

INTRODUCTION

The “Radiant Future” of Spatial and Temporal Dis/Orientations

Dijana Jelača and Danijela Lugarić

THE UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF (POST)SOCIALISM

The future, as a vector of spatial and temporal orientation, by its very nature perpetually evades our full grasp. At the same time, it remains a key focus on the epistemological horizon of our intellectual endeavors. In *The Future as Cultural Fact*, Arjun Appadurai calls for laying “the foundations of an anthropology of the future [...] that can assist in the victory of a politics of possibility over a politics of probability” (2013: 3). The volume at hand answers one such call. It is invested in illuminating the unfinished business of (post)socialism through various disciplinary and transdisciplinary approaches that seek to illuminate the (post)socialist future as a cultural and social fact. The analyses of various cultural forms and practices put forth in this volume illustrate the conceptual complexities of the formerly socialist cultural space(s) of Eastern Europe, and by doing so, question the teleology of linear transitional narratives, and of the assumptions about postsocialist linear progress. By focusing on the “unfinished business of (post)socialism,” we aim to reflect a sense that, when it comes to socialism and its temporal successor, postsocialism, things operate more as continued interruptions of a perpetually liminal state rather than as neat endings and new beginnings. If socialism did not end as abruptly as is sometimes perceived, what remnants of it linger today and will continue to linger in the future? Moreover, if postsocialism is an umbrella term for the uncertain times of various transitions that followed in socialism’s wake, how might the “post” be rendered complicated by the notion that the unfinished business of socialism continues to influence the trajectory of the future? This is

why we adopt (post)socialism, as a visual, orthographic reflection of said unfinished business, as well as of the fact that “post” often implies too linear an approach to time, space, meaning, and history. In this introduction, we discuss postsocialism as a three-pronged process: as an unfinished business of perpetual liminality, as radiant future, and as circuits of intimacies.

As always, it is important to distinguish between socialism and communism, which are sometimes used almost interchangeably in scholarly writings. For example, in their influential volume *Post-Communist Nostalgia* (2010), Maria Todorova and Zsuzsa Gille almost exclusively use the term *postcommunism* as a signifier for something that, culturally and historically, could also be deemed post-socialism: thereby, an interchangeability between the two is reiterated. However, in our understanding, there are significant differences between the cultural and political logic implied by these two terms. As Tatjana Jukić has argued, the political project of communism, in contrast to that of socialism, “[F]orms itself around the logic and dynamics of promise: communism promises classless society that will appear when true communism is achieved, and it unfolds itself during the phantom-like time of promise, not during the time of an actual historical realisation. The logic and the dynamic of this time are messianic and not historical” (2011: 50).

In that respect, communism is premised *on* the future and stems *from* the future “which is forever suspended in the spectral time of promising” (Jukić 2013: 152). In 1961, during the Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist Party, Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev promised that “the current generation of Soviet people *will live* under communism,” inadvertently confirming that communism was still not, at that point in time, a lived practice. Rather, it was, and still is, based on the elusive illocutionary act of promise about the future. In Marxist theory, communism is the desired final stage of socialist revolution and the ensuing socialist state—the future of (what comes after) socialism, as it were. Therefore, socialism, rather than communism, was a lived experience for many decades in various countries in the world. In most general terms, we understand socialism to be a social, political, and economic system that includes governmental control over the means of production in the first instance, as well as a top-down management and distribution of social rights and social welfare. However, throughout the pages of this collection, it will become clear that this generalized definition can only begin to

scratch the surface of the myriad ways in which socialism and its legacies in post-socialist times manifest themselves.

This volume came out of a symposium, “The Future(s) of Post-Socialism,” held at Stony Brook University’s Post-Socialism Research Institute in the spring of 2015. As organizers of the symposium, we sought to put in conversation different scholarly disciplines that have tackled the concept of postsocialism through diverse approaches, yet rarely have a chance to meaningfully interact with one another in dialogic ways. Aiming to put the terms “interdisciplinary” and “cross-disciplinary” to good use, we brought together scholars from history, anthropology, sociology, economics, political science, education, linguistics, literature, and cultural studies to engage in dialogues about what (post)socialism is and what its futures may be, as seen from various disciplinary and (as it inevitably turned out) mutually informative perspectives.

The name of the Stony Brook symposium—and likewise, this volume—sought to reflect a kind of temporal disorientation: the future of something that is already in the temporality of being “post.” The future in the past, or the past in the future. The future of the past, or the past of the future. Or, future and past converging in the present. Indeed, when it comes to postsocialism as a scholarly paradigm (whatever a given disciplinary orientation may be), temporality is one of the concept’s defining traits: it is the *time*, in all its historical, economic, political, social, and cultural dimensions, that came after socialism. Yet it does not follow from this that socialism is merely in the past. Quite the contrary, the term *postsocialism* perpetually refers to the unfinished business of socialism. As Stuart Hall (1996) argued in the context of postcolonialism, meanings implied under the umbrella term *post* (such as postcolonialism, postmodernity, posthuman, posthistory, and so on) are by no means self-understandable. Namely, “if post-colonial time is the time *after* colonialism, and colonialism is defined in terms of the binary division between the colonizers and the colonized, why is post-colonial time *also* a time of ‘difference’? What sort of ‘difference’ is this and what are its implications for the forms of politics and for subject formation in this late-modern moment?” (Hall 1996: 242). This probing question suggests that there is no one meaning to the prefix *post*, and particularly not one that implies a clear-cut end of what came before. The general “faultiness” of transitional theories based on the evolutionary

model of progress has already been argued by different scholars and from different (inter)disciplinary perspectives.¹ In her essay “Post-Post-Transition Theories: Walking on Multiple Paths” (2008), Manduhai Buyendelgeriyn writes about the necessity to step away from the evolutionary epistemological framework that perceives transition as a “bridge” between socialism and capitalism. By pinpointing the unexpectedness of the ways in which postsocialist cultural practices operate in the actual field of contemporary, market-oriented policies, Buyendelgeriyn calls for a renewal of an intellectual debate on postsocialist matters in the framework of post-posttransitional theories. In the seductive but also highly misleading framework of an epistemological model “that operates on the assumption that all societies are parts of a global developmental continuum based on a free-enterprise-driven global economy” (236), transition might act as a signifier of an evolutionary progress which presupposes that each society will (sooner or later) break with the past and arrive at a predetermined destination—that is, in the pre-given capitalist future. Buyendelgeriyn calls for a reexamining of this transitional concept by exploring postsocialist spaces as spaces of temporal nonlinearity, uncertainty, of dynamic being. She notes that “the enduring nature of the [postsocialist] experiences shows that there is no tangible line between the so-called transition and the so-called expected destination” (237). In relation to the more specific (post)-Soviet context, the links between the two *posts*—postcolonial and postsocialist, or more specifically, post-Soviet—have been examined, for instance, by David Chioni Moore (2001), who asks whether the *post* in postcolonial might be the same *post* in post-Soviet, considering that USSR acted as a colonial power in the region for decades. He concludes that these dilemmas reflect the need to rethink both the paradigms of postcolonial (which he considers to be too Anglo-Saxon-centric) and post-Soviet/postsocialist studies (which are rendered too narrow and too area-studies oriented).

In light of our interventions into the understanding of the *post* in postsocialism and its features, Stuart Hall’s simple yet multilayered questions seem to be especially applicable. By challenging the contested spaces and times of postsocialism in various geographical, national, and political contexts, the essays in this volume—each in its own right—illuminate different ways in which the concept of postsocialism operates in contemporary academic discourse.

Many of the essays exhibit the well-established notion that socialism and its successor, postsocialism, are not political and economic systems exclusively—they are also lived experiences, or what Raymond Williams would call “the lived culture not solely on the level of arts and learning, but also on the level of a whole way of life” (1958: 93). Moreover, what can be detected as a subtext in several essays is an understanding that, after the collapse of the socialist systems in Eastern Europe on the political and economic levels, socialism did not, as a social and cultural phenomenon, suddenly become vacant and replaced with entirely new practices. In many ways, where political and economic systems represented a sudden, often catastrophic break, on the level of everyday life and cultural practices, a sense of perpetual liminality (as a deeply felt, lived paradox) became the underlying condition. Even after it was replaced by transitional democracies and neoliberal capitalist economic systems, socialism and its legacy continued to influence everyday life and cultural production in hybrid ways that reflected its ongoing political and discursive importance. In the various disciplinary frameworks presented in this volume, the *post* in postsocialism therefore by no means implies the past, or something that is definitively terminated or foreclosed; rather, the essays challenge and deconstruct the concept’s temporal linearity. For example, in his polemic “The Endless Innovations of the Semiperiphery and the Peculiar Power of Eastern Europe,” David Ost revitalizes the concept of the semiperiphery (first introduced in Immanuel Wallerstein’s 1976 essay “Semi-Peripheral Countries and the Contemporary World Crisis”) as a way to describe how Eastern Europe has operated as a site of innovation that can never be interpreted in local terms, due to the region’s marginal position with respect to the political, economic, and cultural powers that be. Semiperiphery implies a lack of possibility of making globally important political choices on one’s own terms (thus, “periphery”), but also, that the developments in the region can nevertheless espouse significant influence elsewhere (thus, “semi”). Ost illustrates his point through several notable case studies, from Yugoslav self-management to the East European dissidents’ theorizing about civil society in the 1970s and 1980s. Both innovations were subsequently taken up by the more powerful political systems and reinterpreted, decontextualized, and effectively divorced from their original impact and transformative potential. Subsequently, such reinterpreted understandings are integrated back into their

original semiperipheral contexts, often with severe consequences (which Ost discusses with respect to the NGO-ization of civil society in postsocialist Eastern Europe in particular).

Performatively illustrating Ost's argument about the semiperiphery being the source of low-stakes innovation that may be taken up by the (capitalist) core, David M. Kotz argues in his essay "Socialist Future in Light of Socialist Past and Capitalist Present" that Eastern Europe's former socialist systems present a still-viable economic alternative to the currently dominant neoliberal capitalism. Kotz's analytical point of departure is a rather intriguing claim that complicates the temporal linearity of socialist and capitalist times: he argues that, although replaced by capitalism, socialism still has the potential to resolve the main problems faced by humankind today, and to provide a good life for the world's population. Capitalism, on the other hand, has outlived its ability to bring progress or to meet the needs of the majority. His essay uncovers various positive and negative lessons of socialist system(s), which serve as a way to build an argument for one of his provocative theses: that it was not socialism itself that failed, but quite the contrary, that it was the antisocialist elements that increasingly permeated socialism (such as the accumulation of vertical power in the hands of a small minority) that ultimately caused its failure. In both Ost's and Kotz's essays, the global neoliberal present looms large and conveys a sense of urgency for needing to envision feasible alternatives to the iron grip of peak neoliberalism and the resulting, ever-deepening social precarity rapidly expanding on a mass scale.

By addressing the articulation of Yugoslav socialism in contemporary Croatian literature and culture, Maša Kolanović's essay, "Back to the Future of (Post)Socialism: The Afterlife of Socialism in Post-Yugoslav Cultural Space," shows that the cultural life of socialism during postsocialist times is by no means biased and unambiguous: from denial and nostalgia to a "cabinet of curiosities" (Trifonova 2007), the socialist past appears to be a complex and heterogeneous "repository for feelings."² In Kolanović's analysis, art in postsocialist cultural frameworks is understood in relation to Rancière's politics of aesthetics (2004), wherein for many post-Yugoslav artists and social activists socialism is not merely in the past, but also (yet again) in the future. In their essay, "In Friction Mode—Contesting the Memory of Socialism in Zagreb's Marshal Tito Square," Sanja

Potkonjak and Nevena Škrbić Alempijević focus on the (post)memory of the socialist era (primarily related to the former Yugoslav president Josip Broz Tito), and its ambivalent status in Croatia today. They analyze how materializations and evocations of Tito have been treated in public space since the 1990s, and search for everyday (post)memorial practices unleashed by ambiguous politics of memorialization and uncertainty in general political dealings with the socialist past. In her essay “The Futures of Postsocialist Childhoods: (Re)Imagining the Latvian Child, Nation, and Nature in Educational Literature,” Iveta Silova observes childhood as a vast country without a past, but with a present that reaches into the future, thus deconstructing the problematic nature of before/after chronological frameworks in her analysis of educational narratives that construct and constrain the meanings of childhood in (post)Soviet educational spaces. Silova shows how the child, bound to and conditioned by membership and participation in the collectivity, preserved, paradoxically enough, a similar sociocultural position from Soviet to post-Soviet times, which enables us to conclude that, in relation to the discourses of post-Soviet childhood, the post-Soviet time may in many ways also be pre-Soviet.

The need to continue reexamining the notion of socialism and its nonlinear temporality is inscribed within most of the essays in this volume, proving once more the applicability of a popular Russian saying about the future being much more predictable than the past. The specter of socialism—and in particular, its Eastern European iterations—haunted our symposium the same way it has haunted postsocialist fields of inquiry more generally. Indeed, when do we move away from calling a historical period as “post” something that came before it? When we deem that the work of coming to terms with the legacies of what came before has been completed? Or when we conclusively deem that what came before is now historically, culturally, and politically obsolete?

This central question may be framed by co-opting and reframing the title of Katherine Verdery’s edited volume *What Was Socialism and What Comes Next?* (1996a), and be posed as follows: what is postsocialism and when does it cease to exist? Indeed, postsocialism is frequently aligned with the term “transition,” thus implying its unstable standing as a time that is always in-between, rather than a destination in its own right. As Jelisaveta Blagojević and Jovana Timotijević note in their essay “‘Failing the Metronome’: Queer Reading of the Postsocialist

Transition,” “although the term transition itself is not perceived as ambiguous, it nevertheless contains numerous paradoxes, mostly related to the very idea and the meaning of the concepts of change, transformation and alteration, deeply embedded in its meaning.” Their essay casts an innovative light on the term, by examining the postsocialist transition from the perspective of queer and trans* movements and fluidity.

Indeed, when does the transition end? And moreover, can the transition ever be seen as complete? If social structures are dialectical processes rather than static states of being, then we can argue that there is indeed no end to any transition (which does not imply that there should or could be no end to the social and economic dispossession that the postsocialist economic transition has largely brought on). Rather than an abrupt temporal switch, the transition from socialism to post-socialism has been a long process that, in many ways, is still taking place. Writing in 2008, Stenning and Hörschelmann note that many have indeed called for “the end of post-socialism” (and by implication, the end of transition, or arrival to a “finished” state). They counter that these calls are “premature and misplaced, and that there is an urgent need to center our analytical attention on postsocialism *before it is too late*, and before any notion of post-socialist difference is subsumed, without question, into our broader discussions of capitalism and globalization” (2008: 312).

As noted, many essays in this volume ask us not only to challenge and rethink the concept of postsocialism (or, what should be included and what should be excluded from this disciplinary frame), but also to challenge and rethink what we mean by socialism itself. Was socialism merely the unwanted Other (in relation to capitalism, and to the Western world), or were there—on the level of lived experience—traces of capitalist cultural and social formations always already deeply imbedded in the supposedly autonomous socialist practices? Was socialism ever as homogenous as it is often treated nowadays? In other words, did socialism mean the same to everybody, across different social classes and in different ethnonational chronotopes? As Bridger and Pine elsewhere point out, the answer is a resounding no, since firm “reliance on any ill-defined blanket term obfuscates the range and variations of issues involved” (1998: 3).

Studies of postsocialism have overwhelmingly implied a specific location: Eastern Europe, or the former Eastern Bloc. This centrality has at times elided

two important facts: that Eastern Europe is not the only region transitioning from socialism to a different political and economic system (there is, for instance, Eurasia, as well as China, to name two prominent examples that do not fit the standard focus on Eastern Europe), and second, that even within Eastern Europe, there are critical differences between the kinds of socialism that permeated different societies (Humphrey 2002; Svašek 2006; Silova 2010; Todorova 2010; Kolanović 2013). (Post)socialism, therefore, is not a singular set of experiences, nor a homogenous social structure allocated to a specific place.

Much scholarly work on (post)socialism has indeed been about spaces, both physical and mental (Boym 1994; Verdery 1996b; Crowley and Reid 2002; Smith and Timar 2010). In this volume, entitled “Baku’s Soviet *Vnye*: The Post-Soviet Creation of a Soviet (?) Past,” Heather DeHaan writes about the city of Baku, where urban space is treated as a social product par excellence. By mapping the post-Soviet paradigm against competing geospatial frameworks, past and present, DeHaan’s essay argues that the terms *post-Soviet* or *postsocialist* restrict our understanding of Azerbaijan today. Her essay juxtaposes Soviet experience in Baku against the post-Soviet production of the concept of the “Bakuvian,” which speaks not only to the Soviet experience of home, but more importantly to its role in post-Soviet memories of the past. By using Alexei Yurchak’s concept of the *vnye* of Soviet life (2006), DeHaan argues that the *bakinets* (within *vnye*, that is, a conceptual space between the inside and outside of the sociopolitical concerns of a system) remain an emotional part of post-Soviet concepts of home. It is “the Soviet” of post-Soviet memory, born of present-day memory of a lost and politically discredited past. In “Putting the ‘Public’ in Public Goods: Space Wars in a Post-Soviet Dacha Community,” Olga Shevchenko asks what happened to the spaces that were built by the Soviet government as models of social and political control, and with dacha communities in Moscow suburbs in particular. By exploring the possibility of approaching the “public” and the “private” by turning them into ethnographic questions (rather than opposing sides in a pre-given binary), Shevchenko shows how places that initially promoted a sense of social and communal homogeneity are nowadays turned into hybrid spaces, where notions of public good serve to promote often controversial private interests. Robert A. Saunders’s essay “‘Brand’ New States: Postsocialism, the Global Economy of Symbols, and the

Challenges of National Differentiation” focuses on the evolution of the Estonian Branded “Wunderkind” Jüri, and on other practices of nation or state branding in postsocialist Europe and Eurasia, aiming to critically approach the question of why country branding has become so popular across the region. In his analysis, the concept of space is twofold. On one level, it refers to the cultural, political, and social territories of the suddenly sovereign nation states that once belonged to larger socialist federations (USSR, SFRY, CSR). Secondly, it refers to the (mental) spaces of national collectivities and their sense of self. Some of the questions addressed by Saunders’s essay are: What is nation branding actually? How do auto-stereotypes (how we see ourselves) and hetero-stereotypes (how others see us) interlace in the process of national branding in postsocialism? Finally, his essay asks what the shift from socialism to postsocialism actually implies when contextualized within these nation branding processes.

The essays in this volume show that, just as it has a challenging and nonlinear relationship to time, postsocialism as a paradigm has to maintain balance within spaces that are often uncertain and shifting, or perpetually in transition—which implies movement rather than standing firmly in place. Postsocialism is as disorienting with respect to space as it is to time. This understanding of postsocialist spaces as a tectonic ground influences not only our scholarship, but our experiences of the places themselves. As will become clear from the essays that follow, postsocialism, as well as socialism—as that which came before but remains an unfinished business—are far from being rendered entirely obsolete, done away with or fully brought to terms in the present. Whether it is through its still-viable economic alternatives to the undisputed rule of neoliberal capitalism, or through the structures of feelings that articulate intimate/public yearning for it, socialism still circulates as a vital aspect of the postsocialist paradigm, and thus its future may be brighter, more radiant even, than it might seem at first.

REFLECTING A RADIANT FUTURE

By way of inciting further disorientations of given meanings and static notions, we came to the term “radiant future” in reference to tragic loss. When we were in the initial stages of organizing the symposium, one name appeared on all our

independently assembled lists of potential speakers: Svetlana Boym. The name of the entire event, after all, carried an overt reference to her crowning work, *The Future of Nostalgia* (2001), a book that was largely about postsocialist spaces. When we invited Svetlana to the symposium, she graciously declined the offer, citing minor health issues. She also noted that she hoped to join us at some other opportunity in the “radiant future.” Less than a year later, news reached us of Svetlana’s untimely passing. Even though neither of us had ever met Svetlana in person, her passing felt to us like an intimate loss of someone we knew well. For many of us who are influenced by her work, we think this may be so precisely because she wrote about our collective intimacies, whether they be personal feelings shared among many communities, or communal living spaces. She wrote, in exquisite ways, about things not typically examined in scholarly work: the intricate borders between intimate and public spheres, everyday life, homesickness, diasporic intimacy, domestic trash, the totalitarian lacquer box, the psychopathology of Soviet everyday life, graphomania, false passports, toilets, immigrant souvenirs, fire hydrants, mundane occurrences, ordinariness. In light of her death, her use of the phrase “radiant future” stuck with us as a painful reminder of the inevitability of loss, but also of the need to carry on. Moreover, her humorous use of one of the arguably most misused and abused clichés among Soviet political elites (*svetloe budushchee*) in this rather unconstrained context, reminded us once again of the ironically rotating circuit of history, and of the potentially endless chronological vortex, which is how time is experienced by a large number of people who irretrievably lost something (people they loved, home, language, culture, identity, livelihood) during the (sometimes far from radiant) transitional experiences of (post)socialism. This book is, therefore, dedicated to Svetlana Boym, and is, in profoundly complicated and ironic ways, about the paradoxes of the “radiant future” she spoke about. She has left us with the gift of her work that will continue to inspire many.

With respect to the volume at hand and how it came to be, Svetlana has left us with the gift of a witty appropriation of the phrase that may be applied as a powerful metaphor for the future of (post)socialism itself. Separated from the political and ideological implications of the (Soviet) socialist past, the verb “to radiate” means to emit energy in the form of rays or waves. This may be precisely

how the elusiveness of the term (post)socialism could be approached and better understood. If we see it as dynamically “radiating” rather than simply and statically “being,” (post)socialism may be better understood as that which is always simultaneously moving in many directions (including the directions that break down the temporal boundaries between past, present, and future, as well as between Self and Other)—(post)socialism appears to radiate in waves rather than through a stable and continuous presence. These waves are sometimes felt strongly and at other times seem to entirely subside. What may be the future of such radiant elusiveness? And how do we write about it without succumbing to the desire to freeze it in time and space to get a clearer look? Could it be that (post)socialism, similarly to postcolonialism in Stuart Hall’s analysis, does not refer to the strict chronology of evolutionary historical development from pre- to post-, but, instead, to the point of rupture *between* the two epistemes in intellectual history (1996: 243)?

THE CIRCUITS OF INTIMACY

For a quarter of a century now, postsocialism has been approached through many academic and scholarly frameworks that have balanced these various time/space convergences mentioned above,³ some keen on freezing the moment to get a clearer look,⁴ others, like Boym herself, preferring to balance the uncertainties and frustrations of blurry vision. In the limited space of this introduction, we cannot give due diligence to all these (trans)disciplinary approaches. But we wish to call attention to the circuits of the space-time relationship that, although central, often go unremarked in the studies of postsocialism.

For the two of us, as is the case for many others, (post)socialism is a lived experience and an intimate structure of feelings as much as it is a time of economic, political, and cultural transition of the regions formerly designated as socialist. In fact, economic, political, and cultural aspects of (post)socialism are, for us, deeply intertwined with our intimate feelings, so much so that the two cannot be entirely extricated from one another. To wit, we thought it fitting to share here the personal story of our encounter. We were both born in the period of late socialism in what was then Yugoslavia, on the eve of the Yugoslav lifetime president Tito’s death. Our childhoods were lived, separate yet connected, in the final years of Yugoslavia’s existence, and subsequently went up in the flames of war that tore

our birth country apart. Since we were born in a country that no longer exists, our (post)socialist existence is—as is the case for many postsocialist spaces—by default an exilic, diasporic space, even if we remained in the exact same physical spot (an illustration of the point made above, that standing firm in a single location, one still experiences curious spatial shifts in postsocialism). Despite these similar trajectories of our early lives, we first met as adults, in another (post)socialist space (which, coincidentally, happens to be Svetlana Boym's hometown): St. Petersburg, Russia. There we discovered that not only did we grow up in the same city (Zagreb, Croatia), but that we share the same birth year (1979) and were born weeks apart in the same hospital (Zajčeva). Surely many others share these birth coincidences with us (including, it so happens, Maša Kolanović, one of the contributors in this volume), but meeting each other in St. Petersburg in 2006, we felt that these were more than mere chance occurrences. Rather, they became a way in which we could rediscover our lost childhoods through one another. Our parallel-yet-separate early lives diverged, it turned out, when the war started, because of our different ethnic backgrounds, only to converge again fifteen years later through a chance encounter in post-Soviet Russia. When we met in 2006, we each got a chance to discover something new about our separate-yet-connected intimate histories: one of us discovered a person she may have been had she stayed in her hometown; the other discovered a person she may have been had she left. We mirrored one another in ways that felt instantly familiar. As the cliché goes, it was the beginning of a beautiful friendship. But to be precise, it *felt* like a continuation more than a (new) beginning, since our socialist childhoods were so similar that we did not need to *really* get to know one another, and rather felt that we simply picked up where we had unknowingly left off back in 1991. Here again we complicate the linearity of temporal frames, the cloudiness of what is real, and what are solely our (futuristic) projections, through intimate feelings, and through the story of our (post)socialist personal encounter, because the past was discovered anew in the present, the present reformulated our intimate past, and the future of our continued encounters and collaborations radiated through all of it. (Post)socialism as an intimate lived experience, as well as a scholarly paradigm, radiates in waves that complicate temporal linearity and spatial homogeneity.

This book is, therefore, simultaneously about the past, the present, and the future, as well as about the nonlinear radiance between them. While separate

essays in this volume may nominally address only one of the three temporal frames, each essay is meant to be in conversation with the others, which touch on other temporal dynamics and (trans)disciplinary analytics. And while each essay in this volume stands firmly on its own, it is the spaces of both overlap and discord between them that offer most insight about the radiant future of (post)socialism, or the future of (post)socialist radiance. Most likely both.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Danijela Lugarić's part of research for this essay, and during editing process, was supported by funding from the Croatian Science Foundation (project no. 6077, "Neomythologism in the Culture of the 20th and 21st Century").

NOTES

1. For earlier accounts on the subject see, for instance, Burawoy and Verdery's edited volume *Uncertain Transition*, 1999. See also D. Berdhal, M. Bunzl, and M. Lampland, eds., *Altering States: Ethnographies of Transition in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000); L. Kürti, and P. Skalník, eds., *Postsocialist Europe: Anthropological Perspectives from Home* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009); J. Kubik and A. Linch, *Postcommunism from Within: Social Justice, Mobilization, and Hegemony* (New York: New York University Press, 2013).

2. See also Maruška Svašek's edited volume *Postsocialism. Politics and Emotions in Central and Eastern Europe* (2006).

3. See, for example, N. Tumarkin, *Lenin Lives! The Lenin Cult in Soviet Russia* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996); K. Verdery, *What Was Socialism, and What Comes Next?* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996); K. Verdery, *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Postsocialist Change* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); C. M. Hann, ed., *Postsocialism: Ideals, Ideologies and Practices in Eurasia* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Sh. Chari and K. Verdery, "Thinking between the Posts: Postcolonialism, Postsocialism, and Ethnography after the Cold War," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51, no. 1 (2009): 6–34; N. Tulbure, "Introduction to Special Issue: Global Socialisms and Postsocialisms," *Anthropology of East Europe Review* 27, no. 2 (2009): 2–18; I. Silova, ed., *Post-Socialism Is Not Dead: (Re)Reading*

the Global in Comparative Education (2010); M. Todorova, *Remembering Communism: Genres of Representation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010); H. Cervinkova, "Postcolonialism, Postsocialism and the Anthropology of East-Central Europe," *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 48, no. 2 (2012): 155–63; M. Kolanović, ed. *Komparativni postsocijalizam. Slavenska iskustva.* (Zagreb: Zagrebačka slavistička škola, 2013).

4. See, for example, K. Verdery, *The Vanishing Hectare: Property and Value in Postsocialist Transsylvania* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013); Z. Gille, *From the Cult of Waste to the Trash Heap of History: The Politics of Waste in Socialist and Postsocialist Hungary* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007); X. Zhang, *Postsocialism and Cultural Politics: China in the Last Decade of the Twentieth Century* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008); O. Schevchenko, *Crisis and the Everyday in Postsocialist Moscow* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009); B. Luthar and M. Pušnik, eds., *Remembering Utopia: The Culture of Everyday Life in Socialist Yugoslavia* (Washington, DC: New Academia Publishing, 2010); S. Horvat and I. Štiks, eds., *Welcome to the Desert of Post-Socialism: Radical Politics After Yugoslavia* (New York: Verso, 2015); S. Jensen, *Yearnings in the Meantime. "Normal Lives" and the State in a Sarajevo Apartment Complex* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2014).

REFERENCES

- Boym, S. *Common Places: Mythologies of Everyday Life in Russia.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Boym, S. *The Future of Nostalgia.* New York: Basic Books, 2001.
- Bridger, S., and F. Pine. *Surviving Post-Socialism: Local Strategies and Regional Responses in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union.* New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Burawoy, M., and K. Verdery. *Uncertain Transition: Ethnographies of Change in the Postsocialist World.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1999.
- Buyandelgeriyn, M. "Post-Post-Transition Theories: Walking on Multiple Paths." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 37 (2008): 235–50.
- Crowley, D., and S. E. Reid, eds. *Socialist Spaces: Sites of Everyday Life in the Eastern Bloc.* Oxford, UK: Berg, 2002.
- Hall, S. "When Was 'the Post-Colonial'? Thinking at the Limit." In *The Post-Colonial Question*, edited by I. Chambers, and L. Curti, 242–59. London: Routledge, 1996.

- Humphrey, C. *The Unmaking of Soviet Life: Everyday Economies after Socialism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Jukić, T. *Revolucija i melankolija: granice pamćenja hrvatske književnosti*. Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak, 2011.
- . "Between Auschwitz and Siberia. James Joyce, Danilo Kiš and a Zoning of Totalitarianism." In *Ireland, West to East: Irish Cultural Interactions with Central and Eastern Europe*, edited by A. O'Malley and E. Patten, 135–58. Oxford, UK: Peter Lang, 2013.
- Kolanović, M., ed. *Komparativni postsocijalizam. Slavenska iskustva*. Zagreb: Zagrebačka slavistička škola, 2013.
- Moore, D. C. "Is the Post- in Postcolonial the Post- in Post-Soviet? Toward a Global Postcolonial Critique." *PMLA* 116, no. 1: 111–28, 2001.
- Silova, I., ed. *Post-Socialism Is Not Dead: (Re)Reading the Global in Comparative Education*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing, 2010.
- Smith, A. and J. Timár. Uneven Transformations: Space, Economy and Society 20 Years After the Collapse of State Socialism. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 17, no. 2 (2010): 115–25.
- Stenning, A., and K. Hörschelmann. "History, Geography and Difference in the Post-Socialist World: Or, Do We Still Need Post-Socialism?" *Antipode* 40, no. 2 (2008): 312–35.
- Svašek, M., ed. *Postsocialism. Politics and Emotions in Central and Eastern Europe*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2006.
- Todorova, M. *Remembering Communism: Genres of Representation*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.
- Todorova, M., and Z. Gille., eds. *Post-Communist Nostalgia*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.
- Verdery, K. *What Was Socialism, and What Comes Next?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996a.
- . "Nationalism, Postsocialism, and Space in Eastern Europe." *Social Research* 63, no. 1 (1996b): 77–95.
- Williams, R. 1958. "Culture Is Ordinary." <http://artsites.ucsc.edu/faculty/Gustafson/FILM%20162.W10/readings/Williams.Ordinary.pdf>. Accessed September 13, 2015.