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Ten years before the dream of Yugoslavia ended in a bloody nightmare, the Belgrade journal Vidici published its last issue under the editorship of Slavica Stojanović. The entire issue was conceptualized as a glossary of terms used by a group of young philosophers, poets, and writers who gathered around the journal in the late seventies and early eighties to expose the contradictions within the theoretical foundations of a period of Yugoslav history that preceded the death of Josip Broz-Tito, the lifetime president and founder of the so-called “second Yugoslavia.” Besides Slavica Stojanović and Aleksandar Petrović, who provided editorial and philosophical inspiration for the ongoing discussion of the “institution” and its “technologies,” the group included writers like Svetislav Basara, psychologist and feminist activist Lepa Mladjenović, poet and painter Slobodan Škerović, and the writer of this article. After the governmental purge of the Vidici staff in 1981,
whose symptomatic consequences are largely the focus of this article, most of these artists and intellectuals continued to resist the emergent nationalism-within-communism in Serbia and Yugoslavia, which culminated in the breakup of the country and the resulting civil war. Also, many of the strategies developed by the *Vidici* group are presently an inspiration for a new generation of dissidents under the current Serbian regime, which most prominently includes persons associated with Radio B-92, the weekly magazine *Vreme*, the Center for Anti-War Actions, and the Belgrade Circle.

The pressure on the *Vidici* from the local party bosses had begun to increase steadily immediately after Tito's death, since the theories developed by the journal radically deviated from the official visions of “socialist working man and his community.” Most of the ideas formulated by the *Vidici* group had elements of postmodernist and poststructuralist theoretical orientation, developed through reading and critical re-contextualizing of Nietzsche, Freud, and Heidegger from the Western and Dostoevsky and Bulgakov from the Eastern half of Europe. Although the theories of these authors differed widely both in genre (philosophy vs. literary prose) and in origin (Germanic vs. Russian), they had one common feature—the tragic conception of the individual whose destiny is compromised by the power of the institution. These writers and philosophers had been tolerated in socialist Yugoslavia, although the extreme individualism of their theories was at odds with the official “self-management socialism” and its collectivist vision of the universe.

When it became clear that a purge of the *Vidici* staff was being planned by the municipal party bosses, the decision was made to publish a final issue that would sum up the theoretical efforts of this generation of intellectuals. The issue was named “Dictionary of Technology” and appeared in the bookstores in the fall of 1981. It was soon banned by the Municipal Conference of the League of Communists of Belgrade, supposedly because the entry for church (*crkva*) had an illustration of the Yugoslav parliament building next to it. Two weeks later, the entire staff of the journal was fired because of the “unacceptable tendencies” it displayed in its editorial policy. They were replaced by Aleksandar Jerkov and Željko Simić, who are today the leading figures in the political and cultural establishment of the Milošević regime. The latter has even been appointed deputy prime minister of the federal government in 1993. The decision to ban the issue of an intellectual journal with relatively small circulation (1500 copies) was one of the last acts of censorship over intellectual life in Yugoslavia by the already weakened Communist establishment. The ban was a symptom of a growing panic after Tito’s death among his ideological offspring, since the political influence of the *Vidici* group was certainly negligible in comparison to the media uproar caused by the ban. But this purge became an early symptom of the generational shift that has influenced the intellectual scene in favor of nationalist opportunists and to the detriment of theoretical pluralism. By discrediting those who were thinking of Yugoslavia and Serbia in a broader European context, the party effectively encouraged the
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xenophobic attitudes that were already latent within Serbian culture. Večernje novosti, the evening newspaper with the largest circulation in the country, carried a long article charging that

the student literary monthly Vidici has over the last few years developed a system of cryptographic writing in which it has criticized the existing Yugoslav system in such a way that only the initiated could understand what was actually being said. This cryptographic writing allegedly used a number of key words to analyze the Yugoslav system critically. Use of the word “technology,” for example, stood for the existing society; “boys” meant top politicians, officials, and theoreticians; “mirror” meant the existing system of self-management. In contrast to these negative terms, the student monthly used such expressions as “selfhood” to describe individuals who oppose the system, “will” to denote any movement against the system, “apocalypse” to stand for the definite collapse of the existing system. (Antić 2)

This paranoid reception by the official press of the theories developed by Vidici is highly significant. It reflected the attitudes of the one-party establishment, which perceived and constructed conspiracies whenever it was unable to comprehend alternative theoretical and political viewpoints. “The system of cryptographic writing” could therefore be vulgarly interpreted along the lines of conspiracy theories as “an attack on the existing Yugoslav system,” while the authors could be labeled as exponents of “a destructive and unacceptable anarcho-syndicalist and terrorist ideological orientation” (Antić 3). The implicated editorial board could not have been politically further away from the charges brought up against them, since their project was limited to the realm of theory that did not approve of violence. The critical reevaluation of the whole of Western civilization (of which Yugoslavia had been a very ambiguous but symptomatic part) was based on the analysis of language and writing as primary technological instruments for the positing of “values” and “truths” that in turn regulate the discourses of philosophy, science, literature, and politics. These posited truths are institutionalized by the state itself and defended by means that ultimately sanction violence. Vidici opposed these ossified versions of truth, which were rapidly losing referents in post-Titoist Yugoslavia.

It could be argued that their theoretical examination of the technology of power was a first step in replacing the outdated and falsified versions of Marxist-Titoist social philosophy with a viable model of a multicultural and multi-ethnic society based on the concept of “selfhood”: “Technology is everything that is not selfhood” (“Dictionary” 24). Selfhood is the translation of the Serbo-Croatian word ličnost, which the Vidici group used in a specific sense to denote subjectivity that resists an ideological assimilation to mass culture induced by the externally imposed forms of political and social control. This concept of subjectivity was deeply incompatible with the convictions of bureaucratic socialism practiced in Yugoslavia at the time, according to which the individual is first and foremost a part of the collective, to whose demands it has to conform.

The procedure used by Vidici to challenge the “technology” of the state
The apparatus was primarily based on the diachronic analysis of etymologies, a method that has an uncanny similarity with the political platform implicit in deconstruction, initiated in philosophy by Jacques Derrida. The conviction of the French philosopher that theory “should never be separable from the politico-institutional problematic and should seek a new investigation of responsibility, an investigation which questions the codes inherited from ethics and politics,” closely coincided with the credo of the Vidici group (Derrida 17). Another characteristic shared with the deconstructive procedure was the opacity of language used in theoretical analyses, which is the main reason for the governmental accusation levied at the journal of developing “a system of cryptographic writing.” The title entry in the “Dictionary of Technology” will illustrate this property of the theoretical style developed by the Vidici group:

Technology is the production of forms: mind forms (logos) by thinking and technical forms (tekhne) by labor: technology produces both truth and beauty. T. transforms the movement into a form that should be called history, opening the multitude of media for the path of Zeno. Techno-logy is abolished in the living identity of the realized logos (word) and realized tekhne (body)—in Christ. The complete realization of technology is given in the identity of mind, history, and labor (Hegel, Marx): at that point it is necessarily reified. Its concretization in the reified world completes Western history as a movement of dissolution and disdoublement. The disdoubled world is shattered when the will is present. Technology is practically realized as a universal mediator, as the analysis of selfhood and life, a dissection of any firmness for existence, as a gradual sliding into nothingness, as a creation of an “other” (naspramni) world, of a mirror that is identical (truthful) but not alive. Technology is everything that is not selfhood. (“Dictionary” 24)

The prophetic tone of this declaration is constituted by the movement of critical thought that examines various figures (Christ, Hegel, Marx) and assigns positive and negative values to them. Both Hegel and Marx belong to the negative pole since they are perceived as purveyors of “technology,” while Christ receives a positive valuation because he supposedly abolishes it. The world is divided between the mirror (i.e. language, representation), which is the symbol of technology, and that which is reflected in it (i.e. selfhood, body). History is a movement of technology whose consequence is a fragmentation of the individual into progressively smaller discrete units. Technology is then an institutionalized form of control disseminated by the media (through the development of the so-called “information technology” for example) that has no teleological function, but merely simulates reality, reproducing itself ad infinitum.

The model of progressive fragmentation was borrowed by Vidici from the discourse of theoretical physics, where both material reality and discourses used to represent it had been gradually replacing atoms with quarks and even smaller particles. Vidici conceived of Western civilization in its entirety as a product of technology, which splinters the imagined wholeness of selfhood by infiltrating the discourses of science, history, and philosophy. This perception may have been colored by the historical realities of the Balkans that gave rise
to the English concept of “balkanization.” The longing for wholeness and the
eo-Rousseauistic, negative valuation of civilization and its alienating effects
on selfhood was then juxtaposed with the positive concepts of the will and the
body, which are the only human tools available in the fight against the alienating
effects of “technology.”

The position from which Vidici’s indictment was enunciated did not
belong to the realm that the Communists were used to when combating the
emergent leaders of the Serbian nationalist opposition at the time. Writers of
the “nationalist-realist” orientation—Antonije Isaković, Dobrica Ćosić, or Vuk
Drašković—represented the opposition that spoke the same language as the
Communist establishment, moving inside the same historical continuum and
fighting for domination over the discourse of power. The reaction of the
Communist officials to the “Dictionary of Technology” was to reduce the
intended rethinking of Western civilization to the concrete ideological situa-
tion in Yugoslavia. One of the mechanisms of political power in this part of the
world, so well portrayed in Kafka’s parables, is that the main instigators of the
purges always remain invisible. They use the official press to levy charges
against those who stand in the way of their vision of the state and its power.
The invisible party officials felt implicated by the Vidici, although they appar-
etly could not grasp the entire scope of the critique, labeling the theoretical
effort of Vidici as a secret code used to bypass official control. This practice
was inherited from the Stalinist days of the Communist party and used every
time the power structure encountered a semantic territory that resisted or
rejected officially imposed truths and values. Since the opacity of the idiom
used to analyze technological civilization precluded any simplistic categoriza-
tion, the party official in charge of maintaining political correctness had to
resort to the invention of conspiracy with the ultimate aim of supposed violent
overthrow of communism.

At the same time a different kind of political power began to emerge in
Serbia. Dobrica Ćosić, who was until recently the president of rump
Yugoslavia, devoted his literary works to historical revisions portraying the
Serbian people as the victims of the Yugoslav idea. This kind of opposition to
the regime was acceptable, since it was gradually adding the nationalist dimen-
sion to the Communist political system, which was already in deep crisis. By
constructing the truth of the nation, Ćosić countered Yugoslavism with vigor-
ous Serbian nationalism supported by the mythology of age-long victimization.
The then-dominant myth of a Yugoslavism based on “brotherhood and unity”
of all the peoples living on its territory was rebuked by the construction of a
counter-myth that used the same type of literary/political discourse to reap-
propriate the past and construct the truth about one nation—the Serbian one.
The analysis offered by the Vidici group was far more radical, since it discard-
ed the notion of truth as an historical essence and pointed to its constructed
and arbitrary nature. At issue was the production of truth, which for the Vidici
group began with Homer and ended with Hollywood:
Truth (istina). et. isti (Old Church Slavic) to be another. m. lie. i. Truth is the idol of otherness. It is the self-recognition in the mirror, the narcissistic staring of the mind into its forms. When the mirror is broken, there is no need for any truth in life, because the truth is the lie of life. s. idol, otherness, thought. e. g. “I therefore invoke the old prejudice according to which the truth resides in knowledge, although we can know the truth only by the way of thought . . .” (Hegel, Geschichte der phil.). (“Dictionary” 10)

Every truth is a lie, since it portrays itself as the embodiment of some absolute identity. Realist literature, whether official or oppositional, is the original technology for truth-production, a self-reflection that claims eternal validity. It posits universal truths although they are the result of the limited and self-reflective thought process. Thought reifies the life process by translating itself into a signifying code, dissecting life along the synchronic and diachronic axes of the Cartesian grid and confining it to the two-dimensional universe of the white page. Vidici’s literary project set itself against this binary model by attempting to recuperate the “third” dimension that remained in the background of the utterance as the dimension that eludes coding within the simplistic models of technologized discourses and structures. The third dimension was identified with the body, and those who wanted to escape the deadly grip of technology were called to participate in the incarnation of the truth through a cynical method inherent in the teaching of Diogenes and analyzed by Peter Sloterdijk.

The corporeal dimension that Vidici celebrated as the mysterious “third” had opened a variety of topics that were taboo within the socialist society. In the issues preceding the “Dictionary of Technology” the Vidici group explored the way in which the mentally ill, homosexuals, women, and other marginal groups were discarded by various technological procedures of the state. The body became a way out in an overtly institutionalized reality: “To reinscribe oneself in history one needs to reclaim the body” (“Dictionary” 23). Since the historical process excludes the corporeal and renders it absent and invisible, what becomes present and visible within history is the dimension of lie that presents itself as truth. The body has to be the foundation of resistance to this manipulation by dispelling the “Homerick trickery” within history:

Homer. i. History starts with Homer. The blind old man, rhapsodic Homer, is the apparition of history, its performance and its formation. Nothing is known about Homer, neither that he was born, nor that he died. He does not possess a past because he is the origin and does not possess selfhood because he is a form. s. Descartes, the Devil. e. g. “That blind old man was even able to produce Helen’s unusual beauty . . .” (Vidici 8/80, “Revelation of the Mirror”). (“Dictionary” 26)

History is the achievement of the “other” world by literary technology; it is a basis for the profound alienation of the “barbarians,” those historically marginal people who do not recognize limits, borders, and divisions. “Truth” is produced by literary means, through Homeric metaphors and formulas, as a basis for the creation of an ideology that serves as a tool for institutional homogenization and psychological control. The Vidici group treated “literary”
truth as an ideological disguise or a form of faith on the part of those who had established the tacit hegemony and kept it enforced since the imagined “beginning of time.” Homer is a metaphor for the literary (i.e. false) foundation of history based on the purging of the marginal elements that resist symbolization. “Marginalization” preoccupied the Vidici group because in reality they consciously isolated themselves from the ideological field of “truths” and power struggles and attempted to reconstruct the “third,” corporeal dimension, which they believed can find its discourse of the “living word” (živa reč).

What is the “living word”? It is a position of enunciation that abolishes boundaries between genres for the speaking subject—the enunciated is neither a theoretical nor a literary construct. Although it borrows from both, it is not identified with them. It is not a speech about something, nor a phonetic reflection of a referential universe, but a word that stands its own ground, bearing witness to the mysterious “third.” This concept calls for the introduction and recognition of the subjective/corporeal dimension of language in literature, a place where a word is not immediately appropriated by ideological interpretations derived from the “existing system.” This concept has strong affinities with Julia Kristeva’s concept of the semiotic chora, which she ties to the body and its pulsions as well. The construction of the dictionary was the last conscious attempt at opening the possibility for this type of extra-institutional discourse, by creating a catalog of landmark concepts that could presumably resurrect the dimension of body-in-language, even after the historical disappearance of this particular editorial board of Vidici. The awareness of the end and finitude of this effort, the attempt to separate their own word from the abject union with the discourse of power, or in their terminology, the refusal of “boyhood” and the affirmation of responsibility for every subjective act, gave the whole issue the apocalyptic overtones that would materialize ten years later in the Yugoslav civil war.

The officials accused Vidici of using the term “Boys” as a code word for “top politicians, officials, and theoreticians.” A retrospective look at the project “Boys” initiated by the journal reveals the sociocultural mechanisms that underlie the fall of Yugoslavia, as well as the particular moment of crisis that the country entered around this time. “Boys” was the most visible media manipulation project that the student press embarked on in 1980, the year of Tito’s death. With the aid of Belgrade photographer Dragan Papić, Vidici carried out the first in a series of media manipulation projects that featured three Belgrade “Boys” (Srdjan Šaper, Vlada Divljan, Nebojša Krstić). The aim of the project was to demonstrate mechanisms of identification and simulation used by the power structure to produce the desired effects on the population. The “Boys,” who did not have proper names, were dressed in the impeccable attire of successful technocrats, and their images flooded the press during the early 1980s. The format was simple: an array of photographs with captions explaining the media action that was undertaken. “Boys emancipate the woman,” for example, was a project in which a female model was progressively undressed until she was completely naked in the last photograph in the series. The
"Boys" later transformed themselves into a new wave group, Idoli, which became one of the most popular rock groups in former Yugoslavia, obviously yielding to the temptations of the "technology" of the star system. "Boys" was a marginal yet powerful indicator of the crisis that was shaking the entire country at the time. In Slovenia, for example, a small but visible movement that called itself Neue Slovenische Kunst came into existence. Using similar methods of parodic identification with the totalitarian cultural icons and media manipulation, they became known in the West through the "musical" part of the movement, the new wave rock group Laibach. Vidici included their own media manipulation project as one of the central entries in the "Dictionary":

Boys (Dečaci). from Indo-European root Dhei, to suck. m. The essence of idols. i. Objectification of history is necessarily without character: all for the collective, nothing for the individual. Within the institution there is no more selfhood, there are only technologues or, if you like it, Boys. That is the secret behind the project Boys that Vidici has carried out in the year of 1980 A.D. Technology was perceived as the production of the Boys. Vidici has demonstrated, through the possibility of concretely reified technology, the images that exist only in the medium and as a medium and through which all the technologues could see what they were: phantoms without reality. The Boys do not exist, yet they constantly move inside technology. They have their occupations and their fears of life outside the institution. They are the very essence of history. They should be shattered because they are the idols of life. Their end will be the beginning: Seth already rides. s. technologue, technology of life, phantoms. e. g. "Boys are a perfect form:: handsome and smart—human. Behind them stands the nothingness of technology" (Vidici 7/80, "An Experiment in the Technology of Love"). ("Dictionary" 5)

The reaction of the readers was overwhelming: everybody in Belgrade's cultural circles was wondering about the identity of the "Boys," about their role and the concept behind their images. Most of the reactions were emotionally negative. People were really angry at the "Boys," but that anger revealed something else, a displacement of aggression whose primary and repressed aim was the realm of the "Fathers"—those who were in charge. The "Boys" were just a simulacrum, a model for identification that revealed the illusory reality of power as an effect of media manipulation by "top politicians, officials and theoreticians." Baudrillard's remark that images "dissimulate the fact that there is nothing behind them," can be perfectly applied to Yugoslav society after Tito's death (9). The "Boys" were the product of a culture saturated with "Fathers" who tried to regulate everything by institutional norms, since they had no authority based on a valid ethical principle. The new breed of people created after the second world war were brought up to expect the "existing system" to provide them with a substitute for the parent figure, a role successfully played by Tito while he was alive.

The analyses presented by Vidici at the beginning of the 1980s are becoming manifest right now, with the break-up of the country and the resulting civil war. The society of "Boys" that Vidici had criticized was not able to sustain the Yugoslav idea since most of the population expected the solution to come from
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the realm of institutionalized power, from the world of “Fathers,” who have either succumbed to the virus of nationalism or perished with the Communist dogmas. The paternal metaphor lost its power in 1980, together with the original and most powerful paternal referent. After Tito’s death, the Yugoslav political system revealed itself as a simulation, an assembly of “Boys” in search of their true identity. The entry into the 1990s brought the horrible answer to the question of identity as people began to identify with the nationalist values peddled by Tito’s clones: Milošević, Tudjman, Kučan.

The case of Vidici was a minor incident on the political scale, but it perfectly illustrates the new dimension of crisis that Yugoslavia entered in the 1980s. If similar “unacceptable tendencies” within the student press had occurred only a year or two before, there would have been no need for the state to be so subtle and fabricate the existence of a “secret code.” But since the father of second Yugoslavia was now dead, those who were designated to continue his legacy felt powerless and threatened. The accusation raised against Vidici was a paranoid projection: the dominant ideology represented itself as a victim of the secret plot while in reality it was looking for a socially acceptable channel to vent its own aggression. The writers around Vidici were the ideal target since they had no political power, a lack largely due to their own insistence that marginality is the only true position in an overtly ideological political system.

“Our mission at this moment is to make your Evil lose its nerve,” said one of the Slovene Neue Slowenische Kunst members in the early eighties, articulating the emotional platform of an entire generation of Yugoslav intellectuals that resulted in a peculiar version of Weimar culture in the Balkans (Neue Slowenische Kunst 54). This cultural strategy included exposing the underlying principles of the dominant ideology through mimicry and parody. In other words, the new generation of intellectuals was openly tempting the official cultural establishment to move against them and discredit its image as the most tolerant of communist regimes. The Vidici group were also teasing and daring the guardians of officialdom to manifest the totalitarian potential that was disguised within Yugoslavia after it had broken with other countries of the communist block. By openly exposing the mechanisms involved in the creation of the discourse of power, this generation implicitly withdrew itself from the struggle for it. The Vidici group marginalized themselves by the use of an opaque idiom, getting ready for the sacrifice that they sensed was being prepared for them. The pessimism of a culture that had lost faith in itself resulted in a fatalistic relationship to the course society would take in the future. The younger generation of intellectuals were paralyzed, unable to articulate or envision life after Tito in positive terms. The only thing they felt they could do was criticize and wait. The word “waiting” was actually one of the entries in the “Dictionary of Technology”:

Waiting (čekanje) et. Sanskr. §ayati, §akanas, to suffer, to perceive; m. decisiveness, readiness; i. Waiting is a form of historical existence. Waiting, being
here (Dasein), represents the control of history; selfhood is the limit of its movement. There is no need to follow anything, since everything comes by itself; it is only necessary to be here and know how to recognize it; s. politicity (političnost), existence, transcendence; e. g. “Doze by the lampshade, read—let the snowstorm rage outside—wait, until somebody comes” (M. Bulgakov, The White Guard). (“Dictionary” 10)

By 1980, this version of the “politicity” of the subject was almost entirely eradicated, while “ideologicity” blossomed. The most general difference between those two positions was defined by the relationship of the speaking subject to the discourse of power: the “political” subject relates to the state of things while the “ideological” subject is related to things by the State. The first category can exist as a marginality that survives only within the artistic and cultural enclaves, in traces of thought and language that Vidici had attempted to gather in one place. In Vidici’s terminology “politicity” denoted the “will to live right here and right now,” which was the exact opposite of the ideological “living in the past” widely practiced by both the Communist and nationalist politicians: “Politicity is the responsibility of existence; the way of selfhood. All technologists are un-political, they are lukewarm” (“Dictionary” 18).

The “lukewarmness” that characterized the Yugoslav power structure has been turned into a hot and bloody contest of nationalist ideologies today. The purge of the Vidici group was only a first step in the destruction of the generation who saw the Balkans as an essential part of Europe. While postmodernism worked well as a platform for the achievement of sovereignty from Yugoslavia in Slovenia, in Serbia it was effectively suppressed by the emergence of the nationalist political establishment. “Waiting” has resulted in the arrival of Slobodan Milošević, the Balkan version of a populist dictator whose politics seems to be a repetition of the scenario Europe has already seen half a century ago. Milošević has inserted himself into the crisis by invoking the centuries-old suffering of the Serbian people as a foundation for a brutal and chauvinist policy of intolerance that today results in the horrors of “ethnic cleansing.” What preceded this was a kind of “intellectual cleansing” that the Communist establishment carried out in Serbia in the beginning of the eighties. It is no accident, therefore, that the editor-in-chief who succeeded the Vidici group expelled in 1982 was Željko Simić, today one of the most prominent figures in the regime of Milošević. The poststructuralists were pushed out by the new nationalists who had no time to wait. The break-up of Yugoslavia has created a perfect territory for the development of narrow-minded national cultures who continue obsessively to search the past in order to justify their existence. Needless to say this has resulted in the return to “fundamental values” of religion (Orthodox, Catholic, Islamic) and the gradual restriction of individual freedoms that might violate the “national interest.” While Slovenia still manages to maintain its peculiar form of “postmodern nationalism,” the other republics are almost totally in the grip of nationalist nostalgias. “Postmodern nationalism: non-aggressive, non-defensive, non-expansionist, multiculturalist orientation; nation with the ‘feeling’ of national fulfillment and sovereignty.” Dimitrij
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Rupel, the foreign minister of Slovenia and a scholar of Comparative Literature, claims that his country has managed to produce exactly that kind of state ideology, although the term itself sounds like an oxymoron.

Despite the dominant role of regressive nationalism in Serbia, the legacy of the Vidici group is visible in the small but highly creative group of resisters to war and nationalism gathered around the Belgrade radio station B-92. The name of the station, which is the emergency phone number of the Belgrade police, is itself an indication of the kind of methods used by B-92. By employing irony and parody in the highly politicized environment, this radio station not only serves as the only alternative source of information over the airwaves, but also initiates a number of grassroots public actions that expose the inadequacies of the current nationalist regime. For example, in a project called “All the President’s Babies,” Radio B-92 invited all the parents who can no longer support their children because of the disastrous government policies that have led to the war and international trade embargo to donate them to Slobodan Milošević. This resulted in a massive gathering of parents with baby strollers in front of the President’s office. The government quickly reduced taxes on the sales on baby food and diapers, fearing a possibility of a revolt that would be less benevolent than this one. This combination of performance art and social disobedience represents the only adequate response to the current political and cultural situation in Serbia. The political opposition is today almost as nationalist as the ruling Socialist party and has not found a platform that could stop the war and improve the economy. The only hope for the future of Serbia lies with the younger generation that has gone beyond the “technologies of power” and resists the ideology of the nation by a variety of unconventional strategies that were initiated in the early eighties by the Vidici group.
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