

INTERVJU BROJA: dr. sc. Daniel Rafaelić

INTERVIEW OF THE ISSUE: Daniel Rafaelić, PhD



Daniel Rafaelić rođen je 19. lipnja 1977. godine u Bitoli, u Sjevernoj Makedoniji. Osnovu i srednju školu završio je u Zagrebu, a u istom gradu 1996. upisuje Filozofski fakultet. Godine 2002. magistrira na temu *Amar-na period egipatske povijesti umjetnosti*, a 2006. upisuje doktorat na poslijediplomskom doktorskom studiju Moderne i suvremene

Daniel Rafaelić was born on June 19, 1977, in Bitola, North Macedonia. He finished primary and secondary school in Zagreb, and in 1996 he enrolled at the Faculty of Philosophy in the same city. In 2002, he received his master's degree with his master thesis *Amarna period from Egyptian art history (Amarna period egipatske povijesti umjetnosti)*, and in 2006 he enrolled in a doctorate at the postgraduate doctoral study of Modern and Contemporary Croatian History. From 2002 to 2010, he was employed at the Croatian Cinematheque – Croatian State Archives in the service of filmologists-archivists. From 2003 to 2008 he taught the course History of Croatian Film as an assistant at the Academy of Dramatic Arts in Zagreb. From 2007 to 2009, he was the Head of the Department for the Protection and Restoration of Film Materials. From 2003 to 2008 he taught the course History of Croatian Film as an assistant at the Academy of Dramatic Arts in Zagreb. From 2007 to 2009, he was the Head of the Department for the Protection and Restoration of Film Materials. Since 2010, he has been teaching the following courses at the Department of History of the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb: Film as a Historical Source – Film and Propaganda, Old History on Film and The Middle Ages on Film. In 2012, he enrolled in the study of Egyptology at the University of Manchester in England, United

hrvatske povijesti. Od 2002. do 2010. godine zaposlen je u Hrvatskoj kinoteci, Hrvatskom državnom arhivu u službi filmologa – arhivista. Od 2003. do 2008. predaje kao asistent na Akademiji dramskih umjetnosti u Zagrebu kolegij Povijest hrvatskog filma. Od 2007. do 2009. obavlja dužnost načelnika Odsjeka za zaštitu i restauraciju filmske građe. Od 2010. godine na Odsjeku za povijest zagrebačkog Filozofskog fakulteta izvodi sljedeće kolegije: Film kao povijesni izvor – Film i propaganda, Stara povijest na filmu te Srednji vijek na filmu. Godine 2012. upisuje studij egiptologije na University of Manchester u Engleskoj, Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo, na kojem 2017. sječe Certifikat egiptologije, a 2021. i diplomu egiptologije. Od 2013. godine na Odsjeku za psihologiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu izvodi kolegij Psihopatologija i film. Od 2017. do 2019. obavlja dužnost ravnatelja Hrvatskog audiovizualnog centra (HAVC). Kao filmski povjesničar usmjeren je prema istraživanju domaće i svjetske filmske povijesti kao i istraživanju filmskih arhiva s ciljem pronalaska zaboravljenih i izgubljenih filmova hrvatskog stvaralaštva. Godine 2003. i 2008. pronalazi izgubljene filmove Oktavijana Miletića. U Beču 2003. pronalazi njegov film pod naslovom *Kroatisches Baurenleben (Život hrvatskog seljaka)* iz 1943., dok u Berlinu 2008. otkriva Miletićev film *Agram: die Hauptstadt Kroatiens (Zagreb, glavni grad Hrvatske)* iz 1944. godine. Godine 2010. nagrađen je Nagradom Vjekoslav Majcen za doprinos istraživanju hrvatske filmske baštine. Objavio je monografije pod naslovom *Kinematografija u NDH* (2013.) i *Hramovi oteti Nilu* (2019., koautor: Hrvoje Gržina) dok se 2021. nalazi u Cambridgeovoj Povijesti svjetske egiptologije (*A History of World Egyptology*) s poglavljem o drevnom Egiptu u kinematografiji (*Ancient Egypt in the Cinema*).

Kingdom, where he obtained a Certificate in Egyptology in 2017, and a degree in Egyptology in 2021. Since 2013, he has been teaching Psychopathology and Film at the Department of Psychology at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb. From 2017 to 2019, he was the Head of the Croatian Audiovisual Center (HAVC). As a film historian, he is focused on researching domestic and world film history as well as researching film archives with the aim of finding forgotten and lost films of Croatian creativity. In 2003 and 2008, he found the lost films of Oktavijan Miletić. In Vienna, in 2003 he found his film entitled *Kroatisches Baurenleben (The Life of a Croatian Peasant)* from 1943. While in Berlin, in 2008. he discovered Miletić's film *Agram: die Hauptstadt Kroatiens (Zagreb, the capital of Croatia)* from 1944. In 2010, he was awarded the Vjekoslav Majcen Award for his contribution to the research of Croatian film heritage. He published monographs entitled *Cinematography in the Independent State of Croatia* (2013) and *Temples Abducted by the Nile* (2019, co-authored by Hrvoje Gržina), while in 2021 he is in Cambridge's *History of World Egyptology* with a chapter on ancient Egypt in cinematography (*Ancient Egypt in the Cinema*).

Professor Rafaelić, first of all I would like to thank you for your participation in the XII Rostra edition. Before elaborating the interview, one question to start, so, what attracted you to research film history and the history of Egypt and how did these two fields of research become in some way an identification of your scientific career?

It started with – a movie about ancient Egypt. The first movie that I watched from its beginning to its end was Land of the Pharaohs (1955) by Howard Hawks. After that, nothing else was the same. I have been doing film history professionally for two decades now, and I have always been

Profesore Rafaeliću, prije samih pitanja želim Vam zahvaliti što ste pristali biti dijelom XII. broja *Rostre*. Prije razrade intervjuja, jedno pitanje za otvaranje; dakle, što Vas je privuklo istraživanju povijesti filma i povijesti Egipta i kako su ta dva polja istraživanja postala nekako identifikacija Vaše znanstvene karijere?

Počelo je s filmom o drevnom Egiptu. Kad sam kao dijete prvi puta na televiziji gledao neki film u cijelosti, bila je to Zemlja faraona Howarda Hawksa iz 1955. Nakon tog gledanja više ništa nije bilo isto. Poviješću filma bavim se profesionalno, evo, već dva desetljeća i uvijek me mučilo zašto je to nespojivo s poviješću drevnog Egipta. Međutim, kako mi se karijera razvijala, postao sam svjesniji da je sve povezano i da je moja znanstvena zadaća naći ključ te povezanosti. Mislim da sam ključ napokon locirao, na tragu one teze teoretičara filma André Bazina o mumijinom kompleksu, po kojoj čovječanstvo vođeno gotovo podsvjesnim arhetipskim nagonom stvara filmove kako bi izbjeglo finalitet smrti.

Napisali ste djelo *Kinematografija u NDH* koje istražuje jedan prilično nepoznat segment u povijesti NDH, a to je filmska industrija. S obzirom na to da smo s poviješću te tvorevine upoznati u najvećem obliku s političkog i vojnog aspekta, koliko je zapravo kultura bila bitna u tadašnjem ratnom razdoblju 1941. – 1945. godine – bilo u političkom, društvenom ili ekonomskom smislu, i je li zapravo djelovanje filmske industrije trebalo nekako skrenuti pozornost s političkih i vojnih uspjeha i neuspjeha NDH kako bi tadašnje stanovništvo mislilo da je sve u redu i da im se ništa neće dogoditi?

To je jedan od razloga. Stvaranje kinematografske iluzije i eskapizma obilježje je svakog totalitarnog režima i zbog toga je

tormented with the question of why was it incompatible with the history of ancient Egypt. However, as my career developed, I became more aware that everything is connected and that my scientific task is to find the key to that connection. I think I have found that key, following the thesis of film theorist André Bazin about the mummy complex, according to which humanity, guided by an almost subconscious archetypal instinct, creates films to avoid the finality of death.

You wrote a work *Cinematography in the Independent State of Croatia*, which analyzes a quite unknown segment from the NDH, and that is its film industry. Considering that we are acquainted with the history of this state in the greatest form from its political and military aspect, how important culture really was in that war period from 1941 to 1945, in political, social or economic sense? Did the activities of the film industry had a task of somehow diverting attention from the political and military successes and failures of the NDH so that the people of that time would think that everything was fine and that nothing would happen to them?

That is one of the reasons. The creation of cinematic illusion and escapism is a feature of every totalitarian regime and that is why the cinematography of such social arrangements is so exciting to explore. In the Independent State of Croatia, there was a desire to create a pioneering feature-length, sound and artistically valuable films, which led battles with the desire to create films which would serve for propaganda. We also see these two forces in Nazi cinema, where Hitler's (brutal, direct) and Goebbels' (subtle, poisonous) ideas of film propaganda directly clash. Culture was an indispensable part of civil society in the

kinematografije takvih društvenih uređenja toliko uzbudljivo istraživati. U NDH se najviše lomila želja za stvaranjem pionirskog dugometražnog, zvučnog, umjetnički vrijednog filma s onom za stvaranjem filmske propagande. Te dvije silnice vidimo i u nacističkoj kinematografiji, gdje se izravno sukobljavaju Hitlerova (brutalna, izravna) i Goebbelsova (suptilna, otrovna) ideja filmske propagande. Kultura je u NDH bila neizostavni dio građanskog društva. Njeni su dionici tada neki od ključnih hrvatskih umjetnika uopće. Međutim, čini mi se da naše društvo do danas nije uspjelo razriješiti etičko pitanje; kako se diviti umjetničkim dosezima hrvatskih umjetnika toga vremena znajući da u isto vrijeme, kao izravni rezultat rasnih zakona i državne kriminogenosti, u vlak u Auschwitz umire Lea Deutsch.

S obzirom na to da su filmovi tijekom Drugog svjetskog rata bili većinom propagandne prirode, koja je zapravo propagandna filmska mašinerija bila najjača tijekom rata? Jesu li nacisti naizgled mogli dobiti medijski rat da su radili malo „jače i brutalnije“ propagandne filmove ili su im problem radili Amerikanci sa svojom filmskom mašinerijom? Može li se reći da je jedna od bojišnica bila i ona kreativne industrije, napose one filmske?

Propagandni su filmovi, unatoč općem mišljenju, u Njemačkoj razdoblja 1933. – 1945. bili u manjini. Od 1096 filmova snimljenih u III. Reichu, njih stotinu možemo zvati propagandnima. No, nažalost, iako u manjini, njihov je uspjeh kod publike (npr. filmovi Veita Harlana) odradio maksimalnu propagandnu zadaću. Točno i precizno nazivate to „bojišnicom“ kreativne industrije (iako potonju sintagmu danas nekritički rabe naši „kulturni“ političari kako bi tim metajezikom prikrili vlastito neznanje o praksi i materiji). Jako

Independent State of Croatia. Its stakeholders were some of the key Croatian artists that time. However, it seems to me that our society has failed to resolve the ethical issue; how to admire the artistic achievements of Croatian artists of that time knowing that at the same time, as a direct result of racial laws and crimes in the state, Lea Deutsch died in a train for Auschwitz.

Given that films from World War II were mostly of a propaganda nature, which film propaganda machinery was the strongest during the war? Could the Nazis seemingly win the media war if they had made a little “stronger and more brutal” propaganda films, or did the Americans have a problem with their film machinery? Can it be said that one of the battlefields was also that of creative industry, especially film industry?

Despite the general opinion, propaganda films were in a minority in Germany in the period from 1933 to 1945. Of the 1096 films made in the Third Reich, we can call a hundred of them propaganda films. But, unfortunately, although in minority, their success with the audience (e.g. Veit Harlan’s films) did the maximum propaganda task. You accurately and precisely call it the “battlefield” of the creative industry (although the latter phrase is uncritically used today by our “cultural” politicians to use this meta-language to cover up their own ignorance of practice and matter). It is very interesting to see how the areas in which we live in are dealt with by warring cinemas. In 1941 Germans made People in the Storm, in 1942 the British made Undercover, Americans made Chetniks in 1943, and the Soviets made In the Mountains of Yugoslavia. All of them had the task of propaganda. For some, it worked (the German and Soviet examples), and for some

je zanimljivo gledati kako se ovim našim prostorima bave zaraćene kinematografije. *Nijemci 1941. snimaju Ljude u Oluji, Britanci 1942. Undercover, Amerikanci 1943. Četnike, a Sovjeti U planinama Jugoslavije. Svi su oni imali zadaću odraditi i propagandni dio. Nekima je to uspjelo (njemački i sovjetski primjer), a nekima nije (američki i britanski filmovi su premontirani i povučeni iz kina kako se mijenjala politika). To vam pokazuje kako film izvrsno čuva političke ideje koje vrijeme ipak nagrizi. No, ne smijem ne spomenuti vjerojatno najvažniji propagandni film svih vremena, film koji tu zadaću niti ne skriva – a radi se o jednom od najljepših i najboljih filmova uopće – Casablanca Michela Curtiza (1942.).*

Nedavno ste kao jedan od autora uvršteni u kapitalno djelo *Povijest svjetske egiptologije (A History of World Egyptology)* koje je objavila uvažena izdavačka kuća Cambridge University Press. U tom ste se djelu osvrnuli na neke od najvećih uradaka u povijesti filma vezanih za Egipat. Jedan je od tih filmova i neizbježna *Kleopatra* (1963.), najskuplji film tadašnjeg vremena koji je odisao raskoši i skupoćom. Jesu li ti filmovi epskih razmjera imali namjeru biti toliko raskošni i skupi te tako na neki način pokazati svu moć kojom Hollywood raspolaže u smislu da je sposoban rekonstruirati antički Egipat ili su možda željeli pokazati kako je tadašnji antički svijet Kleopatre zaista izgledao imajući namjeru da film bude ne samo zabava za mase, nego i vjerodostojan povijesni uradak?

Mankiewiczeva se Kleopatra otela kontroli, pa je zato došla na zao glas – iako se radi o svezremenskom remek-djelu. Hollywood je tada u ozbiljnoj panici – televizija mu je otela publiku i grčevito proizvodi ono što još jedino ozbiljne mase ljudi privlači u kina – filmske epove. Srećom za nas, to je bilo vrijeme kada se jako

it didn't (American and British films were re-edited and withdrawn from the cinema as politics changed). It shows you how the film perfectly preserves political ideas that time erodes after all. But I must not forget to mention probably the most important propaganda film of all time, a film that does not even hide this task – and it is one of the most beautiful and best films in general – Casablanca by Michael Curtiz from 1942.

Recently you have been included as one of the authors in a capital work *A History of World Egyptology* by Cambridge University Press. In this work, you referred to some of the greatest works in the history of film related to Egypt. One of these films is the inevitable *Cleopatra* (1963), the most expensive film of that time, which exuded luxury and expensiveness. Were these films of epic proportions intended to be so lavish and expensive so that they could show all the power Hollywood has at its disposal in terms of being capable of reconstructing ancient Egypt, or did they perhaps wanted to show what Cleopatra's ancient world at the time really looked like, intending to make the film not only entertainment for the masses but also a credible historical work?

Mankiewicz's Cleopatra got out of control, so it became notorious – even though it is an all-time masterpiece. Hollywood was then in a serious panic – television has robbed its audience and frantically produced what was still the most serious attraction for people to come to cinemas – film epics. Fortunately for us, it was a time when the film was strongly held to be more or less historically and archaeologically grounded, since it was known that the audience was still somewhat familiar with the characters, plot and timeline. Today, on our shame, no one cares anymore about these things, so it regularly happens

držalo do toga da film bude koliko-toliko povijesno i arheološki utemeljen budući da se znalo da je publika ipak do određene mjere upoznata s likovima, radnjom i vremenom. Danas, na našu sramotu, to više nikog nije briga, pa se redovito događa da se mjesecima raspravlja o tome je li Kleopatra bila crna, koplja se lome oko biseksualnog života Aleksandra Velikog ili se zajapureno napadaju filmski prikazi fundamentalističkog ponašanja kršćana u Aleksandriji zloglasne 391. godine. Izvore, koji su dostupniji nego ikad prije su, čini se, svi zaboravili. Zamislite, živimo u vremenu u kojem na vašem telefonu možete, kad god poželite, čitati npr. Plutarha ili Strabona, Apijana ili Lukijana, Vergilija ili Horacija. Pa ipak, to se ne radi. Konačno, i ja i moji kolege s Fakulteta sve češće susrećemo studente koji **nikad** nisu čuli za Kleopatru – a završavaju studij. Dakle, ako oni ne znaju – kako će znati opća publika. Obrazovni sustav nam je u potpunosti podbacio. Fakulteti i škole odavno nisu mjesta gdje se generira i njeguje izvrsnost. Konačno, i film je kao medij odustao od svoje obrazovne komponente. Zabava, umjetnički nevažna, jedino je što repertoar nudi i moralo je doći do urušavanja. Digitalno je društvo u potpunosti obrisalo i ono malo znanja koje je prosječan čovjek posjedovao. Shvativši da mu ne treba, „jer je sve dostupno“, suvremeni si je čovjek dopustio – vjerujem, prvi i zadnji put u povijesti civilizacije – odbaciti od sebe sve što je do tad naučio. To je toliko uspješno odradio, da sad imamo oko sebe prazne ljude bez želje da se taj vakuum ičim napuni.

Da se nadovežem na *Kleopatru*, nedavno je najavljen i *remake* filma. S obzirom na trendove u kojima filmovi postaju *remake*, *reboot*, *prequel* ili *sequel* već postojećih ostvarenja, postavlja se pitanje zašto se to događa i

that for months we discuss whether Cleopatra was black, spears are broken around the bisexual life of Alexander the Great, or film depictions of fundamentalist Christian behaviour in Alexandria in the infamous year of 391 are attacked. Sources, which are more accessible than ever before, seem to have been forgotten by all. Imagine, we live in a time where you can, whenever you want, read on your phone, for example, Plutarch or Strabo, Appian or Lucian, Virgil or Horace. Still, people do not do that. Finally, both me and my colleagues from the faculty are increasingly meeting students who have **never** heard of Cleopatra – and are finishing their studies. So if they don't know – how will the general public know. The education system has completely failed us. Universities and schools have stopped being places where excellence is generated and nurtured a long time ago. Finally, film as a medium has given up on its educational component. Entertainment, artistically irrelevant, is the only thing the repertoire has to offer and there had to be a collapse. The digital society has completely erased even that little knowledge that an average person possessed. Realizing that he did not need it, “because everything is available”, modern man allowed himself – I believe, for the first and last time in the history of civilization – to reject everything he had learned so far. He has done this so successfully, that we now have empty people around us with no desire to fill that vacuum with anything.

To follow up on *Cleopatra*, recently it was announced that a remake of this movie will be made. Given the trends in which films become remakes, reboots, prequels or sequels of already existing achievements, the question arises as to why this is happening and whether Hollywood and the film industry may have run out of ideas. Is it because of that, that

jesu li Hollywood i filmska industrija možda ostali bez ideja tako iskorištavajući prostor koji su ostavili objavljeni filmovi sa svojim pričama koje se mogu iscrpljivati unedogled ili se postojeći filmovi žele „nadograditi“ novim ostvarenjima u kojima će se oni prijašnji nedostaci pokriti preko vizualnih efekata, boljih kamera, scenografija i tako dalje? Igra li možda Hollywood na sigurno s tim pristupom?

*Kvalitetnih ideja Hollywood nema otkako su politička korektnost i neokonzervativizam postali jedina prihvatljiva ideologija. Film koji stvarate mora zadovoljiti **sve**, ne smije propitivati, ismijavati, a čak više ni širiti prostor slobode. Savršen rezultat za intelektualno urušavanje filmskog medija – što je korona samo ubrzala. Mi ovih dana naričemo nad jadnim Afganistancima, a sami smo stvorili civilizaciju u kojoj intelektualni, slobodarski dosezi, npr., Monty Pythona postaju nešto do čega trebamo ponovno stići – a ne nešto što smo odavno apsolvirali.*

Mislite li da današnji plan i program u osnovnim i srednjim školama slabo potiče korištenje filma u nastavi, kao i poticanje učenika na bavljenje filmom i sličnim medijima?

Često sam radio za Agenciju za odgoj i obrazovanje kako bih svojim kolegama predstavio, pojasnio i olakšao uvođenje filma u nastavu. Problem je, međutim, u vremenu koje suvremeni, birokracijom preopterećeni, nastavnici nema dovoljno vremena kako bi kvalitetno i sam pratio kako filmsku suvremenost, tako i filmsku prošlost, ali i literaturu. Što se učenika tiče – oni su u potpunosti odustali od čitanja, pa više ona ključni trokut stvaranja čovjekovog znanja: primanje informacije, obrada informacije i reprodukcija informacije uopće ne funkcionira. Trokut je slomljen i učenici jednostavno

they take advantage of the space left by published films with their stories that can be exhausted indefinitely or do existing films want to be “upgraded” with new achievements in which those previous shortcomings will be covered through visual effects, better cameras, scenography and so on? Maybe Hollywood is playing it safe with that approach?

*Hollywood has had no quality ideas since political correctness and neoconservatism became the only acceptable ideology. The film you create must satisfy **everyone**, it must not question, ridicule or even expand the space of freedom. This is the perfect result for the intellectual collapse of the film medium – which was only accelerated by the corona virus. We are crying out over poor Afghans these days, but we ourselves have created a civilization in which the intellectual, libertarian reach of, say, Monty Python becomes something we need to get back to – not something we have long since absolved.*

Do you think that today’s curriculum of primary and secondary schools weakly encourages the use of film in teaching, as well as not encouraging students to engage in film and similar media?

I have often worked for the Education and Teacher Training Agency to introduce, explain and facilitate the introduction of film in teaching to my colleagues. However, the problem is that in a modern time, overloaded with bureaucracy, the teacher does not have enough time to follow the film’s modernity, as well as the film’s past and literature. As for the students – they have completely given up on reading, so the key triangle of creating human knowledge: receiving information, processing information and reproducing information does not work at all. The triangle is broken and students are simply no longer mentally at the level

mentalno nisu više na razini obrade podataka. Ne znaju što bi s njima, bubaju ih napamet kratkoročno, ne povezuju ih sa svijetom oko sebe i oni vrlo brzo nestanu. Rezultat su djeca koja se ne znaju izražavati, koja su nespemna za život, koja nisu savladala svo potrebno znanje kako bi se mogla učiti suptilnostima, kako bi mogla osjećati, kako bi mogla i nešto doživjeti. Krivnja je, naravno, u našim višedesetljetnim obrazovnim politikama zatrovanim ideologijom i željom za najnižim dosezima, koje to sve vide i znaju – ali ih nije briga.

of data processing. They don't know what to do with them, learn them by heart, don't connect them with the world around them and they disappear very quickly. The result is children who do not know how to express themselves, who are unprepared for life, who have not mastered all the necessary knowledge to be able to learn subtleties, to be able to feel, to be able to experience something. The guilt is, of course, in our decades-long educational policies which are poisoned by ideology and the desire for the lowest reaches, which see and know it all – but don't care.

Kada govorimo o korištenju medija u obrazovanju, mislite li da korištenje povijesnih filmova u te svrhe može poboljšati učenikovo znanje ili pak suprotno s obzirom na to da gotovo svaki povijesni film nije povijesno savršen, bilo to u činjeničnom ili scenografskom smislu pa možda čak i onom emotivnom?

When we talk about the use of media in education, do you think that using historical films for these purposes can improve a student's knowledge or vice versa, given that almost every historical film is not historically perfect, whether in factual or scenographic, and maybe even the emotional one?

Smisao prikazivanja i analize povijesnih filmova u obrazovanju upravo leži u njihovoj dekonstrukciji. Kada se napokon shvati da film nije niti će ikad biti, niti treba biti zamjena za udžbenik – onda će sve teći lakše. Mi smo još uvijek civilizacija koja je nastala na tekovinama velikih filmova (kojih više danas, nažalost, nema), pa se i prema filmu odnosimo kao nečemu sakrosanktnom. Kada naučimo od čega se film sastoji, kako postiže to što postiže kod gledatelja, kad se upitamo zašto je na filmu nešto prikazano tako kako jest – na dobrom smo putu da učenicima i studentima počnemo pojašnjavati neka njima nevidljiva i na prvi pogled neshvatljiva značenja.

The meaning of showing and analyzing historical films in education lies precisely in their deconstruction. When it is finally realized that the film is not and never will be (nor should it be) a substitute for a textbook – then everything will flow more easily. We are still a civilization that originated on the achievements of great films (which, unfortunately, no longer exist today), so we treat film as something sacrosanct. When we learn what a film consists of, how it achieves what it achieves in the viewer, when we ask ourselves why something is shown in the film as it is – we are on a good way of explaining to students some invisible and seemingly incomprehensible meanings.

Postoji li neko razdoblje o kojem biste željeli pisati, a da ima sličan ton kao Vaša fotomonografija *Hramovi oteti Nilu* koju ste stvorili u suradnji s Hrvojem Gržinom i Hrvatskim državnim arhivom?

Is there a period you would like to write about that has a similar tone as your photomonography *Temples Claimed from the Nile* which you created in collaboration with Hrvoje Gržin and the Croatian State Archives?

Nadam se da će do kraja godine napokon biti „vani“ moja knjiga U sjeni piramida: drevni Egipat na filmu. To je knjiga koju sam dugo pisao, knjiga u koju sam dao sve od sebe i knjiga koja će, nadam se, naći ponekog čitatelja. Nakon toga bacam se na novu, krajnje egzotičnu temu.

S obzirom na to da je hrvatska povijest prilično bogata, opširna, na momente komplicirana i kontroverzna, mislite li da bi se trebalo ulagati u vizualni medij koji ne bi bio igrano-dokumentarnog oblika na koji smo već nekako navikli? Primjera je u zadnje vrijeme mnogo: *Hrvatski kraljevi, Republika*, nedavno u kinima prikazivano *Doba uskoka*... Sve su to serijali ili filmovi s dokumentarističkom notom dok vjerojatno postoji dio publike koji bi rado preskočio taj dokumentaristički segment i gledao film koji je u cijelosti igran.

Kod nas se i dalje vjeruje da sve što je filmski dokumentarno – ujedno je i istinito. Nitko ne razmišlja o tome da sve što je dokumentarno – ujedno je i odabrano. Od ukupnosti pojedine priče netko je srezao i odabrao za gledatelja samo neke aspekte. Što je, međutim, s onima koji su izostavljeni? Zašto su izostavljeni? To moramo imati na umu kad pristupamo i dokumentarnom filmu. Hrvatski kraljevi su sjajno odradili posao populariziranja hrvatskog ranog srednjeg vijeka. To je toliko uzbudljivo razdoblje koje se u našim školama predaje toliko neuzbudljivo. Zato taj serijal može savršeno pomoći u razumijevanju materije. Jasno, ako je praćen kvalitetnim udžbenikom koji piše kvalitetni autor. Mi smo, ipak, cijelo vrijeme u velikom problemu s pronalaskom izvrsnosti na svim poljima.

Postoji li neka ustaljena shema stvaranja filma ili serije o hrvatskoj povijesti koje se svi drže, ili zainteresiranosti i ulaganja za igrani film ili seriju jednostavno nema s obzirom

*I hope that by the end of the year, my book *In the Shadow of the Pyramids: Ancient Egypt in Film* will finally be out. It is a book I have been writing for a long time, a book I have put my best into and a book that will, I hope, find some readers. After that, I throw myself into a new, extremely exotic topic.*

Given that Croatian history is quite rich, extensive, at times complicated and controversial, do you think that we should invest in a visual medium that would not be in a feature-documentary form to which we are already in some way accustomed? There have been many examples in the last years: *Croatian Kings, The Republic, The Age of Uskoks* which was recently in cinemas... All these are series or films with a documentary note, while there is probably a part of the audience who would like to skip that documentary segment and watch a film that is fully feature.

*We still believe that everything that is in documentary movies – is the truth. No one thinks about the fact that everything that is documentary is also – selected. Of the totality of a particular story, someone cut and selected to show to viewers only some aspects. However, what about those that are left out? Why are they left out? We must keep that in mind when analyzing documentaries. *Croatian Kings* did a great job of popularizing the Croatian early Middle Ages. It is such an exciting period, which is taught so unexcitingly in our schools. That is why this series can perfectly help in understanding the matter, of course, if it is accompanied by a quality textbook written by a quality author. However, we are, in great trouble because we cannot find excellence in any field.*

Is there an established scheme that everyone sticks to, or an interest, and most importantly the investment to make a feature film or

na niz izdataka koje nosi jedna produkcija u cijelosti?

Nije stvar (samo) u novcu. Ne postoje više obrazovani ljudi koji bi pokrenuli snimanje serija i filmova kako bi se obrazovali neki drugi ljudi. Naši filmaši našoj povijesti filmski pristupaju jedino kroz prizmu povijesnog kretenizma (vidjet ćete seriju Mrkomir) jer je to jedino što (misle) da znaju. Sve stručnije njima je nedosežno – jer ništa o našoj povijesti ne znaju iako su završili škole kao vi i ja. Dakle, dominacija neobrazovanosti i nikakve želje za učenjem.

Za one ljubitelje filmske umjetnosti koji nisu toliko upoznati s cjelokupnom procedurom potrebnom za stvaranje jednog filma, recimo da želim snimiti cjelovečernji film ili mini seriju o Dioklecijanu, što mi je sve potrebno osim, naravno, financija?

Nazvati kolegu Domagoja Burića i pitati ga koliko je daleko odmakao sa svojim Dioklecijanom kojeg priprema već nekoliko godina. 😊

Morate krenuti u čitanje obilja izvora i literature kako biste uopće shvatili tko je bio taj, nama tako važan, rimski car. Jedan je od najvažnijih uopće – a za nas je i dalje turistička vedeta Splita u jeftinom kostimu. Zatim treba ići u pisanje scenarija. Tko će vam to pisati? Dobar scenarist ili dobar povjesničar? Sve su to odabiri koje je po putu morate donositi. Sjetite se Barbierijevog romana o Dioklecijanu. Hermetičan i neprohodan, nije učinio ono što je trebao – popularizirao cara. Drugi romani nisu, međutim, uopće napisani na tu temu, pa je time ovaj Brabierijev još važniji.

Zatim sijedi odabir redatelja, glumaca... tko će ga glumiti? Netko tko mu je fizički sličan? Ili ćemo to zanemariti i staviti

series about Croatian history? Are the problem great expenses that follow such production as a whole?

*It's not (only) about the money. There are no more educated people who would start making series and movies to educate others. Our filmmakers approach our history in a cinematic way only through the prism of historical cretinism (as you will see in the series *Mrkomir the First*) because that is the only thing they think they know. Everything more professional is out of their reach – because they know nothing about our history even though they have finished schools like you and me. Thus, there is a dominance of ignorance and no desire to learn.*

For those movie lovers who are not so familiar with the whole procedure required to make one film, let's say I want to make a feature film or a mini-series about Emperor Diocletian, what do I need except, of course, finances?

Call our colleague Domagoj Burić and ask him how far he has come with his Diocletian, whom he has been preparing for several years now. 😊

You have to start reading the abundance of sources and literature to understand who this Roman emperor, who is so important to us, in fact was. It is one of the most important people in our history in general – and for us it is still the main tourist attraction of Split in a cheap costume. Then you should go into writing the script. Who will write this for you, a good screenwriter or a good historian? These are all choices that you have to make along the way. Think back to Barbieri's novel about Diocletian. It was hermetic and impassable, and did not do what it was supposed to do – popularize the emperor. Other novels, however, have not been written on this subject at all, so this one by Brabieri is even more important.

Gorana Navojca? Toliko je mjesta za pogreške... Slijedi zatim scenografsko-kostimografska izrada Dioklecijanovog svijeta. Vladao je iz Nikomedije, bio je dulje u Egiptu nego u Rimu da bi se na posljetku umirovio u palači pored Salone. Što odabirete od toga? Što scenarij traži? Kako to prikazujete? Vizualno atraktivno ili nekad, čak, ispodprosječno, ali arheološki precizno? Što je, konačno, ono filmski zanimljivo (a nije nužno povijesno) u njegovom životu? Osobno bih savjetovao da se film fokusira ili na njegov egipatski pohod (koji stoljećima kasnije ulazi u arapske priče i legende) ili na sam kraj njegovog života kad ga preklinju da prekine mirovinu i vrati se na tron (pa ga na kraju vjerojatno još i otruju). Njegov Edikt o cijenama, povijesno i civilizacijski toliko važan – filmski je posve nebitan. Eto, samo smo zagrebli problematiku, a pitanja samo isplivavaju. Konačnog odgovora nema.

Koje su najčešće pogreške koje se nalaze u povijesnim filmovima i filmovima slične tematike?

Nikad nisam ništa imao protiv grešaka u filmovima. Dokle god ih budu radili ljudi, a ne roboti, greške će biti vidljive. I najveća platna imaju greške svojih slikara, najveće opere također mjesta koja su, sada znamo, rezultat neke brzopletosti skladatelja. Najveća greška i ujedno neoprostiva je kad u povijesni film ubacite ideologiju i politiku iz vremena nastanka filma. To je siguran put u propast. Vrijeme to najprije pojede. Pogledajte Seljačku bunu (1975.) Vatroslava Mimice. Film veličanstvenog izgleda u čiji je scenarij ubačena ideologija. Zato je tako strašno loše ostario. Rock-opera Gubec-Beg je toliko svježija. Iako, vjerujem, da bi Matija Gubec, da može i pogleda oboje, pao u nesvijest od užasa – kao Krležin Aretej. Taj mi je

Then you have to deal with the casting of directors, actors...Who will play Diocletian? Someone who is physically similar to him, or should we ignore that and just cast Goran Navojec? There are so many rooms for errors... This is followed by a scenography and costume design of Diocletian's world. He ruled from Nicodemia, was more time in Egypt than in Rome, and finally went to retirement in a palace near Salona. What to choose from that? What does the script want? How would you show it, visually attractive or sometimes below the average but archeologically correct? What, after all, is that which is interesting to put in the film (but is not necessarily historical) about his life? Personally, I would advise the film to focus either on his Egyptian campaign (which centuries later started to involve Arab stories and legends) or on the very end of his life when he was begged to end his retirement and return to the throne (so that in the end he was probably poisoned). His Edict on Maximum Prices, so relevant in the history of civilisation – is completely irrelevant in a film. We just scratched the issue, and the questions just come up. There is no final answer.

What are the most common mistakes in historical films and films of similar themes?

I never had anything against mistakes in films. As long as they are made by people and not robots, mistakes will happen. Even the best painters made mistakes on the greatest canvases; the best composers were hasty in some of the greatest operas. The biggest, and at the same time unforgivable, mistake is when you insert ideology and politics from a certain time in a historical film. That is a sure path into doom because time will eat it up. Just look at Vatroslav Mimica's Anno Domini 1573 (1975) about Matija Gubec's peasant uprising. It is

aspekt uvijek bio interesantan. Kako tzv. povijesna ličnost reagira kad vidi sebe na platnu? To možemo, nažalost, tek istraživati od dvadesetog stoljeća.

Sada nekoliko kratkih, brzopoteznih: koje je Vaše najdraže filmsko razdoblje?

Klasični Hollywood – od tridesetih do šezdesetih te njemački nijemi film dvadesetih.

Zemlja faraona (*Land of the Pharaohs*, 1955.) ili Kleopatra (*Cleopatra*, 1962.)?

Oba! Ne mogu bez nijednog!

Najdulji dan (*The Longest Day*, 1962.) ili Spašavanje vojnika Ryana (*Saving Private Ryan*, 1998.)?

Najdulji dan je veličanstven film, a Ryan je ne baš veličanstvena, loša kopija neinteligentnog scenarija. Ne smiju se stavljati u istu rečenicu. To je svetogrđe.

Redatelji stare generacije poput Johna Forda i Federica Fellinija ili redatelji poput Stevana Spielberga i Martina Scorsesea?

Uvijek tzv. stara generacija (dodajem Orsona Wellesa, Alfreda Hitchcocka i Josepha Mankiewicza) kojoj ćemo ubaciti i Martina Scorsesea i Woodyja Allena. Spielberg je tu drugorazredna pojava prvorazrednog marketinga.

Ramzes II. ili Tutankhamon?

Nisu usporedivi. Prvi je vladao iznimno dugo, drugi iznimno kratko. Prvi je pokazao svu monumentalnost svoje vladavine (i svog karaktera), drugi to nije stigao. Ipak, estetika potonjeg, koja u sebi sažima najbolje od Amarne i otvara novi put egipatskoj umjetnosti – traži da mu se makar u tom aspektu priklonim.

a magnificent-looking film in whose script ideology was inserted. That is why it has aged so terribly badly. The rock opera Gubec-Beg is so much fresher because of that. Although, I believe, that Matija Gubec, if he could look at both of them, would – like Krleža's Aretej – faint with horror. That aspect was always interesting for me. How would a historical figure react upon seeing oneself in something like that? Unfortunately, we can only explore this from the 20th century onwards.

Now a few short quick ones: what is your favorite film era?

Classical Hollywood – from the 1930s to 1960s, and German silent movies from the 1920s.

***Land of the Pharaohs* (1955) or *Cleopatra* (1962)?**

Both! I cannot without them both!

***The Longest Day* (1962) or *Saving Private Ryan* (1998)?**

The Longest Day is a magnificent movie, whereas Ryan is not, it is a bad copy of an unintelligent script. It is sacrilege to put them in the same sentence.

Directors of old generation like John Ford and Federico Fellini or directors like Martin Scorsese and Steven Spielberg?

Always the so called old generation (also Orson Welles, Alfred Hitchcock and Joseph Mankiewicz) to whom I would also add Martin Scorsese and Woody Allen. Spielberg is a second-rate phenomenon of first-class marketing.

Ramesses II or Tutankhamun?

They can't be compared. The first one ruled for an extremely long time, the second

Na koncu ovog razgovora, pitanje kojim se tradicionalno zaključuje Rostrin intervju: što biste savjetovali mladim, ambicioznim kolegama humanističkih i društvenih znanosti koji bi voljeli i željeli da njihov rad bude zamijećen u akademskoj zajednici?

Savjet je da što više čitaju i pišu. To je jedini recept za uspjeh. Prije četrdeset godina nitko normalan to ne bi savjetovao jer se to podrazumijevalo. Danas se više ništa ne podrazumijeva.

one extremely short. The first one showed all the monumentality of his rule (and his character), the second did not have the time for that. However, the aesthetics of the latter, which sums up the best of Amarna and opens a new path to Egyptian art – requires that I at least stand with him in this aspect.

At the end of this interview the question that traditionally concludes all of Rostra's interviews: what advice would you give to young ambitious colleagues in the humanities and social sciences who would like to have their work noticed in the academic community?

The advice is to read and write as much as possible. That is the only recipe for success. Forty years ago, no normal person would have advised this because it was implied. Today, nothing is implied anymore.