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ON THE REASONS FOR AN EXHIBITION ABOUT THE CREATION OF YUGOSLAVIA

The main reason for the exhibition *The Day Worth a Century* is the centenary of the Yugoslav unification, i.e. the formal act of proclamation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, which falls on 1 December 2018. As one of the few institutions that still bear the name of the former state in their own name, the Museum of Yugoslavia has a duty to adequately mark the centenary of the formation of that state. In addition to the exhibition, the centenary is to be marked with a conference entitled *The Musealization of Yugoslavia – Freezing or Renegotiating Shared Heritage*, which is to take place on 2-3 December 2018.

At this moment in time, twenty years after its founding, the Museum of Yugoslavia is undergoing a process of rethinking its place and role; conception and systematization of collections; redefining its vision and attracting new audiences. The museum was created with the intention of safeguarding the collections of two institutions: the Memorial Center ‘Josip Broz Tito’ and the Museum of the Revolution of Nations and Nationalities of Yugoslavia, both of which were seen as relics of an obsolete ideology in the early 1990s. For several years, the Museum barely survived in conditions that were hardly adequate to secure its operation. Although various programmatic texts state that the Museum’s task is to study Yugoslavia from its formation to its dissolution, it has always been clear that the limitations of its collections and the strong memorial aspect of the building that houses it make it primarily a museum of socialist Yugoslavia. This situation has changed in recent years, with the museum offering exhibitions dealing with and popularizing topics relating to first Yugoslavia (‘To Be a Falcon Is to Be a Yugoslav’) as well as offering exhibitions that cover the entire existence
of Yugoslavia (‘Yugoslavia: from the Beginning to the End’); a permanent exhibition dealing with the phenomena of both Yugoslav states is currently being prepared. Combined with other activities such as animation and discussion programs, the Museum of Yugoslavia is beginning to reposition itself as a relevant institution for studying the entire period of the existence of the Yugoslav state, as well as the emergence, evolution and endurance of the Yugoslav idea. The introduction of new topics and the tackling of historical segments that had previously been left unstudied or interpreted with an ideological bias, however, is not to be seen as a historical revision or favoritism, but as a result of the conviction that phenomena associated with socialist Yugoslavia cannot be adequately understood without taking account their roots in the first Yugoslavia and that many crucial questions can be fully assessed only in their entire historical vertical. The exhibition The Day Worth a Century aims to trace these studies and presentations, and due to its topic can be symbolically seen as the beginning of a new chapter in the life of this museum after several years of preparation.

This programmatic and research turnaround would not be complete without a shift in the museum's policy regarding the collection, its processing, interpretation and expansion. The importance of organizing similar exhibitions encourages curators to assess the collection, note its limitations and suggest feasible acquisitions.

This approach inevitably includes cooperation with other institutions, museums, archives, libraries and individuals with the ultimate objective of creating a wide network of regional cooperation including exchange of materials as well as views and knowledge of certain questions. In this way, along with encouraging critical thinking as the primary interpretation model, we hope to carve out a space for diverging views and interpretations of specific events, persons and processes, and to herald a time when the common denominator in assessing dissonant topics from our shared past would be achieved on a much higher level.

One of the strategic aims of the Museum of Yugoslavia, which the exhibition The Day Worth a Century also draws on, is to attract contemporary audiences of a different profile. This particularly applies to schoolchildren, whose organized visits to the Museum of Yugoslavia are few and far between. The importance of this exhibition for school audiences, along with additional contents that could supplement and directly expand school curricula, is also reflected in the methodology of interpreting historical events, which aims to emphasize the value of using critical thinking and tackling unresolved questions instead of insisting on ‘final’ truths.

**ON THE JUBILEES OF YUGOSLAVIA**

The marking or ignoring of important jubilees of a state that no longer exists can always be seen through the political prism. However, in the case of the Museum of Yugoslavia, the marking of the centenary of the unification of Yugoslav peoples forms a part of its main activity, which includes the safeguarding and interpretation of the Yugoslav legacy. This jubilee offers an
opportunity to inform the wider public about the formation of a state usually described in contemporary official narratives of its successor states as a misconception and historical mistake. The fact that Yugoslavia fell apart in a bloody war, however, is not reason enough not to mark its centenary and once again indirectly brand the erstwhile state a ‘fatal historical mistake’. It is precisely the widespread ignoring of topics associated with the Yugoslav legacy that deepens the misunderstanding of the contemporary political situation, facilitating manipulation of historical narratives and prolonging conflicts by other means.

The attitude towards the date of the creation of Yugoslavia is also a paradigmatic illustration of the attitude toward the concept of Yugoslavism. The ignoring of this date or its negative interpretation was seen during the period of socialist Yugoslavia, which celebrated its Republic Day on 29 November and for ideological reasons did not commemorate the events of 1 December. In time the attitude towards 1 December gradually changed and important jubilees began to be marked with academic conferences and summits, and the 70th anniversary was even marked in the official calendar of the erstwhile SSRN Yugoslavia.1

To mark this occasion, the Museum of the Revolution of Nations and Nationalities of Yugoslavia organized an exhibition entitled ‘Yugoslavia, Federation, Republic’.2 The prefatory text in the exhibition contains the following sentence: ‘The creation of the unified Yugoslav state is the result of the centuries-long struggle for the liberation of Yugoslav peoples and the aspirations of progressive and freedom-fighting movements on Yugoslav soil... The creation of Yugoslavia in 1918 was the historical premise for the creation of a new, socialist Yugoslavia’.

In retrospect we can see that the attitude towards 1 December was no less complex during the existence of the Kingdom. This date made its way into the official holiday calendar already in 1919, but the unstable political situation in the state made it a rather dissonant event in the shared history of Yugoslav peoples. Soon the date was no longer seen as an important moment that saw all South Slavs unified in the same – their own – state for the first time in history. The day of their unification quickly became a symbol of the political order established upon the inception of the new state, a regime seen by many as unjust.

Official state institutions organized celebratory programs to commemorate the formation of the state, with the participation of citizens, representatives of the army and clergy, state officials and members of the diplomatic corps. To mark the important anniversaries in 1928 and 1938, memorial publications and collections of texts were published, medals awarded and monuments erected to the architects of the unification. On 1 December 1938 another form of remembrance of this date was organized. The Sokol Union of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia opened the hall in the home of the Kršmanović family to visitors, where the unification had been proclaimed twenty years earlier. As a loyal protector of the tradition of unity, the Sokol Union was housed in this historic building during this period.

1 — Union of Socialist Workers of Yugoslavia (Savez socijalističkog radnog naroda Jugoslavije)
2 — Milica Bodrožić, Dragica Bojović, Dragoljub Kuprešanin, “Jugoslavija, federacija, republika” [‘Yugoslavia, Federation, Republic’], MRNNJ 1988
However, there were also responses from those who had been opposed to the idea of Yugoslavia or its political organization at the time. Only five years after the historical act of unification, an op-ed in the daily *Politika* stated: ‘This is the sixth time that we have celebrated this date and every anniversary seems to elicit less enthusiasm. With less enthusiasm, because nothing greater than that 1 December could have been expected, which is of course understandable and perhaps inevitable, and because the great moral capital acquired then has begun to ebb away, which is neither understandable nor inevitable. It is understandable and perhaps inevitable that five years could not have produced as a shining result as our national unification had done, because mere years cannot match what has been in the making for decades and centuries. But it is not understandable and certainly not inevitable that a mere few years could begin to eat away in this horrifying manner at what had been in the making for decades and centuries.’

Three years later to the day, another op-ed in the daily *Politika* summarized the life of the state as follows: ‘The second decade since 1 December is off to a difficult beginning. How will it end?’ And while most towns and cities in the Kingdom of SCS organized official celebrations to mark the day, Zagreb saw mass protests with the protesters displaying black flags that read: ‘1 December 1918 – 5 December 1918 – 20 June 1928.’ Like previous rounds of demonstrations, these protests also claimed human lives, which only added to the very complex situation in the country.

The first Yugoslavian state ended after it was occupied and dissolved by the Axis Powers in 1941; however, it had already been struggling with serious internal problems. The second Yugoslav state ceased to exist in the civil war of the 1990s.

After Yugoslavia ceased to exist, the commemoration of any date associated with the former unity of its constituent peoples was removed from official calendars. The only exception was SR Yugoslavia in the 1990s, which continued to mark 29 November as a public holiday as a way of maintaining continuity with SFRY, while at the same time assigning some importance to 1 December. The 80th anniversary of the unification was marked with an exhibition entitled ‘The Written Word on Yugoslavia’ jointly organized by the Museum of Yugoslav History and the Archives of Yugoslavia at the Sava Center in Belgrade.

However, a notable approach in all successor states, including Serbia since the 2000s, has been interpreting history exclusively in ethnocentric models. This has led to a perception of Yugoslavia merely as a stage in the creation of the nation state as the sole objective of historical evolution or,
alternately, as a misconception and costly mistake. On the other hand, there is a tendency to ignore the positive results that this integration had for the peoples of present-day Western Balkans: unification in a single state, national liberation, abandoning obsolete property relations, a more active role in international relations and modernizing processes. This is a widespread trend in academic publishing and even more so in general publications, media and school textbooks. Finally, it is reflected in the selection of dates that are accorded due attention, which in turns influences wider historiographic production, the organization of academic conferences and exhibitions, and TV programs. The centenary of the end of the Great War will therefore provide a useful test of the condition of post-Yugoslav societies. The choice of the moment in the turbulent year of 1918 to be accorded the greatest attention in each former Yugoslav republic will be the best indicator of the way modern societies feel toward and remember their history.

**EXHIBITION CONCEPT AND CHRONOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

The name of this exhibition about the formation of the Yugoslav state paraphrases the title of the poem ‘A night more costly than a century’, the only love poem written by P.P. Njegoš. It still remains unclear if the poem was dedicated to hope, trepidation and the expectation of a desired meeting or to a real event, but there is no doubt that it is permeated by a sense of yearning – a yearning that seems more valuable than anything that might stand in the way of its fulfillment. A similar hope inspired the supporters of the Yugoslav idea who espoused this concept with romantic fervor without assessing its real potentials. The title *The Day Worth a Century* was chosen to highlight the importance of the commemorated date and to emphasize the fact that the Yugoslav idea can be traced to its native 19th century and throughout the tumultuous 20th century, the century that saw the formation and dissolution of the Yugoslav state, all the way to the 21st century, which can now rethink and research its legacy.

The idea behind this exhibition is to, discussing the period of the formation of Yugoslavia, problematize various narratives about it and offer insights into the different aspects of this historical act, while elucidating the key moments that are necessary for a better understanding of the processes that led to it.

The main chronological framework of the exhibition covers the period from 1904 to 1921, which the curators see as crucial for understanding the circumstances that led to the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. However, the first part of the exhibition also offers a brief overview of the evolution of the Yugoslav idea from the middle to the end of the 19th century in order to introduce the topic to the visitor and allow them to appreciate the complexity and wealth of various visions, interests and aspirations regarding the unification of South Slavs into a single state.

---

*7 — All of these legacies can be linked (to varying degrees) with both the first and second Yugoslav state.*
The struggle for Yugoslav unification was a protracted process. The resolution of this question lasted for decades, not unlike the struggle for the respective unifications of Germany and Italy. But, unlike these two examples of great national integrations completed over the course of the 19th century, the Yugoslav integration was a belated process that finally came to fruition after the end of the Great War. The formative stage of the new state was relatively long and lasted until 1921 – a period remarkably important for understanding a range of problems that would continue to plague Yugoslavia throughout its existence. This was the reason for the curators’ decision not to end their narrative with 1 December 1918, but with 1921, the year in which the state finally received permanent borders and when the promulgation a centralist constitution formalized the main rift in the Yugoslav society, the root of most political crises until the end of the first Yugoslavian state. The year 1904 was taken as the symbolical beginning of the main narrative, which saw the coronation of King Petar I Karadžorđević and the centenary of the First Serbian Uprising, as well as the organization of several cultural manifestations in the Yugoslav spirit. Both contemporaries and researchers have underlined the importance of these cultural events as the symbolical beginning of closer ties in the South Slavic cultural community and the lively cooperation of their cultural workers who were very aware of the political background of their activities.

Within this chronological framework, the exhibition is divided into five sections. Each of these sections begins with contradictory quotes by notable personages, which emphasizes the application of critical analysis by offering different interpretations of the same event to the visitor, while at the same time establishing additional ties with the contents of the exhibition by introducing the language and arguments of the period covered by the exhibition.

**EXHIBITION STRUCTURE**

**Archeology of Yugoslavia**

*In the beginning I had some hope, but now I see that Yugoslavism has so far been merely an ideal word that is empty although there is a lovely ring to it... Yugoslavs do not know their own strength and do not see their own merit. Hence they are wont to blindly surrender into unconditional slavery to foreigners.*

— Petar Petrović Njegoš to Medo Pucić, 23 April 1849

Serbs and Croats are the closest of brothers, but then each people has had its own distinctive name since the time in early history when they lived together or in close proximity, just as they do today. Serbs have their own and Croats their own distinctive history – Serbs their Eastern and Croats their Western church; Serbs on the frontier have their own [...] and Croats their own language; Serbs
Proclamacija o literarnom sporazumu dovršenom u Viničoj, 28. marta 1850. godine.

Narodne novine, 1. travnja 1850.
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Zaštitni znak 'Slavonjska sreća' 1848-1909, iz zbora umjetničkih i kulturelnih predmeta Zagreba.
have their Slavonic and Croats their Latin script. And therefore although Serbs and Croats are the closest of brothers, they are not one and the same people...

— Patriarch Josif Rajačić to the Parliament (Sabor) of the Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia, 1 May 1861

The Archeology of Yugoslavia forms the introduction to the main course of the exhibition. It introduces the visitor to the genesis of the Yugoslav idea and its pioneers, whose generation did not live to see their idea come to fruition. The idea itself emerged in the mid-19th century and evolved in different directions, from a cultural revival of South Slavic peoples in the Austrian monarchy and the creation of a shared language to considerations of a possible unification and struggle for political autonomy. Among the Croatian and Slovene intelligentsia the Yugoslav idea was a form of national revival. From the mid-19th century, influenced by the movement of Pan-Slavism, in Serbia emerged the idea that Serbia was to be the political center that would launch the liberation and unification of South Slavic peoples. The South Slavic idea took two directions in Serbia: unification with Bulgaria or unification with South Slavic peoples west of the Drina River and the formation of a South Slavic state with Serbia at its helm.

Prominent cultural and political workers, the bearers of the Yugoslav idea in the 19th century, are presented at the exhibition with memorial objects dedicated to them by subsequent generations, at the time when the idea gained momentum or during the existence of the Yugoslav state, when they were given recognition for their efforts. The last decades brought ignoring or rethinking the Yugoslav component in their legacy and have reduced it to idealism, misconception or hidden nationalism and chauvinism, depending on the angle of interpretation.

The South Slavic Cultural Space

Like four oaks in a wood that are taller than all other woodland trees and that have for centuries suffered being broken and bent by every storm, when their trunks grow strong and the roots take to the ground more firmly, their branches spread out and their shade shelters all their brothers, so the joint strength of South Slavs now threatens the West, telling their northern brothers of their impending unity.

— Nadežda Petrović, Review of the First Yugoslav Exhibition in Belgrade, 1904

We are brothers by blood and at least cousins by language – but in terms of culture, which is the fruit of many centuries of separate education, we are much more foreign to each other than a peasant from Gorenje to a peasant from Tyrol or a winemaker from Gorica to his counterpart in Friuli.

— Ivan Cankar, Slovenes and Yugoslavs, 1913
The main narrative of the exhibition starts with the second section entitled ‘Yugoslav Cultural Space’. This section illustrates the period in which the idea of South Slavic cultural and political unity became prevalent among the younger intellectual, artistic and cultural elite, as well as present in political life.

In the early 20th century, in less than ten years visual and theater artists, authors and intellectuals established a shared and very dynamic South Slavic cultural space before the formal unification and formation of the Kingdom of SCS. The organizing of the first South Slavic cultural events in Belgrade in 1904 marked the symbolical beginning of their cooperation. The First Yugoslav Art Exhibition, the First Congress of the Yugoslav Youth, and the Conference of Yugoslav Writers and Artists attracted more than 500 guests in an effort to introduce Serbian, Croatian, Slovene, and Bulgarian artists to younger audiences. The ties between artists and the wider cultural elite grew stronger and culminated in the joint representation of Serbian and Croat artists in the Serbian pavilion at the International Exhibition in Rome in 1911.

In this period ideas and opinions traveled in letters and postcards, while cultural workers changed trains to cross the borders of Serbia, the Austro-Hungarian Empire and Bulgaria. One of the main meeting points as well as points of contention between artists and artistic associations were the four South Slavic art exhibitions organized in Belgrade (1904), Sofia (1906), Zagreb (1908) and again Belgrade (1912).
The developments in the South Slavic cultural sphere were inextri-
cably tied to the idea of South Slavic political unity as well as dynamic political
events and upheavals of the time: the formation of the Serbo-Croat coalition,
the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Balkan Wars and the outbreak
of World War One. The war severed existing ties of cooperation, thwarted plans
and stifled their enthusiasm, while the creative work and exhibitions of Ivan
Meštrović became a political tool in the struggle for unification.

The Struggle for Unification

Many think they prefer the name Yugoslavia to the Serbo-Croat-
Slovene kingdom, because they believed that the Serbian name
would dominate others; although it is only fair to have the Serbian
name as dominant because the Serbs are twice as many as Croats
and Slovenes.
— Nikola Pašić to Miroslav Spalajković, 20 April 1917

Our program has yet to be diplomatically and officially formulated.
It has yet to become a European question [...] There is only talk of
the restoration of Serbia, the expansion of Serbia. That is not it. We
need to create a new polity... based on the principle of nationality.
— Hinko Hinković at a session of the Corfu Conference,
16/3 June 1917

The struggle for unification, presented in the third segment of the
exhibition, unfolded during the greatest suffering of the army and civilian popu-
lation of the Kingdom of Serbia. Austria-Hungary used the Sarajevo assassination
of 28 June 1914 to attack and declare war against Serbia. The real motive behind
this move was the aspiration of Austria-Hungary and Germany to initiate a new
division of colonies. The war quickly spilled over from the Balkans to become a
European and global conflict. In the first months of the war Serbia successfully
repelled its much stronger enemy and emerged victorious from the Battles of
Cer and Kolubara. Montenegro joined the war against Austria-Hungary. From
the outbreak of the unwanted Great War, Serbia persevered in its objective of
liberating its ‘unliberated South Slavic brothers’. The Serbian Great Assembly,
convened in the city of Niš, adopted the ‘Yugoslav Program’ and included the
liberation of territories inhabited by the ‘one and the same tri-named people’ and
the unification of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes among its war objectives. The Ser-
bian opposition also supported the aims of the government, but often disproved
proposals about the implementation of the unification process. Prominent Serbi-
an scholars and cultural workers were tasked with advocating war objectives in
Allied countries and lobbying for international support for this cause.

In October 1915 a new offensive led by Germany and Austria-Hunga-
ry, this time joined by Bulgaria, managed to penetrate Serbian defenses and the
Serbian army, government and king began their retreat across Albania to be fer-
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Delegates of the Yugoslav Committee in London, 1916. From the SASA Archive Collections.

Announcement of the "Niš Declaration" From the National Library of Serbia Collections.
Декларација
( Иујава)

На конференцији у Истока према могућностима коалиције и радничким кабинета Храница Србије и председника Радослава Пурђера задржан у Лагорд, који су до дана наконево радили, а у присуству и у присуству Председника Народне Скупштине, имају одлуке о свим
важним, које су пренесена на будућу зарубинску државну Комисију Ора, Србија и Словенија.

Србија својим гласом и својим примером може
испитати да је унуташи политика Конференције
и овог гласа влада различити у свим изјави
на будућу зарубинску државну комисију.

При свакој размени Ора, Србија, Остар
чака тачта и председник чланови, да је тај
нови процес хорор један и много, то је, да је
нова, новорастав и новата, о мајка свога и
нова, то новачке и нова територије, на
која је непрекидан живот и од заједничког
живота прегреница свога националног освајања
и свестраче развоја свога националног и нацијалног живота.
MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANG ÈRES
DU ROYAUME DE SERBIE

Пет. И Удаб в друга зазела није био дана уло- 

жава Српског Савеза, збогу у зема коди Ха- 

вографије.

Писма јединствен гард Орта, Хрваца и Серби- 

ца саглављуто државу која је била око 

12.000.000 државана. Од ње је била гарантова 

народне независности и савремени народни кул-

турни напредак, јак везен традицијама културног 

видирања. Керлинги као детаљ свих ових кул-

турних врела у народ које су истовремени 

сути гравде свог народ у борби изме- 

ну народе гравде, и усклађен план гете межу-

родне заробе.

Дано на Хрпу, 4 јула 1917. године

Председник, 

Христијански Савез,

Пресеђник, 

Митрополит Сава, 

Легат Првобит.

Хи. П. Панчо.
ried to Corfu on Allied ships. The Serbian army suffered grave losses. However, the government of the Kingdom of Serbia continued to insist on its Yugoslav agenda even at this stage of the war despite having been forced to leave its own territory.

In the struggle for unification, which depended on the outcome of the Great War and the will of the Great Powers, the main ally of the Serbian government was a group of political émigrés from Austria-Hungary gathered in the Yugoslav Committee. The core members of the Committee were Ivan Meštrović, Ante Trumbić and Frano Supilo, all of them from Dalmatia; later on they were joined by Serbian politicians from Bosnia and Herzegovina Nikola Stojanović and Dušan Vasiljević. The Committee was officially formed on 30 April 1915 following news of the signing of the Treaty of London. During the war the Committee acted as an independent body representing the Serbian community of Austria-Hungary, cooperating with the Serbian government as its permanent sponsor. Despite their cooperation on reaching the common goal, disagreements arose between some Committee members and the Serbian government concerning the concept of the future state. Frano Supilo was particularly critical of the Serbian government and Nikola Pašić, and in 1916 decided to leave the Yugoslav Committee.

However, a compromise was reached with the signing of the Corfu Declaration on 20 July 1917. In this declaration the representatives of the Yugoslav Committee and the Serbian government agreed to establish a shared, unified, free and independent state after the war – a constitutional parliamentary monarchy headed by the Karađorđević dynasty. The political organization of the future state was to be decided at a constitutional assembly.

The Days of Fateful Decisions

And although we belong to different faiths, we are all sons of the same people and of the same blood. The idea of the national unity of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes has spread to the masses. It has become the political credo and dogma of our national being.

— Statement submitted by the political leaders of Bosnia and Herzegovina to István Tisza, the former Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Hungary, 21 October 1918, Sarajevo

Gentlemen! It is still not too late! Do not rush like geese into the unknown! Do not make any shared governments with the Kingdom of Serbia because there is no one and nothing to represent the Kingdom of Serbia except a single telegram, and it represents something different than you do. Do not take actions that could tomorrow lead to Slovenes and, you Serbs, being called Vojvodinians and Bosnians, and you, our Croats, being called Dalmatians; and above all, you, our local Serbs, do not let it be said that you have all come here today only to collude against the people, especially against Croatia and Croats.

— Stjepan Radić, the leader of the Croatian Peasant Party at a session of the People’s Council in Zagreb, 24 November 1918
The penultimate segment of the exhibition discusses the resolution of the Yugoslav question, which unfolded in the aftermath of World War One. The main motivation behind this section is to depict the speed with which these momentous events unfolded, while the central place belongs to the proclamation of the unification on 1 December in Belgrade. According to Nikola Stojanović, a member of the Yugoslav Committee, the breakthrough of the Salonica (Macedonian) Front marked the beginning of a historical period in which some months proved more decisive for the fate of the people than many decades in other periods had been.8

The struggle for unification entered a new stage. By late September Bulgaria capitulated and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy fell into chaos. In the final phase of the dissolution of the Monarchy, South Slavic lands formed new organs of local administration: people’s councils and people’s committees; finally, on 6 October the People’s Council was formed in Zagreb as the political body representing all South Slavic peoples in the Monarchy. On 29 October the Croatian Parliament (Sabor) announced the dissolution of state ties with Austria-Hungary and the creation of the State of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. The Serbian government and the Yugoslav Committee were thus joined by a third actor on the political stage of Yugoslav unification.

During those days the Serbian army was the only guarantor capable of safeguarding Yugoslav territories and hence the implementation of the unification process effectively began in the first days of November 1918 after its troops crossed the historical frontiers along the rivers Sava, Danube and Drina. The army acted on the orders of the Allied command as well as the invitations of the People’s Council. On 6-9 November, the representatives of the Serbian government, the opposition and the People’s Council held talks about the unification in Geneva, promulgating a declaration on the unification between the State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs and the Kingdom of Serbia based on the dualist principle until the adoption of a joint constitution. This mode – reminiscent of the objectionable Austro-Hungarian dualist model – was refused by Prince Regent Aleksandar, with some representatives of Croatia and Dalmatia also opposed to it. A two-week period of uncertainty ensued, with Serbia and its victorious army on one side and the State of SCS, troubled by its loss of many deserters and a pre-revolutionary mood, on the other. The Italian occupation of Dalmatia, even wider than the territory promised in the Treaty of London, accelerated the decision of the People’s Council to send its envoys to Belgrade in late November to implement their unification with Serbia. At the same time, by the decisions of the People’s Assembly in Novi Sad (25 November) and the Podgorica Assembly (26 November), Vojvodina and Montenegro joined Serbia.

On 1 December 1918 the formal proclamation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was organized in Belgrade. The most important depiction of this historical event is a painting by Ivan Tišov entitled The Proclama-

8 — Nikola Stojanović, Srbija i jugoslovensko ujedinjenje [Serbia and the Yugoslav Unification], Belgrade 1939, p. 63.
tion of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. The picture illustrates the address of the representatives of the People's Council to Prince Regent Aleksandar and his reply, which officially proclaimed the unification. The work by the Croatian artist Ivan Tišov (1870–1928) created in 1926 belongs to his wider opus of historical works and large-format allegorical paintings celebrating the birth of the new state and its ruler. The painting initially decorated the interior of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. After World War Two the building was connected to the newly erected building of the Parliament of Serbia and the painting was closed off by a plaster wall. It was rediscovered and conserved in 2005 and today forms a part of the room that serves as the press hall of the National Parliament of Serbia.

The Foundations of the New State

...The Great Powers resolve international issues based on their own opinions and evaluations. Admittedly, now everything needs to be subjugated to the ethnicity principle wherever they deem this principle applicable; then to the strategic principle wherever they deem this principle applicable, even if the strategic principle is used not to protect a weaker nation from a more powerful one but used against the weaker one...

— Nikola Pašić on small peoples in the Great War

In the first months of 1919 Belgrade and Zagreb are indescribably far from each other: the fastest train usually takes 27 hours to make the distance, and the trains are late almost every day in these disorganized postwar times. The journey from Zagreb to Belgrade and vice versa is a long and arduous ordeal in freezing carriages with broken windows and people are reluctant to set out. This also makes contacts between Serbia and Croatia more difficult.

— Josip Horvat, 1938

After the official proclamation of unification on 1 December 1918, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes entered a difficult three-year-long period of struggle for recognition, border delineation and state consolidation. At the Paris Peace Conference (18 January 1919 – 20 January 1920) the delegation of the Kingdom of SCS fought to secure international recognition for the new state and to negotiate the borders that would include territories

9 — Ivan Tišov's painting is in fact the only contemporaneous visual interpretation of the proclamation of the State of SCS. Rather unusually in view of the development of photography at that time, there are no surviving photographs of the historical event itself. Tišov had not been an eyewitness to the event (unlike the historical session of the Croatian Sabor on 29 October 1918, which he also painted) and probably relied on eyewitness descriptions. This certainly added to the modern documentary value of his composition.

inhabited by a majority South Slavic population. Although Norway, Greece and the United States recognized the Kingdom of SCS in February 1919, the Conference initially treated its delegates as representatives of the Kingdom of Serbia. The Kingdom of SCS acquired collective recognition with the signing of the Treaty of Versailles with Germany on 28 June 1919. However, Greece was the only neighboring country that the Kingdom of SCS did not have any points of contention with. With all of its other neighbors, former enemies and allies alike, it had the following disputed territories: Banat with Romania; the Baja triangle and Pécs with Hungary; Carinthia with Austria; and Rijeka (It. Fiume) and Istria with Italy. Various arguments – ethnic, historical-legal and strategic – were used in these disputes as well as demands rooted in secret treaties signed over the course of the war.

The beginning of the life of the new community was no less tumultuous on the inside. Already during the formation of the first government cabinet, the autocratic tendencies of Prince Regent Aleksandar began to surface. Cabinets replaced one another in quick succession with insufficient authority to resolve important matters. From March 1919 a bitter struggle began in the Provisional People’s Presidency, revealing the diversity of political views from different parts of the new state. The new distribution of political power became apparent at the elections for the Constitutional Assembly. The rift between the centralist faction and advocates of a federation concept that would acknowledge various historical differences would last beyond the promulgation of the Vidovdan Constitution of 28 June 1921.
And although the initial moral capital and enthusiasm that was brought into the new community began to seriously chip away due to the rising dissatisfaction with some government decisions and the emerging form of political organization, it would be inaccurate to conclude that the idea of togetherness was completely spent by 1921. This was not the case, as evidenced by repeated attempts to improve the situation throughout the existence of the first Yugoslavian state; it is also important to note that alliances and rivalries were not always formed along national lines.\(^\text{11}\) The decision to end the exhibition with the promulgation of the Vidovdan Constitution underlines our determination to continue exploring topics related to the first Yugoslavian state.

**THE CONCEPT OF THE EXHIBITION CATALOG**

Fully aware of the complexity of the topic of our exhibition, we have decided to publish the catalog in a rather unconventional format, with ten separate contributions conceived as a logical sequence. Since there is a plethora of published papers, treatises and books on the Yugoslav idea and unification, we thought it necessary to include different points of view. In a bid to avoid any one-sided bias, we have invited ten researchers from Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, Macedonia and Serbia, who

---

\(^\text{11}\) — See: Dejan Đokić, *Nedostižni kompromis. Srpsko-hrvatsko pitanje u međuratnoj Jugoslaviji* [The Unattainable Compromise. The Serbo-Croat Question in Interwar Yugoslavia], Belgrade 2010
write in different languages and scripts. In addition, they come from different academic milieus which offer opposing views rather than a wide consensus on shared topics and which, unfortunately, generally tend to ignore academic offerings from neighboring countries. This approach to topics and facts, as well as views expressed by the authors in their texts, are reflections of the time and context in which they emerged, despite their professionalism and knowledge.

The selection of contributors was made so as to allow different voices to be heard and to offer a current overview of the attitude of researchers and the academic community towards the legacy of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and, more generally, toward the Yugoslav legacy as a whole. The contributors’ willingness to accept our invitation also demonstrates their clear stance and determination to join the discussion and rethink our shared past.
NIKOLA PAŠIĆ AND ITALY ON THE EVE OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE YUGOSLAV STATE (1917–1918)
Serbo-Italian relations were complex ever since the beginning of World War I. Italy was a potential ally to Serbia, but the two countries also had a few points of contention – first and foremost Italian pretensions to a large part of the eastern Adriatic coast, which had also been claimed by Serbia in its program of Yugoslav unification formulated in the Niš Declaration of December 1914. In addition, the interests of the two countries were at odds in Albania and Montenegro, whose unification with Serbia Rome opposed. These disputes reached their peak during the signing of the Treaty of London in April 1915; to secure Italy’s alliance, France, Russia and Great Britain promised the annexation of Istria and northern Dalmatia to Italy in case of an Allied victory. Although the Treaty of London was a secret pact, the Serbian government and its Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs Nikola Pašić – who had unsuccessfully tried to garner more consideration for the Yugoslav program via Russia – soon learned the crux of its stipulations. On the other hand, after they learned the code used by Pašić in his correspondence with his diplomats, the Italians too were hardly unaware of Serbian secrets. The situation changed after the military breakdown of Serbia in late 1915 and the retreat of the Serbian army to Corfu. Having recuperated on the island, the Serbian army was transferred to the Salonica Front. There Italian and Serbian troops became more direct allies, but this, as well as Italian aid during the rescuing of the Serbian army from Albania (seen as inadequate by the Serbs) did little to dispel mutual distrust.

In March 1916 Pašić began a tour of European capitals. First he paid a visit to Rome, where he met with Sidney Sonnino, Italy’s Minister of Foreign Affairs. Sonnino recorded that the conversation focused on general matters and that they principally agreed that Italy and Serbia should come to an agreement

'with mutual concessions', but that this would be difficult to achieve due to Serbia's uncompromising stance. Shortly thereafter, Pašić confided to Ante Trumbić, the chairman of the Yugoslav Committee, that as soon as he tried to delve 'a little deeper' into the Adriatic question in Rome, he was told that the matter should wait for the end of the war. To the Allies Pašić professed that he was satisfied with the talks in Rome, but this was in fact not the case.\(^3\)

He elaborated his view in a telegram to the Serbian envoy in Paris: 'We can accept Italy's demand for supremacy in the Adriatic Sea, but we cannot accept [...] any violation of the nationality principle or having Serbia deprived of any lands inhabited by the Serbo-Croat-Slovene people. [...] So far we have had no talks with Italy – although we have voiced such a desire on multiple occasions. However, the other side has always replied that the time was not yet ripe.\(^4\)

---


Developments in the first months of 1917 – the Russian Revolution and the American entry into the war – brought a major change of circumstances. The new situation meant that the fulfillment of promises made to Italy in the Treaty of London became more uncertain; and Pašić, traditionally a Russophile, had to adapt to the fact that the unity of ‘Serbo-Croats’ and their political unification were becoming increasingly dependent on the will of the Western powers. The Italian envoy in Corfu, Carlo Sforza, noticed Pašić’s concern about the development of the Russian Revolution and his declining authority, which had largely rested on Russian support.⁵ Although all of this made an agreement between Serbia and Italy increasingly likely, their relations were soured in early June when Italy decided to proclaim Albania an independent state under its own protectorate. The Serbian government expressed its protest to the Allies, but Sonnino never replied to its note. After a few days of characteristic silence, Sforza was informed by an embittered Pašić that the Albanian question was crucial for Serbia, because it could potentially end up with only one point of access to the sea that could only be reached through Albanian territory. The Italian tried to placate his Serbian collocutor and interpreted his stance by his hope to have the territory of Albania divided among the neighboring countries. On the other hand, Pašić recorded: ‘The main thing is to prevent Italy from gaining a foothold in the Balkans⁶.

⁶ – DDI, 5, VIII, 151, 170, 177, 179, 191–192; S. Sonnino, Carteggio 1916–1922, a cura di P. Pastorelli, Bari 1975, 243–245; AS, MID-PO, 1917, b. II, f. VII. Nikola Pašić’s note 14/1 June, 1917; Živojinović, ‘Ratni ciljevi Srbije i Italije’, 31–34; D. Janković, Jugoslovensko pitanje i Krfska deklaracija 1917. godine, Beograd 1967, 28–29. At the very beginning of 1917 Pašić told the Italian envoy that Albanians needed autonomy ‘under the leadership of other states’ and that Serbia and Italy ought to come to an agreement on the matter. Sforza gave him a vague reply and noted ‘in jest that the liberation of Serbia and the expulsion of Austrians from central and northern Albania were unfortunately much more pressing issues.’ At the
Around that time representatives of the Yugoslav Committee arrived in Corfu; they had been invited to attend the conference by Pašić, who hoped to resolve the matter of the future organization of the Yugoslav state and show the Allies that the people were in favor of its creation. Sforza tried to learn the topics that were being discussed from Pašić, but received an untrue reply. Since King Nikola of Montenegro claimed that the leaders of the Yugoslav movement were willing to abandon the ‘Serbian cause’ and come to an agreement with Italy through his own mediation and in return for financial aid, Sonnino asked Sforza to look into this claim. Sforza met with Trumbić but, having realized that unification with Serbia was his main political premise, concluded that any further elaboration of the intrigue launched by the Montenegrin king would be futile. ‘Of course, if Serbia was to be defeated or compromised, the “Yugoslavs” would distance themselves from it and espouse another project’, he believed.

Count Sforza learned of the proclamation of the Declaration of Corfu only after Pašić had already left the island. The Italian envoy ‘excitedly’ informed his deputy Ninčić that he was not opposed to the principles formulated in the Declaration, but that the Italian people would be ‘offended’ by Italy’s omission from the preamble, which had praised the Allies. Ninčić promised to try to rectify this, but Pašić telegraphed to let him know that the Declaration could not be changed without the consent of the Yugoslav Committee. When informed of this by Ninčić, Sforza expressed his regret and added that Serbia could only count on Italy in its ‘struggle for the destruction of Austria.’

same time he concluded that Pašić had tried to avoid mentioning Montenegro, because he was aware that Serbia and Italy had completely opposite views on the matter. (DDI, 5, VII, 130–131)

7 — Živojinović, ‘Ratni ciljevi Srbije i Italija’, 40–41, Stanković, Nikola Pašić, saveznici i stvaranje Jugoslavije, 195–196. Commenting on issuing a visa to one of the representatives of the Yugoslav Committee – Franko Potočnjak, allegedly from Belgrade, Sforza warned the Serbs that they were taking on a very serious responsibility to the Allies by presenting enemy nationals as their own subjects. Unconvinced by their explanation that Yugoslavs from Austria-Hungary could receive Serbian passports only after ‘months of meticulous scrutiny,’ he ironically noted that the recently executed Rade Malobabić had also been seen as a trustworthy irredentist at some point. (DDI, 5, VIII, 501–502) Two years later Potočnjak wrote that it was an old ‘Italian maneuver’ to create a ‘rift’ between the ‘Serbs on one side and Croats and Slovenes on the other.’ (F. Potočnjak, Iz emigracije, Zagreb 1919, 82)

8 — DDI, 5, VII, 55–56, 109–110, 277–278, 350, 385–386, Sonnino, Carteggio 1916–1922, 246–248, 259, C. Sforza, Les frères ennemis (L’Europe d’après-guerre), Paris 1933, 249, Živojinović, Italija i Crna Gora 1914–1925: studija o zneverenom savezništvu, Beograd 1998, 235–236, Živojinović, ‘Ratni ciljevi Srbije i Italija’, 41–44, Šepić, Sudbinske dileme rađanja Jugoslavije, II, 141–142; Stanković, Nikola Pašić, saveznici i stvaranje Jugoslavije, 196. The following year, again in a crucial moment for Italo-Yugoslav relations, King Nikola once again tried to launch an intrigue claiming that Trumbić was on the Austrian payroll, but by that time Italian diplomats had understood who they were dealing with. Having realized that he had not been convincing, the Montenegrin king tried again, this time claiming that the Croats and Serbs in Austria-Hungary wanted the creation of several independent states rather than a unified Yugoslav state, which was advocated only by Trumbić and his ‘thirty-ish’ followers, all of them sponsored by Pašić. The Italians eventually found out that the wily but no longer resourceful old man was himself trying to establish closer relations with this purported group of mercenaries and hence distanced themselves from him. (DDI, 5, X, 390, XI, 354–355, 367–368, 6, I, 65–66)

9 — AS, MID-PO, 1917, b. II, f. VII. M. Ninčić to N. Pašić, 24/11 July 1917, N. Pašić to M. Ninčić, 26/13 July 1917, M. Ninčić’s note, 27/14 July 1917, b. II, f. VIII. M. Ninčić to N. Pašić, 27/14 July 1917, DDI, 5, VII, 463–464, Živojinović, ‘Ratni ciljevi Srbije i Italija’, 44–47, Janković, Jugoslovensko pitanje i Krška deklaracija, 374–375. During a discussion of the Declaration where the atmosphere was ‘full of tension’, Trumbić claimed that there should be an ‘energetic stance’ towards Italy and that the Allies should be officially informed about
In the weeks after the Corfu Declaration, Pašić and Sonnino attended the Allied conference in Paris and then a meeting in London where the Prime Minister of Serbia received a louder ovation than the Italian Foreign Minister. In London Pašić was interviewed by the journalist and politician Giuseppe Bevione. When asked how he hoped to reconcile the Corfu Declaration with the Allied promises to Italy, he replied that the new state would include all territories with a compact Slavic population and that Italy could hardly argue that this was not the case in Dalmatia. To the even more provocative question if he was willing to accept a compromise – an alleged counteroffer supported by ‘his English friends’ and Trumbić, who wanted to cede ‘the Bay of Kotor [It. Cattaro] and some islands’ to Italy in return for the promised part of Dalmatia – he firmly replied: ‘No. Kotor is Serbian territory.’ The only compromise acceptable to Pašić was for Italy to gain control of Trieste, Pula [It. Pola] and Valona and thereby secure ‘absolute domination in the Adriatic.’ The Serbian envoy in Rome reported that almost all of the Italian press was ‘bitterly’ writing that Pašić’s statements ‘preclude[d] the possibility of an agreement between Serbia and Italy.’

Yugoslav territorial aspirations. Pašić replied that the Serbian government could not adopt an ‘intemperate attitude’ as the Italian leadership had done and could not risk a disagreement with the Allies by going ‘beyond certain limits and forms.’ (Krfska konferencija: beleške sa sednica Vlade Kraljevine Srbije i predstavnika Jugoslovenskog odbora, Beograd 1924, 152–156; B. Vošnjak, U borbi za ujedinjenu narodnu državu: utisci i opažanja, Ljubljana 1928, 260; Janković, Jugoslovensko pitanje i Krfska deklaracija, 199–200);
This was not a good sign on the eve of imminent talks between Sonnino and Pašić in Rome, which had been suggested by leading British politicians, including Prime Minister Lloyd George. Sforza sent an assessment to Sonnino, stating that the Corfu Declaration was evidence of the Serbian government's reduced strength and that its Prime Minister would prefer a practical deal and 'much more modest solutions, but Serbian ones': 'Pašić was reluctant to accept the formulations of the Corfu Declaration. For the Serbs, the bitterest disappointment at the meetings with the "Yugoslavs" in Corfu was their uncompromising refusal to accept the name of Serbia for the entire planned South Slavic state [...] and the Serbs were forced to wonder if they had been deluding themselves when [...] they believed that they would [...] quickly transform the new state into "Great Serbia"'. According to Sforza, Prince Regent Aleksandar was more enthusiastic towards the Yugoslav Committee – due to the 'illusion of a greater Crown' and the fact that his future subjects, unlike the current ones, had no 'tradition' of murdering their rulers.

On 10 September Nikola Pašić proposed an agreement about the Adriatic question to Baron Sonnino, but he replied that the Corfu Declaration had closed off almost all chances for 'fruitful' negotiations: ‘The Serbian government wanted to step into the field of absolute principles which allows no compromise’. Pašić's statements to the press were making the matter worse: ‘I can't see how all of this could be to the advantage of Serbia’s just and reasonable cause, i.e. the restoration of the Kingdom and its strengthening with the acquisition of an adequate access to the sea’. Sonnino’s condition for an agreement was acceptance of the Treaty of London, with the possibility of reconsidering some details. Pašić replied that the Corfu Declaration, which had been necessary due to Vienna’s attempts to lure Yugoslavs with promises of autonomy, was not an ‘insurmountable obstacle’ for an agreement and concessions, and that with the possession of Trieste, Pola and half of Istria, as well as a few islands and Valona Italy could secure ‘military domination in the Adriatic’. Mentioning the blood that the sons of Italy were shedding for Serbia, Sonnino discarded this proposal as inadequate and described the intention of ‘abolishing’ independent Montenegro intimated in the Corfu Declaration as a ‘serious threat’. The
two septuagenarians concluded their conversation on a calmer note after Pašić stated that he firmly believed in an eventual agreement.¹⁴

Upon his return to Corfu, Pašić discussed a potential prisoner exchange between Serbia and Austria-Hungary with Sforza, who warned him that, while he personally understood Serbian motives, other Italians would not be so quick to justify ‘an act that would give new strength to Austria’. Soon thereafter, Pašić told the Italian envoy that ‘a Croat in Switzerland’ had notified the Serbian government of the possibility of a revolt and surrender of the Croatian and Slovene troops engaged in the Italian Front, if an Italo-Serbian agreement was previously reached. Sforza received the claim with caution, believing that it was not false, but that Pašić had exaggerated it to revive talks on the Adriatic question.¹⁵

On the eve of the Battle of Caporetto, Pašić received reports that German troops were being grouped on the Italian Front, but he disbelieved them and recorded that such reports kept ‘constantly coming out of Italy when they are asked to do something in the interest of all Allies’. However, when an offensive did indeed take place and the Italian army found itself on the brink of utter disaster he became more concerned for the outcome of the war.¹⁶ Passing through Rome soon after that, Pašić did not want to broach any of the contested topics, but he did ask Sonnino to release Yugoslavs held in Italian captivity so that they could join Serbian volunteer units. He also repeated that the Croats – ‘important personages and commanders’ – had informed him that the ‘Yugoslavs would surrender en masse’ to the Italians in the case of an Italo-Serbian agreement.¹⁷

Throughout December Sonnino was repeatedly warned by his ambassadors of President Wilson’s sympathies for Yugoslav aspirations and encouraged to seek an agreement with Serbia. In late December Sforza informed him that the American envoy in Corfu was asking if any progress had been made towards an Italo-Serbian agreement. Claiming that Pašić, enthusiastic as he might be, was not politically strong enough to sign a specific compromise treaty with Italy, he suggested a more general agreement. Sonnino allowed him to work with Pašić on an agreement that would, along with the necessity of ‘sacrifices and concessions on both sides’, acknowledge the ‘mixed character

¹⁴ — DDI, 5, IX, 20–22; S. Sonnino, Diario 1916–1922, a cura di P. Pastorelli, Bari 1972, 190–192; Nikola Pašić – predsedniku vlade: Pašićeva pisma sa Konferencije mira, [ed. by] M. Milošević, B. Dimitrijević, Zaječar 2005, 28; Živojinović, ‘Ratni ciljevi Srbi i Srbija i Italija’, 47–49; Šepić, Sudbinske dileme rađanja Jugoslavije, II, 169–171; M. Bucarelli, ‘Allies or rivals? Italy and Serbia during the First World War’, The Serbs and the First World War, ed. by D. Živojinović, Belgrade 2015, 260–261; Stanković, Nikola Pašić, saveznici i stvaranje Jugoslavije, 199–201, 286. Sforza recorded that Sonnino had been pleasantly surprised by Pašić’s acceptance of the premise that in the Italo-Yugoslav case the border cannot be seen as purely demographic, but that he was not too happy with the reference to half of Istia and division of Albania. Although the conversation would have hardly borne fruit in any case, concluded Sforza, Pašić was wrong to openly challenge the Treaty of London, behind which Sonnino had dug his heels as in a ‘besieged bastion’. (C. Sforza, Fifty years of war and diplomacy in the Balkans: Pashich and the union of the Yugoslavs, New York 1940, 127–129)


¹⁶ — AS, MID-PO, 1917, b. III, f. I. N. Pašić’s notes, 16/3 and 20/7 October 1917; N. Pašić to S. Grujić, 2 November/20 October 1917. Lazar Marković wrote about Serbian solidarity with the imperiled Italian army, and his paper denied reports that the Yugoslavs in Austria-Hungary were rejoicing in Italian defeats. (L. M[arković], ‘L’Italie menacée’, La Serbie, 4 November 1917, 1; ‘Les Yougoslaves et les revers italiens’, La Serbie, 18 November 1917, 3; ‘Les revers italiens et les Slaves’, La Serbie, 25 November 1917, 2)

of the population on the eastern coast of the Adriatic: ‘If Pašić refuses this or a similar formula, his refusal would only work to our advantage in the eyes of the US government.’

At the very beginning of 1918, Lloyd George’s speech on war objectives and Wilson’s Fourteen Points were causes of concern to both Pašić and Sforza. Although the threat of Austria-Hungary’s survival – taken for granted by Lloyd George and Wilson – demanded a further Italo-Yugoslav rapprochement, Sonnino became more reserved towards an agreement with Serbia. Pašić was himself rather vague in his talks with Sforza, but to the latter it nonetheless seemed that he was willing to accept a general agreement. When Sonnino informed him that he was not against an agreement but not at the cost of renouncing Italian territorial demands, Sforza knew that there would be no Italo-Serbian agreement. Oblivious to this, Pašić thought that the participation of the US at the impending peace conference would encourage Italy to reach an agreement with Serbia, but he did acknowledge that the Treaty of London was a strong defense ‘against the nationality principle’.


20 — DDI, 5, X, 58; Sonnino, Carteggio 1916–1922, 255; Valiani, The end of Austria-Hungary, 229. Sonnino was certainly influenced by a telegram from the ambassador in Washington, who, after having complained of Serbian demands, was asked by Secretary of State Robert Lansing ‘with feigned surprise if they were limited to Bosnia and Herzegovina and access to the sea’, and then continued to explain his view of the Corfu Declaration. When he half-jokingly asked if the US would support Serbian demands, Lansing replied: ‘Certainly not to that extent.’ Over the following months the American position changed to the detriment of Italy, whose ambassador unsuccessfully tried to convince them that the Corfu Declaration was an imperialist and anti-Wilsonian document. (DDI, 5, X, 39–40, 5, XI, 531, 561)

21 — Građa o stvaranju jugoslovenske države, 70.
In Paris the Prime Minister of Italy Vittorio Orlando declared that Italy would ‘gladly extend its hand to all nations willing to contribute to the Allied cause – even those that have yet to achieve independence.’ Pašić asked his envoy in Rome to thank Orlando and personally expressed his gratitude to Sforza, who told him that only ‘general statements’ about harmony were welcome and that it was ‘too early’ for anything more. As Pašić’s mouthpiece, in his newspaper La Serbie published in Geneva, Lazar Marković wrote that Italo-Serbian talks were progressing and that a general agreement could help convince democratic Europe and the US of the necessary dissolution of Austria-Hungary: ‘How strange must now seem the anecdote [...] about the first meeting between Pašić and Sonnino in Rome in 1916, when a person from the minister’s entourage, when pressed to recount what had been said, replied in confusion: Well they didn’t say anything!’

In fact, in February 1918, this anecdote was perhaps still untrue, but it was certainly apt, to quote the Italian saying. Once again Sonnino and Pašić had little to say to each other, and hence Italo-Yugoslav negotiations were taken over by Italian unofficial representatives, the Yugoslav Committee, and unofficial Serbian representatives, with the most important among them being Lazar Marković. While Trumbić led the main talks in London, with Pašić’s consent Marković worked towards the restoration of the Serbo-Italian Committee, which was supposed to work on a rapprochement under the control of the Serbian government. After a conversation with Marković, a member of the Yugoslav Committee informed Trumbić that ‘Mr. Laza, and presumably others, were unhappy’ with the importance he had gained in his negotiations with the Italians. On the other hand, Marković was aware of suspicions within the Committee, but assured Pašić that precisely these suspicions ‘demand[ed] continuing the course of action that promised the best results’. These results were achieved by Trumbić, who made the agreement that paved the way for the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities of Austria-Hungary, convened in Rome in April. Pašić also authorized Trumbić to make an agreement, advised him to be patient and avoid ‘clashes about issues of second-rate importance’, and wrote to him to not ‘delude himself that everything could be easily settled’. At the same time, he assured Sforza that Trumbić would be more restrained and would realize that the Italo-Yugoslav border ‘could not be merely demographic, but also geographic and strategic.’

22 — ‘Déclarations de M. Orlando’, Le Temps, 1 February 1918, 4; AS, MID-PO, 1918, b. IV, f. VI. D. Stevanović to N. Pašić, 1 February/19 January 1918; N. Pašić to V. Antonijević, 3 February/21 January 1918; DDI, 5, X, 180. Pašić and Orlando continued to exchange polite messages congratulating important anniversaries or military victories. On the third anniversary of Italy’s entry into the war, Pašić expressed hope that the fourth war year would bring ‘the fulfillment of legitimate national aspirations and desires’ to the Italian people, and the President of Italy returned the sentiment using similar wording. On the fourth Serbian anniversary, Orlando telegraphed stating that Italy – who was also fighting for ‘national unity’ – believed that Serbia would ‘rise from its bloody ruins even more glorious and greater for its own sake and for that of its brethren of the Yugoslav race, who are now disunited and oppressed’. (AS, MID-PO, 1918, b. IV, f. VII. N. Pašić to V. Orlando, 23/10 May 1918; b. IV, f. VI. V. Orlando to N. Pašić, 25/12 May 1918; 1 August/19 July 1918; Srpske novine, 24. July [6 August] 1918, 1)


After the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities in Rome, which he personally attended, Marković wrote that the oppressed nationalities had indignantly rejected autonomy within Austria-Hungary, but that all of this was merely ‘happy improvisation’ and grounds for reaching an agreement between ‘competent governments’. For his part, Sforza recorded that Pašić welcomed the success of the Congress and was glad to hear that Trumbić’s ‘legalistic prolixities’ had vexed the Italian participants.  

However, at this time Pašić was struggling with more pressing problems, as the opposition was trying to remove him from power. The Italian envoy had little affection for opposition politicians and believed that Pašić’s retirement would be a ‘leap into the unknown’ for the Allies – even more so because his political adversaries included the Yugoslav Committee and the London envoy Jovan Jovanović, the opposition candidate for the position of Minister of Foreign Affairs. Although he thought that Pašić was losing some of his resoluteness and self-confidence, Sforza did not exaggerate the importance of the Yugoslav Committee and claimed that ‘real Serbs’ – first and foremost Prince Regent Aleksandar – saw ‘Yugoslavs’ as the stepchildren of ‘Greater Serbia’, i.e. ‘the Kingdom of Serbia expanded by military conquest of as many South Slavic lands as possible’. Whatever his personal opinions might have been, in a declaration to the National Assembly Pašić publicly endorsed a ‘free and unified Yugoslavia’, which could put a stop to the ‘Germanic invasion’ ‘in close friendship with Italy’.  

Over the following three months, Pašić and Sforza did not discuss a political agreement, but the Italian and Serbian government continued their rather futile talks about the formation of volunteer units composed of Yugoslavs imprisoned in Italy.  


25 — L. M[arković], ‘Le Congrès des nationalités opprimées’, La Serbie, 20 April 1918, 1; ‘The Congress of the oppressed nationalities’, Serbia and Europe, 1914–1920, ed. by L. Marcovitch, London [1920], 277–279; Sforza, Fifty years, 159. On the eve of the Congress in Rome, Sforza complained to Pašić about the writings in the emigrant press affiliated with the Yugoslav Committee, and was himself unsure if Trumbić was merely being arrogant or purposely trying to sow the seed of discord. The following month, after Trumbić told him about the advantages of the Treaty of London and the Yugoslav willingness to suffer sacrifice in order to create an independent state, it seemed to him that the chairman of the Yugoslav Committee had ‘matured’. Not hiding his resentment of Pašić, Trumbić attempted to placate other Italian diplomats, although they were distrustful of him and saw his nature as ‘more Levantine than Dalmatian’ and him as their ‘tiriest, most insidious and darkest enemy’. (DDI, 5, X, 265, 293, 298, 304–307, 565. Italian diplomats probably remembered Jovanović’s statements in 1915, when he said that Italy – with which no solidarity was possible – had taken the place of Austria-Hungary as Serbia’s ‘true enemy’. On the other hand, the wary Pašić had never said anything of the sort to the Italians and was held in high regard. The Italian ambassador in Paris and former Minister of Foreign Affairs Tommaso Tittoni wrote to Sonnino that Pašić was the ‘wisest and most moderate’ man in Serbia. (DDI, III, 437, 482, IV, 375, 382; Šepić, Sudbinske dileme rađanja Jugoslavije, I, 186–187, 295.  


28 — B. Hrabak, Jugosloveni zarobljenici u Italiji, 107–120.
Ante Trumbić and the Italian politician Andrea Torre after the signing of the treaty in London.
Prince regent Alexander Karađorđević
Serbian Prime Minister did hint to Sforza that he would be happy to exchange some 'ideas about Albania' with the Italian's superior. However, since the statement to the press underlined that there were no differences between the views of the two statesmen, the members of the Yugoslav Committee and their British patrons wrongly suspected that an agreement had been reached.29 When in September the Italian government issued a statement supporting Yugoslav independence, Pašić wrote that some Yugoslavs were ‘falling for it’ and failing to understand that Italy was not renouncing the Treaty of London.30

In the last months of the war, one of Pašić’s main concerns was the intention of the Yugoslav Committee to become an internationally recognized factor equal to the Serbian government. He justified his objection to this plan by claiming that the ‘Italians were eagerly waiting for a split to appear’ to muddy the waters and ask for the establishment of independent Croatia. Developments in the battlefields were crucial for the resolution of the Italo-Yugoslav dispute and therefore both Sonnino and Pašić stalled and waited. In October Sforza reported that Serbian official circles, although after the breakdown of the Salonic Front they initially hoped for an Italian offensive that would facilitate the liberation of Serbia, were happy about the passive role of the Italian army. When it did eventually spring to action, he noted an air of excitement after the news about the occupation of Yugoslav lands. As regards the dispute over the Austro-Hungarian fleet, which the Yugoslavs tried to appropriate, he reminded the Serbs of Pašić’s earlier statements that the new state had no intention of creating a war fleet in the near future.31

While the fateful events leading up to the Yugoslav unification unfolded in November and December 1918, the Serbian Cavour became increasingly inconsiderate towards the Italians and even began to speak of a war against them. Italian diplomats reported that Pašić endorsed ‘the Slovenes’ exaggerated territorial pretensions’ to secure their support for the ‘organization of greater Serbia’ and that he had allowed the press to launch attacks against Italy in order to strengthen his ‘destabilized personal position’ and find a ‘cohesive element’ for the new state in the potential conflict.32

At the first session of the Geneva Conference on 6 November, according to Trumbić’s notes, Nikola Pašić warned that Italy had plotted against the Yugoslav Committee and then ‘emphasized great Serbia’: ‘This calls for unity on our part […]. We have America on our side […] and the idea of freedom’. On

29 — Sonnino, Diario 1916–1922, 289; DDI, 5, XI, 34–35; Sonnino, Carteggio 1916–1922, 420–421; Građa o stvaranju jugoslovenske države, 265; Jovanović, Dnevnik, 509, 524; A. Mančić, Fragmenti za historiju uiještenja, Zagreb 1956, 71–72; Šepić, Sudbinske dileme rada ranja Jugoslovije, III, 49, 52; Stanković, Nikola Pašić, saveznic i stvaranje Jugoslovije, 227. Even Balfour, the British Foreign Secretary, believed that there was a covert agreement between Pašić and Sonnino, and this piece of information was forwarded to Quai d’Orsay. However, the well-informed French ambassador in Rome Barrière firmly denied this assumption. (Ibid, 298, 292)


31 — Građa o stvaranju jugoslovenske države, 502, 609; Jovanović, Dnevnik, 554; DDI, 6, I, 31–33, 111, 296–297, 365.
The Austro-Hungarian ship Viribus Unitis, given to the State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs and sunk by the Italians just a day later.
the other hand, he claimed, there were the limitations imposed on France and Great Britain by the Treaty of London – which would have been ‘annihilated’ if Kerensky had remained in power instead of Lenin, whose ascent had ‘ruined everything’. Although he formulated his speech to accommodate the sensitive political situation, his assessments were essentially not incorrect. The fact that the Italians had noticed a rift between the Yugoslav Committee and the Serbian ruling circles and emphasized their aspirations to Greater Serbia was due to their attempts at intrigue and ascribing their own desires at least as much as it was rooted in reality. In its dispute with Italy, democratic notions of national self-determination were really on the Yugoslav side, and at the time such notions had a strong champion in the USA and President Wilson. The emerging state would have had an even firmer pillar of support in democratic Russia, but Russia – democratic or otherwise – was no longer an actor on the European diplomatic scene, from which Wilsonian America would also soon disappear. The leading role would be taken over by three victorious European powers. Out of these three, Italy was the least entitled to feel victorious, but the infamous motto of ‘sacred egoism’ (sacro egoismo) that had been used by its statesmen to lead it into the war once again became its guiding principle in international relations. In these circumstances, the Adriatic question could not be resolved to the advantage of the Yugoslav state or become its cohesive element.
ASSOCIATION OF CROATIAN ARTISTS ‘MEDULIĆ’ – VISIONARIES OF THEIR TIME

THE DAY WORTH A CENTURY 1 – XII – 1918
Shortly after the promulgation of the Act on Unification and Proclamation of the Unified Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes of 1 December 1918, the newly elected chairman of the Art Society in Zagreb, Dušan Plavšić, sent a written notification to prominent Croatian artists Ivan Meštrović and Mirko Rački appointing them honorary members of the Art Society ‘in recognition of [...] their immeasurable contributions to the development and success of Yugoslav thought and art through their artistic and political efforts’. Plavšić extended his invitation for cooperation and joint ‘work towards the prosperity of Yugoslav culture’ and ‘young Yugoslav art’ to all Slovene and Serbian artists as well, sending a telegram to the Slovene painter Rihard Jakopič and the former Serbian minister of the interior Ljubomir Jovanović, who had actively participated in the proclamation of unification as a representative of the government of the Kingdom of Serbia.

The dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the establishment of the Yugoslav state following the end of the Great War brought to fruition the aspirations and efforts of the members of the Association of Croatian Artists ‘Medulić’, who had espoused the idea of South Slavic cultural and political unity even before the war. The idea of national Yugoslav art, which had been rejected and criticized by most official institutions and artistic associations

1 — *This text is based on the author’s doctoral dissertation (2014) and book Medulić, the Association of Croatian Artists (1908-1919): Art and Politics, published in November 2016, as well as a series of academic articles and papers that have been published in journals from the same field.
Dušan Plavšić’s telegram to Ivan Meštrović and Mirko Rački, Zagreb, December 1918, Croatian State Archives, Zagreb, Fund 1979 – HDLU 1.3. Cooperation with members and associations (henceforth: HR-HDA-1979-HDLU), 1.3.3.147.

2 — Dušan Plavšić’s telegram to R. Jakopič, Dušan Plavšić’s telegram to Lj. Jovanović, December 1918, HR-HDA-1979-HDLU 121. Main assembly 1883–1938. – Irregular main assembly 15 December 1918. The telegram addressed to Ljuba Jovanović read: ‘Dear Sir, the newly elected board of the Croatian Art Society asks you to convey our brotherly regards to all our artists of the Serbian name in the sincere hope that we will be united in our efforts towards the prosperity of young Yugoslav art.’
in Croatia, became fully legitimized. ‘Prophetic forerunners’, as Vinko Kisić\(^3\) described the prominent artists of the ‘Medulić’ Association including Ivan Meštrović, Emanuel Vidović, Mirko Rački, Tomislav Krizman, Rihard Jakopič, Matija Jama and the late Ivan Grohar and Nadežda Petrović, were appointed to high-ranking positions in the new state and received well-earned praises for their work.

During the turbulent period of the first two decades of the 20\(^{th}\) century, while Croatia and Slovenia were still parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, members of the ‘Medulić’ Association had a leading role in the promotion of the Yugoslav idea and national expression in art. In addition to their social and political activities and their mobilizing platform for popularizing the same objectives, they gained prominence through their artistic work, as well as their remarkable contribution to the progressive development of art. Particularly deserving members include the Croatian sculptor Meštrović and painter Vidović; the Slovene artist Jakopič; and the Serbian painter Petrović, all of whom gave important contributions to the improvement of artistic life by founding art societies and national art institutions and organizing key exhibitions for the development of modern art, both in their native milieus and the wider region.

**ART ASSOCIATIONS AND THE ORGANIZATION OF ARTISTIC LIFE IN THE EARLY 20\(^{th}\) CENTURY.**

The Yugoslav Art Colony

Due to the inextricable links between their artistic and political views, the ties and stronger bonds between the younger generation of Croatian, Slovene and Serbian artists and their joint efforts to promote Yugoslav culture and art began in the first years of the 20\(^{th}\) century, while they were receiving education abroad (Vienna, Munich) and participating in exhibitions of the Vienna Secession movement\(^4\), while their first formal association became the Yugoslav Art Colony. It was established in 1904, almost concurrently with the Alliance of Yugoslav Artists ‘Lada’, during the First Yugoslav Art Exhibition in Belgrade\(^5\), which already brought the first signs of disagreement between the older and younger generation of artists.\(^6\) Along with Nadežda Petrović,

---

3 — ‘They are the prophetic forerunners of the political movement that has led us to liberation and unification after so few years.’ Vinko Kisić (V. K.), Emanuel Vidović, foreword to: *Izložba Vidovića* (Split: Velika realka, 1919), 7–16, 15.


5 — The first exhibition that included various Yugoslav artists was organized to mark the centenary of the First Serbian Uprising and the crowning of King Peter I. For more details see: Dragutin Tošić, *Jugoslovenske umetničke izložbe 1904–1927* (Beograd: Filozofski fakultet, Institut za istoriju umetnosti, 1983), 38–60.

6 — The program of the ‘Lada’ society with its four national divisions (Croatian, Slovene, Serbian and Bulgarian) and the Yugoslav Art Colony underlined the concept of unity among South Slavs and building closer ties between them in the field of art through joint Yugoslav exhibitions. The members of the Colony and many young artists from
who was the most committed to the work of the Colony, its founders were Paško Vučetić, Ferdo Vesel, Ivan Grohar, Rihard Jakopič, Ivan Meštrović and Emanuel Vidović. With the exception of Vesel, who was reluctant to renounce the Lada society, all of them participated at the Exhibition of the Yugoslav Art Colony held at the National Museum in Belgrade in early 1907 and shortly thereafter all became members of the ‘Medulić’ Association. The artists in the Colony shared their efforts towards the improvement of the quality of artistic production, affirmation of modernism and promotion of national art at home and abroad. Their aim was to present their works as Yugoslav, with no ethnic distinctions, and to create a new, contemporary, Yugoslav art that would be based in Belgrade. Along with the founding of the Yugoslav Art Gallery and Academy of Fine Arts, the Colony’s main objective was collective painting of the Serbian countryside and documenting authentic local landscapes, people, customs and national costumes. However, despite Nadežda’s best efforts, this objective never came to fruition.

Although the Yugoslav Art Colony played a historic role in the final break with tradition, affirmation of the modern and the development of the concept of Yugoslav national art, the Colony failed to become a true mobilizing force for the shared aspirations of Yugoslav artists. Except the exhibition in Belgrade, most of its aims remained unfulfilled despite its almost decade-long existence, until the beginning of World War One. Despite Nadežda’s efforts to gather the members in Belgrade, the lack of genuine support of Belgrade authorities as well as the lack of understanding and acceptance of her own art by the general public and art critics did not have the same cohesive and mobilizing power as Meštrović, who was ten years her junior, and the society he founded in 1908 in Split. Meštrović and Dalmatian artists took over the leading role in the organization of artistic life in the region, expanding the membership of the Colony and fulfilling the objectives she had set, with the exception of group painting sessions...
in nature and documenting the life of Yugoslav nations. Although the idea of the Yugoslav Art Colony emerged in the European cultural context, by discovering and valorizing the fundamental points of collecting memory Meštrović managed to revive it using the rhetoric of form-symbol and transform it into an artistic-political program focused on the individual as the protagonist of the concept of unity.

Association of Croatian Artists ‘Medulić’ (1908–1919)

The Association of Croatian Artists ‘Medulić’ was founded in early December 1908 at the First Dalmatian Art Exhibition in Split as a regional association of artists from Dalmatia which, in view of the ethnicity of its exhibitors and the importance of its activities, grew to become a truly Yugoslav organization. All 28 exhibitors became members, while the founders of the Association included Meštrović and Vidović, Rački, Krizman and Bukovac, M. C. Medović, Kamilo Tončić and Ivo Tartaglia. Vlaho Bukovac, whose status as a prominent figure in Croatian art lent legitimacy and weight to the newly founded Association, was appointed its honorary president. Along with Meštrović, Vidović also had an important organizational role and was the most deserving for naming the Association in honor of the renowned Croatian painter Andrija Medulić Schiavore. Unlike the Colony, the members of the Association did not include only visual artists but also prominent authors, mostly Dalmatian (L. Vojnović, M. Begović, A. Tresić Pavičić), politicians (N. Nardelli, J. Biankini, A. Trumbić, J. Smoljaka, P. Grisogono) and art critics (M. Marjanović, A. Milčinović, D. Mitrinović, I. Tartaglia, K. Strajnić, J. Miše), and the Association had its own statute ratified by the Dalmatian government in early 1910. In view of the historical circumstances in Dalmatia and Croatia under the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the membership

9 — Unlike Meštrović, who was enthusiastic, and Vidović, who refused to join Nadežda’s art colony near Sićevo in the summer of 1905, along with her, Jakopić, Grohar and Vesel were the most disappointed by the fact that it did not take place (Ambrozić, „Prva jugoslovenska umetnička kolonija”, 264). In the years of establishing the Colony as well as later, Nadežda’s activities corresponded with the Colony’s ideas and program: in Resnik, Sićevo and other locations in Serbia, she painted national landscapes and places of importance in national memory, portraits of ordinary people, the everyday life of the peasantry and people in national costumes, thereby contributing to the national expression in art (For more details see: Lidija Merenik, Nadežda Petrović: projekt i sudbina (Beograd: TOPY, 2006), 40–42; 48–52; 53–58; Simona Ćupić, „Idea nacionalnog u delu Nadežde Petrović i njenih savremenika”; Milanka Todorić, „Voz, novooslabodi krajevi i umetnički projekt Nadežde Petrović”, in: Naučni skup posvećen Nadeždi Petrović (1873–1915). Zbornik radova, ed. Jasna Jovanov (Novi Sad: Spomen-zbirka Pavla Beljanskog, 2016), 45–55; 86–98. A similar poetics, but without a strong ideological angle, was nurtured by Slovene painters who created their own version of impressionism permeated by the idea of national identity, symbolism and intimism. Their depictions of rural life and landscapes of Slovene provinces remained in the domain of intimate symbolic subjects shown with a degree of melancholy and in time acquired an air of national patriotism, although the painters had not intended this.

10 — In addition to cooperation with regional progressive art associations, the ‘Sava’ Club, the Yugoslav Art Colony and the Serbian Art Association, whose members fluctuated and were at the same time members of the ‘Medulić’ Association, owing to Meštrović and Bukovac it established international contacts with similar societies in Central Europe (the Czech Mánes Association of Fine Artists; the Association of Moravian Artists headed by Joža Uprka). For more details see: Bulimbašić, Društvo hrvatskih umjetnika ‘Medulić’ (1908–1919), 355–357.
Hrvatsko umjetničko društvo • Medulić

P. N. - Monogram - Franc Puleči - Split

Kako se razabire iz priloženih statuta, društvu je „Medulića“ zadaća, da na umjetničkom polju sudjeluje kulturnom podizanju naše domovine.

U svom radu pokretački odbor računa na sve one prosvjetljenije elemente, koji teže za napretkom, te reflektira na njihovu potporu.

Ovim uvjerenjem šalju Vam se statuti s preporukom i molbom, da se izvolite upisati medju društvene članove i time unapredite i učvrstite djelovanje ove narodne institucije.

SPLIT, 15. Februara 1910.

ZA POKRETAČKI ODBOR:

Ulano Bukovac - Tomislav Kizman - Celestin Medulić
Ivan Meštrović - Mirko Rački - Ivan Rendić - dr. Ivo Tartaglia
Ivan Tiso - ing. Kamil Tončić - Emanuel Udovič
and activities of the Association were not bereft of political connotations and its members mostly included the Progressives or their supporters who advocated the political course of Serbophile Yugoslavism. The Association’s activities and particularly its ambitious exhibition plans were facilitated by membership fees and donations of prominent and renowned members, especially Dalmatian politicians. Reflecting political shifts, the Association changed its name on two occasions: to the Association of Serbo-Croat Artists ‘Medulić’ (1912) and to the Association of Yugoslav Artists ‘Medulić’ (1919).  

In the protection of class interests, affirmation of artistic freedom and modern visual formulations, as well as the development of artistic life through high artistic standards and the affirmation of national art at home and abroad, and the formation of national art institutions (School of Crafts, Ethnographic Museum, Art Gallery in Split), the Association ‘Medulić’, with its unquestionable appeal lent by Meštrović’s involvement, achieved an important advance compared to similar associations that had been active earlier or at the same time.

The national program and mobilizing role of the ‘Medulić’ Association in the development of Yugoslav cultural and political cooperation

The largest contribution of the ‘Medulić’ Association to the promotion and presentation of national art at home and abroad came in the form of its exhibitions. The eight realized exhibitions of the Association introduced new standards of exhibition practice. The lively exhibition activity of the ‘Medulić’ Association is attested by the fact that between 1912 and 1915 the Association planned several exhibitions that never came to fruition despite advanced preparations in some cases. The mobilizing ‘national’ program of the Association is discussed here primarily through the creative and political activities of Ivan Meštrović. In the period leading up to the Great War, his engaged political activities, work on the Vidovdan Fragments and the Cycle of Prince Marko (Kraljević Marko) and the idea to build the Vidovdan Temple as a symbol of national...
liberation had a mobilizing effect on an entire generation of artists and art critics in Croatia and in the territory of former Yugoslavia. A selection of artworks exhibited by Meštrović at the Association’s exhibitions allows us to trace his growing use of art in the service of the political idea of the unification of South Slavic peoples and the formulation of a national expression in art, as well as the acknowledgement of this idea in art criticism – it was in the texts penned by Meštrović’s most fervent supporters, Milan Marjanović and Dimitrije Mitrović, that the terms ‘national expression’ and ‘national’ art were coined. By offering monumental works of supra-individual expression, the importance of Ivan Meštrović and his art achieved wide artistic and conceptual recognition.

The First Dalmatian Art Exhibition

At the First Dalmatian Art Exhibition in Split (30 September – 15 December 1098) the idea of national art had yet to emerge, although some art critics saw ‘national feelings’ in Meštrović’s works. It was primarily a regional exhibition by Dalmatian artists, both anti-Italian and anti-autonomist, which sought to present new artworks created abroad. The exhibition also marked the affirmation of new art trends and was a major cultural event for Split and Dalmatia. However, in several places throughout the unsigned preface to the catalog, as one of the aims of the exhibition Ivo Tartaglia underlined ‘joining the artistic forces of not only Dalmatia, but the Croatian and Serbian people in general’, clearly indicating the political orientation and future actions of Medulić members. During the exhibition Meštrović was in Paris, and after the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, he began working on the sculptures of the Vidovdan Cycle, completing them by 1912. He sent a few sculptures from this new cycle to be displayed at the exhibition in Split, where he showcased a total of fifteen works.

The Exhibition of the Association of Croatian Artists ‘Medulić’ in Ljubljana

The exhibition entitled the Second Art Exhibition at the Pavilion of R. Jakopič. Croatian Art Association ‘Medulić’ [II. Umetniška razstava v Paviljonu R. Jakopiča, Hrv. um. Društvo „Medulič“] (3 November 1909 – 15 January 1910) was held at the Jakopič pavilion at the invitation and encouragement of Jakopič.

17 — Prva dalmatinska umjetnička izložba, exhibition catalog, (Split: Splitska društvena tiskara, 1908), 7.
himself. It was organized similarly to the one in Split: there was obvious formulation of national art and no consistency in the exhibition concept, and the content and quality of displayed artworks was varied and inconsistent. In its historical context, it meant the confirmation of Yugoslav unification and affirmation of modernism. Preoccupied with his exhibition at the Salon d’Automne in Paris, Meštrović was too busy to commit to the organization of the exhibition in Ljubljana, and so it was completely taken over by Vidović, who was solely responsible for the selection of displayed artworks. Meštrović exhibited eleven sculptures in Ljubljana, including four Vidovdan Fragments: Sjećanje [Memories], Studija za karijatidu [Study for a Caryatid], Slijepi guslar [The Blind Bard] and Banović Stražinja, with the last replacing Miloš Obilić which appears in the catalog.

Exhibition Meštrović–Rački

The Exhibition Meštrović–Rački (30 April – 30 June 1910) at the Art Pavilion in Zagreb marked the beginning of Meštrović’s increasingly intense political activity and an important starting point in the context of the development of the idea of national art in the program of the ‘Medulić’ Association. This was the first display of a larger number of Vidovdan Fragments in his homeland and was supported by the scenic exhibit in six exhibition rooms; it also enjoyed the support of pro-Yugoslav art critics who recognized the symbolism and political meaning of Meštrović’s sculptures. Another noteworthy feature was Ivo Vojnović’s introduction in the exhibition catalog, which glorified Vidovdan and its protagonists in a romantic gesture of heroism. The critics and the public recognized the Vidovdan Temple as an important rallying cry in the development and encouragement of the idea of South Slavic liberation and unification.

Exhibition In Spite of Non-heroic Times

The exhibition In Spite of Non-heroic Times (Nejunačkom vremenu u prkos, 31 October 1910 – 1 January 1911) at the Art Pavilion in Zagreb was the Association’s central and programmatic exhibition with a marked political and
national character, as suggested in its very title, Ivo Vojnović’s motto. It was this exhibition that rendered the most faithful presentation of the Association’s conceptual and artistic aims: South Slavic unity and national art thematically rooted in heroic folk poetry. Unlike its predecessors, with its 40 exhibitors of different ethnicities, this exhibition was truly South Slavic in nature: along with Croatian, Serbian, Slovene and Bulgarian artists, its contributors included the Czech Joža Uprka. The cycle of Prince Marko, as the thematic lynchpin of the exhibition conceived by Meštrović, was used to symbolize the suffering of the people and the situation in the country, as well as efforts to create Serbo-Croatian and South Slavic unity. Besides Meštrović, contributors to the cycle included the sculptor Rosandić and painters Rački, Krizman and Ljubo Babić. The central spot at the exhibition was given to Meštrović’s equestrian statue of an angry Prince Marko, around five meters tall and placed under the dome in the central part of the pavilion. And while the painted part of the cycle, displayed in a different hall, quite literally illustrated Marko’s life as described in national poetry, the sculptural part of the cycle was free from illustration elements and raised to the symbolical level as an embodiment of a universal idea: suffering, struggle, sacrifice and strength of the people that will lead them to victory and liberation. With its clearly formulated political idea, this exhibition was a reflection of professional and political freedom and the risks consciously undertaken by Meštrović and his close circle of associates.

**International Exhibition in Rome**

At the International Exhibition in Rome (27 March – 7 December 1911), having refused to display their works at the Austrian and Hungarian pavilion without a separate national section, Meštrović and Medulić members showcased their artworks at the pavilion of the Kingdom of Serbia together with Serbian, Montenegrin and Bosnian artists, demonstrating their opposition to the Austro-Hungarian state apparatus and underlining South Slavic cultural unity and the impending political unification. In Croatia, preparations for the exhibition were marked by political scandals. The exhibition at the pavilion of the Kingdom of Serbia, which was built largely because of Meštrović’s decision to display his works together with Serbian artists, was organized so as to prioritize Meštrović’s sculptures, which were very well-received at the exhibition and earned him the first prize for sculpture. The political context of the activities of Medulić members reached its peak in Rome and their art expressed political

---

23 — For more on this exhibition see: Bulimbašić, *Društvo hrvatskih umjetnika „Medulić”* (1908–1919), 185–225.
24 — Slovene members of the Medulić Association did not exhibit their works in Rome. Unlike Meštrović and Nadežda Petrović, who were the most committed to social and political activities, despite their aspirations for liberation from Austrian domination Slovene artists were always politically unpredictable in their affirmation of Yugoslav political unity and, fearing potential repercussions, tended to avoid organizing similar exhibitions or taking part in them.
Vidovdan Fragments and the Cycle of Prince Marko made up more than a half of Meštrović’s exhibits, with 40 out of 68 displayed artworks. Aside from these two thematically distinct cycles, other notable works include two classical portrait busts of Serbian ministers Nikola Pašić and Milovan Milovanović, who had been most vocal in promoting Meštrović to the Serbian government. The inclusion of these busts at the exhibition was clearly Meštrović’s way of expressing his gratitude to the depicted individuals and the Serbian government for the opportunity to display his works in Rome and the privileges accorded to him. After the success of Rome, the moral and material support of the Serbian cultural and political public became increasingly important to him and it was in this direction that his future activities at the ‘Medulić’ Association would be aimed.

The Fourth Yugoslav Art Exhibition

The Fourth Yugoslav Art Exhibition in Belgrade (27 May – 26 July 1912) was the first joint exhibition of the members of the Colony and the ‘Medulić’ Association with the ‘Lada’ Society and came to fruition only after Meštrović personally received an invitation to display his works. At the same time, it marked the end of the domination of ‘Lada’ in the organization of Yugoslav exhibitions. Due to their frequent debacles, ‘Lada’ was forced to abandon its established organizational rules for Yugoslav exhibitions and allow other artistic associations and non-affiliated artists to display their works. As the most influential among them, the ‘Medulić’ Association became an equal partner in the organization and refereeing of the exhibition, and was invited to raise its reputation and quality. In the compromise talks he had with ‘Lada’, in a bid to secure the needed conditions for exhibiting and expand the influence of ‘Medulić’ in Belgrade and Serbia, Meštrović changed the name of his society to the Association of Serbo-Croat Artists ‘Medulić’, with Belgrade becoming another seat of the Association along with Split.

---

27 — For more on the exhibition see: Bulimbašić, Društvo hrvatskih umjetnika „Medulić“ (1908–1919), 227–259. Unlike other Medulić exhibitions, the one in Rome was the most widely discussed in the contemporary Croatian and Serbian press and later in academic literature. For a bibliography see: Bulimbašić, Društvo hrvatskih umjetnika „Medulić“ (1908–1919), 229 (note 565).

28 — These busts were made in 1911, shortly before the exhibition in Rome and during Meštrović’s stay in Belgrade and ongoing discussions about exhibiting his works in the Serbian pavilion. For Meštrović’s reminiscences about Pašić and Milovanović during his work on their busts, see: Ivan Meštrović, Uspomene na političke ljude i događaje (Zagreb: Nakladi zavod Matice hrvatske, 1993), 22–23, 25. The first edition was published in 1969.


30 — Pravilnik za Četvrto jugoslovensku umetničku izložbu, Map J 1844 10s, no. 16, Jakopić’s legacy, Mestni muzej Ljubljana.


The appearance of ‘Medulić’ in Belgrade was not rooted in a national program as it had been at the exhibitions on Zagreb and Rome. Although the Association was represented with the largest number of artists (46) and works (296), Meštrović displayed only eight of his works. His selection was partly personal and intimate (The Hand mixing clay; portraits of his father, mother and sister which are associated with the symbolism of home/homeland) and partly meant to underline the importance of the role of Serbia in the future Serbo-Croat and South Slavic community (portraits of Pašić and Milovanović; medallions with the image of Dositej Obradović for a monument he planned to erect on Vidovdan 1912 in Dalmatian Kosovo). The only displayed Vidovdan fragment was Sjećanje [Memories] bought from the Serbian government in early 1912. This exhibition concept was clearly conceived and adapted to Meštrović’s abovementioned wish to expand the influence of the ‘Medulić’ Association and consolidate his own influence in Serbia and for work on a shared Yugoslav culture to begin in free Belgrade. To this end, Croatian, Serbian and Slovene artists established the Committee for the Organization of Art Affairs of Serbia and Yugoslavia in Belgrade in 1913.33 The notion of an integral Yugoslav community was the fundamental idea behind the exhibition.34 Yugoslavism and Yugoslav cultural unity achieved at this exhibition truly did represent another step forward on the road to political unification and a view of the future of the nations in the region that would come to fruition a few years later, after the Great War.

The First World War interrupted the activities of the ‘Medulić’ Association and the cooperation of Yugoslav artists. While abroad, Meštrović participated in the establishment and work of the Yugoslav Committee. Having deeply felt the sufferings and violence of war, ever since the Balkan Wars he drew on Christian motifs in his expressionist reliefs, but the Vidovdan Fragments, in line with his propaganda aims, were still the central artworks at his exhibitions. However, from the Great War onwards, the national art program of the ‘Medulić’ Association – the esthetic of Secessionist stylization and heroic monumentalism thematically rooted in heroic national poetry – lost its common ideational denominator in Croatian art. Starting from 1916 new stylistic trends emerged at the exhibitions of the newly formed Spring Salon, which was founded owing to the efforts of some Medulić members who continued to exhibit their works at the Salon’s exhibitions. After the war, in the new state, the national style began to seek different, more modern approaches and artistic outlooks.35

33 — Ivan Meštrović was a prominent member of the honorary presidency, while Medulić members V. Becić, R. Jakopić, T. Križman, M. Rački, T. Rosandić, M. Murat, N. Petrović and K. Strajnić were appointed to its working bodies. One of the objectives proclaimed in the program was the construction of Meštrović’s Vidovdan Temple. On the Committee see: Dejan Medaković, „Principi i program ‘Odbora za organizaciju umetničkih poslova Srbije i jugoslovenstva’ iz 1913. godine“, Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta 1/1 (1970): 671–682.
34 — The exhibition catalog was dedicated to the ‘Cultural community of South Slavs’.
The Exhibition of Yugoslav Artists from Dalmatia

The Exhibition of Yugoslav Artists from Dalmatia (27 March – 15 May 1919) was the last joint exhibition of the members of the ‘Medulić’ Association, which formally stopped being active that year. It was organized in the new state, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, under its new name – the Association of Yugoslav Artists ‘Medulić’. It was notably political and national in character. On the eve of the Paris Peace Conference, which was to decide if Dalmatia would become part of Italy or Yugoslavia, it was meant to prevent the Italian occupation of Dalmatia and familiarize the world and the Allies with its rich cultural and artistic tradition. The exhibition was conceived by Ivan Meštrović, who was appointed the chairman of the ‘Medulić’ Association around that time. As he was preoccupied with organizing the politically even more relevant Exhibition of Yugoslav Artists in Paris, the organization of the exhibition in Split was taken over by Ivo Tartaglia, the Association’s secretary and the mayor of Split. Although the exhibition introduced the younger generation of artists that had matured under the patronage of older ‘Medulić’ members (Vinko Foretić, Jerolim Miše, Marino Tartaglia…) and suggested new stylistic trends: indications of futurism, expressionism and metaphysical painting; in line with its national and political aim, like at the Paris exhibition, priority was given to the Vidovdan Fragments and the Cycle of Prince Marko, embodying the idea of national Yugoslav art.

The aims of the exhibition, which was organized in haste and without extensive preparations, are explained in Tartaglia’s preface to the catalog published in Croatian and French, as well as his opening speech. In the preface Tartaglia writes about the rich artistic tradition of Dalmatia and its place in national Yugoslav art, while his speech openly underlines the national as well as artistic aim of the exhibition, stating that the idea of a Yugoslav community, promoted by the circle of artists around Meštrović at their exhibitions, has finally come to fruition. For Tartaglia, if the national aim of the Split exhibition came to be realized and Dalmatia became a part of Yugoslavia, ‘the Medulić Association would have fulfilled its national duty and paid its dues to its founder Ivan Meštrović, who embodied the artistic aims as well as the tendencies, strength and will of the entire Yugoslav nation, which still believes in the “Ghost of Marko’s fury”’.

---

36 — In the summer of the same year, the Association organized a solo exhibition for Emanuel Vidović, which was in fact the last trace of the Association’s activities.
37 — Tartaglia served as the mayor of Split from 1918 to 1928. The city experienced a period of intense urban and educational growth; along with the introduction of electrification, a railway route to Zagreb was constructed, making it the largest port in the newly formed Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes/Yugoslavia.
38 — For more on the exhibition see: Bulimbašić, Društvo hrvatskih umjetnika „Medulić” (1908–1919), 287–313.
39 — ‘This is a noble cause! Today, when a part of Europe denies Dalmatia’s Yugoslavism and when our people on these Adriatic shores are being accused of having no culture, spiritual capacity or any lofty endeavor, while hosting representatives of the most cultured nations in the world in our city, it was our intention to offer at least a little evidence of what we have and what our people can do in the fields of culture and art. We wanted to show that our people have a well-developed appreciation of beauty and the beauty of the people’s soul.’ Ivo Tartaglia, preface in: Jugoslav. Društvo “Medulić”. Split 1919. Izložba jugoslovenskih umjetnika iz Dalmacije (Split: Velika realka, 1919), 7–10, 9.
Members of the ‘Medulić’ Association in the New State

Having seen its political objectives come to fruition with the formation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes as the joint state, the members of the Association of Croatian Artists ‘Medulić’, which ended its activities in 1919, could apply themselves to the primary tasks of their profession: creative production.

Meštrović’s reputation continued to grow. Owing to his works of classical clarity, unique voluminosity and stimulating symbolical endurance, he became a professor at the Academy of Fine Arts in Zagreb (1922) and, shortly thereafter, its rector (1923). In February 1919 Meštrović offered the Serbian government the design for the construction of the monumental Vidovdan Temple and granite sculptures, as well as the option to purchase the Vidovdan Fragments and his model of the temple. However, in 1923 a cultural scandal concerning the purchase of the Vidovdan Fragments broke out; construction plans for the temple were abandoned; and Meštrović suffered heavy moral, material and artistic accusations.41 Although disappointed by the failure to erect the Vidovdan Temple as the symbol of the struggle for the liberation of the Croatian people and Yugoslav unification, over the following ten years he remained the leading state-endorsed sculptor and received commissions for large public monuments which continued to embody his original views and efforts.42

CONCLUSION

By its promotion and protection of class interests, demands for the introduction of high professional standards and freedom of artistic expression, the ‘Medulić’ Association enhanced the artistic life of Croatia and the region, improving its scope, diversity and quality. This impetus was apparent at the exhibitions of the ‘Medulić’ Association, which became increasingly frequent and appealing, offering depictions of distinctive regional landscapes, national customs and local traditions, with their spontaneous approach and fresh language alleviating the differences between major cultural centers and the periphery.

The affirmation of national contributions in the region and abroad achieved by the ‘Medulić’ Association marked an important step forward, with the example and role of Ivan Meštrović being the most deserving for their

41 — For the purchase scandal, see: Duško Kečkemet, Život Ivana Meštrovića (1883–1962–2002), 1. svezak 1883–1932 (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2009), 428. For the purchased sculptures Meštrović was to receive a lifelong annual remuneration of 36,000 francs or 3,000 francs per month; in the case of his death, the same sum was to be paid to his legatees until 1950. However, various disagreements and controversies arose concerning the contract he had signed with the Serbian government and the sum seems never to have been paid in full.

achievements. The self-awareness of Meštrović’s sculptural style, heroic emanation and tectonic condensation of form still impress us with their masterful effects, along with the contributions of painters Emanuel Vidović, Tomislav Krizman, and Mirko Rački; Slovene impressionists Rihard Jakopič and Ivan Grohar; and particularly, during the Great War and before her untimely death, the Serbian painter Nadežda Petrović, all of whom affirmed themselves as the restorers of visual expression. Their enthusiasm, motivational, intellectual and artistic maturity, inclusivity and acceptance of the new spirit and its patterns, secured the status of an important cultural project for the ‘Medulić’ Association as a step forward and legacy to future generations.

THE SYMBOLICAL DYNAMISM OF IVAN MEŠTROVIĆ

Aside from the chronological context of the topic and monograph Medulić, the Association of Croatian Artists (1908-1919): Art and Politics, I would like to supplement my contribution to the exhibition catalog with a short overview of Meštrović’s work and activities after the Medulić period on the artistic, educational and constructional level, which make him a central figure in the first half of the 20th century. ‘On the whole Meštrović was one of the major figures on the historical stage of Yugoslav peoples in the first half of the 20th century and hence he was not spared the controversies of his time. However, Meštrović was unquestionably the leading Yugoslav sculptor of the 20th century and one of the few local artists whose works received international recognition. […] Owing to the primeval power of his talent, his skillful shaping of material and remarkable endurance that allowed him to produce almost a thousand sculptures, Meštrović ranks among the most renowned visual artists in the first half of the 20th century.43 Notable points of memory and signs in space include: architectural monuments – Račić Family Mausoleum in Cavtat (1920–1923); Meštrović Family Mausoleum in Otavice (1926–1932); Monument to the Unknown Hero in Avala, Belgrade (1938); Home of Croatian Artists in Zagreb (1934–1938); public monuments at home and abroad – Well of Life in Zagreb (1905); Marko Marulić in Split (1925), Josip Juraj Štrosmajer in Zagreb (1926), The Bowman and The Spearman (also known collectively as Equestrian Indians) in Chicago (1928); Gregory of Nin in Split (1929); Monument of Gratitude to France in Belgrade (1930).


** This paper was co-funded by the Croatian Science Foundation though its project IP-2018-01-9364 Umjetnost i država u Hrvatskoj od prosječnog do danas [Art and State in Croatia from the Age of Enlightenment to Modern Times].
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA AND 1918

THE DAY WORTH A CENTURY
1 — XII — 1918

IV
Bosnia and Herzegovina entered the last year of the war – in many ways significant and formative 1918 – not as a direct battlefield, but shattered by a lack of manpower due to its population being conscripted, killed or disabled; oppressed by restrictive legislation; exhausted by its war economy, voluntary or forced war aid (with eight war loans), and constant food shortages, rationing and restriction of many necessary foodstuffs, often caused by the unscrupulous monopoly of war profiteers; struck by protracted periods of drought; and plagued by increased mortality caused by numerous epidemics, with the Spanish flu being the most memorable among them. The burden of maintaining a more or less normal life rhythm and securing the subsistence of the shrunk family was borne by women who, forced to leave their homes in search of an income, became the backbone of the civilian workforce, in manufacturing factories, as part of the war economy, in the arms industry, in the fields, in humanitarian campaigns and as medical staff, trying to find strength in sending packages to their loved ones in the battlefield.

The first signs of political change – except the amnesty of political prisoners in 1918\(^1\) – could be seen in the politicians’ increased unease instigated by revived political action in the Dual Monarchy, with the May Declaration proclaimed by the Yugoslav Club in 1917 in the Imperial Council. On this occasion, the Yugoslav Club presented its demand for the establishment of a single Yugoslav state under the scepter of the House of Habsburg and the declaration movement gradually gave rise to various political orientations and specific political actions of political parties, clubs and individuals, essentially either in favor of Yugoslav unification or against it. Another, no less important document – the Corfu Declaration of 20 July 1917 – was issued owing to the joint efforts of the

\(^1\) The amnesty of political prisoners was instigated by the actions of the Yugoslav Club on the occasion of the name day of Empress Zita and included the rescindment of the remaining sentences for 29 persons convicted of high treason. – Glas slobode, no. 33, 27 April / 14 May 1918, 3; Amnesty of political convicts: on the occasion of his birthday, the Emperor pardoned fourteen political prisoners convicted in political trials in Banja Luka and Sarajevo. – Glas slobode, no. 65, 21 August / 8 August 1918, 3.
Serbian government in exile and the Yugoslav Committee founded by Yugoslav émigré politicians from the territory of the Dual Monarchy, most of them liberals from Dalmatia and Slovenia along with three Serbs from Bosnia and Herzegovina (Nikola Stojanović, Dušan Vasiljević, Milan Srškić). This declaration announced that the ‘State of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, known as South Slavs or Yugoslavs, will be a free and independent kingdom with a unified territory’, a monarchy headed by the Karadordević dynasty, and a constitutionally organized state. Political activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina unfolded between these two declarations in the following year and a half.

Among the most active in the matter of Bosnia and Herzegovina was the Slovene politician Anton Korošec. It was his initiative that in July 1917 led to the interpellation to the Imperial Council about the illegal and unconstitutional situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the demand for the reestablishment of the parliament and organizing a series of meeting with Bosnian-Herzegovinian former parliamentarians (Danilo Dimović, Jozo Sunarić, Safvet-beg Bašagić) in Vienna and Zagreb.

Croatian politicians soon issued a statement in support of the May Declaration, as it had had an ‘indescribable magnetic effect on the Croatian people in Bosnia and Herzegovina and its honest and healthy logic had imbued the thinking population with inexpressible enthusiasm’. However, Bishop Josip Stadler disagreed and instead advocated the so-called Croatian solution and a dualist conception of the Monarchy, with the possibility of a trialist organization.

In his refusal of these declarations Stadler was joined by Muslim politicians Safvet-beg Bašagić who had been the last chairman of the Diet of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Šerif Arnautović, the leader of the United Muslim Organization, and they presented their idea about the annexation of autonomous Bosnia and Herzegovina to Hungary in a memorandum to Emperor Charles I on 17 August 1917. A voice of dissention to this view and in support of the declaration came from the ranks of younger Muslim politicians six months later, in February 1918, in the form of a statement by Mehmed Spaho, who declared that the ‘Muslim intelligentsia, and most of the general public, knew that their salvation lay in the concord and unity of all Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.’

The Grand Mufti Džemaludin Čaušević shared this view.

A few Serbian politicians that had not been arrested (Milan Jojkić, Vladimir Andrić i Risto Hadžidamjano) stated their readiness to cooperate with A. Korošec during their talks in Sarajevo in September 1917, but the absence of most of their friends, who were interred in prisons, precluded any po-

---

2 — The statement was published in the Sarajevo daily Hrvatski dnevnik on 3 September 1917, no. 11, 8 September, no. 1. The following statement to the same effect, issued to ‘remove any doubts’, was published in December 1917. – Glas slobode, no. 34, 7 December / 24 November 1917, 4.

3 — Glas slobode, no. 34, Sarajevo, 7 December / 24 November 1917, 4.

4 — Hrvatski dnevnik, Sarajevo, 20 November 1917, 1.

5 — Atif Purivatra, Jugoslavenska muslimanska organizacija u političkom životu KSSH (Sarajevo: Bosanski kulturni centar, 1999), 19.

6 — ‘Do what you like. I will approve any action that will bring freedom to our people. I’ve had enough of our government, both Turkish and German’, Hamdija Kapidžić, „Austrougarska politika u Bosni i Hercegovini i jugoslovensko pitanje za vrijeme prvog svjetskog rata”, in: Bosna i Hercegovina pod austrougarskom upravom (Članci i rasprave) (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1968), 229.
litical agreements. In contrast, Metropolitan Letica was resolute: ‘I have always been opposed to the idea of unification of all South Slavs under the Habsburg dynasty with Serbia and Montenegro.’ In his confidential report the commanding general and governor of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Stjepan Sarkotić, noted that this meeting with Korošec had ‘legalized access to political unification and action to the Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina’. However, as already mentioned,

7 — Grada, 294–297.
a number of Bosnian Serb politicians were actively working on the process of unification of all Yugoslav peoples into a single state at the Yugoslav Committee in London. The position of Serb Bosnians in the Yugoslav Committee was becoming psychologically difficult, between the hammer and the anvil: on one hand the loyalty of Bosnian Serbs to Serbia to the point of martyrdom; on the other hand, the demands of the Yugoslav Committee which seemed to them suitable although the Serbian Prime Minister refused them, and which could also cross the limit that they deemed appropriate. Their solidarity with the Committee ‘even against their wishes and with some contemplation would have been even in favor of a federation’, although none of them and none of the members of the Yugoslav Committee had advocated such a solution during the Corfu Conference. The disagreement of Bosnian Serbs with Nikola Pašić, after his refusal to open the Bosnian question as a separate international issue and insistence on considering the matter only as part of the general Yugoslav unification, was to continue in a new form even after the war.

In early 1918 Bosnian politicians confirmed their support for the creation of a shared, independent and democratic state based on the principles of national self-determination, widely popularized at the time, by taking practical steps towards their political independence from the Monarchy, as well as through joint action and signing a resolution to that effect in Zagreb on 3 March 1918. They informed the National Council of these steps, which promptly banned political gatherings and the planned launching of a newspaper in a bid to put a stop to the promotion of unification.

This, however, did not stop them from reiterating their position in a memorandum addressed on 21 September 1918 to Count István Tisza, the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Hungary and the second important personage to visit Sarajevo during the war, and underlining the complete agreement of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina with other Yugoslav peoples, which also meant that they refused unification with Hungary that had been asked of them. In a separate statement Mehmed Spaho and Halidbeg Hrasnica expressed their agreement with them on the ‘national unity of Yugoslavs and called for the resolution of the Yugoslav question to that effect. They underlined that the Muslim masses did not agree with a handful of beys and they

10 — Pero Slijepčević, „Bosna i Hercegovina u Svetskom ratu“, in: Napor Bosne i Hercegovine za oslobodjenje i ujedinjenje (Sarajevo: Izdanje Oblasnog odbora Narodne odrbane u Sarajevu, 1929), 264.
12 — Slijepčević, Bosna i Hercegovina, 266; Janković, Jugoslovensko pitanje, 360, 414.
13 — Muslim politicians from Bosnia and Herzegovina did not attend this meeting; it remains unclear if their absence was due to an attempt to isolate them or due to their political caution, although a combination of both factors seems most likely.
14 — Glas slobode, no. 60, 3 August / 21 July 1918, 3; ‘G. dr Sunarić, Šola, Grđić, Vj. Jelavić and others are energetically working on launching a newspaper that would advocate the Zagreb resolution of 2 March and it seems they will be granted their wish by 1 October. The paper would be the organ of a Serbo-Croatian coalition which would be joined by many Muslims (the group of dr Spaho, Korkut, Čemalović) and funding has already been secured. The paper would be printed in both Cyrillic and Latin script under the editorship of a special board.’ — Glas slobode, no. 46, 15 June / 2 July 1918, 3.
15 — ‘With all of our brethren of one blood, the Croats, Serbs and Slovenes, we feel that we are one body, wherever we might live.’ — Građa o stvaranju Jugoslovenske države (eds. dr D. Janković, dr B. Križman) (Beograd: Institut društvenih nauka, 1964), I, 296.
were by no means in favor of joining Hungary.’ The Yugoslav Muslim Youth in Zagreb expressed their support for this statement.16

In addition to issuing direct statements supporting the Yugoslav cause, politicians from Bosnia and Herzegovina also took part in the institutional establishment of the future state. The National Council of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs was formed in Zagreb on 6 October 1918; a Plenum for each province was appointed, as well as the Council’s Central Committee. Bosnia and Herzegovina had 18 seats in the Plenum, and six members and two deputies in the Central Committee17; Vladimir Ćorović in the capacity of Secretary represented Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Main Committee of the National Council in Zagreb. In a declaration issued on 19 October 1918 the politicians in Zagreb declared that they had taken their national policy into their own hands, based on the mandate given to them by all political parties. They presented their demand for the unification of Yugoslavs into a separate state and the need to have the Yugoslav part of the Monarchy represented on the impending peace conference. In the streets of Sarajevo, to the surprise of police officers, girls and young women were the first to wear the word ‘Yugoslavia’ on their hats.

Expressions of support for the policy and actions of the National Council in Zagreb came from Muslim18 and Jewish representatives, and even

---

16 — The statement said that in those ‘unconstitutional times’ of war, no one had had any contact with the ‘overwhelmingly illiterate population and therefore no one could represent the people’s views. In contrast, the Yugoslav Muslim youth, on behalf of the entire Muslim intelligentsia, warmly thanks its aforementioned champions for this favor...’ – Glas slobode, no. 75, 25 September / 12 September 1918, 1; no. 80, 12 October 1918, 2.
17 — Two Muslim representatives (Halid Hrasnica i Hamid Svrzo) had previously declared their agreement with the resolution of 3 March 1918 – „Rad Narodnog Vijeća Bosne i Hercegovine u novembru i decembru 1918”, Glasnik arhivâ i Društva arhivista Bosne i Hercegovine, yr. III, vol. III, Sarajevo, 1963, 148.
18 — Statement of Bosnian Muslim politicians with the Zagreb resolution of March 1918, 19 October 1918 – Glas slobode, no. 83, 20 October 1918, 3.
the clerical Party of Rights in Sarajevo. The social democrats of Bosnia and Herzegovina also contributed to this complex ideological spectrum and supported the Yugoslav idea.

In the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, these events were accompanied by the process of forming committees, national councils in counties and townships, which represented new forms of government and included prominent citizens who had not been elected in a democratic procedure. This was also the case with the umbrella institution – the National Council of Bosnia and Herzegovina, whose establishment had been requested by the Central Committee of the National Council of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs in Zagreb; this was followed by the formation of the Main Committee of the National Council for Bosnia and Herzegovina. This was also the case with the National Government for Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was appointed by the National Council in Zagreb following a proposal by the Main Committee of NC BH (six Serbs, four Croats and one Muslim). The Bosnian government was headed by Atanasije Šola, who took up the office after having been released from prison in Travnik, and began its work on 3 November 1918 as the only legitimate organ of the new authority and following a peaceful takeover of power from General Sarkotić, the former Governor of Bosnia and Herzegovina two days earlier. The National Council issued an enthusiastic and edifying proclamation to the people: ‘In this brightest and most solemn hour, when a great, strong and independent Yugoslavia is being created from Vardar to Soča, when the dead are rising from their graves to pay respects to their liberated homeland, when the White Eagle circles above your heads in the sun; when Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia embrace and kiss in sisterly love and, after being apart for so long, come together in a single state; in this hour every sinew in our being quivers and trembles; rejoice, laugh and shed tears of long-awaited and hard-fought happiness; but be merciful and generous, forgive and forget all troubles and slights, and let no one embarrass and sully our golden freedom. Defend everyone’s wellbeing and property; defend the personal freedom and safety of each citizen. – Our people! – A great responsibility has fallen to us, because the whole world is waiting to see if you are worthy of freedom. – People of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes! Your mother Yugoslavia wants you to do her justice in this moment, when it rises great, large and so dear to us, she kisses and blesses you with a tear in her eye, but full of pride.’

The members of the government did all they could to avoid deeper social tremors that could revolutionize the masses and to make the takeover as peaceful as possible. Surprisingly, in some segments there were no signs of this important administrative-legal and social shift. The most assertive act to preserve peace – in view of unrests throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina caused by intimidated agrarian protests, the emergence of so-called ‘Green cadres’ and difficulties during the withdrawal of Austro-Hungarian forces after the defeat of the Central Powers on 15 September 1918 – was taken by the Main Committee of the National Council of Bosnia and Herzegovina on 29 October 1918, which authorized Milan Jojkić, Hamid Svrzo i Vjekoslav Jelavić to meet with the

19 — Statement of the Jews of Bosnia and Herzegovina; the Metamorphosis of the Bosnian Franciscans – Glas slobode, no. 84, 26 October 1918, 3.
20 — GO NV SHS u BiH Sarajevo, 1 November 1918. – Historijski arhiv Sarajevo, Zbirka plakata i proglasa, no. 68/41.
commander of the Serbian Second Army Stepa Stepanović near Višegrad and request the ‘urgent arrival of the Serbian army to Sarajevo’ in a bid to ‘proclaim the independence of entire Yugoslavia’. However, at this time a no less important reason was the obvious inability of the Main Committee and National Government to handle the complex problems of peacekeeping and consolidation of power with no authority of their own and no steady and efficient repression tools such as the police, gendarmerie and army – despite their best efforts and an organized guard as part of national councils organized into a shared network of new rule. The Serbian army entered Sarajevo on 6 November 1918 and was greeted by all religious groups as a liberator and guarantor of stability, as was also the case in all other towns in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Most officers of Yugoslav origin in the former Austro-Hungarian army who had been sent from Zagreb to Sarajevo to establish the army of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, returned without having completed their task. Only a few officers were told to stay in Sarajevo and were entrusted with organizing a gendarmerie together with the Command of the Serbian army. In Zagreb, initial objections were quickly placated when the same invitation was sent to the Serbian army.

21 — Kapidžić, „Rad Narodnog Vijeća“, 151. This was announced after the resolution passed at the session of the Main Committee of the National Council of Bosnia and Herzegovina on 3 November stating that the chosen members would ‘go as parliamentarians to the nearest command post of the Entente army and ask for at least one regiment to come to Sarajevo.’ – Građa, II, 418, 471.

22 — Minutes of the session GO NV BiH, Sarajevo, 29 October 1918. – Građa, II, 418.


25 — Nusret Šehić, „Narodno vijeće SHS za BiH i njegova djelatnost nakon sloma Austro-Ugarske (nov.–dec. 1918)“, Prilozi, yr. XVIII, no. 19, Sarajevo, 1982, 175.
On behalf of the Serbian Supreme Command and Serbian government, Milan Pečanac and General Božidar Terzić were sent to Sarajevo as envoys to consider the possibility of a direct annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to Serbia and familiarize themselves with the general mood on the matter in the National Government for Bosnia and Herzegovina. The first point of the instruction given to General Terzić read as follows: ‘Territorial military organization of the province and installation of new military authority needed to secure safety and army functioning, subject to an agreement with and the wishes of the National Council’; however, correspondence reveals that ‘it would be in the greatest general Serbian interest if Bosnia and Herzegovina would proclaim their unification with Serbia as soon as possible, as Dalmatia has already done. It would be best if this was to come from the Bosnian government and if it would issue a public manifest declaring its unification with Serbia.’ One of General Terzić’s replies states that ‘the local circumstances in Bosnia and Herzegovina demand a lot of tactfulness and caution rather than rash decisions, particularly out of consideration for the Croats in the National government in Sarajevo’ and that ‘it would be politically opportune if the Regent was to issue a public statement that any resolution of the agrarian question would make sure that the Muslims will not incur any material losses’. Although the Bosnian government stated that ‘it had so far acted on the instructions of the Serbian government and that it will continue to do so, but if the current

27 — *Građa*, II, 519.
28 — The letter of Živojin Mišić, Chief of the Serbian General Staff, addressed to B. Terzić on 20/7 November 1918 also states: ‘In this matter you are to employ appropriate tact and discretion. Try to delicately discuss this only with Šola and to make him the initiator of everything. The unification should take place as soon as possible’ – *Građa*, 622.
policy was to change, then they would need to be given new instructions\textsuperscript{29}, the initiative for direct unification with Serbia was scrapped during direct talks between Belgrade and Zagreb.\textsuperscript{30}

However, throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina newly formed national councils proclaimed unification with Serbia not only on behalf of the Serbian people but on behalf of the entire population of Bosnia and Herzegovina ‘regardless of faith and tribe’. At the forefront of this movement stood the national council in Banja Luka, which had always acted independently of the National Council in Sarajevo, disregarding its instructions.\textsuperscript{31} The center of the Bosnian Frontier, with its Kočić tradition and still reeling from the recent war and court trials, was in opposition to Sarajevo and allowed replacement of judges, internments, arrests, upheavals and terrorizing the population, and hence the Main Committee of the National Council for Bosnia and Herzegovina sent its representatives to Banja Luka to calm the situation and form a new committee. However, the National Council in Banja Luka was the first to issue a proclamation to Field Marshal Stepa Stepanović on 27 November 1918 announcing ‘complete unification with the Kingdom of Serbia under the scepter of HM King Petar I’, ‘complying with the irresistible wishes of the people regardless of

\textsuperscript{29} – \textit{Grđa}, 664–665.  
\textsuperscript{30} – This movement for unification in Serbia was also a cause of concern for the government in Sarajevo, and its chairman A. Šola wrote to S. Pribićević requesting an immediate agreement of the Central Committee of the National Council of SHS with the Serbian government and a general solution due to the ‘urgency of the matter and fear of anarchy’. – \textit{Grđa}, 662. Later on the pro-Radical paper \textit{Srpska riječ} blamed the Democrats for the failure of a direct unification of Bosnia and Herzegovina with Serbia. ‘...the blame falls squarely on Mr. Pribićević and his lackeys in Bosnia, who forcibly stifled the voice of the Serbian people in Bosnia requesting unification with Serbia...’. – \textit{Srpska riječ}, no. 108, 20 September 1919.  
\textsuperscript{31} – It had 18 members – seven Serbs, six Croats and five Muslims. – Đorđe Mikić, \textit{Političke stranke i izbori u Bosanskoj krajini} (Banja Luka: Institut za istoriju, 1997), 10.
faith and name”\textsuperscript{32}. On the same and the following day, many of the councils in Bosnia and Herzegovina announced their direct unification with Serbia.\textsuperscript{33} If Field Marshal Stepa Stepanović had any doubts as to the need to ‘help the work of the national councils in regard to unification with Serbia’ so that it could not be abused by opponents ‘as a sign of invasion’, they were resolved on 11 November 1918 by General Živojin Mišić, the Chief of Staff of the Supreme Command, who authorized B. Teržić to begin resolving all military and other issues in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina in agreement with the national authorities. On 2 December 2018 Stojan Protić informed the National Government in Sarajevo that, regardless of this unification movement, ‘administration would remain in the hands of the government in Sarajevo’.\textsuperscript{34}

Per the instruction of the National Council of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes adopted at the session of 25 November, the decision on the unification of the State of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes with Serbia and Montenegro was adopted, and with the act passed on 1 December Bosnia and Herzegovina joined the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. The creation of the kingdom was a major watershed event for the entire population. A new political life began in new state borders and in new circumstances. The document of 1 December 1918 left some administrative functions to the National Council of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was to perform them until the creation of a shared government and their gradual cancellation. The government of the Kingdom was formed on 20 December and it included three representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, one from each of the three dominant peoples (Mehmed Spašho as Minister of Forestry and Mining; Uroš Krulj as Minister of National Health; Tugomir Alaupović as Minister of Faiths).

\textbf{** ** **}

In 1918 the political elites of Bosnia and Herzegovina, despite rifts dating back to the time of the Diet of Bosnia, found a shared cause in their aspirations to unification into a joint Yugoslav state. They expressed their approval through resolutions, statements and practical work in joint institutions that preceded the act of 1 December, as well as their call for the Serbian army to enter the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. While Serbian politicians – either separated during the war as more or less loyal associates of the Dual Monarchy authorities, arrested or present in the Yugoslav Committee – remained ideologically and emotionally attached to the Serbian government and encouraged by the national councils’ movement for direct unification with Serbia, during this fateful

\textsuperscript{32} — Građa, 659.
\textsuperscript{34} — Građa, 495, 518–519, 683.
year Croatian, Muslim and Jewish politicians gradually but firmly crystallized their position in regard to unification. Of course, in all three ethnic-political groups there were some who were opposed to the unification of Yugoslav peoples into a single polity; this would remain a visible legacy in future political life, manifest in divergent views of political parties and religious-ethnic groups about their own roles, political action and the future of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the new state – the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes/Yugoslavia.
IVAN MEŠTROVIĆ’S VIDOVDA TEMPLE, THE CREATION OF YUGOSLAVIA AND THE PARADOXES OF NATIONALISM

THE DAY WORTH A CENTURY
1 — XII — 1918
The Vidovdan Temple is the first and most famous monumental work of the Croatian artist Ivan Meštrović (1883–1962), a sculptural-architectural ensemble made up of over 80 artifacts created at the turn of the first and second decade of the 20th century. Deeply rooted in the tradition of Late Symbolism and Secession, this work was originally recognized not only as a notable example of Central European artistic trends, but also as a narrative complex whose poetical quality became inextricably entwined with its political content. This was made possible owing to the fact that Meštrović rooted his work in the politically strongly instrumentalized epic tradition of the South Slavs and the fact that powerful patrons played an important role in its production and dissemination. In this sense, a notable role was played by the Serbian state and the royal Karadordević dynasty, which began purchasing some of Meštrović’s Vidovdan sculptures as early as 1910 and over the following year sponsored his creative and exhibition activities. Conceived as a semantic and architectural framework for two mutually linked ensembles – the Vidovdan Cycle and the Cycle of Prince Marko, both thematically tied to the tradition of the Battle of Kosovo, its consequences and mythologizing - the Vidovdan Temple was to proudly arise in Kosovo after the Balkan Wars (1912–1913) and the Great War (1914–1918) as a symbol of martyrdom and the end of centennial struggles for the liberation and unification of all South Slavs.

Sculptures representing historical and mythical heroes and heroines: Banović Strahinja (3), Miloš Obilić, Srđa Zlopogleda, Prince Marko, slaves, widows etc. were gradually but irreversibly included into the distinctive ideological structure in the process of resolving the ‘national question’ of South Slavs.

on the eve of the Great War. Seen outside of the comprehensive concept of the ‘temple of the people’s relics’ – to quote the widespread laconic description of Meštrović’s masterpiece – and outside of the historical context in which they represented much more than ‘evidence of adopting elements of Symbolism and Secession’, the Vidovdan Fragments have now almost completely lost their original meaning.

Once the most dangerous weapon of the Kingdom of Serbia in the struggle for liberation and unification of South Slavs and the main symbolical instrument in the process of the creation of Yugoslavia, it thus became a remnant of Yugoslav art and a slightly marginalized testimony of recent Serbian history. However, the gaping void surrounding this monument in both Serbia and other milieus of former Yugoslavia bears evidence to an unwillingness to critically assess it and represents a symptom of a much wider phenomenon. This hiatus reveals the current distancing from any critical rethinking of the creation of Yugoslavia and the Serbian experience in the joint state – Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (1918–1929) and Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1929–1941) – as well as the questionable foundations that the sovereignty of its peoples rested on.

Starting from his first solo exhibitions in Vienna and Zagreb in 1910, where the artist displayed many monumental sculptures, with the large, five-meter-long architectural model of the Temple joining them in 1912 – Meštrović’s monumental synthetic work became inextricably tied to the question of the ‘Yugoslav people’ and the necessity of creating the only political framework that would be acceptable for them – their national state. Through various interpretations that came from both sides of the Austro-Hungarian-Serbian border, the Kosovo Temple embodied the united Yugoslav people in its entirety, whose identity transcended ethnic, linguistic, religious and historical divisions between communities that in the 19th century, based on different criteria, began to identify with the modern ethno-political identities of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. At the time of the appearance of the Vidovdan Temple on the public stage, these national groups were divided by the political borders of two empires – Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire, and two independent nation-states – the Kingdom of Serbia and the Kingdom of Montenegro. Of course, the idea of a Yugoslav community that would transcend individual national identities while also developing simultaneously to it and in a complex symbiosis with it

2 — Милан Шевић, „Косовске песме у камену. Вајарски радови Ивана Мештровића”, Летопис Матице српске 86, 265 (1910), 88.
3 — http://www.narodnimuseum.rs/novi-vek/zbirka-jugoslovenske-skulpture/ Accessed on 20 July 2018
4 — In this sense, the tendency to offer an apologia of Meštrović’s political activities, to distance any assessments of their dominant ideological contents and to interpret his early sculptural and architectural works primarily in the artistic and esthetic context, are highly characteristic. Vinko Srhoj, „Ivan Meštrović i politika kao prostor ahistorijskog idealizma”, Ars Adriatica 4 (2014), 369–384; Barbara Vujanović, „Derivacija klasičnih modela u modernoj umjetnosti: primjer monumentalizma u spomeničkoj plastici Ivana Meštrovića”, Adriatik: zbornik radova Zavoda za znanstveni i umjetnički rad Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Splitu 21 (2015), 153–170; Irena Kraljevac, Ivan Meštrović i secesija. Beč–München–Prag, 1900–1910 (Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 2002). An example of a comprehensive interpretation of Meštrović’s early work in its historical context is offered in: Norka Machiedo Mladinić, „Političko opredjeljenje i umjetnički rad mladog Meštrovića”, Časopis za suvremenu povijest 1 (2009), 143–170.
had a long history.\textsuperscript{5} However, it was not until the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century that the idea of a Yugoslav nation became particularly current and politically operational; it gained a stronger momentum after the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908 and the Balkan Wars, when many eyes began to turn to Serbia as the ‘Yugoslav Piedmont’ that would stand at the forefront of the final struggle for the liberation and unification of all South Slavs.\textsuperscript{6}

The Vidovdan Temple gained a remarkably important and instrumental role in this process. Namely, it is known that Serbian elites acted as the financial and ideological pillar of this grand artistic endeavor. Dozens of bulky statues and plaster casts, as well as the wooden model of the temple, were transferred from one corner of Europe to another like some sort of relics.\textsuperscript{7} The Vidovdan fragments became a part of the distinctive ideological agenda about the Yugoslav people and the necessity of its cultural and political unity, which was equally supported (albeit for different reasons) by the Serbian, Croatian and Slovene elites in Serbia and Austria as well as Bosnia and Hungary. For his part, Meštrović became a fervent supporter of ‘national unity’ (as the ideology of Yugoslavism was usually referred to), and his involvement in the Yugoslav Committee (1915–1918), although more symbolical than political, had a strong impact on the reception of the South Slavic question.\textsuperscript{8}

In the tumultuous war period, his temple was seen as a national martyrium of sorts, dedicated to all South Slavs that had fallen for freedom and restored unification.\textsuperscript{9} In his widely quoted text about the idea of the Kosovo Temple (1915), Meštrović offered a precise outline of the meaning of his endeavor with multiple political connotations:

‘The foundations of this Temple are the unnumbered just victims of our race, its pillars are all those who are suffering and enduring hardship, its prayer is the song of human torture, frankincense is its love, its holy water is the tears of the scorned and of those yearning for justice. The tower of the temple is the purified souls that connect it to the heavens [...]’\textsuperscript{10}

An ideological reinterpretation of these Meštrović’s poetical formulations about the Yugoslav race was offered by Ante Tresić Pavičić (1867–1949), a Dalmatian author and politician: ‘Every part of this temple was conceived as symbolical. The foundations were to depict the unnumbered Serbian and Croatian victims that had died over five centuries fraught with struggles [...]’; the mighty pillars were meant to symbolize heroes and statesmen that out
homeland rests on, all of whom had suffered for freedom.’\textsuperscript{11} For Meštrović, all Yugoslav martyrs, from the Battle of Kosovo to modern times, and the ‘entire Yugoslav nation’ represented the apostles of the ‘religion of ultimate sacrifice’.\textsuperscript{12} This sculptural and architectural work therefore became an object of celebrating Yugoslav nationalism as a secular religion, in which, as noted by Anthony D. Smith, ‘the people itself became an object of a new religion’\textsuperscript{13}

Owing to the instrumentality of the Yugoslav ideology, which is known to have been used as a mask for fulfilling various political objectives, above all those of the Croatian and Serbian political elites,\textsuperscript{14} Meštrović’s temple enjoyed widespread support. As noted by Robert Seton-Watson (1879–1951), it was ‘the triumph of the Yugoslav idea’ [sic], expressed in the language of sculpture and architecture through the artistic ensemble of the ‘new Valhalla of a free and united nation’.\textsuperscript{15} And indeed, Meštrović’s massive display was meant to bear evidence to the dormant and freshly awakened, long-suffering Yugoslav people that were just coming out of their centuries-long forced silence. Seemingly paradoxically, this oniric enthusiasm was spearheaded by Serbian nationalists, using the emotionally charged and newly established Vidovdan tradition for their implementation of Garašanin’s \textit{Načertanije} under the guise of the Yugoslav mission. The suppression of the national myth of Serbian Kosovo and its sanctification, which reached its peak at the turn of the century,\textsuperscript{16} was hence replaced by the narrative of Yugoslav Kosovo and Prince Lazar as the high priest of this new secular ‘religion of ultimate self-sacrifice’. At the same time, some Slovene and Croat nationalists adopted the ideology of Yugoslavism driven by their own pragmatic reasons. However, Yugoslav idealists and those who in the idea of national unity saw a useful instrument for fulfilling particular national aims were united in their shared interests and distrust of conservative circles which, for their own reasons and from different poles of the political spectrum, harshly criticized Meštrović’s artistic project.\textsuperscript{17}

The Yugoslavization of the Kosovo myth, a process that peaked in the decade before the breakout of the Great War\textsuperscript{18}, was the ideological context that made Meštrović’s Vidovdan Temple a symbolic instrument not only in the visualization of the idea of a unified Yugoslav people but also in the process of creating the first Yugoslav state rooted in the nationalist teaching about the

\textsuperscript{11} — Quoted in: Duško Kečkemet, \textit{Ivan Meštrović} (Beograd: Nolit, 1983), 11.
\textsuperscript{12} — Ivan Meštrović, ‘Zamisao Kosovskog Hrama’, \textit{Nova Evropa} 1, 13 (1920): 504.
\textsuperscript{13} — Anthony D. Smith, \textit{Chosen Peoples: Sacred Sources of National Identity} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 42.
\textsuperscript{16} — See: Ivan Čolović, \textit{Smrt na Kosovu polju: Istorija kosovskog mita} (Beograd: XX vek, 2016), 220–227. On the Battle of Kosovo as a theme in Serbian art in the context of the celebration of its 500\textsuperscript{th} anniversary, see: Nenad Makuljević, Уметност и национална идеја у XIX веку: Систем европске и српске визуелне културе у служби нације (Београд: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, 2006).
\textsuperscript{18} — Ivan Čolović, \textit{Smrt na Kosovu polju}, 243–283.
necessary congruence of ethnic and political borders. The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was formed on 1 December 1918 and the new state largely fulfilled this ideal of border congruence, but at the same time opened the problem of the sovereignty of different ethnic groups merged into a single national body on an ethnically, historically and culturally complex territory. The fact that the act of 1 December brought about both the unification of South Slavs and the ethnic completion of Serb, Croat and Slovene ethnic communities represented grounds for the ambivalence underlying the notion of ‘national unity’, which had realized the political objectives of nationalist elites and at the same time become the main obstacle in the development of individual national ideologies. However, the outcome of the negotiations about the international status of the new state at the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919 depended precisely on the argument about the ‘national unity’ of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. The necessity of the fulfillment of their joint natural right was juxtaposed with the historical right of individual South Slavic nations (and not only Austria and Hungary), some of which had fought for the victorious and others for the defeated side in the war. It was precisely for these reasons that several widely acclaimed scholars from different fields – above all the geographer and anthropologist Jovan Cvijić (1865–1927) and the linguist Aleksandar Belić (1876–1960) – were included into the Versailles talks, as a subsidiary but nonetheless crucially important part of the delegation composed of Serbian government members and representatives of South Slavs from former Austria-Hungary. In fact, their work proved the final source of a much wider discourse about the Yugoslav nation, whose last stage reached its climax in the last decade before the Great War. Cvijić’s monograph La péninsule balkanique was strategically published in Paris in 1918, summarizing this intellectual project into a single narrative and postulating that the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes comprised a single ethnic community.¹⁹

The Treaty of Versailles was signed on the day of the Vidovdan feast (St. Vitus Day) of 1919; at the same time, Meštrović’s Vidovdan Temple was displayed at the great Exposition des artistes yougoslaves in Paris, which had been organized under the auspices of the new and as yet unrecognized state. Together with many works by more than sixty artists, Meštrović’s cycles supported the very same demands that were being advocated by the members of the South Slavic delegation in Versailles.²⁰ Thus the Vidovdan or Kosovo Temple came to be canonized as a national shrine of sorts and quite literally became an instrument in the service of the political objectives of the Serbian government and various representatives of the South Slavic population of the former Habsburg Monarchy. The ideological content and political potential of Meštrović’s work – noted by the Austrian professor and one of Europe’s greatest art historians Josef Strzygowski (1862–1941) as early as 1910, when he remarked with concern: ‘It will be very difficult for us if Meštrović was to be understood...”

by his compatriots and if they were to unite under the auspices of his art!21 – became a part of Europe’s new political reality.

However, the distinctive symbolism of the Vidovdan Temple can also provide an answer to the question of the nature of the national state that became internationally recognized on 28 June 1919. Unlike older-generation champions of the idea of Yugoslav unification – such as Josip Juraj Strossmayer (1815–1905) and Franjo Rački (1828–1894), who advocated religious unitarism of the nation though the adoption of either Catholicism or Eastern Orthodoxy – the discourse of Yugoslavism built around the Vidovdan Temple included turning to old, pre-schism unity and the establishment of a ‘religion of ultimate self-sacrifice’ as a shared belief for all South Slavs. In fact, Meštrović’s version of Yugoslavism which corresponded to the notions of national unity (later known as ‘integral Yugoslavism’) excluded non-Slavs and non-Christians from the project of the creation of a Yugoslav nation. And while the problem of Yugoslav Muslims was at the time seen from the prism of their original ‘Slavic’ identity which could transcend religious differences, the case of the majority population of Kosovo and Metohija – the region that was to house the Vidovdan Temple – and minority national groups in other parts of the state was rather symptomatic. Furthermore, this example reveals that the creation of Yugoslavia as a nation state rested on the simultaneous application of mutually contradictory principles of national sovereignty, confirming the phenomenon described by Benedict Anderson as philosophical poverty of nationalism.22

The territorial aspirations of the Kingdom of Serbia are known to have pointed in different directions: to Macedonia and Kosovo, as well as some other regions (including northern Albania) that had belonged to the Ottoman Empire until 1912; to Bosnia and Herzegovina and Sanjak, territories that had been placed under the protectorate of the Habsburg Monarchy after the Congress of Berlin in 1878; and some other regions such as Srem, parts of Banat and Bačka, Slavonia, Croatia and Dalmatia, which had been part of either Austria or Hungary. Various criteria were used to defend these territorial demands. In one case it was the argument of ‘historical right’; in another it was the ahistorical criterion of ‘right to self-determination’ based on ‘natural law’ which included features of ethnicity such as language, vernacular culture etc.23 The central pillar of first Yugoslavia was planted on this unstable soil, with the simultaneous and selective application of different principles of national sovereignty, and the Vidovdan Temple offered a symbolical summary of this ambivalent discourse – on one hand, it postulated the natural right of Yugoslavs as the foundation of their unity, and on the other their shared historical right that was essentially its opposite. The rhetoric of the Kosovo Temple – for example, linking the Battle of

---

Kosovo not only with the historical event of 1389 but also with the history of the rulers of Carantania (7th-8th century); the campaigns of Ljudevit (Liudewit), the Duke of Pannonian Croatia (c. 810–823); and the Battle of Gvozd Mountain (1097) that led to the loss of independence of medieval Croatia—an actually created a rift between the seemingly defeated and obsolete historical right and the right to self-determination, which Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points of January 1918 had made the main guiding principle in the restructuring of Central and Eastern Europe at the Paris Peace Conference. It was a crucial issue equally relevant for historiography and legal theory. This ambivalence was present in both the academic and political discourse of the time and played an important role in promoting some and discrediting other demands for the same territories.

The synergy of the poetic message of the Vidovdan Temple and the political argument for the creation of Yugoslavia—both symbolically and literally brought to fruition through the Paris exhibition and the Versailles talks taking place simultaneously in the spring of 1919 (1) —suggests the twofold conceptual conflict that marked the discourse of the creation of Yugoslavia, which emerged from the overlapping of diverging and contradictory criteria of sovereignty and rule over a certain territory. For example, following the Balkan Wars Kosovo and Metohija, as regions with a peculiar historical status and a complex ethnic structure, were merged with the Yugoslav state in 1918 after their initial annexation to Serbia and Montenegro based on ‘historical right’. This took place irrespectively of the fact that their majority population was ethnically Albanian and in spite of the demands of local Albanians presented at the peace conference in Versailles. This example illustrates not only the deep rift in the political and legal practice of the time but also the postulates that made up the foundations of first Yugoslavia.

The Vodovdan Temple was meant to become the central place for the celebration of Yugoslavia as the new secular religion, while the Serbian nationalist myth of the ‘kingdom of heaven’ was replaced by a Kosovo myth as the apotheosis of the Yugoslav ‘tri-named’ people rather than Serbian. The temple was used to, at least temporarily and for a specific purpose, erase ‘tribal’ identity differences between the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and to transform historical Kosovo into a metaphor of Yugoslav national unity. Meštrović himself repeatedly explained that his ‘temple could not be dedicated to any particu-

25 — On the historical right in the context of legitimizing territorial acquisitions see: Tamar Meisels, „‘Historical Rights’ to Land“, Territorial Rights (Dordrecht: Springer, 2005), 25–43.
lar religion or religious sect, but to all of them together'; it was meant to be a ‘temple of unity’ (2) that would serve as a place for celebrating ‘brotherly love, justice and education’ as the essences of the Yugoslav nation. Through the prism of the Vidovdan Temple, the Battle of Kosovo and its modern ‘sanctification’ became a promise of the postulates that could, in the disjointed reality of everyday life, serve as a cohesive force for all those that were privileged enough to bear the South Slavic name on the eve of the creation of Yugoslavia. The fictional ‘national soul’ of Kosovo, which featured in Meštrović’s own writings as well as those of his advocates, could then transcend ethnic and religious borders, but not the limits of what was referred to as ‘racial borders’ in both the public and academic discourse. The ‘national soul’ could not afford to include the majority population of factual Kosovo, which was identified in the dominant perception with the descendants or lackeys of former national enemies.

The Vidovdan Temple was immediately forgotten after the fulfillment of the national objective and the international recognition of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes as a nation state. Unlike the fictional Vidovdan Kosovo, the territory of this region was in reality transformed into a field of national action, a space of perpetual extraordinary circumstances where no

30 — Александар Игњатовић, Југословенски идентитет у архитектури између 1904. и 1941. године. Рукопис докторске дисертације (Београд: Универзитет у Београду, 2005), 65–103.
Photograph of a drawing of the lateral façade and floor plan of the Vidovdan Temple, 1908–12, ink on paper
Photograph Collection of the Meštrović Gallery in Split (photo credits: Valentino Bilić Prcić) (FGM-4832) Cat. No. GMS 597
IVAN MESTROVIĆ
KARYATIDEN, FRAGMEN
VOM TEMPEL VON KOSOVO
one could even contemplate the construction of such a bizarre and grandiose project. From the very first moment of the inception of the Versailles polity, the Kosovo temple and the accompanying nationalist pomp were pushed aside for good and replaced by the ‘real’ monuments of the national traditions of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Despite the purely rhetorical façade of Yugoslavism with Meštrović’s project for the Tomb of the Unknown Hero at Avala (1934–1938) as one of its building blocks and representative parts, it was precisely these traditions that marked the political and social life of the first South Slavic state, which was fraught with ethnic strife and conflict, political clashes and instability.

After World War II, in the completely changed ideological and political circumstances of the socialist federal Yugoslavia, the nationalist rhetoric of the Vidovdan Temple and its premise of ‘national unity’ were replaced by re-contextualizing Meštrović’s work in the seemingly safe field of esthetic experience and purely artistic values. For example, the Vidovdan caryatid statues were built into the hall of the National Museum in Belgrade as mock support pillars, while some of the most renowned sculptures of the Vidovdan and Prince Marko cycles were put on display in the atrium of the same museum. This was merely one aspect of the discursive transformation of formerly prominent political instruments into silent artistic artifacts. Admittedly, the new position of old Meštrović’s sculptures was an eloquent testimony of the ideological context of the new Yugoslav state, which replaced the tradition of integral Yugoslavism and the myth of a single nation with the idea of inherent differences but shared interests of the Yugoslav peoples, verbalized in the platitude of ‘brotherhood and unity’.

Today, in post-Yugoslav times, at the new permanent exhibition of the recently reopened National Museum in Belgrade, the Vidovdan Temple is represented by a handful of randomly laid out and inaccurately described or completely unmarked sculptures. In this new permanent exhibition, parts of this large architectural-sculptural ensemble, once displayed by the artist himself under the title ‘Fragments’, have become merely fragmentary artifacts in the Yugoslav Sculpture Collection, a part of the ‘stylistic mosaic’ allegedly characterized by their inherent difference to the ‘modernist considerations throughout the European continent’. The twofold de-historization of Meštrović’s great work is enhanced by the fact that the large wooden model of the Vidovdan Temple, added by the artist to his sculptures to form an inextricable exhibition ensemble, has for decades remained completely isolated at the National Museum in Kruševac. From this politico-poetical perspective, the answer to the question of the modern de-contextualization of the Vidovdan Temple – seemingly

33 — The author visited the National Museum two weeks after the opening of the new permanent exhibition, which was ceremoniously inaugurated on 28 June 2018.
34 — Quoted from the accompanying explanation in the permanent exhibition of the Yugoslav Art Collection of the National Museum in Belgrade.
a result of inert continuity with previous periods, seems to lie not only in the 
appraisal of the artistic merits and thematic peculiarities of Yugoslav fin-de-siè-
cle art\textsuperscript{35}, but more so in the social confrontation with the historical experience 
of the formation of Yugoslavia and its short albeit tumultuous political life.

\textsuperscript{35} — Ibid.
ACCESS BY INVITATION ONLY

THE DAY WORTH A CENTURY
1 — XII — 1918
On 13 November 1918 in Zagreb, the Democratic Association of Yugoslav Women organized a tea party in the hall of the Soko organization, in the Koło building, and published an invitation in the Zagreb press. On this occasion, Miroslav Krleža₁, who was twenty-five years old at the time, caused an incident when he verbally attacked Lt. Col. Slavko Kvaternik, a former Austro-Hungarian officer who had recently become the deputy of Mate Drinković, the commissioner of national defense in the People’s Council. The tea party had been organized in honor of ‘Serbian officers who had arrived in Zagreb from prisoner camps in former Austria-Hungary’² and ended on the following day, 14 November, by greeting the Serbian battalion from Ruma and giving them a send-off to Rijeka.³

On 13 November 1918 in Zagreb, the Democratic Association of Yugoslav Women organized a tea party in the hall of the Soko organization, in the Koło building, and published an invitation in the Zagreb press. On this occasion, Miroslav Krleža₁, who was twenty-five years old at the time, caused an incident when he verbally attacked Lt. Col. Slavko Kvaternik, a former Austro-Hungarian officer who had recently become the deputy of Mate Drinković, the commissioner of national defense in the People’s Council. The tea party had been organized in honor of ‘Serbian officers who had arrived in Zagreb from prisoner camps in former Austria-Hungary’² and ended on the following day, 14 November, by greeting the Serbian battalion from Ruma and giving them a send-off to Rijeka.³

———

1 — The Croatian author Miroslav Krleža (1893–1981) personally took part in WWI. In December 1915 he enrolled at a military school and spent July and August 1916 in the battlefields of Galicia. Until May 1917 he served at the auxiliary barracks in Požega. Due to his fragile health he was discharged from active service and sent to work at the translation department of the Zagreb command and then at the Office for Aid to War Orphans. In the Zagreb press he anonymously published analyses of the situation in the battlefields and reports about the destitute situation in the city and wrote seven plays. In 1917 he published his first book, the lyric poem Pan, personally funding its printing. Over the course of the same year he published Tri simfonije (Three Symphonies). In 1918, the year of the November tea party incident, he published poetry collections Pjesme I and Pjesme II (Poems I and Poems II) and expressionist plays Hrvatska rapsodija (Croatian Rhapsody), Krajevo and Cristoval Colon. In January 1919, together with August Cesarec, he launched Plamen, the first literary journal of the Croatian and Yugoslav communist left. See: Brlek, T., Krleža, Miroslav, Hrvatski biografski leksikon, LZMK [available at: http://hbl.lzmk.hr/clanak.aspx?id=6990; accessed on: 30 June 2018].


3 — From October 1918 to January 1924 Rijeka (It. Fiume) was engulfed in political chaos and instability, which saw 18 cabinets change places at the helm of the city. After fifty years of Hungarian administration, the last days of October 1918 saw the People’s Council from Zagreb establish its rule in the city, but the local Italian population refused to acknowledge its authority. The Italian army entered Rijeka on 4 November; having passed through Zagreb, a battalion of the Serbian army arrived in the city on 15 November – the very same battalion that had been given a reception in Zagreb. On 17 November the Italian army occupied Rijeka, immediately blocking lines of telecommunication with Zagreb, and in the morning of the following day the Serbian army retreated to Kraljevica. The Treaties of Rome of 1924 proclaimed the annexation of Rijeka to Italy as the Province of Fiume. See: Patafta, D., „Privremene vlade u Rijeci (listopad 1918 – siječanj 1924)“, in: Časopis za suvremenu povijest, vol. 38, no. 1, 2006, 197–222.
Two weeks later, on 27 November, in the same hall the leadership of Hrvatski Sokol from Zagreb organized a dinner ‘in honor of the newly arrived officers of our brotherly heroic Serbian army, who have been among us for a few days now.’ While their presence had been ‘kindly requested’, the bottom of the invitation had a remark to anyone else who might have been interested in attending: ‘access by invitation only’, a caveat probably included due to concerns over any further incidents.4

Although he had reminisced about his outburst and the tea party before, it was not until the 1940s that Krleža penned a recollection of the drunken November night of 1918, a memoir note published several times and in various versions since its debut in 1952. Besides Kvaternik, Krleža called out many other personages, both present and absent – some by name and others as the symbols of certain groups, i.e. those who had marked the last months of 1918.

Krleža’s manuscript legacy, including different versions of the drunken November night, is kept in the Manuscripts and Old Books Collection of the National and University Library (NSK)5 in Zagreb. In line with the provisions of Krleža’s will, it remained unavailable to the public for twenty years and was finally made public in 2001. Fourteen sealed cases of material were gifted to the library by Krleža’s universal legatee Krešimir Vranešić.6 The Print Collection

4 — The Croatian History Museum has the Invitation of the Zagreb Sokol of 27 November 1918 (HPM/PMH-11198); it has been published in: Jurdana, E., „Dokumentarna zbirka I. Svještanoštva iz vremena Prvog svjetskog rata”, in: Dadoh zlato za željezo: Prvi svjetski rat u zbirama Hrvatskog povijesnog muzeja, Zagreb: Hrvatski povijesni muzej, 2011, 92.
5 — Henceforth abbreviated as NSK [Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica].
6 — The son of doctor Đuro Vranešić, who at his privately owned mental institution hid many people including Miroslav Krleža, and rescued them from certain death. Notwithstanding Krleža’s interventions, in 1945 he was sentenced to death by the Yugoslav authorities and executed in January 1946. Krleža continued to follow the development and studies of his son Krešimir Vranešić and made him his family doctor after Krešimir graduated in medicine. See: Š. Me., Vranešić, Đuro, Krležijana, LZMK [available at: http://
KRLEŽA AND
THE DRUNKEN NOVEMBER NIGHT
1918

In 1918 – the year that saw the end of the World War I, the dissolution of Austria-Hungary and the creation of the Yugoslav state – the November tea party (incident, scandal, outburst, drinking party or however you would like to call it) hardly seems like a noteworthy event. And it would have probably been so if the key antagonist had been anyone but Krleža, who periodically, sometimes in more detail and other times briefly, continued to reminisce about this night for the rest of his life: ‘… and I pass through the crowd and think: there, that’s our history and no one will ever learn or know how it all actually seemed in such a historical moment, when the city of Agram celebrated the downfall of Austria, in the month of October of the year 1918.’

Krleža’s first comment on the tea party was published a week later, on 21 November 1918 in the social-democrat weekly Sloboda. The article was
titled ‘The Black-and-Yellow Scandal’ and subtitled ‘A Comment on my Incident at the Serbian Tea Party at Sokol’; it began with the statement ‘Our problem is demobilization rather than mobilization!’ and continued listing reasons as to why the ‘remnants of the remnants’ of the defeated Habsburg army, i.e. the ‘Croatian green cadres’, needed to be disarmed and disciplined by force. However, Krleža knew that this could not to be done by those ‘who had represented this disciplinarian force two months ago, on behalf of their middle-aged Kaiserism’ – i.e. Austro-Hungarian officers. Continuing this line of thought, Krleža explains his behavior at the tea party: ‘And they were wrong, those who yapped at me, as if I’d personally assaulted Mr. Kvaternik. I don’t even personally know Mr. Kvaternik and have no personal grudge with him. […] but he does represent a dark principle, there’s no doubt about that. And it was this principle that I attacked.’

In 1930 Kalaman Mesarić, director, playwright, translator and theater critic, in his article ‘Krleža klafra...’ remarked that Krleža was ‘generally fond of scandals’ and that his popularity rested on a series of scandals ‘starting from that protest against officer Kvaternik during the turnover...’ In his book of polemic essays Moj obračun s njima [My Reckoning with Them, 1932] Krleža replied: ‘The night of the Kvaternik incident, some drunkards tried to take me apart with their scimitars and would have done so if some other drunkards had not defended me with their revolvers.’ He then remarks that he needs to write a book based on the ‘motif of those drunkards in a stuffy room’ in order to explain ‘to himself and to people around him all of that overcoming and abandonment that grew in me during that drunken November night long ago’ when ‘after ten million corpses a 25-year-old boy rose and, amid many drunken salutes, wanted to salute the dead, the hanged, those who lay frozen in the mud and in the pits....’

In 1942 World War II was in full swing. Krleža remained in isolation until 1945 and refused to cooperate with the Ustasha regime. He continued writing, but not publishing his works. It was then that he wrote a memoir record of the 1918 tea party; it was published for the first time in 1952, in the journal Republika, under the title ‘Drunken Night’. Krleža begins the text by para
phrasing fragments from the local press about that night.\footnote{17} These are followed by a lengthy passage describing the atmosphere at the tea party and analyzing relevant persons who marked the last months of 1918 – both present and absent – and calling them out. Finally, under the subtitle Epilogue, the author offers his own recollection of the event from the publication *My Reckoning with Them* (Zagreb, 1932); describes his everyday life in 1942,\footnote{18} goes back to 1930\footnote{19} and then again to 1918, recollecting his conversation with the Serbian Colonel Vesović, to whom he had been brought after the incident.\footnote{20}

Krleža’s aforementioned legacy contains various manuscript versions and typewritten texts about the November night. These manuscripts include 22 flyers for a ‘saccharine-sweetened coffee substitute’ dating from 1942.\footnote{22} The reverse sides of these flyers contain manuscript fragments for the essay on the drunken night of 1918 – parts of the Epilogue, lists of attendees and invitees, descriptions of the atmosphere at the tea party and parts of the articles published on 14 November 1918 in *Obzor* and *Hrvatska riječ*.

After its first publication in 1952, the memoir of the drunken November night went on to appear in various versions.\footnote{23} In 1956 Krleža included it in his diary *Davni dani* as the ‘Drunken November Night 1918’; this was an abridged version, without the Epilogue, but with the note ‘Diary fragment, autumn 1942’.\footnote{23}
Five years after Krleža’s death, in 1986, Enes Čengić published four books under the shared title S Krležom iz dana u dan [With Krleža From Day to Day] in diary form. On 24 April 1976 Čengić asked: ‘Are your words in the Drunken November Night 1918 authentic or were they written later on, as a literary text?’ Krleža replies: ‘It’s written just as it had been said. [...] And my response was relatively quick-witted, even clever if you like, which was confirmed in practice, starting from the speech of 13 November 1985.’

THE ‘DRUNKEN NOVEMBER NIGHT 1918’
IN THE ZAGREB PRESS

Among the many Zagreb press publications from November 1918 kept at the NSK, there are eight that include overviews of the tea party organized on 13 November 1918 in honor of Serbian officers; however, only two of these mention Miroslav Krleža’s incident.

The paper Glas Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba, along with the announcement that ‘invitees and guests were kindly reminded’ that the tea party was to begin at nine, also states that it was to be preceded by a concert performed by Schlick-Gnezdo at the Croatian conservatory, while the daily Novosti asked

24 — The publicist and author Enes Čengić dedicated most of his writings to Krleža, their first contact dates from 1956. Their contacts intensified in 1971 and lasted until Krleža’s death. Čengić was one of the inheritors of Krleža’s authorship rights and the trustee tasked with managing and protecting his literary legacy. See: Đ. Zć., Čengić, Enes, Krležijana, LZMK [available at: http://krlezijana.lzmk.hr/clanak.aspx?id=1402; accessed on: 30 June 2018].
26 — The morning issue of Obzor, Glas Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba, Novosti, Hrvatska država, Novine, Male novine of 14 November reported about the tea party; the evening issue of Obzor and Hrvatska riječ mentioned Krleža’s incident. Zvonimir Kulundžić informs us that Jutarnji list reported extensively on the event, dedicating three quarters of a page to it, but there was no mention of the incident. There are no issues of Jutarnji list of November 1918 in the NSK collection. See: Kulundžić, Z., Tajne i kompleksi Miroslava Krleže koje su ključ za razumijevanje pretežnog dijela njegova opusa, Ljubljana: SZS Emonica; TDS-SKD Guliver; Zagreb: nezavisna autorska naklada Kulundžića, Žabota i Gluvića, 1988, 28.
ladies and gentlemen to bring their donations-in-kind on Wednesday from 9 to 2 to the Croatian Sokol.'

The day after the tea party, the evening edition of the daily Obzor of 14 November 1918 published an article titled ‘Tea Party in Honor of Serbian Officers’, which names the organizer as the Democratic Association of Yugoslav Women, whose social activities in regard to women’s suffrage had been visible in the press over the last months of 1918, for example in the resolution in which ‘Yugoslav women gathered at the women’s council in the music conservatory on 10 October’ and asked the People’s Council for ‘women’s representation in legislation and government’ in ‘our future unified Yugoslav state of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes’ and to be granted ‘the same rights enjoyed by men at the elections for the next constituency’. They also asked the ‘People’s Council to take care of women and girls who had been employed during the war in place of their husbands’ so that they were not ‘left out on the streets with no income, but given another job and a decent source of livelihood.’

Obzor also mentions ‘our diligent singing choir from Zagreb’ Jug which opened the tea party with their rendition of the song ‘Slovenac, Srb, Hrvat’ [Slovene, Serb, Croat] and the Dalmatian boys who performed the song ‘Srbijanci i Bosanci’ [Serbs and Bosnians]. Glas Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba reports that the tenor and opera member Josip Rijavec sang a song by Konjović. The morning issue of Obzor also states that the venue of the tea party ‘had been wonderfully decked out in national Slavic flags and greenery’, and that the ‘hall and the galleries were completely full of members of all strata’, with the ‘prettier sex especially well-represented’. Hrvatska riječ reported that the choir Lisinski also took part and that ‘ladies in national costumes adorned with flags and flowers orchestrated […] the show, tended and greeted guests. A procession of Sokol members also greeted guests […] and the band merrily played our anthems, La Marseillaise, and other songs.’ Novosti remarked that the ‘hall was too small to accommodate even a small portion of the crowd that had gathered to attend the event. Many left when they realized there would be no room for them to stand, let alone sit down.’

This was followed by speeches of the organizers, Mrs. Šarić and Mrs. Iveković, as well as officials Stjepan Srkulj, Svetozar Pribićević, Mate Drinković and others. Hrvatska država reported that the organizers greeted their ‘Serbian brethren, sincerely from the heart, without demeaning their own tribe,'

27 — “Čajanka u počast srpskih časnika”, in: Glas Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba, no. 244, 13 November 1918, 3; “Čajanka u počast srpskih časnika”, in: Novosti, no. 303, 12 November 1918, 5.
28 — „Skupština ženskog demokratskog udruženja”, in: Glas Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba, no. 243, 12 November 1918, 2.
29 — Petar Konjović (1883–1970), Serbian composer, conductor and music scholar. From 1933 to 1935 he served as the intendant of the Croatian National Theater in Zagreb; together with Milan Zaks, Krešimir Baranović and Branko Gavela, he significantly improved, extended and modernized the theater’s repertoire. See: „Čajanka u počast srpskih oficira”, in: Glas Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba, no. 245, 14. 11. 1918, 2; Petar Konjović, Hrvatska enciklopedija, LZMK [available at: http://www.enciklopedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?id=5818; accessed on: 30 June 2018].
30 — „Čajanka u počast srpskih časnika”, in: Obzor, no. 257, 14 November 1918, 1.
31 — „Čajanka u počast srbskim oficirima”, in: Hrvatska riječ, no. 300, 14 November 1918, 3.
and expressed the sentiments of the entire Croatian people: Good health to you [...], white eagles! Novosti stated that Srkulj, the mayor of Zagreb, mentioned ‘the Illyrians and their movement, Ban Jelačić, who instead on joining forces to liberate the people and went to rescue foreigners.’ Novine recounted the speech given by S. Pribićević, who said that he was not speaking in any official capacity but rather in his personal name and that ‘all of our strength need[ed] to be summoned to unite the Slovene, Croatian and Serbian people into a single state, where the entire people would be its own master.’ Male novine quoted the speech of M. Drinković, who said that ‘the time had not come only for amusement and merriment. [...] The Italians and Hungarians want to take what is ours; other speakers included Vladimir Ćorović, secretary and member of the People’s Council for Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Budislav Grga Angjelinović, member of the plenum of the People’s Council of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs, and the public safety officer in Zagreb. Dušan T. Simović, lieutenant colonel and delegate of the Serbian Supreme Command with the People’s Council of SCS in Zagreb, who was quoted by Novosti as having ‘emphasized the struggle and effort of the Serbian army and praised the unification’; the present officers also included the Serbian artillery lieutenant colonel Antonijević.

Male novine reported that the ‘crowd threw flowers at the speaker’ and that the ‘band played Rado ide Srbin u vojnike [tr. note: Serbian patriotic song].’ The speeches caused ‘a lot of enthusiasm, and joy and pleasure were evident on all faces.’ Obzor continued to state that at midnight the crowd was invited to come out to the streets to greet the ‘battalion of Serbian soldiers’ which was to continue onwards to Rijeka. Along with the planned reception, Male novine mentioned that the ‘train failed to arrive on time’, and Hrvatska država reported that the party lasted well into the early hours of the morning.

33 — “Čajanka u hrvatskom sokolu”, u: Hrvatska država, no. 246, 14 November 1918, 3.
36 — Most examined newspapers erroneously refer to Simović as Simonović or Sinković, with the exception of Glas Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba, which uses the correct name. In his Epilogue Krleža also refers to him by the incorrect name of Simonović. See: „Čajanka u počast srpskih oficira”, u: Glas Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba, no. 245, 14 November 1918, 2; Krleža, M. (n. 10), 258; Narodno vijeće Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba u Zagrebu: 1918–1919.; izabrani dokumenti, Zagreb: Hrvatski državni arhiv, 2008, 616.
38 — „Čajanka u hrvatskom sokolu”, u: Hrvatska država, no. 246, 14 November 1918, 3.
39 — „Čajanka u počast srpskih časnicima”, u: Male novine, no. 279, 14 November 1918, 2.
40 — „Čajanka u počast srpskih časnicima”, u: Obzor, no. 257, 14 November 1918, 1.
41 — „Čajanka u počast srpskih časnicima”, u: Obzor, no. 257, 14 November 1918, 1.
42 — „Čajanka u počast srpskih časnicima”, u: Male novine, no. 279, 14 November 1918, 2; „Čajanka u hrvatskom sokolu”, u: Hrvatska država, 14 November 1918, no. 246, 3.
greet the brotherly Serbian army, but it was nowhere to be seen and no one knew when it was due to arrive. Hours passed. The crowd waited nervously and impatiently. Barely anyone left the street and yet many kept coming. [...] Ladies held large bouquets in their hands, intending to decorate the Serbian heroes with flowers. [...] Flags were flying high: Slovene, Croatian, and Serbian – all of them decked out in flowers. [...] It was ten o’clock. The train entered the station. [...] Lt. Col. Ljuba Maksimović, the commander of the battalion, came out of the first carriage...’ 700 soldiers arrived and ’spent several hours in Zagreb before they continued on to Rijeka in the afternoon...’44 In the 1952 version of the Drunken Night, Krleža gave the following comment of the events concerning Rijeka: ’These Serbs have not come to defend Rijeka but to arrest anyone who isn’t yelling Long live King Petar!’45 Of the examined periodicals, only the evening edition of Obzor46 and Hrvatska riječ47 mentioned Krleža and his outburst.48 Obzor states that ‘in
these turbulent times, even the most intimate of parties can turn into political gatherings’ and that yesterday’s tea party ‘became the stage of a heated debate that delves deep into our future life…’ adding that the Croatian author Miroslav Krleža had cried: ‘Down with the unworthy’ at the moment when Lt. Col. Kvaternik was about to give a speech and called him out for his actions during the Great War. Then Drinković gave a ‘lengthy’ speech in which ‘he took an energetic stand against undermining the reputation of our officers’ who had ‘sworn oaths to the Yugoslav state’. Then Major Grubić, one of the conspirators who had ‘undermined discipline in the former Austro-Hungarian army’, took the floor. Grubić described the plot organized by twelve officers led by Drinković which began in February, at the time of the ‘great German offensive in the West’. Grubić said that Lt. Col. Kvaternik had taken part in the plot ‘in a direct manner’, and ‘during his service with Marshall Borojević rescued Dr Žerjav from certain death, then secretary of Dr. Korošec, although Borojević demanded the death penalty for him.’ He adds that during his service at the ‘military government’ in Belgrade Kvaternik saved ‘hundreds upon hundreds of our people from penalties and persecutions, which can all be proved with documents in our possession.’ Then Krleža took the floor and declared that he was doing so ‘on behalf of the wretched, symbolized in the 25th patriotic battalion, who had been prosecuted and terrorized by their own officers, harboring the liberation idea in their souls and waiting to be rescued by Serbia…’ The crowd began to yell, interject, and express agreement, and then the ‘organizing committee’ ordered the band to play a folk dance and Krleža could not finish his speech. Hrvatska riječ described his outburst as a ‘minor dissonance’ which had prompted Budislav Grga Angjelinović, Mate Drinković, Lt. Col. Kvaternik and Miroslav Krleža himself to speak out, and which ‘could have been avoided had both sides shown a little more tactfulness. However, it was soon ended by the song Iz bratskog zagrljaja, and folk dances.’


51 — Probably the great German offensive that began on 21 March 1918 and involved 65 German divisions; it was directed at the British section of the battlefield between the Somme and the Oise. See: Svjetski ratovi. Prvi svjetski rat, Hrvatska enciklopedija, LZMK [available at: http://www.enciklopedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?id=59137; accessed: 30 June 2018].

52 — Gregor Žerjav (1882–1929), a Slovene politician who during the Great War founded an illegal organization that worked against the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and supported the formation of unified Yugoslavia. See: Žerjav, Gregor, Slovenski biografski leksikon, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti [available at: http://www.slovenska-biografija.si/oseba/sbi898500/; accessed on 29 June 2018].
ON THOSE WHO WERE CALLED OUT

Unlike the Zagreb press in 1918, which reported about a successful tea party, Krleža’s impressions published in 1952 are markedly different: ‘On the damask, roses on silver jugs, laughing porcine heads, Schiller wine, Jerusalem wine, Welschriesling, burgundies, pelinkovac [tr. note: local bitter liqueur], cognac, maraschino, cakes, Gleichgewicht, muškaconi [tr. note: the latter two denote local desserts]; ‘the drunk crowd, wild in its unbridled ecstasy, in its triumph and hallucination’; ‘everything smelled of Beuschel, tripe soup, sausages’; tea, if any was served at all, does not seem to have been important enough for Krleža to note.54

The building of Kolo and Sokol shone ‘in full splendor of its first high-class ball after four long years of war’ and Krleža ended up at the function out of his ‘melancholy loneliness’; having seen that ‘all detectives and ministers, members of the People’s Council of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, high officials of Austria-Hungary and Croat-Slavonic-Dalmatian poets, dullards and taxmen’ had gone mad ‘with joy over this cadaverous feast’, he concluded that it was a ‘ball of petty-bourgeois mush’ and a ‘celebration of philistine enthusiasm.’

In addition to his general impressions of the tea party, Krleža called out everyone, both present and absent including ‘two blood-drenched dynasties’ (the houses of Habsburg and Karađorđević), officers, ladies, and many others – some by name and others as symbols of the general situation in the last few months of 1918, all those who had begun to organize weddings while the wakes were still ongoing: ‘that night, standing over Austria’s open grave [...] they had already found a new suitor for the Kingdom of Croatia.’

53 — Krleža, M., (n. 10), 244–262.
54 — Among the examined Zagreb press, only Novosti mentioned that there had been tea: ‘a lot of food and drink, meat, cake, wine and tea.’ See: Novi Zagreb. Povodom sinočne čajanke u Hrv. Sokolu’, u: Novosti, br. 305, 14. 11. 1918, 3.
Numerous politicians attended the tea party, but Krleža focuses on Mate Drinković, the commissioner of the People’s Council for military affairs, often referring to him as the ‘Minister of War’\textsuperscript{55}, using a plethora of offensive phrases to describe him: ‘drunk like an Illyrian god’; ‘the dumbest of the drunkards’; ‘a civilian dentist’; ‘a ridiculous orthodontist creature with hair bushy and thick like a porcupine’. The politicians were collectively described in the following less than flattering words: ‘All of the branches on our political tree have begun to play so many different tunes that not a single wise, humane word could be heard [...] And these drunken guests, tonight they are fuelled by brandy – double bitter brandies, and the liquor screams, it yells, it sings all kinds of political nonsense, having led them, leading them on, and they roll around in herbal and plum brandy, like a regurgitated Noah’s ark.’\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{55} — Mate Drinković (1868–1931), dentist, publicist and politician; member of the Dalmatian Party of Rights; delegate in the Dalmatian Sabor; member of the plenum of the People’s Council of SCS in Zagreb; member of the Central Committee of the People’s Council of SCS; secretary of the Presidency of the People’s Council of SCS; commissioner for defense of the People’s Council of SCS; See: \textit{Narodno vijeće Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba u Zagrebu: 1918–1919. izabrani dokumenti}, Zagreb: Hrvatski državni arhiv, 2008, 602.

\textsuperscript{56} — See: Krleža, M. (n. 10), 248, 250.
Krleža paints the ‘prettier sex’ in no less unforgiving terms: ‘and so screams the mass of our democratic ‘enchanting prettier sex’; the cute ladies and sugar-sweet grielies are trying to endear themselves to the Serbs’; ‘on their silver trays they’ve spilled a mass of little cakes and cookies following the current motto of Agram: Die armen serbschen Kerle sollen sich anfressen!’ Earlier they had assisted with the ‘severing of people’s arms and legs’; ‘in the national costume of Đakovo, at charity parties they were in favor of continuing the imperial slaughter; they put gold nails into the Slavic Lipa; saluted the wounded en masse and with flowers […] they bowed to the golden slippers of Crown Prince Otto; yesterday they tried to be good Croats and high-class ladies, and tonight Yugoslav democratic women, with only the ideal of the Karađorđević dynasty on their ostentatiously rouged lips, starting with this tea party, from tonight to the day after tomorrow…’

Among the ladies he called out, particularly noteworthy are the ‘three fairies of the SCS’, representing the three nationalities of the new order: a Slovene, a Croat and a Serbian lady – Zofka Kveder-Demetrović, Zlata Kovačević-Lopašić and Olga Kernic-Peleš who danced their ‘drunken Illyrian dance’ and seemed to him no different than their male counterparts – the present officers and politicians. Krleža dedicated to them one of his few footnotes, recounting their greeting of Aleksandar Karađorđević at the Zagreb train station ‘with their routine bouquets of Kranj-Agram-Srem.’ A courtier told him that A. K. said ‘that here in Zagreb [there was] no one but these old – and the king here used a very un-kingly, vulgar, uncouth expletive…’

All three ladies – Zofka, Zlata and Olga – had worked to promote women’s suffrage, as evidenced by their writings published in the journal Ženski svijet (Women’s World), which was renamed Jugoslavenska žena (Yugoslav Woman) in November 1918. This is also supported by the fact that in the Croatian conservatory on 11 November 1918 at the assembly of the Democratic Association of Yugoslav Women, the organizer of the tea party, the editor of this journal Zofka Kveder-Demetrović read a lecture ‘on the orientation of our women in contemporary social and political circumstances.’

57 — In a footnote in his work Davni dani, Krleža provides a translation: ‘Let the poor Serbs stuff their mouths.’ See: Krleža, M., Davni dani: zapisi 1914–1921, Zagreb: Zora, 1956, 500. 58 — Zofka Kveder-Demetrović (1878–1926) was a Slovene/Croat author, journalist and women’s suffrage activist. The other two representatives of the ‘prettier sex’ called out by Krleža were teachers Zlata Lopašić-Kovačević (1862–1938) and Olga Kernic-Peleš who danced their ‘drunken Illyrian dance’ and seemed to him no different than their male counterparts – the present officers and politicians. Krleža dedicated to them one of his few footnotes, recounting their greeting of Aleksandar Karađorđević at the Zagreb train station ‘with their routine bouquets of Kranj-Agram-Srem.’ A courtier told him that A. K. said ‘that here in Zagreb [there was] no one but these old – and the king here used a very un-kingly, vulgar, uncouth expletive…’

60 — Contacts between Zofka Kveder-Demetrović and Krleža were visible in early 1919 when Zofka published an article titled ‘Miroslav Krleža, his sycophants and their Plamen’, where she explains Krleža’s literary opus, stating that she appreciates his talent as an author, but dislikes his cynicism, destructiveness and lack of noble-mindedness. In response, the journal Plamen [Flame], whose founders included Krleža, published a bitter ironic note ‘Na adresu gđe Kveder’ [Addressed to Mrs. Kveder] See: Krleža, M. (n. 10), 246; Đ. Zć., Kveder-Demetrović, Zofka, Krležijana, LZMK [available at: http://klizejana.lzmk.hr/clanak.aspx?id=1769; accessed on: 30 June 2018].
Zofka and Zlata became evident during the Great War. In April 1915 both ladies were to attend the Women's Peace Congress in The Hague as Croatian delegates. The Congress gathered women from both belligerent sides, but the authorities did not allow them to attend.62

At the session of the Croatian parliament (Sabor) held on 29 October 1918 these ‘three tri-named leading ladies of our unification in 1918’ took part in donating silver and gold at the altar of their homeland – i.e. in gifting jewels and precious metals to the People’s Council.63 It was then that the Triune Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia severed all relations with the Kingdom of Hungary and the Austrian Empire, and Croatia decided to join the State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs. As reported in the contemporary press and recorded in the stenographic minutes of the Sabor, a large delegation of women entered the assembly hall; they were ‘led by Zlata Lopašić-Kovačević, who gave an appropriate speech on behalf of Croat, Serb and Slovène women, and was the first to donate her golden cross and chain. Shouting ‘Praise Strossmayer’64 and ‘Long live the tri-named people in the independent and the free state of Croats, Serbs and Slovénés’, the ladies took off their jewelry and laid it on the speaker’s table as an offering to their newly liberated homeland.65

This celebratory moment of severing ties with the Dual Monarchy is also shown in a pencil drawing and a lithograph by the artist Milenko Gjurić, both of which are kept at the Print Collection of NSK.66 The other two prints by Gjurić in the NSK collection depict the atmosphere in the streets during many events – almost daily celebrations in the squares and streets of Zagreb.67

---


64 — In her speech Zlata Lopašić-Kovačević emphasized the importance of Josip Juraj Strossmayer, the bishop of Bakovo and Croatian politician, as one of the main advocates of Yugoslav unification: ‘I believe that it is our duty to remember him and to underline, in this historic moment and at this historic venue, that today we have achieved the ideas which he, sadly, did not live to see.’ See: Vrkatić, L., „Proглаšenje samostalne države Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba, Zagreb, 29. oktobar 1918“, in: Pojam i biće srpske nacije, Novi Sad, 2009, 650.


67 — After the proclamation of the Kingdom of SCS, the first mass protest against the fledgling state took place in Zagreb on 5 December 1918 known as Prosinačke žrtve (December Victims). The act on unification and the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovvenes, promulgated on 1 December 1918, was not ratified by the Croatian Sabor. See: Prosinačke žrtve, Hrvatska enciklopedija, LZMK [available at: http://www.encyklopedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?id=50697; accessed on: 30 June 2018]; Borošak Manjanović, J., „Prvi svjetski rat u zbirkama hrvatskog povijesnog muzeja“, in: Dadoh zlato za željezo: Prvi svjetski rat u zbirkama Hrvatskog povijesnog muzeja, Zagreb: Hrvatski povijesni muzej, 2011, 33.
city, decorated with tri-colored flags, masses carrying the same tri-colored banners at recognizable city sights, became the new iconography of everyday life.68

However, for Krleža, although so many things had changed, nothing had actually changed: ‘only the curtain is down and everything keeps changing like a quick shift of the stage between two acts. They’re removing portraits of Franz Joseph in their offices and putting up nails for new pictures of King Peter in his red marshal’s uniform’, and ‘a few days ago Austria disappeared so discreetly from our little town that many of our esteemed and dear citizens did not even notice that Austria was no longer among us. And yet everything remained unchanged: Priests and Wasserthal, the pharmacy Mittelbach, Kastner and Öhler, the Grand Hotel, the First Bank of Croatia and the Savings Bank, the Berger shop, Kugli, Corso and Lovački rog, the golden watches in Bulvan’s window, books at Breyer’s and Bettelheim’s coats and Mosinger’s photographs [...] in the window of a shop at Jelačić Square, a lovely white furry poodle has a coquettish ribbon in the patriotic tri-colored pattern around its neck; and in the window of the central pharmacy at the Wounded Heart of Jesus, Hippocrates wears a no less coquettish tri-colored ribbon with a white chrysanthemum: relatively many lovely tri-colored ribbons, wet in the November rain, trudge along in front of the dull bourgeois one-bedroom apartments in the downtown...’

The atmosphere at the tea party was at boiling point during the entire night, but the trigger for Krleža’s outburst was the moment when Mate Drinković saluted Slavko Kvaternik, saying that he was ‘ready to lay down his life for his people, at any time and – if needed – even tonight!’70

Kvaternik or ‘Zum k. und k. Generalštab zugetheilter Oberleutnant der k. und k. Infanterie Herr Slavko Kvaternik, as the Head of the Office of the People’s Council Commissioner for Military Affairs, serving as the deputy chief of staff of the Croatian People’s Army and its Leader’ was seen by Krleža as ‘the king’s bloodthirsty mastiff who for four years did little besides slaughtering our own people’ who would be willing to ‘shoot tonight anyone who is not a supporter of King Petar Karađorđević, just as yesterday he’d hanged anyone who was in favor of King Petar Karađorđević, just as he’d waste no time hanging [...] anyone who [...] happens to emerge victorious, because this is not a man but a caricature from my own war fiction, a donkey [...] who was photographed with a dangling cigarette in his mouth while the Serbs swung at the gallows at Terazije

68 — Gjurić’s lithograph Manifestations, 1918 (Manifestacije, 1918; including a representation of Ilica – GZGH 112 gju 8) from the Print Collection of NSK was published in the first issue of Savremenik in 1919. The Collection also includes another lithograph of the same name, depicting the Cathedral (GZGH 117 gju 18). See: Savremenik, yr. 14, no. 1, 1919.
70 — Slavko Kvaternik (1878–1947), a lieutenant colonel appointed as the deputy commissioner of national defense by the People’s Council of the State of SCS in 1918. He retired in 1921 with the rank of colonel. With a group of former Austro-Hungarian and Yugoslavian officers he organized the armed forces of the Independent State of Croatia (NDH). In 1942 Ante Pavelić launched an initiative for his dismissal, which was formally motivated by the unfavorable situation in the army. After this Kvaternik withdrew from all of his duties. In June 1947 he was sentenced to death as a war criminal. See: Tko je tko u NDH: Hrvatska 1941–1945., Zagreb: Minerva, 1997, 226–227; Narodno vijeće Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba u Zagrebu: 1918–1919.: izabrani dokumenti, Zagreb: Hrvatski državni arhiv, 2008, 608.

He also used the word ‘Kvaternik’ as a derogatory term for all former officers of the Dual Monarchy, ‘this army of black-and-yellow condottieri, Landsknechte, Junkers and soldiers, all those cutthroats who have been hanging people for centuries on foreign soil and who couldn’t care less who they’re hanging and slaughtering, because these are butchers by both profession and innate inclination’. His view of Serbian officers was no less harsh: ‘these brothers from Thessalonica and Kajmakčalan will push us and themselves, together with these Kvaterniks, into new disasters’; he equates them with the ‘Kvaterniks’, adding that they ‘smoke cigarettes and tell jokes from the battlefront: ‘there we shot many hostages, hanged thousands of these rascals and traitors’ and tonight it’s all very intimate, warm, humorous and elegant’.

One of the ‘Kvaterniks’ he called out, Svetozar Boroević, the commander of the Zagreb homeland defense and 42nd Croatian defense division and from August 1917 also the commander of the 1st and 2nd Isonzo Army, was accused by Krleža of having ‘engaged in mandrill, senile love affairs’ near Cres at the height of the XI offensive in summer 1917, together with Kvaternik, his then-adjudant. While the ‘entire Kvarner echoed [...] in this devious thunder the chief commander of the Austrian armada [...] accompanied by his adjutant Lt. Col. Kvaternik came to Lovrana every day to sunbathe at the beach’ and ‘visited his mistress in Lovrana [...], while Lt. Col. Kvaternik, as the Generalissimo’s cicisbeo, procured all the trinkets needed for this charming adventure: ice cream, coffee, cognac, whiskey, champagne, cake, condoms and Tafelmusik…’

Both Boroević and Kvaternik are shown in Oton Iveković’s preparatory drawing for the etching U glavnom stanu Sočanske vojske (At the Main Barracks of the Isonzo Army), which was distributed by the Croatian Art Association to its members in 1916. The flyer in Krleža’s manuscript collection with...
Oton Iveković, sketch for the print 'At the headquarters of the Isonzo army', before 1916

At the main headquarters of the Isonzo army, flyer – no. 1 Svetozar Borojević; no. 22 Slavko Kvaternik

U Glavnom stanu Sočanske vojske.

Reprodukcija originalnoga crteža prof. Svetozara Borovevića.

čišćenje, prinijenje, crtež v slišnem obliku izdaja 1 - 30 u.

Od tega datum u katero Sočansco vojsko B. 30 u.

naklada izdajalna ANTUN ULLRIGU, Zagreb, lice 34.
a schematic representation of the main barracks of the Isonzo Army names all present persons, allowing accurate identification of Borojević and Kvaternik in the drawing and etching. In November 1918 Iveković’s active support for the newly established state became noticeable. It was then that the first postwar exhibition to benefit the People’s Council was organized at the Ulrich Salon, showcasing the works of Oton Iveković and Menci Clement Crnčić. Oton Iveković (1869–1939) was an artist who dedicated most of his opus to topics from Croatian history. In the beginning of the 20th century, in line with the unification ideology of the South Slavs, he took part in the efforts to create a shared Yugoslav cultural space, participating in Yugoslav exhibitions and founding the Association of Yugoslav Visual Artists Lada. The war adventure of Oton Iveković began in June 1915, when he volunteered to join the army and began working as the war painter of the Austro-Hungarian army in Isonzo, Galicia and Serbia. After the war he claimed that his intention had been to reach the enemy side: ‘I must go the frontlines so that the enemy cannot capture me’. In the early stages of the war he tried to get a passport in order to travel to Serbia, but having failed to do so, he volunteered for the front, and was assisted by Slavko Kvaternik in this endeavor.

When Drinković gave Kvaternik the floor, it led to a ‘small dissonance’, i.e. Krleža’s outburst, which began with his cry: ‘Down with Kvaternik!’ This act made Krleža an active participant of the drunken night. Up to this point, all of the ladies, politicians, officers and others he mentions were simply parts of his internal monologue. Krleža spoke up, stated his name, and ‘in front of these hightborn dignitaries of mind and sword’, introduced himself as an author, and a Croatian author at that. Amidst cries of ‘long live’ and ‘down with’ as well as Drinković’s threats of gallows, Krleža took the floor and underlined that it was not ‘about Kvaternik personally or about Kvaternik as an individual, but about Kvaternik as a principle’ and that he was speaking on behalf of the ‘patriots of the 25th Zagreb regiment’ and ‘innumerable casualties of this slaughter exterminated by these same Kvaterniks...’ However, having mentioned the triumphant Russian Revolution and Lenin, whose name rang out ‘like thunder in the drunken night’, Krleža antagonized everyone, because ‘in this moment he was alienated from the ranks of the people by all those Zofkas and Olgas and Zlatas’.

77 — Zbirka rukopisa i starih knjiga, R7970 ‘Ce’ 230.
80 — In the ‘Black-and-Yellow Scandal’ of 1918 Krleža fails to mention that he referred to Lenin in his tea party speech, but he does add: ‘Now when the Soviets are springing up throughout the globe like mushrooms, when the masses are moved only by unabashed vested interests rather than proclamations, when armed battalions control governments, when all commanders are appointed in free voting, when the barricades of private law come tumbling down, here we are ruled by a system of terror and imprisonment...’ See: Krleža, Miroslav, ‘Crno-žuti skandal’, in: NIN: nedeljne informativne novine, 18 June 1991, 46.
Krleža arrived at the tea party around midnight. It is not known for how long he stayed or how he was ejected from the tea party; we do know, however, how his visit ended and how it was perceived by the present guests: ‘I ran out of the Croatian inn and found myself in the fog, out in the street. Having received a few boot hits in the softer part of my worldly substance (a body part which is never to be called by its proper name in finer prose). I was booed and crumpled like a firefly under a pig’s hoof. I’d been booed off the stage like a tenor by those Zofkas, Olgas and Zlatas, and they never even let me sing my arias. I must have disappointed them bitterly.’

Unlike Krleža, the press saw the tea party as a major success, as evidenced by the report in the Zagreb daily Novosti: ‘The old decorated hall of the Sokol has heard many a speech and witnessed many a celebration, but a feast such as this one has never been seen. Zagreb is waking. Zagreb is being reborn. The modest and low-key tea party evolved into an event and a celebration of democracy hereto unseen among us. We are indebted to the ladies who organized the event and showed that they understood the importance of this great moment.’

Krleža’s memoir note offers an extensive and exhaustive assessment of the November tea party. A few years later, his characteristic use of vehement torrents of words, repetitions, listing and verbose statements and restatements were parodied by Krešimir Kovačić in his poem Jutro, podne i ponoć (Morning, Noon and Midnight): ‘… Oh the great nothing / Something / And Everything / Damned, damned, damned, damned / Wrenched from all and everyone / That licks and slithers to the devil’s tit / Cursed by Miroslav Krleža / His own signature and full name…’ The poem appears in the collection Par nas sa Parnasa (1922, A Few of Us from Parnassus), which also includes Krleža’s caricatured portrait of Pjer Križanić with the witty caption: ‘I am the wind, I swirl dust/Aren’t you children afraid?’

One wonders if Krleža could have offered a short assessment of the tea party in just a few words. And what do you think, what would this assessment have been?

81 — Krleža, M. (n. 10), 256.
82 — „Novi Zagreb. Povodom sinoćnje čajanke u Hrv. Sokolu”, in: Novosti, no. 305, 14 November 1918, 4. Male novine describes the tea party as a ‘wonderful picture of our present-day free life of the people’; Hrvatska država gave a ‘very positive’ review to the organizers, and described the party itself as ‘pleasant and congenial’. See: „Čajanka u počast srpskim časnicima”, in: Male novine, no. 279, 14 November 1918, 2; „Čajanka u hrvatskom sokolu”, in: Hrvatska država, no. 14 November 1918, 3.
MONTENEGRO IN THE YUGOSLAV STATE (1918–1921)
During World War One the process of achieving Yugoslav unification entered its final phase. On 7 December 1914 the government of the Kingdom of Serbia passed the Niš Declaration, proclaiming the creation of a South Slavic community as its main war objective. The Austro-Hungarian occupation of Serbia and Montenegro in January 1916 put an end to the official war alliance of the two countries against the enemy, and their mutual propaganda attacks became stronger than before. The mistrust of the Montenegrin leadership towards the policies of Prime Minister Nikola Pašić, which began with the Bombing Affair of 1907 and the Kolašin Affair of 1909, was rooted in the justified fear of the state’s disappearance and the downfall of its dynasty. Without the participation of Montenegro, the leading role in South Slavic unification was played by the Serbian government in exile, as expressed in the Corfu Declaration of 20 July 1917. Their respective diverging views on the creation of a joint state became insurmountable and would eventually act as the cause of political disagreement between the two counties. Unlike official Serbia, Montenegrin institutions were opposed to any form of unification that would give one state the role that had been played by Piedmont in the Risorgimento, a stance publicized in articles of the official paper Glas Crnogorca [The Montenegrin’s Voice].

This period saw the formation of parallel institutions tasked with opposing official Montenegrin institutions, portraying themselves as legitimate representatives of the people’s will. In 1917 the Montenegrin Committee for National Unification was formed in Paris; it was supported by Serbia and led by Andrija Radović, the former Prime Minister in exile and a prominent prewar politician.

On the eve of the creation of the joint state, on 21 October 1918, King Nikola I Petrović Njegoš stated in the émigré paper Glas Crnogorca: ‘Brothers, with utmost enthusiasm, joy and passion, today I solemnly declare that I want – and I am certain that all of my faithful subjects in Montenegro share this wish – our dear Montenegro to be a part of Yugoslavia, to honorably enter the
Yugoslav community, just as it had honorably fought and sacrificed itself for it. I would like the Yugoslav confederation to be organized in unity and brotherhood, with everyone keeping their own rights, faith, order and customs, and with no one imposing their dominance; let us all be equals in the bosom of our mother Yugoslavia and let everyone work for its progress and greatness in the company of free and edified peoples.1

By early November, the entire territory was either liberated or occupied by French, Serbian, American, British and Italian troops, as stated in the professional and general public. On 15 October 1918 Glas Crnogorca published on its front page: ‘In the last days of October we have received from Ljubljana via Switzerland the first news of a general revolt in Montenegro. According to these reports, on 12 October Montenegrin armed regiments captured Nikšić, Berane, and Andrijevica. Austrian forces urgently left the country; the Austrian governor and military command fled Cetinje, leaving behind immense military material. The rebels are well-armed. The reports state that Montenegrin volunteer battalions liberated Cetinje, Rijeka and Skadar a few days later. An entire Hungarian battalion was taken prisoner at Andrijevica. Official reports state: The Italian army reached Skadar from Lješ on 30 October. – The Italian fleet landed in both Montenegrin ports, Ulcinj and Bar. The French army, which had reached Montenegro via Metohija, arrived in Skadar. – On 2 November the

1 — Glas Crnogorca, 21 October 1918, p. 1.
French reached Podgorica assisted by Montenegrin rebels. Over 4,000 enemy troops were captured, including 120 officers as well as a lot of ammunition and various war supplies.\textsuperscript{2} The definition problem did not emerge from the Allied troops’ entry into the country, but from their support to one political faction, whose activities violated the sovereignty of the Kingdom of Montenegro and that of the House of Petrović Njegoš.

The process of unification, led by official Serbia through its supporters, ran parallel with the military actions. The Central Executive Committee for National Unification was formed and included Svetozar Tomić, Janko Spašojević, Petar Kosović i Milosav Račević.\textsuperscript{3} This organ passed the Directive on the Election of Delegates in the Great National Assembly in berane, which gave port captancies two delegates each, while the counties had three; towns with less than 5,000 inhabitants were allowed to appoint one delegate and those with a population larger than 5,000 two.\textsuperscript{4} In a bid to spread pro-unification views, a two-page daily called \textit{Novo doba} [New Age] was launched in Cetinje, publishing news on the preparations for the act of unification at the Montenegro and South Slavic levels.

Two electoral lists took part in the elections held in Cetinje: one was printed on white paper and advocated unconditional unification with Serbia; the other was printed on green paper and argued that conditional unification was the best political concept. This led to the emergence of the white and green factions (‘whiters’ and ‘greeners’), which became synonymous with the events of late 1918 and early 1919 in Montenegro.

The Assembly was convened in Podgorica on 24 November and its activities began in the building of the Tobacco Monopoly. Savo Cerović was appointed its chairman, while Savo Fatić and Lazar Damjanović served as his vice-chairmen. Four decisions were passed at the session of the Great National Assembly of the Serbian people in Montenegro held in Podgorica on 26 November 1918: ‘1) to depose King Nikola I Petrović – Njegoš and his dynasty from the throne of Montenegro; 2) for Montenegro to proclaim unification with brotherly Serbia into a single state ruled by the Karađorđević dynasty, and to join the shared homeland of our tri-named people of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes; 3) to appoint the Executive National Committee comprising five members to manage affairs until the finalization of the unification process between Serbia and Montenegro; and 4) to inform Nikola Petrović, the former King of Montenegro, the government of the Kingdom of Serbia, all friendly Allies and neutral states of this decision.’ The Assembly held its final session and ended on 29 November. Although the Assembly sent letters to inform the Allied powers of its decisions, it had no international and legal legitimacy.

An analysis of the decisions passed by the assembly in Podgorica indicates that it had a revolutionary character. The Executive Committee included Stevo Vukotić, Marko Daković, Lazar Damjanović, Risto Jojić and Spasoje Piletić.

\textsuperscript{2} — \textit{Glas Crnogorca}, 15 November 1918, p. 1.
The delegates of the Great National Assembly in Montenegro, Podgorica, 26 November 1918
The decision of the Great National Assembly of the Serbian people in Montenegro

The Montenegrin delegation headed by Gavrilo Đozić, the Metropolitan of Montenegro, which passed the decisions of the Great National Assembly of Montenegro in Belgrade, 1918.
These decisions did not stipulate a monarchical or republican organization of the community. The royal government of Montenegro in Neuilly near Paris responded to the events in Podgorica by publishing the following text on the frontpage of the 7 December issue of *Glas Crnogorca*: ‘As per the Constitution of the Kingdom of Montenegro, only a National Assembly legally elected by the people has the right to pass decisions regarding the sovereignty of the state and its dynasty. The invalidity of the above report is evidenced by the fact that the Montenegrin Constitution does not recognize a ‘great’ National Assembly.’

The events in Montenegro were driven by the international Franco-Italian struggle for domination in postwar Europe. The formation of a unified South Slavic state and of Czechoslovakia, as well as the expansion of Romania, meant the creation of the so-called *cordon sanitaire* (sanitary cordon), a barrier that was to protect the continent from a new rise of Germany and the spreading of communism from Soviet Russia. The plan was hatched under the patronage of France and Great Britain, the leading powers in Europe after the end of the war. After the Entente powers promised to allow Italy to incorporate the eastern Adriatic territories in return for its entry into the war, as stipulated in the Treaty of London of 26 April 1915, Italy supported the opponents of Serbia’s policy of unifying the South Slavic territories into a single state.

The political opponents of the decisions passed at the assembly in Podgorica were preparing to launch a revolt in defense of the state and its honor. Accusations against King Nikola and his behavior during the war caused a lot of dissatisfaction among the population. However, reports of the planned revolt reached the command of the Adriatic troops in Cetinje, a development that would fatefuly shape the course of events. On the eve of the revolt, on 2 January 1919, General Dragutin Milutinović issued an order that began with his assessment of the situation: ‘Since some parts of the Montenegrin people have been led to publicly show their intention to cause unrests in Montenegro and to sever communication between Cetinje and Kotor as well as Cetinje and other towns in Montenegro...’ adding that he had ‘decided to take military action in order to restore peace...’

On 4 January 1919 the rebel headquarters in Bajice near Cetinje submitted its demands to the Executive Committee and the command of the Adriatic troops: ‘1. We all agree that Montenegro should enter the great Yugoslav state together with other provinces and as an equal member with no internal borders – the form of government is to be determined by a regular assembly of all Yugoslavs (constituents), and we will gladly defer to this decision. 2. We ask that a people’s court should find the guilty parties for all events that marred our armed effort; and then, with our head high and clear, we will be able to join this great Yugoslav community, of which our ancestors had...’

---

5 — *Glas Crnogorca*, 7 December 1918, p. 1.
Il Montenegro contro la dominazione serba

La lotta del Montenegro contro la dominazione serba è una pagina storica e di gloria. La sua tenacia e determinazione, unite alla bravura e al coraggio del popolo montenegrino, hanno sancito una vittoria che ha ispirato e ispira ancora oggi. La loro battaglia è un esempio di resistenza e libertà, una lezione per tutti coloro che lottano per i diritti fondamentali del popolo e della nazione.

(Ufficio di A. Montel)
been the oldest and most faithful custodians. 3. We demand the annulment of the assembly decision passed in Podgorica and new free elections in Montenegro to appoint delegates to solve all of our current domestic affairs and to occasionally represent Montenegro at home and abroad.⁷ This document was signed by Krsto Popović, the captain of the Montenegrin army, who from this moment on became the leader of the revolt and its symbol. On the following day General Milutinović replied to the demands: 'Until a decision is passed as per this document, I will continue to keep the peace with my troops and other armed Montenegrins and no armed forces can enter the township of Cetinje without encountering armed resistance from us.'⁸ The main conflicts took place in Cetinje on 6 January, when major armed struggles took place. The revolt did not gain momentum in Rijeka Crnojevića, Virpazar, Podgorica and Nikšić, as the organizers were arrested by the authorities or otherwise thwarted in their intentions. The main architect of revolt was Jovan Plamenac, a former minister in the prewar period. He was appointed Prime Minister in February, after his role as the political leader of the supporters of the Kingdom of Montenegro had been verified.

Having been informed of the developments that had taken place on the previous day, on 7 January 1919 General Paul Venel, the commander of the General Allied Staff in Kotor, presented the following demands: 1. All Serbian and Montenegrin soldiers who have been captured are to be released immediately. Carriages, cars and their drivers are also to be set free. 2. The road Kotor – Cetinje is to be made available for all kinds of traffic. 3. Telegraph and telephone lines are to be repaired. Soldiers and workers tasked with these repairs are not to be disturbed. 4. All demands are to be fulfilled within 48 hours starting from 7 January 1919/25 December 1918 or else I will be forced to intervene with Allied troops. 5. All who have taken part in the revolt are to return to their homes and will not be sanctioned if they remain quiet and lay down their weapons. They are at liberty to submit their complaints to the French general in Kotor and he will forward them to the Commander-in-Chief of Allied Eastern Armies, and he in turn to the French government.⁹ The attitude of France towards these events essentially signaled the political failure of the revolt and any efforts to disrupt the new situation. The next activity of the institutions of the Kingdom of Montenegro was King Nikola’s address of 27 January 1919, at the beginning of the Paris Peace Conference: 'To my beloved people, I implore you, stay peacefully in your homes! Do not take to arms to oppose the battalions trying to wrench the government of our country. I have been assured by high representatives of the Allies that very soon the Montenegrin people will be given an opportunity to decide its future form of government. For my part, let it be known, general, that I will gladly submit to such a decision. NIKOLA.'¹⁰

After the end of the revolt, some rebels continued their resistance through guerilla warfare. This form of struggle came to be known as Komitas warfare and those who used it as Komitas, the same appellation that was used

---

⁹ — Ibid, p. 130.
A battalion of the army of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes crossing the Emperor's Bridge near Nikšić, February 1920.
for their predecessors during the Austro-Hungarian occupation. The territory of Montenegro remained the arena of the conflict between government forces and rebels until 1929 and the death of the last rebels.

Following the failure of the rebellion, in March 1919 the Montenegrin government issued a directive on the appointment of the commander of Montenegrin troops in the Italian city of Gaeta. With Italian support and following an order issued in April, an army was formed in Gaeta and Formia with the intention of returning to the country with the king and government and restoring the state. On the other hand, by supporting Serbian troops France was protecting the implementation of authorities in the emerging country. According to the claims of Montenegrin institutions, many crimes were committed by the official organs against the rebels; however, it is also true that inter-Montegrin struggles between two opposing factions went on at the same.

On 5 March the government in Neuilly near Paris addressed a memorandum to the Conference, explaining the position of its country. The author of the text, Prime Minister Jovan Plamenac, and ministers Pero Šoć and Anto Gvozdenović demanded the following: ‘The Royal Government asks the Peace Conference to prove its fairness to Montenegro and its people, which has suffered so many bitter challenges, i.e. it asks the Conference to allow it to have two representatives and to immediately invite them to attend the Conference and defend the rights and interests of Montenegro.’ In this text they also insisted on the territorial inclusion of the Bay of Kotor (Boka Kotorska), Herzegovina and Skadar (Scutari) as legitimate objectives rooted in a historical tradition dating from the Middle Ages. Contrary to these demands, however, the non-participation of the royal delegation at the conference leads to the unambiguous conclusion of the essential non-recognition of an Allied country. In addition, the crux of the matter was the fact that a delegation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, headed by Nikola Pašić and Ante Trumbić took part in the Conference. The division was also evident among the émigré community, as evidenced by the existence of the Montenegrin division within the Yugoslav team. Its members published a brochure entitled the *The Question of Scutari*, claiming that the area of Skadar/Scutari naturally belonged to the community of South Slavs. However, this appeal had no practical consequences whatsoever.

On the frontpage of its issue of 31 March 1919 the paper *Novo Doba* published the following notice: ‘In the early hours of yesterday morning, from the Executive National Committee in Podgorica we have received the joyful news of unification with our brotherly Kingdom of Serbia, which rang out unanimously and clearly on 13 November 1918 in the Great National Assembly in Podgorica and has been settled happily and finally; the decision was sealed by the order issued to the commander of Allied forces to withdraw all English, French, American and Italian troops from our territory.’

The creation of political pluralism went hand in hand with the consolidation of the military and police forces of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. The new organs did not allow the activation of ‘green faction’ supporters, while at the same time they saw their chance in Komitas warfare and participation in the émigré army. Hence only the representatives of the ‘white faction’ policy ran in the first parliament elections and they were split into several electoral lists.

In addition to the white and green faction, a new, red faction emerged to become the greatest rival of the pro-monarchy circles in the struggle for the future form of government in the state. At the first parliamentary elections of 28 November 1920, in the territory of Montenegro the Communists won four out of ten seats. The remarkable popularity of the communist concept can be explained in several segments, although this by no means indicates that they are mutually exclusive. The British historian Eric Hobsbawm summarized this phenomenon as follows: ‘Austria and Hungary were reduced to German and Magyar rumps, Serbia was expanded into a large new Yugoslavia by a merger with the (formerly Austrian) Slovenia and the (formerly Hungarian) Croatia, as well as with the formerly independent small tribal kingdom of herdsmen and raiders, Montenegro, a bleak mass of mountains whose inhabitants reacted to the unprecedented loss of independence by converting en masse to communism, which, they felt, appreciated the heroic virtue. It was also associated with orthodox Russia, whose faith the unconquered men of the Black Mountain had defended against the Turkish unbelievers for so many centuries.’

The parliamentary elections led to a new reality: due to the great turnout of voters at the elections, the Great Powers completely accepted the sovereignty of the state of South Slavs. The Montenegrin emigration suffered another heavy blow with the death of King Nikola on 1 March 1921 and the disappearance of the symbol of all Montenegrin historic triumphs from the political stage. The diaspora then split into two factions: the supporters of Queen Milena and her grandson Mihailo, the heir to the throne, on one side; and Prime Minister Jovan Plamenac on the other, as a result of the utterly hopeless situation.

The Vidovdan Constitution on 28 June 1921 at the Constitutional Assembly did not acknowledge any state attributes of Montenegro. The coat of arms of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was the Serbian royal eagle, while the shield features the symbols of Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia.

Any interpretation of the views of the Montenegrin general public towards the Yugoslav unification will depend on the angle taken in the assessment of this process. Views on these two events, the assembly in Podgorica in 1918 and the clashes of early 1919, are determined by the definition of historical events. The ‘Great National Assembly of the Serbian People in Montenegro’ was later renamed the ‘Podgorica Assembly’. The conflicts that ensued in the first months of the following year came to be widely known as the ‘Montenegrin rebellion’,

'Christmas revolt', 'Christmas uprising' and 'Christmas rebellion' in different periods. Disagreements concerning the decisions of the so-called 'Podgorica Assembly' are reduced to debates about the definition of entry into the South Slavic state, i.e. the question of whether this was a merger of two counties or the annexation of Montenegro to Serbia. Similarly, the rebels' demands are now interpreted in two diverging ways: as a rejection of the formation of a new state or as aspirations to preserve the statehood tradition of Montenegro through an autonomous position. Nowadays the Montenegrin public does not see the problematic credibility of the 'Podgorica Assembly' in the participants' inclination for a Yugoslav unification but rather in its decisions that nullified the Montenegrin state and abolished all of its attributes. On the other hand, the lack of authority of the leadership of the 'Christmas Uprising' did not follow from contemporary views but from their cooperation with Fascist occupiers in World War II.

The establishment of federal Montenegro in World War II, based on antifascist foundations, nullified all shortfalls of both political factions. The legacy of this period, for the new regime, was not a necessarily negative factor in social life. Niko Miljanić, an official in the royal government in 1919, became the chairman of the Montenegrin Anti-Fascist Assembly of National Liberation (CASNO) in July 1944 in Kolašin; Montenegro was restored as a federal unit in the Yugoslav state, and Jovan Ćetković, a delegate at the Podgorica Assembly, was appointed its vice-chairman.

On 1 October 1941 the communist paper Narodna borba [People's Struggle] published a text on the Petrovdan [St. Peter’s Day] assembly: 'This assembly, just like the one in Podgorica in 1918, was not the result of the people's will. For years we have asked for Montenegrin equality, protested against the way in which the Podgorica Assembly had resolved our status, but, truth be told, we do have to admit that Sekula’s assembly is nothing but open national treason...’17 During the existence of communist Yugoslavia, the official authorities did not look kindly at either of the two factions in the events from the early life of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and saw these divisions as an obsolete piece of history.

Having restored its internationally recognized independence in 2006, official Montenegro showed how it now views the country’s entry into the new state. In 2009 the government erected a monument in Bajice dedicated to the participants of the ‘Christmas Uprising.’ In 2001 the parliament promulgated the Act on the Status of the Descendants of the House of Petrović Njegoš, and Article 1 stated that the royal house had been ‘dethroned in violation of the Constitution of the Principality of Montenegro, by an act of forcible annexation of the state in 1918’. Nine episodes of the TV show Christmas Uprising, directed by Željko Sošić and sponsored by the Ministry of Culture, were aired on Montenegro’s public broadcaster in the first half of 2017. In July 2017 the Municipality of Podgorica rebuilt a monument to Mirko Petrović, King Nikola’s father, which had been destroyed by the supporters of the Podgorica Assembly in January 1919.
However, the general public seems to have the most favorable view of the communist legacy in the formation of the Yugoslav state, because it was this legacy that shaped the antifascist identity of the modern Montenegrin state. Podgorica, Cetinje and Bar all have streets named after Jovan Tomašević, the founder of the Communist Party in Montenegro. Although he had been a member of the white faction during the revolt, the struggle for increased social rights advocated by the communists seems to be the main criterion. Similarly, the non-participation of one political side, the green faction, in the events that led to the formation of the new state results in social empathy. Rooted in its antifascist foundations, modern Montenegro cherishes the positive legacies of both its own and shared Yugoslav heritage.
Državni arhiv Crne Gore, Cetinje, Crnogorska emigrantska vlada – Neji – kod Pariza.
Državni arhiv Crne Gore, Cetinje, Komanda crnogorskih trupa u Gaeti.
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Crna Gora pred Konferencijom mira, Imprimerie Commerciale Serbe, Ženeva, 1919.
Ustav za Knjaževinu Crnu Goru 1905, K. C.
Državna štamparija, Cetinje, 1907.
Sherbo Rastoder, Skrivana strana istorije: Crnogorska buna i odmetnički pokret 1918–1919, Tom 1, Centralna narodna biblioteka „Đurđe Crnojević”; Istorijiski institut Crne Gore; Almanah, Podgorica; Cetinje, 2005.
Jagoš Jovanović, Stvaranje crnogorske nacije i razvoj crnogorske nacionalnosti, Narodna knjiga, Cetinje, 1948.
THE MACEDONIAN ISSUE AND THE KINGDOM OF SCS 1919–1923
The Balkan Wars in 1912 and 1913 marked the beginning of the territorial partition of Macedonia. The neighbouring Balkan states, which had been being antagonized, and their greater-state propaganda on the grounds of Macedonia relatively easily and quickly agreed on the partition of Macedonia. Thus, with the peace treaty signed in Bucharest on August 10, 1913, the territory of Macedonia was distributed among Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece. These Balkan states had formed the anti-Turkish alliance before, during and after the Balkan Wars and, each with its own interests and in its own way, conducted strong propaganda activities to represent the distribution of Macedonia as “the liberation of their brothers from Ottoman Turkey’s authority.”

With minor territorial changes, the First World War and the consequent Versailles Peace Conference confirmed the distribution. Macedonia was discussed there as a geographical territory that the neighbouring Balkan states aspired to with various “legal and national arguments”. The demands for the Conference to establish the integrity of Macedonia and its constitution as a state had no appeal, as neither France nor England had any interest in the problem regarding Macedonia to receive treatment that would damage their allied countries, Greece and Serbia. Bulgaria’s official policy that advocated for the autonomy


of Macedonia, in fact, only compromised such an idea and lessened the chance that it would be achieved. For Serbia’s governing authorities in this period, any form of autonomy for Macedonia was completely inconceivable.

However, ideas aiming for the creation of an autonomous, separate Macedonian state continued on the Macedonian political scene throughout the period of the Balkan Wars and the First World War. The Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in Petrograd consistently worked towards affirmation of the unique Macedonian nationality and in the direction of requesting of the great powers the constitution of a separate Macedonian state. In July 1918, a group of Macedonians met in what was then Vodena (Edessa, Greece) to review the positions and proposals contained in the Corfu Declaration, which had been compiled by the Yugoslav Committee and the Serbian Government. The initiators of the meeting were Čedomir Đurđević, the Serbian Army medical corps colonel, and Grigorije Hadži Tašković. Since there was nothing in the Corfu document regarding Macedonia, the Macedonian group adopted its own declaration, known as the Vodena Declaration. In it, they pleaded for “all Slavic Macedonia and all Macedonians” to be recognized “as a Yugoslav tribe” and included equally in the future Yugoslav state with the other nations. Sometime

3 — From the end of the First World War, although a defeated party, the Bulgarian government through diplomatic channels first demanded that the whole of Macedonia should join Bulgaria. Before the signing of the Treaty of Neuilly-sur-Seine, having realised that it was going to gain nothing in relation to the Macedonian issue, Bulgaria’s policy turned to the idea of the “autonomy of Macedonia.” Vasil Vasiliev, The Government of the BZNS, VMRO and the Bulgarian-Yugoslav relations, Sofia, 1991, 16-18; Foreign Policy of the Government of the BZNS - November 1919- June 1923, Aleksandar Stamboliyski - Documentary Heritage, Sofia, 1989, doc. 1, 13-16.

4 — Nada Boškovska, Yugoslav Macedonia 1918-1941, Skopje, 2016, 40.


6 — A memorandum of June 7, 1913 that was published in the journal “Makedonski Glas” (Macedonian Voice) y. 1. no. 1, clearly states: “Macedonia is inhabited by a homogeneous Slavic tribe, which has its own history, its own way of living, its former statehood, its ideals, and therefore its right to self-determination…” Thus, unambiguously, a unique Macedonian national identity was defined, and hence the rights of the Macedonian nation to its own state and separate church. The journal “Macedonian Voice” (Македонски Голосъ). Organ of the supporters of independent Macedonia 1913-1914. Phototype edition, Skopje, 1968, 17-20; Blaže Ristovski, The Activity of the Macedonians After the Declaration of the First World War and the Memorandum by Krste Misirkov and Dimitrija Cuplevski to the Russian Government in 1914, Glasnik na INI XXI / 2-3, Skopje, 1977, 21-50.

7 — Čedomir Đurđević from Jagodina was a physician, surgeon, medical corps general, professor of the Belgrade University, physician of the Serbian Consulate in Skopje in 1895, Head of the Department of Surgery at the Medical Hospital in Belgrade, medical corps head of the Serbian First Army district during the Balkan Wars, head of the Department of Surgery at the Serbian Hospital in Thessaloniki, Greece, during the First World War, head of the Third Army medical corps in Skopje in 1928, and he was dealing with Slavic medical terminology, even with creation of a common Slavic language which he named “Seslav.” https://sr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Чедомир_Ђурђевић; http://www.rastko.rs/cms/files/books/5062e439f1317; Grigorije Hadži Tašković was born in Vodena, the Aegean part of Macedonia. He studied in Thessaloniki, Greece, during the First World War, head of the Third Army medical corps in Skopje in 1928, and he was dealing with Slavic medical terminology, even with creation of a common Slavic language which he named “Seslav.”

8 — B. Ristovski, The Federative/Confederative Idea in Macedonia in the 19th and 20th Centuries, History of the Ideas on the Grounds of Macedonia, MANU, Skopje, 2000, 119. The Vodena Declaration reads: “1. Nobody disputes that the Macedonians are a Yugoslav tribe, and that is the feeling and thought of all Macedonians across the board; 2. As a Yugoslav tribe, we are solidary with all Yugoslav strivings and we are embracing the Corfu Declaration from 1917. We want and ask the Corfu Declaration to be supplemented by covering all of Macedonia and all Macedonians....” A Hundred of Macedonian Years, Skopje, 2004, 159.
The Serbian army pursues the adversary in a forced march, Skopje, September 1918.
later, in September 1918, Grigorije Hadži Tašković submitted his own “Memorandum” to the Serbian government in Corfu, in which he elaborated in detail on the Macedonian idea as being part of the Yugoslav one and requested “recognition of the individuality of the Macedonians and Macedonia within the borders of the Yugoslav state...”

---

There were various ideational, national and ideological factions within the frameworks of what is being called “the Macedonian Liberation Movement”. Most of them operated in Bulgaria and, economically and politically, were closely connected with the Bulgarian political and bourgeois elites. In fact, through them, Bulgaria’s state policy influenced the events in the case of the Macedonian issue, as well as the political events of the Balkans. However, all of the states that partitioned Macedonia pursued a policy of denationalization and assimilation of the Macedonian people. For example, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (SCS) prevented not only the possibilities for national Macedonian self-identification, but also for any oppositional political action, since, immediately following the foundation of the state, the part of Macedonia that entered the Kingdom of SCS was turned into “a military-police” zone. The population there was ruled by intimidation and terror, with the help of “military” regulations that envisaged the most severe penalties for anti-state propaganda, which, in fact, were the same ones in force during the wartime period between 1913 and 1915.

As a result of the greater-state nationalistic torture in all parts of Macedonia, a multiannual period occurred in which Macedonian national events were extremely rare and “invisible”, not only in the social sphere, but also in the private one. On the contrary, the previously initiated processes of accepting the Bulgarian, Serbian or Greek national feeling as national self-identification, gained even greater intensity among part of the Macedonian population.

Rather than going into the extensive elaborations for the conceptual development of “the Macedonian Liberation Movement”, I am going to review only several positions and concrete actions by certain Macedonian political groups and individuals between 1919-1923 that are directly in connection with the Kingdom of SCS, primarily, the possibility of the Macedonian issue, i.e. the Macedonian national issue being resolved within this country, in whole or in part. In fact, the matter of solving the Macedonian issue with a federal creation, whether it was Yugoslav or Balkan, was not at all a novelty in the period after the First World War, considering that it had existed in the Macedonian political milieu since the second half of the 19th century.¹¹

---


¹⁰ — Even the Serbian representatives from the Vardar part of Macedonia complained about such “governance” at the parliament of the Kingdom of SCS. So, for example, at the session on May 21, 1919, MP Antonije Todorović “...complained about the governance through regulations “without us and for us”. N. Boškovska, Yugoslav Macedonia..., 41-42.

¹¹ — For the presence of this idea in the Macedonian liberation movement until the end of the First World War, see: M. Minoski, The Federal Idea in Macedonian Political Thought (1887-1919), Skopje, 1985, 368.
In this context, the activity of a part of the left-oriented Macedonian political forces in Bulgaria should be noted. Immediately after the First World War they activated and grouped into the Provisional Representative Body of the former united Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (VMRO). This organization was ideologically heterogeneous, comprised of national revolutionaries, socialdemocrats, communists, anarchists, as well as individuals without strong ideational or ideological orientation, and the Uniate priest of French descent Pavel Hristov was its authorized representative at the Paris Peace Conference. Other organizations of the Macedonian emigration stirred to activity in relation to the Macedonian issue before the international political public across Europe and worldwide after the First World War. For example, on November 14, 1920, on the occasion of the Second Assembly of the League of Nations (LN), a group of Macedonian students at the University of Geneva addressed a telegram to the Secretary General, indicating that the Macedonian people had not been consulted in accordance with the principle of self-determination of the peoples, and demanded international factors take steps on these grounds for the constitution of a united and independent state under the protection of the LN. The so-called “Serčani” or “Sandanisti” group basically advocated resolving the Macedonian issue as a Macedonian national issue. A letter from the Ministry of the Army of the Kingdom of SCS in Belgrade to the Third Army Headquarters, dated May 15, 1919, reads about the “Serčani” group that “they, as before, under the leadership of the Komitadji leaders Panica, Bujnov, Kantardžiev, Stojo Hadžiev and others, have no aim of realizing Bulgaria’s ideas towards Macedonia. Their aim is either the autonomy of Macedonia, or a confederation of the Balkan states... They do not feel as either Serbs, Bulgarians, or Greeks. They are named Macedonians-Slavs...” Regarding the cooperation with Yugoslavia, that is, the Kingdom of SCS, this document reads that there were four trends in the political circles of Macedonian immigrants in Sofia and Bulgaria: one for the autonomy of Macedonia under a protectorate of Yugoslavia with municipal and local self-government and schools, one was only interested in “learning and knowing” the possibilities for minimal national and administrative rights of the Macedonians, one for anticipating the development of events, and one was against any kind of compromise and cooperation with Yugoslav officials and Yugoslavia in general. Such “tendencies” are confirmed by other Serbian military sources, who say that, in 1919, some prominent Macedonian activists, including Milan Đurlukov, Györche Petrov, Pavel Hristov and Petar Chaulev, contacted the authorized Serbian representatives in Sofia and were interested in the possibilities for Macedonia to become “an equal member of a...  

12 — The leadership body consisted of: Tasko Spasov Serski, Dimo Hadzhidimov, Mihail Gerdzhikov, Györche Petrov, Petar Atsev and Pavel Hristov. 
13 — For his activity, i.e. for the activity of the Provisional Representative Body before the Paris Peace Conference, see: Lj. Lape, The Conceptual Basis of the Provisional Representation of the Former United Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization and its activity at the 1919 Versailles Peace Conference, History IX/2, Skopje, 1973, 53-96. 
14 — There are also a number of other requests to the LN for the constitution of the Macedonian state, see for more: V. Kuševski, Statehood of the Macedonian People... ASNOM in Creation... 52-53; M. Pandevski, Macedonian Political Programs... Glasnik na INI XXXII/1, Skopje, 1988, 43-68. 
15 — Ivan Katardžiev, The CPY in Macedonia until the Proclamation, Skopje, 1961, 17.
ТЕТОВЦИ, ГОСТИВАРЦИ, Поречани, Галичани!

Свећа је ниспомла дана до 9. новембра, када ћемо замићи да бирамо подначине на Устаничкуму Скупштину. Тога дана се земеним да положимо молит из нове грађанске свести нашега ратувања и интереса тетовског окрука и добре целе земље.

Од нашега гласа ће тога дана замићи наша света доброте Устанички о. српству се увек предајемо, а тежтим и наша свещена света грађанске земље. Тим окликима замићиме нову, која ће се добијао, добру грађанску свечаност и знамећи са сваком једном везом народу и народној, државној и националној слави. За тога дана замићимо свима светом светом земљама и народима, у којима се смењује све наше грађанске свечаности.

Народна Радикална Страна је створила свестрана односна тринаест парламента у своме рату, очекујући да ће им произвести своју поверења. Ова тринаест парламента се на своју плодност иззвало у националним земљама, из обраслагога земља, из српских и из националних земана. Ови је једна његових спасовах да се наша сила да жежу националну делу која се тежи овог српског националног покрета, онако како је и националну делу која се тежи овог српског националног покрета.

Сто година мира и рада у земљама, сто година грађана скриву на и српском националном покрету, а сто година грађана скриву на и српском националном покрету, а сто година грађана скриву на и српском националном покрету.

И Храшкићи и Муслинане којим је српски национални покрет скриву на и српском националном покрету, а сто година грађана скриву на и српском националном покрету.

И Храшкићи и Муслинане којим је српски национални покрет скриву на и српском националном покрету, а сто година грађана скриву на и српском националном покрету, а сто година грађана скриву на и српском националном покрету.

И Храшкићи и Муслинане којим је српски национални покрет скриву на и српском националном покрету, а сто година грађана скриву на и српском националном покрету, а сто година грађана скриву на и српском националном покрету.

На листи Радикална и Муслинана округа тетовског кандидата су:

1. Марко Гричковић, Министар Права из Београда
2. Кадри Сали, председник општине Гостивар
3. Абдулман Раджевић, репетор из Тетова
4. Угрин Љоксимовић, трговац из Нишковца

1. Кандидат за квалитетно послушање

Милорад Зебић, Инспектор Министарства Трговине и Индустрије из Скопља

2. Кандидат за националну земљу

Милан Апостоловић, инженер из Тетова

Зато, браћо из Тетова, Галичиња, Гостивара и Пореча,
нискоградите свима светом земље и свима добром вољом, да Радикалној Страни поново и једном победу на добру свету нас и нашем окружењу тетовском.
Све крајеве наша земља земају нашу задатак и наше јавне окружење тетовском.
Живела Народна Радикална Страна!
На биралишту 28. новембра!

28. новембра 1920. год.
Тетова.

У ИМЕ ОКРУЖНОГ ОБРЕБА НАРОДНЕ РАДИКАЛНЕ СТРАНКЕ
ПРЕДСЕДНИЦИ,
АЛЕКСАНДАР БОГОЈЕВИЋ.
The Komitadji leader Milan Đurlukov, in a conversation with Serbian Captain Milčić in Sofia, said that an influential group of Macedonian political activists sought the “autonomy of Macedonia under the protectorate of Yugoslavia with municipal and local self-government and schools, while the church would be under the Serbian Patriarchate.”

It should always be borne in mind that all political subjects in Bulgaria had a devised and developed political strategy towards Macedonia and “the Macedonian issue”, which, after the First World War, had the basic direction of solving “the Macedonian issue” through reliance on international agreements for the protection of minorities in favour of the Bulgarian national doctrine, i.e. as a Bulgarian national issue. The international activity by the autonomist VMRO also took place within these frameworks over the course of 14 years, namely, from 1920-1934, when, before the League of Nations it declared activity for “the protection, care and demand for the rights” of “the Bulgarian minority” in the Aegean and Vardar parts of Macedonia.

Even though the basic organizational base of the VMRO was the Pirin part of Macedonia, i.e. the so-called Petrich District, and its activity mostly took place in the eastern parts of the Vardar region of Macedonia, its leaders Todor Aleksandrov and Aleksandar Protogerov tried not to compromise Bulgaria too much before the international public as it supported the formation of guerrilla bands operating in the territory of the Kingdom of SCS and the Kingdom of Greece. In spite of such efforts, the VMRO’s activity was the source of constant tension and poor interstate relations between Bulgaria and the Kingdom of SCS.

In fact, prevention of denationalization and the assimilation of “Bulgarians in Macedonia” through the application of international agreements for the protection of minorities was the minimum goal in the programmatical and political determinations of the VMRO. The maximum goals were declaratively differently formulated, so, in the “Memorandum” to the Paris Peace Conference of March 1, 1919, Todor Aleksandrov and Aleksandar Protogerov, on behalf of the VMRO, requested that their delegation to be allowed to present “the aspirations of the Macedonian Bulgarian population” before the Conference and demanded Macedonia’s accession to Bulgaria. Somewhat later on

16 — Dmitar Tasić, War After the War. Army of the Kingdom of the SCS in Kosovo and Metohija 1918-1920, Belgrade 2008, 149-150.
17 — V. Kuševski, On the Activity of the VMRO of Todor Aleksandrov and Ivan Mihailov in relation to the presentation of the Macedonian issue at the League of Nations (1920-1934), One Hundred Years since the Founding of the VMRO and 90 Years of the Ilinden Uprising, Skopje, 1994, 427. Apart from that, the naming of the territories of Macedonia that entered the new states of the Kingdom of SCS, the Tsardom of Bulgaria and the Kingdom of Greece as the Vardar, Pirin and Aegean parts of Macedonia, is a colloquial naming by the Macedonian historiography after 1944.
19 — For example, Protogerov’s letter to Georgi Vandev, dated September 15, 1924, gives instructions that no one should carry weapons or Komitadji clothes, since “here in a free Bulgaria we are only citizens, we should obey the laws and not expose the state.” Cyril Parlichev, “The Assassination of Todor Aleksandrov, Sofia, 2002, 98; V. Vasilev, The Government of the BZNS..., 123-131; I. Katardžiev, Fight..., bk. 2, 191, N. Cvetkovska, Political Activity..., 101-102.
21 — V. Vasilev, The Government of the BZNS..., 64.
they set out the foundations of their political and revolutionary work on the principle: “the achievement of freedom in a form of autonomy or independence of Macedonia within its geographical boundaries.”

Even in the legal Macedonian political circles close to Bulgaria’s policy, there were considerations and positions for resolving the Macedonian issue within the Yugoslav or Balkan federation. Thus, before the Second Grand Convention (Congress) of Macedonia’s Charity Brotherhoods in Bulgaria was held, a group of delegates of the Congress of the Brotherhoods in Sofia and politically engaged people in the public scene led by Vladislav Kovachev and Kliment Razmov organised a meeting on October 11, 1920, in order to overcome inter-party differences and reach a compromise. Four options for resolving the Macedonian issue were debated at the meeting: 1. Independent Macedonia within its natural borders; 2. Independent Macedonia under the protectorate of the LN; 3. Autonomy within Yugoslavia; 4. Autonomy within the Balkan Federation. Despite the efforts by Vladislav Kovachev and Kliment Razmov for autonomy within Yugoslavia to be accepted, the majority of the assembly decided to accept the first proposal. This proved that the idea of the autonomy of Macedonia within the framework of Yugoslavia as a solution to the Macedonian issue still had its followers, despite “decisive rejection by the VMRO” and the rest of the supporters of Bulgaria’s greater-state policy. In this period, except in Bulgaria, such a “Yugoslav” or “Balkan” solution was also backed by the Macedonian student group in Bulgaria and the Macedonian student group in Geneva headed by Anastas Kotzareff. The former issued a public release before the Congress that they were in favour of Macedonian autonomy within Yugoslavia, and the later sent a telegram to the Congress that supported such an idea.

At the very beginning of the Second Congress, which took place on October 18, 1920, heated discussions developed about removing anyone who was in any way related to the illegal VMRO of Todor Aleksandrov from leading positions of the Executive Committee, and later about the proposal tabled by the supporters of autonomy within the Balkan Federation or within the Kingdom of SCS: “autonomy within the framework of a possible South Slavic federation.” The Congress rejected this idea, but the delegates who opposed the old leadership left the Congress and organised themselves in the Interim Commission. The basic conceptual platform of the Interim Commission’s supporters was...
ПОЗИВЪ
КЪМЪ
Македонското население и емиграцията.

МАКЕДОНЦИ!

Родна Македония пакъ влачи робски вериги.
Дългогодишнитъ борби за създаване автономно управление бидоха пръвъзстановени поради бързо развитиетъ съсъ събития.
Войнитъ за присъединението на Македония донесоха разорение и тежко робство; тя биде разкъсана на три части — цълата областъ отъ нея съсъ опустошени.
Опустошение и робство донесоха войнитъ!
Събитията доказаха, че само Автономна Македония подъ протектората на Лигата на Народитъ ще даде свободенъ животъ на всички националности тамъ, ще пръвъзахне ежбитъ между тъхъ и съ това ще се тури край на войнитъ между балканскитъ държави. — Автономна Македония ще послужи като основа за Балканската Конфедерация.
Момента е съдбоносенъ. — Условията съ благоприятни за справедливото разръжение на наша въпросъ. Провъзгласения принципъ за самоопредяване на народитъ дава право на насъ, да изразимъ свободната си воля за бъдещата съдба на Македония.

МАКЕДОНЦИ!
За нашата свобода, за свободния животъ на всички националности, за братството и мира между балканскитъ народи — да издигнемъ мощенъ гласъ за Цълостна Автономна Македония и да подкрепимъ наши и чужди, които високо издигатъ това знаме.

Да живъе Автономна Македония!

Отъ Македонската Студентска Група
при Софийския Университетъ.
“definite abandonment of the idea of national unification and breaking with the state policy and the general national interests of Bulgaria”, since the imposition of the “Bulgarian character of Macedonia” represented an “extremely harmful” act for the liberation of Macedonia.\textsuperscript{25}

Gradually, the Macedonian Émigré’s Federalist Organization (MEFO) was formed from these political circles. The opposition inside the VMRO that was led by Todor Aleksandrov grew closer to the MEFO in early 1922, and this ultimately led to the formation of the Macedonian Federative Revolutionary Organization (MFRO), which was led by Slave Ivanov and the old Komitadji leaders Stoyan Mishev and Gligor Ciklev.

The MFRO did not develop its own political platform for action, but rather accepted the MEFO program. This group was close to the MEFO leaders, Dr Filip Atanasov, Nikola Yurukov and Krum Zografov, and actually acted as an armed wing of the MEFO.\textsuperscript{26} These so-called federalists generally followed the policy of the government of the Bulgarian Agrarian People’s Union (BZNS) and Prime Minister Aleksandar Stamboliyski for reconciliation with the Kingdom of SCS. With this policy, the BZNS counted on “the autonomous status of Macedonia within the state of SCS”.\textsuperscript{27}

The division of the Macedonian political forces into two sharply opposing factions, with their own armed forces, led to a constant armed conflict between the federalist guerrilla bands and the guerrilla bands of Todor Aleksandrov’s VMRO in the Pirin part of Macedonia. The wavering of Stamboliyski’s government openly contributed to the complete defeat of their armed forces. In 1923, the VMRO intensified the armed-terrorist showdown with the federalists, and Nikola Yurukov, Kliment Razmov and other prominent activists of the MEFO had soon been assassinated. A large part of the legal members of the MEFO leadership fled from Bulgaria. Some of the federalists emigrated to Vienna, where they began publishing the journal “Makedonsko Soznanie” (Macedonian Awareness). The first issue was published on December 15, 1923, and they established contact with representatives of the Communist International (CI, Comintern), the Soviet Union and the Yugoslav intelligence services.\textsuperscript{28} Part of the illegal structure of the MFRO moved to the Vardar region of Macedonia in the spring of 1923 and put themselves at the service of the government of the Kingdom of SCS in the struggle against the VMRO’s guerrilla bands.\textsuperscript{29} The “main” armed part of the Association Against Bulgarian Bandits, based in Štip,\textsuperscript{30} was later formed from these guerrilla bands.

\textsuperscript{26} — 100 Years of the VMRO-Golden Bock, Skopje, 1993, 158-159
\textsuperscript{27} — For such a position, Vasil Vasilev refers to the written organ of the BZNS, the journal “Pobeda” (Victory), where in the editorial of December 12, 1922, the government policy for reconciliation with the Kingdom of SCS is justified. V. Vasilev, The Government of the BZNS..., 226.
\textsuperscript{28} — The organ of the Macedonian Émigré’s Federalist Organization in “Macedonian Awareness” in the period from December 1923 to July 1925 advocates the view that “the Macedonian issue is not only a political, but also a national issue”, which, in fact, manifested awareness of a unique Macedonian national identity. D. Pačemska-Petreska, The Macedonian Émigré’s Federalist Organization in Vienna... \textit{Glasnik na INI} \textbf{XXXII}/2, Skopje, 1988, 124.
\textsuperscript{29} — According to official statistics from Serbia, there were 53 VMRO guerrilla bands with 3,245 members operating in the Vardar part of Macedonia from 1923 and 1924, who caused 73 terrorist attacks on persons and facilities. D. Tasić, War After the War..., 150.
\textsuperscript{30} — The Association Against Bulgarian Bandits was formed on September 9, 1923. Formally,
Upon restoration of its activity, the autonomist VMRO gradually began to intensify its relationship with Aleksandar Stamboliyski’s “agrarian government”. The formal reasoning was found in the policy of good neighbourly relations implemented by the government of the BZNS.\(^{31}\) Namely, Stamboliyski’s government was in a very unpleasant position internationally: Bulgaria, as a defeated country in the First World War, had no international reputation and tried to reduce the negative international rating through the pursuit of a peaceful policy. Besides that, during its rule, it was almost constantly subjected to fierce diplomatic pressure from the Kingdom of SCS, Greece and Romania. The pressure from the Kingdom of SCS was particularly strong, and at times grew into open threats of military intervention. Always, the main reason for such threats was the activities of the autonomist VMRO. With a series of statements and agreements with a reconcilable tone and yielding, Stamboliyski and his government strove to remove the pressure from the Kingdom of SCS.\(^{32}\) In this context, Stamboliyski’s statements during his visit to Belgrade on November 8-9, 1922, are worth noting. He not only vowed that the Bulgarian government “... will continue to fight” against the movement of the autonomist VMRO guerrilla bands, but also stated that even if all of Macedonia were offered to Bulgaria, they would not join it to Bulgaria. The entire right-wing opposition in Bulgaria interpreted Stamboliyski’s statements as betrayal of “Bulgarian national ideals”. The newspapers under the influence of the Bulgarian right-wing opposition and those under the influence of the VMRO fiercely attacked the prime minister, who was even accused of “trying to bring Bulgaria into a general integral Yugoslavia someday”.\(^{33}\) The clash culminated in the period following the signing of the so-called Treaty of Niš by the governments of Bulgaria and the Kingdom of SCS.

The Treaty of Niš was signed in March 1923. It was mostly about security issues related to the activities of the VMRO guerrilla bands and the regulation of the protective regime for illegal crossings of the borderline between the two countries. However, even after the signing of this treaty, tensions between the two countries continued. The VMRO guerrilla bands intensified operations in the border regions and sentenced Stamboliyski and his close associates to death for the rapprochement with the Kingdom of SCS. There were also threats from the Serbian side that their armies would cross the border and intervene against the VMRO guerrilla bands. A military coup d’état took place in

31 — In addition, two armed operations by the VMRO guerrilla bands against the federalists took place in Nis on October 16 and in Kyustendil on December 4, 1922. An assassination attempt on the Minister of Interior and one of the most prominent leaders of the BZNS, Rayko Daskalov, took place on December 15, 1922. V. Vasilev, The Government of the BZNS ..., 175-235; The Initial Policy of the Government of BZNS ..., 399.

32 — Thus, for example, after meeting with the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of SCS Nikola Pašić in Belgrade on May 30, 1921, Bulgaria’s Minister of Interior Aleksandar Dimitrov stated that the Bulgarian government was “firmly determined to ban ‘the Macedonian movement’ in Bulgaria and accordingly to advocate the fulfillment of the clauses of the current international agreements.” Nikola Žezov, The Macedonian Issue in the Yugoslav-Bulgarian Diplomatic Relations (1918-1941), Skopje, 2008, 25.

Bulgaria in June 1923, in which the government of Aleksandar Stamboliyski was toppled.34

* * *

In the end, one has to take into consideration the views of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (CPY), which, unlike all other political forces in the Kingdom of SCS, tried to build a stance on the Macedonian issue as a Macedonian national issue.

First, in the period following the formation of the Kingdom of SCS until late 1922, the CPY took the position of Yugoslav national unitarianism. The position “one state-one nation” contributed to the Macedonian national issue having a marginal place in the declarative steps and actions of the Yugoslav communists.35 This position was maintained despite the CI warnings that the national issue would be decisive in the social and political life of Yugoslavia and that this was a factor the Yugoslav communists should take into account.36

In 1923, the Macedonian issue became particularly relevant in the CI and the Balkan Communist Federation (BCF37), primarily due to the estimates that a VMRO38-led uprising in Macedonia was about to begin. Since that period, a series of documents related to the past and future of the Macedonian national issue and the Macedonian liberation movement began to circulate within the CI circles. Thus, the changes regarding the treatment of the national issue began at the Second Conference of the CPY, held in Vienna from May 9–12, 1923. Under pressure from the BCF, the Macedonian issue took a place in the discussions of the Conference; however, there was still no awareness among the ranks of the CPY of the unique Macedonian national individuality. The views of the CPY regarding the Macedonian national issue had a formal character at the Conference, which consequently led to weak activity in the Vardar part of Macedonia.39

35 — Vlado Kartov, The Fight of the Macedonian People for National Self-Determination (1912-1941), Skopje, 1987, 380. In other words, the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes created conditions for the unification of the labour movement of the Yugoslav countries that entered the composition of the new state. The Congress of Unification of the Socialist Labour Party of Yugoslavia (Communists) -SLPY(C) took place from April 20-23, 1919, in Belgrade. The party immediately joined the Third International. On the Second (Vukovar) Congress, from June 20-24, 1920, the party changed its name to the CPY. History of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, Belgrade, 1985, 62-63, 71.
36 — On March 5, 1920, the CI Executive Committee sent a declaration to the Balkan CPs in which the significance of the national issue, and, in particular, the Macedonian issue, was emphasized. The CPY was sharply criticized at the Fourth BCF Conference for ignoring the Macedonian national issue. Gordana Vlajičić, Yugoslav Revolution and National Issue: 1919-1927, Zagreb, 1984, 41, 107.
37 — The Balkan Communist Federation represented an alliance of the CPs of the Balkan countries and was officially formed on January 15, 1920 at the Sofia Conference. The BCF was, in fact, an organ of the CI for the Balkans and its program tasks derived from the CI’s tasks. I. Katardžiev, Fight..., bk.2, 351.
38 — Vlado Popovski, Lenina Žila, The Macedonian Issue in the Comintern Documents, vol. 1, doc. 7, 39. It was a period of intensive efforts by the CI and the BCF to attract the VMRO into “the united revolutionary front” of the Balkans under the control of the communist movement, i.e. the Soviet Union.
Front page of the Socialist Dawn, September 7, 1920


The creation of the “Yugoslav” state after the First World War was based on recognizing only the state-building qualities of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and generated national inequality and widespread popular dissatisfaction, political and security instability, and constant bad relations with neighbouring countries. The part of Macedonia that entered the new “Yugoslav state” was transformed into a “military-police” zone and was regularly exposed to Bulgaria’s official policy of pressure and other internationally relevant factors for giving rights to and protecting the “Bulgarian population” through the application of international treaties for the protection of minorities.

Most of the active Macedonian political forces concentrated in Bulgaria after the First World War and reckoned with the possibility of claiming “rights” for Macedonia and Macedonians within the Kingdom of SCS. The part close to the VMRO was exceptionally negative towards the Yugoslav state and politics, so, they caused armed incidents almost constantly along the border territories, an unstable political climate in Vardar Macedonia, and complications in the relations between Bulgaria and the Kingdom of SCS. Not finding an “understanding” for the Macedonian liberation struggle in Serbian politics, most of the Macedonian social-political activists remained “appendages” of the Bulgarian bourgeoisie and the Bulgarian political elite, that is, the enemies of the Yugoslav state.

The discussions that developed within the frameworks of the CPY in the period after the First World War made it crystal clear in the following years that the Macedonians had a uniquenational individuality and that activity on the grounds of Macedonia could not be developed without solving the Macedonian national issue. Such a conceptual trajectory of the CPY in relation to the Macedonian national issue would prove to be crucial for the future of Macedonia.
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Dalmatia in the Days of Unification

The Day Worth a Century
1 – XII – 1918
At the time of the creation of the Yugoslav state, Dalmatia was officially one of the crown lands of the largely dissolved Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, but hardly anyone in the region regretted the loss of this status. After hundreds of years of being ruled by Venice, which controlled a narrow coastal belt and the islands while the entire hinterlands belonged to the Ottoman Empire, after the end of the Cretan War (1645-1669), Morean War (1684-1699) and the last Ottoman–Venetian War (1714-1718) which ended with the Treaty of Passarowitz, Dalmatia was finally integrated into the geographical area now known under that name. The border between the Republic of Venice and the Ottoman Empire established on this occasion now represents the modern border between Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. As this territorial conquest was accompanied by Venetian losses on all other fronts, Dalmatia was meant to compensate losses in the Peloponnese symbolically, ideologically and economically, especially because it was no longer just a fortified stop on the coastal commercial route to the Levant. Despite many attempts at reform and the intense development of maritime and caravan trade, Venice failed to solve the problem of integration of these two Dalmatias – the coastal and the inland, as well as the integration of the Catholic and Orthodox Morlach population into the legal system of the Republic. Although increasingly prosperous, maritime trade could not conceal existing problems stemming from its inability to implement its legal system in the hinterlands and install a Catholic hierarchy among the Orthodox population, which was the reason that the Serbian Orthodox Church received its true legitimacy only with the establishment of French rule in 1808. The Napoleonic Wars – which had a detrimental effect on maritime trade and destroyed the entire economic infrastructure not only in the province but even in Trieste, which had become an important port in the Adriatic for the Monarchy – brought notions of modernism and affirmed the Illyrian idea as a state-building concept. However, the introduction of the second Austrian rule
after 1813, which brought a long-lasting blockade of trade with Bosnia and the first political alliances and rifts, this idea was sidelined for a long time. The first phase in the formation of the People’s Party, which was based on an alliance of Croats and Serbs against the pro-regime Dalmatian autonomists, eventually ended in a Croat-Serb split. After the stage of cooperation between the autonomists and the Serb party, the split was finally healed with the emergence of the new course policy in the early 20th century and the final triumph of the Yugoslav idea motivated by the fear of Italian irredentist imperialism, which had become espoused by the remnants of the now completely Italianized autonomist party.

Incomprehensible as it might seem from the modern point of view or even as blasphemy in view of the dominant nationalist mood in Dalmatia, the fact is that this region played one of the crucial roles during the formation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, i.e. the first Yugoslav state. There were several reasons for this course of events. The first was the fact that the idea of Illyrism garnered strong support in the region of Dalmatia-Dubrovnik much earlier than in northern Croatia. Largely owing to its centuries-long experience of life between the Ottoman frontier and the continued contacts with Western European universalism, this narrow belt along the eastern Adriatic coast had enough imaginative capacities to allow the emergence of a vision of a shared Yugoslav state, as well as the imperative of creating a stronger community that would prevent the complete conquest of Dalmatia. Combined with the natural commercial orientation of Dalmatia towards Bosnia and Herzegovina, this was hardly surprising. In addition, owing to the abovementioned arrival of Napoleonic Rule in the early 19th century, which created the first South Slavic state known as the Illyrian Provinces, just as it had done in Italy, Dalmatia represented the first constitutive place of the first Yugoslav community although, interestingly, no one evoked the Illyrian Provinces later on, during the formation of the joint state. Ideologically they provided an extension of existing traditions and it was through this province that Illyrism received an organizational framework capable of surviving the short-lived Napoleonic Rule. The greatest intellectual achievement of this short period (1806-1813) was probably left by Ivan Kreljanović Albioni, who authored the Memorie per la Storia della Dalmazia, a history that lends itself to being read as a fundamental work of Dalmatian Illyrism. Notably, this particular brand of Dalmatian Illyrism was vitally different from its northern Croatian counterpart based in Zagreb. While the former was authentic and rooted in the centuries-old local intellectual and cultural tradition, the latter emerged as part of the state-building project which, in addition to the creation of a joint state, also included the formation of future state institutions, such as Strossmayer’s Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts (Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, abbrev. JAZU) and Matica hrvatska (Latin: Matrix Croatica) and others. These different roots eventually led to the increased vitality of Dalmatian Illyrism and later Yugoslavism compared to the Illyrism and Yugoslavism of northern Croatia, a difference that became very evident after the first disappointments in the joint state which occurred fairly early on and with the erosion of the concept of Yugoslav unitarism. These existing foundations combined with the growing threat of Italian irredentist nationalism, which saw Dalmatia as an integral part of unified Italy, created fertile ground for the
emergence of Yugoslavism and even Yugoslav nationalism, which at the time seemed like the only way out of this traumatic situation, even more so because the actions of the nationalist youth on the eve of World War I had already paved the way for this ideological development.

What was the situation in Croatia in the early 20th century? In simplified terms, in their struggle for national affirmation and against their unfair position in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, most political actors developed an awareness of the need for permanent cooperation between Croats and Serbs with the aim of creating the future Yugoslav community. This can be traced back to the mass protests of the so-called national movement of 1903 and the new course policy of 1905 or more specifically, the resolutions of Rijeka and Zadar of the same year. This policy, which was conceived in Dalmatia, grew on its opposition to Vienna and Hungarian nationalism, as well as the idea that the Croats and Serbs were the same people, while operationally advocating the unification of Dalmatia with the Kingdom of Croatia-Slavonia. In the spirit of this cooperation, the signatories of the Zadar resolution concluded that the shared language was thenceforth to be called Croatian or Serbian, as proclaimed at the Council of Dalmatia in 1883; that both Croatian and Serbian history and the Latin and Cyrillic script were to be taught in schools; and that Dalmatian municipal councils with at least a third of Serbian representatives were to display the Serbian flag along with the Croatian. This finalized the rapprochement of Croat and Serb politicians in Croatia; paved the way for the formation of the Croat-Serb Coalition and the implementation of the new course policy. Besides the official authorities of the Dual Monarchy, this cooperation was most bitterly opposed by Josip Frank’s supporters and clericalists; following the guidelines and ideas of the First Croatian Catholic Congress of September 1900, the clericalists saw every Yugoslav community as hostile except a community that would entail the cooperation of Croatia and Slovenia, both with a clear Catholic majority. Regardless of the vacillations of the Croat-Serb Coalition, especially in its attitude towards the government in Vienna, the fact remains that it was thanks to its efforts, as well as the remarkable military importance attached to Dalmatia by the imperial authorities, that the concept of trialism – the concept of a tripartite reorganization of the Monarchy with the formation of a third, Slavic state – was gradually abandoned in favor of the creation of a new Yugoslav state. Later on, the only open opponents to this scenario were the followers of Josip Frank and clericalists, while it was provisionally accepted by Stjepan Radić and his political party. However, by then a series of events had already happened and prompted the nationalist youth to act publicly and espouse a radical policy. The reason for this lay largely in the Coalition’s agreement with Ban Tomašić at the cost of abandoning the course set by its founder Frano Supilo. All of this was accompanied by the fusion of the Croatian People’s Progressive Party with the Croatian Party of Rights in 1910, a development described by Zorica Stipetić in her excellent study on Cesarec as the defeat of Progressivist concepts and liberal ideas that increasingly led the youth to part ways with their original party.¹ In this atmosphere, with the return of absolutism

embodied in Ban Cuvaj, the only resistance was put up by the Social Democrat Party and the Croat-Serb radical progressive youth. The Progressive Youth, founded in 1897 with the aim of putting up resistance to the existing actors in political and cultural life, represented the first generation of modern youth loyal to liberal bourgeois democracy and the vague concept of Yugoslavism, and focused on Croat-Serb cooperation. The second generation of progressive youth remained attached to the ideas of liberalism and anticlericalism, with a particular focus of science; after having abandoned Kvaternik’s victim myth, it espoused Meštrović’s Kosovo myth of vengeance. After the abovementioned split between the Progressives and Supilo in 1910, the Dalmatian and coastal youth became even more radicalized. In terms of their program, this meant believing in a unified Yugoslav nation that needed to create its own republic after the defeat of Austria-Hungary. It was on these pillars that the Croat-Serb Radical Progressive Youth was founded in 1911 in Split; the newly formed organization authorized the Split-born Vladimir Čerina, Oskar Tartaglia i Matej Košćina to launch the journal Val in Zagreb. Radical in its opinions and its later glorification of Belgrade and disdain for Zagreb, under the intellectual leadership of the poet Vladimir Čerina, who eventually ended up in a mental asylum, the journal Val was a slap in the face of the establishment. It is noteworthy that its owner and publisher was Milan Marjanović, a staunch supporter of Yugoslav unitarism, who would go on to debate the character of the First Yugoslavia with Miroslav Krleža on several occasions. Interestingly, just like the members of Young Bosnia, regardless of their idea of a unified Yugoslav nation, they advocated the formation of a federal republic that would underline rather than obliterate existing differences – an aim that would be met only in socialist Yugoslavia.

The revolt of the youth culminated in mass protests against Cuvaj’s regime, which on 31 January 1912 attracted more than 7000 protesters in Zagreb and led to a series of demonstrations throughout Dalmatia, as well as those organized by Yugoslav students in Prague, Vienna and Graz. The protests were certainly the most dramatic in Sarajevo, particularly on 19 February, when they attracted over 1000 protesters led by Luka Jukić and Gavrilo Princip. On 8 June 1912 Jukić made an unsuccessful attempt to assassinate Ban Slavko Cuvaj, murdering his advisor Ivo Hervoić.

As mentioned above, the young assassins followed European trends and also drew on the myth created by Vladimir Gaćinović about Bogdan Žerajić, who also made an unsuccessful attempt on the life on General Varešanin in Sarajevo. After mass student protests, many demonstrators were arrested and, after they were released from prison, went to Belgrade to join the student protests in the city. Among them were Tin Ujević, Krešimir Kovačić and Oskar Tartaglia. In addition to the radicalization of the student movement, the Dalmatian youth was peculiar in that, due to its traditional ties to Italy, it was susceptible to Italian anarchistic ideas. Links with the Italian anarchists were maintained by one of the leaders of the Dalmatian youth, Ivan Alfirević, while their ideas also inspired Nikola Njeguš Vavrak, the assassin of Minister Hochenburger in the Imperial Council in 1911 and member of the Social Democratic Party of Dalmatia. The popularity of anarchism in the Dalmatian proletariat was emphasized by Miljenko Smoje in his story of Roko and Cicibela, where
Lukenije, the assassin of Empress Sissi, appears as one of Roko’s key idols.

All of the above bears strong evidence to the mutual connection between the Yugoslav student movement in Croatia, Dalmatia, Bosnia and Serbia and the general mood among the youth, largely pro-republican and leftist. This is true regardless of the fact that the Kingdom of Serbs, it enjoyed unflattering support from some of them.

In his book *Dalmatia 1867-1972 in the Run-up to the Yugoslav Tragedy*, Radovan Kovačević offers an interesting piece of information: namely, exactly a year before the Sarajevo assassination, in the summer of 1913, after having received the news of Franz Ferdinand’s planned visit to central Dalmatia, including the town of Šibenik, the Dalmatian nationalist youth led by Vladimir Čerina, Tin Ujević and Milostislav Bartulica decided to assassinate the heir presumptive to the Austro-Hungarian throne. They even chose a specific location for the assassination – by a bridge over the Krka River, on the way from Drniš to Knin; the assassins were to be Ujević and Čerina. However, the assassination plan became public knowledge and Franz Ferdinand’s trip to Dalmatia was duly cancelled. However, as Ivan Meštrović, another member of the same group, happened to be in his native village of Otavice, Vladimir Čerina warned him to go into hiding, as he was likely to be the first target of police retribution; having assumed that this might be the case, Meštrović was already on his way to Split, and Čerina managed to catch up with him in Perković, at a train cross-
Although this plan never came to fruition, it is important for understanding the social and political context as well as the youth's readiness to take extreme measures in its effort to create the Yugoslav state. Writing in Paris in 1917, now fully aware that the formation of the new state was certain, Tin Ujević penned a melancholy and fierce text reminiscing about his comrades and their efforts. Significant as this text might be, here it is more important to note his concern, which eventually turned out justified, that the much wanted state could also fail without having fulfilled any of their ideals. Obviously very familiar with the local society and mentality, Ujević writes: ‘Let’s be honest, it would be terrible if we were to remain as many of us had been until yesterday – selfish, envious, petty, conniving, superficial dullards; spineless, illiterate, dishonest, with no willpower or courage, detesting anyone more powerful than us, incapable of achieving anything on our own, underestimating heroism and fervor, fearing thought and sympathy like the devil fears holy water. Beside Yugoslavia’s better soul that birthed Marko and countless other tame, known and unknown, kind and industrious men, there is in Yugoslavia a horrifying atmosphere of foul stench, where the entire Austro-German perfidy embraces the Balkan air of hatred and vindictiveness, a terrible sort of sycophantic world of chasm and crime. To liberate ourselves and our kin from this inner Austro-Germania, from vengeance and inanity – that must be the most pressing task for the Yugoslav educated youth after its victory over the external enemy’. Ujević’s fate and self-imposed exile from the society elite – resorting to public isolation as a form of resistance and avoiding political activities, rejecting utopias and not investing any energy into public causes – might be the best testimony to the final defeat of this generation of idealistic young revolutionaries and the most apt illustration of their deep disagreement with what their dreams had eventually become.

All of the above clearly indicates that the idea for the creation of the Yugoslav state enjoyed strong support in Dalmatia; however, this support was also very obvious in two other important instances. The first concerns the act of Josip Smadlaka: following the debate in the Sabor about the conditions of the impending unification, Smadlaka threatened to go to Belgrade and request direct unification of Dalmatia with Serbia, bypassing Croatia – unless the Sabor reached a positive decision on the matter as soon as possible. This had recently been the case with Vojvodina. The other aspect concerns a matter that deeply troubled Dalmatia: the planned annexation of a large part of this former crown land to Italy. It is widely known that in the secret Treaty of London, which was revealed to the wider public by Frano Supilo, the Allies promised to Italy a large part of Dalmatia in return for its joining the Entente and in case of an Allied victory. Furthermore, precisely during the Paris peace talks, from 5 December 1918 to 7 February 1919, the Italian army and government tried to instigate two armed uprisings on the eastern Adriatic, with D’Annunzio planning to launch an offensive on Zadar, Split and the rest of Dalmatia after capturing Rijeka.

Odgovor Kneza-regenta
ALEKSANDRA KARAGJOGJEVIĆA
Dalmaciji.

Zemaljska vlada u Splitu primila je danas ovaj brzojav:

BEOGRAD, 9. XII. 1918.

„Zahvaljujem se na Vašem pozdravu u ime mile Dalmacije prigodom proglašenja jedinstvenog kraljevstva S. H. S. pod že-
zlom Njegovog Veličanstva Kralja Petra I., mog uzvišenog oca. Danas se pred našim očima ispunio san Gundulića, Kačića i drugih naših velikana, za koje su se uvijek zalagali najbolji sinovi Dalmacije, prednjačeći u tome čitavom radu našem. I Njegovo Veličanstvo Kralj Petar I., moj uzvišeni otac i njegovi predci borili su se negda za slobodu i ujedinjenje našeg naroda. Toj uz-
višenoj zadaći ostati će uvijek vjeran i ja, čuvajući svuda i proti svakomu našu državnu cjelokupnost u granicama neprekinutog našeg etnografskog teritorija i posebno će moja briga biti po-
svećena podignuću te divne i do sada zapuštene Dalmacije, kojoj će se na slobodnom Jadranu povratiti stari sjaji i blago-
stanje i kojoj ja iz dubine srca šaljem moj kraljevski pozdrav“.

ALEKSANDAR.
The Adriatic question was generally one of the most contested issues at the Paris Peace Conference, and also the first point of contention that began to show cracks between Serb and Croat politicians, more specifically Nikola Pašić and Ante Trumbić. In his detailed study about this conference, Dejan Đokić notes that the Adriatic question was intensively discussed during the first six months of the negotiations, but that it was eventually resolved only by the Treaty of Rapallo of November 1920. However, the most intriguing detail from these talks concerns Pašić’s refusal to accept Trumbić’s initial and drastically different proposal for the complete demilitarization of the eastern Adriatic coast and islands. As a native of Split, Trumbić was naturally led by the need to defend his home region from an Italian invasion; in contrast, Pašić was more concerned about the image of military weakness that such a decision would undoubtedly create.

The wider context of the secret Treaty of London included the (in)famous promise of southern Dalmatia to Serbia; the fact that it was declined still represents one of the pillars of nationalistic criticisms of Pašić’s cabinet.

Program svećanosti dočeka vojske.

Nedjelja 12 lipnja.
Zaustavljanja ulaza u 7 sati naveće.
Od 8 sati zaveže skupno počinje svejet da pravi Šipar od Budikina pa a obe strane često sve do Metelina.
Vojnika na svojim glazbom poslije centar u određeni sat i slika na Šupino Polje.
Pogroženje vojske u logoru.
Nominacija grada i ponuđe iz muškar.

Ponedjeljak 13 lipnja.
U 7 sati u jutro općinsko glazba obilazi gradom, a muškari grupeci sa tvrđava.
U 10 sati kapi se sve školce i ulazi na odredena mesta na Poljani.
U 11 sati nastaje se Odbor Nar. Vijeća na odredenom mjestu i kredo na općinskom glazbenom i konjektor u nevjeć.
Svi se vratio skupi u vojskom te se zastavlja pred slavobran na Poljani.
Prezidnički Odbor Nar. Vijeća najviše vojci djeveskošću i predragu predstavnika Vlaste, nakon čega pjevački sbor pjeva „Rože Pravde“.
Predstavnik vojsci odslavljaju u vojsci glazba svira državnu himnu, pjevački sbor pjeva „Ljepa Naša“.
Predstavnik Vlasti odhodak, a poglasar predstavlja zasnovatelje vojske svevlasti.

Predaji zastave zapovjednika paka. Na odrednu zapovjednika općinska glazba svira državnu himnu. Zatim slijedi predaji ostalih darova. Nakon ovoga učinje se poveća gradom ovim redom:
1. Općinska glazba.
2. Sokol.
5. Vlasti.
7. Vatrogaoci.
8. Počasno.
Na večer u 8 sati minijeta grada uz konzertiranje muzike.


ODBOR SLAVE SLOBODE.
There is little point in conjecture and surmise, but it seems fairly certain that such an Allied decision would have led to serious social rifts and political resistance in Dalmatia, of course more so to Italy. In light of these Italian aspirations, with the simultaneous acknowledgement of deeply rooted Yugoslav sentiments in the region, the idea of the creation of a Yugoslav state seemed like the only way out and release from Italian imperialist nationalism. This fear was proved justified by the later events of World War II and the Italian occupation, while the breadth of the Partisan resistance movement showed that this outcome had been unacceptable for the Croatian majority.

In the postwar period – the period when the status of Dalmatia had yet to be resolved and the Allied fleet was still present in Dalmatian ports, ostensibly to guarantee peace although it was realistically causing unrest because it included Italian ships – almost all of the population of Dalmatia supported the creation of the Yugoslav state, awaiting the arrival of the Serbian army as its liberator. Vjekoslav Perica’s remarkable study *Pax Americana in the Adriatic and the Balkans*, which discusses Dalmatia in this period, offers a detailed portrayal of all physical and armed conflicts between Italian sailors and the Dalmatian population in Split and Trogir, with some of these hostilities even ending in fatalities. There was another side to all of this chaos, however: the general popularity of American navy forces and their cultural influence, which left a legacy of jazz and baseball in Split in this short period of time.

In view of the above, it was hardly surprising that Dalmatia received the Serbian army in a very euphoric mood. The euphoria was so overwhelming that the future historian and academician Grga Novak, together with Prvislav Andelinović, penned an open letter to Aleksandar inviting him to come to the Yugoslav and Serbian shore of Hvar. Major Stojan Trnkopović, who commanded the Serbian army that came to Split, was given his own shore; later on, many streets received new names in the spirit of Yugoslavism and monuments to Petar and Aleksandar were erected. For over ten years the city was governed by Ivo Tartaglia, a loyal member of the Democratic Party. Generally, Split was the key Dalmatian city in the Kingdom; it received many infrastructural investments and served as the Adriatic window of the Yugoslav state. This was certainly to be expected for two reasons. The first is the legacy of the Yugoslav idea, and the other the fact that the former capital of Dalmatia, Zadar, now belonged to Italy. The happy marriage between Split and the Yugoslav state, perhaps best embodied in the person and work of Ivan Meštrović, lasted around ten years. Again, there were two reasons for its faltering: the regime’s antagonism towards Croatian nationalism as well as the workers’ movement. Both gradually became markedly influential in the city, although it is important to note that the communist movement was much stronger and it was its strength that led to the denial of the local election results in 1926, which were won by the communists, and their further suspension. However, besides them, there was another strong movement in Split, that of Yugoslav nationalists, which were formally organized as the ORJUNA – Organization of Yugoslav Nationalists, a movement established in Split in 1921, whose large membership base included authentic upper-middle class Croatian families. Their violent propagation of integral Yugoslavism and their proto-fascist ideology inevitably
GRAGJANI!

Zločinačka ruka pokusala je juče da ugasi jedan svijetli život, da u crno zavije našu mladu državu, da uveli cijeli naš narod.

Syn našeg prvog kralja, nasljednik njegova prestola i njegovih vršina, vrhovni voga naše vojske

Regent Aleksandar,

Ljubav i dika naroda našega, trebao je da panu kao isabrana žrtva, da panu u onom času, kad je na novom ustavu položio zavjet, da će biti prvi njegov vrešac, prvi pobornik i zaštitnik našeg jedinstva i naše slobode, i kad se je s tog istorijskog obreda povratio u pratnji Nikole Pašića, sljedog nehmura naše državne veštinice.

Crna prestupnica saka, zločinačka družina, koja, onaj jedna, svakog drugog, spriječi da razvodi svijet i da uhihi društveni poremećaj, iđela je da baci u nered i prevrat našu državu, ovaj mladi i njoj je svijet, koji je mihao, kao kosovski božor, iz krvi jednog milijuna naših najboljih sinova.

Dobri udeš našeg naroda sačuvati su ga od užasne sudbine; Bož pravde, koji nas je dosad sačuvao od propasti, ćuto je i danas naše glase i danas nam je bio spas. Naš je Kralj ustaška nepropregijen, ostao je jači, ljepši, ponosniji nego je bio, u našim čima ljubav prema njemu još je smiljav, još svetlja, još neumrija.

GRADJANI!

Neka Vam ovo crno djevo bude opomena na ognjeno, koja nam domovini prijeti, neka Vam bude poticaj na svagu, na gragjensku smrživost, na stranačku primjire, na plemensku i vjersku ljubav, a neka junačka sreća, koja je još jednom spasila državu i narod spaso u nekoga najzabranijega sina, radije vidljive i gromika izraza u srećnim manifestacijama, koje će da spasenom Regestu kaznu, koliko ga vodi njegova Dalmacija, koliko ga ljubi njen glavni grad i koliko ga obožava sav narod Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca.

SPLIT, dne 30. juna 1921.

Pokrajinska Vlada za Dalmaciju

Podpredsjednik:

Dr. DESNICA.
led to constant physical clashes with the Split communists, most of who came from the working-class population of Veli Varoš. The intensity of these hostilities is perhaps best illustrated by the idea about a march on Belgrade which never came to fruition. Namely, ORJUNA was so fascinated by the rise of Italian fascism and Mussolini’s March on Rome that it planned a march on Belgrade in an effort to emulate him and take power in Belgrade. The plan was eventually abandoned because it was thwarted by communists, who devised a plan of obstruction with designated locations throughout the country where they planned to ambush them. Generally speaking, the initial enthusiasm for the creation of the new state, which was very strong in Dalmatia, began to wane very quickly due to structural injustices of the Kingdom, i.e. due to the regime’s utter insensitivity to the difficult social situation and growing national inequality. These two key moments, combined with the regime’s deep lack of democracy, led to the rise of the communist and pro-HSS opposition, which resulted in constant conflicts between these three political courses, i.e. their respective background ideologies, despite a shared antagonism towards the domicile Italian population and Italian imperialism. These clashes, which lasted until World War II and then spilled over into the war, ending in the final triumph of Partisan anti-fascism, completely shaped the social and political life of Dalmatia in the First Yugoslavia.

The last case of a symbiosis between these antagonistic movements, above all the Croatian national movement and the Yugoslav one, occurred at the opening ceremony for Meštrović’s monument to Gregory of Nin at Peristil in 1929, a celebration of the triumph of the Slavic spirit over the Latin. This did not escape the prominent Italian from Split and Professor Antonio Tacconi, who wrote a text about the ceremony and acknowledged the monument’s artistic value while also underlining the political background of its erection.

If we try to summarize the above at the end of this cursory overview of the situation in Dalmatia at the time of the establishment of the Yugoslav state, we will conclude that it needs to be seen in its authentic context, which was very different from the situation in continental Croatia and which gave rise to the fanatic loyalty of this province to the idea of a joint state. This complex context resulted in the much stronger influence of authentic Yugoslav nationalism and the communist movement than in any other part of Croatia and, consequently, the belated entrenchment of HSS in Dalmatia.
SLOVENES IN THE LAST YEARS OF HABSBURG MONARCHY AND THEIR ENTRY INTO NEW STATE

Political situation in the Habsburg Monarchy at the turn of the century

THE DAY WORTH A CENTURY
1 — XII — 1918
At the turn of the century, the Habsburg Monarchy experienced a period of great prosperity. Economic boom and overall modernization were apparent everywhere. “In fact a general upward development became more and more evident, and at the end of that peaceful century it was swift and multifarious,” writes Stefan Zweig in his wonderful memoirs. “Electric lights brightly lit the streets by night, replacing the dim lamps of the past; shops displayed their seductive new brilliance from the main streets of cities all the way to the suburbs; thanks to the telephone, people who were far apart could speak to each other; they were already racing along at new speeds in horseless carriages, and fulfilling the dream of Icarus by rising in the air. The comfort of upper-class dwellings now reached the homes of the middle classes; water no longer had to be drawn from wells or waterways; fires no longer had to be laboriously kindled in the hearth; hygiene was widespread; dirt was disappearing. People were becoming more attractive, stronger, healthier, and now that there were sporting activities to help them keep physically fit, cripples, goitres and mutilations were seen in the streets less and less frequently. Science, the archangel of progress, had worked all these miracles. Social welfare was also proceeding apace; from year to year more rights were granted to the individual, the judiciary laid down the law in a milder and more humane manner, even that ultimate problem, the poverty of the masses, no longer seemed insuperable. The right to vote was granted to circles flung wider and wider, and with it the opportunity for voters to defend their own interests legally. Sociologists and professors competed to make the lives of the proletariat healthier and even happier” (Zweig 2008, 14; 1958, 25).

“The Monarchy of Controversies” offered a “creative milieu” for the emergence of high culture with specific Central European orientation (Rumpler 1997, 524), a culture that was not limited to a narrow circle of elites in Vienna, Prague or Budapest but rather became the basis of a lifestyle and mind-set that was widespread across all areas of the monarchy. The art was given a new role, it was not only intended for the elites but also for the general public.
The monarchy thus combined two worlds; in the words of historian Vasilij Melik: “One is a world of hatred and conflicts, national, ideological and political struggles – the other is a world of cooperation, understanding, tolerance, efforts for mutually agreed solutions in the fields of culture, politics, national and other issues, as well as in all relations between people. Both world lived side by side and were intertwined with one another” (Melik 2000, 18).

At the turn of the 19th century, the Habsburg Monarchy found itself in a major crisis. One major problem was the dualism, as the monarchy did not function as a unitary state due to its dualist structure. The two state entities were united by a common ruler, finances, the army, and a common foreign policy, but in reality they were so divided that, for example, the inhabitants of one-half of the monarchy had to change their citizenship in order to vote in another half (Johnston 1993, 347–348).

WHAT WAS THE STATUS OF SLOVENES IN THE HABSBURG MONARCHY ON THE EVE OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR?

In his book From the “Black and Yellow Cage of Nations” to the “Golden Freedom”, dealing with the Habsburg Monarchy and Slovenes in the First World War, historian dr. Walter Lukan (2014) asks himself about the achievements of the Slovenes in the period before the First World War. Indeed, they were guaranteed equality under the constitution, a historical structure of the crown lands, and, since 1867, a dualist structure of the state. Despite the unfavourable social structure – as late as in 1910, two thirds of the Slovene population worked in agriculture – they have managed to form a rather developed national society with differentiated political, cultural and economic structures resulting in national interconnection across provincial borders. However, they had no university of their own, and despite the welldeveloped cooperatives, economic organizations were rather weak, with low shares of Slovenian capital. The selfgovernment was under Slovenian control only within provincial autonomy, in Carniola province. This situation was not enough for the Slovenian political elites. They wanted complete autonomy within the national territory. But the odds were against them. The political weight of Slovenes in the multinational monarchy was limited. According to the 1910 national census, which relied on the languages of communication, there were 1,300,000 Slovenes in Cisleithania, which represented 4.5% of the total population.

After the elections of 1911, when 23 Slovenian deputies (out of a total of 516) were elected to the Vienna Parliament, the Slovenian representatives in the National Assembly managed to help form larger parliamentary groups. In 1909, “Slavic Union” was formed on the initiative of dr. Ivan Šušteršič, then head of Slovene People’s Party and later Governor of the Duchy of Carniola, which consisted of the major part of Czech, Yugoslav and Ruthenian deputies. In terms of national politics, Slovenian political elites did not expect much of the aging monarch and Austrian government in the last years before the First World War. They did not expect the necessary reforms of the state to happen,
but instead pinned all their hopes on the Crown Prince Franz Ferdinand. But all hope vanished in 1914 with his assassination.

For many years before the First World War, Slovenian politics – regardless of party affiliation – was aimed at integration with other South Slaves in the Monarchy, especially with the Croats. The politicians did not feel they were strong enough to achieve national goals for themselves. The political aspirations of the vast majority of Slovenians were unchanging during the constitutional period. They considered dualism as the greatest evil, and the policy of the Hungarian government as negative and harmful to the Slavic interests. They wanted the reorganization of the Monarchy into a federation of equal nations. The initiatives for building political alliances with other Yugoslavs, especially the Croats, were coming from the Pan-Slovene People’s Party, which had capable political leaders: Ivan Šusteršič, Janez Evangelist Krek, Anton Korošec. Anton Bonaventura Jeglič, PrinceBishop of Ljubljana, was also an influential figure in the party. But it was Krek who set forth guidelines for the cooperation with the Croats, which later became the general party line (Lukan 2014, 17–21).

Thus, even before the First World War, Slovenians in all three political parties were fascinated with the idea of Yugoslavia. The main reason was fear of increasing Germanization and unfavourable economic development, as well as of Croats and Serbs abandoning them in their concepts and leaving them to the Germans and the Italians with the argument that they are too far away on the outskirts of the Slavic world and too endangered. They did not want the Yugoslav programme to be planned without them. However, despite its strong Yugoslav orientation, Slovenian politics remained firmly within the possibilities offered by Austria.

**RECONVENING PARLIAMENT**

The Slovenes presented their national political aspirations to the new Emperor Charles on 21 May 1917 as part of the consultations with the leading politicians of the parties before the reconvening of the Parliament, when the Emperor received the representatives of the Croatian-Slovenian Club (Korošec, Krek, Šusteršič, Pogačnik, and Špinčič). At the meeting, Šusteršič made a request for a “unified Yugoslav province within the Monarchy” (Lukan 2014, 67). However, subsequent talks with the Prime Minister clearly showed that no changes in the Constitution were to be expected and that it would only be possible to solve the Yugoslav question after the war. This prompted a new direction of Slovenian policy, which manifested in terms of the programme at the first session of the reopened National Assembly on May 30, 1917. Korošec, as the president of the newly formed Yugoslav Club, consisting of all South Slavic deputies of Cisleithania, read the May Declaration, which demanded the unification of all territories of the Monarchy inhabited by Slovenes, Croats and Serb into an independent state under the rule of the Habsburgs. Therefore, in comparison with the historical retrospective of the Slovenian political programmes that emerged in situations of political crises and were the expression of organized political forces – the Catholic, Social Democratic and Liberal Party and other movements – even the May Declaration is nothing new (Stavbar 2017, 67).
THE MAY DECLARATION

Without a doubt, the highlight of the first session of the twenty-second convening of the Parliament were constitutionallaw statements of the Slavic parliamentary clubs. The first statement was given by František Staněk, a representative of the Český svaz ("Czech Union"), who spoke sharply against the dualist system and called for the transformation of the monarchy. After Staněk, the floor was given to Anton Korošec, the president of the Yugoslav Club, who read the constitutionallaw statement of the Yugoslav Club, known to history as "The May Declaration."

The statement contained a request for the formation of a Yugoslav state in the areas with majority Slovene, Croatian, and Serbian population: "The undersigned deputies, united in the Yugoslav Club, declare that they demand, on the basis of the national principle and Croatian state law, the unification of all the territories within the Monarchy inhabited by Slovenes, Croats and Serbs, under the rule of the Habsburg-Lotaring dynasty into an independent state body, free of any national dominance by foreigner and built on a democratic basis. They will make every effort to realize this request by their unified nation. With this reservation, the undersigned will take part in parliamentary work."

The statements by the Czechs and the Yugoslavs caused quite a stir in the Parliament. The German National Association and the Christian National Union rejected both statements already at the same session, and the Government announced it will submit its position towards the constitutionallaw statements after the Emperor’s speech from the throne. The Emperor’s speech the following day did not even mention the constitutionallaw statements, as it had been written before May 30, 1917, nor did it give any hope of the Emperor and government’s intent to thoroughly transform the monarchy (Bister 1992, 184).

At the 4th session of the 22nd convening of the Parliament on June 22, 1917, the Prime Minister issued a negative statement on the constitutionallaw statements of the Slavs. Of course, this was met with a heated response by the Czech and Yugoslav Deputies. Among the Czechs and many other South Slavic nations, the patriotic feelings for Austria have long been absent. In fact, the only remaining connection between the nations of the Danube Monarchy was "the bond of the old dynasty".

Krek also spoke at the session in addition to other members of the Yugoslav Club, and said the famous word, printed by the bulletin of the Yugoslav Committee with great emphasis, both at the time and several times later: "Two ideas will never die: that Slovenians, Serbs and Croats form one nation, that they belong together in term of state and that they must come together in terms of state. If these two ideas are not fulfilled in this state, their fulfilment will come despite us and despite everything, and the potential consequences of this are dangerous for the life of Europe and its peace" (Pleterski 1971, 120–121).

1 — Stenographische Protokolle über die Sitzungen des Hauses der Abgeordneten des österreichischen Reichsrates im Jahre 1917. XXII Session. I. Band. 1. (Eröffnung) Sitzung der XXII. Session am 30. Mai 1917, pp. 34
The Emperor tried to set up a “concentration cabinet” in which each nation would be represented by one minister. However, he did not succeed, despite also negotiating with Korošec with regard to the Yugoslavs, and he accepted the resignation of the Prime Minister ClamMartinic (Cviri 2006, 306).

The new, Seidler government consisted mainly of senior state officials. There were also Slovenian representation with Ivan Žolger who became a minister without portfolio on August 30, 1917. On July 2, 1917, the first steps were taken regarding the demands by the Slavic nations with the proclamation of amnesty for political prisoners, but that was about it, since the indecisive ruler quickly abandoned the idea of federalization of the monarchy.

During parliamentary recess that followed, Seidler was given the task to finalize the formation of the government. However, he soon ran into problems, as the Czechs and the Yugoslavs rejected the offer to enter the government. The Yugoslav Club explicitly refused to participate in the government on August 7, 1917 and expressed its willingness to support only a parliamentary government which would “accept The May Declaration as its programme”. National autonomy within the regional boundaries was not in line with the views of the Yugoslavs. This was the end of the phase in which the Yugoslav club operated in anticipation of the “reform act of the monarch” (Pleterski 1971, 134). The fact that Seidler invited into his government dr. Ivan Žolger, the first and only Slovenian that ever became minister, was not enough to change the view of the Yugoslav Club. The programme of the new government, presented on September 25, 1917, was in conflict with the Czech and Yugoslav constitutional law statement. The government rejected all initiatives and programmes and was met by disappointment and resistance among the Czech and the Yugoslavs. It was not aware of the urgency of the Yugoslav question.

The main topic of the parliamentary debate of November 1917 was hunger and difficulties in the supply of food due to the war. At the same time, actions of military authorities in the Slavic south were being uncovered. The long speeches by Czech, Yugoslav and Slovenian deputies were a sort of obstruction.

Christmas and New Year holidays followed (from December 20, 1917 to January 22, 1918). After that, the criticism of the government only grew louder. The Czechs and the Yugoslavs took every opportunity to criticize the pro-German preference of the government and defend their determination to fulfil the demands from the constitutional law statements. During the interpellations, they pointed out the horrific actions of the authorities in the south and demanded to hold the war minister accountable. On January 22, 1918, Korošec addressed as many as 21 interpellation with a similar content. In criticizing the government, his constant demand was: “Yugoslav state to Yugoslav people!” (Pleterski 1971, 220). In his view, this was the only option for the reconciliation in the Yugoslav area, and at the same time he was passionately fighting for the democratic and national rights of the Croats, Serbs and Slovenes.

---

4 — This is illustrated by the fact that the Yugoslav Club did not participate in the appointment of Ivan Žolger, and that Žolger was nothing more than an expert for administrative and legal issues.
The language of the interpellation was becoming increasingly sharp, in part due to the irrevocable measures such as executions, which Korošec called murders and interpreted them publicly: "The estimates that 250,000 lives of South Slavs were lost in the southeast of the Monarchy due to murders, killings, legal murders, famine, and overall shortage are not unfounded" (Pleterski 1971, 221).

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MAY DECLARATION

The Declaration is one of the most important national political programmes in the history of Slovenes. It has become a cornerstone of cooperation and common political action of the Yugoslav politicians. An important part of the May Declaration was the so-called Habsburg Clause, which advocated for the unifications of the Slovenes, Croats and Serbs under the Habsburg rule, but denounced the Austro-Hungarian state system, dualism. They wanted the monarchy to transform.

The great importance of the May Declaration is also due to the fact that it united the leading Slovene, Croatian and Serbian politicians in the Austrian half of the monarchy and raised the level of political decisionmaking to the level of the nation as a whole. Of course, this had a decisive influence on the national political aspirations of Slovenian party leaders, as well as on the efforts of the Slovene people for national and political independence. The May Declaration was the first common political program of Yugoslav deputies in the Vienna National Assembly.

The May Declaration fell on deaf ears with the highest state officials of the Monarchy. Neither the government nor the emperor accepted the demands. When it became clear in June 1917 that the Emperor is not willing to do anything for the general transformation of the Monarchy, newspaper Slovenc ("The Slovenian") proclaimed on July 28, 1917 that the demands contained in the May Declaration are "the minimum requirements of the Slovenes", which they cannot waive in any case or accept any compromise solution to the Slovene question. In early August, the newspaper wrote that the Slovenian future lies exclusively in the United Slovenia as part of the Yugoslav community.

LJUBLJANA STATEMENT

The response to the May Declaration in Slovene regions was great, especially from June to the beginning of September 1917. The Declaration provoked considerable excitement in the domestic political calm. However, the initial movement in support of the declaration did not have a united leadership and common design. This was later ensured by the Prince-Bishop of Ljubljana Anton Bonaventura Jeglič, who at the end of summer 1917 prompted representatives of Slovenian political parties to sign a statement in support of the May Declaration. Dr. Krek was given the task to bring Archbishop on board and to oust dr. Šušteršič, which he successfully completed. The way for agitation
among people was now open, with the old liberals “crawling under the bishop’s coat” for their safety (Erjavec 1928, 270).

On September 15, Bishop Jeglič, canons Andrej Kalan and dr. Josip Gruden, along with the representatives of the Pan-Slovene People’s Party (dr. Ivan Šušteršič), National Progressive Party (dr. Ivan Tavčar, dr. Karel Triller), and the Slovenian Catholic Workers’ Democracy (Mihael Moškerc, Fran Vidic and Anton Žnidaršič), signed the so-called Ljubljana Statement, which joined the May Declaration and complemented it with a reference to the principle of self-determination of nations. The statement was not signed by the Yugoslav Social Democratic Party. The text of the statement was published by the newspapers Slovenski narod (“Slovenian People”) and Slovenec (“The Slovenian”).

On September 18, 1917, Jeglič wrote in his diary: “Sympathizers of the Pan-Slovene People’s Party are extremely grateful for my effort [...] The liberals strongly approve the move. The ‘Socios’ did not want to join, because the statement is supposedly too patriotic.”5

The war continued, the economic situation and supply were getting worse, and people were becoming apathetic. In addition, there was slow circulation of news about the failures on the frontlines due to strict censorship. The situation was favourable for spreading agitation for independence. Nonetheless, the country allowed considerable political freedom. Parliamentary speeches could be printed, camps and rallies were allowed, although under strict supervision, and represented an opportunity to spread the idea of the transformation of the Monarchy.

**DECLARATION MOVEMENT**

This was followed by a spontaneous statements of support for the May Declaration by the Slovenians. The Slovenian political history during the First World War was thus marked by the beginning of a phenomenon known as the Declaration Movement. It included statements by individual municipal committees for the May Declaration, mass collection of signatures by individuals and associations, and organization of large popular gatherings and camps in support of the Declaration. The Declaration Movement encompassed the entire Slovenian territory in the Austrian half of the monarchy, as well as beyond. According to the preserved census documents, more than 500 municipalities and municipal committees supported the May declaration, and around 326,000 signatures were collected in more than 1,350 places (Stavbar 2017, 228).6

This culminated in around 200,000 signatures of women and girls, which were solemnly delivered to the president of the Yugoslav Club, dr. Anton Korošec, by Franja Tavčar, the wife of the Mayor of Ljubljana, at the large declaration rally in Ljubljana on March 24, 1918.7

5 — Jegličev dnevnik (“Jeglič’s diary”), September 18, pp 719
6 — The Archives of the Republic of Slovenia, Yugoslav Club in Vienna: “Majniška deklaracija: knjige s podpisi žena in deklet za jugoslovansko deklaracijo, 30. 5. 1917”; Regional Archives Maribor, collection “Izjave za majniško deklaracijo”.
7 — The Archives of the Republic of Slovenia, Yugoslav Club in Vienna: “Majniška deklaracija: knjige s podpisi žena in deklet za jugoslovansko deklaracijo, 30. 5. 1917”; Regional Archives Maribor, collection “Izjave za majniško deklaracijo”
The record reads: “On Sunday afternoon, in the festively decorated and jampacked Grand Hall of the Hotel Union, Franja Tavčar, the wife of the Mayor of Ljubljana, solemnly delivered to dr. Korošec seven books with 200,000 signatures in support of the May Declaration on behalf of Slovenian women. She said: “Slovenian women demand a free Yugoslav state within the framework your declaration.” Cilka Krek, sister of the deceased dr. Krek, and dr. Korošec also gave a speech.

The census forms show a growth of the Declaration Movement across the historical lands, showing the mood of the masses in the last year of the war. The statements depict the attitude of the broadest social classes and their desire to overthrow dualism and form a new state entity. A large part of the statements contains the basic idea of the preservation of the Monarchy, since many Slovenes only envisioned union with brother Croats within the Habsburg Monarchy (Stavbar 1992, 1993).
The census forms contain statements by the municipal committees, statements by individual signatories; the vast majority of these were signatures of women and girls, and to a lesser extent men, since a large part of the latter were in the army. In addition, there were statements by various associations (firefighter, catholic, educational associations, book clubs, etc.), school boards, savings and loan banks, clergy, railway stuff, refugees from the Goriška region, and Slovenian boys from the front. During the Declaration Movement and from the rallies, they were sending their statements to dr. Anton Korošec personally and to the Yugoslav Club or to the editorial board of the newspapers such as Slovenec, Slovenski gospodar and Straža.

The Declaration Movement spread in the last months of 1917 and boomed in the first quarter of 1918, with some statement from as late as August 1918. In addition to the main statement and support for the May Declaration and
for the policy of the Yugoslav Club, the vast majority of the statements contains a strong idea of the preservation of the Monarchy, loyalty to Austria, and allegiance to the Emperor Charles. People took the opportunity and complemented their support for the Declaration with descriptions of their problems and burdens in terms of economy and politics. Many perceiver the new Yugoslav state under the Habsburg patronage as “the only […] solution for the Slovenian people” (Stavbar 2017, 117).

In the context of the Declaration Movement, declaration rallies or camps should also be mentioned. Between March 10 and May 12, 1918, a series of public gatherings (camps) was organized in support of the May Declaration, with large attendance. Deputies and prominent Slovene politicians held speeches, explaining to the people the policy and plans of the Yugoslav Club and the work of the deputies, while people expressed their enthusiasm and adopted a resolution in support of the Declaration.

At the beginning of May 1918, the declaration rallies were banned following the Governments position, according to which Slovenian territories should remain unconditionally in a constitutional union with German territories. Despite the ban, declaration rallies were being organized until the end of June 1918. 21 gatherings, meetings, camps were organized – newspapers reported from these events under one of these names from March to June 1918. Seven gatherings were banned, and the resolution was not adopted there. In July 1918, members of the Yugoslav Club no longer organized rallies.

The declaration, in the which the Slovenes declared support for the unification with other South Slavic nations into an independent state under the Habsburg rule, represents an important milestone in the history of the unification of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs into a unified state. As a result, this manifestations and the Declaration itself play an important part in the development of the national consciousness among Slovenes. The support for the May Declaration also emphasizes the highlighting of the mood of the masses in a spontaneous mass movement – a nationwide manifestation, which is what the Declaration Movement was. **Without a doubt, the movement in support of the May Declaration was the largest manifestation of women in history.**

After reviewing all preserved statements in the Slovenian archives, more than 325,000 signatures of support for the Declaration have been found, which represents one quarter of the Slovene population of Cisleithania.

Two other subjects need to be mentioned from the time of the Declaration Movement: the declaration postcards and the symbol of the May Declaration. The declaration postcards by Maksim Gaspari are “true little monuments from a certain period of Slovenian history”, when Slovenes began took their destiny in their own hands (Švajncer 1987, 59–65). A special symbol of the Declaration Movement was also created. An ivy leaf was designed, to link the Declaration Movement to the peasant revolt, as periwinkle was also a symbol of the rebellious peasants. Brooches were designed for women (in silver and green enamel versions), and small symbols with a pin for men (enamelled or silver) (Švajncer 1986, 184–187).
“RADICALIZATION” OF THE NATIONAL MOVEMENT AND BEGINNING OF CREATION OF NEW STATE

With the deterioration of the Empire’s military situation, political leaders of the Habsburg Yugoslavs began to prepare a path for the realization of the self-determination of the Yugoslav people. On September 24, 1918, representatives of the highest Slovenian, Croatian and Serbian political organisations and parties in the Monarchy met in Zagreb. They adopted the Declaration on the Austro-Hungarian peace note of September 24, 1918, explicitly highlighting their determination for the state independence of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs. In late September and early October, the highest state officials were not yet fully aware of the seriousness of the situation, of the risk of collapse of the multinational state, and of the “rapidly increasing alienation of the nations of the Monarchy” (Lukan 2014, 125).

Slovenian, Croatian and Serbian politicians continued with their activities for the self-determination of peoples. On October 5 and 6, 1918, the National Council of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs was established in Zagreb, and the president became dr. Anton Korošec. A supreme political representative body was formed, which “proclaimed and took charge of the struggle of the Yugoslav nations in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy for their state independence” (Fišer 2005, 170).

On October 11, 1918, Korošec had audience with the Emperor at his invitation for the last time. The Emperor warned him of the Serbs and urged for...
the Slovenians to remain loyal to Austria after all. However, Korošec regretfully notes: “Your Majesty, it’s too late. The fate had already decided.” He later said: “With these words, we have essentially said goodbye to Austria and entered a new free state.”

It has to be added that the leaders of the declaration policy did not have a concrete plan for the organization of the desired Yugoslav community. They were postponing the discussion until the autumn of 1918, and it was not before October 1918 that polemics and reflections on the topic began in the newspapers. Fran Šuklje, who published his thoughts in Slovenski narod at the initiative of Korošec, imagined the state of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs – limited in his view to the South Slavic lands of the Austro-Hungary – as a federative republic. His ideas were strongly opposed by the liberals, who rejected Šuklje’s search for the middle path between autonomy and centralism, and labelled his plan as not enough Yugoslavian and too Austrian. Ivan Tavčar believed that the new state had to be “carved out of one stone”. This opinion was shared by numerous Slovenian intellectuals who believed that not only a new Slovenian state was being born, but also a new “Yugoslav nation.”

The National Council assumed the leadership of the entire national politics of the Habsburg Yugoslavs. It rejected the Imperial Manifesto of October 16, 1918, and demanded the self-determination of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs. The political ties with the Monarchy were broken. On October 29, 1918, the SHS State was proclaimed at a rally in Ljubljana. One day before the celebration of the formation of the new State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs, newspaper Slovenec urged the people: “Manifest, decorate your chest at the tomorrow’s walk with a fresh ivy leaf, the symbol of our young, fresh Yugoslavia!”

The last act of the Slovenian national self-determination was carried out on October 31, 1918. On the basis of a unanimous decision of all Slovenian political parties, The National Council formed a government for the Slovenian part of the SHS State. The first president of the Slovene national government became Josip Vitez Pogačnik.

Approximately 200 Slovenian officers and soldiers also reacted to the new situation. On their behalf, Lieutenant-General M. Rostohar solemnly renounced the oath to the Habsburg Emperor and promised loyalty to the new country.

On October 30, 1918, Slovenian military took control over Ljubljana. Similarly, on November 1, 1918, Rudolf Maister took military control over Maribor with 150 men. Maister’s call for mobilization on November 9, 1918, was of key importance for the consolidation of the Slovenian authority in Styria. Based on this mobilization call, the First Maribor Regiment was formed on November 21, 1918, consisting of 70 officers and 2,000 soldiers (Perovšek 2009, 30–31). On the night of November 23, 1918, the last German military formation, Schutzwehr...
(security guard), of about 1,500 men was disarmed. Furthermore, Maister had his military power available for the occupation of the Slovenian national border area. Soldiers led by General Maister formed a demarcation line between German Austria and the SHS State around Radgona, Šentilj in Slovenske gorice, and Kozjak. Maister forced the Austrian military command in Maribor to hand over military authority. He proclaimed Maribor Yugoslav property (Jenuš 2011). Maister was appointed General by The national Council in order to have more authority in further negotiations with the Austrian army about the demarcation in Styria. Slovenian solders also appeared in Gorica, but had to withdraw from there in November 7 due to the pressure of the Italian army.

Slovenians lived the Slovenian independence within the State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs until December 1, 1918, until the unification with the Kingdom of Serbia into Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

The unification of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs was not carried out according to the plans designed during the turmoil of war. The Slovenes and the Croats were swindled, as the Serbian government cancelled the Geneva Agreement,\(^\text{13}\) concluded between the president of the Slovene People’s Party, dr. Anton Korošec, and Serbian Prime Minister Pašić. In addition, the condition that at least two-thirds majority would be needed to adopt the Constitution of the unified SHS state – as was agreed in principle with the Corfu Declaration – was not respected in the process of integration.

\(^{13}\) — The Geneva Agreement, also the Geneva declaration, was an agreement on the unification of the State of SHS and the Kingdom of Serbia. The agreement was adopted in Geneva on November 9, 1918 at the Conference of the Representative of the Kingdom of Serbia (N. Pašić along with three members of the Serbian parliament), the National Council of SHS in Zagreb (A. Korošec, M. Čingrija, G. Žerjav), and the Yugoslav Committee in London (A. Trumbić, G. Gregorin). The Kingdom of Serbia and the National Council of SHS in Zagreb were named the subjects of the Yugoslav state association, and the way of establishing its new government was determined. The authorities in Serbia opposed the agreement since it was contrary to the idea of Greater Serbia. N. Pašić resigned, thus invalidating the agreement.
Within the new state, Slovenians expected significantly better decision-making opportunities in terms of their fundamental sociopolitical, socioeconomic, and cultural and educational issues than in the dissolved Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. They expected to be included in the basic questions of further national development within the new state (Perovšek 2009, 239). But this was not the case.

“IN THE DESIRED LAND?”

What were the consequences of the Slovenian encounter with an “Oriental mentality”, as it was named by Ivan Hribar (1983–1984) in his Moji spo mini (“My Memories”), and what has “the desired land” meant for the Slovenes in the next century: “Yugoslavia – a Historical Mistake or Exigency” (Melik 1994, 51–54), shrinking of the Slovene national territory, liberation from the prison of nations, answer to the question of how did we end up here (Habjan 1997, 149) or simply a “solid national-emancipatory basis” (Perovšek 2009, 15) which led the Slovenes to their own country in 1991?

A trialist idea of the organization was always present with Slovenes, because they were afraid they will not be able to enter the Yugoslav group. Therefore they exerted more pressure on the Croats as politically necessary in order to find connections. Despite this justified fear, Melik (1994, 51–54) believes that the lack of knowledge of Slavic and Yugoslav nations was not understandable or justified. He further notes that this ignorance was accompanied by another quite severe “illness”: self-denial, self-renunciation, self-abasement. This is also evidenced by the survey on the future of the Slovenian language carried out in the magazine Veda, where many people opted for the adoption of the Serbian language in science. Fortunately the abandonment of Slovene remained only in words. The idea of a single Yugoslav nation became widespread among Slovenian parties as well. Also dangerous was the fear of Slovenian individuality, of independent decision-making and independent thinking. Another mistake when joining the new state was the increasing popularity of the theory that Slovenians do not have history, that our intelligence is mostly German in their mentality. On the other side there were the Serbs with their heroism and their “glorious past”. Since the end of the 19th century until the end of the First World War, Slovenian politicians had enough time to get information about the nearby and the distant Yugoslavs, about their habits, their mentality, their values and political methods. There were resources, newspapers, publications available … According to Melik, general knowledge could be better, “but it was poor, almost nonexistent, sometimes it could even be said that there was a desire to avoid the truth, to avoid the real knowledge.” Critical comments on the lack of critical thinking were coming from the periphery.

14 — Title of the article by Fran Šuklje, Slovenian Habsburgera politician, published in the newspaper Slovenec on October 15, 1918; title of the book by dr. Junj Perovšek, great expert and researcher of the Slovenian political history from the end of the 19th century until the Second World War, subtitles “Slovenian experience with the Kingdom of SHS/Yugoslavia 1918–1941 (Ljubljana 2009).
15 — Ibid.
In November 1918, social democrat Anton Štebl wrote in newspaper *Demokracija*, that “after a short period of coexistence between Slovenes, Croats and Serbs, there will be national political struggles, perhaps more vicious that they were ever fought between, for example, us and Germans.” He believed 

16 — Anton Štebl (1877–1942), politician, social democrat. In 1918, he was among the initiators of the opposition in the Yugoslav Social Democratic Party (the so-called “socialist youth”), which began publishing newsletter *Demokracija*. The end of the war, the dissolution of the Habsburg Empire and the formation of the Kingdom of SHS defined Štebl as one of the leading figures of the Slovenian workers movement and of the Yugoslav Social Democratic Party, in which he was a member of the Executive Committee. He became one of the most prominent protagonists of the opposition currents within the Party, and an influential workers leader in Slovenia. Since 1919, he advocated increasingly and with increasing enthusiasm for radical social changes in the social democratic publications, he held speeches at public gatherings, he was president of the regional organization of the Yugoslav Social Democratic Party for wider Ljubljana region. In June 1919, he visited Carinthia and Klagenfurt after it had been occupied by the Yugoslav army. He noted the “miserable” results of the “nationalist presumptuousness and Slovenian annexionistic arrogance above the trampled truth”, and advocated for the self-determination of the population (Enciklopedija Slovenije, vol. 13. pp. 137–138).

17 — Demokracija 1918, pp. 256
that despite the common language, “there is an insurmountable gap between the tribes.”

We also have to note some claims by dr. Šušteršič, who had been excluded from the Slovene People’s Party and from the leadership of Slovene politics and was feverishly attacking the Party’s policy and the formation of the new Yugoslav state, which were written under the proverb Bad company can give you a headache: “A Serb can never be and will never be a Yugoslav. only Serb, Great Serb … He will only be Yugoslav if he will be master … over the Croats and Slovenes.”

He also believed that the Serbs don’t even think about denouncing their Orthodox faith, their Serbian literature, and “their Serbian state.”

Politician and diplomat Bogumil Vošnjak, one of the campaigner for the “ideal Yugoslavia”, never got over the fact that it was never realised in this form (Gačić 2015, 105).

Despite pressures from Belgrade, Korošec was never seduced by the “temptation of returning to the hands of the Habsburg dynasty” (Rahten 2016, 301).

Quite soon, the hopes for an ideal coexistence of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs in the new state proved to be unfounded, and disappointment ensued. However, most Slovenian politicians described the formation of the new SHS State as “national liberation”. Among them was Ivan Hribar. Despite his disappointment with the situation in the new state, he did not change his negative attitude towards the old Austria and remained confident in the new state (Cvirić and Gašperić 2005, 446). In a letter to Pavel Turner, dated February 17, 1924, he wrote: “I, too, am not satisfied with all the circumstances of our state affairs; but I do not despair. I remain an optimist. There is too much creative force in our nation for anybody to be able to question its future. We all have such a strong will for the community and close coexistence, in fact stronger than we are aware of. We are bound together by external threats. They are the best guarantees for the survival of the state.”

The only exception was Lojze Ude, who noted that there are many things “worse [in the Kingdom of SHS] that they were in Austria”, and that Slovenes in Austria “at least mostly lived united in one state, while today the Slovenian compact territory is divided into three or four states.”

The goal of the United Slovenia, for the achievement of which the Slovenes expected a lot from the new Yugoslav state, remained far from accomplished. Similarly disappointing was the loss of the Primorska region, which was renounced by the Kingdom of SHS in terms of international law in favour of the Kingdom of Italy with the conclusion of the Rapallo Treaty on November 20, 1920. National fragmentation remained one of the key issues defining the Slovene national and party politics until the end of the first Yugoslavia.

Despite certain bad experiences with Yugoslavia, the first Yugoslav union had some positive effects on the development of Slovenes. For several
years, Slovenes had a “silent autonomy”, which proved that they are capable of managing and coordinating their own national, cultural, economic and political life. A comprehensive Slovene educational system was set up, it was a period of economic progress and the development of Slovene national cultural life. In addition, Slovenes had considerable political influence and helped shape the state politics of the time. Two Slovenian ministers were appointed to the first government of the new state on December 20, 1918 by Regent Alexander: dr. Anton Korošec and dr. Albert Kramer. A strong national emancipatory basis was formed, which resulted in the independent Slovenian national state in 1991 (Perovšek 2009, 239–240).

However, the joy of unification with the closest linguistic relatives was soon accompanied by disappointment in the last days of October 1918. Within a short period of time, the first Yugoslav union was characterised by a series of permanently unresolved issues – the national and social question, the question of the ideological character of the Yugoslav society, the foreign policy position of the Kingdom. Nevertheless, despite the disappointment of the Slovenes, the Kingdom of SHS/Yugoslavia has also brought them undisputable benefits.

In 1918, a long life in the predominantly German state entity, which threatened Slovenians with Germanisation, came to an end; in 1919, the Prekmurje Slovenes united with the mother nation and broke away from the grip of Hungary. The departure of Slovenes from the Habsburg Monarchy and their entrance into the Yugoslav union was historically validated by one of the more prominent national political leaders, Bishop Jeglič. In 1920, he wrote in his diary: “Yes, I was a loyal Austrian, and I was disgusted by the obvious and especially secretive corrupt agitation against Austria. But I have always wanted Yugoslavs to unite in one whole within Austria. I knew, however, that the realisation of this goal was not possible without a very serious overthrow. Well, the war shook it all up and turn it around in a way that such unification seemed possible. Since this was the aim of the May Declaration, it was dear to me. However, since people did not take much interest in it, or rather didn’t know how to orientate and did not move, and I felt all will be lost and we will be subject to Germanisation, if we do not take action in that opportune time, I took steps to encourage all parties to sign it [the so-called Ljubljana statement from September 9, 1917, which initiated the Declaration movement in the period 1917–1918]. My signature was relevant, and a movement has begun that made Yugoslavia possible. Thank God, who made all the circumstances work together in a way that made all my actions completely legal.”

From the last twenty years of the 20th century onwards, Slovene historiography has balanced the views of the Hapsburg Monarchy and the reasons for its disintegration, and has defined the decisions by the Slovenes to enter the new state. The Habsburg Monarchy was dissolved mainly due to unresolved national relations. It should be emphasized here that the Habsburg Monarchy, as Rozman (1990, 372) points out, was not such a “prison of nation” as it is often painted in journalistic and even scientific texts. The latter also provide the answers to the question of what the “desired land”, as Perovšek (2009, 15) calls is, meant for Slovenes in the next century.
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VOJVODINA AND THE CREATION OF YUGOSLAVIA IN 1918
On the eve of the formation of Yugoslavia in 1918, the area of modern-day Vojvodina, including the historical regions of Bačka, Banat and Srem, was part of the Habsburg Monarchy, more specifically the Kingdom of Hungary, one of two constituent parts of Austria-Hungary. Together with Baranja, Bačka and Banat were parts of southern Hungary, while Srem belonged to the Triune Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia, an entity that enjoyed a special autonomous status within the Hungarian part of the Monarchy. All of these regions were part of the Hungarian county administrative system. The territories of Srem and Baranja corresponded to the borders of the Srem and Baranya counties respectively; most of Bačka (Hun. Bácska) made up the county of Bács-Bodrog; Banat was split between the counties of Torontál, Timiș and Krassó-Szörény.

The position of these regions at the time of the creation of the Yugoslav state was determined by complex social and military-political processes, above all the disintegration of Austria-Hungary and the entry of the Serbian army into the territory of Srem, Banat, Bačka and Baranja. The final chapter in the disintegration of the Habsburg Monarchy unfolded in late October 1918, when the Croatian Parliament (Sabor) decided to proclaim secession and join the State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs, with the power in the territory of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia being transferred to the National Council of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. At the same time, the civil-democratic Aster Revolution happened in Hungary, leading to the formation of a new democratic government led by Count Mihály Károlyi1. An armistice between the victorious Allies and Hungary was signed in Belgrade on 13 November 1918, but the Belgrade Convention had little real importance, because the Serbian troops, following the orders of the commander of Allied troops at the Salonica (Southern) Front Louis Franchet d’Espérey and the chief of the Serbian Supreme Command

Živojin Mišić, had already crossed the rivers separating Serbia and Austria-Hungary a few days earlier and taken control of Srem and a large part of southern Hungary, including almost all urban settlements in Vojvodina. The Convention established an occupation zone with the demarcation line running north of Pécs, Baja, Subotica and Mureș.

Parallel to these political upheavals and the dissolution of the administrative structure of the Dual Monarchy, an intense socio-revolutionary process was unfolding, encouraged by the emergence of ‘Green Cadres’ and ‘logoši’ – groups of deserters from the Austro-Hungarian army who plundered military and civilian structures and estates, sabotaging the war efforts of Austria-Hungary. In the last year of the war, this movement became even wider due to the participation of poor social strata, while the newly returned Russian prisoners of war brought home the communist ideas of the October Revolution. Fearing social unrests and in an effort to secure their material interests, the local population of Vojvodina, particularly the bourgeoisie and major landowners, quietly received the arrival of the Serbian army in November 1918.

Vojvodina’s ethno-demographic characteristics were another important factor in these processes and developments, perhaps even more decisive than political and military factors, especially in light of the fact that the victorious Allied powers decided to make the self-determination concept the guiding principle for determining future international borders. In this context, the remarkably complex ethnic structure of Vojvodina was one of the key factors in the processes that led to the establishment of the first Yugoslav state, the Great People’s Assembly in Novi Sad (1918) and the Yugoslav-Hungarian delineation two years later.

Due to the abovementioned complex administrative and legal position of the regions of Vojvodina, the ethnic structure of its population can be seen from several angles: first, Banat, Bačka and Baranja as the territories of former southern Hungary, which were represented at the Great People’s Assembly of 1918 in Novi Sad; then, Srem which included the present-day Croatian part of Srem with Vukovar and Vinkovci in the Srem county; and finally, the area of Vojvodina in its present-day borders: Banat, Bačka and Srem.

According to the population census of 1921, Banat, Bačka and Baranja, i.e. the parts of these regions that were granted to the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes by the Treaty of Trianon, had a total population of

---

2 — The Serbian army entered Sremska Mitrovica on 7 November, Novi Sad and Pančevo on 9 November, Vršac on 10 November, Subotica and Sombor on 13 November, and Veliki Bečkerek on 17 November (Petar Pekić, Povijest oslobođenja Vojvodine (Subotica: s. n., 1939), p. 132, 151, 212, 246, 277).


4 — Bogumil Hrabak, „Logoši, zeleni kadar i zbivanja pri prevrati u Vojvodini 1918“, Istraživanja vol. 8 (1979), pp. 113–137.

5 — According to the historian Nikola Gaćeša, the population census of 1921 is more useful than the Hungarian census of 1910, because it paints a more accurate picture of the demographic makeup of Vojvodina in terms of its chronology and methodology (Никола Л. Гаћеша, “Демографске и социјалне прилике у време присаједињења Војводине Краљевини Србији 1918. године”, in: Присаједињење Војводине Краљевини Србији 1918, collection of papers, ed. Милутин Смиљанић (Нови Сад: Музеј Војводине; Институт за историју Филозофског факултета, 1993), p. 50).
Serbs, Bunjevci, Šokci and Croats, or 'Serbo-Croats' as they were listed in the census, made up 37%; other Slavs, including Slovaks, Rusyns, Slovenes and others a little over 5%; 5% Romanians; 1,5% Jews; Hungarians slightly under 28%; and 23% Germans. The Serbian population had a relative majority with a 30% share in the total population. Therefore, although the Serbs were the largest ethnic group, no national community had an absolute majority.

In 1921 the Srem County had a population of around 345,000, with around 185,000 Serbs, which meant they had an absolute majority even on their own; taken together, Serbs and Croats made up almost 73%; Germans 16%; and Hungarians 5%.

Looking at the regions of Vojvodina in their present-day borders, according to the census of 1921 Srem, Banat and Bačka had a population of 1,535,794 with 34.7% Serbs; 24.2% Hungarians; 21.9% Germans; 8.5% Bunjevci, Šokci and Croats; 3.8% Slovaks; 4.4% Romanians; and 0.9% Rusyns. Therefore, the Slavic population (47.9%) did not have an absolute majority, but it did have a relative majority compared to the former ruling nations of Hungarians and Germans.

However, the Serbian army conquered some territories that were predominantly inhabited by a non-Slavic population, especially in the borderlands of the territory it now controlled. Aspirations to capture the entire territory of Baranja, the town of Baja in Bačka and Banat of Temeswar were among the war objectives of the Serbian government and the program of Serb politicians from southern Hungary, and hence the 757 delegates present at the Great People's Assembly in Novi Sad included 75 delegates from Banat of Temeswar (with five from the city of Temesvár/Timișoara), five from the town and area of Baja, and one each from Mohács, Beremend and Lippó in Baranya. As part of its maximalist version of territorial demands, the Yugoslav delegation at the Paris Peace Conference requested the inclusion of these territories into the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, although this agenda did not comply with the ethnic principle proclaimed by President Woodrow Wilson.

* * *

The complex ethnic structures of Vojvodina's regions, strong revolutionary zeal and the conflicting interests of various ethnic groups and states during the administrative and legal interregnum between the dissolution of Austria-Hungary and the emergence of its successor states created a convoluted situation in the field, which was reflected in contrasting agendas and differing concepts for the resolution of this complex situation.

---

6 — Ibid, pp. 50–51.
8 — Саша Кицошев, „Промене у етничкој и верској структури становништва Војводине током 20. века“, Теме vol. 3–4 (1997), p. 257. The last Hungarian population census, dating from 1910, provides similar data except in the case of Hungarians (28%) and Bunjevci (2.3%).
9 — Temesvár/Timișoara had a population of 74,000 with only 3,500 Serbs among them; the Baranya county had a population of 350,000 with Serbs and Croats making up 7%. Victor Neumann, Timișoara between „fictive identity“ and „ideal nation“: the identity profile during the interwar period, Balcanica 44 (2013), p. 393; Josip Bosendorfer, Nešto malo o našoj Baranji (Osijek: Prva hrvatska dionička tiskara, 1940), p. 35.
In this context, as the largest population and bolstered by the presence of the Serbian army, the Serbs became the decisive factor in the dynamic processes that were underway in Vojvodina on the eve of the creation of Yugoslavia. The political organizing of prewar representatives of Serbs in Vojvodina and the takeover of power in the territories of Srem, Bačka, Banat and Baranja ran parallel with the gradual conquest of the territory of Vojvodina by the Serbian army. The Serbian People’s Council\(^\text{10}\) (Srpski narodni odbor – SNO) was formed as the main political body and on 3 November 1918 held its first public session in the old building of Matica srpska on Liberation Square in Novi Sad. The aim of this body was to establish a network of people’s councils throughout Vojvodina and the political organization of Serbs as well as other Slavic peoples. On the same day the Serbian National Guard was formed as the city’s peacekeeping organization; the first issue of \textit{Srpski list}, the organ of SNO, was published on 6 November with a circulation of 12,000. When Serbian soldiers entered the city three days later, they were greeted from the balcony of Matica srpska by Jaša Tomić, the president of the Radical Party and one of the most prominent Serb politicians from southern Hungary. As had been the case in other towns, the Serb population of Novi Sad enthusiastically greeted the army and saw its arrival as liberation.\(^\text{11}\)

As contemporaries note, over the following days, events unfolded ‘at a mind-boggling pace’. Parallel to the process of capturing south Hungarian territories by the Serbian army ran the process of forming people’s councils in towns and the takeover of power from Hungarian and German national councils. At the same time, the Serbian politicians defined two conflicting concepts about the way that the regions of Vojvodina would be integrated into the future Yugoslav state. Assuming that Serbia, as an internationally recognized state,

\(^{10}\) — The Serbian People’s Council was formed as early as 1917 with the humanitarian aim of organizing accommodation for children from Bosnia and Herzegovina in the towns of Vojvodina.

was the most important factor in the impending unification, the Radical Party\textsuperscript{12} and its leader Jaša Tomić wanted the territories of former southern Hungary to first be integrated into Serbia and then enter the Yugoslav state together with Serbia. On the other hand, prewar Liberals and Democrats gathered around Tihomir Ostojić, the secretary of Matica srpska, believed that Bačka, Banat and Baranja should enter future Yugoslavia by way of the National Council of Zagreb, together with Croatia, Dalmatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The dilemma ‘Belgrade or Zagreb’ gave rise to a heated debate in November and the final decision was decisively influenced by the view of the Serbian government and Prime Minister Nikola Pašić, who believed that the direct unification of Vojvodina’s regions with Serbia would bolster his own position in his negotiations with the National Council in Zagreb. On a visit to Belgrade in November, Jaša Tomić and Vasa Stajić were instructed by ministers Momčilo Ninčić and Ljuba Jovanović to join Belgrade independently of Zagreb.\textsuperscript{13} In an effort to hasten the formation of the Yugoslav state, one of the most prominent politicians in the National Council of Zagreb, Svetozar Pribićević, sent a message to Stajić advising him to ‘break with Zagreb’, which also helped appease the deep-rooted disagreements among Serb politicians in Vojvodina.\textsuperscript{14}

Although no final compromise and agreement could be reached about the way to integrate the regions of Vojvodina into the Yugoslav state, SNO convened the Great People’s Assembly of Serbs, Bunjevci and other Slavs in Banat, Bačka and Baranja in its proclamation of 17 November 1918. In line with the recommendations of the electoral process, delegates for each municipality were elected at people’s meetings in a public vote of all citizens of at least twenty years of age. For each 1,000 citizens one political representative was elected. For the first time women received the right to run in the election, mostly due to the efforts of Milica Tomić, Jaša Tomić’s wife, who had been a supporter of women’s equality and suffrage even before the war. On one hand, the electoral process rested on progressive and democratic postulates that allowed universal suffrage for all adults of both genders; on the other hand, however, it inaugurated the principle of national inequality because it applied only to the Slavic population, thereby excluding a half of the inhabitants of the regions of Vojvodina.

However, remarkably important for the realization of the entire process was the position of southern Hungarian Bunjevci, who were a decisive factor due to their numbers, particularly in northern Bačka. The Bunjevci of Sombor were split into two factions, with the smaller group advocating cooperation with the Hungarian authorities, but the pro-Yugoslav faction emerged victorious.

\textsuperscript{12} The Radical Party and Liberal Party of Vojvodina emerged from the split in Svetozar Miletić’s Serbian National Freethinking Party after his retirement from politics. The Radicals were led by Miletić’s son-in-law Jaša Tomić, and the Liberals by Mihailo Polić Đesanić.

\textsuperscript{13} — Васа Стајић, “Моје учешће у Југословенском Уједињењу”, у: Споменица ослобођења Војводине 1918 (Нови Сад: Штампарија Јовановић и Богданов, 1929), pp. 175–179. Remembering this audience, Stajić recorded: ‘I said that the opinion of official Serbia held no merit for me. The Serbian government is here today and gone tomorrow. And the idea of national unity existed before this government and it will survive the government. I remain in favor of it.”

after the formation of the People’s Council of Serbs and Bunjevci. The Bunjevci of Subotica had been predominantly in favor of the pro-Yugoslav option even before the entry of the Serbian army into the town and were led by the Catholic priest Blaško Rajić. Three days before the arrival of Serbian troops, mass protests were held in support of the idea of self-determination and the creation of a joint Yugoslav state. On 17 November the representatives of Bunjevci took part in a political conference in Novi Sad to reach a final agreement before the Great Assembly took place, although both Pašić and Pribićević argued for the direct unification of Vojvodina areas to Serbia. However, the discussion was continued at this meeting and the Bunjevci sided with the ‘Zagreb option’; in the end, the majority of delegates signed a compromise and a rather vague agreement to ‘first try the Zagreb route; if Zagreb fails to proclaim unification, Vojvodina will join Serbia directly.’ The pro-Yugoslav and pro-Serbian solution enjoyed the support of the representatives of other Slavic peoples in Vojvodina. The Slovaks of Vojvodina had had a strong political and cultural cooperation with Serbs even in the prewar period; after the arrival of Serbian troops to Vojvodina, they joined Serb people’s councils. In early November 1918 the Meeting of the Slovaks of Bačka was held in Bački Petrovac, which acknowledged the Serbian People’s Council and declared that the Slovaks were tying their fate to that of the Serbi-

an people. The Rusyns also participated in the elections for the Great People’s Assembly despite their prewar indifference to Serb civic parties because the members of the small Rusyn intelligentsia and the clergy of the Greek Catholic Church were mostly integrated into the Hungarian nation or at least harbored pro-Hungarian sentiments. In these new circumstances, however, Rusyn representatives expected the process of denationalization and Hungarization to abate and the preservation of their own ethnic identity.

In October and November 1918, Hungarians and Germans, as the formerly dominant nations in the Monarchy, stood at opposite positions from the Serbs and other Slavic peoples in Vojvodina. After the triumph of the bourgeois-democratic Aster Revolution in Hungary in late October 1918, Hungarian and German councils were formed in Vojvodina following the model of the national council in Budapest. These councils were formed after the downfall of the old regime to consolidate the new political order and supported the policy of Count Károlyi and the territorial integrity of Hungary. However, they wielded real power only as far as the Hungarian and, to a lesser extent, German population was concerned. After the arrival of Serbian troops to Vojvodina, a large part of the Hungarian population believed that the occupation was merely a temporary situation, although the Hungarian national councils were soon dissolved and the stipulations of the Belgrade Convention about the preservation of Hungarian administration violated. In November 1918 and over the following months, the Hungarians of Vojvodina responded to these acts with passive resistance, recognizing only the sovereignty of Hungary.

The Germans on the other side of the Danube were in a very different position than their Hungarian counterparts and did not have the option to consider joining their national state. Although there were several different political factions within the German community, in October and November 1918 none of them challenged the territorial integrity of Hungary. They saw the solution of their national question in a reorganization of the Monarchy. Their political organizations were based in Timișoara, where the Banat Republic was proclaimed in late October with the aim of keeping the entire territory of Banat within the borders of the Hungarian state. It was headed by Otto Roth and, when the Hungarian government abolished the Banat Republic, it nonetheless appointed Roth as its commissioner. The German community expected the Wilsonian principle of self-determination to be applied to them too, and on 8 December 1918 in Timișoara they issued the so-called Swabian Manifest, which demanded the inseparability of Banat and Bačka and the resolution of their status in a referendum.

Over the following months, during the diplomatic
struggle for Banat at the Paris Peace Conference, the Germans of Banat were the subject of contradictory and unreliable news and reports, ranging from the claim that they were all in favor of joining the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slo-venes to the rumor that they supported Romanian aspirations to Banat, which were based on the secret Treaty of Bucharest of 1916, whereby the Entente Powers had promised the entire territory of Banat to Romania in return for its entry into the war.21

* * *

The turbulent and complex situation of October and November was resolved in late November 1918. In Ruma and Novi Sad assemblies were held that would go on to have far-reaching political consequences and that manifested the political will of the Slavic population of Srem, Banat, Bačka and Baranja. Both assemblies were aimed at legalizing the claims of Serbia, i.e. the emerging Yugoslav state, to the territories of southern Hungary and Srem, based on the principle of self-determination. At the same time, they reflected the ambition of the representatives of the Serbs of Vojvodina, i.e. their bourgeois elites, to affirm their own domination in these new circumstances, formalize their role as a political subject and ultimately enact their takeover of power in an official political manifestation, relying on the pro-Yugoslav and pro-Serbian orientation of Bunjevci, Slovaks, Rusyns and other Slavic ethnic groups.

On 24 November 1918, due to the aforementioned special status of the Srem County, a part of a different entity from the area of southern Hungary, an assembly of envoys of people’s councils in Srem was held in Ruma, with 700 delegates from 100 Serb- and Croat-populated settlements. The assembly unanimously passed a resolution declaring that the political representatives of Srem were in favor of the creation of a state of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, albeit conditionally, as ‘in the case of an ethnic or political rift... they opt for the direct annexation of Srem to the Kingdom of Serbia.’22

On the following day, 25 November 1918, the Great People’s Assembly of Serbs, Bunjevci and other Slavs of Banat, Bačka and Baranja was held at the Grand Hotel on the main square in Novi Sad. According to official data, 757 delegates from 211 municipalities took part in the assembly: 578 Serbs, 84 Bunjevci, 62 Slovaks, 21 Rusyns, 3 Šokci, 2 Croats, 6 Germans and 1 Hungarian, including seven women. The Presidency of the Assembly included representatives of all political groups – Radicals, Democrats, Liberals and Social Democrats. On the eve of the Assembly, there were still some lingering doubts about the process of unification and hence two conferences were held to harmonize

21 — Zoran Janjetović, Deca careva, pastorčad kraljeva: nacionalne manjine u Jugoslaviji: 1918–1941 (Beograd: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije, 2005), p. 129. The authorities of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes managed to win over some Germans in western Banat, and one of the representatives of this faction was appointed the governor of Timișoara in February 1919, therefore replacing the Hungarian administration in the city and its vicinity (М. Антоловић, op. cit., pp. 46–47).

Anastas Bocarić, 'The Great People’s Assembly'
Rista Marjanović, Jaša Tomić speaking at the Great People's Assembly about the merging of Vojvodina with the Kingdom of Serbia.
a shared position; eventually the opinion of Jaša Tomić and his Radicals, who advocated the direct unification of Vojvodina regions to Serbia, emerged victorious. The main aim was to have all decisions passed unanimously in a bid to show unity to the Entente Powers. The Assembly was opened by its chair, the Greek Catholic priest Jovan Hranilović from Novi Sad, and then Jaša Tomić and Petar Konjić, a composer and Democrat from Sombor, read two resolutions which declared secession from Hungary and the annexation of Banat, Bačka and Baranja to the Kingdom of Serbia. Any doubts that the Bunjevci might have had were dispelled by the passionate speech of Blaško Rajić who, caught up in the moment, expressed support for the adopted decisions. Interestingly, the declaration of the Slavic municipalities – peculiar in that it also included the Slovaks of Srem – was read by Jan Grunyik and only mentioned ‘unification with the state of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes’. A delegation of the meeting in Ruma also attended the Great Assembly and submitted its own resolution to the Presidency of the Assembly. On the insistence of Democrats and Social Democrats, a statement about safeguarding the minority rights of non-Slavic communities in the future state was also adopted, requesting the same rights for the Serbs, Bunjevci and Šokci who would remain outside of Serbian/Yugoslavian borders. A joint delegation informed Prince Regent Aleksandar and the government in Belgrade of these decisions.

The Great People’s Assembly also formed the People’s Administration for Banat, Bačka and Baranja as a provisional government, i.e. an executive body composed of eleven people’s representatives. The People’s Administration was to be overseen by the Great People’s Council made up of fifty prominent members of the Great People’s Assembly.

Although burdened by the fact that the Serbian government never officially acknowledged its existence and the lack of qualified staff, the People’s Administration gradually took control of the entire territory of Vojvodina, with the final dissolution of the Hungarian administrative system. Hungarians officials were given a choice to either pledge loyalty to the new authorities or be discharged and expelled across the demarcation line. However, the provisional government of Vojvodina resigned after the formation of the government of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes on 20 December 1918. However, it continued its activities in the field until March 1919, when its divisions were fully integrated into some departments in Belgrade.

The German and especially the Hungarian population struggled with coming to terms with the imminent changes, a situation enhanced by the new authorities’ inconsiderate and suspicious attitude towards non-Slavic

23 — The Rusyns also probably represented the Srem part of this ethnic group, as 21 of them attended the Great People’s Assembly, since there were only 12,500 Rusyns in Bačka, this means that they could not have elected so many delegates without the Rusyns of Srem (Владимир Биљна, „Русини Војводине између Хустског руског народног савета и Велике народне скупштине у Новом Саду”, in: Присаједињење Војводине Краљевини Србији 1918, зборник, ed. Милутин Смиљанић (Нови Сад: Музеј Војводине; Институт за историју Филозофског факултета, 1993), p. 212).


Сазив Народне Скупштине
Срба, Буњеваца и осталих Словена.

Дошло је време да Срби, Буњевци и остали Словени у Бачкој, Банату и Барањи одлучују слободно, по својој воли, којој држави желе да припадну.

Тога раза састаће се у Новом Саду 12. (25.) новембра ове године у II часова пре подне.

Народна Скупштина.

Месте састанку је позоришна двориња у Грац-Хотелу.
У ову Скупштину уласке њенихопштинска очвора од првог пословника, који је припада према броју људи. Буњевци и остали Словени бирају пословнике по општинима тако, да на сваку шаљу српску, буњевачку и осталих словенских душа бира по један пословник. Ако пре 1000 пребоја број душа се узима, бира општина још један и пр. на 5450 душа бира 5, а на 5501 бира 6 пословника.

Општине, које имају мање од 200 душа, имају право бирати у општини, која им је најближа, где могу бити више пословника изабраних и чланови приемљиве општине. Општине изабрали су 200 до 1000 душа бирају један пословник.

Општине могу општине изабрани не само у своје красине. За пословнике могу да би општине изабрали и чланови других општина.

Избор пословника мора се обавити најраној до 10. (23.) новембра 1918. У целину 11. (24.) новембра може се избор обавити само у том случају, ако општини могли доћи у скупштину на време.

Колико има душа која општина, искажање за праце које се дели на двоје, у буњевачко-српске општине са Буњевци, који је број душа 10 општину.

Број склопача у руским пословницима одредиће њихове људи од одбора време броју душа по општинама.

Чим овај погон стигне, месни одборци Српског Народног Одбора одабирају свођем в и другим начином, ако се изабра пословници пословника за Народну Скупштину Срба, Буњевца и осталих Словена. Где је нема месних одбора, вала да одмах саставимо из људи, који су својим радом стекли уметност и велик обзира за избор.

Пословник су душа одстављана да окупи у селу пословника Народне Скупштине.

Право гласа имају сви мушки и женски чланови општине, који су напредних 20 године жива. Ко је осуђен због каквог дела није мањи од 20 година треба да има увиђањности и да не дође на избор. Изабрати може бити сваки бирач.
national communities. The situation became even more convoluted after the political initiative of the Romanian population which intensified in late November 1918, although the Romanians of Banat had already formed their people’s councils as a form of passive resistance to the Banat Republic and efforts to preserve the territorial integrity of Hungary.

On the day of the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, 1 December 1918, the Great People’s Assembly of ‘all Romanians of Transylvania, Banat and Hungarian lands’ gathered in Alba Iulia and proclaimed the annexation of the entire territory of Banat with Romania. Over 1,200 delegates included representatives of almost all Romanian-populated settlements in Banat, including Bela Crkva, Vršac and Veliki Bečkerek. The Romanian government approved the decisions passed in Alba Iulia, thereby deepening the existing diplomatic dispute between Romania and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.\(^{26}\)

However, no final resolution of the dispute around Banat and other formerly southern Hungarian regions which included the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Hungary and Romania occurred before the Paris Peace Conference of 1919–1920. The delegation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes gradually abandoned its maximalist program and renounced the territories of central and northern Baranja, Banat of Temeswar and the area of the town of Baja in Bačka. The new map of the Danube valley was made official by the Treaty of Trianon of 4 June 1920. Romania was given control of two thirds of the territory of Banat, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes one third, while Hungary now controlled only 1%. Most of Baranja remained in Hungary, while the southern part of the region – the so-called Baranja Triangle – ended up in the Yugoslav state.\(^{27}\) The withdrawal of the Yugoslav army from Pécs marked the end of the complex and dynamic processes leading to the creation of Yugoslavia and the final establishment of its borders. The borders between Romania, Hungary and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes/Serbia established at the Trianon Palace\(^{28}\) have remained unchanged to this day.


\(^{27}\) — For more on the demarcation see: Andrej Mitrović, Razgraničenje Jugoslavije sa Mađarskom i Rumunijom: 1919–1920 (Novi Sad: Institut za izučavanje istorije Vojvodine, 1975).

\(^{28}\) — The only exception was the territorial exchange between Romania and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in 1924, with Romania receiving Žombolj/Jimbolia in return for Modoš/Modoș (Jaša Tomić) and a few nearby villages.
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Inv. no. ig[po]15(3)jakopić, 1.

61 — Photograph of side façade drawing and floor-plan of the Vidovdan Temple, 1908-12
Ink on paper
From the Meštrović Gallery, Split. Photograph: Valentino Bilić Prćić (FGM-4832)
Inv. no. GMS 597
62 — Portrait of Ivan Meštrović, Belgrade 1908. Photograph was taken in the atelier of M. Jovanović in Belgrade. From the CASA (HAZU) Archive of Arts Collections  Inv. no. F/196-16

63 — In the hightreason process, Austria-Hungary organized the trial of 53 members of the Serbian Independent Party. Photograph From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections  Inv. no. 1-934

64 — Fran Vesel, Croatian and Slovenian artists at the second “Medulić” exhibition opening in Jakopić’s pavilion, Ljubljana, 1909 Photograph From the National Museum of Slovenia Collections  Inv. no. N 29927

65 — Letter from Nadežda Petrović to Rihard Jakopić, 24/02/1909 From the Museum of Modern Art Ljubljana Collections, documentation-archive Inv. no. 26

66 — Dimitrije Mitrinović, circa 1920 Photograph From the University of Bradford Special Collections  Inv. no. NAF 11/1/2

67 — Josip Kozarac, Dead Capitals, Belgrade: “Srpska književna zadruga” [Serbian Literary Association], 1910 Book From the National Library of Serbia Collections  Inv. no. MAT V 15401/129 A

68 — Anthology of Contemporary Serbian Lyrics (Compiled by Bogdan Popović), Zagreb: “Matica hrvatska”, 1911 Book From the National Library of Serbia Collections  Inv. no. MAT I 4153

69 — Poster for the Great Concert of the Ljubljana Bell, for the inundated in Resava, National Theatre, Belgrade, 1910 From the Museum of Theatrical Arts of Serbia Collections  Inv. no. 4167

70 — “Medulić” Exhibition, 1910 (In Spite of Cowardly Times) Catalogue From the National Library of Serbia Collections  Inv. no. MAT III 151069

71 — Card from Anda Petrović from Belgrade, to her sister Nadežda Petrović in Ljubljana (to Rihard Jakopić’s address), 1910 Ink on cardboard 14 x 9 cm Memorial Museum of Nadežda and Rastko Petrović - The National Museum in Belgrade. Documentation Inv. no. DNM-NRP/K-3 (3)

72 — List of committee members of the exhibition in the Serbian Pavilion at the International Exhibition in Rome, 1911 From the Archive of Serbia Collections  Inv. no. MPs, 1911, 66, 78

73 — Letter written by Steva Todorović to the Minister of Education regarding Ivan Meštrović’s Recommendation, 3 September 1910 From the Archive of Serbia Collections  Inv. no. MPs, 1911, 66, 78

74 — Transaction account by the Committee for the Art Exhibition in Rome, 1910-12 From the Archive of Serbia Collections  Inv. no. MPs, 1912, 51, 4

75 — Postcard from Ivan Meštrović to Ivo Tartalja (“A picture of our pavilion”) with photograph of the Kingdom of Serbia’s Pavilion, Rome, 1911 Courtesy of Norka Machiedo Madinić


77 — Padiglione delle Belle Arti del Regno di Serbia: esposizione di Roma 1911 (Catalogue of the Kingdom of Serbia’s Pavilion), Zagreb 1911 From the “Matica Srpska” Library Collections  Inv. no. Тврпч III 1025

78 — Equestrian sculpture of Marko Kraljević, by Ivan Meštrović. Interior of the Serbian Pavilion at the International Exhibition in Rome, 1911 Photograph From the catalogue: Vittorio Pica, Arte Modiale a Roma nel 1911 (The Meštrović Gallery Library)

79 — “The Marko Kraljević Series” – Esposizione Internazionale d’Arte, 1911 (Interior of the Serbian Pavilion in Rome) Photograph From the Meštrović Gallery Photography Collections Inv. no. FGM-975

80 — Reproductions of the photographs from the Marko Kraljević series with poems in Cyrillic, Latin and French, from: Padiglione delle Belle Arti del Regno di Serbia: esposizione di Roma 1911, Zagreb 1911 From the National Library of Serbia Collections  Inv. no. MAT III 151583

81 — Toma Rosandić, A Turk’s Head, 1910 Sculpture in stone 49,5 x 27 x 25,5 cm From the National Museum in Belgrade Collections  Inv. no. 33.394

82 — Ivan Meštrović, Banović Strahinja (torso), 1908 Gypsum sculpture 106,6 x 73 x 42,3 cm From the National Museum in Belgrade Collections  Inv. no. 33.12

83 — Ivan Meštrović, Srđa Zlopoğleda, 1908 Gypsum sculpture 106,5 x 75 x 62 cm From the National Museum in Belgrade Collections  Inv. no. 33.43

84 — Ivan Meštrović, Nikola Pašić, 1911 Sculpture in stone 73 x 41 x 35 cm From the National Museum in Belgrade Collections  Inv. no. 33.295

85 — Letter from Nikola Pašić to Ivan Meštrović, December 1912 From the Meštrović Atelier Archive in Zagreb. Courtesy of Mate Meštrović Inv. no. 647 A1

86 — Postcard – reproduction of the Mičo (Obilić) sculpture by Ivan Meštrović. Published by S. B. Cvijanović, Library in Belgrade From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections  Inv. no. UK 2017/883

87 — Dimitrije Mitrinović, The Appearance of the Croats in the Serbian Pavilion at the International Exhibition in Rome, Jug, 8, Split 1911, 243-248. Serial publication From the National Library of Serbia Collections  Inv. no. Π 7213

88 — Mirko Deanović, The Triumph of Courage and Character, Jug, 5, Split 1911, 136-139. Serial publication From the National Library of Serbia Collections  Inv. no. Π 7213

89 — Milan Marjanović, The Exhibition in Rome and Croatian Artists, Jug, 4, Split 1911, 101-106 Serial publication From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections  Inv. no. UK 2017/853

90 — The Almanac of Croatian and Serbian Poets and Storytellers (ed. Milan Ćurčin), Belgrade-Zagreb 1911. Book From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections  Inv. no. UK 2017/859

91 — Croatian artist Jozo Kljaković beside the sculpture by Ivan Meštrović, the Fourth Yugoslav Exhibition, Belgrade, 1912 Photograph From the photo-archive of the Meštrović Atelier in Zagreb Inv. no. FAM-1518
122 — Silver Plate, gift of Moscow’s Mayor Mikhail Čelnok to Nikola Pašić, April 1916
Diameter 51 cm
From the National Museum in Zaječar Collections
Inv. no. I-2346

123 — Regent Alexander I Karađorđević and the President of France Raymond Poincaré in Verden, 1916
From the Military Museum Collections
Photograph
Inv. no. P-1180

124 — The emissaries of the Kingdom of Serbia in European capitals, The War Album of Andra Popović, Belgrade, 1926
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. MA III 143411 ć

125 — Toni Sirmaj, The Serbian Day in Paris 1914 - 1915
Medal, bronze Diameter 18,5 cm
From the National Museum of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 20_1242

126 — Letter from Miroslav Spalajković, emissary of the Kingdom of Serbia in Petrograd, to Nikola Pašić, disclosing the details of the secret London Agreement, 21 December 1917
From the SASA Archive Collections
Inv. no. 9857

127 — Dr. Woodrow Wilson, President of the USA
Drawing
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. R 2084

From the Congress Library in Washington Collections
Inv. no. 09957u

129 — Jevo Dedijer
Photograph
From the SASA Archive Collections
Inv. no. 13485

130 — Aleksandar Belić
Photograph
From the SASA Library Collections
Inv. no. Ф-190-1

131 — Trhimir Dorđević
Photograph
From the SASA Library Collections
Inv. no. Ф-212-1

132 — Jovan Žujović
Photograph
From the SASA Library Collections
Inv. no. Ф-215-14

133 — Slobodan Jovanović
Photograph
From the SASA Library Collections
Inv. no. Ф-221-8

134 — Bogdan Popović
Photograph
From the SASA Library Collections
Inv. no. Ф-263

135 — Pavle Popović
Photograph
From the SASA Library Collections
Inv. no. Ф-284-3

136 — Jovan Radonić
Photograph
From the SASA Library Collections
Inv. no. Ф-268-1

137 — Stanoje Stanojević
Photograph
From the SASA Library Collections
Inv. no. Ф-278-1

138 — Ljubomir Stojanović
Photograph
From the SASA Library Collections
Inv. no. Ф-280

139 — Jovan Cvijić
Photograph
From the SASA Library Collections
Inv. no. Ф-289-3

140 — Kosta Stojanović
Photograph
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. Ф-1146

141 — Niko Županić
Photograph
From the SASA Library Collections
Inv. no. Ф-329

142 — Miloje Vasić
Photograph
From the SASA Library Collections
Inv. no. Ф-484-3

143 — Kosta Kumanudi
Photograph
From the book Yugoslav National Parliaments and Assemblies by Čedomir Mitrović, Miloš Brašić, Belgrade, 1937

144 — Niko Županić’s seal
7 x 2,5 cm
Courtesy of Veronika Kralj Iglič

145 — Niko Županić’s cigarette case with monogram
10 x 8 cm
From the National Museum of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. N 34090

146 — Jovan Cvijić’s suitcase
Leather, metal
38 x 19 cm
From the Belgrade City Museum Collections
Inv. no. JLL 1477

147 — Aneroid, barometer owned by Jovan Cvijić, 19th century
Metal, leather, glass
38 x 19 cm
From the Belgrade City Museum Collections
Inv. no. JLL 1477

148 — Seals of the Yugoslav Committee
From the CASA (HAZU) Archive Collections
Inv. no. HR AHAZU 4 (JO), 3607

149 — Comité yougoslave glass plate
From the CASA (HAZU) Archive Collections
12 x 24,5 x 2,2 cm
Inv. no. HR AHAZU 4 (JO), 3607

150 — Ante Trumbić and Italian politician Andrea Torre after the ratification of the agreement on future relations between Italians and Yugoslavs, London, March 1918
Photograph
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-377-80-16

151 — Dr Ante Trumbić in conversation with Serbian officers, Thessaloniki, 1917
Photograph
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. I-2442

152 — Members of the Yugoslav Committee with Dr Ante Trumbić, Corfu, 1916
Photograph
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. I-2528

153 — Delegates of the Yugoslav Committee in London, “Илустровани Јадран” [Illustrated Adriatic], September 22, 1917
Serial publication
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. PTI I/99

154 — Regent Alexander Karadžorđević and Dr Ante Trumbić, Corfu, 1917, “Илустровани Јадран” [Illustrated Adriatic], November 10, 1917
155 — The Yugoslav Committee's Manifesto No. 17, 1918
From the Croatian History Museum Collections
Inv. no. ПР I/99

156 — Dr Ante Trumbić's open letter to Austria-Hungary's Marshal Svetozar Borojević, 1918.
From the Croatian History Museum Collections
Inv. no. HPM-PMH-7527

157 — The list of people from Dalmatia that the Austro-Hungarian authorities labelled as suspicious
Document
From the Croatian History Museum Collections
Inv. no. HPM-PMH-7448

158 — Ivan Meštrović, Shield (For the Prince-Regent of Serbia) gift to Regent Alexander from the Yugoslav Committee, 1916
Bronze
Diameter 83.3 cm
From the National Museum in Belgrade Collections
Inv. no. 33,466

159 — The May Declaration, signatures of support
Document
From the Archives of the Republic of Slovenia Collections
Inv. no. ARS, SI AS 584

160 — The May Declaration, ratified by the Yugoslav Club in the Viennese Imperial Assembly, May 30, 1917
Document

161 — Meeting in Zalac in support of the May Declaration, 17 March 1918
Photograph
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MN 6655/17

162 — Serbs, Croats and Slovenes leaflet in support of the declaration movement, 1918
From the Croatian History Museum Collections
Inv. no. HPM-PMH-7448

163 — Declaration postcard, 1918
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, 6236/39

164 — Corfu Declaration
Document
From the CASA (HAZU) Archive Collections
Inv. no. JO_37_19

165 — Participants of the Corfu Conference
Photograph
From the Croatian History Museum Collections
Inv. no. HPM-PMH-7527

166 — Proclamation of the Corfu Declaration, "Српско новање" [Serbian Paper], July 13/26, 1917
Serial publication
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. п 2588 1-155 дод.

167 — Signers of the Corfu Declaration, "Илустровани Јадран" [Illustrated Adriatic], November 17, 1917
Serial publication
From the "Svetozar Marković" University Library Collections
Inv. no. РП I/99

168 — Ante Trumbić, president of the Yugoslav Committee
Photograph
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections

169 — Frano Supilo, member of the Yugoslav Committee
Photograph
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections

170 — Travel permit for Rudolf Đunić, member of the Yugoslav Committee, issued by the military attaché of the Kingdom of Serbia in Rome
Document
From the Croatian History Museum Collections
Inv. no. HPM-PMH-7549

171 — Members of the Yugoslav Committee at a meeting in London, 1916
Photograph
From the SASA Archive Collections
Inv. no. 14267-1

172 — The Paris Department of Yugoslav Committee
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. I-2662

173 — Meeting of the National Assembly of the Kingdom of Serbia's MPs and members of the Yugoslav Committee, Nice, April 21, 1916
Photograph
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 349 19-021

174 — Card sent by Niko Županić to Bogumil Vošnjak, 14 May 1915
From the University Library of Slovenia Collections
Inv. no. 133

175 — Card sent by Niko Županić to Bogumil Vošnjak, 17 May 1915
From the University Library of Slovenia Collections
Inv. no. 134

176 — Yugoslav volunteers from South America visiting the Yugoslav School in Antofagasta (Chile), "Илустровани Јадран" [Illustrated Adriatic], December 8, 1917
Serial publication
From the "Svetozar Marković" University Library Collections
Inv. no. РП I/99

177 — Handing over the flag to the Serbian-Croatian-Slovenian Volunteer Regiment in Bizerte (Tunisia), "Илустровани Јадран" [Illustrated Adriatic], September 15, 1917
Serial publication
From the "Svetozar Marković" University Library Collections
Inv. no. РП I/99

178 — Yugoslav volunteers from Argentina on training in Bizerte (Tunisia), before heading to the front, "Илустровани Јадран" [Illustrated Adriatic], September 29, 1917
Serial publication
From the "Svetozar Marković" University Library Collections
Inv. no. РП I/99

179 — Cemetery of the Yugoslav volunteer division soldiers on the Salonika Front
Photograph
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS SL 35/135

180 — Dr. Milivoj Jambrišak, delegate of the Yugoslav Committee with volunteer corps of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, in Russia, Odessa, 1917
Photograph
From the Croatian History Museum Collections
Inv. no. HPM-79720_5

181 — Croat volunteers, soldiers of the "Zrinski" battalion from Pittsburgh (USA) in training, Marseille, 1917
Photograph
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. I-2431

182 — Soldiers of the First Serbian Volunteer Division on Railway Work, Voznesensk, Russia, 1917
Photograph
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. I-2518
183 — The Second Regiment of the First Serbian Volunteer Division on the Railway from Odessa to Reni 19 July 1916 Photograph From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. I-2519

184 — Soldiers and officers of the Yugoslav Division in France on their way from Russia to the Salonika Front. In the foreground are Dinko Trinaštić, Stojan Protić & Ante Trumbić who visited them on that occasion. Photograph From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. I-2658

185 — The First Serbian Volunteer Division, Russia 1917 Photograph From the Military Museum Collections Inv. no. P-10216

186 — The First Serbian Volunteer Division, Russia 1917 Photograph From the Military Museum Collections Inv. no. P-10217

187 — The Order of Karadžorje's Star with swords Medal Courtesy of Zdravko Novak Paljić

188 — "Miloš Obilić" golden medal for bravery, big Medal Courtesy of Zdravko Novak Paljić

189 — "Miloš Obilić" golden medal for bravery, small Medal Courtesy of Zdravko Novak Paljić

190 — War Cross 1914–1918 (France) Medal Courtesy of Zdravko Novak Paljić

191 — George V Medal for Merit (Great Britain) Medal Courtesy of Zdravko Novak Paljić

192 — St. George Cross (Russia) Medal Courtesy of Zdravko Novak Paljić

193 — Commemorative war cross 1916–1918 (Romania) Medal Courtesy of Zdravko Novak Paljić

194 — War Memorial for Liberation and Unification 1914–1918 Medal Courtesy of Zdravko Novak Paljić

195 — Photograph of the exhibition by Ivan Meštrović at the Victoria & Albert Museum, London 1915 From the Meštrović Atelier in Zagreb Photo-Documentation Inv. no. FAM-1519


197 — Ivan Meštrović, The Idea of the "Vi- dovdan" Temple, "Jaipavi" [The Adriatic] November 25, 1915 From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. p 2193P 2154

198 — Exhibition of the Works of Ivan Meštrović, Victoria & Albert Museum, summer 1915 Catalogue From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. MAF II 67015

199 — The “Maxim” machine gun from the armament of the Serbian army From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections

200 — Mix & Genest induction telephone, 1916. The telephone belonged to the German army and was seized by the Morava Division of the Serbian Army during the Salonika Front breakthrough. Courtesy of Miloš Jurišić Map From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. 6p Kp III 1040

201 — Two photo-albums owned by Petar Korunović, illustrating the life of Serbian soldiers at the Salonika Front. Courtesy of the Korunović family

202 — "War Notebook" by Obren Mandić from Cačak, sergeant of the 2nd field battery of the Serbian Army's Šumadija Division Courtesy of Stevan Ristić

203 — Dr Niko Županić, The Map of Yugoslav Territory, London 1915 Map From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. Kp III 989

204 — M. Kolin, The Land of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Buenos Aires, 1917 Photograph From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. I-2562

205 — Rista Marjanović, the field battery of the Serbian army taking a firing position, 1914 From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections Inv. no. VI-B-735

206 — The prison camp in Trebinje during the war, 1914–1918 Photograph From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. I-2473

207 — The field rapid-fire battery of the Montenegrin Army’s Herzegovina Detachment in action against the Austrians at Grahoovo, January 1916 Photograph From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. I-2434

208 — The retreat of the Serbian army from Pirot towards Niš, 1915 Photograph From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. I-2510

209 — The crossing of the Serbian army over the Vizier’s bridge at the River Drim, during its withdrawal through Albania, 1915 Photograph From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. I-2421

210 — The withdrawal of the Serbian army and the population through Albania, 1915 Photograph From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. I-2510

211 — Celebration on the occasion of the reception of French rapid-fire guns on the Salonika Front, June 1916 Photograph From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. I-2432
212 — The deployment of Serbian troops on Corfu to Thessaloniki, 1916
Photograph
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. I-2556

213 — Dinaričus (Jovan Ćvijić), Unity of the Yugoslavs: first half (with 1 map), Niš, 1915
Book
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. МАГ IV 222

214 — Aleksandar Belić, Serbia and the South-Slavic Question, Niš, 1915
Book
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. МАГ IV 240

215 — Aleksandar Belić, La Macédoine: études ethnographiques et politiques: avec cartes / Paris, 1919
Book
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. ПЛ 153-8

216 — Struggle for the spiritual and political unification of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes: lessons and readings, 1917
Document
From the Historical Archives of Belgrade Collections
Inv. no. 3108, 139

217 — Stanoje Stanojević, What does Serbia want? Niš, 1915
Book
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. МАГ II 18880/1

218 — Jovan Radonić, Serbs in Hungary, Niš, 1915
Book
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. МАГ II 4732

219 — Pavle Popović, La Macédoine serbe, Genève, 1916
Book
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. МАГ II 60459

Book
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. МАГ II 60460

221 — Le programme yougoslave, Paris 1916 (Bibliothèque yougoslave, No 1)
Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P 2278

Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P 2531

223 — Notes on work in Russia from St. Stanojevic and A. Belic, 1916.
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. 4913

224 — Minutes of the meetings of the Committee for Cultural Propaganda in Paris, 1918-1919.
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. 4914

** DAYS OF GREAT DECISION-MAKING **

225 — List of apartments for the accommodation of foreign officials visiting Belgrade before the unification, November 5/18, 1918
Document
From the Historical Archives of Belgrade Collections
Inv. no. 3108, 139

226 — Accommodation in Belgrade for the delegates of the National Council from Zagreb, November 12/25, 1918
Document
From the Historical Archives of Belgrade Collections
Inv. no. ИАБ УГБ, 1918, 3108, 302

227 — List of things for the residence of Crown Prince Alexander Karađorđević in Belgrade, October 28 / November 10, 1918
Document
From the Historical Archives of Belgrade Collections
Inv. no. ИАБ, 1119, К 7 3

228 — Demolished Palace in Belgrade, Belgrade, 1918
Photograph
From the Military Museum Collections
Inv. no. Р-1291

229 — The House of Krismanović in Terazije, the provisional court of Regent Alexander, in which the unification of the Kingdom of SHS was proclaimed on December 1, 1918
Postcard
From the Historical Archives of Belgrade Collections

230 — Proceedings of the Presidency of the National Council, “To the People of the SCS State” informing about the unification, Belgrade, December 4, 1918
Poster
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Serbia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, 31878

231 — The Crown Prince Regent of SCS Alexander’ greeting to all Slovenes, December 8, 1918
Poster
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, 31880

232 — The Delegation of the National Council, before reading the Address, Belgrade, December 1, 1918
Photograph
Belgrade City Museum Collections
Inv. no. ИАБ УГБ, 1918, 3108, 302

233 — The solemn proclamation of the state unity of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, December 1, 1918
Poster
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. ПЛ 153-8

234 — Prince Regent Alexander Karađorđević’s response to Dalmatia, December 9, 1918
Poster
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. ПЛ 154-6

235 — A menu from the Fraternal dinner organized by the citizens of Belgrade in honor of the National Council’s Delegation at the Grand Hotel, Belgrade, 5 December 1918
Poster
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. УК 2018/85

236 — Ivan Tišov, The Proclamation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, 1926
Oil on canvas
From the National Assembly of Serbia Collections

237 — Rista Marjanović, The March of the Yugoslav Volunteer Division during the Salonika Front breakthrough, 1918
Photograph
From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections
Inv. no. ПЛ 14-9

238 — In a forceful charge the Serbian army attacks the enemy, Skopje, September 1918
Photograph
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. И-2653

239 — Paul Roge Bloch, Breakthrough of the Salonica Front
Medal, bronze
Diameter 6.7 cm
From the National Museum in Belgrade Collections
Inv. no. 58_254
240 — Bulgaria signs the peace agreement, War Journal, September 18 / October 1, 1918
Serial publication
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. PL 829

241 — The National Council of the Slovences, Croats and Serbs, Zagreb, 1918
Photograph
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS D_K_4_801

242 — ID belonging to Vilim Bukšeg, member of the National Council
Document
From the Croatian History Museum Collections
Inv. no. HPM/PMH-5714

243 — The field Battery of the Yugoslav Division enters Kosovo, 1918
Photograph
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. I-2525

244 — The advance of the Yugoslav Division from Prizren to Peć, 1918
Photograph
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. I-2565

245 — The French Brigade in Niš, 1918
Photograph
From the Military Museum Collections
Inv. no. P-2519

246 — The proclamation of Emperor Karl I "To My Faithful Austrian People", October 16, 1918
Poster
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, 31894

247 — The Serbian Army enters Kraljevo, 1918
Photograph
From the National Museum in Kraljevo Collections
Inv. no. HMKB, И-1429

248 — The Liberators enter Kragujevac, October 27, 1918
Photograph
Courtesy of Veljko Leković

249 — The order of the Croatian Home Guard district command in Zagreb, 29 October 1918
Document
From the Croatian History Museum Collections
Inv. no. HPM/MRNH-T-6002

250 — The people's oath at St. Mark's square, October 29, 1918
Photograph
From the Croatian History Museum Collections
Inv. no. HPM-PMH-22337-c

251 — The people's oath at St. Mark's square, October 29, 1918
Photograph
From the Croatian History Museum Collections
Inv. no. HPM-PMH-22337-a

252 — The declaration of complete independence, "Hrvatska država" [The Croatian State], Zagreb, October 29, 1918
Serial publication
From the Croatian State Archives Collections (Croatian State Archive Library)

253 — "The constituting of Yugoslavia", Ljubljana, October 29, 1918
Photograph
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, R 2772

254 — Ivo Kerdić, Unification of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, 1918
Medal, silver plated bronze Diameter 8 cm
From the Modern Gallery, Zagreb Collections
Inv. no. MG-2892-86

255 — Jubilee edition stamps of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1910, with overprint "The State of SHS. - Bosnia and Herzegovina". Complete series in 16 values, November - December 1918
Courtesy of Nikola Ljubičić

256 — Rista Marjanović, French General Louis Franchet d'Esperey, commander-in-chief of Allied Forces on the Salonika Front
Photograph
From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections
Inv. no. IV-A-31

257 — The liberation of Požarevac, 1918
Photograph
From the Military Museum Collections
Inv. no. P-4057

258 — Austria-Hungary's battleship Viribus Unitis
Photograph
From the Croatian State Archives Collections
Inv. no. HR-HDA-1950

259 — The citizens of Belgrade awaiting the arrival of the Serbian Army, October 20 / November 2, 1918
Photograph
Courtesy of Miloš Jurišić

260 — Forming of the Transitional Board for public security in Belgrade, October 31 / November 13, 1918
Poster
From the Historical Archives of Belgrade Collections
Inv. no. ИАБ, ОГБ ф.1, п. 20/1918

261 — Preparations for the arrival of the Prince Regent Alexandre in Belgrade, October 26 / November 8, 1918
Poster
From the Historical Archives of Belgrade Collections
Inv. no. ИАБ, ОГБ ф.9, п. 21/1918

262 — Troop parade, Belgrade, 1918
Photograph
From the Military Museum Collections
Inv. no. P-253

263 — Prince Regent Alexandre receiving flowers from the people, Belgrade 1918
Photograph
From the Military Museum Collections
Inv. no. P-5612

264 — Major Rudolf Maister addressing the gathered soldiers, 1918
Photograph
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS 5783_8

265 — Rista Marjanović, The Serbian Army packing technical equipment and weaponry on tugboats in its forward advance to Zemun, November 1918
Photograph
From the City of Belgrade Institute for the Protection of Monuments Collections
Inv. no. VI-A-799
266 — “Austria accepts all conditions for peace and truce”, 1918
Poster
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. ПЛ 135-6

267 — “People! The old Austro-Hungarian State is destroyed”, Novi Sad, 1918
Poster
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. ПЛ 135-23

268 — The Italian occupation of the Slovene Littoral: General Petitti di Roreto in Piran, 1918
Photograph
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, A26 6595/04

269 — “People!”, Proclamation of the Yugoslav Academic Council, October 25 / November 7,1918
Poster
From the Croatian State Archives Collections
Inv. no. HR-HDA-907 (7/51)

270 — “People! Soldiers!”, proclamation of the National Council of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs, 1918
Poster
From the Croatian State Archives Collections
Inv. no. HR-HDA-907 (1/8)

271 — Map showing the line of the Italian occupation of the Adriatic coast, 1918
(From the atlas: La Question Italo – Yougoslave: expliquée par des graphique)
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. Kp III 897

272 — “Summons to coastal refugees”, the Ljubljana City Magistrate, November 12, 1918
Poster
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, 31866

273 — “To the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes!”, proclamation of the Yugoslav Academic Youth, 1918
Poster
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, 31883

274 — Proclamation of curfew for youth prohibiting them from the streets of Ljubljana after 6 pm, the Ljubljana City Magistrate, November 4, 1918
Poster
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, 31865

275 — Proclamation on compulsory medical examinations for soldiers returning from the front, the Ljubljana City Magistrate, November 18, 1918
Poster
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, 31868

276 — Proclamation on fruit trade, National Government of the SCS in Ljubljana, October 25, 1918
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, 31869

277 — Proclamation on the registration of military service for those born in 1901, the Ljubljana City Magistrate, November 26, 1918
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, 31870

278 — “Slovenian parents!”, proclamation of the Ljubljana City Magistrate, November 14, 1918
From the National Museum of Contemporary History (Slovenia) Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, 31887

279 — Proceedings from the Geneva Conference, Geneva, November 9, 1918
Document
From the Archives of the Republic of Slovenia Collections
Inv. no. AC 1655

280 — The Geneva Declaration, Geneva, November 9, 1918
Document
From the Archives of the Republic of Slovenia Collections
Inv. no. AC 1655

281 — Rista Marjanović, Units of the Serbian Army enter Novi Sad, November 1918
From the Historical Archive of Zrenjanin Collections
Inv. no. VI-A-1079

282 — The arrival of the Serbian Army in Veliki Bečkerek, November 1918
From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections
Inv. no. VI-A-736

283 — The ceremonial arrival of the Serbian Army to Velika Kikinda, November 20, 1918
From the National Museum of Kikinda Collections
Inv. no. 2076

284 — French “Renault” tanks at the square in Novi Sad, 1918
From the Historical Archive of Zrenjanin Collections
Inv. no. 3Ф 830

285 — Pronouncement of the Mayor of the Serbian Army, V. Bugarski in the name of the Sremski Karlovac National Council, October 25 / November 7,1918
Poster
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. ПЛ 135-59

286 — Notice by the commander of Sremski Karlovci for collecting the equipment of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy, November 8,1918
Poster
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. ПЛ 135-60

287 — Entrance of the Serbian Army to Zagreb, November 27, 1918
From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections
Inv. no. VI-A-1047

288 — Rista Marjanović, The Citizens of Zagreb greeting the Serbian Army passing through the city accompanied by military music, November 1918
From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections
Inv. no. VI-A-1198

289 — Invitation by the Zagreb “Sokol”, Zagreb, November 1918
Document
From the Croatian History Museum Collections
Inv. no. HPM-PMH-111-198

290 — Rista Marjanović, Delegates of the National Council on a boat transporting them from Zemun to Belgrade, November 27, 1918
From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections
Inv. no. B-444

292 — Rista Marjanović, Delegates of the National Council on one of the stations along the route from Zagreb to Belgrade, November 27, 1918
Photograph
From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections
Inv. no. B-464

287 — Entrance of the Serbian Army to Velika Kikinda, November 20, 1918
From the National Museum of Kikinda Collections
Inv. no. 2076

288 — Rista Marjanović, Serbian units arrive at the railway station in Vinkovci in their advance towards Zagreb, 1918
Photograph
From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections
Inv. no. VI-A-736

289 — Rista Marjanović, The Citizens of Zagreb greeting the Serbian Army passing through the city accompanied by military music, November 1918
From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections
Inv. no. VI-A-1047

290 — Invitation by the Zagreb “Sokol”, Zagreb, November 1918
Document
From the Croatian History Museum Collections
Inv. no. HPM-PMH-111-198

291 — Rista Marjanović, Delegates of the National Council on a boat transporting them from Zemun to Belgrade, November 27, 1918
Photograph
From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections
Inv. no. B-444

292 — Rista Marjanović, Delegates of the National Council on one of the stations along the route from Zagreb to Belgrade, November 27, 1918
Photograph
From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections
Inv. no. B-464
293 — Rista Marjanović, Session of the Serbian National Committee in the old building of 'Matica Srpska' in Novi Sad, November 1918 Photograph From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections Inv. no. VI-A-174

294 — Rista Marjanović, Jaša Tomić speaking at the Grand National Assembly about the affiliation of Vojvodina to the Kingdom of Serbia, November 1918 Photograph From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections Inv. no. VI-A-470

295 — “Two decisions of the Great National Assembly”, Novi Sad, November 12/25, 1918 Poster From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. 3/1-554

296 — The arrival of the Unification Delegation from Banat, Belgrade, November 1918 Photograph From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. I-2654

297 — Identity card of the local People's Council of Serbs and Bunjevci in Sombor in the name of Dr. Kosta Bugarski, October 31, 1918 Document From the Sombor City Museum Collections Inv. no. 1903

298 — Resolution adopted at the Serbian National Assembly in Velika Kikinda, October 28, 1918 Document From the National Museum in Kikinda Collections Inv. no. 2439

299 — Participants of the Great National Assembly of Montenegro, Podgorica, November 26, 1918 Photograph From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. I-2422

300 — The Montenegrin delegation led by Archbishop Dožić carrying to Belgrade the decisions reached by the Great People's Parliament of Montenegro, 1918 Photograph From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. I-2656

301 — The decision of the Great People's Parliament of Serbs in Montenegro Poster From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. 3/1-553

302 — Poster: “Montenegrins” by the National Unity Committee, Cetinje, November 8, 1918

303 — Proclamation “To Yugoslavs” by the Montenegrin King Nikola, Neuilly-sur-Seine, October 7/20, 1918 Photograph From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. МИД-ТО roll 548, recording 186 (folder 10)

304 — The Berane initiative for the unification of Serbia and Montenegro, Andrijevica, October 24, 1918 Document From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. AJ-336-25-7274

305 — Rista Marjanović, Sailors from Boka Kotorska, on the streets of Zagreb, in the procession for the unification of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and the affiliation of Istria to the future Kingdom, 1918 Photograph From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections Inv. no. VI-A-1097

306 — Report on the activities of the Military Command of Zagreb, 16 December 1918 Document From the Croatian State Archives Collections Inv. no. HR-HDA-124, ОНО 270-1919

307 — Montenegrin King Nikola with family, Lyon, 1916 Photograph From the Library of Congress in Washington Collections Inv. no. 3c08491

308 — Several pages from the blood-stained album of the Karađorđević’s, published by the Montenegrin Refugee Committee, Rome 1921 Book From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. Пл 154-10

309 — Nikola Petrović and his Court: the Epilogue of a Shameful Rule (Collection of autographic documents in 18 facsimiles) Sarajevo: the editorial board of the Voice of the People [Glasnaroda], 1919 Book From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. P-346

310 — The Battalion of the Kingdom of SCS Army crossing the “Emperor’s bridge” near Nikšić, February 1920 Photograph From the Library of Congress in Washington Collections Inv. no. OS450

CONSTITUTION

311 — M. Mandić, An overview map of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. Кр I 203

312 — Border stone from the border of the Kingdom of SCS and Austria 16 x 30 cm From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. 514 I 1/3

313 — Members of the political delegation of the Kingdom of SCS at the Paris Peace Conference Photograph From the Library of Congress in Washington Collections Inv. no. 29261

314 — Meeting of the Allies’ Committee at the Peace Conference in Versailles, 1919 Photograph From the Library of Congress in Washington Collections Inv. no. 50568

315 — The Ethnographic Section of the Kingdom of SCS delegation at the Paris Peace Conference Photograph From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЉДФ_139_001

316 — The Delegation of the Kingdom of SCS members’ list at the Paris Peace Conference Document From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections Inv. no. AJ-336-52-13

317 — Dr. Ante Trumbić’s pass for the Peace Conference in Paris Document From the Croatian History Museum Collections Inv. no. HRM-102620
Page 318 — Ivan Tišov, The SCS Delegation at the Paris Peace Conference
Oil on canvas
182 x 310 cm
From the National Museum in Belgrade Collections
Inv. no. 32_2330

319 — The business-card of Andrija Radović, member of the Kingdom of SCS delegation at the Paris Peace Conference Document
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-28a-6403

320 — The business-card of Otokar Ribarž, member of the Kingdom of SCS delegation at the Paris Peace Conference Document
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-16-1636

321 — Telegram by Stojan Protić, the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of SCS about the status of Otokar Ribarž in the Delegation of the Kingdom of SCS Document
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-28-6403

322 — Andrija Radović, member of the Kingdom of SCS at the Paris Peace Conference Photograph from the book: Čedomil Mićić, Miloš Brašić, From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. АЈ-336-52-156

323 — La question de Scutari, Paris 1919 Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P 2626

From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P2484

325 — Presentation of Andrija Radović on the question of Shkodra Document
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-28-7294

326 — Proclamation of the Seres Revolutionary Committee on the resolution to the Macedonian question Document
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-24-2030

327 — Proclamation of the Macedonian students at Sofia University Flayer
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-24-2631

328 — A. Belitch, Les revindications des Bulgares à la lumière de leurs propres actes, Paris 1919

329 — L. Wuhrer, Carte Ethnographique du Banat, Paris Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P 2490

330 — Personal note on the demarcation between Serbs and Romanians in Banat From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-4-7210

From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P 2488

From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P 2516

333 — The decision of the Great People’s Assembly on the annexation of Banat, Bačka and Baranja to the Kingdom of SCS reached in Novi Sad, February 27, 1919 Document
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-17-516

334 — Letter from Nikola Pašić to the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of SCS S. Protić about the stance of the German municipalities in Baranja From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-16-1636

335 — Jovan Cvijić’s analysis of the question of Baja and Subotica Document
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-17-4159

336 — The reception of Major Ocoković at Repaš and the people’s Oath of Allegiance to King Peter, September 14, 1919 Photograph
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-17-7244

337 — Hungarian report to the Americans about the anarchy among Serbian troops in Baranja Document
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-18-4765

338 — US Colonel Charot’s report on the morale of the Serbian troops in Baranja Document
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-18-4847

339 — Telegram from the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of SCS Lj. Davidović seeking the delay of the evacuation from Hungary Document
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-16-4611

340 — Report to the Peace Conference in Paris about the rebellion in Subotica, April 21, 1920 Document
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-15-6121

341 — Telegram by M. Ninčić about the Subotica rebellion investigation, June 16, 1920 Document
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-15-6473

342 — The Hungarian Revolutionary Government’s propaganda leaflet: “Brothers, Soldiers!” From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. MID, PO 1918 IX Cs, dos. I (1)

343 — The Hungarian Revolutionary Government’s propaganda leaflet: “Serbian Brothers!” From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. MID, PO 1918 IX Cs, dos. I (2)

344 — The Hungarian Revolutionary Government’s propaganda leaflet: “Croatian Brothers!” From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. MID, PO 1918 IX Cs, dos. I (3)

345 — J. Cvijic, Carte Ethnographique des Regions Septentrionales Yougoslaves Map
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. Kp II 919
346 — St. Stanoyévitch, Le role des Serbes de Hongrie, Paris 1919
Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P 2525

Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. D P 2488

348 — A. Belic et S. Mihaldjic, La Baranya, Paris 1919.
Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P 2514

349 — Yovan Radonitch, La Batchka, Paris 1919.
Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P 2501a

Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P 2514

351 — D.J. Derocco, Carte Ethnographique de la Carinthie, Paris 1919.
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. Tb Kp 5634

352 — The Committee for the implementation of plebiscite in Carinthia, 1920
Photograph
From the Slovenian National Museum of Contemporary History Collections
Inv. no. MNZS 14207

353 — The border crossing at Ljubelj
Photograph
From the Slovenian National Museum of Contemporary History Collections
Inv. no. MNZS 2932_10

354 — Commemorative Medal for the twentieth anniversary of the battles of liberation in the northern parts of Yugoslavia (1918-1919), 1939
From the National Museum in Belgrade Collections
Inv. no. 20 428

355 — Photographs of war clashes in Carinthia
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Archival Collections, General Milorad Terzić’s photographs

356 — Carte des Regions Yougo-slaves (Editions Bossard)
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. Vb 3723

357 — Ant. Lazic, Ethnographical Italo-Yugoslav-German Frontier
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. KP 314 48

358 — L. Wuhrer, Les revendications italiennes envers l’Autriche qui a combattu pour le Pan germanisme contre l’Entente
Map
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. 3733

359 — L. Wuhrer, Les principes du president Vilson et les aspirations Italiennesen Carinthie, dans la province de Goritz et en Carniole
Map
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. 3733

360 — The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes' report to the Peace Delegation about the state of affairs in Rijeka, 25 March 1920
Document
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-8-6028

361 — La Question di Fiume
Graph
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. 3739

362 — Signees of the Rapallo Treaty, 1920
Photograph
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. P 2645

363 — Program for the army’s welcoming ceremony in Šibenik, June 12-13, 1921
Document
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P 2627

Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P 2627

365 — La question italo-yugoslave expliqué par des graphiques, /s. f. / /s. a./.
Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections
Inv. no. P 2627

Book
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. YK 2017/871

367 — Letter from Andrija Radović to the Delegation of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes Government at the Peace Conference, April 7, 1919
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-26-6736

368 — Telegram by Slavko Grujić, the Kingdom of SCS Ambassador in Washington in which he expresses the opinion of the US Assistant Foreign Affairs Minister on the status of Montenegro
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. AJ-336-26-6743

369 — The Versailles Peace Treaty signed between the Entente states and Germany, June 28, 1919
From the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia Collections

370 — Treaty of Saint-Germain signed between the Entente states and the Republic of Austria, September 10, 1919
From the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia Collections

371 — The Treaty of Neuilly-sur-Seine signed between the Entente states and Bulgaria, November 27, 1919
From the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia Collections

372 — The Treaty of Trianon signed between the Entente States and Hungary, June 4, 1920
From the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia Collections

373 — The Treaty of Rapallo signed between the Kingdom of Italy and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, November 20, 1920
From the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia Collections

374 — Letter from Józef Kajaković to Ivan Meštrović, March 26, 1919
From the Meštrović Atelier archive in Zagreb, letters safeguarded by the Meštrović Atelier in Zagreb. Courtesy of Mate Meštrović
Ident. 647 A1
Inv. no. 448 A2

375 — Almanac for the year 1918 (ed. Pero Slijepčević), Geneva. “Prosveta” Society, 1918
Courtesy of Kosta Knežević

376 — Exposition des artistes Yougoslaves au Petit Palais de la Ville de Paris du 12 avril au 15 mai 1919
From the Academy of Fine Arts Library, the Uroš Predić Legacy
Inv. no. T 73/76(064)

377 — Typewriter “Imperial Model B”
From the Museum of Science and Technology Collections
Inv. no. T 2.7

378 — Agitation poster showing Pašić ploughing a field with harnessed serfs
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П792

379 — Map of the historical evolution of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, 1804-1918 (publication of the Circle of Serbian Sisters, 1921)
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. Kr I 224

380 — The city of Belgrade’s Constituent Assembly’s elections candidate list, 1920, voting place “Čubura Tavern”
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П 834

381 — Constituent Assembly elections candidate list, 1920, Belgrade electoral district
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П1836

382 — Constituent Assembly elections candidate list, 1920, Belgrade electoral district
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П1 837

383 — Constituent Assembly elections candidate list, 1920, for the regional judiciary of Velika Kikinda and Veliki Bečkerek
Poster
From the Historical Archive of Zrenjanin Collections
Inv. no. 084-1

384 — Constituent Assembly elections candidate list, 1920, for the electoral district of Veliki Bečkerek-Velika Kikinda
Poster
From the Historical Archive of Zrenjanin Collections
Inv. no. 084-2

385 — Constituent Assembly elections candidate list, 1920, for the electoral district Veliki Bečkerek-Velika Kikinda
Poster
From the Historical Archive of Zrenjanin Collections
Inv. no. 084-3

386 — Constituent Assembly elections candidate list, 1920, for the electoral district Veliki Bečkerek-Velika Kikinda
Poster
From the Historical Archive of Zrenjanin Collections
Inv. no. 084-4

387 — Constituent Assembly elections candidate list, 1920, for the Metohija electoral district
Poster
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. ПП1146-2

388 — Two voting balls
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. ПЗ 1865. II 1/13

389 — Poster: “To Belgrade Tradesmen”, regarding the Belgrade elections, August 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П 577

390 — Poster: “Tenants, take care of your own skin!” by the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, Belgrade, 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П 579

391 — Flyer: “Vote for the Communists”, 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П 583 (1)

392 — Communist Party of Yugoslavia poster “Consumers, paupers, intellectuals and manual laborers”, Belgrade 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П 583 (2)

393 — Communist Party of Yugoslavia poster “City of Death”, Belgrade, 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П 601

394 — Poster: “To Destrstitute Radicals!” Belgrade, 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П 602

395 — Announcement to the citizens of Belgrade about the Constituent Assembly elections date and the prohibition to sell and serve alcoholic beverages, Belgrade, September 23, 1920
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П 776

396 — Flyer against Mihajlo Lukarević, the People’s Radical Party’s candidate at the Constituent Assembly elections, Belgrade, 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П 787 (1)

397 — Flyer against Mihajlo Lukarević, the People’s Radical Party’s candidate at the Constituent Assembly elections, Belgrade, 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П 787 (2)

398 — Flyer “Citizens of Belgrade” – call to vote for the radicals at the Constituent Assembly elections, Belgrade, 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П 788

399 — Democratic Party Flyer “Who votes for the radicals, votes for...” – call to vote for the democrats and not the radicals, Belgrade, 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П 790

400 — Flyer “To tradesmen, small businessmen and independent citizens” – call to vote for the Trade-Civic list, Belgrade, 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 3П 799
401 — Notice “To the Citizens of Belgrade” calling upon them to vote for Lj. Stojanović candidate of the republican list, and slandering the radicals and democrats, Belgrade, 1920
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП 804

402 — Communist Party of Yugoslavia notice “Workers, Clerks, Tradesmen!”, Belgrade, 1920
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections ЗП 807

403 — The Belgrade organization of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia’s notice “Citizens of Belgrade! Voters!” Belgrade, 1920
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections ЗП 806

404 — Communist Party of Yugoslavia flayer “Clerk! Civil Servant! Servant!” Belgrade, 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП 809 (1)

405 — Communist Party of Yugoslavia flayer “Clerk!” Belgrade, 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП 809 (2)

406 — Communist Party of Yugoslavia notice “To the working peoples of the villages!” Belgrade, 1920
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП 816

407 — Calling upon the citizens of Belgrade to vote for Nikola Pašić at the elections for the Constituent Assembly, 1920
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП 823

408 — Poster “Read, then vote, Serbian People!” 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП 827

409 — Poster of the Peoples Radical Party “People of Tetovo, Gostivar, Poreč, Galičani,” 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП 829

410 — Announcement of the Serbian Warrior’s Party “To Warrior-Voters,” 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП 830

411 — “The Great gathering of all workers from Belgrade and its area,” November 5, 1920
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП 832

412 — Announcement: “Women! Citizens of Belgradel call to the gathering with representatives of the women’s movement as speakers, Belgrade, May 1921
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП11419

413 — Poster of the People’s Radical Party for the Constituent Assembly elections, Belgrade, 1920
From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ГП1117-175

414 — Poster “People! Dear people of Srem! Brothers radicals”, November 1920
From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ГП1117-188

415 — Poster of the Croat Community “Read and pass on! Croats”
From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ГП1135-17

416 — Democratic Party poster “For the Democracy of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes”
From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ГП11146-4

417 — “Citizens! The hand of the criminal! — announcement of the Provincial government for Dalmatia regarding the assassination of the regent
Poster
From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ГП11153-6

418 — Funeral service for Minister Milorad Drašković, 1921
Poster
From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ГП11143-136

419 — Communist gathering in Belgrade, 1920
Photograph
From the Historical Archive of Belgrade Collections Inv. no. ЗП565

420 — Announcement: “Obznana” prohibiting any form of communist activity, December 29, 1920
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП1536

421 — The Communist Party of Yugoslavia’s elections candidate list, Belgrade, 1920
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП1578

422 — Communist Party of Yugoslavia poster for the Belgrade elections, Belgrade, 1920
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП1585

423 — Communist Party of Yugoslavia poster for the Belgrade elections, Belgrade, 1920
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП1584

424 — Rista Marjanović, Handing over of the Address at the first session of the Provisional National Representation Body, March 1919.
Photograph
From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections Inv. no. В-463

425 — Rista Marjanović, The First meeting of the Provisional National Representation Body in the hall of the new palace, March 1919.
Photograph
From the Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Collections Inv. no. В-772

426 — Regent Alexandre’s Proclamation “To my People the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes” on the formation of the first Kingdom of SCS government, December 24, 1918
Poster
From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ГП11153-14

427 — Regent Alexandre’s opening speech for the Provisional National Representation Body’s session, March 16, 1919
Poster
From the National Library of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ГП11153-57

428 — Pjer Kržanić, Propaganda poster presenting the Radical Parliamentary Community, the Radical Party’s association with Slovene clerics and the Yugoslav Muslim organisation, 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections Inv. no. ЗП1794
429 — The first government of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Andra Popović’s War Album, Belgrade 1926
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. MAG III 151087

430 — Stojan Protić’s telegram in which he reports to the Delegation in Paris about the crisis of the government, August 1919
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. АЈ-336

431 — Agitational poster on Stojan Protić’s constitution proposal, 1920
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. ЗП 793

432 — Josip Smođlaka, Draft of the Yugoslav Constitution, Zagreb, 1920
Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections,
Inv. no. П 215

433 — Constitution Draft: based on the proposal by Stojan M. Protić: the definitive text, after the discussion with the Committee, Belgrade, 1920
Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections,
Inv. no. П 17

434 — Radivoje K. Novaković, The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes’ Constitution Proposal, Belgrade, 1919
Book
From the “Svetozar Marković” University Library Collections,
Inv. no. П 1120

435 — Notice to the citizens of Belgrade that the Constituent Assembly will commence working on December 12th, 1920
Poster
From the Archives of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. ЗП 1536

436 — The official opening of the Constituent Assembly. After the final royal speech, Regent Alexander accompanied by Nikola Pašić, returns to the palace, December 12, 1920
Photograph
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. YK 2018/78

437 — King Alexander I Karađorđević taking the oath on the Constitution, November 1921

438 — Letter from Regent Alexander to General Pašić informing him about his wish that General Hadžić become minister of the defence, May 22, 1921
From the Historical Museum of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 1000-1963

439 — Grand session of the Constituent Assembly
Photograph
From the Historical Museum of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 4325 (2-3)

440 — The service in the Cathedral Church, after the proclamation of the “Vidovdan” Constitution, Belgrade, June 28, 1921
Photograph
From the Historical Museum of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 4338-1

441 — People gathered at Terazije, after the proclamation of the “Vidovdan” Constitution, June 28, 1921
Photograph
From the Historical Museum of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. 4340

442 — The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes Constitution, Belgrade, 1921
Book
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. 2529 II 4/165

443 — Petar Madižarević, Map of the Kingdom of SCS, Belgrade, 1924
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. УК 2018/84

444 — ½ dinar nominal value banknote, issued by the Ministry of Finances of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, February 1, 1919
76 x 46 mm
From the National Bank of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. IV/214

445 — 1-dinar nominal value banknote, issued by the Ministry of Finances of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, November 20, 1919
93 x 66 mm
From the National Bank of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. IV/215

446 — Dinar-crown banknote the value of ½ dinar – 2 crowns, from 1919, issued by the Ministry of Finances of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, February 1, 1919
76 x 46 mm
From the National Bank of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. IV/216

447 — Dinar-crown banknote the value of 1 dinar – 4 crowns, issued by the Ministry of Finances of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, February 1920
93 x 66 mm
From the National Bank of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. IV/217

448 — Dinar-crown banknote the value of 5 dinars – 20 crowns, issued by the Ministry of Finances of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, February 1920
100 x 64 mm
From the National Bank of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. IV/218

449 — Dinar-crown banknote the value of 10 dinars – 40 crowns, issued by the Ministry of Finances of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, February 1, 1919
142 x 73 mm
From the National Bank of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. IV/219
450 — Dinar-crown banknote the value of 20 dinars – 80 crowns, issued by the Ministry of Finances of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, February 1, 1919
140 x 82 mm
From the National Bank of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. IV/220

451 — 10-dinar banknote, issued by the National Bank of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, November 1, 1920
Obverse 142 x 81, reverse 135 x 110 mm
From the National Bank of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. IV/221

452 — 1000-dinar banknote with rosette, issued by the National Bank of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, November 30, 1920
182 x 108 mm
From the National Bank of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. IV/222

453 — Banknote of the nominal value of 0.25 dinars – ¼ dinars, issued by the Ministry of Finances of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, March 21, 1921
92 x 62 mm
From the National Bank of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. IV/223

454 — Dr Milorad Nedeljković. Just before the resolution of the currency issued, Zagreb 1919
Book
From the Museum of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. УК 2017/873

455 — “The announcement of the continuation of stamping banknotes of Austro-Hungarian origin in Ljubljana”, 16 January 1919
Poster
From the Slovenian National Museum of Contemporary History Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, 31893

Poster
From the Slovenian National Museum of Contemporary History Collections
Inv. no. MNZS, 31892

457 — Memorandum from the General Inspectorate of the Ministry of Finances to the great mayors informing them on cases of smuggling unstamped crown banknotes, 31 March 1921
Document
From the Historical Archive of Zrenjanin Collections
Inv. no. ф. 97 4597-21

458 — A Culture Scandal. The Government and Meštrović, “Слободна Трибуна”, 485, 3, 4. 02.06.1923, Zagreb
From the National Library of Serbia Collections
Inv. no. P2552

459 — Receipt to Ivan Meštrović for the period 16.03.1919-01.03.1920 with note that he should be paid on a monthly basis in the future.
From the Archives of Yugoslavia Collections
Inv. no. АЈ-66-578-945

460 — Stamps, issues for Timisoara. Regular Hungarian brands with a new value of 10/2 filers and 30/2 filers, May 15 – July 1, 1919.
Courtesy of Nikola Ljubičić

461 — Stamps of the State SCS, editions for Slovenia, complete series, April 8, 1919
Courtesy of Nikola Ljubičić

462 — Stamps of the “Kingdom of Serbia”, with motifs of the characters of King Peter I and Regent Alexander, October 1, 1919
Courtesy of Nikola Ljubičić

463 — Stamps of the “Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes”, with the image of King Peter I, value of 1 and 10 dinars, June 24, 1920.
Courtesy of Nikola Ljubičić
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