

Pregledni rad
UDK 321.74(497.11):929 Cenić M.
321.74(497.11):929 Marković S.
Primljeno: 22.11.2016.
Odobreno: 05.12.2016.

Dejan Jovanović,
Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Belgrade

THE ORIGINS OF SERBIAN SOCIALISM

Abstract

Aim of the paper is to identify causality among the particularities of political ideologies of two socialists Svetozar Markovic and Dimitrije Cenic and political and cultural environment in which they were working and creating. On the other side text elaborates pre-modern Serbian institutions and other particularities in context of the Serbian political model. This means that the main hypothesis of the text is that distinctiveness of so called “Serbian socialism”, was a result of particularities of the Serbian political model in the second half of 19th century. Particularities of that model are presence of Serbian national issue in discourse, and social and economic circumstances in Serbia in that time.

Keywords: *Svetozar Markovic, Dimitrije Cenic, cooperative, municipality, Serbian socialism*

1. INTRODUCTION

The text elaborates the second half of 19th century in Serbia. Observation is focused on political ideology of two Serbian socialists, Svetozar Markovic and Dimitrije Cenik on one side, and pre-modern Serbian institutions and other particularities in context of the Serbian political model on the other side. Aim of such observations is to identify causality among the particularities of political ideologies of two above, socialists and political and cultural environment in which they were working and creating. This means that the main hypothesis of the text is that distinctiveness of so called “Serbian socialism”, was a result of particularities of the Serbian political model in the second half of 19th century. Particularities of that model are presence of Serbian national issue in discourse, and social and economic circumstances in Serbia in that time. We shall provide arguments to show that because of such circumstances, the pre-modern institutions, such as cooperatives and municipalities, were considered a possible cornerstone in building a modern democratic state.

At the beginning, we are going to make a picture of evident digressions of the socialism in Serbia, from the classical Marxism. Then, we will place such digressions into relevant context, in order to explain them. We will abstract the crucial elements of the Serbian political model which we recognized in Serbia in that time, and make more clear picture of them, so that we can argue the main hypothesis.

2. SOCIALISM

Socialist ideology in modern context means a general ideology including many doctrinaire branches and some of them has become separate ideologies. Having in mind that the subject matter to the text is limited to the second half of 19th century, we shall take Marxism, as the main branch of socialism in those days as a reference, according to which we will determine and define political thoughts of Serbian socialists. In principle, Marx’s idea is grounded on deep social polarisation between exploiters and the exploited, divided in two classes. Revolution is the only way to overcome such unfair polarisation. According to Marx, only proletariat is may lead the revolution. Theoretical vanguard of the proletariat, organised in political party, should provide a kind of ideological leadership. Objective is to discontinue achievements and heritage of the state and society of that time through “dictatorship of proletariat”, which will lead new society into communism. Since according to Marx, private property is the main cause of economic inequality, it also has to be abolished, because legal and political equality means nothing

without the economic one.¹ It should be highlighted that Marxism is an international ideology that considers nationalism, as ideology of bourgeoisie class, to be its main enemy. It is interesting to see the attitudes of Marxism concerning methods and means of the revolution, since the roads to socialism were divided in 19th century into a revolutionary and a reformist way. Although this division process was phased and lasted several decades, its existence is essential for the conclusions hereof. “Focal² point of ideological orientation of social-democracy in its theory and practice is achievement of political power by peaceful means. This is why the stronghold if its ideology is a state ..., , ... active actor is not proletariat, but social-democratic party”³ In fact, some of such digressions from classical Marxism may be found in political thoughts of Serbian socialists, as well as some unexpected elements.

3. SERBIAN SOCIALISTS

Ideological digressions of political thoughts of Svetozar Markovic and Dimitrije Cenic from the classical Marxism, represent characteristics of political thoughts, making that what we call “Serbian socialism”. Views on the revolution actors and goals, especially on the method of running the socialistic revolution, views about the role of violence, regards to bureaucratic administration of a state and to property issue, contain considerable digression from the classical Marxism. Their views concerning religion and church are also interesting with respect to their digression from the rigid stand of the classical Marxism concerning that issue.

Svetozar Markovic, although adopted some of Marx’s views concerning the role of violence, he did not reject violence as a mean and considered the revolution to be “transformation of human being and society, conditioned with rising awareness ... social transformation cannot be done with one violent act, one blow... No. This requires long, phased development, it needs organisational work of its generations, this requires intellectual and moral development..”⁴ Svetozar Markovic, unlike Marx’s desire to fully abolish private property, suggests “that economic

1 Simeunovic, Dragan, “Uvod u političku teoriju”, Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade 2009, 123.

2 All quotations herein are translated by the author of this article

3 Simeunovic Dragan, “Teorija politike”, Science and Society Association, Belgrade, 2002, page 222

4 Simeunovic, Dragan, “Novovekovne političke ideje u Srba knj.1”, Institute for Political Studies Belgrade, 2003, page 300

relationships - property relationships should be fundamentally changed".⁵ However, even more interesting digressions of Markovic's political views are concerned of the Serb national issue, saying that "he saw, as his life goal, liberation of Serb people and their unification in one strong European state, by uniting people instead of governments."⁶ So this is clear that Markovic did not regard only the interests of international class of proletarians and workers, but also interests of the nation he belonged to, and said: "We consider liberation to be the main goal of our Serbian politics. Liberation politics we consider to be the only politics of our people: any other politics we see as anti-national, as a proprietary politics."⁷ He suggested to Serbian socialists not only social emancipation, but also the liberation of Serbian people as a political goal, and moreover he declared any other politics to be anti-national. Svetozar Markovic "is of opinion that the revolution should begin as a national liberation of Serbian people living out of Serbia and then to grow to total social revolution in transformed Serbia."⁸ In other words, he advocated unity of national and social revolutions which shall promote status of the Serbian people. "Besides all remarks, S. Jovanovic was full of praise for Markovic concerning the national issue, unlike the liberals who regarded the people in a romantic manner, idealising them. S. Jovanovic highly appraised Svetozar Markovic's contribution in evaluating the Serbian tradition, by introducing more realistic and critique views about the people, their condition and awareness, against the glorification of the people's "innate sense" of democracy etc."⁹ Svetozar Markovic introduced practice of critical review of the Serbian history according to which the national tradition should be subject to critique, and take from it only the best, and in this context he used to say that "in Serbia only the good should be kept, and the opposite to the good should be abolished, event the opposite is totally Serbian".¹⁰ Having this in mind, Milan Matic noticed that Svetozar Markovic was the first one who treated the Serbian issue from three aspects, social, political and cultural, since they are so mutually connected and without any of them it is not possible even to think about solution of the Serbian national issue neither in 19th nor in 20th century, until now."¹¹ According to Markovic, "Serbia - it is not a duke, not ministers, not heads

5 The same

6 Simeunovic, Dragan, "Novovekovne političke ideje u Srba knj.1", Institute for Political Studies Belgrade, 2003, page 305.

7 The same, page 308.

8 The same, page 324.

9 Matic Milan, "O srpskom političkom obrascu", Political Sciences Institute, Belgrade 2000, page 274.

10 The same, page 254.

11 The same.

or captains, judges or village heads, jurisdictions and offices, Serbia - it is the Serbian people, Serbs.”¹² We can notice totally unusual attitudes for a left-winger and socialist in 19th century. It is interesting that Svetozar Markovic is not alone in his “left-shifting” and that we can follow development of the Serbian socialism by researching political thought of his successor Dimitrije Cenic.

Dimitrije Cenic regards socialism as “sociability, i.e. a whole society taking care of every member. Mutual assistance and support - this is the essence of socialism.”¹³ Despite acceptance that fundamental principles of socialism are universal ones, he said that “... in applying those principles, folk workers, whether they like or not, must pay attention to their working conditions and circumstances, and must adjust their work to such conditions and circumstances.”¹⁴ This means that he, in every society, sees special and authentic way to socialism, conditioned by local circumstances. Then, in his manner he commented on those who understand socialism in dogmatic way, and said: “Perhaps some fanatic socialist may consider the recognition of living circumstances to be a weakness, but I cannot help it - the things are - what they are!”¹⁵ In line with his attitudes, Dimitrije saw two roads to socialism i.e. two kinds of socialists. He classified on one side all those who want the fall of the existing state and the system, in order to build a new one on its ruins. On the other side, he classified those who, despite all failures of the existing state and the system, work on benefit of those who are weaker, on benefit of the whole society. He denied all those who said that socialism intends to destroy foundation of the society, emphasising that the socialism is a naturally born idea willing to enforce foundations of the society – sociability. He considered “mutual assistance and support and love”¹⁶ to be an essential idea of any society. On the other hand, concerning the foreign politic, Dimitrije advocated the unification of all Serbian territories in one entire state, “Montenegro, Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Old Serbia, Dalmatia, Srem and entire Vojvodina should compose one entire state, since they are one people.”¹⁷ This is to be recalled that he saw such political unification as an integral part of socialism. He said that on the road of the national production

12 The same, page 276.

13 Dimitrije Cenic, article “*Socijalizam u Srbiji*”, in “Izabrani spisi Dimitrije Mita Cenić 2”, Latinka Perovic, Rad, 1988., page 105.

14 The same, page 93.

15 Ibidem.

16 Dimitrije Cenic, article “*Socijalizam u Srbiji*”, in “Izabrani spisi Dimitrije Mita Cenić 2”, Latinka Perovic, Rad, 1988.,page 108.

17 Branko Nadoveza, “*Koncepcija federacije Mite Cenića*”, the SANU Digest, *Socijal-demokratsko nasleđe u Srbiji – Dimitrije Cenić, Institute for Text-books and Educational Means*, Belgrade 1995. page 214

salvation, socialists are “united with all real patriotic forces”, adding that “for our country, the only salvation is that socialism and patriotism become the same, one notion.”¹⁸ In this context we can say that Cenec was advocating the socialism with national colours, and that the socialism in Serbia “may be only Serbism.”¹⁹ It is clear that the two Serbian political thinkers, besides digression concerning the method of carrying out the revolution and its actors, make significant deviation regarding the objectives of the socialist revolution. The said digressions make just a small portion of many existing, apparently making that what we call particularity of Serbian socialism, which was created as an autonomous system of ideas and political process and goals in that period.

The main question is: **What did cause such particularity?**

4. SERBIAN POLITICAL MODEL AS A CAUSE OF THE SERBIAN SOCIALISM PARTICULARITY

In our opinion, political culture is crucial, since it has fundamental effect on political processes, formation of political ideas and phenomenon. In order to show existence of a distinctive political culture, we have to separate or describe some of its elements. An assumption we try to prove is that one of such elements, in this case, was public political discourse about the Serbian national issue. The major common element of political elite and the people’s tribunes in those days, even of ordinary peasants, was almost identical attitude on the Serbian national issue. Such attitude entailed non-compromising desire of a political community for national liberation and unification of Serbs. This is why we can find historical comparison between the Principality and Kingdom of Serbia of that time, with Italian Piedmont. After analysing the documents, we can come to a conclusion that there was no significant political thinker in that period, who did not devote special place in his works to the Serbian national issue. Concerning socialism, we may prove that the most of its particularities, which existed, were result of adjusting taken classical ideology to the local political discourse, i.e. political culture that predominated in Serbia in that period. The mechanism seems to be a logical one, since in practice it would be impossible to obtain any political legitimacy, if we neglect the central issue of the dominant discourse. Really, researches and

¹⁸ Mihailo Markovic, “*Shvatanje socijalizma Dimitija Cenića*”, the SANU Digest *Social-democratic heritage in Serbia – Dimitrije Cenec, Institute for Text-books and Educational Means*, Belgrade 1995. page 34

¹⁹ Dragan Simeunovic, “Novovekovne političke ideje u Srba”, Political Sciences Institute Belgrade, 2003. page 387

presentation of the arguments show that digressions by Svetozar Markovic and Dimitrije Cenic from the classical Marxism were, in considerable part of their thoughts, directly or indirectly connected to great consideration of the Serbian national issue in that period.

In addition to the Serbian national issue as an element of the Serbian political model in 19th century, we would like to point to one also important, perhaps even more important element of the Serbian political culture. Apparently, social-economic particularity of the Serbian society in the second half of the 19th century was conditioned by absolute domination of peasant population and lack of industrial production. Although the Obrenovic the second half of the 19th century centralised and bureaucratized Serbia at great extent, Serbian socialists called for pre-modern institutions as a nucleus in revitalisation of democratic spirit of the Serbian people and building of a modern state founded on the people's political participation. With this respect, Svetozar Markovic said that "practical sense of socialism for internal and external progress of the Serbian people is implied in the following: social transformation inside, based on national sovereignty and municipal self-administration; revolution in Turkey and federation in the Balkans..."²⁰ "We only need to perfect out social institutions, to study and apply all scientific discoveries and to organise division and combination of labour in the manner most beneficial for progressive development..."²¹ "Natural development of the Serbian civilization would be when all those notions that had already existed in the Serbian municipality, are established, expanded and realised in the institutions"²² Markovic explicitly stated that "there, where municipal property, borrowings (bartered labour) and moba (Moba is farmer-to-farmer volunteer work) exist, only one step beyond is required to reach regular organisation of municipal collective production."²³

"Briefly: Serbian state would reach the ideal of the current European state, i.e. would become a cooperative in which an individual would be able to provide foodstuffs that s/he is not able to provide by his/her work..."²⁴ Dimitrije Cenic took almost identical stand regarding the role of Serbian cooperative community in modern Serbia and he considers production in Serbia to be agricultural potential, and than handicraft and industrial potential, having in mind circumstances in Serbia in that

20 Matic Milan, "O srpskom političkom obrascu", Political Sciences Institute, Belgrade 2000, page 276.

21 The same, page 270.

22 The same, page 271.

23 The same, page 270.

24 Matic Milan, "O srpskom političkom obrascu", Political Sciences Institute, Belgrade 2000, page 271.

period. He saw increased production as a result of successful cooperation between the state and cooperative, which requires capital, knowledge and mass production. Capital could be provided through district or central bank, and knowledge via people's schools that would be established with purpose in municipalities and adjusted to municipal economic circumstance. In his opinion, it is possible to organize mass production through either capitalism or cooperatives. Certainly, he opted for another solution. "Cenic thought that mass production in Serbia might be reached when poor agricultural workers organise joint cooperatives, in order to cultivate land and breed livestock by their collective work, while the municipality would provide them necessary tools and machinery."²⁵ His solution for distribution of goods is a partial state regulation through district and municipal warehouses, as well as through cooperative's actions.

Having in mind the above, we consider cooperatives as a socio-economic unit and Serbian municipality as a political self-administration unit to be unavoidable institutional element of the specific Serbian political model, and according to that, in our opinion it is necessary to make more detailed picture of its structure and purpose.

5. SERBIAN COOPERATIVE AND SERBIAN MUNICIPALITY

Cooperative is very old, both as a notion and institution. It existed before feudalism, with Slavic tribes where a family was a core social unit. Initial oral and the people's terms were "home", "house", "big fireplace", "large group clique", "cooperative house", "cooperative family"..., etc. For instance, Serbian Civil Code dated 1844, in all its texts used the terms "cooperative", "house", "housing cooperative".²⁶ Considering the terms, it may be concluded that the Serbian cooperative is a collective institution established as an institutional framework, almost as an organic extension of the family as the core social unit.

The oldest written sources about cooperatives are from Byzantine, dated from 12th century. The sources may be classified in archives of monastery properties and on judicial property legal acts. Like Byzantine monasteries, and Serbian monasteries begun keeping records of their properties. The minutes were taken about type and quantity of the goods in possession, lists of cooperative families in all surrounding villages. The Decani monastery brotherhood was the most diligent in the records

²⁵Obren Blagojevic, "Cenićevi ekonomski pogledi", The SANU Digest *Socijaldemokratsko nasleđe u Srbiji – Dimitrije Cenić, Institute for Text-books and Educational Means*, Belgrade 1995. page 65

²⁶ Iljic, Nikola "Istorija zadruga kod Srba", Službeni list, Belgrade, 1999, page 14-16.

keeping. Housing cooperatives were carrying out agricultural works at belonging monastery properties and places. Even through documents we can notice that for instance, when cooperative's land is disposed by means of sale, purchase, exchange, all the cooperative members had to be named as "owners". There are even some notes that the decisions by the cooperative head concerning sale of the property were denied, if such decision was made without consent of other members of the family cooperative.²⁷ Regarding the above, it could be concluded that cooperatives were not just collective institutions, but were based on collective property. It is deemed that the principle of a cooperative collective property entered into the Byzantine legislation as a result of influence of Slavic common law, after they inhabited the Balkans.²⁸

Other type of written sources is related to judicial property legal acts in Byzantine, which were made mostly for purchase, sale or exchange of parts of collective cooperative property. The point is that no change in ownership could be registered in the deed books without prior consent of all members of the respective cooperative. The same rules applied to the Serbian medieval legal tradition.²⁹ The above lead us to a key element of common property and clarify the nature of the relationship among members of a family - cooperative. Their relationships were certainly focused on cooperation and solidarity, whether forcibly or not; without those elements, functionality of such institution was impossible.

Dušan's Code shows us that the Byzantine law was not the only one that known a cooperative. The Code prescribed and governed complex relations of a cooperative ("fireplace", "smoke", "houses", etc.) with other government institutions. The Code also treated the institute of collective liability of a house, family, cooperative. In fact, those are old customs that became laws, which knew just collectives such as family, relatives, brotherhood and tribes..³⁰ These facts prove that core unit of manufacture was linked to core social unit, and that introduction of a statehood just followed the established situation.

Family house or a cooperative community consists of a simple family i.e. father and mother with their children, By time, the family was growing since married sons stayed to live and work within their family - cooperative. At the beginning, seniority was held by the oldest man, but it changed later and the most capable male member was elected.³¹ For instance, the oldest member could be sick, lazy,

27 The same, page 17.

28 The same.

29 Ilijic, Nikola "Istorija zadruga kod Srba", Službeni list, Belgrade, 1999, page 18.

30 Ilijic, Nikola "Istorija zadruga kod Srba", Službeni list, Belgrade, 1999, page 18

31 The same, page 19

squanderer etc. This means that such family cooperative implies collective life, work, production and consumption of goods. The basic classification to smaller and larger cooperatives is done according to the number of members. Smaller cooperative consists of a simple family - husband, wife and their children. The smaller cooperative is also called "sole cooperative" or "inokostina". Sole cooperative is a basic cooperative unit, and all other cooperatives are developed from it. Larger cooperative consists of a simple family, which is enlarged by relatives being members of the same cooperative.³²

Further we may mention typology by V. Popovic, differing three types of the cooperatives: complete, incomplete and heterogenic cooperatives. *Complete cooperative* is a cooperative where whole family lives in the same place, works and produces in community. *Incomplete cooperative* is a cooperative in which some family members do not live with others, but live out of the cooperative. They are mostly young man engaged in transhumance for a longer period, or poorer men who are forced to go to other places to work as day laborer or agricultural workers. *Heterogenic cooperative* is a cooperative in which all members have various occupations while in its composition there is no cooperative homogeneity. Heterogenic cooperative is richer in its material and cultural development, and distinctive because its members are linked by interest instead blood cognation. In the Middle Ages, this type of cooperative community was primarily present with nobilities and squires.³³ Heterogenic cooperative might be compared to contemporary agricultural cooperative community that is not based on blood cognation, but on common interest of its members.

Before and after uprisings of Serbs, there were in Serbia two prevailing types of the cooperatives. The first is fraternal cooperative comprised of sibling brothers, who with their families composed a community. By division of such cooperatives, each of them was becoming a sole (inokosnik), and so established another type – parental cooperative. Parental cooperative consists of a father with his wife and sons living and working in the same community. Following the said typologies and definitions of various types of cooperatives, the conclusion is that the basis for mutual connection of the cooperative is blood cognation before all. This is a foundation for building confidence, solidarity and cooperation. Besides, it is obvious that the interest is a motive for joining, since due to primitive production method there was a need for joined provision of goods. For these reasons, such interest is primarily economic one, led by self-preservation. A cooperative performs this functions as a

³² The same, page 20

³³ Ilijic, Nikola "Istorija zadruga kod Srba", Službeni list, Belgrade, 1999, page 20.

community.³⁴ “In the history of cooperative, the associated individuals have always been carriers of economic activities. This fundamental principle was applied to both patriarchal and contemporary cooperative. With this regard between past and new, contemporary cooperative there has always been a similarity which is characteristic for this specific economic organisation.”³⁵ This means that although collective economic unit is based on blood cognation and economic interest of its members, old Serbian cooperative is primarily a patriarchal institution. We could say that such cooperative could not survive without patriarchate.

Svetozar Markovic wrote that loneliness and self-supporting in the world morally kills the labour class in the West, and calls for groups for “mutual assistance”, “for informing”, and by other means, to compensate the community that fell together with the fall of patriarchal lifestyle.”³⁶ According to Markovic, traditional Serbian cooperative can not survive without domination of patriarchate in society; however, this does not mean that elements of cooperative association cannot be applied to contemporary labour class. He suggests establishment of various labour associations, which may undertake some of the roles of Serbian cooperative. These old roles include various institutes that upgrade basic functions of a Serbian cooperative, such as “moba”, borrowing and “spreg”. “*Moba*” implied gathering of several cooperative communities in order to jointly complete works in one of the communities, considering that such large works could be completed only by joint efforts. “*Moba*” was repeated from one cooperative community to other, according to needs. It was a free, volunteer farmer-to-farmer labour, but the head of the land where the work took place was obliged to feed and water all workers. *Borrowing* means apparently barter of labour, or labour as a borrowing. For example, cooperatives exchanged workers for various labours according to the needs: a digger for a weight carrier; a picker for a billhook, etc. *Spreg* means collective use of plowing livestock. The poorer, who did not have enough livestock for plowing, associated their cattle to others, in order to cultivate land of the associated ones. One who could provide smaller number of the livestock, provided a longer work of his cattle, and the account would be fair. This means that time of work and certain number of engaged livestock was taken into account. Capital of the cooperatives did not need to be mixed, but the labour was collective and total workforce was available to every single community, and no one was denied such workforce. Markovic said that “in addition to these institutions, there are, with the Serbian people, real people’s association, which principles and conformation

34 The same

35 Ilijic, Nikola "Istorija zadruga kod Srba", Službeni list, Belgrade, 1999, page 21

36 Markovic, Svetozar "Srbija na istoku", Prosveta, Belgrade, 1946, page 32

are compatible with modern idea of an association".³⁷ As an example of such association, he mentioned the institute of "bacijanje" - collective livestock grazing, which is apparently a sort of professional association of livestock breeders, based on solidarity, which also existed in Switzerland. Markovic claimed that economic correlation of Serbian workers overwhelmed the cooperative solidarity, entering into a wider sphere out of economic intrapersonal relations in a cooperative community. Collective labour, as an institute, is characteristic for them. Besides cooperatives and other associations, Markovic gives special status to Serbian municipality, as a political institution acting out of the state. The municipality is in fact as a local self-administration being in accordance with economic activities of the cooperative as an economic self-administration. Supporting this thesis, he said: "Cooperative community and municipality – the two Serbian institutions have remained untouched by the Turkish state system. Serbian people collected their broken national life in the communities, and from them resisted the Turks. Cooperatives were economic, and municipalities political units of Serbian people... Immediately at the beginning of the Serbian uprising, it was clear that cooperative community was a fireplace where a sparkle of the revolution blazed, which destroyed Turkish state system, and that it was foundation for a new Serbian state."³⁸ Here we can establish that a cooperative, in addition to its economic and other functions that it performed for its members, apparently is an actor in society in which it acts. Cooperative has capacity to act as a collective subject, in order to protect individual interests of its members .

Therefore, a cooperative is laborer's, farmer's, solidaric, economic, collective, supporting, socially aware and active, non-governmental institution with long-lasting success in preserving individual, existential and other interests of its members. It seems that a cooperative can survive only in synergy with all its functions. If one of the fundamental elements is taken, cooperative cannot function optimally.

37 Markovic, Svetozar "Srbija na Istoku", Prosveta , Belgrade, 1946, page 26

38 The same, page 34

6. CONCLUSION

Based on the above, we can conclude that historical, political social and economic conditions that existed in Serbia in the second half of 19th century, crucially influenced establishment of special political discourse.. Such political discourse had significant impact on development of political ideas and processes, as well as on establishment of special type of parliamentary socialism in Serbia. This "Serbian socialism" essentially differed from the European social democracy, because it lacked the characteristic internationalism relying on labour class. Instead of it and on its place the Serbian socialism puts Serbian people and national unification. In addition, Serbian socialism intended to build modern democratic state on not-modern foundation, but which was deemed as a possible solid foundation for independent development of society and establishment of a state. The foundation consists of old institutions - Serbian cooperative and municipality.

References:

- Cenić, Dimitrije Perović Latinka "Izabrani spisi Dimitrije Cenic 2", Rad, 1988.
- Codex of works SANU *Socijaldemokratsko nasleđe u Srbiji – Dimitrije Cenić*, Institute for Text-books and Educational Means, Belgrade 1995.
- Ilijić, Nikola "Istorija zadruga kod Srba", Službeni glasnik, Belgrade, 1999
- Matić, Milan "About Serbian political model", Political Sciences Institute, Belgrade 2000.
- Marković, Svetozar "Srbija na Istoku", Prosveta, Belgrade, 1946.
- Simeunović, Dragan, "Uvod u političku teoriju", Institute of Political Studies Belgrade 2009.
- Simeunović, Dragan, "Teorija politike", Science and Society Association, Belgrade, 2002.
- Simeunović, Dragan, "Novovekovne političke ideje u Srba knjiga 1", Institute of Political Studies, Belgrade, 2003.

OSNOVE SOCIJALIZMA U SRBIJI

Apstrakt

Cilj rada je pronalaženje uzročnosti između osobnosti političke misli dvojice srpskih socijalista Svetozara Markovića i Dimitrija Cenića, političkog i kulturnog konteksta u kojem su radili i stvarali. Sa druge, strane predmet teksta su pred-moderne srpske institucije i druge osobnosti u kontekstu srpskog političkog obrasca. To znači da je glavna hipoteza ovog teksta to da je osobnost onoga što nazivamo "srpski socijalizam" uzrokovana karakteristikama srpskog političkog obrasca u drugoj polovini 19. veka. Karakteristike tog obrasca su sveprisutnost srpskog nacionalnog pitanja u diskursu, te društveni i ekonomski uslovi u Srbiji toga doba.

Ključne reči: *Svetozar Marković, Dimitrije Cenić, zadruga, opština, srpski socijalizam*