

HISTORIOGRAPHY IN SLOVENIA TODAY

Peter Vodopivec

Slovene historiography lived through the fall of communism, the disintegration of Yugoslavia, and the independence of Slovenia without major turmoil. In 1992, Vasko Simoniti, historian of the then younger generation, published a controversial article in the central historical studies review, *Zgodovinski časopis*, in which he claimed that “as a rule historians [at the time of communism - *P.V.*] did not politically expose themselves,” and that historical research in Slovenia (as elsewhere in Yugoslavia) after WW II was “rather one-sided and (politically) controlled.”¹ But Bogo Grafenauer, one of the “fathers” of contemporary Slovene historiography, firmly rebuked him and—in an extensive reply—tried to prove that in their research, in spite of pressures, historians had always followed professional standards fairly autonomously, and so the political change and democratic reforms of 1991 did not represent a specific turning point for them.²

In reality the standpoints of the two authors did not differ as much as it seemed at first sight. They both agreed that in the years from 1945 to 1990 research on the older historical periods was much more autonomous and independent than the study of the period after 1918, to which the communist authorities—wishing to confirm their own legitimacy—devoted more attention and contributed more funds. They both said that researchers, under political pressures, increasingly oriented themselves to “recent and revolutionary history” (i.e., the history of the workers’ and “revolutionary” movement, the revolt against the occupying forces during WW II, and the communist party and post-war communist era), whereby the balance between the studies of individual periods of the past was upset, and so-called “early history” (before 1850) was shifted to the background. They were also both of the opinion that the consequences of such political directing were more than detrimental to historiography, since the result of the ideological and political

¹ Vasko Simoniti, “O slovenskem zgodovinopisju 1945-1990 ali kako je na zgodovinopisje vplivalo staranje oblasti,” *Zgodovinski časopis* 3.46 (1992): 387–93.

² Bogo Grafenauer, “O pisanju v slovenskem zgodovinopisju,” *Zgodovinski časopis* 1. 47 (1993): 117–29.

narrowing of the historical horizon was an extremely one-sided and deformed image of the Slovene and South-Slav past.

Grafenauer and Simoniti thus diverged mainly in the evaluation of the shared guilt and responsibility of historians for the aforementioned condition. While Simoniti claimed that, after 1970 in particular, Slovene historians excessively subordinated themselves to the wishes and requests of communist policy, Grafenauer objected that they persistently resisted the pressures and tried to maintain a high professional level in the treatment of the recent as well as the more distant past; he himself was supposed to be an example of such attitude, although he could not change the political situation and research conditions.

The discussion, hardly begun, thus halted. In the following years a few critical analyses of Slovene historiography after WW II were published, but mostly abroad.³ In 1994, a special poll on Slovene history and historiography was also organized by the magazine *Naši Razgledi*: its conclusion was that “nothing much happened” to Slovene historiography during communist times, because what had happened was only what had been happening to the Slovene intelligentsia traditionally—from the end of the nineteenth century on. From the origin of Slovene national parties and from the polarization of Slovene territory into opposing ideological camps, the Slovene intelligentsia rather easily and emotionally fell under the influence of various ideological and political groups that tried to catch it (more or less successfully) in their party nets. In this light, the world after 1945 was a continuation of the history that had started before, except that there was much less choice in the extremely constricted communist political space. Independent individuals who refused to be involved in parties or ideology were—even after 1945—looked upon as eccentrics who could not count on either institutional or professional support, and as a result found it hard to avoid political difficulties.⁴

In spite of such (self)critical reflection, Grafenauer’s claim that 1991 did not represent a special turning point for Slovene historiography was correct. Under the influence of social and anthropological historical

³ Milica Kacin Wohinz, “Appunti sull'attuale storiografia Slovena,” *Storia Contemporanea in Friuli* 22.23 (1992): 145–55; Peter Vodopivec, “L'historiographie en Slovenie dans les années 80, Histoire et pouvoir en Europe Médiane,” ed. Antoine Marès (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1996) 123–27.

⁴ The poll started in issue 5 (4 March) of *Naši Razgledi* in 1994 and ended in issue 12 (10 June).

studies in Western Europe, criticism of traditional directions of historiography at home and aggravated political conditions in Yugoslavia, important changes occurred in Slovene historiography as early as the mid eighties. Following the example of Western European, particularly French and German authors, some, mostly younger scholars directed themselves to the study of less researched or un-researched social and cultural-historical topics, while others engaged in the interpretation of the recent and distant past (from the Middle Ages to the most recent history) in a politically, ideologically, and nationally more open and relaxed way than previous generations. Among the first forerunners of the new era were researchers of Roman Catholic ecclesiastical history and Christianity. Already in 1986, Rajko Bratož had published a historical outline of the Christianization and ecclesiastical organization in Roman times of subsequently Slovene territory,⁵ and thereby laid an important foundation for a synthetic *History of the Church in Slovenia*, published in Ljubljana in 1991⁶. In 1989, Slovenska matica organized the first of two symposiums on the role of the Roman Catholic Church in Slovene cultural and political life,⁷ which highlighted the great importance of the clergy and church in Slovene national development. In the same year, a monograph by France M. Dolinar on the historical formation of Slovene Ecclesiastical Province was also published, the author of which perhaps deserves most credit for the reinstatement of church history as an equal branch of Slovene historiography.⁸

⁵ Rajko Bratož, *Kršćanstvo v Ogleju in na vzhodnem vplivnem območju oglejske cerkve od začetkov do nastopa verske svobode*, Series Acta Ecclesiastica Sloveniae 8 (Ljubljana: Teološka fakulteta, 1986).

⁶ Inštitut za zgodovino Cerkve pri Teološki fakulteti, *Zgodovina Cerkve na Slovenskem* (Celje: Mohorjeva družba, 1991).

⁷ Dolinar, France M., Joža Mahnič, and Peter Vodopivec, eds. *Vloga Cerkve v slovenskem kulturnem razvoju 19. stoletja* (Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, Celje: Mohorjeva družba, Klagenfurt, Gorizia: Goriška Mohorjeva družba, 1989); Dolinar, France M., Joža Mahnič, and Peter Vodopivec, eds. *Cerkev, kultura in politika 1890-1941* (Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1993).

⁸ In the 1990s, research of church history started to flourish significantly. Various issues of church history were treated by France M. Dolinar, Marjan Smolik, Jože Mlinarič, Metod Benedik, Joško Pirc, France Kralj, Bogdan Kolar, Anton Ožinger, Andrej Vovko, Stane Granda, Darko Friš, and Liljana Žnidaršič Golec.

At the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, the start of a new era in the writing of Slovene history was clearly marked by young researchers of the WW II and of the post-war, communist periods. In 1992, Jera Vodušek Starič's *Seizure of Power (Prevzem oblasti 1944-1946)* was published in Ljubljana, which, even at the time when the author defended it as her doctoral thesis, caused disagreement and controversy. In it, Vodušek Starič comprehensively, in a broad Yugoslav context and with a precise analysis of the war-based Slovene political and juridical system, described the principal stages of the communist seizure of power, and also extensively dwelt on the communists' reckoning with real or presumed opponents, mass exterminations, and political trials. Her work, which was the first comprehensive and politically unburdened presentation of Slovene political conditions in the years 1944–46, encountered critical rejection by the public, as well as open expressions of approval and praise.⁹ It thus rather overshadowed other, equally innovative monographs, also dealing with the history of the post-war political authorities; for example, Aleš Gabrič's *Slovene Cultural and Agitprop Policy 1945-1952*, published in 1991 (its sequel, *Socialist Cultural Revolution, Slovene Cultural Policy 1953-1962*, was published in 1995), and Božo Repe's *Liberalism in Slovenia*, which appeared in 1992. Repe treated the policy of Stane Kavčič's government in the second half of the 1960s, and stated that the reformist plans of the communist "liberals" between 1967 and 1972 were the last attempt at modernization of Yugoslav communism. The three books had in common that they originated already in the 1980s and were very critical towards the communists and their policy.

At the beginning of the 1990s, and even after, the issue of the communist violence during and after WW II was in the focus of public attention, which is probably understandable. Issues of the disintegration of Yugoslavia and the causes of the tragic end of the Yugoslav federation, in contrast, aroused much less interest among Slovene historians, which was surprising enough. It is true that Slovene historiography, except for a rare exceptions, by tradition dealt mostly with national history but, at the same time, until the second half of the 1980s it almost unanimously

⁹ The book was also positively evaluated by the author's colleagues in history after its publication, even by some of those who had criticized it before. The author received the highest Slovene scientific acknowledgment for her work, the state award for scientific achievements.

demonstrated long-term Slovene allegiance to the Yugoslav cause and the view that the Slovenes had no choice—either in 1918 or in 1948—but to accede to Yugoslavia. The first to question this direction was Vasilij Melik, who at a convention of Slovene historians in 1988 stated that the Slovene decision to be part of Yugoslavia rested on false presumptions even in 1918.¹⁰ Some historians agreed with him, trying to reconstruct in more detail the visions of Slovene political leaders and national ideologists before 1918 and after, while simultaneously stating that the Slovenes in 1918 almost unanimously decided for Yugoslavia and continued en masse to favor Yugoslavia right up to the second half of the 1980s, when Yugoslavia was already cracking along all its seams. We also find such evaluations in Ervin Dolenc's excellent review of Slovene cultural policy and Slovene endeavours for cultural autonomy in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (SHS), published in Ljubljana in 1996.¹¹ Otherwise, in most Slovene historical works dealing with the Yugoslav period of Slovene history, Yugoslavia only represented a framework, while the real subject of interest was Slovene history. In his book *Slovene Independence in 1918*,¹² Jure Perovšek analyzed in detail the one-month state of SHS, uncovering numerous interesting, previously unknown facts. He affirmed that the state of SHS was a confederation in which the Slovenes de facto maintained their national independence. This statement triggered a few public doubts, but again, no in-depth professional discussion. Perovšek's earlier book, entitled *Liberalism and the Slovene National Issue*,¹³ which examines the national policy of the Slovene Liberal Party and intelligentsia during the first Yugoslavia and clearly demonstrates that it was the result of a simple calculation, is less problematic: the liberals were only significant politically if they joined with the Belgrade democrats; as soon as they lost the support of Belgrade, they could no longer resist the overwhelming Catholic Party.

As is well known, the Catholic politicians also successfully lobbied in Belgrade, since during the Yugoslav Kingdom, Anton Korošec

¹⁰ "Leto 1918 v slovenski zgodovini," *Zgodovinski časopis* 42.4 (1988): 525–32.

¹¹ Ervin Dolenc, *Kulturni boj. Slovenska kulturna politika v Kraljevini SHS 1918-1929* (Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1996).

¹² *Slovenska osamosvojitve leta 1918: Študija o slovenski državnosti v Državi Slovencev, Hrvatov in Srbov* (Ljubljana: Modrijan 1998).

¹³ *Liberalizem in vprašanje slovenstva: nacionalna politika liberalnega tabora v letih 1918-1929* (Ljubljana: Modrijan, 1996).

was twelve times minister, twice deputy prime minister, and once (the only non-Serb) prime minister. However, historians studying the policy of the Slovene Catholic Party (SLS) after 1918 were more interested in its striving for autonomy than in its connections in Belgrade. In 1991, a new, eagerly awaited biography of Korošec was published, which unfortunately treated his life only until 1918.¹⁴ However, Mirko Stiplovšek produced a much more in-depth presentation of the policy of the SLS and the extended autonomy of both Slovene regional governments (*oblast*) from 1927 to 1929, which, he argued, had a very beneficial influence on Slovene economic and cultural development in the first Yugoslavia.¹⁵ Andrej Rahten also limited himself to an outline of Slovene Catholic policy only and researched the activities of the SLS deputies in the Belgrade Assembly in the 1920s.¹⁶

The only original Slovene outline of the history of the two Yugoslavias was thus published in 1995 by Jože Pirjevec, who, as a Slovene from Trieste, typically observed Yugoslavia more from outside than from inside. Pirjevec did not doubt the long-term Slovene allegiance to Yugoslavia, but he presented Yugoslavia as an explicitly controversial formation, more prone to division than to cohesion from the very start. Although critical towards communism and particularly towards Kardelj's fantasies, which peaked in the constitution of 1974 and in the Associated Labor Act two years later, he was persuaded that Yugoslavia was blown apart by Serbian nationalism, headed by Slobodan Milošević. The book received favorable criticism in Slovenia, and sold well, but it did not provoke any professional discussion and even less a wish to follow it. The second comprehensive book Pirjevec wrote, on "the Yugoslav wars" (1991-2001)—the first and until now only historical monograph by a South Slav scholar to analyze military conflicts and wars in Slovenia, Croatia, and Bosnia and Hercegovina in the 1990s—shared the same fate.

¹⁴ Feliks Bister, *Anton Korošec, državnozborni poslanec na Dunaju: življenje in delo 1872-1918*, trans. Janko Moder (Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1992).

¹⁵ Miroslav Stiplovšek, *Slovenski parlamentarizem 1927-1929: avtonomistična prizadevanja skupščin ljubljanske in mariborske oblasti za ekonomsko-socialni in prosvetno-kulturni razvoj Slovenije ter za udejanjenje parlamentarizma* (Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 2000).

¹⁶ *Slovenska ljudska stranka v beograjski skupščini. Jugoslovanski klub v parlamentarnem življenju Kraljevine SHS 1919-1929* (Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, 2002).

It received favorable reviews but attracted no particular public and professional attention.¹⁷

The impression that there was no further Slovene interest in events in the former Yugoslavia during the 1990s and the bloody wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina would naturally be false. However, as far as history is concerned, the main topic for a segment of the public and for the new political parties was the "Slovene reconciliation," which, as viewed by those who most eagerly called for it, was not possible until facts about the communist terror and the real causes of the fratricidal conflict during WW II, followed by mass exterminations of the communists' opponents, were precisely known. Demands for a re-interpretation of the history of WW II in Slovenia and of post-war communist policy greatly split public opinion, while a flow of criticism was directed towards the historians supposed to be particularly responsible for the one-sided and distorted historical presentation of recent Slovene history.¹⁸ This criticism was only partly justified. As early as in the 1970s and 1980s, historians were not completely unanimous in their descriptions and evaluations of the developments during WW II; in the second half of the 1980s and at the beginning of the 1990s they actually and visibly diverged.

Among the first to engage in systematic research of the anti-communist and anti-partisan camp was Boris Mlakar, who published several papers and a book in the 1980s on the Home Guards in the Slovene littoral.¹⁹ Mlakar maintained that the ruthless civil conflict and the collaboration in Slovenia were not merely consequences of the middle class parties' inconstancy and anti-communism, but of communist radicalism as well. In 1991, at the convention marking the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Liberation Front, Bojan Godeša persuasively demonstrated that the Communist Party in 1941,

¹⁷ Jože Pirjevec, *Jugoslavija 1918-1991* (Koper: Lipa, 1995) Jože Pirjevec, *Jugoslovanske vojne 1991-2001* (Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 2003).

¹⁸ In the mid 1980s, the bibliography of the national liberation struggle, the Liberation Front, and the partisan movement in Slovenia numbered more than 50,000 units, although with memorial works and publications prevailing, and far fewer expert works, based on sources. After Metod Mikuž, research of partisan resistance was comprehensively elaborated by Tone Ferenc, and authors such as Mirko Stiplovšek, Ivan Križnar, Zdravko Klanjšček and Milan Ževart.

¹⁹ Boris Mlakar, *Domobranstvo na Primorskem* (Ljubljana: Borec, 1982).

just as prior to the beginning of the war, faithfully followed the Comintern's instructions. Up until 22 June 1941, its leaders hesitated and even unbelievably naively expected that Germany would experience a proletarian revolution, while after 22 June they initiated armed activity against the occupier, persuaded that the war would be brief and that the Red Army would defeat the German Army in a few months.²⁰ In *Who Is Not with Us Is against Us* (*Kdor ni z nami, je proti nam*, 1995).²¹ Godeša focused on the political and ideological divisions of the Slovene intelligentsia and the role the intellectuals, split between the resistance and anticommunist groups, had in Slovene controversies during WW II.²² In the 1990s, other researchers as well contributed more politically balanced studies of conditions and relations in Slovenia during WW II than was the case during the communist period.²³ At the focus of their interests was and remains the communists' policy and their revolutionary plans, partisan military strategy, the policy of traditional parties and their connections with the Yugoslav Government in London, and various forms of civil resistance and collaboration.

In 1994, Jera Vodušek Starič stirred up particular attention with her book *The Mačkovšek Dossier*.²⁴ With the support of documents, she pointed out the connections between Slovene liberals and British intelligence and, simultaneously, their unsuccessful attempts to stop the civil conflict. Tamara Griesser Pečar and Martin F. Dolinar wrote a book in which they refuted the accusations against Bishop Rožman;²⁵ while in his extensive monograph on the secret anti-fascist organization of the Slovene clergy in Primorsko, Egon Pelikan profoundly changed the

²⁰ Bojan Godeša, "Priprave na revolucijo ali NOB?" eds. Ferdo Gestrin, Bogo Grafenauer, and Janko Pleterški. *Slovenski upor 1941* (Ljubljana: SAZU, 1991) 69–85. The article treats Slovene communist activity in the period from the summer of 1940 to the attack of Nazi Germany on Soviet Union.

²¹ *Kdor ni z nami, je proti nam: slovenski izobraženci med okupatorji, Osvobodilno fronto in protirevolucionarnim taborom* (Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1995).

²² *Kdor ni z nami je proti nam: Slovenski izobraženci med okupatorji, Osvobodilnofronto in protirevolucionarnim taborom* (Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1995).

²³ Damjan Guštin, Vida Deželak Barič, Zdenko Čepič, Jože Dežman and Egon Pelikan.

²⁴ *Dosje Mačkovšek* (Ljubljana: Arhivsko društvo Slovenije, 1994).

²⁵ *Rožmanov proces* (Ljubljana: Družina, 1996).

existing picture of the resistance in southwest Slovenia.²⁶ Pelikan's book was based on until then unknown archival material (above all on Engelbert Besednjak's personal archives). It traced the national and antifascist activities of Slovene priests and Christian-Socialists in the Slovene littoral from 1920 until 1945. The latest synthetic results of the long-term research in the archives are Tone Ferenc's monograph on the Slovene Četniks, anticommunist groups, and non-partisan resistance units that were attacked and defeated by the Slovene partisans in 1943, and Boris Mlakar's comprehensive book on the Slovene Home Guards. Both authors are in the first place focusing on the inner organization and functioning of the anticommunist and non-partisan groups and units, on their political strategies, military tactics and orientations.²⁷

The reinterpretation of the prevailing historical picture of WW II still has its opponents in Slovenia. A frequent objection is that such "revision" tries to reduce the importance of the anti-fascist and anti-occupier struggle, and to burden the communists with exclusive blame for the collaboration and the civil war. This criticism, however, is without foundation. With the exception of few individuals who ascribe complete responsibility for the Slovene wartime internal conflict to the communists, other researchers try to show primarily that political conditions during WW II were much more complex than presented so far. Although there are substantial interpretive differences, they may be generally summed up in the following: The development of war incidents on Slovene territory, which led to the fratricidal conflict and communist revolution during WW II, was rooted in the lack of democratic traditions among Slovenes and in the pre-war political and ideological divisions in Slovene politics. Thus, in 1941, the dominant pre-war political parties underestimated the population's spirit of resistance and lost the initiative in organizing against the occupiers. This is precisely how the rapid

²⁶ *Tajno delovanje primorske duhovščine pod fašizmom: primorski krščanski socialci med Vatikanom, fašistično Italijo in slovensko katoliško desnico - zgodovinsko ozadje romana Kaplan Martin Čedermac* (Ljubljana: Nova revija, 2002). The Slovene Collegium in Rome also organized two scientific symposiums on Bishop Rožman and Lambert Ehrlich, with the participation of historians of all views. The organizers published the discussions from both symposiums in scientific miscellanies.

²⁷ Tone Ferenc, *Dies Irae, Četniki, vaški stražarji in njihova usoda jeseni 1943* (Ljubljana: Modrijan, 2002); Boris Mlakar, *Slovensko domobranstvo* (Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 2003).

success of the originally little more than one thousand-strong communists, who organized mass resistance and turned it into a revolution, can be interpreted and understood. The civil war that broke out simultaneously was ideologically for the most part a result of the conflict between two authoritative and exclusive conceptions—between Bolshevism and Catholic clericalism. This was the more tragic because both camps, one supporting the Liberation Front and the other opposing it, trusted in an Allied victory and sought contacts with them, while the circle of sympathizers of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, in spite of fairly numerous collaborators, was negligible. The price of the ruthless Slovene internal ideological and political reckoning was extremely high. According to the latest research of the victims of WW II, more than 90,000 people lost their lives in Slovenia from 1941 to 1946, which is at least by 25,000 more than previously estimated.²⁸

Public discussion of the events during and after WW II is yet today filled with emotion, while history mostly serves as an argument for the confirmation of current political views. Boris Mlakar wittily compared such a situation to a self-service store in which everybody takes from the past only what he needs.²⁹ In this respect, it is characteristic that there is much less interest in the reinterpretation of other historical periods, although these have also been subject to profound “revision” since 1990. Such is the case, for example, with the Middle Ages. Peter Štih persuasively questioned the mythicized national picture of the early (Karanthian) medieval period and the stereotype of Slovenes’ thousand-year “subordination.” Arguing that modern national ideas should not be transposed onto older periods that did not recognize modern national categories, he efficiently denationalized medieval

²⁸ These figures are the result of a research project going on at the Institute for Modern History in Ljubljana since 1997. The victims are documented by names, if possible with the quotation of place and method of death. The research encompasses the period up to 1946, since it also includes the post-war victims of communists killings. According to data available so far, there were more than 13,500.

²⁹ Boris Mlakar, interview, “Zgodovino so zamenjali s samopostrežbo” (“History Has Been Replaced by Self-Service”) *Dnevnik* 27 May 1995, cited in Bojan Godeša, *Druga svetovna vojna in današnje slovenske travme, Problemi slovenskega zgodovinopisja v 20. stoletju, Teze za razpravo na okrogli mizi* (Ljubljana: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 1999).

history.³⁰ A new phenomenon in Slovene historiography is cultural historical research on the aristocracy in Slovene territory, which is mostly directed towards material culture, the spiritual horizon and everyday life of aristocratic families. Dušan Kos began his extensive and ambitious research of the nobility with *Between the Castle and the City*, published in 1994, in which he discussed the attitude of the nobility towards castles and towns in fifteenth century.³¹ Maja Žvanut focused, in her book *From a Knight to a Noble Landlord*, on the social and cultural development of the aristocracy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.³² Owing to its original, fictional approach, and the fact that it follows French historical anthropology, Marko Štuhec's book, with the typical title *Red Bed, Cockroaches and the Tears of the Widow Prešeren*, particularly attracted reviewers' attention. Štuhec deals with the material culture of the Carniolan aristocracy in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.³³ The study of attitudes towards life and death in the past is also a completely new topic for Slovene historiography. An innovative book on this subject was published in 1996 by Marta Verginella. She studied the testaments in the Slovene countryside around Trieste and revealed a substantial shift from the initially strictly spiritual to a more concrete experience of basic existential issues in the course of the nineteenth century.³⁴

Research on the nineteenth century and its middle classes has continued to receive major attention. Socio- and historic-cultural studies less burdened with nationalism have produced altered evaluations of individual events and periods from 1800 to 1900 (for example, a lighter depiction of the period prior to the March revolutions of 1848, a more critical treatment of the Slovene national movement after 1861, a more

³⁰ Štih's principal book is entitled *Goriški grofje ter njihovi ministeriali in militi v Istri in na Kranjskem* (Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 1994). New interpretations of the early Middle Ages are primarily engendered by his discussions in the *Zgodovinski časopis (Historical Journal)*.

³¹ *Med gradom in mestom: odnos kranjskega, slovenještajerskega in koroškega plemstva do gradov in meščanskih naselij do začetka 15. stoletja* (Ljubljana: Znanstveno raziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti, 1994).

³² *Od viteza do gospoda* (Ljubljana: Viharnik, 1994).

³³ *Rdeča postelja, ščurki in solze vdove Prešeren* (Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 1995).

³⁴ *Ekonomija odrešenja in preživetja. Odnos do žvljenja in smrti na tržaškem podeželju* (Koper: Zgodovinsko društvo za južno Primorsko, 1996).

precise investigation of ideological directions of middle-class parties).³⁵ Stane Granda's book about 1848 in Dolenjsko (Lower Carniola) is a modern, socio-historical monograph dealing with the impact of the 1848 Austrian revolution in the Slovene territory. In his book *The Slovene People's Party in the Vienna Parliament (1897-1914)*, Andrej Rahten gave a rather new and synthetic picture of Slovene Catholic parliamentary politics before WW I; Petra Svolfšak systematically dedicated herself to completely new research of WW I in Slovenia.³⁶ The first precise research of the German political movement on Slovene territory, carried out for Styria and Carniola by Janez Cvirn and Dragan Matić, provides a contrast to heretofore one-sided historiography oriented to the Slovene national community only.³⁷ However, study of the middle classes and the living culture in towns in the nineteenth century became a real hit in the 1990s.³⁸ Andrej Studen presented the housing and living culture of the middle classes in Carniola in numerous works, while Igor Grdina, in his outstanding, complex, and literary monograph, described the German-Slovene middle-class dynasty of the Ipavec family, which originated in Styria.³⁹ The new social and cultural historical orientation is also typical

³⁵ Among works dealing with these issues are: Egon Pelikan, *Akomodacija ideologije političnega katolicizma na Slovenskem* (Maribor: Obzorja, 1997); Andrej Rahten, *Pozabljeni slovenski premier; politična biografija dr. Janka Brejca (1869-1934)* (Celovec: Mohorjeva založba, 2002); Zvonko Bergant, *Slovenski klasični liberalizem: idejno-politični značaj slovenskega liberalizma v letih 1891-1921* (Ljubljana: Nova revija, 2001).

³⁶ Stane Granda, *Dolenjska v revolucionarnem letu 1848/1849* (Novo mesto: Dolenjska založba, 1995); Andrej Rahten, *Slovenska ljudska stranka v dunajskem parlamentu: slovenska parlamentarna politika v habsburški monarhiji* (Celje: Založba Panevropa, 2001); Petra Svolfšak, *Soča, sveta reka. Italijanska zasedba slovenskega ozemlja* (Ljubljana: Nova revija, 2003); WW I topics were also treated by: Branko Marušič, Dragan Matić, Vlasta Stavbar, Rok Stergar and Marta Verginella.

³⁷ Janez Cvirn, *Trdnjavski trikotnik, Politična orijentacija Nemcev na Spodnjem Štajerskem (1861-1914)* (Maribor: Obzorja, 1997); Dragan Matić, *Nemci v Ljubljani: 1861-1918* (Ljubljana: Oddelek za zgodovino Filozofske fakulteti, 2002).

³⁸ This subject has been treated by several authors, including Zora Torkar, Eva Holz, Peter Vodopivec, Janez Cvirn, and Igor Grdina.

³⁹ Andrej Studen, *Stanovati v Ljubljani: soacilnozgodovinski oris stanovanjske kulture Ljubljančanov pred prvo svetovno vojno* (Ljubljana: Studia humanitatis, 1995); Igor Grdina, *Ipavci* (Ljubljana: Znanstveno raziskovalni center SAZU, 2001).

of the research of the history of emigration, highlighted by the studies of Marjan Drnovšek.⁴⁰ And finally, thanks to research by Jasna Fischer, France Kresal, Žarko Lazarević, Jože Prinčič, Andrej Pančur, Zdenko Čepič, and Neven Borak, economic history has experienced a profound revival, only being recognized as a specific branch of Slovene historiography in the last decade.⁴¹ Among recently published monographs on economic history, mention should first be made of *The History of the Slovene Banking* by Žarko Lazarević and Jože Prinčič (with an extensive, separate summary in English), a book on the Habsburg monetary reforms and the financial conditions in Slovene regions in the nineteenth century by Andrej Pančur, and the Neven Borak's profound monograph on the economic aspects of Yugoslavia's demise.⁴²

The Slovene departure from Yugoslavia and the latter's disintegration was synthetically presented in a monograph by Božo Repe,⁴³ who observed that Slovene independence was a result of the Yugoslav government's inability to find a way out of the deep economic, social, and political crisis in which the Yugoslav Federation found itself in the 1980s and, simultaneously, of Serbian nationalism and the highly strained relations between Serbia and Slovenia by the end of the 1980s. Repe also stated that important, particularly economic foundations of independence had already been laid by communist politicians. This view gave rise to heavy protests by certain protagonists of Slovene independence and by representatives of the new parties established in 1990. Most researchers hold the position that the tendency for independence had a fairly small number of supporters in 1988 in Slovenia, and that the turning point in public opinion was reached only during the military judicial proceedings against Janez Janša and his fellow accused in the summer of 1988. The idea that Slovene historical

⁴⁰ *Pot slovenskih izseljencev na tuje – od Ljubljane do Ellis Islanda* (Ljubljana: Mladika, 1991).

⁴¹ Jasna Fischer, Žarko Lazarević, and Jože Prinčič also published a review of the history of the economy on Slovene territory in English. See *The Economic History of Slovenia, (1750-1991)* (Vrhnika: Razum, 1999).

⁴² Žarko Lazarević and Jože Prinčič, *Zgodovina slovenskega bančništva* (Ljubljana: Združenje bank Slovenije, 2000) (Ljubljana 2001; Andrej Pančur, *V pričakovanju stabilnega denarnega sistema* (Celje: Zgodovinsko društvo, 2003); Neven Borak, *Ekonomski vidiki delovanja in razpada Jugoslavije* (Ljubljana: Znanstveno in publicistično središče, 2002).

⁴³ *Jutri bo nov dan* (Ljubljana: Modrijan, 2002).

development logically and for several decades tended towards national independence has thus only been advocated by Janko Prunk in his work *The Slovene National Rise* (1992).⁴⁴ The book caused one of the rare public controversies in which a large number of historians participated. For the most part, they firmly rejected Prunk's thesis.

Critics reproach Slovene historiography for excessive fragmentation, lack of professional criticism, ethnocentricity, and—especially researchers of the recent period—also a teleological understanding of history.⁴⁵ The reproach of fragmentation is certainly accurate, as focused group studies are fairly scarce, as are syntheses. The *Illustrated History of Slovenes* (1999) is not such a synthesis,⁴⁶ since it consists of a number of enlarged encyclopaedia articles, while the new history of Slovenes up to the eighteenth century, written by Peter Štih and Vasko Simoniti,⁴⁷ so far remains without a head, as the part dealing with the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has not yet been published (for which the excessively slow author of this paper is responsible). The five-volume *Chronicle of Slovene History* encompasses the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and is an outstanding publishing achievement of Nova Revija.⁴⁸ The *Chronicle* is also exceptional for the fact that it is a product of a large team of authors and written in stories that—particularly with the nineteenth century—show a clear shift of researchers' interest from political to social and cultural history.

Claims that professional discussions and polemical criticism are practically non-existent in Slovene historiography are equally accurate. One of the rare such criticisms, which even resulted in a special monograph and a historical exhibition, was the writer (!) Drago Jančar's conceptually persuasive criticism of an exhibit on the Slovene twentieth century that lacked any mention of the communist terror during and after

⁴⁴ *Slovenski narodni vzpon* (Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenija, 1992).

⁴⁵ The principal reproach in this connection is that historical events are no longer evaluated on the basis of their actual nature and their placement in time, but from the point of view of "their final result."

⁴⁶ Janez Cvirn et al. *Ilustrirana zgodovina slovencev* (Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1999).

⁴⁷ *Slovenska zgodovina do razsvetljenstva* (Celovec: Mohorjeva družba, 1995).

⁴⁸ Slovenska kronika XX. stoletja, 1, 1900-1941, ed. Marjan Drnovšek et al. (1995); 2, 1941-1995, ed. Marjan Drnovšek et al. (1996); Slovenska kronika XIX. stoletja 3, 1800-1861, ed. Janez Cvirn et al. (2001); Slovenska kronika XIX. stoletja 4-5, 1861-1918, ed. Janez Cvirn et al. (2003).

WW II. Consequently, Jančar, together with the historian Vasko Simoniti, prepared a special exhibit on “totalitarianism in Slovenia,” entitled *The Dark Side of the Moon*. It was accompanied by an extensive collection of discussions by various experts.⁴⁹ A relatively successful discussion on twentieth-century Slovene historiography was organized by the Institute for Modern History in 1999, although it actually revealed that Slovenes are not capable of discussions without mutual ill feelings and accusations.

Third, the reproach of the ethnocentricity of Slovene historical research is equally justified. Slovene historiography rarely discusses Slovene history in its wider European context and only few historians have enquired into how Slovenes were in the past viewed and understood by others in Europe and U.S. Uroš Lipušček's book *Ave Wilson: The U.S.A. and the Remaking of Slovenia at Versailles 1919-1920* is thus a completely new contribution to the understanding of more recent Slovene history.⁵⁰ Lipušček's extensive research into the archives and documents of a special group of American experts called the Inquiry reveals that American diplomatic advisors had as early as 1918 discussed the formation of not just one, but several South Slav states, among them Slovenia. Lipušček is the first and until now sole researcher who has examined Slovene history and Yugoslav politics in the years 1919–20 with reference to American diplomatic sources and through the eyes of American diplomacy. Lipušček discovered that American experts following WW I were aware that the new Yugoslav state would be a very unstable creation and for this reason considered the possibility that on the territory that became Yugoslavia there would arise independent countries: Serbia and Montenegro, Croatia, and Slovenia.

While there were historians who have at least occasionally engaged in the study of post-1945 South Slav, Balkan, and Central European history, there are almost no such studies any longer. In one way it is surprising and difficult to understand that after 1990 Slovene researchers practically stopped dealing with Slovene relations with other Yugoslav nations in the past, although this subject should have been particularly interesting after the Slovene separation from Yugoslavia.

⁴⁹ *Temna stran meseca: Kratka zgodovina totalitarizma v Sloveniji 1945-1990* (Ljubljana: Nova revija, 1998).

⁵⁰ *Ave Wilson: ZDA in prekrajanje Slovenije v Versaillesu 1919-1920* (Ljubljana: Sophia, 2003).

Historians' involvement in the study of Slovene relations with Italians and Austrians has been so much more lively. Particularly as regards relations with the Italians, a publication on Slovene-Italian relations in the past produced by a Slovene-Italian group of experts, was an important success.⁵¹ The attempt at a similar project with the Austrians was less successful, owing to excessive politicization of the work on the Austrian side. Thus far only the Slovene historians have published their work⁵². Slovene relations with Austria and Italy were also discussed in books and articles dealing with the history of Slovene minorities in both countries. Milica Kacin Wohinz and Jože Pirjevec thus published a *History of Slovenes under Italy* (2000), and Nevenka Troha's book, which came out a year before, is a complex analysis of the post-WW II Trieste conflict, based mainly on Slovene archival material.⁵³

From what has been said above, it is clear that Slovene historians likewise cannot boast major historical publications in foreign languages. In this respect it is particularly obvious that there is no synthetic review of Slovene history in any of the major languages. Nevertheless, two very precious works in English by authors living outside Slovenia deserve particular mention here. The first is *The Historical Dictionary of Slovenia* (1996) by Carole Rogel and Leopoldina Plut Pregelj;⁵⁴ the second is Glenda Sluga's *The Problem of Trieste and the Italo-Yugoslav Border* (2001), for which the author received a prestigious Australian academic award.⁵⁵

⁵¹ Milica Kacin-Wohinz, Nevenka Troha, eds. Slovensko-italijanski odnosi 1880-1956: poročilo slovensko-italijanske zgodovinsko-kulturne komisije - I raporti italo-sloveni 1880-1956: relazione della commissione storico-culturale italo-slovena - Slovene-Italian relations 1880-1956: Report of the Slovene-Italian historical and cultural commission (Ljubljana: Nova revija, 2001).

⁵² Duan Nečak, Boris Jesih, Božo Repe, Ksenija Škrilec, and Peter Vodopivec, eds., Slovensko – avstrijski odnosi v 20. stoletju: Slowenische – österreichische Beziehungen im 20. Jahrhundert (Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 2004).

⁵³ Milica Kacin Wohinz and Jože Pirjevec, *Zgodovina Slovencev pod Italijo* (Ljubljana: Nova revija, 2000); Nevenka Troha, *Komu Trst*, (Ljubljana: Modrijan, 1999).

⁵⁴ 1st ed. (Lanham: Scarecrow, 1996).

⁵⁵ *The Problem of Trieste and the Italo-Yugoslav Border: Difference, Identity, and Sovereignty in Twentieth-Century Europe* (Albany: State U of New York P, 2001).

Slovene historiography therefore does not have conceptual and national controversies such as there are in Serbia or Croatia. At the same time it undoubtedly remains too closed within its borders, since even more comparatively oriented studies are scarce. Changes in this direction are urgent, although there is no sign yet that the small number of Slovene historians will soon decide on making them.⁵⁶

Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino

⁵⁶ By my calculations, history in Slovenia has been more or less systematically researched and the research results published by about 120 historians.

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that this is crucial for ensuring the integrity of the financial statements and for providing a clear audit trail. The text notes that any discrepancies or errors in the records can lead to significant complications during an audit and may result in the disallowance of certain expenses.

2. The second part of the document outlines the specific requirements for record-keeping. It states that all receipts, invoices, and other supporting documents must be retained for a minimum of three years. Furthermore, it is required that these records be organized in a systematic and accessible manner, such as by date or by category, to facilitate the audit process. The document also mentions that digital records are acceptable, provided they are secure and can be easily accessed and verified.

3. The third part of the document provides guidance on how to handle common situations that may arise during the record-keeping process. For example, it addresses the issue of lost receipts, suggesting that a copy of the receipt should be made and the original should be replaced as soon as possible. It also discusses the treatment of cash transactions, noting that these should be recorded in a separate ledger and supported by bank statements or other reliable evidence.

4. Finally, the document concludes by reiterating the importance of thorough and honest record-keeping. It states that the primary goal is to ensure that all financial activity is properly documented and can be substantiated. This not only helps in the preparation of accurate financial statements but also contributes to the overall transparency and accountability of the organization.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30