February 2014

The Disintegration of Yugoslavia: An Analysis of Globalization Effects on Union and Disintegration of Yugoslavia

Una Bobinac

Bowling Green State University, unab@falcon.bgsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/irj>

Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#), and the [International and Area Studies Commons](#)

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Recommended Citation

Bobinac, Una (2014) "The Disintegration of Yugoslavia: An Analysis of Globalization Effects on Union and Disintegration of Yugoslavia," *International ResearchScape Journal*: Vol. 1, Article 1.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25035/irj.01.01.01>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/irj/vol1/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at ScholarWorks@BGSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in International ResearchScape Journal by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@BGSU.

The Disintegration of Yugoslavia: An Analysis of Globalization Effects on Union and Disintegration of Yugoslavia

Una Bobinac

ABSTRACT

The purpose of writing this project is to identify the influence globalization had in two most important parts of Yugoslavia: its formation as well as its fragmentation. The effects of this ongoing process range from direct intervention in the breakup of Yugoslavia to more indirect influence in its formation. This research strongly centers on previously established and well accepted theories of globalization to illustrate the consequences globalization had on Yugoslavia specifically. Throughout the research, the concept of critical globalism emerges as the prevailing method in the attempt to explain the events that took place in this region. The findings and conclusions may prove to be a useful in the interpretation of Yugoslavia's history not through a region-centric lens but through a more global understanding.

Globalization, as it has been discussed, has a polarizing effect: either being the answer to world struggles or an agent of cultural erosion. This has been illustrated in what are today seven separate states: (Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Montenegro, Macedonia, and Kosovo [which was not an original republic, but a province]) in the Balkans where once existed one: Yugoslavia. In this region, globalization joined the nation-states together in 1943 and in the 1990's was an agent of separation. From a mix of three distinctly different languages and three different religions, a national adhesion was present for more than 40 years. During that time, Yugoslavia and its citizens enjoyed prosperity unmatched in most of Europe and a distinct collectivist culture was present, regardless of ethnicity or other formal distinctions. Beginning in the late 1980's to the early 1990's turmoil was beginning to surface that would become irreparable separation not only of borders but of people as well. Though the events that led to the tumultuous breakup of Yugoslavia are still relatively fresh, and not enough time has passed for all to objectively reflect upon, both internal power struggles as well as international pressures

and interferences caused (indirectly or directly) the breakup of Yugoslavia. Globalization in its first mass-effect after World War II and Yugoslavia's president, Josip Broz Tito, brought the peoples of Yugoslavia together through necessity. After the dissipation of the previously unifying global forces, the death of Tito, and rising internal ethno-nationalist sentiments, Yugoslavia broke apart. In the following pages we will look at the dual effects of globalization on Yugoslavia (both direct and indirect) in an effort to understand its process of union and later fragmentation. I will try to prove that in the process of union, global forces played an indirect role and local forces played a more direct role while in the balkanization of the Balkans, both global and local forces were equally important and destructive players.

In the following pages, we will look at the events in Yugoslavia in two parts: the unification and formation of the SFRY in the context of post-World War II globalization and the disintegration and consequences following the disintegration also in the context of globalization. I will be using previously established and generally well-accepted social theories in order to explain how a strongly bonded nation came to exist from previous ethnic tensions as well as try to explain how that same nation came to return to the previous unrest, war, and seemingly permanent tension all in response to globalization as well as internal changes. The union of Yugoslavia was a mix of local and global forces, as was the disintegration. However, the direct intervention of globalizing forces in the latter, reinforced with local tensions, is what ultimately resulted in the Yugoslav Wars and the fragmentation of Yugoslavia in the 1990's.

In this analysis of the occurrences in the union and fragmentation of Yugoslavia, I will employ discourse analysis to enhance the understanding of the interactions of the responsible actors.

Discourse analysis, the study of social interactions through language, and particularly in the context of power relations, is a good qualitative method of writing on the topic of Yugoslavian union and disintegration because it will highlight the power struggle between the global powers against the internal powers (especially under Tito). With respect to the union, discourse analysis will be useful in the examination of the USSR versus USA power struggle as well as their influences against Tito's power, which came to coexist very well in the SFRY. Tito used the power relations of the two giants to his advantage. In the context of Yugoslav disintegration, discourse analysis will help analyze the power relations of the global forces (NATO, USA, EU) which had a hand in the break-up and the internal powers, particularly those of the JNA (Yugoslav National Army) and other anti-separatist groups. This examination will culminate in the power struggle of traditionally strong nations (like USA) against the now weak ex-Yugoslav republics, especially in the global scope.

Discussions involving globalization greatly depend on the view of the speaker. In the examination of the events which took place in Yugoslavia, I will present it in the globalist view of globalization which contends that globalization is inevitable and vital. Within the general agreement of globalists, there is also a distinction: that of optimist globalists and pessimist globalists. The optimist see globalization as a process that raises living standards and spreads democracy (el-Ojeili,14). In the following analysis of this paper, the optimistic globalists will be represented by the outside influences on Yugoslavia (namely the USA) because the USA's role in the disintegration of the SFRY was under the name of global integration and the spread of democracy and capitalism. The pessimistic globalists, who believe globalization is destructive, see it as a process of homogenization that breeds inequality and violence (el-Ojeili, 14). This

view will be represented from the point of view of intellectual elites of the past SFRY and current ex-republics who see the fragmentation of the SFRY as a consequence of western-led globalization.

For the purposes of this paper (pertaining to this region), we will consider modern, wide-spread globalization as having begun at the culmination of the Second World War in 1945. From this year, globalization processes (in the areas of economics, politics, and culture) have magnified in speed and intensity, affecting all areas of the globe, not excluding Yugoslavia. The agents of these changes due to globalization (both exogenous and endogenous and ranging from a recession to ethno-centrism) will later be discussed in detail. Economic and political globalization had an earlier introduction in Yugoslavia than did cultural globalization, coming in full force only after the 1970's and close to the political existence of this state. Economic globalization, which is the most prevalent sphere of globalization, is an increasing interdependence of the economies of the world to create a stable, functional global economy. This globalization, however, has adapted an Americanized, neoliberal economic system model and has embraced free market capitalism, trade agreements, and other factors of economic (global and national) policy. The implementation of this economic global arrangement has not only resulted in near-disaster in countries that were not ready for it (as was the case with 1980's Yugoslavia), but has also contributed to a rising wealth gap world-wide (Amin, 218). Political globalization has manifested differently from economic globalization in that traditional political power (at least in the global sphere) of nation-states being primary actors has partially transferred to supranational entities (el-Ojeili, 97). The effects of political globalization on Yugoslavia have had a wide range: from exogenous international intervention to endogenously led fragmentation.

Cultural globalization, which has come to be the most talked about and the most “feared” has had a profound effect on the remnants of the Yugoslav republics and had truly begun to take root only after formal disintegration. This type of globalization however has had a seemingly paradoxical effect. On one side, the culture has become more westernized while simultaneously, there have been cultural eruptions which seem to want a return to the times of the SFRY.

Globalization, through all the possible areas it encompasses, has had a profound effect on Yugoslavian unification and fragmentation both from within and without.

I began to look at globalization and its effects in the years following World War II as it indirectly caused the union of Yugoslavia and the formation of the SFRY. Although Yugoslavia, as we have defined it, had begun to exist out of seeming response to outside pressures, the establishment of a common or similar identity of the “southern Slavic” people had existed previously. To understand how this very important component came to be the glue that held the people together and that Tito would use as a call to union, we must understand certain historic events and their impact on this region.

The identity of a culture is a means of defining one’s self in both an inclusive and exclusive way; it is “how we view ourselves, what we see as central in what makes us “us” and how we see ourselves against others” (el- Ojeili, 149). What this meant for Yugoslavia was a clear line of what made the southern Slavs different from the Hungarians, Albanians, Slovaks, and Romanians as well as a clear line of what made Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, and Bosnians, and other ethnic groups similar to each other. Despite a geographic proximity and language similarity, the first time a distinct national consciousness post-Ottoman Empire was born was during a time of

occupation and the awakening of the movement “Young Bosnia”, which ended in the assassination of Franz Ferdinand. For the first time, the southern Slavs were beginning to be self-aware and from the perspective of the occupying Austro-Hungarian Empire, “in large circles, more and more the thought was growing that Serbia, as a dangerously nationalistic revolutionary nest, needed to be destroyed” (Corovic, 699). The aftermath of World War I brought with it the first union of diverse people of this region under the name of “the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes”. The history of union through identity is important to establish a precedent but also will be important as I continue to discuss how this collective identity evolved from this, to a stringent, collectivist culture, and finally to a metamorphosis of globalization’s impact on Slavic identity.

The consolidation of Yugoslavia, as stated, was a result of both global and local powers. To better understand this in relation to Yugoslavia, I used the modernization theory as discussed by Jan Pieterse. Although Pieterse talks about his interpretation of modernization and development theory to set a framework for his own theory which he calls critical globalism, his interpretations of these processes is useful in the analysis and explanation of the events that took place in Yugoslavia. In the final discussion of the consequences of the balkanization of Yugoslavia, we will again return to Pieterse and more directly to his own before mentioned theory. Through the reading of development theory as examined by Pieterse, we see a parallel but alternative development arising in the union of Yugoslavia, an idea that I will later re-visit. Modernization as discussed by Pieterse and as how I have adopted it into this framework incorporates both endogenous change and exogenous change (though exogenous change is still considered secondary to endogenous change). Within the context of endogenous change, “social

differentiation, rationalization, universalism, achievement and specificity” are considered and the “spread of capitalism, industrialization through technological advancement, westernization, and nation building” are considered in the context of exogenous change (Pieterse, 551). In the remainder of this section, I will analyze the endogenous and exogenous changes that created the SFRY.

Undoubtedly the most important exogenous change for arguably the whole world (World War II) was also the most important deciding factor in the formation of Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia had itself participated in World War II (some parts on the side of the Axis powers and some parts on the side of the Allied powers), and was led to victory by the leadership of the Partizan faction leader, Josip Broz who would later come to be better known as “Tito”. After the formation of the opposing NATO and Warsaw Pact member countries, most European states felt global pressure to choose sides. Yugoslavia, under the guidance and rule of Tito, chose to participate in and lead the Non-Aligned Movement out of necessity and out of desire to not capitulate to either the USA's or the USSR's pushes to follow their specific economic and political ideals. This dual, two-pronged political and economic globalization pushing from both sides forced a united Yugoslavia into existence by virtue of exigency. Tito brought to light the similarities of the Southern Slavs while highlighting the differences between them and those of the surrounding nations to unify a previously battered region.

Tito and thereby Yugoslavia was able to maintain cohesion both from within and from without due precisely to its status as a middle-ground ideology. Yugoslavia functioned as a very strong semi-periphery country whose importance lay in the political sphere. The push of western

capitalism increased in intensity with each passing year after the Second World War and this exogenous influence “assigned as it were a specific economic role, but the reason is less economic than political” (Wallerstein, 405). Aside from this important capacity as a middle stratum between the core and the periphery, Yugoslavia also adopted a role as mediator and hybrid of the two most prevalent ideological and economic systems: that of the USA and the USSR. The SFRY became a cross-breed of two opposing ideologies and incorporated a piece of both, though strategically did not adopt nor conform fully, yet maintained enough similarity to ameliorate both the east and the west. From this we see that the conditions of the outside world manufactured Yugoslavia as it came to exist.

Internal (or endogenous) changes also greatly shaped Yugoslavia, and also shaped its future fragmentation. The change with the most impact in this sphere was Tito's remaking of the internal structure of Yugoslavia in two very important areas: the culture and the economic system. First, Tito realized that the mix of ethnicities, languages, and religions created an unstable atmosphere, and therefore urged and sometimes forced the adoption of a new identity: that of being Yugoslavs only. This meant an abandonment of previous identification by ethnic means, and a more secular society where religion was discouraged. The latter was in part due to Tito's communist tendencies but also as a preemptive measure to dissuade religious quarrels due to difference. As discussed by Leslie Sklair, we can understand the need for a collective Yugoslav identity because “culture-ideology practices are the nuts and bolts and the glue that hold the system together. Without them, parts of the system would drift off into space.” (Sklair, 115). Sklair was talking specifically about transnational practices in globalization and consumerism, but we can clearly see how that idea translates very well into the situation in

Yugoslavia. Tito was in effect the only emission of a “mini” cultural globalization that affected internal Yugoslavia, resulting in a new collectivist identity. This culture had to be created almost artificially in a top-down approach which came from Tito and the government of the time, in order to make a new identity that encompassed all of the south-Slav ethnicities. From this, the slogan of “May we keep brotherhood and unity safe like the pupils of our eyes”, the annual celebrations of the “Day of Youth”, and the initiations of children as young “pioneers” are all examples of the initiative it took to create an internal coherence which came from inside.

The second major endogenous change which impacted union and formation of Yugoslavia were the economic reforms (and integrations of seemingly opposing viewpoints) by Tito under which Yugoslavia functioned. Economically, Yugoslavia was an experiment of three parts: a private sector, cooperatives, and state-owned enterprises. It also functioned as a welfare state, under which jobs were assured for long-term employment and vacations were paid for a month out of each year. Yugoslavia was not defined as a “statist” nation, however, due to the mix of private enterprise in economics as well. This very important role of the state and ultimately the change of this role, as will be later discussed, were integral for the union and ultimately the disintegration.

Along with the internal economic changes, Tito also implemented changes that made Yugoslavia a player in the global economic arena. Yugoslavia was able to gain international recognition as well as prosperity through its endogenous economic changes that coincided with the international community needs, particularly through “linkages” that Sklair discusses. These linkages can be either forward or backward (depending on either local consumption of material or the supplying of a local firm to produce another product). And though “not all linkages are necessarily

beneficial to the host economy, and those in different industries may have different characteristics, linkages can be crucial in the transformation of economic growth into general development” (Sklair, 95). During the time of Tito and the economic policy of the SFRY, there was always a balance between the local and the international, further strengthening Yugoslavia’s economy and promoting a general well-being. The changes that would follow, as we will see, threw off that balance and had disastrous consequences on multiple levels of Yugoslavia’s society.

From the above mentioned internal transitions and transformations, a strong case can be made for Yugoslavia (primarily under the guidance of Tito) being an emitter of what has come to be called an “alternative globalization”. Tito’s experimental fusion of seemingly discordant aspects into a cohesive whole was a success that provided a viable alternative to both the Americanized neoliberalism and the Soviet statistism. Although Yugoslavia itself did not survive, Tito’s political, cultural, and economic ideas were used as prototypes to create economic models that are prevalent today. One cannot help but notice the economic similarities between the SFRY and the system that China uses today. This was yet another strategy Tito employed to further join Yugoslavs together, because theirs was a system that was the best of both presented options yet was not either one.

The year 1980 was momentous for Yugoslavia; Josip Broz Tito had died. The unity, prosperity, and peace of Yugoslavia did not last forever as the metaphoric death of Yugoslavia seemed to have coincided with the very real death of Tito. For Yugoslavia, this meant much more than the death of a beloved president, it meant the death of the symbol of unity. It also meant a death of

the secular ideas which had kept the SFRY together. This process, however, was not one-sided either. There were both endogenous and exogenous changes which impacted the final result. The single most important and devastating exogenous change upon Yugoslavia was the economic pressure on Yugoslavia (particularly by the USA) to change their system into accordance with the neoliberal state system. In the neoliberal state there are three prevailing facets: private property rights, rule of law, and institutions of free functioning markets and trade (Harvey, 64). Without Tito, Yugoslavia was particularly sensitive to outside pressures and under the guidance of people with ulterior motives and people with naïve belief that this would be economic progress, adopted this economic and political system that had previously been unknown to them. The mixed market economy of the SFRY, after the death of Tito and after neoliberal, free market reforms first began to take place in the late 1980's suffered immensely. Egon Zizmond analyzes the economic collapse of Yugoslavia's economy through three factors: environmental factors, the characteristics of the economic system, and economic policy actions (Zizmond, 101). The environmental factors (pertaining to raw materials and other geographically relevant assets) remained unchanged in this transition period while the second and third sets of factors began to transform in accordance to global pressures. The characteristics of the economic system came to be increasingly more capitalist in nature and economic policy actions were driven by people generally unfit to lead in this new arena Yugoslavia was previously unfamiliar with. Economic globalization had adverse effects on the Yugoslav economy, leading it to collapse and exacerbated the building tensions.

COUNTRY			COMPANIES		MARKET REFORMS				FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS	
	Population (in millions)	The share of private sector in GDP (in %)	Privatization of large enterprises	Privatization of small enterprises	Control and restructuring	Liberalization of prices	Foreign trade and foreign exchange market	Competition policy	Banking sector reform and interest rate liberalization	Capital market and non-bank intermediaries
Slovenia	2	65%	3	4+	3-	3+	4+	3-	3+	3-
Croatia	4,5	60%	3	4+	3-	3	4+	2+	3+	2+
Yugoslavia	8,6	40%	1	3	1	3	3	1	1	1
BiH	4,1	40%	2+	3-	2-	3	3	1	2+	1
Macedonia	2	60%	3	4	2+	3	4	2	3	2-

Source: Radenkovic, Dragana. "Role of Direct Foreign Investment in Development of Balkan Countries" *South Eastern Europe Journal of Economics* 2. (2004): 106. Web. 1 Oct 2012.

The above graph depicts the economic reforms that took place in the republics in 2001. It is important to note that in 2001 "Yugoslavia" encompassed Serbia and Montenegro. This graph is particularly interesting in the international influences aspect of this paper since free market policies that were being implemented came from the west. In contrast to nearly all nationalized enterprises during SFRY, the increase in privatization is a clear influence of economic globalization. The numbers in the charts are assigned "grades" by the EBRD (European Bank of Reconstruction and Development) and indicate the lowest grades for Yugoslavia and Bosnia & Herzegovina, possibly because they were the last to adopt western business practices fully.

The most recent exogenous interference on Yugoslavia was the 1999 NATO bombing, which was done under the name of peace-promotion led mostly by the USA. The USA had indisputably been the unilateral global power who indirectly controls many international organizations, including NATO. NATO's initial mission in its inception was to contain communism though it drastically deviated from its path with the 1999 bombing campaign on Yugoslavia. The bombing was justified as a means of bringing down Milosevic and his brutalities in Kosovo which

impeded on Albanian self determination. The bombing, however, generally centered on television stations, power grids, and resulted in nearly 300 cases of “collateral damage” (Martin). An investigation of civilian deaths was enacted and the director of the Human Rights Watch, Kenneth Roth concluded, “NATO should have done more to protect civilians.” The report further went on to say that 30% of the attacks and 50% of death because of Operation Allied Force were a result of “illegitimate or questionable targets”. Among the intolerable number of occurrences during which civilian lives were lost, the Human Rights Watch concluded that 33 of those happened in areas of dense population (Roth). This seeming united effort by the global community caused more damage than it had intended to quell and left an additional agent of general distrust of the “West”. This action by NATO was also an indication of an incident when globalization’s creation of authority by supranational entities (here most notably the United Nations) was undermined by the individual interests of NATO because Operation Allied Force was never approved by the UN and is still considered to have been illegal.

The exogenous changes seemed to have exacerbated one major endogenous change: severe ethno-centrism within the ex-republics of Yugoslavia on two major fronts. Firstly, the “balkanization” of the Balkans cannot be explained without the mentioning of the ethno-centric motivations of leaderships of Franjo Tudjman, Slobodan Milosevic, and Alija Izetbegovic. Each of these men, promising a brighter future (only for his respective ethnic group), rallied behind him poor and angry (and therefore easily persuaded) citizens. The global arena had put an emphasis on modernization and nation-state efficacy. The leaders of the Yugoslav republics interpreted this emphasis to an unprecedented level, authorizing and supporting civilian deaths and ethnic cleansing for the sake of a pure, superior nation-state, feeling that the opposing ethnic

groups had halted their republic's progression into the new era. This has attempted to be explained as a result of self-determination of these peoples; although, realistically it transcends self-determination and instead ventures into the arena of what Benjamin Barber calls “Jihad”. Particularly in Yugoslavia, “self-determination has at times amounted to little more than other-extermination” (Barber, 11) as was the case in the Croat aggression on Serbs in Operations Bljesak and Oluja as well as the Serb aggression on Bosniaks in Srebrenica. Bosnia, particularly, is a special case because it is in effect a mini-Yugoslavia in which three ethnicities and three religions strive not only to prosper but to simply survive. We can see then that “in this tumultuous world, the real players are not nations at all but tribes, many of them at war with one another. Their aim is precisely to redraw boundaries in order to divide” (Barber, 8). The international actors have attempted to address this issue in the Dayton Accords which divided Bosnia & Herzegovina into two autonomous regions, each with their own government.

A second endogenous change that has developed in response to such ethno-centrism is a re-definition of each ethnic identity. One such way has manifested in an upsurge in religious fundamentalism within the ex-Yugoslav republics in all three of the present religions- Catholicism, Islam, and Orthodoxy. This fundamentalism, more in accordance with Stuart Sim, leads to an intolerance of others and a turn to tradition in search of security (el-Ojeili, 166). Mirko Blagojevic believes that the changes seen in Serbia have also occurred in Bosnia with regard to Islam and in Croatia with regard to Catholicism. The religious revival serves to reaffirm religious identification, doctrinal beliefs, and religious behavior (Blagojevic). These recent changes are endogenous and serve to further hold together an identity (especially one seen as historic) while also excluding other potential members.

The fragmentation of Yugoslavia, as I have illustrated, was a multi-directional, complicated affair in which it is difficult to deduce with any certainty a single most important actor. Both outside influence as well as internal tensions led to the current state of affairs.

The events that have taken place continue to unfold and the saga of this country has not finished. However, preliminary deductions can be made as to the consequences this has had on the people, the land, and the individual republics. These changes can be seen in the current economic status of the newly formed republics, a desire to integrate into supranational organizations (namely the European Union), a continuation of the 1990's ethno-centrism, continued separatist movements, and a particularly interesting consequence- the phenomenon that has come to be called "Yugonostalgia".

Firstly, the economic differences between Slovenia (an EU member nation) and the other ex-Yugoslav republics is glaring. The graph below illustrates a very important indicator of economic well-being (unemployment rate) for the year 2011. The lowest unemployment rate (that of Slovenia) is three percent less than the next-lowest rate. Surprisingly, the unemployment rate of Montenegro is surprisingly low, but that may be due to an increase in foreign investment in Adriatic Sea resorts. What this information tells us beyond the apparent advantage of being Slovenia is something perhaps more telling: the exclusion of the other ex republics as a bias of Western Europe. Slovenia's independence was an easy procedure, but not so for countries like Croatia and Bosnia whose bids for independence from Yugoslavia were brutal affairs. Croatia and Serbia have on-going considerations for EU integration, which with some citizens is a

contested participation due to skepticism that any western ideals would be beneficial in this area of the world.

Country	Unemployment Rate
Croatia	17.7%
Serbia	23.4%
Bosnia & Herzegovina	43.1%
Slovenia	11.8%
Macedonia	31.4%
Montenegro	14.7%

Source: "Croatia: CIA World Factbook." *Central Intelligence Agency*. Web. 1 Oct 2012

Though the precise reason for Slovenia's success cannot be asserted with any certainty, there can be speculated a few reasons for this. First and foremost, Slovenia, by virtue of its location more than anything else, had always been more a part of western and central Europe than of the Balkans. Though "cultural mentality" is a tricky notion to define, it seems particularly convincing in this case. Furthermore, Slovenia's industrial and production importance during the time of the SFRY did not change as it transitioned into an independent state. Instead, those same beneficial industries became more concentrated in a smaller space, providing Slovenia with a strong economy that the other states simply did not have or had not yet independently developed. Globalization has been recognized as an American and Western- European led frame of mind, whose prejudices and ideas of Eastern Europe as an unstable, savage environment have propagated and prolonged the post-Yugoslav trauma and have manifested into a self-fulfilling prophecy. A consequence of the Yugoslav Wars, in economic terms, has been detrimental and in the greater scope, has further illustrated to the western world the apparent inferiority of the Balkan region.

Secondly, “Yugonostalgia” as a phenomenon has been the greatest cultural consequence, especially amongst ex-Yugoslavia’s youth population, demonstrated particularly in popular music. This form of nostalgia is manifested in three lenses: a fond remembrance of the past, and distrust of the dismal present, and an optimistic outlook into the future (Bancroft). The promises of the 80’s and 90’s of the globalizing world have proven to be empty, and the fond stories of the grandparents of today’s youth about Yugoslavia seem like plausible alternatives. This cultural change is two-fold; it is both a denunciation of the current global culture as well as a reflection onto the old, local culture. What has stuck out especially in my investigation of this particular aspect is the surprising amount of Slovene yugonostalgic rock music. Bands such as Zaklonisce Prepeva and Rock Partyzani produce songs with strongly worded lyrics in mainly two ways: a love and regret for the past, and a satirical, abysmal outlook for the present and future. The disintegration of Yugoslavia has produced a general dissatisfaction with the current systems, especially amongst the youth who yearn to experience the elevated stories their parents and grandparents tell them of what Yugoslavia once was. An anomaly exists in that Slovenia, which identified least with Yugoslavia would most forcibly show such nostalgic feelings. Further, it is interesting that the youth, which was born either during the war or after the disintegration and never experienced the SFRY, would have such devotion for something unknown to them.

Alongside this nostalgia, however, also exists a continuation of ethno-centrism evidenced in border-crossing anxiety and shirts with slogans similar to “Sve Srbe na Vrbe” meaning “All Serbs on the Birch”. Further, it seems as though the bloody Yugoslav Wars on the 1990’s set into motion a carving up of the land that has not yet finished. Most recently, Kosovo unilaterally declared independence in February of 2008. Though the case of Kosovo is different from the other separations and though it is still not formally recognized as a new state by the UN (due to

protest most notably from Serbia, Russia, and China), it is still an illustration of the seemingly never-ending shrinking of what was Yugoslavia.

The consequences of the Yugoslav Wars manifest themselves in a multitude of facets: from economic struggle, to persistent ethnic tension. However, hope remains in the new generations who have not seen war and whose desire is to coexist and potentially mutually benefit from their neighbors and ex-citizens.

The Yugoslav Wars of the early and late 1990's have become part of history books; they are now quantified studied through various disciplines of the social sciences. The battles have ceased, the bombs have stopped falling, and gun shots are no longer heard. For the people of ex-Yugoslavia, however, the absence of formal declarations of war does not mean that these same battles are not fought behind closed doors. Bosnia is still largely a sore spot for all, where Serbian entrance into Sarajevo or Bosnian entrance into Banja Luka takes courage and careful planning. Similar ethnic tensions are apparent between Serbs and Croats where a Serb was killed in Split, Croatia while on vacation on basis of nationality. Both sides continue to call each other by their nationally defined World War II army names to demonize the other side, despite knowing that an 18-year old had nothing to do with his or her father's or grandfather's actions.

From the analysis of globalization and its effects on Yugoslavia (in both its inception and its fragmentation) I again return to a two-sided globalist view of globalization, and more, specifically, to Jan Pieterse's theory of critical globalism in an effort to objectively look at these consequences. Pieterse defines critical globalism as "theorizing the entire field of forces in a way

that take into account not just market forces but also interstate relations, civil societies, etc” (554). That is to say, it is an adaptation of globalism that takes into account all spheres of influences as well as multi-directional globalizations when appropriate. Critical globalism coexists with globalizing processes while neither attempting to disengage them nor celebrating them (556). Though consequences of globalization in the affairs of Yugoslavia were, arguably, good in one instance and destructive in another, we cannot define globalization itself as either good or bad. Taking the case of Yugoslavia, through the lens of critical globalism we can instead analyze the negative consequences and possible ways in which they could have been avoided while simultaneously anticipating potential benefits in the years that are to come. As these nations move forward into the increasingly globalised world of the 21st Century, it will become more and more important for them to cooperate without regard for national or ethnic identity. For some Yugoslavia was nothing more than a mechanism of national suppression while for others it was the very essence of what a cooperative, multinational state is. As it has been said by many in ex-Yugoslavia “Yugoslavia is not a state of borders, it is a state of mind”. Until that same state of mind can again be reached, the world may regrettably continue to anticipate conflict.

Analyzing the events of Yugoslavia was a difficult process due to the very nature of the subject matter. Yugoslavia was a mix of different religions, languages, and ultimately of different people (at least in some individuals' perceptions) which resulted in multiple “versions” of the events. The most imposing limitation on this subject, then, is the lack of time for reflection both for the people directly involved as well as for the international community which wishes to gain an understand of these tragic developments. Only 20 years have passed since the onset of the Yugoslav unrest and only 4 since the latest piece (Kosovo) has separated from the recognized successor state. Most of the people involved in the wars are still alive, providing wonderful first-

hand accounts of these events. However, those same people are naturally biased toward their own stories, often to the detriment of objective reflection. For that reason, the analysis of the disintegration of Yugoslavia is a difficult process because of conflicting view points, still fresh wounds, and a continuing lack of objectivity on all sides.

In my discussion of the events that shaped and broke Yugoslavia, I have focused mostly on previously written theories of globalization (in its various components) in a general view in an effort to explain and present a possible reason and path to union and fragmentation. I have not, however, looked in depth into specific facets that have both shaped these events as well as those which may have been particularly influenced by these events. For example, I have not included the status of women in these events. Undoubtedly, as has been in the case in history, women have been the most affected segment of society, which is something I have not considered in this examination. Also not considered were individual narratives of people involved to which access was possible. Inclusion of these stories and post-war effects on women would have made this account richer in primary source and factor-specific information but could have potentially also further complicated the already intertwined elements that shaped the outcome of Yugoslavia. As previously mentioned this paper is an incomplete interpretation of the local and global effects on Yugoslavia because of its very complicated nature and still developing story. However, it undoubtedly yields important information and possibilities of further analysis. As noted at the beginning, globalization is an ongoing process, which means that its effects have anything but been completed in regard to Yugoslavia. This paper looks at globalization and Yugoslavia only so far as the present time, while future similar analyses could consider my propositions in a larger scope as stories and developments continue to evolve in this complicated history.

The most pertinent question to me in the course of this investigation was what factor specifically has made reconciliation in the Balkans seemingly impossible. In other areas of the world, religious differences (such as in Chile) have been able to coexist, language differences (such as in India) have been able to coexist, and ethnic variety (as in the USA and Germany) have been able to coexist. Interestingly, ex-Yugoslavs who migrate to other countries seem to be able to peacefully coincide despite the differences which tore them apart in their homeland. The implication would seem to be that there were perhaps one too many differences for Yugoslavia to overcome. In a future study of similar interest, it would be fascinating to individually assess each of these three differences and attempt to explain the reason of the volatile nature of the Balkans.

WORKS CITED

- Amin, Ash. "Regulating Economic Globalization". *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 29.2 (2004): 217-233. Print.
- Bancroft, Claire. *Yugonostalgia: The Pain of the Present*. Diss. SIT Graduate Institute, 2009.
- Barber, Benjamin. *Jihad vs. McWorld*. 1st ed. New York: Times Books, 1995. Print.
- Blagojevic, Mirko. *Current Religious Changes in Serbia and Desecularization*. Diss. Belgrade Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory. 2006.
- Corovic, Vladimir. *Istorija Srba*. Nis. 2008. Print.
- "Croatia: CIA World Factbook." *Central Intelligence Agency*. Web. 1 Oct 2012.
- El-Ojeili, Chamsky and Patrick Hayden. *Critical Theories of Globalization*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. Print.
- Harvey, David. *Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Print.
- Martin, Vivian. "Civilian Casualties of NATO's War on Yugoslavia". *International Action Center*. N.p. Web. 24 Oct 2012. <http://www.iacenter.org/warcrime/25_civil.htm>
- Pieterse, Jan Neverdeen. "The Development of Development Theory: Towards Critical Globalism". *Review of International Political Economy*. 3.4 (1996): 541-564. Print.
- Radenkovic, Dragana. "Role of Direct Foreign Investment in Development of Balkan Countries" *South Eastern Europe Journal of Economics* 2. (2004): 106. Web. 1 Oct 2012.
- Roth, Kenneth. "New Figures on Civilian Deaths in Kosovo War." *Human Rights Watch*. N.p., 08 2000. Web. 19 Nov 2012. <<http://www.hrw.org/news/2000/02/07/new-figures-civilian-deaths-kosovo-war>>.
- Sklair, Leslie. *Globalization: Capitalism and its Alternatives*. New York: Wiley. 2000. Print.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. "The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts

for Comparative Analysis”. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16.4 (1974): 387-415. Print.

Zizmond, Egon. “The Collapse of the Yugoslav Economy”. *Soviet Studies* 44.1 (1992): 101-112. Print.