

## BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA MANIPULATED BY THE SERBIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY\*

Muhidin Pelesić

Univerzitet u Sarajevu – Institut za historiju  
muhidin.pelesic@iis.unsa.ba

### **The Dream of Affirming Bosnian historiography**

Two decades after the end of the Second World War, it was possible to give a “review in the form of a summary paper on the state of historiography in Bosnia and Herzegovina.”<sup>1</sup> Esad Pašalić reminded us of an earlier misconception that there are no traces of the oldest human settlements in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Thanks to the visible efforts of the staff in the National Museum, today the New Stone Age (Neolithic) has been scientifically examined to such an extent that this period for the territory of Yugoslavia can be considered the most fully researched in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Pašalić

\* This article was published in “Contributions” No. 29, Sarajevo: Institute for history, 2000, page 367-404.

<sup>1</sup> *Pregled istoriografskog rada u Bosni i Hercegovini od 1945. godine do danas*, Sarajevo, december 1966, 56. (copy in the author’s archive. Hereinafter: *Pregled istoriografskog rada ...*) “A group of historians from Sarajevo participated in writing this review according to the intentions of the Commission for History of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Council for Scientific Work of the Socialist Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.” The following are engaged: Esad Pašalić, “Prilog o istoriografiji predslovenskog perioda Bosne i Hercegovine” (3-12); Anto Babić – Desanka Kovačević, “Prilog o istoriografiji srednjevjekovne Bosne i Hercegovine” (12-20); Branislav Đurđev, “Prilog o istoriografiji perioda ilirske vladavine u Bosni i Hercegovini” (20-26); Nedim Filipović, “Neke primjedbe o izučavanju perioda turske vladavine u Bosni i Hercegovini” (26-36); Milorad Ekmečić – Hamdija Kapidžić – Ferdo Hauptman, “Prilog o istoriografiji novog vijeka Bosne i Hercegovine” (36-42); Nikola Babić, “Prilog o istoriografiji radničkog pokreta i narodne revolucije u Bosni i Hercegovini” (43-52).

warned that Yugoslavia and Bosnia and Herzegovina did not have a history of the “pre-Slavic era”. At the same time, he warned of a “critical situation” regarding the education of young people for the research of prehistory and antiquity, “given our current system of schooling in high schools.”<sup>2</sup>

Anto Babić and Desanka Kovačević stated that “the medieval history of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in relation to the periods that preceded it and that followed it, was greatly neglected, and, secondly, that the Bosnian Middle Ages as a topic of research and development previously attracted more attention from those scholars who worked outside the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina than from domestic historians, whether experts or amateurs.” Babić and Kovačević, considering the achievements of historiography in Bosnia and Herzegovina until 1941, stated that greater success was achieved in preparatory research and individual studies, than in general conclusions and broader syntheses. The most valuable result of scientific activity from the end of the 19th century until 1941 was, according to these authors, “an extensive fund of data that can serve as a scientific heritage and basis” for the development of historiography. Although from 1945 until the time of writing their text, the focus of historiographical research was set on the recent period of Bosnia and Herzegovina (with a special focus on the history of the labour movement), Babić and Kovačević stated: “in many ways more favorable opportunities have been created than they have ever been in the past.”<sup>3</sup>

Branislav Đurđev reminded that the scientific research of Bosnia and Herzegovina under Turkish rule “has its own tradition” even before the First World War. “The fund of Turkish sources (is) better preserved in Bosnia and Herzegovina than in any other republic in our country”, Đurđev mentioned and continued “that there were experts in Bosnia and Herzegovina who could work on Turkish sources.” Therefore, historiography was significantly better when it came to the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina,

---

<sup>2</sup> *Pregled istorijskog rada*, 5-12. Pašalić, like some of his colleagues, was concerned about the complete abolition of classical grammar schools, which rather “darkened the prospects for the development of work” on ancient and medieval history, *Pregled istoriografskog rada*, 20.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 16-17.

than in the case of the history of “other Yugoslav republics at that time.” Đurđev considered it important to recall the fact that, between the two world wars, an attempt was made to make Belgrade a centre of scientific research of the Ottoman period of South Slavic history. At that time, the Serbian Academy of Sciences tried to initiate the systematic publication of Ottoman historical sources. However, according to Đurđev, “that work had neither a respectable program nor a plan.”

After the Second World War, the research of the Ottoman period, as Đurđev says, “made great progress.” In 1950, the Oriental Institute was founded in Sarajevo. The systematic collection and purchase of Ottoman material in the country and microfilming that from abroad have been intensified. As early as the mid-1960s, the Oriental Institute had a huge fund of Ottoman archival documentation relating to Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Vojvodina, Slavonia, and Montenegro. Đurđev then expressed dissatisfaction with the fact that “the research for the publication and the publication of that material lags far behind in comparison with the work on the collection.” In his opinion, the historiography of the time did not investigate a number of problems whose solution involved a serious historical synthesis of Bosnia and Herzegovina “under Turkish rule”. In addition, Đurđev warned that the historical and ethnic problems of Bosnia and Herzegovina during the Ottoman rule remained beyond the reach of science. He saw a good solution, given the circumstances at the time, in the establishment of a center for historical sciences at the Academy of Sciences and Arts of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which should coordinate work on the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina.<sup>4</sup>

Nedim Filipović located the main weakness of the previous research of the Ottoman period in Bosnia and Herzegovina “in that the issues of that period were treated almost exclusively from the point of view of the development of the Turkish state and its institutions, and the history of social development of that state was neglected.” This is, after all, the case with the examination of the history of Turkish rule in our other republics.<sup>5</sup> Filipović

---

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 20-26.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

was very angry with the fact that “the question of social superstructures, primarily the question of spiritual structure, was simplified (...) and reduced to the ideological-religious antithesis of Oriental-Islamic and European-Christian culture.” At the same time, both factors of that antithesis remained insufficiently examined and insufficiently illuminated.<sup>6</sup>

Ekmečić, Kapidžić and Hauptman underlined the lack of a large number of extensive and scientific syntheses for the history of the recent period of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In their opinion, “the chain of valuable monographs in most cases is composed of doctoral dissertations.”<sup>7</sup> There were no organized endeavors and teamwork on the history of “recent times of Bosnia and Herzegovina”. Several such attempts have failed “on the simple fact that there are always more plans than scholars to accomplish them.”<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 28. In the continuation of his article, Filipović talks about the prejudices transmitted “in modern times in a large part of our society” as an almost a priori view that everything that belongs to the heritage of Oriental-Islamic civilization is directly alien to our national culture and cannot be integrated into the heritage fund of our socialist spiritual culture. It is probable that this first source of the said prejudice had a considerable influence on the fact that in our educational institutions and in the circle of personal study of our people little work was done on scientific study and acquisition of systematically constructed knowledge about the development of Oriental-Islamic civilization and its achievements (as is the case in developed capitalist and socialist countries). This state of affairs goes so far as to appear under a double light: as an anachronism of our time and as a kind of primordial ignorance of that civilization. As a result, our history of literature and art has neglected the examination of the Oriental-Islamic heritage in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In our opinion, we should systematically study the creation of our people in oriental languages, critically illuminate those works and accept what has real aesthetic and thought value as an expression of our creative spirit in the field of Oriental-Islamic civilization, which means that this creation should not be left out the fund of our civilization as part of world civilization. *Ibid.*, 28-29.

<sup>7</sup> The authors of this article considered that the guilt for this was equally individual and general: “an individual is not stimulated enough for this type of work, and the tradition of scientific work in Bosnia and Herzegovina draws him to work on small things.” Bosnia has never had a scientific school built in Yugoslav historiography, and this historical shortcoming is being overcome with effort. At the same time, it should be noted that there are few people engaged in scientific work in Sarajevo. They are also repeatedly engaged in teaching, and the financial effect of their scientific work disengages them more than it engages them in serious endeavors. *Ibid.*, 40

<sup>8</sup> The state of historiography in B&H will, as the three professors write, “be somewhat improved” when the Department of History of the Sarajevo Faculty of Philosophy “fills its staff with new young people who need to be trained for serious scientific work.” Accordingly, all other scientific institutions should boldly renew their successors, not taking into account how purposeful their

There was a lack of discussions on the history of Bosnian society. Topics such as the history of the “birth of national consciousness” were completely bypassed. In most cases, this issue has been addressed by politicians, “but their contributions do not have the character of a legal and authoritative scientific endeavor. It is mostly a matter of ideology”, reminded the mentioned three authors. The public, business organizations, and even publishing companies showed little interest in historiographical works.<sup>9</sup>

Nikola Babić complained that “more extensive and complex works from the political, economic and cultural history of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which could serve as a general framework for research into the development of the movement, are very (...) rare.”<sup>10</sup>

Conclusions and proposals<sup>11</sup> were formulated in anticipation of “consideration and discussion of the most important problems” of historiography and the hope that “this material will be useful in making final positions and finding solutions.”<sup>12</sup> The first conclusion warned: “The history of Bosnia and Herzegovina, taken as a whole, has not been examined and studied as required by historical science, with special regard to the need to exa-

---

cooperation in teaching will be. There can never be too many scholars, and real talents never grow up in scarce space and in small numbers. But, apparently, they did not agree on whether the institute would be linked to the history department of the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo, or, perhaps, within the integrated institute for the labour movement and oriental studies. Imaginary institute “could be connected to the newly established Academy of Sciences and Arts of Bosnia and Herzegovina.” *Ibid.*, 40-41.

<sup>9</sup>The signatories of this proposal advocated that Bosnian publishing companies form “special departments” that would be “exclusively interested in historiography”. They believed that editions “based on a commercial basis” would help historiography. An example was found in the Belgrade publishing company “Prosveta”. *Ibid.*, 42.

<sup>10</sup>According to the same author, “those rare are the works in which, within the treatment of certain phases or certain problems from the national history of this period, the development, place and role of the working class are followed.” *Ibid.*, 44-45.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, 52-56.

<sup>12</sup>Since the collaborators, who wrote *Pregled istoriografskog rada*, “did not start from the same principles and points of view”, two editors (Dr. Esad Pašalić and Dr. Milorad Ekmečić) were in charge of drawing conclusions with proposals. They did so “leaving (...) the original formulations in each of the individual proposals.” *Ibid.*, 1-2.

mine all periods and domains in their connection and continuity.” Of all the republics of Yugoslavia, Bosnia and Herzegovina is certainly in last or penultimate place in this respect, although in some cases it has richer source material and a more diverse history (specifics in antiquity, religious diversity and dynamism in the Middle Ages, pronounced peculiarities in Turkish rule, belated development of capitalism, peasant uprisings in the 19th century, more direct influences of the foreign policy of the great powers, the main territorial stronghold of the National Liberation War, etc.).

Although, according to the authors of the review, “real serious scientific work in the field of the history begins only in 1945”, it was still not available and also did not meet the needs of “real science and broad education”. It was stated that historiography has evolved in proportion to the formation of new institutions (the University, institutes, Scientific Society, Society of Historians, State Archives). At the same time, the spontaneity in the formation and development of these institutions promised the consequences of such an approach: “fragmentation of institutions, individual work, absence of major collective interventions, exclusive orientation to the national history as well as the recent history of BiH, a disorder in general documentation and archives, unorganized approach to publishing monographs”. The mentioned shortcomings and inadequate working conditions in historiography have contributed to the reduced interest in historical science and more thorough interventions in it. In the mid-1960s, Bosnia and Herzegovina did not have a sufficient number of qualified historians, and the same people carried out several organizational and research tasks. The lack of money was mentioned as a major obstacle to the steady rejuvenation of the historiographical profession in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The impermissible state of younger historians has put them in a position “to work in fragments, neglecting broader ideological and theoretical studies, and to prepare the important syntheses.” The low salaries of Bosnian historians have forced them into a tedious race to earn extra money on inadequate jobs. The profession of historian has been gripped by “running away to jobs that pay faster and better.” The whole course of the disorderly state of historical science in

Bosnia and Herzegovina was supplemented by the understanding of local authorities and public opinion that historiographical work “represents a second-class intellectual work and that anyone can do it.”<sup>13</sup>

### **A walk through the torments of the history of the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina**

The proposals that were then formulated “in order to alleviate and eliminate these shortcomings”<sup>14</sup> globally marked the chronology of events in Bosnian historiography until the end of the 20th century. At the beginning of the same month (December 6, 1966) in which the *Pregled istorijskog rada* was completed, at a meeting of historians of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the idea of realizing the project *History of the Peoples and Nationalities of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Istorija naroda i narodnosti Bosne i Hercegovine)* was presented. This project was adopted in 1968 at the Academy of Sciences and Arts of Bosnia and Herzegovina (ANUBiH).<sup>15</sup> According to some

---

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 52-54.

<sup>14</sup> Quality financial support for historical sciences was sought, as well as study stays of historians in the country and abroad, “which has so far represented a significant shortcoming of our personnel policy.” It was necessary to “discuss and clarify” the issue of forming a “complex historical institute” and “consider the role of the Academy of Sciences and Arts of BiH in taking over the organization and directing scientific research in the field of history.” The question of determining the place and importance of higher education in the formation of new generations of historians was raised. The regulations at the time and the lack of money made it impossible for the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo to organize a postgraduate study of history. A more coherent plan for publishing historical material is missing. A serious problem of high schools, especially grammar schools, has arisen, in which “education in the field of history and social disciplines has been reduced to a minimum, which is reflected in further education at higher education institutions.” In addition to the research of national history, “work on the study of certain domains and problems” from world history was also proposed. The “basic task” of historiography in Bosnia and Herzegovina was the question of considering “more comprehensive scientific syntheses about certain periods and areas” of history. At the same time, “scientific critique” had to be “developed”, especially in scientific publications where, in addition to questioning “factual material”, methodological issues and the general theoretical basis of published papers had to be considered. *Ibid.*, 54-56.

<sup>15</sup> *Prilozi za istoriju Bosne i Hercegovine I. Društvo i privreda srednjovjekovne bosanske države* (Hereinafter: *Prilozi za istoriju Bosne i Hercegovine ...*), Special edition, vol. LXXIX, Department of social sciences, vol. 17, Sarajevo: Academy of Sciences and Arts of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1987, 5.

long-published works, ANUBiH was supposed to realize the project from March 1968 to 1975, and its finalization was considered to be the completion of five volumes (?), with 500 pages each.<sup>16</sup> The Oriental Institute and the Institute for the History of the Labour Movement included in their plans the topics from the project that were to be realized by their researchers.<sup>17</sup>

By a significant coincidence, on December 6, 1966, at a meeting of historians from Belgrade and the Board of Directors of the Serbian Literary Co-operative (SKZ), an elaboration of the history of the Serbian people was envisaged “to be an ordinary multi-volume work of synthetic character”. The study was “accepted in principle and placed in the basis of the project for writing the *History of the Serbian people (Istorija srpskog naroda)*.”<sup>18</sup> At one

<sup>16</sup> Šaćir Filandra, *Bošnjačka politika u XX. stoljeću*, Sarajevo: Sejtarija, 1998, 281. A philosopher by formal education (considers himself a Hegelian), fascinated by the importance of politics, being its ambitious researcher (even to the dangerous edge over which the more experienced and more meaningful than him often turn into a whirlwind of temptation, more or less discreet, practicing this the ancient skill of achieving power), Dr. Filandra, however, did not know enough about the diversity and abundance of factography that could help him (re) construct his variation on the topic he observes. If he had known about the archives, which he managed to miss, then his fuller knowledge of this problem would have resulted in a more relevant conclusion. Thus, readers are left with hope in the author’s readiness to make corrections and useful additions to the new edition of the book and, of course, the possibility of using the offered argumentation.

<sup>17</sup> *Prilozi za istoriju Bosne i Hercegovine I*, 5.

<sup>18</sup> The last version of the study was completed in 1971. Discussions and agreements in the SKZ confirmed the understanding, highlighted in the study, “that the history of the Serbian people must overcome the thematic one-sidedness of traditional views of history, in which the policy of the area had full priority.” With the Marxist orientation of our historiography and changes in the interest of the modern world in history, the problems of economic and social development are inextricably linked with all forms of life and creativity. The earlier idea of twelve was reduced to six books. Hiring a wide range of specialists enabled, according to the Editorial Board, “the realization and faster production of *History*”, but, on the other hand, the homogeneity of the work, the unique style and proportions of a number of chapters were reduced. SKZ organized research in archives and libraries in the country and abroad. “Thousands of pages of archival material collected” were supposed to represent “a fund of documents, which will serve in further research works and improvement of the *History of the Serbian people*”. *Istorija srpskog naroda, Prva knjiga. Od najstarijih vremena do Maričke bitke (1371)* (Hereinafter: *Istorija srpskog naroda, Prva knjiga...*), Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga, 1981, V-VIII.

It could hardly have occurred to any of the authors of the *History of the Serbian People* that, relatively soon, the time would come when they would need, not only “improvement”, but the writing



time, it seemed that ANUBiH and SKZ, each with its own paths, would happily bring their scientific caravans to their final destinations. But the Bosnian luggage was too heavy. In vain the party-state sacks were full of money.

The Fifth Congress of Yugoslav Historians (Ohrid, 1969) reflected with its theme (*Ethnic and National Processes in Our Country*) the great interest, of different energy and intensity, in the “national question of Bosnian Muslims”. Despite the different approaches and attitudes of the participants, “through the discussion it was undoubtedly established that Muslims represent one national specificity...” There was an opinion that a special scientific meeting should be organized on this issue.<sup>19</sup>

Four years after that, Bosnian historiography was far from stable. Ideas have already been heard that a more adequately set “Institute (for history, cit. M. P.) organizes work on the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina.” They

---

of a new history under that title.

<sup>19</sup>The basic guidelines for the Congress were given by Dr. Avdo Sućeska's paper on the “historical basis of the peculiarities of Bosnian Muslims” which traced “the path of Bosniak national themes to Yugoslav historiography as legitimate issues and areas of research ...”. But that path quickly turned into difficult trail. According to the almost inaccessible archives of the League of Communists of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bosnian politicians were aware in mid-1971 that “neither the history nor the culture nor the customs of a people in Bosnia and Herzegovina have been adequately covered in our textbooks.”

At the same time, Bosniak intellectuals, including historians, warned that “in the textbooks, Muslims do not have a realistic basis for recognizing and identifying with their own culture.” High school textbooks in national disciplines “were not written according to the programs of Bosnia and Herzegovina”, so “Muslims” faced the pressure of expecting a possible nationalization of Serbs and Croats. The presented data, on the example of textbooks for primary schools from the first to the fourth grade, show a “representation of Muslims of 2%, representation of Croats 7%, representation of Serbs 62% ... In the names representation is 4% Muslim, 7% Croat and 52% Serb.” By disclosing the data that most of the textbooks “are imported according to the Belgrade and Zagreb programs and according to the teacher who teaches a specific course”, an attempt was made to alert the politicians to the damage done to the culture and history of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Š. Filandra, *Bošnjačka politika*, 234-235, 316-325.

Two and a half decades after the end of World War II, the Yugoslav communist leadership “recognized” the right of Bosniaks to call themselves “Muslims” as a nation. Until the “Muslims” were recognized as a nation, Bosnia and Herzegovina was considered the hinterland of Serbia and Croatia. Wolfgang Hopken, “Jugoslovenski komunisti i bosanski Muslimani”, in: *Književna revija*, Sarajevo, maj 1990, no. 32, 7.

indirectly signaled that it was too much work for the ANUBiH. Prominent Sarajevo historian Dr. Branislav Đurđev, just before his retirement, complained to colleagues that his department had abolished the subjects: Turkish language and the History of the Middle East and thus cut its roots. He claimed that the Department of History “as a scientific institution generally exists; it exists as a set of scholars, the vast majority of whom are quite adequate, but it does not exist as an organization.” The Department of History of the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo missed in the early 1970s an ideal opportunity for a thorough affirmation within the Yugoslav framework and an additional impetus for the systematic research of this segment of Bosnian history. Several departments of history from other Yugoslav universities were interested in sending candidates to Sarajevo for postgraduate studies “in the history of the Yugoslav people under Turkish rule”. It was accepted by consensus that in Sarajevo “there really is a wide source base and the strongest scientific forces for studying Oriental studies and the history of the Yugoslav people under Turkish rule.” Although the decision on postgraduate studies at the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo was made two years earlier (data on these events were presented in 1973 – op. cit. M. P.) the professors of the Department of History did not do the program. Some of their younger colleagues could only express regret and disappointment over the serious failure of their professors.<sup>20</sup>

In the year that was supposed to mark the end of writing the History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina (*Istorija naroda Bosne i Hercegovine*), ANUBiH came up with the idea of organizing meetings of historians engaged in this project. The meetings (November 19 and December 8, 1975) served to discuss “the problems of ethnic development in Bosnia and Herzegovina”. Several dozen published pages of articles (discussions)

---

<sup>20</sup> “Discussion: Razvoj i programski zadaci Instituta za historiju u Sarajevu”, in: *Opredjeljenja*, Sarajevo, October 1973, no. 4, 129, 131, 139. A contribution to the reconstruction of the then generational relations within the organization of Bosnian historians is a critique of Mr. Iljas Hadžibegović, addressed to his professors Dr. Branislav Đurđev, Dr. Milan Vasić and Dr. Nedim Filipović. Only Dr. Đurđev tried to explain that due to the expected retirement he could not agree to “take all the weight of the organization” of postgraduate studies, including “compiling the program”.

were, until then, the only reliable, public and textual trace of the mentioned History.<sup>21</sup>

The question is how many engaged authors and collaborators then remembered, albeit fragmentarily, the conclusions reached seven years earlier. The President of the *Commission for the History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Dr. Branislav Đurđev, reminded, at the end of March 1969, of the earlier conclusion “to develop a thematic program for processing the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina* by July 15 this year at the latest.”<sup>22</sup> In addition, he recalled the previously adopted *Synopsis* and the *Work Plan of the Commission for the History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*.<sup>23</sup> The Commission undertook the obligation to implement the project *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina* in six (6) books. To that end, subcommittee (editorial offices) were formed for each of the six books.<sup>24</sup>

The deadlines for the completion of four books of the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina* were to be: 1971 (first book); 1973 (second book) and 1974 (third and fourth books). Work plans and deadlines for the completion of the fifth and sixth book were to be determined after with the Institute of History. The committee was to cooperate with the Oriental Institute, the Institute for the History of the Labour Movement / Historical

<sup>21</sup> “Discussion: Problemi etničkog razvitka u Bosni i Hercegovini”, u: *Prilozi*, Sarajevo: Institut za historiju, Sarajevo, 1975–1975, vol. XI–XII, no. 11–12, 261–342.

<sup>22</sup> ANUBiH, Document no.: 505/69, Sarajevo 26. 3. 1969. In the mentioned thematic program the conceptual and technical elements of the courses needed to be worked out as well as methodology, staffing opportunities, work phase and processing deadlines. *Istorija naroda Bosne i Hercegovine*.

<sup>23</sup> ANUBiH, Attachments to document no. 505/69.

<sup>24</sup> ANUBiH, *Plan rada Komisije za Istoriju naroda Bosne i Hercegovine* (Hereinafter: *Plan rada Komisije...*). Attachment to the document no. 505/69, 1-2. The subcommittee were formed for: 1) the Middle Ages (head. academician Anto Babić); 2) Turkish period until the end of 17th century (head. Member of ANUBiH, Nedim Filipović); 3) Turkish period, 18th and 19th century (head. prof. dr. Avdo Sućeska); 4) Period of Austro-Hungarian rule (head, prof. dr. Hamdija Kapidžić); 5) Period 1918–1941 (head. Nedim Sarač) and 6) Period of The NLS and the Revoluton (head. Nikola Babić). Prof. dr. Milorad Ekmečić was meant to be a consultant to the third and fifth subcommittee. Among members of the sixth subcommittee were Veselin Đuretić i Zdravko Antičić, and Prof. Dr. Desanka Kovačević was involved in the activities of the first subcommittee.

Institute (transformation was underway), the Department of History at the Faculty of Philosophy, the Department of History of Law at the Faculty of Law and the Faculty of Political Sciences in Sarajevo. It was envisaged that in the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, first-class attention would be paid to the history of the country and the problems of the development of the people. According to the idea of Dr. Đurđev's committee, special attention should have been paid to the issue of "economic, social (emphasized in the text – cit. M. P.) and cultural" history of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina.<sup>25</sup>

In early March 1974, even the most optimistic ones began to feel uneasy about the state of the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina* project. The deaths of the heads of the two subcommittees, Ante Babić and Hamdija Kapidžić, caused serious problems in their replacement. The situation was aggravated by the resignation of academician Branislav Đurđev and his resignation from the position of president of the Committee for the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Alojz Benac reminded that there is a "great moral responsibility" of the authors engaged in the *History* project, which was given great publicity. Manuscript submission deadlines have been extended several times. In Benac's opinion, "it is primarily a matter of the prestige of the experts engaged in the execution of this task to set themselves so that the production of *History* will be their main task." Benac noted a serious omission ("a unified conception of the work has not yet been made") and a lack of coordination among authors who "do their parts quite independently".

Those present managed to agree: that the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina* will have the "character of a synthetic history", and that the approximate deadline "for the production of the entire work is the end of 1975." They unanimously demanded that Branislav Đurđev lead the

---

<sup>25</sup> ANUBiH, *Plan rada Komisije*, 2. The financing of the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina* is provided with money from the Fund for Scientific Work of ANUBiH and the Republic Fund for Scientific Work. Each subcommittee (editorial office) signed a separate contract with the project financiers.

Committee for the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina* again. On the other hand, the authors and collaborators were made clear that there would be enough money for the project.<sup>26</sup>

The chronology of events was, at times, marked by the efforts of certain authors of *History* to exercise their “right of precedence” in the treatment of certain topics, to the detriment of other interested and also competent authors.<sup>27</sup> At one meeting, Nedim Filipović almost cried out: “We don’t know who has already done what.” Optimistically hoping for the completion of parts of *History* by 1974, Branislav Đurđev considered that “it is of fundamental importance to explain how Bosnia and Herzegovina became a common homeland that connects its peoples. It is necessary to determine the framework within which the Muslim people originated and developed.”<sup>28</sup> The plans of some historians obviously did not imply their actual participation and assistance in the realization of the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Thus, soon after this attempt by ANUBiH to “push” the realization of the *History* project, Prof. Dr. Milorad Ekmečić requested “that he not be invited to meetings of the Committee and subcommittees in the future.”<sup>29</sup>

Attempts were also made to further discipline the participants in the *History* project with the use of the authority of the League of Communists of Bosnia and Herzegovina (SK BiH). Thus, on June 25, 1974, the active members of the CK SK ANUBiH organized the meeting of all members of the League of Communists who worked on the project *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, or were in institutions that could help its completi-

---

<sup>26</sup> ANUBiH, *Zapisnik sa zajedničke sjednice Izvršnog odbora Predsjedništva Akademije i Komisije za istoriju naroda BiH, održane 7. marta 1974. godine u prostorijama Akademije*, 1-4.

<sup>27</sup> ANUBiH, *Zapisnik sa sastanka III potkomisije u Komisiji za istoriju, održane 15. marta 1974. godine u prostorijama Akademije*, 1.

<sup>28</sup> ANUBiH, *Zapisnik sa sastanka II potkomisije u Komisiji za istoriju, održane 7. marta 1974. godine u prostorijama Akademije*, 1-4.

<sup>29</sup> ANUBiH, *Zapisnik sa sastanka sarajevskih istoričara koji se bave proučavanjem austrougarskog perioda bosansko-hercegovačke istorije, održanog 17. aprila 1974. u 12 sati u prostorijama Akademije*, 1.

on. The *Reminder for Discussion (Podsjetnik za diskusiju)* presents the view that busy work, “sometimes even unnecessary”, prevents most of the associates from being more fully engaged in writing the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*. There was also a kind of indirect threat that “certain Bosnian-Herzegovinian historians do not see this task as their obligation.” In order to avoid confusion, a directive was finally issued according to which historians “must fulfil” the previously accepted obligations.<sup>30</sup>

Although the meeting was not characterized as successful, after it, the work on the *History* “came to life considerably”. A year later, project collaborators were told that the deadline for submitting texts was the end of 1976. That deadline, after several previous prolongations, should not have been exceeded, because it was “the matter of honour of the historian of Bosnia and Herzegovina”, said academician Branislav Đurđev.<sup>31</sup> But there was no shortage of new problems. The head of the third subcommittee resigned and severed all ties with the *History* project.<sup>32</sup> At this moment, the authors asked: “Are we capable of such a condensed, synthetic presentation, not

<sup>30</sup> ANUBiH, Aktiv SK članova Akademije. Sarajevo 17. VI 1974. god. *Poziv na sastanak*, Prilog: *Podsjetnik za diskusiju*, 1-3.

<sup>31</sup> ANUBiH, Branislav Đurđev, *Uvodna riječ na skupu istoričara 2. jula 1975. god.* (Hereinafter: *Uvodna riječ...*), 1. Academician Đurđev again accepted the duty of the President of the Committee for the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, provided that “he is not responsible for organizational affairs, since it is a matter of subcommittees.” ANUBiH, *Zapisnik sa sastanka saradnika na izradi Istorije naroda Bosne i Hercegovine održanog 2. jula 1975. godine u prostorijama Akademije* (Hereinafter: *Zapisnik... 2. jula 1975. godine...*), 4.

<sup>32</sup> ANUBiH, *Uvodna riječ*, 1. It was about the resignation of prof. Dr. Avdo Sućeska. This act caused a new division of work among those already engaged and an attempt to include new associates. But, in that way another gap was inadvertently opened through which the opponents of the *History* project could enter. Despite his refusal to participate in the project, they again called for the cooperation of Milorad Ekmečić. Yugoslav and Bosnian-oriented scholars, gathered around the fading project of the *History of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, had not yet (clearly enough?) recognized the anti-Bosnian orientation that increasingly influenced Ekmečić's engagement. ANUBiH elected prof. Dr. Rado Petrović for the head of the III subcommittee. See: ANUBiH, *Zapisnik sa sjednice III potkomisije u Komisiji za istoriju naroda Bosne i Hercegovine, održane 28. aprila 1975. godine*, 1-2; ANUBiH, Document no. 07-355, Sarajevo 27. V 1975; *Zapisnik sa sastanka III potkomisije u Komisiji za istoriju, održanog 27. oktobra 1975. godine u prostorijama Akademije*, 1-2; *Zapisnik sa zajedničke sjednice II i III potkomisije u Komisiji za istoriju naroda BiH, održane 16. januara 1976. god. u prostorijama Akademije*, 1-2.

only given our personal abilities, but also because we do not have enough pre-work for it?” *The history of the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina* should have expressed three projected goals: to be read, to be a necessary manual and to solve as well as initiate, key scientific problems in the history of BiH. At the same time, as if the work was just beginning, the shortcomings of the project were recorded, and criticized.

One of them was omitting political history. Finally, the conscience of some engaged researchers spoke, who became aware of the side road they found themselves on: “True, we write primarily the history of peoples, society and culture (...) but we cannot reduce the history of the state only to sociological and legal side.” Only then is rejected the “argument” that, allegedly, the history of the country in the pre-Slavic period and the political history of Bosnia and Herzegovina were “treated and presented separately, so that it is not necessary to go into those areas.” There was no place for cultural history at all in the draft of the second book. “The third book does not even introduce the strengthening of Bosniakism among Muslims in that period, nor does it introduce the appearance of awakening of national consciousness among Serbs and Croats at the end of that period”,<sup>33</sup> and all in a vicious circle of awareness of time leaking through the wreckage of unfinished business. A guest from Belgrade, academician Vasa Čubrilović, also attended the whirlwind of problems at the meeting of associates engaged in the History project, held on July 2, 1975. This old conspiratorial sage did not approve of solving such a complicated problem with his proposal “that the *History of Bosnia* should be treated as the history of the *country*”<sup>34</sup> (underlined in the document – op. cit. M. P.).

#### The Committee for the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*

<sup>33</sup> ANUBiH, Branislav Đurđev, *Uvodna riječ*, 10-11. Academician Đurđev appealed to his colleagues that although “certain periods in the history of the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina have been insufficiently examined, so a synthetic approach on a solid basis cannot be given without a deeper investment in the study of material, it would not be good if that moment made it impossible to complete the work on time.” Branislav Đurđev, *Uvodna riječ*, 12.

<sup>34</sup> ANUBiH, *Zapisnik... 2. jula 1975. godine*, 3.

tried with all its power to direct the authors and collaborators towards the finalization of the project. The authors of the texts were informed that in terms of the spatial determinant, “all the territory that belonged to Bosnia at that time will be included, but so that the focus will be on the territory and people of Bosnia and Herzegovina within today’s borders. However, it was important not to neglect the discussion of evicted Bosnians and their share in cultural, political and social life (Bosnians at the Porte, Bosnian merchants in Belgrade, etc.)”<sup>35</sup> It took eight years from the adoption of the project for the authors to finally “agree” on the mentioned issue.

The project management and the political structure of the Socialist Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina summed up all the forms of persuasion used so far to persuade the authors and collaborators to complete the work they had accepted with significant financial and other benefits. The threat by the party authority and the reference to the needs of the people for a complete history of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with a reminder of the duty of historians to complete it, gave limited results for some authors. Others were already doing their job and sticking, according to their abilities, to the agreed rules and deadlines. However, some ignored almost all constructive initiatives. There is one more means left – money, bait and coercion at the same time. The Republican Community for Scientific Work, as the financier of the project, decided, as part of the extended financing of the project in 1976 and 1979, to reduce the requested amount of money.<sup>36</sup> According to the reactions in the subcommittees of *History*, at that time the authors were promised that, after the manuscript was handed over, they would be rewarded with an increased percentage of the advance payment paid. In this way, the authors were signaled to hurry with the completion of the work while there was still money to be paid. Some of the junior associates claimed to their subcommittees that they would be able to fulfil the-

---

<sup>35</sup> ANUBiH, Document no. 07-17/76-2, Sarajevo 10. 11. 1976. Prilog: Uputstvo saradnicima na izradi teksta Istorije naroda Bosne i Hercegovine, 1.

<sup>36</sup> ANUBiH, Document dated: 21. X 1975, Prilog: Informacija o uključivanju suradnika i radnika na izradi III knjige Istorije i o finansijskoj situaciji, 3.



ir obligations under the *History* project only after the completion of their doctoral dissertations. A number of their senior colleagues continued to refrain from declaring a deadline for completing their work. Thus, it could be heard that one “presupposes”, the other “cannot see it more precisely”, the third “will try their best”, etc.<sup>37</sup>

The twilight of the *History* project took place, paradoxically at first glance, at a time that was still conducive to its successful realization. Bosnia and Herzegovina’s policy was inclined to affirm the uniqueness of its Republic, its significance and potential, which, in the end, contributed to the legitimization of the then party-state leadership at the local and national (Yugoslav) level. The discussion on history teaching at the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo, held in late 1978 and early 1979, presented the position of official communist policy that “the way in which the history of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina has been studied so far is generally unsatisfactory” and that “the point is that the study of the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina is the basic central task of the Department and the Faculty of Philosophy.” The fiercest opponent of the introduction of a special course of history of Bosnia and Herzegovina was Milorad Ekmečić. However, at the time, his and similar views were “scientifically and politically powerless”. The discussion was pointed out by the conclusion on the existence of the necessary conditions for the introduction of a new subject, noting that the basic task of the Department of History is “teaching and studying the history of the people of BiH.” This defeat was compensated by Ekmečić and like-minded people by conspiratorial destruction of ANUBiH’s attempt to finalize the project of the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*. They significantly influenced the challenge and reconceptualization of the project.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> ANUBiH, *Zapisnik sa sjednice IV potkomisije u Komisiji za istoriju naroda Bosne i Hercegovine, održane 17. marta 1976. godine u prostorijama Instituta za istoriju*, 1-3.

<sup>38</sup> “In the Academy (July 1982 – op. cit. M. P.) they do not hide the fact that a number of associates (Ekmečić and others) believe that there is no adequate scientific basis for such endeavors”, although these disputing forces are in favor of publishing part of the work under title “Prilog izučavanju naroda Bosne i Hercegovine” (...) By that ANUBiH politically did not stand behind its own state. Because, for its (ANUBiH – op. cit. M. P.), predominantly Great Serbia-oriented members, who

In the letter from 1985,<sup>39</sup> addressed to the President of ANUBiH, a group of historians tried to talk from afar about the catastrophic failure of the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina* project. Milorad Ekmečić could be satisfied with the capitulation, from the previously well-shaken historiography of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Academy of Sciences of BiH. In his personal part of the letter, Ekmečić emphasized the issues he gave priority to in future research. These are, among others: demographic research of the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina from the end of the 15th century to 1918 (in the explanation of the nomination of the topic, Ekmečić wrote: “Everything we have so far in this regard is extremely unreliable, and in many cases it is conscious nurtured mythology”); the agrarian question before 1878; peasant uprisings in the 18th and 19th centuries (Ekmečić determined the price and form of his calculated political and manipulative advance wrapped in the thesis: “There are also uprisings of the Muslim population, but most of them

dominated and managed it, the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina itself was disputable, so they did not want to write a history of what does not exist according to them (...) Bosnian communist leadership tolerated such a situation because it did not have such a degree of agreement in its own ranks that it could be imposed on the Academy with a clear position. Š. Filandra. *Bošnjačka politika*, 288-291, 280-281. These were clear signs of changes that took place in the anti-Bosnia-Herzegovina direction.

<sup>39</sup> The President of ANUBiH, Academician Svetozar Zimonjić, asked Dr. Desanka Kovačević, Dr. Milorad Ekmečić, Dr. Enver Redžić and Dr. Marko Šunjić to present their views “on current issues of historical science”. The four of them jointly wrote the introductory part before, separately, presenting their views.

In the introductory part, they also spoke about the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*: “The failed Project of the History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina, adopted at the end of 1968, is an experience for both historians and the Academy, which should not be repeated. It turned out that the situation in historical science is part of the general situation in society (...) A quarter of a century has passed since the appearance of the second volume of the History of the Peoples of Yugoslavia, which ends in the 18th century, and historians still seek their consent and support in the addresses of political forums to organize work on writing the history of the Yugoslav peoples of the 19th century.

There was no lack of political support in BiH to prepare the history of its peoples, and yet in the last 17 years such relations have been agreed, which have significantly contributed to the fact that the Project has not been realized. History is not only a political science in terms of the subject that is extensively present in its development, but also in terms of the assessments and judgments it reports on events. Often in the works of historians, their political beliefs and national affiliation are unmistakably recognized.”; 1-2. A copy of the letter in the author’s archive.

are associated with the Christian rayah as a form of general agrarian revolution.”); “the problem of Islamization” (Ekmečić estimates his interest in this topic: “Here, too, science has remained burdened with political ideology”); he could not avoid the fascination with the policy of “creating artificial nations in BiH between 1878 and 1918”; he lobbied for attention to the history of genocide and the suffering of the population (because, as he claimed, “Bosnia and Herzegovina was the homeland of genocide in both world wars and this fact should be worked on persistently and in the long run”).<sup>40</sup> In order to prevent the autonomous operation of institutions that brought together Bosnian historians, Ekmečić, labelling the achievements of historiography in Bosnia and Herzegovina as unreliable, sought to fortify his own contribution as a pseudo-scholar, but in fact a politician of Greater Serbism. The race for the complete domination of Ekmečić’s group of Great Serbia beliefs over the historical guild in Bosnia and Herzegovina gained momentum.

The *Preface to the publication* of the first book of *Prilozi za istoriju Bosne i Hercegovine*<sup>41</sup> is more than interesting. Justifying the failure, the representatives of ANUBiH claimed in 1987 that the initiative from almost two decades ago should have had “as an aim” (sic!) to “write a synthetic history of Bosnia and Herzegovina.” A kind of “pearl” of that lament represents reasoning: “... and, as it happens in our other scientific research on a global scale, the ultimate possible goal – the synthetic history of Bosnia and Herzegovina – has remained out of real reach.” It was indirectly acknowledged that “a certain number of authors, although significantly small” fulfilled their obligations. A claim was even presented, according to which the Editorial Board “accepted for publication papers that met the set criteria and requirements.”<sup>42</sup> That was far from the truth.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 3-6.

<sup>41</sup> *Prilozi za istoriju Bosne i Hercegovine I*, 5-6. In 1983, the Presidency of ANUBiH closed the project *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, with the intention of publishing part of the received works in the Academy’s publications. Š. Filandra, *Bošnjačka politika*, 281.

<sup>42</sup> *Prilozi za istoriju Bosne i Hercegovine I*, 5-6.

<sup>43</sup> ANUBiH, III Subcommittee for the History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Review written by Dr. Mustafa Imamović on November 2, 1976 for the text, Article III of the Subcommittee

Six hundred and sixty-six (666) pages printed in two books<sup>44</sup> remain to testify to the fiasco of the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina* project. It was a gain that Greater Serbia intellectuals caught in flight. The hesitation, opportunism and disunity of pro-Bosnian scholars conditioned the formation of space for the expansion of the Greater Serbia challengers to the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Led by Ekmečić, the “Greater Serbs” used this as a significant expansion of the basis for continuation of destroying Bosnia and Herzegovina’s content. Manipulating and modifying the facts became their method in order to eliminate the very thought of the authenticity of the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Their position in Bosnia and Herzegovina was significantly strengthened in the form of an ever-widening bridgehead by the emergence of the *History of the Serbian people (Istorija srpskog naroda)*.

### **Forcing Bosnia with the History of the Serbian People and Other Historiographical Diversions**

A look at the maps in the first book of the *History of the Serbian People*<sup>45</sup> points to the conclusion that the members of the editorial board for historical maps have not evolved significantly in relation to the works of Mihailo Dinić.<sup>46</sup> Sima Ćirković, who in his works and performances differed significantly from the aggressive current of Serbian historians, opposed the opinion “which is still present today, that Bosnia was a neighboring area of

---

and Secretary of the Committee for the History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Dr. Muhamed Hadžijahić, *Obrazovanost kod Muslimana*, ends with the following statement: “In its content, the text of Dr. Muhamed Hadžijahić on education among Muslims, is a real refreshment that will significantly enrich the presentation of the history of BiH with new and interesting data on issues that have so far been simply silenced in various reviews of history.” It remains unknown for what reason Hadžijahić’s text was not published, after receiving a positive review.

<sup>44</sup> *Prilozi za istoriju Bosne i Hercegovine I*, 264. *Prilozi za istoriju Bosne i Hercegovine II*, Special edition, vol. LXXIX, Department for Social Sciences, vol. 18, Sarajevo: ANUBiH, 1987, 402.

<sup>45</sup> *Istorija srpskog naroda, Prva knjiga*, (see historical maps).

<sup>46</sup> Mihailo Dinić, *Srpske zemlje u srednjem veku. Istorijsko-geografske studije*, Prepared by Sima Ćirković, Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga, 1978.

Serbia that was occasionally included in the Serbian state. Bosnia was an area within Serbia...”<sup>47</sup> For Dimitrije Bogdanović, there is no dispute that Hum and Bosnia are “one with other Serbian lands”<sup>48</sup>

When writing about the army of the Bosnian eyalet, Vladimir Stojančević juggles several terms: “Turks”, “Bosnian army”, “Turkish Bosnian army”.<sup>49</sup> This author is not precise enough even when he talks about the status of Serbia in the time of Knez Miloš Obrenović. While in one place he mentions the “political development of Serbian independence”,<sup>50</sup> in another he rationalizes his presentation by mentioning “the parts of the Belgrade pashaluk in which the Serbs had a kind of self-government,”<sup>51</sup> The massive use of the scientifically unfounded name “Belgrade Pashaluk”<sup>52</sup> belongs to the numerous mirages of Serbian historiography.

Radovan Samardžić calls the Muslims of the Bosnian eyalet both Turks<sup>53</sup> and Bosniaks.<sup>54</sup> When he needed it for his story, it was not strange for Samardžić to refer to some “narrative” in order to say what and how he intended.<sup>55</sup> His efforts to “legalize” and multiply the number of “Turkish dignitaries of Serbian origin”<sup>56</sup> are a bit touching. A little impartial research

---

<sup>47</sup> *Istorija srpskog naroda, Prva knjiga*, 162.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 227.

<sup>49</sup> *Istorija srpskog naroda, Peta knjiga, Prvi tom, Od Prvog srpskog ustanka do Berlinskog kongresa 1804–1878*, (Hereinafter: *Istorija srpskog naroda, Peta knjiga, Prvi tom ...*), Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga, 1981, 53, 118.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 218.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 229.

<sup>52</sup> It is possible to prove that this imaginary “Belgrade pashaluk” has something to do with the “treatment” of certain national complexes. “Belgrade pashaluk” is not mentioned in Ottoman documents, because such did not exist in the Ottoman Empire. There was the Smederevo Sanjak, which included Belgrade. Domesticated in the vernacular, the name “Belgrade pashaluk” was accepted in the official correspondence of the Habsburg Empire. Although inaccurate, it later moved from local writings to contemporary historiographical literature, and especially to journalism.

<sup>53</sup> *Istorija srpskog naroda, Četvrta knjiga, Prvi tom, Srbi u XVIII veku* (Hereinafter: *Istorija srpskog naroda, Četvrta knjiga, Prvi tom ...*), Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga, 1986, 432-434 and further.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 447, 451, 453.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 443, 446.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 446.

would show that behind the names of Samardžić's favorites are high-ranking officials of the Ottoman Empire – of Bosniak origin.

Trained in the spirit of solidarity, synchronized in the system of networks of guild, political, interest and other connections, Greater Serbia-oriented historians loudly, praised the goods offered in the *History of the Serbian people*. Ekmečić's inferior student and imitator, Dušan Berić, euphorically claimed in 1988 that no synthesis had been made in the last ten years in which the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina, from the end of the 18th century to 1914, was treated "as a coherent whole". According to Berić, until such a synthesis "is done, the worthiest substitutes for it are certainly those sections from the *History of the Serbian people* that refer to Bosnia and Herzegovina and originate from the pen of M. Ekmečić."<sup>57</sup> Although Ekmečić's texts, published in the *History of the Serbian People*,<sup>58</sup> for experts are boring and outdated statistics of attempts to achieve Serb domination in Bosnia and Herzegovina, they were, as we can see, a reference point for members (I think the use of this term, which usually defines a member of a military or paramilitary formation, is appropriate) of unconditionally militant currents in the formation of Greater Serbian historiography.

During the publishing campaign of the first books of the *History of the Serbian People*, the historiographical guild in Bosnia and Herzegovina was in a kind of turmoil. Scientific conference on the topic of *Post-war development of historiography on Bosnia and Herzegovina (after 1945)*<sup>59</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Dušan Berić, *Bosna i Hercegovina od kraja XVIII veka do 1914. u najnovijoj jugoslovenskoj istoriografiji*, Reprinted from *Zbornik Matice srpske za istoriju*, Novi Sad, 1988, 37, 173. While praising Ekmečić, Berić, like similar representatives of the Greater Serbia intellectual madmen, maliciously rejoiced over the corpse of the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*.

<sup>58</sup> "Srpski narod u Turskoj od sredine XIX veka do 1878", in: *Istorija srpskog naroda, Peta knjiga, Prvi tom*, 447-526; "Društvo, privreda i socijalni nemiri u Bosni i Hercegovini", in: *Istorija srpskog naroda, Šesta knjiga, Prvi tom. Od Berlinskog kongresa do ujedinjenja 1878-1918*. (Hereinafter: *Istorija srpskog naroda, Šesta knjiga, Prvi tom ...*), Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga, 1983, 555-603; "Nacionalni pokret u Bosni i Hercegovini", in: *Istorija srpskog naroda, Šesta knjiga, Prvi tom*, 604-648.

<sup>59</sup> *Savjetovanje o istoriografiji Bosne i Hercegovine (1945-1982)* (Hereinafter: *Savjetovanje o istoriografiji Bosne i Hercegovine ...*), Special edition, vol. LXV, Department for Social Sciences, vol. 12, Sarajevo: ANUBiH, 1983, 181.

was marked by affirmative indicators of the reach of Bosnian historiography, the failure of the project *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina* and deciphering the signs of difficult times.<sup>60</sup> To remind the audience, the fact was presented that, at the XV World Congress of Historians (Bucharest, August 1980), of the five Yugoslav papers in the main program of the Congress, three were from Bosnia and Herzegovina. “It is estimated that this was one of the most successful appearances of Yugoslav historians at world congresses in general.” The history of medieval Bosnia had been studied in Ljubljana, Zagreb, Belgrade, Priština and Novi Sad. Likewise, Soviet, American, Italian, German, and French historians were interested in medieval Bosnia. Significant results were noted in the “study of the cultural heritage of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and especially in the study of the Oriental-Islamic component of that heritage.” Younger, pro-Bosnian historians advocated the continuation and unification of basic research into the last phase of Ottoman and the entire period of Austro-Hungarian rule. They saw their permanent task in the development of team interdisciplinary

---

<sup>60</sup> The consultation was held on 11 and 12 of February 1982 in the premises of the Academy of Sciences of BiH. The co-organizers of this conference were the Society of Historians of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Institute of History in Sarajevo and the Department of Social Sciences of the ANUBiH. According to the intentions of the organizers, “the basis of this conference is the idea of the need to perform an analytical review of the development of historiography in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as an expression of the needs of the entire Yugoslav historiography to determine the real state of affairs in this scientific discipline and to determine further tasks.” Obviously heavy-hearted, the members of the editorial board later had to admit that there were “several cases of discussions failure not only from the scientific-professional point of view, but also from the point of view of social-ideological orientation.” *Savjetovanje o istoriografiji BiH*, 3-4.

Just as the exploitation of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s resources and the status of its economy were largely directed by the interests of the stronger federal units of the SFRY, so, as we can see, this conference on the historiography of Bosnia and Herzegovina was conceived “as an expression of the needs of all Yugoslav historiography.” Simply put, attempts were made in every way to impose custody on Bosnia and Herzegovina as a consequence of a deep-rooted understanding (especially in Belgrade and Zagreb) that Bosnia and Herzegovina could not be “equal” to Serbia or Croatia. Even in the pauses between such efforts from Belgrade and Zagreb, there were many followers in Bosnia and Herzegovina of the policy of hindering the more comprehensive and freer development of this Yugoslav republic.

work. The condition, results, and scientific potential provided a “solid basis” for the synthesis of the period between the two world wars. A certain backwardness of Bosnian historiography, compared to historiography “in other Yugoslav republics”, was observed in the period related to the Second World War. The small number of collections of published sources and, in part, unorganized archival holdings, made it difficult to carry out significant research into the period after the Second World War.<sup>61</sup>

Accepting the positive tones about the achievements of historiography in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Alojz Benac warned “that there is a rather serious shadow over that assessment”. It was about the then state of the project *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Speaking about the difficulties, he mentioned “two main reasons: first, Bosnia and Herzegovina did not have state continuity and, second, three peoples live in it, two of which are native peoples in other republics, while the question of the genesis of the Muslim people is not fully crystallized. (...) If the historians of this republic are not able to make such a synthesis, at least on a smaller scale, I think that this society would not evaluate the work on historiography in Bosnia and Herzegovina quite positively.”<sup>62</sup> Giving his opinion “on the reasons for the failure of the project”, Enver Redžić gave the impression that after 13 years, from the beginning of this initiative, the basic problem “was not in the real scientific possibilities of the planned author team – mostly well-known, distinguished historians – but, above all, in my sense of things, mostly in the lack of belief that, as a scientific unit, this history will meet the requirements of each member of the author team, as well as lack of willingness to finish their parts.”<sup>63</sup> Branislav Đurđev was appalled by the thought “what a danger the strengthening of nationalism in the Marxist movement poses for the development of socialism in the world and in our country and in connection with that (...) the strengthening of nationalist deviations in historiography which

---

<sup>61</sup> *Savjetovanje o istoriografiji BiH*, 25, 31, 37, 53, 65, 76, 84, 113, 119.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 123-124.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 156.



was considered to be Marxist.” He warned that “nationalist aspirations have strengthened in our historiography as well.”<sup>64</sup> A plastic example of a subgenre of Serbian nationalist (para)historians is Dr. Zdravko Antonić. Of modest knowledge, which he compensated with immeasurable ambition, he hid behind the pretended party (SKJ) “orthodoxy” which he caricatured and shamelessly presented to the public. Sensing changes in the political wind rose, this science-lost guest spoke at the conference about his alleged concern for “those works that speak of the destruction of the Serbian population”. Striving to fit into the system into which he threw the bottle with the message, Antonić ideologically tried to “add” to the Ustashas and the Chetniks also the “Muslim urban politics”.<sup>65</sup> He did not have to wait long for the award in the form of a well-situated “advisor” and “organizer” of memoirs of high-ranking officials in Belgrade.

The publication of the encyclopedic chapter *Socialist Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Socijalistička Republika Bosna i Hercegovina)*<sup>66</sup> has

<sup>64</sup> Đurđev warned: “If socialism is filled with nationalism in our country, the Yugoslav socialist community is in question. And in our historiography not only do nationalist deviations in solving historical problems appear quite often, but nationalism is also reflected in the fact that we organize quite easily when we need to work on the histories of individual peoples, but we find it difficult to organize when we need to work on the history of the peoples and nationalities of Yugoslavia. We also struggle a lot about historical topics when it comes to the Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia. Writing the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina* is reflected, in a way, in the same way as writing the *History of the Peoples and Nationalities of Yugoslavia*. It is not the history of one nation.

When it comes to relations between nations, historical science must, above all, be critical and objective. Even the worst historical rifts between nations, with an objective scientific explanation, merge into mutual understanding. When assessing the historical role of its people, critical historical science cannot give any people a reason to be unjustifiably proud and more important than other peoples (...) Today there are historical works, allegedly made from Marxist positions, which in terms of objectivity are lower than many in positivist positions. This supposedly Marxist historiography attacks even relying on positive knowledge and interpretation under the guise of speaking out against positivism. Indeed, historiography which has been considered to be Marxist has been swept away by a romantic nationalist wave.” *Ibid.*, 125.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 156-159.

<sup>66</sup> *Socijalistička Republika Bosna i Hercegovina*, Chapter from II Edition of *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, (Hereinafter: *Separat Socijalistička Republika Bosna i Hercegovina*), Zagreb: Jugoslovenski leksikografski zavod, 1983, 296.

resulted in rather violent reactions among some historians. At the initiative of the Society of Historians of Bosnia and Herzegovina (*Društvo istoričara Bosne i Hercegovine*), on May 29, 1984, a discussion on historiographical texts was organized in the mentioned encyclopedic chapter.<sup>67</sup> From a large number of critically intoned contributions, I single out two: Prof. Dr. Desanka Kovačević Kojić noted that the 1956 edition of the Encyclopedia published a study by academician Ante Babić, *The Medieval Bosnian State (Srednjovjekovna bosanska država)*. She protested because Prof. Marko Vego performed “insertions, as well as some other interventions, which illegally changed the text of Prof. Ante Babić.” As examples of “subsequent insertion of unargued views into Babić’s original text”, Kovačević Kojić stated, among other things: “People are often called Bosniaks (...); it is not said that they were also called Serbs.” Then, she spoke about the modifications and elimination of views on the Bosnian Church, the omission and shortening of parts of the text on the nobility,<sup>68</sup> etc. On the other hand, Dr. Rasim Hurem sharply criticized the contribution of Pero Morača, JNA colonel

---

In the introductory remarks to this section, the editorial board of the Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia for FR Bosnia and Herzegovina explained the reasons for this research endeavour: “The Yugoslav Historiographical Institute and the Editorial Board of the Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia for FR Bosnia and Herzegovina, after agreement with the Council and the Central Editorial Board of the Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia, decided to publish the monographic encyclopedic article *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, published in Book II of the second edition of the Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia (...) No similar work has been written in Bosnia and Herzegovina so far.

There are still no appropriate syntheses about the history or literature of the people of this republic, for which, by the way, there is a great need. Therefore, this special work will also serve as a substitute for such works. It may also serve as a concise template for some larger syntheses.” *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>67</sup> “Istoriografski tekstovi u separatu ‘Bosna i Hercegovina’ – II izdanje Enciklopedije Jugoslavije” (Hereinafter: “Istoriografski tekstovi u separatu”...), u: *Prilozi*, Sarajevo: Institut za istoriju, 1986, XXI/22, 261-312.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 261-262. Miroslav Krleža spoke about the first edition of the Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia as follows: “Its first edition is quite bad, different from the General Encyclopedia, which is mostly good. Ranković’s influence was present in the first edition. Bosnia is a total failure in that encyclopedia. The Bosnian editorial board was a unitarian society, to put it mildly. Muslims are, I must say frankly, completely ignored. At the expense of that editorial office and the texts it prepared, we received countless letters from Muslim intellectuals, but, according to a strict directive, we had to put them all *ad acta*. The whole nation and its culture were then silenced.” Enes Čengić, *Trubač u pustinji duha. S Krležom iz dana u dan (1975–1977)*, Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1990, 75-76.

from Belgrade: "... he does not write about mass Chetnik crimes against Muslims in the autumn and winter of 1942/1942 and later. It remains unclear whether P. Morača by 'mass crimes' against Muslims and the Croatian population means crimes of insurgents (for example, mass crime against the Muslim population of Kulen-Vakuf, September 6–7, 1941, or the crimes of Chetniks (members of Chetnik formations) or, perhaps, the crimes of both. Also, P. Morača does not write about the numerous exiles of Muslims from the countryside to the cities of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which were caused by Chetnik crimes against the Muslim population in the countryside."<sup>69</sup>

Former editor-in-chief (until October 1982) of the editorial board of the Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia for SR Bosnia and Herzegovina, academician Muhamed Filipović, did not attend the mentioned gathering of historians. Filipović's letter to the president of the Scientific Section of the Society of Historians of Bosnia and Herzegovina was not presented to the participants, but was later published with other authorized presentations. Filipović reminded that Desanka Kovačević Kojić (medieval history) and Milo Vasić (period of Ottoman rule) "for reasons known only to them refused to cooperate" in writing the article for the Encyclopedia. The same applied to Nedim Filipović and Avdo Sućeska. In addition, Filipović wrote "that some necessary experts from recent history, too, had refused to work and engage in this project." Filipović explained why the editorial board "decided to entrust the creation of texts to the existing forces that were willing to work. The editorial board decided to take this step for the following reasons: (1) because it is natural for our environment to produce a historiographical account of itself; (2) it is logical to engage the forces that exist, because these forces are capable of this task and because it is logical that the environment gets a picture of itself through this presentation; (3) that it was unacceptable for us to agree to forced immobilization and conscious capitulation to those forces that have suggested to us that we were not capable of it and that we had to agree for more developed environments to write our history

---

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 293.

for us.”<sup>70</sup> A decade and a half later, Academician Filipović left a trace of his vision of that painful episode in a kind of autobiographical essay.<sup>71</sup> In the mid-1980s, a time arose in which “cases of nationalist ‘guerrillaism’ in Yugoslav historiography were not uncommon.”<sup>72</sup>

At the beginning of July 1986, a colloquium was held at the Academy of Sciences of Bosnia and Herzegovina on a detailed project for research in the field of history, named as Social Goal XIII / 2 (*Društveni cilj*, XIII / 2; hereinafter DC XIII / 2). The project, as it was explained at the time, “was made (...) with the broad cooperation of all scientific institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina that work on the advancement of historical science, as well as their historians in our republic and beyond (...) The coordinator

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 311.

<sup>71</sup> “Scientists and writers of Serbian nationality almost all refused to work within the concept we accepted. I think they received a directive from someone not to help the concept and publication that should affirm Bosnia and Herzegovina as a state and as a separate historical and cultural entity. On the other hand, many Muslim writers suffered from fear and were reluctant to collaborate on the project in these circumstances. I must point out here that the late Vaso Čubrilović helped me a lot in overcoming the lack of Serbian authors, which would certainly have been the subject of sharp criticism if it had remained that way, and the Separate appeared despite the obstruction of our Serbian authors (...) After that edition, it was no longer possible to say that the most important things about Bosnia and Herzegovina were not known and thus justify intentional oversight and ignorance. Precisely because of this unexpected success, for everything was planned to ensure failure, I was rudely expelled from the Encyclopaedia (...) Only, everything was already in vain at that time. I wrote an extensive text, in which I taught a lesson to poor historians, who were afraid and did not want to cooperate on the project, and then, according to the directive, suddenly began to find its great flaws (...) Occasionally people from the Bosnian Sarajevo environment fell into these actions, such as Rade Petrović, who were used to ‘prove’ the unfoundedness and harmfulness of some of my views. The most glaring example of such an attack was Petrović’s statement in NIN against my thesis that the peoples that made up the former Yugoslavia had independent historical processes and that they experienced a common history only with the creation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. I knew about these actions, but I also knew that as long as Krleža was alive, and he had a decisive influence in the political leadership of Bosnia and Herzegovina in these matters, simply none of the leading people wanted to resent him and be against his will, and that no one can do anything to me. However, as soon as Krleža died, I knew my days were numbered.” Muhamed Filipović, *Pokušaj jedne duhovne biografije (Pokušaj opisa životnih okolnosti koje su me formirale i uticale na moj duhovni razvoj)*, Sarajevo: Avicena, 1999, 128-129, 135.

<sup>72</sup> Drago Roksanđić, “Savremenost i istorijska svest”, u: *Marksistička misao*, Beograd: Marksistički centar Centralnog komiteta Saveza komunista Srbije, 1985, vol. 2, no. 85, 79.

of this work was in the Institute of History in Sarajevo.” A medium-term (five-year) and long-term work program were established for each thematic area (from the Middle Ages to the so-called period of socialist construction). The medium-term work program envisaged the completion of close to 70 monographs, studies and other scientific contributions. The long-term work program planned “almost all the most important tasks of historical science in Bosnia and Herzegovina for a longer period of time that passes into the XXI century.” Historians from Bosnia and Herzegovina were mostly involved in the medium-term work program. It was expected “that the successful realization of goals and works in the implementation project will have multiple scientific and social significance and application in the field of education, culture, science, especially its individual disciplines such as sociology, law, political science, philosophy, etc.” According to the relations in the scientific community of Bosnia and Herzegovina at the time, ANUBiH was not the organizer of scientific research and “its service (was) limited to monitoring development and making assessments of future needs.” At that time, Milorad Ekmečić especially emphasized that the policy of ANUBiH “is to perform a more moral than organizational role.” According to him, “little use has been made of non-republican human resources. Apart from consultations on research, there are few experts outside Bosnia and Herzegovina related to this research.” In fact, it was about Milorad Ekmečić and Radovan Samardžić realizing how Bosnian historians learned a lesson from the experience with the debacle of the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina* project. By talking about “non-republican human resources” and working on a “Yugoslav basis”,<sup>73</sup> Ekmečić and Samardžić tried, above all, to include as many authors from Serbia as possible in this work and thus keep the DC XIII / 2 project under the control of the Belgrade intellectual “elite”.

---

<sup>73</sup> *Naučno-stručni kolokvij o izvedbenom projektu Društvenog cilja XIII/2. Istraživanja iz oblasti istorije* (Sarajevo. 3. jula 1986), *Stenografske bilješke* (Hereinafter: *Naučno-stručni kolokvij...*), Naučne komunikacije, knj. VI, Odbor za istorijske nauke, Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, 1986, 5, 9, 13-15, 23-24, 35-38, 51.

The scientific conference on migration processes in Bosnia and Herzegovina<sup>74</sup> showed that Greater Serbia's historiographical pressures and attempts by Serbian chauvinist-oriented intellectuals to become the dominant factor over Bosnian science were intensifying. It so happened that the honor of Bosnian historiography was argued and sharply defended by the philosopher prof. Dr. Rasim Muminović. In his speech, mentioning the Yugoslav peoples, Muminović reminded those present that "not all are equally recognized, although they are equally known, at least not in the history of our peoples. Irrefutable proof for this provides the status of Muslims who, despite being the third largest group of people in Yugoslavia, still do not have their own written history (...) This fact of the non-existence of the history of one existing nation makes our historiography an exemplary ideology, because in it appears an entire nation without a homeland, history, and even without a name by which it has been known for centuries in the world (...) Doesn't it follow by logic that someone takes good care of this non-existence of history, or for that the people readily agree to something like that?"

Muminović explained that the reason for his speech was given by some participants in that scientific gathering, "as much as the audacity of some so-called scientists" from Belgrade who omit Muslims because of their hatred towards that people. "Unfortunately", Muminović continued, "this is just one of a plethora of those who influenced Muslims not to have their own written history even today, that is, to emerge in the history of our peoples as a phantom. Of such hatred and deliberate ignorance, only slightly less dangerous is the forgery that was expressed here in some statements, as well as the ideological obfuscation represented here in the speeches of D. Berić and Bulatović (whose name I do not know). As for the latter two, it would be a Sisyphean task to enter into debate with them due to their non-differentiation of

---

<sup>74</sup> *Migracije i Bosna i Hercegovina (Materijali s naučnog skupa Migracioni procesi i Bosna i Hercegovina od ranog srednjeg vijeka do najnovijih dana – njihov uticaj i posljedice na demografska kretanja i promjene u našoj zemlji, održanog u Sarajevu 26. i 27. oktobra 1989. godine)* (Hereinafter: *Migracije i Bosna i Hercegovina...*), Sarajevo: Institut za istoriju u Sarajevu, Institut za proučavanje nacionalnih odnosa Sarajevo, 1990, 671.

the individual from the whole in social phenomena.”<sup>75</sup> Bosnian historians seem to have motivated their lack of a sharp response to the nebulous views of the Greater Serbia assailants by some sort of their own understanding of overwhelming contempt. However, Berić, Bulatović and the like explained this by the lack of courage of pro-Bosnian historians, which led to an increase in the self-confidence of these essentially rude and primitive gangsters in science.

As time went on, some more withdrawn and cautious people from the ranks of Serbian historians appeared on the scene, who consciously maneuvered towards their definitive fit into the Greater Serbia intellectual detachment. Thus, at the scientific conference *Spread of Islam and Islamic Culture in the Bosnian eyelet (Širenje islama i islamske kulture u bosanskom ejaletu)* held on March 7–9, 1991 on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo, academician Milan Vasić failed at Ahmed S. Aličić’s exam. In his brief review of Vasić’s presentation, Aličić (who was not given the opportunity to elaborate on his disagreement because Vasić submitted his paper when the collection was already being processed) stated that “the methodology by which the author approached this topic (*Islamization in Yugoslav countries* – op. cit. M. P.) completely wrong and unscientific. Namely, the author repeats the mistakes of his predecessors, primarily those from the 19th century who used the method of excess, and not the method of process, when considering the issue of the spread of Islam (Islamization) (...) If we continued to approach this issue with the method of Milan Vasić, we would never come to a definitive or approximately definitive solution. With a brief insight into the paper that Vasić submitted to the press, we identified a number of contradictions, and the biggest one is that the author claims that where there was greater resistance to Turkish expansion and power, Islamization was more massive. It is nonsense (...) In this short review, we will also mention that by looking at the literature used by Milan Vasić, we found that none of the works he used belong to the reference literature in this regard. He

---

<sup>75</sup> R. Muminović, *Historija znanosti ili obmana? Migracije i Bosne i Hercegovina*, 587-590. In his presentation, Dr. Muminović focused on the speeches of Dušan Berić and Radomir Bulatović.

did not understand the works of Nedim Filipović on this issue, Inaldžik's claims were unverified and we think they were presented very superficially, and almost all other literature is Islamophobic and is written from the heart and not with a document."<sup>76</sup> Thus, in the case of Milan Vasić, another artificially maintained "greatness" was delegitimized in the open range of demonstrated professional ignorance and tendency towards manipulation of historical factography. This professor of the period of Ottoman rule in the South Slavic countries was remembered by several generations of students as a person who often in lectures, with obvious enjoyment, read Serbian epic poetry, especially the one "about Turks and hajduks", considering it, I guess, useful for the teaching process at the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo. For years, Vasić's irresponsible attitude towards postgraduate studies at the Sarajevo Department of History was well-known, and he assisted Milorad Ekmečić in shifting responsibility to the Bosnian society and authorities.<sup>77</sup>

Considering the topic of aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina and historical science, Academician Enver Redžić testified to the failure of the Academy of Sciences of Bosnia and Herzegovina with the *History of the Peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina*: "Forced to defend itself from aggression, Bosnia and Herzegovina was repeatedly disarmed. The fact that during almost half a century of the Republic's existence, Bosnia and Herzegovina did not receive a scientific synthesis of its history is substantial evidence of the Republic's spiritual self-disarmament and its inability to be historically completed. Bosnia entered the war without a scientific work on its millennial existence! Now, historians could continue to dissect it scientifically (...) The lack of a scientific synthesis of the history of BiH has been confirmed as an objective ally of the destruction of the historical integrity of BiH."<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> Milan Vasić, "Islamizacija u jugoslovenskim zemljama", in: *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju, Naučni skup "Širenje islama i islamska kultura u bosanskom ejaletu"* (Hereinafter: *Naučni skup "Širenje islama"* ...), Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, 1991, 41, 425-441; A. S. Aličić, "Osvrt na izlaganje M. Vasića 'Islamizacija u jugoslovenskim zemljama'", u: *Naučni skup, "Širenje islama"*, 443-444.

<sup>77</sup> *Naučno-stručni kolokvij*, 26-27.

<sup>78</sup> Enver Redžić, "Agresija na Bosnu i Hercegovinu i historijska nauka", in: *Dijalog*, Sarajevo: Centar



## Harambaša Ekmečić and a group of hajduks

When he entered the world of science with the praise of Dr. Hamdija Kapidžić, it seemed that Milorad Ekmečić's career would have an exclusively scientific line.<sup>79</sup> But it was not so. Politics has long ago fatally dragged Ekmečić into the vortex in which he still finds himself today. From his statements, it can be concluded that he spelled the letters of political opinion through the issue of the "Muslim nation". From his traumatic childhood and youth, the decades of obsessive hardships, his understanding of the issue of "Muslims" ended in incurable hatred. Although he once said that he does not do well in politics, "that is, that it looks more like a goose walk on ice", from the previous part of the text, one could learn something about the forms of his political engagement. He couldn't bear to be just an observer. He had to feel what it was like to be an "employee" in politics. He was attracted by the violent energy of the idea that he should do what he could in the endeavor of the old Serbian political guideline of "complete return of Bosnia to the Serbs". In time, from thinking about new borders, he came to the position that he was expected to think: "if there is a division (...) of the borders, there will then be a new internal war. Obviously they (the borders) will go much further west than the mouth of the river Bosna – with at least another million human heads on that altar."<sup>80</sup> It is known that Ekmečić was an irreplaceable advisor and associate of Radovan Karadžić and a constant supporter of Slobodan Milošević.<sup>81</sup>

---

za filozofska istraživanja ANUBiH – Međunarodni centar za mir u Sarajevu, 1998, no. 1, 60, 71.

<sup>79</sup> Dr. Hamdija Kapidžić, "Milorad Ekmečić, Ustanak u Bosni 1875–1878, Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1960, 385", in: *Godišnjak Društva istoričara Bosne i Hercegovine*, Sarajevo, 1962, vol. XIII, 384.

<sup>80</sup> Miloš Jevtić, *Živa reč Milorada Ekmečića*, Gornji Milanovac: Dečje novine, 1990, 66, 71, 74, 132. Ekmečić's interests are indicative in that direction: "As a professional historian, I have always been curious about what an Eastern European intellectual would do if he replaced the university chair with an armchair in his country's government." Milorad Ekmečić, "Savremeni istočnoevropski intelektualac i Makijaveli", in: *Filozofija i društvo 111, Zbornik radova, Dedicated to professor Ljubomir Tadić*, Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu, Institut društvenih nauka, Centar za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju, 1991, 169.

<sup>81</sup> D. Zarić, "Kao svoj sa svojim", *Javnost*, Sarajevo, 2. mart 1991, 2; Vesna Mališić, "Pukla tikva natroje", *Duga*, Beograd, 16–30. 3. 1991, 26–27; Nikola Stojanović, "Imenjake Nikole Stojanovića",

For a long time, Ekmečić was considered “the most influential Bosnian Serb”,<sup>82</sup> and to some he looked like “Dobrica Ćosić’s spiritual brother from Bosnia and Herzegovina.”<sup>83</sup> Ekmečić very much implied the use of military force in achieving the goals of Milošević’s and Karadžić’s policies. This historian who looked like an old bird was simply fascinated by the diverse content of the meaning of military and strategic principles.<sup>84</sup> One expert on such type of intellectuals commented on Ekmečić’s interests in the following words: “... won’t it be that the historian who tells us that the Serbs were never late anywhere, caught himself, together with the writer (Dobrica Ćosić – op. cit. M. P.), not in some civil aporia, but in one unsolvable military contradiction.”<sup>85</sup> When he was convinced that the Serbs had failed to destroy Bosnia and the Bosniaks, Ekmečić allowed himself to say: “Serbian politics today is being forced to recognize independent satellite states in Bosnia and Croatia. It’s as disgusting as swallowing a frog.”<sup>86</sup> Connoisseurs of circumstances, when talking about Bosnians living in Belgrade, place Ekmečić among politicians: “Milorad Ekmečić – Dobrica Ćosić from the left bank of the river Drina – who got an apartment in Belgrade and who appears in the media whenever it is necessary to bring a little national adrenaline to the people.”<sup>87</sup> Some of the Belgrade media, saturated with Ekmečić’s political and entertaining appearances, remind the accessible part of the public that this academic proposed the division of BiH in early 1992.<sup>88</sup> It is clearly suggested that part of the bill for the consequences of the intellectual servicing of Milošević’s and Karadžić’s divisive anti-Bosnian “politics” should be given to Milorad Ekmečić.

---

*Duga*, Beograd, 10–24. 10. 1992, 97; Milan Milošević, “Krojači narodog odela”, *Vreme*, Beograd, 29. 7. 1991, 7.

<sup>82</sup> Mirko Kovač, *Cvjetanje mase*, Sarajevo: Bosanska knjiga, 1997, 111.

<sup>83</sup> Armin Bešlija, “Nevinost naroda i opravdanje zločina”, *Vreme*, Beograd, 26. 8. 1991, 62.

<sup>84</sup> Milorad Ekmečić, *Srbija između Srednje Evrope i Evrope*, Beograd: Politika – BMG, 1992, 46.

<sup>85</sup> Slobodan Blagojević, *Tri čiste obične pameti*, Beograd: Radio B92, 1996, 14–15.

<sup>86</sup> Milorad Ekmečić, akademik, “Izjava nedjelje”, *Vreme*, Beograd, 8. 5. 1995, 48.

<sup>87</sup> Biljana Mitrinović, “Suljo i Mujo su se lepo snašli”, *Reporter*, Banjaluka, 4. 8. 1999, 45.

<sup>88</sup> Slobodanka Ast, “Akademici protiv režima”, *Vreme*, Beograd, 9. 10. 1999, 17.

Why did the brief account of Ekmečić's achievements begin with a story about his political engagement? Simply, because he is a politician in science! Most of his key interventions in historiography have infamously passed in the assessments of objective connoisseurs. As is well known, the Croatian historian "Mirjana Gross easily dealt with Ekmečić's double standards", which he, cultivating "Serbian prejudices", applied extensively in his section of the text of the *History of Yugoslavia* (Beograd: Prosveta, 1972).<sup>89</sup> It was noticeable that after that time Ekmečić turned his back more and more on science, rapidly profiling himself according to the form of a malicious, vengeful and destructive arbiter in the historiographical affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In a recent interview,<sup>90</sup> Ekmečić once again pointed out another shadow that was once cast on his self-love by the critique of the text in the *History of Yugoslavia* carried out by four "Muslim historians". When, in mid-1972, *Prosveta* announced the imminent publication of the *History of Yugoslavia*, the editorial board of the Belgrade magazine *Gledišta* decided to organize a discussion about the book. Historians from Belgrade, Novi Sad, Zagreb, Ljubljana, Sarajevo and Podgorica were invited. However, none of the four authors (Ivan Božić, Sima Ćirković, Milorad Ekmečić and Vladimir Dedić) appeared at the discussion, held on January 19, 1973, in the editorial

---

<sup>89</sup> Ivo Banac, "Rat prije rata: Raspad jugoslovenske historiografije" (Hereinafter: "Rat prije rata ..."), in: *Cijena Bosne. Članci, izjave i javni nastupi 1992–1993*, Zagreb: Europa danas d.o.o, 1994, 21. The discussion on the History of Yugoslavia, which Croatian historians, led by Mirjana Gross, began in the *Journal of Contemporary History* (Institut za historiju radničkog pokreta Hrvatske, Zagreb 1973, vol. 2, no. 12, 7-76), grew into a long-standing, most notable controversy within the historiographical guild in the SFRY. When he finally became aware that he had lost, Ekmečić concluded his participation in the controversy by kicking the door. Not remaining indebted to him, Gross resented Ekmečić for a "personal attack" on her "which has not yet been recorded in the pages of Yugoslav historical journals." She stated that "Ekmečić knows no bounds in arbitrary approaches to facts (...) It seems that Ekmečić, with all the network of distortions, avoiding problems, subterfuge, swearing and pathetic phrases, still suspects that there is something more than 'women's whims' of this 'stupid woman historian.'" "U povodu povlačenja Milorada Ekmečića od polemike", *Jugoslavenski istorijski časopis*, Beograd 1977, no. 1–2, 168–171.

<sup>90</sup> Svetlana Jajić, "Gorki nikom potrebni lek. Razgovor sa Miloradom Ekmečićem", *Književne novine*, 987/988, Beograd, 1 and 15 January, 1999, 6. Ekmečić then said: "Muslim historians became ideological flag bearers in the destruction of the Yugoslav state."

office of *Gledišta*. At the agreed time, twelve invited historians were there, and some apologized for not coming due to obligations. As stated in the explanation, “the editorial board did not offer any separate theses to the participants in the discussion, but the book itself served as a basis for it.” For this occasion, we will limit ourselves to the presentations of Avdo Sućeska, Alija Bojić and Mustafa Imamović.

Avdo Sućeska opened the discussion in which, among other things, he said: “The book, for the most part, although not to the same extent and with the same dose of criticism, presents the history of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians, while the history of other Yugoslav peoples is less researched, with a poor history of Bosnia, and especially the history of Bosnian Muslims.” Alija Bojić could not understand “why the uprisings of the Muslim rural masses in Bosnia and Herzegovina against Ottoman feudalism in the 17th and 18th centuries are not mentioned, and somewhat more elaborated. It is understandable and justified that smaller peasant revolts against feudal exploitation and foreign conquerors are being worked out among ‘historical peoples’, but it is incomprehensible that the nationwide three-month armed resistance of the bare-handed, predominantly Muslim people of Bosnia and Herzegovina against Austro-Hungary is mentioned only once in the *History of Yugoslavia*.” Mustafa Imamović also criticized the approach of the authors of the *History of Yugoslavia* who “mostly settled on the history of its three ‘great’ nations (Serbs, Croats and Slovenians) and that the ‘phenomena’ that carry the epoch were most often sought and found in the history of the most numerous Yugoslav nation. Smaller Yugoslav peoples appear in this book only as an occasional and incidental detail against the background of ‘great’ historical events.” Agreeing with the previously expressed opinion that “the history of Muslims is neglected”, Imamović added: “It is difficult to state everything that the authors said wrongly or superficially about Muslims, and what they did not say at all. In terms of some historical interpretations, the book often does not have the necessary distance from the popular mythology that emerged during the centuries-old Christian-Islamic confrontation, one front of which was also in our region. Krleža once called such a state of mind

the ‘circle of Turkish magic.’” Imamović showed that “the presentation of the history of Muslims in the Ottoman period (...) is extremely one-sided and poor.” In addition, he was simply “amazed at how many mistakes and inconsistencies there are sometimes on just one page.” Deeply disappointed and dissatisfied, Imamović concluded: “I think that what is given in the first two volumes of ‘History of the Peoples of Yugoslavia’ (1953, 1961) remains unsurpassed in our country. In that respect, this ‘History of Yugoslavia’ is a step backwards. That is why it should be regretted that the third book ‘History of the Peoples of Yugoslavia’ has not been worked on for years.”<sup>91</sup>

Thus, it became clear that Milorad Ekmečić does not know well enough the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the country in which he was born, and that due to non-scientific reasons he is permanently disabled to learn it at any time. The distorted presentation of the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina necessarily influenced the distorted picture of the history of Yugoslavia. It seems that it was more disturbing for Ekmečić that he was eloquently unmasked by “Muslim historians”, than even the lost controversy with Gross and numerous other later attacks on his writing, together. He was not ready to forget or forgive Muslims. In addition to the three mentioned, another “Muslim historian” presented a negative opinion on the *History of Yugoslavia* in the same year. Fuad Slipičević based his critique from the “position of historical materialism”. His final position was “that such a major undertaking, such as the synthesis of the history of the people of Yugoslavia, requires much more effort than the authors put in.”<sup>92</sup>

For years, a group of SANU academics strained their eyes, aggravated their gout, and had heart problems “over maps of Bosnia, trying to find at least a goat path that could be walked from Belgrade to Karlovac and passed exclusively through Serbian villages and towns.”<sup>93</sup> In the first half of the 1980s, the

<sup>91</sup> “Istorija Jugoslavije”, in: *Gledišta*, Beograd: Beogradski univerzitet i Republička konferencija Saveza omladine Srbije, March 1973, no. 3, 261-266, 305-314, 320-326.

<sup>92</sup> Fuad Slipičević, “Marginalije uz ‘Istoriju Jugoslavije’”, in: *Vojnoistorijski glasnik*, Beograd: Vojnoistorijski institut, January to April 1973, no. 1, 133-140.

<sup>93</sup> Ivan Stambolić, *Put u bespuće. Odgovori Ivana Stambolića na pitanja Slobodana Inića*, Beograd: Radio B-92, 1995, 125-126.

famous SANU Memorandum was drafted and “brushed”. It was planned to form a “gerontocratic forum of philosophers, who would determine exactly what is in the interest of the Serbian people, which should then be a binding norm and should be operationalized into the political strategy and tactics of the existing regime.”<sup>94</sup> At the same time, problems in the guild of historians of Bosnia and Herzegovina piled up almost daily. The previous practice of directing postgraduates and doctoral students towards Belgrade as, allegedly, a guide (in reality, more and more a police officer) of historiography in Yugoslavia was continued. This did not pass without shocks, which brought well-meaning and honest historians to despair.<sup>95</sup>

As it is known, “the final product of the SANU line was the book by academician Milorad Ekmečić, *The Creation of Yugoslavia 1790–1918*, which appeared in 1989 in Gazimestan on the occasion of the 600th anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo.”<sup>96</sup> However, this work of Ekmečić’s, which he considered his “life synthesis”, proved to be very unstable and frail at the first touch of scientific criticism.<sup>97</sup> It was, again, clear that Ekmečić did not rule over matter and that he tendentiously interpreted and manipulated facts from historical events.<sup>98</sup> Regardless of the aforementioned scientific

---

About SANU’s public political activity: Olivera Milosavljević, “Zloupotreba autoriteta nauke”, in: *Srpska strana rata. Trauma i katarza u istorijskom pamćenju*, Prep. by Nebojša Popov, Beograd – Novi Beograd – Zrenjanin: Republika – Vikom – Čitaonica, 1996, 305-338.

<sup>94</sup> Miladin Životić, *Contra bellum*, Beograd: Beogradski krug/AKAPIT, 1997, 133.

<sup>95</sup> One of the signs of the real domination of the Greater Serbia lobby in Sarajevo was the publication of *Ekmečić’s collection (Godišnjak Društva istoričara Bosne i Hercegovine*, Sarajevo, 1988, vol. XXXIX, 192). His followers thus prepared for Ekmečić a certain surrogate of pagan apotheosis. Their walking idol allegedly had a “modest, extremely honest and dignified life path” and they, led by Dr. Tomislav Kraljačić, express “recognition of an exemplary man of extraordinary moral and intellectual strength.”

<sup>96</sup> I. Banac, “Rat prije rata”, 31

<sup>97</sup> Milorad Ekmečić, *Radovi iz istorije Bosne i Hercegovine XIX veka*, Beograd: Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod, 1997, 10.

<sup>98</sup> Srećko M. Džaja, “Mavar Orbin dvadesetog stoljeća”, in: *Jukić*, Sarajevo: Zbor franjevačkih bogoslova “Jukić”, 1989/90, no. 19–20, 118-131; Nenad Filipović, “Osmanska Bosna i Osmansko carstvo”, in: *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju, “Stvaranje Jugoslavije 1790–1918” Milorada Ekmečića*, Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, 1991, vol. 40/1990, 433-457.

“torpedoes”, Ekmečić was often mentioned in the pages of the Serbian official press as a “large-format” historian.<sup>99</sup> This provoked a reaction from the Serbian opposition press. However, the solid net of the experienced fisherman was lowered into the net. Ekmečić’s memorable book became “a model which students read with the greatest reverence at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade, where, thanks to Professor Đorđe Stanković, it practically became an inevitable manual.”<sup>100</sup>

At the Congress of Serbian Intellectuals in Bosnia and Herzegovina on March 28, 1992, Ekmečić threatened: “It must be clear to European diplomats that in the event of destabilization of their relations in Europe, Serbian people gain at least one symbolic external ally – the possibility of an armed peasant uprising in Bosnia which no one will be able to stop.”<sup>101</sup> At the Second Congress of Serbian Intellectuals (Belgrade, April 22 and 23, 1994), one of the main goals of which was to support the Bosnian Serb leadership, led by Radovan Karadžić,<sup>102</sup> Ekmečić also ‘politicized’: “By right to self-determination the four existing Serbian states will be united into one, with careful measurement of the steps in the peace negotiations (...) Our goal is to preserve Serbian unity and to crown it with one Serbian state.”<sup>103</sup>

Enjoying the great material help of the Serbian state and using the closeness to the “circles of political power”,<sup>104</sup> Ekmečić’s circle of historians realized several projects. At one international gathering, Ekmečić bitterly defended the position that “science has created a significant achievement

---

<sup>99</sup> Nikola Milošević, “Ekmečić i Tadić – boljševici vanpartijski”, *Srpska reč*, Beograd, 2. 9. 1991, 25.

<sup>100</sup> Maja Miljković, *Beogradski istoriografski krugovi i problem racionalnog sagledavanja fenomena nacionalnog interesa na kraju 20. veka* (manuscript), Arhiv Instituta za istoriju u Sarajevu, 3.

<sup>101</sup> Academician Milorad Ekmečić, “Srpsko nacionalno pitanje danas”, *Javnost*, Sarajevo, 28. 3. 1992, 5.

<sup>102</sup> Svetlana Đurđević-Lukić, “Kongres je bio”, *NIN*, Beograd, 29. 4. 1994, 15.

<sup>103</sup> Zoran Marković, “Na popravnom iz Memoranduma”, *Duga*, Beograd, 30. 4. – 13. 5. 1994, 85.

Cult Belgrade journalist Petar Luković could not bear not to call this event “Congress of Serbian pocket-sized superintellectuals” and “Congress of quasi-intellectuals.” “Kongres *mojih intelektualaca*”, *Vreme*, Beograd, 2. 5. 1994, 64.

<sup>104</sup> Same as in footnote 100.

to consider Bosnia and Herzegovina as a Serbian country since the immigration of Slavs to the Balkan Peninsula.”<sup>105</sup> For the second time, Ekmečić imagined that Bosniaks were allegedly aggressors and not an attacked nation brought to the brink of survival. He mentioned American “exploitation of Bosnian Islamism” and “its radicalism.”<sup>106</sup> The aging academic felt it was time to construct a false alibi for the Greater Serbia genocide against Bosniaks. For him, there was just a “civil war.”<sup>107</sup> In his review of the book (a collection of papers from a symposium) *The Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Their Historic Development from the Middle Ages to the Dissolution of Yugoslavia* (Harvard University Press, 1994), Ekmečić, excitedly claimed that “an independent state of Bosnia is possible only on a mythological basis.”<sup>108</sup> According to his short-sighted view of history, the West is responsible for “creating an artificial Bosniak nation.” In an attempt to conceal Serb responsibility for the war and genocide, Ekmečić is trying to obscure the reality: “Muslims in Bosnian, Albanian, and Croat intelligentsia are once again playing the role of horsemen of major campaigns to destabilize the Balkans, as was the case with their ancestors in 1914 and 1941.”<sup>109</sup> But whatever happens, he dreams of the Serbian people being “united and defiant again as in Radovan’s time in 1992.”<sup>110</sup> The criminal Milorad Ekmečić did not even try to cover his tracks. He and similar ideologues of the Balkan slaughterhouse, known as “all Serbs in one state”, “held their

<sup>105</sup> Milorad Ekmečić, “O istraživanju istorije Bosne i Hercegovine danas”, in: *Bosna i Hercegovina od srednjeg vijeka do novijeg vremena, Međunarodni naučni skup, 13–15. decembar 1994, Zbornik radova*, Knjiga 12, Istorijski institut Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti, Beograd – Novi Sad: Istorijski institut SANU Beograd – Pravoslavna reč, 1995, 20.

<sup>106</sup> Milorad Ekmečić, “Uloga islama u socijalnom i političkom razvoju Balkana”, in: *Islam, Balkan i velike sile (XIV–XX vek), Međunarodni naučni skup, 11–13. decembar 1996, Zbornik radova*, Knjiga 14, Istorijski institut Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti, Beograd: Istorijski institut SANU, 1997, 52.

<sup>107</sup> Milorad Ekmečić, *Ustanak u Bosni 1875–1878*, Third edition, Beograd: Novinskoizdavačka ustanova Službeni list SRJ – Balkanološki institut SANU, 1996, 11.

<sup>108</sup> *Istorijski časopis*, Beograd: Istorijski institut Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti, 1997, vol. XLII–XLIII (1995–1996), 407–411.

<sup>109</sup> Milorad Ekmečić, “Predgovor”, in: Aleksandar del Val, *Islamizam i Sjedinjene Države. Alijansa protiv Evrope*, Beograd: Javno preduzeće Službeni list SRJ, 1998, 9, 13.

<sup>110</sup> Milorad Ekmečić, “Čuje li se veliko zvono cara Ivana”, *Duga*, Beograd 10–23. 4. 1999, 41.



own requiem with the results that followed on the basis of all their ambitions.”<sup>111</sup>

Ekmečić's comrades from the Greater Serbia intellectual corps are of different generations (from gray-haired old men to scientific “youth”), intellectual capacities, perseverance, possibilities of adaptation to different conditions of social engagement, etc. Among them are sometimes seen “wrong” people whom some did not expect. Or, perhaps, is it about knowledge from the past about characters who were expected to do something better and “in evil times”?

Academician Radovan Samardžić, perhaps the most literate among that group, was completely captivated by stereotypes about his people and their relations with other nations in the last years of his life. Neighbors “also used Serbian torment to liberate themselves”, and then the cooperation of those neighbors was transformed “into their hatred against everything that is Serbian.” He was enslaved by legends about how the Ottoman Empire “was almost continuously in the hands of the viziers of Serbian origin” for most of the 16th century. According to Samardžić, “because it is obliged to unite its people”, Serbia had to “start destroying two empires, not only Turkish but also Habsburg”, because Serbia was “squeezed by their borders”. About Bosnia: “Bosnia and Herzegovina was occupied by Austro-Hungary in 1878 which deliberately began to sow the seeds of denationalization.” On the losses of the Serbian population in the Second World War: “The number of missing Serbs (...) has not been determined, but it certainly exceeds one million victims.”<sup>112</sup> “Speaking about the penetration of Islam into Southeast Europe”, Samardžić created an ideologized construction about the so-called “spiritual renegade”: “Becoming a renegade out of fear or greed usually leads to the repression of one's former spiritual being into the lower strata of consciousness. From this can arise two phenomena that are most often intertwined: one is in the mixture of old and new religious or ideological

---

<sup>111</sup> Same as in footnote 94.

<sup>112</sup> Radovan Samardžić, *Ideje za srpsku istoriju*, Beograd: Jugoslavijapublik, 1989, 219, 233, 250-251, 253, 258.

folklore, and the other is in the appearance of hatred towards their former fellow believers or tribesmen, which stems from the subconscious into which one renegade's being was pushed.”<sup>113</sup>

Academician Vasilije D. Krestić sees Bosnia and Herzegovina as a kind of a frontier, on whose territory Serbia is defending itself from Croatia. His visions seem to be incubated within the phenomenon of persecution mania: “It is quite certain that Serbia, as a state, like Croatia, must “have an eye and an ear” on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in that vital area for it. If Serbia persecutes the Serbs there for various reasons (ideological, party-political and personal), and does not take into account the global state interests, it is certain that it will lose the battle with the Croats, because it is also certain that the Croats will not calm down until they reach the Drina and lean under Belgrade and reach Zemun.”<sup>114</sup>

Academician Veselin Đuretić has been talking about the “national-surrogate identities” of the Montenegrin, Macedonian and Muslim nations for the second decade in a well-known style of spilling as a log flammable subtle statements. According to him, the Serbian “complete determination” includes “Serbs of the Orthodox, Catholic and Mohammedan faiths”. The only political position he would possibly be interested in is a “function” in the Department of National Orientation in the United States of Serbia.<sup>115</sup> So, inquisitor and chief of proselytism in one person! In order not to be unclear, Đuretić explained: “We flatter national surrogates, even those who stand for a ‘sovereign’ and ‘independent’ Bosnia and Herzegovina. We allow the greatest irony of our history – to become a minority of our own converts. Every historian knows that 95 to 98 percent of Muslims are Serbs!”<sup>116</sup> That is why they were sad when it was heard from the podium that “it will no

<sup>113</sup> Ljiljana Habjanović-Đurović – Radovan Samardžić, “Negovanje sopstvene sebičnosti”, *Duga*, Beograd, 14–27. 9. 1991, 11.

<sup>114</sup> Vasilije D. Krestić, *Genocidom do velike Hrvatske*, Beograd – Novi Sad: Matica Srpska – Arhiv Srbije, 1998, 144.

<sup>115</sup> Vesna Mališić – Veselin Đuretić, “Demokratski vanzemaljci bez krova nad glavom”, *Duga*, Beograd, 14–27. 9. 1991, 16–17.

<sup>116</sup> Ljiljana Habjanović-Đurović – Veselin Đuretić, “Srbija u samici”, *Duga*, Beograd, 1–14. 2. 1992, 15.

longer be possible to say that only Karadžić or Plavšić want it that way, now the entire intellectual parliament is behind them” (V. Đuretić).<sup>117</sup>

Vasa Kazimirović, a historian of bereaved Serbs, taught readers of the newspaper *Javnost*, “Serbian People in Bosnia and Herzegovina” (as stated in the headline) what they should think about the policy of the current president of Serbia: “If anything must be acknowledged to Milošević, as statehood and as political wisdom, then, it has nothing to do with any expansionist and hegemonic aspirations, and it refers to the unification of Serbs in one state.” Kazimirović warns that “uniting Serbs in one state does not automatically mean danger for other minorities who would remain in such a community.”<sup>118</sup>

The aforementioned Prof. Dr. Đorđe Stanković allowed himself the right to, in December 1993, propose territorial solutions that split two internationally recognized states, at a high price to be paid by their citizens. Stanković suggested: “In our opinion, at this moment Krajina does not have capable, emerging political and military figures, they do not have a biological substance for permanent resistance and conditions for the creation of independent state. Krajina can be saved only if it unites with Republika Srpska in Bosnia and Herzegovina.”<sup>119</sup>

Dr. Nikola B. Popović is also not free from the idea that the knowledge of a historian allows him to influence the Serbian public by making belligerent statements: “But there is no reason to characterize the creation of the Serbian state from Serbian lands west of the Drina and Danube as extreme and nationalistic. If this new state is greater in relation to what is called Central Serbia, why wouldn’t it be called like that, when no one cares about Great Britain in relation to England.” Then there is a story about the right to a “national roof over Serbs’ heads”: “Serbs in Bosnia have no choice. Their only salvation is military victory and creating a position for them

---

<sup>117</sup> Same as in the note 102.

<sup>118</sup> *Vreme*, Beograd, 3. 8. 1992, 54.

<sup>119</sup> Đorđe Stanković, *Izazov nove istorije (2)*, Beograd: Novinsko-izdavačka ustanova Vojska, 1994, 264-265.

to dictate further political conditions. On the other hand, they have been brought by the international community to the point that that they must not win?! Serbs are doomed to create their own national state in their area, no one can take that right away from them.”<sup>120</sup> A little of “warrior” rhetoric from a safe distance from the battlefield, and this provincial megalomaniac received another “national” wage without fear.

Considering that he had gained enough authority for himself as the director of the SANU Historical Institute, Dr. Slavenko Terzić faltered the Bosnian Serbs with the Great Serbia stereotype: “According to some historical and ethnic law, this country is an integral part of the Serbian ethnic space. Orthodox Serbs for centuries made up the majority in Bosnia.”<sup>121</sup> Dr. Radoš Ljušić does not allow the people to have the name they inherited from their ancestors: “Well, there are no Bosniaks. There are Serbs of the Muslim faith, there are Muslims, or there may be Croats of the Muslim faith or Muslims. But there are no Bosniaks. Bosniaks as a people (...) do not exist.”<sup>122</sup>

Dr. Dušan Berić was known for a time as the bearer of the retold “characteristics” of his mentor Milorad Ekmečić: “Two outcomes are possible for his future development: to learn one foreign language fluently and jump over the Bosnian fence, or he will lose his health by sitting in the archive.”<sup>123</sup> A little more than a year after that, going to his former “well-established” job at the Faculty of Philosophy in Novi Sad, he threatened his colleagues at the Institute of History: “Muslims should be slaughtered!”<sup>124</sup> His sick extremism is conditioned by the coordinates of Greater Serbia: “After the disintegration

---

<sup>120</sup> Milan Nikolić – Nikola B. Popović, “Sabor srpske pameti”, *Intervju*, Beograd, 1. 4. 1994, 25; Đoko Kesić – Dr. Nikola B. Popović, “Veliki plišani meda”, *Duga*, Beograd, 19. 8. – 1. 9. 1995, 39.

<sup>121</sup> Miloslav Rajković – dr. Slavenko Terzić, “Bosna je zemlja srpska”, *Oslobođenje*, (Srpsko) Sarajevo, 1. 2. 1995, 5.

<sup>122</sup> *Most dijaloga. Razgovori ratu usprkos (April 1994 – June 1997)*, Banja Luka: Radio Slobodna Evropa Prag – Zaklada Friedrich Naumann Zagreb – Media centar Prelom Banja Luka, 1998, 214.

<sup>123</sup> *Savjetu Instituta za istoriju u Sarajevu*, Sarajevo, January, 27. 1991. Arhiv Instituta za istoriju u Sarajevu, 2.

<sup>124</sup> Damir Hrasnica, “Bitka za vremensku prognozu”, *Dani*, Sarajevo, 10. mart 1993, 31.

of Yugoslavia, Bosnia and Herzegovina became a fiction and disintegrated into its constituent parts. It was finally divided on religious grounds. It is not an ethnic division, many make this mistake (...), most of the Catholic world and all Muslims are basically of Serbian ethnic origin. They speak Serbian (...) Serbia is no more Serbian than Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina or Republika Srpska (...) The state is being built step by step, here in this war as well (...) It is a tragic part of the path of creating a common Serbian state, but even such a path is crossed and the final goal is reached.”<sup>125</sup>

Dr. Đorđe Mikić also accepted the already worn-out claim of the Greater Serbia “writers of history”: “After all, the overall history of Bosnia and Herzegovina shows that it cannot be independent with Brčko or without Brčko, except under occupation.”<sup>126</sup> Dr. Ljubodrag Dimić, an ambitious candidate for the “keeper of the seal” of some of the misconceptions and products of manipulation of Serbian historiography, “allows himself” to take note that a Muslim nation was among the artificial nations.<sup>127</sup>

Accepting the established stereotypes of Serbian historiography as the “truth about Bosnia”, Dr. Dušan T. Bataković argues in the book *The Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina. History and Politics* (Paris: Dialogue, 1996) that BiH could survive only within larger, supranational, structures and that Serbs represented an absolute or relative majority of the population. In addition, he spreads a theory about the alleged repression and discrimination of Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina. For him, BiH was Yugoslavia in miniature, and allegedly could not survive the disintegration of the common state.

Dr. Milan St. Protić became directly involved in politics, repeatedly showing how he treats events in Bosnia and Herzegovina. He was dissatisfied with the “brutal removal of Radovan Karadžić from the political

---

<sup>125</sup> Nada Puvačić – dr. Dušan Berić, “Dva srpska Pijemonta”, *Duga*, Beograd, 16–29. 3. 1996, 31.

<sup>126</sup> Dr. Đorđe Mikić, “Ne može BiH biti samostalna”, *Oslobođenje*, (Srpsko) Sarajevo, 24. 2. 1999, 15.

<sup>127</sup> Ljubodrag Dimić, *Srbi i Jugoslavija. Prostor, društvo, politika (Pogled s kraja veka)*, Beograd: Stubovi kulture, 1998, 65.

world.”<sup>128</sup> Dr. Srđa Trifković confirmed his participation in politics, among other things, as “the official spokesman for Dr. Radovan Karadžić, the Bosnian Serb leader.”<sup>129</sup>

The engagement of archaeologist Dr. Đorđe Janković from the Department of Medieval Archaeology at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade is also interesting. He claims that in 1993 and 1994 he found two, allegedly Serbian graves near Bosansko Grahovo, which he dated to around 400 AD (sic!). This archaeologist, whom the students call “Đoka the barbarian”, did not forget to mention “the example of Muslims, because most of the Muslims are of Serbian origin.”<sup>130</sup>

### **The Virus of Lies in the Destruction of Science**

It is well known that at the time of the disintegration of Yugoslavia (SFRY) and the Yugoslav historiography, legends and the ideological distortion were created by the professional historians, not by the amateurs (who followed the professionals by inertia). A great number of Serbian historians took an evil part in creation and serving the ideological and political objectives of the last Great Serbian attempts to conquer Bosnia and Herzegovina. Prevalent part of the Serbian historians participated in this process in order to support the aggression on Bosnia and Herzegovina. A lesser number of the Serbian professional historians, who opposed to the abuse of the

---

<sup>128</sup> Milan St. Protić, “Ništa dobro”, *Javnost*, (Srpsko) Sarajevo, 7. 9. 1996, 17.

<sup>129</sup> “Srbi stežu obruč oko Klintona”, *Duga*, Beograd, 11–24. 6. 1994, 63.

<sup>130</sup> Zoran Stefanović – dr. Đorđe Janković, “Ko smo mi”, *Duga*, Beograd, 9–22. 7. 1994, 90-91, 93-94. This example and other cases were mentioned at the end of 1999 at a gathering of Serbian archaeologists in Belgrade. Dr. Marko Popović, a scientific adviser at the Archaeological Institute in Belgrade, noted that “there are trends that conflict with science, pseudoscience that is politically manipulated. Serbs are declared the oldest people, and Slavs the bearers of Indo-Europeanization. This phenomenon is very similar to the thesis about the Indo-Germans, on which the Nazi ideology was based. We are now faced with quasi-science, especially in the archeology of the early Middle Ages, the interpretation of our arrival and existence here. These interpretations have a romantic overtone and are far from the meticulous science of the modern world. There is a great danger that this trend will prevail, and we know that it is the ideological basis of the fascist system wherever fascism has appeared.” “Trend u sukobu s naukom”, *Reporter*, Banjaluka, 22. 12. 1999, 6.

historical science, was isolated in a kind of an “intellectual ghetto” or forced to emigrate.<sup>131</sup>

The Serbian historians’ manipulation was directed at “proving” that, allegedly, Bosnia and Herzegovina has never been a united country, that BiH after the disintegration of Yugoslavia (SFRY) has no conditions to survive independent, that the greatest part of the Croats and Bosniaks have the “Serbian ethnic origins”, speak Serbian language, as well as that BiH is Serbian, as much as Serbia and Montenegro are.

According to the views of Serbian historians, ultimately loyal to the Great Serbian ideology, the present state, as they say, “to solve the Serbian national question” is only one phase of a planned strategic objective – to create the “state of all Serbs”. Though the Serbian society is victim of the pseudomorphosis, along with evident decline of its structure, the Great Serbian historians are consistent in their attempts “to prove” that a national rebirth of their own people has taken place. Perpetuating of the energy to maintain such thinking fatally contributes to downgrading of Serbian historiography, but influences the sufficient intensity of destructive ideology within the Serbian society. The consequences of it will be felt for a long time in the region of the South East Europe. Of course, among the historians of the destructive Great Serbian barbarism (already known as “Great Serbism”) will have to answer the question of an ordinary citizen of Belgrade: “Why is our new history only a sum of misfortunate deaths, stupidity, vulgarism and diletantism?”<sup>132</sup> The answer should also be sought in their acceptance of Dobrica Ćosić’s claim: “A lie has preserved the Serbian people in history just as much as heroism.”

---

<sup>131</sup> I. Banac, “Rat prijete rata”, 14-33.

<sup>132</sup> Aleksandar Tijanić, “Dokle, bre, Čarnojeviću?”, *Nezavisne novine*, Banjaluka, 9. 6. 1999, 44.

## MANIPULACIJE SRPSKE HISTORIOGRAFIJE O BOSNI I HERCEGOVINI

### Sažetak

“Legende i ideološka iskrivljenja”, unutar raspada jugoslavenske države (SFRJ) i raspada jugoslavenske historiografije bile su kreacija profesionalnih historičara, a ne amatera (koji su ih po inerciji slijedili). Veliki broj srpskih historičara koji su u tome učestvovali imali su zlokobnu ulogu u kreiranju i servisiranju ideoloških i političkih ciljeva posljednjeg velikosrpskog pokušaja osvajanja Bosne i Hercegovine. Pretežni dio esnafa srpskih historičara učestvovao je i suučestvovao u poslu podržavanja agresije na Bosnu i Hercegovinu. Manji dio profesionalnih srpskih historičara koji se usprotivio zloupotrebi historijske nauke, bio je izoliran u svojevrсна “intelektualna geta” ili prinuđen da emigrira u inostranstvo.

Slijed proteklih događaja pokazuje nepoznavanje i svjesno iskrivljavanje povijesti Bosne i Hercegovine od strane većine srpskih historičara (u ovom radu spomenuta je tek nekolicina takvih), uz odsustvo njihove želje i deficit intelektualnih mogućnosti da je, zaista, upoznaju. Oni su se opredijelili za manipulaciju kao metod i sredstvo za prikriivanje povijesne istine u cilju ostvarenja, kako se to obično imenuje, velikosrpskog državnog koncepta. Takav stav, sada već jasno formulirane, velikosrpske historiografije uvjetovao je konstantu potcjenjivanja drugih naroda Bosne i Hercegovine uz, istovremeno, svjesno raspirivanje i održavanje destruktivne energije srpske mitomanije i grandomanije. To je, u završnici raspada SFRJ, i agresiji na Bosnu i Hercegovinu, značajno doprinijelo genocidu nad Bošnjacima i Hrvatima, izvršenom u velikosrpskoj režiji. Ideološka eliminacija, zaogrnta u togu pseudoznanstvenih parametara velikosrpske historiografije, sračunato je prethodila fizičkoj eliminaciji Bošnjaka i Hrvata u velikosrpskom genocidu. Kao da je sve znanje, koje su velikosrpski historičari usput sabra-



li, služilo isključivo za regrutiranje dovoljnog broja ubijedenih pristalica za izvršenje zločina nad, unaprijed označenim, “neprijateljem”.

Prema gledištu srpskih historičara, bespogovorno odanih velikosrpskoj ideji, dosadašnja faza “rešavanja srpskog nacionalnog pitanja” usmjerena je planiranom strateškom cilju – formiranju “države svih Srba”. Mada je srpsko društvo žrtva pseudomorfoze, uz evidentne znakove raspada i propadanja cijelih dijelova njegove strukture, velikosrpski historičari istražuju u pokušajima “dokazivanja” da se, navodno, radilo o nacionalnom preporodu njihovog naroda. Perpetuiranje energije za održanje takve vrste mišljenja fatalno doprinosi daljem srozavanju cjeline srpske historiografije, ali uvjetuje i održanje dovoljnog intenziteta destruktivnih ideologija unutar srpskog društva. Posljedice takvog stanja osjećat će se još dugo u cijeloj regiji jugoistočne Evrope.

Svakako da će među historičarima locirani ideolozi i propagatori velikosrpskog barbarizma (već nazvanog *velikosrbizam*) morati pokušati odgovoriti na pitanje jednog Srbina iz Beograda: “...zašto je naša nova istorija samo zbir nesreća, smrti, gluposti, prostaštva i diletantizma?” Odgovor treba tražiti i u njihovom prihvatanju stava Dobrice Ćosića: “Laž je u istoriji očuvala srpski narod taman toliko koliko i junaštvo.”

Translated by Damir Bešlija