

PAUL STUBBS

Yugocentrism and the Study of the Non-Aligned Movement: Towards a Decolonial Historiography

PAUL STUBBS

THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS, ZAGREB

PSTUBBS@EIZG.HR

UDC 94(497.7):341.176

<https://doi.org/10.32728/flux.2021.3.6>

Original scientific paper

Yugocentrism and the Study of the Non-Aligned Movement: Towards a Decolonial Historiography¹

There has been a renewed scholarly interest in recent years concerning the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). This text addresses some of the challenges posed by focusing on NAM through a lens of Yugocentrism that is reliant on socialist Yugoslav sources alone. To reinsert socialist Yugoslavia into a global historiography, one needs to perform a double movement: The first part concerns bringing Yugoslavia back into global social relations; the second part concerns decentering its positionality and ensuring that other sites of analysis and struggle, and the relations between them, are taken into consideration. Seeing NAM as a prefigurative, multi-nodal, networked community rather than a traditional international organization suggests that privileging one node at the expense of others will lead to a distorted and incomplete analysis. This paper addresses the complex relationship between the Bandung Afro-Asian conference of April 1955 and the Belgrade NAM summit of September 1961. NAM and the G-77 are also studied as overlapping groupings in terms of membership and objectives. The paper contributes to the development of a critical decolonial historiography of the Cold War period that addresses the need for multi-sited, para-sited, and meta-historiographies by going beyond Yugocentrism whilst still retaining a nuanced concern with global Yugoslavia across different conjunctures.

KEYWORDS:

Non-Aligned Movement, socialist Yugoslavia, Yugocentrism, decolonial historiography, Bandung, G-77

¹ This article is the result of the collaborative research project Models and Practices of Global Cultural Exchange and Non-aligned Movement: Research in the Spatio-Temporal Cultural Dynamics (IPS-2020-01-3992), supported by the Croatian Science Foundation and the Slovenian Research Agency. A version of this paper was presented at the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory in Belgrade via Zoom on December 7, 2020. I am grateful for comments received on that occasion and for close attention to earlier drafts by Aida A. Hozić and Rada Iveković.

Introduction: History, Theory, Archives

The study of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and, in particular, the development of a nuanced understanding of the complex and contradictory role played within it by socialist Yugoslavia, particularly until the death of Tito in 1980, can be framed in terms of the intersection of the moments of socialism and the decolonial. Such a study can certainly bring a deeper understanding of the interactions between the Global East and the Global South,² when both terms are used as a form of what Spivak has termed “strategic essentialism,”³ even if the former is both “slippery” and “hard to categorize.”⁴ The fact that Yugoslavia no longer exists as a state, and that socialism was also overthrown, means that these interactions are now often forgotten from the vantage point of the post-Yugoslav space and post-socialist studies.

Studying socialist Yugoslavia and NAM requires manoeuvring within and between another “post”—that of “post-disciplinarity”—which brings multiple and diverse tools to bear on a particular research question, regardless of disciplinary boundaries.⁵ Moving beyond a trivial and trite acclamation that “history is far too important to be left to historians,” there is a need to address some of the disciplinary practices of some historians, which sometimes appear to resemble an assemblage of disciplinary peculiarities that fails to recognize the need to navigate “between the posts” and, at times, deny that the posts even exist or are worthy of serious attention. It is still the case that historians “often [pursue] detailed archival research...loudly proclaiming themselves practical empiricists to whom ‘theory’ is irrelevant.”⁶

At the risk of caricature, there is a marked tendency amongst some historians to write academic texts that eschew any engagement with theory in favour of an at times overly rigorous review of the extant literature to shore up a narrative claim that “other historians have approached the topic that way, but I am going to treat it **this** way,” perhaps suggesting more implicitly than explicitly that **this** way is not only different but superior. Of course, there is “Theory” and “theory” (and all points in-between). All texts are written both **for** and **against** so many things, yet they themselves are often crude straw persons to be set up and knocked down. Here, “the post-colonial turn” is conceived as only a turn rather than the road itself, and indeed much of what passes for “canon”—ironic in and of itself for something that began as an anti-canonical exercise—tends to be both over-theorized and indeed theorized a priori, standing tall and proud above any minor empirics that may be

134

² Paul Stubbs, Sofiya An and Tatyana Chubarova, “Poverty, Inequality and Well-being in the Global East: bringing ‘the social’ back in,” in *Social Policy, Poverty and Inequality in Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*, ed. Sofiya An, Tatyana Chubarova, Bob Deacon and Paul Stubbs (Stuttgart: Ibidem-Verlag, 2019), 11–43.

³ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, “Subaltern studies: deconstructing historiography,” in *Selected Subaltern Studies*, ed. Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Oxford: University Press, 1988), 3–32.

⁴ Martin Muller, “In Search of the Global East,” *Geopolitics* 25, no. 3 (2018): 736.

⁵ Bob Jessop and Klaus Neilson, “Institutions and Rules,” *Research Papers on Institutional Network Theory* 11 (2003): 1–11.

⁶ Stephen Mennell, “Concluding Remarks: history, sociology theory and the fallacy of misplaced abstractness,” *InterDisciplines* 1 (2010): 112–38.

contained within. Even the exciting, dynamic, and rather recent connections between post-socialist and post-colonial studies sometimes seem in danger of prioritizing *longue durée* historical narratives containing over-generalizations and a sort of reading of history backwards in a deterministic, path-dependent kind of way.

Stuart Hall's metaphor for theoretical work is pertinent here. It conceives of theory as "struggle" and "wrestling with the angels," arguing that "the only theory worth having is that which you have to fight off, not that which you speak with profound fluency."⁷ In conversation with John Clarke, Wendy Brown in a sense subverts the metaphor, suggesting that "too often... theoretical categories or pieces of theoretical arguments get wielded like weapons rather than like candles to light a room."⁸ This idea of theory as enlightenment, which is as far away from Enlightenment Theory as possible, is akin to Shannon Mattern's "little t" theory in the sense of "models to help us make sense of things, frameworks to help us ask questions." She points to the nature of knowledge production, a central theme in post-colonial thought, with a strong preference for work by "groups of people who develop their ideas collaboratively, over time, through processes that likely won't bring glory to any one of them."⁹

Alongside the a- and even anti-theoreticism of some historians nestles a related phenomenon, that of a fascination with and reliance upon "the archive" as source, method, and unproblematic "fountain of wisdom" upon which to base historical texts. There is by now, of course, a large and growing literature on the complexities of "the archive" as a "source" of historical knowledge, not least in terms of the constructed and selective nature of all archives, which suggests that silences and absences may be as important—if not more important—than presences.¹⁰ As Phil Cohen reminds us, the impulse to suck the archive dry, to "get to the bottom of things" in the name of objective history can come to resemble "an obsessive ambition to capture and sum up the world."¹¹ As an exemplar of critical post-curatorial practice and even of a kind of Utopian speculation, the net-art collective *From Bandung to Berlin* takes us on a non-linear journey of alternative possibilities through a meandering maze of "what ifs" including "what if the Berlin Wall had never been built?" or "what if the Berlin Wall had never been demolished?" Their take on "the archive" is particularly worthy of note:

The past is controlled via the archive. But through archives, too, the past is reshaped, reinterpreted and even reinvented. The archive is a utopian— or dystopian—site of knowledge, an imagined junction where identities, memories, values and beliefs are contested. ... The stories here are the

⁷ Stuart Hall, "Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies," in *The Cultural Studies Reader*, ed. Simon During (London, Routledge, 1999, Second edition), 97-111.

⁸ Wendy Brown, "In Conversation," in *Critical Dialogues: thinking together in turbulent times*, ed. John Clarke (Bristol: Policy Press, 2019), 53-68.

⁹ Shannon Mattern, "Theoretical humility," *Words in Space*, May, 2012, accessed March 22, 2021 <https://wordsinspace.net/2012/05/07/theoretical-humility/>.

¹⁰ Jason Lustig, "Epistemologies of the Archive: toward a critique of archival reason," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24 (2020): 95-117.

¹¹ Phil Cohen, *Archive That, Comrade! Left legacies and the counter-culture of remembrance*. (Oakland: PM Press, 2018).

specters of something else in our common history, that which has fallen through the cracks. We're not here to look for lost memories. We want to be lost in memories. To create an intimate liaison with time but at the same time keep a distance from it.¹²

It is not only whether, in Spivak's terms, the "sub-altern can speak" through the archive, but also in what sense the archive "speaks" at all that is at issue. "Hearing the archive" is always a complicated and contested act of translation, of "imaginative, symbolic and affective work"¹³ situated within "a field of possibilities that is already structured...in favour of certain outcomes."¹⁴ Perhaps all writing of history is an act of translation in which decolonial (as opposed to more "orthodox") histories are both more aware of this and consciously strive for "readerly" texts that make possible pluralist ecologies of knowledge that "move away from conventional Western modes of knowing"¹⁵ and are also more attuned to why this is so important.

The approach to socialist Yugoslavia and the Non-Aligned Movement developed here also derives from two perhaps more profound—and certainly more long-standing—dissatisfactions that intertwine with a concern with the under-empiricized and *longue durée* nature of much of what passes for post-colonial studies. One comes from the tradition of "global social policy"¹⁶ and the profound historical "presentism"¹⁷ within which it approaches "the global" and even "social policy," treating both from a peculiar Northern and Western standpoint and ignoring both "prior imaginings of world space"¹⁸ and "the complex and heterogeneous realities of social welfare around the world."¹⁹ Even within a recent "historical turn" in global social policy studies, the Non-Aligned Movement has been notable mainly for its absence.

The second is the chronic Eurocentrism of contemporary post-Yugoslav studies in which—whether within explicitly comparative work or not—the post-Yugoslav states are almost exclusively rendered legible in relation to each other, in relation to other post-communist states in what tends to be termed Central and Eastern Europe, and/or in relation to Western Europe and, in particular, the European Union and its member states. As hinted at above, it is not only that Latin America, Asia, and Africa are ignored

¹² "From Bandung to Berlin," accessed March 11, 2021, <https://frombandungtoberlin.com>

¹³ John Clarke, David Bainton, Noemi Lendvai and Paul Stubbs, *Making Policy Move* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2015), 188.

¹⁴ Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Habitations of Modernity: essays in the wake of subaltern studies* (Chicago: University Press, 2002), 34.

¹⁵ Arturo Escobar, *Encountering Development* (Princeton: University Press, 1995), 216.

¹⁶ See Bob Deacon, Michelle Hulse and Paul Stubbs, *Global Social Policy* (London: Sage, 1997), and Bob Deacon and Paul Stubbs, "Global Social Policy Studies: conceptual and analytical reflections," *Global Social Policy* 13, no. 1 (2013): 5-23.

¹⁷ Noemi Lendvai and Paul Stubbs, "Globale Sozialpolitik und Governance: Standpunkte, Politik und Postkolonialismus," in *Nord-Süd-Beziehungen im Umbruch: Neue Perspektiven auf Staat und Demokratie in der Weltpolitik*, ed. Hans-Jürgen Burchardt (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2009), 219-43.

¹⁸ Wendy Larner and William Walters, "Globalization as Governmentality," *Alternatives* 29 (2004): 495-514.

¹⁹ James Midgeley, "Social Development and Social Welfare: implications for social policy," in *A Handbook of Comparative Social Policy*, ed. Patricia Kennett (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2004), 217-38, 234.

as potential comparators and relevant interlocutors, it is that the legacy of socialist Yugoslavia is treated in a very limited way and, indeed, re-read through its relation to Euro-Atlantic institutions and states and/or in relation to the “superpowers” of the Cold War, the United States, and the Soviet Union. Hence, in complex and multiple ways, the Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav space is, not unlike that of other parts of the post-socialist space, evacuated from the terrain of imperial or colonial relations or, at best, within crude notions of “historical legacies,” re-positioned within “the end of Empires” in very crude and simplistic ways. Of course, this evacuation of the region from global historical processes is also present in much of contemporary scholarship on the European Union that fails to address the EU itself as a neo-colonial actor.²⁰

How can a critical, nuanced understanding of socialist Yugoslavia’s relation to the Non-Aligned Movement be developed that acknowledges “paradoxes, contradictions, and antinomies”²¹ by exploring diverse social, economic, political, and cultural imaginaries with reference to changing global geopolitics in different conjunctures or spatial-temporal frames? Yugoslavia’s “liminal” or “soft” hegemony of the movement in the context of its European positioning in relation to members almost exclusively from the Global South is important here. Of course, a decolonial sensibility towards the non-aligned would focus as much, if not more, on the space it offered for meaningful transnational exchanges in the realms of science, art and culture, architecture, and industry—a kind of “non-alignment from below”—as it would on NAM as an international organization—“classic accounts of Tito’s travels and NAM conferences,” as Cosovschi has suggested.²²

137

NAM is contradictory in so many ways, not least in terms of existing as a prefigurative post-national configuration, an imagined networked community that both transgresses the spatial order of nation states but also reproduces and indeed amplifies a nation-state logic. A linear reading of NAM through a kind of realist International Relations frame, in terms of the maximization of (national) self-interest, misses so much. Interestingly, NAM became a litmus test, especially in the 1960s and 1970s, for the changing spatial and political contours of resistance from the Global South, albeit with many contradictions, silences, and erasures. In short, it becomes a key focus not only of East-West divisions during the Cold War but also of North-South contestations—hence the importance of a reflexive decolonial sensibility.

²⁰ József Böröcz, *The European Union and Global Social Change* (London: Routledge, 2010).

²¹ Paul Stubbs, “Socialist Yugoslavia and the Antinomies of the Non-Aligned Movement,” *LeftEast* online, June 17, 2019, accessed March 12, 2021 <https://lefteast.org/yugoslavia-antinomies-non-aligned-movement/>.

²² Agustin Cosovschi, “Searching for Allies in America’s Backyard: Yugoslav Endeavors in Latin America in the early Cold War,” *The International History Review*, 2020 online, accessed March 12, 2021 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07075332.2020.1755339>.

On Yugocentrism, Yugosplaining, and Eurocentrism

The main purpose of this text is to address some of the challenges posed by a focus on NAM based exclusively or primarily on socialist Yugoslav sources, and some of the strategies and tactics that may be needed to overcome the problems of what can be termed **Yugocentrism**. The term hardly appears in the academic literature, and it is more often tied to a kind of “ironic nostalgia” in Svetlana Boym’s sense of the displacement of a mythical place that can be remembered but not rebuilt.²³ It was used in this way in an online interview with the Berlin-based art historian Bojana Pejić:

We were very Yugocentric, as I like to call it. We thought we were the center of the world, because we had important foreign politics...We had a lot of contacts with Africa, India, and other developing parts of the world. Our opinion really was that we were the center of the world—after all, we were modern, we had modern socialism, and modern art.²⁴

Of course, it is precisely this invocation of the word “modern” as a key element of Yugocentrism that is so jarring to a decolonial sensitivity, belonging as it does to a set of theories “that both declares and desires universal applicability for itself.”²⁵ There can be no doubt that socialist Yugoslavia was, first and foremost, a modernizing project and that socialist Yugoslavia, in fact, brought its own particular stance on modernization into the *always already* modernizing project of the Non-Aligned Movement. This was primarily done through the framework of rapid industrialization and urbanization, the modernization of agricultural production, and the expansion of education and mass literacy during the period Suvin terms “the twenty glorious years” between 1945 and 1965.²⁶ In the second half of this period, this translated into improved living standards. It is the complex relationship between modernity, developmentalism, and economic and political order that is at stake here. Socialist Yugoslavia’s “liminal hegemony” of the movement in the 1960s and 1970s offered a vision of modernity radically different from the hegemony of Northern and Western models that were seen as creating dependency, peripherality, and neo-colonialism. At the same time, as Kardelj frames it, “rapid economic and social development.”²⁷ through sovereign national planning—albeit with transfer of knowledge across states—was seen as the key to progressing up the “slippery slope” of development.²⁸ Implicitly more than explicitly (although some oil-producing states had a much higher GDP than Yugoslavia), socialist Yugoslavia was the exemplar of modernization for other non-aligned states to follow.

138

²³ Svetlana Boym, *Common Places: mythologies of everyday life in Russia* (Harvard: University Press, 1995).

²⁴ Bojana Pejić, “I tell my students not to believe me,” accessed March 12, 2021 <http://testimonies.umprum.cz/en/bojana-pejic.html>.

²⁵ Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: cultural dimensions of globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996).

²⁶ Darko Suvin, *Splendour, Misery and Possibilities: an x-ray of socialist Yugoslavia* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 33.

²⁷ Edvard Kardelj, *The Historical Roots of Non-Alignment* (Zagreb: Spektar, 1975).

²⁸ Stubbs, *Antinomies*.

To what extent Yugocentrism was a necessary feature of development practice and knowledge production, particularly after socialist Yugoslavia's break with Stalin in 1948, is very much an open question. Indeed, a need to overcome real political isolation was no doubt a driving force behind a search for alliances with the Global South. Again, contradictions abound because the "eclecticism"²⁹ of the Non-Aligned Movement, together with the liminality of Yugoslav hegemony that preferred paths of "self-determination" to a simplistic idea of exporting the Yugoslav model, were never entirely disentangled from a sense of superiority. As Catherine Baker suggests, as much as "non-alignment built identification with global anti-colonial struggle into the narrative of Yugoslavia's state identity," this was an anti-colonialism that was often "race-blind"³⁰ and all too frequently Eurocentric.³¹ It is also important to disaggregate Yugoslavia and to address the nature of Yugoslavia's own political, economic, and social divisions that were akin to a kind of internal "neo-colonialism."

Indeed, in terms of knowledge production, this Eurocentrism can be found in both the work of the main ideologue of Yugoslav socialism Edvard Kardelj and in the main oppositional philosophical orientation in and around the Praxis group. Kardelj's reflections on non-alignment can be gleaned from his essay "The Historical Roots of Non-Alignment,"³² which expresses Yugoslav solidarity with anti-imperialist struggles around the globe and opposition to the neo-colonial hegemony reflected in the economic dependence of post-colonial states. The text, running to some seventy-five pages, contains no references, but its broad argumentation relies on Marxist-Leninist theorizations of "objective necessity," anti-imperialism, and economism with non-alignment as a "step in a process of political modernization."³³ For Kardelj, the logic of socialist and working-class struggles connected his internal reformist agenda, which was primarily based around self-management, with an internationalist opposition to "hegemonism." His arguments on the "historical inevitability" of the success of non-alignment not only rode roughshod over the specificities of decolonial struggles in the Global South and across the continents of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, but were also silent on the dynamics of racism within colonial oppression and, crucially, appeared oblivious to the analysis of "race" and "class" developed by, among others, Cabral, Cesaire, Fanon, and Nkrumah.

The Praxis school, a group of mainly philosophers from the Universities of Belgrade and Zagreb, published the journal *Praxis* between 1964 and 1975

²⁹ Catherine Samary, "Introduction," in *Decolonial Communism, Democracy and the Commons*, ed. Catherine Samary and Fred Laplat (Dagenham: Merlin Press, 2019), 1-11.

³⁰ Catherine Baker, *Race and the Yugoslav Region: postsocialist, post-conflict, post-colonial?* (Manchester: University Press, 2018), 111.

³¹ Konstantin Kilibarda, "Non-Aligned Geographies in the Balkans: Space, Race and Image in the Construction of New European Foreign Policies," in *Security Beyond the Discipline: Emerging Dialogues on Global Politics—Selected Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Conference of the York Centre for International and Security Studies*, ed. by Abhinava Kumar and Derek Maisonville (Toronto, ON: York Centre for International and Security Studies, York University, 2010), 27-58.

³² Edvard Kardelj, *The Historical Roots of Non-Alignment* (Zagreb: Spekter, 1975).

³³ Robert W. Cox, *Approaches to World Order* (Cambridge: University Press, 1996), 294.

during the heyday of the Non-Aligned Movement, and they also ran a regular summer school on the island of Korčula that attracted many of the star names of Western left philosophy including Habermas, Goldman, Lefebvre, and the Eastern European dissident Agnes Heller.³⁴ The sources of their profound Eurocentrism are legion, and some of them relate to their uncritical reliance on the analyses of the Frankfurt school. One could speculate that their silence on the Non-Aligned Movement might not be unrelated to their animosity towards anything Kardelj focused on as the Party philosopher. As Karkov points out, the turn to extreme nationalism by some prominent Praxis figures in the late 1980s and early 1990s has a lineage in earlier formulations of a profoundly racist humanism that set a clear binary between the humanist practice of praxis and ethnocentric “primitivism” and “even savagery.” Not unlike Western Marxist humanism, Praxis philosophy, he argues, “never manages to free itself from its colonial(ist) dispositions (and) from the developmentalist fallacy that pits its own humanism against the presumed inhumanity of others.”³⁵ The silence of the Praxis group regarding non-alignment, along with its failure (which paralleled that of Kardelj) to reference critics of colonialism from the Global South and its failure to connect with Caribbean decolonial humanism, is telling. Karkov suggests that part of the problem here was, in fact, “that they were only reading the Western radical canon and each other, rather than someone like Franz Fanon.”³⁶ They had modelled their idea of the “praxical human being” as male and Western, thereby reproducing “the model of the global middle class who over-represent themselves as *the human* at the cost of dehumanizing in various degrees everyone else.”³⁷

140

It is then the specificities rather than the “exceptionalism” of socialist Yugoslavia that are important in terms of understanding the complexities of its positionality in different conjunctures and in relation to the so-called First, Second, and Third Worlds. Marina Blagojević’s feminist reworking of the notion of “semi-peripherality” seems particularly useful here, in that it differentiates Yugoslavia from both “the core” and “the periphery” as a paradoxical “social hybrid” marked by ambivalence in terms of simultaneously “catching up” with and “resisting integration” into the core.³⁸ Of course, “semi-peripherality” was very different in socialist Yugoslavia than in the post-Yugoslav space, being marked as it was by forms of “self-colonization”³⁹ alongside “de-development” and “repatriarchalization.” How to hold together the multiple registers of modernity and the ways they are structured in

³⁴ Boris Mikulić and Mislav Žitko, eds., *Aspekti Praxis: refleksije uz 50. objeltnice* (Zagreb: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2015).

³⁵ Nikolay Karkov, “Decolonizing Praxis in Eastern Europe: towards a South-to-South dialogue,” *Comparative and Continental Philosophy* 7, no. 2 (2015): 193.

³⁶ Karkov, “Praxis,” 197. In fact, *Praxis* 3–4, 1969 does include a short review of Fanon’s *Wretched of the Earth* by Ivan Kuvačić (*Praxis* 3–4; 606–610) that begins with lengthy quotes from Sartre’s Foreword, criticises the link Fanon makes between nationalism and Eurocentrism, and ends by comparing the book to Nietzsche’s Zarathustra. I am grateful to Nataša Kovačević for alerting me to Kuvačić’s review.

³⁷ Karkov, “Praxis,” 196.

³⁸ Marina Blagojević, *Knowledge Production on the Semi-Periphery: a gender perspective* (Belgrade: Institute for Criminological and Sociological Research, 2009).

³⁹ Blagojević, *Knowledge Production*, 34.

dominance is, of course, a highly complex question in decolonial thought. There is a need to recognize the “awkward relationship,” epistemologically and beyond, between the “Global East” and the “Global South”⁴⁰ and seek to construct poly-centric or even “ex-centric” knowledge⁴¹ of these relations.

Although they may overlap, Yugocentrism—at least in terms of knowledge production—is, of course, not the equivalent of Eurocentrism. Indeed, this is pointed out with a degree of irony by a recent series of essays that attempt to celebrate “Yugosplaining” to “counter forms of Westernsplainning to which we have long been subjected.”⁴² Yugosplaining is a response to the “collective erasures” of the socialist Yugoslav past, including the systematic “forgetting of the Yugoslav global role.”⁴³ Re-membling—literally putting the narrative back together—must address what Vjosa Musliu has termed “the inherent coloniality of (former/post) Yugo as a category”⁴⁴ if it is to distance itself from Eurocentrism.

In broad brush stroke terms, here Eurocentrism should be treated as shorthand for the belief that, amongst the intersecting dualisms of West-East and North-South, it is the global North West that has a monopoly on, or at least a prior claim to, theory that portends to be universal. Modernity and the Enlightenment are presented as twin gifts to the world that ignore, as Jean and John Comaroff would have it,⁴⁵ both their co-constitution in and tangible violence and erasure of the colonized. In a recent essay, Çapan addresses some of the key elements here:

What enables Eurocentrism as a system of knowledge to get reproduced is the rearticulations of the spatio-temporal hierarchies that take Europe as an isolated space and situate it temporally as being ahead of everyone and everywhere else. These reproductions are made possible because of the way in which the categories of the non- West are re-articulated. As such, breaking through those spatio-temporal boundaries requires not only the rewriting of histories through underlining the different ways in which events that were considered to have originated in Europe occurred in connection with other spaces but also to interrogate the formations and transformations of the Western and non-Western subject and the historical and discursive construction(s) of the “difference.”⁴⁶

141

To reinsert socialist Yugoslavia into a global historiography, while also remembering that “knowledge of the globe” and “global knowledge” are not at all the same thing, one needs to perform a double movement: One must bring

⁴⁰ Čarna Brković, “Epistemological Eclecticism: difference and the ‘Other’ in the Balkans and beyond.” *Anthropological Theory* 18, no. 1 (2017): 106-28.

⁴¹ Homi Bhabha, *The Production of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994).

⁴² Srđan Vučetić, “Yugosplaining the World,” *The Disorder of Things*, July, 2, 2020, accessed March 16, 2021 <https://thedisorderofthings.com/2020/07/02/yugosplaining-the-world-%E2%80%AF/>.

⁴³ Vučetić, “Yugosplaining.”

⁴⁴ Quoted in Vučetić, “Yugosplaining.”

⁴⁵ Jean Comaroff and John L. Comaroff, “Theory from the South: Or, how Euro-America is Evolving Toward Africa,” *Anthropological Forum* 22, no. 2 (2012): 113-31.

⁴⁶ Zeynep Gülşah Çapan, “Eurocentrism and the Construction of the ‘Non-West’,” *E-International Relations* June 19, 2018, accessed March 16, 2021 <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/06/19/eurocentrism-and-the-construction-of-the-non-west/>.

Yugoslavia back into global social, political, economic, and cultural relations while at the same time decentring its positionality, thus ensuring that other sites of analysis and struggle and the relations between them are taken into consideration. Research firmly rooted in the anti-colonial struggles of Africa, Asia, and Latin America is of vital importance to a reconsideration of the significance of non-alignment. Yet, in the words of the rapper Rakim, "it ain't where you're from, it's where you're at that counts."⁴⁷ In other words, what matters most may not so much be a case of where you look from but rather how you look at these relations. In the next section, the focus is on three separable but interlinked themes related to navigating the challenges of decentring both socialist Yugoslavia and, to an extent, the Non-Aligned Movement itself.

The Multi-Nodal Trajectories of Non-Alignment: India, Bandung, and the G- 77

Within what one might term a "realist" or "objectivist" understanding of International Relations, it is, of course, perfectly reasonable to analyse the Non-Aligned Movement as "just another international organization" much like any other, in which it is largely the sum of individual "national interests" that determines the trajectory of the organization. At the same time, the ideological component of NAM formed a binding element, particularly in relation to "peaceful co-existence" and "anti-colonialism," so that "non-alignment" was always much more than a mere synonym for "neutrality,"⁴⁸ and it indeed ushered in a new kind of "internationalism."⁴⁹ NAM was as much a networked community whose rules were rather flexible and, (crucially for our purposes here) as such, it must be conceived as "multi-nodal," notwithstanding socialist Yugoslavia's pivotal role. Understanding NAM as a network captures something of its "architecture of complexity"⁵⁰ and focuses attention on sets of relationships, flows, and trajectories.

Holding on to a multi-nodal perspective is important since privileging one node at the expense of others will inevitably lead to an incomplete and potentially distorted analysis. At the same time, practical and strategic choices need to be made about which nodes are to be the primary focus of study and whether this is inductive or deductive. Since the Belgrade meeting of 1961 had twenty-five participating states and three observers and subsequent summits attracted a significantly larger membership, this was a network with a large number of nodal points. Although the web of relationships can be presented visually, choices of what to study and why remain of immense importance. At the same time, of course, it is not only relations between NAM Member States that matter but also their relationships with those outside the movement and, in particular, with global hegemon

⁴⁷ Quoted in Paul Gilroy, "It Ain't Where You're From; It's Where You're At ... the dialectics of diaspora identification," *Third Text* 13 (2008): 3-16.

⁴⁸ Peter Willetts, *The Non-Aligned Movement: the origins of a Third World alliance* (London: Frances Pinter, 1978).

⁴⁹ Paul Stubbs, "The Emancipatory Afterlives of Non-Aligned Internationalism," *Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung*, January 2020, accessed March 16, 2021, <https://www.rosalux.de/en/publication/id/41556/the-emancipatory-afterlives-of-non-aligned-internationalism/>.

⁵⁰ Albert-Laszlo Barabasi, "The Architecture of Complexity," August 2007, *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, accessed March 16, 2021 <https://barabasi.com/f/226.pdf>.

such as the United States, the Soviet Union and, to an extent, China.

Strategically, thinking in terms of “primary nodes” enrolled in the network with a greater intensity than others may be of value, providing, of course, that one specifies the criteria for selecting such primary nodes and understands that they vary conjuncturally, contextually, and thematically. Along with socialist Yugoslavia, one could consider in broad terms Algeria, Cuba, Egypt (the UAR), Ghana, India, Indonesia, Libya, and Tunisia as the most obvious candidates here. Five of these countries, along with Zambia and Sri Lanka, hosted the first seven NAM summits between 1961 and 1983, which demonstrates the overlap between understanding NAM as networked governance and a more realist IR stance. Crucially, the nature and character of the relationships, their modalities, intensity, directionality, and flow cannot be known entirely in advance of empirical investigation. Embracing a decolonial sensibility and epistemology must necessarily involve a continual decentring marked by “hybridity, syncretism, (and) multi-dimensional time”⁵¹ and a temporary, strategic fixedness or “re-centring” based on conjuncture and thematics that is oriented as much, if not more, towards power as it is towards temporality.

A recent example of this kind of approach is Lukasz Stanek’s “Architecture in Global Socialism,” which explores architectural mobilities and entanglements and “new geographies of collaboration”⁵² and exchange among Eastern Europe, West Africa, and the Middle East. He focuses on diverse “modalities...trajectories, speed, and rhythms.” It treats “places of work as sites where new collective subjectivities emerged and where global projects of solidarity were tested and challenged, confirmed, or refuted”⁵³ as the “cogs of antagonistic worldmaking projects [that] sometimes gnashed and ground, and sometimes complemented each other.”⁵⁴ A kind of “non-alignment from below” that includes architectural, artistic, cultural, and educational exchanges is then just as important as the inter-state diplomacy of NAM. For all its faults, NAM’s project of “post-colonial state-building” was a “direct result of the legacy of colonialism”⁵⁵ and created conditions, albeit sometimes uneasily, for a kind of “free poetics”⁵⁶ as new nation states and their artistic subjects came to agency on the global stage. One could go further, of course, and explore the complicated and shifting transnational networks that existed in the post-1945 period across the socialist world, termed by Mark, Kalinovsky and Marung as “trajectories of modernization and globalization...often deeply intertwined with the histories of socialism in non-European world regions.”⁵⁷

⁵¹ Anne McClintock, “The Angel of Progress: pitfalls of the term ‘postcolonial’,” *Social Text* 31/32 (1992): 86.

⁵² Lukasz Stanek, *Architecture in Global Socialism: Eastern Europe, West Africa, and the Middle East in the Cold War* (Princeton: University Press, 2019).

⁵³ Stanek, *Architecture in Global Socialism*, 27.

⁵⁴ Stanek, *Architecture*, 33.

⁵⁵ Bojana Videkanić, *Nonaligned Modernism: socialist post-colonial aesthetics in Yugoslavia* (Montreal: McGill-Queens’ University Press, 2019), 116.

⁵⁶ Glissant quoted in Videkanić, *Nonaligned Modernism*, 132.

⁵⁷ James Mark, Artemy M. Kalinovsky, and Steffi Marung, “Introduction,” in *Alternative Globalizations: Eastern Europe and the Postcolonial World*, ed. James Mark, Artemy M. Kalinovsky, and Steffi Marung (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020), 3.

Space precludes an attempt at a critical, multi-nodal analysis here. Instead, shifting the focus to India's relationship to non-alignment serves as an exemplar in part because, as Willetts argues,⁵⁸ its "paradoxical" and "atypical" position in the movement in some ways parallels that of socialist Yugoslavia itself. India's independent foreign policy, as articulated by its first post-independence Prime Minister Jawarharlal Nehru, was both nationalist and moralist, thus conforming to its self-image as "a special type of Great Power."⁵⁹ The similarities, or perhaps better homologies, between Nehru and Tito can be seen in this quote from a book focusing on India's foreign policy under Nehru:

Among his most striking contributions was the attempt to fashion a distinctive international personality for the country. From the outset he declared that India would resist the seductions of both sides in the Cold War; that it would steer its own course unfettered by the views of the great powers; that it would stand for a world order based on reason and persuasion rather than bigotry and violence. Nehru's reputation, in his lifetime and after, was largely built on the claim that he had substantially succeeded in this endeavor. India's prominent role in creating the "non-aligned bloc [sic]," in pushing for a ban on nuclear tests, in mediating conflicts within Korea and Indo-China: all seemed to attest this success. Writing two decades after Nehru's death his biographer, Sarvepalli Gopal, could assert that "these are no mean achievements and place Nehru among the leading statesmen of the twentieth century."⁶⁰

144

Nehru's noted reluctance to combine his principled commitment to non-alignment, which arguably pre-dated Tito's, and to formalize it in any way within an organization or even conference is well known.⁶¹ Equally clear is India's need for broader international support during its border dispute with China, which resulted in something of a propaganda blitz in 1960 through its ambassadors across the world, including in Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav archives provide details of at least fifteen meetings that year between the Indian ambassador to Yugoslavia and Yugoslav leaders, including Foreign Minister Koča Popović, his deputies Srđa Prica and Veljko Mičunović, diplomat Bogdan Crnobrnja, and others, before the start of the XV UN General Assembly in New York.⁶²

Between the Brijuni meeting of Tito, Nasser, and Nehru in July 1956 (the significance of which Nehru played down)⁶³ and the Belgrade event itself, India withdrew from a prominent role and in fact opposed the intention of some states to found the movement primarily on what Nehru saw as "radical" anti-colonialism. Nehru's attendance at the Belgrade summit was in doubt until the very last minute, and he insisted on guarantees from the Yugoslavs

⁵⁸ Willetts, *The Non-Aligned Movement*, 8.

⁵⁹ Willetts, *The Non-Aligned Movement*, 6.

⁶⁰ Srinath Raghavan, *War and Peace in Modern India: a strategic history of the Nehru years* (Ranikhet: Permanent Black, 2010), 1.

⁶¹ Cf. Renu Srivastava, *India and the Non-Aligned Summits: Belgrade to Jakarta* (New Delhi: Northern Book Centre, 1995); Jurgen Dinkel, *The Non-Aligned Movement: genesis, organization and politics (1927-1992)* (Leiden: Brill, 2019).

⁶² Arhiv Jugoslavije, Beograd (Archives of Yugoslavia, Belgrade), Kabinet Predsednika Republike (Cabinet of the President of the Republic), Fund no. 837, KPR I-5-b/39-4.

⁶³ Srivastava, *India and the Non-Aligned Summits*, 9.

that this was to be a one-off event. In the end, as Crnobrnja's diaries of the time suggest, Nehru eventually came because not doing so would have risked India's isolation.⁶⁴ What is also clear is the supportive stance towards the movement from Nehru's daughter, Indira Gandhi, during her decade as Prime Minister from January 1966 to March 1977. This very short and still partially Yugocentric exploration of India's role in the Non-Aligned Movement is suggestive of the importance of "triangulating" archival sources by reviewing literature with a non-Yugoslav focus and working with researchers in other key NAM states.

A more complex and contested issue concerns the relationship and manoeuvrings between the Bandung Afro-Asian Conference of April 1955 and the Belgrade Non-Aligned Movement Summit of September 1961. Within contemporary post-colonial and decolonial thought, frequent reference is made to "the spirit of Bandung" and "Bandung humanism." An illustration of Bandung being privileged over non-alignment can be found in a special issue of the *Inter-Asian Cultural Studies* journal from 2015, which focused on Bandung sixty years on with essays by Samir Amin⁶⁵ and notable social policy scholars, including Roberto Bissio⁶⁶ and Jomo Kwame Sundaram.⁶⁷ In these essays, non-alignment is either by-passed completely, the role of Yugoslavia is ignored, or the radicalism of Bandung is even occasionally contrasted with the conservatism of NAM.

There is no small amount of confusion and a great deal of contention regarding the relationship between Bandung, Belgrade, and non-alignment. Certainly, a non-Yugocentric focus on Bandung is both desirable and realistic, not least because socialist Yugoslavia was not a participating state. It sent two observers, Jurij Gustinčič and Jože Smole, who were formally present as journalists but reported back on political lines, drew encouragement from the "the first large international meeting that, in practice, confirmed the possibility of anti-bloc politics," and noted the crucial mediating role played by the Indian and Egyptian delegations.⁶⁸ As Aida Hozić reminds us,⁶⁹ in her memoirs, Tito's wife, Jovanka Broz, falsely places herself and Tito at Bandung and even claims credit for putting the idea of the Non-Aligned Movement into Tito's and Nehru's heads.

Scholars of global Yugoslavia need to treat Bandung on its own terms rather than merely accept Rajak's argument that, in comparison to Bandung, Yugoslavia was successful in making NAM truly more global. After all, Yugoslavia and Cyprus were the only European participants (Cyprus

⁶⁴ Bogdan Crnobrnja, *Neočekivana promjena: kako je stvoren pokret nesvrstanih: dnevnički zapisi Bogdana Crnobrnje iz 1961. godine* (Belgrade: Muzej istorije Jugoslavije, 2016), 74.

⁶⁵ Samir Amin, "The World Without Bandung, or for a polycentric system with no hegemony," *Inter-Asian Cultural Studies*, 17, no. 1 (2016): 7-11.

⁶⁶ Roberto Bissio, "Bandung in Latin America: the hope for another world," *Inter-Asian Cultural Studies*, 17, no. 1 (2016): 19-26.

⁶⁷ Jomo K. Sundaram, "Carpe Diem: Bandung, historical inequalities and development goals," *Inter-Asian Cultural Studies*, 17, no. 1 (2016): 27-32.

⁶⁸ Arhiv Jugoslavije, Beograd KPR I-4-e/1.

⁶⁹ Aida Hozić, "False Memories, Real Political Imaginaries: Jovanka Broz in Bandung," in *Meanings of Bandung: postcolonial orders and decolonial visions*, edited by Quynh N. Pham and Robbie Shilliam (Čondon: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016), 95-100.

was already present in Bandung), and Latin American countries tended to join later but also in rather small numbers. He also argues that Yugoslavia transformed the spirit of Bandung into a movement.⁷⁰ However, even here we need to bear in mind that it was not really a formalized movement until the Lusaka summit in 1970, and even then, it was the Yugoslavs who, for example, remained most opposed to a permanent secretariat. Certainly, the failure to ever hold a Bandung II (which was often, although not always, a result of Chinese aggression) created a space for NAM to take the spirit of Bandung forward, not least in terms of its anti-colonial discourse, by amplifying an anti-bloc politics whilst also, in some ways, blunting what might be termed an anti-racist radicalism. In any case, the complexities of a developing non-alignment alongside a symbolic Bandung are worthy of further exploration beyond simplistic binary divisions between “radical” and “conservative” currents. A broader discussion of the shifting, yet also intersecting, anti-colonial counter-hegemonic worldmaking projects after Bandung is beyond the scope of this paper; but it is ultimately necessary for a multi-nodal analysis that decentres not only socialist Yugoslavia but also the Non-Aligned Movement itself.⁷¹

One interesting similarity between Bandung and Belgrade is their performative or iconographic status as early “international media events”⁷² that treated politics as a kind of symbolic theatre. At the same time, it is very important to contrast Bandung as a symbol of the “awakening” of post-colonial Africa and Asia and a deliberate attempt to position post-colonial elites and publics as having an identity of interests on one hand, with the Belgrade summit’s presentation of Yugoslav modernity and “hand of friendship” to nations emerging from colonialism on the other. Comparing and contrasting the aesthetics of Bandung and Belgrade may be a fruitful avenue for research, not least in terms of Branislav Jakovljević’s designation of socialist Yugoslavia as a “performance state.”⁷³ Without further shoring up Yugocentrism, socialist Yugoslavia’s positioning vis-à-vis other international meetings and movements, whether they came to fruition or not—be it the Afro-Asian conference, the Islamic Conference, the Pan-African Congress, or the ill-fated Conference of New Emerging Forces (CONEFO) that Sukarno tried to organize before he was overthrown⁷⁴—at least suggests the need for these diverse movements to be examined on their own terms.

Just as contentious is the relationship between NAM and the G-77, a group made up of the countries that signed a joint declaration at

⁷⁰ Svjetožar Rajak, “Companions in Misfortune: from passive neutralism to active uncommitment – the critical role of Yugoslavia,” in *Neutrality and Neutralism in the Global Cold War: between or within the blocs?*, ed. Sandra Bott et al. (London: Routledge, 2016), 72–89.

⁷¹ See *inter alia* Adom Getachew, *Worldmaking After Empire: the rise and fall of self-determination* (Princeton: University Press, 2020), James Byrne, *Mecca of Revolution: Algeria, Decolonization and the Third World Order* (Oxford: University Press, 2016), and Jeffrey Friedman, *Shadow Cold War: the Sino-Soviet competition for the Third World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015).

⁷² Dinkel, *The Non-Aligned Movement*, 57.

⁷³ Branislav Jakovljević, *Alienation Effects: performance and self-management in Yugoslavia, 1945–1991* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2016).

⁷⁴ Stubbs, “Antinomies.”

the end of the first United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD I) in 1964 and held its first Ministerial Meeting in Algiers in 1967.⁷⁵ Again, it is overly simplistic to argue that NAM steered the Global South's political agenda while the G-77 steered its economic agenda.⁷⁶ NAM and the G-77 should be seen as complementary and sometimes overlapping constellations with similar memberships and objectives that exercised a degree of strategic differentiation due to the G-77's formal status within the United Nations and its bodies and agencies. Although there was no formal joint co-ordinating committee until 1994,⁷⁷ NAM's increasing focus on socio-economic development starting in the 1970s meant there was close co-operation between NAM, UNCTAD, and the G-77.

Indeed, as early as July 1962, the non-aligned states held an economic conference in Cairo attended by thirty-three member countries; three observer countries; and six international, global, and regional organizations. From this point on, NAM pursued a set of broad "developmentalist" goals: rapid industrialization, efficiencies in agriculture, ease of financing for the Global South, national economic planning and, crucially, a level playing field for open terms of trade as opposed to protectionism that set the agenda both for UNCTAD and the subsequent attempt to construct a new international economic order (NIEO). The greater focus on North-South relations and economic questions throughout the 1970s is worthy of note here. Again, at the risk of Yugocentrism, it is important to bear in mind the way in which UN bureaucracy assigned socialist Yugoslavia to work with, and be in competition for executive positions with, African and Asian countries in the preparation phase of UNCTAD,⁷⁸ which was repeated over a decade later at the Paris Conference on International Economic Co-Operation, widely known as the North-South Summit. This made Yugoslavia very aware of its obligations to the Global South but—and this was amplified in the wake of the oil price shocks of the early 1970s—also made it understand its liminal position as part of neither the economic core nor the periphery.

Although this is extremely complicated, a kind of confluence between "socialist" and "neoclassical" globalization was, as Johanna Bockman outlines,⁷⁹ institutionalized to an extent through the G-77, UNCTAD, the UN Economic Commission for Europe, and, crucially, in terms of the NIEO. This adhered to what Jure Ramšak⁸⁰ describes as an evolutionist and state-centered vision of development, which was itself the dominant model within

⁷⁵ Ian Taylor and Karen Smith, *United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)* (London: Routledge, 2007), 37.

⁷⁶ Chris Alden, Sally Morphet and Marco Antonio Vieira, *The South in World Politics* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010), 57.

⁷⁷ Taylor and Smith, *UNCTAD*, 39.

⁷⁸ Taylor and Smith, *UNCTAD*.

⁷⁹ Johann Bockmann, "Socialist Globalization Against Capitalist Neocolonialism: the economic ideas behind the new international economic order," *Humanity* April 20, 2015 accessed March 22, 2020 <http://humanityjournal.org/blog/socialist-globalization-against-capitalist-neocolonialism-the-economic-ideas-behind-the-new-international-economic-order-2/>.

⁸⁰ Jure Ramšak, "Shades of North-South Economic Détente: Non-Aligned Yugoslavia and Neutral Austria Compared," in *Socialist Yugoslavia and the Non-Aligned Movement*, ed. Paul Stubbs (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, forthcoming).

the UN at the time, although Cuba, for example, was often more strident in its condemnation of multi-national corporations than other NAM Member States. All of this points to a need to explore these international institutions on their own terms, their relations with the policy and political “elsewheres” of the International Financial Institutions, and to trace the shifting meanings of developmentalist discourses over time. Again, this cannot be achieved through a reliance on socialist Yugoslav sources alone.⁸¹

Towards A Decolonial Historiography of Non-Alignment

The themes noted above are suggestive of some of the challenges for the development of a kind of critical decolonial historiography of non-alignment that goes beyond Yugocentrism whilst still retaining a nuanced concern with global Yugoslavia across different conjunctures. Decolonial historiography is not merely another historiography to be added but rather, as Taylor-Garcia puts it, one that “works to redefine the very conditions in which knowledge is produced and legitimated, situating ethical relationships as central, and recognizing that what is put forward is the basis for thinking through another world.”⁸² A truly decolonial historiography, she argues, must be “transcolonial” in its analysis, given that “the delineated boundaries of influence by colonial empires were not ... fixed,” and it is therefore necessary to address “colonial assemblages” or “a confluence of colonialisms”⁸³ delineated conjuncturally. Decolonial historiographies thus involve an “ethics of translation”⁸⁴ that open up new narratives and bring the colonized into the research process—a non-appropriating encounter with the “face of the Other,” as Levinas⁸⁵ would have it, that turns impossibilities into possibilities⁸⁶ judged in terms of the sensibilities of humility and heteroglossia (multi-voicedness).⁸⁷ It is, of course, about asking questions such as “Whose research is this?” and “Whose interests does it serve?” It is also about, if not more so, “Is the researcher’s spirit clear?” and “Do they have a good heart?”⁸⁸

Three interlinked methodological strategies derived from anthropology/ethnography that are applicable to, and potentially some of the foundations of, decolonial historiography will be discussed by way of conclusion. First, the idea of multi-sited historiography is adapted from the

⁸¹ In this sense, Jurgen Dinkel, *The Non-Aligned Movement: genesis, organization and politics (1927-1992)* (Leiden: Brill, 2019) is an extremely important attempt to construct a history of non-alignment that does not rely exclusively on Yugoslav source material.

⁸² Daphne V. Taylor-Garcia, “Decolonial Historiography: thinking about land and race in a transcolonial context,” *In Tensions* 6, 2012, accessed March 22, 2021 <http://www.yorku.ca/intent/issue6/articles/pdfs/daphnevtaylorgarciaarticle.pdf>, 5.

⁸³ Taylor-Garcia, “Decolonial Historiography,” 12.

⁸⁴ John Clarke et al, *Making Policy Move: towards a politics of translation and assemblage* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2015), 205.

⁸⁵ Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity: an essay on exteriority* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2011).

⁸⁶ Rada Iveković, “On permanent translation (we are being translated),” *Transversal Texts*, June, 2002, accessed on March 22, 2021 <https://transversal.at/transversal/0606/ivekovic/en>, 1.

⁸⁷ Clarke et al, *Making Policy Move*.

⁸⁸ Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: research and Indigenous peoples* (London: Zed Press, 2012), 10.

anthropologist George E. Marcus's advocacy of multi-sited ethnography⁸⁹ that highlights the importance of "multiple sites of observation and participation that cross-cut dichotomies such as 'the local' and 'the global,' 'the lifeworld,' and 'the system.'"⁹⁰ As such, it appears easily transferable to a reflexive, multiply-positioned historiography requiring research in multiple, interconnected sites in which "the global, the imperial, and other transregional factors are neither static contexts of, nor all determining forces on, the local but rather 'emergent dimensions' of specific localities."⁹¹ Transnational histories based on multi-sited historiography does not therefore constitute an uncritical plea for global history as a "melting pot," but it does demand of historians positioned outside of Africa, Asia, or Latin America that they (we) become "collaborators rather than tourists."⁹²

Second, para-ethnography, or parasite ethnography, was originally envisaged by Holmes and Marcus as referring to recursive and collaborative spaces of co-production between anthropologists and others with "shared, discovered, and negotiated critical sensibilities."⁹³ Para-sited historiography is more than just a plea to "let me in." It instead opens up "post-disciplinary" approaches to things that actually matter and, borrowing from Michel Serres, it prioritizes reflections from our "sources" or "interlocutors" about the functioning of the systems and institutional routines in which they have been embedded.⁹⁴ As such, it is a strategic choice very well suited to work on NAM, and one that aims, as Dorothy E. Smith puts it in her call for "institutional ethnography," to render visible the ways that agents "are connected into the extended social relations of ruling and economy and their intersections."⁹⁵ Para-sited historiography is transversal in its praxis and is akin to Freirian "conscientization"⁹⁶ "amplifying contradictions in order to become more conflictual"⁹⁷ or, in fact, in Mouffe's terms, more "agonistic" and a kind of reflexive—and affective—struggle.⁹⁸

Third, meta-ethnography, best known in medical anthropology and educational research (cf. Noblitt, 1988), attempts to systematize the interpretation of findings across multiple sites and studies through the development of heuristic models, seeking to preserve the interpretative qualities of the original work whilst generating new insights regarding the system as whole. In his book on Michel de Certeau, Ian Buchanan devotes a whole chapter to how "meta-historiography" allows "the field of historical

⁸⁹ George Marcus, "Ethnography In/Of the World System: the emergence of multi-sited ethnography," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24 (1995): 95-117.

⁹⁰ Marcus, "Ethnography."

⁹¹ Andrew Zimmerman, "Africa in Imperial and Transnational History: multi-sited historiography and the necessity of theory," *The Journal of African History* 54, no. 3 (2013): 331-40, here: 336.

⁹² Zimmerman, "Africa," 340.

⁹³ Douglas Holmes and George Marcus. "Collaboration Today and the Re.Imagination of the Classic Scene of the Fieldwork Encounter," *Collaborative Anthropology* 1 (2008): 136-70.

⁹⁴ Michel Serres, *The Parasite* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007).

⁹⁵ Dorothy E. Smith, *Institutional Ethnography: a sociology for people* (Lanham: AltaMara Press, 2005).

⁹⁶ Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 1998).

⁹⁷ Janna Graham, "Para-sites like us: what is this para-sitic tendency?," *New Six Degrees Museum*, February 9, 2014, accessed March 22, 2021 <https://www.newmuseum.org/blog/view/para-sites-like-us-what-is-this-para-sitic-tendency>.

⁹⁸ Chantal Mouffe, *Agonistics: thinking the world politically* (London: Verso, 2013), 1-18.

discourse" to be treated the way history itself treats "myth and tradition," namely as "an instrument of culture, not merely its record."⁹⁹

In a sense, this is a plea for thinking and collaborating globally and writing locally or, more collectively, multi-locally and within a spirit of humility. The key starting point then becomes a critical interrogation of the relationship between place (or institution or movement), the analytical procedures utilized, and the texts produced. This speaks to what Gal Kirn has recently described as a revolutionary rupture and a politics and practice of emancipation that remembers, reconstructs and translates "all of these anti- and de-colonial contributions of the second part of the twentieth century [that] have been swept away in the age that allegedly ended history."¹⁰⁰ A focus on socialist Yugoslavia must be a necessary part of this, but it is far from being sufficient.

⁹⁹ Ian Buchanan, *Michel de Certeau: cultural theorist* (London: Sage, 2000), 54–67.

¹⁰⁰ Gal Kirn, *Partisan Ruptures: self-management, market reform and the spectre of socialist Yugoslavia* (London: Pluto Press, 2019).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alden, Chris, Sally Morphet and Marco Antonio Vieira. *The South in World Politics*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.
2. Amin, Samir. "The World Without Bandung, or for a polycentric system with no hegemony," *Inter-Asian Cultural Studies* 17, no. 1(2016): 7-11.
3. Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
4. Baker, Catherine. *Race and the Yugoslav Region: postsocialist, post-conflict, postcolonial?* Manchester; University Press, 2018.
5. Barabasi, Albert-Laszlo. "The Architecture of Complexity," August 2007, *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*. Accessed March 16, 2021 <https://barabasi.com/f/226.pdf>.
6. Bhabha, Homi. *The Production of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.
7. Bissio, Roberto. "Bandung in Latin America: the hope for another world," *Inter-Asian Cultural Studies*, 17, no. 1(2016): 19-26.
8. Blagojević, Marina. *Knowledge Production on the Semi-Periphery: a gender perspective*. Belgrade: Institute for Criminological and Sociological Research, 2009.
9. Bockmann, Johanna. "Socialist Globalization Against Capitalist Neocolonialism: the economic ideas behind the new international economic order," *Humanity* April 20, 2015. Accessed March 22, 2020 <http://humanityjournal.org/blog/socialist-globalization-against-capitalist-neocolonialism-the-economic-ideas-behind-the-new-international-economic-order-2/>.
10. Böröcz, József. *The European Union and Global Social Change*. London: Routledge, 2010.
11. Boym, Svetlana. *Common Places: mythologies of everyday life in Russia*. Harvard: University Press, 1995.
12. Brković, Čarna. "Epistemological Eclecticism: difference and the 'Other' in the Balkans and beyond." *Anthropological Theory*, 18, no. 1(2017): 106-28.
13. Brown, Wendy. "In Conversation." In *Critical Dialogues: thinking together in turbulent times*, edited by John Clarke, 53-68. Bristol: Policy Press, 2019.
14. Buchanan, Ian. *Michel de Certeau: cultural theorist*. London: Sage, 2000.
15. Byrne, James. *Mecca of Revolution: Algeria, Decolonization and the Third World Order*. Oxford: University Press, 2016.
16. Capan, Zeynep Gulsah. "Eurocentrism and the Construction of the 'Non-West'," *E-International Relations* June 19, 2018. Accessed March 16, 2021 <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/06/19/eurocentrism-and-the-construction-of-the-non-west/>.
17. Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Habitations of Modernity: essays in the wake of subaltern studies*. Chicago: University Press, 2002.
18. Clarke, John, David Bainton, Noemi Lendvai, and Paul Stubbs. *Making Policy Move: towards a politics of translation and assemblage*. Bristol: Policy Press, 2015.
19. Cohen, Phil. *Archive That, Comrade! Left legacies and the counter-culture of remembrance*. Oakland: PM Press, 2018.

20. Comaroff Jean and John L. Comaroff, "Theory from the South: Or, how Euro-America is Evolving Toward Africa." *Anthropological Forum*, 22, no. 2 (2012): 113-31.
21. Cosovschi, Agustin. "Searching for Allies in America's Backyard: Yugoslav endeavors in Latin America in the early Cold War," *The International History Review*, 2020 online. Accessed March 12, 2021 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07075332.2020.1755339>.
22. Cox, Robert W. *Approaches to World Order*. Cambridge: University Press, 1996.
23. Crnobrnja, Bogdan. *Neočekivana promjena: kako je stvoren pokret nesvrstanih: dnevnički zapisi Bogdana Crnobrnje iz 1961. godine*. Belgrade: Muzej istorije Jugoslavije, 2016.
24. Deacon, Bob, Michelle Hulse and Paul Stubbs. *Global Social Policy: international organizations and the future of welfare*. London: Sage, 1997.
25. Deacon, Bob and Paul Stubbs. "Global Social Policy Studies: conceptual and analytical reflections," *Global Social Policy* 13, no. 1 (2013): 5-23.
26. Dinkel, Jurgen. *The Non-Aligned Movement: genesis, organization and politics (1927-1992)*. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
27. Escobar, Arturo. *Encountering Development*. Princeton: University Press, 1995.
28. Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 1998.
29. Friedman, Jeffrey. *Shadow Cold War: the Sino-Soviet competition for the Third World*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.
30. "From Bandung to Berlin." Accessed March 11, 2021, <https://frombandungtoberlin.com>.
31. Getachew, Adom. *Worldmaking After Empire: the rise and fall of self-determination*. Princeton: University Press, 2020.
32. Gilroy, Paul. "It Ain't Where You're From; It's Where You're At ... the dialectics of diaspora identification," *Third Text* 13 (2008): 3-16.
33. Graham, Janna. "Para-sites like us: what is this para-sitic tendency?" *New Six Degrees Museum*, February 9, 2014. Accessed March 22, 2021 <https://www.newmuseum.org/blog/view/para-sites-like-us-what-is-this-para-sitic-tendency>.
34. Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies." In *The Cultural Studies Reader*, edited by Simon During, 97-111. London, Routledge, 1999, Second edition.
35. Holmes, Douglas and George Marcus. "Collaboration Today and the Re.Imagination of the Classic Scene of the Fieldwork Encounter," *Collaborative Anthropology* 1 (2008): 136-70.
36. Hozić, Aida. "False Memories, Real Political Imaginaries: Jovanka Broz in Bandung." In *Meanings of Bandung: post-colonial orders and decolonial visions*, edited by Quynh N. Pham and Robbie Shilliam, 95-100. London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016.
37. Iveković, Rada. "On permanent translation (we are being translated)," *Transversal Texts*, June, 2002. Accessed on March 22, 2021 <https://transversal.at/transversal/0606/ivekovic/en>.

38. Jakovljević, Branislav. *Alienation Effects: performance and self-management in Yugoslavia, 1945-1991*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2016.
39. Jessop, Bob and Klaus Neilson. "Institutions and Rules." *Research Papers on Institutional Network Theory* 11(2003): 1-11.
40. Kardelj, Edvard. *The Historical Roots of Non-Alignment*. Zagreb: Spekter, 1975.
41. Karkov, Nikolay. "Decolonizing Praxis in Eastern Europe: towards a South-to-South dialogue." *Comparative and Continental Philosophy* 7, no. 2 (2015): 180-200.
42. Kilibarda, Konstantin. "Non-Aligned Geographies in the Balkans: Space, Race and Image in the Construction of New European Foreign Policies." in *Security Beyond the Discipline: Emerging Dialogues on Global Politics—Selected Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Conference of the York Centre for International and Security Studies*, edited by Abhinava Kumar and Derek Maisonville, 27-58. Toronto, ON: York Centre for International and Security Studies, York University, 2010.
43. Kirn, Gal. *Partisan Ruptures: self-management, market reform and the spectre of socialist Yugoslavia*. London: Pluto Press, 2019.
44. Larner, Wendy and William Walters. "Globalization as Governmentality," *Alternatives*, 29(2004): 495-514.
45. Lendvai Noemi and Paul Stubbs. "Globale Sozialpolitik und Governance: Standpunkte, Politik und Postkolonialismus." In *Nord-Süd-Beziehungen im Umbruch: Neue Perspektiven auf Staat und Demokratie in der Weltpolitik*, edited by Hans-Jürgen Burchardt, 219-43. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2009.
46. Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totality and Infinity: an essay on exteriority*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2011.
47. Lustig, Jason, "Epistemologies of the Archive: toward a critique of archival reason." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24 (2020): 95-117.
48. Mark, James, Artemy M. Kalinovsky, and Steffi Marung, "Introduction." In *Alternative Globalizations: Eastern Europe and the Postcolonial World*, edited by James Mark, Artemy M. Kalinovsky, and Steffi Marung, 1-34. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020.
49. Mattern, Shannon. "Theoretical humility." *Words in Space*, May, 2012. Accessed March 22, 2021 <https://wordsinspace.net/2012/05/07/theoretical-humility/>.
50. Marcus, George. "Ethnography In/Of the World System: the emergence of multi-sited ethnography." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24, 1995: 95-117.
51. McClintock, Anne. "The Angel of Progress: pitfalls of the term 'post-colonial'." *Social Text*, 31/32 (1992): 84-98.
52. Mennell, Stephen. "Concluding Remarks: history, sociology theory and the fallacy of misplaced abstractness." *InterDisciplines* 1(2010): 112-38.
53. Midgeley, James. "Social Development and Social Welfare: implications for social policy." In *A Handbook of Comparative Social Policy*, edited by Patricia Kennett, 217-38. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2004.
54. Mikulić, Boris and Mislav Žitko, eds. *Aspekti Praxis: refleksije uz 50. obljetnice*. Zagreb: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2015.

55. Mouffe, Chantal. *Agonistics: thinking the world politically*. London: Verso, 2013.
56. Muller, Martin. "In Search of the Global East. Thinking between North and South." *Geopolitics* 25, no. 3 (2018): 734–55.
57. Pejić, Bojana. "I tell my students not to believe me." Accessed March 12, 2021 <http://testimonies.umprum.cz/en/bojana-pejic.html>.
58. Raghavan, Srinath. *War and Peace in Modern India: a strategic history of the Nehru years*. Ranikhet: Permanent Black, 2010.
59. Rajak, Svjetožar. "Companions in Misfortune': from passive neutralism to active un-commitment—the critical role of Yugoslavia." In *Neutrality and Neutralism in the Global Cold War: between or within the blocs?*, edited by Sandra Bott et al, 72–89. London: Routledge, 2016.
60. Ramšak, Jure. "Shades of North-South Economic Détente: Non-Aligned Yugoslavia and Neutral Austria Compared." In *Socialist Yugoslavia and the Non-Aligned Movement*, edited by Paul Stubbs. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, forthcoming.
61. Samary, Catherine. "Introduction." In *Decolonial Communism, Democracy and the Commons*, edited by Catherine Samary and Fred Laplat, 1–11. Dagenham: Merlin Press, 2019.
62. Serres, Michel. *The Parasite*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
63. Smith, Dorothy E. *Institutional Ethnography: a sociology for people*. Lanham: AltaMara Press, 2005.
64. Spivak, Gayatri Chakrovorthy. "Subaltern studies: deconstructing historiography." In *Selected Subaltern Studies*, edited by Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, 3–32. Oxford: University Press, 1988.
65. Srivastava, Renu. *India and the Non-Aligned Summits: Belgrade to Jakarta*. New Delhi: Northern Book Centre, 1995.
66. Stanek, Lukasz. *Architecture in Global Socialism: Eastern Europe, West Africa, and the Middle East in the Cold War*. Princeton: University Press, 2019.
67. Stubbs, Paul. "Socialist Yugoslavia and the Antinomies of the Non-Aligned Movement." *LeftEast* online, June 17, 2019. Accessed March 12, 2021 <https://lefteast.org/yugoslavia-antinomies-non-aligned-movement/>.
68. Stubbs, Paul. "The Emancipatory Afterlives of Non-Aligned Internationalism," *Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung*, January 2020. Accessed March 16, 2021, <https://www.rosalux.de/en/publication/id/41556/the-emancipatory-afterlives-of-non-aligned-internationalism/>.
69. Stubbs, Paul, Sofiya An and Tatyana Chubarova. "Poverty, Inequality and Well-being in the Global East: bringing 'the social' back in." In *Social Policy, Poverty and Inequality in Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*, edited by Sofiya An, Tayana Chubarova, Bob Deacon, and Paul Stubbs, 11–43. Stuttgart: Ibidem-Verlag, 2019.
70. Sundaram, Jomo K. "Carpe Diem: Bandung, historical inequalities and development goals." *Inter-Asian Cultural Studies* 17, no. 1 (2016): 27–32.
71. Suvin, Darko. *Splendour, Misery and Possibilities: an x-ray of socialist Yugoslavia*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

72. Taylor, Ian and Karen Smith. *United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)*. London: Routledge, 2007.
73. Taylor-Garcia, Daphne V. "Decolonial Historiography: thinking about land and race in a transcolonial context." *InTensions* 6, 2012. Accessed March 22, 2021 <http://www.yorku.ca/intent/issue6/articles/pdfs/daphnevtaylorgarciaarticle.pdf>, 5.
74. Tuhiwai Smith, Linda. *Decolonizing Methodologies: research and Indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Press, 2012.
75. Videkanić, Bojana. *Nonaligned Modernism: socialist postcolonial aesthetics in Yugoslavia*. Montreal: McGill-Queens' University Press, 2019.
76. Vučetić, Srđan. "Yugosplaining the World." *The Disorder of Things*, July 2, 2020. Accessed March 16, 2021 <https://thedisorderofthings.com/2020/07/02/yugosplaining-the-world-%E2%80%AF/>.
77. Willetts, Peter. *The Non-Aligned Movement: the origins of a Third World alliance*. London: Frances Pinter, 1978.
78. Zimmerman, Andrew. "Africa in Imperial and Transnational History: multi-sited historiography and the necessity of theory." *The Journal of African History* 54, no. 3 (2013): 331-40.