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1. The Circumstances and Indications of Concepts

The concept of multiculturalism is linked to the immigration context and to the crisis of the modernisation project (v. Semprini, 2000). Chronologically, therefore, the period involved is the second half of the 20th century. Yet can one say that multicultural society and a pluralistic approach to regulating inter-ethnic and intercultural relations are really new phenomena? It seems, on the other hand, that the connection between ethnically and/or culturally plural societies and the modern migration context produced simplified views in regard to multiethnic and multicultural phenomena. Certainly, migration changed the social landscape of immigrant countries, but it was not the only cause of their ethnic and cultural diversity. Furthermore, emigration societies are also multicultural and multiethnic. It seems to have been forgotten that societies have always been culturally and ethnically plural and, in spite of numerous homogenisation strategies, they remain plural. However, plurality does not have to mean that a society is also pluralistic. During the history of nation-states different cultural policies were introduced in order to regulate relationships in ethnically and culturally plural societies. Roughly, they could be distinguished as assimilationist and pluralistic policies. The assimilationist policy dominated in Western societies over the whole century. Each nation-state wanted to eliminate (cultural and ethnic) differences. In the second part of the 20th century so-called integrationist models emerged, i.e. models of power in which the dominant group endeavoured to protect its continuity. They were based on an attempt to integrate “others” (mostly immigrants and groups differing from “our” society, from “our” culture) into “our” culture and into “our” society (Mullard, 1988). The multicultural model followed later (cf. Constant, 2000). Some critics considered these latter models to be nothing else than more sophisticated assimilationist models. Others, however, regard multiculturalism not merely as an aspect of the education of migrants and minorities, but as a way of realising an intercultural1 project that would encompass the entire society (Camilleri, 1995, Costa-Lascoux, 1995). Despite the typical

---

1 Quite often the terms “multiculturalism” and “interculturalism” overlap in usage, or are considered synonymous. The concept of “multiculturalism” is generally thought to mean a form of cultural policy and a concept of society (“multicultural” society) in which more cultures co-exist on equal footing, while “interculturalism” is thought to mean a cultural policy aimed at creating an intercultural society (a society in which more cultures interact, creating by this interaction a “new cultural synthesis”) (Porcher, 1986). The very term inter (lat. “between”) indicates dynamics and inter-relationship, while the term multus/plures (lat. many, much/more, more of them) implies the simultaneous existence of more elements, in this context – more cultures. However, further discussion on the concepts in use today is needed, since they are not always given the same meaning in the pertinent literature.
scheme – ranging from assimilation to multiculturalism – certain forms of the multicultural approach to regulating cultural and ethnic diversity can be identified in not so recent history (Parekh, 2000, Smith, 2001, Demorgon, 2002). This paper will attempt to confirm this claim on the example of the Croatian schooling system at a time when Croatia was a part of multiethnic or rather multinational states.²

However, first of all it is necessary to examine the concepts of multiculturalism and multicultural society. Keeping in mind the socio-historical context in which the concept of multiculturalism (first) appeared, as well as confusion in regard to its definition and interference with similar or related concepts, and also various interpretations and practices linked with them, the concept of multiculturalism is understood here as a cultural policy that bases itself on accepting the fact that various cultures exist in a society (or state) and that attempts to produce a mix or at least a harmonic coexistence of these cultures. As opposed to multiculturalism, which is a programme and a mode of action, the concept of multicultural society pertains to a situation. It denotes a society marked by cultural plurality, i.e. by the presence of different cultures that most often live together in peaceful coexistence.

In regard to the principles of multiculturalism (as they were formulated by Martine Abdallah-Pretceille)³, the analysis of school regulations in Croatia, and of the curriculum goals and tasks from the beginnings of state regulated education in the 18th century to the present day, shows the continued presence of at least some of them. The first principle pertains to the existence of special and complex legal regulations guaranteeing rights for everyone. It manifests itself in the legislative regulation of rights to education in the individual’s mother tongue and in the framework of his or her culture. The second principle, which includes the expression of differences in

² The history of educational systems could offer a retrospective view, *inter alia*, of cultural policy. Modern educational systems actually began in connection with the development of nation-states (and the formation of nations). This process occurred in Europe during the 18th and 19th centuries. Educational systems had to serve the “national interest”, as conceived by dominant classes in society. Education became a state concern and an institution of the state. The state viewed schools as an important factor that could help make children good subjects and good citizens. The 19th century was a time when elementary schooling blossomed. Apart from teaching basic literacy and arithmetic, the purpose of elementary schools was, above all, to educate pupils in a patriotic spirit. By focusing on the common past and common culture, schools became a source of ethnic and of national awareness (Gellner, 1983; Hobsbawm, 1989; Schnapper, 1991; Smith, 1991).

³ Multiculturalism is based on the following principles and postulates: giving priority to group affiliations and not to the individual; spatial distribution of diversity with the goal of rounding out diversity by creating social and geographical areas that can be considered homogeneous (China Towns, etc.); implementing special and complex legislative regulations guaranteeing rights to everyone; accepting cultural relativism as opposed to cultural evolutionism; expressing diversity in the public area, which is considered a means towards recognising diversity; schools, universities, city districts and institutions must reproduce cultural differences and make them visible in society (Abdallah-Pretceille, 1999).
collective and public life, was put into effect through the opening of schools and classes, first for members of linguistic and confessional (in 18th and 19th century) and later for ethnic and national minorities (after WW I). These two principles imply a third one that gives priority to group rights over individual rights and hence accentuates the recognition of ethnic diversities (Abdallah-Pretceille, 1999).

It is possible, therefore, to speak of a kind of pluralistic approach in regulating cultural diversity within the schooling system in Croatia\(^4\). The multiculturality of education in Croatia can be traced on two levels. On the first level – on the one hand, one can analyse the various ways in which specific education was regulated for members of minority groups living in the Croatian territory and, on the other hand, one can analyse the ways in which the right to instituting a Croatian national educational system was implemented in multiethnic or multinational states. On the second level, it is possible to follow the trail of multiculturality within educational subject material intended for the majority Croat people. The contents of this subject material also indicate a heterogeneous pattern, which contributed to the formation of national identity, naturally to the degree to which schools functioned as a socialisation factor.

2. Three Multiethnic/Multinational States – Three Examples of Multiculturality in the Croatian Education System

A multicultural approach to education stems from an acceptance of the fact that Croatian territory is multicultural, as is best illustrated by its ethnic structure (see Table 1).

Table 1: Ethnic structure of Croatia (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croats</td>
<td>69.83</td>
<td>68.53</td>
<td>78.72</td>
<td>80.29</td>
<td>75.07</td>
<td>78.10</td>
<td>89.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechs</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarians</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims/Bosnians</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthenians and Ukrainians</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbs</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovaks</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenes</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others and unknown</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^4\) The term Croatia is used here for all historical periods. By this term applies more or less to the historical Croatian territory, as it is defined by contemporary state border.
From the first population censuses until the most recent one, the existence of a large number of different ethnic groups on the territory of Croatia is apparent. Yet Table 1 also shows that they do not constitute a large proportion of the total population of Croatia. Namely, except for Serbs, none of them constitutes a significant percentage in the total population of Croatia. However, Croatia's specific historical development is reflected in the distribution of populations on its territory. Some ethnic groups are concentrated in certain regions: Italians in Istria; Germans, Hungarians, Czechs, Slovaks, Ruthenians and Ukrainians in parts of Slavonia.

The concentration of certain ethnic groups in particular regions and in cities, their ethnic origin, their economic and political power, the reasons for their immigration to Croatia – favoured by socio-historical circumstances within and outside of Croatia, brought about specific relationships between ethnic groups and, *inter alia*, the regulation of their educational rights. Just as the multinational and multiethnic states which Croatia was a part of influenced the country's ethnic structure, their political organisation and power relations influenced the fact that schooling in Croatia was from the very beginning multicultural.

During its history, Croatia had been a part of three multinational states. Each of them, in specific socio-historical contexts, had had its own way of perceiving issues of ethnic diversity, which also meant that they had had their own educational conceptions in regard to these issues.

2.1. The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy

The first such state had been the Habsburg Monarchy (which in 1867 was restructured into the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy). Within this non-national empire, the present-day territory of Croatia had been divided under different administrations into regions such as Croatia and Slavonia, Istria, Dalmatia and Military Frontier. Despite the Habsburg view – dating from the time of enlightened 18th century absolutism – that the empire could be modernised and homogenised in a German spirit, the ethnic complexity of the empire, together with internal and external pressures, determined the actual priorities. For the Habsburgs, it had been most important to remain on the throne and national integration with German domination came only afterwards (Taylor, 1948). Educational policy conformed to this scheme. From the very first regulations in which the state assumed responsibility for general and

---

5 Before WW II Croats and Italians were the main ethnic groups in Istria (according to census of 1910 there were 47.7% Croats and 37.2% Italians in the Croatian part of Istria). After WW II the number of Italians decreased (6.7% of total Istrian population according to census 1991) but they remained spatially the most homogenous on that territory (Klemenčić et al., 1993).

6 The share of Italians and Germans in the urban population of the mentioned regions was greater than their proportion in the total population. The share of the Germans, for example, in the town of Osijek (Slavonia) in 1900 was 50.44%, while they made 37% of the total population in the commune of Osijek. After WW II their number dramatically eroded (*Narodnosni i vjerski sastav...*, 1998).
compulsory education it had recognised the right to education in the mother tongue and in the framework of one’s own confession.\textsuperscript{7}

With the establishment of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and later with the Croat-Hungarian agreement (1868), the greater part of Croatia’s territory acquired a certain degree of autonomy in the framework of the Hungarian part of the Monarchy. This autonomy also entailed educational autonomy. Thus, in 1874 the first autonomous Croatian school law was passed, which had authority in all of Civic Croatia and Slavonia (i.e. Croatia and Slavonia outside of the Military Frontier). It was a modern and liberal law for that time period, which, together with the curriculum that accompanied it implied the development of Croatian national sentiments.

Demilitarisation of the Military Frontier was a slow process, and thus, when the first Croatian school law appeared, in the Military Frontier the frontier school regulations of 1871 still remained in effect. Here, as well as in other regions, schooling in the mother tongue was prescribed, but the schools were dominated by the German language, the language of the army and of the administration. The Military Frontier was finally joined to Civic Croatia in 1881, and the passing of the second autonomous Croatian school law in 1888 was partially motivated by the need to synchronise the schooling legislation of the newly integrated area. Although this law was a step backwards in regard to the modernisation of the Croatian school system, it was also, in a certain sense, an adaptation to different needs, a part of which were ethnic. Namely, the secularisation prescribed by the first school law had been sharply criticised by the Church. The Catholic Church had lost its previous absolute dominance over school affairs. On the other hand, the Serb elite and clergy in Croatia believed that Serb ethnic identity could be created and preserved only through the Orthodox Church. External interests overlapped with Serb interests, which strengthened the confessionalisation of the entire school system. This re-confessionalisation of the schools was seen as a concession to the Serb \textit{etnie}. The law simplified the establishment of confessional schools, yet only the Serbian Orthodox Church managed to retain a certain autonomy in regard to secular authorities. The Catholic Church was not alone in perceiving this situation as unequal. A part of the political elite saw it as unjust (unfair) in an ethnic sense (Cuvaj, 1912).

It is difficult to speak of a school system that directly contributed to Croatian national integration\textsuperscript{8} but this system was from the start open to diversity. Citizens of

\textsuperscript{7} During the “Springtime of Nations”, there had been no mention of ethnic and national minorities. The term “national minority” first appeared in international law after the World War I. The break-up of previous states and the creation of new state communities had brought about the need to protect the rights of persons that remained in territories outside of their parent countries.

\textsuperscript{8} It is impossible to speak of Croatian national integration via a unified school system, but it must be noted that the role of schooling on the formation of national sentiment was not altogether negligible. It did provide a way of expanding education among the populace, a more accessible form of education, and it did enable the formation of a thin layer of Croatian intelligentsia, reared in opposition to the
the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy who were in a minority position in relation to the Croat population had the right to education in their mother tongues\(^9\). The right of Serbs to schooling within the framework of their own culture (religion, script) was especially noted in the law. Besides schools in Croatian and/or Serbian, there were schools in Slovak and Ruthenian and, naturally, in the languages of the peoples that were politically dominant in Monarchy (Germans and Hungarians) (see Table 2).

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
School language & 1885 & 1890 & 1895 & 1902 & 1905 & 1913 \\
\hline
Croatian (and Serbian) & 678 & 1189 & 1232 & 1345 & 1401 & 1561 \\
\hline
Hungarian & 13 & 15 & 19 & 24 & 43 & 84 \\
\hline
German & 31 & 51 & 48 & 38 & 33 & 25 \\
\hline
Slovak & - & 2 & 2 & 5 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline
Ruthenian & 2 & 2 & 3 & - & - & - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Elementary schools in Croatia and Slavonia according to language of instruction}
\end{table}

According to: Školstvo u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji od njegova početka do konca god. 1895. uz pregled humanitarnih i kulturnih zavoda, Zagreb, 1896: 52–53; Franković et al., 1958: 153, 249.

However, at that time schooling in the rest of Croatia was regulated by four other laws: the Hungarian law applied in the area of Međimurje and Baranja\(^10\), and separate regional laws in Istria, Dalmatia (and, until 1881, in the Military Frontier). These regional laws were based on the Austrian school law of 1869. All these laws permitted education in the mother tongue, yet the realisation of this right was different in the various areas.

\(^9\) If we take a look at the ethnic structure of Croatia we will see that ethnic groups in Croatia were mainly composed of people from within Austro-Hungary, who as citizens of the Monarchy had freedom of movement within its borders. When they would settle outside of their home regions they would find themselves in the position of linguistic and confessional minorities in relation to the local (domestic) population.

\(^10\) Hungary guaranteed its citizens the right to education in their mother tongue not only in its School law, but also in its Law on National Minorities. Nevertheless, this right was suppressed each and every day. Emphasis was placed on the integration of the Hungarian political nation, which strove to be also culturally homogeneous. In a country which began to build its national integration on Hungarian nationalism, and in which the Hungarian ethnie was only a relative majority, language had to be an essential unifying factor. The Hungarian language was compulsory in schools. Teachers and pupils were rewarded on the basis of a good knowledge of Hungarian and for work directed at national integration (Kokolj and Horvat, 1977). Furthermore, in the Hungarian law on national minorities, Croats and Slovenes were not even mentioned as separate nationalities. Hence they were exposed to even stronger Magyarisation. Hungarians even attempted to expand their lan-guage onto the autonomous territory of Croatia and Slavonia (Gross and Szabo, 1997).
Dalmatia, although it had been recognised in the Croatian-Hungarian Agreement as part of the Triune Kingdom (together with Croatia and Slavonia), and thus as an autonomous region within Hungary, in reality never attained such a status. The school law prescribed schooling in the mother tongue. However, the decision on the language of instruction was left to local school authorities. In the Dalmatian school system, which was poorly developed, the Italian language was dominant. Nevertheless, when the Popular Party came to power (in 1873), local school boards increased efforts aimed at introducing the Croatian language into schools (see Table 3) (Perić, 1974).

Table 3: The development of elementary schooling in Dalmatia according to language of instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Croatian</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to: Narodna prosvjeta, 1909, 4: 184; Ströll, 1900: 4.

A similar provincial school law was passed in 1870 in Istria. This law also stipulated that provincial authorities could decide on the language of instruction. However, due to the particularities of the electoral law, most provincial assemblies were dominated by Italians. In areas with Slavic majorities (made up of Croats and Slovenes), the Italians gradually permitted the expansion of Slavic languages. Yet this process was slow and difficult (see Table 4). The increase in the number of Slavic schools was mostly due to the efforts of Istrian patriots organised in the Society of St. Cyril and Methodius, than to provincial school authorities.¹¹

Table 4: The development of elementary schooling in Istria according to language of instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Croatian</th>
<th>Slovene</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


¹¹ Thus in 1913 there were 133 provincial schools in the Croatian language in Istria, and 43 school run by the mentioned Society (Barbalić, 1918).
Two lines of multicultural approach in the Croatian education derived from this situation. The first stemmed from the fact that all educational regulations in all parts of the Monarchy prescribed the right to specific schooling in order to guarantee the respect of linguistic and confessional differences. The second manifested itself in the fact that schooling in the Croatian area developed on the basis of diverse regulations, which led to curricula with differing educational goals. These goals pertained to ethnicity and established different identificational frameworks. In Dalmatia and Istria the purposes of education were directed towards developing a feeling of regional (Dalmatian or Littoral/Istrian) identity, followed by affiliation to the (Austrian) state and loyalty to the ruler and the monarchy\textsuperscript{12}. Croatian schooling in Međimurje and Baranja was exposed to strong Magyarisation pressures, whereas town of Rijeka was divided between Italian and Hungarian influences.

2.2. The Kingdom of Yugoslavia

After the First World War, the creation of new states brought about the problem of peoples who, all of a sudden, found themselves in minority positions outside their mother countries. The League of Nations attempted to regulate the problem of these new minorities through international agreements. Yet everything ended in the reality that the victorious powers imposed obligations of minority protection on defeated or newly created states (Macartney, 1934). In the Saint Germain Agreement, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (later the Kingdom of Yugoslavia), as a newly created state, assumed the obligation to protect minorities living on its territory. First of all, members of these minorities had the right to schooling in their own languages.

The creation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia brought about a full reversal in the Croatian educational scheme. The referential framework changed. A Middle-European empire had been replaced by Yugoslavism. The Kingdom of Yugoslavia had been created with the aim of creating a unified nation. The main goal of education became developing Yugoslav national sentiments. Support for this was sought in the teaching of history and geography, in forced fabrication of a common history and in the introduction of a unified orthography for a triple-named language, called officially Serbo-Croato-Slovene. The curriculum was identical in all parts of the kingdom. The same curriculum applied to members of national minorities, although they had (in addition) the right to specific education in their own mother tongues.

\textsuperscript{12} There was also the problem of textbooks in the regions outside the jurisdiction of the autonomous Croatian school system. In general, central (Austro-Hungarian) authorities approved them and then translated them into the relevant languages. The situation was similar in regard to education curricula, especially in respect to subjects that fostered national homogenisation (the mother tongue, history, geography) (Franković et al., 1958).
However, the various nations that made up that state also had various notions in regard to the traits of the proposed future nation. They also had had various notions on how to realise that idea through education. In reality and in accordance with political power, the conception upheld by the Pan Serb bourgeoisie prevailed – and this involved instilling in pupils “integral Yugoslavism”, based on the Piedmont role of Serbia. The implementation of this conception provoked much resistance from Croats and Slovenes (Åèìè•, 1996–1997, Frankoviæ et al., 1958).

In accordance with the peace treaty, after the First World War a part of Croatia remained outside the borders of the Yugoslav Kingdom. As one of the victorious forces in the world war, Italy was not obliged to sign the agreement on respecting minority rights signed by the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, however – making reference to its democratic traditions – Italy expressed its determination to uphold the ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversities of all its citizens. Nevertheless, this promise was broken from the start, and when Mussolini came to power (1923) he promptly declared that he did not consider the obligations and promises of the former government to be binding on his fascist regime. Hence, all Croatian schools in Istria were closed and replaced with Italian schools. It turns out that there is not much usefulness in laws if they are not consistently implemented, but even more damage can result if there are no laws. Such a situation lasted until the collapse of the fascist regime in 1943 and the creation of the “second” Yugoslavia (Bratuliæ, 1955).

2.3. Socialist Yugoslavia

After the break-up of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and the turbulent period of WWII when the curriculum in Croatia was once again dramatically changed, a new Yugoslav federation was established that included (also) the Republic of Croatia.

The third multinational state in which Croatia found itself was a socialist federative republic and its stance towards the national question derived from Marxist-Leninist ideology, in which national questions were not the dominant issue. However, the new state authorities had to adjust that ideological aspect to specificities pertaining to the historical development and the establishment of the new state. In order to avoid the discontent of the various peoples that had contributed to the break-up of “old” Yugoslavia, “socialist” Yugoslavia (1943–1991) was founded on the basis of an

---

13 When the Banovina of Croatia was est-ablished in 1939 the curriculum was immediately Croatised.

14 Istria, the cities Rijeka and Zadar, the is-lands Cres, Lošinj, Lastovo and Palagruža were given to Italy.

15 The change in the curriculum diverged into two directions. The first was the result of the establishment of a fascist state, racial laws and national exclusiveness in education, as in other spheres of life. The second direction pertained to education on the territory under the control of the Anti-Fascist movement, which in a certain sense was the forerunner of later changes in the education system in Croatia as a part of socialist Yugoslavia.
“equality of peoples and nationalities”. Built upon a federal principle, the new Yugoslav state thus allowed a certain decentralisation of the educational system and so jurisdiction over education was given to republican and provincial authorities. Federal laws were supposed only to provide orientations for republican laws. However, the second most important and yet at the same time most pronounced trait of the educational system was strict control by the ideological centre. Centralism and uniformity precisely in the sphere of programming school messages strongly overshadowed the flexibility and decentralisation of the educational system. For this reason the educational system worked (mainly) better in respect to the formation of cultural and national identities of national minorities (“nationalities”) than for members of “constitutive” nations that lived outside their “parent” republics. Namely, while members of national minorities had organised education in their mother languages and cultures (see Table 5), members of all the constitutive Yugoslav nations, if they lived outside their “parent” republic-states, did not. To be exact, they were given the right to education in their mother tongues and the right to gaining knowledge of their national cultures, but this right in general did not actually have the possibility of being realised, especially not within the territory of the Croatian-Serbian diasystem (Čačić-Kumpes, 1992).

Table 5: Elementary schools with the instruction in the languages of national minorities in socialist Croatia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthenian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Juridical regulation of the education of national minorities in Croatia gradually arrived at solutions to the issue of minority schooling that could be considered an advancement towards the intercultural concept of education. For example, the Law on education in the languages of nationalities of 1979, besides upholding the right of national minorities to be educated in their own language and in their own cultural traditions, also established the possibility of bilingual education, as well as the obligation of children from the majority people to learn the language of minorities in those areas of the country where the Croatian language and minority language had equal official status.
The identificational referential framework was once more changed, although it remained multicultural. It went from the level of the native region to the level of the parent republic, and finished on the level of Yugoslavia (and not any Yugoslavia, but Socialist Yugoslavia). Attempts were made to build sentiments of communality on the basis of the recent past – the Anti-Fascist resistance under the leadership of the Communist Party. The common system of values rested on universal values – however, ideological formulations were regularly added on to them.

3. From Multiculturality in Education towards the New Challenges of Pluralistic Cultural Policies

The history of the Croatian schooling systems within multiethnic and multinational states does not conform to typical modernisation patterns of national homogenisation through education. This is due, most likely, more to the effects of social and historical circumstances, and less to the liberalism of the ruling elites that conceived the educational policies. Nevertheless, it is necessary to stress once more that there was a certain continuity of the multicultural approach to education in Croatian schooling, despite specific approaches to education in different time periods and state frameworks. This experience remains a permanent value also in the present time period, in which – as Nathan Glazer ironically stated – all of us are multiculturalists now. It seems worthwhile to emphasise certain aspects of this experience so that they might, perhaps, stimulate thoughts in regard to the conceptualisation of education, first of all in Croatia, but likewise in other possible multinational forms of integration, including the European framework (the European Union).

An analysis of the Croatian example of regulating ethnic diversities in education in the socio-historical circumstances of three diverse multiethnic/multinational states indicates certain problems. Appropriate laws and regulations are the basic precondition for regulating ethnic diversity through education. Official regulations provide a basis for institutionalising the acceptance of cultural differences via the educational system. This is the only way in which the socialisation of the young generation into a system of values and norms that promotes the right to be different-, that accepts differences and is tolerant of them, can be moved from the sphere of voluntary action, privacy, chance and superficiality to society in its entirety. We have seen that even democratic countries, such as pre-fascist Italy for example, do not respect minority rights when they are not encoded in law. Indeed, they often suppress them. Furthermore, we have seen that it is insufficient to just pass law regulations. They must be conform, first of all, to the spirit of the times and to the needs of people, but also to the educational infrastructure. Society, i.e. the state as the main organiser of education, must create conditions so that prescribed goals can be achieved through appropriate laws and regulations, fitting curricula and with the help of trained teachers. Thus, for example, it was impossible to realise the idea of integral Yugoslavism.
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with the domination of one nation (or people) in a country in which there were at least three nations. These nations were on different levels of economic and political development; they had different histories and, above all, all three had a developed sense of their own national specificity. They also had national elites that were ready to mobilise their own peoples on the basis of this national awareness. This can be seen likewise in the weak effects of both Magyarisation among the Slavic minorities in Hungary and of prolonged Italianisation in Istria.

It has also become apparent that the only satisfactory way of regulating ethnic differences in education is to continue developing and advancing such regulatory measures. Such a continuity cannot be broken or backtracked without negatively effecting the mutual relationship between ethnic groups. Once a certain level of rights has been attained it cannot be reduced, since members of individual ethnic groups would experience this as unjust. And feeling something as unjust provokes frustration and the need to revolt. The manifestation, strength and form of such a revolt depends on the status and power of a given group at a given moment, on its mobilisation strength and potential, however there is always a great likelihood that discontent will sooner or later emerge and demand the realisation of the group's rights. Furthermore, the level of rights must be general and equally valid for all people. It should not depend on the size or on the power of a certain group.

Today schools are still the most widespread socialisation factor that transmits a unified educational message, defined through the goals and tasks of the curriculum, especially through programmes pertaining to the mother tongue, history and geography. However, the influence of schools has always depended, and with the development of technology depends even more, on the effects of other factors. Realisation of the education goals of schools is easier, if it is harmonised with the intents of other, more and more powerful socialisation factors, ranging from the family to mass media.

Again it should be noted that education and the teaching of values implies a close co-operation between schools and communities. It is impossible to disentangle emotional and cognitive learning in this sphere. If pupils are faced with violations of human rights in the society in which they live, the teaching and educational efforts of schools will remain isolated and mainly ineffective. The conditions for a broad socialisation of these values can be achieved only through public expression of tolerance on all levels of behaviour in the entire society and through an effective and not only declarative respect of human rights in daily life. If this is not the case, intolerance, xenophobia, racism, violence and ethnocentrism will continue to grow.

The question now arising pertains to the degree to which present nation-states are ready to accept open cultural contacts without fear for cultural identity, and also to what national elites are prepared to do in order to implement tolerance in education and to teach tolerance? The importance of these questions stem from the fact that there is no educational system anywhere that can secure equal opportunities in
societies if such equality does not exist in the laws and in the socio-economic conditions. However, normative acceptance of diversity is only a precondition of its articulation.

The European Union, which has been building itself on an acceptance of diversity, has an opportunity to apply insights gained from the painful experiences of former multinational states. Mutual relations between member states and European education should be based on a minimum of common elements, and should not fear cultural and ethnic diversities. In this matter the need of each participant to feel an equality of rights and equal value should never be forgotten. Every entity, regardless of its size, economic or political power, history and culture, should be able to participate equally in the common undertaking. Education is a sensitive field of cultural activity in which the selection of programme contents and ethical values, as well as the formulation of tasks and goals, must find a balance between a multitude of cultural and educational traditions.

As far as the Croatian education system goes – its development should certainly make use of Croatia’s rich pluralistic tradition, in combination with gained experiences. This will not be easy, since the recent conflict objectively placed a strain on interethnic relations. The pronounced nationalist discourse in the last decade of the 20th century only fuelled the fire, which now has to be patiently and carefully extinguished. The solutions offered in regard to securing minorities education rights may perhaps pertain to the general level in the European Union. It seems that they should be carefully studied. Namely, realisation of the right to separate schooling may lead to ghettoisation.16 If there would be less fear or reasons for fearing the assimilation capabilities and ambitions of the majority nation, than it would perhaps be possible to integrate minority and majority populations into common educational programmes, with the possibility of choosing special programmes and different languages of instruction. Yet a more flexible approach to the organisation of schooling should likewise not exclude already the existing and stabilised option of education in separate schools, or school departments, for all those that desire it. The history of the Croatian education system provides us with examples of regulating rights to education in which one can observe elements that appeared in later formulated multiculturalist (and perhaps even interculturalist) policies. Apart from some common points in regard to conceptualising regulations, common problems in their implementation can also be seen. Nevertheless, despite numerous difficulties and justified criticisms, it is difficult to envision other ways of assuring the further effective development of the multicultural (and especially the interculturalist) concept and also of this aspect of the education system in Croatia. Hence, in this context, a detailed analysis of the Croatian plural and pluralistic experience can serve as a stimulating source of insights, useful in the development of credible pluralistic cultural policies.

16 This pertains especially to the Serb population in Croatia after the recent war.
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