

logies and living oral memory. In the post-communist age historians are busy with excavating national pasts. The cold memory of Tito is unacceptable in the reconstitution of a national collective memory. In the context of a new post-communist myth of national salvation, Tito is instrumentalised as a symbol of political evil. In the official memory of the main former Yugoslav republics he is redundant or unacceptable. But on the other side, in the Yugo-nostalgic people's memory and in living oral memory, he is still a positive person. After the collapse of Yugoslav socialism memories of Tito were "unfrozen" and became the subject of historical controversies. While anticommunist historians demonised Tito, he is the hero and positive person in the people's memory. The mobilisation of an antititoism has reshaped the Serbian right.

Chapter 11 treats Tito's self-understanding and personal traits which effected his rule, and the last *Chapter 12* gives a judgement on the function of Tito's rule and the role of his personal achievements.

The historical and theoretical framework of this book is the permanently facing comparison and elevation of the two opposite sides of Tito's rule. In other words, the historical judgment of Tito's role premises a differentiation between its progressive and conservative components. History will, probably, give more weight to Tito's charisma as a means of integrating a complex state, than as an expression of his personal ambitions without thereby denying that the growing charisma induced return effects and encouraged immoderate political ambitions. History will register the deeper enlightening and state-integrative goals of the party management more than the small group career interests that were protected by the leader's cult. Personal glorification and the instrumental use of the ruler's cult are a historically more ephemeral and less important aspect in comparison to the objective role of the charisma. Tito's charisma was an important base for state centralization and, during his first stage, for accelerated technological and economic modernization of the country as well. The super-ethnic elevation of the leader's cult encouraged cosmopolitization, deprovincialization and pacification of the chaotic Balkan spaces. That is the central historical function of Tito's rule, but it cannot be separated from its ideological basis. As one version of a super-ethnic cosmopolitan ideology, Marxism certainly played an important role in bringing closer traditionally related, but also conflicted, ethnic groups. As a means of self-protection of several small ethnic groups from cultural and linguistic discrimination, isolation and provincialism, Yugoslavianism (opposite today's nationalisms) found in Marxism a strong instrument of modernization. Internationalistic ideology and the cult of super ethnic class leader were inseparable components of the uneven and contradictory process of Balkan cosmopolitanization.

In this process the role of Tito's personality were active. As a wise, penetrating and flexible politician, by

skilfully using his own authority in foreign and domestic politics, Tito as a ruler managed to keep the Yugoslav ethnic groups together in a common state for the longest period of time, and gave Yugoslavianism its most lasting state form. In the history of the Left, he will be remembered as a ruler who, in the framework of his times, tried to democratize one-party socialism. This attempt was inspired far more by the direct democratic plebeian tradition of socialism than by a search for an institutionally and legally regulated division of power. In a relatively conflict-less way and with the help of a monopolistic party, Tito developed a specific regime of personal power and then became its captive, convicted that his life-long rule was the irreplaceable core of integration. Despite the civil war in Yugoslavia in the 1990-th and the downfall of multiethnic Yugoslavia, it seems that, like in many similar historical examples, immeasurable personal power will remain in the shadow of demonstrated modernizational historical achievement.

Memory of Tito is a kind of "symbolic power" in the politics as strategic public claim-making and struggle over public meanings in specific cultural contexts. While present politicians have power over memory, memory also has power over them. The uses and abuses of memory of Tito show a connection between memory and interests. Our past has so often been instrumentalised to legitimate the national state and its glory. Cold memory of Tito (without emotionalism and moralisation), presented in this book, could actually serve as a subversive counter concept to a new monumental historical founding myths. Undoubtedly present book by the Prof. T. Kuljić (Faculty of Arts, Belgrade) is the basic work for every researcher who is dealing with post war problematic of the Tito's Yugoslavia.

Avgust Lešnik

*Almut Höfert: DEN FEIND BESCHREIBEN.
"TÜRKENGEFAHR" UND EUROPÄISCHES WISSEN
ÜBER DAS OSMANISCHE REICH 1450–1600.
Campus Historische Studien, Band 35.
Frankfurt/New York, Campus Verlag, 2003, 456 str.*

Pričujoče delo je v zadnjih letih morda celo najbolj odmevno znotraj tematike, ki jo obravnava. Höfert na osnovi reprezentativnih virov analizira formiranje etnografske vednosti o Osmanih v Evropi 15. in 16. stoletja, kar poizkuša po eni strani povezati s političnim in gospodarskim sodelovanjem med Osmani in izbranimi evropskimi silami, po drugi strani pa to postaviti v kontekst evropskega etnografskega pisanja. Njegova raziskava se ukvarja s temelji evropskega antropološkega razvoja, ki so bili postavljeni v 15. in 16. stoletju in pri

katerih gre za osnovni vzorec družbenega klasificiranja in opisovanja. Ta vzorec se je v osnovnih potezah kljub vsebinsko pomembnim spremembam obdržal vse do 21. stoletja. Za zgodovinske študije o popotnih poročilih velja, da tovrstni viri nudijo celoto mnogih aspektov za zgodovinsko raziskovanje. Na osnovi dosedanje znanstvene literature se je Höfert lahko osredotočil na ne zgolj politični in kulturni kontekst, temveč tudi na skupni označevalni princip, ki druži dela evropskih zgodnjenovoveških avtorjev o Osmanih. Ta označevalni princip Höfert označuje kot "epistemološko konfiguracijo", uporablja pa še dva druga pojma. Pojem "Episteme" tako povezuje epistemološko konfiguracijo z diskurzom o "turški nevarnosti" (*Türkengefahr*) in se sprašuje o njuni splošni značilnosti. V teku svojega raziskovanja je Höfert razvil tezo, po kateri naj bi za nastanek te epistemološke konfiguracije odločilen impulz prispevalo raznorodno evropsko nasprotovanje – tako ideološko kot vojaško – Osmanom.

Delo je razdeljeno v sedem poglavij. Uvod predstavi stanje raziskav v kontekstu "kritične antropologije" in "postkolonialnih študij", pri katerih gre za poskus, kako v dobi globalizacije preseči dihotomijo med aktivnim, raziskujočim zahodnjaškim subjektom in molčečim, nezahodnjaškim objektom. V prvem poglavju je prikazan razvojni lok od 15. v 16. stoletje, ko se je prek sovplivanja številnih dejavnikov in tradicij razvila nova epistemološka konfiguracija, ki je odločilno vplivala na generiranje in klasificiranje znanja o posameznih družbah. Celoto teh informacij Höfert imenuje "etnografsko vedenje", s čimer označuje temeljno kontinuiteto določenih uradnih toposov v opisovalnih vzorcih družbenih struktur med 16. in 21. stoletjem. Sklicevanje na tovrstno kontinuiteto pa se navezuje zgolj na točno določene topose in upošteva precejšnje spreminjanje teh vsebinskih kategorij skozi čas. Drugo poglavje je posvečeno diskurzu "turške nevarnosti", ki je obilno vplival na nastanek korpusa etnografskega védenja o Osmanih. Tretje poglavje je zamišljeno kot dopolnilo drugemu poglavju ter se sprašuje o akterjih in razmerjih moči tega diskurza, ki ga poizkuša artikulirati v različnih kontekstih, iz katerih so razvidni različni vplivi na nastanek etnografskega vedenja. Pri tem je posebna pozornost posvečena trem velesilam: Benetkam, Franciji in avstrijskim Habsburžanom. Četrto poglavje analizira dvig etnografskega védenja o Osmanih v 15. stoletju, ki je bilo politično motivirano. Peto poglavje se posveča vprašanju, v kakšni meri se je v zgodnjem novem veku ohranjalo etnografsko znanje iz antike in srednjega veka. V šestem poglavju se avtor loteva metodološkega prevpraševanja dosedanjega védenja o zgodnjenovoveškem odnosu do Osmanov. V sedmem poglavju pa sledi zaokrožitev epistemološke konfiguracije etnografskega poznavanja ter ureditev le-te glede na analize v prejšnjih poglavjih.

Almut Höfert **DEN FEIND
BESCHREIBEN** »Türkengefahr«
und europäisches Wissen über
das Osmanische
Reich 1450–1600



campus HISTORISCHESTUDIEN

Delo Almute Höferta vsekakor predstavlja pomemben mejnik pri preučevanju odnosa krščanske Evrope do Osmanov v zgodnjem novem veku, saj je prvo tovrstno delo, ki primerjalno obdela celoten korpus dokumentov, s katerimi se ukvarja. Kot pomanjkljivost knjige pa bi tu lahko omenili izostanek obravnave odnosa do "Turka" v celotni vzhodni Evropi, kar bi lahko v prvi vrsti pripisali nepoznavanju jezika in posledično tudi ustreznih znanstvenih del s tega območja. Prav tako je nekritično uporabljen naziv Evropa in evropski, saj je ta naziv prihranjen zgolj za zahodnoevropska območja, česar se Höfert zaveda ter to poizkuša kompenzirati s sklicevanjem na obravnavanje koncepta evropskega v latinskem krščanstvu pod vplivom "turške nevarnosti", ki naj bi to zavest sploh obudila in temeljito prevrednotila.

Klemen Pust