

SUMMARY

ON "HISTORY OF YUGOSLAVIA"

Towards the end of 1972 Belgrade publishers "Prosveta" edited a book entitled "History of Yugoslavia"; the authors are University Professors: Ivan Božić, Sima Ćirković (Belgrade), Milorad Ekmečić (Sarajevo) and the publicist Vladimir Dedijer. (The book contains 608 pages, 59 historical maps, 202 pictures.)

From the very beginning the book incited great interest among readers and scientific critics, owing it to the authors' new conceptional lay-out as well as to its being the first Yugoslav after-war historiography survey to be made of periods from the "antique heredity on the grounds of Yugoslavia" up to the picturing of development and the very estimate of "historical significance of Yugoslav 1941—1945 revolution". As the basic task of the "Časopis za suvremenu povijest" is to give critical and timely information on the more important achievements in Yugoslav historiography of more recent history, this number has dedicated the whole section "Actualities" to the "History of Yugoslavia". The editorial has considered the book to be worth of such an attention because of numerous historical appearances and problems it encompasses and deals with. In order to cover well the parts of the book which deal with the periods that fall into the programme and contents of interest of the magazine, i. e. 19th and 20th century ones, the authors of those parts being M. Ekmečić and V. Dedijer, the editorial has turned to known scientific historians and has asked them to help with their articles to the more thorough and deeper understanding of some basic problems in these periods which in the interpretation of the "Histor of Yugoslavia" call for the discussion.

Mirjana Gross in her article "The Idea of Pan Yugoslavia in 19th c. as Seen in "History of Yugoslavia"" points to the erroneous interpretation of some essential problems that M. Ekmečić discusses in his review of the 19th c. Croatian history. M. Ekmečić's consideration of history of Yugoslavia, and not the one of the Yugoslav peoples, can be clearly detected in his talking only of Serbian and Croatian areas. The history of the other peoples of the future Yugoslavia is treated only as a background to the basic problems that have taken the author's interest. Thus the reader is lead to consider the relations Serbia—Croatia as *the* problem of Yugoslavia. But not even the whole territory of Serbia and Croatia is talked of in its completeness. According to M. Ekmečić the idea of "Croatian society" covers only the territory of Croatia of BAN, i. e. the Croatian areas governed by Ban. The essence of his discussion lays in the interpreting of the relations between the officially recognized Belgrade and the "unofficial" Zagreb which is the bearer of the same aristocratic and reactionary mentality as the very leaders of the Habsburg Monarchy. Thus describing the Croato-Serbian relations the author automatically calls Pan Yugoslav all the events, activities and aspirations, or at least most of them, tending to connect the Yugoslav territories without any studying of their contents, except for the ideology of the Croatian Rights' Party. M. Ekmečić's vision of the Croato-Serbian area admits only for two ideologies: Serbian and Pan Yugoslav one among the Croats, this one not bearing any characteristics of the Croatian nationalism, and then an exclusively nationalistic ideology, "purely" Croatian one, i. e. belonging to the Croatian Right's Party. There is no so worded mentioning of the existence of the exclusively Serbian nationalistic ideology, which could not have been related to the idea of Pan Yugoslavia.

In the essay entitled "On Interpretation of 19th c. Croatian History in the "History of Yugoslavia"", *Vera Ciliga*, discusses M. Ekmečić's approach to some questions raising in the Croatian history from the end of 18th c. to the second half of 19th c. As he has taken up the idea of the Greater Magyar Hegemony circles about the Croatia being a province of Hungary, M. Ekmečić has done the same in considering the Croats in Istria as Slavs, a mass unconscious of its nationality among Italians the only nationally

minded part — the very idea actually supported by all Italian and pro-Italian writers. By him the Croats in Dalmatia are mentioned as Slavs or "Dalmatian population", while, apart from Italians, the only other nationally differentiated element are Serbs. Thus, keeping silent on Croatians he achieves a strong impression of the Serbian Dalmatia, the impression with does not correspond to the reality. M. Ekmečić's criteria regarding the single people of Yugoslavia are not always uniform, so while the Serbian population is given its national name, the greater part of the Croatian population is made inexistant by being marked as "štokavski" (speaking the most literary Serbo-Croatian dialect "što") catholics. In keeping with this attitude he calls Croats in Bosnia "catholics in Turkish empire", while those in Vojvodina are being treated alike under the name of "South-Slav catholics". If it were the question of M. Ekmečić's conception of religion as the one constituting the nations, he would then talk of Serbs as "štokavski Orthodox Church members" or "South-Slav Orthodox Church members", but there is not an example to be found of that in the whole text.

Bogdan Krizman in his "Beginnings of the State of Yugoslavia and Its International Relations as Shown in "History of Yugoslavia"", discusses only that part of book which was written by V. Dedijer, pointing to author's many mistakes in facts as well as to his erroneous interpretations. He concludes that V. Dedijer's text in "History of Yugoslavia" shows a very skillful journalist, always in to incite the curiosity of reader with interesting but not necessarily important details, and to narrate; the even worse thing is that V. Dedijer has not shown a thorough knowledge nor has the followed faithfully the achievements of Yugoslav historiography in the research on the creation of Yugoslav country and its outer policy during the between-the-war period. If he had the made use of these achievements he would not have reached such an inaccuracy, nor written so many faulty estimates nor such pattern statements.

Hrvoje Matković in his critical supplement "Synthesis Should be Based od Already Examined Facts" gives his consideration to V. Dedijer's text in the chapter "Yugoslavia between Centralism and Federalism". After analyzing this chapter of the inner political development of Yugoslavia from 1918 to 1941, the reviewer concludes that it is not a text of a very successful synthesis. It does not discuss the essential lines of development nor does it state the social appearances and relations, inconsistencies or moving forces; all this has been mentioned but little. According to this text the dilemma between the centralism and federalism lies more in the form than in the contents, while the true meaning of the dilemma and its roots are not visible.

The critic *Stanislava Koprivica-Oštrić* in her critical "A Review of Communist Movement as Seen in "History of Yugoslavia" points to the fact that V. Dedijer had shown only fragments of the role of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ) and given it character of almost an ephemeral appearance; the movement's developing into a historical subject as the bearer of the revolutionary changes of the Yugoslav society is not to be seen.

Zorica Stipetić in her "On the Approach and Interpretation of the Process of Culture in "History of Yugoslavia"" shows the author's clear non-uniformity of methodical approach when it comes to the interpretation of the cultural component. According to the reviewer the authors have failed in their tendency to offer an easier inspection of the foundations as well as of building up when describing the togetherness and unity of the historical process. The channels of the movements towards that goal had been as different as had been the results achieved.

Ivan Jelić in his critical review: On the Approach to the History of Yugoslav Revolution in "History of Yugoslavia" discusses V. Dedijer's interpretation of some essential problems from the period between 1941 to 1945 in Yugoslavia, with the stress on the National Liberation war and revolution. V. Dedijer's reconstruction of the process of this event is not at all based on trying to synthetize the results of Yugoslav historiography researches on revolution, but it represents his own idea and knowledge of it. The reconstruction with such facts not only does not give the possibility of a more balanced and uniform inspection into a display and explanation of some appearances

but has even become disharmonic with regards to the chronology and geography. The survey with such facts is in many ways of lesser significance or almost worthless when supposed to be a synthesis of discussions tending to better understanding the problems of the development of revolution. Thus, the text, very often fragmentary mosaic of facts, is clearly characterized by the episodal and often anecdotal intonation.

Slobodan Žarić discusses V. Dedijer's survey of the Yugoslav revolution in his: *Some Problems Spotted in the Essay on National Liberation War and Revolution in "History of Yugoslavia"*. He points to a number of omissions and wrong interpretations of V. Dedijer, the biggest one being in indentifying the idea of Yugoslav revolution with the idea of the movement of resistance, although those are two very different qualities.

To conclude the reviewing of the book in the whole but upon the mentioned critical essays on the "History of Yugoslavia", i. e. on the texts written by M. Ekmečić and V. Dedijer which encompass the periods of 19th and 20th centuryes, it can be stated that the book contains a number of erroneous estimates and interpretations as well as many mistakes of facts. Because of that it is clear that the "History of Yugoslavia" being meant for the readers abroad too could only misinform the public.