

Vinko Korotaj Drača

Arhiv Srba u Hrvatskoj, Zagreb

**ORDINARY PEOPLE: NARRATIVES OF NATIONALISM, CRIME,
WAR AND HISTORY IN *THEY WOULD NEVER HURT A FLY*
BY SLAVENKA DRAKULIĆ**

Pregledni znanstveni rad

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17234/9789533792668.22>

The paper analyzes Slavenka Drakulić's non-fiction novel *They Would Never Hurt a Fly*, in which the author shares her personal impressions of the war crimes trials before the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. Drakulić's narrative is connected to Hayden White's theory of history as a narrative construction. In doing so, the motifs through which Drakulić shapes her war narrative are identified, including the framing of the story within the structural framework of tragedy and the use of irony as a trope.

Keywords: literature, non-fiction, Slavenka Drakulić, war crimes, metahistory, Yugoslavia

1. Introduction

Towards the end of his life, Stanko Korać wrote his memoir titled *Memories of a Man without a Homeland*. Writing in Belgrade as socialist Yugoslavia descended into a brutal ethnic war, Korać considered himself apatriote, one of the numerous people who were left stateless after Yugoslavia's tragic dissolution, because of their unwillingness to identify with any of the nation states which have emerged from the conflict. Feminist author and journalist Slavenka Drakulić, who since the 1990's has lived practically on the road between Sweden and Croatia and mostly published abroad due to her refusal to conform to dominant nationalist discourse, can also be regarded as apatriote of sorts. But while Drakulić mostly wrote about post-Yugoslav society from the perspective of an outsider – her liberal convictions and ethnically plural identity (she was a child from an interethnic marriage) clashed

with hegemonic nationalist culture of wartime Croatia – Korać, a nationally conscious communist, spent most of his life in sort of internal exile in conflict with the literary and political establishment. His criticism of Croatian communist functionaries who adopted assimilationist stance towards Croatian Serbs, resulted in his stigmatization and isolation, branding him as Serb nationalist until the end of his life (Marinković 2024: 70). Stanko Korać warned of the dangers of nationalist tendencies in Croatian society early on taking a firm and uncompromising stance against trends of linguistic and cultural hegemony in socialist Croatia, seeing the dangers of nationalist homogenization of multiethnic republics of Yugoslavia. Twenty years later, he saw how the same unifying and ethnocentric tendencies that he warned about, resulted in brutal politics of war and genocide as nationalist elites moved to carve ethnically pure spaces out of the Yugoslav melting pot.

Slavenka Drakulić, on the other hand, initially welcomed liberalization of political field in Yugoslavia in the late 1980's, as she herself put it, naively believing that fall of socialism will result in prosperity and happiness for people of East Europe (Drakulić 2022) only to contemplate causes of nationalism and war afterwards. Her observations of the war crimes trials in Croatia and before the International Criminal Tribunal for former Yugoslavia, were published as *They Would Never Hurt a Fly*, a book she designated as “non-fiction novel”. Non-fiction novel is in itself, a weird kind of designation: on the one hand the definition assumes that the narrative will relay factual events, on the other the genre definition of “novel” assumes certain level of literalization, intimacy and fictionalization of plot. *They Would Never Hurt a Fly* is not fictional work because events Drakulić is writing about actually unfolded, but it also cannot be called a historiography because author is aware that what she is writing about is deeply personal narrative, rooted less in historical chronicle than in her own introspective and imaginative experience of trials. Previous authors who wrote about novels of Slavenka Drakulić also outlined her explicit stance that every personal act is also deeply political (Zlatar Violić 2006). Accordingly, focus of Drakulić's historical narrative moves away from collective narratives of the past and impersonal and leans heavily into psychological states, individual lives and intimate moments. Each chapter of Drakulić's novel focuses on a single actor in the violent Yugoslav dissolution and all but two (Milan Levar, who was a witness killed in

Gospić after agreeing to testify before the ICTY and Mira Marković, wife of Slobodan Milošević and Serbian politician in her own right) have been prosecuted and charged by ICTY. Drawing on Hannah Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem* Drakulić describes perpetrators of war crimes as “ordinary people” who in everyday life “wouldn't hurt a fly”. Thus, causes of extreme ethnic violence in the Balkan is not in some sort of extraordinary psychological or moral makeup of its perpetrators.

According to American historian and philosopher of history Hayden White, historical work can be considered “a verbal structure in the form of a narrative prose discourse that purports to be a model or icon of past structures and processes in the interest of explaining what they were by representing them (White 1975: 2). White thus analyzes historiography as a form of narrative itself by distinguishing following levels of conceptualization in historical work: chronicle, story, mode of emplotment, mode of argument and mode of ideological implication. Chronicle and story refer to arrangement of data from unprocessed historical record that has to be transformed into the story: chronicle arranges them in temporal order of occurrence, while story characterizes events in terms of inaugural, transitional and terminating motifs (ibid. 5). Part of historical record that is selected as beginning of narrated (hi)story is inaugural motif, transitional motif is part of the story that indicates a certain direction of events, while terminating motif indicates apparent resolution (ibid. 5–6.). We can say that the story of Yugoslav dissolution and war in *They Would Never Hurt a Fly* takes as its inaugural motif's specific politics of socialist regime regarding historical memory, as its transitional motif war and war crimes, and trials in Hague act as a resolution or terminating motif. Those elements will be further analyzed in the following chapter.

2. Dissolution, war crimes and transitional justice: inaugural, transitional and terminal motifs of war

Before the Yugoslav wars there was always ambivalent experience of socialist Yugoslavia. Mainstream political narratives of post-Yugoslav countries often present Yugoslavia as failed or failing oppressive state. For Croatian nationalists, Yugoslavia was “Serb dominated” and they regard National

Liberation War as occupation of the country by communists, while Serb nationalists regard Yugoslavia as mistake designed to enslave and weaken Serbian people (Jović 2017: 233). For Slavenka Drakulić, Yugoslavia and its political culture, especially official attitude towards history, represent the seed of future dissolution and war. She places the inaugural motif in the story of Yugoslavia's breakup in the aftermath of the World War II. Reminiscing about experience of her father, who fought as one of Tito's partisans Drakulić indicates singular problem that has, in her opinion, led to the War of the 1990's:

My father never spoke about the four years he fought as a Partisan under the command of Josip Broz Tito in World War II. He wanted to forget it, and for a long time I saw this as a sign of sanity and self-preservation. "A human being survives by his ability to forget," Varlam Shalamov writes in *Kolyma Tales*. But I knew that even though he did not speak about it, my father must have remembered the war. It was the single most important period in his life, and he must have been marked by it much more than I have been marked by the recent war in the former Yugoslavia. He fought; I did not. And the more I think about it, the more I am convinced that the combination of his silence and the official version of the historical events of 1939-45 made this latest war possible. (Drakulić 2004: 8)

Silence as a mode of self-preservation in face of a trauma, thus lead to repetition and destruction of the Yugoslav community. Plot of Drakulić's narrative starts in silence and official version of history. She is not alone to blame official version of World War II history and repression of individual and collective memory for the war: many witnesses and experts in Hague trials, expressed identical or similar notions. For example, Serbian historian and diplomat Milan Bulajić, who testified as defence expert witness during the trial of Slavko Dokmanović, stressed the fact that there was no "Croatian Willy Brand" in socialist Yugoslavia who would apologize for genocide against the Serbs and acknowledge their collective historical trauma (IT-95-13a-T, 1998: 2399). It was one of the many testimonies that brought three kinds of cultural memory into interaction: collective memory, history remembered and interpreted in daily interactions between members of community, individual memory tied to personal experience, like the one of Drakulić's father, and institutional memory, through which political elites ascribe meaning to

political events and imposing it onto society through institutional means (Lebow 2006: 13). Individual memory of ethnically motivated Ustasha or Chetnik massacres and occasional acts of revenge committed by National Liberation Army, which were never mentioned in the official history books that propagated almost mythical narrative of Tito's Partisans defeating vast armies of fascist conquerors and small number of domestic traitors, survived despite silence. Because trauma was never officially acknowledged it was easy for nationalist leaders to use it to mobilize people for another war. In short absence of individual memory from public sphere, prevalence of institutional "historical truth" and its contrast with repressed collective memory of ethnic groups made acts of ethnic violence possible and legitimate. The decision of individuals to deny their wartime trauma in order to be able to survive actually gave proponents of collectivist ideologies like nationalism legitimacy in interpretations of history. Thus, it is actually the buried memory, untold stories of World War II, that serve as inaugural events of War of Yugoslav dissolution.

War itself serves as strong transitional motif of the book. Book focuses on war crimes as almost constitutive events of war itself. But more importantly, Drakulić questions what made war crimes possible and concludes that it was the normalization of ethnic hatred, process she sees as analogues to gradual acceptance of antisemitism in Nazi ruled Germany as described by literary scholar Viktor Klemperer:

As in Germany, in Croatia you first stopped greeting a person of the other nationality, perhaps only because you were afraid that others would see you acknowledging him. Unbelievable as it is, this seemingly insignificant concession, this small act of adaptation to a new reality of the total national homogenization, set you on a dangerous road. Turning your face aside in fact created the opportunity for someone else to commit war crimes in the name of the very same principles of isolation and elimination of the others.

(Drakulić 2004: 193)

Manipulation and appropriation of institutionally repressed individual memories made them parts of collective narratives of ethnic nationalism, that perceived Croatian, Serbian or Muslim Other as threat and cause of decades or centuries long grievances. Trauma was collectivized to legitimize

acts of violence. Terminating motif for it all was the public event of ICTY trials. At first, Drakulić regards them as boring. She speaks of a certain witness examination she follows during the trial of Omarska and Keraterm guards, that focused on the layout of rooms. She apparently loses focus but was then abruptly brought to reality by judge's mention of the blood on the walls (Drakulić 2004: 22). Mention of this macabre scene in a tedious matter-of-fact context of a trial shows Drakulić that "drama is in the fact that everything really happened: there were real deaths, real victims and real murderers" (ibid.).

Hague trials serve, for Drakulić as epilogue to the story of the war, specifically because telling the truth of the war, that is often tedious and always unglamorous and unpleasant prevents similar tragedies from playing out in the future. She regards post-Yugoslav nation-states as "unable to wash their own dirty laundry" (ibid. 16–17). But they have no luxury of mythologization of their recent past in a way Yugoslav communist did: this is true message of progress and catharsis Drakulić wants to tell and which will shape the way she emplots and ideologically frames the story of dissolution of Yugoslavia.

3. Destruction of a fairy-tale: lessons of a tragedy

After selecting the motifs around which story is told, a historian needs to provide meaning for the story. One of the means through which meaning is provided is a process Hayden White calls emplotment: Emplotment identifies the kind of story historian is narrating. White, using literary classification of Northrop Frye, recognized four main modes of emplotment: "romance, comedy, tragedy and satire" (White 1975: 6–7). Romance tells the story of triumph of good over evil, epic narrative about protagonists fighting against adversity and emerging victorious. Satire is on the other hand contrasts romance, drama that results in apprehension that man will always fail to conquer his darker impulses and his own drive for death and destruction. Comedy and Tragedy fit in between, as dramatic narrative of partial liberation: in Comedy, there is a reconciliation between different social and natural forces, while in Tragedy, there is a great shakeup and downfall of the protagonist, but the one that is followed by cathartic lesson for the future: somber resignation to the conditions under which humans exist as historical beings

(ibid. 9). In retellings of Drakulić, institutional history of People's Liberation struggle took form of a romance: there are history books filled with heroism, great battles and great victories (Drakulić 2004: 11), there is a cult of personality and official ideology of different nations living together in Yugoslavia (ibid. 88), the socialist state that was more open and progressive than socialist states of the Warsaw pact.

Beginning of *They Would Never Hurt a Fly* foreshadows the fact that Drakulić, always sceptical towards what she considers mythologization of history, choose to tell different kind of narrative. First paragraph we encounter tells us a story of a fairy-tale land destroyed:

ONCE UPON a time, in a faraway part of Europe, behind seven mountains and seven rivers, there was a beautiful country called Yugoslavia. Its people belonged to six different nations, and they were of three different religions and spoke three different languages. They were Croats, Serbs, Slovenes, Macedonians, Montenegrins, and Muslims yet they all worked together, went to school together, married each other, and lived in relative harmony for forty-five years. But because it is not a fairy tale, the story of this beautiful country has no happy ending. (ibid. 1)

Although Drakulić realizes beauty and interethnic harmony as elements of Yugoslav experience, the fact that they were temporary is considered element of tragic reality; fairy-tale lands cannot exist. Even more horrible is the fact that the actors of the bloody downfall of fairytale kingdom are not larger than life villains one would expect in Disney's fairy-tale: they are surprisingly common and vulgar: Mirko Norac is "A plump, plain young man with a shy smile and a double chin", who "looks more soft than dangerous" (ibid. 40) and is a waiter who is easier to imagine "in a café in Sinj, serving coffee and beer to the locals and chatting with them about the scores of Sunday's soccer game than giving orders for mass executions" (ibid.). Goran Jelisić, man sentenced for execution of Muslim civilians in Bijeljina is someone who

[...] looks like a man you can trust. This young man of thirty, something about his clear, serene face, lively eyes, and big reassuring grin, would make you feel safe sitting next to him in a train compartment at night. A man with such a face usually helps elderly women cross a street, he will stand up in a street-car to let an invalid sit down, or he will allow you to go ahead of him in a supermarket line. He will return a lost wallet to its owner. (ibid. 66)

If actors of the story are described as every day, banal people, the story itself is far from great narrative of war of light against darkness and good against evil. Perpetrators are no villains and no masterminds: they are moved by base urges and often don't exactly seem to know why they are performing those horrible acts they stand accused of. Jelisić, calm and shy man before the war, for example, is displayed as underdog who indulges in newfound authority war bestows upon him, almost intoxicated by power over life and death (Drakulić 2004: 82). Only quality Norac possessed that made him into executioner of Gospić Serbs was his blind loyalty and nothing else (ibid. 40). Sometimes they are quite oblivious about their own agenda, seemingly just going with the flow of atrocities and chaos that surround them. One of the perpetrators of Potočari massacre Dražen Erdemović "always felt like there was an outside force determining his life" (ibid. 108). Later, when Erdemović speaks to one of the Muslim men he is supposed to execute, they talk causally about what happened to them and how did they find themselves in this nightmarish situation. Erdemović wishes someone could explain to him what happened to them "ordinary people". Afterwards Dražen lets his fellow soldiers shoot the man like the others with minimum protest (ibid. 115–116). The story of bloody civil war seems to be, in most cases, nothing more than tragedy of everyday pettiness, passivity and conformism. But what makes Drakulić's tale a tragic narrative is the fact that there is no cynicism in the end: there is knowledge to be obtained from grotesque horror of these events. Towards the end of the book Drakulić explains what we as community can learn by striving to understand the acts of war criminals. It is the lesson on guilt and responsibility. Drakulić first stresses the need to individualize guilt: not all Croats or Serbs should be considered guilty for specific crimes. But responsibility is the other matter altogether: while collective guilt is wrong, collective responsibility is necessary to move forward as society: everyone was, in some way responsible and even complicit for ethnically motivated crimes:

More than a decade after the beginning of the war in the Balkans, it is essential that we understand that it is we, ordinary people and not some madmen, who made it possible. We were the ones who one day stopped greeting our neighbours of a different nationality, an act that the next day made possible the opening of concentration camps. We did it to one another. Maybe this is

a good reason for considering whether it is too easy to put a hundred men on trial in The Hague. What about the others who embraced the ideology that led to the deaths of two hundred thousand people? Perhaps they did not believe in it, but they certainly did not protest against it. If it is true that there is no collective guilt, can there be collective innocence? (Drakulić 2004: 103)

After the tragic end of the fairytale, one should not accept nationalism and conformity to politics of ethnic division as sort of unexplainable force, that pushes us to be compliant. They are not simply circumstances thrust onto communities; they are policies communities produce through their own action or inaction. Thus, lessons of a Yugoslav tragedy are lessons about lack of collective innocence: communities need to be held constantly accountable for bloody parts of their own history.

4. “Battleship” of general Mladić: ironic tropes in history of Yugoslav wars

Chapter of *They Would Never Hurt a Fly* dedicated to Bosnian Serb general Ratko Mladić is not centred around Srebrenica massacre or siege of Sarajevo, but around suicide of Mladić’s daughter Ana in March of 1994. The narrative of wartime tragedy and crime is thus transposed into personal sphere of patriarchal Serbian household, where Drakulić gives her imagination a free reign while trying to guess and outline causes of Ana’s suicide. The chapter is aptly named “Punished by the Gods” and metaphorical transposition is foreshadowed when Drakulić calls Mladić “loser at both fronts”: on Bosnian front where pressure of the international community made him withdraw and accept Dayton agreement after conquering 70% of territory, and his home where he suffered personal tragedy of daughter’s suicide (Drakulić 2004: 159). Literary simile between frontlines of War in Bosnia and domestic front is further complicated in two ways. First is the counter-intuitiveness of the metaphor. Literal battlefield of a regularly televised conflict is compared with family home, in European culture usually regarded as a private sphere and place of sentimental calm, comfort and affectivity (Davidoff 2003: 16). One could argue that Drakulić, writing from articulate and self-aware feminist standpoint, subverts and undermines the traditional patriarchal divide between personal and public, specifically, between masculinized domain of warfare and conquest, presented by amount of territory

under military control, and feminized domain of household and family life, represented through care for emotional wellbeing of children. Second way in which simile seems complicated is Drakulić's claim that "the real story about Mladić is not the one of his victories and losses on the battlefield; the real story about him is that of his personal tragedy" (Drakulić 2004: 159). So, a true story of Ratko Mladić isn't the one journalists, historians and lawyers wrote and talked about: not the story of genocide and war crimes or his later glorification at the hands of Serbian nationalists. It is the story of his personal tragedy, the one that was untold and unfamiliar to broader public and to this day largely unexplained.

Hayden White called this particular literary trope that inverts the conventional discursive order to offer radical, self-critical conceptualization of the world irony (White 1975: 37). White, who analysed use of literary tropes in works of 19th century historians, regarded irony as radically sceptical trope that points out inadequacies in conventional depictions of the historical process, especially those who try to recognize universal laws of history. Drakulić here uses irony to invert the ways histories of warfare have been written. The true history of the Bosnian war is not only set in the bunkers and ruined towns of Bosnia's conflict or cabinets of political leaders. The scene that Drakulić chooses as central is set in the small kitchen of Mladić family in Belgrade. Focal moment of the story happens night before Ana Mladić's suicide, when Mladić family plays "Battleship"¹. Key question Drakulić tries to answer is why a group of adult people – Mladić, his wife Bosa, Ana and her brother Darko – would spend the evening playing a children's game. "Battleship" makes her reminiscence of her own childhood, and she considers the scene of adults playing the game oddly weird and intriguing. In another twist of irony, what at first seems like innocent, childish game is revealed as something else: family ritual that unmask power relations within Mladić family. First, Drakulić reveals that it was general's wish to play "Battleship". When he was home, Ratko Mladić loved having his family around him and play some innocent game as if there wasn't a bloody war he took part in just

¹ Instead of using the trademarked name "Battleship", Drakulić calls the game "Sinking ships", literally translating the brand name of the game in Serbo-Croatian ('Potapanje brodova').

hundreds of kilometres away. Ana and Darko, probably wanted to do something else, but were incapable of defying their authoritative father (Drakulić 2004: 170–171). Also, Drakulić remembers that “ Battleship ” is not innocent game at all: it is a military game. Even surrounded by family, Mladić is a soldier, and war is eternally and oppressively present, thanks to his own inability to be anything else (ibid.). It is inability of Ana to confront her father about things he was doing in Bosnia that led to her suicide. This is another way in which personal tragedy and public warfare at the same time intertwine and subvert the division between them: Mladić’s role as ruthless general in Bosnia, destroys his family. At the same time, his role of soldier, which became intrinsic part of his identity, prevents him from reflecting upon crisis in his family and brings war to his kitchen table. Victory in Bosnian war in the end proves to be a defeat – both in a military sense and in his personal life. Ana won the game of “ Battleship ” symbolically defeating her father, punishing him for his cruelty and hubris, but again, losing her life and failing to stop the tragedy in Srebrenica and Sarajevo. It is a tragedy of men set into their social roles who dragged everything before them down, destroying entire communities together with their own carefully built worlds. Only very powerful, emotionally charged moment of irony expressed in the scene of “ Battleship ” game can attempt to describe the arrogant futility of nationalist projects and substitution of truth and political responsibility for childish games that left both victors and victims dead.

Another skilled employment of irony by Drakulić considers what is at the same time dark and humorous twist on official Yugoslav ideology of Brotherhood and Unity: interpersonal relationship of accused war leaders in Scheveningen prison. Despite their different ethnic backgrounds and the fact that they fought on opposing sides, the prisoners of Scheveningen detention unit, apparently live in harmony. Examples of said unity are staggering general Rahim Ademi, Albanian who fought on Croatian side, reverently greets Slobodan Milošević with “ Mr. President ” (Drakulić 2004: 201) despite the fact that Milošević, at that time, wasn’t even president of FR Yugoslavia. Goran Jelisić, convicted for murder and torture of Muslims is good friend with Esad Landžo, Bosniak man convicted for crimes against Serbs in Čelebići camp (ibid. 204). Many prisoners, as Drakulić says, seemingly unaware of irony, had started referring to atmosphere in the prison as one of

“brotherhood and unity” (ibid. 205–206). Similar sentiment was described in a poem written by Simo Zarić convicted of ethnic cleansing. Poem was named “Truth about The Hague” and in it Zarić describes the spirit of unity among the perpetrators of ethnically motivated crimes:

We are trapped in our own sorrow
One is gone, another one follows
There are Serbs and Croats in our brig
And Bosniaks, we' re all caged like guinea pigs.

We don't speak of what went on
Past is past, what's gone is gone
Here we live together like before
As if we never went to war.

We' re war criminals or so they say
But here like children, we laugh and play
They call us bad but quite contrary
Our crowd is friendly, our band is merry.

If the folks in our lands
Knew that we are all good friends
They would all change their ways
For sake of peace they'd throw their guns away.

So all you good and honest men
Hear this song and think again:
You just do what we have done
And you can also live as one.²

Simo Zarić (2007)

5. Conclusion

Slavenka Drakulić took work of Hannah Arendt as basis of her literary endeavour. The purpose of endeavour was to explore causes of brutal ethnic civil wars in Yugoslavia, wars that had brought “Fairytale of Yugoslavia” to

² Translated by Vinko Korotaj Drača.

its bloody end. From the outset, she recognized that all history is an act of narration leading her to choose “non-fiction novel” as form of work through which she will tell her story of war, crime, nationalism and justice. This unique blend of facts described in court files and imagination as a tool for penetrating into obscure and seemingly complex motives and sources of ethnic violence enables her to center many of the aspects of the Yugoslav wars that are consciously and unconsciously absent from official narratives, or when present within them, they are often regarded onedimensionally, without awareness of deeper implications they might have on society and politics of post-Yugoslav countries.

First unique aspect is the way in which Drakulić organizes motifs in her story. For her, root cause of the Yugoslav Wars is the discrepancy between official truth of World War II, that focused on mythologization of People Liberation Struggle, and individual and collective cultural memory of atrocities, ethnically motivated violence and cycles of revenge. This enabled mobilization of collective trauma by nationalist actors which substituted the socialist political mythologies for nationalist ones. In the end, trials in Hague serve as terminating motif of history of Yugoslav wars – they serve as final test, place where people of Yugoslavia get to confront the truth of the conflict and avoid repeating same mistakes.

Second aspect is the plot of tragedy Drakulić imposes upon the narrative of Yugoslavia’s dissolution. War is, through stories of its actors, painted as history of gradual and conformist normalization of nationalism and ethnic discrimination. The perpetrators of the crimes are mostly petty, banal people, with superficial agendas. It was actually willingness of “ordinary people” to silently take part in nationalist mobilization which made crimes possible and pre-empted any possibility of peaceful reconciliation of divisions present in the late years of Yugoslavia. Tragic dissolution of Yugoslavia boils down to choice of the path of least resistance taken by many Yugoslav individuals and hidebound nature of its identities and institutions.

Third aspect is Drakulić’s employment of irony to underline the inadequacy of common perspectives on Yugoslav wars. Her use of irony paints the world in which nothing is as it seems: key actors of genocidal interethnic violence live in harmony that recalls spirit of “brotherhood and unity”, and family

games reveal unhealthy fascination with authority and violence, which only leads into destruction of families and communities. Presenting dissolution of Yugoslavia and wars that ensued through trope of irony, enables us to see that there was no “ancient hatred” or predetermining factors that made war and dissolution inevitable. History of ethnic violence in the Balkans is no grand narrative: it is the story of few unscrupulous power-hungry men, and passive, conformist society that failed to stop them.³

Bibliography

Davidoff, Leonore. 2003. Gender and the Great Divide: Public and Private in British Gender History. *Journal of Women's History* 1. 11–27.

Drakulić, Slavenka. 2022. Bilo jednom 1989. *Buka*. 2. 3. 2022.
<https://6yka.com/kolumne/slavenka-drakulic-bilo-jednom-1989/> [02/03/2025]

Drakulić, Slavenka. 2004. *They Would Never Hurt a Fly: War Criminals on Trial in the Hague*. Penguin Books. London.

Jović, Dejan. 2017. *Rat i mit: politika identiteta u suvremenoj Hrvatskoj*. Fraktura. Zagreb.

Marinković, Dušan. 2024. *Nalaženja Stanka Koraća: otpor institucionalnoj asimilaciji*. SKD Prosvjeta. Zagreb.

Unified Court Records Database: International Criminal Tribunal for former Yugoslavia. Sudski predmet Dokmanović (IT-95-13a-T). 1998.

White, Hayden. 1975. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in 19th Century Europe*. The John Hopkins University Press. London.

Zarić, Simo. 2007. Haaška istina. *Blog Dnevnik.hr*. 7. 3. 2007.
<https://blog.dnevnik.hr/boric/2007/03/1622368709/simo-zarichaaska-istina1998.html> [07/03/2025]

Zlatar Violić, Andrea. 2006. Pretvorbe ženskog glasa u suvremenoj hrvatskoj prozi. *Sarajevske sveske* 13. <http://www.sveske.ba/en/content/pretvorbe-zenskog-glasa-u-suvremenoj-hrvatskoj-prozi> [07/03/2025]

³ The article has undergone expert proofreading by a native speaker.

OBIČNI LJUDI: NARATIVI NACIONALIZMA, ZLOČINA, RATA I POVIJESTI U *ONI NE BI NI MRAVA ZGAZILI* SLAVENKE DRAKULIĆ

Sažetak

Rad analizira nefikcionalni roman Slavenke Drakulić *Oni ne bi ni mrava zgazili*, u kojem autorica dijeli vlastite impresije o suđenjima za ratne zločine pred Međunarodnim krivičnim sudom za Jugoslaviju. Drakulićkino pripovijedanje povezuje se s teorijom Haydena Whitea o povijesti kao narativnoj konstrukciji. Pritom se prepoznaju motivi kojima Drakulić oblikuje narativ o ratu, uokviravanje priče u fabularnu strukturu tragedije i korištenje ironije kao tropa.

Ključne riječi: književnost, Slavenka Drakulić, ratni zločini, metahistorija, Jugoslavija