

# HISTORY OF SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE (19<sup>TH</sup>-21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY)

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Zagreb

Zagreb, 13 April 2019

Council hall

The University of Zagreb  
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences  
Doctoral programme of Modern and Contemporary Croatian History in  
European and World Context



and the  
University of Regensburg



**Publisher:**

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb  
FF press



Doctoral programme of Modern and Contemporary  
Croatian History in European and World Context

University of Regensburg, Chair for the History of Southeast and Eastern Europe  
Leibniz Institute for East and Southeast European Studies (IOS Regensburg)

**For the publisher:**

PhD Vesna Vlahović-Štetić, full professor

**Doctoral workshop:**

**HISTORY OF SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE (19<sup>TH</sup>-21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY)**

**Editor:**

Iskra Iveljić

**Graphic design:**

Marko Maraković

**Computer layout:**

Ivanka Cokol

**Circulation:**

100 copies

**Printed by:**

Kolor klinika d.o.o., Zagreb

**HISTORY OF SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE**  
**(19<sup>TH</sup>-21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY)**

 **FF press**



## INTRODUCTION

The tectonic changes after the Fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and disintegration of Yugoslavia enticed some historians to proclaim the superiority of the Western democracies (Francis Fukuyama), to foretell the alleged end of East European history as a specific field of research (Jörg Baberowski) or to revive the old *limes* between East and West as a civilisation boundary (Samuel Huntington). Other historians, whose voices were heard not so much in the general public, but among the experts, posed the question of southeastern European history as European history (e.g. Holm Sundhaussen) or as global history (Marie-Janine Calic). The enlargements of the European Union since 2004, which embraced a large portion of this area of Europe, seemed to justify the latter approach.

Yet, after 30 years it is high time to discuss whether Southeastern European history represents a specific field of research? If so, what are its distinctive traits and its relationship to other regions such as Central Europe, Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean? Some other issues that are open for discussion are: What is the role of politics in this process? Are there terminological or conceptual shifts regarding Southeastern Europe, Central Europe and newly introduced Western Balkans? What are the differences between intrinsic and extrinsic views on the region? What was (and still is) the extent of various Western models and of mutual, intraregional influences? Last but not least, one should take into consideration the development of postcommunist historiography and address the continuous discontinuities that mark the history of the region even in the 21st century.

The doctoral workshop should enable doctoral students in Zagreb and Regensburg to present their research as the basis for the discussion on similarities and differences in their thematical, conceptual, spatial and chronological framework. In what ways is their work influenced by discourses in the academic and general public? Do modern social media play a role in this

process? What are the potential points of communication and cooperation between the doctoral students as well as between their professors?

Ulf Brunnbauer  
Klaus Buchenau  
Iskra Iveljić  
Branimir Janković

## PROGRAMME

### **9.30 Opening remarks**

**Iskra Iveljić, Ulf Brunnbauer, Klaus Buchenau**

### **9.45**

**Vinko Drača**, Mental health on the margins of Austria-Hungary: Poverty, backwardness and marginality in the discourse of fin de siècle Croatian psychiatry

### **10.10**

**Nikola Tomašegović**, *Whose culture?* Perceptions of Croatian cultural identity in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century

### **10.35**

**Oliver Panichi**, External influences and internal evolutions in an “open” border: the nineteenth-century path of Dalmatia towards its present

### **11.00 Discussion**

### **11.30 Coffee break**

### **11.50**

**Frederik Lange**, Border – Bridge – Grave. The creation and representation of ambivalent patterns categorizing the Drina river

### **12.15**

**Vedran Obućina**, South-Eastern European History: a Blueprint for the Faith-based Reconciliation?

### **12.40 Discussion**

### **13.15 Lunch**

**15.30**

**Stefan Gužvica**, (In)Equality in International Communism: Understanding Informal Hierarchies of the Comintern

**15.55**

**Dora Kosorčić**, Interpretive models and narratives of Archbishop Alojzije Stepinac in contemporary Croatian historiography

**16.20 Discussion**

**16.50 Coffee break**

**17.10**

**Karlo Jurak**, Historical revisionism after the dissolution of Yugoslavia and the roots of retraditionalization

**17.35**

**Dea Marić**, History education in «the region». Policy agendas and history teachers' perceptions

**18.00 Discussion**

---

## SUMMARIES

*Vinko Drača*

### **MENTAL HEALTH ON THE MARGINS OF AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: POVERTY, BACKWARDNESS AND MARGINALITY IN THE DIS- COURSE OF FIN DE SIÈCLE CROATIAN PSYCHIATRY**

History of psychiatry in Croatia starts with the opening of Royal Croatian asylum for the insane (*Kraljevski zemaljski zavod za umobolne*) in Stenjevec in 1879. In the first couple of decades asylum superintendents were physicians educated at Austrian and German universities. German and Austrian psychiatry at the end of the century adhered to a more-or-less strict somatic and hereditary model of the etiology of mental illness. But this somaticism was not without its social implications; somaticist psychiatry was also influenced by a worldview based on notion of degeneration and social Darwinism. Patients of Stenjevec asylum were predominantly rural agricultural workers and laborers. The communication between physicians and patients took place in the context of huge inequality of power and social positions. Asylum superintendents were also people of higher social standing and they wielded institutional and discursive power over their patients and: they had better upbringing and as medical doctors educated abroad they represented intellectual elite of the still predominantly agricultural Croatian society. Notions of hereditary degeneration and backwardness soon became part of the medical image of Croatian rural population - it was described as “primitive”, intellectually underdeveloped because of its “hereditary taint” and prone to alcoholism and sexual deviance.

In this paper author will present different interconnected notions of marginality that emerged within the discourse of fin de siècle psychiatry in Croatia; one can speak of marginal position of patients, marginal position of Stenjevec as a “provincial asylum” within Austria-Hungary and marginal position of psychiatry in relations to other branches of medical care. By analyzing patient files and professional publications of Croatian psychiatrists who were superintendents or have worked in Stenjevec asylum from 1879 to 1918 one can see development of psychiatric discourse that at the same

time encompassed ambivalent notions of backwardness of Croatian rural communities and anxieties related to challenges of modernity.

*Nikola Tomašegović*

### **WHOSE CULTURE? PERCEPTIONS OF CROATIAN CULTURAL IDENTITY IN THE LATE 19<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY**

After the breakup of socialist Yugoslavia, it became an ideological and political imperative to (re)position Croatia as a Central European country. The Yugoslav period of Croatian history emerged as a historical deviation, an 'unnatural' dislocation of (Central) European Croatia into its internal Other, the Balkans. All that was perceived as negative in the development of Croatian society could simply be attributed to the devastating influence of the wildness and backwardness of the Balkans. The devious and double-faced Yugoslav modernism, especially that of the socialist Yugoslavia, was to be held accountable for the destruction of the innocent and gullible Croatian Central European cultural utopia. Yet, if we look at the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the formative period for Croatian national ideologies, the perceptions of Croatian regional and cultural identity seem more complex. Both the Yugoslavism and the *pravaštvo* (the exclusivist Croatian national ideology) worked within the South-European, i.e. Balkan and Yugoslav framework, while at the same time appropriating German and French national models, cultural, philosophical and scientific influences, and Habsburg political traditions. It is especially interesting to explore these questions with regard to the late 19<sup>th</sup> century polemics between the modernists and the traditionalists, as it was largely based on differing conceptions of the relationship between Croatian culture and Europe. Is it possible to adopt modern cultural ideas without jeopardizing dominant national traditions? How can we discern between modern German cultural and political influence (the *Drang*)? What is the best model for modernizing (Yugo)Slav culture? In this paper I wish to address these questions that troubled the Croatian intelligentsia at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

*Oliver Panichi*

**EXTERNAL INFLUENCES AND INTERNAL EVOLUTIONS IN AN “OPEN” BORDER: THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY PATH OF DALMATIA TOWARDS ITS PRESENT**

For Dalmatia the 19th century was the decisive period in the construction of modern national identities. The interweaving of Dalmatian history with multinational empires is an element both specific as well as common to other contexts (e.g. Northern Italy until 1861-1866, Trentino and Trieste until 1918).

However, Dalmatian proximity to the Ottoman Empire is a specific factor to be considered, in particular Dubrovnik's proximity to Herzegovina. Another Dalmatian dimension is the struggle of the “young nations” for their emancipation by means of the campaign for public and liturgical uses of their mother tongue (connected to the broader and Romantic bond between national identities and language) or by the historiographical tendency to give historical depth to the national existence. The influence of the nineteenth-century intransigent Catholicism, born elsewhere but active in specific ways in Dalmatia, can't be overlooked.

These elements were the local adaptations to the ideals of European culture and political movements, such as the influence of Italian *Risorgimento* in Dalmatia in the mid-19th century.

Our perspective is linked to that adopted by Diana Mishkova, to identify the complex relationships between “Western” modernity and the specificities of “another Europe” and to think about the differences between intrinsic and extrinsic views on this region. From these points of view, Dalmatian history is a part of Southeastern European history, but also of “European history”.

Finally, in regard to sources we think it is useful to analyze local as well as “global” sources, such as the documentation of the Holy See, a universalistic institution *par excellence*, or the reports of the consuls of the Kingdom of Italy in Dalmatia which provide a perspective from an “other”, which at the same time was rooted in the “local milieu”.

We will offer a selection of specific cases, treated synthetically, that we believe can be linked to our general interpretation and clarify it further.

*Frederik Lange*

**BORDER – BRIDGE – GRAVE. THE CREATION AND REPRESENTATION OF AMBIVALENT PATTERNS CATEGORIZING THE DRINA RIVER**

The presentation gives an overview on my ongoing project on the Drina river. It focusses on the different categorizations put on the Bosnian-Serbian border river from 1878 until 2014. I am researching how the different patterns of interpretation were created, and by whom; which political purposes were behind this and – last but not least – how the representations of these interpretations look like. The Drina is mainly constructed in three categories: the river as a border, as a connecting element or a bridge and a site of violence. The project is bisected, on the one hand it is shown how these patterns were created in the history of events, on the other hand there is the portrayal of the representations, with approaches from the cultural memory studies.

In its course of 346 kilometers the Drina was mainly perceived as a border river. Beginning with the demarcation between Eastern and Western Roman Empire, Catholicism and Orthodoxy, and after wars and political changes until today, the Drina seems to separate more than it connects. The Drina as a border is mythical, charged with connotations of being an eternal border, or a civilizational, religious and political *limes*, best shown in the nationalistic imaginations in the Independent State of Croatia (*Nezavisna Država Hrvatska*). Besides, like all rivers, the Drina connects its shores and the areas between source and estuary. The river as a connecting element stands diametral to the border functions. One example is the centralizing image of the Drina as the spine or windpipe of the nationalistic figure of the “Serbian body”. Like many borders the Drina valley became a symbol for a contested site of violence: Frontline in the First and heavily fought site in the Second World War up to a site of massacres and “ethnic cleansing” in the wars of the 1990s.

I want to show how these patterns were (de- and re-) constructed, how they face or replace each other, how the contest of representation looked and looks like; and by this demythologize the common myths.

---

*Vedran Obućina*

## **SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY: A BLUEPRINT FOR THE FAITH-BASED RECONCILIATION?**

The historical development of the Balkans is marked by “raw cosmopolitanism”, i.e. the historical presence of many ethnicities, ethnic/national identities, and established and semi-established religions. Mixed populations and pluralistic societies, with minorities so large that they cannot be overlooked in the political processes, have caught the imaginations of many travellers and locals who made a perception of this region as conflict-driven. A generalisation of the Balkans, as a region where *longue durée* historical processes such as the social modernisation, lack of modern judicial and democratic political traditions, parochial political culture etc. make up a pejorative image of this region, settling it somewhere in between (*Zwischenraum*) Europe and Asia.

Particular interest is given to the religious communities and faith-based conflicts that were active until very recently between the Roman Catholic, Muslim, Orthodox and other communities. This paper proposes another vision of the Balkans, as a region where the very same religious traditions may help to build peace and coexistence, despite the fact that religions have been a part of the Balkan conflicts. The overwhelming pessimism over the effect of religions is challenged by the pieces of evidence of historical coexistence, tolerance and traditions in the Balkans. In order to revive this positive tradition, this PhD research is focused on the qualitative analysis of the recent conflicts and the reconciliation process done by the clergy, based on the faith, holy scripts and the religious tradition. Education and personal theological interest of clerics revive the potentials created when sacred creeds and ways are presented together. The research is focused on local-level and grassroots initiatives, their successes and failures, theological reasoning for the faith-based reconciliation, and tries to highlight the South Eastern European region as a place where faith can reconcile and unite if the national and international level of religious diplomacy is accepted on the local levels. By stressing the work of religious diplomats and self-healing potentials of religion, the Balkans may be de-Balkanized by relativizing the “proneness” to religious conflicts.

*Stefan Gužvica*

**(IN)EQUALITY IN INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM:  
UNDERSTANDING INFORMAL HIERARCHIES  
OF THE COMINTERN**

In the spring of 1938, two Paris-based Yugoslav communists wrote alarming letters to Georgi Dimitrov, the general secretary of the Communist International, claiming that their party has been taken over by Trotskyists and saboteurs. By doing so, they circumvented an entire chain of command which included the Comintern Cadres Department, the International Control Commission, the Balkan Secretariat, and the Special Commission for the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ). This breach of the Comintern's hierarchy and division of labor did not bring wrath on the concerned comrades. Instead, it brought Dimitrov into the Yugoslav power struggle, just as they had hoped. Moreover, they seem to have done it at the advice of Dimitrov's personal emissary in Paris. Why was this acceptable? In this chapter, using the case study of Balkan communist parties, I will illustrate the existence of a semi-formal hierarchy of constituent national sections of the Comintern. This hierarchy was never formally established in official documents, but instead arose out of everyday practice and was later codified through ad hoc decisions of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. It had a crucial effect on practical day-to-day activities of the organization, and was constantly present in the correspondences of officials. In the case of the Balkan parties, the Bulgarian communists (BKP) were on top, often overseeing the affairs of the KPJ and exercising influence over the Yugoslavs, while the Albanian communists, who did not even have a party until 1941, were under the jurisdiction of the KPJ. Although the dominance of Bulgarians in the Comintern after 1934 is well-known to scholarship, the more complex dynamic of Comintern's informal hierarchies has not been researched. This chapter aims to fill the gap in scholarship by arguing that these hierarchies are crucial for understanding international communism in the interwar period.

*Dora Kosorčić*

**INTERPRETIVE MODELS AND NARRATIVES OF ARCHBISHOP ALOJZIJE STEPINAC IN CONTEMPORARY CROATIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY**

In Croatia the fall of communism presupposed the theoretical, methodological and thematic „liberation“ of historiography, which translated into addressing until then marginalized or „forbidden“ topics. One of them was the life of Archbishop Alojzije Stepinac, which, in contemporary Croatian historiography, is widely analyzed. Furthermore, in the context of pending canonization of Alojzije Stepinac, his life and activities are extensively debated not only in historiography, but also in public and political discourse. Since there are controversies regarding various aspects of Stepinac’s actions during the Second World War, particularly his relations with the Ustasha regime in the Independent State of Croatia, a question arises in what ways historiographical analyses and interpretations constitute the basis for debate, and what is the influence and correlation of these academic interpretations on discourse and imagery of Stepinac in Croatia. This paper thus analyzes interpretive models and narratives about Archbishop Stepinac, as a case study and a point of reference. The thesis of this paper is that contemporary Croatian historiography is characterised by binary interpretations of Stepinac’s actions in regard to three aspects: racial politics in the Independent State of Croatia, the campaign of compulsory conversions of Serbs to Catholicism, and Stepinac’s relations with the communist regime after 1945. Consequently, this analysis poses an introduction to the topic of theoretical and interpretative frameworks of contemporary Croatian historiography, with emphasis on controversial topics, its (dis)continuities and place within European historiography.

*Karlo Jurak*

## HISTORICAL REVISIONISM AFTER THE DISSOLUTION OF YUGOSLAVIA AND THE ROOTS OF RETRADITIONALIZATION

Yugoslavia developed in a specific way (a kind of a so-called Yugoslavian *Sonderweg*) between the West and the East, so we cannot interpret it only in terms of Eastern European history, or even Southeastern European history, because of its different development with regard to Bulgaria, Romania and Albania. Consequently, researchers of Southeastern Europe must take into account the similarities, but also the differences between Yugoslavia and other Southeastern European countries. Crucial difference refers to the interpretation of the Fall of the Berlin Wall, since the year 1989 was not seen as a „liberal“ year in Yugoslavia whereas the substantial similarity consists in retraditionalization and historical revisionism in the post-communist period.

Historical revisionism after the Fall of the Berlin Wall and the dissolution of Yugoslavia moves from the October Revolution to the French Revolution, i.e. from the last to the first point of its project, because of the existing continuum on this line (elimination of revolutionary tradition such as national liberation, anti-colonial and anti-fascist heritage and movements). Thus the process of retraditionalization is the immediate consequence of the breakdown of real-socialism. The real-socialist project in Eastern and Southeastern Europe carried out the modernization which included some basically liberal values and achievements such as the rights of women, judicial equality, the separation of church and state, etc. Because of that, conservatives and other radical right-wingers today equate liberalism and the Left, and when they attack „communism“, they really attack liberal democracy and the heritage of the Enlightenment. This is the essence of historical revisionism and the meaning of the process of retraditionalization.

Therefore, the aim of this paper is to underline similarities and differences between Yugoslavia and other former real-socialist states and to emphasize the role of historical revisionism and retraditionalization in specific circumstances of the transition period.

---

*Dea Marić*

## **HISTORY EDUCATION IN «THE REGION». POLICY AGENDAS AND HISTORY TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS**

Many studies on politics of history education in Southeastern Europe have established that the crucial leap from content-driven history education towards history education aimed at developing historical thinking has not yet been made (Dimou, 2008; Koulouri, 2002; van der Leeuw-Roord, 2012; EUROCLIO, 2018). Several researchers point to essentialist and stereotyping approaches to *Others*, “singular truth” and exclusivist approaches to shared histories in history curricula and textbooks (Koulouri, 2002; Dimou, 2008; Marić and Jovanović, 2017; EUROCLIO, 2018.). At the same time, many (predominantly) international initiatives aimed at fostering transformative history education were undertaken in the region.

This paper will largely cover a study that assessed the impact of such attempts by bringing insights into teachers' perceptions of history education and their teaching practices across Western Balkans (Marić and Jovanović, 2017). Has teaching paradigm shifted from lecture-dominant to learner-oriented (Jones, 2007) and from one narrative transmission to narrative analysis (Assman, 1995)? A large-scale mixed-method study explored how more than 1200 history teachers from Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia see the current state and what type of future developments in history education they strive for. Through the combination of quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection teachers' perceptions of several aspects of history education were explored. Amongst other, their teaching practices were examined because of their importance for critical engagement with counter narratives and controversies. Teachers' individual characteristics, their self-perception in the wider educational and societal context and their understanding of history (teaching) were explored in order to find out whether they influence their practices of teaching about difficult topics. The paper also addresses terminological and conceptual changes in regards to «the region» (from Southeastern Europe to former-Yugoslavia and Western Balkans) in different educational policies and research agendas as well as their implications on the practice of history teaching.

### LITERATURE:

- Assman, J. (1995) "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity", *New German Critique*, No. 65, Cultural History/Cultural Studies (Spring - Summer, 1995), pp. 125-133
- Dimou, A. (Ed.) (2009) "Transition" and the politics of history education in Southeast Europe, Göttingen: V&R unipress
- EUROCLIO (2018). Making sense of the past that refuses to pass. Recommendations for teaching Wars in Yugoslavia and its successor states, <http://devedesete.net/policy-paper/> last accessed 13<sup>th</sup> of May 2018.
- Jones, L. (2007) *The Student-centered Classroom*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Koulouri, C. (2002) *Clio in the Balkans: the politics of history education*, Thessaloniki: Center for democracy and reconciliation in Southeast Europe
- Marić, D. and Jovanović, R. (2017). *Teachers On Teaching: How Practitioners See The Current State And Future Developments In History Education Across The Western Balkans (Rep.)*, Hague, The Netherlands: EUROCLIO.
- Van der Leeuw-Roord, J. (2012), *A Key to Unlock the Past. History Education in Macedonia: An Analysis of Today Suggestions for the Future*, Hague/Skopje: EUROCLIO

---

## BIOGRAPHIES

**Vinko Drača** was born in 1989 in Zagreb. He is currently attending last year of PhD program of Modern and Contemporary History of Croatia at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb. He has attended many conferences and workshops: doctoral workshop “Archive Material and My Doctoral Dissertation” in Ljubljana (2018), conference “Migrations in Visual Culture” in Belgrade, workshop “RiSeminario” in Rijeka. Vinko Drača is taking part in the international project “Managing Maladjustment in the Modern World. Perspectives from Southeastern Europe” organized by BAYHOST (so far two workshops were held on Faculty of Philosophy in Rijeka). As a member of society of culturologists Kult.co he took active part in their scientific conferences in Ljubljana. He participated in international scientific convention “Desničini susreti” twice: in 2017 (“Smrt u opusu Vladana Desnice i europskoj kulturi – poetički, povijesni i filozofski aspekti”) and in 2018 (“Zagreb 1924. – 1930. i 1945. – 1967.: društvo, kultura, svakodnevnica”).

He was a member of the organizing committee of PhD conference “Revolutions and Upheavals in History” and coordinator of the student workshop “Europe as Group Fantasy”. He published papers in journals *Acta Medico Historica Adriatica*, *Historijski zbornik*, *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog Fakulteta* and *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina*.

**Stefan Gužvica** is a doctoral student at the Graduate School for East and Southeast European Studies of the University of Regensburg. He researches the international communist movement in the interwar period and labor under socialism, with a particular focus on Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. He is currently writing a dissertation on the transnational links within the Communist International during the Great Purge (1936-1939), under the supervision of Professor Ulf Brunnbauer.

**Karlo Jurak** is a doctoral student of postgraduate doctoral programme Modern and Contemporary Croatian History in the European and World Context at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb. He

graduated in philosophy and general linguistics in 2017 at the same Faculty. During his studies he was the participant and the organizer of many scientific conferences and meetings related to various topics from the field of social and political philosophy, philosophy of language and history of ideas. He was also the editor of a student magazine and the active member of some student organizations. The main areas of his interests are: history of political ideas, social and political history, history of southeastern Europe, etc.

**Dora Kosorčić** (1991) is a doctoral candidate at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. She holds a master's degree (MA) in History, specializing in 20th century history. She has worked as a junior editor in Srednja Europa, publishing house specialized in publishing historiographic and linguistic literature. She has translated and edited the Croatian edition of Stéphane Bruchfeld's and Paul A. Levine's book *Tell Ye Your Children. A Book about the Holocaust in Europe 1933-1945*. Her fields of research are: history of socialism in Yugoslavia, socialist ideology, contemporary Croatian history, theory and methodology, historiography.

**Frederik Lange** studied history, art history, and Southeast European Studies in Göttingen and Jena. In 2015, he completed his Master degree in history at the Georg-August University of Göttingen with a thesis on World War II in (post-) Yugoslavian history textbooks. From 2016 to 2017 he worked as an editorial assistant for the *Südost-Forschungen* at the Leibniz Institute for East and Southeast European Research (IOS) in Regensburg and as a research assistant at the Regensburg office of the Graduate School for East and Southeast European Studies. In 2017, he also worked as an assistant for the project "Corridors for Dialogue through Cooperation – Research and Dialogue Project" of the junior research group "Frozen and Unfrozen Conflicts" at the IOS. Since November 2017, he is a scholarship holder of the Graduate School for East and Southeast European Studies in Regensburg, working on his doctoral thesis on the Drina river.

**Dea Marić** holds an MA in History and Sociology. She is a lecturer at the History Department of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb where she teaches various courses related to History

Teaching. She is currently enrolled in doctoral programme in Modern and Contemporary Croatian History in European and World Context at the same Faculty. Her main research interest is the social role of history education in the context of post-conflict societies. She is a president of Croatian History Teachers Association and an active member of European History Teachers Association (EUROCLIO). In the course of her professional career, she worked on various positions in schools, CSOs and institutions responsible for implementation of European Framework Programmes for Research and Innovation.

**Vedran Obućina** is a Croatian political scientist, political analyst for area studies of the Balkans and the Middle East, and an Orthodox Old-Catholic priest and theologian oriented to the ecumenical and interfaith dialogue. He is a PhD student at the Department of History at the University in Regensburg, with the topic „Religion Based Reconciliation. How the Clergy Increases the Role of Religion in Finding Peace. Case Studies of ex-Yugoslavian Conflicts“. He is the author of a book *Political System of the Islamic Republic of Iran* (in Croatian, 2018) and of many scientific and specialist articles as well as the attendee of more than 20 international scientific conferences worldwide.

**Oliver Panichi** studied History at the University of Bologna and graduated with a thesis on Yugoslavism. Thanks to his knowledge of Serbian and Croatian language, he was enrolled in a PhD Program in European History at the University of Teramo (Italy), with the following supervisors: Professor Giovanni Pizzorusso (specialist in Modern History and History of Catholic Missions in the World) and Professor Egidio Ivetic (of the University of Padua), specialist in History of Yugoslavia and in History of the Balkans from the Modern Age to the present day. Professor Klaus Buchenau of the University of Regensburg was also a supervisor of his thesis: *Ragusa (Dubrovnik) in the 19th century: nations, religion, identities. From Slavism to the Serb Catholic idea: new perspectives about an uncommon city.*

In addition to the political, religious and cultural history of Dalmatia and Dubrovnik in the Habsburg era, he has recently also conducted research in the following fields: Birth of the Old Catholic Church in Croatia

after the First World War; Birth of the Czechoslovak National Church after the First World War; the Eastern Question and the revolts in Herzegovina and Bosnia in 1875, with special attention to the diplomatic policy of the Kingdom of Italy and the presence of Italian volunteers on the battlefields in these regions and in Serbia.; Relations between the Holy See and Italian and Slav nationalism; question of the Catholic liturgical language in Dalmatia at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries.

As a further field of research, he is studying mysticism in the Catholic world (19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup>) centuries, with particular attention to the political and social aspects of these phenomena and to the Marian Apparitions in Italy and Europe.

**Nikola Tomašegović** was born in Zagreb in 1991, where he finished elementary school and high school. He graduated in history and philosophy at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Zagreb in 2016 with MA theses: *Governmental Function of the Development of Statistics in Civil Croatia during the Second Half of the 19th Century* and *Kant's Philosophy of History in the Context of German Enlightenment Discussions*. He received the award for academic excellence in the undergraduate program in history and was granted the scholarship of the city of Zagreb for the year 2014/2015. Currently he is a PhD Student of Modern and Contemporary Croatian History in the European and World Context, working on his thesis titled *The Modernist movement of „the Youth“ in Croatian culture and politics at the turn of the 20th century*. From 2018 he is employed as a teaching assistant at the Chair of Croatian History of the Department History, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Zagreb, where he teaches courses on Croatian 19th century history. He is also a team member of the research project *The Transition of Croatian Elites from the Habsburg Monarchy to the Yugoslav State* financed by the Croatian Science Foundation and led by Prof. Iskra Iveljić. His areas of research include: 19th century intellectual history, history of knowledge and history of science, modern Croatian history in the European Context and theory and history of historiography.

Bibliography: <https://www.bib.irb.hr/pregled/znanstvenici/367974>

Papers available on: <https://ffzg.academia.edu/NikolaTomašegović>