

THE NON-ALIGNED HUMANISM OF RUDOLF BRUČI: THE COMPOSER AND THE SOCIETY OF SELF-MANAGEMENT SOCIALISM

*Nemanja Sovtić*¹
University of Novi Sad
Academy of Arts

Received: 15 February 2017

Accepted: 1 June 2017

Original scientific paper

ABSTRACT:

In 1979 the oratorio *We Are All a Single Party* was performed, composed by the Yugoslav composer Rudolf Bruči, who in an interview for the Novi Sad daily newspaper *Dnevnik* explained his driving motives in the following way: “I wanted to preserve the spirit of our revolutionary songs and to speak in a modern, familiar way, understandable to everyone, about the decades in which our revolution was born and grew; about the legendary activities of pre-war communists, the difficult days of the War of National Liberation, the liberation and reconstruction of the country, about Tito and his invaluable contribution to the development of our self-management socialism and *non-aligned humanism*” (*Dnevnik*, 10 April, 1979). In this article I argue that the syntagm “non-aligned humanism” is suitable for identifying the connection between the aesthetic and the political in Rudolf Bruči’s creative output, observed as a consistent author’s opus. At the core of this thesis lies the assumption that non-alignment in regard to the West or East was a major political and aesthetic orientation of Yugoslav self-management socialism. The intersubjective field of this self-management socialist pluralism produced creative entities – composers such as Bruči – whose works were created under the principles of direct political engagement and modernist aestheticism as different manifestations of the same ideology. Within the specific rationality of *non-aligned humanism*, the concrete poetic-morphological characteristics of Bruči’s compositions become coherent subjective (Bruči’s personal) and objective (social) achievements.

KEY WORDS: Rudolf Bruči, self-management, non-alignment, humanism, East, West

The oeuvre of Yugoslav composer Rudolf Bruči combines the social functions of the artist and his membership in the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in a single unit differentiated by the mechanisms of inclusive disunity. Currently, the reception of Bruči's life and work is framed by the dominant cultures' recollection of socialism as a socio-economic system with which Bruči was directly related, as well as by the perspective of the transitional and post-socialist society. Bruči's contribution to the cultural life of Novi Sad is proven through the institutions he founded/led and the awards he was given for his creative and social activities. Memories, anecdotes, myths, and the indicative silence about Rudolf Bruči all point to the legacy the composer left in Novi Sad, permeated with interpretations of the socialist past, from n(e)ostalgia to historical revisionism². Bruči's instrumental music has been exempted from the nostalgic evocation and negative evaluation of the socialist past because it has been regarded by Serbian musicological discourse as part of an autonomous, modernist artistic field. In regard to Bruči's artistic accomplishments, Serbian musicology in the Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav period has produced: (1) encyclopaedic texts, (2) analytical articles on the formal and compositional-technical elements, and (3) fragments in broader overviews of Serbian music by genres and fields. From the perspective of an *artistically autonomous* creative entity, Bruči is considered from the point at which elements of his instrumental and stage works intersect with the general flows of Serbian and Yugoslav music. The need to emphasize Bruči's belonging to these flows is explained not by the small number of more comprehensive scientific views on the poetic-aesthetic characteristics of Bruči's oeuvre. Papers addressing Bruči from the perspective of contemporary interdisciplinary musicology practices are almost non-existent.

The individualization of Bruči's creative being requires, above all, stylistic analyses of the composer's musical language. Differentiation of the genres of instrumental, vocal-instrumental, and stage works of Rudolf Bruči takes place within the traditional disciplines of opera, ballet, cantata, and art song, and orchestral, concertante, chamber, and solo music. Bruči's musical language corresponds to the third (1951-1970) and the fourth (1956-1980) periods of modernism, according to the periodization of Melita Milin.³ Transformations of the composer's creative persona range from

2 In Southeastern Europe, revisionism considers the socialist past through the mirror of recent social processes, such as transitional capitalism, democratic political pluralism, and traditional religious-confessional conciliarity; nostalgia in an idealized vision of the socialist past, seeking for a better and more human-centred future. Although nostalgic and revisionist perspectives are conflicting cultural memories, they function as complementary discourses in the ideological war against the socialist heritage. Since the critical impact of nostalgia in practice is negligible, the "civil war" between nostalgic and revisionist memories is rather the ideological "smokescreen" which facilitates the elimination of workers' rights acquired under socialism and contributes to the complete breakdown of class solidarity.

3 Milin defines the third period of modernism in Serbian music according to stylistic criteria (three streams: neoclassicism, neo-expressionism, and poetic archaization), while in the fourth she includes composers of different generations and stylistic-compositional poetics, who have in common the fact

Zhdanovian national classicism in the late 1940s, through the adoption of elements of European radical modernism during the 1950s and 1960s, to the reaffirmation of a national/regional idiom in the mid-1970s. Thus, a developmental line of Bruči's oeuvre conjugates general tendencies of the post-war music scene in Eastern Europe. Some of the most significant stylistic features of Bruči's artistic creation include heterogeneity of musical material, genre syncretism, symmetry as a regulator of musical flow, the expressive treatment of twelve-tone melodies, musical folklore, imitative polyphony, whole-tone and eight-tone scales, and the constructive role of rhythm. Few musicologists who have studied Bruči's music have given a relatively adjusted assessment of the composer's creative development. Bogdan Đaković noticed that Bruči's compositional-technical maturity is the "combination of an on-going search and positively affirmed elements of musical tradition" (Đaković 1992: 29), while Vesna Rožić characterized Bruči's creative approach as "the application of new musical techniques to the traditional thinking of music" (Rožić 2000).

The categorical apparatus of a stylistic analysis, however, overlooks the *differentia specifica* of Bruči's poetics. The creative path, which coincides with the developmental trends of the artistic environment,⁴ exhibits a deficient theorization if there is no contextual setting within which compositional practice and the autopoietic view of the author meet their social representations.

Bruči's reflection on socially responsible creativity in the light of self-management socialism and its internal and external orientations, is detailed in the articles "The Role of a Music Creator in the Modern Development of a Self-Management Socialist Society" (a paper submitted to the annual assembly of SOKOJ) and the "Manifest of the Third Avant-Garde." Both texts were written in 1977. In the first, Bruči sublimates a self-identifying framework of Yugoslav musical culture, within which a binary model, "ours-someone else's," operates, and focuses on the individual (human figure, human-centred being) as a self-management unit of the united, yet, as far as interests are concerned, pluralistic, society.⁵ In the "Manifesto," the composer criticizes

that "they approached the current tendencies in musical thinking, sometimes achieving synchronicity" (Milin 1998: 112), in which the author refers to techniques of working with sound masses, serialism, electronic music, aleatoric music, working with magnetophone tapes, and minimalism.

4 As is best demonstrated in *The History of Serbian Music*, Bruči shares every stylistic determination or contribution to some genre field with at least five other Serbian composers (these are only Serbian composers visible on the musicological "radar," while there is, as well, a significant number of those not so prominent, whose oeuvres could easily be, in a similar way, "dissolved" into general categories).

5 In the article "The Role of a Music Creator in the Modern Development of a Self-Management Socialist Society," Bruči criticizes the "creative-thinking drabness" of Yugoslav music, its "vagueness" and "isolation from tendencies in society and life." Starting from the assumption that "a particular culture, including our own, can be affirmed in the world and in its own country only within the fundus of its own values," Bruči concludes that "in a culture, art and music may reach the fullness of their own artistic being (...) only if they (...) without rejecting any fruitful influence on the side (...) keep their own physiognomy and individuality." Rather than adopting "foreign models and standards," Bruči suggests "the path inspired by

the “dehumanized avant-gardes” of the West; their conformism, integration into the system, and the neo-colonial Eurocentric “reflexive and psychological model.” As for Yugoslav musical culture, Bruči proposes “its own direction,” its “restoring music to humanism and humane-centred tendency,” as well as the self-management practice which can only be achieved by “synthesizing the entire historical musical experience – musical, linguistic, and operative acoustic means - remaining in the new sound ...”⁶

Since Bruči did not create his ideological horizon *ex nihilo*, between the lines of the composer’s statements there operate the texts on which his auto-poetic and socio-musical reflections rely. His understanding, according to which the revolutionary achievement of a socialist society is examined at the level of the emancipation of humanity serving as an aesthetic need and as the fundamental content of art, roots Bruči’s articles deeply in the aesthetic thought of Yugoslav philosophers such as Danko Grlić,⁷ Ivan Foht, Pavle Stefanović, and others. This Yugoslav aesthetic

time” which leads through “revolutionary developments in music.” Integration into the “courses of a ‘new world culture’” based “on our own elements of sensibility and understanding” is for Bruči the final stage on that path. “The new world culture” is perceived by the composer as “a new, global culture (...) to which the people of the newly liberated world of the non-aligned greatly contributed.” Thus, Bruči proclaims that “Yugoslav composers should (...) advocate the Yugoslav policy of non-alignment and the support of cultural achievements of the Third World” by “disproving colonialist concepts towards particular cultures and especially the musical creativity of those people” with their own creativity.

6 Remarking that “the West does not accept and even refuses the work of art with a message of humanity,” in the “Manifest of the Third Avant-garde,” Bruči states that “incontestably the greatest part of what is going on in contemporary music is out-of-date, survivals (...).” The composer believes that “today, contemporary music is groping in the dark,” and that “its philosophy and ideology have collapsed, no matter how much at one period they contributed to new musical knowledge. Today, it is no longer the time to disclaim a man,” summarizes Bruči; “an artist should take care of how to establish him in his work.” Acknowledging that, in the beginning, “for many avant-gardists, hermeticism, alienation, and absurdity meant a kind of rebellion,” Bruči concludes that “nowadays (...) generally speaking, the Western avant-garde is fully conformist, harmless, integrated into the system, channelled,” that “it contradicts nothing,” that “its own crisis attributes to the general one,” whereby, “it is not able to resolve that crisis,” but still “it imposes – from its Eurocentric point of view – with great persistence, taking different ways, often with a very good strategy, its thinking and psychological model on the ‘peripheral’ cultures.” Claiming that in “the twentieth century, Europe has experienced two avant-gardes: around the First World War and in the Second World War,” Bruči invokes “the time when the third avant-garde should appear, based on man’s new experience.” “That third avant-garde,” the composer believes, “will not be possible if it continues to dissipate music and to look for dimensions and thoughtfulness on the same path where the second avant-garde feverishly stooped: in anti-music – in silence, but rather (only) if (it) synthesiz(es) the entire historical musical experience – musical, linguistic, and operative acoustic means, remaining in the new sound, with the meaning of a profound recommencement of humanity, questing for the primeval need of art to search and examine the world and to find the truth.”

7 In his book *Art and Philosophy*, Danko Grlić makes reference to the consequences of Heidegger’s theses concerning the progress of science and technology which is perceived to be a cause of the *forgetting*

thought and Bruči's reflections, embodied in the already mentioned articles, lead the composer's creative practice to the doorway of the political.

The main concerns of Yugoslav self-management society – where to go regarding internal and foreign political affairs, particularly in a world of antagonistic bloc-like division between East and West – indirectly also became the primary dilemma of Yugoslav art.⁸ Under the specific rationality of socialist self-management pluralism, Bruči's numerous, different compositions merge into one consistent oeuvre. The intersubjective field of Yugoslav self-management society could have produced creative entities whose (various) pieces were characterized by direct political engagement and modernist aestheticism as different aspects of the same ideology. Therefore, it is necessary to examine the mechanisms of interpellation, genealogy, and ideological premises of the Yugoslav self-management socialism in the creative development of Rudolf Bruči, a holder of the social role of composer in a historically established society.

* * *

Linking “their own path to socialism” with the particularities of the Yugoslav revolution,⁹ self-management theorists were not imagining a specific, Yugoslavian ideology (Titoism), but a social organization derived from the “proper reading” of Marx and Lenin. Self-management actualized Marx's idea of abolishing property relations and exploitation through the transfer of funds for production to the hands of an association of free producers. Self-management rejected the Soviet model of a monolithic, homogeneous, and non-confrontation society as a compromised project that in the post-revolutionary period required excessive use of the repressive state apparatus. The assessment that the pluralism of interests of different social subjects should not be overcome by violence, but rather turned into a dialectic flywheel of future socialist relations, shaped self-management theoretical practice. Policies of decentralization, democratization, and debureaucratization sought “the dying out of the state” as the

of being (Dasein), i.e. the alienation from the authentic “kind of being” of a human, and in this context, presumes the Yugoslav self-management socialism to be the society of emancipatory potential which does not sacrifice “true humanity” to modernization. Art plays a key role in the further social liberation and discovering of true humanity in a self-management society, and its philosophical ambition and social role should be to defend the humanization of society from the increased external coercion of scientific-technical modernization.

8 Primarily of the artists who were members of the League of Communists.

9 In historical and political assumptions about self-management, Yugoslav historiography included: (1) the specificity of the Yugoslav revolution, in which took part not only the working class, but also the peasantry and part of the civil faction; (2) the fact that the creation of a socialist state was preceded by the governing of autonomous organs of the national government, for which entry into the common state was at the same time an act of national emancipation; (3) conflict with bureaucracy on the inner level; (4) resistance to imperialism and hegemony in international relations.

last stop on the path of integrating work and society, managed through workers' councils and national committees. According to its own theory, socialist self-management did not, like liberal democracies, segregate the general will from that of the workers. Instead of imposing on society an abstract subject of the working class, the political system of self-management socialism spurred the emergence of a concrete structure of interests arising from social life. The disintegrative impulses of economic reality¹⁰ self-management were amortized by maneuvering between the Scylla of bureaucracy and Charybdis of the accumulation of social contradictions, thereby ensuring that the relationship between short-term and long-term interests did not become a mechanism for stopping the reproduction of social totality.

The need for the harmonization of legitimate special and general social interests defined the categorical imperative of self-management socialism and determined the role of a party in a society "in transition."¹¹ Political scientist Adolf Bibič considered that a multitude of different individual, common, and general interests in mutual conflict requires subjective control, rather than being left to objective historical flows (Bibič 1981: 260), while philosopher Jovan Mirić viewed self-management as a process/system/movement which obligated the party with the agenda of conserving the revolutionary course.¹² Self-management, therefore, required the leadership and control of the communists. The legitimacy of the party, founded upon the Marxist belief that in time the authorities/property would be dying in the hands of the working class, was confirmed by the need for arbitration between conflicting parties in an imaginary pluralistic society. According to the theory of self-management, the party's competence included ensuring conditions through which the alienation of surplus labour was gradually decreasing, so that the individual interests of

10 The economic sphere was threatened by a fundamental contradiction between the interests of workers fully to dispose of the material social value they produced and the general interest of society to appropriate a part of that value in order to provide a basic and extended reproduction of production conditions.

11 "The origin of pluralism of self-management interests, which emphasizes the principle of concreteness and the immediacy of the expression of interests and seeks to limit the 'politicization' of interests, simultaneously contains another principle: that self-management entities act in such a way that the categorical imperative of their actions is not their personal or partial special interest in their empirically isolated, unexplored form, but aligned with the interests of others, with another *legitimate* (emphasized by N.S.) specific interests, and the general interests of society" (Bibič, 1981: 261).

12 "As a party of the revolution, it (The League of Communists, noted by N.S.) has historical responsibility for overall social development and for the dignity of every man, and therefore must engage all social forces at the front of building self-management. *Its contradictory position* (emphasized by N.S.) imposes on it very complex and responsible tasks and an appropriate methodology of action: it must be equally the party of the movement as well as the party of the system (...) It (The League of Communists, noted by N.S.), in the conditions of socialist self-management and pluralism of interests, must consistently adhere to the revolutionary course between the Scylla of dogmatic bureaucracy and the Charybdis of civil liberalism without commanding political positions" (Mirić, 1981: 273).

the workers did not stand in the way of the interest of the class. The Communist Party saw itself as a vehicle of the avant-garde power that theoretically conceived, classified, and acted practically in order to preserve the revolutionary course, preventing a turn to bureaucratic dogmatism and civic liberalism.

After four decades of self-management social life, and more than two in its *post mortem* phase, it became difficult not to notice the discrepancy between intent and realization; that is, not to see the contradiction between self-management theory and practice. Self-management socialism aimed at gradually bringing about the extinction of the state by increasing the administrative apparatus in the society “in transition.”¹³

Historian Marie-Janine Čalić described the Yugoslav political system as a “complicated ‘delegate’ system, in which delegates, starting from self-management bodies, elected district and provincial assemblies, which then chose the parliaments of the republics” (Čalić 2013: 318–319).¹⁴ Moving towards the association of free producers led to a combined path between the market economy and the so-called “negotiated economy,” which left Yugoslavia facing a high unemployment rate and directed a considerable number of its citizens to seek wage labour in the capitalist countries of Western Europe, primarily Germany, Austria and Italy. The foundation of the classless society was carried out by the “red bourgeoisie” – by modernization, industrialization, and urbanization – processes that resulted in an increasing disparity between

13 This started with workers’ councils in factories, regulated by the *Basic Law on the Management of State Economic Enterprises and Higher Economic Association by the Workers’ Collective* passed in June 1950 and continued with national committees in the municipalities and counties enabled by the *General Law on National Committees* passed in 1952. According to Article 2 of the *Constitutional Law on the Basics of the Political and Social Organization of the Federative People’s Republic of Yugoslavia and of the Federal Organs of Authority*, passed in January 1953, institutions for self-management democracy also included elections, recalls, referendums, voters’ assemblies, people’s councils, participation of people in administration, and judiciary organs, as well as other forms of direct management (Petranović-Zečević 1988: 1028). Through the 1976 *Law on Associated Labour*, created with the purpose of “linking overall social work,” were established the Basic Organizations of Associated Labour (OOUR), which integrated themselves into Complex Organizations of Associated Labour (SOUR).

14 Regarding the situation in which this system of self-management found itself in the late 1970s, Čalić characterizes it as a “polycratic galimatias of various self-management bodies,” stating that by the end of the 1970s 1.5 million new provisions for the application of the law were created, and that by 1980 were assembled 94,415 “basic democracy units” (Čalić 2013: 319). R. Peković explains the bureaucratic “overflow” in self-management socialism as the redoubling of (self)-managerial competencies: “Self-management developed in conditions under which the competences of the state and federal state and party bodies were still decisive, and where almost the whole production belonged to the state. On the other hand, the emancipation of business entities led to other forms of decentralized bureaucracy in municipalities and companies in the form of various alliances and symbioses of directors and party and trade union organizations, bypassing the role of workers and separating members of workers’ councils from production and workers” (Petranović-Zečević 1988: 1038).

life in the city and in the countryside, as well as in growing economic inequality between different regions and republics. Non-alignment with the eastern and western blocs turned into an equidistance policy, through which Yugoslavia's foreign policy was indirectly controlled by the bloc-like division of the world (especially from the moment it began to collapse). As in the mechanism of "communicating vessels," Yugoslav culture became a bricolage of cultural models of the East and West.

The gap between the norms and the effects of self-management socialism can be viewed in different ways, but it appears that amongst the professional (and broader) public the prevailing opinion is that self-management was a utopian and maximalist project, whose dialectical indeterminacy faded and which was inapplicable to the reality of Yugoslav everyday life, which demanded clear, direct, and non-contradictory moves.¹⁵ The innate deficits of self-management were made apparent by Yugoslav lawyers, sociologists and philosophers announcing the collapse of the state, warning that the institutional inertia of self-management society did not tolerate radical reform initiatives. The presentist teleology (self)-satisfyingly bespeaks that the breakup of Yugoslavia was encoded in its original foundations, amongst which self-management socialism occupies a central position because of its a *posteriori* obvious inability to solve systematically the problem of the internal splits in Yugoslav society.

There are, however, premises for different views of self-management socialism. According to Slovenian sociologist Rastko Močnik's theory of institution, status and class social structures consist of institutions that provide individuals with contradictory requirements within their normal functioning. Caught in the trap of contradictory demands, an individual expects an *ad hoc* suggestion in which the ruling ideology is reproduced. The hierarchization of contradictions produces supplementary institutions that do not offer dialectically more advanced solutions to the contradictions generated, but they do confirm orders for fulfilling more important requirements. It is said that Močnik's theory does not find its interpellative power in the capacity of the ideology to form a solid and well-organized social structure, but in the institutional production of contradictions. Under the influence of institutions, individuals are

15 "Specifically, Kardelj then discusses to whom exactly to assign the resources of a formerly centralized state and consolingly assumes that the 'territorialization at a lower level' (their transfer to municipalities, but mostly federal republics) will take place 'in the sphere of self-management at all levels' (*Integration* 42). It is not clear what this means, except for the ritual inclination towards an overarching principle, because self-management barely existed at any level other than that of the core enterprises. His triumphant horizon of economic reform reads: 'Such is the integration of the present and the future of mankind. It transcends all boundaries and all languages. But, in order to develop, it must be a true product of the needs of the production relations of each individual nation and must never be imposed from outside' (42). Now we rub our eyes and ask: which planet are we on? On that where we had the Vietnam War and the Cold War? Is international economic cooperation based on the socialist fraternity or on the selfish interests of capitalist corporations and states? The great anti-imperialistic ending of his peroration fails to remember its beginning. In other words, until the mid-1960s, Kardelj and other decision-makers at the top succumbed to the deadly disease of equalization of all the most distant utopian horizons of a larger package of measures and of its pragmatic moment" (Suvin 2014: 296).

being “massively called” into the social structure; that is, interpellated and subjectivized. Močnik’s theory of institution explains the dynamics of the development of Yugoslav society in the light of the channeling of contradictions into a socially formative service until the moment at which “structural tensions and contradictions can no longer be restrained by the additional bricolage of existing elements,” at which point “there comes a comprehensive transformation that from the root changes the structure of (...) *social revolution*” (Močnik 2003: 146–147).

The application of the theory of institution as the theory of the material existence of ideology by Rastko Močnik, allows for a structural description of the interpellative mechanisms of self-management socialism. Močnik develops Lévi-Strauss’s thesis, according to which the existence of society whose parts hold diametrically opposite approaches towards totality requires a *zero-institution*. The unifying differential line – the *zero institution* – is not antagonistic and has no other role but to legitimate other institutions. It is an *empty form* which different ideological discourses *over-determine*, aiming to gain a *hegemonic* social position. The over-determination of the zero institution, however, leaves a social structure which is dynamically dysfunctional, which is why it requires additional institutional articulation through *supplemental institutions*.¹⁶

Self-management can be considered an empty form of relations, which would anticipate the expression of interest pluralism in Yugoslav society. It was conceived as a representation of totality, which would not mutually antagonize its parts. In various domains of social life, self-management was over-determined by conceptually different ideologies, such as a “pluralism of interests” in labour-economic spheres, “non-alignment” in foreign affairs, and “social aestheticism” in the cultural domain.¹⁷ The

16 The fundamental question raised by Močnik is: why does the interaction of individuals with different ideological discourses sometimes come to interpellation, and sometimes not? Within Althusser’s theory, the answer to this dilemma, according to Močnik, asks for an addition in the form of the modified scheme of Lacan scheme for transfer in psychoanalytical situations. It comes to interpellation when a certain ideological discourse offers the meaning that coincides with the unconscious phantasm of an individual. However, Močnik correctly concludes that this condition for interpellation is too “strong” to have explanatory value in cases of ideological interpellation of larger proportions which homogenize one society. Therefore, he proposes a thesis on interpellation which is done through the material existence of ideology, i.e., the institution. Močnik’s theory implies that hegemonic ideology does not draw interpellative force from its ability to organize a social structure well, to make it functional, but rather from its propensity to leave it always incomplete and produce contradictions. For individuals caught before the contradictory requirements of institutions, which appear as a part of their normal functioning, decisions are necessarily delegated to the ruling instance – the representative of hegemonic ideology powerful enough to hierarchically classify contradictions, i.e., to decide which request is to be met. Under the impact of contradictions in a normal functioning of institutions, the individuals are being “called out” within a social structure, i.e., largely interpellated and subjectivized.

17 The theory of self-management relied on the Marxist project of the erosion of state and the concept of the “association of free producers.” Instead of imposing the interest of the working class on society, as the interest of an abstract political entity, self-management intended to present a concrete structure of interest, aroused from a labour-economic reality of social life, in the political domain of society. In prac-

mentioned social binders are constituted by ideological premises of self-management, explicitly or implicitly referring to them. If it is accepted that self-management functioned as a hegemonic ideological complex whose operative mechanisms are clearly described by Močnik's theory of institution, then the transposition of self-management to the domain of cultural/aesthetic production directly contextualizes artistic work such as Bruči's.

The intertwining of the domains of the aesthetic and the political in socialist Yugoslavia establishes the existence of the heterogeneous self-management creative practice of Yugoslav artists. Aesthetic and cultural oscillations, characteristic of the sixth and seventh decades of the 20th century, are explained by the regime's instrumentalization of culture for internal and external purposes.¹⁸ The development of Yugoslav high culture in the context of foreign policy "representations for the world" requires an interpellative framework in which Yugoslav art faces the constructs of "East" and "West" as a *conditio sine qua non*. The aforementioned framework of interpretation ties this platform more closely to the most important Yugoslav international projects and aesthetic ideology in Yugoslavia; the art created "in the vicinity" of the Party, and consequently the creative practice of Rudolf Bruči, is ideologically set right

tice, self-management, supporting the concept of "pluralism of interests," institutionalized the possibility for the interests of social factors to be found in mutual collision. The permanent institutional "overcoming" of systematically produced contradictions became a socially imposed responsibility of self-management bodies. It was often also the case that the supplemental solutions were mutually contradictory, which intensified the effects of the interpellative mechanism. When conflicting views on totality threatened the survival of social structure, there appeared the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the state superiors or Tito, bringing *ad hoc* solutions which differentiated the legitimate interests from those which threatened the maintenance of revolutionary policy. Therefore, the interpellated individuals were forced to an unconditional identification with the subject of hegemonic ideology, due to contradictory institutional requirements which could only be hierarchically classified by its representatives.

18 It is common thinking that the pieces created as commissions from the Party (inspired by revolutionary themes, realized in the appropriate genres), are products of the order-like repressive cultural politics beside which the authors developed their authentic creative entities, based on the immanent rationality of compositional-technical innovation and the aesthetic need of the traditional concept of music, and exercised them in the autonomous fields of symphonic, concertante, chamber, and, possibly, stage music. However, the relatively short duration of the dogmatic course of socialist realism and the turning to socialist aestheticism undermine this simplified picture. The historian Predrag Marković demythologizes the relationship between the regime and culture, describing it as a "policy of purchasing and corruption, rather than of repression and intimidation," further explaining it as a need for the Yugoslav communists to keep the aureole of "socialism with a human face" in the eyes of the world, while at the same time building the cult of revolution for "home usage" (Marković 2007: 43). Thus, the mythical scheme, according to which Yugoslav composers are at the same time "staff" artists of the Party and authentic creative personas, is remythologized by presenting the Yugoslav artists as self-conscious, yet corrupted intellectuals, able to distance themselves from the ruling ideology, but too conformist-minded.

in the middle of the imaginary West-East-Non-Aligned triangle.¹⁹

The modifications of socialist realism on one hand, and radical and moderate modernism on the other, resulted in the creation of a modernist-oriented *socialist aestheticism*, as a *supplemental institution* whose reference was self-management non-alignment foreign-policy. The *de facto* “and (on the East) and (on the West)” situation in Yugoslav culture was co-produced by the declarative “neither (on the East) nor (on the West)” foreign policy, and for the ideological effect to be complete, it was presented as Yugoslav artists’ *own artistic path*.²⁰

Post-socialist discourses often interpret non-alignment as the fruit of Yugoslav adventurism and Tito’s charisma, lessening the contribution of non-aligning to global relations in the post-war period. The thesis of the transformation from dualism to tri-alism of social organization (Lévi-Strauss) through the formation of a zero institution (Močnik) normalizes non-alignment in the light of the Cold War and positions it in proximity to the place where it itself desired to be. Instead of opposing the Warsaw Pact and NATO, the Non-Aligned Movement built a bridge between the conflicting sides. The non-alignment did not acquire its interpellation power by being the third bloc, but in representing the potential for leaving the bloc division of the world.²¹ Like self-management, non-alignment territorialized the space around a unifying/de-antagonizing actant, failing to maintain itself in the position of a global

19 Predrag Marković points out that “a myth should not be made out of broadmindedness of Yugoslav artists” precisely because all the important directions in the Yugoslav aesthetic ideology were assigned by the Party. “The Yugoslav regime,” says Marković, “realized in 1948, after the conflict with Stalin, that flirting with modernism in culture leaves a good impression on the West, and that it does not cost much. On the contrary, it brought not only political points (...). There also was the use of culture in the direction of winning the East. Tito’s only major attack on modern tendencies in art occurred at the time of the rapprochement of the USSR and Yugoslavia in 1962. Interestingly, at a similar time, Khrushchev attacked modernist tendencies in the journal *Novi Mir* (*The New World*). Perhaps Tito attacking abstract art was a small concession in an insignificant field, in order to demonstrate solidarity with the Soviets, without scarifying larger interests” (Marković 2007: 43–44).

20 The interpellative force of socialist aestheticism as a non-aligned aesthetic ideology was in an institutional vacuum of contradictions, in which Yugoslav foreign policy fell while balancing between East and West. The regime rarely gave aesthetic and poetic guidelines to Yugoslav composers in repressive forms, such as Tito’s attack on abstract art in 1962. More often, these were institutionalized “suggestions” – awards and commissions for the artists whose work at a particular time suited the foreign policy interests of the country. What Marković identified as “purchasing and corruption” could be the Lacanian pro-alternative which produced the interpellation and subjectivization of Yugoslav artists such as Rudolf Bruči, in a state project of non-aligned, self-management culture.

21 “The non-bloc states represented at this Conference are not going to create a new bloc, nor can they be a bloc. They truly want to collaborate with every government that seeks to contribute to the consolidation of trust and peace in the world. (...) They believe that the further expansion of the non-engaged part of the world is the only possible and necessary alternative to the course of the total bloc division of the world and the intensification of Cold War policy” (Petranović-Zečević 1988: 1084).

zero institution.²² Nevertheless, it subjectivized states and individuals by distributing roles in the international community. The fact that they were accepted from a cynical distance did not weaken, but strengthened the interpellative potential of non-alignment. As a supple “subject presumed to know,” non-alignment stretched Yugoslavia to the horizons of the world and across its edge. The criticized “escape from Europe” de-provincialized the Yugoslav collective identity, suppressing, relativizing, and humourizing the Balkan mental map.

* * *

The theory of ideology, supported by the social history of socialist Yugoslavia, lays the foundation for a hypothesis of the ideological horizon of self-management pluralism as a backbone of the authorial consistency of Bruči's oeuvre. The composer's articulation of *non-aligned humanism* converges with the first steps of the state's non-aligned policy made after the “non-bloc” Conference held in Belgrade in 1961, and was convened because of the danger of nuclear war between the USA and USSR. The artistic transposition of the term *non-aligned humanism* began with a creative lull after Bruči's study-visit to Vienna from 1953 to 1954. The creative crisis of the late 1950s, apparent in a reduced output, gives evidence of a careful mulling over of a new social framework, perhaps even of a grieving over the concrete horizon of expectations offered through socialist realism. Bruči emerged from this crisis once he decided to cope with the social contradictions of the Yugoslav self-management pluralism by conjugating them with his own creative practice, and having them dialectically resolved in his music. As an artist and a member of the Party, Bruči invested in a (self)-critical attitude towards social aporias, dialectically leaning towards utopian optimal projection and the dystopian apocalyptic scenario. The composer's creative productivity of the seventh and early eighth decades of the 20th century provides evidence of the strong driving motives of a moulded worldview.

The term *non-aligned humanism* refers to Bruči's vocal-instrumental music based on a poetic/prose text, libretto, or stage narrative, yet also to his instrumental music whose latent ideological dispositive is adduced to the analytical reading of the internal relations of the musical material. At an immanently musical level, *non-aligned humanism* is manifested as an interaction of morphological and semiological elements of musical language, which represent functions/meanings of the external pressure of *modernization* and its assimilation with views on a *truly human-centred being*. The elements of Bruči's musical language, classified in the categories of “constants” and “variables,” describe a developmental physiology potentially based on the dialectical tension between the *permanence* and *transformation* of Yugoslav self-management socialism. The “constants” include traditional particularities of musical expression,

22 “The assembled heads of the non-bloc countries' states and governments do not make concrete proposals to resolve all international disputes, especially those between the two blocs” (Petranović-Zečević 1988: 1084).

which in Bruči's oeuvre are in counterpoint with stylistic-technical articulations of new sound and modernist practices.²³ The new-sound elements of musical structure, historically developed to challenge the aesthetic totality of a piece, were included by Bruči in his *opus magnum et perfectum* in the belief that the conflict between the attractive and repulsive forces in a piece of music could conjugate/resolve the social contradictions of self-management Yugoslavia and the non-aligned world. At an immanently musical level, Bruči's *non-alignment* is reflected in endeavours of technical innovation, a result of the "destructive tendencies of modernization," to be subordinated to human-centred existence, which occurs neither under socialist Eastern governments, nor in the liberal-capitalist West. Bruči's creative output is non-aligned along the dichotomous poles of East – West and traditional – modern, but it, as a human creative enterprise, builds a dialectal relationship between the external and internal references of the Yugoslav policy of non-alignment.

23 The concept of *new sound* in this case would include all the "conditions of a material" developed in the European context during the 20th century, starting from atonality and athematicism to electronic music, which, compared to the suitability of the late romantic means of expressions and neoclassical forms in socialist realism, had a modernist and avant-garde aura.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Altiser, Luj (2009) *Ideologija i državni ideološki aparati*. Loznica: Karpos [*Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*].
- Bibič, Adolf (1981) "Samoupravni pluralizam." In: Radule Knežević (ed.) *SKJ i subjektivne snage socijalističkog samoupravljanja*., Zagreb: Savez komunista Hrvatske, 252–265 ["Self-governing pluralism." *League of Communists of Yugoslavia and Subjective Forces of Socialist Self-Governing*].
- Bruči, Rudolf (1977) "Uloga muzičkog stvaraoca u savremenom razvoju samoupravnog socijalističkog društva." *Zvuk* 4, 30–35 ["The Role of Music Creator in the Contemporary Development of the Self-Managing Society"].
- Bruči, Rudolf (1977) "Manifest 'Treće avangarde.'" *Oklo*, 15-29. prosinca 1977, Zagreb: "Oklo" ["Manifesto of the "Third Avant-Garde""].
- Bruči Rudolf (1977) *Postavke radne grupe kompozitora redakcije programa J M T*. Manuscript [*Starting Points of the Composers' Working Group of the Program Desk of the Yugoslav Music Review*].
- Focht, Ivan (1959) *Istina i biće umjetnosti*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost [*The Truth and Being of Art*].
- Grić, Danko (1965) *Umjetnost i filozofija*. Zagreb: Mladost [*Art and Philosophy*].
- Ђаковић, Богдан (1992). *Опера Гилгамеш као уметничка синџеза стваралачкој љуџи Рудолфа Бручија*. Unpublished thesis, Library of the Faculty of Music in Belgrade, ДИПЛА-4/1 / Ђаковић, Богдан (1992). *Opera Gilgamesh kao umetnička sinteza stvaralačkog puta Rudolfa Bručija*. Unpublished thesis, Library of the Faculty of Music in Belgrade, ДИПЛА-4/1 [*Opera Gilgamesh as the Artistic Synthesis of Rudolf Bručić's Creative Journey*].
- Kuljić, Todor (2011) *Sećanje na Titoizam – Između diktata i otpora*. Beograd: Čigoja štampa [*Remembering Titoism – Between Dictate and Resistance*].
- Marković, Predrag (2007) *Trajnost i promena*, Beograd: Službeni glasnik [*Permanence and Change*].
- Милин, Мелита (1998) *Традиционално и ново у српској музици њосле Другој свејској рајна (1945–1965)*. Београд: Музиколошки институт САНУ / Milin, Melita (1998) *Tradicionalno i novo u srpskoj muzici posle Drugog svetskog rata (1945–1965)*. Beograd: Muzikološki institut SANU [*The Traditional and the New in Serbian Music after the Second World War 1945–1965*].
- Mirić, Jovan (1981) "Pluralizam interesa i samoupravno-demokratska konstitucija zajednice." In: Radule Knežević (ed.) *SKJ i subjektivne snage socijalističkog samoupravljanja*. Zagreb: Savez komunista Hrvatske, 265–273 ["Pluralism of Interests and the Self-Governing-Democratic Constituting of the Society." *League of Communists of Yugoslavia and Subjective Forces of Socialist Self-Governing*].
- Močnik, Rastko (2003) *Tri teorije: institucija, nacija, država*. Translated by Branka Dimitrijević. Beograd: Centar za savremenu umetnost [*Three Theories: Institution, Nation, State*].
- Čalić, Mari-Žanin (2013) *Istorija Jugoslavije u 20. veku*. Beograd: Clio [*History of Yugoslavia in the 20th Century*].
- Petranović, Branko, Zečević, Momčilo (1988) *Jugoslavija 1918/1988*. Beograd: Rad [*Yugoslavia 1918/1988*].
- Rožić, Vesna (2000) *Adaptacija novoglazbenih tehnika na tradicijski slog: skladatelj Rudolf Bruči*. Unpublished thesis. Academy of Music, University of Zagreb, Departement of Musicology

[*Adaptation of the New-Music Techniques to a Traditional Setting: The Composer Rudolf Bruči*].

Suvin, Darko (2014) *Samo jednom se ljubi : radiografija SFR Jugoslavije*, Beograd: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung [You Love Only Once. Radiography of SFR Yugoslavia].

НЕМАЊА СОВТИЋ

НЕСВРСТАНИ ХУМАНИЗАМ РУДОЛФА БРУЧИЈА: КОМПОЗИТОР И ДРУШТВО САМОУПРАВНОГ СОЦИЈАЛИЗМА

(САЖЕТАК)

Стваралаштво Рудолфа Бручија, југословенског композитора и члана Савеза комуниста СФР Југославије, још увек је недовољно истражено. Индивидуализација Бручијевог стваралачког субјекта захтева стилску анализу композиторског музичког језика и разумевање друштвеног контекста у којем је настало његово дело. Теорија идеологије, поткрепљена елементима друштвене историје социјалистичке Југославије, представља ослонац за хипотезу о идеолошком хоризонту самоуправног плурализма као кључном ослоњу ауторске конзистентности Бручијевог опуса. Рефлексија друштвено одговорног стваралаштва у светлу самоуправног социјализма и његових унутрашњих и спољних оријентација дата је експлицитно у композиторским написима. На позадини специфичне рационалности самоуправног плурализма, транспонованог у естетичку идеологију, стилски различите Бручијеве композиције сливају се у непротивречан ауторски опус. Бручијева стваралачка пракса и аутопоетички искази реферишу се на несврстано политичко понашање социјалистичке Југославије, оличено у (не)бивању (н)и на Истоку (н)и на Западу. На иманентно музичком нивоу несврстани хуманизам се манифестује као артикулација националног класицизма у пољу радикалног и умереног модернизма, односно интеракција морфолошких и семиолошких елемената музичког језика у функцијама/значењима спољне принуде модернизације и њеног саображавања са претпоставкама хуманог бића.

Кључне речи: Рудолф Бручи, самоуправљање, несврстаност, хуманизам, Исток, Запад