

At the end of 1972 the *History of Yugoslavia (Istorija Jugoslavije)*, by Ivan Božić, Sima Ćirković, Milorad Ekmečić and Vladimir Dedijer, was published in Belgrade. Since the second volume of the large *History of the Peoples of Yugoslavia (Istorija naroda Jugoslavije)*, a collective work by Yugoslav historians, had only reached the end of the 18th century, this new publication represented the first post-War attempt at giving the history of the Yugoslav peoples as a whole, up to the creation of socialist Yugoslavia. Its publication is made even more important by the fact that it has recently come out in an English translation.

Public discussion on the *History of Yugoslavia* has shown this attempt at a synthesis to be insufficiently uniform. All the parts that refer to the history of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Moslems, the National Liberation War and the presentation of Croatian history as a whole, particularly with regard to the Yugoslav ideal, have been criticized. Articles in Croatian scholarly journals have shown this presentation of Croatian history cannot be considered fit to enable the reader to understand Croatian history correctly, especially that of the 19th century. Thus the editorial board of *Historijski zbornik* decided to supplement this number of *Historijski zbornik* with an English translation of an evaluation of the *History of Yugoslavia*, by Jaroslav Šidak. This evaluation was first published in the monthly *Naše teme* (Zagreb) 1973, no. 10, pp. 1752-1763, and then, together with notes, in *Historijski zbornik* XXV-XXVI, 1972-73, pp. 521-530.

*The Editorial Board*

S. ĆIRKOVIĆ<sup>1</sup> - I. BOŽIĆ - M. EKMEČIĆ - V. DEDIJER,  
ISTORIJA JUGOSLAVIJE (THE HISTORY OF YUGOSLAVIA), Belgrade 1972,  
595 pages.

A book, which has almost 600 rather large pages and is the fruit of several years of work by four authors, faces the reviewer with a very delicate and in many ways a very thankless task. The purpose of such a review cannot be to correct particular data, although the factual reliability of any text of this kind is an essential precondition, and quite certainly it was a precondition that must have caused all kinds of difficulties for the authors. It demands in the first place a basic familiarity with all the national and regional histories that are under consideration. On such a familiarity depends not only the exactness, but also the choice of data and the perception of their significance in historical development. On this last, of course, the conception of the book as a whole also has a decisive influence. Quite certainly the two volumes of the *History of the Peoples of Yugoslavia (Istorija naroda Jugoslavije)*, already published, which trace the past of the Yugoslav peoples almost to the end of the 18th century, greatly helped the first two authors. The second two, however, who had no such base to start from, were forced to create one by themselves, which they attempted to do on the basis of the many articles and partial attempts at synthesis in recent Yugoslav historical studies. Their work was made even more difficult by the fact that almost two thirds of

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the name of I. Božić appears first in the title of the book, I consider it justifiable, and because of my further argument necessary, to begin the title with the name of S. Ćirković, the author of the section concerned with the earliest period, that is up to the 13th century (pp. 5-68).

the text was allotted to the description of the last two centuries, thus making it necessary to include many more data and much more detail.

As the authors pointed out in their Introduction, they »in closest collaboration determined the volume and character of the book, established the themes, the general conception, the methodology«, and each wrote his text »with the aid of frequent discussions on how to bring into harmony the thematic and methodological approach to certain periods«. Although they allow that there may be other conceptions of the »past of Yugoslavia« besides the one they give, they do not — unfortunately — in their Introduction try to provide a concise and theoretically substantiated account of their own approach. It is true that it could justly be argued that the text itself best shows what that conception is, but it does not directly explain it.

The very title of the book demands explanation, and there is no doubt that in a way it reflects the conception of the whole. Would not the mention of the peoples of Yugoslavia in the title better express the purpose of this synthesis, not only with regard to their centuries-long history, but also to their further development? And while it cannot be said that the authors did not try to cover the history of all our peoples, reading the text carefully we cannot rid ourselves of the impression that they gave their primary attention to the development of Serbian statehood, and that it is the political past of the Serbian people that provides the skeleton of this synthesis, which reaches its peak in the National Liberation War. Such an approach was bound to reflect unfavourably on the history of the other peoples of Yugoslavia, especially on the Croats who, unlike the others, even »Within the Framework of Great Monarchies«, as the second part is called, quite certainly retained certain forms of statehood, albeit of an expressively feudal type. But this could not have been different during the feudal period, and it strongly influenced all later development. Thus the evolution of Croatia, and through it the development of the whole of the Yugoslav state community cannot be correctly understood without it.

In spite of this approach, which permeates the whole text, and in spite even of the closest collaboration among the authors who, even during work, as they state in their introduction, »exchanged comments and contributed to the final formulation of the whole text«, the chapters of each author clearly bear the mark of his personality. The sections by the first two, both distinguished medievalists, are stylistically very close in their desire to provide an objective and exact presentation of past events. Although the chapters concerning recent history differ from those concerning the Middle Ages in the presentation of the material from all its aspects, the endeavours of both these authors to limit themselves to a factual presentation of events and avoid generalizations and subjective evaluations is obvious.

The text by Milorad Ekmečić differs from the rest of the book in many stylistic characteristics, which make it very subjective. It is true that Ekmečić went furthest in an attempt to present all components of historical development, and was not satisfied to give a more or less mechanical list, but in his desire to theoretically generalize his results he too often sacrificed factual history to meditations, interesting though these may be. His evaluations show similar characteristics and sometimes lack any firm basis of fact. The stylistic form in which he expresses himself introduces into a scholarly study certain features more characteristic of literary, non-scholarly texts.

The most considerable part of the book, whose author is Vladimir Dedijer, also differs in overall character from the first two texts, but resembles Ekmečić's text only inasmuch as it too has expressively subjective characteristics. In Dedijer's

case also there is an aspiration towards a complete presentation of all the components of historical occurrences, including economy and culture. He certainly knows how to write vividly and touch deeper chords in the reader, but his work lacks some of the essential characteristics of a scholarly text. His choice of data is often anecdotic and completely insignificant for any understanding of trends of development. His manner of presentation is essentially journalistic and his coverage of the war period is in many places conceived in the form of a memoir.

The above evaluation of the texts might lead us to argue that the authors, in keeping with the purpose of the publisher, consciously tried to make their work accessible to a »wide circle of readers«, even to the »foreign reader« — as they say in the Introduction. However, since they themselves wanted to give a »presentation based on the most recent scholarly research«, the evaluation above cannot be considered unjustified. A synthesis may dispense with analytical procedure and a scholarly apparatus — and that, combined with an overall conception, is what makes it a synthesis — but it must nevertheless be capable of being judged by the standards of scholarly research, and in manner of presentation and in style be understandable by the wider circle of non-experts.

Thus — although it cannot be denied the *History of Yugoslavia* has an overall conception in manner of treatment, style and whole approach to the material, it lacks that relative cohesion which any synthesis, carried out by several experts, necessarily demands.

An important element in these shortcomings would seem to be the disproportionate division of the book. It has four parts, which each in its own manner reflects the basic idea, and also gives the periodization of this uniformly conceived history of the peoples of Yugoslavia. Although the division into periods is essentially the same as usual, the titles the authors gave the parts of the book, to express the contents — and thus also the meaning of historical occurrences — are difficult to harmonize with the true flow of history.<sup>2</sup> We cannot here enter into any detailed consideration of these parts, for this would demand more extensive discussion. But for any real evaluation of the book as a whole the size of the four parts must be mentioned. The second part, which presents the period from the 16th to the 18th century, is the shortest. Unlike the *History of the Peoples of Yugoslavia*, which allotted that period a whole volume of several thousand pages, here this period, incomparably more important and more decisive than medieval history for understanding the further development of the peoples of Yugoslavia until today, is presented in 80 pages only. And even though there may be some arguments in favour of greater space for the third part (19th century), 130 pages, the 230 pages that have been devoted to the last forty years completely disturb any balance in the distribution of the text. There is no doubt that the National Liberation War should have been allotted a fitting amount of text, but it should also have been freed from details of purely memoir importance of the kind in which Dedijer's text abounds, and the account should definitely have been extended until the end of 1945, when the »struggle for social revolution«, mentioned in the title of that part, took its final form.

Cultural history takes up a special part in any historical synthesis. The authors of this book have not neglected it, but each chose data, mainly from the arts and literature, according to his own taste knowledge. In places these data give an impressions of sporadic gleaning from secondary, or even tertiary sources. Unfor-

<sup>2</sup> The titles are the following: 1. The Rise and Fall of Medieval States; 2. Life and Struggles within the Framework of Great Monarchies; 3. The Struggle for National States and a Modern Society; 4. Roads to Unity and the Struggle for Social Revolution.

tunately, the authors did not manage to dovetail the history of culture into the general flow of events. The creation of a single organic whole from the different components of historical development is, in any case, very difficult to achieve, and is often beyond the strength of an individual. Even so, it is difficult to justify the meagre presentation of cultural activities during the Illyrian Movement, when they were all placed in the service of the national idea, and thus created the foundations of modern Croatian culture. A similar example is that of Croatian modern literature at the turn of the century. This book gives no more than passing mention to several names, among which, for instance, we shall search in vain for the name of — Vladimir Nazor (first mentioned in connection with the National Liberation War!).

Taking the book as a whole, written as it was for a wide circle of readers in Yugoslavia and abroad, it is necessary to indicate one more drawback, which sometimes makes it very difficult to find one's bearings in past events. We allude here to the inconsistent and unexplained use of historical names of territories. This criticism applies also to some of the supplementary maps. When describing the early Middle Ages, for instance, the term »Baptized Serbia« is used without further explanation — and with no justification being given — for a state which, as the author says, was »destroyed in the second half of the 10th century« (p. 40). Although Byzantine Dalmatia is mentioned the text does not describe it, and Map 6 (p. 39), under the name of Dalmatia »at the beginning of the 11th century« includes all the territory which did not get that name until the Venetian period in the 17th century and at the beginning of the 18th century. As the name Dalmatia is still used today in the same sense, the unversed reader may easily make the mistake of back-transferring that concept to ancient times, when the hinterland of the Dalmatian towns, i. e. of Byzantine Dalmatia, was occupied by the heartland of the Croatian state. The »Kingdom of Dalmatia and Duklja« at the end of the 11th century, whose centre was »around Lake Skadar«, is also unexplained, which makes the confusion around the concept of Dalmatia even greater. The text mostly mentions »Slovene provinces«. This term must mislead the reader concerning Slovene ethnic characteristics, not only those of Carniola, but also of the German parts of Styria and Carinthia. Attempts at Germanization in modern history were unable markedly to modify the border-line of that compact ethnic region, which had already been in the main established several centuries earlier. In fact, in Austrian history, the concept of »province« did not have any strongly determined regional meaning, but was a political-administrative term, so that in that context also the use of the word is inappropriate. The plural form of »all the Serbian lands« also raises some doubts. As, for instance, Map 6 shows, Bosnia up to the river Vrbas can be included under that name. A different kind of confusion is caused by the inconsistent use of names the Habsburg monarchy. Its official name truly changed during history, but it was never arbitrary or left to chance. In this book it is usually called the Habsburg Empire, or just the Empire, or Austria, even after it became a dual state in 1867. The name Empire has even been written in the text of the ultimatum that Austria-Hungary put before Serbia in 1914 (p. 377)! If we add to that the name »Emperor Francis« (!) for Francis Joseph I, or the use of »*Mađarska*« instead of »*Ugarska*« for Hungary up to 1918, although all Croatian state documents from the 1868 Agreement onwards consistently mention only *Ugarska*«, then such omissions reflect an insufficient familiarity with the meanings that hide behind those names and terms, especially those concerning the nature of statehood.

## II

It is difficult, using scholarly arguments — even if we disregard for the moment recent international developments in Yugoslavia — to justify the fact that so little attention has been paid to the Moslems in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Even if we take into account the difficulties that, as the title of the book demands, would arise from treating not only peoples ethnically Yugoslav, but also other peoples and nationalities on the territory of present-day Yugoslavia, to omit such an important group of the Slav population from any history of Yugoslavia as such, does not contribute to a deeper knowledge of that history, not to a better understanding of the present day.

Although the authors attempted to present the history of the other Yugoslav peoples from all aspects, the conception of the book — as I pointed out at the beginning — placed the main stress on the most developed component of statehood. Thus we may well question whether, and how, the authors managed to include the history of the Croatian people in the presentation of Yugoslav history as a whole. Since from the beginning there was no intention in the present review of entering into all the details of the text, we mainly take into account data in which the concept as the whole is reflected, and also data which are, in the opinion of the reviewer, important for a more complete presentation of Croatian history.

The authors call their presentation of the Middle Ages the »Rise and Fall of Medieval States«. This is a very inappropriate title for the history of the South Slavs from their coming to the fall of some of them under the Turks. Croatian history is here limited to certain basic facts which sometimes lack continuity. Even taking into account the need to economize in space — which, as have already said, is in any case not well distributed — we can still find no justification for the fact that, for instance in the political history of the 12th to the 15th century, space could be found only for the reign of the Bribir princes about 1300, and that during the period of Croatian rulers (until 1102) internal developments, especially cultural development, except for the glagolism, are hardly mentioned. If the reign of Croatian rulers over Byzantine Dalmatia, up to Dimitrije Zvonimir at the end of the 11th century, is reduced only to »temporary reign over particular towns« (p. 41), without even extending that possibility to Tomislav — all of which could be the subject of a more serious scholarly discussion — Byzantine Dalmatia cannot simply be jettisoned from Croatian history as if there had been no closer links between them. All later development quite clearly showed that political separation did not isolate the Dalmatian towns from their Croatian hinterland and that their internal development, demographic, economic and artistic, showed them to be inalienably part of Croatian history. Unfortunately, even where there is written testimony which excludes any doubt of this — we are thinking here of Croatian 16th century writers, from Marulić onwards — this book only mentions the »abundant flowering of Dalmatian literature« (p. 133), and individual writers are only located according to their birthplace.

The accession of the Hungarian Arpads kings to the Croatian throne is not shown here as the result of an agreement between states — over which there are still conflicting opinions — but it is quite correctly stated that in Croatia »independent state development continued in forms of state administration, legality and historical tradition« (p. 47). This fact, however, does not come sufficiently to expression in the further text. Croatian 12th century history is drowned in the history of Hungary. Such a conclusion is inevitable from the formulation ac-

ording to which Croatia in 1102 »became part of Hungary« (p. 44), and her »life as an independent state« took place »within the framework of Hungary« (p. 47). This is also reflected on the maps, where Croatian is, as a rule, not even shown. Thus the reader can never know that Croatia was the only land within the »lands of the crown of St. Stephen« which retained some of the essential characteristics of a state — from a border with Hungary, through an Diet and her own army, to a separate executive authority (the *Herceg* or *Ban*).

Social conflict in Croatian lands, including those in Dalmatian communes, and the development of the Croatian village, are given a purely peripheral place. I think that here too the *History of the Peoples of Yugoslavia* was much more consistent and full. This is so also in the case of Dubrovnik, which is, it is true, mentioned often, but not until p. 98 are any facts given about its internal life, and especially its economic development.

The existence of the Cyrillic script in Croatian lands is limited to the statement that it was a »type of diplomatic minuscule« (p. 84), and there is no attempt to explain this interesting phenomenon more closely. Also, the Pcljica Statute, written in that »Croatian script« (*»arvacko pismo«*), as Cyrillic is called in it, is not mentioned in the book, although it is one of the most important legal historical documents in the Slav south.

The scant space accorded to the period from the 16th to the 18th century has already been mentioned as one of the greatest shortcomings of the whole book. Basic events important for a proper understanding of Croatian feudal statehood have not been completely bypassed, but the essential context of Croatian history in that period comes to insufficient expression, and it was that context that determined all its future development until today. The Turkish invasion broke up Croatian ethnic unity and the Croatian 16th and 17th century diaspora left behind it traces that could not be erased. The lightly generalized statement that »before Osmanli pressure the Croatian people retreated to the west and north, to return to lands wrested from the Sultan after Christian victories« (p. 113) is incorrect. Except for the so-called second colonization of the Istrian peninsula in the 17th century, which determined its present-day ethnic composition, and which is not mentioned in this book at all, those migrations caused great and permanent losses in ethnic continuity and greatly decreased the number of Croats. The Military Frontier, whose formation is most closely connected with these changes, is also not shown here with that clearness and exactness which characterise the chapters concerning it in the *History of the Peoples of Yugoslavia II*. Even the details about its settlement do not give a correct idea of the changes that took place there. Nor can it be stated that the soldiers in the region of the Border were mainly Serbs« (p. 113), and a little later on write, with awkward stylization, that the Catholics »in Slavonia made up one third of the population, and in Croatia over one half« (p. 159), nor does the statement that the »Serbian borderers were the enemies of the nobility, who wanted to turn them into serfs« (p. 166) correspond with reliably established fact. Of course, there were various kinds of conflict, which is understandable, but, except for the question of the Bishop's tithe, which was most at issue, the main problem was whether the Borderers would accept inclusion as warriors, and not as serfs, in the existing hierarchal system of Croatia. This can best be seen in the, here bypassed, »Vlach Law« of the Croatian Diet of 1629, according to which »Vlach sons« »if they [...] join the state of their own free will«, must be freed from forced labour and »not be considered serfs«.

It is surprising that greater attention is not paid to the frequent common resistance of serfs on the estates of Croatian nobles and the neighbouring borderers, and also to the common resistance of borderers, regardless of faith, against pressure from above, The so-called 1755 Severin Revolt of the borderers is only

briefly mentioned, although its importance can best be seen from the sentence passed by the royal commission, according to which sixty out of a hundred borderers were Catholics. The serf's revolt, which broke out in 1755 on the initiative of those same borderers and which, because of the impetus it gained, for the first time made the authorities play a more decisive role in production relations in the Croatian village, is left out completely, as is also the great 17th century revolt in the Posavina region. If, finally, we take into account the fact that the greatest Croatian peasant revolt, that of 1573, is described in a truly pale manner in this book, and that, except for the change in the name of Gubec, which is entered as a footnote, none of the most recent results concerning the development of feudal dues and the deeper causes of the revolt have been made use of, we can only conclude that social development and struggles, so important for Croatian lands in those days, have been, to put it mildly, neglected.

In the presentation of cultural development there are three names of Croats that mean something within the constellation of European culture of their day. These are: Matija Vlačić (Flacius), Julije Klović (Clovio) and Andrija Medulić. In this book they are not even mentioned. The basic ideas of Juraj Križanić, incorrectly called an older contemporary of I. Gundulić (p. 193), have not been faithfully recorded, and his chief work, the first of its kind among the South Slavs, has not been mentioned at all. Nor has Vitezović's importance for the further development of Croatian national culture and for the birth of 19th century national ideologies been fittingly presented. Unlike the »citizen of Trogir« Lučić, who is mentioned directly after him, Vitezović of Senj is, exceptionally, mentioned as a »Croatian writer« (p. 193). Baltazar Adam Krčelić has also been left out, although his *Annuae* do not deserve to be bypassed.

Decisive for any understanding of the most recent decades in the development of the Yugoslav peoples, from the fall of the Monarchy in 1918 until today, is a correct understanding of the process by which they became modern nations in the 19th century. This is a period that was allotted enough space in the book and the author of this section — in spite of various incorrect details — gave what is on the whole an interesting and in many ways original presentation. The Croatian component in it however, is not satisfactory for several reasons.

There is no doubt that religion played a decisive role in constituting the Croatian and Serbian nations and that, as the author says, to a certain extent religion became the »touchstone of nation in the Serbo-Croatian region« (p. 235). This statement should, of course, be extended to the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Moslems — which the author does not do.

However, he further states: »not only did the religious background of the modern Yugoslav intelligentsia hinder integration into a single society on the basis of a community of language, but religion throughout the whole 19th century provided a framework for separate communities« (p. 199). Thus generalized, this does not correspond to what actually happened. As can be seen from the further text, the above statement refers only to the Serbs and Croats, for whom the author used two different standards. According to him, Karadžić's view that all those who speak the *štokavski* dialect are Serbs, regardless of religion, »pushed the ideology of the Serbs strongly towards the European west, across the traditional borders of the Orthodox religion« (p. 237). This »language basis in the ideology of the Serbs«, from Dositej Obradović onwards, the author in every case obviously considers progressive, although — in the final analysis — he is conscious of its historical incorrectness. »The language formula of unity«, he concludes his speculations on this point, »was not realistic enough, and at moments necessarily became an academic prejudice which, in later decades, was many times to

become the source of evil because on each side a name was imposed upon whole regions, which the people living in the region did not acknowledge as their own« (p. 244). This conclusion is completely correct, but it does not square with the author's treatment of details. Any attempt, ideological or political, to achieve the national unity of Serbs and Croats — even of Moslems in Bosnia and Herzegovina — to be achieved under the Serbian name the author seems to consider to be understandable in itself. But he vehemently condemns the Croatian Party of Right which, in his words, »tried to constitute a pure Croatian nation, outside the Yugoslav framework« (p. 311), although it was aiming at the same goal, only under the name Croat. The author finds justification for this inconsistency in the supposition that the Party of Right was a »consistent Catholic movement« (p. 311), backing this with one argument only, the religious position of E. Kvaternik. He did not take into account that in 1864 Kvaternik had in mind also the »Croatian system in reserve« which would, in the case of the final fall of his great-Croatian idea, save the Slav nature of the Croats »if necessary« even under the name Serb.<sup>3</sup> The author's approach breaks down in particular on the main ideologist of the Party of Right — A. Starčević.

In correspondence with the author's previously quoted conclusion, we should expect him to present the Illyrian Movement with special care, because it was the only one which consistently advocated the Yugoslav idea, but unfortunately he did not do so.

It is true that it was a mistake of the Illyrian Movement to consider that a single literary language was essential for all the South Slavs, and it was especially a mistake to try to unite them all under a name that was not alive among the people. One explanation of the first may be that for the Croats, speakers of the *kajkavski* dialect, it meant giving up their whole literary tradition. The second grew out of the very realistic awareness that no community of the South Slavs, whatever form it might take, could be achieved under any of the »genealogical« names, nor by their negation. The Vojvodina Serbs, however, whose national consciousness was more developed, and especially Vuk Karadžić, opposed that awareness believing that a South Slav community, whatever its size, could be achieved by exclusive use of the name Serb. Their basic supposition, which had no foundation in fact, but certainly left its mark upon the author, was that the name Croat was unknown among »the *štokavski*-speaking Catholics, who were in time integrated into the Croatian nation« (p. 242). In 1836, at the very beginning of the Illyrian Movement, Karadžić claimed that those *štokavski*-speaking people, even against their will, had no alternative than to call themselves Serbs, because otherwise they would have no national name.<sup>4</sup> On the contrary, in 1842 the creator of the term »Slavo-Serbs of the Catholic religion« P. J. Šafařík himself, claimed that the »national name of the Croats greatly exceeded the boundaries which are allocated to the Croatian (i. e. *kajkavski*; J. Š.) dialect«<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> E. Kvaternik, *Promemorija princu Jérômeu Napoléoneu*, translated and with introduction by Dr. Franjo Bučar, Zagreb 1936, pp. 64/65.

<sup>4</sup> Vuk S. Karadžić, *Srbi svi i svuda. Kovčezić za istoriju, jezik i običaje Srba sva tri zakona I* (Serbs All and Everywhere. A Case for the History, Language and Customs of the Serbs of all Three Laws I) Vienna 1849, p. 6.

<sup>5</sup> »Jméno národní Chorvatův daleko za meze, od nás nářečí chorvatskému vytčené zasahuje [...]« P. J. Šafařík, *Slovanský národopis*, 4th edition. Prague 1955, p. 69. In another place (p. 61) Šafařík states as a known fact that the »Western branches, which belong to the Roman Catholic Church, do not use the name Serb« (*vědomot' že západní, k římsko-katolické církvi se přiznávající větve jména Srb neužívají* [...])« Šafařík entered this last fact only in the second edition of work, 1849.



For a correct evaluation of the role of Catholicism in the process of constituting the Croatian nation it is certainly decisive that, except for some isolated and fruitless attempts, clericalism had no basis among the Croats as a cultural and political movement, and the Catholic clergy, from the Illyrians to the followers of Strossmayer, were to a great extent among the main champions of the Yugoslav idea among the Croats. Even Mihovil Pavlinović, stressing Catholicism as one of the essential characteristics of Croatism, remained consistent in his tolerant treatment of Orthodoxy and the idea of a wide community of South Slavs as their final goal. It seems that in this case the author generalized from the specific case of the Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where the clergy really did play an important role in the constituting of the nation, although there too that process was finally successfully terminated by the peasant movement of the Radić brothers.

The same tendency to generalize is apparent in the author's treatment of political development in Croatia after the abolition of feudalism in 1848. He alleges that there was a »submissive mentality«, and adds to this »insufficient democratic examples from the entire earlier history« and »the constant basing of national goals on historical rights and the past« as the »main source« of party »doctrines« (p. 303). He even denies that there were any »popular risings« among the Croats, except those existing in the — language of historians.<sup>6</sup> Was the constant unrest in Croatian villages, from the great peasant revolt of 1573 to movements on the eve of the 1848 revolution the result of »a submissive mentality«, and were not all those revolts in themselves very stirring »democratic examples«? The statement about historical rights as the »main source« of political parties is also not correct, in spite of the fact that it truly had great importance in constituting the Croatian nation. The Illyrian *Manifesto of the Croato-Slavonian People*, with which the Diet addressed itself to the world in 1848, in the first place stressed the natural right of a people, and even the ideological creators of the Party of Right did not exclusively use historical right as a starting point. In 1889 Starčević, on the eve of his death, confessed to the principles of the French Revolution and extolled the rule of the Convent,<sup>7</sup> and even Kvaternik, who in fact provided the Party of Right with its historical base, did not deny to the natural right precedence over the historical right.

The 1848 Manifesto, which was written by Ivan Mažuranić, together with the *Demands of the People of March 25* and Article XI of the Croatian Diet were certainly the most consistently thought out and expressed programme of the Illyrian Movement, but unfortunately the author did not give them any attention at all. However, without an analysis of those texts — short though it might be — that movement of national revival cannot be understood. Instead of trying to justify the negative attitude of the Serbian public towards it by an alleged lack of trust »in the activities of the Illyrians who were fighting for the national language, but talking German in their homes« (p. 242) — an obvious example of the author's quickness to generalize! — and of uncritically taking in the supposition of the alleged »great influence of Austria, especially Catholicism« on the Illyrians, what should in the first place have been clearly separated was »literary« Illyrism and political »Croatism«, something the Illyrians themselves consistently

<sup>6</sup> It is not clear just what the author has in mind when he mentions both »opposition« political parties and those »which historians called popular risings« (p. 303). In Croatian historiography the latter is used for events in which the broad national masses in the town and village took part, for instance in 1883 and 1903. It is decidedly not used for any opposition parties or their activities.

<sup>7</sup> A. Starčević, *Ustavi Francezke* (French Constitutions), Zagreb 1889.

did. And during the 1848 revolution the policy of the Illyrians should especially have been given the place that befits its importance. The reader learns nothing definite about the »long-term programme of reformation of the Empire on a federal basis« (p. 251), which is contained in Article XI already mentioned. That programme was the most progressive of all similar programmes of the time because it started from the linguo-ethnic principle and, in harmony with it, conceived the unity of the South Slavs in the frame of the Monarchy on the same basis. The programme of federalization within the Monarchy, thus conceived in conditions which were not yet mature enough for any better solution, was supported by the most progressive politicians of the time, not only Croats but also Serbs from Vojvodina and Slovenes. To connect this with the »struggles of South Slav conservative forces« (p. 254) is to sacrifice historical truth to unscholarly motives.<sup>8</sup>

On top of all that has been said already about the third part of the *History of Yugoslavia* we must add Croatian history after the 1848 revolution is misrepresented and incorrect in many details. Such important events as the activities of the Diet in 1861, the Croatian-Hungarian Agreement in 1868 and the so-called Yugoslav Congress in 1870<sup>9</sup> are very cursorily or incompletely presented. We must be sorry that readers of this book will get a very distorted impression of Croatian 19th century development. It is a distortion all the more difficult to explain as Croatian historians during the last two decades have managed to provide reliable foundations for a good and complete presentation of that period.<sup>10</sup>

The 20th century, which is given in the fourth part of the book, also shows insufficient acquaintance with Croatian history. This part is very truly uneven. It does contain some good observations, but there are also incredible mistakes, culminating in the statement that it was the National Council of the State of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes — and not the Croatian Diet — that broke off, on October 29, 1918, the centuries-long statal links between Croatia and Austria and Hungary (p. 402). Mistakes of this type, insignificant only at first glance, prove that the position of Croatia within the Monarchy is not at all clear to the author.

Since the text of this part, as was already pointed out at the beginning, is journalistic, the most absurd allegations can be found in it. For example the statement that »there are elements of the ancient Bogumil beliefs in Radić's behaviour« (p. 432)! — the author speaks of a »bogumil interpretation of history« (451)! — or that in which the author explains Frank's »hatred of the Serbs« by

<sup>8</sup> That incorrect opinion about the negative relationship of the so-called »left wing« of the Illyrians (the nationals) to the question of the federalization of Austria was brought into Croatian historiography by V. Bogdanov, *Društvene i političke borbe u Hrvatskoj 1848/49* (Social and Political Struggles in Croatia 1848/49), Zagreb 1949.

<sup>9</sup> According to the author (p. 282), the preparatory gathering in Sisak was attended only by Croatian politicians from the civil Croatia which, as he said, wanted to unite Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia »so that they could enter into a real union with Hungary as a federation«. But Slovene politicians also took part in the meeting. It was in fact called because of them, and Mrazović, the »soul of the preparations«, at that time opposed the idea of a real union with Hungary. Compare on this V. Ciliga, *Narodna stranka i južnoslavensko pitanje (1866—70)* (The National Party and the Question of the South Slavs), HZ XVII, 1964, pp. 108-111.

<sup>10</sup> The results of that work are entered in the *Povijest hrvatskog naroda 1860-1914* (History of the Croatian People 1860-1914), Zagreb 1968, written by J. Šidak, M. Gross, I. Karaman and D. Šepić, and which M. Ekmečić himself reviewed in the *Jugoslavenski istorijski časopis* 1969, no. 3, as a »stable basis for further scholarly research and evaluation« (p. 88).

his »non-Croatian origins« (p. 371), i.e. his Judaism! Very different from the interestingly presented data about the economy of old Yugoslavia is the presentation of cultural creativity among the Croats, which consists of names picked at random and in which the rich work of Miroslav Krleža, describing his »intimate friends« among Party leaders (p. 452) and some data of a memoir nature, are given in a few empty words.

The extensive description of the National Libetration War, which in many ways awakes our interest as the interesting testimony of a participant, but not a scholar, is chiefly limited to the main partizan forces and their fights. Events in Croatia are mentioned only sporadically, although they in many ways had a decisive influence on the whole course of the Revolution.

\*

The *History of Yugoslavia* was not written only for the Yugoslav public. It has, so it is said, already been translated into English, and the English translation will very probably soon appear to the world book market. This review is no recommendation for such publicity. On the contrary, although it cannot be considered complete — for a detailed evaluation would itself become book-size — nevertheless it contains many arguments which, as far as Croatian history is concerned, already make a new revised supplemented edition essential. It is, of course, an open question whether this is possible, bearing in mind the overall conception and the way the various parts have been treated. In any case, the *History of Yugoslavia* has proved that the complete history of the Yugoslav peoples cannot be written without the collaboration, in some form, of experts whose scholarly work allows them to produce well substantiated judgements about the history of their people. The same is, of course, true of the presentation of the National Liberation War. In choice of advisers the publisher did not decide on such a course, nor did the authors, it seems, consider help of that type desirable. We must hope — and that is the only thing left to us — that any new attempt at such a synthesis, in the interests of scientific truth and of our common life, will build into its foundations the lessons which many of the faults of the *History of Yugoslavia* teach us.

(Translated by *Nikolina Jovanović*)

*Jaroslav Šidak*

H I S T O R I J S K I  
Z B O R N I K

Redakcioni odbor

*IVAN KAMPUŠ  
BERNARD STULLI  
JAROSLAV ŠIDAK*

*Glavni i odgovorni urednik:*

*JAROSLAV ŠIDAK*

IZDAJE  
SAVEZ POVIJESNIH DRUŠTAVA HRVATSKE