

The Balkans as the Core of European Civilization? Kosta P. Manojlović's collaboration with the Balkanski institut [Institute for Balkan Studies] in Belgrade (1934–1941)*

IVANA VESIĆ

Representations of the Balkans as a cultural and political entity in Western European historical, political, diplomatic and journalistic narratives in the past centuries have for the past two decades occupied a prominent place in the research of numerous scholars. The most influential among them were the investigations of Maria Todorova, Božidar Jezernik, Vesna Goldsworthy, David Norris, Milica Bakić Hayden (according to ČOLOVIĆ 2013), and others, whose focus was oriented towards the deconstruction of the so-called “Balkanist discourse” with the aim of discovering the trajectory of negative stereotypes on the Balkans and Balkan peoples until the most recent times.¹ Although inspired by Edward Said’s insights into the problem of Orientalism as a derogatory discourse and practice of Western European politicians, scholars, and journalists, these researchers of the phenomenon of “Balkanism” have mostly been unfamiliar with their historical predecessors who, as early as the 1930s, initiated extensive debate on similar issues in the specific geopolitical circumstances of the time. This group of journalists close to the Yugoslav political elite, supported by dozens of scholars from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania, Germany, Austria, and elsewhere, founded the Institute for Balkan Studies, an entity with the primary objective of launching a broad campaign in both academic and public circles of Balkan and European countries to combat the widespread negative preconceptions of Balkan peoples and culture.²

* This paper is part of research done on the project *Serbian Musical Identities Within Local and Global Frameworks: Traditions, Changes, Challenges* (No. 177004), funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

1 On the recent establishment of Balkanist discourse in the writings of various scholars and its general scopes and ideological grounding, see ČOLOVIĆ 2013.

2 The idea for the foundation of the Institute for Balkan Studies came from Ratko Parežanin, an experienced journalist, writer and politician, and his politically like-minded collaborator Svetozar Spanačević. Parežanin was not anonymous in Yugoslav political and public circles owing to his diplomatic activities in the early 1920s (he was a press attaché in Vienna from 1924 to 1927) as well as his work as a member of the National Assembly (he served as Member of Parliament from the Radikalna stranka [Radical Party], 1927–1929). According to his own testimonies (see LAPČEVIĆ 2013), he was

The idea and its realization came about in the aftermath of political events thought to be important for the future of the Balkan peoples – their security, trade, cultural unification, and so forth. Foremost among these was the signing of a pact between Yugoslavia, Romania, Turkey, and Greece in Athens on February 9th, 1934; it was believed that this treaty would improve relations between Balkan countries and promote their closer collaboration in various areas, and, eventually, bring about political unity in the form of a federal state. The creation of this Balkan Entente, although incomplete, as Bulgaria and Albania refused to take part, together with the Balkan Conferences that preceded it,³ once again revived the concept of a Balkan Confederation popular since the mid-19th century among Balkan politicians and intellectuals,⁴ and

a keen supporter of the king Alexander's dictatorship announced on January 6th, 1929, interpreting it as a positive step for the preservation of the state. Once again appointed to a diplomatic position (from 1929 to 1933), he had the opportunity to "empirically" confirm his belief in cultural commonalities between Balkan countries (according to LAPČEVIĆ 2013). Traveling through Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Romania, he was able to notice many similarities in the lifestyles of the average population in the Balkans, together with these countries' strong historical, cultural and geographical bonds. Even before he came in close touch with Balkan countries, he publicly expressed his assumption that the Balkans represented an autonomous entity: "The Balkans is a world unto itself. But, as such, it is not self-sufficient, it does not live for itself nor in the name of itself, but for Europe and Asia, as well as all of humanity" (PAREŽANIN according to LAPČEVIĆ 2013). On Parežanin's professional and political evolution, see LAPČEVIĆ 2013.

- 3 The initiative towards *rapprochement* between Balkan countries became firmly manifested in the late 1920s among the political elite of most of these nations. As a result, several Balkan conferences took place annually from 1930 to 1934, the first in Athens (1930), followed by Istanbul (1931), Bucharest (1932) and Salonica (1934). The objective of the conferences was to find an adequate political platform for the foundation of the Balkan Confederation (Balkan Entente), an ideal that had been reappearing after the 1848 Revolution in diverse political circumstances. For a more detailed review of the issues discussed at these Balkan conferences, and the discrepancies among the various countries, see LOPANDIĆ & KRONJA 2010: 35–45; KERNER & HOWARD 2014. See also PRESHLENOVA 2014.
- 4 The vision of unified Balkan countries and their close collaboration in politics, economics, culture, and art had occupied the minds of many influential political leaders and intellectuals since the mid-19th century. Among the Serbian elite alone there were several "projects" for Balkan unification that were discussed in public or privately before the end of the First World War. Proponents of Balkan "brotherhood" came from a distinct political background which, together with the general geopolitical tendencies of the time, influenced their narrative and aims. Among the most important were the proposals of the Serbian prince Mihailo Obrenović from the 1850s, the founder of the Serbian Socialist movement, Svetozar Marković, the liberally oriented Mihailo Polit-Desančić, Vladimir Jovanović, and others. Worth mentioning in this context were also the undertakings of Serbian and Balkan socialists from the end of the 1900s. The leaders and activists of social-democratic parties from Serbia, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Turkey, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Slavonia, Montenegro, Romania, and Greece introduced regular Balkan conferences since 1909 with the goals of promoting the necessity of liberation of the Balkan peoples and their collaboration in trade and economy, spreading the notion of their cultural interconnection, resisting the imperialist ambitions of leading European capitalist states, etc. On the historical development of the concept of Balkan unification in Serbia, see PIROČANAC 1895; MILUTINOVIĆ 1937; LILIĆ 2016. On the approach to this idea in the Socijaldemokratska stranka Srbije [Social-Democratic Party of Serbia] in 1900s, see IZVEŠTAJ BEOGRADSKJE RADNIČKE KOMORE 1932: 92–102.

stimulated public activism of the political, intellectual, and cultural elite throughout Balkan countries and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia.⁵

The foundation of the Institute for Balkan Studies represented just one of the many projects inspired by the cluster of political events surrounding the establishment of the Balkan Entente, but was unique in many aspects. Firstly, it was conceived and executed by non-officials who had close liaisons with renowned individuals from various social fields: politics, science, art, music, journalism, etc. Secondly, from the start, its founders adhered to a clearly formulated program which was not treated as a dead letter, but, on the contrary, motivated a series of both organizational and creative activities that culminated between 1936 and 1938.⁶ Finally, through systematic and well-planned propaganda (or, in today's terms, "public relations"), the founders of the Institute gained support of a number of distinguished scholars, diplomats, and journalists who, either directly or indirectly, helped it accomplish its main goals.

Among the influential individuals who took part in the activities of the Institute for Balkan Studies was the composer, ethnomusicologist, and cultural activist Kosta P. Manojlović, who was the Institute's only Yugoslav representative in the field of music from 1934 to 1941. According to archival documents, Manojlović was not meant to be the sole music expert to collaborate with the institute. In September 1934, probably at Manojlović's recommendation, an invitation for collaboration was also sent to Petar Konjović, composer and at the time Director of the Narodno kazalište [National Theater] in Zagreb, but he refused the offer due to "overwhelming professional obligations".⁷

5 One of the most effective attempts at creating closer bonds between the Balkan peoples was the establishment of the Balkan Games (a sort of a regional version of the Olympic Games), which were organized from 1929 to 1939. Due to the popularity of sports among various social groups, this kind of propagation of the idea of Balkan unity turned successful, attracting the attention of the large part of the population (see KISSOUDI 2009). Moreover, there were various initiatives in the domain of the arts, such as exchanges of music ensembles and individual artists and scientists from the Balkan countries during the 1930s, public exhibitions, etc.

6 The strivings of the leaders of the Institute for Balkan Studies, as well as their motives for its foundation, were outlined in a cover letter sent to the local authorities on April 24th, 1934 (Arhiv Jugoslavije [Archives of Yugoslavia, "AY"], Balkanski institut [Institute for Balkan Studies], AY-F101-1). In it, it was stated that the Institute had two main goals: 1) to stimulate collaboration between Balkan states and peoples, and 2) to objectively inform the public outside the Balkans of the region's material and spiritual culture and heritage. To fulfill these goals, it was necessary to create one large "inter-Balkan" library, which would contain works on the history, geography, folklore, economics, and political history of Balkan states and peoples. It was also important to create a collection of statistics that could serve various research purposes. Finally, the plan was to publish works on the topics of economics, culture, and science in the Balkan countries. On the Institute's program and ideological framing, see PAREŽANIN 1980.

7 Letters were sent to Konjović twice, on September 26th, 1934, and on October 1th, 1934. The directors of the Institute for Balkan Studies saw Konjović as a potential collaborator, probably owing to his

Several reasons likely motivated the selection of Manojlović as correspondent for issues of Yugoslav and Balkan music. Among other things, the leaders of the Institute relied on a group of historians from the University of Belgrade, particularly Professor Vladimir Ćorović who was, supposedly, well acquainted with Manojlović's investigations into the folk music heritage of "Southern Serbia". Manojlović had been a member of a team of experts led by Ćorović who did field research in the region of Raška, the monastery of Visoki Dečani, and Bijelo Polje, during July and August of 1934 (see MANOJLOVIĆ 1934). Besides, Manojlović was known in academic circles owing to his long-term cooperation with the Ethnographic Museum in Belgrade. For instance, he published three of his seven research papers on the traditional folk music of "Southern Serbia" in the museum's scientific journal, *Glasnik Etnografskog muzeja* [*Bulletin of the Ethnographic Museum*], in 1926, 1933, and 1935,⁸ and participated in its various research expeditions. Last, but certainly not the least, Manojlović was an enthusiastic public proponent of the ideas of All-Slavism and Balkan cultural *rapprochement* since the early 1920s in Yugoslavia, elaborating these concepts in his writings and ethnomusicological and cultural work (see VEŠIĆ 2016: 127–140).

As I shall discuss later, Manojlović's interpretations of Balkan culture and cultural heritage shared some similarities with the views of the leaders of the Institute for Balkan Studies. Still, this music scholar arrived at his insights within the sociopolitical circumstances characteristic of the first decade of the Yugoslav state. Together with the norms and values of ethnographic studies and studies of Serbian church music, music performance, and cultural diplomacy of the time, this had left a specific imprint on his narrative; as such, it is possible to observe certain discrepancies as well. The comparison of Manojlović's understanding of the Balkans with notions held by the Institute's main ideologues has the following objectives. Firstly, I shall point to ideological departures in the narratives analyzed, and endeavor to explain their possible causes. Secondly, both their distinctions and correlations will be considered from the perspective of the symbolic struggles and divisions in Yugoslav public

high reputation. They offered him to join many respectable scientists and experts in working on the first volume of *A Book on the Balkans*. See AY, Institute for Balkan Studies, AY-F101-7. It is important to mention that Manojlović probably had part in the engagement of the Bulgarian music scholars for the institute's publications, above all of Professor Stoyan Brashovanov from the University of Sofia. Although it is not possible to conclude this from the correspondence of the Institute's officials with Brashovanov, which lasted from 1934 to 1937 (see AY, Institute for Balkan Studies, AY-F101-4), the fact is that he knew Manojlović from their collaboration on the establishment of the Sveslovenski pevački savez [All-Slav Choral Union] during the early 1930s. This is indirectly confirmed by Manojlović's testimonies about the foundation of the Union, especially in meetings that took place in Ljubljana in May 1932. See MANOJLOVIĆ 1933: 188–190.

8 Manojlović's publications are listed in the References.

life in the 1930s. Finally, Manojlović's collaboration with the Institute for Balkan Studies will be explored within the phenomenon of the dissolution and marginalization of the liberal faction in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia on the eve of World War II.

The analysis and conclusions presented in this paper are partly the results of research carried out in my doctoral dissertation (VESIĆ 2016), which was complemented by investigation conducted from May until November 2016 in the Archives of Yugoslavia and the National Library of Serbia. For this purpose I analyzed various published and unpublished sources: the documents of the Institute for Balkan Studies and materials of the Ministry of Education of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia;⁹ publications of the Institute, including two volumes of *Knjiga o Balkanu* [*A Book on the Balkans*], the book *Balkan i Balkanci* [*The Balkans and its Peoples*], and the journal *La revue internationale des Études balkaniques* [*International Journal of Balkan Studies*] (1934 to 1938); memorial of the Institute, by Ratko Parežanin (1980, second edition), and, finally, journal articles and letters written by Kosta P. Manojlović between 1922 and 1939.

In the following discussion I will first consider the ideological aspects of the program of the Institute for Balkan Studies. While examining in brief the crucial assumptions on which it was grounded, I will focus primarily on the critique of the Western European Balkanist narrative as one of its most significant elements, along with the project of de-Balkanization of Balkan studies and the Balkans among intellectuals and the broader public in the Balkans, Europe, and worldwide. The second part will be dedicated to an exploration of Manojlović's narrative on Balkan culture and heritage, and the last part will consist of concluding remarks.

Scientific and cultural program of the Institute for the Balkan studies: an overview of its main objectives

The mission of the Institute for Balkan Studies was manifold, as outlined in the cover letters that Ratko Parežanin, journalist and one of the founders of the Institute, dispatched to Yugoslav and foreign authorities (mostly diplomats and ministers, journal editors, and scholars), and elaborated in his editorials, as well as in the articles of Petar Skok, Milan Budimir (SKOK & BUDIMIR 1934; SKOK & BUDIMIR 1936 [1936]), and Tadeusz Zieliński (ŽELINSKI 1936) published and reprinted in the Institute's journal and books. In addition to supporting the strivings of political leaders of the Balkan states towards overall *rapprochement* by cultural and scientific means, the Institute's main ideologues believed that

9 They are kept at the Archives of Yugoslavia (AY-F101, AY-F66).

it was absolutely imperative to establish the discipline of Balkanology based on comparative research of political, cultural, and economic histories of countries created in the Balkan peninsula from ancient until modern times, together with their literary, artistic, and linguistic development.¹⁰

Explorations of this kind were meant not only to promote cultural closeness and similarities of the various Balkan peoples and, concurrently, foster tendencies towards political unification among both the elite and the general public, but were also understood as the principal starting point in challenging the views of the Balkans prevailing both among the European public and academic circles. The critique of Balkanist thought represented, in my opinion, one of the focal points in the cultural and political program of the Institute for Balkan Studies. Actually, it functioned as a cohesive element between, on the one hand, the academic aspirations of its leaders and collaborators, and, on the other, their broader political goals, thus politicizing the standard academic narrative and, simultaneously, supporting certain scientific, artistic, educational and international policies of the political and intellectual elite.

As discussed in the papers of the Institute's key activists, the rejection of the European understanding of Balkan peoples and culture was anchored in several assumptions. According to the Institute, European powers had in the past intentionally interrupted political and cultural collaboration between Balkan countries so as to maintain their own expansionist and monopolizing efforts (see PAREŽANIN 1936: X–XII). The great powers' hidden motives were masked by systematic propaganda aimed at portraying Balkan peoples as politically immature, culturally underdeveloped, and unable to accept modern and enlightened ideals of social and political organization. Furthermore, the Balkans was conceived of as “the powder keg of Europe”, “antisocial savagery”, the cradle of anarchism, barbarism, and chaos (1936: XII). Not only were European intellectuals and publicity affected by distorted views of their South-

10 The significance of the creation of the new discipline of Balkanology was thoroughly explained in Petar Skok and Milan Budimir's article entitled “But et Signification des Études balkaniques” [“Goal and significance of Balkan studies”] published in the first issue of the Institute's journal (SKOK & BUDIMIR 1934 [1936]). Criticizing the nationally oriented work of Balkan countries' academies of sciences, Skok and Budimir pointed to its harmful effect on science. Instead of particularisms in scientific research, the two experts pleaded for the broadening of the perspective which would take into consideration “a shared reality in the Balkans” and explain it by historical, linguistic, ethnographic, and geographical explorations (1934: 3). The existence of a shared experience among the Balkan peoples, despite their political, cultural and economic divisions through history, was interpreted as the main impetus for the change in the scientific approach in this part of Europe. The discipline of Balkanology was meant to be grounded on a comparative frame which would arise from finding analogies and correlations among the individual “cases” or, more precisely, particular Balkan peoples and their “civilization”. The focus of the research was to be put primarily on historical issues, but also on an investigation of the linguistic similarities of Balkan languages, the commonality of literary styles, similarities in folklore practices, etc. On the scientific narrative created in the Institute for Balkan Studies, see MIHAJLOVIĆ 2013.

Eastern neighbors: so was the Balkan elite (PAREŽANIN 1936: XII). The internalization of this false self-image was interpreted as the most detrimental aspect of European hegemonizing practices, termed “Balkanism” (1936: XI).¹¹

While pointing to the mechanisms and motives behind the construction of a Balkanist narrative, the ideologues of the Balkan institute sought to create a more objective approach to scientific research, journalism and travelogues from the Balkans. In their opinion, this goal could be achieved through the engagement of Balkan scholars interested in the development of Balkan solidarity, together with European scholars not influenced by prejudices about Balkan peoples and culture (see PAREŽANIN 1936: XII). Besides rejecting negative stereotypes about this part of Europe, the involvement of “Balkanology without Balkanism” was, among other things, to lead to the discovery of the Balkans’ positive cultural and political contributions to European civilization (1936: XIV). Ultimately, scientific findings of this discipline were also to serve as a basis for constructing a “Balkan soul”, leading gradually to the regeneration and stabilization of the Balkans, or to a so-called Balkan *Risorgimento*.¹²

11 As Parežanin observed, “for some time we left research and explanation of our history, art, literature, customs, folklore, and so on to prejudiced journalists and scientists, mostly from outside the Balkans, who served powers not disinterested in the fate of this part of Europe. Hence, it is reasonable that in this kind of literature it was important to find and accentuate distinctions between Balkan peoples, and, when these were absent, to falsify the facts. [...] That non-Balkan peoples fell for the claims of such ‘politically influenced’ literature is problematic, but that Balkan peoples were affected and manipulated by them is tragic. Even today we can find examples of its use by some Balkan scientists and journalists in order to support their views on certain political issues.” (1936: XII).

12 The assumption of the broader effects of Balkan collaboration and unity was discussed in detail in an article by Tadeusz Zieliński titled “Ancient civilization, Europe and the Balkans” (ŽELIŃSKI 1936). According to him, the ideals of Greco-Roman culture continually reappear in the history of European civilization, with deep and transformational influence. Their periodical revival led to three culminating points in the Europe’s history, as manifested in three periods of cultural revitalization: the first initiated by St. Ambrose, the second known as the Carolingian Renaissance, and the third emerged in the 14th century (1936: 4–5). Although Zieliński believed a fourth manifestation of Greco-Roman ideals seemed less probable in utilitarian and machine-oriented European culture of the 20th century, its only possibility lay in the cultural potential of the Slavic peoples. This fourth renaissance was, as he believed, destined to have a Slavic imprint, but would encompass the Balkan countries as well. As Zieliński pointed out, “although Balkan peoples are not ethnically connected, they are interrelated owing to the artistic monuments of ancient civilizations. Therefore, they will have an important role in the Slavic Renaissance, which we have termed thus because of the predominance of the Slavic peoples.” (1936: 19–20). Unlike Zieliński, who emphasized the role of the Slavs, the views expressed in the chapter of *The Balkans and its Peoples* (ANONYMOUS [PAREŽANIN & SPANAČEVIĆ] 1937: 145–156), titled “Osnova i put” [“The basis and the path”], showed firm adherence to the concept of a genuinely Balkan Renaissance. These opinions were founded on a belief in the future autonomous development of this part of Europe, which would result from a discovery of its authentic traditions and values. This search for the “common ground” of the Balkan peoples and their unique historical and cultural heritage would, supposedly, enable the construction of a specifically Balkan type of political and economic organization. The economy would be based on policies different from those of capitalist countries, including a cooperative model, while the political and social order would be founded on the assumed brotherhood of Balkan peoples, to be expanded by means of thorough educational, cultural and scien-

Similarly to recent critics of the phenomenon of Balkanism, whose findings were critically examined by Ivan Čolović (2013), despite their emancipatory ambitions and struggle against false representation of Balkan cultures and peoples, the activists of the Institute for Balkan Studies, “did not escape the trap of stereotypical, essentialist definitions of cultural identities, especially when they accept the notion that the Balkans are a region possessed of a particular, substantive identity, not realising that it is upon this very notion that the ossified Balkanist discourse rests” (ČOLOVIĆ 2013). In addition, this group succumbed to the intertwining of political and academic narratives, not unlike the very intellectuals and scholars they criticized. While they did discredit the creators of Balkanist narratives as having produced them as a result of hegemonic cultural and political aspirations, at the same time they propagated the foundation of an academic discipline whose political role they did not even try to conceal.

Collaboration of Kosta P. Manojlović with the Institute for Balkan studies: a glimpse at the correspondence of their narratives

I will now concentrate on Manojlović’s collaboration with the Institute for Balkan Studies, focusing on how his political and cultural aspirations corresponded with those of the Institute’s ideologues. This will allow me to make further generalizations. As I have already indicated, Manojlović was chosen as a correspondent of the Institute most probably owing to his expert knowledge of the folk music heritage of this part of Europe. Consequently, it is not surprising that the leaders of the organization appointed Manojlović as both contributor to their collective publications and reviewer of their papers on music. According to archival documents,¹³ from June 1934 until the end of 1935, he was invited to write several papers for the Institute’s editions, one on Yugoslav folk music, another on the music of Albania and, finally, one on the music of the Balkans.¹⁴ Apart from this, Manojlović was asked to review and edit manus-

tific collaboration (ANONYMOUS 1937: 153–156). The principle of *čojstvo* and *junaštvo* – the preservation of those less mighty from the powerful, as well as from oneself – was also observed as the core of an imagined unified Balkans (1937: 155). Constituted on these components, the new Balkans was perceived as the *spiritus movens* for cultural regeneration on a global scale, representing a successful example of political integration of culturally diverse states and peoples (1937: 156). Moreover, “the Balkans [was] [...] to show to the world once again the type of spiritual sobriety which existed in the Classical era.” (1937: 156). The prerequisite for such process was the creation of the Balkan soul.

13 See AY, Institute for Balkan Studies, AY-F101-7, Kosta Manojlović, Professor of the Music Academy in Belgrade..

14 According to the Institute’s official correspondence with Kosta P. Manojlović, he was asked to write an article on Yugoslav folk music for the first volume of *A Book on the Balkans* on July 25th, 1934, probably

cripts on music in Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey, and Greece submitted to the editorial board of *A Book on the Balkans*.¹⁵ Although his article on Yugoslav folk music appeared in the Institute's journal in 1936 in German (see MANOJLOVIĆ 1936) and, later on, in the second volume of *A Book on the Balkans* in Serbian (a revised version, MANOJLOVIĆ 1937), it is not clear what happened to his other writings: whether they were written and planned to be published in future volumes of this publication, and why the editors decided not to include them in the published volumes. I did not find any evidence in the archival material that could explain the absence of Manojlović's paper on music in Albania from the Institute's publications.¹⁶

The correspondence that Manojlović and Ratko Parežanin carried on from 1934 until 1937 reveals that Manojlović responded with enthusiasm to the projects of the Institute for Balkan Studies, and that he also contributed profusely to their realization. Still, whether Manojlović's appreciation and support for the undertakings of the Institute's leaders and collaborators resulted merely from his conviction of their scientific significance and value, or from the commonality of his and their political and cultural views, needs to be clarified in detail. Considering Manojlović's public activities and his correspondence with the authorities and published writings from the 1920s and 1930s, it is obvious that the answer to this question is all but unambiguous.

An examination of Manojlović's dealings with the Južnoslovenski pevački savez [South-Slav Choral Union, "SSCU"] from 1924 to 1932, as well

by Parežanin. Several months later, on October 26th and December 6th, he was offered to submit a paper on the contemporary music in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia along with an article on music in Albania (except Albanian folk music) for the same edition. In a letter written to Parežanin in late 1935 (undated, a response to Parežanin letter from October 23rd, 1925), Manojlović revealed that he was working on the article "Balkanska muzika" ["The music in the Balkans"] which was conceived "as a synthesis" in the book's chapter dedicated to music. Since the publication was released in 1936 without this section, it seems that the editors decided to publish it in the second volume. See AY-F101-7.

15 In a letter from the Institute's Editorial Board of October 23rd, 1936, Manojlović was invited to peer-review seven manuscripts on music written by experts from Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey, and Greece. In the same letter, Manojlović was asked to come into the Institute's office to "discuss some technical details" on his manuscripts on Yugoslav and Albanian music.

16 In Parežanin's letter from January 28th, 1937, there is an announcement of the second volume of *A Book on the Balkans* as well as a confirmation of publication of the Manojlović's manuscripts on the Yugoslav folk music and on the music in Albania. See AY-F101-7. In the meantime, Manojlović's article on Yugoslav folk music, translated in German, appeared in the Institute's journal (see MANOJLOVIĆ 1936), while its revised version written in Serbian came out in the aforementioned second volume (see MANOJLOVIĆ 1937). The reasons behind the omission of the paper on Albanian music are hard to speculate about from the available data. It is only known that Kosta P. Manojlović prepared the manuscript together with music examples. This is confirmed in his letter to Ratko Parežanin on February 11th, 1937. In it he stated that it would be "a pity" both for the quality of articles [the one on Yugoslav folk music and the music in Albania] and for the quality of the whole publication if the music examples are not printed "since it is easy to write them down, make a litograph, and put them in an appendix." See AY-F101-7.

as of his selected publications, among which pride of place was given to two synthetic research papers, 1929's *Muzičko delo našeg sela* [*Musical oeuvre of our village*] and the 1937 "Južna Srbija u svetlosti muzike" ["South Serbia from a musical perspective"], revealed the presence of a specific set of beliefs and values that were repeatedly reaffirmed. Manojlović was undoubtedly strongly devoted to the idea of cultural *rapprochement* of the Balkan peoples, but his attention from the early 1920s onward was primarily oriented towards Slavic nations and their unification in the fields of art, education, and science (ethnography). Moreover, from the 1924 foundation of the South-Slav Choral Union to the outbreak of World War II, this music scholar never lost his fervor for the ideal of All-Slavism and South-Slavism, its narrower version, sharing his views with numerous intellectuals from liberal, and, particularly, conservative circles (see VEŠIĆ 2016: 127–140).

Manojlović's vision of All-Slavism was grounded on an assumed great, regenerative role of Slavs in 20th century history, their future cultural superiority over traditionally dominant Western European peoples, and the need for constituting their own authentic political and social order and culture. This vision was expressed through his work on the foundation of the All-Slav Choral Union¹⁷ and, to a degree, in an article on the musical *oeuvre* of Yugoslav peasants (MANOJLOVIĆ 1929). In this publication, Manojlović spoke openly about the necessity of protecting musical folklore of the Yugoslav peoples as a means of creating a potent and, at the same time, autochthonous Yugoslav or South Slav culture and nation which, in his opinion, "should expand to the shores of the Black Sea, connecting the Slavic South directly with the great Slavic Russia" (1929: 64). Although unorthodox in certain aspects, Manojlović's interpretations of All-Slavism were mostly in line with those propagated by conservative Yugoslav intellectuals and state-supported organizations such as Soko Kraljevine Jugoslavije [Sokol of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia], Narodna odbrana [National Defence], Kolo srpskih sestara [Circle of Serbian Sisters], etc. (see VEŠIĆ 2016: 147–160). It was also in accord with the views of Tadeusz Zieliński, correspondent of the Institute of Balkan Studies and ardent proponent of the Slavic *Risorgimento* seen as the "Fourth Renaissance" in world history.

However, the fact that Manojlović insisted on Slavic unification, excluding non-Slavic Balkan peoples from his perspective, did not conform to the ideals

17 See AY, Ministry of Education of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, AY-F66-363-607, Kosta P. Manojlović, Secretary-General of the SSCU, Circular letter to the members of SSCU, February 7th, 1925; AY, Ministry of Education of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, AY-F66-363-607, Report and speeches of Kosta P. Manojlović from the 1st Congress of the All-Slav Choral Union in Poznań, Poland, May 21st, 1929; MANOJLOVIĆ 1933.

advocated by the ideologues of the Institute of Balkan Studies. Yet his views were not in complete opposition to theirs. The common ground for Manojlović's All-Slavism and the concept of Balkan revival espoused by the Institute's leaders was the idea of the need of cultural and political emancipation of South-Eastern European peoples, their close collaboration, and their decisive commitment to the realization of autochthonous social, political, and cultural development. In addition, both perspectives were based on a rejection of derogatory narratives about this part of Europe and its culture and inhabitants, either explicitly, as was the case with ideologues of the Institute of Balkan Studies, or more indirectly in the case of Manojlović. Also, they were both the result of a revival of concepts from the past – 19th-century Pan-Slavism and ideas of Balkan unification – that were remodeled and adapted to the political circumstances of the interwar period. Finally, it should be pointed out that both sides believed that the Balkans was, and should once again become, the core of European civilization, through either Slavic or Balkan upheaval. Certain analogies in these currents of thought probably help to explain their intertwining in the public field obvious not only among correspondents of the Institute for Balkan Studies, but also in some conservative circles (for instance, among the group gathered around the journal *Nova smena* [*New Generation*]).

Concluding remarks

An analysis of the program and narrative of the Institute for Balkan Studies and Kosta P. Manojlović's divergence from it is important on several levels. Broadly speaking, it points to the diversification of stances about Yugoslav cultural and political development in the public field between the two World Wars, especially among conservatives. This would certainly be more noticeable if other positions in the political spectrum of the time were put into perspective. At the same time, this analysis reveals a tendency towards an amalgamation of distinctive views that belonged to the same ideological currents, instead of their mere coexistence. This is a significant characteristic given the historical and political context of the mid-1930s in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. As I indicated in my doctoral dissertation (VEŠIĆ 2016), the trend of polarization typical in the Yugoslav public sphere at the time stimulated political regroupings, ideological shifts and, finally, the merger of dissimilar factions or sub-factions. In particular, this trend led to the aggregation of individuals, intellectual circles, and organizations, despite their ideological differences. The example of Kosta P. Manojlović and the Institute of Balkan Studies confirms this assumption. The social,

political and ideological grounding of the narratives promoted by Manojlović and the Institute's ideologues certainly needs further explication, not only in the context of Yugoslavia, but also in the interwar milieu of South-Eastern and Central Europe.

REFERENCES

ANONYMOUS. [PAREŽANIN & SPANAČEVIĆ] [Парежанин, Спанаћевић] "Osnova i put", in: *Balkan i Balkanci*, Beograd: Balkanski institut, 1937, 145–156.

BUDIMIR, Milan, SKOK, Petar. "Destinées balkaniques", *Revue internationale des Études balkaniques* 4 (1936), 601–613. ["Balkanska sudbina", in: *Knjiga o Balkanu*, vol. 1, Beograd: Balkanski institut, 1936, 400–411]

ČOLOVIĆ, Ivan. "Balkanist Discourse and Its Critics", *Hungarian Review* IV/2 (2013), http://www.hungarianreview.com/article/balkanist_discourse_and_its_critics.

IZVEŠTAJ BEOGRADSKJE RADNIČKE KOMORE O RADU 1926–1931. [Извештај београдске Радничке коморе о раду 1926–1931] Beograd: Izdanje Beogradske Radničke komore, 1932.

KERNER, Robert J., HOWARD, Harry N. *The Balkan Conferences and the Balkan Entente 1930–1935. A Study in the Recent History of the Balkan and Near Eastern Peoples*, reprint, California: University of Berkley Press, 2014 [1936].

KISSOUDI, Penelope. *The Balkan Games and Balkan Politics in the Interwar Years 1929–1939: Politicians in Pursuit of Peace*, New York: Routledge, 2013.

LAPČEVIĆ, Stevo M. [Лапчевић, Стево М.] "Ratko Parežanin, JNP Zbor i Balkanski institut", <https://socialisticki.wordpress.com/2013/02/25>, March 25, 2013.

LILIĆ, Vladislav. *Balkan Intellectuals and Plans for a Balkan Federation in 1860s and 1870s: American and Swiss model in the political thought of Vladimir Jovanović and Lyuben Karavelov*, unpublished master thesis, Vienna: Universität Wien, 2016.

LOPANDIĆ, Duško, KRONJA, Jasminka. *Regionalne inicijative i multilateralna saradnja na Balkanu*, 2nd edition, Beograd: Evropski pokret Srbija, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2010.

MANOJLOVIĆ, Kosta P. [Манојловић, Коста П.] *Muzičko delo našeg sela*, Beograd: Štamparija Tucović, 1929.

MANOJLOVIĆ, Kosta P. [Манојловић, Коста П.] “Sveslovenski pevački savez”, *Muzički glasnik* 7 (1933), 185–192.

MANOJLOVIĆ, Kosta P. “Jugoslavische Volksmusik”, *Revue internationale des Études balkaniques* 4 (1936), 580–584.

MANOJLOVIĆ, Kosta P. [Манојловић, Коста П.] “Jugoslovenska narodna muzika”, in: *Knjiga o Balkanu*, vol. 2, Beograd: Balkanski institut, 1937, 309–313.

MANOJLOVIĆ, Kosta P. [Манојловић, Коста П.] “Južna Srbija u svetlosti muzike”, in: A. Jovanović (ed.), *Spomenica dvadesetpetogodišnjice oslobođenja Južne Srbije 1912–1937*, Skoplje, 1937, 967–1014.

MIHAJLOVIĆ, Vladimir D. “Genius loci Balkani: recepcija prošlosti i konstruisanje akademskog narativa o balkanskom nasleđu”, *Etnoantropološki problemi* 3 (2013), 779–803.

MILUTINOVIĆ, Kosta N. [Милутиновић, Коста Н.] “Tri projekta balkanske konfederacije”, in: *Knjiga o Balkanu*, vol. 2, Beograd: Balkanski institut, 1937, 180–193.

PAREŽANIN, Ratko. [Парежанин, Ратко] “Uvodna reč”, in: *Knjiga o Balkanu*, vol. 1, Beograd: Balkanski institut, VII–XVI, 1936.

PAREŽANIN, Ratko. *Za balkansko jedinstvo. Osnivanje, program i rad Balkanskog instituta u Beogradu (1934–1941)*, 2nd edition, Minhen, 1980.

PIROČANAC, Milan S. [Пироћанац, Милан С.] *Knez Mihailo i zajednička ranja balkanskih naroda*, Beograd: Državna štamparija, 1895.

PRESHLENOVA, Roumiana. “Uniting the Balkans: Common Desires and First Initiatives in the Interwar Period”, in: W. Loth, N. Paun (eds.), *Disintegration and Integration in East-Central Europe*, Publications of the European Union Liaison Committee of Historians, vol. 16, Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2014, 93–104.

SKOK, Petar, BUDIMIR, Milan, “But et Signification des études balkaniques”, *Revue internationale des Études balkaniques* 1 (1934), 1–28.

VEŠIĆ, Ivana D. [Весић, Ивана Д.] *Konstruisanje srpske muzičke tradicije u periodu između dva svetska rata: uloga podela u srpskoj političkoj i intelektualnoj eliti*, unpublished Ph.D. Diss., Beograd: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, 2016.

ŽELINSKI, Tadeuš [Желински, Тадеуш]. "Antika, Evropa i Balkan", in: *Knjiga o Balkanu*, vol. 1, Beograd: Balkanski institut, 1936, 1–20.

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

Arhiv Jugoslavije [Archives of Yugoslavia] (Belgrade, Serbia)

- Institute for Balkan Studies, F101
- Ministry of Education of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, F66