav archaeological journals frequently published a list of publications received through the exchange, and, an increasing number of reviews of foreign publications. In this way, they informed the wider scholarly audience which new (foreign) publications they had acquired, while the reviewing of foreign publications (and of the Yugoslav publications reviewed abroad) keep them actively engaged in the discussion on internationally important topics.



Figure 2. Graph presenting number of cities of institutions exchanging their publications with *Arheološki vestnik*. Total numbers (countries: 39; cities: 137; the estimated number of institutions: 150; in some cities (e.g. New York, Berlin, Vienna) several institutions were exchanging their publications)

Grants

The grants and exchange of scholars in the 1950s seem not very numerous in terms of absolute figures. Still, then, if taking into account that there were not more than 100 archaeologists in the whole country, of whom some 30 worked in academia (universities, archaeological institutes, and national museums), the

grants for studying or researching abroad were not that rare at all. In fact, most mid- to high-level scholars could access them.⁹ If we look at the grantees in the 1950s and 1960s, it is possible to conclude that selection of the grantees had much more to do with practical and financial circumstances, and not with ideological ‘filtering’. One need to bear in mind that there was a great demand for grants in all sciences in that time Yugoslavia, and archaeology simply was not on equal terms with, for example, engineering and technology, or medicine; the country simply lacked experts in all fields.

Considering the grants, the earliest case of archaeologists going to study abroad dates to 1947, when Irma Čremošnik, assistant curator at the National Museum in Sarajevo, went to Prague for two months to work on her PhD thesis.¹⁰ Soon followed the other archaeologists of the younger generation. In 1950 out of 28 scholars from Yugoslavia, who received grants for specialising abroad, two were archaeologists, Milutin Garašanin went to Vienna, while Branko Gavella to Paris (Milosavljević 2020, in press). In 1953, Alojz Benac received an invitation of Gerhard Bersu to visit the Roman-Germanic Commission in Frankfurt (Schnurbein 2002, 13). Considering the study grants in the 1950s and early 1960s the German archaeological centres, and Vienna, are again at the top of the list of destinations.¹¹

On the (Western) German side, the most engaged in re-establishing ties with the Yugoslav archaeology was the Roman-Germanic Commission in Frankfurt, and especially its Director Gerhard Bersu. Bersu was an almost ideal person for this task. He was intensively engaged in the archaeology of South-Eastern Europe since the late 1920s, he regularly participated at the archaeological excursions of the ‘Danubian’ archaeologists, and he had widely spread network of colleagues and collaborators across the whole Europe already prior the Second World War. Moreover, due to his anti-Nazi background – because of his Jewish origin he was deposited from the office in the Roman-Germanic Commission in 1935 and, subsequently, went to exile to the UK in 1937 – Bersu was a perfect candidate for becoming one of the principal archaeological directors in Germany who could re-establish broken ties with the international scholarly community, Yugoslavia included. It was probably on his initiative (and powers he had as the Director of the Roman-Germanic

⁹ At the Roman-Germanic Commission only, there were 13 Yugoslav scholars until 1956, and 11 between 1956 and 1958 (Schnurbein (2001, 268).

¹⁰ Irma Čremošnik, Životopis (nedatiran), personalna mapa. Arhiv Referata za doktorski študij Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani.

¹¹ E.g. Milutin Garašanin (Vienna 1950), Stane Gabrovec (Tuebingen 1956–1957), France Stare (Munich, Marburg on Lahn 1954/55), Zdravko Marić (Vienna 1959), France Leben (Heidelberg 1964–1966), Zoran Dimitrijević (Heidelberg 1962–1963), Alojz Benac (Greece 1952, Frankfurt 1953, Münster 1965, visits to Germany also in 1952 and 1954), Zdenko Vinski (Göttingen 1963), France Osole (Kiel 1960s).

Commission), the Commission started to intensify the relationships with the Yugoslav archaeology since the beginning of the 1950s. With the assistance of Vladimir Miložčić, a former student at the University of Belgrade who moved to Munich after the war, he made the first contacts with the new generation of the Yugoslav archaeologists and soon launched a program of guest visits. Schnurbein (2001, 268) records that the Yugoslav archaeologists were indeed the largest national group among the guests of the Commission in the 1950s. Bersu, in 1953, sent Wolfgang Dehn to a visit to Yugoslavia to strengthen the ties.¹² Soon after his return to Germany, Dehn arranged visits of several Yugoslav scholars.¹³ Another visit from Germany came in 1956 when Franz and Eckehart Schubert made their study trip in the framework of their project about early metallurgy (Schnurbein 2001, 268). The endeavours of the Roman-Germanic Commission were well paid – between 1953 and 1958, there were 24 scholar visits from Yugoslavia.¹⁴

Other countries were much less present.¹⁵ As it seems, in the 1950s, there were almost no grantees who would study or specialise in the countries in the Eastern Bloc; short visits to conferences yes. From the first generation of the post-war scholars, the real ‘globetrotter’ was Božo Škerlj, professor of anthropology at the University of Ljubljana since 1946, who also taught at the Department of Archaeology. Škerlj, in the period of six years (1952–1958), studied and researched in the USA, UK, France, Switzerland, Middle East and Egypt, Sweden, Poland and Czechoslovakia (sic!).

Apart from the similar conceptual agenda and shared archaeological topics, the reasons for such ‘grant geography’ were also very much practical. The west-

¹² Originally, it was Bersu who was planned for this trip, but instead of him went Dehn. The trip was organized by joint efforts of the Commission and the Yugoslav side (we could not get the information which body was involved) which covered Dehn's expenses of travels within Yugoslavia. At this occasion, Dehn visited all major Yugoslav centres (universities, national museums) and gave several lectures.

¹³ For instance, in 1955 Draga and Milutin Garašanin, and Alojz Benac participated at the excavation of Heuneburg; Stane Gabrovec, Borivoje Čović, France Leben and Radoslav Galović participated at the same excavations in 1956, in the same year Čović also participated at the excavations at Feddersen Wierde. There was also exchange in the opposite direction, Franz Schubert participated at the M. Garašanin's excavation of Pavlovac in 1954 and the Alojz Benac's excavation in Zecovi in 1955.

¹⁴ „Die Sonderrolle, die Jugoslawien im Ostblock spielte, wird hier besonders augenfällig.“ (The special role of Yugoslavia had in Eastern blow was obvious.) (Schnurbein 2001, 268).

¹⁵ E.g. Branko Gavela (Paris 1950), France Osole (London 1960s), Savo Tutundžić (Kairo 1959 – 1960); Grga Novak (Research excursion in Egypt 1963), Jaroslav Šašel (Graz 1960s, Princeton 1969).

ern countries provided much more opportunities for exchange of scholars through standardised programs of exchange (e.g. Humboldts scholarships etc.), and, last but not least, the (West) German centres of excellence and scholarly networks, were places to go to profound the knowledge 'required' for modernisation of the Yugoslav archaeology. Also, among the incoming scholars, those from Western Germany were most numerous. That the grantees were not 'filtered' on the ideological basis or, better to say, not on this base only, speaks the fact that among the receivers of the grants were also scholars who could hardly be considered as supporters of the Communist Party.¹⁶ Instead, another pattern can be discerned, that of the seniority. The most dominant group are the scholars with already considerable scientific reputation or were planned to specialise and develop specific topics which were considered especially important for further development of archaeology, either in their respective republics or in Yugoslavia.

Another necessary mean for developing the internationalisation was smaller grants aimed at participation at international conferences and meetings. We were not able to make a comprehensive list of smaller grants in the 1950s and 1960s, simply because they were quite numerous and many of such visits are not adequately recorded. However, from various sources (bibliography of the principal archaeological journals, obituaries, Festschriften, etc.) it could be argued, that all major academics from Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia, who graduated before 1955, more or less regularly participated on the international scientific meetings. The number of such grants only increased through time. We do not have enough data to present these activities in more detail, but the pattern should not differ much from the pattern of the study grants. It is also clear that the participation of the Yugoslav archaeologists was already notable in the 1950s and only increased in the following decades. So far, the earliest case we know is the attendance of Jože Kastelic, Mihovil Abramić and Milutin Garašanin at the 3rd Congress of the UISPP in Zurich in 1950 (Garašanin 1951). Especially well-integrated seem to be the Palaeolithic specialists, Srečko Brodar, professor of Quaternary Sciences at the University of Ljubljana (also teaching at the Department of Archaeology) who regularly attended the meetings of the Hugo-Obermeier Gesellschaft (1952 in Regensburg, 1954 in Reutlingen, 1955 in Saarbrücken). In addition to this, S. Brodar in 1955, within the program of the 5th meeting of this society, organised an excursion to the Palaeolithic sites in Slovenia, which was probably the first excursion of foreign scholars to Yugoslavia after the Second World War.¹⁷ Brodar, in 1953, also participated at the INQA (Association Inter-

¹⁶ In this sense the most illustrative case is that of Zdravko Marić who was imprisoned for 6 months in 1949 as 'politically suspicious' (Dautović and Lalević 2009, 267), and yet, ten years later, he was given study grant for Vienna.

¹⁷ On S. Brodar's papers and discussions at Hugo Obermeier Gesellschaft's meetings see Freund (1954, 1956a, 1956b, 1957).

national pour l'Etude du Quarternaire) meeting in Rome. Another interesting early example was Josip Korošec's attendance in Varese, Italy, in 1954, on the conference on prehistoric pile-dwellings (also attended by G. Childe). Through time the presence of the Yugoslav archaeologists increased at the meetings of the UISPP (*Union Internationale des Sciences Pre- et Protohistorique*),¹⁸ UIAS (*Union International Archéologique Slave*), AIEGL (*Association Internationale d'Epigraphie Grecque et Latine*), INC (*International Numismatic Council*), AIAC (*Associazione Internazionale di Archaeologia Classica*) and some other.

Under 'smaller grants' we have also considered participation in excavations in foreign countries. The earliest such case we have found in our bibliographic survey was Marinko Gjivoje, student of agronomy and archaeology at the University of Zagreb. Together with another student of archaeology from the University of Zagreb, he joined the archaeological camp of the International Student Committee in Denmark, at the excavations of the Viking fortress at Aggersberg in 1950 (Gjivoje 1950).¹⁹ While the case of students was more by chance, the examples of programmed cooperation were the excavations at Heineburg and Feddersen Werde. There in the period of two years (1955–1956) participated Alojz Benac, Draga and Milutin Garašanin, Borivoje Čović, France Leben, Stane Gabrovec, Radoslav Galović (see footnote 12 and Schnurbein 2002, 13).

However, there is also another pattern emerging from the brief survey of participants on the international conferences and receivers of study grants. In the 1950s and 1960s dominated the grantees (in terms of their number and frequency of visits) from Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the republics with most developed archaeology in that period. Much rarer were grantees from Macedonia, Montenegro and Kosovo. The primary reason for this pattern should be looked in the fact that in the sense of national/republican frameworks archaeology in Macedonia, Montenegro and Kosovo was institutionalised only after 1945.

¹⁸ Especially active on the UISPP congresses was Zdenko Vinski who attended at least four of them: 5th Congress in Hamburg (1958), 6th UISPP Congress in Rome (1962); 7th Congress in Prague and 8th Congress in Belgrade (1971), while Milutin Garašanin was a member of the UISPP Council in mid-1950s.

¹⁹ In his brief note on this camp, Gjivoje (1950) did not record the name of the second student, only that he was from the same university. It could be that this was Stojan Dimitrijević. Nives Majnarić Pandžić (2000, 19), in her bibliography of Stojan Dimitrijević, wrote that he, as a student participated at the excavations of at Aggersborg a year later, in 1951, what might be a mistake. Concerning these excavations, Gjivoje brings very interesting information, that the official language in this camp was Esperanto (sic!). Later, Gjivoje became one of the most renown Yugoslav experts in Esperanto, and also published a book on archaeology in this language – Marinko Ĝivoje, *Interesa arkeologio*, SAT 1973).

Membership in international organisations

Parallel with the increase in other domains of international collaboration also increased the membership of the Yugoslav archaeologists in international organisations and foreign scholarly societies. We have already seen that S. Brodar became a member of the Hugo-Obermeier Gesellschaft in 1952, while Josip Korošec was the first 'new' Yugoslav archaeologists to become the member of the German Archaeological Institute (1953); in 1956 we found him also among the organisers of the Council for International Slavic archaeology in Krakow. In 1957, France Osole, professor of quaternary geology, later also teaching at the Department of Archaeology, was a member of the Honorary Committee at the 80th anniversary of the Henry Breuil in 1958. Milutin Garašanin was a member of one of the UISPP Council in 1956.

The membership of foreign scholars in the Yugoslav scholarly societies was also relatively common. Maybe not so much in the early 1950s but through time their number increased. At the academies of sciences and arts, foreign scholars usually could not become full members, but corresponding members only.²⁰ Similar statutory arrangements also existed in cases of the 'official' scholarly societies, such as the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia. Such societies could also award foreign scholars with honorary membership. In the document from 1968, which lists corresponding members of the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia, among 38 corresponding and honorary members, there are 26 archaeologists from 12 countries.²¹ Except for Greece and Albania, the majority

²⁰ Until the 1970s, there were two foreign archaeologists members of the academies of arts and sciences in Yugoslavia, both nominated before the Second World War: Eynar Dyggve from Denmark became the Corresponding Member of the Serbian Academy (1940), later also of Croatian (late 1940s) and Slovene (1958) academies, and Rudolf Egger, Austria, Corresponding Member of the Serbian Academy (1934).

²¹ Six countries were with three members: W. Germany (Kurt Bittel, Wolfgang Dehn, Wolfgang Krämer), Italy (Luigi Bernabo Brea, Massimo Palottino, Giuseppe Bovini), Bulgaria (Vasil Mikov, Dimitar Dimitrov, Krastju Mijatev), Romania (Dumitru Berciu, Emil Condurachi, Jon Nestor), Czechoslovakia (Jan Filip, Jan Eisner, Josef Poulik) and Soviet Union (Nikolay Merpert, Boris Rybakov, Vladimir Blavatsky). Two members came from Austria (Karl Kromer, Rudolf Egger) and Poland (Józef Kostrzewsky, Witold Hensel), and one member was from the USA (R. Enrich), France (Georges Daux) and Hungary (Amalia Mozsolics). Since in the same list there are also 12 Yugoslav archaeologists, it seems logical that foreign scholars were awarded corresponding membership while the Yugoslavs received the honorary membership. Unfortunately, there are no exact dates when foreign scholars became corresponding members, so it is challenging to distinguish between earlier (1950s) and later corresponding members (1960s). Due to political reasons (split with Soviet bloc), we assume that the archaeologists from the Eastern countries were awarded mostly in the 1960s.

of them came from the neighbouring and other Central European countries (20 out of 26), clearly showing the ‘shared’ archaeology.

The presence of foreign research teams in Yugoslavia is of somewhat later date. It can be followed from the late 1960s onwards when the Yugoslav archaeology, archaeologists and sites, became much more known on the international scene. Also, the Yugoslav institutions increased their capacities and competencies to act as quality partners. And, at the end of the day, when free crossing of the border was made possible.

The first (symbolic) heyday of the two decades of planned endeavours in raising the level of internationalisation was the 1st Congress of Slavic Archaeology in Warsaw in 1965, while the grand finale represented the 8th UISPP Congress organised in Belgrade in 1971. The initiative for the UIAS Congress in Warsaw was put forward at the 1st Seminary on Slavic Archaeology held in Krakow in 1957, to which the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia was, for the first time, invited as a collective. The Society’s representative was Josip Korošec who brought back a standing invitation to the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia to attend the future seminars, planned to be organised annually. At the Seminar in Krakow it was proposed to form an international organisation, similarly organised as the UISPP, the most renowned international archaeological organisation at that time, established in 1931 in Berlin. The idea was to organise the first international congress of the UIAS already in 1961 in Moscow, followed by the second congress in Warsaw five years later.²² However, for some reasons, the Moscow congress was cancelled, and the 1st Congress of the Slavic Archaeology was held in Warsaw in 1965.²³ Before the Warsaw congress, there were another two seminars, in 1958 in (East) Berlin with the general topic “Slavic tribes in historical sources between 7th and 10th Centuries”, and in Czechoslovakia (on several locations) in 1959, with the general topic “Hillforts and towns between 7th and 10th Centuries”. The representatives of the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia attended both seminars. For the Berlin Seminary, joint Yugoslav presentation was prepared while for the seminary in Czechoslovakia, each republic prepared individual presentations.²⁴

The Warsaw congress was attended by a very large number of scholars, also by present-day standards – about 500 coming from all Slavic and several other

²² Zapisnik sestanka srednjeveške sekcije ADJ – Celje 1957; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 17.

²³ UIAS had six more congresses and intermediary meetings: Warsaw 1965, Berlin 1970, Szeged 1971, Bratislava 1975, Sofia 1977, Kiev 1985. The Yugoslav archaeologists regularly attended the UIAS Congresses. UIAS ceased to actively exist in the mid-1990s.

²⁴ Zapisnik sestanka srednjeveške sekcije ADJ – Celje 1957; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 17.

European countries (Sulimirski 1967, 212–213). The Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia sent quite a numerous delegation led by Mirjana Ljubinković, Janko Belošević and Danica Dimitrijević. Altogether, there were six Yugoslav papers presented by Đurđe Bošković, Mirjana Ljubinković, Radivoje Ljubinković (Serbia), Zdenko Vinski (Croatia), Pavle Mijović (Montenegro) and Boško Babić (Macedonia).²⁵

Alongside the scientific program, the Congress also included an exhibition “The Culture of the Slavs in the Early Middle Ages”, displayed at the State Archaeological Museum in Warsaw, to which contributed all Slavic countries, and also Germany, Hungary and Romania (Sulimirski 1967, 214). The Yugoslav part, entitled “Material Culture of the Slavs from the 6th to the 13th Century in Yugoslavia”, was, according to our knowledge, the first Yugoslav archaeological exhibition displayed abroad. It was quite an enterprise to make it. The preparations for the exhibition were coordinated by the Medieval Section of the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia, which selected the objects from a number of the museums in Yugoslavia,²⁶ and then organised their copying and shipping to Poland. The Yugoslav exhibition was presented in Warsaw from 14 November 1965 to 14 March 1966 and received a special reward from the organisers.²⁷ That this Congress was highly prioritised also speak some ‘diplomatic gestures’. The Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia bestowed the copy of the portrait of the medieval Serbian king Vladislav, painted at the monastery at Mileševa, to the National Museum in Warsaw, while the Croatian Section of the Society bestowed the copies of the Višeslav’s baptistery and the King Branimir’s inscription. The exhibition was later moved to Podgorica (Titograd) in 1966, where it was put on display during the 7th Meeting of Yugoslav Archaeologists in Herceg Novi.

The grand finale in internationalisation planned by the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia followed six years later, in 1971, with the organisation of the 8th Congress of UISPP in Belgrade. The initiatives for closer cooperation with the UISPP was put forward already in 1957 by the Prehistoric Section of the Archaeological Society. In 1958 a special delegation, led by Alojz Benac,

²⁵ Poročilo o delu Srednjeveške sekcije ADJ med dvema kongresoma – *Informator* 18: 5–7. More on the Warsaw meeting see also in Korošec (1967).

²⁶ In making of the exhibition participated three sections of the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia (Medieval, Slovenian and Croatian sections, Archaeological section of the Society of Museum Workers of Vojvodina (Arheološka sekcija Društva muzejskih radnika Vojvodine), National Museum in Sarajevo, National Museum in Ljubljana, Archaeological Museum in Skopje (*Informator* 1966, 6).

²⁷ Poročilo o delu Srednjeveške sekcije ADJ med dvema kongresoma, *Informator* 18: 5–7.

was sent to the meeting of the International Council of Prehistorians in Prague.²⁸ Following the UISPP recommendations, the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia established first the National Commission of Prehistorians and Protohistorians which was presided by the President of the Prehistoric Section of the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia. Members of the National Commission were representatives of the principal national archaeological institutions and also the individual (Yugoslav) members of the UISPP.²⁹ The National Commission *de facto* acted as a liaison between the UISPP bodies and Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia. The first significant project of the National Commission was the organisation of the international exhibition on the Neolithic in the Balkans. To this end, in 1962, a special organising committee was appointed, but due to the lack of resources, the exhibition was ultimately cancelled.³⁰

Cooperation with the UISPP intensified through time, and the National Commission was invited to send a delegation to the 7th UISPP Congress held in Prague (1966).³¹ Encouraged by great success at the Warsaw UIAS Congress, the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia to run for the organisation of the 8th Congress of the UISPP.³² By 1968 it became clear that Yugoslavia was selected as an organiser of the 8th UISPP Congress in Belgrade. Special National Organisational Committee was established, presided by Grga Novak, Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts (today Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts).³³ Members of the Committee were archaeologists from all Yugoslav republics. At the Congress, altogether 21 papers of the Yugoslav archaeologists were presented (thirteen from Serbia, two from Slovenia, four from Croatia and two from Macedonia) (Novaković 2015, 247). In many respects, the 8th UISPP Congress

²⁸ Zaključki sestanka Uprave Arheološkega društva Jugoslavije – Sombor 1959; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 19. In the minutes of this meeting we find the term “International Council of Prehistorians” (*Mednarodni svet prazgodovinarjev*), which is probably colloquial, and refers to the Permanent Council of the UISPP or, what is also possible, Executive Committee of the UISPP.

²⁹ Zaključki sestanka Uprave Arheološkega društva Jugoslavije – Beograd 1960; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 19).

³⁰ Oblikovanje Organizacijskega odbora za organizacijo mednarodne razstave o neolitiku na Balkanu (1962) – SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 22. Trivia: The international guests from Egypt, Sudan and Turkey were explicitly invited to this exhibition under the special request by the Federal Council for Science (Savezni naučni svet), which, however, withdrew the funding.

³¹ Poročilo o sestanku Prazgodovinske sekcije v Puli leta 1964 – *Informator* 3/10: 5–7.

³² Zaključki sestanka Prazgodovinske sekcije ADJ v Novem Sadu leta 1965 – *Informator* 4/13: 1–3.

³³ Grga Novak later presided over the whole 8th UISPP Congress.

in Belgrade was a great success for the Yugoslav archaeology, which for the first time had a chance to abundantly demonstrate its overall achievements and archaeological heritage to the global audience. This meeting can also be symbolically considered as the accomplishment of the strategically planned internationalisation coordinated by the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia, and ultimately the conclusion of the renewal stage.

The year 1971 indeed marks a climax of the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia and the endeavours of the archaeologists leading the renewal of the discipline in the first two post-war decades. But, almost at the same time when the Society so triumphantly accomplished its major tasks, it ceased to exist in the form established in 1950. In 1972, the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia was transformed into an Association of the Yugoslav Archaeological Societies, following general federalisation of the Yugoslav state. After this transformation, the Association was left with much less executive powers and funding.³⁴ The powers and funds shifted to the republican (national) archaeological societies, which considerably grew in their membership and activities in the 1960s, the international collaboration included. Thus, new circumstances and conditions for the development of the archaeological discipline were created, and the 'old' centralised style of management and coordination could not anymore sustain the development of archaeology in Yugoslavia. The dispersal of the executive powers and funding positively affected the internationalisation. In the 1970s and 1980s significantly increased the number of local institutions and individual archaeologists engaged in international projects and networks, pursuing their specific agendas, which were not coordinated from one place. Ultimately, the degree of internationalisation in a decade or two increased for an order of magnitude compared to the 1950s and 1960s.

Concluding remark

The intention of this paper was not to present a detailed corpus of empirical evidence regarding the process of internationalisation of archaeology in Yugoslavia, but mostly to shed light on the dominant patterns in this process. We are fully aware that many individual cases of grants, study trips, participation at conferences, publication exchange or other forms of international interactions have escaped us. Nevertheless, we hope that we have revealed the principal trends and the background logic which largely determined them.

³⁴ The remaining funds were almost completely aimed at publication of *Archaeologia Iugoslavica*, *Arheološki pregled* and some monograph series published by the Association of the Yugoslav Archaeological Societies.

References

- Babić, S. and M. Tomović. 1996. *Razgovori o arheologiji*. Beograd: 3T.
- Dautović, A. and O. Lalević. 2008/2009. „Bibliografija radova Dr. Zdravka Marića“. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine*, Arheologija n.s. 50/51: 267–270.
- Dow, J. R. 2018. *Heinrich Himmler's Cultural Commissions: Programmed Plunder in Italy and Jugoslavia*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Garašanin, M. 1951. „III kongres praistoričara i protoistoričara u Cirihu“. *Starinar* n.s. II: 287–289.
- Gjivoje, M. 1950. „Arheološko logorovanje međunarodnog studentskog komiteta u Danskoj“. *Historijski izbornik* III: 459–460.
- Hofman, I. 2006. „Savet za nauku i kulturu vlade FNRJ 1950–1953“. *Arhiv, časopis Arhiva Srbije i Crne Gore* 1–2: 21–28.
- Freund, G. 1954. „Bericht über den Kongress der Hugo Obermaier-Gesellschaft 1952 in Regensburg“. *Quartär* 6: 59–75.
- Freund, G. 1956a. „Der 3. Kongreß der Hugo Obermaier-Gesellschaft 1954 in Reutlingen und die anschließende Exkursion in die Schweiz“. *Quartär* 7/8: 205–221.
- Freund, G. 1956. „Der 4. Kongreß der Hugo Obermaier-Gesellschaft 1955 in Saarbrücken und die anschließende Exkursion nach Südfrankreich“. *Quartär* 7/8: 222–240.
- Freund, G. 1957. „Der 5. Kongreß der Hugo-Obermaier-Gesellschaft 1956 in Regensburg und die anschließende Exkursion nach Österreich und Jugoslawien“. *Quartär* 9: 195–221.
- Korošec, J. 1950. „Prvo posvetovanje jugoslovanskih arheologov“. *Zgodovinski časopis* IV: 212–215.
- Korošec, J. 1967. „1. Mednarodni kongres za slovansko arheologijo v Varšavi“. *Zgodovinski časopis* XXI: 256–259.
- Lorber, Č. 2019. „Uvod u proučavanje Arheološkog društva Jugoslavije (1949–1991)“. *Etnoantropološki problemi*, n.s. 14 (3): 909–936.
- Majnarić Pandžić, N. 2000. *Stojan Dimitrijević*. Novi Sad: Nevkoš.
- Milosavljević Monika. *Dvostruka senka. Uvođenje kulturno-istorijskog pristupa u srednjovekovnu arheologiju*. (in press)
- Novaković, P. 2008. „Experiences from the margins“. *Archaeological Dialogues* 15 (1): 36–45.
- Novaković, P. 1999. „O fašizmu in arheologiji na Primorskem in v Istri“. *Annales, ser. hist. sociol.* 9: 491–501.
- Novaković, P. 2012. „The ‘German School’ and its influence in the national archaeologies of the Western Balkans“. In *Scripta in honorem Bojan Djurić*, edited by B. Migotti, P. Mason, B. Nadbath and T. Mulh, 51–71. Ljubljana: Zavod za varstvo kulturne dediščine Slovenije.
- Novaković, P. 2014. *Historija arheologije u novim zemljama Jugoistočne Evrope*. Sarajevo: Univerzitet u Sarajevu.
- Schnurbein, S. 2001. „Abriß der Entwicklung der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission unter den einzelnen Direktoren von 1911 bis 2002“. *Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission*, Band 82: 137–291.

- Schnurbein, S. 2002. Vorwort des ersten Direktors der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des deutschen Archäologischen Instituts / Riječ prvog direktora Rimsko-germanske komisije Njemačkog arheološkog instituta. *Godišnjak* 30. Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja: 12–13.
- Sekretariat Srednjevekovne sekcije ADJ. 1966. Izveštaj o radu Srednjevekovne sekcije ADJ u periodu između dva Kongresa. *Informator* 18: 5–7.
- Sulimirski T. 1967. “The First International Congress of Slavonic Archaeology (Warsaw, September 1965)”. *The Slavonic and East European Review* Vol. 45, No. 104: 212–215.

Archive sources

- Irma Čremošnik, Životopis (nedatiran), personalna mapa. Arhiv Referata za doktorski študij Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani.
- Zaključki 1. zasedanja Arheološkega sveta FLRJ, 19. in 20. december 1952*; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 17.
- Poročilo o delu Koordinacijskega odbora arheologov FLRJ in Arheološkega sveta FLRJ od maja 1950 do oktobra 1953*; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 17.
- Zaključki s sestanka Uprave Arheološkega društva Jugoslavije – Sarajevo 1955*; SI AS 1175, Arhiv republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 17.
- Zaključki s sestanka Uprave Arheološkega društva Jugoslavije – Split 1956*; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 17.
- Zaključki sestanka Prazgodovinske sekcije ADJ – Split 1956*; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 17
- Zaključki Sestanka srednjeveške sekcije – Celje 1957*; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 17.
- Zaključki sestanka Uprave Arheološkega društva Jugoslavije – Sombor 1959*; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 19.
- Zaključki sestanka Uprave Arheološkega društva Jugoslavije – Beograd 1960*; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 19.
- Oblikovanje Organizacijskega odbora za organizacijo mednarodne razstave o neolitiku na Balkanu (1962)*; SI AS 1175, Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 22.
- Seznam častnih in dopisnih članov ADJ* – Arhiv Republike Slovenije; AS 1177, Arhiv ZADJ, TE 17.

Črtomir Lorber

Odeljenje za arheologiju
Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Ljubljani

Predrag Novaković

Odeljenje za arheologiju
Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Ljubljani*Internacionalizacija kao dugoročni strateški projekat
posleratne obnove jugoslovenske arheologije (1950–1971)*

Arheologije zemalja koje su u periodu između 1918. i 1991. bile u sastavu Jugoslavije predstavljaju mozaik različitih tradicija. Na njihov razvoj znatno su uticale političke promene u poslednjih sto pedeset godina koje su zahtevale značajnu rekontekstualizaciju discipline i njene prakse. Obnova arheologije u socijalističkoj Jugoslaviji posle Drugog svetskog rata delovala je na dva nivoa – u izgradnji već postojećih nacionalnih odnosno republičkih sistema arheologije i u stvaranju „nove“ sinteze zajedničke jugoslovenske arheologije. Značajnu ulogu u tom procesu imalo je Arheološko društvo Jugoslavije, osnovano 1950. godine, zamišljeno kao zajednička i glavna stručna organizacija za koordinaciju arheološkog rada i nauke u zemlji. Među najurgentnijim zadacima društva bilo je uspostavljanje adekvatnih uslova za arheološki profesionalni rad i međusobnu saradnju svih jugoslovenskih arheologa i arheoloških institucija, uključujući i međunarodnu saradnju i promociju jugoslovenske arheologije u inostranstvu. Iako je Arheološko društvo Jugoslavije u 1950-im brojalo manje od 100 članova, program internacionalizacije (razmena publikacija i štampanje domaćih publikacija na stranim jezicima, učestvovanje na međunarodnim naučnim skupovima, usavršavanje domaćih arheologa u inostranstvu, gostovanja stranih stručnjaka) bio je vrlo ambiciozno planiran i vrlo uspešno sproveden u relativno kratkom vremenu. Vrhunac planirane izgradnje međunarodne saradnje predstavlja učešće jugoslovenskih arheologa na 1. Međunarodnom kongresu slovenske arheologije u Varšavi 1965. godine i organizacija 8. Kongresa UISPP u Beogradu 1971. godine. Oba događaja bila su rezultat intenzivne višegodišnje promocije jugoslovenske arheologije i stvaranja mreža na međunarodnom nivou tokom 1950-ih i 1960-ih godina. Naša namera u ovom radu nije bila predstavljanje svih oblika i okolnosti internacionalizacije jugoslovenske arheologije već ukazivanje na logiku tog procesa i glavne obrasce njegovog delovanja u prve dve decenije revitalizacije arheologije u Jugoslaviji.

Ključne reči: internacionalizacija, arheologija, Jugoslavija, Arheološko društvo Jugoslavije, međunarodna saradnja, obnova arheologije

*Internationalisation comme projet stratégique
à long terme du renouveau d'après-guerre
de l'archéologie yougoslave (1950 – 1971)*

L'archéologie des pays ayant fait partie de la Yougoslavie entre 1918 et 1991 présente une mosaïque de traditions différentes. Leur développement a été influencé d'une manière importante par les changements politiques dans les 150 dernières années demandant une recontextualisation notable de la discipline et de sa pratique. Le renouveau d'archéologie en Yougoslavie socialiste dans la période après la Deuxième Guerre mondiale agissait à deux niveaux : la construction des systèmes archéologiques nationaux, c'est-à-dire républicains, déjà existants et la création de la « nouvelle » synthèse d'archéologie yougoslave commune. Le rôle important dans ce processus appartenait à la Société archéologique yougoslave, fondée en 1950 et conçue comme une association professionnelle commune et principale pour la coordination de la science et du travail archéologiques du pays. La production de conditions adéquates pour le travail professionnel archéologique et la coopération mutuelle de tous les archéologues yougoslaves et institutions archéologiques ainsi que la coopération internationale et la promotion de l'archéologie yougoslave à l'étranger, figuraient parmi les devoirs les plus urgents de la société. Bien que la Société archéologique yougoslave ait compté moins de 100 membres dans les années 50, le programme d'internationalisation (échange de publications et impression de publications nationales en langues étrangères, participation aux colloques scientifiques internationaux, perfectionnement des archéologues yougoslaves à l'étranger, visites d'experts étrangers) était ambitieusement planifié et réalisé avec beaucoup de succès dans une période relativement courte. La participation des archéologues yougoslaves au Premier congrès international d'archéologie à Varsovie en 1965 et l'organisation du 8^e congrès d'UISPP à Belgrade en 1971 présentent la culmination de la création de coopération internationale planifiée. Ces deux événements étaient le résultat de la promotion continue de l'archéologie yougoslave qui durait plusieurs années et de la création du réseau international pendant les années 50 et 60. L'objectif de ce travail n'est pas tellement de présenter toutes les formes et circonstances d'internationalisation de l'archéologie yougoslave, mais plutôt d'indiquer quels étaient la logique de ce processus et les modèles principaux de son action dans les deux premières décennies de la revitalisation de l'archéologie en Yougoslavie.

Mots-clés : internationalisation, archéologie, Yougoslavie, Société archéologique yougoslave, coopération internationale, renouveau d'archéologie

Primljeno / Received: 6. 9. 2020.

Prihvaćeno / Accepted for publication: 15. 9. 2020.