710), titled *Global Themes and Dynamics*, contains thematic essays that explore the effects of the Seven Years' War on religion, culture, science, demographics, and gender roles. Douglas Fordham's essay, "Visual Arts and Culture," examines the war's impact on the visual culture. The author identifies four major developments: changes in depictions of martial scenes, the establishment of new cultural institutions, the emergence of new print products-particularly maps, that offered new geographic representations of war to wider audiences-and an increased interest in collections of Native American art. Fordham also stresses the importance of the war for the development of national schools of art. In "Luxury and Consumption," Robert S. DuPlessis examines the war's impact on the transformation of consumer culture in the North Atlantic area during the latter half of the 18th century. Assessment of the war's influence on scientific development is provided in Stéphane Van Damme's "Science and Technology during the Seven Years' War," while Mark Peterson's "Demography and the Seven Years' War" outlines wartime demographic conditions and changes, and analyzes emerging demographic thought. In "Women and Gender," Sara T. Damiano provides a gendered examination of Seven Years' War through six case studies, each focusing on a different area: Britain, West Africa, New England, the Great Lakes and the Ohio River Valley, Louisiana and Jamaica. Brian Young and Richard Whatmore's essay, "Religion and Politics in the Seven Years' War," assesses the religious and political discourses in postwar Britain. The final essay of this *Handbook*, Marian Füssel's "Commemoration and Memory," examines the culture of remembrance of the Seven Years' War, focusing on commemorations, historiography, and visual arts.

The Oxford Handbook of the Seven Years' War offers a holistic view of one of the great conflicts of the Early Modern period. Its geographic and thematic diversity make it a valuable contribution to the historiography of Seven Years' War and the 18th century. As such, it is particularly useful for scholars of the Early Modern period, as well as for history students, seeking a comprehensive account of the conflict.

Marko Krička
doi: 10.19090/i.2025.36.184-186

ISTRAŽIVANJA – JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL RESEARCHES 36, 184-186

Miloš Vojinović (ed.), *Visions of the Future: The Yugoslav Space 1914–1918. A Thematic Collection of Documents*, Novi Sad: Akademska knjiga, 2024, 456 pages
(Miloš Vojinović (ur.), *Vizije budućnosti: Jugoslovenski prostor 1914–1918. Tematska zbirka dokumenata*, Novi Sad: Akademska knjiga, 2024, 456 str. (Serbian Cyrillic)).

When historian Ferdo Šišić published his collection *Dokumenti o postanku Kraljevine Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca, 1914–1919* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1920), his aim was clear. By bringing together key available acts and official statements from this period, he sought to present to the domestic audience the process of forming the newly established Yugoslav state. His undertaking was of undeniable significance, not only in the discipline of history but also within the broader social and political landscape, where the struggle to shape dominant interpretations of the recent past was already underway. It is therefore telling that Šišić's collection, unintentionally, outlined the framework within which subsequent debates on this topic would unfold. Although, in his own words, he sought the selected documents to "provide readers with an objective picture, even if not perfect and complete," the intention to show "how and what the best sons of our nation did for its liberation and unification" reveals convictions that shaped his selection. After all, like the creators of the documents he collected, Šišić was among those "who, from 1914 to 1919, not only lived through our history but also created it" (*Dokumenti*, pp. i–ii). A native of Vinkovci, he served as a member of the ethnographic-geographic section of the delegation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes at the Paris Peace Conference, where his attention was

primarily focused on the diplomatic struggle over the Adriatic. As a result of his stay in France, he produced another collection of acts and documents, *Jadransko pitanje na Konferenciji mira u Parizu* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1920), a complementary series to his *Dokumenti o postanku Kraljevine Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca*. For the Yugoslav historian, compiling and publishing these volumes was not merely an academic endeavor; he also regarded it as his "patriotic duty" (*Jadransko pitanje*, p. 3). Such a perspective did not reflect a fleeting personal contradiction; rather, it embodied a prevailing norm that remained one of the principal drivers of uncertainty and ruptures in the historical interpretations of Yugoslavism and its issues. The self-proclaimed pursuit of objectivity, on the one hand, and a sense of duty—political, national, and even emotional—on the other, created a somber antinomy from which contemporaries of the Yugoslav state devoted to exploring its past could scarcely free themselves.

Throughout the 20th century, this pattern haunted attempts to publish primary historical sources related to the creation of Yugoslavia. Its manifestations varied. On the fiftieth anniversary of the outbreak of the First World War, historians Dragoslav Janković and Bogdan Krizman presented the collection *Građa o stvaranju jugoslovenske države (1. I – 20. XII 1918)* (Beograd: Institut društvenih nauka, 1964), in part to address the shortcomings of Šišić's compilation. In their assessment, it was characterized by "one-sidedness and a certain orientation," since it included "only what contributed to the creation of the Yugoslav state as a unified community of Yugoslav peoples as it would appear at the end of 1918." As a result, its character was more "manifestato-like and political" than "truly scholarly." Instead of following this approach, Janković and Krizman aimed to introduce a "new and more comprehensive collection of materials" that "also presented disagreements and struggles among the factors in the process of creating the Yugoslav state," intended to contribute to its "better, more rounded understanding" (*Građa*, p. 6). However, the same type of heuristic shortcomings permeated their efforts. Just as Šišić's collection represented an affirmation of the way the Yugoslav state was founded, Janković and Krizman's undertaking served as a means of legitimization of the Second Yugoslavia, interpreting 1918 as a flawed beginning to the joint life in the new state, which—by the very act of unification and through the actions of those who carried it out—was doomed to fail.

The pervasiveness of the present did not preclude advances in scholarship. Even a cursory glance at the unfolding evolution of Yugoslav historiography reveals a notable progression in both efforts and scholarly undertakings aimed at grasping the meaning of the events from 1914 to 1918, as well as the developments that led up to them. This trajectory reached its high point during the 1970s and 1980s, most notably in the works of Milorad Ekmečić, Đorđe Stanković, and Andrej Mitrović. Yet even their efforts remained confined to the limited horizon of expectations. An appreciation of this fact forms the basis for the publication of a new anthology of sources entitled *Vizije budućnosti: Jugoslovenski prostor 1914–1918. Tematska zbirka dokumenata*. As emphasized by its editor, Miloš Vojinović, research associate at the Institute for Balkan Studies of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, for Yugoslav historiography the act of unification of the South Slavs into a single state constituted the vantage point for observing the past. The year 1918 was regarded as *annus mirabilis*, a year of birth, which irrevocably brought together the destinies of the Yugoslav peoples. This outlook is correctly attributed by Vojinović not only to Šišić, Janković, and Krizman, but also to other authors who collected and compiled records on the creation of Yugoslavia. Even when accounts reflecting different conceptions of the state's internal structure were published, particularly concerning the conflicts between unitarist and federalist currents, the underlying perspective remained unchanged—reconstructing the past teleologically, with December 1, 1918, as the point of departure.

In *Vizije budućnosti*, Vojinović seeks to adopt a different method. As he remarks in his introductory study, the collection is based on "a more inclusive approach" to the source materials

(p. 19). The intention was "to gather in one place the viewpoints of all relevant historical actors who operated within the Yugoslav space, regardless of which side they fought on or whether they supported Yugoslavia or not" (p. 24). As a result, the anthology brings together a wide range of documents. These include well-known texts such as the Niš and Corfu Declarations, as well as competing visions put forward by a myriad of actors, including Živojin Perić's plan to unite Serbian territories into a single federal state under Austria-Hungary, Ivo Pilar's concept for redefining Croatian national unity based on the preservation of the Habsburg state and the liquidation of the policy of Croatian-Serbian cooperation, the Serbian Social Democrats' proposal for a union between Serbs and Bulgarians, an initiative to establish a territorial corridor between the future Czechoslovak and Yugoslav states, and a poem about a pan-Slavic republic, written by an anonymous author and posted on a public notice board in one of Zagreb's parks. Among the selected records—which include official memoranda, proclamations, diary entries, memoirs, manifestos, parliamentary speeches, reports and more—the reader can encounter conflicting interpretations of the political events during the war, differing visions of the internal organization of a prospective joint state, alternative approaches to agrarian and other social issues, perspectives of the South Slavic diaspora and intentions of non-Yugoslav peoples. By giving voice to a wide range of actors, Vojinović seeks to counteract the dangers of a tunnel vision in which individuals are considered solely on their own, without regard for their opponents and conflicting viewpoints. As he states, "in doing so, it is possible to better understand not only what they wanted, but also what their plans prevented" (p. 49). This underscores the core purpose of the anthology: "an attempt to transport readers into the world of (the Great War) contemporaries, to uncover their mental inventory, the goals they pursued, the categories in which they thought, as well as the invisible mechanisms that shaped their planning for the future" (p. 48).

Behind this principle lies a clear intervention in the way we think about the course of the events during the First World War in the lands that would become part of the Yugoslav state. Vojinović rightfully points out that his aim was not to provide a comprehensive revision of the historiographical production on this topic. Nonetheless, his carefully crafted reflections merit further commentary. The core component of his argument is that to fully understand how Yugoslav unification occurred, one must recognize the openness of historical developments, seeing the final outcome not as the only point of departure, but as one of several possibilities. This is undoubtedly true. Vojinović briefly considers the potential of counterfactual history as a tool for achieving this goal, though it appears—justifiably—that he himself remains unconvinced of the usefulness of this method. More importantly, he cautions against reducing historical experience to a single, linear path, urging instead a thoughtful consideration of imagined possibilities that never came to pass. Such an understanding of the contingency of the past opens up space for deepening historiographical analysis, encompassing both the structures at play and the individuals who acted within them.

This approach raises an important issue. Vojinović's critique of earlier efforts to publish historical sources on the creation of Yugoslavia rests on the premise that historians are inseparable from their own era and its political and ideological assumptions. As he himself noted in an insightful centennial essay on Habsburg and Yugoslav historiography, throughout the century after the collapse of the former and the emergence of the latter state in 1918, they were inherently presentist. Yet, this perspective calls for a more nuanced delineation of contemporary historians' efforts to grasp the significance of these events. Vojinović touches on this issue only in passing, noting that scholars today remain in much the same position as their predecessors. The fact that, in light of his contribution, this constitutes a rather modest treatment is clearly illustrated by one of the first responses to *Vizije budućnosti*, which closes with a lament over the very occurrence of the creation of the Kingdom of

Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. This hardly represents the intended outcome of Vojinović's deliberate and measured efforts to "direct attention to the future, as it was seen by historical actors in the past, thereby opening up space for new and important questions" (p. 25).

Still, the matter presents an opportunity to further examine the problems of contemporary interpretations of the unification of South Slavs. Following Vojinović's contention that the year 1918 was regarded as *annus mirabilis* in Yugoslav historiography, one might argue that today, this stance has been effectively reversed. In fact, prevailing accounts of the Yugoslav state in Serbian scholarship could be viewed through the lens of *annus horribilis*, a year of disasters. In contrast to the singularity of *annus mirabilis*, the notion of *annus horribilis* unfolds within a polarity. It contains both 1918 and 1991. From the outlook of 1918, it illustrates the mistakes and failures that led to the unification of the Yugoslav state, with catastrophic consequences; from the outlook of 1991, it portrays the blunders and calamities that caused and followed its disintegration. In both instances, the antinomy Šišić ran into seemingly endures. Yet, epistemological conditions of current ways of articulating the past have been transformed. Vojinović's use of the concept of presentism in the above-mentioned essay can be examined to reveal the changed circumstances. He follows François Hartog's idea that the term should be understood as "the sense that only the present exists, a present characterized at once by the tyranny of an instant and by the treadmill of an unending now" (*Regimes of Historicity. Presentism and Experiences of Time*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2015, p. xv). But this absence of the future, woven into our regime of historicity, is a distinct feature of the contemporary neoliberal order. As the French scholar notes, "there is something specific about our present" (Ibid., p. xviii). Historians living and working throughout the existence of the Yugoslav state were firmly anchored in a different regime of historicity and the assumptions it imposed on their scientific models. At the current conjuncture, however, as Hartog observes, "the crisis of the future unsettled our idea of progress and produced a sense of foreboding that cast a shadow over our present" (Ibid., p. 196). The past could not escape this shadow—it has obediently surrendered to the reign of a futureless present. Amidst such circumstances, one might turn to the scholar who first articulated a comprehensive understanding of this profound cultural transformation and its connection to broader social development. As American literary critic Frederic Jameson points out: "There is nothing that is not social and historical—indeed, everything is 'in the last analysis' political" (*The Political Unconscious. Narrative As a Socially Symbolic Act*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981, p. 20). This is the vantage point from which scholars ought to orient themselves in order to advance their understanding of Yugoslavia's history. In doing so, they should tread carefully with texts capable of seamlessly reaching across time to persuade their readers. Many in *Vizije budućnosti* are precisely of that nature.

Vukašin Marić

doi: 10.19090/i.2025.36.186-189

ISTRAŽIVANJA – JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL RESEARCHES 36, 186-189

Biljana Vučetić, *In the Name of Humanity. The American Red Cross in Serbia, 1914–1920 –1922*, Beograd: Istorijski institut, 2023, 258 pages.
(Biljana Vučetić, *U ime humanosti. Američki Crveni krst u Srbiji, 1914–1920–1922*, Beograd: Istorijski institut, 2023, 258 str. (Serbian Cyrillic)).

Over the past few decades, the history of international relations has undergone a notable transformation. In response to calls for the "internationalization" of international history, scholars have gradually moved beyond the confines of methodological nationalism, which had long served as the dominant analytical framework in the field. Rather than maintaining a somewhat narrow focus on inter-state diplomacy, the so-called "transnational turn" in historiography has advocated for an expanded scope of inquiry that encompasses a broader array