

Integrating Rijeka into socialist Yugoslavia: the politics of national identity and the new city's image (1947–1955)

Marco Abram*

Department of History, University of Rijeka, Rijeka, Croatia

(Received 26 July 2016; accepted 18 December 2016)

This article investigates the politics of national identity implemented in Rijeka after World War II, when the city was integrated into socialist Yugoslavia. These national and political transitions posed various challenges to the consolidation of the Yugoslav Communists' power. The nationalities policy embedded in the slogan "Brotherhood and Unity" was the official answer to the national question, promoting collaboration among the Croatian majority, the Italian minority, and other national communities in the city. This article focuses on the definition of postwar Rijeka's image, investigating the relationship between Yugoslav socialism and national identities in everyday political practice. The negotiation of the representation of national identities in a socialist society led to ambivalences, contradictions, and contentions expressed in and through Rijeka's public spaces, highlighting the different orientations of cultural and political actors. The process of building socialist Yugoslavia in this specific borderland context reveals the balance and tension between the multinational framework and the integrative tendencies pertaining to the legitimization and consolidation of the socialist system.

Keywords: socialism; national identities; Rijeka; Yugoslavia; borderlands

Introduction

On 10 February 1947, after two years of diplomatic contention, the postwar peace treaties signed in Paris gave the city of Rijeka (Fiume) to the newly established Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. Since May 1945, the Yugoslav administration ruling the city had been preparing for unification and had begun imposing the new rule of power (Roknić-Bežanić 2012). The juridical annexation legitimized and accelerated the integration process: within several months, Rijeka had been unified with the Yugoslav center of Sušak.¹ Rijeka represented the main urban center in the territories that Yugoslavia had obtained from Italy after the war and embodied a major challenge in building the new socialist system. The problem of recovering from serious war damage was intertwined with a number of controversies relating to the national and ideological transition from Fascist Italy to socialist Yugoslavia. Furthermore, according to the Party's evaluations, by 1949, the makeup of two-thirds of the city had changed, as the great majority of the Italian population, together with other inhabitants of different national backgrounds, had abandoned the new Yugoslav and socialist Rijeka from 1945 to 1948.² These population movements were part of this border area's traumatic postwar transition, which has been interpreted in a

*Email: abram.marco@yahoo.it

variety of ways in the extensive scholarly literature. This literature has considered the Yugoslav authorities' responsibilities, different contextual conditions, and the element of choice (Ballinger 2002; Dukovski 2001; Hrobat Virloget, Gousseff, and Corni 2015; Orlić 2008; Pupo 2006; Troha 2009; Volk 2004; Wörsdörfer 2009). At the same time, the demographic changes were reinforced by the resettlement of people coming from other Croatian regions and Yugoslav republics. This article focuses on the politics of national identity implemented by the Party in the period between the official annexation of Rijeka in 1947 and the months following the signing of the Trieste memorandum in October 1954 that settled the border dispute between Italy and Yugoslavia (see Sluga 2001). The aim is to investigate the relationship between socialism and national identities that characterized everyday political practice in a territory with a long history of multiculturalism and national contention as the Upper-Adriatic area. Paying attention to this complex borderland can make a significant contribution to better understanding how socialist Yugoslavia was built.

The role of national identities in the socialist Yugoslav experience has been widely studied, particularly the emergence of "nationalist deviations" since the 1960s. However, fewer works have studied in depth the everyday implementation of the Party's solution to the national question in the process of building the Federation. This article is inspired by a growing literature that reexamines the role of national politics and national discourses in consolidating the legitimacy of Communist states, highlighting the difficulties and the contradictions in Communists' attempts to cope with national feelings, moving between the embrace of internationalist values and the development of socialist patriotism (Martin 2001; Mevius 2009). The Yugoslav Communists presented themselves as the political force that had managed to solve the national question in the country. Socialist Yugoslavia was established as a multinational state, with the official politics of Brotherhood and Unity recognizing the separate national identities of the different South-Slavic peoples, proclaiming a strong discontinuity with the integrative model that had characterized the monarchical Yugoslavia. Post-revolutionary multinational states, such as the Soviet Union, showed that the unifying principle of socialism could substitute for the integrating role of nationalism in the nation-state (Martin 2001). Nevertheless, the value of the Yugoslav idea was not completely rejected and, as in other Eastern European republics, the framework of interwar nation-states still had some influence (Mevius 2009). The idea of the unity of the South Slav peoples was refashioned within the socialist framework, but several studies have stressed the possible different meanings and interpretations of the Brotherhood and Unity concept (Haug 2012; Jović 2008; Wachtel 1998). The evolution of Brotherhood and Unity into a new socialist Yugoslavism has been studied in its ambivalences, sliding between its internationalist meanings and integrative tendencies that – according to several scholars – were detectable until the beginning of the 1960s (Gabrič 2004; Jović 2008; Pavković 1999). Similarly, the ambiguities of the Macedonian, Montenegrin, and Bosnian Muslim socialist nation-building – developed under the general framework of Brotherhood and Unity – have begun to be taken into consideration (Brunnbauer and Grandits 2013).

This debate has paid less attention to the role and position of non-South-Slavic national minorities, despite their significant demographic weight in the new socialist Yugoslavia. In the immediate postwar period – during which "enemies of the people" were extensively persecuted – minorities suffered different forms of political and national repression, with the German population's imprisonment in camps and expulsion the most extreme form. Nevertheless, the official Party's solution to the national question had to ensure a fully equal relationship among the various Yugoslav nations and national minorities. National minorities were not included in the traditional Yugoslav idea, but the policy of Brotherhood

and Unity was extended to them and they were officially granted cultural rights and permitted to use their own languages (Janjetović 2015). In everyday political practice, hence, a balance between building a “New Yugoslavia” as a socialist multinational federation and the State of the South Slavs had to be found (Jović 2008, 58–59). The role of national minorities – the term *narodnosti* (nationalities) only being introduced in the 1963 Constitution (Budding 2007, 102) – in relationships with “constituent” Yugoslav peoples and the integrative potential of the socialist system generally constitute under-researched aspects of the socialist Yugoslav construction process. The experience of the Italian minority in Yugoslavia, for example, has only recently been taken into consideration by Croatian historiography (Dota 2010, 57–103). On the other hand, Italian historiographical research is often limited to an Italian point of view (Giuricin and Giuricin 2008). As has been suggested, the dynamics of the relationship among the Italian, Croatian, and Slovenian populations in Yugoslavia’s western borderlands have to be understood in the wider context of the construction of the Yugoslav socialist regime and of the Party’s general nationalities policy (Mihelj 2012; Orlić 2008).

Cities were the most disputed territories in this border region, as shown by the case studies of Trieste, Pula, Rijeka, and Split. At the same time, limited geographical contexts have proved useful in studying the enforcement of the politics of Brotherhood and Unity and everyday intercommunal relations (Bergholz 2013). Since the postwar ideological orthodoxy generally prevented real confrontations in the Party commissions, debates concerning the representation of national identities often moved into the sphere of everyday political practice. In this paper, urban landscapes are approached as an important medium through which state ideology was communicated, but at the same time “socialist spaces” are understood here as “disputed” spaces (Azaryahu 1986; Crowley and Reid 2002; Diener and Hagen 2013). Even in a strongly ideological political system, public spaces could reveal “the ways in which competing [...] agencies, institutions, and officials expressed conflicting opinions, even if they rarely admitted that they were engaging in debate” (Petroni 2000, 4). In multinational state formations such as socialist Yugoslavia, the public representation of national identities was an important issue in these negotiations. In overcoming a monolithic understanding of socialist systems, this paper investigates how cultural events – such as the changing of street names, the building of monuments, the organization of celebrations, and the opening of public exhibitions – expressed everyday negotiations among a multiplicity of actors in the construction of Rijeka’s new image. The analysis of the postwar public articulation of national discourses offers a relevant contribution to understanding the contested and variable role of national identities in the building of socialist Yugoslavia.

Postwar Rijeka: a “city of Brotherhood and Unity”

After several centuries under the Habsburg Empire and various autonomous/independent periods, two decades of Italian rule, and World War II, Rijeka was integrated into socialist Yugoslavia. The rebuilding effort after the widespread bombing suffered by the city during the conflict eased the redefinition of meanings attached to the city’s public space. Several important symbols of the previous political/national system were destroyed or removed during the war, among them the Venetian St. Mark’s lion on the city’s main dock, an important monument built to emphasize the “Italianness” of the city (Susmel 1939, 112–114). Other references to fascism and the Italian state disappeared over the following months, together with the Habsburg two-headed eagle atop the city’s bell tower. While the most urgent aspects of the ideological de-commemorative process took place quite quickly,

the construction of a proper new city image was perceived as a problem for several years.³ After the war, Rijeka was the most important urban center of the “newly liberated” Croatian and Yugoslav territories, but at the same time – despite the ongoing exodus – the biggest and one of the more influential Italian communities of the new Federation still lived in the city. The new city’s image was supposed to recognize its integration into Yugoslavia but also its specific national composition. In the immediate postwar phase, territorial autonomy was presented as a possible political solution for the newly annexed regions. Trieste and its district, for example, were often presented as a potential seventh republic within the Yugoslav Federation (Sluga 2001, 85). In the summer of 1945, high-ranking Party members such as Vladimir Bakarić and Edvard Kardelj approved autonomous status for Rijeka.⁴ Nevertheless, everywhere in the Federation, proposed autonomist solutions had to be weighed against a wider pragmatism and awareness of tactical considerations in pursuit of the Party’s and the state’s consolidation (Haug 2012, 113–114; Budding 2007, 94–100). Furthermore, the “extreme” Soviet model that had organized and *institutionalized* autonomous national territories down to the village level during the 1920s was significantly attenuated from the mid-1930s onward (Martin 2001, 403). Over the following months, the idea of an autonomous status for Rijeka silently disappeared from the political agenda while, with the ratification of the Paris peace treaty, the city was definitively integrated into the People’s Republic of Croatia.

Nevertheless, this administrative solution did not solve postwar Rijeka’s identity issues, as a surge of migration reshaped its demographics. The prewar Italian population registered in the 1936 census, in a period of Fascist denationalizing politics, amounted to 36,887 people (72%), most of whom left Rijeka between 1945 and 1948 (Purini 2010). In the turbulent immediate post-conflict phase, the Yugoslav authorities persecuted political opponents and encouraged the departure of a wide range of potential “enemies of the people.” Nevertheless, they started to become seriously concerned when, in implementing the right to opt for Italian citizenship guaranteed by the Peace Treaty, Italian workers also began to leave the city. To relaunch the port industry, they were replaced with workers coming from all over Yugoslavia. According to the 1953 census in Rijeka, there were still 7770 inhabitants declaring themselves Italians, but also 4748 people declaring themselves Slovenes and 4028 Serbs, while 56,354 (75% of the population) considered themselves Croats.⁵ Population numbers show that national affiliation was not the only appeal of the new socialist Yugoslavia. Between 1946 and 1947, while many Italians left the city, at least 2000 Italian Communist-oriented workers migrated to Rijeka, mostly from Monfalcone (a port and industrial town close to Trieste) to be employed in Rijeka’s shipbuilding industry and to contribute to the “building of a new socialist society” (Puppini 2005). Also for ideological reasons, a small number of left-oriented Italian intellectuals moved to the city, abandoning their Western-oriented country (Purini 2010, 266–267). The presence of this new population made it more important for officials to promote inclusive public discourses.

During the war and in the postwar years, both in Istria and Rijeka, the idea of Brotherhood and Unity was not only used to reinforce the union of Yugoslav peoples, as it was in most other regions in the Federation, where it was often interpreted as a new version of Yugoslavism, a socialist Yugoslavism (Jović 2008, 57–59). In the border area, the slogan of Brotherhood and Unity also attempted to reinforce cooperation between Italians and Croats as developed during the so-called People’s Liberation Struggle. The period from 1941 to 1945 was at the center of a public memory strictly codified by the Yugoslav Communist Party, while at the local level – in Rijeka’s public spaces – it was possible to detect how the discourse on the past was modified to respond to different political needs. First, the

People's Liberation Struggle was the source of a "patriotic" legitimization of the Party and the foundation myth for the Second Yugoslavia. The "incorporation of Istria and Rijeka into the homeland" was central to the Partisan movement's political agenda in the region (Dukovski 2001, 69–72). For this reason, Croatian/Yugoslav partisans and patriots who had fallen "for the freedom of their people" were celebrated in the first commemorative plaques unveiled in Sušak.⁶ At the same time, the political legitimization of the Italian national minority in the Yugoslav Federation was based on the involvement of the Italian Partisans who, according to the official politics of memory, fought "side by side" with the Yugoslavs. After the annexation, several of Rijeka's streets were named after Italians who participated in the local liberation movement.⁷ The first monuments erected in the former Italian part of the city mostly celebrated – both in the Italian and Croatian languages – the People's Liberation Struggle as a multinational experience inspired by socialist values. For example, a memorial in honor of 16 Croatian and Italian antifascists who had been shot by the Germans stressed that they sacrificed themselves "for the proletariat the world over, for the Brotherhood and Unity of Croats and Italians, for the international solidarity of the working class in the bloody struggle against fascism."⁸ The official status of this policy was confirmed by the Central Agitprop commission of the Communist Party of Croatia.⁹ Nevertheless, the city's minority institutions were the main actors in the promotion of the memory of the role of the Italian population in the liberation war.¹⁰

Rijeka's public space reflected the central role of the People's Liberation Struggle in legitimizing socialist Yugoslavia, while it also revealed the different orientations and divergences in public memory regarding the war, which cannot be understood as a monolithic discourse imposed by the central political authority (Karge 2014). Local reinterpretations – promoted by different local actors – responded to different needs, ranging from the promotion of patriotic and national liberation discourses attached to the Partisan Resistance, to the celebration of the Resistance's revolutionary outcomes. The second was particularly important for involving the Italian minority in the construction of a new multinational community in socialist Rijeka.

The socialist promotion of national identities

In the postwar years, the memory of the People's Liberation Struggle was the unquestionable cornerstone of public rhetoric, but it was not the only point of reference when implementing a politics of national identity in the city. When building the new socialist community, the importance of granting "forms of nationhood" to Italians and Croats was particularly emphasized. Rijeka was presented as a "city of Croats and Italians," where they could live and develop their national cultures and consciousness. Communist cultural politics were rooted in a guarantee that the people had access to culture. To this end, a new socialist culture might be "instrumentally" articulated in national languages and forms. As in the Soviet Union, national identities were considered a trait of modernity that could not be expected to disappear immediately after the revolution. The socialist system should not just tolerate, but even encourage a socialist version of national development, while disarming any possible reactionary nationalism.

The Party focused its main efforts on the revival of Croatian identity in the city. This was justified as a reaction to the Italian "occupation" and to the strong Italianization of Rijeka during the fascist period, but also in continuity with the Croatian Communists' wartime propaganda calling for the liberation of Croatian people and territories (Haug 2012, 75–82). As in the rest of the country, altering the city's place names was one of the first steps in redefining the city's image (see Radović 2013). Rijeka's central streets

and squares were named after important personalities in the national awakening of the Croatian people. These included Frano Supilo, Vatroslav Lisinski, and Vladimir Gortan, to whom the central former Piazza Dante was dedicated.¹¹ It became important to establish new cultural institutions such as museums and art galleries in the city, and to organize celebrations to reconnect Rijeka with the Croatian cultural and historical background. Once established within the binational People's Theater, the Croatian Drama's inaugural production was a "Croatian" Renaissance drama on freedom (*Dubravka* by Ivan Gundolić) and a Croatian national opera devoted to a crucial battle fought by the Croats against the Ottomans in the sixteenth century (*Nikola Šubić Zrinski* by Ivan Zajc).¹² When the new art gallery opened in 1950, one of the first important events, supported by the republic's government, was an exhibition of Croatian sculpture of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, to familiarize the population with "the most important and most characteristic works of Croatian Sculpture from Ivan Rendić to the present day."¹³ Likewise, Ivan Zajc, a Rijeka-born Croatian composer particularly active in the second half of the nineteenth century and the author of some of the most important Croatian national operas, was increasingly celebrated. Together with the proletarian struggle, the Partisans, and other socialist references, Rijeka's public spaces were scattered with figures of Zajc, presented as a symbol of the city's contribution to Croatian culture. In 1951, the extensive celebrations organized for the 120th anniversary of Zajc's birthday represented the best expression of a renewed public narrative on the national awakening of the Croatian people.¹⁴

The revival of Croatian national identity in Rijeka has led some scholars to recognize an immediate "intense Croatization" of the city (Pupo 2006, 123). Nevertheless, the general framework of the Party's nationalities policy and a need to gain the support of the "ideologically healthy" part of the Italian population also favored the definition and promotion of a new socialist Italian identity in Rijeka. This process relates to the topic – subject of a wider literature – of the Italian national idea during and after World War II. The trauma of the (lost) war and the rise of an antifascist resistance movement encouraged the shaping of a post-fascist national identity in Italy. The Italian Communist Party and other left-oriented parties, in trying to present themselves as national subjects, favored a rapprochement between leftist traditions and the Italian national idea (Gentile 2006, 355–363). In Yugoslavia, Rijeka was the seat of the most important Italian minority institutions and was the main Italian cultural center, influenced by the presence of leftist cultural workers who had moved there from Italy. In this context, the minority's political elite promoted the process of the re-elaboration of Italian national culture in terms compatible with the new socialist system. It was important to encourage – as pointed out by Italian Communist leaders – "a new national pride" among the Italians in Yugoslavia, impossible to enjoy in the motherland under the capitalist system and American influence.¹⁵ In 1948, at the *Circolo Italiano's* yearly assembly held in the historical building of Rijeka's People's Theater, the leadership stressed how, along with the promotion of the new socialist culture, the minority would have:

to revive the most progressive traditions of Italian life and culture, that from Dante to Mazzini, from Leonardo to Galileo, expressed in immortal works which have become part of the world's heritage; the most noble tradition of politicians, writers, and philosophers who, for the sake of truth, suffered persecutions and exile, imprisonment and torture, often sacrificing their life, from Bruno to Campanella, Matteotti, and Gramsci; the glorious Garibaldinian tradition that shone in the first *Risorgimento* deeds and that helped many peoples in their rise to freedom; the revolutionary and new partisan tradition that picked up the dying Italy and led her back on the path of honor.¹⁶

This general approach was reflected in the city's public space, since the 1945 street names in the very center of the city remained, representing Italian national culture through a pantheon of writers, artists, and musicians.¹⁷ These cultural references did not recall traditional socialist iconography, but celebrated the Italian people's contribution to "world progress" over the last centuries. The renegotiated Italian national identity developed especially through the activities of the Italian minority institutions. The most visible, the Italian Drama section at the People's Theater in Rijeka, performed alongside Soviet and classic plays the works of such famous "Italians" as Goldoni, Alfieri, Pirandello, and Machiavelli. According to Rijeka's Italian newspaper *La Voce del Popolo*, the Italian *Risorgimento* plays were intended to exalt a love for freedom, while other plays were designed to help understand medieval Italian history.¹⁸ The introduction to *La Mandragola* by Machiavelli praised the author for being "a proponent of Italian national unification" while making the mistake of referring to the wrong class.¹⁹ In this framework, the legitimization of the Italian national minority as part of a multinational socialist community in Yugoslavia had to be reinforced not only via involvement in the Liberation War but also through its progressive traditions. Even after the breakup with the Cominform in 1948, which led to strong political pressure being placed on the Italian minority due to many Italian Communists' support for Stalin (Puppini 2005, 77–82), within the Party, there were concerns about the risk of a "national" understanding of the repression by the Italian population. In the context of the decisive persecution of Italian Cominformists and growing suspicions concerning the Italian minority's loyalty to Yugoslavia, political leaders emphasized the importance of "involv[ing] Italian masses through cultural work" and promoting the activities of the minority institutions.²⁰

While the Italian minority enjoyed a certain recognition in Rijeka's public spaces in this postwar period, the city also had a growing population of other national communities, particularly Slovenes and Serbs. As a consequence, public rhetoric and public activities started to emphasize the wider meanings of Brotherhood and Unity among the different peoples living in the city. The Slovenian community grew significantly during the first half of the twentieth century. After the war, in the new socialist system, its right to "cultural development" was recognized by the founding of the Bazovica cultural-artistic society, which among other things was particularly committed to the celebration of personalities such as Ivan Cankar or France Prešeren, the most important Slovenian romantic national poet. The centenary of Prešeren's death, for example, was commemorated at the city's House of Culture (Riman and Riman 2008, 12–34). For Croatia's Serbian community, after the war, the Party established the Prosvjeta cultural society (Šarić 2014). Its local arm, Pododbor, was active in Sušak as early as 1946, and following the city's unification, a newly established Rijeka-based Pododbor gradually started to participate in the city's cultural life.²¹ The institution was particularly committed to celebrating Serbian historical figures such as Vuk Karadžić and Saint Sava. It also celebrated the historical date of Vidovdan.²²

To understand the politics of national identity at the time, it is worth considering the Party's approach to the problem of "national indifference." As emphasized in the recent literature, "national indifference" can be particularly useful in understanding national dynamics in mixed populated areas such as the Habsburg Empire (Judson and Zahra 2012). Pioneering work on the Upper-Adriatic region has started to question the commonly held scholarly trend that "treat[s] Slavic and Italian identities and populations as already clearly delimited by the end of World War II" (Ballinger 2012, 123). A front-page article published in one of the main Rijeka newspapers in 1947 stated:

For the benefit of the Italians and the Croats in this region, the disappearance of that kind of national indetermination inherited from our painful past is necessary, and it is necessary [...] that everyone take a more and more healthy and correct pride in his nationality. [...] National indecision and indifference help neither the Italians nor the Croats, but only delay our common development and implicitly favor the enemy of our brotherhood and of our peaceful construction. We wish Croats and Italians to develop culturally and nationally, we wish each Croat to love his mother tongue and each Italian his own.²³

Moreover, different communities' political exponents and cultural workers complained about the mix of languages spoken by children in schools (see Riman 2013, 373) or about the fact that "little work has been done for the awakening of national consciousness. Boys from Opatija say that they are Opatijci [from Opatija], not Croats."²⁴ More generally, documentary sources revealed the constant efforts made by "national" institutions in appealing to national mobilization. Besides the fact that numerous activities were actually undertaken, there were often complaints about the insufficient involvement of workers and intellectuals in the *Circolo italiano di Cultura*, the Slovenian house *Bazovica*, and the Serbian *Prosvjeta*.²⁵ In some cases, the lack of enthusiasm for national mobilization promoted by the regime was due to dissatisfaction with the institutionalized forms of nationhood permitted in a socialist society. In others, people had no particular interest in the everyday public practice of national identity, whereas some simply did not feel a strict belonging to national categories.

Over the first postwar years, when confronting national questions in Rijeka's multinational territory, the Party generally adopted principles implemented in the Soviet Union. The strong emphasis on socialism as a unifying principle and the importance of an inclusive discourse toward the Italian minority presented the Yugoslav Federation as a socialist project implemented by different peoples. In other parts of the country, Yugoslavist ideas could be used – together with socialism – as a "legitimization argument" in consolidating a unified state and the Party leadership (Abram 2014). On the border, the role of Yugoslavism and the legacy of the "historical struggle" fought by the South Slavs for their state were not particularly emphasized. In the immediate postwar years, Brotherhood and Unity had to be defined mainly in socialist and internationalist terms.

A contested city's image: the "ambiguities" of multinationalism and the contradictions of the integration process

The promotion of Rijeka as a multinational and multicultural territory, unified by the spirit of Brotherhood and Unity, entailed a wide dynamic of negotiations, but also controversies and sharp tensions. Under the common ideological framework of socialist nation-building, different national actors were recognized and supported in the city's public spaces. Nevertheless, the understanding and the re-elaboration of these ideological directives on the local level led to disagreements over the definition of socialist national identities. As has been argued, the Soviet slogan that proclaimed culture to be "national in form and socialist in content" was not always easy to put into practice (Brunnbauer and Grandits 2013; Martin 2001, 182–184). The floor was opened to different opinions about which modes of expressing national identity were to be considered "correct" and which "chauvinistic." In some cases, "primordial" views of national communities were promoted, with an emphasis on traditional definitions of national common languages and cultures, and on historical continuities that were not really coherent with the modernist Marxist view of the national idea as a "bourgeois superstructure." In this context, especially among intellectuals active in various cultural bodies and institutions, a commitment to the promotion of national identity

could overshadow the wider process of building a socialist society. Furthermore, restricted available resources produced confrontations among cultural and political actors, while everyday political practice resulted in disputes over the meanings of public spaces.

In the early postwar years, the representative institutions of the Italian minority were active subjects. Amid a growing discourse of Croatian identity, Italian Communists lamented the “insufficient” implementation of Brotherhood and Unity. Croatian Party members themselves often stressed “mistakes” in their behavior toward Italians, from the lack of political representation in the Party and in governing structures to expressions of “chauvinism” against the minority.²⁶ The minority leadership continued to advocate for its visibility and public presence in this period, as evidenced in one of the most important fields: the implementation of bilingualism. In August 1948 – following the first contentions with Italian Cominformist groups – the Croatian Central Committee promulgated new instructions to support the complete implementation of bilingualism in the city.²⁷ This opened the door for several Italian representatives to start to advocate these policies on various Rijeka committees and boards.²⁸ Similarly, the Italian newspaper *La Voce del Popolo* conducted a public campaign, publishing letters of complaint by Italian citizens and pictures of signs written only in Croatian. It criticized mistakes and asked the People’s committee to “intervene decisively” in the cases that had not been resolved.²⁹ These demands were extended to various fields. A public representation of the progressive Italian tradition was, for example, openly invoked in the new city gallery:

Living in this, our region, next to our Croatian brothers, while also an Italian minority, I believe it is necessary to show what has been done not only by the Yugoslav artists, but also by the Italians, through paintings that demonstrate the struggle waged by the people in Italy for those social purposes we achieved.³⁰

If these episodes illustrate the setbacks in implementing the politics of Brotherhood and Unity, they also show that official actors among the national minority, to a certain degree, could advocate for Italian public representation and for influencing the definition of Rijeka’s new city image. One of the most significant examples concerned the bridge that linked Rijeka with Sušak. In May 1952, a new monument was placed there to recall Tito’s words celebrating the removal of the “artificial” border that divided the city.³¹ The monument was also intended to exalt the new brotherhood and, for this reason, some Italian Communists demanded that Tito’s words also be engraved in Italian on the commemorative plaque, and not just in Croatian, as had been done.³² According to the minutes of the meeting of the City’s People’s Committee, the committee assented, recognizing the role of the Italian language and its importance at the city’s most symbolic landmark.³³

In this atmosphere, through appealing to general principles and “Brotherhood and Unity,” Slovenian intellectuals also came to support Slovenian national culture, demanding, for example, the right to open a Slovenian cultural house and school. They promoted these initiatives independently, to the extent that the local Party Committee complained that they had started to work on propaganda before the Committee had even been informed. Moreover, criticisms were expressed regarding the idea of opening Slovenian schools.³⁴ Despite the Slovenian leadership’s claim that “Italians have their schools” too, constitutive nations were not considered national minorities in socialist Yugoslavia. Nevertheless, in obtaining the support of Zagreb and Ljubljana, the Slovenian community managed to open a Slovenian school section, along with a cultural house (Riman 2013, 372–374). In the same period, Rijeka’s Prosvjeta expanded its activities and obtained a new visibility in the city’s space. In January 1949, for example, the Serbian association organized an event in

honor of Saint Sava at the Central House of Culture.³⁵ During the early postwar years, Saint Sava was still celebrated in socialist Serbia as being an educator of the people (Milićević 2007); nevertheless, he remained a prominent traditional symbolic figure of “Serbianness.” So as to promote the city’s multinational image, Saint Sava was celebrated in one of the most representative institutions in Rijeka’s city center.

With limited forms of national agency available to cultural actors in minority communities, Croatian cultural actors obtained greater influence over public space. Croatian national discourse used by the Party during the war later gave cover to those claiming that Rijeka was a Croatian city and had to look like a Croatian city, which contradicted the multinational dimension to the city’s image and proved to be a problem at the local level, as influential Party official Vladimir Bakarić told the Croatian Politburo.³⁶ Nevertheless, some intellectuals, cultural workers, and local Party cadres persisted in championing Croatianness for Rijeka, due to differing understandings of “national territory,” one of the most important expressions of national discourses. If the Soviet nationalities policy gave a central role to the recognition and definition of national territories, Yugoslav politics were less resolute in this sense, granting (not without ambivalence) national territories to just the five constituent Yugoslav peoples (the republics) and autonomy for two multinational territories (Kosovo and Vojvodina) (see Budding 2007). Since Rijeka was part of the Republic of Croatia, it could be considered part of the Croatian national territory. On the other hand, the rights of nationalities in socialism had to be reflected in the territory, through the recognition of their public presence. This contradiction between representations of Rijeka as a multinational or Croatian city found public expression through, for example, the issue of the city’s street names. From 1951, a public debate emerged on this topic and the possibility of keeping the Italian street names in the city became increasingly contested. An article in the *15 dana* magazine noted:

We have 27 streets named after Yugoslav artists and intellectuals, but 25 streets are named after Italian artists and intellectuals. Can you imagine anybody in Italy even considering naming a street after Ivan Mažuranić or any other of our intellectuals? [But] No Croat in this city would have anything against the idea of naming some streets after the Italians of Rijeka who fell in the struggle for a free Yugoslavia and for the establishment of socialism.³⁷

The article, which advocated a Croatian character for Rijeka, showed how such contention over the city’s image questioned the representation of Italian identity in the city if defined as a “traditional” national identity that could somehow express the “Italianness” of Rijeka.

The Party maintained an ambivalent approach to this argument in the late 1940s and early 1950s. The leadership’s attempts to control and prevent “nationalistic” deviations were thwarted by recurring disagreements on the role of multinationalism within the Party structure itself. Concerns about the undesirable effects of the politics of Brotherhood and Unity gradually emerged, especially regarding the work of the “national” cultural and artistic societies that were animating the city’s cultural life. At the beginning of the 1950s, according to the Slovenian leadership, the Party started to view the Bazovica society as “chauvinistic.” It became harder for Bazovica to carry out its activities and the Slovenian school section was closed (Riman and Riman 2008, 32–41). Moreover, in 1950, the local committee of the Serbian Prosvjeta stopped its activities, probably because of problems concerning the national orientation of this institution (Šarić 2014, 323–324). In November 1951, the city’s committee denounced “negative phenomena” in the city’s cultural and social life, including the attempt of the main (Croatian) cultural society, Jedinstvo (Unity), to renounce its “socialist” name and instead take the name of the prewar “patriotic” society called Jeka sa Jadrana (Echo of the Adriatic Sea). Behind this choice, the committee said, lay the goal of “splintering the society and fomenting chauvinism between Croats and

Italians.”³⁸ During the same few months, the Union of the Italians of Istria and Rijeka was accused of focusing too much on cultural “Italian” work – thus neglecting political work – and a preeminent part of its leadership was ousted.³⁹ These dynamics show how the decreasing importance of the expression of different national identities – which began to be considered less relevant to the further development of the new socialist self-managed society (Haug 2012, 133–162; Jović 2008, 60) – worked at the local level. At the same time, some hesitation about the role of Croatian national identity persisted, as was clear in the naming of Rijeka’s central avenue, the Korzo. In 1952, the road’s name was changed from the problematic Korzo Red Army to Korzo Ivan Zajc, for the Croatian composer. But this reference was at the very least unusual for the most prominent avenue in a socialist city, and a few months later, the avenue was renamed the more socialist Korzo of the People’s Revolution.⁴⁰

At the beginning of the 1950s, the evolution of Yugoslav foreign policy increasingly affected the politics of national identity at the local level. Between 1951 and 1953, new international tensions rose around the unsolved “question of Trieste” and the heated dispute between Yugoslavia and Italy, which led to a gradual redefinition of the politics of national identity. The Yugoslav authorities presented expressions of Italian nationalism on the border (Mihelj 2012; Vinci 2015) as a “new Italian irredentism” that threatened the status of the “newly liberated” territories. Tensions rose in the local Party branches and in the city. Over those months, the need to legitimize Croatia and Yugoslavia’s possession of Rijeka resulted in much more space being given to champions of the city’s Croatian national identity. The issue of lasting expressions of the “Italianness” of the territory was of course the most sensitive, and the local Party responded by allowing a much stronger affirmation of Croatian national belonging in Rijeka (i.e. demonstrating Yugoslav sovereignty). In certain cases, Party members also complained about the “pedantry” of Italian intellectuals and cultural workers in defending Italian culture in the city.⁴¹ As regards one of the most sensitive topics – bilingualism – in March 1953, one of the most important local Party leaders publicly rejected the protests over bilingualism claiming that Rijeka was a Croatian city, before denying any assimilatory intent.⁴² The process of reinforcing the city’s Croatian (and sometimes also Yugoslav) image proceeded. The Italian translation of the important monument on the bridge never materialized, while the People’s Theater was renamed after Ivan Zajc.⁴³ A general revision of the meanings of the public spaces became radicalized in October 1953, when in Rijeka, as in other Yugoslav cities, harsh public protests followed the decision of the US and Britain to leave the administration of Trieste (and Zone A) to Italy. During this strong “patriotic” mobilization triggered by the threat of a military conflict, several signboards in Italian were destroyed or erased in the city. The local Party reported concern about these “incidents,” denouncing expressions of “chauvinism” and “extremism” against Brotherhood and Unity. Nevertheless, the importance of bilingualism in the city as a necessary expression of national “ravnopravnost” (equality) was openly questioned.⁴⁴ Over the following months, bilingualism *de facto* disappeared from Rijeka’s public spaces, while a revision of the city’s street names was carried out by the People’s Committee and finally implemented in 1955, erasing most of the references to Italian culture.⁴⁵ As the public role of multinationalism receded, the serious repercussions of international tensions, together with a decline in the demographic weight of the Italian population, favored these tendencies – even without the explicit suspension of the official Brotherhood and Unity policy.

This process worried a significant part of the Italian leadership. Many complained that “you do not see a single Italian flag in the city,” while others just accepted the dwindling role of multinationalism in building a new socialist society and the “Croatian character”

of the city.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, differences in approaches and attitudes concerned the Party and continued to affect the politics of national identity, as witnessed by the argument over the Italian Drama section in Rijeka. The Drama was considered expensive and unprofitable because of the limited Italian public in the city. Many saw it as an obstacle to the development of the People's Theater as a whole and, between 1952 and 1956, there were different attempts to downgrade the role of the institution or even to close it. Nevertheless, if at the local level the Italian section's political relevance was widely questioned, the central ideological organs in Belgrade firmly criticized Rijeka's leadership.⁴⁷ The section stayed open, and its preservation was the most explicit case in which the Party – at its different levels – eventually protected an expression of “Italianness” in the city. While international politics played a role – Belgrade understood the importance of a *détente* with Italy and sought reciprocity from Italy in protecting the rights of Yugoslav minorities there – the episode also reflected the ideological ambivalence of the Party's general nationalities policy, which aimed to avoid isolating minorities but also to avoid the contradictions of integrative politics. The marginalization of national identities in socialism – which was followed by the promotion of a common Yugoslav culture in the 1950s – in many cases permitted a more South-Slavic understanding of the community that undermined the official multinational ideological framework. In response, a non-ethnic version of the Yugoslav idea – as a sense of belonging to the Yugoslav state that could also appeal to the national minorities – started to be occasionally evoked.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, only from the beginning of the 1960s could a definition of the Federation as a self-managed community of nations (*narodni*) and nationalities (*narodnosti*) be clearly affirmed (see Haug 2012; Jović 2008).

Conclusions

Postwar Rijeka represents a significant site through which to observe the process of building the socialist Yugoslavia. As a border territory with a strong multicultural background, it requires a methodological approach beyond the often-adopted “national perspectives” and it must be understood within the wider processes that characterized the creation of the new state. On the other hand, paying attention to borderlands reveals specific dynamics that are significant for understanding the construction of the Yugoslav Federation as a whole, integrating the better researched experience of the center (or centers) with that of the borderlands. In Rijeka, the Party's politics sought a balance between the need to offer continuity to Croatian national claims on Rijeka and Istria propagated since the wartime period, and the importance of multinationalism as a socialist answer to the national question. In the first period, the politics of Brotherhood and Unity were implemented in a local version. In an attempt to deal with the multicultural heritage and a changing multinational demography in Rijeka, the Party initially supported the development of socialist national identities and the legitimization of the new Yugoslav federation as mainly a socialist and internationalist project. The public presence of the Italian minority also favored the “distinguished” public expressions of other Yugoslav national communities while, following the paradigms of the Soviet nationalities policy, the Party criticized national indifference. Nevertheless, an analysis of the city's transition also draws attention to the negotiations, improvisations, and contradictions in the politics of identity. Amid growing political tension, the need to consolidate the Yugoslav state and reinforce the sovereignty of the “newly liberated territories” led to clear attempts in Rijeka's public spaces to reinforce the city's Croatian identity. This entailed limiting the public presence of the Italian national minority in comparison with previous years, while it also highlighted some of the ideological contradictions inherent in the building of socialist Yugoslavia.

Over the years that Tito's state was being constructed, despite the important role they played, the nationalities policy and the politics of national identity did not appear to be linear and coherent processes planned by the center. They suggest a constant struggle to legitimize the socialist system from not only an ideological but also from a national point of view. This article has illustrated the flexible interaction between socialism and national identities, challenging rigid understandings of Rijeka's and the Upper-Adriatic area's postwar experience either in terms of an essential nationalist conflict between "Slavs" and Italians or as a "freezing" of national issues under the rule of the new Communist power. Considering different national communities sheds light on how the socialist system did not simply repress national feelings, but instead recognized them as playing a role in the socialist society. The promotion of national identities was not the main aspect of the Party's public rhetoric, but it did occupy a substantial space in this phase, to be reduced only later by the further development of socialism. On the other hand, references to "Yugoslav" belonging were less emphasized, because it was important to avoid the perception of potential ethnic assimilation when consolidating the Party's power.

Public spaces in Rijeka reflect both diachronically and synchronically different identity discourses promoted by different cultural and political actors. The ambiguities of socialist nation-building complicated the evaluation and control of the ideological orthodoxy of the national discourses. "Wrong behaviors," denounced on several occasions, were often the result of ideological uncertainties concerning the interpretation of socialist national identities. One of the clearest examples of this is the ambivalence surrounding the idea of "national territory" that was often taken for granted in the division of national republics, but produced contradictions in multinational territories. The Party line fluctuated in relation to the political situation, showing a more integrative approach when needed, but this never went unquestioned. Of course, the general context was influenced by a range of underlying national tensions – Croatian and Italian Communist cadres were not always impervious to national feelings – but the ideological differences within the Party regarding how to approach the national question were also crucial. Support for multinationalism or for large-scale integration was not necessarily defined by national belonging.

The general tendencies that resulted in a smaller role for national identities in the Federation, in favor of a more unified socialist culture on the Yugoslav level, opened the way to contradictions that became explicit on the local level when political tensions rose. This conceded ground to those forces in the Party that wanted to limit the public presence of national minorities, while certain expressions of Croatian national identity were often permitted under the ambivalent framework of socialist Yugoslavism. These kinds of unresolved problems regarding the relationship between socialism, national identities, and Yugoslav unity would become one of the main challenges for the Party in the near future.

Funding

This work was supported by the Marie Curie FP7-PEOPLE-2011-COFUND program NEWFELPRO [grant agreement no. 79].

Notes

1. The state border lay on the river of Riječina between 1924 and 1941. It separated Rijeka – on Italian territory – from Sušak, on Yugoslav territory.
2. "Problemi u partiskoj organizaciji Grada Rijeke", 1949, in *Zapisi Politbiroa Centralnog komiteta Komunističke partije Hrvatske: 1945. - 1952.*, 2, Zagreb: Hrvatski Državni Arhiv, 2005, 181.
3. "Rijeka – grad bez spomenika," *Riječki List (RL)*, 31-8-1951, 2.

4. "Zapisnik sa sastanka CK KPH," 26-07-1945, in *Zapisnici Politbiroa Centralnog komiteta Komunističke partije Hrvatske, 1945–1952*, 1, 77; "Zapisnik sa sjednice CK KPH," 11-09-1945, in *Zapisnici Politbiroa Centralnog komiteta Komunističke partije Hrvatske, 1945–1952*, 107.
5. *Popis stanovništva 1953. Narodnost i maternji jezik*: Knj. 8, Belgrade: Savezni zavod za statistiku, 1959, 222.
6. See, for example, *Spomenici socijalističke revolucije – Rijeka*, Rijeka: Skupština Općine, 1983, 84, 242.
7. For example Aldo Colonnello, Aldo Negri and Ottavio Valich, see *Rijeka. Plan grada*, Rijeka: Turistički ured, 1951.
8. *Spomenici socijalističke revolucije – Rijeka*, Rijeka: Skupština Općine, 1983, 99; "Otkrivene spomen-ploče i spomenici," 27. *Srpanj*, 8-1-1950, 4.
9. "Objašnjenje na odluku za dizanje spomen ploče drugovima Gennari Mariu i Duiela Giuseppe-u," 1-10-1948, Hrvatski Državni Arhiv, HR-HDA-1220, k. 10.
10. "Verbale della seconda riunione ordinaria del Comitato esecutivo dell'Unione degli Italiani dell'Istria e di Fiume," 17-12-1951, 4–5; Archivio Centro Ricerche Storiche Rovigno (ACRS), UIIF 170/73.
11. See *Rijeka. Plan grada*, Rijeka: Turistički ured, 1951.
12. *Svečano otvorenje Narodnog Kazališta Rijeka*, Rijeka: Narodna Štamparia, 1946.
13. "Izložba Hrvatskog kiparstva XIX. i XX vijeka u Rijeci," *RL*, 9-12-1950, 2 and 13-12-1950, 3.
14. *RL*, September–December 1951.
15. Eros Sequi, "Fierezza nazionale degli italiani in Jugoslavia," *La Voce del Popolo (VP)*, 21-03-1948, 1; Id., "Noi, Italiani della Jugoslavia," *Almanacco 1951*, 27–29.
16. "Con una grande manifestazione gli italiani di Fiume inaugurano l'Assemblea del loro Circolo di Cultura," *VP*, 14-03-1948, 1.
17. See *Rijeka. Plan grada*, Rijeka: Turistički ured, 1951.
18. See "Sviluppo del Dramma italiano del Teatro del Popolo di Fiume," *VP*, 13-7-1948, 2; "Il Befardo di Berrini," *VP*, 11-12-1947, 2; "Vittorio Alfredi," *VP*, 13-10-1947, 3.
19. "Niccolò Machiavelli, autore de 'La Mandragola,'" *VP*, 17-05-1950, 2.
20. "Zapisnik sa sastanka Mjesnog Komiteta KPH Rijeka," 25-08-1948, 2–3, Državni Arhiv u Rijeci, HR-DARI-209, k. 29.
21. "Vukova proslava u Sušaku," *RL*, 8-10-1947, 3; "Kulturno-umjetnička priredba Srba u Rijeci," *RL*, 27-05-1948, 2.
22. "Izveštaj tajnika na redovnoj godišnjoj glavnoj skupštini SKPD Prosvijeta Pododbora u Sušaku," 7-03-1948 and 06-03-1949, HR-HDA-640, k. 30.
23. "Libertà e sviluppo nazionale," *VP*, 22-11-1947, 1.
24. "Zapisnik sa druge partijske konferencije Parijske organizacije IV rejona Rijeke," 22-09-1952, 5, HR-DARI-884.
25. "Note sull'attività dei circoli italiani di cultura," *VP*, 8-5-1947; "Kulturno-umjetnička djelatnost Slovenaca u Rijeci," *RL*, 3-12-1949, 2; "Zapisnik godišnje glavne skupštine Pododbora," 20-03-1949, 1, HR-HDA-640, k. 30.
26. For example "Zapisnik sa sastanka Mjesnog Komiteta KPH Rijeka," 25-08-1948, 2–3, HR-DARI-209, k. 29; "Zapisnik. 1. Partijska konferencija Mjesnog Komiteta K.P.H.-e Rijeka" 6,7-11-1948, 14–15, HR-DARI-209, knj. 7.
27. "Obavezatne upute o upotrebi talijanskog jezika," *Narodne Novine. Službeni list Narodne Republike Hrvatske*, no. 67, 20-8-1948.
28. See "Verbale della V. sessione ordinaria del C.P. II. rione di Fiume," 17-09-1948, 2 (and attachment) and "Verbale della VII. sessione del Comitato popolare del II. rione di Fiume," 10-12-1948, 5, HR-DARI-91, k. 453.
29. "Bilinguità nelle insegne," *VP*, 24-10-1948, 2. More in general, see *VP* between August and December 1948.
30. "Note sulla Galleria di belle arti," *VP*, 13-5-1949, 3.
31. "Otkivanjem spomen ploče na Titovom trgu u Rijeci," *RL*, 27-5-1952, 1.
32. "Relazione della riunione tenuta il 3 dicembre 1953," ACRS, UIIF 4779/85.
33. "Zapisnik XV. redovne sjednice Narodnog odbora grada Rijeke," 3,4-06-1952, HR-DARI-86, k. 621.
34. "Zapisnik sa sastanka plenuma mjesnog komiteta KPH Rijeka," 1-7-1947, 4–5, HR-DARI-209, k. 29.

35. "Izveštaj tajnika na redovnoj godišnjoj glavnoj skupštini SKPD Prosvijeta Pododbora Rijeka," 06-03-1949, 2–3, HR-HDA-640, k. 30.
36. "Zapisnik sjednice biroa CK KPH održane u Zagrebu dana 6.VIII.1948 godine," in *Zapisnici Političeskog Centralnog komiteta Komunističke partije Hrvatske: 1945–1952*, 1, 503.
37. "Tiziano i Bošković," *15 Dana*, 15-07-1953, 7.
38. "Demokracija postoji za one koji aktivno učestvuju u izgradnji socijalizma," *RL*, 18-11-1951, 1–2.
39. "Zapisnik sa sastanka Biroa Oblansnog Komiteta KPH Rijeka," 6-10-1951 and 20-10-1951, HR-HDA-1813, k. 1.
40. See *Vodič kroz Rijeku, Istru, Hrvatsko Primorje, Kvarnersko otočje i Gorski Kotar, Rijeka, Turist*, 1952, 27; *Plan grada Rijeke sa popisom ulica i trgova, Rijeka, Turist*, 1952.
41. "Izveštaj o radu Sekvi Erosa i Franki Elrija u Talijanskoj uniji," 9-12-1952, 5, HR-HDA-1220, k. 8.
42. "IV. Gradska konferencija SKH za Grad Rijeku," *RL*, 10-03-1953, 1.
43. "Zapisnik II. redovne sjednice Savjeta za Prosvjetu i kulturu NO-rada Rijeke," 5,6-06-1953, HR-DARI-86, k. 622.
44. "Zapisnik sa sastanka Rajonskog Komiteta SKH Centra," 13-10-1953, HR-DARI-207, k. 26; "Zapisnik sa sastanka Rajonskog Komiteta SKH Zamet," 12-11-1953, HR-DARI-223, k. 25.
45. See the speech on the topic in HR-DARI-86, k. 621; "Zaključak o izmjeni naziva nekih ulica i trgova na području grada Rijeke," *Službeni Vjesnik NO-a grada Rijeke*, no. 2, 1955, 18–19.
46. "Relazione della riunione tenuta il 3 dicembre 1953 con alcuni membri della minoranza," 3-10-1953, ACRS, UIIF 4779/85.
47. "Zapisnik 8. sjednice Savjeta za prosvjetu i kulturu GNO-a," 2-9-1952, 1, HR-DARI-86, k. 622; "Stenografske beleške sa sednice Ideološke komisije," 8,9-05-1956, 51, Arhiv Jugoslavije (AJ), *Centralni Komitet Saveza Komunista Jugoslavije – Ideološka komisija*, k. 5, VIII, II/2-b-87.
48. "Le minoranze nazionali e l'idea jugoslava," *VP*, 29-11-1953, 7.

References

- Abram, Marco. 2014. "Building the Capital City of the Peoples of Yugoslavia. Representations of Socialist Yugoslavism in Belgrade's Public Space 1944–1961." *Politička Misao* 51 (5): 36–57.
- Azaryahu, Maoz. 1986. "Street Names and Political Identity: The Case of East Berlin." *Journal of Contemporary History* 21: 581–604.
- Ballinger, Pamela. 2002. *History in Exile: Memory and Identity at the Borders of the Balkans*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ballinger, Pamela. 2012. "History's 'Illegibles': National Indeterminacy in Istria." *Austrian History Yearbook* 43: 116–137.
- Bergholz, Max. 2013. "Sudden Nationhood: The Microdynamics of Intercommunal Relations in Bosnia-Herzegovina after World War II." *American Historical Review* 118 (3): 679–707.
- Brunnbauer, Ulf, and Hannes Grandits, eds. 2013. *The Ambiguous Nation: Case Studies from Southeastern Europe in the 20th Century*. Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag.
- Budding, Audrey Helfant. 2007. "Nation/People/Republic: Self-determination in Socialist Yugoslavia." In *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia's Disintegration*, edited by Lenard J. Cohen and Jasna Dragović-Soso, 91–129. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- Crowley, David, and Susan E. Reid, eds. 2002. *Socialist Spaces: Sites of Everyday Life in the Eastern Bloc*. New York: Berg.
- Diener, Alexander C., and Joshua Hagen. 2013. "From Socialist to Post-socialist Cities: Narrating the Nation Through Urban Space." *Nationalities Papers* 41 (4): 487–514.
- Dota, Franko. 2010. *Zaračeno poraće: konfliktni i konkurentski narativi o stradanju i iseljavanju Talijana Istre*. Zagreb: Srednja Europa.
- Dukovski, Darko. 2001. *Rat i mir istarski: model povijesne prijelomnice (1943. 1955.)*. Pula: C.A.S.H.
- Gabrič, Aleš. 2004. "National Question in Yugoslavia in the Immediate Postwar Period." In *Jugoslavija v hladni vojni*, edited by Jasna Fischer, 425–448. Ljubljana: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino.
- Gentile, Emilio. 2006. *La grande Italia. Ascesa e declino del mito della nazione nel ventesimo secolo*. Milan: Mondadori.

- Giuricin, Ezio, and Luciano Giuricin. 2008. *La Comunità Nazionale Italiana. Storia e Istituzioni degli Italiani dell'Istria, Fiume e Dalmazia (1944–2006)*. Rovigno: Centro di Ricerche storiche.
- Haug, Hilde Katrine. 2012. *Creating a Socialist Yugoslavia: Tito, Communist Leadership and the National*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Hrobat Virloget, Katja, Catherine Gousseff, and Gustavo Corni, eds. 2015. *At Home but Foreigners: Population Transfers in 20th Century Istria*. Koper: Univerzitetna založba Annales.
- Janjetović, Zoran. 2015. "Nacionalne manjine u Jugoslaviji 1945–1955." In *Nacionalne manjine u Hrvatskoj i Hrvati kao nacionalna manjina – Evropski izazovi*, edited by Ljiljana Dobrovšak and Ivana Žebec Šilj, 63–92. Zagreb: Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar.
- Jović, Dejan. 2008. *Yugoslavia: A State that Withered Away*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- Judson, Pieter, and Tara Zahra, eds. 2012. "Sites of Indifference to Nationhood." *Austrian History Yearbook* 43: 21–137.
- Karge, Hajke. 2014. *Sećanje u kamenu – okamenjeno sećanje?* Belgrade: Biblioteka XX Vek.
- Martin, Terry. 2001. *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923–1939*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mevius, Martin, ed. 2009. "Socialist Nations: The Communist Quest for National Legitimacy in Europe." *Nationalities Papers* 37 (4): 377–544.
- Mihelj, Sabina. 2012. "Drawing the East–West Border: Narratives of Modernity and Identity in the Julian Region, 1947–1954." In *Cold War Cultures: Perspectives on Eastern and Western European Societies*, edited by Annette Vowinckel, Marcus M. Payk, and Thomas Lindenberger, 276–296. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Miličević, Nataša. 2007. "Stvaranje nove tradicije: Praznici i proslave u Srbiji 1944–1950." *Tokovi Istorije* 4: 169–178.
- Orlić, Mila. 2008. "Poteri populari e migrazioni forzate in Istria." In *Nafraghi della pace. Il 1945, i profughi e le memorie divise d'Europa*, edited by Guido Crainz, Raoul Pupo, and Silvia Salvatici, 25–41. Rome: Donzelli.
- Pavković, Aleksandar. 1999. "Yugoslavism: A National Identity That Failed?" In *Citizenship and Identity in Europe*, edited by Leslie Holmes and Philomena Murray, 65–94. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Petrone, Karen. 2000. *Life Has Become More Joyous, Comrades. Celebrations in the Time of Stalin*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- "Problemi u partiskoj organizaciji Grada Rijeke." 1949. In *Zapisnici Politbiroa Centralnog komiteta Komunističke partije Hrvatske: 1945–1952*, 2, 181, 2005. Zagreb: Hrvatski Državni Arhiv.
- Pupo, Raul. 2006. *Il lungo esodo*. Istria/Milan: le persecuzioni, le foibe, l'esilio/Rizzoli.
- Puppini, Marco. 2005. "Il controsodo monfalconese in Jugoslavia tra Trattato di Pace e Risoluzione del Cominform." In *Il mosaico giuliano. Società e politica nella Venezia Giulia del secondo dopoguerra (1934–1954)*, edited by Marco Puppini, 65–94. Gorizia: CIRDSS L. Gasperini.
- Purini, Piero. 2010. *Metamorfosi etniche. I cambiamenti di popolazione a Trieste, Gorizia, Fiume e in Istria 1914–1975*. Udine: Kappa Vu.
- Radović, Srđan. 2013. *Grad kao tekst*. Belgrade: Biblioteka XX vek.
- Rijeka. Plan grada 1951*. Rijeka: Turistički ured.
- Riman, Barbara. 2013. "Riječka Slovenka Zora Ausec i Slovenci u Rijeci nakon 1945. godine: 'bratski narod' ili nacionalna manjina." In *Intelektualci i rat 1939.–1947. Zbornik radova s međunarodnog skupa Desničini susreti*, edited by Drago Roksandić and Ivana Cvijović Javorina, 363–378. Zagreb: Filozofski Fakultet.
- Riman, Kristina, and Barbara Riman. 2008. *Slovenski dom Kulturno prosvetno društvo Bazovica*. Rijeka: Slovenski dom KPD Bazovica.
- Roknić-Bežanić, Andrea. 2012. "Rijeka od oslobođenja 1945. do Pariškog mirovnog ugovora 1947. Godine." PhD thesis, University of Zagreb.
- Šarić, Tatjana. 2014. "Srpsko kulturno društvo 'Prosvjeta' u Socijalizmu." *Arhivski Vjesnik* 57: 307–331.
- Sluga, Glenda. 2001. *The Problem of Trieste and the Italo-Yugoslav Border: Difference, Identity, and Sovereignty in Twentieth-century Europe*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Susmel, Edoardo. 1939. *Fiume e il Carnaro*. Milan: Hoepli.
- Troha, Nevenka. 2009. *Chi avra' trieste? sloveni e italiani. tra due stati*. Trieste: Irsml FVG.
- Vinci, Anna Maria. 2015. "Per quale italianità? La nuova mitologia della patria al confine orientale nel secondo dopoguerra." In *La difesa dell'italianità. L'Ufficio per le zone di confine a Bolzano*,

- Trento e Trieste (1945–1954)*, edited by Diego D'Amelio, Andrea Di Michele, and Giorgio Mezzalana, 331–354. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Volk, Sandi. 2004. *Esuli a Trieste. Bonifica nazionale e rafforzamento dell'italianità sul confine orientale*. Udine: Kappa Vu.
- Wachtel, Andrew B. 1998. *Making a Nation, Breaking a Nation. Literature and Cultural Politics in Yugoslavia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Wörsdörfer, Rolf. 2009. *Il confine orientale: Italia e Jugoslavia dal 1915 al 1955*. Bologna: Il Mulino.