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literary and a sociological approach, for example by scrutinizing and comparing crucial concepts in both domains, or by a thoughtful transplanting of concepts from one disciplinary context to the other. Paul comes closest to such an approach when, for example, she traces the history of a concept (such as borderlands), and thus contextualizes it. But Paul’s focus on the US discourse of migration within American studies restricts her pursuit of interdisciplinarity.

The strong points of this solid work are many. One of them, however, is at the same time its weakness. For, while it is undeniably very satisfying to read extensive acknowledgements of the debates of the last decade, and an overview of the main bones of contention, Paul’s scrupulous summing up and answering to all these objections is sometimes just a bit too dutiful. Such a respectful wariness to a host of critical positions is, on the one hand, a sign of scholarly integrity, on the other hand, it suggests the wish to take on the burden of a whole field. This anxious effort to cover the totality of the field is visible in the conclusion, where suddenly the argument is extended to film analysis and novels by white and male authors. But it is simply not possible to cover this totality, nor should it make sense to try to do so. Surely, not everyone in the field is driven by the same analytical desire, or speaking from the same position. A consciously, less anxious, specifically situated position might have led to a lighter, more experimental and perhaps even more innovative analysis.

But this is just an afterthought on the kind of studies we need after the sound, meticulous work presented by scholars such as Heike Paul. Paul’s study shows us the state of the art in the feminist theorizing of migration and postcoloniality. This is where we are. And now, how to proceed from here? How to overcome the tired oppositions between the literary/the social, between materiality/metaphor? Let us thank Paul for her thorough exploration of this theoretical borderland, an exploration that urges us to move on, in other directions, and with other, perhaps also more circumscribed gestures.

Isabel Hoving
University of Antwerp

WITCHES FLY HIGH: THE SWEEPING BROOM OF DUBRAVKA UGREŠIĆ

Dubravka Ugrešić
The Culture of Lies, trans Celia Hawkesworth

Dubravka Ugrešić
The Museum of Unconditional Surrender, trans Celia Hawkesworth

Today, from the perspective of my nomadic-exile, I can only be grateful to my former cultural milieu. I invested my own money in the purchase of my broom. I fly alone. (The Culture of Lies, p. 273)

The first book by Dubravka Ugrešić to appear in English translation was her postmodern, metafictional novel Forging the Stream of Consciousness (Ugrešić, 1991), a novel on writers and writing. The story is located in Zagreb and centred around
an international meeting of writers. In an extremely witty and intriguing way, Dubravka Ugrešić used this imaginary meeting (modelled on an existing tradition of international writers’ conferences held regularly in Zagreb) to weave quite a complex story in which many genres are skilfully merged. Written at a time when the Berlin Wall was still standing, the novel cleverly combines elements of the cultural history of the region with an amusing play on various types of narration, so, in the end, a novel on writers turns out to be a novel on writing.

_Fording the Stream of Consciousness_ was, significantly, published by the feminist publisher Virago Press, and it was almost immediately followed by another title by the same author, _In the Jaws of Life_ (Ugrešić, 1992). This second book foregrounds more strongly Ugrešić’s interest in women’s issues. This is particularly obvious in the first part of the book, in the short novel _Steffie Speck in the Jaws of Life_, in which Dubravka Ugrešić skilfully uses patterns and stereotypes of romantic novels to create her own story about that eternal plot, the search for love. The heroine of the story, a typist from Zagreb and reader of romantic novels, simply wants to find a boyfriend. She tries some of the usual ways to solve the problem; she discusses it with her friends, she tries dating different kinds of men, she gets disappointed and depressed. To get away from the problem, she goes on a diet (taken from a women’s magazine), tries reading (starting with _Madam Bovary_), or goes to the theatre (of course, to watch _Hamlet_, but only lasts out till the moment Ophelia is dead), and, finally, she tries by learning foreign languages. And then, quite unexpectedly, her prince charming appears, to take her . . . for coffee.

This short but effective novel is full of witty authorial comments on the way in which the heroine’s destiny is framed; narration is followed by various pieces of advice on household maintenance, and in many places there are innovative devices for the readers which invite them to interfere with the narration. Significantly, those devices imitate the instructions in sewing patterns, which can be found in many women’s magazines (‘\*\*\* – – – – – Cut the text along the line as desired’, says one, while the other goes as follows: ‘/ / / / / / / Pleat: Make large thematic stitches on either side of the author’s seam’). And the novel does not have a ‘proper’ happy ending, but closes with a discussion by the author-narrator with her potential readers – in this case, her mother, neighbours and relatives, all of them women – about the ways in which the story of Steffie Speck and her prince charming can be continued. The scene is hilarious, but in the end the narrator has to conclude rather seriously that none of the women she has gathered there can invent anything different from the well-known patterns. ‘So, none of you can think of anything? Other then clichés, I mean, nothing from life? From your own lives? Haven’t you lived?,’ she cries in amazement. But this cry for the authenticity of women’s lives is ignored. Forgetting the realities of their own lives, the women she is addressing happily turn to fairy-tales for grown-ups and pour over an old album of Hollywood heart-throbs, inventing their own, personal romances instead of a plot for Steffie Speck’s fictional life. Leaving them enchanted by their own stories, the author-narrator ponders on how ‘everything was a cliché, including life itself’, and that ‘the kitsch microbes are the most vigorous organisms of the emotions’.

When it was first published in Croatian, the short novel _Steffie Speck in the Jaws of Life_ made Dubravka Ugrešić quite popular in her home country. Its unusual topic, its freshness of style and its exquisite wit made it an immediate success. The novel was also among the first to show that new topics, broadly recognized as women’s issues, were soon to become more prevalent in the literature of the former Yugoslavia. Subsequent titles, _Život je bajka_ (‘Life is a Fairy Tale’) and _Forsiranje romana reke_ (‘Fording the Stream of Consciousness’), confirmed and reinforced the author’s success.

Hence it might have been expected that her first two books in English would
simply mark out another step in her already successful career, helping a much wider audience to discover and recognize a talented and highly promising woman author from a small Slavic literature. And such recognition really happened, but in a frame which inevitably affected the reading of these two Ugrešić books. Her early novels, which were originally written with the author’s deep conviction that it is only literature that counts, acquired in the following years a new, symbolic and even prophetic meaning. From a distance of almost 10 years now, it seems as if some elements of the plot in her early novels were destined to become ‘realized metaphors’ of her own life in the future. By the time these English titles were published, life in her own country had already become saturated with ‘kitsch microbes’, following quite bloody, but nevertheless rather cheap clichés from the repertoire of power struggles. The small Balkan country, once known for its special position in-between the East and the West, entered the transition in its own way, with the war. Its citizens – and many of them quite involuntarily – were overnight turned into representatives of their nations; it was nationalists who took the stand. The Serbians were the first to conclude that their nation was endangered, and that they had to protect it at any cost; they trusted in arms, and in their macabre president, still in power on the road to the destruction of his own people. The others followed, having such a perfect excuse. The result is well known. While the two parts of Europe, the so-called East and the so-called West, in the early 1990s faced each other with new hopes (and fears), and with a new will to understand, citizens of the former Yugoslavia found themselves in the midst of a cruel war, maintaining again their special, in-between position, but this time in such a terrifyingly ironic way.

Thousands of people lost their lives, homes, identity, children, thousands of people became émigrés, refugees and homeless in their own country. The war raged on all the fronts, permeated all the pores of life, spilled out on the screens of televisions which were permanently on, out of newspaper reports and photographs. In the fragmented country both real and psychological wars were waged simultaneously. Mortar shells, psychological and real, wiped out people, houses, cities, children, bridges, memory. In the name of the present, a war waged for the past; in the name of the future, a war against the present. In the name of a new future, the war devoured the future. Warriors, the masters of oblivion, the destroyers of the old state and builders of new ones, used every possible strategic method to impose a collective amnesia. The self-proclaimed masters of life and death set up the coordinates of right and wrong, black and white, true and false. (The Culture of Lies, p. 6)

This new reality was imposing itself on everybody, it could not be escaped. And the writer who once believed that it was only literature that counted, had to face it. In her own, humorous way, Dubravka Ugrešić speaks of this recognition in her first book of essays on the war in the former Yugoslavia, Have a Nice Day, From the Balkan War to the American Dream (Ugrešić, 1994):

... all my life I had been doing everything in my power to retain my right to my one single privilege of being a writer. I refused to be a member of any parties, organizations, commissions and juries, I avoided being left or right, upper or lower. I was a damned outsider. I refused membership in mountaineering, feminist or diving clubs. I believed that a writer should have no homeland or nation or nationality, a writer must serve neither an Institution nor a Nation, neither God nor the Devil, a writer must have only one identity, his books, I thought, and only one homeland: Literature (where did I get that idea?). (Have a Nice Day, p. 138)
But it soon turned out to be impossible. At home, she was reproached for being indifferent to the sufferings of her compatriots. And abroad, an imposed set of labels was there to be applied both to her work and to her:

As soon as I crossed the border, the customs officers of culture began roughly sticking identity labels on me: communism, Eastern Europe, censorship, repression, Iron Curtain, nationalism (Serb or Croat?) – the very labels from which I had succeeded in protecting my writing in my own country. . . .

– The American market is saturated with East European writers – an editor in one publishing house told me.
– Oh? – I said.
– I personally don’t intend to publish a single one – he said.
– But what has that got to do with my books – I said, stressing the word books.
– You are an East European writer – he replied, stressing every word. (Have a Nice Day, pp. 38–41)

So Dubravka Ugrešić decided to face both, the new reality in her home country and the old set of preconceived ideas which continued to frame the perception of East Europe in the West, and so the book Have a Nice Day came to be written. The book is a collection of short texts originally written on a regular basis for Dutch newspapers during 1991 and 1992. All the texts were written in the form of short essays which could serve as entries for a fictional ‘dictionary’ of everyday life, in which various things like manuals, jogging, Coca-Cola or cappuccino were the topics. But everyday life had different meanings for the citizens of Amsterdam and for the citizens of Croatia or Bosnia, so it was impossible for Dubravka Ugrešić to think about it without speaking about the war, identity, missing people. West and East meet in these short essays, a world of peace, self-assured in its comfortable security, meets there with the troubled region in which war became possible in Europe once again.

Have a Nice Day is a book which attempts to mark out the points of identification and the points of misunderstandings between worlds which have to live together, but mistrust each other, East and West. It is a book against the war raging at that time in Croatia. Ugrešić wants to make its senseless horror visible. She speaks of people being killed by the bombs thrown at them by the Federal Army, which was supposed to protect them. She speaks of the bombardment of Dubrovnik as a crime equal to the bombardment of Venice – to the amazement of a western journalist who, understandably, cannot imagine the city of Venice being bombarded (Have a Nice Day, p. 20). But the book is written without hatred, without a simplified taking of stands; rather it takes that in-between stance, which refuses to choose once and for all between ‘us’ and ‘them’, simply because we are either both, or neither. This was a stance which many of us from the former Yugoslavia felt to be quite a comfortable position, but which turned to be the position on the margins, made literal both by the local nationalists and the outside observers who wanted a complex story to be made clear and simple. Have a Nice Day is a book written with a sharp eye and warmth, full of tragi-comedy, which the clear view from the margins can produce.

It was from those margins that everything became visible. Not only the big moves of the big players, which offered the frame of easy choices, but the sufferings and injustices on the small scale, upon which new realities were built. And it is on these sufferings and injustices that Dubravka Ugrešić concentrates. And her sharp eye cannot overlook the fact that the new realities created with so many big words, and so much unnecessary human suffering, are also saturated with cheap
manifestations of *poshlost*, which turn out to be the other side of the monumental project of national rebirth. In his book about Gogol, Vladimir Nabokov uses the term *poshlost*. *Poshlost* is a Russian word which, because of its wealth of meanings, Nabokov prefers to English equivalents such as cheap, inferior, sorry, trashy, scurvy, tawdry and the like', says Ugrešić, explaining her choice of the term. She recognizes *poshlost* everywhere around her in the newly born countries, as well as recognizing it in the old one. 'In the schizophrenic heads of citizens of the former Yugoslavia not only are two realities refracted, past and present, but two types of kitsch: the old type, already long since dead, and the new which grows out of the old, on the assumption that the recipient has long since consigned the first model to oblivion' (*Kitsch*, *Have a Nice Day*, pp. 170–1).

I believe that Ugrešić’s ability to recognize *poshlost*, to name it and make it visible, was one of the main reasons why she became a ‘public enemy’ and, between 1992 and 1993, one of the most ferociously attacked of the so-called ‘Croatian witches’. It would have been a great threat to the new nationalists in power, simply because it would have been very difficult to encourage people to make sacrifices not in the usual name of ‘higher goals’ and ‘eternal national dreams’, but in the name of a notion simply framed as *poshlost*. The attack on the ‘Croatian witches’, five women writers and journalists who dared to speak against the mainstream, was orchestrated late in 1992, continuing into 1993, particularly for Dubravka Ugrešić. She was attacked for her non-patriotic texts, texts published abroad, which very few people managed to read at the time in Croatia, but to which so many felt obliged to react. It was a public lynching of the Other, a woman who dares to think differently. Thus a gendered point of view, so clearly visible in *The Jaws of Life*, proved its importance in the life of the novel’s author, this time not in such an amusing form. Hence in 1993 she decided to leave the country, going into voluntary exile, making the decision that some of her characters in *Fording the Stream of Consciousness* had had to face before her.

In these two latest books by Dubravka Ugrešić, transgressions across the borders between possible worlds of literature and the world of immediate reality are visible once again. What was once considered to be a part of a literary game (Dubravka Ugrešić was known as a writer who liked to keep the author’s presence visible in her fiction) became over the last decade a manifestation of a completely different process; it is now the immediate reality that keeps interfering with her literature. In her latest novel, *The Museum of Unconditional Surrender*, Dubravka Ugrešić speaks of exile.

But it is not her personal story that Dubravka Ugrešić wants to narrate there, although the novel is written in the first person, and it might seem as if the author speaks about herself. At the very beginning the reader of *The Museum of Unconditional Surrender* is confronted with a stern assertion by the author: 'The question as to whether this novel is autobiographical might at some hypothetical moment be of concern to the police, but not to the reader' (*The Museum of Unconditional Surrender*, p. 1).

This somewhat abrupt and quite determined statement is a clear manifestation of the author’s will to protect herself and her novel from oversimplified patterns of biographical interpretations. If anyone wants to see anything personal in this book, then it can only be seen as a reflection of the personal experiences of many refugees and exiles. It is not actual names that are important here, but that particular point of view of the Other, the displaced person, whose life has been shattered into pieces, and for whom a fragment becomes the only acceptable form of expression, because it corresponds with his or her perception of the world.
That is why *The Museum of Unconditional Surrender* also adopts a fragmented structure. The novel starts with an unusual explanation of that method:

In the Berlin zoo, beside the pool containing the live walrus, there is an unusual display. In a glass case are all the things found in the stomach of Roland the walrus, who died on 21 August 1961. Or to be precise:

- a pink cigarette lighter, four ice-lolly sticks (wooden), a metal brooch in a form of a poodle, a beer-bottle opener, a woman’s bracelet (probably silver), a hair grip, a wooden pencil. . . .

The visitor stands in front of the unusual display, more enchanted than horrified, as before archaeological exhibits. The visitor knows that their museum-display fate has been determined by chance (Roland’s whimsical appetite) but still cannot resist the poetic thought that with time the objects have acquainted some subtler, secret connections. . . .

The chapters and fragments which follow should be read in a similar way. If the reader feels that there are no meaningful or firm connections between them, let him be patient: the connections will establish themselves of their own accord. (*The Museum of Unconditional Surrender*, p. 1)

In other words, the loose structure of the novel is just a narrative device which signals to the reader how the text should be perceived. In this case, fragmented narration corresponds to the way in which displaced people perceive their realities, as a series of discontinuities. But Ugrešić’s narration does not seek to mime their perception, nor does she want to retell their lives. Instead, she constructs situations which correspond to actual events, in detail, emotion, or gesture; doing so, she reveals to her readers a fragmented form in which the actual world presents itself to displaced people.

If we read it in such a way, *The Museum of Unconditional Surrender* can be seen as an extremely fine piece of metafiction.

*Metafiction* is a term given to fictional writing which self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as an artifact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality. In providing a critique of their own methods of construction, such writings not only examine the fundamental structures of narrative fiction, they also explore the possible fictionality of the world outside literary fictional texts. (Waugh, 1996: 2)

And in this case it is the fictionality of the actual world that Dubravka Ugrešić wants to underline.

That is why the assertion at the beginning of the novel about the inadequacy of the question of whether the text is autobiographical or not can also be related to the meaning given to a small photograph reproduced on the first page of the book. It is a photograph of three women in old-fashioned bathing suits, standing up to their waists in water, and laughing into the camera. Below the picture there is an inscription: ‘Photograph of unknown swimmers. Taken on the Pakrac river (Northern Croatia), at the beginning of the century. Photographer unknown.’ As the reader finds out later in the book, this is the photograph which the narrator carries around with her, ‘like a little fetish object’, whose real meaning is not known. This small picture has some secret power over the narrator, it draws her to it, and she keeps on trying to delve into its hidden story. It is like a ‘hidden passage’ through which she can slip into ‘a different space, a different time’. *The Museum of Unconditional Surrender* attempts in a way to be such a photograph. Or rather, an album of such photographs. There might be a reality behind them, but
it is not important whose faces are there, or if they can be recognized at all. The photographs themselves tell their own stories to each and every reader.

This small photograph of three women, whose original meaning is lost for ever, conveys another important message to the reader. It points to the way in which terms like ‘remembrance’ and ‘forgetting’, or ‘past’ and ‘future’ are conceptualized in the world of displaced people. It is a kind of obvious proof of the unreliability of remembrance and the impossibility of keeping the past alive. An impossibility which is most clearly understood by all those who were forced to renounce all material proof of their previous lives. ‘“Refugees are divided into two categories: those who have photographs, and those who have none”, said a Bosnian, a refugee’ (The Museum of Unconditional Surrender, p. 7). But the question is if the photographs really make any difference, and if they can keep their meaning without the rest of the frame – without the world in which they were taken.

This unreliability of photographs, as visible tokens of our need to keep the past alive and to preserve some material proof that it really existed, is quite touchingly elaborated in the part of the novel called ‘Family Museum’. Left alone in her Zagreb flat, with the known world changing violently outside her walls, and herself changing slowly with time, the narrator’s mother decides to arrange a family photograph album, as if she wants to ‘put in order’ her own life.

But arranging an album does not only imply rediscovering the past, it also implies recreating it. As with any other form of memory – and any form of history as well – such an effort is not based on preservation alone, but also on selection and exclusion. In that sense, the episode with the family album has a significant metatextual meaning, indicating also that The Museum of Unconditional Surrender should be read as a metafictional novel. Here is one detail which clearly points in that direction:

I never liked the whole business of taking photographs. I found tourists, armed with cameras, objectionable, I found looking through other people’s albums or watching their slides a torment.

During a trip abroad I bought a cheap automatic camera, and once the object was already there I shot several films. After some time I looked through the photographs and established that the scenes I had photographs of were all I remembered of that journey. I tried to remember something else, but my memories stayed tenaciously fixed on the content of the photographs.

I wonder what I would have remembered and how much if I had not taken any pictures. (The Museum of Unconditional Surrender, p. 26)

The issue here is not so much to speak about the way the narrator herself has framed her memory, but how memory itself is being framed, and in particular collective memory. In the novel it is refugees and exiles who perceive and recognize this artificiality of memory most explicitly. And at the same time, they perceive in the most immediate way the artificiality and constructedness of so-called ‘reality’, which for many of them turned out to be not only unstable, but sometimes an event fantastic in itself.

The Museum of Unconditional Surrender speaks of the experience of being displaced. The mother in ‘Family Museum’ was displaced in some way all her life. She left the country in which she was born, Bulgaria, to go and get married somewhere in an unknown territory, Croatia, in the former Yugoslavia. Settling there, she felt ‘at home’ for several years, realizing that her own past had faded away, gradually obliterated by the new frame, which she considered to be a ‘stable referent’. But when the country began to fall apart, she felt lost again, turning back
to her memories to find some safe ground for herself. But memory proves also to
be selective and unstable. Thus the mother feels that ‘in the end life is reduced to
a heap of random, unconnected details’, in which she cannot find a firm point to
hold onto.

This may well be a feeling that many people share regardless of where they live.
But living in a stable environment helps suppress it, while people who have to
face radical changes in their lives have to face the illusion of stability more clearly.
It becomes obvious for them how realities are constructed. Many citizens of the
former Yugoslavia had to experience that disillusionment in a highly dramatic
way. The new realities which were constructed in front of their very eyes often
asked of them to change not only their present and future lives, but also their own
past and their identities.

This is the point at which these two recent books by Dubravka Ugrešić turn out
to be related. They both speak about this process of construction of realities, but
in two different genres. While The Museum of Unconditional Surrender is written as
a novel, that is as a piece of fiction on fictionality of reality, The Culture of Lies is a
volume of essays which deals in a much more immediate way with the new reali-
ties in the region of former Yugoslavia. Ugrešić names these texts as ‘antipolitical
essays’, which in this case refers to her refusal to be manipulated by any politics.
It is also an attempt to ‘take back from politicians’ one’s language and one’s phil-
osophy, as György Konrád puts it in his essay ‘Antipolitics of a Novelist’, from
which Ugrešić quotes at the beginning of her book.

Dubravka Ugrešić was among the first to claim her right to defend ‘her
language and her philosophy’ from the totalizing forces of nationalism which
started to reconfigure the spaces of the Balkans in the late 1980s and early 1990s.
The Culture of Lies uses material taken from real life in the former Yugoslavia to
demonstrate the constructedness and artificiality of new realities created there at
the cost of so many people. Of course, by demonstrating these new principles of
construction, she also points to the old ones. Surprisingly or not, it emerges that,
despite ideological differences between two kinds of realities (new and old ones),
which are supposed to be fundamental, many of these principles are very much
the same, with the same effect: annihilation of individuality in the name of ‘higher
goals’.

The book also reveals some of the most powerful and efficient mechanisms
which serve to make invisible the work and effects of totalizing forces. Ugrešić
speaks of both the social and individual strategies of mimicking which people
used to make themselves invisible and socially unresponsible. In this way a
‘culture of lies’ is created, in which significant parts of the society participate in
some way, at least publicly. Ugrešić points to their responsibility, yet she does not
find everybody equally responsible. There were those who created new politics of
destruction, those who promoted it, and those who executed it. And of course,
those who had to suffer its consequences.

Dubravka Ugrešić is well aware of the fact that with the disintegration of the
common country the world has changed violently for too many former Yugoslavs:

Such an abrupt transformation of values, occurring in many spheres of
everyday, cultural, political, and ideological life has generated confusion in
the heads of many citizens: bad has suddenly become good, left has suddenly
become right. In this re-evaluation of the blotting out of one’s personal life,
one’s identity, a kind of amnesia, an unconscious or conscious lie have
become a protective reaction which enables one quickly to adopt the new
identity. (The Culture of Lies, p. 79)
That is why it is writers and intellectuals that she addresses here in the first place, as the ones who are supposed to recognize such lies, and to be antipolitical in Konrád’s sense of the word. But it was writers and intellectuals who were too often among those who were ready to overlook the fact that new lies were being produced with the construction of new realities; and too many of them ready to contribute to those lies. And it is something that Ugrešić’s book clearly reveals. It shows that to contribute to the culture of lies does not mean only to be one of those who obviously promote it; it also means an acceptance of the lies that others have uttered, or a willingness to overlook them. A culture of lies is equally produced, or at least reinforced, by an acceptance to live uncritically in such a culture, and by contributing to it on a small scale. And it usually means to accept *poshlost* as a part of everyday life.

Revealing all this, Ugrešić’s ‘antipolitical essays’ go much further than their immediate topic might suggest. Speaking about the region of the former Yugoslavia as a recent, still clearly visible example, they reveal many of the secret mechanisms that any culture of lies relies upon. Thus this book clearly shows how easily such a culture becomes possible, and it does not only concern the Balkans region. That is why we need these essays so much, and why they have to be read so carefully.

NOTES

1. *In the Jaws of Life* comprises two originally separate titles. One is the short novel *Štefica Čvek u raljama života* (Zagreb, 1981), here published as the first section of the book under the title *Steffie Speck in the Jaws of Life*. The other is a collection of short stories, *Život je bajka*, here *Life is a Fairy Tale* (originally published Zagreb, 1983). The book also includes a long story, *Ljubavna priča* (*A Love Story*), from Ugrešić’s first book (*Poza za prozu*, Zagreb, 1978); the tale is again centred on issues of writing.

2. In 1984, a film based on the book, titled *U raljama života* (*In the Jaws of Life*), was produced by Croatian film director Rajko Grlić and scripted by Ugrešić and Grlić.
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