

Danijel Dzino: “Dissecting ‘Balkanist’ discourse in the present and the past: Review of N. Raspudić, *Jadranski (polu)orientalizam* and V. Drapac, *Constructing Yugoslavia*”

**Danijel Dzino**

Department of Ancient History  
Macquarie University  
Sydney, Australia  
[danijel.dzino@mq.edu.au](mailto:danijel.dzino@mq.edu.au)

Nino Raspudić, *Jadranski (polu)orientalizam: Prikazi Hrvata u talijanskoj književnosti*. Zagreb: Naklada Jurčić, 2010; pp. 433, bibliography; hbk 130 HRK, ISBN: 9789532450477

Vesna Drapac, *Constructing Yugoslavia: A Transnational History*. Basingstoke UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010; pp. xv + 335, 5 maps, index, hbk £55; pbk £18.99, ISBN: 9780333925553.

Understanding the past is today not only limited to understanding and interpreting historical events, but also on the study of knowledge, understanding how and why we know what we know about the past. The ideas of Michel Foucault about the close relationship between discourse and power and, even more, Said’s Orientalism and the ways the cultural ‘Other’ is perceived in literature, represent the most significant foundation-stones of contemporary postcolonial discourse. Postcolonial readings of early modern and 19<sup>th</sup>/early 20<sup>th</sup> century Western literature related to Eastern and Southeastern Europe show very specific literary techniques used to describe and perceive these regions as European internal ‘Others’. Such accumulated ‘knowledge’ about Eastern Europe and the ‘Balkans’ significantly affected the ways these regions were perceived, not only in literature, but also in politics and historiography.<sup>1</sup>

Both books reviewed here are firmly rooted in bodies of works and ideas developing from these initial works. More specifically, they explore two distinct and attractive topics, which both belong in the wider context, famously called ‘Balkanist’ discourse by Todorova.<sup>2</sup> Raspudić’s study focuses on the perception of the Croats in early modern and modern Italian literature, while Drapac deals with the origins and changing perceptions of Yugoslavia from outside perspectives, focusing on Anglophone and francophone writing.

Nino Raspudić is lecturer of Italian studies at the University of Zagreb, and is

---

<sup>1</sup> Wolf (1994) (Eastern Europe); Todorova (1998); Goldsworthy (1998) (‘Balkans’), also see earlier works of Bakić Hayden & Hayden (1992); Bakić Hayden (1995) on internal ‘Balkanizing’.

<sup>2</sup> Todorova (1997): 10-11. On developments in research of a ‘Balkanist’ discourse, which increasingly diversifies analysing external and internal ‘Balkanisms’, see e.g. Fleming (2000); Bjelić & Savić (2002); Blažević (2007): 87-94, etc.

also known in the Croatian media as a columnist and social activist. His second book, which can be translated into English as: *The Adriatic (Semi)Orientalism: Representations of the Croats in Italian Literature*, is the outcome of his PhD thesis, passed recently with accolades at the University of Zagreb. As it appears quite clearly from the title, the book is concerned with literary stereotypes and enduring models in the Italian representation of the Croats, covering the period from the Enlightenment to the late 20<sup>th</sup> century. Both coasts of the Adriatic present good examples of a discrete and well-defined geographical unit, which is shown in the network of cultural and political interactions detectable in each historical period. However, their relationship through history has not always been placed on equal grounds. Raspudić's thesis makes a strong point about this inequality, clearly exposing its origins and aspects. Historical circumstances resulted in political powers from the Italian peninsula (Rome in antiquity, papacy in the Middle Ages and Venice in the early modern era) all exercising political and cultural domination over the eastern Adriatic coast. For that reason, Italy and her parts were perceived as the political and cultural centre by the inhabitants of the Eastern Adriatic in different historical periods. For the same reasons the Italians consistently perceived the eastern Adriatic coast as a periphery, an unstable border region 'infected' by various 'barbarians', Slavs, Turks, communism and 'Balkanism' of the post-communist period (pp. 9-11).

The first three chapters of Raspudić's book are focused on defining its methodology and positioning within the wider context of recent research on Orientalism and especially the earlier mentioned discourse on 'Balkanism' (pp. 5-60). Raspudić defines the relationship between the Adriatic coasts and discourse on Croats in Italian literature as 'semi-Orientalism'. In his words, it is a perception of "something close, but not equal to Said's Orientalism – almost identical to [the] *Balkanism of Todorova*." I am not fully convinced that Raspudić's 'semi-Orientalism' is really so much different from the 'Balkanism' of Todorova (pp. 34-37).<sup>3</sup> For me personally, they both appear fairly identical, certainly defining 'Balkanism' as a much wider concept, and trans-Adriatic 'semi-Orientalism' as one of its well-defined regional variants. I do agree, however, with Raspudić's criticisms of Todorova (pp. 36-37). He points out, quite rightly, that her view of the 'Balkans' as a geographically defined area is not necessarily the most precise definition, because the geographical Balkan Peninsula and the discursive, imagined textual 'Balkans', do not always correspond.<sup>4</sup> Also, he points out that 'Balkanism' is not only limited to the Ottoman inheritance, but its continuing life in Western perceptions shows that the 'Balkans' is firmly formed as a distinct 'cultural' unit. In this context, it is also worth mentioning that the analysis of 18<sup>th</sup> century Venetian writings, and especially Fortis' travel diaries, does not play a prominent place in Todorova's study, which makes Raspudić's study an even more important contribution to the study of the

---

<sup>3</sup> Todorova goes to considerable length in order to distance 'Balkanism' from Said's 'Orientalism' – Todorova (1997): 7-20, see also Bjelić (2002): 6-7. Similar to Raspudić, Berber (2010) sees the discourse on Bosnia and Herzegovina in British travel literature as different from 'Balkanism' and 'Orientalism'.

<sup>4</sup> Todorova (1997): 11 "There is historical and geographical concreteness of the Balkans ..."

developments of the ‘Balkanist’ discourse.<sup>5</sup>

The theoretical section is a bit too long for my taste, making the book appear too much as an original PhD thesis. This is nevertheless understandable, and, I am afraid, an unavoidable strategy, because Raspudić is primarily addressing a Croatian (and South Slavic) audience, which is not necessarily entirely familiar with his theoretical foundations. Following the theoretical section, Raspudić discusses actual literary perceptions of the Croats. Late medieval and humanist perceptions of the eastern Adriatic were not well shaped in Italian literature, which lacked real interest in the eastern Adriatic (pp. 61-74). However, the change of political circumstances in the late 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century brings about Venetian political expansion in former Ottoman possessions on the eastern Adriatic coast, but also its immediate hinterland (pp. 75-90). It is not surprising that the most important part of the book is devoted to the Venetian Alberto Fortis and his *Viaggio in Dalmazia (Travels in Dalmatia)* from 1774 and polemical response to Fortis made by Ivan (Giovanni) Lovrić (pp. 91-142).

Fortis has become a focus of research over the last decades. In Anglophone literature this is certainly due to the influential study of Larry Wolff, entitled *The Discovery of Dalmatia in the Age of Enlightenment*, from 2001. Raspudić represents a new - I could even dare say - ‘rebellious’ stream in Croatian scholarship, not unlike Markulin who published a paper from similar positions at the same time.<sup>6</sup> Raspudić and Markulin both rebel, with good reason, against the acceptance of the colonial narrative in Croatian, but also wider South Slavic scholarship, which perceived Fortis as a ‘friend’ who opened Dalmatia to the world. In contrast to this prevalent view, they both show the existence of almost all structural elements of Orientalism in Fortis’ descriptions of inhabitants of the Dalmatian coast and its hinterland. Raspudić presents the context of Fortis’ work, his audience and his deep impact on future Italian literary perceptions of the eastern Adriatic coast. The enormous importance of Fortis on these later perceptions, and even the very foundations of the ‘Balkanist’ discourse, cannot be overestimated. His work was quickly translated into German (1776), English and French (1778), serving as a literary and ‘ethnographic’ model of ‘knowledge’, not only to Italian but also to other travelers. He is undoubtedly the key foundation-stone in the development of Balkanist discourse, although Fortis rarely receives credit in modern studies of travel literature in southeastern Europe.<sup>7</sup>

The importance of Fortis and his perceptions is well-shown in relation to the discourse on Morlacchism (pp. 143-54).<sup>8</sup> Raspudić, after Fortis, analyses further developments in Italian literature, and the development of what he sees as two literary models for the perception of the Croats.<sup>9</sup> The first one is a ‘good savage’, such as depicted in Goldoni’s play *La Dalmatina* (pp. 155-64) from 1758, or the works of Niccolò Tommaseo (e.g. *Scintille*) and the series of newspaper articles by Giuseppe Mazzini (pp. 193-236). The model of ‘bad savage’ develops in the *Memoari* of Carlo

<sup>5</sup> She discusses earlier Venetian travellers, but not Fortis, Todorova (1997): 65-66.

<sup>6</sup> Wolff (2001): 76 ff.; Markulin (2010), see also McCallam (2011).

<sup>7</sup> For Fortis’ impact on French perceptions of the region, see the recent study by Sajkowski (2012): 161-86 and McCallam (2011): 132-41.

<sup>8</sup> Morlacchi: Christian Slav-speaking inhabitants of the immediate Dalmatian hinterland, mostly of the Orthodox religion, see in English Wolff (2001): 126 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Goldoni and Gozzi are also analysed in Wolff (2001): 25-40.

Gozzi (pp. 165-80). They are also shaped in the context of Austro-Hungarian conflicts with the Italians in the 19<sup>th</sup> century with the construction of cruelty committed by Croatian soldiers serving in Austrian-Hungarian armies (pp. 181-92). This model becomes dominant during and after the Second World War, when it becomes part of 'common knowledge' in Italian discourse (pp. 297-332).

Raspudić's book clearly shows that Italian literary discourse about the Croats is inter-textual, and the earlier authors strongly influence later writings. It also shows that Italian literary discourse is founded on unequal grounds, presenting the eastern Adriatic population on a lower civilizational level, child-like, animal, emotional, faithful or cruel and savage.<sup>10</sup> There is not much to add to this book, except perhaps that it could be more deeply embedded into scholarship on 'Balkanist' discourse, as a few general works are missing from the impressive bibliography, such as *Inventing Ruritania* by Vesna Goldsworthy. As said before, I am slightly at unease with the term 'Semi-Orientalism' because what Raspudić defines under that name is nothing more than a distinctive sub-species of outsider 'Balkanism'. The writing style is fine and easy to read, and the scholarly breadth of research is nothing but impressive. The cover page illustrating a plastic lamb on a spit (a recognizable visual symbol of 'Balkanism') *made in China*, the artwork of Marko Vekić, is quite an original and appropriate addition to the book. The significance of Raspudić's book extends to two levels – the first being the recognition and definition of discourse on Croats in Italian literature. Nevertheless, it is also undoubtedly important in 'local' scholarship as Croatian scholars in general steer clear of engaging more deeply in 'Balkanist' debates. This attitude is certainly partly driven by the Croatian discursive self-perception of belonging to the 'West', making Croatian scholars less perceptive to detect and analyze Croatian inclusions in outsider 'Balkanist' perceptions and discourses.

### X X X

While Raspudić focuses on Italian trans-Adriatic perceptions, an Australian scholar of Croatian origin, Vesna Drapac, in her second monograph, analyzes the literary mechanisms in which Yugoslavia, as a common state of South Slavs, was conceived and projected in Western imagination. This book deals with much more sensitive matter, because Yugoslavia is a political project that only, relatively recently, ended in total failure with significant loss of human lives, accompanied by huge material and emotional damages. Drapac's main thesis is that the history of Yugoslavia is, in essence, transnational and cannot be observed in isolation, i.e., that taking the Yugoslav political structure and its inhabitants as a unit of analysis provides just one part of the picture.<sup>11</sup> For that reason, she decided to focus on influential outsiders' perceptions of Yugoslavia, from its conception to its collapse in the early 1990s. This book explores a different range of sources, most importantly academic and other prominent commentators, but also uses popular magazines, memoirs and personal

---

<sup>10</sup> Certainly, we should not forget that the Croats formed their own discourses about the Italians, see for example Bešker (2011).

<sup>11</sup> It is very useful to compare it with Džaja (2002). Those two studies have different focus but do share similar ideas.

correspondences, illustrating both popular and private perceptions. The emphasis is placed on Anglophone sources (mostly English and American), but the author also makes good use of francophone sources.

Throughout the book Drapac makes the important point that the history of Yugoslavia should be viewed integrally, from the time when the ideas of a common state for the South Slavs was constructed, in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century to its demise, rather than focusing only on the Kingdom and socialist federation as two distinct units of analysis (pp. 9-10, 17, etc.). The first chapter (pp. 22-62) shows quite clearly how the whole discourse on the common ‘origins’ of the South Slavs and the idea of a common state came into existence. She recognizes how much it was rooted in the racial discourse of the time and social-Darwinist ideas about dominant and submissive ‘races’. There are two dominant lines in this discourse according to Drapac. Firstly, the Anglophone attitude towards Catholicism in the late 19<sup>th</sup>/early 20<sup>th</sup> century was very negative, and contrasted with a positive outlook on Orthodox Europe (pp. 37-46). Secondly, ethnography and anthropology of the time, using contemporary racial discourse, developed a classification of the South Slavs, whereby the Serbs were perceived as dominant over other South Slavs, especially after Serbia became a kingdom in 1882 (pp. 46-52). The idea of union was presented as a re-unification of ‘brotherly nations’, rather than unification of culturally and linguistically similar but different ethnic groups. Drapac reveals the incredible significance and influence of the intellectual circle around British politician and few-times prime-minister William Gladstone in shaping the ideas about South Slav unity under Serb leadership before the First World War. This circle included, amongst others, English historians – Robert W. Seton-Watson, E. A. Freeman and Freeman’s famous son-in-law, Arthur J. Evans, the discoverer of Knossos (pp. 27-36).<sup>12</sup> Such ideas sharply contrasted with ‘local’ internal narratives of Yugoslavism, such as the Croatian revival in the circle of Archbishop Josip Juraj Strossmayer (pp. 23-24), or Serbian views and changing political interests.

As Drapac points out, the appearance of the Yugoslav Kingdom cannot be understood without these 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century ideas. Thus, it is obvious that Yugoslav unification was not a new or hasty thing, but something that was the result of significant theoretical preparations. In her words, the change of political geography after the First World War and the disappearance of the Habsburg Empire, resulting in the imagined state of the South Slavs, became presented as a geo-strategic necessity and an ‘unavoidable’ reality. At the same time, unification was projected as a result of general will, which was, in reality, far from true. Chapters two and three (pp. 63-148) show the next step in the construction of Yugoslavia in Western perceptions, this time as an extension of ‘Gallant Serbia’. The racial discourse in which outside observers operated at this time constructed three ‘tribes’ (Serbs, Croats and Slovenes),

---

<sup>12</sup> An important part of this circle were certainly British travellers and humanitarians Georgina Mackenzie and Adelina Irby, whose book *Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe* significantly influenced the ideas of Gladstone’s circle and especially Arthur Evans (Drapac, pp. 25-26), cf. Anderson (1966) in English on Irby.

It is quite amusing in this context to see that in 2013 the British-Croatian Association organised symposium in the Ashmolean museum entitled “Sir Arthur Evans in Dalmatia“, as a part of celebrations related to Croatian joining to EU.

originating from the Serbian 'stock', thus constructing 'Yugoslavs' as an 'integrated race' which corresponded with internal centralizing policies of the Karađorđević dynasty. The belief in Yugoslavia amongst its strongest supporters, such as Seton-Watson, was so strong that it could not be shattered, even with the dictatorship of King Alexander I Karađorđević, from 1929 to his assassination in 1934. In fact, some of the outside observers (as well as the King's own propaganda) resorted to 'Balkanist' discourse, defending the king's abolishment of democracy as an attempt to preserve peace from 'Balkan tribal passions' (pp. 117-35). Political opposition of the Croats, articulated by the Croatian Peasant Party included the demands for autonomy and political rights in the Kingdom. Nevertheless, outside observers almost unanimously perceived them as 'negative' when compared with 'progressive' Yugoslavism, while the Croats were projected in these perceptions as 'restless', irascible and problematic (pp. 144-48).

The fourth chapter analyses the period of the Second World War and the created political disarray in the region and briefly disintegrated Yugoslav political construction. Drapac is one of the first scholars ever to observe Yugoslav collaboration and resistance to the Nazi regime in a comparative context with other parts of Nazi-controlled Europe. Her conclusions are that war-time resistance followed different narratives, general patterns of European resistance movements, but was also strongly impacted by very specific local factors. The lack of an integrated Yugoslav civic or national identity meant that post-war Yugoslavia could exist only through credentials built upon an anti-fascist resistance and partisan movement, i.e. as a communist state (pp. 149-94). So, it is not surprising that this period was a fruitful breeding ground for the rise of new myths which were carefully embedded into the foundation-myths of the communist state (pp. 149-54). Drapac shows these myths largely being founded on deception – Yugoslav resistance was anti-fascist, not pro-communist, and certain myths used later, such as the one about 'genocidal Croats' had no support in available evidence. It is clear that Croatian Nazi-collaborationists, who formed the ruling structures of the Independent State of Croatia, established in 1941, represented an extremist and marginalized minority. They gained some support only because of Croatian resentment of the earlier regime, not because of the existing and continuing grass-roots support (pp. 154-72). Drapac also pays due attention to the narratives of women in the Second World War, which were mainly disregarded or mythologized by earlier scholarship (pp. 183-88).

The fifth chapter (pp. 195-236) deals with the communist-led federation. While communist Yugoslavia is often regarded as a separate unit of historical analysis from the first Yugoslavia, Drapac presents compelling arguments that they should be analyzed together, as a single unit. She underlines some quite interesting similarities between the monarchy and socialist federation, such as the position of war in the foundation myths of both entities, as well as the failure of those myths to produce a coherent civic or national identity.<sup>13</sup> Outside perceptions produced a discourse on federal Yugoslavia, drawing on familiar 'knowledge' about the 'Balkans'. The Yugoslavs are frequently portrayed as a 'breed of people' saved from themselves and

---

<sup>13</sup> The role of the armed conflicts in the renegotiation of South Slavic identities was examined by Vlaisavljević (2002).

their ‘tribal’ murderous passions by a communist leader, later Yugoslav dictator Josip Broz (Tito). It is not surprising that communist propaganda resorted to a similar use of ‘Balkanist’ discourse (pp. 205-06). While the discourse of the integrated ‘Yugoslav race’ and political centralization was no longer viable after 1945, the outside perceptions changed very little: South Slavs (especially the Serbs and Croats) were continually portrayed as closely related and ‘barely distinguishable’ nations. The same relates to the construction and the existence of a hybrid ‘Serbo-Croatian’ language in federal Yugoslavia. Tito’s resistance to Stalin in 1948 made his regime acceptable to the West which mostly turned a blind eye to frequent abuses of human rights, portraying it as a ‘benevolent’ dictatorship – again reminiscent of earlier views of the royal dictatorship of King Alexander I.

While the breakdown of federal Yugoslavia certainly cannot be explained through a single narrative, but only as a complex interplay of different factors,<sup>14</sup> Drapac also points out a few important reasons for the collapse. In her opinion, the commemoration and celebration of Second World War resistance was the most important element which maintained cohesiveness in communist Yugoslavia. However, after some time, memories were no longer enough for new generations (“*passing of the Partisan generation*”), which challenged it. Even more importantly, Drapac also points out that communist lack of tolerance for any dissent prevented the development of structured opposition which shared a civic sense of Yugoslavism. This meant that after Tito’s death in 1980, the push for democratization of society went through a national rather than civic agenda. There was no coherent civic or national Yugoslav identity or Yugoslav institutions – only some 5% of the population declared themselves ‘Yugoslavs’, usually those belonging to the inner city elites in cities with a larger proportion of mixed population, such as Sarajevo (pp. 228-36, 245-56).

Although Drapac can be criticized for the selective approach she takes towards the sources,<sup>15</sup> in my opinion such an approach was necessary as it shows the structure of the changing discourse on Yugoslavia against a background of internal developments. The reliance on Anglophone and francophone sources certainly provides just a part of the picture, with germanophone and Italian perceptions presenting a different picture, as we can partly see from Raspudić’s book. Drapac focuses her analysis mostly on the dynamics of the Serbs and Croats and Croatian grievances, which were undoubtedly grossly underplayed and underestimated in modern scholarship and Western perceptions. However, certainly more could have been done to bring into focus the Slovenians, Macedonians and Bosnian Muslims (modern-day Bosniaks), not to mention the Albanians (modern-day Kosovars) in the disputed region of Kosovo/Kosova as well as looking into the fears of Yugoslav breakdown, real and constructed, amongst the Serbs outside Serbia.

There is an unavoidable parallel between the outside perceptions of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Yugoslavia, which Drapac could also underline more in this book. What this book discovers about the outside constructions of Yugoslavia is highly applicable in a comparative context to ‘little Yugoslavia’ – Bosnia and Herzegovina.

---

<sup>14</sup> See Ramet (2005), especially 54-75.

<sup>15</sup> Pawlovitch (2011).

It is fascinating how the ‘discovery’ of South Slavs as a ‘people’ who should be ‘reunified’ by British travellers Irby and Mackenzie (and Evans)<sup>16</sup> corresponds with their ‘discovery’ of Bosnia and Herzegovina.<sup>17</sup> The view of Bosnia and Herzegovina as ‘Serbian lands’ was used as crown evidence by Gladstone’s circle that the Serbs should be a leading force of South Slavic ‘reunification’ (pp. 45, 51). The perceptions of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Western literature, inspired by the conflict in the 1990s, draws upon similar literary mechanisms, earlier used to imagine Yugoslavia, simplifying its history and changing constructions of culture and tradition.<sup>18</sup> They constructed a whole new discourse on ‘good savages’, which created an imaginary Bosnia and Herzegovina, the ‘land of multiculturalism and tolerance’ in Western perceptions. This discourse was contrasting its counterpart, and also equally distorted the perception of perpetually ‘warring tribes’ in the ‘Balkans’, exemplified in the words of former British prime-minister John Major in the 1990s. The frequent use of the term ‘multiculturalism’ for multi-national and multi-religious Ottoman- and Habsburg- ruled Bosnia and Herzegovina is particularly misleading in these works. This term describes modern Western societies, which regulate, by law, tolerance and equality between different ethnic and gender groups and different religions. Bosnia and Herzegovina, until the later 20<sup>th</sup> century, can hardly be described as such place. It is similar with the recent attempts to construct a pre-modern Bosnian nation in scholarly literature.<sup>19</sup> Such outside constructs are sharply contrasted with current political reality and irreconcilable (but intersecting and interconnected) internal historical and identity-narratives of the Muslims-Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats, combined with the continuing inability of post-Dayton institutions to create a unified civic or national identity in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Both, Raspudić and Drapac show the arrival of a new generation of scholars equipped with theoretical approaches of postcolonial criticism, drawing inspiration upon general studies on ‘Balkanist’ discourse. Italian perceptions of the Croats and outsider views of Yugoslavia are just two specialized studies in different discourses dealing with this part of the world. These works are not only relevant as a part of a growing corpus of works, but also because strongly rooted stereotypes continue to impact perceptions of the region. It is worth mentioning a few. Raspudić (pp. 301-02) brings forward an excellent example of the story about the bowl filled with human eyes brought to Ante Pavelić, the leader of the collaborationist Independent State of Croatia in the Second World War, a fictional episode from the novel *Kaputt* by Curzio Malaparte. This fictional story was later frequently used as ‘fact’ about Croatian and ‘Balkan’ cruelty by historians and the press, especially during the conflicts in the 1990s, thus trivializing the real and documented crimes of Pavelić’s regime. The

---

<sup>16</sup> Todorova (1997): 97-98.

<sup>17</sup> See recently published dissertation of Berber (2010) discussing the discourse on Bosnia and Herzegovina in English travel literature between 1844 and 1912. It is very disappointing that this author heavily focuses only on the depictions of Bosnian Muslims, disregarding completely the Serbs and Croats from Bosnia and Herzegovina, who are barely mentioned in this study.

<sup>18</sup> This relates to the whole region, Goldsworthy (2002): 27-31.

<sup>19</sup> E.g. Fine & Donia (1994); Malcolm (1996). This discourse is also incorporated in the Bosniak narratives, see Mahmutćehajić (2000) for example. For a proper examination of historical myths and realities in Bosnia and Herzegovina see Džaja (2005) and also Džaja’s article in this volume of CSR.



discourse on Balkanism is deeply rooted in Western political approaches towards the whole region, from political ideas that the West must intervene in the Balkans, and 'civilise' it, which in essence did not change much from the later 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>20</sup> New Western media-discourse which demonized the Serbs during and after the conflicts in the 1990s also used familiar elements of the 'Balkanist' discourse in this new context. It is well exemplified in a string of Hollywood movies, the last being a very unfortunate release about the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina, *In the Land of Blood and Honey*, by Hollywood megastar actress-turned-director Angelina Jolie from 2011.<sup>21</sup>

'Balkanism' is therefore very much alive and kicking, and is therefore a reason to attract more research focus. The books of Raspudić and Drapac represent important contributions in the growing discourse on Orientalism and 'Balkanism', and it is very important that they are both translated – Raspudić into English (and Italian) and Drapac into Croatian, in order to facilitate and improve dialogue between 'local' and 'global' scholarship.

### Bibliography

**Anderson, D.** (1966): *Miss Irby and Her Friends* (London).

**Bakić Hayden, M.** (1995): 'Nesting Orientalism: The Case of Former Yugoslavia', *Slavic Review* 54(4): 917-931.

**Bakić Hayden, M. & Hayden, R.M.** (1992): 'Orientalist Variations of the Theme "Balkans": Symbolic Geography in Recent Yugoslav Cultural Politics', *Slavic Review* 51(1): 1-15.

**Berber, N.** (2010): *Unveiling Bosnia-Herzegovina in British travel literature (1844-1912)* (Pisa).

**Bešker, I.** (2011): 'Ova mržnja stara - Nazor i stereotipi o Talijanima u hrvatskoj štokavskoj književnosti', *Croatian Studies Review* 7: 31-48.

**Bjelić, D.** (2002): 'Introduction: Blowing up the "Bridge"'. In: Bjelić & Savić (2002): 1-22.

**Bjelić, D. & Savić, O.** (eds.) (2002): *Balkan as a Metaphor: Between Globalization and Fragmentation* (Cambridge MA).

**Blažević, Z.** (2007): 'Rethinking Balkanism: Interpretative challenge of the early modern Illyrism', *Etudes Balkaniques* 2007/1: 87-106.

**Donia, R.J. & Fine, J.V.A.Jr.** (1994): *Bosnia and Herzegovina. A Tradition Betrayed* (New York).

---

<sup>20</sup> A. Hammond (2006), and more comprehensively in A. Hammond (2007) arguing that the Anglophone travel-writing on the 'Balkans' through 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century ultimately reflects the foreign policy objectives of their countries.

<sup>21</sup> On the demonization of the Serbs in media for example P. Hammond (2004), cf. Longinović (2002) and on 'Balkanist' discourse going wild in all directions in the Western perceptions during the 1990s see Goldsworthy (2002).

**Džaja, S.M.** (2002): *Die politische Realität des Jugoslawismus (1918–1991). Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Bosnien-Herzegowinas. Untersuchungen zur Gegenwartskunde Südosteuropas* 37 (Munich).

\_\_\_\_\_. (2005): 'Bosnian Historical Reality and its Reflection in Myth'. In: *Myth and Boundaries in South-Eastern Europe*, ed. P. Kølsto (London): 6-29.

**Fleming, K.E.** (2000): 'Orientalism, the Balkans and Balkan Historiography', *American Historical Review* 105(4): 1218-1233.

**Goldsworthy, V.** (1998): *Inventing Ruritania: The Imperialism of the Imagination* (New Haven).

\_\_\_\_\_. (2002): 'Invention and In(ter)vention: The Rhetoric of Balkanization'. In: Bjelić & Savić 2002: 23-38.

**Hammond, A.** (2006): 'Balkanism in Political Context: From the Ottoman Empire to the EU', *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture* 3(3): 6-26.

\_\_\_\_\_. (2007): *The Debated Lands: British and American Representation of the Balkans* (Cardiff).

**Hammond, P.** (2004): 'Humanizing War: the Balkans and beyond'. In: *Reporting War: journalism in wartime*, eds. S. Allan & B. Zelizer (London & New York): 174-189.

**Longinović, T.Z.** (2002): 'Vampires like Us: Gothic Imaginary and "the serbs"'. In: Bjelić & Savić (2002): 39-78.

**McCallam, D.** (2011): '(Ac)claiming Illyria: Eighteenth-Century Istria and Dalmatia in Fortis, Cassas, and Lavallée', *Central Europe* 9(2): 125-141.

**Mahmutćehajić, R.** (2000): *Bosnia the Good: Tolerance and Tradition* (Budapest).

**Malcolm, N.** (1996): *Bosnia: A Short History*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London).

**Markulin, N.** (2010): "'Prijetelj našega naroda": Prikazbe Drugoga u djelu *Viaggio in Dalmazia* Alberta Fortisa', *Povijesni Prilozi* 38: 213-233.

**Pavlowitch, S.K.** (2011): 'Review of Drapac, *Constructing Yugoslavia*', *English Historical Review* 126(518): 221-222.

**Ramet, S.P.** (2005): *Thinking about Yugoslavia: Scholarly debates about the Yugoslav Breakup and the Wars in Bosnia and Kosovo* (Cambridge).

**Sajkowski, W.** (2012): 'Obraz ludów bałkańskiego wybrzeża Adriatyku we Francji epoki Oświecenia', PhD diss., University of Adam Mickiewicz, Póznan.

**Todorova, M.** (1997): *Imagining the Balkans* (New York).

**Vlaisavljević, U.** (2002): 'South-Slav identity and the Ultimate War-Reality'. In: Bjelić & Savić (2002): 191-208.

**Wolff, L.** (1994): *Inventing Eastern Europe. The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford, CA).

\_\_\_\_\_. (2001): *Venice and the Slavs: The discovery of Dalmatia in the Age of Enlightenment* (Stanford, CA).