

UDC 930.85 (4—12)

YU ISSN 0350—7653

ACADEMIE SERBE DES SCIENCES ET DES ARTS

COMITE INTERACADEMIQUE DE BALKANOLOGIE
DU CONSEIL DES ACADEMIES DES SCIENCES ET DES ARTS
DE LA R.S.F.Y.

INSTITUT DES ETUDES BALKANIQUES

BALCANICA

ANNUAIRE DE L'INSTITUT DES ETUDES BALKANIQUES

XVI—XVII

BELGRADE
1985—1986



<http://www.balcanica.rs>

преглед „Новија књижевност у Срба“, Рашко В. Јовановић закључује да је многе Ристићеве „критичарске оцене потврдила позоришна сцена“. Значајно је то што је Ј. Ристић у позоришту „видео драгоцену могућност просвећивања неутке масе и шансу за ширење њених духовних видика“ (стр. 251—258).

Климент Џамбазовски, у чланку „Ангажовање Јована Ристића око школовања деце Димитра Миладинова у Кнежевини Србији (261—266), сматра да је „основни мотив Јована Ристића да се ангажује око школовања кћерке Димитра Миладинова била конфронтација против бугарске и грчке политичке пропаганде у Македонији ради заштите српских

политичких и националних интереса“.

Сигурно је да један зборник радова не може у потпуности да обухвати сву делатност једног од највећих српских политичара и дипломата XIX века. Зато, и после објављивања овог Зборника у коме је Ристићева политичка делатност после 1878. године једва поменута а његове полемике са критичарима његових историјско-мемоарских дела остале сасвим по страни, остаје безброј отворених питања из живота и рада Јована Ристића.

Непријатна је чињеница да су радови са научног скупа одржаног 1981. објављени тек 1985. године.

Љубодраг П. Ристић

THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN YUGOSLAVIA

Ivo Banac, *The national Question in Yugoslavia: origins, history, politics*, Cornell University Press, 1984.

What is really going on in American Southeastern historiography? Judging by publications — quite a lot, especially in last few years. After a voluminous and ambitious two volume *History of the Balkans* (Barbara Jelavich, Cambridge University Press, 1983), the year 1984 was marked by another very ambitious and pretentious work, this time written by Ivo Banac under the title *The Yugoslav National Question* published by prestigious Cornell University Press. The book of Ivo Banac received highest praises in American historical circles from several among the best known Southeast European experts: Istvan Deak, Gale Stokes, Michael Boro Petrovich and Peter Sugar. The fact that Banac was a distinguished graduate student of professor Wayne Vucinich from Stanford University and that his doctoral dissertation served as the backbone of this work merely supports the statement that the study *The Yugoslav National*

Question attracted full attention of the American historical public.

Some of the reviewers placed the book of Ivo Banac among the most successful historiographical achievements ever written in Western literature on Balkan history. Moreover, this study was named the definite history of the national problem in Yugoslavia in its formative period.

All those flattering words which were written about Banac's book as well as the attention that was given to it, challenged the author of these lines to write a review of his own. It seems in order, at least, that someone from the other side of the Atlantic sketches few general remarks about the work which received so many compliments from eminent history professors from the United States.

The volume *The Yugoslav National Question* is the first work ever written on the topic of national problem in Yugoslavia in both American and Yugoslav histo-

riography. However, some historians, mainly in Yugoslavia, treated certain specific questions related to the national question, but Banac's attempt is veritably the first one which analyses the problem in its full complexity. Among those works we might mention just few among the most important ones: D. Živojinović, *Amerika, Italija i stvaranje Jugoslavije* (Beograd 1970), Desanka Pešić, *KPJ i nacionalno pitanje 1919—1939* (Beograd 1983), Đ. Stanković, *Nikola Pašić i jugoslovensko pitanje* (Beograd 1985) and M. Zečević, *Slovenska ljudska stranka i jugoslovensko ujedinjenje 1917—1921* (Ljubljana 1975). A conference dealing with the creation of Yugoslavia was organized in 1978 at the University of California, Santa Barbara, USA. The majority of the papers presented on this occasion referred to the national problem of the newly created Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and thus contributed to this outstandingly important, one could even argue — crucial problem of modern Yugoslav history. However, none of the works mentioned here concentrates on the entire problem. Ivo Banac, and this should be repeated once again, is the first historian to tackle this topic as a whole and took the high risk of entering the labyrinth of political and national complications which the Yugoslav people had to face immediately before and after the act of unification. How successful really was the attempt of Ivo Banac?

* * *

The book of Ivo Banac begins with a long introduction in which the author analyses the genesis of national ideologies of Serbs and Croats as two major factors in South Slavic union and their essentially different historical experiences from the Middle Ages to the beginning of the 20th century.

The second part of this study concentrates on various Serbian political and national movements and institutions and their principal ideological characteristics, as vie-

wed by the author, during the period of unification and the first years in the life of the unified country. As an antipode to this "centrist" Serbian tendency, Banac places Croatian political movements led by the Croatian Peasant Party joined by several smaller and less important political organizations from Montenegro and Macedonia as well as the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. These movements the author named "the hard opposition". "The autonomous opposition", according to Ivo Banac, was represented by the Slovenian Catholic Populists, Croatian liberal bourgeoisie, Muslims from Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Cemiet Muslim movement.

These three political groupings which had contested each other over the issue of unification and nature of the unified state, as seen by the author, represented three major ideological streams with opposite approaches to political and national organization of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

In the third section of his study, Ivo Banac discusses historical developments, mainly political, during the initial three years in the life of united Yugoslavia 1918—1921, ending with the analysis of the first Yugoslav constitutional act — Vidovdan (St Vitus Day) Constitution passed by the constitutional assembly on June 28, 1921.

In the conclusion the author develops his own understanding of the Yugoslav union and gives his personal judgement of the achievements and failures of the Yugoslav state projecting its initial problems to the catastrophe of World War Two.

It seems virtually impossible to examine all aspects of the Yugoslav national question and of Ivo Banac's study in this short book review. Instead, one could, at least, draw the attention to several most important problems and misconceptions of this work.

The most serious problem of Banac's book seems to be the general methodological mechanism

adopted by the author. Unfortunately, consciously or unconsciously, Ivo Banac confused causes with consequences and vice versa. Instead of searching for real historical origins of the Yugoslav unification (historical, political, cultural, economic etc.) and seeking for the roots of Yugoslav difficulties and successes in the early years of the unified state, Ivo Banac started from a preconditioned idea that everything went wrong in Yugoslavia from the very beginning, finally collapsing in 1941, largely due to Serbian centrist, almost dictatorial, role in pre-war Yugoslavia. The rest of Banac's study simply follows this basic misconception: his "original" statistics on the number of various national groups in Yugoslavia (which chiefly differ from the official ones), his emphasis on Serbian predominance in the period after 1918 etc.

A good part of Ivo Banac's book is devoted to developments of national ideologies of Serbs and Croats, especially during the 19th century, it seems however, that the author did not understand, or did not want to understand that the 19th century was the age of nationalism: following this overwhelming wave of history the Serbian young state, born in the Revolution of 1804, started to develop purely national political program which was finally shaped in Garašanin's *Načertanije* in 1844. Serbian national idea not only marked the entire modern history of Serbia from 1804 to 1918 and political strategies of all Serbian rulers and governments, but also stood as the only, historically unavoidable phase in the national development of the Serbian state. In this respect, the Serbian nation simply followed in the footsteps of European historical trends.

On the contrary, the idea of South Slavic union and integration was not a national program, but a historical surrogate for those peoples who could not develop purely national, state building consciousness due to the overwhelming power of the ruling nation (in the case of Habsburg Monarchy-Aus-

trian and Hungarian). The South Slavic concept of Croatian intellectuals was directed towards South Slavic integration and unification under the Habsburg Crown, certainly not as a purely national, independent state. All this is rather clear and logical and already very well known in modern Yugoslav historiography. That is why it seems rather strange that someone with Banac's reputation confuses these two different processes by placing them on the same historical level (pp. 80—85).

On page 105 there is a sentence so characteristic for Ivo Banac's way of thinking about nation ideologies:

"The Serbs felt a communality with the Orthodox Slavs, with Russians in particular, but the enthusiasm for things Slavic never overwhelmed them, as often happened among Croats and some other Slavic peoples (Slovenes, Czechs)".

The author could not comprehend the important difference between nationalism, national idea and program which necessarily leads towards the creation of the national state and the feeling of affiliation to other members of the same ethnic group within a foreign empire. In this second case there is no national idea in its proper, state building form.

Ivo Banac makes a clear distinction and divides the development of Serbian national ideology into two phases: 1. the period in which Orthodoxy and Serbdom were synonyms and 2. the period of secular Serbian national ideology. Naturally, in the course of the 19th century the Serbian national concept was developed and finalized along the lines of modern national trends which included secularism and cultural developments. But, this process, which in Serbia lasted until the beginning of the 20th century, represents the period of the national state formation based on a mature national ideology. During the previous period which was stamped

by Ottoman occupation and domination, the Serbian Orthodox Church was the only promoter of the Serbian national sentiment (besides Serbian epic poetry, which played the role of a promoter, but was not an institution). These two periods came as a result of certain historical processes and certainly not as their cause.

When examining the problem of relation between the Yugoslav Committee and the Serbian government during World War One, Ivo Banac accuses Serbian ministry for not giving the equal position to the Committee and for treating it as "a Serbian propaganda agency" (p. 118). The author suddenly forgot that, at the time, Serbia was an independent state, with its armed forces and government, fighting on the side of Entente in the World War, while the Yugoslav Committee represented a handful of political emigrés from Austria-Hungary. The difference in importance is more than obvious, and needs no further discussion.

Besides these few, but important problems of this study, Banac's book suffers from often unfair judgements of some distinguished historical figures. This is what he writes about Nikola Pašić:

"His talents were few. He was not a creative thinker, much less a tolerable ideologist, writer, speaker, or even a demagogue. His grammar was atrocious and his poltry knowledge of history and literature was the butt of many jokes. Most important, though he exploited events, he was not a man of vision". (p. 158).

Nikola Pašić remained in Serbian and Yugoslav politics longer than any other individual in history — exactly forty eight years. The development of the strongest and most massive Serbian political movement, the creation of Serbian modern state, the greatest military victories and finally the creation of Yugoslavia are closely attached to his name. He was educated in Zurich, Switzerland, he spoke several foreign languages and was

among the best known men in Europe of his time. He wrote seldom but well. Some of his articles (among which the most famous was "Ne dajte oružje", Don't Give Up Arms, which was published in *Samouprava*, the official organ of the Radical Party in Serbia, and which was the plug that started the Timok rebellion in October of 1883) show him as a writer of direct style and strong logic. At last, it is not simply by accident that there are three biographies written about Nikola Pašić (by Count Carlo Sforza, by Alex Dragnich and by Đorđe Đ. Stanković), let alone innumerable articles and brochures.

These few sketchy words about Nikola Pašić, revolutionary, political leader, prime minister and diplomat, should be sufficient to prove the falsification of Banac's statement.

Few words ought to be said about Ivo Banac's bibliography and usage of written sources. Among cited archival material, curiously enough, there are no documents from any of Belgrade archives. This seems rather odd if one bears in mind that the Yugoslav Archives, the Serban Archives and the Archives of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts as well as the Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, all situated in Belgrade, contain huge piles and innumerable boxes of precious materials crucial for Banac's particular topic. Moreover, the author of this study has not consulted two of the largest libraries in Yugoslavia: The National Library of Serbia and the Belgrade University Library, both located in Belgrade.

Thus, the archival foundations of Ivo Banac's work seem rather thin and insufficient. This becomes even more important if one understands the complexity of the subject Banac had chosen to write about.

It is interesting and even symptomatic that Banac has not consulted the brilliant work of Milorad Ekmečić, *Ratni ciljevi Srbije 1914* (Serbia's War Aims 1914, Belgrade

1973), although the author discusses, in detail, that particular problem (pp. 116—117).

On several occasions, Banac refers to the autobiographical book of Prince Đorđe Karađorđević, *Istina o mom životu (The Truth About My Life, Belgrade 1969)*, and treats it as a reliable and serious historical source. The truth is that this book is understandably biased and is not always the most trustful source of information for obvious reasons. Prince Đorđe Karađorđević, who was forced to renounce his claim to the throne in 1909, had a highly subjective and unbalanced opinion of both his father King Petar Karađorđević and his brother King Aleksandar Karađorđević. More than that, his wild character and unstable behaviour led a number of people who had known him well, to think of him as an unbalanced personality.

Regarding statistical data, Ivo Banac's study does not always appear as a reliable source. For example, on page 166 the author gives strict percentage of the number of Serbian and Albanian population in Kosovo region without referring to the source of his information. The same can be applied to Banac's statistics on the number of Yugoslav population by national affiliation. Here again the author develops his own statistical

method which defers fundamentally from the official one.

Ivo Banac's Study *The National Question in Yugoslavia* was an attempt to clarify the most complex and controversial problem in modern Yugoslav history. Banac dared to treat the problem that no historian ever dared to touch. In this respect, the work of Ivo Banac stands as the most courageous historiographical adventure in recent years. Unfortunately, this book could not avoid certain significant problems. In this brief review, some of those problems were mentioned and discussed.

The bombastic approach and literary style of Ivo Banac, full of hidden biases and misconceptions has not contributed a great deal to the final resolution of the Yugoslav national question. The author remained torn between personal political preferences and national sympathies and historical, cultural and social currents of modern Yugoslav history.

When someone misunderstands historical processes and developments what comes as a result is a piece of unsuccessful historiography. When, however, the author misinterprets those same historical processes and developments, one could rightfully question his intellectual integrity.

Milan St. Protić

ФАШИЗАМ И ОКУПАЦИЈА

Czesław Madajczyk, *Faszyzm i okupacje, t. I Ukształtowanie się zarządów okupacyjnych*, Poznanj 1983, 792 стр. t. II *Mechanizmy realizowania okupacji*, Poznanj 1984, 736 стр.

О немачком и италијанском фашизму (1938—1945) штампано је већ неколико хиљада монографија, неколико стотина томова изворних публикација, као и неколико десетина хиљада мањих научних расправа и чланака различитог садржаја и вредности, претежно информативног карактера. При таквом мноштву публикација

сваки неупућени читалац имао би право да суди да о овом проблему знамо целу истину и да се досадашњим научним тврђама мало шта може додати. Ново двотомно дело Чеслава Мадајчика, најистакнутијег пољског познаваоца проблематике Трећег Рајха и једног од водећих светских историчара који се баве историјом