



UDC 811.163.41:323.1(=163.41)  
Manuscript received: 19.05.2011.  
Accepted for publishing: 02.08.2011.  
Scientific polemics

Serbian Political Thought  
No. 2/2011,  
Year III, Vol. 4  
pp. 121-141

Momčilo Subotić<sup>1</sup>  
Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade

## The Renewal of Serbistics

### Introduction

It is known, from the researches conducted by many public opinion agencies, that most Serbs and other citizens of Serbia are inclined towards Serbia's accession to the European Union. However, things have gone a step backwards today compared to the nineties; no one in the Serbian politics, or in the key national institutions, such as the SANU (Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts), Matica srpska and others, is even trying to conduct the analyses of Serbian defeats, to face the wrong ideas of Yugoslavism and Yugoslav politics and state. Without scientifically based and critical analyses of the status of Serbian nation and its state's state constituencies, no further European integrations are possible. In other words, until the time when the Serbian political and intellectual leadership is finished with the Yugoslav era of its history, and realize and correct all the historical forgeries and counterfeits it was based on, the European integrations on an equal basis and by European standards will not happen. It is likely that the Serbian leadership, for the umpteenth time in the recent history, cannot overcome the excess history which, in the Balkan's „barrel of gun-powder“ has always been too much.

The Serbs have to answer the question of what happened to the Serbian national identity in the Yugoslav state to themselves first; do the European standards for entering „the family“ of the European nations, based on the linguistic definition of a nation, also stand for the Serbian people, being multi-confessional such as some other European nations (Germans, Hungarians, Albanians etc.).

---

1 Senior research fellow  
momcilosubotic@yahoo.com

Today, a humiliatingly great number of the Serbian people, including educated Serbs, doesn't have a basic knowledge of the Serbian language, in fact they don't know which language they speak: Serbian, Serbo-Croatian, many will say. In the recent times, also Bosniac/Bosnian, Montenegrin, soon maybe the language of Vojvodina as well. Many a Serb will say it is the same language and that it is irrelevant whether it is called Croatian, Bosniac/Bosnian, Montenegrin, not realizing that it is not so and that for the reasons of linguistic forfeiting, or „renaming“ the Serbian language, division of the Serbian people on the religious background took place, which was the presumption of breaking up the Yugoslav state and creation of anti-Serb satellite state-like constituencies. On religious basis, as the „national watershed“, synthetic nations have been created on the Serbian ethno-linguistic territory.

None of the Serbian political establishment, from Milosevic to Tadic, realized that the Serbs have their own national programme as well, and the fact that this programme is based on the Serbian language. Not being able to realize that caused all the failures of the Serbian side in the war led for „the Yugoslav heritage“.

### **Serbian Idea of Yugoslavism**

It is the programme the Serbs used to have in the pre-Yugoslav period and the one they have to renew in the post-Yugoslav times. It is basically a philological programme. It primarily deals with the identity of Serbian language, Serbian literature, national tradition, and national origins of the Serbs. A philological discipline that studies the mentioned phenomena is called – Serbistics. Just as the philologies of other people study their languages, literature and the identities, Serbistics study Serbian language, Serbian literature and identity of Serbian people.

Serbistics is, in fact, a national programme founded on the idea of Saint Sava, Dositej and Vuk, and the European philological and Slavistic idea. It is the programme of „Srbi tri zakona“ (Serbs of all three religions) by Vuk.

Modern Serbian state has been, from the time of Karadjordje until today, since its foundation, tragically ideologically divided between the West and the East, between Europe and Russia. By the same formula, dynasties in Serbia ruled and interchanged. It went on until the Yugoslav period. However, what is important to mention is that in the pre-Yugoslav period the Serbs were aware of the Serbian linguistic-ethnic community. It was a Sveti Sava – Dositej - Vuk Serbian linguistic para-

digm that also created a Serbian idea of South-Slavism. Amongst the Serbs, this idea was most consistently advocated by the champions of Matica Srpska Teodor Pavlovic and Jovan Subotic, and it was generally accepted by the Serbian social and political elite until the World War I. What did this idea consist of? Pavlovic and Subotic highlighted the fact that there were four similar South Slavic peoples: the Slovenes, the Croats, the Serbs and the Bulgarians, different by their languages. This language uniqueness did not prevent them to establish cooperation and cultural, even political closeness. However not a political, especially not an ethno-linguistic unity was established. This idea was also supported by Prince Mihailo, as well as the leading Serbian scientists and politicians in Serbia: Stojan Novakovic, Ljubomir Stojanovic, Nikola Pasic, Milovan Milovanovic, Slobodan Jovanovic and others. Pavlovic – Subotic's South Slavic idea successfully confronted Strossmayer – Jagic's paradigm of Yugoslavism and Serbo-Croatistics.

The Serbian idea of Yugoslavism based on Vuk's philology programme about „Srbi tri zakona“ and the linguistic differentiation of Serbs and Croats, existed until 1915 (Nis Declaration of Serbian Government), and then the Strossmayer – Jagic's idea of „one three-name people“ mastered the Serbian social and political elite. It was accepted by Stanoje Stanojevic, Aleksandar Belic, Jovan Cvijic, Jovan Skerlic. Skerlic suggested in 1913 that the Croats should accept Ekavica dialect and that Serbs should accept the Latin alphabet. Cvijic supported Garasanin's standpoints that a small country was not sustainable in the Balkans. Slobodan Jovanovic thought similarly. The reasons asserting the Serbian state directed them to the creation of South Slavic state.

Even though scientifically based and compatible with the European Slavistic ideas of Fihte, Herder, Dobrovski, Kopitar, Miklosic, Safarik, Dositej and Vuk, the Serbian idea of Yugoslavism was abandoned first in the philological and later on in the political field.

## Croatian Idea of Yugoslavism

In no case is philology so related to the geopolitics and instrumentalized for geopolitical purposes as in the case of the Croatian, ie. Austro-Croatian projection of Illyrianism and Yugoslavism, and Serbo-Croatian lingual- ethnic phenomenon.

In no case has geography made such a determinative influence on political ideas and state politics, as it is the case with Croatia. A geographic factor here is identified with the state reason. Therefore „geo-

politics is an impulse for Croatia more than for other South Slavic peoples“. Because it cannot spread to the North and West, Croatia is striving towards the East, ie. the Serbian ethnic territory. A paradox of the Croatian geopolitics is consisted in an aspiration of the Croats to politically bind themselves to the West, and at the same time territorially expand to the East. It was influenced by the shortcomings of the geopolitical position of Croatia, as well as the age-old aspirations of the Roman Catholic Church towards Orthodox Balkans, but also by the weakness of the Serbian philology and politics in the last century and a half. On such basis Illyrianism of Ljudevit Gaj and Yugoslavism of Josip Juraj Strossmayer emerged. These ideas and movements, based on a „Croatian historical and state right“ and Croatian „political“ nation, were directed toward unionism, catholicizing and croaticizing of the Serbian people in the western Serbian countries and towards creating religiously homogenic and ethnically clean Great Croatia.

With Illyrianism, the Croats abandon their language and take over Vuk's Serbian people's language and declare it the literary language of the Croats; and so they come into an unbreakable relationship with the Serbs. The movement had extremely geopolitical connotations; its aim was creation of a geopolitically distinct and sustainable Croatian state. Both Gaj's Illyrian as well as Strossmayer's Yugoslavian ideology were geographically determined, in function of deleting Serbo-Croatian ethnic borders and conquering Serbian ethnic territory. With their political and territorial aspirations, the Illyrians continue spreading the ideas of the Great Croatia of Pavle Riter Vitezovic, whose „Croatia rediviva“ became the obligatory literature and instructions for the work of Gaj, Starcevic, Strossmayer, Jagic, Kvaternik, Franko, Supil, Pilar, Trumbic, Radic, Macek, Pavelic's Ustaše and their „Croatia sacra“, to Tudjman and his nearly ethnically clean Croatia. All of them called on „Croatian state and historical right“ and a thesis on Croatian „political“ nation when creating Croatian geopolitical „optimum.“ They negated the Serbian language, Serbian name and Serbian people west of the Drina river, and they differed only by the method of fight against the Serbs.

And so with the Illyrianism, which started with „throwing the Croatian language out of the window“- as Miroslav Krleža used to say, and taking on Vuk's Serbian language, the Austro-Croatian geopolitical project of the three-county Kajkavica dialect speaking Croatia coming out on the Serbian linguistic and ethnic territory was formed.

With Illyrianism, the first historical encounter between the Croats and the Serbs occurred; that encounter also signified their mutual conflict, that has lasted until today. What Gaj didn't manage to realize, due to the opposition of the Serbian national institutions and the conscious

individuals, Strossmayer's Yugoslavism and Jagić's philologic Serbo-Croatistic project did. Both Strossmayer's Yugoslavism and Jagić's model of Croato-Serbs, identical by language and different by religion, were marked by extremely Croatian characteristics.

This state-building project of theirs was interfered with, as a „disturbing factor“, the Serbian people with a clear national awareness, politically mature and constitutional. With the help of the Viennese Court and the Roman Catholic church all Roman Catholic Serbs became Croats, others were assimilated or killed during the 20th century Croatian genocidal over the Serbs, which was completed by the ethnic cleansing and biblical exodus of the Serbs from the Republic of Srpska Krajina and Croatia between 1990 and 1995.

Until the Illyrian Movement, the Serbs and the Croats had lived separately, each on their ethnic territories; they were different by their languages: the Croats spoke their Kajkavian Croatian, and the Serbs their Stokavian Serbian language. With Illyrianism, Austria tried to prevent the Serbian idea and carry out de-Serbianisation of the Serbian people in its territory, in times when the Principality of Serbia, as a priority of its foreign policy, focused on liberation and unification of the Serbs under the Turkish and Austrian rule. The Viennese court and the Roman Catholic Church tried to keep the Croats as a separate popular community, to reinforce them at the expense of Serbs and use them as a tool for accomplishing their geopolitical interests and missionary and proselistic goals. That course in the Croatian politics became visible especially after the First Catholic Congress that took place in Zagreb in 1900. Since then, the Croaticism is organized on the Catholic basis; at that Catholic – Croatian gathering the decision was made that all the Serbo–Croatian speaking Catholics and truthfully the Serbian speaking Catholics had to be considered Croats.

The Croatian idea of Yugoslavism is therefore significantly different from the Serbian idea. Its main political protagonists were Ljudevit Gaj and Josip Juraj Strossmayer, and as far as philology is concerned, it was Vatroslav Jagić. By its nature, it relies on the idea of the Great Croatia of Pavle Riter Vitezović (1652-1713). In a more extreme form, Riter's thesis was most consistently represented by Ante Starčević „The Father of the Homeland“, whose denial of the Serbs and the call for their eradication had a massive support in the Croatia society in any turbulent time.

When we say that the Croats took over Serbian language, we take into consideration the following facts. Ljudevit Gaj (1809-1872), who spoke Kajkavian dialect, started publishing his *Novine horvatske, slavonske i dalmatinske* and its supplement *Danica* in 1835 in Croatian, ie. Kajka-

vian dialect, and then, after only a few published issues he changed to the Illyrian, therefore the Stokavian Serbian language. When the Viennese Court forbade the Illyrian movement in 1843, the Strossmayer's idea of Yugoslavism came out on stage. Croatism takes place of the Illyrianism; it became an „heir“ of the Illyrian idea; everything that had the Illyrian name, starting from the language, literature, cultural and public institutions now gets the Croatian name and content.

Josip Juraj Strossmayer (1815-1905) preached Yugoslavism, which was completely different from the one preached by Pavlovic- Subotic, and it had a strong signet of Austrian and Austro-Croatian interests. For the purposes of the re-organized Austria as the federation of various nations, Strossmayer also planned to include Yugoslavs consisted of three tribes: the Slovenes, the Croats and the Serbs, who were supposed to be the third federal unit of a state pictured as such. Zagreb was supposed to be the centre of such created Yugoslav community. Strossmayer excluded the Bulgarians from this South Slavic community as they were not part of the Habsburg Monarchy. Strossmayer used to say that it was one people, that the Serbs and the Croats have one people's language (which would have meant that the Croats spoke Kajkavian and Stokavian dialect, and the Serbs Stokavian and Kajkavian, which was totally random and untrue), that they strive to achieve political unity (which was also untrue). His theses were under a strong influence of geopolitical standpoints. Strossmayer was preoccupied with the issue of the Croatian territory. Territorial integrity and sustainability for him was the most important geopolitical task, because „every state cares immensely for its territorial integrity, and I am asking you, where do many disputes, many lasting wars come from? That is why territorial integrity was kept and defended by duty“ (Strossmayer-Racki, 1971:133). Strossmayer's moto was a complete catholicizing of the Serbs, and not only the „Austrian“ Serbs but also those in Serbia, as argued by the latest book on the bishop Strossmayer by the academic Vasilije Krestic (Krestic 2006). His Yugoslavian idea had two tasks, within the same goal: firstly, to spiritually unite the Serbs and the Croats within the Roman Catholic church, and then to Croatise Serbs based on the language they had in common with the Croats.

Vatroslav Jagic (1838-1923), the greatest Croatian philologist, who was involved in politics as much as in academia, supported Strossmayer's idea of Yugoslavism and advocated a thesis efficient as far as Croats were concerned, however confusing and non-academic. „In an extensive article called Jugoslaveni (The Yugoslavs) Jagic outlined that Croato-Serbs, or Yugoslavs, are one people, as they speak one language consisted of three dialects: Cakavian, Kajkavian and Stokavian. Since

Slovenes speak Kajkavian, they are also Yugoslavs. Jagić, however, did emphasize that the Serbs and the Croats, even though one people by the language, are in fact two people, different by their religion, therefore all the Catholics are Croats and all the Serbs are Orthodox. So he proclaimed that the Serbian and Croatian national identity is marked by religious affiliation, because it was in the interest of the Croats. According to Jagić's project, the common national language of the Serbs and the Croats, Serbo-Croatian, rather Croatian or Serbian ie. Stokavian, was supposed to be divided on Ekavian (the Serbian part) and Ijekavian (the Croatian part). These Jagić's views were brought to life in Tito's time by the Novi Sad Agreement, 1954 (Milosavljević 2003: 19-20).

Jagić's taking over Serbian language and forging it into Croatian language was completed at the end of 19th and the beginning of 20th century. It is testified by the two books: *Hrvatski pravopis* (Croatian spelling) by Ivan Broz (from 1891, for which the author admits was done on the corpus of Vuk Karadžić and Djuro Daničić), *Gramatika i stilistika hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika* (Grammar and stylistics of Croatian or Serbian language) (from 1899, also done on the corpus of Vuk Karadžić and Djuro Daničić) and *Rjecnik hrvatskog jezika* (Dictionary of Croatian language) by Ivan Broz and Franjo Iveković (based on the corpus of Vuk Karadžić, Djuro Daničić, Njegoš and Milan Dj. Milicević). So, the Croatian authors themselves wrote in Serbian, and then openly forged the truth giving the Serbian language a Croatian name. Serbian language remains to be Serbian language, regardless of who speaks it and regardless of national identification one is determined by.

The Serbs resisted Croatian Illyrianism, which in its basis was the idea of the Great Croatia, but did not resist Strossmayer's Yugoslavism and Jagić's Serbo-croatistics – the main followers of the Illyrian idea, being the Austro-Croatian geopolitical project (Subotić 2007: 150-183).

## Sins of the Serbian Philology and Politics

One cannot claim that there were not Serbian intellectuals and politicians who pointed out to the Croatian politically-territorial pretensions at that time. It was done by: archpriest Ruvarac, in his well known writing *Evo, sta ste nam krivi* (Here, what you are to be blamed for), Milovan Milovanović: *Srbi i Hrvati* (The Serbs and the Croats), and also in the articles under the same name by Nikola Stojanović and Nikola Pašić. The Serbian government got into the war with the Yugoslav programme, ie. with the goal of liberating unfreed brothers, the

Croats and the Slovenes and unification into a common Yugoslav state. However, Serbian social and political elite did not entirely see through the Croatian political mentality and did not take into consideration religious differences. They neglected messages and decisions made on the First Croatian Catholic Congress held in Zagreb in 1900, where the decision was made that all the Serbian speaking Catholics were to be considered Croats. They did not seriously take into consideration anti-Serb demonstrations of the Croatian right movements followers and clero-furtimegms in 1892, 1895, 1902, 1905, and then in 1914, which represented the unbroken chain of genocidal actions towards the Serbs, which would culminate in NDH (the Independent State of Croatia) during the World War II, and was continued in ethnical cleansing of the Republic of Srpska Krajina in the war of 1991-1995.

Even the most eminent Serbian philologists are not innocent when it comes to the blurred view of the Serbian language and its taking over by the Croats. In that field, even the most important Vuk's followers behaved not academically, such as Djuro Danicic, who at first consistently advocated Vuk's views on Serbian language and "Srbi tri zakona". The support to Vuk's views of Serbian language and literature is testified by Danicic's work: *Rat za srpski jezik i knjizevnost* (The War for Serbian Language and Literature) and *Razlike između srpskog i hrvatskog jezika* (Differences between Serbian and Croatian Languages) in 1858, unfortunately, however, after Vuk's death, he would accept the Croatian thesis (Strossmayer and Jagic's) on bi-national name of Serbian language: Croatian or Serbian, which is why he was appointed a secretary of JAZU (1867) and moved from Belgrade to Zagreb, where he wrote „Rjecnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika“ (Dictionary of Croatian or Serbian Language) published by JAZU in 1882 (Subotic 2006: 21-45).

The leading Serbian philologists in the Yugoslav period behaved almost identically. It is best testified by the fact that *Rečnik srpskog književnog i narodnog jezika* (Dictionary of Serbian Literary and National Language) started by Stojan Novakovic, 1888, the Serbian Academy of Science and Arts kept publishing as *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika* (Dictionary of Serbo-Croatian Literary and National Language). And all this after the secessionist wars and formation of the new states in the territory of former SFRY, when all the states decided to abandon the dual name and named their language after the new state-nation.

Just as they made the Serbian language their own, equally did Croatian linguist Gaj reject his and take over Vuk's Latin for Croatian alphabet. He did this in the very beginning of the Illyrian movement. No

eminent Serbian linguist, such as: Vuk Karadžić, Djuro Daničić, Stojan Novaković, Ljubomir Stojanović, Aleksandar Belić, Pavle Ivić, Petar Milosavljević, Miloš Kovacević, Radmilo Marojević, Radoje Simić and others, said or wrote that the Latin alphabet was not Serbian letter. Also, it shows that the Serbs are not the only bi-alphabetical people, but also the Germans, the Polish, the Romanians, the Turkish and others, and that this fact did not violate their national identity. Language is the most important for recognition and preservation of a national identity. The language is more important than the letter. The Movement for the Renewal of Serbistics advocates for the universal European values and standpoints, even those related to language and letter, which means those values based on ethno-linguistic views of Slavistics from the pre-Yugoslav period.

Unfortunately, the Serbian social and political elite still has not realized the geopolitical essence of the Serbo-Croatian philological phenomenon. By making Vuk's Serbian language Croatian literary language, the Croats stepped into the wide territory of Serbian Stokavian language, i.e. into the Serbian ethnic and historical territory. Without having taken over Serbian language they would never have been able to expand to Dalmatia, Slavonia, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Dubrovnik.

Dobrica Ćosić once said that the Serbs are the people that wins at war, and loses in peace. Disappointed by the Serbian giving up marking Serbian ethnic, historical and state territory in the new state, a celebrated Serbian General Živojin Mišić said something similar.<sup>2</sup> These are the most serious accusations for the Serbian politicians and ideologists. Are they justified? As far as the way of unification into the first Yugoslav state is concerned, as well as the form it was organised and functioning, these accusations are more than justified!

The first Yugoslavia, as Petar Milosavljević pointed out, was not created in the ideas of St Sava, Dositej or Vuk, nor in the ideas of Matica srpska, or the Serbian Royal Academy. As well, the idea of Serbs being only Orthodox did not come from these great Serbian men and the former Serbian national institutions. It was the idea of Josip Juraj Strossmayer, a bishop from Đakovo, and his philological deputy Vatroslav Jagić. It was one of the main ideas of the First Roman Catholic Congress (Zagreb, 1900). Based on those ideas the Serbian people corpus was being broken, only by being taken down to its Orthodox part. Even

---

2 Faced with the easy sale of the heritage of the Serbian victories in the wars of 1912-1918, Duke Mišić cried out: „there are no wars that the Serbian soldiers wouldn't win, nor their heritage that Serbian politicians wouldn't ruin“. According to: Matic, M. (2000) *O srpskom političkom obrascu*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije, p. 89.

worse, based on the Strossmayer – Jagić's ideas, the identity of Serbian language was also undermined.

As it is known, the first Yugoslav state was Serbia, previously joined by Montenegro and Vojvodina, namely Banat, Baranja, Srem and Backa regions, as well Slovenes, the Croats and the Serbs from the territory of the defeated Dual Monarchy, who formed internationally unrecognized State of the Slovenes, Croats and Serbs. The first Yugoslav state was, therefore, entered by the three people with their territories. Today, the Slovenes and the Croats have their independent states. What's with the state of Krajina Serbs?

From the beginning, the first Yugoslav state was burdened with the so-called Croatian issue. Two people, who were at wars with each other until recently, united into one state, there were conflicts of political ideas and mentalities and different understanding of a state. Due to the conflict of the idea of Serbia that „liberates and unites“ and the Croatian separatism, the first Yugoslav state did not last very long.

Josip Broz continued where Strossmayer left of. Under the excuse of the „Great Serbia hegemonism“, he protected the Croats for their genocide over the Serbs, according to the order by KI (Comintern) and in the spirit of the political views of the Brits and the HSS (Croatian Peasant Party) he carried out federalisation of the country that was not based on either historical or ethnic principle, he established the „balance state“ based on a principle „weak Serbia - strong Yugoslavia“. This model of his barely outlived its creator.

Josip Broz stayed away from any Yugoslavism; he launched his thesis of „the brotherhood and unity“, proclaimed new nations in the form of Montenegrins, Macedonians and Bosnian Muslims openly started confederalisation of the Yugoslav state in the sixties.

The second Yugoslavia, the communist „balance state“, the federation established on an anti-Serb basis, promoted new nations and republic-states emerging from a Serb linguo-ethnic substrate, and autonomuos regions also constituted in Serbia, and not, for instance, in Croatia, where there were more historical, ethnic, linguistic and other reasons for that. Having accepted Yugoslavism and communism the Serbs became divided, halved people, which was not the case with other Yugoslav people. „Communism gave a new strength and attraction to Yugoslavism“ (Zivojinovic 1997: 102), constructed Yugoslavia as a typical compromise creation, by landmarking some units as non-Serbian, which was a way of occupation of Serbia by so-called national peripheral of artificial and immatured nations (Petranovic 1993: 101).

„The Serb inequity was the price of survival of Yugoslavia“ - Djilas used to emphasize (Cosic 2002: 276). Josip Broz divided Serbs into four republics and autonomies, therefore into six federal units. Nobody complained, as everybody lived in an illusion that they were in a joint Yugoslav state. Inter-republic administrative lines were not considered borders nor were they confirmed by any legal act. On the contrary, they were represented as „lines made in marble“ (Broz), that connect Yugoslav people. The Serbs faced the issue of borders of their own country after de facto and de iure the Yugoslav state seized to exist.

It is appropriate to use a parallel here. „The Serbs, unlike the Germans and Italians, have remained until today prone to regionalism and regional awareness... Forced change of identity of Montenegrins after the World War II has, as a consequence, state and cultural separatism... For the incitement of the regional awareness and creation of synthetic nations both state tradition (Montenegro) and dialect and folklore characteristics (Macedonia) were used, but also religion (Bosnian Muslims)“. As an equivalent to Montenegro, a historian Slavenko Terzic pointed out Bavaria „which was a separate German state for centuries, with the court and dynasty, and yet today it does not occur to anyone in Germany or Europe to talk about “Bavarian nation“ or Bavarian cultural inheritance outside the German cultural heritage“ (Terzic 1999: 246). The name of the territory they live in, Montenegrins have not changed for centuries. Until the end of the World War II they were all Serbs by nationality. After the decision „from above“ (The Comintern, or rather party and state leadership headed by Broz), almost all of them became Montenegrins by nationality.

Croatian linguistic separatism had the lead here as well. First the Novi Sad Agreement from December 1954, „established“ a common national and literary language of Croats, Serbs and Montenegrins, named Croato-Serbian/Serbo-Croatian. Here is what one of the leading Serbian philologists Petar Milosavljevic says about it: „The Novi Sad Agreement was a complete victory of the Croatian strategy, impersonated in the Serbo-Croatistics. At that Agreement, it was declared that the national language of the Serbs, Croats and Montenegrins (meaning Cakavian, Kajkavian and Stokavian) is one language, and that from there on it should be referred to as Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian. Literary language of Serbs and Croats, as per conclusions made at this Agreement, was built on Stokavian basis, equally and in two variants from the beginning: Ekavian and Cyrillic with the centre in Belgrade and Ijekavian and Latin with the centre in Zagreb. Based on this division into Serbian and Croatian variants, implicitly were projected divisions of Serbian and Croatian languages“ (Milosavljevic 2008: 214). So, the Montenegrins, who always called their language Serbian, and then

Serbo-Croatian from 1955 until 1992 were caught by separatism too. Already in 1967, the Croats, headed by Miroslav Krleža rose against this Agreement with their Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika (Declaration on the Name and Position of Croatian Literary Language). Krleža doesn't talk about „Croatian language thrown out of the window“ anymore, but he defends the Declaration saying that „the Serbs and the Croats have one language called Croatian by the Croats, and Serbian by the Serbs“. The Declaration was supported by more than 100 Croatian writers and intellectuals and all Croatian cultural and educational institutions.

Around 40 Serbian writers responded to this with a Proposal for Consideration, by which advocacy of the Croatian side for equality of the Croatian language was notified and accepted, and then in March 1971 Matica hrvatska formally gave up the Novi Sad Agreement with a short statement. The 1974 Constitution contains Croatian separatistic demands, including those regarding the language; the language is either Croatian or Serbian, as well as in Strossmayer's or Jagić's time. It was just an interphase in a complete renaming of Serbian language into Croatian, which would follow in the process of a breakup of the Yugoslav state.

On the initiator of the idea of breaking up integral Serbian idea, Petar Milosavljević argues: „The greatest project of putting out integral Serbdom was carried out by Strossmayer's follower in the first and the second Yugoslavia - Viktor Novak... Novak's book (Magnum Crimen, M. C.) suggests: „Serbs, beware Roman Catholicism; they are your enemies“. Novak was a link in the Strossmayer - Tito's idea of Yugoslavism, which he recommended to the Serbs. His book in Tito's Yugoslavia practically buried the idea of the Serbs as an integral corpus: ie. as the people that is not only Orthodox, but also partly Roman Catholic and Muslim people ...“ (Milosavljević 2007: 132).

As powers, state ideas and ideologies passed through these regions, they would tear off the Serbian national tissue, for their own political interests, and create new nations. It was first done by the the Ottoman Empire creating Muslims, who would be turned into a nation by a decree of Tito's regime, and this nation is called Bosniacs today, later on Austria carried out Croatiation of Catholic Serbs, whose conversion into Croats would also be conducted by the communist regime of Josip Broz. Broz's communist system produced the Macedonians and the Montenegrins, and forcibly created the Croats out of Catholic Serbs – Bunjevci and Sokci.<sup>3</sup>

---

3 „An order by Josip Broz from May 1945 was that Bunjevci are Croats. The key sentence of that document reads: „as nationalities of Bunjevci and Sokci do not exist, you are therefore

The Serbs in Croatia, even though a constitutional and people equal with the Croats, experienced that the Croats took on their Serbian language for the second time. All the Serbian educational and cultural institutions were shut down, the last one being Prosvjeta in 1980. By political arrangement, the status and position of the Serbs in the Yugoslav federal unit of Croatia was guaranteed by the Constitution: the Socialist Republic of Croatia was established as a bi-national republic, the state of Croats and Serbs, such as, for example, Belgium is a state of the Flemish and Wallons, or Switzerland is a tri-national state of the Germans, French and Italians. The Croats, however, similarly to taking over and stealing Serbian language, did the same with the Serbian people: they took constitutionality away from them and brought them down to the national minority.

Thirty years after the Novi Sad Agreement, *Karta hrvatskog jezika s dodatkom srpskog* (A chart of Croation language with addition of Serbian) in the book *Dobar dan* (Good Day) by Tomo Matasic showed up in Munich, 1984! It clearly geographically showed how Serbo-Croatian or Croato-Serbian was divided into two halves based on Ijekavica - Ekavica pronouciation, ie. Eastern and Western versions of the „one and unique“ language (Subotic 2008: 151-152).

When asked whether Serbia meets all the requirements to be called a country by a journalist from *Glas javnosti*, a geopolitical scientist Milos Knezevic, the editor of a journal *Nacionalni interes* says that „Serbia is, first of all, a residual constituency, which means that it was the last state created in the secessionist chain of post-Yugoslav constituencies, and that its future could be a sort of a collective regional territory. Everything the EU member states attribute as important to their own countries, they deny it for Serbia“ (*Glas javnosti* 2009).

It is obvious, namely, that the „break-up“ of the Yugoslav state was motivated by the desire of the West to disable creation of an even bigger, primarily Serbian state in the Balkans. In addition, the West, meaning „Vatikan-German block“ and the USA, decided not only to encourage creation of the new satellite small states in the Serbian ethnic and historical territory, but also to completely cripple Serbia by giving independence to Kosovo and announcing separatism in Vojvodina to bring it down to „collective regional territory“.

---

ordered to treat all Bunjevci and Sokci solely as Croats regardless of their statement“. This is the document of County NOO of the Backa Palanka County from 18 May 1945, which was a result of Tito's speech at the founding congress of the Communist Party of Serbia on 8 May 1945. At that occassion he said: „We are building brotherhood and unity, but Serbian sovinites from Vojvodina would not approve a Croat to be Croat, they call him Bunjevac. He asks for a pass to Belgrade, and the other one writes his nationality as Bunjevac“. According to: Lalic (2005).

And while the newly created states in the territory of the former SFRJ (SFRY) are trying to completely distance themselves from the former state and ideology, getting the new identity of their statehood, Serbia, in other words its October 5 government, somehow seem to have been unable to pull out of the fake claws of Yugoslavism. It can best be seen in the field of philology, which had an impact on creation of the Yugoslav ideology and state. In their efforts to round up their statehoods Croats, Bosniacs, and Montenegrins declared what was Serbo-Croatian until yesterday, which in fact is Serbian language as Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin language. What kind of a philological-ideological confusion the Serbian authorities have found themselves in also shows the fact that in Serbia, Serbian is both majority and minority language, in other words both Croatian and Bosnian are declared minority languages, such as Hungarian, Albanian, Bulgarian, Romanian, Russian, Slovakian, Ukrainian and Roma. It is certain that no reasonable person would claim that it is not Serbian. In the Hague Tribunal, that primarily prosecutes the Serbian ethno-linguistic idea, the linguistic issue has been simplified and it is in the spirit of extended Serbo-Croatistics – the Serbian language has been declared a BCS language.

The political and social elite in power in Serbia (SANU, Matica Srpska, Vuk's legacy, Faculties of philology...) has no answer to all this. And it looked as if it was not going to be like that! Post-Yugoslav and post-communist Serbia was, until the Dayton Agreement, politically quite homogenous in articulation and defence of the rights of Serbs in the territory of the former Yugoslavia. If we recollect, until the Dayton, the authorities and opposition in Serbia advocated the right of the Serbian people to self-determination in the federal units of Croatia and BiH, which guaranteed that they remained with the entity of the Serbian people in a unique state. At that time, the first and then the Second Congress of Serbian intellectuals took place, demanding from the European and the international institutions that the same principles of the international law that apply for other nations should apply for the Serbian people as well. In addition to that, the linguistic principle was mentioned and the thesis of eminent European linguists and philologists was emphasised, that the Stokavian speaking territory is the Serbian language and that the Serbs of various confessions live there, which should be consistently respected during territorial separation.

Not only did the separation of the Yugoslav people care about linguistic or ethnic principles, it was carried out with the foreign support by force and the new authorities in Serbia also took the standpoints of our enemies on the Serbian guilt for the Yugoslav drama. This untrue, false claim, based on which DOS (Democratic Opposition of Serbia)

won power, represents the biggest obstacle for an honored and dignified running of Serbian state's politics. Like their mentors from the West, the new DOS authorities in Serbia accused the regime of Slobodan Milosevic for all the hardship, neglecting or not knowing, whatever, that the West, headed by the USA is not here for the human rights but for utterly concrete geostrategic and geopolitical motives. And that the Serbian people and their state are just an obstacle and experiment for an attitude towards the East, Russia and its energy resources (Milosevic 2008).<sup>4</sup>

The current authorities of Serbia advocate its entry to the EU without an alternative, not once asking themselves why this organisation does not treat us as it treats other states and people of Europe. How is it possible that „the EU has no alternative“, when 22 of its states (out of 27 EU member states) are taking away Kosovo and Metohija from us. With a miraculous masochism, the current regime practically takes part in destroying its own country. Why don't the Serbian authorities ask that, when it comes to the Serbs and Serbia, the EU applies the European principles regarding the linguistic determination of a nation.

As the Serbian issue must be dealt with today, apart from rethorical mists, as all other issues, the fact that, in the past, there were many Serbs Roman Catholics, and that they gave enormous contribution to the Serbian people and culture, must be considered. It cannot be claimed that there are no Serbs Roman Catholics, and at the same time, ignore the fact that the only Serb who received the Nobel Prize was a Roman Catholic Ivo Andric.

It has to be considered also that in the Roman Catholic church itself, the Serbs in the past, gained one of the highest titles that the church hierarchs in this church can have, right next to the Pope, the title of the Serbian primate. No other Slavic people in the Balkans had such rank. The Croats and the Slovenes only have cardinals in their church orders.

The Roman Catholic church can never in principle claim that it is open to all people, and forever closed to one people, the Serbian people. This great Church must correct this sin.

It is similar with the Muslim religious community. If, according to the Muslim religion, the door is open to all the people in the world, it cannot be said that there is no place in this religion for the Serbs only. In Tito's Yugoslavia, as soon as identified as Muslims, they automatically become other people, Muslims with a capital M, later on renamed

4 Especially see the papers: Stepic (2008); Dugin (2008); Subotic (2008); Knezevic (2008); Petrovic Pirocanac (2008).

to Bosniacs. Such an attitude cannot be accepted even out of clearly Islamic Canonic reasons. When a standpoint is brought out now that there were, there is or there must be Serbs Muslims, it is only enough to remind of the three undisputed great men: Sokollu Mehmed Pasha (Mehmed Pasa Sokolovic), Mesa Selimovic and Emir Kusturica, the most known Serb in the world today.

A thesis according to which Serbs are only Orthodox is both academically incorrect and socially and nationally harmful. At that gathering in Novi Sad, organized by the Movement for the renewal of Serbistics and the Government of the Republic of Srpska Krajina in exile, Irinej Bulovic, the bishop of Novi Sad, said, amongst other things in his closure, that the Serbian Orthodox church did not take the stand that the Serbs have to be just Orthodox. It is not possible to take such a stand even canonically.

### **The Renewal of Serbistics – The Renewal of the Serbian National Programme**

The Movement for the Renewal of Serbistics, acting for more than a decade, consisted of the most eminent philologists, linguists, writers, historians, political scientists, in its numerous publications renews and appeals for the renewal of the Serbian philological tradition from the pre- Yugoslav period, and especially from the pre-Tito period. The Movement demands renewal of the tradition of Matica Srpska, Serbian Academy of Sciences, educational system in Serbia, as well as the renewal of the Serbian idea of Yugoslavism. It requires that the state and European factors treat Serbian language and literature in the same manner as they treat other European languages and literatures. In other words, they should be identified according to the identities they used to have in the pre-Yugoslav period. This, first of all, means that the Serbian people, as many other European peoples, is a multi-confessional and, as other European peoples, it can be different by its language, no way by its religion, which is in accordance with the European standards.

The ruling thought in Serbia today is between the Strossmayer's/Jagic' Croatian Yugoslavism and „Euro-unionism“ which are both supra-national ideas. There are: Illyrianism, Yugoslavism, Eurounionism, but not Serbism. We entered these mentioned integrations past and against Serbism. And it is not natural; no other people did the same. Serbo – Croaticistics is still the official linguistic conception in Serbia and all its national institutions. This is not natural either. But this is harmful for the interests of the Serbian people. Other nations of the former state „renamed, additionally named and de-named“ Serbian language

into Croatian, Bosniac/Bosnian, Montenegrin, and the official Serbian authorities are not able to not only protect their own language, they name it incorrectly which is non-academic and harmful for the national interests.

The path of renewal of Serbistics is very hard. Serbistics has not come to life in the key national institutions: Matica srpska, SANU, Vuk's legacy, at the Serbian faculties and institutions of philology, and other national institutions. Thus we have an amazing paradox, that this Slavic discipline is being studied at seven institutions and institutes for high education in Poland, and nowhere in Serbia. True, the Department for Serbistics was established at the Faculty of Philology in Belgrade in 1998, however the dean of the department, Radmilo Marojević, was forced, just a few months later, in January 1999, to resign, and the Department for Serbistics was closed.

The struggle between Serbistics and Serbo-Croatistics continues, which unfortunately is still only present at the Serbian national institutions, after the defeat of the Yugoslav idea and the break-up of the Yugoslav state. Both Yugoslav states were built on Strossmayer's and Jagić's standpoints. Their standpoints were accepted by Serbian linguists and philologists, as well as Serbian politicians in both Yugoslavias, but also the official Serbian state and national institutions in the post-Yugoslav period.

However, it is completely certain that the Movement for the renewal of Serbistics is moving in the good direction, and that it will achieve its scientific and national goal. Established on prof. Petar Milosavljević's initiative at the Faculty of Philology in Pristina in 1997, the Movement manifested its activity several times.

For the first time, it happened at the founding assembly in Pristina, 1997. On that occasion, 63 signatories signed the two documents: Platformu Pokreta za obnovu srbistike (The Platform of the Movement for the Renewal of Serbistics) and Memoar o srpskom jeziku, srpskoj književnosti i srpskoj sabornosti (Memoir on Serbian Language, Serbian Literature and Serbian Unity).

For the second time, 14 philologists and writers from the Serbian territory published Slovo o srpskom jeziku (A letter on Serbian Language), 1998.

For the third time, the Movement made its appearance at the international academic meeting that was held in Novi Sad on 23 and 24 November 2007 under the title Srpsko pitanje i srbistika (Serbian issue and Serbistics). At this meeting in Novi Sad the Conclusions on the identity of Serbian language, Serbian literature, Serbian letter and Ser-

bian people were made. This scientific gathering was supported by the Government of the RSK in exile, with active participation by its members, and intensive cooperation continues with the Movement for the renewal of Serbistics since then. On the initiative and elaboration by Petar Milosavljevic, the Movement for the Renewal of Serbistics and the RSK Government in exile renewed the work of Matica srpska in Dubrovnik with its seat in Belgrade, on the occasion of 100th anniversary since its foundation on 1 August 2009. This cooperation resulted in the international academic gathering called *Ljetopis Matice srpske u Dubrovniku* (A Chronicle of Matica srpska in Dubrovnik), participated by around thirty scientists, and in publication of two anthologies of the same name.

The Serbs are going back to their national programme. That programme is philological in its basis, as it concerns the identity of the Serbian language, Serbian literature and Serbian people. Serbian national programme was, in the Yugoslav period, removed on behalf of the Yugoslav programme. Serbs lost a great deal of their linguistic, literary, national and religious identity in that period. Serbian national institutions: Matica srpska, Serbian academy of science, Serbian literary association, University departments of Serbian language and literature – strengths of the Serbian people in the past – became weaknesses in the Yugoslav, especially Tito's period, used as a tool for realisation of Tudjman's – Croatia national programme, under the Yugoslav name.

It is necessary to draw a difference between a national and a state programme. The Serbian national programme isn't the same as the state national programme. The national programme concerns all Serbs, regardless of the state they live in and their religion; whether they live in Serbia, Montenegro, Slovenia, New York, or elsewhere, it is a Serbian linguistic and cultural programme, the programme of the Serbian ethno-linguistic community. The state programme concerns all citizens, and they are not of the same language and ethnic origin; this programme relates to the state attributes: economy, security, internal politics, foreign politics, army, etc.

„If the Serbs want to build their national house so that it stays, in the same way other people are doing it, they have to incorporate all of its important parts into it. That implies one of the most valuable parts of the Serbian people, the part that used to be in the territory of Croatia today.

There were Serbs at prominent places who easily signed off Dubrovnik, and then the Republic of Srpska Krajina as well. We are witnesses that Kosovo followed after that. In a way, the issue of Vojvodina remaining within Serbia has been raised.

Serbian national programme, the renewal of which we openly advocate for, does not imply any “signing off” (Milosavljević 2007: 78-79).

## Conclusion

In an ideological sense, Serbia today is between the failed Yugoslavism ie. Croatian idea of Yugoslavism and the idea of Eurounionism, while in a geopolitical sense Serbia and Serbian people as a whole are in the position most similar to that from the time of the Berlin Congress and later. The Serbian social and political elite has to critically re-examine the Yugoslav period of its history, especially the Austro – Croatian geopolitical project of Gaj’s Illyrianism and Strossmayer’s Yugoslavism, as well as Jagic’s project of Serbo-Croatistics, which caused great losses for the Serbs in ethnical, linguistic, religious, and geopolitical areas. That period of the Serbian history was a discontinuity in every sense. These processes ended in a violent and anti-constitutional break-up of the Yugoslav state in 1990-1995, by Slovenia and Croatia, followed by Croato – Muslim coalition in BiH, and then the Croats first, and later on Bosnian Muslim, and at last Montenegrin renamed the appropriated Serbian language into Croatian, Bosnian, Montenegrin. The paradox would not be bigger if separatists in the Serbian Vojvodina did the same, proclaiming the „Vojvodina“ language as a foundation of some Vojvodina identity. In other words, in the Serbian ethno-linguistic territory new, non-Serbian nations-states were formed, which gave up Serbo-Croatian, in fact Serbian language, searching for their own identity. Only Serbia, or its political leadership and national institutions (Matica srpska, SANU, Vuk’s Legacy, Faculty of Philology and other related faculties and institutes...) remains a prisoner of historical failures and forgeries in the form of Croatian Yugoslavism and Serbo-Croatistics.

All of these states are trying to get hold of the membership in the European Union; to that strives Serbia too. But Serbian academia and politics should correct the mistakes from the past first, return to Serbistics – the science of Serbian language, Serbian literature and Serbian people, founded on the European values and recognized by the European Slavistic authorities. Serbia is supposed to hand in the negotiation application for the EU accession, and this application, based on the foundation of the European rules and standards, reads as follows: „that the European rules and standards are respected equally for all people and states, primarily ethno-linguistics standards, on the occasion of accessing ‘the family of European nations’; that, in accordance with the international law norms, Serbian state constituencies and the right to

their union into one Serbian state in the Balkans are recognized“ (Subotic 2009: 198-199). Could the Serbian authorities today submit such a European application to the EU? Hardly so, almost impossible! This is due to the fact that the Serbian authorities today still live in the mists of Yugoslavism, and wrongly assumes that Serbia is guilty of a breakup of the former state. It therefore begins with the same premises as those that broke up our state and took away Kosovo and Metohija. Every Serbian authorities that would want to resolve the Serbian national and state issue „in parts“ and not integrally, is unsuccessful and unwanted by friends and enemies. How would the American–NATO EU react to such hypothetic demand? With disbelief and loathing, maybe even threats or new sanctions. What to do then?

Finally, as a solution imposes Russia, which according to Dugin, shares with Serbia the same geopolitical destiny but not the perspective. Is this the priority of Russian political strategy today (Radinovic 2009: 113-122)? We think that the Russian attitude towards Europe as far as the energy in three directions is concerned, of which one goes through Serbia, represents the directions not only for the Serbian economy, but also for the new, integral Serbian geopolitical paradigm, that can be achieved with the support from Russia.

## Bibliography

- Bojovic, D. (2007) „Opet o „preimenovanju“ (doimenovanju, razimenovanju) srpskog jezika u Crnoj Gori, i još ponečemu“. In: Milosavljevic, P., Subotic, M. (eds.) *Srpsko pitanje i srbistika*. Logos, Knjigotvornica Logos: Backa Palanka-Valjevo. Cosic, D. (2002) *Piščevi zapisi (1981-1991)*. Beograd: Filip Visnjic.
- Dugin, A. (2008) „Geopolitika Nove Evrope“. In: Milosevic, Z. (ed.) *Rusija i Balkan - pitanje saradnje i bezbednosti*. Beograd: Institut za politicke studije, pp. 51-52.
- Glas javnosti (2009) Da, ali samo na papiru. Glas Javnosti [online]. Available at: <http://www.glas-javnosti.rs/clanak/politika/glas-javnosti-16-02-2009/da-ali-samo-na-papiru> [Accessed on 16 February 2009].
- Knezevic, M. (2008) „Snaženje Rusije i savremena Srbija“. In: Milosevic, Z. (ed.) *Rusija i Balkan - pitanje saradnje i bezbednosti*. Beograd: Institut za politicke studije, pp. 209-244.
- Kostic, L. M. (2000) *Katolički Srbi*. Novi Sad: Dobrica knjiga.
- Kovacevic, M. (2005) *Protiv neistina o srpskom jeziku*. Istocno Sarajevo: SKPD Prosvjeta.
- Kovacevic, M. (2007) „Srpski jezik i njegove varijante“. In: Milosavljevic, P., Subotic, M. (eds.) *Srpsko pitanje i srbistika I*. Logos, Knjigotvornica Logos: Backa Palanka-Valjevo.

- Krestic, V. (2006) *Biskup Štrossmajer -Hrvat, Velikohrvat ili Jugosloven*. Jagodina: Gambit.
- Lalic, V. (2005) Đilasove „privremene“ granice. *Novosti* [online]. Available at: <http://www.novosti.rs/vesti/naslovna/aktuelno.69.html:172642-272-ilasove-privremene-granice> [Accessed 3 August 2005]. Marojevic, R. (2000) *Srpski jezik danas*. Beograd: Biblioteka Serbika.
- Matic, M. (2000) *O srpskom političkom obrascu*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Matic, M. (2003) „Srbija: istorijske krize i demokratska reforma“. *Srpska politička misao*, (1-4): 7-24.
- Matovic, V. (2007) „Ne može se rijeka kroz duduk natjerati“. In: Milosavljevic P., Subotic, M. (eds.) *Srpsko pitanje i srbistika I*. Logos, Knjigotvornica Logos: Backa Palanka-Valjevo.
- Milosavljevic, P. (1997) *Srbi i njihov jezik – hrestomatija*. Pristina: Narodna i univerzitetska biblioteka.
- Milosavljevic, P. (2003) *Uvod u srbistiku*. Beograd: Trebnik.
- Milosavljevic, P. (2006) *Srpska pisma, Besjeda – Banja Luka*. Beograd: Ars libri.
- Milosavljevic, P. (2007) „O razlikovanju srpskog i hrvatskog jezika“. In: Milosavljevic, P., Subotic, M. (eds.) *Srpsko pitanje i srbistika I*. Logos, Knjigotvornica Logos: Backa Palanka-Valjevo.
- Milosavljevic, P. (2007) „Reforma latinice Vuka Karadzica“. In: Milosavljevic, P. (ed.) *Srpsko pitanje i srbistika 2*. Logos, Knjigotvornica Logos: Backa Palanka-Valjevo.
- Milosavljevic, P. (2007) *Ideje jugoslavenstva i srpska misao*. Valjevo: Logos.
- Milosavljevic, P. (2007) *Srpsko pitanje i srbistika*. Logos, Knjigotvornica Logos: Backa Palanka-Valjevo.
- Milosavljevic, P. (2008) „Identitet i preimenovanja srpskog jezika“. In: Subotic, M., Djuric, Z. (eds.) *Srbija – politički i institucionalni izazovi*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Novak, V. (1967) *Vuk i Hrvati*. Beograd: SANU.
- Petranovic, B. (1993) *Jugoslovensko iskustvo srpske nacionalne integracije*. Belgrade: Sluzbeni list SRJ.
- Petranovic, B. (1993) *Srbija u Jugoslaviji i velike sile*. Beograd: Vojnoistorijski glasnik.
- Petrovic Pirocanac, Z. (2008) „Američko ukotvljavanje, rusko kašnjenje i srpska „Sibirska dilema“ na Balkanu“. In: Milosevic, Z. (ed.) *Rusija i Balkan - pitanje saradnje i bezbednosti*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije, pp. 295-320.
- Radinovic, R. (2009) „Srbija između NATO-a i Rusije“. *Nacionalni interes*, 5(1-2): 113-122.
- Stepic, M. (2008) „Srbija u evroazijskoj i neoevroazijskoj koncepciji – uporabna geopolitička analiza“. In: Milosevic, Z. (ed.) *Rusija i Balkan - pitanje saradnje i bezbednosti*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije, pp. 23-50.
- Stojanovic, J. (2007) „Identitet i status srpskog jezika u Crnoj Gori (nekad i sad)“. In: Milosavljevic, P., Subotic, M. (eds.) *Srpsko pitanje i srbistika I*. Logos, Knjigotvornica Logos: Backa Palanka-Valjevo.
- Strossmayer, J., Racki, F. (1971) *Politički spisi*. Zagreb: Znanje.

- Subotic, M. (2006) *Novija srpska politička istorija*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Subotic, M. (2007) „Austro-hrvatski geopolitički projekat ilirstva i jugoslavenstva“. In: Milosavljevic, P., Subotic, M. (eds.) *Srpsko pitanje i srbistika 1*. Logos, Knjigotvornica Logos: Backa Palanka-Valjevo.
- Subotic, M. (2007) „*Filologija i geopolitika*“. In: Milosavljevic, P., Subotic, M. (eds.) *Srpsko pitanje i srbistika 3*. Logos, Knjigotvornica Logos: Backa Palanka-Valjevo.
- Subotic, M. (2008) „Rusija i savremeno srpsko pitanje s posebnim osvrtom na Kosmet“. In: Milosevic, Z. (ed.) *Rusija i Balkan - pitanje saradnje i bezbednosti*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije, pp. 191-208.
- Subotic, M. (2008) *Srpsko pitanje danas*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Subotic, M. (2009) „Republika Srpska Krajina – Kosovo i Metohija-Južna Osetija-Abhazija i uloga Rusije“. *Nacionalni interes*, 5(1-2): 183-200.
- Subotic, M. (2010) *Politička misao srbistike*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Terzic, S. (1999) „O srpskom političkom i kulturnom regionalizmu–mogućnosti prevazilaženja“. In: *Srpski duhovni prostor*, zbornik radova sa naučnog skupa (Bijeljina 29-30. oktobar 1998). Banja Luka, Srpsko Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Republike Srpske, pp. 239-250.
- Zivojinovic, D. (1997) „Vatikan i Srbi u XX veku“. In: Kadijevic, V. (ed.) *Geopolitička stvarnost Srba*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Zutic, N. (2006) *Srbi rimokatolici takozvani Hrvati*. Beograd: SRS.
- Zutic, N. (2007) „Vatikan i srpski jezik i književnost od 17. do 20. veka“. In: Milosavljevic, P., Subotic, M. (eds.) *Srpsko pitanje i srbistika 1*. Logos, Knjigotvornica Logos: Backa Palanka-Valjevo.