

Vojislav Šešelj, PhD

IT-03-67-T
D594-1/57440
30 January 2017

594/57440

MB

THE IDEOLOGY OF SERBIAN NATIONALISM

**The Scientific and
Publishing Work of Prof.
Lazo M. Kostić, PhD**

**Second Edition
Great Serbia Jsc
Belgrade 2002**

Vojislav Šešelj, PhD
THE IDEOLOGY OF SERBIAN NATIONALISM
The Scientific and Publishing Work of Prof. Lazo Kostić, PhD

Editor-In-Chief

Saša Radovanović

Editing board

Vesna Marić, Zlatija Sević, Ivana Borac, Milica Gogić,
 Severin Popović, Ljubica Davidović, Ivana Đurić,
 Vesna Zobenica, Ljiljana Mihajlović, Zorica Ilić,
 Zlata Radovanović

Publisher

Great Serbia Jsc
 Belgrade, Zemun, Trg pobede 3

For the publisher

Vojislav Šešelj, PhD

Printed by

“Etiketa”, Boleč

For the press

Milenko Dramlić

Print run

3000 copies

**I DEDICATE THIS BOOK TO MY DEAR PARENTS - TO
 MY MOTHER DANICA AND TO THE MEMORY OF MY
 FATHER NIKOLA, WHO BROUGHT ME UP IN THE
 SPIRIT OF GREAT SERBIAN NATIONALISM AND
 LOVE FOR RUSSIA,
 AND TRANSFERRED TO ME THE ANCESTORS'
 LEGACY THAT THE TRUTH, FREEDOM, JUSTICE
 AND ONE'S HOMELAND ARE THE HIGHEST MORAL
 VALUES TO WHICH A MAN IS BORN, LIVES AND
 DIES FOR.**

CIP – Catalogued in the publication of
 the National Library of Serbia, Belgrade

929: 34 Kostić L.

323.1 (= 163.41) (091)

ŠEŠELJ, Vojislav The Ideology of Serbian Nationalism: The Scientific
 and Publishing Work of Prof. Lazo M. Kostić,

PhD/ Vojislav Šešelj – Belgrade:

Great Serbia, 2002 (Boleč: Etiketa) –

1024 pages: 23 cm

Circulation 3,000

ISBN 86-83451-22-4

a) Kostić, Lazo (1897-1979) b) Serbs – National consciousness

c) Nationalism – Serbia

COBISS-ID 100685580

I. The ideology of Serbian nationalism has been developing for centuries, based on the intellectual shaping and targeted creation of a national consciousness and the historical destiny of the Serbian people, as well as through the actual state-forming political practice of constant defence and liberation wars, democratic aims and liberal tendencies. A Serb's primeval being is connected to the deep feeling of belonging to this highest form of collective consciousness and to identification with its system of values, strength of the spirit, the projection of national unity within the entire established state, solidarity, the love of justice and tolerance based on the highest humanistic ideals and traditional principles of the good and the humane.

The entire history of Serbia indicates that a subjective view of the world of peoples, social groups, political organizations, the law or church institutions, as well as wise individuals, demonstrates in practice an extraordinary objective power, drive, basis and catalyst for historical events, social movements and magnificent works. The ideas definitely have a realistic power and potential, higher or lower, but the majority of conflicts between people and social groups - the crucial ones especially - start with conflict in the sphere of ideas. Ideology is a characteristic of man. There is no man without ideology and there is no link between people that is stronger than the ideological one. Ideology lives within society, through the society and shares its rises and falls; it leads the society forward in its development or stops and hinders it. Dominant ideologies are often prone to ideological analysis of the past and the comprehensive creation of the future. They determine objectives, design collective endeavours, value the practical results of political movements and their leaders and, quite often, they bind human consciousness, indoctrinating and instrumentalizing it.

The primeval Serbian national idea of freedom, solidarity and unity created a state-forming policy and the collapse of the state-created conditions for a specific ideology or resurrection and the necessity to sacrifice individuals, collectives and generations to achieve it. The tragic trait of heroic destiny, transferred from generation to generation, was the basic inspiration, the source of spiritual drive, the energy of heroic engagement and the instinct to bear and suffer in order to create an opportunity to regenerate the old blaze and glory. A Serb could have been deprived of his country and freedom, but not of his essential belief in God on which he built his own church, accepted the spiritual and cultural values of a civilized world and the highest achievements of the historical development of humanity, deeply pervading them with his national identity and state-creating ambitions. At the very beginning, by arriving in the Balkans, the Serbs expressed the impossibility of coming to terms with Turkish rule, but they did not wish or try to resist all foreign influences. They put their belief into one God and the large number of demigods into new, Christian, apparel; they replaced the traditional župan (zhupan) titles of their rulers with the titles of kings and emperors, but they jealously kept the language, the tribal and family traditions, their fighting spirit and their refusal to accept slavery. It is unbearable for Serbs to be slaves and they do not wish to be slave owners either

The Serbs could resist all temptations except their inner divisions. Wise, brave and noble, they were not immune to the cursed seed in the core of all quarrels, disputes, fights and spites. For centuries, the Pledge of Saint Sava to one faith and one national state has been a guideline for the future, as well as the main object of dispute and destruction for all the Serbian enemies. The attitude towards the national state was always the border stone between honour and the lack of honour, patriotism and treason, fidelity and conversion, heroic deeds and cowardice, honesty and dishonesty, pride and contempt, honour and meanness. Always on moral trials, the people suffered enormously, mutilated by being constant outcasts, but in the long run, all this strengthened the basis of the free spirit, the heroic ethics and the state-forming instinct.

National unity has been based on religious unity for more than one millennium and, in the case of Serbs, this related to the spontaneous unity of tribes and families, it merged through the consciousness of mutual language and origin from prehistoric times. Only the orthodox version of Christianity, with specific national content, could represent a cohesive factor for the idea of the Serbian state, able to fight against five centuries of slavery under the Turks and the perfidious Roman-Catholic proselytism. It is the basis of the Serbian political ideology, which developed through fighting against the hardest historical temptations into a state-forming ideological system that drew the attention of the best Serbian thinkers for centuries, stimulating them to leave their personal mark on the rich spiritual foundation and magnificent cultural and intellectual heritage. The ideology of Serbian nationalism represents a qualitative synthesis of the highest achievements of the Serbian national spirit and the intellect of its leading minds.

II. However, this fully matured ideological system has not been comprehensively covered and presented in any of the scientific, theoretical works. It has been simply dispersed through numerous works by leading Serbian intellectuals, from Saint Sava to the present time. Every scientist, politician and writer approached this issue from a personal, professional, practical or other split aspect. The voluminous work of pre-war Serbian university professor Lazo M. Kostić, PhD, which has mainly been published in modest emigrant circulations, is almost without precedent in that sense, and it has been unavailable to the broader reading public in the homeland for decades.

At the end of the 70s, as a young assistant full of enthusiasm and digging through the neglected and dusty library of the Faculty of Political Sciences in Sarajevo, I found several books by Professor Lazo Kostić. The books covered burning national issues based on research by the most fruitful Serbian emigrant writer of all times. Who knows how they ended up in the library, since their distribution in the homeland was prohibited under threat of draconian sanctions. In his preface to the book *Cultural Circumstances in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, written in Vidovdan in 1970, Lazo Kostić writes that: "At the end of March and April, I received two extraordinary orders from the country: a set of books on B&H ordered by the Faculty of Political Sciences in Sarajevo and the Republic Confederation of Working People of Bosnia and Herzegovina. They paid

for them fairly. At the same time, some university professors from Sarajevo, obviously Moslems, ask for a book on Moslem nationality. It seems that these books are widespread in B&H". I personally believe that the persons placing orders for the book must have been Moslem intellectuals from within the regime structures of power, since only that can explain the incredible passivity of the communist State Security Service, which was most demonstrative and rigorous in pursuit of any more liberal thought, especially those aiming to treat the Serbian national issue objectively. I read five books covering the problem of ethnic and religious relations in Bosnia and Herzegovina one after another. In the following years I obtained about ten additional brochures and, in 1989, during a three-month lecture tour in Canada, America and Australia and a one-and-half-month tour in Western Europe, visiting almost the entire Serbian Diaspora, I managed to obtain all Kostić's remaining books with selfless help of friends. The suitcase full of emigrant books was confiscated at the Belgrade airport on 9 October 1989 on my return from London and, several months later, a large package of similar content sent to me from Sydney suffered the same fate. The police was surprised by my persistence in asking for the return of those books and, during the general warming of the political atmosphere in Serbia at the beginning of 1990, all the books were returned to me.

Upon my return to Belgrade and having read all the books, the idea came to me to write a detailed monograph on the scientific work of Lazo Kostić. In this time of intensive political activities related to the renewal of the multi-party system, my study of Kostić's books lasted significantly longer than would be the case under more normal circumstances. Although Kostić, as a renowned lawyer and university professor, wrote a large number of scientific books and articles before World War II, I based my monograph on his post-war opus where he reached his intellectual peak. I presented the first part to public scrutiny already in August 1999.

Somewhat later, I added an analysis of his pre-war scientific and publicist works, which he wrote as renowned university professor or statistics expert. They are grouped into three basic units covering the problem of constitutional law and the political system, administrative law and theoretical statistics with a processing of the results obtained by key practical statistical research of that time.

Kostić's emigrant studies are fully dedicated to the Serbian national issue, and there has been no author in the history of science who covered all the key elements that endangered the Serbian national being and who affirmed its vitality, perseverance and loyalty to the idea of an independent and democratic Serbian state encompassing all the Serbian countries, more comprehensively and in more detail than Kostić did. My excitement over each new brochure covering the problems that no one in the scientific circles in the homeland for half a century had the courage or possibility to cover, can only be imagined - followed by my pleasure when I recognized, on the pages of Kostić's books, the long suppressed ideas that I had spent time as a political prisoner for reaffirming and renewing during Tito's time.

III. Gradually my monograph on the scientific and publication work

of Lazo Kostić grew into a specific textbook on Serbian nationalism. The initial, modest concept grew into an idea to encompass and systematize into one book almost all the historical facts, scientific statements, theoretical elaborations, national ideas and political objectives on which modern Serbian nationalism is based. In the process, it was necessary to shatter certain prejudices, doctrinarian delusions and digressions, resulting in the basic products of Yugoslavism, communism and monarchism. The results of Kostić's research activities represent the basic foundation and milestone of this systematization but, with their critical valorisation and interpretation, it was necessary to research the studies of other authors that covered certain national issues in more detail.

I published the first parts of the monograph as a column in *Great Serbia*, the publication of the Serbian Radical Party, raising the initiative to collect and publish Kostić's the collected works. This fact possesses symbolism that is not accidental at all, since the publication of the newspaper began nine times under the same name during the past one hundred and twenty years, mainly under historical circumstances when the Great Serbia state-forming idea underwent great ordeals. One of the greatest Serbian patriotic poets, Stevan Kačanski, founded the *Great Serbia* Society in 1887 as a conspiracy organization of Serbian patriots and started the weekly newspaper *Velika Srbija (Great Serbia)* on 14th January 1888. The newspaper was published until 1893, causing continuous propaganda fire in the Austro-Hungarian press against it. When Kačanski died in 1890, the president of the *Great Serbia* Society, Dragutin Ilić, was forced to flee Serbia in 1891 to avoid the blazing rage of Austria-loving king Milan Obrenović. The newspaper was edited for some time by the son of the old bard, Vladislav Kačanski. After the dynastic change, Dragutin Ilić returned to his homeland in 1903 and resurrected *Great Serbia* as a daily newspaper, but he was only able to print it for a few months. Two newspapers named *Great Serbia* were issued separately in Valjevo and Niš in 1914 but only for a short time. Then, from 1916 to 1918 in Thessalonica, a popular daily newspaper under the same name was printed. From 1921 to 1926, there were again two simultaneous editions of *Great Serbia*, one published by Radivoje Novaković and the other by Gavra Davidović, as the body of the Serbian Party. After World War II, a group of persecuted intellectuals from Ravna Gora illegally copied about sixteen issues of *Great Serbia* as a bulletin, using the duplication technique, and it is interesting to note that the then-almighty communist police never discovered them. I started the present, ninth incarnation of *Great Serbia* in my private edition in 1990 as the newspaper of the Serbian Chetnik Movement and after the union with the National Radical Party in 1991, it became the gazette of the Serbian Radical Party.

I published the last five parts of the monograph and the comprehensive afterward in *Serbian Free Thought*, a magazine on philosophy, social studies and political criticism published by the Serbian Radical Party. The magazine has been published regularly for two years now. Its orientation is extremely patriotic, namely that of great Serbia and, on the Serbian scientific and publishing stage, it represents something

really refreshing in its quality, volume and its openness to different theoretical views and attitudes. Significantly, it is one of the truly rare scientific magazines that is not published with the financial support of the Western secret services or the so-called non-governmental organizations and seemingly private foundations with extremely subversive ambitions in connection with Serbian national interests, state integrity, independence and individuality.

IV. In December 1999, the Zemun Information-Business System and the Serbian Radical Party agreed with Kostić's daughter Darinka Đukić and great granddaughters Marija and Isidora Perić, who inherited the author's rights, to finally realize the idea of printing the collected works. The Editing Board was immediately established, I was appointed Editor-In-Chief and, after three months of hard work, all the works were ready for printing. The monumental opus of this great Serbian intellectual and patriot revealed itself before us in all its grandeur, on almost ten thousand closely printed pages in B5 format.

In a letter to his daughter, Lazo Kostić left a list of all the works he published before World War II. Branko Nadoveza, PhD, and Ivana Đurić edited that bibliography, reducing it to the basic texts since, in the majority of cases, Kostić published those works under different titles and incorporated texts previously published as scientific articles in magazines into large books.

I organized the bibliography of Kostić's post-war books and brochures in a similar manner and I reduced a list of over eighty works to precisely seventy. The first editions of some books and publications were subsequently introduced by Kostić into newer and more comprehensive works under different titles. Besides that, he published about 2000 texts in emigrant newspapers but he reprinted all the more significant texts in the topic collections covered by the basic bibliography (which is complete in the preface to the collected works), while he took some essential parts from the others.

V. Simultaneously with this detailed analysis of Kostić's works, in the monograph I presented the opinions of other top scientists on very important issues for the development of the Serbian national consciousness, the historical tragedy of the Serbian people and, particularly, on the publicist work of the Serbian political emigration. I am convinced that such an approach and its results can represent a stimulus for the younger generation of Serbian intellectuals and scientists in the field of humanistic sciences to dedicate their theoretical and research efforts to problems that were simply banned from scientific institutions, publishing houses and periodicals for half a century under the political dictatorship.

Systematic measures were used to force our people to forget our own history. We succumbed to that form of brainwashing and we were consequently sentenced to a repetition of history in an even more tragic form. Those who did not bow before the anti-Serbian history and totalitarianism were persecuted, suffered in prisons and were removed from all the organized spheres of cultural and scientific life. Mediocre individuals without pride and honour who were ready to engage in the

realization of vile projects to destroy all that is Serbian were proclaimed as the creative intelligence.

The times have changed radically. Communism fell ten years ago, but our main enemies remain essentially the same, only the degree of their cruelty and hate multiplied. Faced with the lack of scruples of the aggressors, the savagery of the new American world order, Croatian hate and Catholic bestiality, we see the topicality of Kostić's works even today, and the degree in which that proud inhabitant of Boka understood the Serbian troubles and the necessity of determined fight and facing the primeval evil. We have published Kostić's collected works with pride, convinced that we are doing a great thing for the culture of the Serbian people. There is no doubt that professor Lazo M. Kostić, PhD, is one of the great names of Serbian science, whose intellectual opus will have a far-reaching influence on future generations of ambitious lawyers, historians and publicists. Also, in its wholeness, it will represent a precious ideological basis for modern Serbian nationalism and patriotism. The collected works of Lazo Kostić have been grouped in line with the subject matter of the texts into ten big volumes, which I titled in the following manner: 1. Constitutional Law, 2. Administrative Law, 3. Theoretical Statistics, 4. Njegoš and Serbdom, 5. The Serbian National Consciousness, 6. Serbian National Traditions, 7. Croatian Barbarianism, 8. Yugoslavism and Communism, 8. Serbian Bosnia and 10. Serbian History and Patriotism. Each volume represents a topic and a conceptual whole. In this way, the homeland pays its best tribute to a big son of the Serbian people and shows the young generations that national endeavours and patriotic sacrifices do not have to be forgotten.

The structure of the monograph is somewhat different, since the composition needed to be adjusted to the basic textbook purpose and the attempt to logically systematize the ideology of Serbian nationalism and to make it more accessible to modern Serbian patriots, who are yet to encounter the decisive fight for the survival of the nation and the state.

VI. The very ideology aims to form human consciousness, both individually and collectively. It therefore differs from science in that it also possesses a mobilizing function, desiring to materialize itself through a specific political movement, to be productive, targeted and programme-based. Great ideas are spiritual food which determines the meaning of life, questions reality and changes it. In that manner, the ideals, end goals, the catalysts of political fighting, their orientation, correcting factors and indicators are being developed based on ideas. We belong to the ideals; we follow them with our hearts and our minds. In our mind, they are understood and rationalized, while in our heart they are sensed and loved. The mind and emotions are united through fighting, through the creative and rebellious effort to realize an ideal, at least in approximation. People identify themselves with the ideas and ideals in which they believe and through which they recognize their own individual goals, aspirations, ambitions and values. The existing collective ideals are inspired or revived by a long-covered soul, but new collectives are created with more organizational cohesion, readier for a dedicated fight and the temptations that are yet to come.

The greatest ideas are born in suffering, destruction, slavery, grief and despair. They are simply a gift from God that reflects hope, restores self-esteem, inspires faith in heavenly justice and helps understand the eternal struggle between good and evil. The evil permanently tends to enslave and destroy us by affecting our soul, manipulating our reason, humiliating our tradition and laughing at our national pride and sense of honour. We, the Serbs, represent an obstacle to the darkest powers of this world because of being Slavs very similar to the Russians, because of being Orthodox, nationally aware, solid, unconquerable and inhabiting a very important geopolitical space where the strategic interests of large powers clash. We were occupied by the Ottoman Empire and two German empires. The Vatican tried to turn us into Catholics or to physically eradicate us. We were destroyed by fascism and communism, and today we are a bone in the throat of the most cruel and most dangerous forms of totalitarian – globalism and mondialism.

We have been seriously hurt in all historical clashes. Our national body is covered with scars. But we are still breathing. We have slave shackles on our hands and chains clatter on our feet, but the immortal Serbian soul cannot be enslaved. Again there are many traitors among us, converts to Moslemism or lovers of the religion of foreign empire and its laws, but the spirit of Matavulj's Philipenda stands unchanged. Hungry and thirsty, naked and barefoot, Serbs do not come to terms with globalist and Masonic occupation. In them, the energy has been born of new grand deeds and riots. The larger, stronger and more powerful our enemy, the more unbreakable is our defiance. Force prays to no God, God shatters the force. It is again David against Goliath, the Serbian peasant *opanak* (translator's note: a very basic form of soft-soled footwear) against the NATO boot and its pitiful Balkan servants who joined each occupation army, thrusting their "brotherhood" knife into the Serbian back.

Many Serbian lands are enslaved today, occupied, with the Serbs chased away from them. But the modern generations and the generations yet to come must not just come to terms with that. No one has the right to write off the Serbian territories on behalf of the Serbian people. That issue remains the subject of dispute as long as the dispute is unresolved. And the dispute can only be resolved by releasing what is Serbian and uniting it with mother Serbia. Without that, our history would lose sense, our philosophy of existence would be bereaved of logical thinking and the nation would be deprived of the material foundation of the collective consciousness. There is no doubt that we Serbs would be divided into three categories in that fight: active and dedicated national fighters, traitors and passive observers. The goal of this book on the ideology of Serbian nationalism is to have as many aware national fighters as possible and as few traitors as possible. Regarding the present passive observers, they are all potential fighters but their soul has to be enlightened. We have to teach them, to educate them nationally, to awake their patriotic consciousness and their love of their homeland.

Nationalist education begins in early childhood, in the family home, and it has to continue through the school system, cultural and national activities, public life, press and publications. Each Serb should be brought

up as a defender of the homeland from the early years; each Serbian woman should be brought up as an honourable and dedicated Serbian mother, as a pillar of the family nest. The American pseudo-culture uses its Hollywood idiocies for that very reason to attempt to separate us from our role models, from the national history. Using the deafening noise of electric instruments and tone enhancers, they intentionally separate us from our national song and the melody that is close to the soul. The state without its own history wishes to cancel ours as well. It treats us like donkeys. It strikes us with the stick when we are stubborn and treats us with a carrot from time to time when we are obedient. It breaks our state organization and disables the independent functioning of our economic system. They kill our national pride with donor conferences and blind our people with empty promises. They artificially created our social misery, deepened it using sanctions and blockades in order to bring down our moral and national values, our legal principles and our political authorities through poverty.

One half of the solutions to the present problems - the constant inducing of crises rendering the political decision-making processes complicated, hindering institutions, introducing newly designed quasi-legal principles - is a way to make American custody permanent and irreplaceable. The truth is not important, the profit is; individuality is replaced by hypocritical adjustment, but brutality remains the prevailing method of American communication with Serbian political leaders - both the persons of character and strength or the poltroons and spineless individuals. The ones refusing to be conquered are permanently under deafening media and political campaigns of slander and put-downs; therefore rare are the ones who survive this constant pressure and these methods of improved psychological war. The weak, helpless, morally undeveloped, labile of character and possessing minimal knowledge, are being forced upon Serbia as model leaders, ready to cooperate with Western forces. The cooperative ones are actually obedient spineless people and poltroons.

They have completely indoctrinated our trade union movement as well, put it under their control, made it political and instrumentalized. And when the political change came, the disappointed workers, sobered by the sudden worsening of their already-difficult social position, are painfully awoken politically to the understanding that they no longer have a serious trade union. Only now can the hungry workers see the real greed and plunder conducted by the ones who, until yesterday, swore by the workers' interests. For one entire decade they manipulated the students and created main strike squads based on their trust, and nowadays they reward those students with enormous scholarships and the preaching that it has to be like this since that is what they fought for. The unserious previous government enabled them to pervade the Serbian media scene in large numbers. The state propaganda is slowly and clumsily led and several hundred local radio and TV stations and over one hundred newspapers, magazines and non-governmental organizations were used to systematically poison the Serbian people with ideas, to imprint it with the false image of reality and to kill any desire to resist the mondialist

infection and the anti-Serbian hysteria. The propaganda approach is based on the fact that a large majority of people is naturally ready to believe uncritically in what is written and what they hear or watch on TV. Very rare are those who are governed only by doubt and only a bit more frequent are those ones who rely on natural intelligence - by persuasively pointing to the construction of propaganda stencils and mondialist ideological matrices, by breaking the usual laziness of the spirit with successful rhetorical figures and, most importantly, by governing the indisputable historical, political and economical facts.

In its wave of comprehensive ideological indoctrination, the Serbian enemy counts on the light-mindedness and simplicity of common people, their naivety and goodness. Wherever they take control of the government bodies, first in the Republic of Srpska and in Montenegro, and now in Serbia, they intend to fully recompose the educational system and to eliminate the national history, culture and tradition from the curriculum, as obsolete and inadequate for the trends of the modern world. They wish to break and pacify us, while they are arming themselves. They devalue our state-forming ideals and relativize the issue of independence and sovereignty. They persuade us that the best thing is to stay without our own national state and melt into the sea of already enslaved and nationally deprived peoples who sacrificed their own values for false financial promises. Instead of investments, jobs and bread, we have drug addiction and homosexuality to definitively finish off our national moral and family environment. They would very much like to eliminate our army and proclaim desertion as true patriotism. They regularly cover their trickeries and evil intentions in quasi-humanistic phrases in order to create fatal hesitation, indecisiveness, fear and equanimity in the soul of the opponent.

In this manner, they hinder the normal functioning of state institutions in accordance with the basic principles of legal order; they enforce political movements and solutions, the expression of weakness towards the enemy. Moral breakdown is able to produce auto-destruction of the nation but the preservation of a moral and fighting spirit, in spite of all temptations, leads to the rebirth of the national idea and enthusiasm - new state-forming efforts. History constantly tests the vitality of each national idea, exposing it to temptations and making it stronger, either perfecting it or destroying it. The value of the national idea is most clearly shown in the quantity of hatred shown by enemies and traitors against it. A healthy national consciousness turns the hatred of others into the energy of will-strengthening and decisiveness, while in a weak national consciousness it produces resignation and apathy. The greatness of the national ideal and political goal is measured by their resistance, permanence and unyielding quality. Belief in the idea brings decisiveness and defiance - a readiness to sacrifice. The disbelieving ones are sure to lose in the beginning. The self-confident ones are able to temporarily step down, to notice mistakes and wrong attempts, to correct the tactics and perfect the strategy, but never to stop fighting for the realization of the end goal - measuring your own strength by the size of your temptation.

Belgrade, 24 September 2002, Vojislav Šešelj, PhD

The first edition of this book was sold out in one month. Preparing the second edition, I tried to correct all the proof-reading and correction errors (mainly typos) from the first edition, especially the three major ones. On page 551, three opening sentences of the text were omitted; on page 698, during preparation for printing, one part of the text was deleted from the comprehensive quote and one part that does not belong there was inserted; on page 736, part of the quoted text was omitted.

Belgrade, 23 December 2002

Vojislav Šešelj, PhD

Chapter I

THE HISTORICAL SUBSTRATE OF SERBIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY

I. The Prehistoric Homeland of the Serbian People

1. Great Serbia between the Vistula and Elbe Rivers

The prehistoric period of the Serbian past is covered by a thick layer of oblivion and it can be only partially historically reconstructed on the basis of archaeological excavations and linguistic research, through etymological comparisons and cultural presumptions. Basic unknown facts relate to determining the oldest homeland of Slavs, the initial ethnic substrate on which they were educated as people and the conditions under which they appeared to the East European lands. It is not known for certain which main Slavic branch the Serbs originated from. The Slavs inhabited the territory from the north shores of the Black Sea to the south shores of the Baltic, from the Urals in the east to the confluence of the Elbe in the west. At the time, they were mentioned for the first time by Roman writers. The Romans first mention the Slavs as the Vends and, several centuries later as the Sclavines and the Ants. It is not impossible that the name Sarmats also refers to them, since that people could not be identified ethnically in another way. It is very difficult for scientists to reliably separate the old Germanic and the old Slavic tribes. "Regarding mention of the Serbs and Croats, there are two basic opinions: one is that the Serbs came to the Balkans from today's Galicia, the other is that they came from Saxony, while the Croats are most often said to originate from the vicinity of Krakow and the north-eastern Czech Republic. More recently, one circle of researchers places the Serbs on Polish territory as well. There were three routes of the Slavic movements towards the Balkans: along the lower Danube, over the Carpathian Mountains and the Czech Republic, Moravia, Slovakia and Pannonia" (Relja Novaković: *From where did the Serbs Come to the Balkan Peninsula* (historical and geographic essay), Institute of History in Belgrade, Narodna knjiga, Belgrade 1977, page 21).

According to Novaković, who is without any doubt the best expert on the Serbian prehistoric past, the Porphyrogenitus' expression 'White Serbs' indicates the river Laba (Elbe) and the expression albis – white is

trusted. And it was true - that trust led to two whole centuries of stable Byzantine rule over new Serbia, until the Serbian people more openly expressed their state-forming ambitions.

Judging from the document written by the Priest Dukljanin which was made by compilation or the pure piling up of texts by his various predecessors resulting in problematic reliability ranging from pure fantasy to relevant historical facts, the Serbs and the Croats came to the Balkan Peninsula from the north-west. It seems that, at that time, the Serbs inhabited the land around the river Una, maybe even to the west and most probably in the area of today's river Lika. As Einhard states in his *Chronicles* of the uprising of the Posavina Prince Ljudevit between 818 and 823, Ljudevit once escaped from Sisak and joined the Serbs (page 54-55). Novaković presumes that the Serbs could not have come from their original homeland in one continuous march, considering the great distance. Instead they approached more gradually, temporarily inhabiting areas somewhere in Pannonia. We can conclude that "the Serbs from Serbia near the Balkans, somewhere on the north-west access routes to the Balkan peninsula, had begun their migration to the Balkans from Pannonia, most probably passing through the valley of Una and staying for some time not only along that river and to the east of it, but also to the west" (page 55). From there, they spread to the east and south-east. "If we add to this the fact that Porphyrogenitus, who lived 200 years before Dukljanin, claimed that even during his time Lika, Krbava and Gacka did not belong to the geographic or political area of Croatia but were 'only kept under the rule of their ban', we can rightly presume that the knowledge that Lika, Krbava and Gacka had been either a specific area with a different name or had belonged to some other tribe before their inclusion into the Croatian state was preserved even until the 10th century" (p. 56).

The toponomastics indicates the places with names that contain "sarb" in their stems, to the north from the river Warta and between the Oder and the Vistula. Russian historian Jastrebov placed the border of the ancient Serbia with the river Elbe and its tributary Saale to the west, including the area of the so-called North or Old March, Thuringia and Saxony to the south, the river Bodra to the west as far as its confluence with the river Oder, then along the Oder to the confluence of the Warta, then following the Warta to the east, north of Poznan and following a relatively straight line to the river Vistula, then along Vistula to the Gdansk Bay. That spacious area was inhabited by four big Serbian tribal groups: Bodrić, Ljutić, Lužičan and Pomorjan. The following tribes can be identified with the Bodrić: the Polabljan, Vard, Bitenc, Smolinac, Njan, Rarog, Varn etc. Among others, the Lužičan included the tribes of Zarovan, Skudrić, Nisan, Glomač, Milčan, Trebovljan, Žarovnjan, Žitic, Suselac etc. The Ljutić included the tribes of Sprevan, Plonjan, Moračan, Zemčić, Lešić, Govoljan, Naletić, Doljan, Ukran, Ratar, Rečan, Dolenc, Prekopjenci, Hižan and Ranjan. From the Pomorjan, the Kašub, Slovinci and Licik tribes have been remembered. The Serbian coast runs in full continuity from the confluence of the Elbe to the confluence of Vistula and into the Baltic Sea, including the Island of Rigen. Roman writers call the Serbs of

identical with the Slavic name of that river. White Serbs would therefore mean the Laba (Elbe) Serbs, which is confirmed by the fact that the Serbs never called themselves "white". Porphyrogenitus notes several basic geographic determinants of the Serbian homeland. It is located on the other side of Hungary, in the neighbourhood of the Frankish state. In 531, the Serbs had Thuringia as neighbour on their western borders, ruled by the Franks. If the primary Serbian land was called Bojka (Boyka or Bohemia), we can also speak of one part of the wide former Celtic district of Boja (Boya), the south parts of which are now Bavaria and Czech Bohemia. In the east, the Serbs had the first Croatia as a neighbour. Porphyrogenitus calls that 'White' as well, which can also indicate the river Elbe, which most probably divided the first Serbian and Croatian territories. The Serbs had inhabited that homeland forever and, in their collective memory there was simply no data that they had moved from somewhere else. The Serbs were the immediate neighbours of the Franks, according to Porphyrogenitus, while the Croats lived in the vicinity of the Frankish territory. Novaković locates the Croats towards the Sudetes, in the area of the source of the river Vistula and the town of Krakow.

Constantine Porphyrogenitus speaks of the status of the Croatian homeland in his time: "Other Croats remained in the neighbourhood of the Frankish state and they are called the White-Croats, having their archont; they are subordinates of Otto the Great, king of the Frankish state, which is called Saxidim, and they have not been christened, they live in peace with Turks (Hungarians) and enter into kinships with them" (page 43). The writer of this part of the Porphyrogenitus document "probably knew the status and relations in that part of Europe well, and for that reason he does not mention the Serbs. He must surely have known of the fact that, in 928, the Glomač Serbs fell under the rule of Henry I of Saxony, after which the Milcs were quickly conquered, possibly the immediate western neighbours of the White Croats" (page 44). The Franks did not destroy the Serbs, but they stopped them from being an independent political factor of the time, thus coming into direct contact with the Croats. The second determinant also indicates that the Croats lived east of Bavaria, which indicates the present Slovakia and Moravia, in the immediate vicinity of the Hungarians, who moved in afterwards. Since the Serbs were located in the area between France and White Croatia, White Serbia had been exposed to the Franks before the Croats were, and it was considerably weakened by the movement of a large Serbian mass to the Balkan Peninsula. Historical sources testify that, in 928, the Franks took over Jana (Gana) as the last stronghold of the Glomač Serbs.

The Serbian homeland then can be clearly located between the banks of the Elbe in the west, including the river Saale, and the banks of the Vistula in the east, though without its spring where the Croats most probably lived. The river Oder flowed through the centre of White Serbia. Byzantium invited the Serbs to its territory because, unlike the other Slavs, they were not allied with the Avars and because they could represent an efficient barrier to further Avar plundering raids. That shows that the Serbs of that time were known as brave and steady fighters and that the centre of the civilized world at that time thought they could be

their time the Vends and, in one place, Cornelius Nepos (b.c.) mentions them as the Inds. Regarding the Croats, almost all modern researchers trace their primary location to Little Poland and partially to the north-east Czech Republic” (p. 101). The Serbs lived to the west and north of the Croats, with the Czechs, Moravians and Slovaks to the south and the Poles to the east of them.

Judging from the content of texts by old writers Prisk, Jordan, Procopius, Biblius Sequester, Simokates and Alfred, we can conclude with considerable certainty that the Serbian branch of the Slavic tree was first called the Vends and that the land on which the Serbs lived was called Sarmatia. The Nestor's chronicle or Laurentius' Chronicle, one of the oldest Russian texts dating from the 11th century and referring to the much older Slavic past, speaks of the Serbs who live to the north of the Czechs and Moravians. The Byzantine historian from the fifteenth century, Laonicus Chalcocondyles, also calls Russia Sarmatia. That this claim is argued is confirmed by the terms Raška (Raška) and the Rac in comparison to Russia and the Russians. Even today, the Serbian language is very similar to Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian, even closer to Bulgarian than to Polish, Czech, Slovak, Slovenian and Croatian, which is almost extinct. The Russians were also called the Ants and some respectable linguists find the same source for the Vends, through Vands or Vinds to Ants. Cananus Lascaris and Flavius Biondo indicate the Polabian (Elbe River) origin of the Serbs in the fifteenth century and Antonio Bonfini, Albert Krantz and Marthin Cramer in the sixteenth century. Erasmus Stella paid particular attention to the Serbs between the rivers Elbe and Saale and to the Glomacš and Dalemincis, stating that there is a common name for them – the Misans. Peter Albinus calls that area Mysnia. The Germans today refer to it as the Meisen area, since it was conquered by Saxons in 928. “Albinus says that this land was not called Meisen in 700, but Sorabia, Dale Dalemincia, Lomacia, Surbia etc., and at that time the town of Meisen was called Misin and Misna” (p. 134). The memory of Mysnia as part of the ancient Serbian homeland between Elbe and Saale was preserved in the last name of one of the oldest Serbian families in Hum lands - Misita.

At the time of Charlemagne, the Elbe and the Saale represented the border between the state of Charlemagne and Serbia. In the famous *Chronica Carionis* printed by Caspar Peucer in the fifteenth century and speaking of the Frankish border on the Elbe and the Bohemian mountains, there is “data on the organization of the borderline March towards the Serbs, which is one of the oldest ones to be mentioned in the histories of the Franks and which was organized to write off the rebel Serbs and prevent their advancement” (p. 137). Confirming the information of old Ptolemy that the Vends are the largest Sarmat people, the author of this chronicle presumes that the Vends came to Europe from Asia Minor, where they were mentioned by Homer as the Henets (Venets), first “to the shores of the Black Sea, and then spreading from there to the north where in his time they hold power over areas now called Russia, Lithuania and Poland. However, he adds to this that the name and language of the Venet area in the bay of the Adriatic Sea indicate that the Henets came to Illyria

and the neighbouring countries as well, but he is not sure whether they were brought there by Anthenor himself on his way from Asia or if they came to those parts when they were already in Europe, taking the opportunity to gradually move to the south, searching for milder and more fertile land” (p. 137). He further claims that, at the time of their arrival in Venice, the Vends took the lands between the Elbe and the Vistula - Bohemia etc.

The Spangenberg Quernfurtische Chronica from 1590 and Hitrey's chronicle from 1592 also speak of the Elbe and the Saale as the Frankish border with the Henet Sorabs. “Regarding the Serbs, Hitrey considers that they came to the Elbe and the Saale with the name originating from the old Sarmats” (p. 140). He mentions the fatal migration at the beginning of the fifth century when the Wandals, Swevs and Burgundies, as Germanic peoples, abandoned that territory and left for the Rhine. Novaković considers that it could have happened even before the fourth century, when the Boy, as a Celtic people, left Bohemia and it became inhabited by the Slavs-Czechs. The German historian Neugebauer writes of the Serbs who lived near Germany in 1618, especially about the Bodrić and Ljutić tribes, and indicates that their land was later inhabited by the Poles, possibly after their migration to the Balkan Peninsula. “The Poles are of Slavic and Sarmatian origin. A long time ago, coming from Sarmatia and crossing the river Vistula, they came to the part of Germania which was before that time inhabited by the Vends or Wandals [...] Neugebauer expresses his belief that the Vends lived in Germania before the arrival of the other Slavs in the following sentence, in which he says that those newly arrived Slavs obtained names from the neighbouring tribes already living there, which were called not only Vends or Vinds, but also Wandals” (p. 146). That could explain the fact that the present language of the Lusatia Serbs is closer to Polish than to Serbian. When the huge mass of Serbs moved out, some of them still remained in the first Serbia from the Elbe to the Vistula. They were encountered there by the Polish, who assimilated the majority of them and significantly influenced the language of the remaining part. We should bear in mind that, at this time, the differences between certain dialects of the Slav language were incomparably less than today, when the primary Slav language has split into a large number of individual languages through the constant development of dialects. Poland was not inhabited from far away, but from the vicinity, while the neighbouring areas remained very sparsely populated. Additionally, the confusion in discerning between the Vends and the Wandals is present in some other authors, but history has clarified that long since. Without any doubt, the Wandals are one of the German peoples, while the Vends are Slavs, Serbs above all.

Bohuslav Balbin quotes Veleslavin and his saying that “in 451, the Slavs or Vinds inhabiting Vistula, suppressed the remaining Wandals at Oder and Saale and took the area of the later Macklenburg and Pomerania, and then they captured March, Brandenburg and Mysnia” (p. 157). This is therefore the piece of data indicating that the Serbs spread from the direction of the Vistula towards the Elbe. On the confluence of the Oder, a large city named Vinita was located. It was later destroyed by the Danes,

but it is attested by various sources to be the largest European city outside the Roman Empire. The direct distinction between the Vends-Serbs and the Poles and Czechs to which the Croats belong is obvious and it is present in Otrokini, Balbina, Pesina, Crieger, Jeca, Clüver, Bangert, Joan Mihremij, Neugebauer, Elias Reisner and other authors, whose points of view are considered by Novaković in detail. Similar writings can be later found by Banduri, Krieger, Rundlig and Eckhart, who aim to solve the ancient Slavic past, and who regularly draw a parallel between the Serbs and the Vends, indicating that they belong to the Sarmates as a broader ethnic determinant. In 1730, Schetgen and Kreutzig write of two Serbias - a Vend and a Balkan one, indicating the Lusatian Sorbs and their Balkan relatives. "Reminding immediately that Ptolemy at the time of Augustus wrote that some Serbs live between the Ceraunian Mountains and the river Ra (Volga), and that that Plinius in the mid 1st century wrote that there are also Serbs living among the peoples inhabiting the area around the Meotian Sea (the Sea of Azov). Writers interpret this as a movement of Ptolemy's Serbs a bit towards Europe within fifty years" (p. 163-164). That Serbian movement went towards the west until they established the "large province" of Serbia in Germania. From there, they moved to the Balkans and there the authors quote Constantine Porphyrogenitus. It is interesting that both Schetgen and Kreutzig call the Kingdom of Slavonia and Bosnia the White Serbia. The name may be imprecise, but there is no doubt they were acquainted with the fact that, since their arrival in the Balkans, the Serbs inhabited both Slavonia and Bosnia.

It is also significant when Wendebourg explains in 1732 how the Serbs inhabited Mysnia. "In the third century, when the Teutonic peoples began to change places for the first time, Hermundurs moved from the land o Meisen, which they inhabited until then, to the Danube and, after that, with the Swevs to whom they belong, moved to Gaul and partly to Hispania. So it happened that the Serbs, Vendish people by origin, moved to Mysnia, which was left without inhabitants, and gradually subjugated and populated it entirely" (p. 165). In 1745, Iordanus Iohannus Christopher in his *Origin of Slavs* claimed that the Slavs came to Germania from Russia. Russia is primarily known as the Big Sarmatia. He says that it must have happened not later than the fourth century. "It is interesting that Iordanus mentions Srb (Serp) in relation to the Serbian move to Dalmatia and says that this area was once inhabited by the Serbs, adding that those were the Serbs among which Ljudevit came, fleeing from Sisak from the Frankish army in 822" (page 167). Johann Christoph Dreyhaupt considers the Serbs and the Vends to be the same people in 1749, as do many other German authors, treating those two terms as synonyms. At the same time, the majority of those authors point out that the Croats are of Czech origin and that they differ from the Serbs in that sense. Some add to that a "Leh", i.e. Polish origin, but it is most probable that one and a half millennia ago, there was almost no difference between the Czechs and Poles.

In his book *Lehs and Czechs* from 1771, Joseph Aleksander Yablonski points out that he "found Serbs mentioned in the eastern part of Europe, and concluded that before they left the Serbs from the parts near the

Volga, in the vicinity of which they lived, first inhabited the areas now called Mysnia and Lusatia, and then came to their present land from Germania, which they named Serbia" (p. 184). In 1772, Theophilus Segerus, quoting Kosma of Prague who claimed that the Bohemian Czechs once called today's province of Mysnia Serbia and that the Lusatia Veneds call themselves Serbs even today, concludes: "What can be more truthful now than the fact that these Slavic Serbs, inhabitants of Misnia, founded the kingdoms of Slavonia and Serbia in Illyria?" (ps. 188-189). In 1790, the famous German historian Gebhardi, in his *History of Vendish-Slavic States*, asserts that the Serbs "came from Poland in the VI century, not as conquerors but as settlers who were invited to inhabit the lands between the Elbe, the Oder and the Saale [...]" In 630, the Serbian Prince Dervan joined great ruler Samo and freed himself from Frankish and Avar rule. In a further description of events in the mid VII century, it is interesting that, in one note, Gebhardi talks of the size of the Serbian land that encompassed, it seems, part of Lucica and the eastern Schlesian-Polish areas all the way to the Vistula" (p. 199.) With that, Gebhardi explains how the Balkan Serbia was created. "In 640, one exiled Serbian prince got the opportunity to establish the Serbian state of Servica near Thessalonica and Red Serbia. The latter fell apart and was divided into Serbian Dalmatia (or four independent states of Travunija, Duklja, Neretva and Zahumlje), South-Western Slavonia and North Slavonia. From the latter two states, much of the later states of Bosnia, Raška, Serbia and Herzegovina were formed. From the VII to the X century, the motherland in north Germany and Poland had the name of White or Great Serbia" (p. 199-200).

Gebhardi especially indicates that "researchers of older history disagree on the origin and meaning of names (Zrbs, Servii, Siurbs, Sorabs, Sorbs, Serbs, Urbs and Srbsts). Some think that they are of ancient origin, which later appears in the form of Ptolemy's and Plinius's Servias (Servin), who inhabited the steppes of Astrakhan at the time of Christ's birth and later stayed in Severia. Others presume that the oldest name of all the Vends was Serp" (p. 200). Gebhardi thinks that after the death of the Serbian king Dervan in 640, they fought among themselves and the conflict was resolved when the weaker side, led by one of Dervan's sons, left for the Balkans, first to the south, in Servika, and later to Illyria, where they got new land, as well as the Upper Mesia. "In this land, the Serbs spread and founded several states, managed by archonts or bans or župans (zhupans), who remained connected to their motherland on the river Saale in Germany. One tribe, ruled by the so-called king of Slavonia, lived like nomads until 1099 when it was conquered by the Hungarian kings. This tribe inhabited the mountains between Dalmatia, Macedonia, Serbia, Bosnia and Croatia. Another Serbian or Slavonic state that was established on the Dalmatian shore and which fell apart into the smaller states of Paganja, Travunija, Duklja, Neretva area (Narenta) and Zahumlje or Herzegovina, was strengthened from time to time by the Serbs from Germany, but it ceased to exist in 1168 by falling under supreme Greek rule. The Republic of Dubrovnik, which still flourishes, and the states of Serbia and Bosnia, which belonged to Turkey since 1463, and one small

Comment [a1]: Translator's note. We were unable to find any source in order to translate the name so we left it in the original Serbian version. Possible spelling g: Otrochinius

Comment [a2]: Translator's note. We were unable to find any source in order to translate the name so we left it in the original Serbian version.

Comment [a3]: Translator's note. We were unable to find any source in order to translate the name so we left it in the original Serbian version. Possible spelling: Iordanus Michremius

2. The Balkans before the Serbian Migration

Archaeological finds indicate that people have inhabited the Balkans for over forty thousand years before the Serbs came, but only the last thousand years BC is a historical period, since the ancient Greek and Roman civilizations left written records on everything. Layers of prehistoric culture enable overviews of all three basic periods of the Stone Age, which is divided into the Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic eras, as well as the Metallic Age, further divided into the Copper, Bronze and Iron Ages. People inhabited these parts at the end of the last ice age, which is significantly later than the inhabitation of western European areas, but the migrations were more frequent, cultural dynamics was faster and the conflicts between the agricultural and nomadic groups were more intense. At first, highly diverse and primitive, through development and constant enrichment from outside, the Balkan culture became more and more individual and harmonized between the different social groups and, as some authors note, probably more homogenous in the ethnic sense. Firstly, as clearly differentiated ethnic groups identified by history in the Iron Age (at the end of the second and the beginning of the first millennium BC) there are Dardans, Tribals, Illyrians and Thracians. The statement may be only conditionally true, since we must bear in mind that this is a time with a low level of development of social consciousness and rapid ethnic assimilations. Besides the four basic groups, the Panons, Autariats, Skordiscs, Penests, Pances, Dacians etc. appeared before the arrival of the Romans. All of them were included in the process of cultural pervasion, parallel with the strengthening of mutual economic relations, especially trade. They were particularly exposed to the Greek cultural influence. There were often plundering wars, especially when the Celts appeared on the Balkans from the north at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the third centuries and the Scythians from the east, raising the encountered native population in their march towards the southern parts. Agriculture was increasingly being replaced by plunder, which became a more efficient branch of the economy of peoples who were culturally far behind the Mediterranean civilizations for several centuries.

There were many wars, but with little written data about them. The Tribals, for example, significantly affected the ancient Macedonia but were suppressed by Aleksandar the Great and soon disappeared as a people. Aleksandar also defeated the Dardans and the Illyrians, before he left for his eastern conquests. Half way through the second century, the Romans conquered Macedonia and systematically went northwards to the Danube. The entire area was controlled by them during the transition between the old and the new era. But the border on the Danube was restless and affected by constant wars. The Romans found that the Balkan peoples had various degrees of social, cultural and political development and a mass uprising against Roman rule began in year 6 AD that affected the entire Roman state. Only the disagreement between the rebels enabled

Serbian settlement near the Bulgarian city of Sofia were created from it, in a certain sense. In all these countries, Serbian settlers preserved the administration of their (old) homeland and their love towards it was so strong that Greek and Roman places were renamed after German villages and towns" (p.202).

In the book, published in a new edition in 1808 in Pest and entitled *The History of the Kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia, Serbia, Raška, Bosnia, Rama and the Republic of Dubrovnik*, Gebhardi points out that the Serbian Vends possessed "not only Serbia and Bosnia, but also the parts of Dalmatia between the towns of Draca, Dubrovnik and Neretva, as well as the islands of Mljet, Brač, Hvar and Korčula. Opposed to them, the Croatian Vends inhabited western Dalmatia through to the border with Istria and the Vendish March, as well as the area to the Sava and Cetina - and maybe even to the Drava... The Croats finally founded the Hungarian-Slavonian and Dalmatian-Croatian state, while the Serbs formed the present Bosnian and Serbian state, which primarily consisted of four smaller states, and then two larger monarchies, which spread from Omis to Vardar and Drac" (p. 203). At the same time, Gebhardi claims that the Serbs came to Germany in the fifth century from the direction that led through Poland and that they inhabited a wide area from the Elbe and Saale, to the Oder and Vistula.

In 1783, Karl Gotlieb Anton writes that the Serbs are Slavs who lived on the Volga and who, together with Yazig, represent the ancestors of the Slavs. "Gotlieb points out that it seems very probable to him that the old, first name of the Serbs and Yazig was Serbs (Serben) and that later that people split into two groups, the Serbs and the Yazigs" (p. 205). He quotes the ancient writers Strabon and Ptolemy, and later Prokopius, Jordan, Popovic, Tredyakovski and others. Among other things, Gotlib bases his belief that the Serbs are a very old ethnic group on the claim that the Serbs are one of the most famous peoples. He says: "We still have one kingdom of Serbia and the Vends in the Upper and Lower Lusatia call themselves Serbs (Serben); Meisen and Lusatia were called Serbia in the Middle Ages" (p. 206). Gotlieb also goes to point out that the Byzantines called the land, which stretched from the Gallus River to the Elbe River, Great Serbia, considering that the Serbs inhabited that territory since before Tacitus, and not from the fifth century.

Safarik locates the first Great Serbia as stretching from the district of Minsk and the river Bug in the east, through Poland, Lusatia, and part of the Czech Republic behind the Laba or the Elbe as it is known by the Germans. He presumes that the Serbs from Red Russia came to that area. Observing the great similarity between the Serbian and Belarus languages, Safarik thought that the Serbs came directly from there to the Balkans and he thus explains the fact that Lusatian Serbian is closer to Czech and Polish. He, therefore, neglects the large ethnic and linguistic influence of the Poles and Czechs on the remaining small number of Serbs after their majority left for the Balkans. Presuming that the Serbs came to the Balkans from Red Russia, he thinks that the old Serbian land of Boyka is today's Russin Boyka in eastern Galitia. He considers the Lusatian, Bodrić and Ljutić tribes to belong to Polabian Serbs, stating that they inhabit the

the Romans to suppress the uprising after three years of bloody fights. The Balkans was constantly restless under Roman rule as well, but roads were quickly built, the state administration was developed and systematic Romanization was carried out. The entire area of Illyria was divided into two provinces - Upper Mesia, which covered mainly today's Serbia, while the western Serbian lands were encompassed by the province of Dalmatia. A large number of towns and military camps were built. At the end of the fourth century, the Roman Balkan provinces were mostly affected by the Goths and Ostrogoths, but also by the Huns and Alans, who would soon take over the leading position among the barbarians. In order to resist the Huns, emperors settled the border areas with the Goths and Sarmats. However, the Huns were unstoppable and, in mid fifth century, they reached deep into Greece. The Romans recognized the border that went through Niš and the Huns completely emptied the entire territory within five days walk north of Niš in order to prevent recruitment into the Roman army. Mesia and Pomoravlje were completely devastated. When Attila died, the Huns lost primacy over the barbarians, but the barbarians continued to attack the Roman positions on the Balkans. In the second half of the fifth century, almost the entire peninsula was plundered by Ostrogoths. In the first half of the sixth century, the emperor Justinian defeated the Goths and enforced the border area around the Danube, facing the Pannonian Gepides. Gepides called to the Avars for help, a people of Hun origin and even more blood-thirsty than Attila's warriors. The Scythians appeared at the same time. The Avars and the Scythians are most probably the same people.

Prokopius writes of the first Slav attack in the Balkans, which happened at the time of the emperor Justin I who ruled from 518 to 527. Those were Ants and Slavines, who lived in the steppes north of the Danube confluence. The nomadic Bulgarians appear at the same time, and the Byzantine authors say that they were Huns. The Slavines and Ants went through the Vlaška forests and steppes to Thrace. Many Ants joined the Byzantine army as mercenaries, thus defending Thrace from the Bulgarians. Both the Ants and Slavines inhabited the Danube shore from Đerdap to the Black Sea. "Based on archaeological excavations of ceramic of the 'Penkovka' type, we can follow the path of Ants' movement from Ukraine in the west to Đerdap, while the Slavine migrations can be determined by the discovery of urns of the 'Prag-Korsek' type in the area of the Czech Republic, Moravia and areas behind the Carpathian mountains, to Vlaška and Moldavia." (*History of the Serbian People*, volume I, page 110). In 545 and 550, there were two large Slavine plundering raids over the Danube and into Thrace, to Niš, even Drač, reaching the walls of Constantinople at one point and covering the entire area of Dalmatia. After plundering everything that crossed their path, the Slavines withdrew to the north of the Danube River. In their crossing of the Danube they were assisted by the Gepids, who were at war with Langobards as Byzantine allies. In 551, the Gepids helped the Avars (Huns) cross to the south of the Danube in order to plunder the Balkan provinces and they reached Thessalonica and Constantinople. The Slavines and Ants only killed men in wars, while they captured women

and children and naturalized them; the Avars killed everybody, without mercy or compassion - especially the mightiest Avar tribe, the Kutrigurs.

In 559 the Kutrigurs charged over the frozen Danube in masses, leading all the other Avarian tribes. The Byzantine writer Teophan claims that they were followed by a mass of Slavines. They reached Thrace and Thermopylae and almost reached the Constantinople city gates. Soon the force of Avars was significantly weakened because the Byzantine diplomacy managed to start a bloody feud between their two main tribes, the Kutrigurs and the Utigurs, but they were able to enter Thrace in 562. There were serious clashes between the Avars and the Ants, and soon the Avars defeated the Gepides, formerly their allies. A new Avar invasion came in 567 and it lasted for almost two years in the entire area of Bosnia and Dalmatia. Byzantium was threatened already in 578 by Slavines from Vlaška and the emperor formed an alliance with the Avars who seriously harmed Slavines but did not succeed in stopping their invasion. After the unsuccessful siege of Thessalonica, the Slavines returned to their bank of the Danube in 584 with enormous gains. In 582, the Avars renewed their conflict with Byzantium and conquered Sirmium and Singidunum. In 586, the Slavines were again before Thessalonica. That same year, the Avars plundered the entire area of Mesia (Serbia), leaving it almost completely without population. In 588 the Avars broke into Mesia and Scythia and the Slavines into Thrace, to Peloponnesus. In 591, the Byzantine emperor Mauritius managed to come to peace with the Persians and transfer his entire army to the Balkans in order to suppress the Avars. He made an agreement with the Slavines and enabled them to inhabit the Bulgarian and Romanian banks of the Danube and they helped him in his campaign against the Avars upstream to Sirmium.

In the new advance in 594, the Avars were defeated, but the next battle was lost by the army of the Empire and the Avars found themselves on the Sea of Marmara. That same year, there was a conflict between the Byzantine army and the Slavines on the territory of Vlaška, which continued the following year. The Slavines already inhabited the entire territory of today's Bulgaria and Thrace. To the west, besides the completely devastated Mesia, the Avars again plundered Bosnia and Dalmatia in 597. In 599 they continued to Nikopolis. It was only in the year 600 that the Avars were completely defeated by the Byzantine army on Titel hill, but that army experienced a complete disaster in 602 when it attacked the Slavines. The army rebelled against the emperor who was killed along with his entire family. But, when leaving the Danube front, it enabled mass colonization by the Slavines and Bulgarians (peoples of Avar origin). The Bulgarians were incomparably less numerous than the Slavines but, they played the leading role from 680. In time they became completely Slavic, leaving the Bulgarian name to the Slavines. Constantinople was attacked again in 626 by the Slavines, led by the Avars. During the siege, there were conflicts between the Avars and the Slavines and the Avars withdrew, leaving the Slavines, Bulgarians and Gepids to permanently inhabit the conquered territories.

II. Serbian Political History

1. State-Forming History before the Nemanjić Family

The Serbs were invited to the Balkan Peninsula by the emperor Heraclius, who ruled between 610 and 641. They came from the north of Europe and they were not yet converted to Christianity, though Porphyrogenitus says they were called the White Serbs. The previous ruler was succeeded by two sons and one of them led part of the people to the Byzantine lands. First they inhabited the territory near Thessalonica and, after that, the region between the river Sava and the Dinara Mountain range. "A Srb in Lika is obviously related to the old tribal name of the Serbs. One group of Serbs remained north of Olympus. Its centre was in Srbica (Servia, Serfiye). The Byzantines very quickly tore a part of them and resettled them to Asia Minor, where the earliest mention of the Serbian tribal name was preserved in the name of the town of Gordoservon in Bythnia, documented in 680-681" (p. 144). The first Serbian princedoms were Neretljansko, Zahumsko, Travunijsko and Dukljansko. The Serbs inhabited an almost barren land, and they assimilated what little remaining Romanized old Balkan population they encountered. The old population left significant traces in the further development of the Serbian language. As opposed to the Croats and the Bulgarians, the Serbs were never under the supreme power or domination of the Avars. They accepted Byzantine rule, but it was very loose and very often purely formal due to the general circumstances of the empire, and this was the case for a full two hundred years after their settlement there. The expansion of the Bulgarian state at the beginning of the ninth century would bring many Serbs under its power in 827, such as Timocan, Moravci and the Serbs from the banks of the Danube River. "The Byzantine-Bulgarian rivalry that influenced the development of the eastern part of the Balkan Peninsula continued and was transferred to the central areas in which the Serbs lived. That rivalry determined the political position of the oldest Serbian state and significantly influenced its development" (p. 147).

Porphyrogenitus says that the ruler's son, who led the Serbs to the Balkans, died before the Bulgarian invasion, i.e. before 680, and was succeeded by his son, then his grandson, and consequently by the entire line of rulers from the same order, but history only records the names of the Princes Visoslav, Radoslav, Prosigoj and Vlastimir. There is no special data about the rule of the first three, though Vlastimir managed to defend Serbia from the Bulgarians between 836 and 852. Vlastimir was the grand duke and he married his daughter to Krajina, the son of his vassal, the Zhupan of Travunijan Veloje, and bestowed on him the title of prince, which was the beginning of the individual local dynasty to which the Princes Hvalimir and Čučimir belonged. Vlastimir's heirs, Mutimir, Strojimir and Gojnik, shared the land between themselves but, as the eldest son, Mutimir kept the leading role. In 852, the Bulgarian khan Boris was also defeated in an attempt to conquer Serbia. Since Vlastimir's sons

IT-03-67-T
fought among themselves in the meantime and Mutimir won, he entrusted Khan Boris with watching over his younger brothers, while Gojnik's son Petar escaped to Croatia. As an outcast, Strojimir's son Klonimir married a Bulgarian woman of high birth and fathered Časlav. "The branching of the Serbian ruling order and its dissipation by leaving for the neighbouring countries had subsequent unfavourable consequences. Stems of the ruling dynasty were an adequate weapon for foreign forces in their fight for influence and supreme rule over Serbia" (p. 149). Mutimir ruled until 892, without questioning the supreme Byzantine Empire rule and not having any problems with it, since the Byzantine Empire did not attempt to interfere with internal Serbian relations.

Prince Mutimir was succeeded by his eldest son Pribislav in 892, but his power was taken away from him by Gojnik's son Petar. Petar's rule was unsuccessfully challenged by Mutimir's middle son Bran. When Petar defeated and imprisoned him, he ordered Bran to be blinded so that he could no longer have pretences to the throne. With Bulgarian assistance, Strojimir's son Klonimir attempted to take over the throne in 898, but he was defeated and killed by Petar. Petar managed to conquer the Serbian Princedom of Neretva, but Hum, which was ruled by Prince Mihailo Višević, remained out of his control. In 917, upon being informed by Mihailo Višević that Petar was in league with the Byzantine delegation on an anti-Bulgarian basis during the big wars between Bulgaria and Byzantium, the Bulgarian emperor Simeon sent an army to Serbia, led by Pavle Branović. Petar Gojniković was tricked and enslaved, and the throne was seized by Pavle, recognizing the Bulgarian supreme rule instead of the Byzantine one. He was unsuccessfully challenged with the assistance of Byzantium by Zaharije, the son of Pribislav, and he was seized and delivered to the Bulgarians by Pavle. As Pavle in the meantime crossed over to the Byzantine side, Simeon supported Zaharije who won the throne in 920, driving Pavle from the country. Zaharije immediately revolted against the Bulgarians and crossed over to the Byzantine side, completely defeating the Bulgarian army sent by Simeon to intervene. The subsequent Bulgarian strike, led by Klonimir's son Časlav in 924, was so fierce that Zaharije fled the country. Almost all the Serbian nobility was then captured and taken to Bulgaria, along with a large number of Serbs. A lot of the population escaped to Croatia across the river Cetina and the rest sought Byzantine protection. The Bulgarians then broke the Serbian state-forming power and Princedoms of Neretva, Hum, Travunia and Duklja became independent.

When Simeon died in 927, Časlav, who was formerly protected by the Bulgarians, used the confusion in the empire to escape to Serbia and renew the country with Byzantine help and many of the displaced Serbs returned from the neighbouring countries. The western border of Serbia ran along the Cetina, close to Livno and along the Pliva, the north border was on the Sava, including Bosnia, Usora and Soli. In the east, Serbia encompassed the valley of the West Morava and the south border reached all the way to Drač. "Bosnia was a part within Serbia, limited to the valley of the river with the same name and it was not until later, most probably during the time of Ivek, that the name of Bosnia spread to the western part

of the former Serbia” (p. 162). The Bosnian part of Serbia was threatened by the Hungarians, but Časlav defeated them and killed the Hungarian PGrand Duke Géza. But, in another conflict on the banks of Sava, Časlav was captured by the Hungarians and drowned in the Sava. There is no reliable data about Časlav’s heirs and the subsequent destiny of the Serbian state, but it seems that Serbia was divided into Raška and Duklja. Duklja was ruled by Časlav’s half brother and Radoslav’s son from his second marriage, while Raška was ruled by Tihomir, whom Časlav wanted as his heir. According to the legend, Tihomir first introduced the title of grand župan. Historical documents again speak of the Serbian state of Duklja, ruled by the Byzantine ally Jovan Vladimir, which was the reason why the Bulgarian Emperor Samuil went to war against Duklja in 998. Samuil devastated Raška, Duklja and Bosnia, but returned the captured Jovan Vladimir to the Duklja throne, previously marrying him to his daughter. All the Serbian lands were now under Samuil’s supreme rule. Samuil was defeated in 1014 by the Byzantine army of emperor Vasilus II and died that same year, with his state being engulfed in severe unrest over the inheritance of the throne, during which Jovan Vladimir was executed in 1016. When Samuil’s heir Jovan Vladislav fell to Drač in 1018, all Serbian lands once again fell under supreme Byzantine rule, but divided into more independent princedoms.

The entire area of Serbia to the west of Raška was, in an administrative sense, one Byzantine thema ruled by the empire administrator or commander. Historical proof of the existence of the commander and strategist of Serbia were preserved. It is possible that the seat of the thema of Serbia was in Sirmium. Constantine Diogenes was the administrator of Sirmium and the strategist of Serbia at the same time - that is, of the watershed of the Morava and Belgrade, considering that Raška, Duklja, Bosna and Zahumlje had the status of vassal states. Zahumlje encompassed the previous Neretva princedom, but its territories to the north of the river Neretva were taken from time to time by the Croats. The Hum princes often extended their rule to the old Serbian border on the river Cetina, holding the islands of Brač, Hvar and Korčula. Already in 1034 the Duklja ruler Stefan Vojislav, most probably coming from Hum or Travunija, rebelled against the supreme Byzantine rule. The Byzantines suppressed his rebellion in 1036, capturing him. After a year, Vojislav escaped captivity and started a new rebellion, becoming independent in 1038. In 1040, he defeated a new Byzantine army expedition and an even bigger one in 1042. Vojislav managed to include the entire areas of Zahumlje and Travunija into his state. As Byzantium could not conquer Vojislav, the emperor was forced to compromise. Duklja remained independent, recognizing a formal vassal relationship with Byzantium. In 1055, Vojislav was succeeded by his son Mihailo, who strengthened good relations with Byzantium. However, in 1072, when major uprisings on the Macedonian territories began, Mihailo responded to the rebellion leaders’ request and sent his son Bodin to be their leader. Bodin was pronounced emperor Petar. In the first attempt, the Byzantine army was defeated and the rebels took a very wide territory, but they were finally broken. Bodin was taken prisoner and his father had to

make serious efforts to free him. Due to the internal Byzantine weaknesses and rebellions, Mihailo not only remained in power, but he managed to conquer Dubrovnik in 1077. When the Normans from the south of Italy succeeded in coming into Byzantium via Drač in 1082, Mihailo’s son Bodin used the opportunity to incorporate Raška and Bosnia into his state, at least for a short time, and to renew the former Serbia. When the Normans were driven away, the Byzantine army commander succeeded in defeating and capturing Bodin sometime before 1090, but Bodin made an agreement with the emperor in 1091 and returned to the Serbian throne. Historical records hold more data about Bodin’s cordial relations with the crusaders.

King Bodin brought Zhupan Vukan and his brother Marko to power in Raška somewhere in the 80s. Vukan was a close relative of Bodin, but it is not known on which grounds. In all the conflicts with Byzantium, Vukan was a reliable ally to Bodin and he managed to take the entire area of Kosovo and Metohija, leading successful wars until 1106. When king Bodin died in 1101, Vukan participated in the internal dynastic conflicts in Duklja. Vukan was replaced on the throne in the inner Serbian lands by his nephew Uroš I. When the Emperor John II Comnenos won the Byzantine-Hungarian war in 1129, the Serbs were seriously plundered as Hungarian allies, and a large number of them was moved to Nicomedia in Asia Minor. However, the alliance between Serbia and Hungary was strengthened in 1130 when Jelena, daughter of Uroš I married the Hungarian king Béla II, enabling Raška to continue the fight for independence from Byzantine rule, considering that it could not expect more significant help from Duklja, which was torn by inner conflicts. At the time of the new Hungarian-Byzantine war in 1149, Serbia was ruled by Uroš II, son of Uroš I and the brother of Hungarian Queen Jelena and commander Belosh. The Byzantine army plundered Serbia and Serbian ruler Uroš II was defeated in 1150 at the battle of Valjevo, being forced to negotiate and accept the renewal of the vassal relationship.

2. Serbia at the Time of the Nemanjić Family

There were major shocks in the Serbian ruling family, and the great Zhupan Uroš II was deposed in 1155 and his brother Desa was brought to the throne. The Byzantine emperor managed to return Uroš II to power for a short time but Desa soon regained the position of grand župan, although until then he ruled the Serbian territories near the sea - Zeta, Trebinje and Zahumlje. There is no reliable data on all these events but, in 1162, the Byzantine Emperor Manuel Comnenos brought Desa to rule in Raška, who in return denounced the rich area of Dendra near Niš. Since Desa remained in close relations with the Hungarian court, he was invited to Niš in 1163, where Manuel arrested him and sent him to prison in Constantinople. When he returned to Serbia he died in Trebinje, where he was buried. After Desa, Grand Zhupan Tihomir, brother of Stefan Nemanja, is mentioned as holding the throne of Raška, and he came from a family which was closely related both to the Raška and Zeta dynasties. Their father Zavida was forced to escape to Zeta in the first half of the

twelfth century and his son Nemanja was born in Ribnica and baptized in a Latin ceremony, in order to be baptized again according to Orthodox church rituals when the family returned to Ras. He was district prefect of Toplica, Ibar, Rasina and Reka. He became close to the emperor Manuel I Comnenos and gained his trust, receiving the area of Leskovac to manage. Nevertheless, he argued with his brothers. He deposed Tihomir and became great župan in 1168. The dethroned brother and his followers got Byzantine assistance and a mercenary army, which was defeated in Kosovo by Stefan Nemanja, and this also where Tihomir was killed. The new grand župan succeeded in renewing relations with the Byzantine emperor and establishing his rule. In 1172 he was already at war with Byzantium, being in close relations with the Hungarians, Germans and Venetians. Forced to negotiate, Stefan Nemanja was captured and taken to Constantinople, where he pledged allegiance to the emperor Manuel I Comnenos. Upon his return to Serbia, he respected the pledge until the emperor's death.

When Emperor Manuel died in 1180, the political situation in the Balkans changed at its very root. Byzantium was engulfed in internal discontent and power struggles in which a heir to the throne who was still not of age was killed. Hungary renewed conflicts, and the Serbian-Hungarian army reached Sofia in 1183. Stefan Nemanja started fighting to take over Duklja from Byzantine rule, putting the dynastic rights of his family in the first place. The attempt was successful and he gave Dukljato his eldest son Vukan to rule in 1186. Then Nemanja's brothers, the Princes Miroslav and Stratimir, unsuccessfully besieged Dubrovnik. Nemanja organized an official greeting to the German Emperor Friedrich I Barbarossa and his army in Niš in 1189. While Byzantium feared the unknown true intentions of the huge German crusade army, the Serbian ruler took an opportunity to expand his territory to Kosovo, Metohija and Skoplje and the entire area between the Western and the Great Morava. He was defeated by the Byzantine army in 1190 on the Morava and the emperor temporarily regained Niš and Belgrade. There were negotiations in which the independence of the Serbian state was practically internationally recognized and Nemanja's son Stefan was offered the emperor's niece as a wife. Besides that, the Serbs accepted the supreme rule of the Byzantine emperor but without any actual obligations - that is symbolically. Nemanja was recognized over all the conquered territories and Serbia encompassed Levač and Lepenica in the north and the valley of Morava in the east. It extended to Vranje in the south and Zeta, Travunija and Zahumlje in the west.

a) Gaining Full State Independence

On gaining state independence, Serbia entered into a period of enmity with Hungary, with which it had a conflict of strategic interests. Nemanja got support from the Byzantine army in the Serbian-Hungarian war in 1192. In 1196, he assembled a great state assembly at which he transferred power to his middle son Stefan, announcing his will to become a monk. Nemanja renewed the monastery of Hilandar and died in 1199. In 30

1202, the brothers Stefan and Vukan had a serious quarrel. The latter joined Hungarian King Emeric and the Hungarian army invaded Serbia, driving Stefan out. Emeric introduced his title of king into Serbia and his heirs preserved it until 1918. Vukan accepted the supreme rule of Emeric. The first to oppose it was Bosnian Ban Kulin, who had been a Hungarian vassal until then and whose sister was the wife of Nemanja's brother, Miroslav, Prince of Hum. Serbia was attacked and devastated by the Bulgarian Emperor Kaloyan in 1203. This significantly weakened Vukan and enabled Stefan to return to the throne in 1205 after a persistent fight. The youngest of Nemanja's sons, the monk Sava, mediated and appeased the quarrelling brothers.

The collapse of Byzantium in 1204 created new perspectives for the Serbian state and boosted the old ambitions for expansion towards the south. Stefan Nemanjić ended his marriage with a Byzantine princess and married the granddaughter of the Doge of Venice Enrico Dandolo. Ana Dandolo persuaded her husband to accept Catholicism, gave him a son, Uroš, and died in 1217. Stefan received the royal crown from the Pope Honorius III. When Sava Nemanjić obtained independence of the Serbian church from the Emperor of Nicaea and patriarch in 1219, Stefan Prvovenčani (Translator's note: Stefan the First-Crowned) abandoned his pro-western orientation and directed himself towards the east. Stefan's coronation ended Hungarian plans on the Balkans and strengthened the state independence of Serbia. Stefan had to intervene in Zahumlje where, after the death of Prince Miroslav, his son from the first marriage Petar chased away Miroslav's widow and his minor son Andrija. Stefan defeated Petar and gave the coast of Ston and Popovo polje to prince Andrija, leaving to Petar the territory between the rivers Neretva and Cetina. After that he became friends with the ruler of Epirus Theodore I Angelus, who soon became the Emperor of Thessalonica and pretender to the throne of Constantinople. Stefan married his eldest son Radoslav to the emperor's daughter. When his father died, Radoslav inherited the Serbian throne in 1228 and led extremely pro-Greek and pro-Byzantine politics. However, his father in law was disastrously defeated in 1230 by the Bulgarian Emperor John II Asen. Radoslav lost his main stronghold and was driven from the throne by rebelling nobility in 1234, which brought his younger brother Vladislav to the throne.

King Vladislav's political position was oriented towards the Bulgarians and he married Beloslava, the daughter of Emperor John II Asen. When the Hungarians threatened Zahumlje in 1237, under the pretence of pursuing the Bogomiles, Vladislav rushed with his army as far as the river Cetina. There he signed an alliance agreement with the town of Split. Then a Mongol invasion thundered through Serbia in 1241 like a storm. That same year, the Bulgarian emperor died and the nobility became increasingly dissatisfied. Vladislav was forced to give the throne to his youngest brother Uroš I, who ruled for the following 33 years.

During the first years of Uroš's rule, the political situation in the Balkans was favourable for the Serbian state. The Bulgarians and Hungarians were significantly weakened by Mongol plundering and the

Nicean Empire, with which Serbian ruler was in good relations, spread to the south. Uroš rarely went to war, directing all his power towards strengthening and stabilizing the state. Mining, agriculture and trade developed. The king was in conflict with Dubrovnik around 1252 over the Roman Catholic Church's dispute between the Bar and Dubrovnik archbishops. The Roman Catholic influence was introduced at the court by Queen Helene d'Anjou. In 1253, an unsuccessful attack on Serbia was led by the Bulgarian emperor Michael Asen. There were problems with the Hum Prince Radoslav, who formed alliances with Dubrovnik, the Bulgarians and the Hungarians in turns. The relations with the Bulgarians were significantly improved with the Emperor Constantine Tikh Asen in 1257, who was half Serbian and proud to have Nemanja and St Sava as his ancestors. That same year, Uroš involved himself in the conflict between Epirus and Nicea, thus ending the friendship with the Nicaeans and conquering Skoplje. Uroš I attempted to conquer Mačva from the Hungarians in 1258, but was defeated and taken prisoner. Peace was achieved through marriage between Uroš's son Dragutin and the Hungarian king's granddaughter Katalina. Uroš renewed his friendship with the Nicaeans when Michael VIII Palaiologos came to the throne of the empire in 1258 and succeeded in renewing Byzantium in 1261. This friendship was ended by a failed engagement between Uroš's younger son Milutin with the emperor's daughter Ana.

Uroš succeeded in eliminating the local power of subsidiary branches of the Nemanjić family tree in Zahumlje, Travunija and Duklja and to reduce them to the role of provincial nobility, while the role of the highest king's officials was taken by loyal members of other noble families. Miroslav's and Vukan's line soon died. Uroš I besieged Dubrovnik in 1275 but, the following year, he entered into serious conflict with his son Dragutin, which led to war in which Dragutin was assisted by the Hungarian and Kuman armies. Uroš I was defeated and withdrew to Zahumlje, entered a monastery and died the following year. Dragutin became king in 1276, but remained on the throne for only six years. In 1271, the Byzantine army attacked Serbia, reaching Lipljan, and at the beginning of 1282 Dragutin fell from his horse and broke his leg. He abdicated at a gathering in Deževu on behalf of his brother Milutin, and he got the northern parts of Serbia to rule.

King Milutin immediately went to war against Byzantium in 1282, taking Skoplje, Polog, Ovče polje and Zletovo, reaching Bregalnica. Michael VIII Palaiologos prepared a counter attack, but he died late that year. His heir, Andronicus II Palaiologos, sent his army on a punishing and plundering operation in 1283. The army was composed of Tatars and it was soon forced to retreat by the Serbs. Dragutin assisted his brother and the Serbian army came to the Aegean shore and Athos in 1284. The brothers returned to the north with substantial loot and, when his troops had rested, Milutin took Strumica, Prosek, Prilep, Ohrid and Kroja, establishing a new border on that line and stabilizing it. Milutin's attention was then directed to the north, where Dragutin acquired Mačva-Bosnian ban's dominion from his mother in law, the Hungarian queen Elisabeth, significantly extending the territory under his command. Within

that territory, Dragutin got Belgrade and, immediately after that, Braničevo and he started leading his foreign policy independently from Milutin. The Tatars then reached deeply into the Bulgarian and Hungarian lands and the Tatar vassals from Gornjačka gorge on the river Mlava, Drman and Kudelin attacked Dragutin's lands. However, Dragutin's raid against those plunderers was unsuccessful and they devastated the majority of Dragutin's territory with the assistance of the Tatars and the Kumans. Milutin came to his aid and they completely defeated the enemy, annexing the entire area of Braničevo to Dragutin's part of the Serbian kingdom. The second Tatar vassal, Prince Shishman of Vidin wanted revenge and came near Peć with a great army. In the counter strike, Milutin seriously defeated Shishman and took Vidin. After that, he made peace with the Bulgarian nobleman and married his daughter Ana to Shishman's son Michael. In order to appease the Tatar khan Nogay as the Bulgarian lord, Milutin expressed his loyalty by sending him his son Stefan with several boyar sons as prisoners. However, Nogay was soon killed in internal Tatar conflicts and there was no more danger to Serbia from that side.

After Dragutin, as lord of one part of Serbia, Bosnia, Mačva and Krajina, substantially reinforced his position and became independent, relations between the brothers worsened, which stopped further offensives against Byzantium. However, Milutin took Drač away from the Byzantines in 1296 and, the following year, a big Byzantine march on Serbia failed. In 1299, Milutin entered a peace treaty with the emperor Andronicus II. Milutin surrendered his third wife, the Princess Ana, and a group of hostages to the Byzantines and, at the same time married the emperor's six-year-old daughter Simonida and got the territories through to the line of Ohrid, Prilep and Štip, which he had previously conquered, as her dowry. Dragutin had similar success in the north as well. He married his daughter to Bosnian Ban Stjepan I Kotromanić in 1284 and married his son Vladislav to the Hungarian king's niece Constance Meresini and got the Herceg's domain of Slavonia from King Andrija III as hereditary territory in 1292. When Andrija died, Dragutin intervened with the inheritance proceedings as pretender to the Hungarian throne. In 1201 there was a war between Milutin and Dragutin. Using the conflict between the brothers, the Croatian ban Pavle Šubić came into Serbia, conquering the territories of Hum. Milutin captured Pavle's nephew Mladen II and forced Šubić's army to retreat from Hum in 1306. There is no direct historical data about the war between Milutin and Dragutin but it lasted for a long time and caused great destruction in Serbia. Milutin was driven by the thought of accepting a union and negotiated with the Popes on that issue through emissaries. He formed alliances with western rulers who aimed at renewing the Latin empire.

Dragutin had no success in the Hungarian conflicts and he did not receive any support for internal Serbian conflicts. The peace between Dragutin and Milutin was reached eventually in 1312, without important territorial movements. Dragutin accepted Milutin's primacy. In 1313, Mladen II Bribirski, Pavle's heir, attacked Serbia and took over Hum and the Neretva valley. Milutin soon regained the temporarily lost territories

and his son Stefan rebelled against his father in 1314, but Milutin's army was incomparably stronger. The defeated Stefan asked forgiveness from his father in the vicinity of Skadar, but Milutin only forgave him on the surface. He imprisoned him in Skoplje, where he was blinded in order to make him incapable of ruling and sent with his family into exile in Constantinople, where he spent seven years. Soon it became obvious that Stefan was not completely blind. On the other side, Dragutin called for a meeting of clergy and noblemen at which he transferred his power to his son Vladislav, entered a monastery soon afterwards and died in 1316. Milutin soon managed to capture and imprison Vladislav, taking over the rule over his territory as well, but by doing this he provoked the enmity of the Hungarian king Carl Robert. At that moment, Milutin was in conflict with Dubrovnik and the Hungarians joined against him with Pope John XXII, Mladen II Bribrski and the south Italian ruler Philip of Tarento. Mladen II attacked Hum again in 1318, with a certain initial success, but he soon had to withdraw from the Neretva valley. The Pope incited the Albanian Catholic feudal lords against the charismatic Serbian king. In 1319, the Hungarian army entered Serbia and captured Mačva and Kolubara, but King Carl Robert had to withdraw temporarily in order to permanently capture those areas the following year.

Before he died, Milutin gave the throne to his younger son Konstantin. He yielded to persuasion from the church circles and allowed his elder son Stefan and his family to return to the homeland in 1320. He gave him the Budimlje zhupa. After that he became seriously ill and this brought the state into internal chaos. He died in 1321. His son Stefan Uroš III Dečanski was crowned king on 6 January 1322 after a certain struggle for the throne. The struggle continued even after the coronation and Konstantin was killed. The confusion enabled Vladislav to escape from the dungeon and he soon took over the control of his father's territories, taking on the title of king, but he lost Usora and Soli, which fell to the Bosnian ban. Stefan took Rudnik away from him. In the land of Hum, his brothers Branivojević became outlaws, but were defeated by the Bosnian ban Stefan II in alliance with Dubrovnik. But when Stefan II took the area from the confluence of the Neretva to the Cetina, and Dubrovnik took Ston and Pelješac, there was a war with the Serbian king. King Stefan regained Pelješac, but not the Neretva Zagorje, where border conflicts with Stefan II continued for a long time. Since his wife died upon his return from the exile, Stefan Uroš III married Maria Palaiologos, the daughter of the nephew of emperor Andronicus II in 1324. Her father was the prefect of Thessalonica. The Serbian army fought in 1327 on the side of emperor Andronicus II against the young emperor Andronicus III, interfering with the internal Byzantine dynastic fights. Then, Byzantium and Bulgaria jointly attacked Serbia in 1330.

Stefan first completely defeated the Bulgarian Emperor Michael Asen, and the king's son Dušan received special fame from that battle. Since Stefan's former son-in-law Michael was killed, Stefan Uroš III brought Ivan Stefan, the son of Michael and his sister, to the Bulgarian throne. When he learned of Michael's fate, Andronicus III quickly abandoned Macedonia, and the Serbs regained their previous property on that territory

without fight. Soon there was a conflict between Stefan Uroš III Dečanski and his son Dušan and there were several military clashes. Father and son were reconciled in 1331, but only for a short period. That same year, Dušan captured his father and kept him in the Zvečan fortress, where he soon died under suspicious circumstances. Stefan's nephew also lost the Bulgarian throne that same year. King Dušan then married Jelena, sister of the new Bulgarian King John Alexander. In 1332 Dušan had to suppress the rebellion of the Zeta noblemen. He gave the entire coastal area, stretching from Ston to Dubrovnik itself, to Dubrovnik in 1333 under the condition that they pay an annual tribute and allow the local population to hold Orthodox Church services. At the same time, he settled the inter-state relations with Stefan II Kotromanić. In 1334, Dušan took his army towards Thessalonica, previously securing the north-western borders, but he soon had to stop that war under the walls of Thessalonica since he was attacked from the north by the Hungarian King Carl Robert. Dušan sealed an agreement with the Emperor Andronicus III Palaiologos that the Serbs could keep Ohrid, Prilep and Strumica. After that, he turned his army against the Hungarians, raised panic among them with quick strikes and drew them across the Sava. The Pope helped the Hungarians and the conflicts continued in 1338 and 1339, and the Serbian army crossed the Sava River. When the throne was inherited in 1342 by Carl's son Layosz I, the attacks on Serbia continued but without significant force and Dušan could turn to the south again. When Andronicus III died in 1341, Byzantium was burdened by nobility fighting over the regency for the minor heir to the throne, which even led to civil war.

b) The Rise and Fall of the Serbian Empire

The unsuccessful usurper to the regency John Cantacuzene escaped to Serbia in 1342. Dušan received him with great honours and formed an agreement with him on alliance against the empress Ana of Savoy, the mother of the minor heir to the throne. John unsuccessfully besieged Ser two times while, in Albania, Dušan took Berat, Kanin and Kroja - almost all of the territories except for the Anjou Drac. After that, he continued his quest in Macedonia, taking the fortresses towards Thessalonica. John Cantacuzene abandoned the alliance with Dušan in 1343 when his Byzantine political strongholds grew stronger. After that, Dušan entered an alliance with Anne of Savoy and married his son Uroš to the sister of the young Emperor John V Palaiologos. In 1345, Dušan took Ser, the peninsula of Chalcidiki, along with Athos and the city of Christopolis. In Ser in 1345, Dušan proclaimed himself emperor and the coronation took place in 1346 in Skoplje, where the state assembly met. In spite of the anathema of the Constantinople Patriarch Calist from 1350, in 1351 the Emperor John V Palaiologos proclaimed Dušan the exalted Tsar of Serbia out of gratitude after Dušan provided him with precious assistance in arms in his fight against John Cantacuzene: "Among the Orthodox Christians, no one had stronger rights than the legitimate emperor to accept or challenge someone's royal rank, and the act of religious punishment pronounced by the patriarch Calist was reduced to

relations between the Constantinople and Peč patriarchies. John V never withdrew his recognition, not even when he became Emperor of Byzantium. Ten years after Dušan's death and under changed political circumstances, he called Dušan's wife Jelena the "exalted empress (despina) of Serbia" (p. 530.)

The Emperor Dušan conquered Epirus and Thessaly in 1348, but he persistently planned to take over Constantinople. In 1349 he published his famous Code. Dušan regained the entire Hum territory all the way to the Krka River in 1350. However, he had to rush back to Macedonia where he was threatened by John VI Cantacuzene with Turkish assistance. The Serbian emperor managed to regain all the lost cities. In 1354, he was forced to drive off the Hungarian King Ludovic I of Rudnik. Dušan suddenly died in 1355. There were suspicions that he was poisoned. The following year, Serbia lost Epirus and Thessaly, but the emperor Uroš managed to drive away Matthew Cantacuzene from the vicinity of Ser. The noblemen Rastislavić from Braničevo bowed to the Hungarian king, which facilitated the efforts of Ludovic I to reach deep into Serbia with his army. The Serbs were driven from their territories in 1359. Despot John Commn Asen became an outcast himself in the area of Komina and Valona, joining the Venetians. The expelled lord of Epirus, Dušan's half-brother the despot Simeon conquered the fortress of Kostur and proclaimed himself emperor. He was defeated in 1358 near Skadar. After that, he left for Thessaly, where he was accepted as a ruler and he emphasised his Serbian and Byzantine heritage since his mother was a Palaiologos. He ruled until 1371, when he was succeeded by his son Jovan Uroš, who remained in power until 1373. The Tsar Uroš I the Weak entrusted his mother, Dušan's widow Jelena, with rule in the area of Ser. Within the empire, Balšić family in Zeta and Vojislav Vojinović in the territory between the river Drina and Kosovo, Rudnik and the sea grew stronger and they encompassed the old župas of Drenovica, Konavle, Trebinje and Popovo polje. Vojislav aimed to return all the lands of Hum and his role in the state became very significant, but he suddenly died in 1363 and his death significantly altered the equilibrium of power in Serbia.

The centre of political power and influence was transferred to the southern territories, where the district lords rapidly gained their independence. The most powerful were the Mrnjavčević brothers, and their influence grew by extending family relationships during the rule of the insufficiently able emperor Uroš IV. Uroš announced Vukašin as his co-ruler in 1365, appointing him king according to the pattern applied by the Tsar Dušan to his son. The Mrnjavčević had support from the nun Jelena - the former tsarina. However, the rest of the nobility was increasingly less friendly towards them, especially when Vukasin's son Marko became the young king, which meant an heir to the throne. The empire was disorganized, central revenues grew weaker, as did the military power since the tsar was left without a mercenary army and had to rely on the military obligation of the district feudal lords. In 1369, there was a conflict in Kosovo between the Mrnjavčević and the Ras nobility, from which Lazar Hrebeljanović withdrew in a timely manner and left the army of Nikola Altomanović to perish. The co-ruling

arrangement broke down then and the Tsar Uroš IV died in 1371 without any heirs, which meant the end of the high line of the Nemanjićs. The Mrnjavčevićs were affected by the Turks, whose plundering raids had been stopped by Uglješa several times before. The brothers bravely entered the territory under Turkish control with a huge army, but they were surprised by the Turks and beaten at Marica in 1371. When his father died, Vukasin's son Marko was crowned king, but he could not gain actual political authority in other Serbian lands and soon became a Turkish vassal. Konstantin and Jovan Dragaš, rulers of Eastern Macedonia, also became vassals.

The Serbian state crisis deepened and the territory to the north of Skoplje was divided into four separate districts, Zeta of Balšićs, Kosovo belonging to Vuk Branković, Pomoravlje of Lazar Hrebeljanović and the Western Serbia of Nikola Altomanović. Bosnia was already an independent kingdom, the ruler of which, Tvrtko, was considered the king of Serbia as well. Lazar and Tvrtko defeated Nikola Altomanović by joint efforts in 1373 and divided his territories among themselves. The only institution that remained whole was the Serbian Orthodox Church, which continually insisted on creating conditions for the renewal for the Nemanjić empire. Prince Lazar increasingly stood out in terms of his undisputable political authority and his title has the determinant of the lord of the entire Serbian territory. Like Tvrtko, he added the title of Stefan to his name, and there are presumptions that he applied valid church ceremonies to legalize his title as a Serbian autocrat. Lazar was recognized in that role by the Byzantine court and the patriarch of Constantinople. In 1375, church peace was achieved and it was crowned by certain ceremonies removing the anathema over the grave of the Emperor Dušan in Prizren.

The Turks gradually infiltrated the south of the Balkan Peninsula, taking towns, interfering with the internal conflicts of the local nobility and slowly suppressing the Byzantine rule. The territories of King Marko and Konstantin Dragaš, who shared Macedonia as Turkish vassals, had several decades of relative peace, troubled only by the occasional passing Turkish troops. During that period, Prince Lazar strengthened his position by eliminating unruly nobility and entering into kinships with the strongest ones, all with full church support. He regained all the Serbian territories to the Sava and the Danube except for Belgrade and Smederevo. He bordered with Tvrtko on Drina. At the beginning of the eighties, his army shattered the Turks at Paraćin, when they entered Lazar's territory for the first time. In 1366, his strength led sultan Murad to temporarily abandon his attack on Serbia. Great conflict was soon to follow though, for which both parties were thoroughly prepared. Lazar unified all the noblemen as his allies, except for the Balšić. King Tvrtko joined Lazar and sent a strong army contingent commanded by Vlatko Vuković. The armies clashed in the Kosovo polje, on Vidovdan in 1389, and both rulers were killed. All of Europe celebrated Serbian victory that year and the stopping of the Turks, but that cost the Serbs dearly. As it seems, the battle ended in stalemate, since both parties sustained unbearable losses. Constantine the Philosopher was the first to

call the Battle of Kosovo a Serbian defeat in his biography of despot Stefan Lazarević. Judging from the long-term consequences, it truly was a great Serbian defeat.

Attempting to exploit the extremely difficult situation of the Serbian people, the Hungarian King Sigismund attacked Serbia in the autumn of 1389, reaching Gruža. Because of that, Tsarina Milica was forced to reach peace with the Turks in 1390 and to accept the vassal relationship to Sultan Bayezid, by giving him her daughter Olivera as wife. This enabled Milica and her son Stefan Lazarević to resist the Hungarians. Vuk Branković also became a Turkish vassal, since the Turks previously took Skoplje away from him. Đurađ Stracimirović Balšić initially associated with the Turks in the conflicts of the local nobility but, because of an argument with his cousin Konstantin Balšić, he distanced himself from the Turks and turned Catholic in 1391. The Turks took Bulgaria in 1392. Vuk Branković took the side of the Hungarians but he was captured by the Turks in 1397 and remained a prisoner for the rest of his life. King Marko and Konstantin Dragaš were killed in 1395 as sultan's vassals on Rovine. The Turks gave the major part of Branković's territories to Stefan Lazarević. During that time, Đurađ II Balšić was at war with Sandalj Hranić. When Vuk Branković disappeared from the scene, the Turks controlled the important strategic communication with Bosnia, through Zvečani and the Lim valley, and from time to time Turkish raiding parties entered Bosnian territory or interfered with local nobility disputes there.

c) The Serbian Despotate

In 1402, in the battle of Angora, the Mongols under Tamerlane severely defeated the Turks, captured sultan Bayezid and later executed him. Stefan and Vuk Lazarević participated in the battle as Turkish vassals, as did Grgur and Đurađ Branković. Olivera was captured, as was Grgur. However, they were later rescued. Upon return from war, Stefan obtained the title of despot from John VII Palaiologos - the title that is the second in rank after the emperor - and he returned with it to Serbia, renewing its state independence. While he was in Constantinople, he conflicted with Đurađ Branković who was temporarily imprisoned there and escaped to sultan Suleiman, asking his military assistance. Stefan Lazarević immediately entered into alliance with Đurađ Stracimirović Balšić. He gathered a large army and, on 21 November 1402 in Kosovo near Gračanica, in the town of Tripolje, he clashed with the Turks and their vassal Đurađ Branković and defeated them. Stefan temporarily made peace with the Turks, who were preoccupied with inner conflicts. After that, he formed an agreement on a vassal relationship with the Hungarian King Sigismund in 1404 and, in return, got Belgrade and Mačva. Belgrade then became the Serbian capital for the first time. Stefan was now able to drive all the Turkish military troops north of Skoplje and made peace with the Brankovići and truce with the Turks, which gave him precious time to rest and internally regulate the state. In 1405, there was a mutiny of inhabitants of the Skadar area against the rule of Venice, which grew into a war between Balša III, the son of Stefan's sister Jelena against Venice.

Stefan unsuccessfully mediated several times, trying to protect the interests of his nephew. The uprising was started in 1408 by Stefan's younger brother Vuk Lazarević, who went to the sultan to ask for his help. The Brankovići joined him.

In 1409, the Turks with their new allies fiercely attacked Serbia and ravaged it severely, coming close to Belgrade. Stefan refused to surrender to the Turks, but he had to reach a compromise with his brother and give him the southern part of the state. Vuk Lazarević and the Branković brothers recognized the sultan's supreme power. The same year, the brother of sultan Suleiman, Musa, rebelled against him and Stefan entered into an alliance with Musa. Musa was defeated in 1410 and Stefan rescued himself with the aid of the Byzantine emperor. Vuk Lazarević and Lazar Branković were executed by Prince Musa as Suleiman's allies. Stefan regained the southern territories, which he had previously had to renounce. Musa managed to kill Suleiman in 1411 and take over the throne. However, Stefan soon had to fight with his previous ally and new sultan. In a firm alliance with the Hungarians, the Serbian ruler got many territories inside Hungary, and Srebrenica as well. He thus grew stronger materially and financially and the southern Hungarian borders were safer. When sultan Musa came into Serbia again in 1412, Stefan did not have many problems chasing him out. Đurađ Branković returned to the country and made peace with Stefan. Stefan, who did not have any children, proclaimed his nephew Đurađ the heir to the throne.

Musa started another attack on Serbia in 1413. He was stopped at Stalać but the Turks plundered Niš and Kruševac. Stefan entered into alliance with Musa's brother Mehmed and obtained help from the Hungarians, led by the Mačva ban Jovan Moravički. Sandalj Hranić joined as well, having previously become Stefan's brother-in-law by marrying the widow of Đurađ Stratimirović Balšić, Jelena. Stefan led the army to Škopska Crna Gora and there he entrusted Đurađ Branković with the command. At the Vlatiš Mountain, Musa was defeated and killed. As an act of gratitude, Stefan got significant territories to the east of Niš from sultan Mehmed I, but he also recognized the vassal relationship, which brought Serbia a precious period of peace. However, the Turks infiltrated the inner Bosnian conflicts more and more through the Brankovići's territory, and they spread into Albanian territories as well. Those territories as well as the lands of Tsar Uglješa in the south were in a double vassal relationship for some time - namely they were subjects of the Turks and Stefan. When Balša III died in 1421, he had no male heirs. Before his death he left his territories to his uncle despot, and all the territories of the Lazarevići, Brankovići and Balšićs were united under Stefan's full rule and in double vassal relationship to the Turkish and Hungarian rulers. The Venetians took the opportunity to take hold of sea towns. That forced Stefan to intervene. He raised an army and took back the towns of Drivast and Grbalj and Bar afterwards. Then he entered into a truce with the Venetians, trying to resolve the remaining problems through diplomacy. The war was renewed in 1422 when Stefan unsuccessfully besieged Skadar. In 1423, he gave the command of the armies to Đurađ Branković, who was more successful and the Venetians

were forced to sign a peace treaty and renounce Budva, as well as to pay contribution to the Serbian ruler for Skadar.

Suspicious of the relations between Serbia and Hungary, which were growing increasingly stronger and of the intense Serbian defensive preparations, the new Turkish sultan Murad II attacked Serbia in 1425 and almost reached Kruševac. After negotiations, the Turks were willing to withdraw from the Serbian territory. Using the problems the despot was having, Bosnian King Tvrtko II attacked Srebrenica. After reaching peace with the Turks Stefan directed his army and chased Tvrtko II away. The Turks attacked again in 1427 and came near Resava. The despot Stefan died that same year. According to the Treaty of Tata in 1426, in order for Hungary to recognize his heir Đurađ Branković, the Serbs had to return Belgrade and Golubac. When he received the news of despot's death, King Sigismund rushed to Belgrade and met Đurađ there, pronouncing him a Hungarian baron and confirming his vassal status in a special ceremony. Đurađ gave over Belgrade but he did not manage to give Golubac as well, since the town commander Jeremija rebelled and enabled the Turks to take over this important Danube stronghold. The Turks continued to plunder the Morava valley and Braničevo, but they did not succeed in conquering Novo Brdo, though they besieged it for months. Đurađ made peace with the Turks, recognizing the supreme power of the sultan and undertaking the obligation to pay an annual tax that was by a quarter higher than Stefan had been paying, to provide military assistance to the sultan and prevent the Hungarian army from crossing over the Serbian territories in case of war with Turkey. He lost the area of Timok and Niš, Kruševac, Vranje and Preševo and the Turks still held the strategically important fortresses in the heart of the Despotate, on the route to Bosnia.

Since he remained without large towns/fortresses, the despot Đurađ began to build Smederevo as the new capital. He sent his daughter Mara to the sultan's harem. In Zeta, Đurađ and Lješ Đurašević revolted with the assistance of Venice, but they were willing to cooperate with the Turks as well. In 1430 they had to recognize the despot's rule but, in return, they received greater independence of their lands. Đurađ interfered for several years with the internal conflicts of the Bosnian nobility and in 1435, he solved the dispute with the Venetians with the Smederevo contract. In the Hungarian/Turkish war, the Hungarian army passed through Serbia on their way back and caused serious material damage, making the Turks angry.

In order to propitiate Murad II, Đurađ Branković gave him the town of Braničevo. When Sigismund died, his daughter's husband, the Austrian Duke Albert of Habsburg, became the Hungarian king in 1438 and the Turks used this opportunity to invade Serbia and Transylvania, plundering and burning everything in their path. Murad II personally besieged Smederevo in 1439. The despot crossed over to Hungary to ask for help and entrusted his son Grgur with the defence of the capital. Smederevo fell after three months of siege, when the brave defenders ran out of food. Of the entire area of Serbia, only the territory of Novo Brdo and Zeta remained free. After the fall of Smederevo, a certain agreement was

nevertheless reached with the Turks and Grgur got the former territory of Vuk Branković in return for the promise of his loyalty. A large part of the population moved out of Serbia. Many people were taken into slavery by the Turks. The Sultan marched on Belgrade in 1440 with the great army, but even after six months of siege he could not manage to conquer it. After he clumsily interfered with the struggle over the Hungarian throne, Đurađ arrived that year in Zeta via Venice. The Turks set a price on his head in 1441 and he had to leave for Dubrovnik. The Sultan ordered the despot's sons Grgur and Stefan to be blinded. Then Murad II took hold of Novo Brdo as well. Đurađ decided to return to Hungary to pay reverence to the new king Ladislaus Jagiellon, whose arrival to the throne he had previously opposed. In mid 1441, the Turks broke into southern Hungary and plundered it thoroughly.

That was a sufficient reason for Ladislaus to focus his attention on the war against the Turks. That same year, his army, commanded by John Hunyadi and Nikola Iločki, encroached deep into Serbia. Like the Turks, they raided everything in their path. Hunyadi won his greatest victories on the territories of Wallachia. Ladislaus obtained great financial help from the Pope and the European rulers. He enabled Despot Đurađ to gather the refugee Serbs. Ladislaus gathered an army of 25,000 knights and adventurers and Đurađ gathered eight thousand Serbs. He was joined by the Bosnian Duke Petar Kovačević with 700 horsemen. They encroached into Serbia in 1443 along the Morava River valley and severely defeated the Turks at Niš and Aleksinac. Soon they took Pirot and Sophia. The Turks lost several more battles, but the army retreated in January 1444. However, the successful campaign brought confusion into Turkey and motivated the Christian Europe to continue with the war. Murad II was forced to ask for peace and he sent the emissary to Đurađ with the assistance of Sultana Mara, with the offer to return Serbia to him. Ladislaus agreed to that in 1444 in Adrianople. A ten-year peace was made and almost all the territories were returned to the despot, except Niš and Kruševac. The Turkish garrisons remained only in the old Branković territories. Đurađ was taking over his towns, but Ladislaus changed his mind and went to war again, but bypassing Serbia. He was defeated at Varna, where he was killed at the age of twenty. The despot tried to regain the western territories as well. He agreed with Stefan Vukčić Kosača who returned to him the Upper Zeta, but he argued with Stefan Tomaš over Srebrenica. The Venetians tricked him and refused to return the coastal towns. He married his son Lazar to the daughter of the Despot Thomas of the Morean Palaiologos. On that occasion, the emissary of the Byzantine emperor gave Lazar the insignia of the despotic title, which Stefan Lazarević and Đurađ Branković had received before him.

In 1448, John Hunyadi, as the Hungarian governor, on behalf of the infant King Ladislaus the Posthumous, went to a new campaign against the Turks across Serbia. Đurađ did not want to join him and Hunyadi's army ruthlessly robbed the Serbian population. After the three-day battle on the Kosovo polje and great mutual losses, the Turks chased Hunyadi away. The despot put Hunyadi in a dungeon and only freed him after the Hungarians had promised him in a contract to pay for all the material damage, as well as to refrain from

sending an army across Serbia in future attacks. In 1451, Đurađ definitely regained Srebrenica, which had previously changed masters often. Before that he had unsuccessfully tried to force the Venetians to return the coastal territories back to him, because of the conflict among the Crnojević brothers. During 1452, he sent the army against the Venetian exponent Stefanica Crnojević twice, but it was defeated. The new Sultan Mehmed II freed his step-mother Mara from the harem and cordially sent her to her father, returning Đurađ Toplica and Dubočica with her as well. As soon as Constantinople fell, the sultan nevertheless demanded that Đurađ give over Smederevo and Golubac and, in 1454, he went against Serbia with an enormous army that occupied the entire country, killing all the men and taking the women and children into slavery. Đurađ escaped to Hungary and the Turks besieged Smederevo, after Rudnik which had soon surrendered in an attempt to deceive the invaders and free the defenders. Smederevo bravely resisted and the sultan soon withdrew, but Serbia was affected by famine and plague. The despot returned to the capital and gathered an army in order to go to the south with Hunyadi. The Turks were surprised and defeated at Kruševac and the Hungarian-Serbian army withdrew towards Belgrade. Serbia was so devastated and destroyed that it did not recover for a long time, and the sultan went on a new campaign in 1455. Novo Brdo fell after forty days of siege, followed by the former Branković territory where the population was slaughtered in huge numbers.

The despot closed a peace treaty with the sultan in 1456, giving all the territories south of Kruševac and the Western Morava to the Turks. The land connection between the Despotate and Zeta was cut. The Turks did not keep to the agreement and went against Belgrade that same year. Along the way they attacked Smederevo, but unsuccessfully and with significant losses. The Hungarians and Serbs suddenly attacked the Turkish Danube fleet with ships and boats and completely defeated it, freeing Belgrade from the river blockade. The fierce Turkish charge on the fortified town was repelled and the Turks withdrew. Old and exhausted, Đurađ died that year and was succeeded by his son Lazar Branković. Lazar achieved a new treaty with the sultan in 1457, by which the Turks returned him his father's territories and promised not to attack him as long as he lived. In the meantime, Hungary was torn by inner conflicts of the gentry over predominance. Lazar cooperated with King Ladislaus and got Kovin and several fortresses on the north bank of the Danube from him. However, Lazar's mother Jerina died as well in 1457 and his brother Grgur, sister Mara and uncle Thomas Kantakouzeno went over to the Turks. The only one who remained loyal to Lazar was his blind brother Stefan and the conditions in the state worsened progressively. The plague epidemics did not cease either. Despot Lazar suddenly died in January 1458, aged thirty and without male heirs. A governorship, consisting of Mihailo Andelović, Lazar's widow Helena Palaiologina and his blind brother Stefan, was immediately established. The governors soon clashed between themselves though. Andelović went to Smederevo, where he was publicly proclaimed despot, but, since he let the Turkish army unit enter the town, the people rose in mutiny in which the

Turks were killed and Andelović was arrested. The Serbian landed gentry recognized the blind Stefan Branković as despot. Having received the news of Lazar's death, Stefan Tomaš immediately captured Srebrenica, Zvornik and Timok, coming as far as the Drina River.

The Turks attacked Serbia again in 1458, leading the blind Grgur Branković as their pretender to the despot's throne. Golubac fell and Belgrade was surrounded. The entire despotate was reduced only to Smederevo. That year, the Bosnian King Stefan Tomaš asked the approval of the Hungarian King Matthias Corvinus for the marriage between his son Stefan Tomašević and the eldest daughter of Lazar Branković, which would bring him the despotate. This marriage was entered into as soon as the king gave his consent, and Stefan Tomaš renounced his vassal status towards the sultan. On 1st March 1459, Stefan Tomašević became the Despot of Serbia. Soon after that, Stefan Branković was expelled from Smederevo. Stefan Tomašević, being a Catholic, was never sincerely accepted by the people, and his arrival on the despot's throne represented a particular challenge to the Turks. At the beginning of the summer, the Turkish army arrived under Smederevo and the town was surrendered without fight, which represented the final collapse of despotate. The title of despot was, however remained for political reasons. The Hungarian King Matthias pronounced Grgur's son Vuk, who ran to him from Turkey, the Serbian despot in 1464. Vuk Grgurević proved to be a brave and skilful military commander. He managed to burn down Srebrenica in 1471; the town had already been in the Turkish hands for a long time. He defeated the limited Turkish army units on the Danube several times. Thanks to the Serbian warriors, King Matthias succeeded to get through as far as Kruševac in 1480.

The Hungarian king systematically supported the settlement of the Serbian population in the territories of Srem and Banat, thus securing the southern borders and obtaining good warriors to be used on all the European battlefields. When the head Serbian military commander, Despot Vuk Grgurević died in 1485, King Matthias invited Stefan's sons

Đorđe and Jovan Branković, who lived in the valley of the Italian river Po to come to Hungary. The two brothers came to Srem in 1486 accompanied by their mother and bringing the holy relics of their father. Đorđe got the title of despot and the major part of the family territories. When King Matthias died in 1490, the landed gentry did not wish his illegitimate son János for the successor, but the Bohemian King Ladislaus II instead. The Serbian gentry divided into two groups and the Branković brothers supported János. There was a conflict in which János Corvinus was defeated and the council of gentry elected the Bohemian pretender ruler, which weakened the positions of the Serbian despot. Đorđe Branković turned to the Roman-German King Maximilian I of Habsburg, who encroached into Hungary and reached Belgrade. The conflict ended in a compromise - the Habsburg would retreat provided that he inherited the throne if Ladislaus had no legitimate heirs. During 1493 and 1494, there were several conflicts between the Hungarians and the Turks and the mutual invading of territories on both sides. Đorđe participated in several internal conflicts as well, and his brother Jovan was also pronounced

despot in 1494, when the king decided to double all the important functions in his defence system. The despots had many problems with the Roman Catholic prelates who attempted to impose the payment of the church tithe to their territories as well. The Orthodox Serbs were the dominant population of Srem for a long time, so the Hungarian official documents call this country Rascia, after Raška and the Serbs – the Raci. “The grandchildren of Despot Đurđe were forced to cope under the changed circumstances in the Hungarian kingdom, to try to defend what they had at their disposal and to be as independent as they could on their territory. A favourable circumstance for them was that they could add to the formal rights and authorizations they had as the land rulers, bearers of the title of despot, barons of the Kingdom and the commanders of *banderije* (squads), the reputation and glory of the ruling order the offspring of which they were. Because of this, they were respected and assisted by the Serbian gentry outside their territories and they were loved by the entire Serbian people, though formally it did not owe them any obedience and loyalty. The influence of the despots in this generation was far wider than their nobility and their *banderije* (volume II, p. 454).

In the national consciousness, the Branković family represented the rulers of Srem, who kept the state continuity of the Serbian empire. Between 1497 and 1499, Đorđe Branković secretly entered a monastery and soon after that he was ordained as a priest-monk under the church name of Maxim. It seems that he was a Belgrade Metropolitan for the last years of his life. Despot Jovan married the daughter of Stefan Jakšić Junior, Jelena, thus becoming kin with the most powerful Serbian family in Pomorišje, which inherited the lands of the Belmužević family as well. Miloš Belmužević died in 1501, after he had become famous in 1500 by invading the Turkish territory and collecting an enormous amount of loot. In the war between Hungary and Turkey from 1501 to 1503, Despot Jovan began war operations. The sultan asked Jovan to negotiate a peace agreement and promised to return all the territories in Serbia and Bosnia to him. Jovan informed the king of that but continued the battle. He chased the Turks away from the Kolubara and made his way into Bosnia. Despot Jovan was the main king's negotiator with the Grand Vizier in 1502. At the end of that year, he died of fever without male heirs.

In 1521, Sultan Suleiman I took advantage of the unstable internal situation in Hungary and the incompetence of its ruler and seized Šabac and the entire territory of Srem. Srem was completely destroyed and devastated and then Belgrade was besieged as well and conquered within one month. The Turks invaded Srem again in 1523, but this time they came to Banat too, where they seized the fortifications on the river bank the following year. The mighty Turkish nobleman Pavle Bakić the Serb ran away to Hungary in 1525. Duke Pavle warned the Hungarians about the forthcoming great Turkish invasion. In 1526, the sultan marched with an enormous army of about one hundred thousand men. He forced the Sava near Belgrade undisturbed. The Serbs abandoned Srem and moved to Pomorišje. After a major combat, the Turks seized Petrovaradin and soon reached the Drava River. The great battle took place on 29th August 1526 south of Mohács and the Hungarians were thoroughly defeated

there. After the Battle of Mohács, the sultan took Buda without any resistance. The Turks plundered it, crossed the Danube and burned Pest. The Turkish army withdrew with enormous loot and numerous slaves, leaving garrisons in the Srem fortifications. The villagers rioted in Hungary, followed by the Serbs in Pomorišje, spreading the uprising in Banat, Bačka and Srem. Jovan Nenad became the leader of this uprising and he pronounced himself emperor. He seized two fortresses from the Turks in Srem and prepared to attack Petrovaradin and Ilok, but he was lacking cannons. He took Ferdinand's side against Szapolyai in the conflict over the throne. Szapolyai's men killed Jovan Nenad in Szeged in 1527.

3. The History of Serbian Bosnia

Even during the Roman rule, the Bosnian territories were the least populated ones and the Avar plunders left them almost without any inhabitants. At the beginning of the 7th century, the Serbs encountered few Roman survivors there and assimilated them faster than they assimilated any other people. There are very few written traces about the old Roman inhabitants, so the archaeological findings are the only existing testimony. Only the Illyrian uprising and its quenching at the beginning of the Christian era left significant impression on the Roman contemporaries and later historians. All the historical sources testify that at the time of arrival to the Balkans, Bosnia was inhabited only by the Serbs. Although both the Serbs and the Croats were moved from their ancient homelands, clearly distinguished from the early beginnings, to the previously devastated and depopulated areas, and they both recognized the rule of the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius, the ethnical border between them was clearly distinguished even in their homeland, running from the confluence of the Cetina River across Livanjsko polje to the Pliva and Vrbas Rivers. The waste Serbian territory under the Byzantine rule had a very high degree of independence and the specific political units called parishes were established there. They were grouped in the flatlands and the river valleys and there were no strictly defined borders between them. The prevailing mountainous terrain and the insufficiently developed social relations that remained on the level of military democracy for a long time since, in the final stages of the first communities and the rudimentary forms of state, slowed down the formation of the coherent political organization of the society. In the system of loose Serbian family-tribe formations, the central leaders of the people had an almost symbolical authority in comparison to the local župans. Therefore, the entire Serbian territory was at the very beginning divided into a large number of small principedoms, such as the Principedom of Neretva, Zahumlje, Bosnia, Travunia, Duklja and Raška, which were pretty solidary and harmonious in mutual relations, but without a clearly expressed intention to dominate each other. The majority of those first parishes, their names and leaders, faded out from the collective memory without leaving a written trace.

In the east, the territory of the original Serbia bordered with Bulgaria and the demarcation line in the north ran across the Danube. Therefore,

Constantine Porphyrogenitus speaks of the town of Soli (Tuzla) as one of the six largest towns in Serbia. But Soli was not situated in Bosnia. Bosnia was mentioned for the first time in documents as late as the 10th century, as the territory surrounding the river Bosnia, conditionally speaking between the Vrbas and the Drina Rivers. It was without any doubt and firmly a part of Serbia, since Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Priest Dukljanin and the Byzantine writer John Kinnamos all agree on that matter. The Serbian ruler Časlav defended Bosnia from the Hungarian plundering raids as early as the beginning of the 10th century. Even at the time of Časlav, Bosnia had a local leader known as ban, which is probably a term of Avar origin. When Časlav died, Bosnia was devastated by the Croatian King Krešimir in one larger raid. After that, it was a victim of Macedonian Emperor Samuel. After the collapse of Samuel's state, Bosnia came under the supreme Byzantine rule and a Bosnian ban had the same status as a Zhupan of Raška or a Prince of Zahumlje. When Duklja suddenly grew stronger in the 11th century, it incorporated Raška, Bosnia, Zahumlje and Travunia. Zahumlje was previously adjoined by the Princedom of Neretva. Bodin brought Prince Stefan, who had also sworn allegiance to him as the Zhupan of Raška, to rule Bosnia as governor. Unlike ban, whose function primarily had military character, a prince was mainly the holder of the civil power, to which the military one was subordinated. Around 1138, Bosnia fell under the domination of the Hungarians and, in 1139, the king Béla II of Hungary symbolically proclaimed his infant son Ladislaus the Herzog of Bosnia. Bosnia was actually ruled by the local bans who recognized the supreme Hungarian rule. Historical documents mention only one of those bans by name - ban Borić. The Byzantine Emperor Manuel Comnenos defeated and suppressed the Hungarians in 1166 and Bosnia, together with Srem and Slavonija, returned under the Byzantine domination, which was of the same nature as in the other Serbian countries. This is all the existing data about Bosnia until the end of the 12th century.

a) Gaining Actual State Independence

When Raška gained independence under the Grand Zhupan Stefan Nemanja, it created a very suitable shelter for Bosnia, which separated its territory from Byzantium, and the Nemanjić dynasty directed their ambitions towards the south. Bosnia was treated as something already there, owned, at hand, and there was no need to invest any additional efforts into it. There was a completely different situation in the territory northern of the original Bosnia, Usora and Soli. The protection provided by the Nemanjić was very precious and actual danger could come only from the Hungarian side. However, the Hungarian state was most often preoccupied with other problems. Bosnia started establishing its specific state only with Ban Kulin, who ruled as ban in the status of a Byzantine governor. He is mentioned in the historical sources several years after the Emperor Manuel I Comnenos died in 1180. Kulin joined the Serbian and Hungarian campaigns against Byzantium and soon after that he formally recognized the supreme rule of the Hungarian king, which brought him

actual independence in practice. "Ban Kulin was on good terms with Serbia. He had family relations with the Serbian ruling families, since his sister was married to Miroslav, Duke of Hum, brother of Stefan Nemanja" (Sima Ćirković: *History of the Medieval Bosnian State*, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1964, p. 47). Unlike the Nemanjić family, Kulin was pretty tolerant towards the Bogomil heresy which actually appeared in his time, being brought over from Serbia. That burdened him with the hate of the Roman Pope and the enmity of the Hungarians.

In the internal conflict within the Nemanjić dynasty - between Vukan and Stefan - Kulin openly took Stefan's side, providing him also with the military assistance to return to the throne. He partly managed to justify himself before the Roman Curia in 1202 and the Pope's envoy was satisfied with the statements and the promises of the Bosnian Bogomils at Bilino Polje in 1203. However, the problems were only temporarily solved and they soon reappeared in an even graver form. Since Bosnia was part of the original Serbian state, its religious organization was undivided after the adoption of Christianity. "Identification of Serbia with Bosnia in the Catholic Church centres was carried out at times when the entangled issues regarding the rights of the coastal archbishoprics were resolved and when the history of those rights was researched, as is usual in similar cases. It can therefore be a circumstantial testimony about the former political and church unity of Serbia and Bosnia. The spontaneous church separation ran simultaneously with the political separation, which most probably happened in the second half of the 10th century. The eastern and southern parts of the former 'Christened Serbia' - later Raška, came under the authority of certain Byzantine dioceses, while the memory of Serbia as a united area of jurisdiction could only be preserved in the coastal Catholic centres" (p. 50).

There are sources in Dubrovnik that indicate that the first Christian inhabitants of Bosnia did not speak Latin and had national names as well. This is a proof that the eastern service was performed in Bosnia and that its monks belonged to the Order of St. Basil of the Byzantine church tradition. The Archbishops of Dubrovnik did not make any serious efforts to change anything in this direction, and they were only concerned with keeping their diocese and receiving the appropriate gifts on time. This situation continued until the Bogomils, being expelled from Serbia ruled by the Nemanjić dynasty, appeared in Bosnia. The Roman Curia intensified its activities on the territory of Bosnia in order to extend its territory and prevent the infiltration of the heretic influences and movements into the Dalmatian coastal towns, which had already proved susceptible to that. In 1225, the papal bull confirmed the handover of Bosnia, Usora and Soli to Ugrin, the Archbishop of Kalocsa, with the task to eradicate the heretics. Handing over the territories meant that the archbishop could hire more powerful gentry to go to a crusade and to be paid with the value of territory when they perform their task.

Kulin was succeeded by Ban Stefan, about whom there is almost no data in the historical sources. There is also no data on the progress of the crusades either, but it seems that they were at least partially successful, since as early as 1233 Ban Mateja Ninoslav appears as a Catholic and a

strongholds in Bosnia for a long time” (p 68). All that remained of the Roman Catholic Church organization merged with the Bosnian Bogomil church.

Approximately after 1249, Ninoslav was succeeded by his cousin, Ban Prijezda, who was given new territories in Slavonija by Béla IV in 1255, for his loyalty. The sources indicate that two years before that Béla made war in Bosnia, but there is no more reliable data than that. At that time, Bosnia was completely separated from the Banate of Mačva, to which Usora and Soli belonged, so the Slavonian lands were territorially separated from the Bosnian territory. The Hungarians established banates as the protective zone for the defence of the main state territory. Since 1284, Usora and Soli, as well as Mačva with Belgrade, were held by the Serbian King Dragutin after he had ceded the throne to his brother Milutin. That same year - 1284 - Dragutin's daughter Jelisaveta married Prijezda's son Stefan I Kotromanić. “This alliance between Bosnia and Serbia showed significant political results almost a century later, when the relationship with the highborn Serbian royal family provided Ban Tvrtko with the legal basis to proclaim himself descendant of the Nemanjić dynasty and to be crowned king of Serbia” (p. 75). Since Hungary was preoccupied with other problems, Bosnia grew more and more independent and its vassal relationship with the Hungarian king became purely formal.

Stefan I Kotromanić succeeded his father on the ban's throne between 1287 and 1290 but he was soon threatened by the Prince of Bribir, Pavle Šubić, who gained power using the weaknesses of the Hungarian rulers. The beginning of the 14th century in Bosnia was marked by severe fighting. Pavle Šubić proclaimed his brother Mladen the ban of Bosnia. Mladen seized the Lower Lands from Kotromanić and began to drive him eastwards. Then the Šubić family threatened Hum as well. In 1302, a big battle was fought between Stefan I Kotromanić and Mladen Šubić, but the historical sources do not say anything about its progress and outcome. However, the usurper was killed in the battle as early as 1304 and his son Mladen II managed to occupy almost the entire area of Bosnia, proclaiming himself its ruler. The Kotromanić family kept certain territories and Stefan I died before 1314. His family had to flee the country and take refuge in Dubrovnik. A certain compromise was made with the Šubić family, so the Kotromanić family returned soon. The Šubić had to spare all the captured Bosnian noblemen and they did not manage to significantly change the existing social relations, in spite of their supreme power. When the Serbian King Milutin defeated Mladen II Šubić in the region of Hum in 1319, his territories began falling apart and detaching themselves. The first to go were Šibenik and Trogir, which sought protection from the Venetians. The positions of the Šubić family grew weaker in Hungary as well, since King Charles Robert began strengthening his central power and limiting the power of the arrogant noblemen. The king reached an agreement with Stefan II Kotromanić and they jointly attacked Mladen II, who was defeated and captured. Bosnia was again a direct vassal of the Hungarian king with a large degree of independence. Stefan II warred against the Lord of Cetina, Nemigc, from

Hungarian vassal. That same year, the Bishop of Bosnia was removed from the post as unworthy of the title and being accused of secretly supporting the heretics, to be replaced the following year by a religiously fanatical German Dominican. The Bishopric of Bosnia was removed from the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Dubrovnik and subjected to the direct jurisdiction of the Roman Pope. Ban Ninoslav had many problems with the disobedience of the Bosnian gentry which inclined towards heresy. It forced him to distance himself from the church and the Hungarian proselytist action to a certain degree, especially after he had realized that the plans of the Hungarian king were based on the aspiration to keep Bosnia in complete subordination. In 1253, the entire territory of Bosnia was given to Herzog Koloman in return for leading a new crusade. This tossed Ninoslav completely into the embrace of the Bogomils, whose support he saw as his only chance to preserve the state independence. After two years of battles, about which there is no detailed data, Koloman informed the Pope that he had destroyed the Bosnian heretics. In the course of the proceedings, he seized one part of Hum from Prince Toljen, who was a descendant of Nemanja's brother Miroslav. The new bishop was appointed, a Hungarian Dominican, who burned the Bogomils at the stake. Ban Ninoslav kept aloof at the beginning but, at a suitable moment, the Bosnian gentry organized well and succeeded in banishing the Crusaders. Ban Ninoslav and his state were unexpectedly saved by a Tatar invasion on Hungary in 1241, which prevented retaliation for the banishment of the Crusaders. The Tatars stampeded through parts of Bosnia as well, but they did not cause that much damage there as in the Hungarian or Croatian territories. In the conflict that broke out between the Dalmatian towns of Trogir and Split in 1243, the Hungarians fought on the side of the inhabitants of Trogir and Ninoslav on the side of the inhabitants of Split, together with the Prince of Hum, Andrija. The Hungarian King Béla IV sent one part of his army, commanded by the Croatian Ban Dionisije to attack Split, while he attacked Bosnia with the other part. Ninoslav was forced to surrender to the Hungarians in 1244, but they did not interfere in the internal Bosnian political relations, insisting only on church issues. Ninoslav kept his territories in Slavonija, in the vicinity of Đakovo as well, but he donated a significant amount of land to the Roman Catholic Church in Bosnia. “The Catholic Church organization in Bosnia had all it needed for successful work, except for the support of the population, which was either under the influence of heretics or faithful to their traditional church” (p. 67). Catholicism could not gain a significant stronghold, so, after two years, Béla IV was again thinking about undertaking a crusade. The Pope then decided to exclude the Bosnian Catholics from the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Dubrovnik and adjoin them to the diocese of the Archbishop of Kalocsa. “Immediately after the mid 13th century, the Bosnian Catholic bishop no longer resided in Bosnia but in Đakovo, the village received by the bishopric at the very beginning of the reform from Herzog Koloman. His seat remained there in Slavonija for centuries, since he did not manage to return to Bosnia. Together with him, the Catholicism as a whole, being attached solely to the idea of one reformed Latin bishopric, lost all its

1324 to 1326, in order to retrieve the Lower Lands. Finally, in 1326, he liberated the old Serbian territory of Krajina, between the Neretva and the Cetina Rivers, as well as the Livanjsko, Dunavsko and Glamočko polje. The western Bosnian border came as far as the Cetina and the Sana Rivers, which meant a large territorial expansion.

When king Dragutin died, the Hungarian king gave Stefan II Kotromanić Usora and Soli. Since the noble family Branivojević became independent on the territory of Hum after Milutin's death, threatening the neighbouring lands, Stefan II Kotromanić formed an alliance with Dubrovnik against them in 1326. Stefan Dečanski and his son Dušan were unwilling to protect the rebellious gentry, who were defeated and Bosnia adjoined the confluence of the Neretva to its territories. Kotromanić was in conflict with feudal Lord Vitomir, the ruler of Trebinje and Konavli in 1329, but he was severely punished by King Dušan who defeated him at Pribojska Banja. Kotromanić drew a conclusion about what he could or could not do from that. The rulers of Raška let him destroy the unruly family Branivojević but they determinedly defended the loyal Vitomir. Soon Kotromanić made peace with Dušan and Bosnia was granted a long period of peace, necessary to consolidate and strengthen from the inside the territorial expansions that doubled its surface. By liberating the Lower Lands, i.e. the coastal region of Makarska, the Bosnian army destroyed the Catholic Church organization there. However, when the valley of Neretva and the inner part of Hum were seized, the army encountered the Orthodox population and the noble family Sanković, who were not forced to renounce their religion, although the Serbian Orthodox church hierarchy was negatively biased towards the Bogomils. It was important that the "Orthodox clergy did not conflict with the Bosnian church in the sphere of politics, the Christian and the Franciscan were the only ones to fight over influence on the ruler's court" (p. 109).

After 1334, Pope Benedict XII attacked Ban Stefan II Kotromanić with full force, since he failed the Roman hopes for the renewal of Catholicism in Bosnia, accusing him directly of the failure of the inquisition as well. He invited the Serbian noble families Kurjaković, Šubić and Nemić to attack Bosnia and provide armed support to the Franciscan proselyte endeavours. The Hungarian King Charles Robert opposed that and threatened the Croatian nobility that he would pursue them as outlaws if they attacked his loyal vassal. In 1339, after the threat of attack by the Croatian noblemen was removed, the king himself sent a general of the Franciscan order to Bosnia to investigate the church situation. The general was cordially greeted in Bosnia and the ban persuaded him that he desired the renewal of Catholicism, but he made excuses that the main obstacle "was the schismatic in the neighbourhood, who the heretics immediately addressed for help, as soon as he undertook something against them." It is obvious that "he exaggerated the danger in order to avoid solutions that would cause conspiracies and fighting in the newly consolidated state" (p. 111). After that, the Franciscans concentrated on the gradual and patient missionary action in order to convert the Bosnian Bogomil population within the next one hundred and twenty years. They built monasteries in the central town settlements, where the feudal relations were not so pronounced and where

the Saxon miners and traders from Dubrovnik settled down. The Bosnian church still dominated the rural areas, which weakened its positions in the long run. "However, it was not directly endangered yet, since it found support in connections with the gentry – the support which will remain stable for a long time. The role of arbiter between the rulers and the nobility, which the church held and strengthened exactly at this time, made it unreliable in the political life of Bosnia. Because of its role to 'examine' or 'try' a nobleman accused of 'disloyalty'; the church became the protector of the basic rights of the nobility. The Bosnian church could not be removed from Bosnia without simultaneously endangering the balance in the relations between the state and the gentry" (p. 112).

In 1345, Ban Stefan II entered Knin with his army in order to protect the interests of the Hungarian king, and to assist him in subduing the arrogance of Croatian noblemen. He took the Hungarian side in the conflict with Venice over Zadar, but started plotting with the Venetians against the Hungarians only the following year, so that the Venetians would in return eliminate Mladen III Šubić, Stefan's ally who represented a latent war threat to Bosnia. Stefan II was in conflict with the Serbian Tsar Dušan in 1350 over the land of Hum. After the failure of negotiations, Dušan encroached into Hum with his army and returned all the territories as far as the Cetina River. However, when he returned his troops to Macedonia, the Bosnian ban took over the land of Hum and the Serbian tsar was so preoccupied with other affairs that he never managed to deal with the problem of Hum again. In 1353, Stefan's daughter Jelisaveta married the Hungarian King Louis, which significantly increased the political reputation of the Bosnian ban family. That same year, Ban Stefan II Kotromanić died without living male heirs and the council of noblemen elected the son of Stefan's brother Vladislav, the fifteen-year-old Tvrtko, as the new ban. King Louis immediately seized the entire territory of Hum northern of the Neretva from Tvrtko, but he entrusted him with rule of Usora. The issue of heretics was reactivated as well, which particularly affected Tvrtko.

b) The Bosnian-Serbian Kingdom

However, there is not much historical evidence about the first ten years of Tvrtko's rule, which means that the situation might have been relatively peaceful. In 1363, the Hungarian King Louis went to war quest against Bosnia, referring to religious reasons. His siege of the fortified Bosnian town of Soko on the Pliva River was without any success, so he returned to Hungary. That Hungary after that. The same year he sent his army against Usora which besieged Srebrenik, but also without any success. Bosnia managed to defend itself in a highly dangerous situation. But Tvrtko had more and more problems since his noblemen were becoming too independent. The gentry rioted openly in 1366 and dethroned Tvrtko, who had to flee Bosnia. Tvrtko's brother, Ban Vuk was brought to the throne. With the assistance of the Hungarian king, Tvrtko regained control over one part of the Bosnian territory and contended with his brother for the support of certain district lords. Tvrtko won and, as

early as 1367, he controlled the entire territory of Bosnia, from which Vuk had to flee. However, he made peace with his brother after several years. In 1373 Ban Tvrtko united with Prince Lazar against Zhupan Nikola Altomanović, whom they defeated and divided his lands among themselves. Tvrtko then got the upper Podrinje, territory of the Mileševo Monastery and Gacko. He seized Trebinje, Konavle and Dračevica from Đurađ Branković in 1377. Since he was a descendant of the Nemanjić family without any doubt - his great grandfather being king Dragutin - Tvrtko's ambitions to renew the Serbian empire under his rule grew because he already possessed the wide territories of the former Nemanjić state.

Tvrtko, therefore, no longer considered adjoining as many Nemanjić territories to his state as possible, but adjoining his own state to the renewed Serbian empire, in which he would be ruler. On Mitrovdan in 1377 in the Monastery of Mileševa, on the grave of St. Sava, Tvrtko was crowned King of Serbia, Bosnia, Coastal Region and the western lands. He added to his name the traditional Nemanjić family name Stefan, which was afterwards born by all other Bosnian kings – also pronounced in colloquial speech as Stevan, Stjepan, Šćepan or Stipan. Since that time, Tvrtko particularly emphasized his title of the Serbian ruler. “Based on later political cooperation with Prince Lazar and the engagement in the defence of Serbia against the Turks, it can be concluded that Prince Lazar and Vuk Branković approved of Tvrtko's act. The deprived and embittered Đurađ Balšić was without any doubt an opponent of the Bosnian Ban and he certainly did not recognize him as the Serbian ruler” (p. 138). Tvrtko was recognized his Serbian royal title by Venice and Dubrovnik, as well as the Hungarian king Louis.

Because of the constant conflicts with Dubrovnik and an unsuccessful attempt to bring Kotor under his rule, Tvrtko built the town of Novi at the entrance of the Bay of Kotor in 1382 and immediately opened a salt market there. The inhabitants of Dubrovnik hindered the transportation of salt and seized the cargo with their navy, so Tvrtko had to yield and accept their requests. However, the following year, he started obtaining ships for his own fleet. In 1385, the Hungarian Queen, his cousin who was still under age, ceded him Kotor and he also received the important market of Drijeva on the Neretva River. In the internal Hungarian conflicts over the throne, Tvrtko took side against Sigismund of Luxembourg, by sending the Grand Duke Hrvoje Vukšić, Lord of the Lower Lands to fight on the side of Ladislav of Naples. Tvrtko's army seized Klis and plundered the vicinity of Nin and Split in 1387. The Turks encroached into Bosnia across the Balšić territory in 1388, but they were defeated by the Bosnian army at Bileća. In 1389, as the King of Serbia and Bosnia, Tvrtko sent his army commanded by Duke Vlatko Vuković to the Battle of Kosovo, where many Bosnian noblemen were killed. Tvrtko reported to the entire Europe that the Serbian army had won and the historical records testify that he personally was fully convinced of that. After that he again attacked Dalmatian towns. In 1390, Split, Trogir and Šibenik, as well as the islands of Brač, Hvar and Korčula, Korčula fell under the power of the King of Serbia and Bosnia. The negotiations with

Stefan Dabiša Kotromanić became the new king and he quickly stabilized his power. In 1392, he managed to drive away the Turks who encroached into Bosnia again. However, the noblemen became more and more arrogant. First, the Radić brothers and Beljak Sanković tried to surrender Konavle to the people of Dubrovnik, but were chased away by the Dukes Vlatko Vuković and Pavle Radenović who divided their territories among themselves. No later than 1349, Dabiša and his noblemen turned towards Sigismund more openly, opposing the Croatian noblemen who still supported Ladislav of Naples. The King of Serbia and Bosnia returned Dalmatian towns to the Hungarian King and even agreed that Sigismund should inherit the Bosnian throne after his death. Stefan Dabiša died in 1396. Sigismund reached a compromise with the Bosnian noblemen that Dabiša's wife, Jelena Gruba, should temporarily rule Bosnia. During her rule, Duke Hrvoje Vukčić played the main role in managing the state affairs. Prince Pavle Radenović and Duke Sandalj Hranić, nephew of Vlatko Vuković were also very significant. Sandalj seized Budva in 1396 and ruled it for two years. A large number of other feudal lords were also behaving more and more freely.

Bosnia was also invaded by the Turks in 1389, but they soon withdrew without any results because of the harsh winter. That same year Stefan Ostoja Kotromanić was elected king, mainly because of Duke Hrvoje Vukčić. Bosnia ceded Konavle to Dubrovnik in 1399, as well as the zone towards Ston - the coastal area of Slansko. The Bosnian gentry again turned towards Ladislav of Naples, supporting his pretensions to the Hungarian throne. Because of that, Sigismund went to war against Bosnia as early as 1398, attacking Hrvoje's western territories. The King of Hungary was defeated and Hrvoje took parish Dubica from him and kept it for three years. The following Hungarian attack was also repelled. Under the pressure from Bosnia, Zadar recognized the supreme rule of Ladislav of Naples in 1401, followed by Trogir and Šibenik in 1402, through Hrvoje and Ostoja. In the joint action of Hrvoje's army and Ladislav's fleet, Split was subdued as well. The timid Ladislav of Naples came to Zadar but he did not dare go to Hungary and be crowned there, so he appointed Duke Hrvoje as the royal governor of Hungary, Croatia, Dalmatia and Bosnia, giving him the title of Herzog of Split. The coastal towns again came under the actual Bosnian power. Duke Hrvoje was the immediate ruler of Split, Brač, Hvar and Korčula and he became the main person in the Bosnian kingdom, in whose shadow ruled King Ostoja. “Ladislav formally elevated the herzog not only with the herzog title which increased his rank, but also with the governorship which turned the natural order of things: as a Bosnian nobleman, Hrvoje was under Ostoja's rule and as the king's governor he rose above him” (p. 197).

Stefan Ostoja aggravated his relationship with Dubrovnik, and his nobleman Radić Sanković entered the coastal region of Slansko with his army. Dubrovnik secretly offered Hrvoje an annual tax if he reconciled them with the king, but that intervention failed and Ostoja himself began to plunder the territory of Dubrovnik, reaching the town walls. Hrvoje did

not assist Ostoja in his war endeavours; there was a breach between them and Ostoja decided to become the vassal of Sigismund of Luxembourg again. After a series of events, Hrvoje was reconciled with Ostoja and Sigismund. Sigismund requested Ostoja to return the coastal territories to Dubrovnik and soon a new conflict broke out between Ostoja and Hrvoje. Hrvoje dethroned Ostoja in 1404 and the assembly of gentry called *Stanak* elected a new king - Tvrtko II, son of Tvrtko. Bosnia turned towards Ladislav of Naples again. Sigismund sent his army to Bosnia under the command of Jovan Moravički, Ban of Mačva. The Hungarians entered Bobovac where Ostoja had already taken refuge and, in 1405, the Hungarian army conquered Bihać as well. The Hungarians attacked again in 1406 and plundered half of Bosnia that year. Sigismund initiated a crusade against Bosnia in 1408 under the pretext of eradicating the heresy. In that war, almost two hundred Bosnian noblemen were killed. Bosnia was betrayed by Ladislav of Naples as well, who invited Venice to buy the Dalmatian towns and islands. When Duke Hrvoje found out about that, he decided to reconcile with Sigismund and bring Šibenik, Trogir and Nin under his supreme rule Šibenik, Trogir and Nin, while Zadar and its surrounding islands still recognized Ladislav. A bloody division took place in Bosnia, which ended in other noblemen recognizing Sigismund as well.

In 1409, King Tvrtko II was dethroned and the following year Sigismund appointed Duke Hrvoje as Bosnian Viceroy, intending to crown himself as the King of Bosnia. But then the former King Stefan Ostoja returned and regained the throne with the assistance of Sandalj Hranić. In 1410 Sigismund's army, with Hrvoje's support, attacked Bosnia and forced Sandalj Hranić and Pavle Radenović to accept Sigismund's coronation as the Bosnian King. The acceptance lasted for a very short time. The enmities were renewed in 1411 and Sandalj attacked Srebrenica and its Hungarian garrison. After that, there was a new reconciliation and Sigismund accepted Ostoja as the King of Bosnia and his vassal. All the leading Bosnian noblemen and King Stefan Ostoja gathered at the big celebration in Buda in 1412 and the long disputes and conflicts between Bosnia and Hungary ended then and there. However, new internal conflicts soon appeared. While Sandalj Hranić made war against the Turks with the Serbian Despot, Hrvoje Vukčić attacked his territories. Because of that, Sigismund proclaimed Hrvoje an outcast in 1413, which Split used to separate itself from Hrvoje's territories and the Hungarian King gave Brač, Hvar and Korčula as a gift to Dubrovnik and the north-western territories below the Cetina River to the Croatian noblemen. Hrvoje attempted to regain Sigismund's trust by promising to turn Catholic, but his pleadings were futile. Since Venice abandoned him as well, the only assistance Hrvoje obtained came from the Turks. In 1414, the Turks brought the former King Tvrtko to power as well, which resulted in Bosnia having two rulers at the same time. The Hungarian army went against Hrvoje in 1415 and clashed with the Turks at Lašva. The Hungarians were defeated there. After that, King Ostoja and Sandalj Hranić reconciled with Hrvoje renouncing Sigismund, and the sultan recognized Ostoja as the King of Bosnia. The Hungarians were driven from Usora and the internal conflicts continued in Bosnia. King Ostoja and Sandalj Hranić captured

and executed Pavle Radenović, who supported Tvrtko II. Pavle's son was almost blinded too and the country was divided. Nevertheless, since both Pavle's sons managed to save themselves, Petar and Radoslav Pavlović with Turkish assistance started a fight against their father's murderers in 1415. Fighting and plundering continued in 1416. That year, Duke Hrvoje died. Ostoja quickly divorced and married Hrvoje's widow Jelena, thus gaining the majority of Hrvoje's territories. The *Stanak* of noblemen was arranged by Sultan Mehmed, through his emissaries in 1416, and it was decided there that Ostoja should be captured and imprisoned. Having found out his prospects, Ostoja escaped his pursuers and turned against Sandalj Hranić. He seized Blagaj and subordinated the gentry of Hum. King Stefan Ostoja Kotromanić died in 1418.

That same year the Turks encroached again, assisting the suppressed Sandalj Hranić. The son of Ostoja, Stefan Ostojić was elected king. He continued the conflict with Sandalj and disturbed the relations with Dubrovnik as well. He became close to the Pavlović family, but he soon argued with them when the Turks attacked Bosnia again in 1420. Petar Pavlović was soon defeated and killed by the Turks. Sandalj then regained the major part of the Hum territories. With Sandalj's assistance, Stefan Tvrtko II returned to the throne and strengthened his rule rapidly. He renewed relationships with Venice and Hungary. He reconciled Sandalj Hranić and Radoslav Pavlović, who soon became kin as well. The settlement of the internal political situation prevented further Turkish interference and influence peddling. In 1424, Tvrtko II successfully repelled a Turkish raid but he failed to seize Srebrenica from Despot Stefan in 1425. The Turks encroached into Bosnia in 1426 causing great devastation. In his efforts to become close to Hungary, Tvrtko issued a charter in the form of his last will in 1427, upon Hungarian suggestion, in which he left his throne to Count Herman of Celje. This led to conflict with the district rulers and Tvrtko lost the support of Sandalj Hranić and Radoslav Pavlović. When Tvrtko II proposed to Sigismund's daughter Dorotea, he was accused of supporting heretics and schismatics in Bosnia. He managed to justify himself before the Pope Martin V and he married Dorotea in 1428, but the gentry boycotted his wedding. Bosnia was in a double vassal relationship, towards the Hungarian king and the Turkish sultan.

In 1433, the Serbian Despot dispossessed Tvrtko II of Usora, Zvornik and Teočak. Radoslav Pavlović and Sandalj Hranić supported the despot in that conflict. Tvrtko's adversaries brought Radivoje Ostojić to Bosnia as pretender to the throne and Tvrtko had to escape to Hungary. He returned to Bosnia in 1434 with the assistance of the Hungarian army, and the death of Sandalj Hranić enabled him to drive Radivoje Ostojić away in 1435. Nevertheless, Sandalj's successor Stefan Vukčić Kosača soon became independent and was recognized by Tvrtko II in 1436. The Turks invaded Bosnia again in 1439 and plundered the country as far as Jajce. The following year, Tvrtko II besieged Omiš together with Stefan Vukčić and the town surrendered. Tvrtko attacked the already very mighty Vukčić in 1443, but he soon had to ask Dubrovnik to mediate in making peace. That same year, Stefan Tvrtko II died. Noblemen elected Ostoja's son Stefan Tomaš

Kotromanić the new king. For three years, Stefan Vukčić was attempting to impose Radivoje Ostojić as king, but without any success. The King of Hungary, Ladislaus confirmed Stefan Tomaš as the King of Bosnia after some doubts about the pretences of the Celjski family. Tomaš attacked Stefan Vukčić in the alliance with Venice and Ivaniš Pavlović in 1444 and seized the Drijeva market. That same year he took Srebrenica from the Turks. Stefan Vukčić engaged the Turks against King Tomaš. Tomaš had to find shelter in Bobovac and the Despot of Serbia and the Duke of Hum united against him. The king lost Srebrenica again. The peace was made in 1446, when the king married the duke's daughter Katarina. The disputes with the despot continued.

At the time of King Stefan Tomaš Kotromanić, a great Catholic proselytistic action led by the Franciscan monks took place in Bosnia. Tomaš gladly joined the pursuit of the Bogomils, mainly driven by the possibility of easily confiscating their property. His greed was increased by the fact that the Bogomils in the meantime renounced their initial asceticism and dedicated themselves to gaining material fortune. The district rulers were turning Catholic at rapid pace, as did the Hrvoje's descendants Đurađ and Petar Vojsalić. Stefan Vukčić clashed with Stefan Tomaš again in 1448 and that conflict lasted for the following three years. The year Constantinople fell, 1453, King Tomaš and Herzog Stefan clashed over the succession of the coastal Ban Petar Talovac. But a new danger from the Turks united them in 1456. The following year, the Turks came to Bosnia again and destroyed it as far as the Sava River. Tomaš did not get the promised assistance from the Pope and the European rulers. A new Turkish invasion followed in 1458 and, when he had closed a peace agreement with the sultan, Tomaš hurried to marry his son to the daughter of the Serbian Despot. The Turks attacked Bosnia in 1459 as well, besieging Bobovac and Vranduk. In the counter attack, Tomaš besieged the Turkish fortification of Hodidjed. Tomaš's son was accused of surrendering Smederevo to the sultan without a fight in order to save himself and the European capitals buzzed with that news.

During these last years of Bosnian independence, the Bogomil heresy completely failed and the Catholics and the Orthodox started competing over the new believers. "The Bosnian Franciscans complained to Ivan Kapistran in 1455 and he forwarded those complaints to the Pope - that the Metropolitan of Raška prevented them from converting into Christianity those who were of Patarene belief, meaning that many people died 'outside faith' since they did not wish to embrace the Orthodox Church" (p. 319). Tomaš openly favoured the Franciscans. Many Bogomils were turned Catholics by force, but they did not sincerely accept the new religion and assisted the Turkish conquerors. Tomaš was forced to surrender Usora, Srebrenica, Zvornik and Teočak to the Turks in 1460 and, in 1461, the king died. There were suspicions that he was poisoned. He was succeeded on the throne by his son Stefan Tomašević who immediately agreed with Herzog Stefan, through mediation of his stepmother and herzog's daughter Katarina. That same year there was a conflict with the Dalmatian Ban Pavle Strančić. In 1462, the relations with Hungary improved. Sultan Mehmed II personally attacked with a great

army in 1463, blocked any possibility of Hungarian assistance across the Sava River and besieged Bobovac and Jajce. King Stefan took shelter in Ključ. Pasha, besieging the Ključ fortress, promised the king to let him go if he surrendered. The king thought he could escape as he had done before in Smederevo. He surrendered, but the sultan ordered Stefan Tomašević to be beheaded. None of the Bosnian fortresses gave any significant resistance. Before he returned, the sultan established Turkish garrisons in all the towns. After Mehmed withdrew, the Hungarian King Matthias Corvinus attacked his Bosnian strongholds. After a long siege, the Hungarians took Jajce and a large number of other towns. The following year, the sultan returned with great army but he did not manage to win Jajce back. The Hungarians took Usora, besieged Zvornik and came as far as Srebrenica.

In 1465, Sultan Mehmed II proclaimed Matija Kotromanić, son of Radivoje Ostojić and grandson of Stefan Ostoja vassal king in Bosnia. He had the Lašva district among his territories and figured as vassal king for the following six years. In 1471, he announced the renewal of the Bosnian kingdom on the territories he controlled. He proclaimed nobleman Nikola Iločki the King of Bosnia, who was crowned in Jajce that same year. In order to oppose him, the sultan proclaimed Hrvoje's descendant Matija Vojsalić the new king. The king proclaimed by the Turks contacted the Hungarian King immediately afterwards. Having found out about that, the Turks besieged six of his towns. Matthias Corvinus sent military assistance to the besieged Matija Vojsalić in 1476 which rescued him, but he and Nikola Iločki died the following year. Bosnia sank deep into Turkish slavery.

4.The History of the Hum Territory, Travunia and the Princedom of Neretva

Constantine Porphyrogenitus wrote that the Avars completely plundered the old Roman province of Dalmatia. It is stated that the Croats encountered the Avars in the part of Dalmatia they colonized, so they killed one part of the Avars and conquered the other. The conquered Avars were later assimilated by the Croats. That situation extended as far as the Cetina River. Constantine Porphyrogenitus says that the territory of Serbia was also completely devastated by the Avars, but the Avars did not remain there long. He expressly says that Duklja, Paganja, Zahumlje and Konavli were deserted, since the Avars killed and enslaved the people there, which meant that they took them away into slavery. In Chapter 30 of his essay *On Peoples* which was written around the mid-10th century, he says that "there are still descendants of the Avars in Croatia and they are visibly of Avar origin" (*History of Montenegro*, Editing Board for the Montenegrin History, Titograd 1967, p. 284). It is interesting that Porphyrogenitus adds one administrative addition to this almost anthropological remark, in which he makes a distinction between the territory of Krbava, Lika and Gacko, ruled by the ban, and the eleven Croatian tribal counties" (p. 284). The Avar raids in the Dalmatian part of Illyria left many archaeological and toponymical traces, but there are

absolutely no signs of the possible presence of the Slavs, either in written sources or in archaeological material, until the Serbs and the Croats appeared following the invitation from Emperor Heraclius. Constantine Porphyrogenitus very clearly and expressly claims that the inhabitants of Duklja, Zahumlje, Travunia, Konavle and Neretva are the Serbs. He specifically states that Duklja is inhabited by the Zahumljani. Therefore, it is the same Serbian tribe that settled in the territory of Hum.

a) The Period of Parishes and Autonomous Princedoms

The Serbs grouped in small populated conglomerations called parishes in the river valleys, karst fields, on the high plains, etc. A large number of those parishes formed princedoms. The princedoms in the Adriatic coastal region have been recorded to history, since there are written traces about them, while the princedoms in the continental part of the territory were simply forgotten during the process of establishment of the first Serbian state. The reason for that probably lies in the fact that the coastal princedoms of Duklja, Travunia, Zahumlje and Neretva showed a greater degree of organizational and political vitality and can be compared only to Raška and Bosnia in that regard. The historical data tell us that the Višević family played a leading role in Zahumlje, with their leader Mihailo, while the Beloje family had the same role in Travunia. There are no similar sources for Duklja and the Neretva princedom. These territories did not have princes in the actual sense of that word, but certain senior zhupans, as stated by Porphyrogenitus. Here we should remind ourselves that the Serbs had some sort of a primitive kingdom in their homeland, and that one of the king's sons brought them to both parts of Illyria, to Dalmatia and Panonia, as well as to Praevalitana and Moesia Superior. The central government was very loose, like the supreme Byzantine rule, and the main role was played by the family leaders. The Serbian Archont or the king recognized the supreme power of the Byzantine emperor and Porphyrogenitus says of the senior zhupans as family leaders that "they yield only to their archonts". The basic political and territorial units were the counties. According to Porphyrogenitus, Travunians originate from the Serbs who did not accept Christianity under "that archont who ran over to Emperor Heraclius" and, because of that, the "Travunian Archonts were under the rule of the Serbian Archont, but in the second half of the 8th century through to the mid 9th century their power grew and, although they were merely zhupans they ruled the entire area of Travunia" (p. 302).

The parish assemblies, consisting of the most respectable representatives of all the families, ruled the parishes together with the zhupan, preserving the initial system of military democracy in the developed tribal system. The old, ancient Roman population could only be found in rare refugee groups that lived in the mountains or in the coastal towns, terrified by the earlier savagery of the Avars and very friendly towards the newly-arrived Serbs. Although they belonged to a completely different civilization, they were assimilated relatively quickly and had a crucial cultural influence on the Serbian people, making it more Christian and enriching it with the achievements of the old Greek and Roman

societies. The majority of the Romans escaped to the islands in the Adriatic Sea, where they had the best protection since the Avars did not have a fleet. Over the entire 7th and 8th centuries, the Serbs lived in a specific status of semi-state, gradually accepting Christianity and the early feudal social relations.

In the *Libellus Gothorum*, Podgorje is mentioned as a separate Serbian territory which would encompass Nikšićko polje, the Upper Morača and the valley of the Komarnica River, the lower course of the Piva and Gatačko and the Nevesinjsko polje, Viševa on the upper course of the Neretva, Kom, Dabar, the Neretva and the Rama. The other sources do not mention it and since Priest Dukljanin is too imaginative and highly unreliable writer regarding elementary factography, according to the undivided opinion of science critics, the dilemma of whether Podgorje really existed as a territorial and political unit remains.

The first mentioning of the inhabitants of Zahumlje in written documents is the fact that they used the weak rule of the Byzantine Emperor Michael II to gain independence under the rule of their zhupan between 820 and 829. They are mentioned for the second time in 871 during the defence of Bar from the Saracens and, after that, they were even transported across the Adriatic Sea with the Neretljani to participate in the defence of the southern Italy. The Neretljani are mentioned in 830 when they sent an emissary to the Doge of Venice in order to justify themselves for their previous frequent pirate raids on Venetian ships. They agreed with the Venetians about the peace and stopping the mutual attacks at that time, but they did not stick to that agreement for long and in 834, they attacked and killed a large group of Venetians who were coming back from a trading trip to Benevento. In 840, Venice sent a military expedition of 32 war ships against the Neretljani, which did not achieve particular success so it made peace with the Neretljani Duke Družik. While the Zahumljani and the Neretljani defended the southern Italy, their lands were plundered by the Byzantine admiral Niketas, who even enslaved a lot of the Serbs who lived there. Byzantium took its revenge on them because of their frequent plundering of the coastal towns in Romaea. The enmities that started then lasted until 878. A compromise was reached so that the inhabitants of Zahumlje and Travunia started, for example, obtaining the annual tribute from the people of Dubrovnik since 881 in exchange for not attacking the town's surrounding area, its inhabitants and its vineyards. The tribute from Dubrovnik was called the *mogorish*. There is a grounded presumption that, since the Serbs arrived to the Balkans, the Zahumljani were ruled by the ancestors of Mihailo Višević in continuity. Constantine Porphyrogenitus wrote that the name Zahumlje originates from the hill of Hum, while Ioannes Lucius thinks that the first name of the Trebisnjica River was Zahuma or Zahumštica, which is also quoted by Šafarik and Stanojević. Quite a number of hills in the present Herzegovina are called Hum, as well as a large village near Popovo polje. The pan Serbian ruler Petar Gojniković who had already ruled the territory of Hum, conquered the Princedom of Neretva in 912.

As stated by Šafarik, the Zahumljani definitely, for the third time, accepted Christianity during the rule of Prince Mihailo Višević, who took

the Holy Archangel Michael as the patron saint of his family. His father was called Višeslav, after the Vistula River from the neighbourhood of which the Serbs came, according to Porphyrogenitus. Mihailo was a close ally of the Bulgarian Emperor Simeon, whom he helped capture Petar Gojniković in 917 in order to make Zahumlje independent again. He expanded his territory at the expense of Travunia and Duklja. However, the Byzantine Emperor Romanos Lekapenos won over Mihailo Višević in 923, by appointing him patrician and proconsul and giving him the rule over Dubrovnik and Kotor. The Zahumljani participated in the Byzantine battles against the Bulgarians since then, for the Bulgarians came to the Zahumlje border, having driven away the Serbian ruler Zaharije. As presented by the Croatian historian Ferdo Šišić on page 217 of his *Reference Book*, Mihailo participated to the church assembly in Split in 925 following the invitation from Pope John X. Based on Višević's participation; the official report speaks about the Serbian presence at the assembly as well. However, Mihailo Višević did not participate to the second assembly held in Split in 927, because it was not related to the Serbian issues but to the relations between Bulgaria and Croatia. When Mihailo Višević died around 930, Zahumlje was more firmly integrated into the Serbian state ruled by Caslav.

The *Libellus Gothorum* states that the brother-in-law of the Zhupan of Raška, Predimir, came to the throne of the so called Tetrarchy, i.e. Hum, Travunia, Duklja and Podgorje in 976. He had four sons: Hvalimir, Boleslav, Dragoslav and Sjevlad. Predimir divided the territories entrusted to him so that Hvalimir got Duklja, Boleslav got Travunia, Sjevlad got Podgorje and Dragoslav got the territory of Hum to rule. When Predimir died, he was succeeded on the throne of the Tetrarchy by the son of Boleslav, Silvester, who was followed by Tugomir, who was succeeded by Hvalimir with his three sons, among which Dragimir ruled Hum and Travunia. After Samuel had defeated the Serbian King Vladimir and plundered his lands, he enabled Dragimir to regain Travunia. After that Dragimir was captured and executed by the people of Kotor, but his wife managed to escape and she gave birth to a son Dobroslav-Vojislav. Dobroslav-Vojislav supported Byzantine Emperor Basil II, who enabled him to come to the throne of Travunia. When Duke of Hum Ljutovid with the Zhupan of Raška and the Ban of Bosnia went after him, Vojislav sent his son Gojislav to fight them. Gojislav was injured in that conflict and Vojislav died soon after.

Stefan Vojislav acquired the entire territory of Serbia in 1043, including Zahumlje. For almost a century, Zahumlje remained a part of the Serbian state as a whole, but since 1131 it is part of the territories of Gradinja, who also kept Duklja, Trebinje and the coastal area from Kotor to Skadar. Gradinja was succeeded by his son Radoslav. When he accepted the supreme rule of the Byzantine Emperor Manuel, an uprising broke out and Desa, the son of Uroš, was brought to rule. In 1165, Nemanja entrusted his brother Miroslav with Zahumlje. Miroslav died around 1198 and he was succeeded by his son Andrija who was not yet of age. Andrija's brother Petar took the title of prince from him. At that time, Hum extended as far as the river Cetina. When Petar died around 1230, he

was succeeded by his grandson Tolen who lived until 1239. At that time the entire territory of Hum was taken by the Branivojević brothers, until Stefan Kotromanić came and drove them away, leaving Petar Tolenović, son of Tolen, on his small estate in Popovo polje and Primorje. The Bosnian Ban married his daughter Katarina to Nikola, Petar's uncle, after he had killed Petar who had been unwilling to yield to him. In 1249, there is a mention of Andrija as the Grand Prince of Hum, with his sons Bogdan and Radoslav. Sometime before that, the Hungarian King Koloman destroyed the Bogomil heretics in the territory of Hum between the Neretva and the Cetina Rivers, which was not ruled by Andrija. As early as 1254, Andrija's son Radoslav is mentioned in documents as the Grand Prince of the Hum territory.

On the other hand, the data about the Neretljani is even rarer, extremely sporadic and accidental so to speak. It is known that they killed the Archbishop of Split once, that they were extremely unruly, freedom-loving, violent and prone to piracy. For a long time, piracy was their only commercial activity. Their territory under Biokovo was sometimes also called Podgorina, which should be distinguished from the parish of Podgorje. In their hinterland lived the Imočani on the land which had always belonged to Zahumlje. It is difficult to tell which data, news or hint about the Neretljani is true and which is a product of the folklore, legend and imagination of the later times. "However, the document of Berigoj, the King of Neretva, dated 1050 in which he was mentioned *cum cuppanis* and which was signed by three zhupans as witnesses (Radoban, Bodidrag and Sedrag) and the captain Tihan, is completely authentic" (Mihailo Dinić: *The Gentry of Hum and Trebinje*, Naučno delo, Belgrade 19067, p. 2).

At the beginning of the 15th century, the entire territory of the former Principedom of Neretva was located on the spacious territory of Duke Hrvoje Vukčić, the strongest nobleman in Bosnia, together with Sandalj Hranić and Pavle Radenović. Hrvoje Vukčić held the line Skadrin-Ključ as far as the river Sava. The Serbian military garrison, assigned by Tsar Dušan to his sister as the protection of her lands, was maintained in Skadrin for a long time. The Hrvoje's territory was separated from the territory of Sandalj by the Neretva River. Sandalj Hranić was Orthodox, while Hrvoje Vukčić was Bogomil until his death. He built a Bogomil temple in Jajce, but historical records indicate that he helped both the Orthodox and the Catholic Church. The right bank of the Neretva to its confluence and the Zaoštrog territory under Biokovo is known to have been held by the local noble family Šimranović. Their progenitor was Grgur Šimrak who was mentioned in documents in 1433 and 1442, since his serfs had been accused of robbery, fighting, stealing cattle etc. It seems that they also had some lands on the other side of the Neretva, in the vicinity of Stoc, while the area of Nevešinj was ruled by the Purčić family and Dabar by the Picević. Stefan Šimraković "was married to Milica, daughter of Tvrtko Borovinić [...]. On the other hand, we know about Vladislav Šimraković as well, and Petar Šimraković appeared as Petar Pavlović, the Duke Šimraković of Hum [...]. As the son and the heir of Prince Pavle, he agreed about something with Vladislav, the son and

the heir of Princess Milica, 'from the order of Herzog Hrvoje' and Stepan Šimraković. Andjela of the late Vladislav Šimraković and Pavle, son of late Vladislav, and Duke Petar Pavlović appear as the successors of Herzog Hrvoje" (p. 37-38).

Travunia consisted of the following parishes: Ljubomir, Fatnica, Rudina near Bileća, Kruševica, Zrm, Risan, Dračevica, Konavli and Zrnovica. The centre of Travunia was the town of Trebinje. Zahumlje, or the land of Hum, which is the most beautiful medieval term, encompassed ten parishes: Ston with Pelješac, Popovo polje, Zažablje, the Neretva valley from Bregava and Trebižat to the sea, Ljubuški, Imotsko polje, Mostarsko blato, Dubrava and Dabarsko polje. Judging from the important archaeological findings from the 9th century, it is presumed that Zavala was the centre of parish Popovo polje, while Hum was the main place in the entire area. Parish Ljubuški or Velika gora bordered with the Rastok parish, which belonged to the Principedom of Neretva or Paganja. The border line went across Orah, Grab and Vašarovići. Paganja further encompassed the mountain range of Biokovo and the narrow coastal zone to the river Cetina and the islands of Brač and Hvar. All those Serbian territories had maximum autonomy in the Byzantine state, which did not even make any efforts to fully spread its administrative apparatus to the inland territories, limiting itself to the management of coastal towns. This management was also pretty loose and left them a considerable freedom of action. It was sufficient for the emperors that the entire territory of Serbia was peaceful and that the Serbs protected the empire from barbaric invasions. The Neretljani went furthest in gaining independence, openly opposing the Christianization and being engaged in piracy. For that reason, the Byzantine fleet intervened against them in 870, commanded by the drungary Niketas Ooryphas. That same year, Byzantium suppressed the Franks and strengthened its rule in the Dalmatian coastal towns. It defended those towns from the Arabs who had destroyed many of them. Only then did Emperor Basil I make the Neretljani consent to Christianization and "they accepted Christianity through the emperor's delegates and the Greek priests, after having sent one delegation to the Emperor Basil asking to be Christianized" (p.353). The Serbs were not Christianized through missionary work, but the ruler- zhupan or prince - convened the assembly of the people he ruled and they jointly reached a decision on collective Christianization. The Serbian Christianization also followed all the rules of the initial tribal democracy.

The noble family Višević very early gained great power and wealth in Zahumlje. At the end of the 9th century, the sources mention Prince Višeta and his son Mihailo Višević ruled in 912. Mihailo captured the Byzantine Protostator Peter Patriciak that the same year and sent him to the Bulgarian Emperor Simeon. In 917, Petar, the Prince of Neretva, led a pro-Byzantine policy, unlike Mihailo who inclined towards the Bulgarians. "During the battle of Anchialus in 917, the Strategos of Drač, Protostator Leo Phocas led one Byzantine delegation to Paganja to negotiate with the Serbian Prince Petar." From the presentation of Constantine Porphyrogenitus it can be seen that Mihailo inclined towards Bulgaria even then. "Being jealous of this – says Porphyrogenitus –

Mihailo, the Archont of Zahumlje, told Simeon, the Bulgarian Archont, that the Emperor of Romea was bribing Archont Petar to connect with the Turks (the Hungarians) and to go to war against Bulgaria. This caused the conquering of Serbia by Simeon and the fall of Prince Pavle" (p. 361). Mihailo Višević is also mentioned as a Bulgarian ally in 926, the year when he went to a plundering raid against some Byzantine lands in the southern Italy. He conquered the town of Siponte. The following year, after Simeon's death, Mihailo changed side to pro-Byzantine. He received the title of proconsul and the status of patrician from the emperor, while Porphyrogenitus states that Mihailo's territories reached as far as the town walls of Dubrovnik, so the inhabitants of Dubrovnik paid him the rent for vineyards. In 927, Mihailo moved the centre of his state to the area of Ston. He participated to the Assembly in Split in 925, where the issue of defining the spheres of interest of the Kotor and Dubrovnik Episcopates was discussed. There is also a papal letter in which Mihailo is addressed as duke.

The first lord of Travunia mentioned in the historical sources was Beloja, who married his son to the daughter of the Serbian ruler Vlastimir. Beloja was succeeded by his son Krajina, grandson Hvalimir and great-grandson Čučimir. Both Vlastimir and Beloja were descendants of the first Serbian archont, who brought his people to the Balkans. "Having married his daughter to Krajina, Vlastimir appointed Krajina Archont of Travunia, thus bringing Travunia in a dependent position towards Raška, and the successors of Krajina, Hvalimir and Čučimir remained dependent of the rulers of Raška for good." *Libellus Gothorum* states that Beloja was only a nickname of Pavlimir and that his predecessors were Radoslav and Petrislav. "On the other hand, it claims that the Great Zhupans of Raška before Vlastimir were Tihomir and Ljutimir, that Ljutimir and Pavlimir-Beloje clashed over the power on the Lim River and that Ljutimir was killed on the Ibar. Priest Dukljanin also said of Pavlimir, i.e. Beloje that he fought against the Hungarians on the territory of Srem and won the Battle of Bjeljina. *Libellus Gothorum* gives a large number of names of representatives of the ruling family through several generations - Tihomir, Predimir, Krešimir, Hvalimir, Boleslav, Dragoslav, Svevlad, Silvestar, Stefan, Legec, Tugomir, Hvalimir, Petrislav, Dragimir, Miroslav and the seven sons of Legec. All this is extremely unreliable from the historical point of view, since it has not been confirmed by any other source and it is impossible to clearly separate factography from imagination or exaggeration in the works of Priest Dukljanin without an adequate comparison. In any case, it was one very mighty and vital family.

Constantine Porphyrogenitus was no longer alive at the time of the Samuel's empire and his book *On the Administration of the Empire* was written between 948 and 952. Priest Dukljanin dates the rule of Tugomir in Travunia to the time of the rise of Samuel, whose uprising broke out in 976. According to Dukljanin, Tugomir was succeeded by Hvalimir and, at that time, according to *Libellus Gothorum*, Travunia spread to Zeta, Zahumlje and Podgorje. Since Hvalimir had three sons, he divided his land and gave Zeta to Petrislav, Travunia and Zahumlje to Dragimir and Podgorje to Miroslav: "Miroslav drowned by accident in the Lake Skadar

Comment [K.B.4]: Translator's note: We were unable to find any source in order to translate this name, so we gave the suggested spelling here

and Petrislav got his territories as well. After Petrislav's death, there were two rulers – Vladimir, son of Petrislav in Zeta and his uncle Dragimir in Travunia and Zahumlje” (p. 381). Priest Dukljanin's background for this data was the comprehensive historical document *The Chronicle of Travunia*, a unique historical source, which is therefore impossible to verify. Dragimir was expelled by the Bulgarian Emperor Samuel during his raid but, when Jovan Vladimir became Samuel's son-in-law, the emperor again entrusted his uncle Dragimir with the rule over Travunia.

Dragimir was killed in Tivat, attempting to seize power in Duklja after Vladimir's death. His son Dobrosav was born as a posthumous child, he spent his childhood in Bosnia with his uncle and his youth in Dubrovnik, where he was educated and brought up by his cousins. He married the granddaughter of Emperor Samuel in Dubrovnik. After Dragutin's death, there is a mention of Ljutovid in 1042 as the Prince of Hum. Ljutovid was highly suspicious of the King of Duklja, Vojislav and his domination. According to *Libellus Gothorum*, Travunia was ruled by Predimir's son Boleslav at the beginning of the 11th century, but this data is not particularly reliable since Priest Dukljanin started presenting verified data only when he wrote about Jovan Vladimir based on his biography. After Dragimir, Travunia did not attempt to rule Duklja any more. However, at the time of Ljutovid, Travunia, Zahumlje, Bosnia and Raška solidarily opposed the domination of Duklja until their resistance was subdued. When Vojislav died, Travunia became restless again and Zahumlje was out of control. The Domanek's rebellion additionally complicated the situation, but even after his death Travunia had certain autonomy and served as a shelter for Radislav. “Travunia was loosely connected with the central power, especially during the dynastic fights and the crisis in Duklja, and some enemies of Prince Radoslav easily incited Travunia, Zahumlje and parts of Duklja to rebell during his rule and surrendered them to the Zhupan of Raška, Desa. Zahumlje held an independent position as well, which can be concluded from the fact that Gradihna found refuge from the persecution of King Đorđe in Zahumlje” (p. 405).

The documents mention the Zhupan of Trebinje Grej, who was captured by the Byzantines in 1150 in the battle of Tara but freed himself the following year and who is mentioned by Desa as a witness in his charter. He died around 1180, during the rule of the last Prince of Duklja and Hum, Mihailo. The fewest historical data was preserved about Podgorje. When the Byzantine army attacked Raška after 969, the Zhupan of Raška with his two sons and a daughter escaped to Duklja, where his daughter Prehvala married the King of Duklja, Predimir. Predimir then proclaimed his wife's brother Radigrad Zhupan of Trebjesa and Onogošt. In 976, Predimir organized an anti-Byzantine rising in Raška with the refugee Zhupan of Raška and returned his father-in-law to the throne, but as his own vassal. After Predimir's death, Svevlad, his youngest son, inherited Podgorje with all the parishes. At the time of King Hvalimir, Podgorje was subordinated to Duklja and the lord of the territory was Miroslav, the youngest son of Hvalimir. When Miroslav was killed, his eldest brother Petrisav took Podgorje and adjoined it to Duklja entirely.

Before 1189, Stefan Nemanja seized the land of Hum from his nephew Mihailo and gave it to his brother Miroslav. Mihailo's widow Desislava fled to Dubrovnik. However, under King Uroš, “the period of individual princedoms ruled by branches of the Nemanjić family ended. Almost at the same time, the Princes of Hum, the descendants of Nemanja's brother Miroslav and Vukan's successors in Zeta disappeared. It is difficult to presume that this was a result of coincidence. In the mid 13th century, Miroslav's descendants made specific agreements with Dubrovnik; the Zhupan of Hum, Radoslav, son of Prince Andrija, was at one point even the enemy of King Uroš I and entered then alliance with Dubrovnik and the Bulgarian emperor against the King of Serbia. At the time of Dragutin, one son of Prince Andrija still lived in Hum but he did not hold the title of prince any more. Kaznac ruled over Hum on behalf of the king, in agreement with the gentry. Miroslav's descendants were degraded to the position of local squires and the actual power went to the people sent here by the Kings of Serbia” (the second book, volume I, p. 12-13)

At the beginning of the 14th century, the Croatian Ban Pavle Šubić rushed in the land of Hum and took the valley of Neretva, Nevesinje, Ston and the coast as far as Dubrovnik, appointing the Croatian nobleman Konstantin Nelipčić his governor on the conquered territory. Pavle Bribirski also participated in the siege of Kotor in 1301, assisting Venice, Zadar and Dubrovnik in their attempts to destroy Kotor, but without any success. His incursions into the Serbian territory were enabled by the internal conflict between Milutin and Dragutin. In 1318, Milutin set out to return the Serbian royal territories and he captured Grgur, brother of Mladen Šubić. He let him go when the Croatian noblemen returned to him all the Serbian lands. When the young King Dušan was already running the state affairs, the local gentry, the Branivojević brothers, became arrogant, rebelled and clashed with Dubrovnik and Bosnia. However, they were defeated, so Stefan Kotromanić adjoined Hum to Bosnia and the people of Dubrovnik seized Ston and Pelješac, which were confirmed to them by Dušan afterwards.

One of the strongest families among the Zahumlje gentry were two brothers Nikolić, Bogdan and Vladislav - descendants of Nemanja's brother Miroslav and nephews of Stefan Kotromanić. Their ancestors lost the ruling position but the family grew stronger again in time and began to exceed local significance. Bogdan's son Tvrtko was the Zhupan of Popovo polje and he is mentioned in that role in 1319. Brother of Bogdan's and Vladislav's father, Toljen had two sons, Petar and Brajko but they did not have any successors and their territories fell to the share of the Nikolić family. Historical sources tell that the Nikolić family held Dušan's side against Stefan Kotromanić. The next generation of the Nikolić, Vukosav, Petar and Miloš are mentioned in 1392 as the supporters of King Dabiša, who transferred to them the right to collect *mogorish* from the people of Dubrovnik. As supporters of Dabiša's widow Jelena, the Nikolić family was in disfavour of the new King Ostojica and they had to flee to the territory of Dubrovnik. Vukosav Nikolić was later a vassal of Sandalj Hranić and was killed on his side in 1403, during a

conflict with the people of Dubrovnik. In 1414, the Nikolić family supported King Ostoja against Tvrtko II and they were again authorised to collect *mogorish*. Besides that, they annoyed the people of Dubrovnik with their constant attempts to impose new duties. Grgur Nikolić was so persistent in this matter that he even ignored Ostoja's orders to abolish the duties. He only made a deal with the people of Dubrovnik in 1418. Together with the Hum noblemen Radivojević, Grgur Nikolić took side of Stefan Ostojić against Sandalj Hranić, in their attempts to free themselves from vassal relation to the Kosača family. Since they failed, the people of Dubrovnik mediated in their reconciliation with Sandalj. When Sandalj Hranić died in 1435, the Nikolić family remained loyal to his successor Stefan Vukčić. That also refers to Grgur's sons Vuk and Vukašin.

The leading noble family at that time in Trebinje were the Ljubibratić. They were vassals of the Bosnian nobleman Radoslav Pavlović and fought on his side against the people of Dubrovnik. Their ancestor in the 13th century was Radonja Kudelinović, who successfully held on both under the rule of Balšić family and under the kings of Bosnia. For some time he was in conflict with Prince Pavle Radenović and took refuge in Dubrovnik for that reason. His grandson Pasko, son of Dobruško was the leading nobleman at the time when the Kosača family took Trebinje over from the Pavlović family. The mighty noble family of Staršić grew between Trebinje and Konavle, towards Popovo polje held by the Popović family. In the valley of Neretva, the most powerful families were the Milatović in Duvno and the Semković in Livno.

b) The Hum Territory as an Independent State

The territory of Hum was practically an independent state during the rule of Duke Stefan Vukčić Kosača, Herzog of the order of Saint Sava, who was formally the vassal of the Bosnian king first and of the Turkish sultan afterwards. His father Vukač was brother of the mighty lord Sandalj Hranić. The Kosača family originate from the vicinity of the river Drina. Stefan married Jelena Balšić, daughter of Balša III in 1424, probably aged 20, and inherited the territory of Hum in 1435, when his uncle Sandalj died. Having instrumentalized King Tvrtko II, the rightful King of Bosnia, the Hungarian King Sigismund attempted to get hold of all the previously divided feudal lands through him. That was not difficult after Hrvoje Vukčić died in 1416, since his territories were mainly adjoined to the feudal territory of King Ostoja. However, Sandalj's successor opposed the Hungarian intentions and the fact that he sent the Croatian noblemen Frankopan against Stefan and won over the people of Dubrovnik for that purpose, did not help Sigismund much. Stefan's position in the war with the Hungarian exponents was aggravated by the conflict with Radoslav Pavlović. Venice interfered as well, attempting to seize Novi from Stefan through Kotor. Despot Đurađ and the Turks were on Stefan's side and the people of Dubrovnik soon changed their attitude, counting on the fact that Stefan was a much better neighbour than the Venetians. In return, Stefan Vukčić issued a charter for the people of Dubrovnik in 1435 in Nevesinje, which presented the full independence of

his ruling position. It differs from the previous Sandalj's charter, where Sandalj Hranić put the authority of the Bosnian king, in whose country he was a great district lord, in the first place. This is a convincing legal document that testifies to the independence of Hum. That same year, the Turks encroached into other parts of Bosnia to a limited extent, which significantly weakened the pressure on Stefan and facilitated the stabilization of his power. He introduced order among his noblemen and suppressed foreign military attacks.

The dispute between the Hungarian king and Ivan Frankopan over the succession of Ivan Nelipčić, the Prince of Cetina, provided Stefan Vukčić with an opportunity to interfere in the internal Hungarian disputes on the side of Frankopan and send his army towards the river Cetina in 1436. Frankopan died late that year and his territories were taken over by the Hungarian exponent Matko Talovac. However, Stefan, being in a very favourable position, managed to reconcile with the Hungarian king and obtained from him the official confirmation for all his territories. He forced Radoslav Pavlović to accept peace at that time and took over the actual control of Trebinje. Stefan reconciled with King Tvrtko II as well, but he did not yield to him and for the following couple of years they acted as equal allies. They jointly made war against Radoslav Pavlović in 1437. Tvrtko's role in that was a brief one but Stefan destroyed Radoslav, who asked for Turkish protection and help. Under the Turkish pressure Stefan was forced to return him the territories, but he soon improved his relations with the Turks, which was not the case with Radoslav, and this enabled Stefan to definitively eliminate Pavlović as a threat.

In 1439, Stefan attacked the Hungarian territories in the coastal area and besieged Omiš, which he seized after eight months of siege, defeating Ban Matko Talovac. He had a conflict with Despot Đurđe, but this conflict was reduced to incidents along the border and plunders. In 1441, the Turks exercised pressure on Stefan to attack Dubrovnik, where Despot Đurađ resided. Stefan resisted the pressure and secretly warned the people of Dubrovnik at the same time. In agreement with Dubrovnik, he managed to remove the threat by bribing Turkish dignitaries. However, the people of Dubrovnik tricked him with the promise to reimburse him all the costs. That same year, Stefan took one part of the Upper Zeta and appointed Stefanica Crnojević the district lord of five cantons. Venice was considerably worried about this, since it affected the safety of its territories in the Serbian coastal region. In 1443, Stefan fought against King Tvrtko for a brief period of time. His conflict with Venice lasted longer and, during this time, Duke Stefan unsuccessfully entered the Lower Zeta too. The Venetian Republic invested all its diplomatic and bribing efforts to keep these territories without larger war efforts. Therefore, the Venetians opposed to Stefan and Stefanica the three younger Crnojević brothers. They gradually won over all Stefan's followers and supporters in the entire area of Zeta. The Venetian Prince of Skadar besieged Bar, which was held by Stefan's followers. Stefan ran to aid the besieged town but he did not arrive in time and some noblemen surrendered Bar to the Venetians for benefits' sake.

Invigorated by the success in Bar, the Venetians planned to take Omiš

from Stefan, as well as the great harbour of Drijeva on the Neretva. But they soon gave up that, since Stefan possessed significant forces, aside from the defeat in Zeta. After the death of the Bosnian king Tvrtko II, Stefan entered the conflict with his successor King Tomaš, who was supported by the Venetians and Ivaniš Paylović. Stefan was driven away from the valley of Neretva and the Venetians seized Omiš early in 1444. That same year, Stefan asked for protection the King of Aragon, Alfonso, undertaking to be his vassal and the subject of Apulia. Alfonso provided him with certain diplomatic assistance and the imperilled Stefan managed to recuperate and suppress the forces of King Tomaš in mid 1444, regaining Drijeva. Tomaš's pressure weakened because of a new Turkish encroachment into Bosnia. Stefan returned the town of Medun to Despot Đurđe and became his ally. In 1445, he reached a compromise with the Venetians, renouncing Omiš and he resisted one additional deep breakthrough of King Tomaš's army. After that, Stefan made peace with Tomaš, to whom he gave his daughter as wife, so the king returned Drijeva to Stefan in 1446. At that time, it seemed that Stefan's lands, at least formally became a part of the Bosnian state again. The people of Dubrovnik made intensive efforts to break down the good relationship between Duke Stefan and Despot Đurđe, but their intrigues had little effect and were short-lived.

In 1447, the Turks invaded Stefan's territories and burnt Drijeva, but they did not remain there long and they soon made peace with the duke. As early as the following year, Stefan participated in the war against King Tomaš as Đurađ's ally. After that victory, Stefan Vukčić Kosača proclaimed himself Herzog of Hum and the Coastal Region and, the year after, he specified his title even more, naming himself the Herzog of St. Sava. The Turks immediately recognized and confirmed his new title, as did the neighbouring Christian states where the title of herzog followed immediately after the title of king in the nomenclature. "Just as Trytko bound himself to the Nemanjić dynasty and the Serbian state tradition through Mileševa, Stefan emphasized the specific position of his lands, which once were a constituent part of the Serbian state, through Mileševa and St.Sava as well" (Sima Ćirković: *Herzog Stefan Vukšić Kosača and his Age*, Naučno delo, Belgrade 1964, p. 108.) The constant disputes the herzog had with Dubrovnik over trade and borders escalated in those years and were temporarily settled through diplomatic efforts for a certain period of time, though Stefan was even ready for an armed conflict.

Herzog continued the conflicts with King Tomaš in 1449 and again in 1450. In 1451, Stefan attacked Dubrovnik and soon broke its resistance in Župa and Konavle. The people of Dubrovnik asked for peace negotiations and, in the meantime, looked for allies. Despot Đurađ, the Roman Pope, King Tomaš and the Hungarians took side of Dubrovnik. The hardest blow for the herzog was the fact that they won over his son Vladislav, who had been angry with his father since Stefan had stolen his son's girlfriend and made her his lover. Because of that, the herzog's wife Jelena became his enemy too. Since Herzog Stefan, like many other neighbouring Serbian rulers and noblemen, was the Lord of Dubrovnik as well, the people of Dubrovnik put a price of fifteen thousand ducats on his head, simultaneously offering the sultan to buy

the herzog's entire territory themselves. Herzog continued the siege and came near the city walls before hurrying with the majority of his army to help Kotor, which was under attack by groups of Albanian bandits. The people of Dubrovnik used this opportunity for a counter attack on the herzog's forces, but they suffered a severe new loss having fallen in a cunningly prepared ambush. The people of Dubrovnik were saved by the fact that, late that year, the sultan made peace with the Hungarians which encompassed Dubrovnik as well. The herzog received an order from Constantinople to stop his attacks on Dubrovnik and to return the captured territories.

As soon as the sultan's emissary left Dubrovnik, the enmities were renewed and the herzog took Konavle again. When the people Dubrovnik complained, the Porte sent a new emissary in March 1452. Stefan was completely shaken by an open rebellion led by his son Vladislav, his mother and grandmother and assisted by Duke Ivaniš Vlatković. The rebels soon took the entire territory of Hum and the Turks ultimately demanded that the herzog's army leave Konavle. The Bosnian king and the people of Dubrovnik intervened with an army on the side of rebels. In order to win it over as an ally, the herzog offered Venice the whole territory of Krajina and Drijeva. The Venetians accepted and took Drijeva, but withdrew without fight when the larger army of the triple alliance approached. Soon there were conflicts among the allies, since the King of Bosnia asked for the town of Blagaj and Vladislav refused to surrender it. Tomaš then withdrew his army and the weakened people of Dubrovnik were defeated by Stefan immediately afterwards. The sultan's third emissary brought the decision that Stefan must pay compensation to the people of Dubrovnik for the last attack on their territory, but he did not make any substantial efforts to realize that decision. Regarding the conflict between father and the son, the Turks were neutral at first but, soon afterwards, they sent armed forces to support the herzog. Vladislav was soon defeated and he reconciled with his father. Herzog mercifully granted amnesty to all the rebelling noblemen in 1453.

Simultaneously with the renewal of his state, the herzog also won the sympathies of new Hungarian King Ladislaus, as well as the confirmation of his status and territories. Herzog Stefan again held Drijeva and the Venetians returned Krajina to him. The peace negotiations with Dubrovnik lasted somewhat longer though. In 1454, the herzog's state was affected by plague epidemics and famine. Stefan's son Vladislav married Anna Cantacuzena, a cousin of Jerina Branković. Herzog Stefan Vukčić bravely declined Turkish request to participate with 8,000 of his soldiers in the sultan's march against Belgrade in 1456, but he agreed to assist the sultan in his attack on Skenderbeg in Albania. He forestalled the conspiracy of the Vlatković brothers and drove them out of Herzegovina. The same year when his youngest son Stefan was born and his second wife Barbara, the Italian, died – 1459, the herzog seized the town of Cačvina on the Cetina River from King Tomaš. King Tomaš slandered the herzog before the Turks - reporting that Stefan allegedly allied with the Christian rulers against them - and asked for Turkish help to return Cačvina. The Turks encroached into the herzog's state with significant

forces and he took refuge in Blagaj with his family. The Turkish encroachment repeated in 1460 and, after much plunder, the herzog was forced to pay a significant amount to the sultan for the sake of peace. Soon the sultan demanded Cačvina, which was located on a significant strategic route, from him. When King Tomaš undertook a major enforcing of Christianization, upon the instruction from the pope, the herzog widely opened the borders of his state to all the pursued Bogomils and Orthodox, thus showing his opinion of the Bishop of Rome.

When Tomaš died, the herzog reconciled with his successor Stefan Tomašević and sent his son Vlatko to the coronation ceremony. He allied with the new King of Bosnia against the Croatian Ban Pavle Sperančić, who had previously seized one town from Bosnia. Venice opposed that alliance in the light of its ambitions directed towards the northern territories, but it wished to direct the king and the herzog towards the fight against the Turks. Then there was a new breach between Stefan and his son Vladislav, since the father had not kept his promise to divide his territories between his sons before his death. Vladislav went over to the Turks and offered sultan one hundred thousand ducats in exchange for his help in taking half of the state from Vladislav's father. The sultan agreed and assembled a great army for that purpose, but he suddenly had to redirect it towards the Danube where he was threatened by the Hungarians. The sultan tried to force money or several towns from the herzog but without any success. The herzog declined a new request from sultan to assist with his army and cannons in the sultan's attack on Dubrovnik. In 1463 the Turks encroached into Herzegovina again, but their main force was directed towards Bosnia. The herzog was defeated on the Breznica River and Vladislav appeared with the Turkish army as well. The herzog with his family fled to Novi by sea. When sultan withdrew soon, leaving strong garrisons in the conquered towns, the herzog attacked them immediately. He reconciled with Vladislav again and the eldest son joined the battle against the Turks, managing to liberate Ljubuški. All but three of the towns were freed. Even though he got from his father one quarter of the state to rule, Vladislav rebelled again. Persuaded by Venice, his father yielded to him. In cooperation with the Hungarians, his sons freed almost the entire territory of Bosnia from the Turks. The conflict between the herzog and Vladislav was heated again in 1465 and this time it was a definitive one. The Turks went against Herzegovina again that same year. The Venetians used the opportunity to take Krajina away from the herzog. The Hungarian army entered the valley of the Neretva River. In 1466, the herzog met with the Hungarian noblemen in Dubrovnik, looking to engage as many mercenaries as possible. He became ill though, made his last will and testament and died there.

With the assistance of the King of Naples, Ferdinand of Aragon, Vladislav attempted to get hold of his father's state, but the Hungarians and the Venetians opposed that. Vlatko became the new ruler and he had the support of the domestic gentry. Herzog Vlatko soon worsened his relations with the Hungarians by refusing to finance their army in the Neretva valley. By way of retaliation, the Hungarians blocked his father's inheritance in Dubrovnik. In spite of all these troubles, Vlatko continued

to fight against the Turks and returned Trebinje and Popovo polje in 1468. In 1470, he reconciled with the Turks and undertook an obligation to pay an annual tax to the sultan. The sultan's emissary forced the people of Dubrovnik to pay the herzog his father's money. The Vlatković family rebelled against him again on the territory to the west of the Neretva, with the support of people of Dubrovnik. Because of that Vlatko joined the Turks in 1471 in plundering the territory of Dubrovnik. The Turks drove the Hungarians out of Počitelj that same year. In 1472, Vlatko turned against the Turks by joining forces with Venice and the King of Naples. In 1475, after the Turkish defeat at Skadar, Vlatko attempted to get back the entire territory of Herzegovina and, early the following year, Ivan Crnojević, his sister's husband, sent him three thousand soldiers as help. However, Vlatko and Ivan conflicted in 1476. Ivan withdrew his army and devastated Onošgost along the way. The weakened Vlatko had to retreat before the Turks as far as the fortress of Novi. With the assistance of his youngest brother Stefan, who had converted to Islam in the meantime and had significant influence on the Porte as Ahmed Hercegović, Vlatko attempted to reach an agreement with the Turks. The Turks wanted to use the herzog in their conflict with Ivan Crnojević in order to eliminate him afterwards as well. Vlatko did not improve his relations with Ivan, but he did not accept the Turkish invitation to go to war against him either. He attempted to consolidate his forces and attacked the Turks in Bosnia in 1481 after the death of Sultan Mehmed II. Defeated by Daut Pasha, he fortified himself in Novi, looking to the Venetians for protection. He even had a small troop of Hungarian soldiers in his fortress. When the Turks besieged Novi late that year, the Venetians let Vlatko down. Vlatko surrendered the fortress to the Turks and retreated deep into Herzegovina with his people, where he remained for some time under Turkish rule after 1482. After that he moved to the Venetian island of Rab with his family, where he died.

5. Serbian Montenegro

a) Serbian Duklja

The territory of Duklja, the name of which the Serbs inherited from the Romans, consisted of nine parishes: Lješko polje, Podlug (Upper and Lower Zeta, today Podgorica), Gorska (the mountains to the east of Zeta), Kupelnik and Oblik on Lake Skadar, Crmnica, Grbalj, Budva and Pripratna between Ulcinj and Bar. The parish of Gorska encompassed the present territory of the Kuči tribe and the town of Medun. The data on Duklja in the 7th and the 8th century is very scarce. It is mainly church writings, i.e. inscriptions on graves, which do not testify about political history. The period of the 9th century was partially encompassed by the chronicle of the Byzantine writer Jovan Skolica from the 11th century and by *The Biography of St. Vladimir*, which *Libellus Gothorum* relies on for this period. The ruler of Duklja at the end of the 10th century was Jovan Vladimir, whose political authority spread to all the Serbian lands, though with different intensity. Vladimir sent emissaries to Byzantine emperor in

990, asking for his assistance to defend Duklja from the Bulgarian Emperor Samuel. The Arabs captured his emissaries along the way and the Byzantines bought them back. Samuel attacked Duklja in 997; he besieged Prince Vladimir in Oblik on Taraboš and attacked Ulcinj at the same time. Oblik fell, Vladimir surrendered and was imprisoned in Prespa. Ulcinj remained Byzantine territory, but Samuel burned Kotor and Dubrovnik, reaching as far as Zadar and passing through Bosnia and Raška on his way back. Samuel's daughter Kosara fell in love with the imprisoned Vladimir and the Serbian prince thus became the emperor's son-in-law and the emperor assigned to him "the land and kingdom of his fathers and the entire territory of Drač" (p. 382). Besides Duklja, Vladimir ruled supreme over all the other Serbian lands that were not directly ruled by Samuel. It is unknown whether Jovan Vladimir was crowned King of Serbia and how this happened, or whether he was just called a king in the national tradition based on the fact that he was a pan-Serbian ruler. Samuel died in 1014 and his son, Emperor Radomir, was killed after one year by his nephew Vladislav. In agreement with the Archbishop of Ohrid, Emperor Vladislav tricked Jovan Vladimir into coming to Prespa where Vladislav had him murdered in 1016, planning to take Duklja and the entire territory of Serbia. However, Vladislav was killed in 1018 in the conflict with the Byzantine army near Drač, and his state failed.

Duklja dominated the entire Serbian land and gave pan-Serbian rulers during the entire 11th century. In 1042, it defeated the Byzantine army near Bar, gaining independence. Previously, after Jovan Vladimir had been killed, his uncle Dragomir started with his army from Travunia to take Duklja in 1018. The people of Kotor killed him in the church of Tivat, since the town patricians of Roman origin wished to remain within Byzantium. Dragomir's pregnant widow Dragimira, having received news of her husband's death, went to her father Ljutomir, the Grand Zhupan of Raška. But her father died directly before her arrival and she had to go to her uncle, the Ban of Bosnia. Along the way she gave birth to a son Dobroslav near Foča. Vojislav seized power in Duklja under unclear circumstances, as a very close relative of Vladimir, also mentioned as Samuel's nephew. The family relationship was so close and indubitable that Priest Dukljanin confusedly draws a parallel between the newborn Dobroslav and Vojislav. Vojislav started a fight for independence from Byzantium in 1034, as described earlier. He soon became the indisputable pan-Serbian ruler and the history of Duklja represented the basic flow of pan-Serbian history until the death of King Bodin in 1101. At this time, Raška, which had already been under the rule of the same dynasty of Duklja for a long time, took over the leading role. Vojislav already controlled all the Serbian territories through to Taglica. The Byzantine emissaries talked Ljutovid, the Prince of Hum, the Zhupan of Raška and the Bosnian Ban into rising against Vojislav. Their joint army, commanded by Ljutovid, went across Travunia against Vojislav while the Byzantine army simultaneously attacked him from the direction of Skadar. Vojislav completely defeated the Byzantines and chased the remains of their army as far as the Drina River. "The war was then continued against the Prince of Zahumlje, Ljutovid. The operations were commanded by Vojislav's son Gojislav,

who led his troops across Konavle to the Klobuk hill near Trebinje. Then he sent a large number of wounded Greek prisoners to Ljutovid to spread fear among the army gathered on Klobuk. According to the author of *Libellus Gothorum*, this did not confuse Ljutovid at all and he challenged Vojislav to duel. Ljutovid and Gojislav were accompanied to the duel by three soldiers each. One of Gojislav's fellow-fighters, Udobic, pulled Ljutovid down from his horse which caused panic in Ljutovid's army, although the wounded Ljutovid managed to escape" (p. 389). Those victories strengthened Vojislav and his allies for a long time, "Duklja becomes the homeland of all the Serbian territories. It will keep this advantage in spite of the internal crises and Byzantine attacks, until the definite rise of Raška under Nemanja and the capturing of Duklja" (p. 390).

According to *Libellus Gothorum*, Vojislav was succeeded by Gojislav, though it was not determined in which year, while his three brothers got adequate feudal territories and his mother preserved harmony among brothers. Gojislav and his youngest brother Predimir directly ruled Travunia, but none of the brothers was called king but prince and their mother was still respected as queen. Gojislav was soon killed by Travunian conspirators led by nobleman Domanek, who managed to incite to rebellion the entire area, with the Byzantine assistance. The brothers reached an agreement and swore that Radoslav and his heirs would be the rulers of Zeta and Travunia when those territories were captured. Mihailo came to the throne after his mother's death. When he stayed a widower, he married a cousin of the Byzantine Emperor, which significantly contributed to consolidating his relationship with Byzantium. Then he broke his agreement with Radoslav and left Zeta to the rule of his eldest son from his first marriage, Vladimir. Mihailo had eleven sons, of whom Vladimir and Bodin conquered Raška, and the king entrusted his son from the second marriage Petrislav with the rule over it. At the time of the Macedonian rising in 1072, led by nobleman Đorđe Vojtjeh, the rebels asked Mihailo to lead them and he sent them his son Bodin. Bodin was crowned emperor in Prizren under the name of Petar and thus proclaimed Samuel's heir, but he still had to fight the Greeks and the Bulgarians in the following years. After considerable initial success, the Byzantines captured him and took him to the captivity. King Mihailo skilfully organized his release and return to homeland.

Mihailo most probably died in 1082 and his son Bodin became the Serbian king. Priest Dukljanin claims, though other sources do not mention it at all, that Mihailo was succeeded on the throne by his brother Radoslav. Bodin rioted after a while and drove Radoslav and his eight sons to Travunia, where they remained as district rulers. Be that as it may, Bodin's constant conflicts with Radoslav's heirs are an actual historical fact. The first Archbishop of Bar, Petar, mediated in the reconciliation that enabled Bodin to renew his rule over Raška and Bosnia, where he appointed his loyal relatives Vukan and Marko Zhupans of Raška and Stevan the Prince of Bosnia. They are most probably the sons of Bodin's brother Petrislav. Bodin had many problems with the sons of his uncle Branislav and he went to war against Dubrovnik when they took refuge there. The chronicles of

Dubrovnik record that Stevan, the King of Bosnia (actually prince), besieged the town in 1004, having been invited by Bodin. The historical sources record that Bodin seized Dubrovnik then and built one additional fortress there, in which he left his garrison. After a couple of years, its commander surrendered the fortress to the people of Dubrovnik in exchange for the status of nobleman and the noble Gradić family of Dubrovnik are his descendants.

When Bodin died, the power was taken by his son Mihailo but he failed to stabilize it due to the great hatred of the people towards his mother Jakvinta. There was a riot in which Bodin's brother Dobroslav was proclaimed king. The Byzantine Emperor put forward the brothers and sons of Prince Branislav, who lived in exile in Constantinople, as pretenders to the throne. However, Branislav's brother Gojislav stayed in Drač where he married and the other brother Kočepar went to the Great Zhupan of Raška, Vukan, and incited him to ally against Dobroslav. Vukan went against Duklja, defeated Dobroslav in the battle on the Morača and took him to captivity in Raška. He proclaimed Kočepar ruler of Duklja, but soon forced him to flee to Bosnia in order to settle in Zahumlje, where he died. Vukan appointed his son-in-law Vladimir, grandson of King Mihailo and son of Bodin's brother Vladimir, the new King of Duklja. Queen Jakvinta and her son Đorđe poisoned King Vladimir and falsely accused Dobroslav of doing that, although he was in a dungeon in Skadar at the time of Vladimir's death. Bodin's son Đorđe became the ruler of Duklja in 1118, but he was soon dethroned by the Byzantine army, which had defeated him earlier and which brought Grubeša, son of Prince Branislav who was kept in a dungeon in Skadar by Đorđe, to the throne.

The dethroned king fled to Raška and his mother Jakvinta was taken to Constantinople where she died. In 1125, the army of Raška attacked Duklja and defeated Grubeša near Bar. Đorđe was brought back to the throne. Soon, Đorđe attacked Raška in order to free Zhupan Uroš I, who had been dethroned by his noblemen, from prison. He succeeded in that but Duklja permanently surrendered its primacy among the Serbian states to Raška. Đorđe still had problems with his numerous cousins - pretenders - especially with Vladimir's sons, some of whom he had blinded. However, with the assistance of the Byzantine army, Gradihna, Dragihna and Prvoš defeated Đorđe below the town of Oblik. The people of Raška went against Đorđe as well and he was captured in the Oblun fortress and taken to Constantinople where he died in a dungeon. The national assembly then proclaimed Gradihna king. Gradihna's successor was his son Radoslav, who was proclaimed Prince of Duklja by the Byzantine Emperor Manuel Comnenos. The exact year is not known, but Emperor Manuel lived until 1180. It probably happened before 1149, as other sources claim that, at that time, during the rule of Dukljan Prince Radoslav, Desa, the Zhupan of Raška, held Travunia, Zahumlje and large part of Zeta. It is not known for sure whether Desa was the son or the brother of the previous Grand Zhupan of Raška Uroš II, but Desa had his strongholds in Duklja as well. Therefore, the rule of the Prince of Duklja, Radoslav, was reduced to Kotor, Skadar and their coastal region. Byzantium regained domination over Raška in 1150, using the conflicts

IT-03-67-T

between Desa and Uroš II. The emperor judged that Uroš should remain Grand Zhupan, while Desa kept rule over Travunia and Zeta and he soon renewed the confusion in Raška, affecting the Byzantine positions. This situation lasted until Stefan Nemanja arrived.

Making war against Byzantium, Nemanja conquered Duklja and all its coastal towns between 1181 and 1186, appearing as the descendant of Prince Vojislav in the role of pan-Serbian ruler and establishing the foundations of the most famous Serbian dynasty of all times. According to the data of Priest Dukljanin, the genealogy of Vojislav's descendants is very interesting as a recapitulation of an important period of Serbian history, which was pretty neglected at the time of the Nemanjić dynasty. Prince Vojislav had five sons with Emperor Samuel's niece - Gojislav, Mihailo, Saganek, Radoslav and Predimir. Mihailo and Radoslav were kings. King Mihailo's sons from his first marriage were Vladimir, Prijeslav, Sergije, Derija, Miroslav and Bodin and those from his second with the niece of Emperor Constantine IX were Dobroslav, Petrislav, Nićifor and Teodor. Vladimir's son Vladimir became king and had a son, Mihailo, with the daughter of Zhupan Vukan. Bodin and Dobroslav became kings. Bodin had four sons, Mihailo, Đorđe, Arhiriz and Toma. Đorđe became king. King Radoslav had eight sons - Branislav, Gradislav, Hvalimir, Stanihna, Kočepar, Gojislav, Dobroslav and Pribinek. Branislav had seven sons - Predihna, Petrislav, Gradihna, Tvrdislav, Dragihna, Dragilo and Grubeša. Gradihna and Grubeša became kings. The sons of Gradihna were Prince Radoslav, Jovan and Vladimir. King Grubeša had four sons - Prvoš, Grubiš, Nemanja and Stracimir. This is just the recorded data and many royal descendants were undoubtedly forgotten by history. A royal dynasty with as many branches as this one had to be full of internal dynastic conflicts in the feudal environment and these conflicts dominated the political life and hindered the fight for full state independence.

During his rule, Stefan Nemanja appointed his son Vukan the district ruler of Duklja and his brother Miroslav of the Hum territory. Nemanja's relation to the royal family of Duklja cannot be doubted and it was never questioned by any historian. But many family relations remained unclear and, according to the available documents, certain towns resisted Nemanja's rule as it introduced a higher degree of centralization than usual. Some of the rebellious towns with a strong Roman element were destroyed by the Serbian ruler. His son Vukan, as district ruler, increasingly called himself a king according to the tradition of Duklja and he is being addressed in this manner in some official documents. There is an inscription on St. Luke's Church in Kotor in which Vukan is called the King of Duklja, Dalmatia, Trebinje, Toplica and Hvosno. "Vukan is presented with the royal title in other documents of his time as well. In its basic part, Vukan's royal title without any doubt relied on the title of his predecessors from Duklja and contributed to preserving the tradition of the formerly independent kingdom of Duklja. Duklja was treated as 'the great kingdom from old times' and Stefan and Sava referred to it in the negotiations with the Pope that led to Stefan's coronation" (*History of Montenegro*, Titograd 1970, book two, volume I, p. 4).

When Nemanja died, Vukan, as the eldest son, challenged Stefan's

precedence and asked for help from the pope and the Hungarians in that regard. In 1202 there was an open conflict in which Stefan was driven away and the state was destroyed due to participation of the Hungarian army in that event. On the basis of that intervention, Hungarian King Ludovik seized the title of Serbian king for himself as well, and his successors proudly pointed it out as late as 1918. Vukan proclaimed himself Grand Zhupan of the entire Serbia and recognized the supreme Hungarian power. In order to crown him as king, although he would remain a Hungarian vassal, the pope asked Vukan to swear allegiance. However the coronation never took place, Stefan returned to the throne and brothers were reconciled through the mediation of St. Sava. Vukan returned to Zeta, recognizing Stefan's supreme rule. In 1208, Vukan was succeeded by his son Đorđe, to whom Vukan transferred power before his death. Since the crusaders seized Constantinople in 1204, Venice appears in the Serbian coastal area as a great force with which Đorđe made an agreement against Lord Kroja Dimitrije, who endangered the Venetian rule over Drač. In these years, the Venetians even brought Dubrovnik under their rule. Since Michael I Angel, the Lord of Epirus, grew stronger soon, he controlled the Venetian territories in Albania and endangered Serbia by conquering the Serbian town of Skadar. Soon, Stefan stopped his advance and established friendly relations with the Michael's successor Theodore.

When Stefan Nemanjić was crowned with the papal crown in 1217, the old royal title of Duklja was completely overshadowed, though Vukan's son Đorđe referred to it as the district ruler as early as 1242. Đorđe was officially Prince of Duklja, although the entire territory was increasingly referred to as Zeta. On one of the frescoes in the Morača Monastery, the second son of Vukan, Stefan, is titled king as well but, during the rule of the Serbian King Stefan Uroš I, Vukan's sons were the last in the royal tradition of Duklja: "Even later, it happened that the members of the ruler's closest family had the former territories of Duklja or some part of them under their rule, along with the other lands, but this did not continue the independent state tradition of old Duklja. At the same time, Duklja vanishes from the state symbolism. Before King Vladislav, the title of Nemanjić dynasty contained Dioklitia with Dalmatia and, after that, parts of the old title were merged into the generic name 'coastal lands'. Later on, the only distinction between the 'Serbian' land (or 'the land of Raška') and 'coastal' in the Serbian royal title is left to remind us of the different history of the Serbian lands and their individual tradition" (p. 13).

b) Serbian Zeta

Simply speaking, further state development led to feudal centralization, which was a common tendency in the entire Europe at that time. The state power increased simultaneously with its ruler's ability to directly rule over the territory. Having ousted his father from the throne and forced him to retreat to Hum and enter a monastery, Dragutin gave the rule of Zeta, Trebinje, Plav and the Upper Ibar to his mother Jelena. The same territory was entrusted by King Milutin to his son Stefan and,

from that time, the name of Zeta spread over a larger territory than it had initially implied. There was already a distinction between Upper Zeta, which reached Ostrog, and Lower Zeta between Lake Skadar and the Adriatic Sea, but this difference was purely geographical and not administrative or political. The Zeta noblemen put pressure on Stefan to seize the crown from his father and, after longer hesitation, he yielded to them but without any success and his father punished him severely. Having blinded Stefan and driven him away, Milutin entrusted his younger son Konstantin with the rule over Zeta. At that time, the king undertook an administrative reform in the entire Serbian state, dividing it into smaller administrative units, *kefalijas*, which significantly weakened the power of the district lords. In 1321, a certain Ilija is mentioned as a *kefalija* (Translator's note: town elder, head of the administrative unit) in Zeta and it is possible that he was a local zhupan somewhere before that. Ilija had a son named Đurađ who was the castellan of Tsar Dušan in Skradin and national tradition considers him the ancestor of the later mighty Đurašević family, i.e. the Crnojević. When Stefan Dečanski was crowned king, he offered reconciliation to his brother Konstantin and an important position in the state. When his brother refused, he defeated him. The Zeta gentry took Stefan's side and, as some sources state, Konstantin was executed in a cruel manner. The Zeta gentry played a significant role in the settling of accounts between the young King Dušan and his father Stefan Dečanski, namely by helping Dušan.

The highest degree of centralization of the feudal Serbia was reached in Dušan's empire, in which the state unity was preserved by district governors appointed by Dušan, mainly reliable cousins or able military commanders. Since Dušan's successor was not fit to rule the great Serbian-Greek Empire, the natural centrifugal feudal tendencies were awakened again. A certain nobleman named Žarko gained independence at that time in Zeta, but there are almost no records of him save that he disputed with the people of Dubrovnik and that the people of Dubrovnik complained to Tsar Uroš about him in 1356. Žarko showed his arrogance in his rule over the important market of St. Srd. Since Žarko yielded in some dispute against the Venetians, they pronounced him a citizen of Venice in 1357, as Lord of Zeta, the Bojana and the Serbian Coastal Region. Since Ulcinj was still formally ruled by Tsarina Jelena, Uroš defended Skadar from his uncle, Simeon Nemanjić, the Emperor of Epirus, in 1358 and it is obvious that Žarko's independence was not particularly great.

The Balšić family, as district rulers of Zeta, are mentioned for the first time in history in the charter of Uroš IV the Weak in 1360, by which the people of Dubrovnik are guaranteed freedom of trade, which refers to all parts of the state, Zeta included. According to Orbinius the Maur, the Balšić family came from the Lower Zeta and grew stronger when they started ruling Skadar, spreading their control as far as Kotor. In the conflict of Vojislav Vojinović and the inhabitants of Kotor with Dubrovnik in 1361, Đorđe and Stracimir Balšić sided with Dubrovnik and Kotor emerged from this conflict significantly weakened. Direct enmities between the Balšić family and Vojislav Vojinović began in 1363, but the

details were not recorded. The Balšić family conflicted with the Lords of Drač, Karlo Topija and Blažo Mataranga, and the inhabitants of Dubrovnik mediated in these conflicts, but again there is no detailed data about that. There are documents that testify that the Balšić family was a close friend of King Vukašin, Uroš's co-ruler, and that Đurađ married Vukašin's daughter Olivera. In 1364, Karlo Topija managed to capture Đurađ Balšić in one battle and the youngest brother Balša II gained supremacy. Đurađ was freed after a great ransom was paid. In the meantime, the inhabitants of Kotor attacked Budva and killed its commander Površko and the Balšić had to regain their positions there in 1365, renewing their conflicts with Kotor. Tsar Uroš and Venice engaged themselves with the protection of Kotor. In order to strengthen their positions on the Adriatic Sea, the Balšić agreed to a union in 1369, but only formally and, the following year, peace with Kotor was made through the Venetian mediation.

The conflicts with Karlo Topija were renewed in 1368 and the Balšić family used that quest to conquer Ulcinj along the way. Kotor accepted the supreme rule of the Hungarian king in 1370. In 1371, King Vukašin and Đurađ Balšić met in Skadar and agreed about the joint action against Nikola Altomanović, the realization of which was prevented by Vukašin's hurry to return to Skoplje as soon as possible. After the battle of Morača, Đurađ hurried to take Prizren, which had been under Vukašin's control until then, and he succeeded in defending the town from the attacks of Nikola Altomanović in 1372. He reconciled with Nikola the following year but, when the Altomanović family was defeated by Lazar and Tvrtko, Đurađ seized the opportunity to get hold of Trebinje, Konavle and Dračevica, as well as the tax of St. DMITAR, traditionally paid by the inhabitants of Dubrovnik to the Serbian rulers. In 1373, Đurađ visited Dubrovnik and confirmed all the privileges the people of Dubrovnik had previously had in the Serbian lands in his charter, accompanied with a solemn oath.

As the two most prominent and the strongest Serbian noblemen, Lazar Hrebeljanović and Đurađ Balšić, organized the church assembly in Peć on which monk Jefrem was elected patriarch. With the assistance of the local gentry, Tvrtko I took Trebinje and the neighbouring parishes from Đurađ in 1377. Đurađ died the following year and was succeeded by his youngest brother Balša II, the only remaining son of Balša I, the progenitor of the noble family, since Stracimir had already died before 1373. Balša II immediately imprisoned his nephew Đurađ II Stracimirović in a fortress, only to eventually release him and be reconciled with him. As early as 1382, Balša II besieged Kotor, which had been taken by the Venetians in 1378. In 1383, Balša conflicted with Tvrtko over the coastal territories and besieged Kotor again in 1384, but the town was taken by Tvrtko. Balša II took Drač in 1385 and proclaimed himself Duke of Drač, although the Balšićs did not possess any feudal titles until then and were satisfied with being called lords. That same year, Balša II was killed in a battle with the Turks who attacked his newly gained territories. The battle took place near Berat.

After the death of Balša II, his widow Komonina undertook rule over

Valena, Kanina, Himera and Berat, which were all part of her dowry, and Topija regained Drač. Đurađ II Stacimirović Balšić only inherited Zeta with Skadar, Drivast and Lješ and he determined that Ulcinj would be his capital. In 1386, he married Jelena, the daughter of Prince Lazar. Certain noble families immediately started rebelling against Đurađ II. He was left without Lješ and the territory south of the Drim River. The Crnojević family grew independent in the Upper Zeta with the support of King Tvrtko I and Đurađ remained in the zone between Lake Skadar and the sea, from which the Balšić family began their expansion. Đurađ started cooperating with the Turks, assisting in two of their raids in Bosnia in 1386 and 1388. After Dubrovnik intervened early in 1389, Đurađ I reconciled with Tvrtko I, but the Lord of Zeta did not participate in the Battle of Kosovo that same year. Đurađ's nephew Konstantin, the son of Đurađ I and Teodora Dejanović, also related to the Byzantine royal family, clashed with him in 1390. Konstantin Balšić gained the patronage of the Turkish Sultan Bayazit I, which threw Đurađ II into the arms of the Pope. In 1392, there was a war between Đurađ II, Konstantin Balšić and Radić Crnojević with which the Turks interfered. The Sanjak-bey of Skoplje imprisoned Đurađ Stacimirović Balšić when he came to him for negotiations, and Radić Crnojević seized that opportunity to take Budva and the Tivat region, entering the Venetian service in 1392. Đurađ surrendered Skadar, Drivast and St. Srd to the Turks, keeping Ulcinj with the obligation to pay tax. The Turks enabled Konstantin Balšić to gain rule over the Albanian town of Kroja as their vassal. With Venetian assistance, Đurađ seized Skadar, Drivast and St. Srd from the Turks in 1395, together with some of Konstantin's territories and, as early as 1396, he ceded those towns to Venice. He kept Ulcinj and Bar and their surrounding area for himself and received from the Venetians their title and an annual rent in exchange for the ceded territories. At around that same time, the brothers Radić and Dobrivoje Crnojević took Grbalj from Đurađ II and besieged Kotor, which paid him annual tribute. The Crnojević were well-loved among the local population as loyal to the Orthodox religion, unlike the hated Balšić family who had turned Catholic. The Crnojević family was joined by the Paštrović, leaving Budva without support. Radić Crnojević was killed in 1396 during the conflict with Đurađ II. That was used by Sandalj Hranić, who took over the domination of Kotor and seized Budva as well. He agreed with the Paštrović and made a deal with the Venetians, who gave him citizenship and the title of Grand Duke of Raška and Bosnia, as well as the Lord of Budva and Zeta.

In the Upper Zeta, when Radić Crnojević died, his brothers Stefan and Dobrivoje lost all their influence and their close relatives the Đurašević family grew stronger and started calling themselves Crnojević, based on that. They reached an agreement with Đurađ II to drive Sandalj out of Budva and take over the city and its surroundings. Among the Đurašević-Crnojević family, the historical sources mention brothers Đurađ and Aleksa-Lješ in 1403. As for Đurađ II Stratimirović, he joined the Hungarian King Sigismund late in 1396, who appointed him Prince of Hvar and Korčula, which lasted until 1402. Đurađ II died in 1403 and, the year before that, the Venetians executed Konstantin Balšić in Drač. Đurađ

II was succeeded by his only son Balša III, who was still not of age and who was supported by his uncle, the Serbian Despot. With his mother Jelena, Balša III led the Serbian national and Orthodox religious policy and immediately clashed with the Venetians. He incited an uprising of the Serbian population in the Skadar area in 1405 and so the long Skadar war started. The Venetian fleet intervened and recaptured the territories of Skadar. Balša III took shelter in Drivast with his mother, and the Venetians seized Ulcinj, Bar, Budva and finally Drivast where the Balšić family continued fighting back. Balša III asked the Turks for help and became their vassal. With the help of the Turks and his uncle, he attacked the Venetians. He also had the support of the Đurašević family and many other noble families. Simultaneously with the conflicts, negotiations were underway for a couple of years through intermediaries. In 1409, Jelena Balšić went to Venice with the same goal and proved herself a tough and able negotiator. She agreed a one-year truce but, in the meantime, the Turks also made an agreement with the Venetians against the Serbs. The Venetians tried to double cross both the Serbs and the Turks but Balša III attacked the Venetian lands again in 1410, with significant success. His mother Jelena married Sandalj Hranić in 1411, which gained him a new ally. Peace was made in 1412 when Balša III seized Bar and Ulcinj and it was agreed that the status had to be returned to what it had been before the war, with a certain financial compensation to the Lord of Zeta.

This result of the conflict with the Venetians returned both the power and the authority to Balša III and he was able to quickly spread his supreme power to the entire area of Zeta. Đurašević continued to rule Paštrovići, Luštica and the hills above Budva and Kotor and they remained faithful to Balša, in spite of all temptations and direct invitations to join the Venetians. In 1413, Balša substituted Sandalj Hranić in the siege of Kotor and he remained on pretty bad terms with the Venetians. Balša also had conflicts with certain Albanian tribes, which were incited against the Serbs by the Venetians. He invited his cousin Stefan Balšić Maramonte to return to Zeta and he came in 1419.

It is presumed that he was the son of Konstantin Balšić. That same year, the Second Skadar War between Balša III and the Venetians broke out, in which the Lord of Zeta immediately besieged and took Drivast. The following year Kotor accepted the supreme Venetian power and the Venetians installed their prince and commander there. Immediately after that, Balša III defeated the Venetian army on the Bojana River. In response to that, the Venetians seized Budva and the inhabitants of Kotor joined their war efforts, seizing Luštica. Balša III went against Kotor with the Đurašević family in 1420 and they were joined by the villagers of Grbalj who rose against the gentry of Kotor. At that time, Balša III was already gravely ill and disappointed with the fact that it was impossible for Stefan Balšić Maramonte to adjust to the Serbian environment in Zeta, so he went to the Serbian Despot to transfer the rule of Zeta to him. He married his daughter Jelena to Herzog Stefan Vukčić. He died in the despot's court in 1421 and he was buried there with honours. When the Venetians learned about his death, they immediately took all of Balša's towns. Balša's cousin Maramonte left Zeta and Balša's property was

inherited by his mother, Sandalj's wife Jelena. "The political conflicts that had started before also continued in the following period, which was characterized by a closer relationship between the separate parts of the former Serbian state. Zeta again became a part of it, becoming subordinated to the Serbian Despot. Stefan Lazarević held the first place among the Serbian lords and, after his death, Đurađ Branković took his place and became the sole ruler of all the preserved parts of the former empire" (volume II, book II, p. 133).

Đurađ and Lješ Đurašević became dukes under Despot Stefan. Soon the despot himself with his large army arrived in Zeta. First, he went after the rebellious Albanians in the Skadar Mountains and they, frightened, hurriedly yielded to him with great joy. The despot demanded that the Venetians return all the Zeta towns. He took Drivast and the Đurašević took Grbalj and *Svetomiholjska Metohija*. Đurađ Đurašević built a fortress there and put it under the command of his son Stefanica. After that, the despot took Bar, entrusted the rule of Zeta to his commander Mazarek and returned home. The Venetians kept Skadar, Ulcinj and Budva, but only the area within the town walls. After the unsuccessful negotiations, the enmities were renewed but the Serbian siege of Skadar was without any results. The attack on Skadar was repeated and Đurađ Branković joined the Serbian army in 1423, following the instructions of the despot. The Venetians retreated and gave Budva to the Serbs, keeping Grbalj for themselves.

When new Serbian-Turkish conflicts arose in 1427, the Đurašević family, who in the meantime had started calling themselves Crnojević, rebelled against the despot and attempted to join the Venetians. When they were refused there, they turned to the Turks. Maramonte also appeared as pretender in Zeta, starting to make alliances with some Albanian tribal leaders in the mountains over Skadar and closing an agreement with the Turks, with whose help he took all the Venetian territories and the despot's Drivast. Drivast was soon regained though and the Crnojević yielded to the despot again. In return, the despot gave their territory much more independence than they had previously had. Maramonte fled to Venice. The conflicts between the Serbs and the Venetians continued over the territorial borders and trade conditions, but they were ended after several series of negotiations, by the Smederevo Agreement in 1435.

Since the Serbian despotate was soon vitally threatened by the Turks again, Despot Đurađ Branković was unable to defend the state border territories with the same characteristic attention as before, especially the very remote areas like Zeta. As the son-in-law of Sandalj Hranić's widow and Balša III's mother Jelena, Duke Stefan Vukšić Kosača attempted to spread his rule over Zeta and the sons of Đurađ Đurašinović Crnojević wished to stop his attempts, even asking the Venetians for assistance. However, the Venetians decided to remain neutral while the Turks increasingly threatened Zeta from the south, together with the Venetian territories. In 1440 the despot came to Zeta attempting to defend it from the Turks, but his relations with the arrogant Crnojević family were pretty disturbed. When the Serbian ruler left Zeta in 1441, Stefan Vukčić came

to Upper Zeta and closed an agreement with Stefanica Crnojević, moving towards the coast and taking Bar. At that moment, Budva and Luštica requested Venetian protection, upon the despot's recommendation, since he could not ignore the fact that Stefan Vukčić was already a Turkish vassal. The Venetians decided to take over all the despot's coastal territories and put them under their rule and that was why Stefan Vukčić and Stefanica Crnojević rushed again into Bar with their armies in 1442, where they had left an autonomous government the year before. The Venetians prepared to defend their territories but the greatest problem for Stefan Vukčić was caused by a sudden riot on the part of the three brothers of Stefanica Crnojević who went over to the Venetians.

After unsuccessful negotiations with the Venetians, Stefan Vukčić left Zeta that same year, being unprepared for war, while the Venetians proclaimed Kojčin Crnojević the Grand Duke of Zeta. When the Venetians moved to snatch Bar, Stefan Vukčić returned with an army, reaching as far as Skadar and withdrawing again, leaving the Venetians to fear his future arrivals. The Venetians seized Bar in 1443. As Stefan Vukčić was threatened from other sides, he was unable to engage himself in Zeta any more and Stefanica Crnojević also agreed with the Venetians, insisting on the return of Stefanica's son Ivan, who was in the duke's service as some sort of prisoner, in the case of a possible peace treaty with Kosača. However, general circumstances in the Balkans soon changed, Despot Đurađ Branković and Duke Stefan Vukčić closed an alliance and the despot's troops returned to Zeta, taking over the fortresses of Soko and Medun from Kosača in 1444. The following years the despot was preoccupied with other problems and the Venetians conflicted with Skenderbeg over North Albania.

In 1448, Despot Đurađ Branković sent Duke Altoman to Lower Zeta. The duke was immediately joined by the house of Crnojević, while the Grbalj Serbs rose against the Venetian rule. Nevertheless, the Venetians caused a breach between Duke Altoman and Stefanica Crnojević by the skilful placement of false rumours, which caused the failure of the Serbian siege of Bar. When they discovered the Venetian trick in 1449, Altoman and Stefanica devastated the vicinity of Kotor as far as the town walls in a new attack on the Venetians. The negotiations in which the Venetians wished to gain time and make the Crnojević consent to treason, began. There were conflicts between the brothers and Stefanica eliminated Đurašin and Kojčin from the political scene in 1451. Stefanica Crnojević did become a traitor and put himself in the service of the Venetians in 1452, causing a great deal of bloodshed and devastation in Grbalj as the Venetian Duke. "He plundered and burnt the houses of the Grbalj villagers and tricked the most prominent leaders of the riot into captivity, as stated by the chronicler Manjo. The Duke of Kotor sentenced thirty of them to death and they were hanged in Kotor. After that, on 3 March 1452, he sentenced their sons that were over 12 years old, together with about two hundred more adult men to permanent exile under the threat of hanging if they ever appeared in Grbalj or on the territory of Kotor again" (volume II, book 2, p. 226-227).

The before unseen Venetian rule of terror was established in Grbalj

and only the Turks rescued the Serbs from it. Altoman's intervention was unsuccessful, except that he seized the fortress of Zabljak from Stefanica Crnojević. Thomas Cantacuzene, the despot's brother in law, also did not manage to defeat the forces of Crnojević and soon the Venetian banner waved above the entire area of Zeta. Stefanica received precious material for sewing clothes worth two hundred ducats from the Venetians as a reward for his services. In the meantime, the Turks completely took the Branković territory and the territorial connection between Zeta and the despotate was broken. In 1455, Stefanica Crnojević was proclaimed the Venetian noblemen, together with his previous title of duke.

c) Serbian Montenegro

The Venetian rule over Upper Zeta was purely formal and the actual ruler was Stefanica Crnojević, who soon replaced the Venetian lion and returned to use the Serbian two-headed white eagle woven on a red flag. Crnojević's brother-in-law Đurađ Kastriot Skenderbeg accepted the Serbian two-headed eagle, but in black, as the main insignia on the Albanian flag. Upper Zeta was increasingly called Montenegro, both after the Crnojević family and the large mountain range located at its heart. Montenegro had a specific actual independence with a certain Venetian financial assistance, but it was constantly disrupted by the Turkish plundering raids. The rule of Stefanica Crnojević was disturbed by the constant suspicion of Herzog Stefan Vukčić. His successor Ivan Crnojević led a much more pragmatic policy, renouncing the unconditional submission to the Venetians and constantly balancing between Venice, Turkey and Hungary. When his wife died, Ivan married the daughter of Herzog Stefan, whose prisoner he had once been. He seriously clashed with the Venetians in 1465 and went after Kotor. The people of Grbalj and the Paštrović family immediately joined his army. However, because of the growing danger from the Turks, peace was reached with the Venetians the following year. The people of Grbalj remained insubordinate during the following couple of years and Paštrović, Crmnica and Grbalj were given to Ivan to rule and his old family provision was doubled.

Ivan Crnojević reached an agreement with the sultan in 1471 and recognised his supreme power together with the obligation to pay the taxes. The following year though, he again adopted an anti-Turkish policy in agreement with Herzog Vlatko Vukčić. When the Turks seized the territories on the left side of Zeta and Morača from him, he stopped paying taxes in 1473. In 1477 he became a Venetian nobleman and opposed the Turkish invasion with the Venetian help and in return facilitated the defence of Skadar to the Venetians. That same year, the Turks were completely defeated near Skadar and they did not undertake any new raids in the following three years. In 1475, Ivan had some new misunderstandings with the Venetians and Herzog Vlatko, which enabled the Turks to renew the great fortress of Podgorica and the entire town, thus gaining a powerful stronghold for further conquests. Nevertheless, the new attack on Skadar in 1478 was unsuccessful and Ivan Crnojević stood out again in obstructing the Turks, controlling almost the entire area of Lake Skadar. Angry because of

their failure, the Turks seized Ivan's capital Žabljak on the Bojana River but he managed to escape in time. Unfortunately, the discouraged and exhausted Venetians surrendered Skadar to the Turks without a fight in 1479. After that, the Turkish forces went after Ivan Crnojević, who left Montenegro after serious conflicts in which he was unable to hold out for long. He took refuge in Apulia with his family.

After several months of exile, Ivan Crnojević returned to the coastal area of Zeta, but the Venetians were unwilling to assist him in returning his territories and they even denounced him to the sultan. In the constant clashes with the Turks, his brother Đurađ was killed in 1480. But as early as in 1482, after the death of Sultan Mehmed the Second, Ivan Crnojević managed to free and renew his little state as far as the left banks of the Zeta and Morača Rivers. The following year, he achieved a significant victory over the Turkish army but, in early 1482, he recognized the supreme Turkish power and agreed to pay taxes to the new sultan. Incessantly fighting against the Venetian policy of converting the Orthodox Serbs to Catholicism, Ivan Crnojević, after a temporary stay in Obod, moved his own metropolitan centre to the village of Cetinje, which was located in the hills and therefore considered the safest place. In 1489 there were several conflicts with the Venetians in the hinterland of Kotor, in which Ivan's son Đurađ stood out and the Venetians were forced to ask for Turkish assistance. Ivan had already sent his youngest son Staniša to Constantinople in 1485, where he turned Moslem and changed his name to Skenderbeg. The sultan instructed his vassal to stop fighting the Venetians and to reimburse them for the damages they had suffered during the conflicts. Ivan married his predetermined successor, his son Đurađ, to a Venetian princess but he died before his son's wedding actually took place. Đurađ Crnojević became the new Montenegrin ruler in 1490.

However, many unresolved disputes remained between the Serbs and the Venetians and they led to a series of incidents between 1493 and 1496. In 1496, Đurađ accepted the anti-Turkish action of the King of Naples and clashed with his brother Stefan over it. Stefan Crnojević openly took the Turkish side and, as the sultan's commissioner, he told Đurađ to leave Montenegro. He was hoping that the Turks would entrust him with power as their vassal, but his title as the Montenegrin ruler was only formal since the Turks ruled over Montenegro directly. The relative political independence of Montenegro actually ceased to exist in 1496 and, for the following two years, Montenegro and Stefan Crnojević were monitored by the Sanjak-bey of Skadar and, in 1498, Montenegro was formally adjoined to the sanjak district of Skadar.

As early as 1499, the war between the Venetians and the Turks broke out and the hopes of the Serbian people to liberate at least one part of their country were awakened. During negotiations with Venice, consent was given to place Montenegro and Grlalj under the Venetian rule, provided that district management was given to Đurađ Crnojević. However, angry with the Venetians who had arrested him and kept him during his exile, Đurađ made simultaneous contact with the Turks. Neither the Turks nor the Venetians trusted him much and, in the end, the sultan granted him one timar (Translator's note: land granted by the Ottoman sultans) in Anadolija.

In 1500, the Paštrović family decided that they would rather live under Turkish rather than the Venetian rule. However, the Montenegrin Lords submitted a request to the Republic of St. Marco in 1501 in order for the Montenegrin to become Venetian subjects. The Serbian expectations failed in 1503 when Venice had to agree an unfavourable peace agreement with the Turks. In spite of that, the Montenegrin Serbs did not bear the Turkish slavery peacefully and they raised a great uprising in 1505, which was quelled bloodily. The unrest, small conflicts and banditry did not stop and the sultan appointed Ivan's son Skenderbeg Crnojević as ruler of the separate sanjak district, in order to appease the Serbs. "The acceptance of Islam did not destroy Skenderbeg's sense of family relations and awareness of his origin. His long stay in Turkey made him cold, tranquil, greedy and avid. Like all the Turkish feudal lords, Skenderbeg sought to gain as much fortune as he could from his position" (*History of Montenegro*, book III, volume I, Titograd 1975., p. 27). The sultan's action proved to be highly premeditated, since the arrival of Skenderbeg Crnojević stabilized the Turkish rule in Montenegro. Beside that, the new sanjak-bey settled the local Turkish relations with the Venetians.

Skenderbeg Crnojević treated his own people very strictly and oppressively and, after a quiet period of six years, a riot was raised in 1519. The riot was quenched the following year with the intervention of the four neighbouring sanjak-beys, with considerable massacre and arson. Skenderbeg became even more violent and greedy after this terrible massacre of his own people. When the central Turkish administration carried out a census in 1521, he personally arranged that as many dead people as possible were entered into registers in order to enable him to impose greater taxes on their living relatives. Among those few who survived, many moved to Venetian territory, fleeing the unbearable oppression. Skenderbeg's rule lasted until 1530 and it was directly opposed to the national lore, which related the Serbian state-establishing traditions to the Crnojević dynasty and to the legend that Ivan or Đurađ Crnojević had transferred the power to the Episcopo of Cetinje before they left Montenegro. According to official Turkish data, the entire territory of Montenegro had a total of 2,500 family homes at the beginning of the 16th century, which encompassed the district of Lješ, Rijeka, Črtnik and Katun. Although Turkish rule left the status of landowners to a significant number of Serbs, the people of Montenegro, Brda and Herzegovina did not accept the Turkish slavery and the enemy who occupied those territories had no peace in that part of the large Islamic empire. There is no original historical data on the large number of conflicts in which the Serbs defeated the Turks, but the memory of them was preserved in the national tradition through narration accompanied by the *gusle* (Translator's note: a single-stringed musical instrument). The Serbs joined wholeheartedly each Venetian clash with the Turks, the defence of the coastal towns against the Turkish fleet etc. The mass uprisings of the Serbian people became more frequent during the war between Austria and Turkey from 1593 to 1606. The most significant was the Herzegovina uprising, which was raised by Grdan, Duke of Nikšić, in 1597. In order to obtain the assistance of the pope in the fight against the Turks, Patriarch Jovan expressed a willingness to accept union through his

emissaries in 1601.

Negotiations of the leaders of Montenegro, Brda and Herzegovina with the representatives of the Duke of Naples and great adventurer Carl Emanuel I on joint action against the Turks took place in 1608 and the duke was presented with the prospect of becoming a king. Similar contacts were later established with the Dukes of Mantua and Tuscany on the same basis, as well as with the Spanish court, but all the attempts of Duke Grdan and Patriarch Jovan remained unsuccessful. Grdan died in 1613 and Jovan in 1614 and with them died the attempts to engage the western Roman Catholic states in the crusades in the Balkans. These negotiations however contributed to increasing the role of the Assembly of National Leaders in Montenegro as a more specific body in comparison to the General Montenegrin Assembly and the strengthening of the specific tribal democracy in the conditions of the specific self-government within the Turkish state. In order to appease the Serbian people, the sultan proclaimed Vujo Rajčev duke and landowner, i.e. the lord of the entire area of Montenegro in 1620. The tribes in Brda and Herzegovina had a similar self-management. Each Turkish attempt to cancel such autonomy led to bloodshed and major losses on both sides. In this manner, the Pasha of Bosnia plundered the Bjelopavlić family with a great army in 1611, but he did not dare extend his raid to the families of Kuč and Kliment. The Turkish punitive raids caused much ill to the Serbs but without any permanent success. The great uprising in Brda took place in 1632 and it lasted for six years. The Turks suffered significant defeats several times on the battlefield, but the tribe of Piperi were the ones to suffer the hardest blow this time.

In 1645, the War of Candia brought new hope to the Serbian people and led it to strengthen its relationship with the Venetians. The Montenegrin inflicted a serious defeat on the Sanjak-bey of Skadar, who attempted to punish them for two years of not paying the tax. After that, the Turks attempted to appease the Serbs in Montenegro, Brda and Herzegovina in order to prevent their instrumentalisation by Venice. Often, political over commitment, both to the Venetians and the Turks caused inner conflicts in Serbia. In 1649, the leaders of the Katun, Rijeka, Crmnik, Lješ and Pješivac Districts reached the decision to accept Venetian rule and renounce the Turkish one. This caused great rage among the Podgorica Turks and their plundering raids intensified. With Serbian assistance, the Venetians took Risan but they failed to take Bar as well. The Nikšić family liberated Grahovo and the Kuč family liberated Medun. Soon the rioters were convinced that Venice would abandon them as well, ignoring their desire for freedom and manipulating great national perishes for its own interests. When the Venetian army was defeated at the Lješko polje, the leaders of Montenegro, Brda and Herzegovina began to understand that they had been left to their own fate. In the following years, the Serbs, abandoned by the Venetians, suffered serious Turkish oppression. The number of people who accepted Islam grew and the tribes fought among themselves.

d) The Constant Uprisings against the Turks

IT-03-67-T

The pugnacious spirit would start to renew after the unsuccessful Turkish siege of Kotor in 1657. There were new occasional attacks by certain Serbian tribes in which the Turks suffered significant losses. The people of Herzegovina and Brda attempted to make new war arrangements with the Venetians but nothing serious was gained from those efforts. On the other hand, diplomacy had to be applied in the relationships with the Turks. The latent low intensity unrest continued. The Turks tricked and killed 57 Herzegovinian Princes in Kolašin and soon afterwards they devastated the entire Nikšić parish. During the Turkish taxes the following year, large number of Nikšić inhabitants moved to Srem while the Serbs from the Montenegrin districts moved to Istria in large groups. The banditry against the Turks was also suddenly strengthened, mainly relying on the territory of Boka. The bandits significantly shook the Turkish administration but they maltreated the Christian population unbearably as well. The Venetians thought of introducing a tax on bandit loot and in this manner they supported the introduction of slavery too, the victims of which were often the Christians. The slave trade flourished for several decades in the towns under the Venetian rule.

Although the occasional conflicts with the Turks never ceased, the true euphoria of pugnacious feelings was caused by the news of the great Austrian victory over the Turks in 1683 near Vienna. The following year, Venice started the Moreian war, which put the Serbs of Montenegro and Brda into grave intertribal conflicts.

Regarding possible cooperation with the Venetians, the Serbs were pretty cautious after the previous negative experience in the War of Candia. The Kuč and the bandits of Boka were the first to join the fight on the Venetian side, while the other tribes asked the Venetians to be the first to start the war operations. Having sensed that something was going on, the Turks undertook a preventive military raid in 1685 and plundered Montenegro. The Venetians sent the outlaws led by Bajo Pivljanin but the Serbs were defeated on Vrtijeljka and Bajo was killed. The Turks seized Cetinje as well and systematically plundered the local population. There was also a serious breach among the Montenegrin leaders, who split into the ones who continued cooperation with the Venetians and the ones who were for an agreement with the Turks. "If the Montenegrins had opposed the Turks jointly and determinedly, the Pasha of Skadar would have been defeated. But the very fact revealed the lack of unity of the Montenegrin tribes, which were unable to agree even in a situation like this" (p. 176.) The Turks managed to calm Montenegro for a certain period, but Herceg Novi was seized from them by the Venetians with Serbian assistance in 1687.

The fall of Herceg Novi gave the Serbs an additional impetus and they successfully prevented the new raid of Sulejman Pasha on Montenegro. The most serious Turkish defeat was that inflicted on them by the Kuč, assisted by other inhabitants of Brda. *Vladika* Visarion informed the Venetians in 1688 that the Montenegrin leaders had decided to accept the supreme Venetian rule. Zare Grkinić, an inhabitant of Boka, was appointed as the Venetian Governor in Cetinje. The solidarity and unity in

551/57440

the fight of the tribes of Montenegro and Brda was renewed. But after a few more great Montenegrin victories over the Turks, achieved with a little Venetian assistance, the Venetian army in Cetinje started treating the Montenegrins as their subordinate subjects, which caused great discontent among the people. There was considerable jealousy between the Austrians and the Venetians over the domination of the Serbian territories after the expected success of the great offensive against the Turks in 1689, during which the great pan-Serbian rising against the Turks was also organized. But when the Turks raided Montenegro again, all the half-heartedness and insufficiency of the Venetian protection became apparent. The failure of the Austrian offensive on the wider Serbian territory encouraged the local Turks and their raids on the territories of Montenegro and Brda increased. However, the Turks were regularly defeated and repulsed until 1692 when Sulejman Pasha, the Sanjak-bey of Skadar, went after Cetinje. The opposition of the Serbs who stood in the way of the attack was short and futile and the Venetian garrison in Cetinje soon surrendered. Before they left, the Venetians mined the Monastery of Cetinje, showing the contempt they felt towards the great Serbian holy object.

Although the Venetian defeat on the territory of Montenegro was complete, they had significant success in Herzegovina due to the persistence of the Serbian insurrectionists and their refusal to come to terms with Turkish rule. Because of Serbian bravery, the Venetians took Trebinje in 1694. The Serbian success in Herzegovina renewed the fighting enthusiasm among the people of Brda and Montenegro and directed them towards the renewal of cooperation with Venice. The Venetians started the systematic relocation of the Serbian population from the territory under Turkish control to Dalmacija and the Bay of Kotor. By the Karlovac peace treaty of 1699, the Venetians kept the entire area of the Bay of Kotor, but they had to leave Herzegovina, which additionally stimulated the emigration of the Serbs. The Montenegrins, especially the inhabitants of Katun, continued the bickering with the Turks until 1706, when they were forced to calm down and accept the payment of taxes.

The constant Serbian conflict with the Turks had all the characteristics of a religious war, above all because of the constant Turkish attempts to convert the Christians into Islam, but also because the enemies were not actual Turks but the Serbs converted to Islam. During the time of Bishop Danilo, the investigation of the converts to Islam began among the inhabitants of Cetinje and the Đeklić family, and those who were unwilling to return to the religion of their forefathers were liquidated. The investigation was initiated in 1707 and it represented a guideline for the following decades on how to protect the Serbian national unity and the Orthodox religion as the only possibility of survival. There was no great religious intolerance at the very beginning of introduction of Islam to the Montenegrin hills, but it increased while the converts lost connections with their nationality. The Moslems no longer considered themselves Serbs and they fully identified themselves with the Turks.

The new political moment in the history of the Serbian people was introduced by the first arrival of the Russian tsar's emissaries to Montenegro in 1711. The great empire of eastern brothers of the same

origin became the Serbian protector, main support and pledge. From that moment on, the Serbs from Montenegro, Brda and Herzegovina would not fear loneliness in the wide world. As early as the great Russian-Turkish war in 1710, Emperor Peter I Romanov sent Mihailo Miloradović, an inhabitant of Herzegovina from Podgorica and colonel of the empire and Ivan Lukačević, captain of the empire, to Montenegro to raise the Serbs against the Turks. In July 1711, 24 of the most eminent leaders of Montenegro and Herzegovina met with Mihailo Miloradović and *Vladika* Danilo in Cetinje to agree on the fight against the Turks. "Immediately after that, the Montenegrins, the people of Herzegovina and the neighbouring tribes started preparations for an armed rebellion against the Turks. The speed with which it was carried out was fascinating and it merely showed how deeply the people were convinced that Russia would assist their fight against the Turks. For the first time in centuries of arduous slavery, the emissaries of the great and mighty Russian tsar came to see the Serbs in Montenegro and to offer them assistance and protection. This had the effect of a real revelation. The most powerful Orthodox ruler in the world had contacted the people who had suffered Turkish violence for centuries, who saw the Turks violating their holy objects and who were despised by their neighbours and friends the Venetians and called schismatic. It was truly an extraordinary event, which changed the destiny of the people of Montenegro and Herzegovina" (p. 253).

Even though no spectacular results were achieved, the sheer force of the uprising forced the Turks to recognise Montenegro as a war party and to enter into a truce with it, although it had been recognized as internal Turkish territory by the Peace of Karlovac. The Catholic neighbouring states were disturbed by the appearance of the Russian influence among the Orthodox Serbs and they preferred the Turkish victory, especially when the Orthodox *vladikas* and priests appeared as leaders of the uprising. The Venetians immediately established an economic and political blockade of Montenegro. When the Russians made peace with the Turks, the inhabitants of Montenegro, Brda and Herzegovina continued fighting in companies. The Turks attacked Montenegro with a great army in 1712 and reached Cetinje with great losses, tore down the monastery and plundered the settlement. But they soon had to retreat and they suffered additional great losses from the Serbs along the way. In the national legend, this campaign was retold as the great Turkish defeat, especially the battle on Carev Laz. The Turkish failure and especially the news about the renewal of the Russian-Turkish war, inflamed the pugnacious feelings of the Serbs and fighting in companies were continued with changing success but without any tragic Serbian defeats.

e) The Time of *Vladika* Danilo

An even greater Turkish punitive expedition started for Montenegro in 1714, with 30,000 soldiers commanded by Bosnian Vizier Numan Pasha Cuprilić. The Turks seized Cetinje again, together with the entire District of Katun. The Venetians closed their border while the Turks killed without mercy - mainly Serbian women and children. Several thousand

Serbs were brutally killed and the entire territory was plundered and burnt. This massacre only strengthened the Serbian determination to fight against the Turks without compromise and also incited brotherly feelings towards the Russians to the maximum extent. Since that time, “Russia accepted the liberation struggle of the Montenegrins, which was essential for the further historical development of Montenegro. For that reason, the name of Russia had a magical overtone for the Montenegrin *vladikas* and clergy” (p. 266).

Since a large number of Montenegrin refugees found shelter in Boka, in spite of the Venetian prohibitions, the Turks asked for those refugees to be delivered to them. Since the Venetians refused to surrender the refugees, a new war between the Turks and the Venetians broke out in 1714. Upon his return from Russia in 1715, *Vladika Vasilije* established cooperation with the Austrians as well and he met with Eugene of Savoy. In 1717, the Montenegrins assisted in the Venetian attack on Bar but without significant success. Soon, the Venetians and the Turks were reconciled and *Vladika Danilo* managed to suppress all significant Venetian influences in Montenegro using skilful political moves and managed to frustrate their policy of disuniting the Montenegrin tribes.

The occasional Serbian battles with the Turks continued in the following years, mainly in the form of fighting in companies. After the death of *Vladika Danilo Petrović* in 1735, his nephew Sava Petrović came to the *vladika's* throne but he was extremely incapable of political action. The jealousies and blood revenges between the tribes were immediately renewed. In 1737, Russia and Austria joined the war against the Turks, which incited the Serbs to a new uprising that encompassed all the Serbian territories under the Turkish slavery and which was led by Patriarch Arsenije IV. While the inhabitants of Brda and Herzegovina joined the uprising in masses, the Montenegrins remained pretty passive. It seemed as though they had a precognition of the failure of the Austrian action. After the Austrian army had withdrawn from central Serbia in 1738, the Turks undertook several campaigns against the inhabitants of Brda. The Vasojević family suffered terrible plunders and murders, while the Kuč and Kliment families together inflicted serious damage on the Turks. After the peace treaty had been closed with the Austrians in 1739, the Turks immediately started preparing a great offensive on Montenegro and Brda the following year. The Kuč and Kliment families suffered the most and fighting in companies was intensified again. *Vladika Sava* spent some time in Russia in 1743, where he was received very cordially but he did not present an ability to gain political maximum by this visit. “Although the trip of Metropolitan Sava Petrović to Russia did not have the character of a significant political dialogue, it was important for strengthening the political relations between the Russia and Montenegro, which were very important for the further liberating fights of the Montenegrin people. The *vladika's* very presence in St. Petersburg reminded the Russian court of a brother Slavic nation in the Balkans, looking for Russian help and protection. The Russian court did not decline this request.” (p. 303.)

Alongside the incapable *Vladika Sava*, the importance of Vasilije Petrović, the Archimandrite of Cetinje, significantly increased. As Sava's deputy, during the *vladika's* stay in Russia, he travelled to Venice and presented himself there as the main representative of the Montenegrin people. There was a serious conflict between Sava and Vasilije because of this and it caused a new split in Montenegro since the tribe leaders chose between the two sides. The conflict drove *Vladika Sava* completely into the arms of Venice and his sycophantic attitude towards the Venetians sometimes went beyond all limits. At the same time, the Venetians mistreated the Montenegrins in a different way, especially the Njeguš tribe. The Montenegrins retaliated by not making too big a distinction between the Turks and the Venetians, often even attacking the people of Dubrovnik and even the Orthodox Serbs from neighbouring territories.

Vasilije Petrović developed lively church and political activity and he was proclaimed Metropolitan and Exarch of the Peć Patriarchate in 1750 in Belgrade by Patriarch Atanasije II. He made many clumsy moves and had a lot of trouble, but he showed great energy and loyalty to the Serbian state-establishing idea. In 1752 he went to Russia where he remained for a year and a half. He was greeted with the highest honours there and he took the opportunity to develop lively and intense political activities on behalf of the Montenegrin Serbs. Vasilije's success in Russia bothered the Venetians and they tried to poison him three times upon his return. He opposed Sava's agreement with the Turks regarding the tax payment and induced the Montenegrin to stop paying it in 1755. In 1756, the Turks started a major attack on Montenegro with Venetian support. The lonely Montenegro prepared to defend itself. “Vasilije's last action aimed at the moral and political strengthening of the Montenegrin tribes was the election of the main leaders at the Assembly that took place in Cetinje early in November. Under the waving Russian flag, Vasilije encouraged the gathered people and assured them that Russia would protect them” (p. 343). The Turks attacked Montenegro from all sides but the Serbs defended themselves bravely and persistently and forced the enemy to retreat. This manifested in the national consciousness as a great victory. However, the peace treaty signed the following year obliged the Montenegrins to pay taxes again.

Immediately before the Turkish attack, Vasilije went to ask for Russian help, insisting on emigration of the Montenegrins to Russia. Accompanied by 140 Montenegrins, Vasilije went to Russia again. He returned to Montenegro in 1659 with considerable Russian gifts in money and he was greeted by a large group of Serbs near Budva. The Russian colonel Puchkov accompanied him. Showing certain political skills and the diplomatic experience he had gained, Vasilije soon settled the relationship with the Turks and the Venetians in order to normalize life in Montenegro, knowing that the time of the final liberation and gaining of Serbian independence would not come yet. However, there was considerable competition among the leaders in Montenegro over who could officially go to Russia and be close to the Russian court. The

District of Crmnik and Kotar clashed over this issue and there were victims in that conflict. Vasilije's plans were significantly upset by colonel Puchkov, who voiced a negative opinion of Vasilije's character in his report, but this did not affect his strategic commitment. "Russia has been and remained the hope in all his political ambitions and dreams" (p. 365). In 1765, he left for Russia again and died there the following year. Tsarina Catherine II ordered that Vasilije should be buried with the highest church and military honours and sent assistance in money to Montenegro via special emissary.

g) The False Tsar Šćepan the Little

Vasilije's death caused an internal political crisis in Montenegro because of the lack of a person with generally accepted authority. There were tribal splits when *Vladika* Sava appointed his nephew Arsenije Plamenac his successor and proclaimed him episcope. The fellowship of Petrović could not come to terms with that. At that very moment, the false emperor Šćepan the Little appeared on the scene and, with Sava's assistance, this self-proclaimed tsar became recognized and accepted by the tribal leaders. In the primitive family organization of a military democracy, he was greeted with joy and he managed to bring peace, to reconcile the fighting tribes and stop the blood vengeance. Falsely presenting himself as the Russian Tsar Peter III, in Montenegro he was considered the embodiment of the people's hopes for the renewal of the Serbian empire, which had lasted for centuries. Using his rhetorical abilities, he demonstrated messianic inspiration to the illiterate people. When Sava grasped the amount of power Šćepan had gained within such a short time and after he had received a letter from Obreskov, the Russian emissary in Constantinople, who wrote that Šćepan was a liar and a crook, Sava attempted to reveal and dethrone Šćepan the Little. But it was too late. Šćepan was already too powerful and at one point he even put *Vladika* Sava and some of his relatives in prison. The self-proclaimed tsar came to Cetinje as late as 1768 and soon the inhabitants of Brda recognized his authority. Mejine, Pobor and Brajić joined him, as well as the territories under Venetian control.

The Venetians decided to poison Šćepan the Little that same year. They applied the utmost retaliatory measures against the inhabitants of Mejine, Pobor and Brajić. They arrested Šćepan's supporters throughout Boka. The Russians were amazed by the political success of the self-proclaimed tsar. Tsarina Catherine II sent a special emissary to remove the false tsar from Montenegro. The Turks were highly suspicious. Šćepan represented a major threat to foreign forces. The Turks undertook a war campaign with fifty thousand soldiers - twice the number of the entire Montenegrin population. Šćepan the Little and the Montenegrin army were defeated in the Gorge of Ostrog, but the Turkish operations were soon halted because war with Russia broke out. The Montenegrins celebrated a victory gained without many victims. The following year, in 1769, the tsarina sent count Alexei Orlov and Prince George Dolgorukov to Montenegro to organize a Serbian uprising, having estimated that the

success of the self-proclaimed tsar was only the expression of the Montenegrins excessive love of Russia. Dolgorukov came to Cetinje and read the tsarina's declaration at the assembly, and ordered Šćepan to be arrested, which caused the failure of his mission. Having correctly judged Šćepan's authority, Dolgorukov returned him the administrative power and Šćepan thus corrected the unfavourable impression he had left with his cowardice during the Turkish campaign. All the problems the great powers had with the false tsar were only resolved in 1773, when Šćepan the Little was slaughtered while sleeping by his Greek servant, following the instructions of the Pasha of Skadar.

After the death of Šćepan the Little, a new political crisis broke out in Montenegro, characterised by the conflict over power between the *vladika's* family of Petrović and the governor's family of Radonjić. Besides his innate inability, at the time of the self-proclaimed tsar, *Vladika* Sava lost all his worldly jurisdictions, which created a wide open area for political action on the part of Governor Jovan Radonjić. Sava personally confirmed to Jovan his hereditary title of governor, having previously antagonized his own fellowship by ordaining Arsenije Plamenac. Metropolitan Vasilije had earlier determined Petar Petrović as his successor and sent him to school in Russia. Extremely capable, intelligent and educated, Petar I was the only one able to oppose Radonjić. In 1774 Mahmud Pasha Busatlija plundered the Kuč, who escaped to Montenegro with terrible losses. The new Turkish threat forced the Montenegrin leaders to address Russia again. Governor Radonjić and Archimandrite Petar Petrović addressed the Russian court at the same time. Petar immediately left for Russia with a couple of inhabitants of Boka. The next time, in 1777, he went with Radonjić, but without success, since the rumour had spread that certain Montenegrin leaders had already been making alliances with Austria. On their way back, the delegation led unsuccessful negotiations with the Vienna court as well. The political conflicts deepened in Montenegro and the pro-Austrian policy of Radonjić met an increasing number of opponents. When Sava Petrović died in 1781, Arsenije Plamenac became the new Metropolitan. Montenegro was threatened by famine as well.

h) The Rule of Petar I and Petar II

In 1784 in Sremski Karlovci, Metropolitan Arsenije Putnik proclaimed Archimandrite Petar I Petrović, the *Vladika* of Montenegro, the Coastal Region and Skenderija, since Arsenije Plamenac had died six months before. In 1785, Petar I left for Russia but he was expelled from St. Petersburg after being slandered by some Montenegrins there. Prince Potemkin showed particular intolerance towards him. That same year, Mahmud Pasha Busatlija encroached into Montenegro with a great army. The Serbian resistance was broken down soon and the Turks seized Cetinje. They took hostages, plundered the monastery and forced obedience from the Montenegrin leaders. On their way back, they massacred the Paštrović family. In 1785, Mahmud Paša went to Nikšić and tricked and murdered the prince and 150 inhabitants of Rovač there.

The war between Russia and Turkey broke out in 1878 and Austria interfered on the side of the Russians the following year. Russia sent Major Sava Mirković to Montenegro as the tsarina's emissary, while the Russian ambassador in Venice addressed *Vladika* Petar in a letter. Tsarina Catherine II invited the entire population of Serbia to rise against the Turks in 1788. Soon, the Austrian delegation arrived in Montenegro. The leaders divided into two groups. The pro-Russian group was led by *Vladika* Petar I and the pro-Austrian one by Governor Radonjić. *Vladika* called for an assembly of leaders in Cetinje, which gained a notably anti-Austrian character. Both the inhabitants of Brda and Herzegovina declared themselves against cooperation with the Austrians. However, Petar I was soon reconciled with the Austrian delegation and agreed with the Montenegrin leaders to start fighting the Turks.

That same year, Mahmud Pasha killed the Austrian delegates who came to win him over to their side, which caused great fear among the Austrian officers in Cetinje. A new Russian delegation soon came with the tsarina's message to begin war against the Turks. After several unsuccessful attempts, the Austrians left Montenegro and their mission proved a failure. On that occasion, Petar I said to the Russian tsarina: "Our people direct their hopes only towards Russia as a country of the same religion and origin as ours and, although this is a general war of allies, our people are devoted only to Russia. They consider the Russian soldiers their brothers and they cannot stand any others. This deeply rooted belief cannot be beaten out of us" (p. 440). Because of his pro-Austrian orientation, Governor Radonjić was completely defeated politically. The Russian-Turkish war ended in 1792 without any significant results for the Christian peoples in the Balkans, whose destiny was the reason it broke out in the first place.

When Mahmud Pasha attacked again in 1792, the Montenegrins and the inhabitants of Brda readily and jointly opposed and repelled him. The following year, the arrogant and rebellious pasha defeated the sultan's army near Skadar. When he attacked the inhabitants of Brda again, the Montenegrins wholeheartedly came to assist their brethren. The Montenegrins with the Piper and Bjelopavlić tribes completely defeated the six times more numerous Turkish army on Martinić. That same year, there was an even larger battle in Krusi in which Mahmud Pasha was killed and the Serbian triumph was complete. After these glorious battles, Montenegro, joined the Bjelopavlić and Piper and, in close alliance with the other inhabitants of Brda and Herzegovina, was rightfully considered an independent state. Petar I persistently worked on establishment of the state institutions. In 1798 he founded the Court Administration of Montenegro and Brda as the supreme authority of the state, which united its administrative and judicial branch. The work on the establishment of state institutions was hindered by a renewal of enmities and conflicts among the tribes, of blood vengeance and general insecurity. The age-long state of anarchy resisted the establishment of a central state power, the law and order. That same year, the General Code of Montenegro and Brda was issued, and it contained the entire *Discipline* from 1796, as its prequel. The establishment of the highest state body and the issue of the Code did

not significantly reduce the importance of the national and leaders' assemblies, but it represented a basis for the development of the state structure and the rule of law

Petar I systematically reduced individual power and competencies of tribal rulers and he met with the greatest resistance from Governor Jovan Radonjić and, after him, his son, Governor Vukolaj Radonjić, who was twice removed from that post by the decision of the Assembly of National Leaders, first in 1818 and definitively in 1830. The conflict of the leader's houses of Petrović and Radonjić reflected the conflict of the Russian and the Austrian interests, in which the Austrians were defeated. After Petar I died, Ivan Vukotić and Matej Vučićević, who had previously, as tsar's emissaries, brought significant Russian financial assistance to the state of Montenegro and Brda and to the poor people, attempted to assume the political supremacy in Montenegro. However, Petar II defeated them by political means after a couple of years, having gained the support of the great majority of leaders and the sympathies of the Russian court. As the ruler of Montenegro and Brda since 1830, when his uncle Petar I died, Petar II continued his state-establishing activities with even greater ardour. He established the Senate, the Guard and the Champions, thus perfecting the basic instruments of state power and implementing strong centralization. His most strenuous efforts were to introduce payment of taxes among people with whom the Turks very rarely had success enforcing payment. For decades, the Montenegrin budget was based on irregular Russian donations, the amount of which often changed. The dissatisfaction of certain leaders occasionally led to unrests and even to tribal uprisings. The Turkish and Austrian paid agitators especially would deal in peddling influence and the most serious opposition to Petar II was represented by his cousin Đordije Petrović, an advocate of the pro-Austrian option in the state orientation, which would soon completely fail after great havoc, as did the previous one – the governor's. The majority of people almost instinctively wished for centralized state rule and Montenegro as a whole never even thought of renouncing the direct support from Russia.

The process of uniting the Montenegrin Serbs with the inhabitants of Brda and Herzegovina was slow and gradual. Montenegro, which had previously consisted of the Katun, Crmnik, Rijeka and Lješ Districts, was adjoined by the Bjelopavlić and the Piper as early as 1796 after the great victories over the Turks. When the Turks attacked the Moračani in 1820, the Montenegrins and the other inhabitants of Brda came to their rescue in great numbers and the Turkish army was completely defeated. That same year, the Rovčani and the Moračani adjoined Montenegro. In 1831, the Kuč, who were constantly threatened by the Turks and had a very sensitive geographic position, joined the united state. At the same time, relations with all the other tribes in Brda and Herzegovina strengthened and often led at least to the joint opposition to the Turks, mutual solidarity and the peaceful resolution of disputes etc. The Turks plundered Grahovo in 1836 and, in 1838, a compromise was reached concerning the territory of Grahovo as the particular buffer zone between Montenegro and Turkey, which was still formally under Turkish control. In 1839, the inhabitants of

Montenegro and Brda defeated the great Turkish army that went after the Bjelopavlić near Kosov Lug. There was indecisiveness and unrest in Kuči in those years, which was instigated by the neighbouring Turks in an organized manner, but the final union with the Montenegrins was never questioned. The Turkish informers occasionally influenced the Bjelopavlić and the Piper, but these actions were efficiently suppressed by severe sanctions. In 1840, Smail-aga Čengić undertook to conquer Morača, where he was killed.

Over the next ten years, the Herzegovinian tribes Banjani, Grahovljani, Župljani, Uskoci, Pivljani, Drobljaci and Vasojevići came closer to Montenegro and Brda. The awareness of a full national unity was fully developed in them, although, in reality, this unity had not been fully achieved. They had a very high degree of autonomy in their relationships with the Turks and the Turkish rule was mainly reflected only symbolically through the payment of a minimum annual tax. But fighting in companies continued and the Turks were unable to deal with them. The clashes with the Turks in the border districts also happened frequently and the Serbs suffered significant losses after the Turkish conquest of the islands of Vranjina and Lesendra at Lake Skadar, since it affected both fishing and trade. Petar II developed lively diplomatic activity in order to recover those islands with the assistance of Russia and other great forces, but without much significant success.

During the rule of Petar I and Petar II Austria made continual efforts to gain and keep the best political positions as possible in Montenegro and Brda. The Montenegrin territory had great strategic importance to the Vienna court and the Serbian military abilities and their pugnacious spirit increased the Austrian desire to instrumentalise them in order to fulfil imperial ambitions: they wished to mobilize as many Montenegrins as they could into their *freikorps* and to protect Banat and Bukovina more efficiently with their assistance. But all the Austrian plans failed and the exponents of the Vienna policy among the Serbian people did not manage to gain a significant stronghold in the long run. The Montenegrin relations towards the Austrians depended directly on the attitude of St. Petersburg towards Vienna. After the French terminated the Venetian Republic, the Austrians appear as the new rulers of Boka and the immediate Montenegrin neighbours, which facilitated their political, military and intelligence activities, but which was still insufficient for the success of the Montenegrin politicians favoured by important personalities at the Vienna court. Vienna actually prevented the long desired Montenegrin exit to the Adriatic Sea and the Catholic empire manifested itself as a direct obstacle to the realization of vital Serbian national interests. At the same time, the Austrians systematically interfered with the exercising of the canonical jurisdictions of the Montenegrin Metropolitan in the entire coastal area. The disputes over territorial division lasted for decades and, after much hesitation, Petar II agreed to give over the Monasteries of Maine and Stanjević to the Austrians.

Montenegro was never again insecure about the definitive acceptance of the protection of the Russian Empire, although there were often unpleasant surprises and disappointments in this. Montenegro, Brda and

Herzegovina had a growing strategic importance for Russia, in order for it to lead the Balkan and anti-Turkish policy and, for that reason, it assisted the Serbs, although insufficiently. Its help was precious in the desperate fight for survival. Of great significance in strengthening the positions of Montenegro were the visits of Petar II to St. Petersburg in 1833 and 1837. The Russian diplomatic and financial assistance increased and Russia treated Montenegro as an independent state as of 1837, although its independence was not recognized by international law. The missions of the tsar's special emissaries Ozereckovski, Kovaljevski and Čevhin had very good results for the destiny of the Montenegrin people and the state of the territory of Montenegro and Brda in the following years. The fact that the inhabitants of Montenegro and Herzegovina fought together with the Russians against the French in Boka and near Dubrovnik was of particular historical importance. As early as 1796, the French cooperated with the Turks on an anti-Serbian basis. With Russian support, the Montenegrins entered to Boka in 1806 to oppose the French occupation and, immediately after that, they seized Konavle with the Herzegovinians. That year, the Russians and the Serbs seized both Korčula and Brač but did not keep them for long since the Russian fleet had to surrender Boka to the French. The conflicts between Montenegro and France continued with lower intensity, with constant riots and uprisings on the part of the inhabitants of Boka. In 1813, the union of Montenegro and Boka was proclaimed at the Assembly in Dobrota and, in 1814, the Serbs defeated the French army in the entire territory from the coast near Budva to Herceg Novi. The Russian fleet came as well and the Serbian-Russian rule over Boka lasted until the Congress in Vienna.

The rule of Petar I and Petar II was marked by the establishment of stronger relationships with the Serbs from the other Serbian countries, mainly with the rebellious and partly liberated Serbia. Both rulers of Montenegro and Brda made great efforts in the field of education and enlightenment and the printing of books, and they were both skilful writers themselves. In their time, Montenegro and Brda underwent a rapid economic development. Beside all the wars and ill fortune, the Serbs were affected by famine, the plague and various illnesses several times during their rule and that period of development and obvious state-establishing and liberating progress was also characterized by one misfortune after another.

i) The Rule of Prince Danilo

Shortly before his death, Petar II appointed his close relative Danilo Stankov Petrović as his successor and sent him to Russia to study. Njegoš died late in 1851 and, immediately afterwards, the Assembly of National Leaders elected Pero Tomov Petrović as the new ruler of Montenegro. After that unanimous election, Pero Tomov signed himself as prince in all the official documents. At that moment, Danilo was in Vienna, travelling to Saint Petersburg. The Russian court immediately supported his hereditary rights, based on Njegoš's testament and sent tsar's emissaries to Cetinje to inform the Senate and national leaders of the Russian attitude. The leaders

unanimously accepted this attitude but, as soon as the tsar's emissaries had left Cetinje, the information was released that the election of Pero Tomov as Montenegrin prince was confirmed. As a response to that, the Russian ambassador in Vienna suggested that Danilo should return to Montenegro and provided him with official confirmation that Danilo was considered the legitimate Montenegrin ruler by the Russian court. When he arrived in Cetinje in late December 1851, Danilo entered into a fierce conflict with his uncle Pero, in which bloodshed was narrowly avoided. However, the Russian support prevailed and the senators slowly began to take Danilo's side. The debates continued as late as January 1852, when the National Assembly definitively confirmed Danilo as ruler. Danilo had already reconciled with Pero in February and he was able to leave for Russia. In March, the National Assembly adopted the petition to the Russian tsar to proclaim Montenegro a hereditary principedom, which would represent an important step towards gaining complete independence and fully separating the secular from the spiritual rule. Since Colonel Kovaljovski, the new Russian emissary, submitted a very favourable report on the internal status of Montenegro, the Russian tsar decided to recognize Danilo as the hereditary prince, invested him with a medal of high honour and granted him an official audience on Vidovdan in 1852. The prince returned to Cetinje in August and he was greeted with a gun salutes and the enthusiasm of people.

The Russian recognition of the hereditary Montenegrin principedom disturbed the western powers, which had been building the anti-Russian coalition for a long time and fully exacerbating the Serbian relations with the Turks, who were already burdened by the actions of Omar Pasha in Bosnia and Herzegovina related to disciplining the gentry opposed to reforms and to disarming the Christians. In October 1852, the inhabitants of Katun ambushed the Bimbasha of Nikšić, Đulek Bey, in Duga, executed him and completely defeated his squad, capturing substantial spoils of war. As a response to that, Omar Pasha Latas grouped his forces in Herzegovina, thus inciting the rebellious feeling of the Herzegovinian Serbs. The Vizier of Skadar, Osman Pasha started bribing some of the Piper leaders to oppose the prince, which motivated Danilo to severely retaliate against the conspirators. The inhabitants of Rijeka went after the Turks on their own initiative and regained the fortified Žabljak from them. Osman Pasha went with a considerable army to recapture Žabljak but all the Turkish efforts were in vain and the death toll was enormous. Porte then decided to begin a general attack on Montenegro. The Russians immediately recognized the great danger to Montenegro and suggested that Danilo should retreat from Žabljak, which he did in the last days of 1852, taking substantial spoils with him. The Serbian retreat did not dissuade the Turks from announcing war. Omar Pasha Latas gathered 50 thousand soldiers for the attack. Prince Danilo could mobilize a maximum of twenty thousand people and oppose them to the Turks who started encroaching from three directions in January 1853. At first, the Crmnik District was the most affected but, after that, the Turks fiercely attacked Martinić, Piperi and Bjelopavlići, burning houses and killing women and children without mercy. In the north, Grahovo fell to Turkish hands but the Serbs stopped

further encroachment of Derviš Pasha. They made desperate efforts to withstand the attack of Ismail Pasha from the direction of Nikšić. The Turks paid for the successes achieved with great losses and, late in January 1853, there was a certain lull on the battlefields. But the news of the incredible Serbian bravery spread across Europe.

Russia immediately sent significant financial assistance to Montenegro and Austria donated large quantities of war material from the arsenals in Kotor, but the coordinated Russian-Austrian diplomatic offensive in Constantinople had the greatest effect, pervaded by direct war threats if the Turkish army did not retreat from Montenegro. This spoiled the enthusiasm of the renewed Turkish military attack in February. The greatest massacres of the Serbian population were performed by the army of Omar Pasha in Bjelopavlići and Piperi. The first Turkish defeat was the Battle of Rodinj, where over two hundred of the sultan's soldiers were killed. This raised the Serbian fighting moral enormously. The efforts of Omar Pasha to bribe certain tribe leaders to facilitate the progress of his army were unsuccessful. The sudden Serbian attack on the village of Glavica led to the death of a thousand Turks and the same number of Malisors surrendered, so the Serbs liberated Orja Luka. It is estimated that, in their campaign against Montenegro, the Turks had about five thousand victims and six thousand wounded soldiers. That and the growing diplomatic efforts of Russia and Austria forced them to enter a peace agreement late in February, according to which everything had to be returned to the state it was before the war. However, the Serbs continued to attack and plunder the retreating Turkish army, causing new Turkish losses and doubling the rage of Omar Pasha.

Crowned by victory and impressed by the highest honours paid to him by the Austrian Emperor that same year in Vienna, as well as by the new Russian medal of highest order - and supplied with large quantities of money arriving from St. Petersburg, Prince Danilo fully demonstrated his autocratic nature. His political opponents were few in number and led by Pero Tomov, Danilo's uncle, who had to escape to Kotor with a group of like-minded followers, where he died in 1834. Even as emigrants, Milo Martinović and Stefan Perović Cuca continued to work against Danilo's despotism and autocracy. When the war between Russia and Turkey broke out late in 1853, Tsar Nikolai I twice sent the emissaries to Montenegro to explore the possibility of a pan-Serbian uprising against the Turks. The emissaries concluded that it would be too risky in a little state already exhausted by the previous war, although Danilo was ready to rise to weapons. The conflicts with the Turks continued in Vasojevići, while the fighting in companies was also intensified in Herzegovina. Austria suddenly began to change its policy towards Montenegro, attempting to suppress the Russian influence. Montenegro was affected by famine again and many families had to move to Serbia. In spite all these problems, Danilo continued to organize and consolidate the state authority. In 1854, he introduced the rank insignia and the red war flag with a white cross in the middle - and, soon after that, he determined the Serbian tricolor as the official state flag.

The libertine behaviour of the prince and his followers culminated in

the summer of 1854 in the Ostrog Monastery in the raping of girls, which led to the rebellion of the offended Bjelopavlić family. Danilo quenched this rebellion with brutal force. England and France expressed growing interest in the Montenegrin situation and soon their consuls came to Cetinje. At the beginning of 1855, the prince married Darinka Kvekić, a Serb from Trieste and Danilo's Code was formally issued on Đurdevdan, as a big step forward in the formulation of the Montenegrin state legal order. The following year, following prince's instruction, Duke Mirko quenched a rebellion in Kuči with fire and sword. Even children in cradles were killed in the Drekalović fellowship. The plunder of Kuči led to Turkish intervention. The Turks seized Medun and the European forces assumed a highly unfavourable attitude towards Montenegro as a consequence of the Russian defeat in the Crimean War. England, France and Austria insisted on Prince Danilo's recognition of the supreme sultan's power. Under the pro-western influence of Princess Darinka, Danilo disturbed his relations with Russia. In spite of Russian warnings and open opposition, Danilo entered into negotiations about the recognition of the sultan's supreme sovereignty, which prompted Tsar Alexander II to stop assisting Montenegro. Đorđije Petrović openly opposed the prince, whom he had previously supported wholeheartedly in his conflict with Pero Tomov. In spite of Danilo's unchanged behaviour, Russian diplomacy managed to win France over in order to postpone the decision about Turkish sovereignty. Persuaded by Princess Darinka, Danilo travelled to Paris in 1857. During the seeing-off ceremony in Cetinje, a senator accompanying the prince was killed by loose shrapnel from the honorary platoon. While Danilo was in Paris, Duke Mirko began to stifle the pro-Russian opposition, accusing them of coup intentions. The Senate President Đorđije Petrović fled to Kotor after Milorad Medaković, followed by their closest adherents. They met the same fate as previous emigrants to Montenegro, who were skilfully manipulated by Austria. On his return to Cetinje, Prince Danilo began to cement ties with Serbia and Prince Aleksandar. Serbian statesmen suggested to his emissary that Montenegro should reassume a pro-Russian course. That same year, Danilo organized the murder of Montenegro's most prominent emigrant, Njegoš's nephew Stefan Cuca Petrović in Constantinople, which tarnished the prince's reputation among the Serbian people considerably.

Towards the end of 1857, there was renewed uprising among the Vasojevići in Herzegovina. The Serbs soon took over the vast area between Spuz and Podgorica. Facing new dangers, Prince Danilo once again sought protection from Russia. He was hoping to restore the trust of the Serbian people, whom he had troubled with his harsh and arrogant rule. He also persuaded the people of Grahovo to refuse to pay Turkish levies. The Montenegrins engaged in intensified fighting in companies across the part of Herzegovina south of the River Neretva. In December, the Herzegovinian rioters comprehensively defeated Mujaga Serdarević's troops. All the Herzegovinian tribes joined in the uprising, with Grahovo at the heart of it, while Duke Luka Vukalović became the widely-accepted leader of the uprising. During 1858, the major European forces became more directly involved in contemplating the developments in

Herzegovina, divided into the Russia and France blocs, which protected Serbia's aspirations and that of England and Austria, which defended Turkey's interests. Prince Danilo used all his assets to aid the rioters and so the Turkish accusations were directed at Montenegro, which was put under growing diplomatic pressure from Austria and England. In February, the Turks were defeated while launching an attack on Zupci, but eventually managed to reduce the entire area to ashes in the second onset. Helped by the people of Katun, the Herzegovinian forces succeeded in pushing the Turks as far as Trebinje. Russia fervently defended Serbia's interests, while Turkey started to mass its troops in Herzegovina, preparing to launch an attack on Montenegro. Using Ljubomir Nenadović as its representative, Danilo reconciled completely with the Russian government, which restored his invaluable confidence in these critical times. When the Turkish army looted Banjani and attacked Grahovo in early May, Danilo did not hesitate. He instantly mobilized the people of Katun and Rijeka and sent them to attack the Turks, delegating command to his brother Duke Mirko. The whole of Herzegovina was involved in the uprising. The fighting lasted a few days and both sides sustained heavy losses. After a temporary ceasefire, the Turks retreated, but the Serbs blocked their way, surrounded them and launched a synchronized attack. The Turks were completely defeated on 13 May, with 7,000 troops killed in action.

The news of the Serbian victory at Grahovo spread panic amongst the Bosnian and Skadar Turks. Mobilization was conducted feverishly in Bosnia. "It's interesting that, in that moment, the Ottoman mobilization of fresh troops was aided by a Catholic bishop named Barišić, who used his propaganda for that purpose. He openly stirred up hatred in the Catholics towards the rioters and the Montenegrins, hinting to the Turkish authorities that it was possible that the Catholics could engage in an armed assault on the rioters" (Branko Pavićević: *Prince Danilo I Petrović Njegoš*, "Literary Gazette", Belgrade 1990, page 345). However, the magnificent victory of the Serbian army sent shockwaves throughout Europe. A special emissary to the Russian tsar arrived at Cetinje on Vidovdan to congratulate the Serbian Prince of Montenegro on the victory. In order to avoid further conflict, the great powers appointed a commission to deal with the delimitation of Turkey and Montenegro. A representative of Montenegro was included in the commission, which meant recognition of the *de facto* independence of this small Serbian state. There were some clashes with the Turks, first at Beri and Formak near Podgorica in July 1858. The Serbs attacked Kolašin, which got Danilo into considerable diplomatic problems. The commission completed its work after a few months, which was followed by the signing of the Constantinople Protocol in November 1858 relating to the delimitation, while the following year was characterized by the tedious fieldwork of marking the border. The Herzegovinian rioters continued fighting in 1859, but Montenegro refrained from aiding them openly, meaning that the leaders of the uprising were forced to make peace with Turkey. However, conflicts continued into 1860. The first uprising was sparked off in Gacko and was quelled bloodily in a massive civilian massacre.

The Austrian hostility towards Montenegro mounted and became more open. The Vienna Court was uncompromising towards the *de facto* creation and indirect recognition of a small Serbian state, whose ruler Danilo enjoyed enormous popularity among the enslaved Serbs and represented an obstacle in Austria's expansionist policy. The hatred Turkey felt for Danilo was implacable. Prince Danilo was assassinated on 12 August 1860 in Kotor by Todor Kadić, motivated by his personal vindictiveness as a result of the prince's previous wrongdoings against the Bjelopavlići, while directly aided by the Turkish authorities. There is also strong suspicion that the former Senate president Đorđije Savov Petrović was directly involved in the preparations for the assassination. In any event, the incident was a terrorist endeavour by the Montenegrin emigrants, who had lived and operated in the territory of Austria for years, enjoying great support and aid from the Austrian authorities and, in the aforementioned case of slaying a sovereign, enjoying Turkish leniency. The Austrian police showed little immediacy in arresting the murderer.

j) The Rule of King Nikola

In accordance with his last will and testament, Prince Danilo was succeeded by Nikola Petrović, son of Duke Mirko. Prince Nikola continued with the policy of support for the Herzegovinian rioters and a new uprising broke out in 1861, which was directly joined by the Montenegrin troops. The Porte sent an ultimatum to the Prince to cease aiding the rebellion of the Herzegovinian Serbs, which was resolutely ignored by Cetinje. That was a reason for Turkey to start a new war against Montenegro, with 55,000-strong troops led by Omar Pasha Latas. The Serbs had the capacity to send only fifteen thousand troops, including Montenegrins and Herzegovinians. The Turks launched a synchronized attack from three directions – from Podgorica, from Herzegovina and across Vasojevići. The commander of the Montenegro army was Duke Mirko, while the Herzegovinian Serbs were led by Luka Vukalović. The Turks hit hard and advanced rapidly, annihilating everything in their path, and soon threatened Cetinje itself. The Russian envoys exerted strong pressure in Constantinople and managed to force Turkey into a truce, but Prince Nikola was compelled to sign the peace treaty under extremely unfavourable conditions. The territory of Montenegro was not reduced but the Turks claimed the right to build a fort at an important communication road between Spuž and Nikšić. Duke Mirko was forced to flee the country and all communication with the Herzegovinian rioters ceased. The following year, the great powers persuaded Turkey to give up on building the fort on the territory of Montenegro.

Prince Nikola did not desist from the liberation plans and continued war preparations intensively. In 1866, a union between Serbia and Montenegro was formed, according to which Montenegro would be incorporated into the big Serbian state ruled by the Obrenović dynasty once the liberation of all the Serbs was complete. As Prince Mihailo was assassinated two years later, the union never achieved its set goals, but Serbia's help was instrumental in the process of modernizing the

IT-03-67-T
Montenegro army. Over the years to come, sporadic skirmishes and minor armed clashes with the Turks continued along the border. The patriotic organization United Serbian Youth developed its heightened activism in almost every Serbian state, strengthening the patriotic climate and the fighting spirit. "After the death of Prince Mihailo, the Prince of Montenegro was no longer willing to give up the throne in favour of the Serbian rulers or to incorporate Montenegro into the expanded territory of Serbia. Prince's ambitions grew, since he was supported by Russia and praised by the youth, and he dreamed about leading the great Serbian state. The rumours were spread that Russia intended to bring Prince Nikola to the throne of Serbia. Montenegro's efforts to become as internally sound as possible and increase its participation in the national liberation movement were predominantly interpreted by the Serbian politicians as an attempt to become increasingly competitive in the process of creating a larger state. The Serbian Government were harbouring hopes that they would succeed in diminishing Montenegro's influence on the national liberation movement. That sparked off a conflict of interests, largely in Herzegovina, which Montenegro saw as part of its sphere of interest and a natural direction for expansion. The rivalry was having a diverse influence on the development of the national liberation movement" (*The History of the Serbian People*, book V, volume I, page 442).

Avoiding the conflict between Montenegro and Serbia, the Serbs single-handedly sparked an uprising against the Turks in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1875. The Herzegovinian rioters were increasingly more openly aided by Montenegro. In 1876 in Venice, Serbia and Montenegro forged a secret military alliance and, on 30 June, declared war on Turkey. Montenegro's war plan was based on an effort to liberate Herzegovina all the way to the Neretva River, and the Montenegrin troops were concentrated in that direction accordingly, while the immediate command was assumed by Prince Nikola. The Serbs of Montenegro and Herzegovina joined forces and quickly broke through to Nevesinje, but made a strategic retreat before a mighty Turkish army and waited for it at Vučji Do, where the Turks were convincingly defeated on 28 August. After the magnificent victory and after Austria threatened not to allow the expansion into Herzegovina, Nikola redeployed his troops towards Podgorica. On 14 August at Fundina, he dealt the Turks an even heavier defeat and finished them off in subsequent skirmishes at Podgorica and Spuž. Heavy uprising clashes took place in the valley of the Lim and Tara rivers. As Serbia was leading a failing campaign, Russia forced the Turks into truce on 1 November. In late April in 1877, Nikola launched an all-out attack on the Turks as soon as he had received news of Russia's declaration of war on Turkey. What followed was that 65,000 Turkish troops attacked Montenegro from three directions. Massive Serbian efforts hampered the Turks' advance and inflicted heavy defeats in the Ostrog Pass and at the Morača Monastery. Since Turkey was then forced to withdraw the bulk of their troops and reinforce their front facing the Russians, Prince Nikola took over Nikšić and Bileća. Then he turned his efforts to the south, liberating Bar and Ulcinj in early 1878. The Treaty of

San Stefano of 3 March ensured the independence of Montenegro and its territorial expansion. The Congress of Berlin denied Montenegro a large part of its territory, but confirmed its independence. Montenegro retained Nikšić, Kolašin, Spuž, Podgorica, Bar and Žabljak, as well as Plav and Gusinje, which were soon relinquished so that Montenegro could get Ulcinj, all the way to the mouth of the River Bojana. Montenegro's access to the sea was achieved but with severe Austrian restrictions and a limited sovereignty of the seaside stretch.

Nikola initiated an agricultural reform in 1879, seizing large estates owned by the Muslims – especially emigrants – and bestowing them on the poor Orthodox Serbs. The prince's self-willed attitude often came into play at estate allocation, with frequent examples of protectionism and nepotism. The government was fundamentally reformed when the Senate was abolished and the State Council with ministries and the Supreme Court were both established. The State Council represented the unity of the legislative, executive and supervisory power. The Prince's personal power remained undisputed, while his cult grew in public life. Nikola fiercely fought all his political opponents and the unlike-minded. A number of celebrated war commanders and respectable men were forced to emigrate. In 1900, Nikola displayed aspirations to become king. Montenegro developed diplomatic relations with all the major forces and neighbouring nations, but its consular activities abroad were conducted by the Russian diplomatic envoys. The economy was making a slow progress and was hampered badly by the lingering patriarchal mentality. There was no real political life but the state endeavoured to establish the Great Serbian propaganda and the heroic ethos of the liberation of the entire Serbian people. As a devoted Russophile, Nikola Petrović felt a personal hatred and animosity against the Austrophilic Milan Obrenović. The Montenegrin prince aided Serbian political emigrants, while his eldest daughter Zorka married Prince Petar Karađorđević. The relationship with Milan's successor Aleksandar was somewhat more bearable. Nikola and Aleksandar met at the funeral of the Russian Tsar Alexander III in 1894. In 1896, Nikola visited Belgrade and, the following year, Aleksandar came to Cetinje. Deals were made about joint liberation campaigns, but inter-dynastic disputes continued in a somewhat milder manner. In 1902, Nikola began showing interest in having his son Marko become the heir to the Serbian throne, as it was evident that Aleksandar would remain childless. For that very purpose, Mirko married a less direct descendant of the Obrenović family. The military coup of May 1903 shattered these dreams however.

The inter-dynastic tensions continued between the Houses of Petrović and Karađorđević. Russia continued to provide extensive aid to Montenegro and the two signed a formal military alliance in 1910. Prince Nikola gave Montenegro a constitution in late 1905, introducing apparent parliamentarism. However, the Implemented Constitution only tailored Nikola's personal authority to the other autocratic models of that age. In 1906, students in Montenegro publicly protested against Nikola's regime. The prince brought those who signed the declaration to trial but, because of their daring attitude, the court dropped all charges. Prince Nikola

suffered an additional blow when large demonstrations of joy were organized by the citizens of Cetinje as a consequence of the acquittal of the accused. There were no political parties in the September 1906 elections, but the people predominantly voted for more liberal candidates. The members of parliament fiercely criticized the prince's speech, which brought about the fall of the Government. Marko Radulović formed a new government on the motion of the parliament club. In its critical response to the Prince's speech, the Parliament insisted that the juridical system be reformed fundamentally. Due to the Prince's frequent obstructions, Radulović's Government resigned in early 1907. A new government was formed by Andrija Radović, enjoying the support of the majority of members of parliament. The same year, the People's Party was founded as the first political party whose programme was developed using the programmes of the Radical Party in Serbia and the Serbian Radical Party in Vojvodina as a model, only more temperately formulated. Prince Nikola was instantly engaged in a political battle with the People's Party, forced the Government to resign and formed another led by trusted Lazar Tomanović. The prince's followers formed the True People's Party. Since the People's Party originated from the parliament club, its members were popularly called *klubaši* (Translator's note: the clubists), while the Prince's supporters were called *pravaši* (Translator's note: the true ones). The *klubaši* were systematically persecuted, while the *pravaši* enjoyed support and privileges. Soon the leadership of the People's Party bowed to the pressure and came under the Prince's subordination. The Parliament was dissolved in July and a new one was elected in November. In July, the prince visited Vienna where he received support for his efforts to take on the progressive Serbian youth, who had publicly confronted his self-will and autocracy in the *May Statement*. The prince introduced the public voting system at the parliamentary elections in order to prevent any of the *klubaši* from becoming members of parliament. The prince's agents and officers demolished the printer that issued *National Thought* in Nikšić to prevent the pro-*klubaši* newspaper from being published. They also pulled down Gutenberg's monument in the printer's courtyard. Under circumstances of harsh repression, looming bloodshed and the possibility of Austria's direct intervention, the People's Party withdrew from participating in the elections. The party was consequently disbanded.

A great number of the *klubaši* were forced to flee Montenegro. Immediately after the rigged elections, the Prince brought the "bombing affair" to light, so that Serbian officials – including Nikola Pašić himself – could be accused of anti-dynastic conspiracy. In May 1908, charges were brought against 132 individuals involved in the bombing affair and, as no conclusive evidence was presented, an Austro-Hungarian agent Đorđe Nastić was called as the principal witness, making false accusations of the Serbian Government. The trial turned into the prince's political fiasco and he consequently pardoned those condemned to death. The prince's public reputation was undoubtedly damaged by these fraudulent court proceedings. It was not until the Austro-Hungarian Annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908 that the conflicted regimes of Serbia and Montenegro made their peace, renewing a strong anti-Austro-Hungarian

sentiment among the people of Montenegro. However, the international position of the two Serbian states was too weak for any considerable resistance and they both recognized the Annexation in 1909. That same year, the Prince uncovered another conspiracy and dealt with its organizers ferociously, although their actions had seemed fairly naive. Five perpetrators were sentenced to death, which altered the relations with Serbia. In 1910, on the 50th anniversary of his rule, Nikola officially declared himself king – an explicitly Serbian king – alluding to the tradition of Zeta, which became the first Serbian kingdom in 1077. Despite all the measures of Nikola's regime, a few followers of the People's Party were elected as members of parliament.

King Nikola assisted the 1911 uprising of the Catholic Malisor Albanians against the Turkish rule. In early 1912 he travelled to Russia and, on his return, met the Bulgarian emperor in Vienna. In August 1912 the Montenegro army clashed with the Turks at Mojkovac, while the king stirred the Berane Serbs into an uprising. A military alliance was then forged with Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece, while Montenegro declared war on Turkey on 8 October. Prince Danilo was inexplicably late in his deployment towards Shkoder, which enabled the Turks to regroup and prepare their defence, and so the previous Serbian successes in the battlefield were not capitalized on in a timely manner. On the eastern front, Serdar Janko Vukotić liberated Mojkovac, Bijelo Polje, Pljevlja, Berane, Rožaj, Plav, Gusinje and Đakovica. Vukotić then set out with some of his troops to aid the siege of Shkoder, which would later cost the Serbian army dearly. In February of 1913, Serbian troops led by General Petar Bojović, who assumed control as the commander in charge of all armies, joined the Montenegrins' campaign. The western powers opposed the Serbs' liberation of Shkoder and decided to blockade the Montenegro coastline in protest. After heavy Serbian casualties from constant charges, Shkoder eventually yielded on 24 April. In early May, King Nikola was forced to comply with the ultimatum from the western powers and abandon Shkoder. As a result of this, Prime Minister General Mitar Martinović resigned and a new government was formed by General Janko Vukotić.

On 10 July 1913, King Nikola declared war on Bulgaria, firmly taking sides with the under-attack Serbia. In January of 1914, new parliamentary elections were held, where many candidates publicly declared themselves for the programme of the People's Party. The *pravaši* suffered a bitter defeat. Janko Vukotić afterwards formed a coalition government, as the foreign affairs were compelling the members of parliament towards greater unity. The previous Government of Mijušković strove for a true union with Serbia, while Vukotić's advocated a military, customs and diplomatic one. Upon hearing news of Austro-Hungary's declaration of war on Serbia, Montenegro immediately declared war on the Habsburg Empire. In early August, Duke Radomir Putnik developed the Common Plan of the Serbian and Montenegro armies' campaigns in the war against Austro-Hungary. On 15 August, Austria attacked and captured Pljevlja on the Montenegro front. King Nikola named Serbian general Božidar Janković as the Chief of Staff, who had just arrived from Belgrade along

with his deputy, Colonel Petar Pešić. There were three more members of the Serbian military mission and two Montenegrin officers in the headquarters. Janko Vukotić became the commander of the Sandžak Army and Mitar Martinović became the commander of the Drina Detachment. The

King's son Petar was in charge of the Lovćen Detachment, while Duke Đuro Petrović led the Herzegovinian Detachment. Towards the end of August, the reorganized Sandžak Army liberated Pljevlja and penetrated deep into Bosnia, taking over Pale, Jahorina and Romanija. The Drina Detachment advanced towards Kalinovik. The main weakness of the Montenegrin units was the lack of discipline when forced to retreat after heavier enemy fire. The Herzegovinian Serbs, particularly those of Trebinje, Gacko and Bileća, joined the Montenegro army in great numbers. There were so many Bokelji coming from America that a Bokelji Battalion was formed.

In late 1914, Montenegro was struck by a food crisis. Help from the allies was slow and inconsistent. Fifty thousand people were mobilized indefinitely, which hampered the already poor agricultural and industrial productions. Profiteers manipulated prices and caused inflation. Various diseases spread and emergency sanitary missions were sent from the allied nations. There was a division in the ranks of the ruling family, while the king's sons increasingly displayed their pro-Austrian and pro-German aspirations. The rivalry between generals Janko Vukotić and Mitar Martinović also grew. The Army was affected by political disputes, while the gulf widened between the people with their sincere and profound great Serbian tendencies and the Petrović Dynasty. Sensing that his dynastic interest were in jeopardy, Nikola considered the possibility of a separate peace. In August 1915, he left Montenegro, never to return. His son Danilo offered Aleksandar Karađorđević a federal concept, copying the model of Bavaria's status within Germany. Belgrade was highly reserved and lenient, in order to prevent any divisions during the war campaign.

On 5 January 1916, the Austro-Hungarian Army launched a full-scale attack on Montenegro. In a counterattack, Janko Vukotić heavily defeated the enemy at Mojkovac, despite the lack of food and ammunition and having three times as few troops at his disposal. The Austrians were fended off on all the front lines, which was of great significance for the Serbian army on retreat across Albania. At the Lovćen front, Prince Petar abandoned his unit, thus facilitating the Austro-Hungarian push. Lovćen soon fell, although the Montenegrins put up a fierce resistance and inflicted heavy casualties on the enemy. Lazar Mijušković's government was leaning towards capitulation. Cetinje fell on 13 January 1916, while the king ordered the army to prepare for a new battle, preventing it from leaving the state. That same day, the Government called for truce. The unconditional capitulation was accepted on 15 January, which aroused bitter resentment in both the army and the people. There were even some armed rebellions. Janko Vukotić had been ready for further resistance and the retreat of the army, but disorder had crept in within the state institutions. "All the evidence indicates that Nikola I wanted to leave country on his own, not accompanied by an army that was heavily

indoctrinated with the idea of unity with Serbia, so that he alone could represent the continuity of the state of Montenegro and fulfil his wish to influence the political decisions of the Entente powers relating to the future of Montenegro” (*The History of the Serbian People*, book VI, volume II, page 105). That marked the end of the independent state of Montenegro and the liberation of the territory facilitated its incorporation into a single Serbian state, a decision eventually made at the Great National Assembly in Podgorica on 26 November 1918.

6. The Serbian People Under Turkish Rule

The centuries-long period of Turkish rule catastrophically historically degraded, economically ruined and culturally degenerated the Serbian people, meaning that the tragedy of its destiny, starting as a military defeat and a political collapse, became an overall social regression. A mature and advanced civilization of Byzantine character was swamped by semi-savage Asian hordes. The Turkish conquerors gradually took over nearly the entire Arabian world and enslaved it, but also adopted its distinct Islamic religion, adding a new, militaristic feature to it. It was their own response to Roman Catholic Europe and its crusades from previous centuries marred by religious blindness, but it was mostly the Eastern European Orthodox peoples who were on the receiving end, unaccustomed to religious hatred and unwilling to be slaves to it. Through systematic weakening and brutal devastation of the Byzantine Empire, the Vatican contributed greatly to this onset, proving how plausible its own theological prejudices and ideological blindness were. The Turkish sultans did not secure the religious title of the Head of the Islamic world until 1517, when Selim I conquered Egypt. In 1534, they seized Baghdad, the former seat of the caliphate, which ensured Turkey's domination over all the other Muslim states.

a) The General Situation in the Enslaved Serbian States

Penetrating into the Serbian territory, the Turks enslaved tens of thousands of men, women and children and took them to distant markets, while the entire population of certain regions was sometimes deported to sparsely populated areas deep in their empire, in time stripping them of their ethnic identity and national consciousness. They caused mass famine through their incessant pillaging, decimating the subdued people with until then unknown diseases that caused mass epidemics. They populated their state apparatus and military garrisons by bringing various vassals from all the regions under the sultan's sovereign rule. The barbaric blood tax was most frequently applied to Serbs, as well as the process of overall Islamisation, which was not implemented using blatant violence, but rather treacherous coercion. “Some of the most intense pressures offered the prospect of a better and safer existence, but also persuading people that the best possible faith was the one being offered to them, claiming it was more in-depth, that it caused fewer moral dilemmas, that it allowed everyday pleasures and ensured a heavenly home. Dropping in number as

a result of the conquerors' blows, a great number of Serbs converted to Islam in order to save their lives and property, but also so that they could blend in with those enjoying full rights and could feel and show the others their increased significance. In areas populated by Serbs, the Turks did not establish as many settlements as in other states, but they insisted on Islamisation as they were shrewd enough to understand that the converted ones were far more successful at undermining their own former compatriots and relatives than anyone else. In the Balkans and especially in the Middle East, the layers of history were too deep not to create a general experience that the converted ones share, most frequently suppressed in their subconscious – bitter resentment towards the former like-minded believers they had once betrayed, compelled to prove themselves through outbursts of anger against those very people” (*The History of the Serbian People*, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1993, book III, volume I, page 14).

The hardships under the Turkish occupation naturally homogenized the Serbian national consciousness and increased the importance of their own autocephalous church. As the medieval feudal class had been totally obliterated, the peasantry became a dominant social class, and distinguished warriors and priests were recruited from it. The stabilization of Turkish rule and the Serbian social cohesion decreased tensions through lowering feudal taxes paid to regional Turkish lords so that the Serbs would agree to participate in the further Turkish military campaigns. This gave birth to and developed a distinct military organization of the Serbian community, which would revive certain state-forming traditions in an autonomous status. The Serbian collective interests would increasingly be defended before the Turkish central authority by their military officers, assuming the role of national leaders. The Turks allowed the development of certain forms of self-government in the villages, believing that it would make tax collection easier while, for the Serbs, it represented germs of the restored political life to come. “This system was undoubtedly a great test for the Serbian conscience. The people could remain faithful to their own religion and historical lore, but once moved in the direction of improved survival conditions, they could easily have been tempted to safeguard themselves by converting to Islam. Success in any kind of service brings both individuals and groups into the familiar state of vehemence when the ideas of a persuasive sovereign are recklessly accepted” (page 19).

The Islamized Serbs stood out as the finest warriors and the most capable statesmen, but the Christians also performed their duties very conscientiously and vehemently, until fiercer oppression turned them into outlaws or members of a neighbouring Catholic states' military service. However, they proved fatally prone to western coaxing into reckless and prematurely provoked mass uprisings. As the genuine Turks lived exclusively in cities, the occupying forces largely relied on the Islamized elements among the population of rural areas, who increasingly identified with them, feeling both a historical connection and rejection by their Christian compatriots. The Islamized Albanians became notorious in almost all the Serbian states for their bandit activity, often placing

themselves at the disposal of local moguls and distinguishing themselves as especially ferocious in times of anarchy. The process of Islamisation continuously put their faith to the test, perfecting moral values and developing within the framework of rural municipalities a distinct model of patriarchal democracy and a superior form of nationalism, until then almost entirely unknown to other European peoples. In time, the Orthodox Serbs mastered the art of trading and craftsmanship, with an exceptional degree of social mobility and the ability to adapt – a vitality that economically matched the inert Turkish parasitism with success. That would imprint a new element of hatred on the consciousness of the local Muslims consumed with envy, pampered by privileges and expected to show excessive religious devotion, altogether typical of all renegades. The hatred was so intense that certain eminent Christians were brutally killed merely for being so successful that their success made them conspicuous in the local converts' eyes. The Serbs responded to this with vengeful road banditism, intensifying their uprising activities and strengthening their social mimicry, which concealed the true extent of their economic rise under the envious gazes of the righteous, but incapable ones.

On multiple occasions in major wars, Serbia was utterly devastated. The Christian Serbs suffered greatly, but the Muslims too were forced to flee into inland Turkey. Fluctuations of the entire population were highly dynamic and intensive, while demographic losses were dramatic. The Turks also set up military frontiers in troubled border areas, aiming to implement Islamisation in those areas most thoroughly, while in Bosnia and Herzegovina that work was most easily carried out among the members of the Bogomil sect. The Muslims living in the central regions of Serbia were largely concentrated in the territory north of the Sava and Danube Rivers after the Turks had been driven out. Western Christian armies killed and drove the Muslims out, although there were cases of their conversion to Christianity. The Turkish theocratic state totally suppressed authentic human individuality and a sense of freedom, turning every vassal, believer or non-believer, into the sultan's serf, while treating the sultan himself as a servant and earthly envoy of the Prophet. Such a servile system led to an absolute monarchy of the theocratic type. There was a rigid hierarchy among the serfs and clear differentiation between the sultan's privileged serfs-believers and the non-believers, who were given extremely inadequate legal protection, often only on paper. Private property as such was non-existent, as all the land was considered to be state-owned, only with the hereditary right of use, but only under the condition that all feudal taxes were paid regularly. Moreover, the Christian folk were forcefully tied to the land.

At first, the convertees not only nourished but were publicly proud of their Serbian origin. Some were even boasting of a noble lineage, whether they genuinely belonged to one or imagined they did. Accordingly, the first Sanjak-bey of Bosnia, Mehmed-beg Minetović, pronounced himself "the sovereign of the Serbian state as of 1463" (page 54). Those who moved high up the hierarchy crucially influenced the further conversion of their kinsmen and compatriots. Meanwhile, the Turks divided the Serbs into the common people and the Vlachs. The common people were tied to

the land with severe peasantry constraints. The Vlachs were supporting workers with special privileges and their status was so popular at one point that all Serbs strove to achieve it. The very term originates from the name for the remainder of the pre-Serbian inhabitants of the Balkans, and later for all the cattle-breeders in Serbia under the rule of the Nemanjić dynasty. Numerous self-governed principalities came to be – especially in the border regions – which forced a change of the principle of collective responsibility in order to maintain the loyalty of the Serbian inhabitants.

The Serbian territories were expanded with Turkish conquests and Serbian settlement west of the Vrbas and north of the Sava River. The process was accelerated by abolishing the privileges of the Serbian people who, with the expansion of the territory, found themselves inland rather than at the border and thus turned into common people. Masses of people accordingly moved to the new border regions in order to avoid the peasantry status, which suited the Turks as the people of the regions of Slovenia, Croatia, Dalmatia, Lika, Banija and Kordun had been displaced as a result of their conquests. The Serbs soon became the ethnic majority, while the Muslims were concentrated predominantly in the cities. Western Slavonija was named Little Wallachia shortly afterwards, as it was heavily populated with Serbian border guards, Vlachs and Armatoles, as they were called. They enjoyed considerable social autonomy and a separate military organization with their own officers, princes and dukes. Together with the colonization of the newly-conquered Turkish territories, the Serbs moved to the neighbouring Christian states in an organized manner, but they insisted beforehand that they should be granted the same privileges the Turks had given them, including the status of free soldiers and the abolishment of all feudal taxes. The tragedy of the Serbs' fate was evident from the fact that Serbian soldiers were engaged in military campaigns on both sides and in great numbers. Moreover, on the one side of the border, they were Islamized and on the other they were Catholicized, while both processes were aimed at erasing their national identity and collective consciousness. Their own Orthodox Church helped them resist the denationalization more successfully, but a huge demographic loss was unavoidable. Radovan Samardžić estimates in the quoted section that around one quarter of all Serbs was converted to Islam by the mid-sixteenth century. It is likely that another quarter were further denationalized through conversion to Catholicism.

The relatively great extent of Islamisation integrated the Serbian ethnic group into the Turkish social structure more tightly. The more eminent and capable convertees reached the highest civil service positions and managed key imperial affairs, some insisted on their origin and traced their Serbian noble roots, while some proved their loyalty with ruthless and frantic persecution of their own people. The pinnacle of the Serbian influence on the Turkish Court was reached during the age of Grand Vizier Mehmed Pasha Sokolović and his powerful kinsmen. In those days, Christian Serbs expressed their insubordination in the operations of the *uskoci* and *hajduci* (Translator's note: freedom fighters), while more substantial uprisings took place in the late 16th century. The Serbian uprising in Banat in 1594 awoke the Serbian national self-awareness and

upset the Turkish authorities to such an extent that the Turks, blinded by hatred, burned the relics of Saint Sava, the founding father of Serbian nationalism, on Vračar. Over the decades that followed, the Serbs became rebellious, leading to major riots and uprisings. The lengthy war between Turkey and Austria of that time boosted their hopes and liberation ambitions. By means of their Christian enthusiasm and constant readiness for anti-Turkish campaigning, the Serbs actually showed they did not distinguish the Roman Catholic manipulations from the imperial ambitions of western rulers, as they gambled on the relatively bearable position and a significant degree of church-political autonomy that Turkey offered, eager to ensure their cooperation and loyalty. However, although they frivolously and good-heartedly participated in every Christian military campaign and subsequently suffered greatly, sustaining heavy losses in both manpower and property, all the historical experience further developed and perfected their national consciousness. A great Turkish defeat at Sisak in 1593 opened up prospects of liberation. In those years, Serbian rioting gained in number so much that some squads consisted of a few thousand men. Legends spread of feats performed by the leaders of the uprising – Đorđe Rač, Deli Marko and Starina Novak. At times, the most prominent *hajduci* joined the ranks of Austrian, Hungarian, Transylvanian or Vlachian armies, battling the common enemy. Historical data reveals Starina Novak's great victory over a large Polish army. Starina Novak was in alliance with Duke Michael of Wallachia at the time, while the Poles were in alliance with Hungary. Heroic Serbian warriors "were everyone's choice and they were very welcome in all armies, but they were also ferociously annihilated at times once their rioting nature became too conspicuous. They would then usually flee to Wallachia, where the majority of their tribal leaders were, where people used Serbian to write and went to church, and where their mother land could be seen – or at least dimly perceived – across the Danube river" (page 269).

In the west, the Serbs led a tenacious battle against the Turks within the ranks of Senj *uskoci*, often turning to piracy and rioting, cooperating with Austria and clashing with Venice and Dubrovnik, whose existence depended on the flourishing of trade with the Turkish regions. One of the most significant *uskoci* fortifications was the town of Klis, which was invaded by the Turks in the 16th century and afterwards liberated by the *uskoci* and once again conquered by Turkey. Around 1600, Senj was considered a nest of bandits not only by Turkey, but also by the Roman pope, Venice and Austria. The Austrian general Rabatta assumed control over Senj as an imperial commissary in 1601, fiercely fighting the *uskoci* leaders. Rabatta was fully supported by the new Bishop of Senj, named De Dominis, at the mass hanging and beheading action, which was yet another confirmation of the Roman Catholic treachery towards Serbs, who had been Christianized, exploited in military campaigns and then discarded. Towards the end of that year, Rabatta rolled out cannons on the Fortress of Senj, shelling the civilian inhabitants of the town. *Uskoci* and their wives charged in desperation and seized the fortress, killing Rabatta. Through this incident, the Senj *uskoci*

acquired *de facto* political independence, which was only reinforced by the 1606 clash between the Vatican and Venice. The *Uskoci* then intensified their anti-Turkish and anti-Venetian land and sea efforts. Austria occasionally performed acts of retaliation against the *uskoci* whenever placed in an unpleasant international political position, but otherwise saw them as an invaluable asset in fighting the Venetian naval supremacy. A war between Austria and Venice broke out in 1615, directly caused by the *uskoci* rioting. According to the 1617 peace treaty, Austria was obliged to banish the *uskoci* from Senj and they were mostly displaced to Žumberak and Otočac, but not entirely, which meant that the Senj pirates were still operational throughout the 17th century.

Throughout the entire 17th century, *hajduk* campaigns gained in number deep into occupied Serbian territories. The people's uprisings became more frequent and wider, predominantly initiated as international Turkish-Christian clashes. It started with Duke Grdan's uprising of 1579, which was joined by Brđani and the Herzegovinians. Patriarch Jovan began to forge plans for a widespread Serbian anti-Turkish uprising. The Serbian leaders expressed their readiness on two occasions to accept foreign adventurous noblemen as their kings, the first of which was the Prince of Transylvania, Sigismund Báthory, followed by Karl Emanuel I, Duke of Savoy. During the Cretan War from 1645 to 1669, Venice stirred the Serbian people into rebellion against the Turks particularly intensively, even organizing *uskoci* and *hajduci* squads. A great number of Serbian Morlachs then accepted the Venetian reign, inhabiting vacant Dalmatian coastal stretches. With their help, the Venetians took over more than eighty Turkish strongholds in Dalmatia, including Klis and Sinj. In 1649, the leaders of the Katun, Rijeka, Crmnica, Liješ and Pješivac districts accepted the Venetian supreme authority and the jurisdiction of the Governor of Paštrović, Vuk Orlandić. Similarly to the Turks, the Venetian slave trade flourished too, causing a multitude of the Muslim population, enslaved by the Boka and Makarska *hajduci*, to be handed over to Italian merchants. Many Serbs emigrated to the territory of Venice, where they again faced extinction due to wars and plague outbreaks. As war devastation affected the Muslims too, the region of Bosnia and Herzegovina – where the *hajduci* and *uskoci* campaigned most intensively – was nearly devoid of inhabitants. The Turks renewed their fierce levies upon the Christians and killed, pillaged and burnt. Then, in 1662, they held a mass execution of Serbian princes in Herzegovina. The final term outcome of the long Cretan War brought only suffering and misfortune to the Serbs.

b) The Ever-Restless Belgrade Pashalic

The deep encroachment of the Austrian Army into Serbia's territory in 1689 once again stirred many Serbs into mass rebellion. A particularly significant fact was that the Rašković brothers, the regional rulers of the vast autonomous principality of Stari Vlah - incorporating the districts of Sjenica, Morava and Zlatibor - turned away from the Turks and joined the Austrians. The head of the prince's family, Mojsije Rašković, inflicted a heavy defeat upon the Turks in the battle of Sjenica. Taking revenge on

the Turks for the mass slaughter of Serbs the year before, the rebels burned Novi Pazar to the ground. That brought about only more extreme Turkish repression, spreading the Serbian uprising far and wide. Simultaneously with the military efforts, the Austrians hastened the mass exodus of Serbs, causing six thousand people to emigrate to Slavonija from the town of Užice and its surroundings alone. Slavonija was systematically populated by Serbs from Pomoravlje, while Lika was populated with Bosnian Serbs. The fighting continued and the Serbian rebels and the Austrian army soon liberated Kruševac and Niš, pushing the Turks to central Macedonia, all the way to the city of Sofija. The Emperor of Austria, paying respect to the Serbian contribution to his war campaigns, began to renew certain elements of Serbia's traditional statehood by awarding Đurađ Branković the title of count and recognizing his ancestry reaching back to the medieval feudal family of Branković, the last rulers of Serbia. However, the newly-installed Serbian despot's relationship with the emperor soon deteriorated as his ambitions concerning the renewal of the unified Serbian state had been considered too high and not in accordance with the true interests of the Vienna Court.

Reacting to an ultimatum from the Commander in Chief of the Austrian Army, general Piccolomini and the Count of Baden, the Patriarch of Serbia Arsenije III Čarojević, provoked an uprising and subsequently led the great exodus of Serbs. When the Count of Baden led a campaign to Vidin, parts of the Austrian Army remained under the command of general Piccolomini along with the Serbian rebels. Soon afterwards, he stirred Rožaje and the entire areas of Kosovo and Metohija to uprising, liberating Skopje and ordering that the city be burned due to a plague outbreak. When Piccolomini died shortly afterwards of plague, the Austrian army was soon plunged into turmoil and relations with the local Serbs deteriorated. The new Austrian commander Holstein was heavily defeated in Kačanička Gorge when clashing with the Turks, which marked the beginning of a great Turkish offensive. The new commander general Veterani attempted to build a fort in Niš. There were many Tatars in the Turkish army, who were exceptionally brutal to the civilian population, causing mass migrations of Serbs. The Turks annihilated everything in their path - killing, pillaging and burning monasteries. In June 1690, the patriarch convened a Church and People's Council in Belgrade, where the Austrian Emperor Leopold I was recognized as the Serbian king and a decision was made to continue fighting the Turks from the Hungarian territory. It was demanded that the emperor recognize and confirm all the rights that the Serbian Orthodox Church had enjoyed under Turkish rule, as well as all the privileges granted to the entire Serbian people, both the indigenous and the newcomers. The emperor accepted the demands and the emperor's privileges marked the forthcoming period of state and legal history of the Serbian Pannonia. The Serbian people thus represented a unique and autonomous political entity in the entire Austria and Hungary, while its church was recognized as an important public and legal institution under the Habsburg sovereignty.

Then Austria handed over the city of Niš to the Turks without a fight and withdrew only the German population, while the Turks killed a few

thousand stranded Serbs. The Austrian army withdrew swiftly, neglecting the fate of their Serbian allies. As a result of a mass exodus, many Serbian regions were totally abandoned. Famine and plague spread everywhere. Belgrade fell in October, despite elaborate preparations for its defence. Another mass migration of Serbs took place 1697, when Prince Eugene of Savoy was retreating from Bosnia, having previously seized Doboj, Maglaj and Sarajevo, helped decisively by the Serbs. Tens of thousands of Serbs crossed the Sava River and inhabited Slavonija and, in 1698, the Emperor Leopold I issued a special patent concerning their privileges. According to the Treaty of Karlowitz of 1699, the border between Turkey and Austria was drawn along the Tisa river bed and following a straight line from its mouth to the mouth of the Bosut River, then down the Sava river to the mouth of the Una River. This is how the Belgrade Pashalic, established in 1687, became Turkey's most important northernmost stronghold - especially the Srem and Smederevo sanjaks, under direct authority of the Belgrade muhafiz. The pashalic was constantly hit by rioting, while the Serbs were exposed to the harshest brutality from the savage border troops and local Turkish feudal lords. During the period between 1698 and 1717, the Belgrade muhafiz was changed on sixteen occasions.

The disorganization of the country's civil service and widespread corruption, robbery and lawlessness were preventing the Turkish authority from stabilizing, undermining its military power. In order to facilitate easier tax collection and normalize food production, the autonomy of districts and municipalities was reinstated, run by elected princes. The princes quickly became a new independent class of Serbian lower administrators and leaders. The Orthodox Serbs were divided into landowners, *čiflije*, villeins, day labourers and tenants. The situation was identical in the territorially reduced Belgrade Pashalic, whose civil service was perhaps in even greater anarchy and with more ruthless exploitation of the Serbian population, as free yeomen were stripped of their remaining land. Herzegovina was in a permanent state of rebellion, with full-scale *hajduci* rioting and ready to launch a mass uprising against the Turks at any time. One of the biggest uprisings was sparked off in 1710 and reached its peak in 1711, when the Bosnian Turks began to wage war on Russia. The rebellion was suppressed bloodily after Russia's failed war campaign and the signing of the peace treaty with the sultan. As part of the systematic repression of the Orthodox Serbs, the Turks closed down the Sarajevo church.

After Austria had conquered Belgrade and the Treaty of Požarevac had been signed in 1718, the Niš fortress gained considerable military significance for the Turks, while the city of Niš itself was proclaimed one of the centres of the Rumelian Pashalic. Turkish central authority still failed to impose order in the sensitive northern regions, while the area of Niš was devastated by the janissary rebellion of 1721. The rebellion was eventually quelled, but for long time afterwards, gangs of outlaws and bandits - former Turkish soldiers - controlled the rural areas and their brutal violence made the Serbs' lives miserable. The clashes would reach gigantic proportions at the time of the 1730 janissary rebellion in

Constantinople, while the key instigators were the Constantinople Albanians, ever-hungry for pillaging and killing. Mass road banditry, pillaging, burning and killing forced the local folk to migrate to cities in great numbers, while agricultural land was neglected and there was constant threat of famine. The new sultan began major reforms of the central authority in 1731, while the authorities of local *zaim* and *spahis* were seriously restricted in 1735. The Persian War, however, caused even harsher levies to be imposed on the Christian people, with the area of Niš being an exception. The Turks tried to convince the Serbs coming from regions under Austrian rule to settle by promising long-term abolishment of taxes. This contributed to the stabilization of the social atmosphere and the consolidation of the Turkish army. A great number of Serbs from Kosovo and Metohija then relocated to the area of Niš, as they could no longer withstand the Albanian levies. At no point and nowhere have the Serbian people have been treated so inhumanely and brutally as they were by the Turkish regents of Albanian origin, but also by the pressure of the Albanian scoundrels, tribal cliques and rascals, feeble soldiers and passionate leeches.

The consolidation of the Turkish Army enabled the sultan to triumph in the new war against Austria and return the borders of his empire to the Danube and Sava rivers with the Treaty of Belgrade in 1739. The internal military and political stability would be short-lived though, as the original Turkish imperial disease could not be cured completely. The Belgrade Pashalic restored its status of the military frontier, but the Turkish army was in turmoil once again and the janissaries became arrogant and interfered in all social affairs. Total legal insecurity, self-will and terror endangered both the Orthodox Serbs and the Muslims. Local Muslims sparked off uprisings in Niš and Užice, while cannons thundered in Belgrade in the first war between the two janissary sides in conflict in 1755. The occasional rigorous interventions by the central authority and the merciless execution of janissary rebels could not bring a permanent truce. Many Albanians arrived in the city of Belgrade itself and the chaos reached its pinnacle thanks to their inability blend into any civilized social order. The timar system that had existed until then was arrogantly abandoned and the forced labour system that was quickly implemented reduced the peasantry to mere serfdom. Turkey's internal crisis would be aggravated by defeats in the war against Russia from 1768 to 1774 and against Austria from 1788 to 1791. Then Sultan Selim issued a decree on the banishment of janissaries from the Belgrade Pashalic and the abolition of the forced labour system, which was implemented in 1792. In 1801, the janissaries made a forceful return to the Belgrade Pashalic and their tyranny became absolutely unbearable.

Serbs were eagerly anticipating the arrival of the Russian army, but they actively collaborated with the Austrians at the same time and were ready to join any Christian armada at any time in their campaign against the Turks. During the Austro-Turkish War, one of the Serbian *freikorps* commanders, Koča Anđelković, encroached into Serbia and settled in the sub-districts of Požarevac, Smederevo, Kragujevac and Jagodina, stirring the Serbs into uprising in 1788 in a region that was also known as Koča's

Krajina. The Serbs took up arms in great numbers and threatened Turkish forts and major communications. In the battle of Bagrdanski Gorge, the Turks were comprehensively defeated. Wishing to retaliate, the Turks imposed ruthless repression upon the civilian population, but suffered subsequent defeats in military clashes against the rebels. Koča was quite a self-willed and headstrong commander, brave but lacking a sense of discipline. He had weak connections with the Austrian Army. However, the great Turkish invasion, dominated in manpower by the blood-thirsty Albanians, could not be repelled for much longer in any event. The Serbian *freikorps* retreated across the Danube River, joined by a host of Serbian civilians. Koča was captured by the Turks at Tekija and executed by impalement. For some time, *freikorps* squads, led by Jovan Branovački and Marjan Jovanović, campaigned in eastern Serbia, while Major Mihailo Mihaljević campaigned in north-west Serbia. During the liberation of Belgrade the following year, the crucial role was performed by the Serbian rebels and the Serbian *freikorps*. The Serbs encroached deep into Turkish territory, liberating Karanovac, Kruševac and Kladovo, but Austria's regular army refused to follow them or occupy the territory and the people knew they would once again be left in the lurch. In the aftermath of this war, the Turks methodically burned and devastated the Kolubara region and Šumadija, slaughtering a great number of Serbs, especially princes and other prominent leaders. The Serbian migration across the Danube River in 1790 almost reached the proportions of that of 1690.

According to the terms of the 1791 Treaty of Sistova, the Serbs were given amnesty and they were invited to return to their homes, while Sultan Selim III banished the janissaries from Serbia and executed their leader Deli-Ahmed, who had been responsible for dreadful atrocities against the Serbs. The incident sparked off a janissary uprising, which was quelled bloodily. The banished janissaries regrouped and attacked Belgrade in 1792, conquering it shortly afterwards, breaking the resistance of the regular Turkish garrison. The Porte reacted instantly, but the janissaries defeated the Turkish army from Bosnia, only to be defeated by the bulk of the army coming from the direction of Niš. The position of the Serbs had become somewhat more bearable when Haji-Mustafa Pasha became the commander of Belgrade and instantly began implementing the sultan's reforms. He also managed to mobilize a significant number of Serbs on a voluntary basis, in an attempt to defend himself from a resurgence of the janissaries from the outlawed town of Vidin. He kept six hundred Serbs as members of a fully-employed garrison and his personal retinue, placing great trust in them. The Porte confirmed the earlier autonomy of peasantry and principality, while the Turks were forbidden from raiding Serbian homes or inhabiting Serbian settlements. Serbs were allowed to build churches and monasteries and the tax system was overhauled, while Serbs were ordered to engage in defence against potential janissary resurgences in return. The janissary forces attacked Belgrade again in 1794 and took over the city but not the fort, so Haji-Mustafa was able to crush the attackers, aided by the Serbs and fresh Turkish troops. Mustafa then launched an assault on the Vidin outlaws and consequently suffered a

preparations and, in their fear, they decided to organize a preventive mass execution of Serbian princes, priests and other prominent leaders on the 4th February 1804, hoping to leave the people unguided. However, the execution of princes only hastened the timing of the uprising.

defeat. New privileges were bestowed on the Serbs in 1796, meaning that only the princes were in charge of tax collection. Facing the danger of janissary resurgence, Mustafa Pasha formed the Serbian people's army of 15,000 troops in 1797, with Captain Stanko Arambašić as the commander. When the outlaw Passvan-Oglou led an assault on Belgrade in 1798, he quickly penetrated as far as the fort itself, but was defeated there by the Serbs who had leapt to aid Mustafa's successor, Osman Aga. However, the Sultan's army once again failed to take over the outlawed Vidin.

Failing to defeat it totally, the Porte reached an agreement with Passvan-Oglou, while the sultan allowed the janissaries to return to Belgrade Pashalic in 1799 and returned them all the property, rights and privileges that they had previously owned. Under the influence of the new janissaries, Osman Aga instantly changed his attitude towards Serbs, harassing and arresting the people's leaders. He executed Stanko Arambašić just because his reputation among the people unsettled Osman Aga. Haji-Mustafa Pasha soon returned to Belgrade to assume the role of vizier and immediately imposed new levies in order to pay off the overdue wages to his soldiers. Although they were reserved at first, the janissaries soon revealed their true nature and incidents occurred more and more frequently. They murdered their own commander Kara-Ismaïl, who had been trying in vain to enforce some discipline on them. They also carried out the assassination of more prominent Serbian princes and priests. Passvan-Oglou once again came into conflict with the Sultan in 1800, while the Serbs were again called upon in an attempt to banish him from Vidin. The Turks assassinated the Metropolitan Metodije of Belgrade in 1801. That same year, the janissaries sparked off a rebellion, in which Mustafa Pasha was defeated and forced into their service. Next the janissaries conquered Šabac and Zvornik, while other towns followed. There was an atmosphere of general insecurity, which contributed to an increased number of *hajduci* squads.

Seeing through his attempts to suppress the janissaries with the aid of the sultan, leading Dahijas Aganlija, Kučuk-Alija, Mehmed-Aga Fočić and Mula-Jusuf murdered Mustafa Pasha. The dahijas split the Belgrade Pashalic amongst themselves and set up their own system of rule, completely undermining Serbian princes while promoting Muslim scoundrels, particularly Albanian ones, to high positions of authority, enabling them to constantly pillage, beat, kill and rape. The forced labour system, the most severe form of feudal constraints, was restored. Turkish spahis were killed and banished. The levies were increased considerably and all connections with the Porte were severed. Incapable of defeating them, the Porte recognized the dahijas as a legitimate authority and appointed a new vizier in 1803 – former janissary agha Hasan-aga Pasha. A great number of Turkish spahis emigrated to Zemun and there prepared a revolt against the dahijas-usurpers. They cooperated in their effort with Serbian princes, helping them acquire weapons and ammunition. Tocun-aga of Požarevac provoked a rebellion, calling upon many Serbian soldiers, but the janissaries quickly discouraged him from further fighting. The situation became unbearable and Serbian national leaders began to intensify their preparations for the revolt. The dahijas found out about the

c) The State of Affairs in the Bosnian Pashalic

Throughout the 18th century, rebellious atmosphere prevailed in Herzegovina, which was constantly clashing with the local Turks, but also suffered sporadic assaults by the Imperial army, while the Bosnian Serbs turned to *hajduci* (*people fighting the Turks with the use of guerrilla tactics*) campaigns. The northern regions of Bosnia were constantly invaded by the Serbian *Freikorps* from Slavonia. Many Serbs who converted to Islam after being banished from Slavonia and Hungary by the Austrian army found refuge in the Bosnian Pashalic, where they were more concentrated than in other Serbian regions. They were killed in great numbers as elite soldiers of the Turkish army in various remote battlefields, while they suffered significant casualties caused by plague epidemics, which mostly affected the urban population. As the Bosnian Pashalic was detached from all major strategic communication routes, the Porte allowed it authority over its own defence, which only strengthened the reputation and status of the local Muslim feudal chiefs. They succeeded in inflicting a heavy defeat on the Austrian army that penetrated into the territory of Bosnia in the battle of Banjaluka in 1737. The Turkish municipal chiefs – the *ayans* – who comprised captains, janissary aghas, pashas and beys, were summoned in special councils by the Bosnian vizier at least once a year, which gradually built their autonomous awareness. They were unfailingly loyal to the Porte whenever it did not interfere with their internal affairs, but when their interests were in jeopardy, they were prepared for acts of insubordination and revolt. Ayans and janissaries regularly manipulated the Bosnian wālis and imposed even harsher repression on the Serbian folk, always craving for pillage and wealth and prepared for the worst imaginable oppressions. The process of turning timars into citliks (Translator's note: smallholdings) had begun. If the central authority attempted to prevent or limit their tyranny and lawlessness, Bosnian Muslim feudal chiefs readily provoked uprisings against the sultan. When they were not threatened from the outside, they engaged in bloody internal clashes that sometimes even led to extinction. On several occasions, the sultan's high envoys created order in the Bosnian Pashalic using fire and sword and by strangling and poisoning, which caused the assassination of many rampant local noblemen. The orthodox Serbs were among the victims of these constant clashes and riots, and spells of legal insecurity were frequent. Nonetheless, they maintained a steady economic growth. Muslim Serbs from Bosnia were psychologically introvert and prone to fatalism, in most cases belonging to a parasitic economic class, while the Orthodox displayed an incomparably higher degree of social and psychological vitality and economic expertise, mastering craftsmanship and trade almost completely.

The First Serbian Uprising rocked the Bosnian Pashalic hard and renewed hope of pan-Serbian liberation, unification and the formation of a state that would incorporate all the Serbian lands. Having been disobedient to the sultan and the central authority for a long time, the Bosnian beys were intimidated by the revolutionary achievements of their Christian compatriots and they rushed to aid the Belgrade Turks and the Porte's army, attempting to quell the uprising. Bosnian and Herzegovinian Orthodox Serbs responded with increased *hajduci* campaigning and constant rioting. This was facilitated by the deaths of a great number of feudal chiefs, killed in their campaigns against the rebellious Serbia, a land that could not be appeased. Major armed rebellions broke out all across eastern Bosnia and Bosnian Krajina. Many thousands of Bosnian Serbs joined Karađorđe's army. Catholic Serbs from the Jajce district also joined the uprising, led by Ivan Samardžić, who instantly established direct contact with Karađorđe. The Turks began mass repression, killings and torching. The biggest Serbian uprising began in 1809 near Gradiška and was led by a Sarajevo rifle maker, Jova Jončić, soon spreading over the entire territory between the rivers of Bosna and Una. The Turks managed to capture Jončić and behead the rebels but failed to defeat them entirely before the onset of winter. The mass impalement of the captured Serbian peasants followed.

The inhabitants of the Herzegovinian region of Drobniak took up arms as early as 1805, soon to be joined in great numbers by those of Piva. That same year, the rebels inflicted a heavy defeat on Sulejman Pasha of Skopje at Kulići. It was only in the third foray that Sulejman Pasha managed to conquer Drobniak and, subsequently Piva, but the Serbian resistance never ceased. The Turks attacked the Drobniak population in both 1810 and 1812, but did not feel safe for a long time to come in any region of Herzegovina. When the Serbs appeared to have been pacified, a fierce clash broke out in 1820 between the Bosnian and Herzegovinian beys on one side and the Porte and the Vizier of Travnik on the other. The Sultan sent Jalaluddin Pasha to quell the rebellious converts that same year and he took over Srebrenica, Sarajevo and Mostar after bloody battles. He executed more than three hundred local Turkish feudal chiefs. Regardless of this, the Bosnian beys directly opposed the banishment of the janissaries from their own pashalics. The following year, the Sultan named Abdurahman Pasha as the new Vizier of Bosnia, who had been making his way through Bosnia under heavy fighting. He killed more than six hundred Bosnian and Herzegovinian beys after savagely crushing their resistance. Both the Sultan's envoys and the local Turks continued to systematically banish Orthodox Serbs by pillaging and various acts of violence. Many prominent Serbs – potential national leaders – were brutally murdered. In many places, the Serbs put up armed resistance, which only aroused the anger of the frightened Turks. In 1830, Mustafa Pasha of Škoder, an Albanian nobleman, rebelled against the sultan's reformist attempts. Although his rebellion was quickly quelled, it stirred the local Bosnian feudal chiefs, who were themselves dismayed by the introduction of the compulsory military service obligation called *Nizam-ı Cedid*. They were led by the Captain of Gradačac, Husein Gradašević,

who was followed by nearly all the Bosnian captains and beys, but not those of Herzegovina. Husein-captain mainly strove to preserve the remnants of the feudal system and the bey privileges. At Lipljane in Kosovo, Husein-captain, often referred to as the "Dragon of Bosnia", defeated the sultan's army led by the Grand Vizier himself. The Porte offered a truce to Husein-captain and promised that he would be named the next Vizier of Bosnia. At the same time, Porte was working to create scepticism with other Bosnian Muslim leaders and an internal schism, and he consequently named Kara Mahmud Pasha as the Vizier of Bosnia in 1832, who, aided by Herzegovinian Turks, beat Husein-captain in the three battles of Prijepolje, Goražde and Pale. Herzegovina was then separated into new, Mostar Vilayet, while the Turks moved the seat of the Bosnian Vilayet from Travnik to Sarajevo. That definitively broke the back of the Bosnian Beylik.

Alarmed by the success of the Serbs' uprising in the Belgrade Pashalic and the continuing influx of Muslim *muhajir* - refugees from northern regions, the Porte began the preventive measure of terrorizing the Serbs of the Vilayet of Rumelia, most frequently killing prominent Serbs from Niš, even including *Vladika* Melentije in 1821. The forced labour system was imposed there too, with the overall insecurity and tyranny of the regional Turkish chiefs. The Serbs' position was toughest in the Priština and Peć pashalics, where the savage Albanian criminal instinct became a prominent factor. The most unscrupulous process of Islamisation was conducted there between 1821 and 1836. A great Serbian uprising was sparked off in Timok Frontier in 1833, which spread to all townships from Sokobanja and Knjaževac, to Negotin and Zaječar. In 1835, the Peasant Uprising broke out in Niš, and then Pirot in 1836. Seeking a peaceful resolution, Prince Miloš mediated with the Porte. The Serbs of the Vranje Pashalic were tormented the most by mandatory statute labour in iron and copper mines, and many of them emigrated. The Serbs of the Niš Sanjak sparked off a mass uprising in 1841, which encompassed the area as far as Pirot and Vranje. The uprising was spearheaded by a peasant leader from Gornji Milanovac, Miloje Jovanović. The Pasha of Niš soon completely quelled the uprising, with invaluable help from the Albanian irregular army, who dispersed through the Serbian villages and slaughtered the weak, pillaged and raped. The entire region of the uprising was devastated. The position of the Serbian people in Turkey had become impossible. They were repressed throughout the region by various renegades from central administration, while Serbs traditionally responded with *hajduci* campaigns.

The faltering Turkish Empire attempted to deal with the situation in the country with an administration overhaul and the centralization of authority but an obsolete social system, irresolvable internal national and religious contradictions, increased bonded labour for the western forces while carelessly raising loans from them and absolute failure in all economic efforts would speed up the process of its political and social decay. Not even the abolishment of *sipahis* could stabilize the situation, as the Timar system was replaced by an even less efficient feudal form, while growing expenditure of the central treasury would only lead to the

introduction of new levies, as taxes were raised beyond measure. Local feudal chiefs engaged in more organized resistance to the reforms, particularly in Bosnia, which would lead to imperial Serasker Omar Pasha Latas crushing their rebellion in 1850. All citizens were only formally treated as equals before the law, as the tradition of imperious behaviour by the local Turkish converts could not be that easily eliminated. New peasantry riots took place near Niš and in Posavina, as well as a full-blown uprising in Herzegovina in 1852, which lasted ten years. The new Serbian uprising began in Bosnia in 1857, but it was quelled the following year. The great powers were increasingly interfering with the internal affairs and put pressure on the Porte to improve the position of the Christian population, particularly to meet the Serbs' demands and rescind the forced labour system and thirds, as well as prevent the leasing of the charging of tenths, as the realization of these tax leases brought on the most flagrant misuses and sheer looting. The Ottoman Land Law of 1858, adopted by the Porte, introduced a reform in the land ownership structure and it was supplemented with special legal acts over the coming years. This did not solve the central problems however, especially the issue of serfdom. The Safer Decree of 1859 and the Leskovac Law of 1860 somewhat improved the conditions, but not enough to revive the ailing empire in the long run. In all the Serbian lands under Turkish rule, the mood for liberation was alive among the people. The national consciousness, the level of education and the fighting spirit were quickly restored, while a key role was performed at that time by the public and secret dealings of the Serbian Government.

In 1875, the Serbs provoked a mass uprising near Nevesinje, while it soon spread across Herzegovina and then to the entire area of Bosnia, Sandžak and Vasojevići. The Herzegovinian uprising was spearheaded by Duke Mićo Ljubibratić, former secretary to the uprising leader Luka Vukalović, who had moved to Russia in 1862. The Bosnian rebels were immediately joined by established dissidents Petar Petrović Pecija, Vaso Palagić and Golub Babić. The biggest military success was achieved in Herzegovina. The Turks had mobilized the entire Muslim population and many Albanians. The Herzegovinian Serbs were directly aided by the Prince of Montenegro, who then became their Commander in Chief. Bosnia was treated as Serbia's area of influence but when Petar Karadorđević came into the region, Bosnia became the centre of inter-dynastic clashes. The most prominent Herzegovinian leader, Duke Peko Pavlović, inflicted a heavy defeat on the Turks at Muratovica in 1876. The Orthodox Serbs were joined in great numbers by the Catholics of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Don Ivan Musić of Popovo polje was proclaimed a Serbian duke by the Prince of Montenegro. In the war against Turkey that broke out that year, the Montenegrin army was successful in its campaigns, which was not the case with the Serbian army, as Austro-Hungary seriously interfered in Bosnian and Herzegovinian affairs. The Austrian secret service recruited Duke Ivan Musić for their own purposes. The Austrophilic regime of Milan Obrenović lost Russian support, which meant that Russia redirected its help to Bulgaria and consequently entered the war against Turkey in 1877. The following year, it was decided at the

The Young Turks soon began the process of Islamisation of all the enslaved peoples, negating their national and cultural uniqueness. In 1909, a mass campaign was initiated during which weapons were seized from the Serbs of the Pljevlja Sanjak, followed by extremely violent behaviour on the part of the Turkish military and police units. Forests and pastures were still taken away from Serbs, so that the area could be inhabited by the *muhajir*, arriving after the Austro-Hungarian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Turkish authorities aimed to include Serbs in the compulsory military service, but they evaded the mobilization in masses. In mid-1912, the Serbs of the Berane nahia began a mass uprising in order to oppose the devastating and disorderly Albanian squads and a local Turkish garrison. In an attempt to pacify the Serbs, the Porte agreed to pay huge reparations. The majority of the Serbian people boycotted that year's elections, although the Young Turks managed to persuade some of the Serbian representatives into an agreement with the local Muslims to collectively vote for the Muslim MPs. Those political combinations could

not be accepted by the people, who placed no trust in the Young Turks and consequently boycotted the elections. The effects of the national and political efforts of the Serbian Government eventually bore fruit, especially in the system of education, while the national consciousness of the Orthodox Serbs of the Old Serbia and Macedonia resisted the strongest temptations. These were the final stages of the Islamisation, most ardently implemented by the Shqiptar, combining it with their Albanisation. The spirit of a capitalist economy, spreading fast across the European part of Turkey, proved a much more attractive notion to the Christian than the Muslim population, while the economic progress was conducive to political emancipation. The spirit of rapid social changes stirred up the Turkish state organization that had been stagnating for centuries, instigated a national awakening and centrifugal tendencies, for which not even the Young Turks' authorities had a response, increasingly resorting to repression. Thus they banned nationalistic political parties in 1910. This prevented further activities of the Serbian National Organization, now renamed the Serbian Democratic League. Abandoning the previous strictly political and party engagement, the organization transformed into an educational and charitable one. The impetuous moves of the government only added fuel to the fire, causing the people's dissatisfaction to grow constantly, while the state could not consolidate. Soon the Balkan Wars would deal the final blow to the political, economic and social agony of the ailing Ottoman Empire in the Balkans.

7. Serbian Pannonia

At the time of the great migration, a portion of the Serbian population settled in Pannonia and in Banat, Bačka, Srem and Slavonia, regions almost completely devoid of their population as a consequence of previous barbaric and especially Hunnic and Avar devastations. The settlers found only the indigenous Gepids – a people of Germanic origin – who were so scarce in the area that they entirely vanished through thorough assimilation. The extent to which Pannonia had been emptied through war devastations is best illustrated by the fact that there are very few existing pre-Serbian toponyms in the entire region. It has to be emphasized that Pannonia encompasses a part of the former Illyria and not the entire Pannonian Plain. The Roman Empire was involved in bitter clashes with various barbaric hordes that had once been joined by Slavic people. That is when the Slavs “went down in history as impressionable people, while they acted as auxiliary troops waging wars for the Hunnic and Avar tribes, serving as a substance in the creation of a state and later a nation. The Bulgarian and Hungarian states, and subsequently nations, were created on a Slavic ethnic basis. Even the greatest Slavic state – Russia – was organized by foreigners, who gave it their own name. In the process of the formation of the Romanian nation, the Slavs played an important, perhaps even crucial role. Before the Hungarians came, they were the largest population of the Pannonian Plain and the surrounding mountains (Đušan J. Popović: *Serbs in Vojvodina*, Matica Srpska, Novi Sad, 1990, volume I, page 38).

As Dušan Popović writes, “opposing the firm, almost cast-iron, military, political and social organizations of the Hungarians and Bulgarians, the Slavs at that time were lacking any political or social organization and were without much sense for greater integrations. They were grouped in tribes and clans and were involved in continuous internal clashes. Their chiefs held little power. All the important decisions were brought by the people's council or parliament. That was a primitive form of democracy similar to anarchy. One Byzantine author rightly noted that the Slavs were ‘leaderless’. In those days, the Slavs did not have names for any positions of higher authority. The oldest Slavic names that denoted authority and power were: *vladika*, head, chief, master; while those of foreign origin were: prince, zhupan, ban, king and emperor. A Slav was not much of a warrior. Their army consisted only of infantry. Their weapons were arrow, spear and shield; they were unfamiliar with armour. They made their bows out of wood. They were reluctant to engage in open-field battle, they favoured guerrilla style fighting in gorges and woods. They were skilled at manufacturing small, primitive vessels – rafts and boats. Their native lands – the vast area beyond the Carpathians in the endless plains bristling with forests and flowing and still waters – they were occasionally harassed by the prairie horse peoples on their way to war campaigns in western or southern Europe. As small-time farmers and cattle breeders, the Slavs were unable to oppose the prairie horsemen more resolutely (page 38).

As the Serbs, unlike the great bulk of the Slavs, had come to the Balkans in an organized fashion – invited by the Byzantine emperor – they most probably had a more developed social structure, more distinctive collective consciousness and a more natural martial aptitude. In the Dalmatian region of Illyria, they did not find any Slavs that had reached the area before them but it is possible that they came across some Slavic people in Pannonia, who they adopted as their own, particularly in Slavonia. “The ethnic differences between the Serbs who settled north of the Danube and Sava rivers and the Serbs who inhabited the regions south of the Danube and Sava were non-existent or minute. The biggest initial difference between the two groups of Serbs was of the political kind, and later on even religious; but these differences were not that crucial for them, only for the state authority leaders. The newly-inhabited Hungarians called all the Slavs from their territory – both Southern and Northern Slavs – *Totovi*, while they called all those from Raška *Raci*. The Hungarians used *Totorac* as the name for Slovakia, but also Slavonia. Our people called the modern-day Slavonia *Slovinje*, while Slavonia's current name was formed from the Hungarian Latinity ‘according to the rules of the phonetics of the Hungarian language’. The inhabitants of Slavonia had called themselves *Šokci*, translated as ‘Slavonians of the Catholic law’. The Hungarian state authorities called our Serbian ancestors in their territory *Totovi*, while the emigrants from the Serbian political territory were called *Raci*. Due to this fact, there are many places in modern-day Serbia north of the Danube that bear the name *Tot*” (p. 39).

The Serbs that migrated from Raška later called the compatriots they came across in Hungary *Totovi*, while many of them had the word

incorporated in their surnames, for example Totović. “The fact that the area was inhabited by the Serbian population as early as the Serbs’ colonization of the area is corroborated by facts much older and more reliable than any other written accounts. These are the facts provided by local toponymy, which displays their ethnic history with this body of data. In such cases, the names of large-scale features – the Alps, the Pyrenees, the Danube and the like – are not interesting as they were inhabited by diverse ethnic groups and their names do not depend on one individual group. According to our thesis, the names of lesser features are far more important – those of smaller rivers, springs, streams and particularly settlements, whose history was linked with distinctive, even smaller social groups. Such places, if left uninhabited for prolonged periods of time, were then given their own names by the new settlers (page 40).” It was especially significant that the Serbian national element was mostly “contained in the names of the smallest features (settlements, fields, streams, ponds, woods, etc.). Many of these names – some of which are very exotic – are identical to the names of today’s native regions in Old Serbia and Šumadija. Those facts determine the age of our people better than anything else, as well as the social and cultural significance of these regions. That can be clearly seen from the volume of data published, not by our own but by the Hungarian national science (page 40).

Since all the Pannonian regions were part of the Byzantine Empire, Christianity was spread there by Greek missionaries and church ceremonies were held according to the eastern rites. “Therefore, we should be aware that terms such as Greek, schismatics, acatholics, *totovi*, *Raci* or Serbs are just synonyms; that they all practically mean Serbs or Serbian, as there were no other peoples in this region that would belong to the Eastern Church” (page 43). Historical sources provide accounts of the Banat Serbs embracing “Christianity during the Bulgarian rule. Although he was a vassal to the King of Hungary, the Bulgarian Chief Ahtum maintained connections with the Byzantine Empire and embraced Christianity in Vidin ‘according to the Greek Rite’ (of the year of 971). The Serbs in Bačka, it seems, belonged to the Srem Episcopate with its centre in Mitrovica. There was a ‘Greek Rite’ monastery in Mitrovica, founded before the schism of 1504 ‘for Greek monks of Slavic and Serbian nationality’. A letter from Pope Sylvester to King Stephen II of Hungary, who had embraced Christianity and become known as the Apostolic King among his people, proves how much the eastern rite was widespread throughout Hungary. In the letter, the Pope is surprised that there were nine ‘Greek’ monasteries and only one ‘Latin’ one in Hungary” (page 43). The ethnic border between the Serbs and the Croats in the Slavonian part of Pannonia was marked by a territorial differentiation between the Shtokavian and Kaikavian dialects, which shifted north-eastwards over time as the Serbs later inhabited these lands. For centuries, many Serbs were subjected to systematic conversion to Catholicism, while those that switched to the Latin rite were called the Bunjevci and Šokci.

In the earliest days, the Serbs had their own parishes and small princedoms, which is confirmed by certain toponyms, although they did

not have time to create a state, as they were outwitted by Hungarians, “a people of the Mongolic race, of the Turan genus and the Finn-Ugric group, part of the Uralic language family,” who arrived in the Pannonian Plain in 895, from the territory of Great Moravia in the north, while they found Serbian tribes under Bulgarian rule in the Pannonian regions of Illyria. Although many Hungarians embraced Christianity of the eastern rite at first, they very soon switched to the Latin rite, which led to the pope crowning the Hungarian King Stephen with a Roman-Catholic crown in 1001, bestowing on him the title of “Apostolic King”. In the centuries to come, Hungary was a firm Catholic stronghold and spearhead of the proselyte work in that part of Europe. The Hungarians first conquered the Serbian Bačka, Srem and Banat, and then they conquered Slavonia in 1091. In 1097, they defeated the Croats and subsequently fully incorporated the Croatian state into Hungary in 1102, gaining access to the Adriatic Sea and capturing Dalmatian towns all the way to the Cetina River, which they would later fight over with Venice. The Serbs and other enslaved Slavic peoples were reduced to serfdom. “In their struggle against the Hungarians in these regions, the Serbs relied on the Byzantine Empire and their compatriots south of the Danube. In order to sever these ties, the Hungarian Duke Zsolt waged military campaigns against the Byzantine Empire on several occasions but without much success, as the influence of the Byzantine Empire was still strong. It may be, as Professor Radonić successfully argues, that its very proximity contributed to the fact that both Banat and Transylvania – in those days ‘almost entirely populated by Slavic peoples – had a special position towards central and western Hungary for a long time to come – almost two centuries. They were not managed as Counties, but rather by parishes and princes” (p. 46).

The Hungarians assimilated various Slavic peoples fully, including the Serbs. Through the assimilation of the Slavs, they altered their own racial features but they also imposed their language, national spirit and statehood. The Slovaks and Croats were subjected to Hungarization the most, while the Serbs resisted it the most vigorously. “According to their scientist Armin Vambery, there is not a drop of Hungarian blood in the blood of the modern-day Hungarians, while according to another scientist – Kaszonyi – there is perhaps just one per cent (p. 49). The Hungarians were extremely intolerant towards the Slavs; they were bigoted, insatiable and merciless, while their general attitude is perhaps best illustrated by the Hungarian proverbs, in which the Slavs “were not extolled a single virtue; there is not a single positive word to describe them. They were not granted anything and even the positive qualities of Slavs were presented as negative. All these proverbs depict the Slavs as harsh, gluttonous, ignorant and abnormal. These proverbs ooze a deep contempt and disgust. The Slav is the most miserable human being to bear the name of a man; in fact, they are not even human [...] A Slav becomes a man – a true and complete man – when he becomes a Hungarian” (p. 49). Various documents recount that the Serbs participated in the Hungarian dynastic conflicts of the 11th century in an organized manner. The Serbs from Bačka were then led by one Radovan, while the Zhupan of Bačka County

in 1074 was a Serb named Vid. The Hungarians did not take over Srem from the Bulgarians until 1071 after the Battle of Manzikert. The Byzantine Emperor John II Comnenos, aided by the Banat Serbs, defeated the Hungarian army at Pančevo. During the rule of Géza II, who began his reign as a minor in 1141 and ruled until 1161, Hungary was governed by his uncle Beloš – son of the Serbian Grand Zhupan Uroš I and brother of his daughter Jelena, the mother of the king of Hungary. The entire 12th century was marked by Byzantine and Hungarian clashes over Srem, in which Serbs participated. Towards the end of the 12th century, Bela, King of Hungary, significantly reduced the Serbs' autonomy in Banat, discharging Serbian fort commanders and eliminating parishes and principedoms, replacing them with Hungarian forms of organization with a central authority and local subdivisions.

Many Serbs in Hungary were literally forced to adopt Catholicism in the 13th and 14th centuries. Orthodox priests were imprisoned or banished from the state, while King Louis brought Roman-Catholic *glagoljaš* priests (Translator's note: priests who used the Glagolitic missal) from Dalmatia to hold church services in Serbian according to the Latin Rite. He later employed Bosnian Franciscans. They had the most success in Slavonia and Krašovska County, while the Serbs from Srem, Bačka and Banat firmly resisted. In 1396, the Turks penetrated into Srem for the first time and enslaved a great number of the population of Mitrovica. The political situation had changed dramatically. Hungary had fundamentally changed its attitude towards the Serbs, at least for a while. In the early fifteenth century, Hungarian King Sigismund reinforced his relationship with Despot Stefan Lazarević and awarded him vast tracts of land, mostly in Banat, and named him Grand Zhupan of Bečkerek County. He designated Dmitar, son of King Vukašin, as the Zhupan of Arad County. Despot Stefan acquired Zemun, Kupinik, Mitrovica, Slankamen and some rich land deep in Hungarian territory in 1411, becoming one of the most affluent feudal chiefs in Hungary. The majority of managers of his estates were Serbs and he settled many Serbian peasants in that land. "It is true that despots became the most prominent dignitaries, spearheads of the Hungarian crown and enjoying certain sovereign rights, but in reality they were vassals of the Hungarian kings and had their own duties as such. The despot was obliged to be in command of a large banderia army, equal in size to that of the king. The despot was required to appear before the Court from time to time as a member of the king's retinue" (p. 73).

Sigismund, the King of Hungary, and Despot Stefan reached an agreement in Tata in 1426, according to which Serbia became a vassal state of the Hungarian crown, while Belgrade was incorporated into Hungary, as along with Mačva and Golubac. Sigismund named the despot's successor Đurađ Branković as the Herzog and Despot of Raška and Albania. Đurađ inherited all of his uncle's land and acquired new land in Hungary. He appointed and employed even more Serbs in his estates. Đurađ had a major conflict with a Hungarian chief John Hunyadi in which he lost some land. During that time, the prelates of the Roman-Catholic church did not rest and they used every opportunity to spite the Orthodox Serbs and work on their proselytistic campaign. After the fall of the

Serbian despotate, a key role among the Pannonian Serbs was performed by Despot Vuk Grgurević, also known in folk tradition as *Zmaj Ognjeni Vuk* (Translator's note: Vuk, Fierce as Dragon). He arrived in Hungary in 1465 along with a Turkish deputation whose mission was to negotiate peace. Hungarian King Matthias rejected making peace with the Sultan, but invited Vuk to remain in the king's service, granting him Slankamen and Kupinovo. Vuk stood out in many war campaigns and became the despot in 1471, while his property continually expanded. After taking over Zvornik and Srebrenica, the majority of Serbs migrated to Srem. Even more Serbs later resettled from Braničevo and Kruševac to Banat. We have already seen what happened with the Serbian despots prior to the Battle of Mohacs.

By the end of the 16th century Banat, Bačka, Baranja and Srem were heavily colonized by Serbs from Raška. In those days Banat was called Srbija. However, the Serbs heavily colonized Slavonia too. As early as in 1469, Vuk Grgurević was granted plenty of land spreading from Sisak to the mouth of river Lonja into the Sava, encompassing more than one hundred villages. Despot Jovan Branković's widow Jelena settled many Serbs on her own land in Slavonia. Vladislav, a descendant of Stefan Vukčić, also settled a great number of Herzegovinian Serbs. In the late 16th century, the whole of Slavonia was entirely populated by ethnic Serbs. The regions around Požega and Pakrac were called Serbia, *Rascija* or Little Serbia by the local Catholics. Serbs from virtually all the Serbian lands were settled in great numbers in Slavonia, either spontaneously or in an organized way. Simultaneously, Dalmatian and Bosnian Serbs colonized the regions of Lika, Banija and Kordun, which had previously been abandoned by the Croats, fleeing from the Turks.

As a historic curiosity, a Catholic nobleman Ivaniš Berislavić was named the next Serbian despot in 1504, after marrying Jelena, the widow of Despot Jovan. He too lived in Kupinovo, surrounded by the Serbian court personnel, signing himself as the Serbian despot and also protecting the national interests and the Orthodox Church. He died in 1514, when his widow Jelena was given the authority to defend the border at the Sava River. Her minor son Stefan was proclaimed Serbian despot in 1520, while his mother continued to lead the state, until she was forced to flee to Slavonia from the Turkish invasion, accompanied by her family. Once Turkey had withdrawn in 1522, Despot Stefan returned to Srem and began to repair the demolished fortresses, but little could be done after the great Turkish campaign and Hungary's defeat at Mohacs. After the Battle of Mohacs, Despot Stefan spent years seeking the king's aid to fortify his towns and repel the Turks in vain. As the aid never came and unable to personally maintain the garrison, he withdrew his army from the fortified towns of Basc and Felegyhaza in 1529, thus clearing the way for the Turks towards Buda. King Ferdinand accused the despot of high treason, arrested him and incarcerated him and his mother. While the King was hesitant to release him at the recommendation of Court Council, Despot Stefan escaped to Turkey and surrendered there and the sultan entrusted him with his previous lands in Srem and Slavonia. That is when Despot Stefan established a friendly relationship with a Turkish vassal named

Janos Szapolyai, providing auxiliary troops for the Turks and enjoying their support in his relations with Hungary. In 1530, the despot clashed with the supporters of King Ferdinand but, in the years to come, worked towards a peaceful agreement with the king, although eventually in vain. In 1536, Stefan came into conflict with Husref, the Sanjak-bey of Smederevo and Belgrade, resulting in his death.

In the battles against the Turks of the first half of the 16th century, the most prominent Serbian commanders were Radič Božić (whom Janos Szapolyai named Serbian despot in 1527), Pavle Bakić and his brother Petar, Radoslav Čelnik and others. During one anti-Turkish campaign, King Ferdinand proclaimed Pavle Bakić as the Serbian despot in 1537, but Pavle soon died in a clash with the Turks at Đakovo. The appearance of the self-proclaimed Emperor Jovan Nenad after the Battle of Mohacs speaks volumes about the turmoil Hungary was in. Jovan Nenad managed to take over Subotica in 1527, after which he inflicted a heavy defeat on Hungarian nobleman Valentin Terek. A mystic, prophet, preacher and warrior, Jovan Nenad had a few more glorious victories and he also slaughtered many Hungarian noblemen in direct clashes. He prevented the Hungarians from returning to their estates in Bačka after the retreat of Turkey, claiming all the abandoned land for himself. The Serbs supported him fervently. According to various accounts, he had between ten and fifteen thousand troops at his disposal. He was called emperor by his supporters, as he insisted on that. At first he was in cordial relations with Janos Szapolyai, but he soon turned his back on him and joined the ranks of King Ferdinand. Then Szapolyai sent a great army to confront Jovan Nenad, which the self-proclaimed emperor defeated at Moriš, it was told that even more Hungarians died in that battle than in the Battle of Mohacs. All this took place in 1527. Soon afterwards, Szapolyai sent an even bigger army, which finally defeated Jovan Nenad, whose 8,000 troops were killed in action. After inflicting defeat upon Jovan Nenad, Szapolyai once again attempted to win over Jovan Nenad, but once he realized the self-proclaimed emperor would remain faithful to Ferdinand, he secretly organized his assassination in Szeged. There was hardly another figure that was able to become so significant and successful and contribute to so many events within one year than Jovan Nenad. Of all of his friends, it was Krsto Frankopan – a Croatian nobleman – who publicly gloated over Jovan Nenad's death the most. Most of Nenad's troops were taken and resettled to Srem by one Radosav, while some of them remained in Pomorišje. In those days, Srem was ruled by the Turks. During Turkey's invasion of Buda in 1529, Radosav joined Ferdinand's side, together with a great number of Serbs, and was consequently awarded huge estates in Krušedol by the king.

The Serbs continued to participate in the Hungarian inter-dynastic clashes and to segregate themselves on that basis, but the pretenders realized their value and aimed to win them over, awarding them various perks compared with the Hungarian peasants. Midway through the 16th century, the Serbs penetrated deep into Hungarian territory on several occasions, pushing their way towards Vienna, while Mehmed Pasha Sokolović conquered Banat in 1553. Serbian noble families, who had

emigrated from Serbia, soon vanished and their descendants often embraced Catholicism and renounced their kin. However, a new noble class was being created from prominent war commanders, who were particularly respected in these conditions of permanent peril to the state. The Serbian peasantry were often involved in conflicts with the Hungarian noblemen, while the horsemen and šajkaši (Translator's note: special troops, mainly naval) had plenty of reasons to be dissatisfied with meagre and irregular wages. The State Council itself ruled to allow the Serbs to be exempt from duties, only to impose the same duties again. When the state was in danger, the rulers promised nearly all that the Serbs demanded, but would soon forget about it once the danger would pass. The cycle would then repeat. The state of turmoil continued into the 17th century and, during the Thirty Years' War, Emperor Ferdinand II issued a statute on privileges for the Serbs in the Varaždinska Krajina in 1630. "The Croatian and Slavonian councils refused to engage in battle against Serbs. The councils of 1630, 1635, 1638, 1647, 1649, 1659 and 1681 all ruled against the Serbs, while the last three councils demanded that 'Serbian privileges be revoked'" (page 176). Profiting from the unpleasant and negative experiences, the Serbs increasingly insisted on having conditions explicitly defined, under which they would leave Turkish territory and settle in the Hungarian territory.

Chaos continued to rule in Banat after the Turks had seized most of it. Many Serbs moved to Transylvania, where the situation was even more alarming. There was no organization or discipline. Hungarian renegades appeared, causing brutal slaughter in Serbian villages, with mainly Serbian women and children murdered. As Hungary was in turmoil, every local nobleman followed his own policy. Some lived in peace with the Serbs, but some engaged in constant clashes with them. Many Serbian armed troops infiltrated deep into Turkish territory and caused havoc there. A great number of Serbs became professional soldiers/noblemen, who occasionally changed their chiefs, while the number of those who turned to *hajduci* revolt should not be disregarded. They would pillage and rob the Turks, but also Christian merchants, and sometimes Roman-Catholic bishops as well, who they particularly despised because of their malice and treachery in conducting their proselyte work. The Hungarian noblemen organized their rebel groups that pillaged the Serbs inhabiting the territories under the Turkish rule, which illustrates overall political and moral principles of the time.

With the fall of Buda in 1541 and the subsequent conquest of the entire region of Banat, conditions were created for the Turks to set up the Buda Pashalic, which would encompass central Hungaria, Banat, Bačka, Baranja, Srem and Slavonia. Nearly all the local Hungarians and most of the *Sokci* abandoned the entire territory. Only the Serbian Orthodox population continued to live there. The Turks forcefully populated the area with fresh Serbs from all the Serbian regions, getting them to inhabit the entire countryside. It was mostly Turks – predominantly Islamized Serbs – who lived in the cities, but also other indigenous ethnic groups. Serbs had great privileges in the Buda Pashalic, compared to the situation deep in Turkish territory. Many were incorporated into the Turkish auxiliary troops,

particularly as members of the infantry, who were called the Armolates. The revival of the Serbian Orthodox Patriarchy in 1557 spurred the reinforcement of the Serbian religious life north of the Sava and Danube, while all the Serbian people, although under occupation, were united around a distinct church and theocratic system of autonomy.

The Serbs from Banat began uprising activities against the Turks in 1594. Accompanied by Vlachs, they pillaged and burned Vršac, a major Turkish stronghold and economic centre. Soon they conquered Bečkerek, followed by Bečej and Titel. They also raided a Turkish fleet on the Danube, confiscating a load of weapons and ammunition. Timisoara Begler bey Sofi Sinan Pasha led a great army to quell the rebellion, but was heavily defeated near Bečkerek. The Hungarians were duplicitous and reluctant to aid the Serbs, while the Austrians offered only limited support. Esztergom and Timisoara resisted the Serbian attacks until the Turks sent an army of 30,000 troops to attack a 4,300-man Serbian army. The Serbs stood no chance of repelling them and almost all of them were slaughtered in the battle at Bečkerek. The Timisoara Pasha then skinned the Serbian Vladika of Vršac alive, which marked the total crushing of the uprising and the devastation of Serbian townships. A notable feature was that the Turks used a significant number of Tatars in crushing the uprising, and they were particularly savage. What followed was the so-called Long War from 1594 to 1606 between Turkey and Hungary, during which the Tatars were used even more and devastated many Serbian regions, especially the areas around Sombor, Subotica and Baja. The next region after Banat to be heavily hit was Bačka. The Turkish authorities in Serbian Pannonia would not be undermined significantly until the defeat at Vienna in 1683. When Emperor Leopold took over Buda in 1686, the fighting spirit was stirred throughout the Serbian people. The Serbs of Banat were the first to revolt, paving the way for the Austrian army to penetrate deeper into inland Turkey. However, the Serbs were once again subjected to the most dreadful hardship.

The death of General Piccolomini and the defeat of the Austrian army facilitated major Serbian migrations north of the Sava and Danube rivers, as they would not wait for the Turkish invasion in their homes due to their devoted participation in the campaigns. It is estimated that more than forty thousand people resettled in the reign of Patriarch Arsenije III Čarnojević, predominantly to Srem and Bačka, all the way to Pest, while the Bosnian Serbs colonized Slavonia in great numbers. The Hungarians welcomed the Serbian refugees with downright hostility, while the Roman Catholic Church did not hesitate to begin pressuring Serbs into converting. Emperor Leopold, influenced by Cardinal Kolonić, disliked the Serbs, but he found them essential as valuable fighting manpower in guarding the southern state frontier. In order to win them over, he awarded them privileges that no other ethnic group in his vast state had been awarded. The first privilege of 1690 guaranteed Serbs the freedom of religious service according to the Orthodox rite and the use of the Julian calendar, while the patriarch and the clergy were awarded all the rights they had had under the Turkish occupation. The most crucial aspect was that only an Orthodox Serb elected by the national and church council could be elected Head of the Serbian

Orthodox Church. He would then appoint bishops and priests, erect churches, and build schools and monasteries. The second privilege the Serbs were accorded in 1691 was as a token of the emperor's gratitude for their immense contribution to the great victory over the Turkish army at Slankamen. According to the privilege, the patriarch acquired the right to appoint officers in the Serbian national army, arbitrate legal disputes, confirm guild statuses, and inherit the property of heirless deceased Serbs, which all marked the introduction of a theocratic and autonomous reign. The Serbian people were entitled to elect their own local authority bodies. The third privilege of 1695 abolished the duty to pay tax to the Roman Catholic Church, which only caused more intense hatred by the Jesuits.

In 1691, the emperor agreed to allow the Serbs to elect their own vice-duke and the first one elected was Jovan Monasterlija, although the Serbian people had wanted to see count Đorđe Branković appointed, who was in disfavour of the court. Monasterlija led an army of ten thousand Serbian soldiers in the Battle of Slankamen, where Grand Vizier Mustafa Cuprilić was killed. Monasterlija was a capable officer, but was not particularly interested in the Serbian national issues, instead being totally dedicated to serving the Austrian Court. However, the patriarch managed to win him over through lengthy persuasion and explanation, causing him to become entirely devoted to averting the process of conversion, which was most intense in Slavonia and Baranja. He soon managed to revive and stabilize the church organization. The patriarch and the vice-duke convened the national council in early 1694, where they presented their request that the Serbs from the area surrounding Buda be relocated to Lesser Wallachia, the region between Požega and Pakrac, as well as that the Serbian people – both the indigenous and the new-comers – be directly responsible to the emperor himself, without the mediation of the gentry and the parishes. The final position, confirmed by the emperor, defined the colonization of the Serbs as temporary and that they would return to their homeland once it was liberated. Soon the Šajkaši river flotilla with a Serbian crew was restored. In 1697, Serbs were prominent in the battle at Senta and, after heavy casualties on both sides, the Turks retreated. That same year, the emperor named Prince Eugene of Savoy as the commander of the Serbian army and forged an anti-Turkish alliance with Russia and Venice. The Austrian army, which incorporated a great number of Serbs, managed to repel Sultan Mustafa's new invasion and force him to flee. Eugene of Savoy conquered Sarajevo that year, which caused many Bosnian Serbs to follow him in retreat and settle in Srem and Bačka. The clashes came to an end with the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699, which regulated that the Austrian frontier should be withdrawn to a line from the mouth of river Tisa towards Mitrovica, and from the Bosut river mouth, down the Sava and all the way to the Una River. The Turks retained Banat.

The Treaty of Karlowitz consolidated Austria's international position and it aimed to improve the situation in the newly-conquered regions of Serbian Pannonia in accordance with its own interests. Austria had made its true intentions abundantly clear eleven years before by appointing Cardinal Leopold Karl Graf von Kollonitsch Lipót as the Archbishop of Esztergom and a Hungarian primate as the President of the Court Treasury. Soon, the

imperial privileges that had been granted to the Serbs were forgotten, which was followed by the process of systematic conversion. The social status of the resettled Serbian population was extremely serious. Emperor Leopold began officially violating the previously agreed Serbian privileges, using a 1700 special decree to threaten the Orthodox schismatics with banishment from Pecs if they did not convert to Roman Catholicism within a certain period of time. He did order the banishment of the Orthodox population in 1703, emphasizing that only Catholic Serbs were to be allowed to remain in Pecs. Soon, the pressure on the Serbs reduced considerably after the Hungarian uprising led by Francis II Rakoczi, as the Vienna Court circles feared the resentful Serbs could join the uprising. Moreover, it became known that the disappointed Serbs had sought help on several occasions from the Russian Tsar Peter the Great, expressing a wish to collectively emigrate to Russia.

After Leopold's death, the new Emperor of Austria, Joseph I confirmed the Serbian privileges in 1706, both ecclesiastical and secular ones. The Serbs were organized into their own Rac police and named their own officers. The Catholic prelates still would not abandon their intention of turning them into serfs, to disperse them ethnically across wide areas and turn them into the sheep of the Vatican. Serbs benefited most from the fact that the imperial generals considered them outstanding soldiers and indispensable border guards at the banks of the Tisa and the Sava. The Slavonska Krajina, with its centre in Osijek, was formed on their initiative and was divided into Upper, Central and Lower Posavska and their respective headquarters in Gradiška, Brod and Rača. Apart from the Slavonska Krajina, the Podunavska Krajina was also established in the regions of Srem and Bačka, with its centre in Petrovaradin. The Podunavska Krajina was subordinated to the Slavonska Krajina and its Osijek generality. Furthermore, the Potiska Krajina was formed northwards up the river Tisa, with its centre in Szeged, and the Pomoriška Krajina was established with a centre in Arad. In all four Pannonian frontiers, only the chief headquarters officers were Germans, while the rest of them were Serbs.

The Rac police was retained beyond the territory of the military frontiers for a long time afterwards. The Serbs of Lesser Wallachia – the mountainous region of Central Slavonia – jealously guarded their special status and they sparked an uprising in 1706, revolting against the abolishment of the frontier privileges. Fierce clashes with Hungarian noblemen continued in other Pannonian regions as well, after their attempts to impose the yoke of serfdom on the Serbs. The Serbs proved they would rather become outlaws than become serfs and, consequently, their only outlaw gang murdered the Bishop of Đakovica in 1701. The concentration of the Serbian population north of the frontier regions was so heavy that even the Hungarians gave the name Serbia to the region encompassed by lake Balaton, the north Pomorišje, the Danube and the Drava, trying in vain to establish a Timar system there. By recklessly intruding into the Serbian territory, Rakoczi ruined his own uprising. They were soon defeated by the frontier Oberkapetan Jovan Popović Tekelija, who avenged their earlier slaughter of Serbian civilians. Mojsije Rašković and Jovan Manasterlija

also participated in breaking Rakoczi, but Rakoczi was not entirely defeated until 1711, which only proves the extent and strength of his uprising, which lasted eight years. The war devastation caused the Serbian population to concentrate towards the eastern and southern border areas.

The new Austro-Turkish war began in 1716 with a victory by Eugene of Savoy at Petrovaradin, which was followed by the fall of Timisoara, Pančevo and Nova Palanka that same year, meaning that the entire region of Banat was conquered. The Savoy prince had a great number of Serbs available in his army, who showed outstanding war morale. The Serbian police captured Šabac, Bijeljina, Doboj and Brčko. Only the Šabac fortress remained in Turkish possession. During the winter period, the Serbs successfully repelled all Turkish invasions into Srem. As early as the spring of 1717, the Austrian army besieged Belgrade and seized it after two months, which sparked the exodus of the entire Muslim population. The Turks abandoned the Šabac fortress and the entire area of Podunavlje to Oršava and of Serbia to Niš without a fight. The Treaty of Passarowitz of 1718 awarded Austria all the conquered territories – Semberija, Šumadija through to West Morava and the entire area between the Drina and the mouth of the Timok. Banat was given a regional administration with its centre in Timisoara, while the Kingdom of Serbia, as the conquered region was officially called in Austrian documents, was initially under military authority, only to be followed by the establishment of the Belgrade administration as of 1720, led by Field Marshal Prince Alexander of Wurttemberg. The government was identical to that of other Habsburg states, while the Serbs retained their traditional principality and town self-governance. Apart from the regular army garrisons, Austria introduced a system of captaincies of the Serbian national militia, using the organization of the military frontiers as a model.

The self-willed Austrian authorities and the pillaging of its protagonists soon bred the resentment of the Serbian population, which was depleted in numbers and impoverished. Moreover, Vienna persistently aimed to limit even the formal privileges of the Serbian people, and therefore the Court War Council issued the First Declaratory Act to the Belgrade administration and the national administration in Banat in 1727 on the stimulation of the integration of the state authority and the Roman Catholic Church. The widespread national discontent, which was widely expressed publicly, did not prevent the issue of the Second Declaratory Act in 1729, which had the Serbian national and church rights even more limited and reduced, causing the national and church council in Belgrade to decline the declaratory act the following year with a special memorandum expressing bitter resentment, especially due to the ban on building churches, forceful tax collection and military contributions. Emperor Charles VI would not yield to the Serbs' demands, instead confirming the restrictions from both declaratory acts by issuing an explanatory rescript. A new Serbian council was held that same year in Belgrade in response to the note, where even more urgent demands were made that the 1715 privileges be respected. The emperor responded to the Serbian revolt by issuing another rescript in 1734, yielding only negligibly by excluding the Treasury from the allotment of the inheritance of the Serbian bishops. Due to the deep unease and looming

discontent of the Belgrade Serbs, the emperor yielded more significantly in 1735 by issuing a distinct letter of protection. The following national and church council, which was held that year in Sremski Karlovci in a more peaceful atmosphere, demanded that the Emperor extend the articles of the letter of protection. In his reaction, the Emperor decided against issuing another grammata, promising to severely punish all those who do the Serbs injustice.

The new Austro-Turkish war sparked an uprising of the Serbs under Turkish rule in 1737. There were many Serbs in the Austrian army of Francis, Duke of Lorraine, which was moving from Jagodina towards Niš. Soon Kruševac fell before the invasion of the Serbian militia, while the Serbian rebels helped conquer Novi Pazar. The Turks fled from Požega, Karanovac and Trstenik without a fight. After the fall of Niš, where the Serbian rebels played a key role, the Turks captured the spearhead of the uprising – Arsenije IV Jovanović Šakabenta – planning to hang him, but the patriarch managed to escape. However, it soon became clear that the most senior Austrian commanders could not rise to the challenge of Balkan warfare, while the Turks began pushing the Austrian army, which was retreating towards the Danube, followed by a host of Serbian civilians, fleeing before the vengeful and blood-thirsty Turks. In 1739, the Austrians suffered a heavy defeat at Grocka, while Belgrade was affected by a plague outbreak; it was consequently abandoned by all its population and the Austrians surrendered the city that same year. The Treaty of Belgrade that was signed shortly afterwards regulated that Austria relinquish all of its territory south of the Sava and the Danube rivers to Turkey, while the agreement was ceremoniously ratified in 1740 upon the fulfilment of obligations.

The decision not to abolish the military border north of the Sava and the Danube proved to be fortunate for Austria, which saw its territory extend far to the south. Although the border guards faced many problems with the authorities and timar classes at that time, they were still forced to pay various taxes and readily waited for another key defensive role. The officers became economically stronger as they were awarded hereditary titles and positions, becoming equals with the classes of priests and rich merchants. Preventing Hungarian noblemen from assuming control over the region of Banat, inhabited exclusively by Serbs, introduced the fastest economic development in agriculture, trade, craftsmanship and manufacture. In that respect, the situation in Srem and Slavonia was much more severe, owing to the arrogance of the civil servants and the immeasurable hatred that the Roman Catholic prelates regularly displayed for the Orthodox population. The situation was so unbearable that Serbs increasingly became renegades. Likewise, the Serbs in Bačka and Baranja were fed up with constant contributions and the leasing of land, the greed of the Hungarian sipahi and the insatiability of the Roman Catholics, while at the same time Germans and Hungarians were colonized in their regions.

The Serbian peasants of central Slavonia sparked an uprising in 1722, which was spearheaded by Stefan Marković. An ageing Serbian border captain named Pera Segedinac joined the rebellion of the Hungarian noblemen and peasants in Pomorišje in 1735, who were also disgruntled

with the actions of the central authority, represented by cruel German officers. He was brutally executed in Buda by the authorities. That same year, revolts spread across Posavina, but were quelled savagely. The following year, the unrest spread to Podunavlje in Srem. There was a schism between the Serbian officers and priests in Bačka, which additionally complicated the conflict between the Metropolitan of Karlovac and the Bishop of Bačka. The incidents, however, did not prevent the Serbs of the entire region of Pannonia from taking up arms in great numbers in 1737 and begin a war on Turkey.

The withdrawal of the southern border to the Sava and the Danube made Austria loosen bureaucratic restraints and the proselyte pressure on Serbian border guards, and they were mobilized in 1741 in huge numbers to fight for the Habsburg imperial heritage in a war against Bavaria, Prussia and France. The Serbian soldiers were badly equipped and poorly led by German officers, which caused them to engage in mass desertion. Then, as early as 1742, an uprising began at the Posavinska Krajina due to the meagre situation, which was jointly fronted by prominent officers and priests. The implementation of a Hungarian decree on the demilitarization of Potisje, Pomorišje and Podunavska Krajina, which had been enacted two years before and confirmed by Empress Maria Theresa, began in 1743. Simultaneously, the Posavska Krajina was set up and its territory was extended to Zemun, while the Serbian border guards' status was considerably improved by state acts of 1754. A huge number of Serbian families – who had lived in the demilitarized frontiers – emigrated to Russia. The Vienna Court hired the Serbian border guards for the Seven Years' War between Austria and Prussia, which broke out in 1756 and during this war, despite major casualties, the value of the Serbian armed forces was once more proven in crucial battles. That motivated the Empress to once again extend the Military Frontier area and significantly improve the social position and legal status of the Serbian population. It was then that Mihailo Mikašinović became the first Serbian general. Serbian border guards were prominent in the two-year war for the Bavarian heritage in 1778.

The position of the Serbs outside the Military Frontier was still extremely hard however. They were systematically turned into serfs and forcefully converted to Catholicism. For that very reason, many of them moved to the border areas, while Vienna was forced to protect some of the most heavily populated areas from feudal tyranny by establishing Komora dominium in Srem, the Potisje Crown District in Bačka and the Great Kikinda District in Banat, to which the system of imagined sipahi fiefs did not apply for a long time afterwards. That proved especially important in Great Kikinda, when Maria Theresa affixed the entire region of Banat to Hungary in 1779. Once the Turks had been banished, Banat, Bačka, Baranja and Srem were inhabited exclusively by Serbs, including the Catholicized *Bunjevci* and *Šokci*, while in Slavonia, where the majority of the population were Serbs, there were also some Croats, who were mobilized in the forties by Baron Franjo Trenk in his criminal gangs, together with the worst criminals. These gangs, named Trenk's Pandours, performed most extreme brutalities against Orthodox Serbs. In the latter

part of the eighteenth century, Vienna began to systematically colonize Germans, Hungarians, Romanians and other nationalities in the region of Serbian Pannonia, allowing them great privileges and often banishing Serbs from their own land. The Pannonian Serbs aided the First Serbian Uprising in every possible way and it considerably improved their national consciousness and solidarity. Simultaneously, as their economic and social situation deteriorated due to the fast-paced accumulation of capital under the Austrian rule, the Serbian peasants grew increasingly determined to oppose the alien authority and the sipahi tyranny. The first to revolt were the people from Srem in Voganj in 1807, stirring the entire area of Fruška Gora to arms. This was the famous Tican's Rebellion, the centre of which was in Vrdnik. The instantly proclaimed goal was to affix Srem to the liberated part of Serbia and Karadorde, or at least to abolish the feudal levies and affix the Srem County to the Military Frontier. In their attempts to crush the rebellion, the authorities were actively aided by Metropolitan Stratimirović, who maintained that the peasants' ambitions were an illusion. The leader of the rebellion, Teodor Avramović Tican, was captured in 1809 and executed by dismemberment. Another futile rebellion attempt was made by the Serbs and Romanians of the Vlachian-Illyrian regiment in Banat. The ringleaders were severely punished, while the church leaders who betrayed them were decorated. Serbian peasants revolted against the tyrannical feudal Chief Metropolitan Stratimirović on his estates in Dalj and Borovo, as well as in Voćin and Virovitica County. The Serbian peasants of Slavonia were insubordinate in the years to come, while more substantial revolts took place in 1815 and 1826, to which the authorities responded with severe repression.

Although the Serbs were proclaimed full citizens of Hungary at the Pozsony Council in 1792, their civil class and eminence slowly and arduously exercised their formal right to be integrated into the civil service and the system of justice. Their economic and financial development could no longer be hampered, while they strenuously worked on the system of education, as well as other forms of educational and cultural activity. Apart from conversion, the Serbs were increasingly threatened by the officially forced process of Hungarianization. The Hungarian Revolution of 1848 displayed open chauvinism towards the Serbian people, although the Serbs had initially supported the revolution sincerely, expecting it to feed their own national appetite as well. Lajos Kossuth expressed his intentions to suppress that very Serbian nationality. The Serbian Banat, Srem, Bačka, Baranja and Slavonia plunged into political turmoil, while the Serbian youth took to streets and the peasantry renewed the old fighting spirit and resistance to feudalism.

That same year, the famous May Parliament was held in Karlovci, which was initially convened as a church assembly, but instantly grew into a national parliament. Serbian Vojvodina was then proclaimed and Metropolitan Rajačić was named patriarch, while Colonel Stevan Šupljikac was named Serbian duke. The Hungarian government rendered all the decisions made at the May Parliament illegal, but the Vienna Court camarilla supported the Serbs. Đorđe Stratimirović was elected President of the Serbian Central Committee, which was followed by the establishment

of an entire network of regional and municipal committees, and village sub-committees, as well as new government institutions. The Serbian national movement was especially strengthened by resentful border guards following the imperial decision to subordinate the Military Frontier to the Hungarian authorities. In early June, Serbs took up arms in order to prevent the invasion of the Hungarian army into the territory under their control and into the border areas. It was in the first clash that the Serbs managed to repel the Hungarian army from Karlovac and force them to retreat into the Petrovaradin fortress. The Serbian-Hungarian war sparked a Serbian uprising in the regular army units, whose soldiers were joining the Serbian national movement, while many volunteer soldiers came from Serbia. The Serbs forced the Croatian officer Rastić into capitulation with swift military campaigning in Mitrovica, quelling the open hostility of the Srem Catholics.

Although a ten-day truce was declared in late June between the Serbian border guards and the šajkaši on one side and the Hungarian army on the other, the Hungarian army caused bloodshed by terrorizing the Novi Sad Serbs on the Hungarian Parliament election day. That only aggravated the Serbian-Hungarian war. The Serbs suffered a defeat at Vršac in July, which did not demoralize them, and they inflicted subsequent defeats on the Hungarians in southern Bačka. The Hungarians responded by slaughtering the Serbian civilian population. The heaviest Hungarian defeat took place at Sentomaš, which was then renamed Srbobran. The Serbs from Banat claimed an important victory over the Hungarians at Ečka. After that, the Hungarians charged with all their lines of attack and in overwhelming numbers, but the Serbs repelled the assault and inflicted even heavier casualties on the enemy. In the counterattack that followed, they significantly strengthened their positions around Srbobran. It almost happened that even Bela Crkva fell into the arms of the Serbian army. In early September, Hungary went on another great offensive, inflicting severe blows on the Serbs, but failed to muster enough strength to crush the Serbian army and the people, who defended themselves desperately. The important Serbian stronghold of Perlez was temporarily conquered by the Hungarians, but the Serbs soon recaptured it in a counterattack. The Serbian positions were stabilized, as all Hungarian assaults in Bačka were repelled, but Serbian charges in Banat were unsuccessful too. Serbs were relieved when the Vienna Court launched an attack on the revolutionary Hungary and, accordingly, ceased to treat Serbs as rebels.

Serbian leader Đorđe Stratimirović was at the height of his popularity, but Patriarch Rajačić worked against him perfidiously and with increasing persistence, in league with Vienna and collaborating with the Croatian ban Jelačić. Rajačić made a brutal attempt to topple the 25-year-old and politically inexperienced commander Stratimirović, but was prevented by the Serbian army. The Serbian Government took Rajačić's side, and Stratimirović was forced to make peace with the Patriarch. Since Duke Stevan Šupljikac, now already an imperial general, was unwilling to interfere with Serbia's political affairs, Rajačić's role had become undisputed. The warfare against the Hungarians continued and now the Serbian army was led by Šupljikac, a man loyal to the emperor, while

Stratimirović was sidelined. Hungary's offensive against the Serbian positions in Banat in November initially bore fruit, but the Serbs soon crushed it, significantly aided by the Serbian volunteer soldiers. In the midst of the clashes, the promoted Field Marshal Lieutenant Supljikac died and Hungary requested to negotiate with Serbia. The new Emperor Franz Joseph I guaranteed the Serbs their old privileges with his December Decree, but refused to precisely specify the frontiers of their dukedom. A new clash between Rajačić and Stratimirović broke out, causing the sceptical Patriarch to name the German general Mayerhofer as the commander of the Serbian army after Supljikac's death. In January 1849, the self-willed Patriarch was bitterly opposed by the National Committee, but they had little help, as Rajačić enjoyed full support from the imperial authorities. Shortly afterwards, the imperial army was deployed towards Pest, causing the Hungarian pressure in Bačka and Banat to subside considerably. After their victory at Pančevo, the Serbs made a rapid advancement along the frontline northwards, while the quickest deployment was along the Banat side in two columns led by Duke Stevan Knjčanin and General Todorović. Soon afterwards, Great Bečkerek, Vršac, Vrbas, Sombor, Bečej, etc. were liberated all the way to Subotica and Szeged.

Massive Serbian military efforts soon bore fruit solely for the Austrians, who gradually took over the control of Serbian units, destroying their fighting morale with the abolishment of the Serbian language and the Cyrillic alphabet, and the introduction of German as a mandatory official language. The imposed Imperial Constitution of March 1849 guaranteed national survival and religious freedom to Serbs, but not territorial autonomy. The new reconstruction of the system of authority regulated that Vojvodina became the seventh Hungarian county, while the Serbs were left bereft of both military and civil authority and the Patriarch demoted to the rank of imperial commissary for civilian areas. The Serbs were heavily demotivated and demoralized in subsequent battles, as the Hungarians launched a large-scale counter-offensive and penetrated as far as Petrovaradin. The Hungarians slaughtered thousands of Serbian civilians; the Serbian army was in turmoil, as their regions were plunged into total anarchy, while refugees were pouring in from all directions. In early April, Đorđe Stratimirović assumed command of the Serbian army in Titel and soon afterwards inflicted a heavy defeat on the Hungarians. There was a new mobilization of volunteer soldiers from Serbia but, in spite of major victories in Bačka, the Serbs were defeated in Banat. A reversal of fortunes came in July however, when the Hungarian army capitulated to the Russian and Austrian armies. The revolting Serbs from Srem, dissatisfied with Austrian deceptions and the conformity of the Serbian leaders, gathered in masses to express their radical political demands that Mayerhofer's military administration be abolished in the Serbian principedom and that the patriarch's tyranny be restricted. Croatian Ban Jelačić was sent to Serbian Vojvodina to silence the Serbian national aspirations and put an end to the national government officials, while Rajačić was summoned to Vienna as the Court was discontent with his zeal in working against his own people. The Emperor demanded more submissiveness and absolute obedience.

The Decree of the 18th November 1849 proclaimed establishment of

the Dukedom of Serbia and Tamiš Banat, which was entirely independent from Hungary and directly subordinated to the Austrian Ministry in Vienna. The dukedom encompassed most of Bačka, Banat and Srem, while the emperor accepted the idea as a token of gratitude to Russia for their invaluable support in quelling the Hungarian revolution. The dukedom did not incorporate the Military Frontier, which was intentionally divided to diminish the proportion of Serbian people compared with other nationalities. The Emperor bestowed the title of Grand Duke of the Dukedom of Serbia on himself, as well as the right to name a Serb as the vice-duke, who would be the governor of the civil administration. He refused to name Novi Sad – a city predominantly inhabited by Serbs – as the administrative centre, instead opting for Timisoara, where the Serbs were a minority. The Military Frontier was still governed by the notable Serb-hater Ban Jelačić, while a Banat-Serbian military administration was established on the last day of the year, with an Austrian count in charge of it. Across the territory, the authority was bureaucratic and centralized, which was the main feature of the period of the ban's absolutism. Feudalism was destroyed at its foundations, but the bureaucracy proved powerful – especially its tendency to constantly raise taxes. The economic situation of the Serbian peasantry and the civil class was increasingly hard, while their education and culture deteriorated. Germanization was systematically implemented, while Pan-Slavism was suppressed. To make matters worse for them, the Serbs of Vojvodina had already been involved in political conflicts and split into the proponents of the House of Karađorđević and those of the House of Obrenović.

Austria's defeat in 1849 in the war against France and Piedmont introduced the fall of Bach's absolutist regime – it weakened central authority and pushed it towards collaboration with Hungary on an anti-Serbian basis. On 26 August 1860, the reinforced Imperial Council made a decision in absolute secrecy that the Serbian dukedom would be abolished and affixed to Hungary. The decision was not made public until four months later, when everything had been prepared for its swift implementation. The municipalities of Ilok and Ruma belonged to the Banate of Croatia. Serbs were devastated and expressed their increasingly bitter dissatisfaction publicly. Patriarch Rajačić, a proven Austrophile, was appalled and refused to lead the delegation of prominent Serbs to Vienna until he received an opinion of the Serbian Parliament. In 1861, the emperor allowed a council to be held in Karlovci that was marked by political debates, and this way the emperor indirectly recognized the Serbs as a political nation. The Annunciation Assembly was convened on 2 April and discussions continued for nearly twenty days on whether a more favourable option for the Serbs would be to reach an agreement with the Austrian emperor or the Hungarian politicians. Eventually however, unanimous conclusions were reached, the most important of which was the demand to restore the Serbian dukedom. The emperor promised to meet the demand, but failed to honour the promise. The new Austrian defeat in the war against Prussia in 1866 brought an advantage to the proponents of the dualistic reorganization of the monarchy and definitively pushed the feudalists to the margins. That additionally jeopardized Serbian interest,

caused resistance from all their political groups and affirmed Svetozar Miletić as a Serbian national leader, using uncompromising opposition. In August that year, the Founding Assembly of the United Youth of Serbia was held in Novi Sad, which would shortly afterwards evolve into a key factor in raising the Serbian national consciousness and political emancipation in all Serbian lands, strengthening the democratic and republican ideas as the backbone of its national struggle and forever embodying them in the foundations of modern Serbian nationalism.

The Austro-Hungarian arrangement of 1867 and the consequent reorganization of the government were met with disapproval from Miletić's Serbian People's Liberal Party, which would soon prove to be the cause behind the passing of the politically and nationally restrictive Act on Nationalities and the Act on Church-School Autonomy. That great party of Serbian liberals was founded formally in January 1869 at a conference in Bečkerek, where its programme declaration was adopted, based primarily on detailing the national ambitions and interests. Using various legal manipulations with the election threshold and constituencies, the Hungarian authorities succeeded in ensuring that there were only a handful of Serbian representatives in Parliament, which was of little help, as they were led by Svetozar Miletić, who bravely, persistently and with an exquisite oratorical gift created an unbearable political atmosphere for the ruling Pest circles. In 1870, Miletić was sentenced to a year in prison, but he continued his national struggle without rest. Certain milder factions prevailed at the Second Party Conference in Bečkerek in 1872, due to some dissent within the party, caused by the compromising attitude of some of its leaders. However, more intensive parliamentary struggles continued with the same fervency, further strengthening the Serbian national consciousness.

Although the Austro-Hungarian agreement had already regulated it, the Military Frontier was not affixed to Hungary until 1873, which sparked a new Serbian revolt. Miletić's Liberals claimed the abolishment would also have positive consequences, as the Serbian population in all of Pannonia had been given a chance to unite politically and free themselves of the tutelage of the priest and officer class, while the first elections had already shown that a vast majority of the former border population voted for Miletić. The Serbian People's Liberal Party began to gain an advantage in church-national assemblies, marginalizing the conservative social elements and their traditional condescension towards the central authorities. However, internal party turmoil and disputes had begun under the influence of Hungarian informers, which led to poorer election results in 1875, and in 1876 Svetozar Miletić was once again arrested, held in custody for a year and a half and then convicted of high treason on the basis of a single fake witness. In early 1878, Miletić was sentenced to five years in prison, but was eventually pardoned towards the end of 1879. The Serbian national struggle continued at full ferocity and no threats or arrests could stop it for a long time to come. Miletić became seriously ill in prison and was unable to continue his political engagement with his earlier vigour. The party was increasingly affected by internal divisions into opportunistic compromisers and feisty nationalists. In Svetozar Miletić's absence, the leading role in the party was taken on by the much more moderate Mihailo Polit-Desančić, but

the majority in the leadership of the party was soon gained by the opportunists. They held a separate conference in Budapest in 1884, where they proclaimed that they would abandon the Bečkerek programme and expressed loyalty to Hungary, confirming the decision even more explicitly at the voters' assembly in Kikinda. The idea was most adamantly opposed by Jaša Tomić, who had already become a prominent Serbian radical within the party. The opportunists became a separate Serbian People's Party and were publicly opposed by Polit-Desančić, while they were known as the notabiliteti among the people. The Hungarian authorities used election manipulation, broke the law and resorted to violence to ensure them a passage to Parliament, thus enjoying their assured quietism and pro-government voting.

The authentic Liberals were partitioned into two factions – Polit-Desančić's moderates and Jaša Tomić's Radicals. In 1887, they already held separate party conventions and the Radicals, as a party five times larger, named their party the Complete Serbian People's Liberal Party, retaining the party publication Flag as their own, which contained the inscription in its header that it was the voice of the Serbian Radical Party in 1891. This schism within the party directly caused a complete election defeat, while the conflict between the Liberals and the Radicals became so great that it descended into unbridgeable hatred. Due to the terrible insults and defamations he suffered, Jaša Tomić challenged one of the Liberal leaders, Miša Dimitrijević, to a duel and subsequently killed him. He was sentenced for that and spent six years in prison, between 1890 and 1896. The turmoil eventually subsided and the Radicals and Liberals began to cooperate in anti-regime campaigns, jointly boycotting the elections in 1895. The national issue in Hungary was becoming increasingly complicated as other ethnic peoples were rising, while the official, regime chauvinism ceaselessly added fuel to the flames. The Radicals had undoubtedly assumed the leading role within the Serbian opposition, securing a vast majority in the Serbian national-church Parliament in 1902. Mita Mušicki was the first Radical deputy to be elected in the Hungarian Parliament in 1905. The following year, the Radicals won three deputy seats at an early election, while the Liberals had one. Francis Joseph abolished the Serbian national-church autonomy in 1912, which united all the Serbian parties – Radicals, Liberals, Democrats and the independent ones – against the regime.

8. Serbian Krajina

After the Battle of Mohacs, Hungary was hit by disorder and a division into the proponents of Ferdinand I of Austria and those of the Turkish vassal Janos Szapolyai. Returning from their campaign against Vienna in 1532, the Turkish army completely devastated Slavonia, while the Turks had captured Krbava and Lika four years before, annihilating the Croatian population they came across that was unable to flee in time. In 1536, they captured Požega and subsequently established the Požega sanjak, which comprised Brod and Gradiška. The last Serbian Despot Pavle Bakić was killed in 1537 at Gorjan while fighting for Western Srem and Eastern

Emperor Rudolf II named the Austrian Archduke Charles II of Styria as Commander-in-chief of the Military Frontier, while the following year he issued a special recommendation to regulate direct governing and the formation of the war administration. A huge sum of money was allocated for building new forts. Between 1579 and 1583, the great Fort of Karlovac was built as the main centre of Military Frontier from Senj until the Kupa and was named the Kralovac Generality. Banska Frontier was established from Karlovac to Ivanić and the Croatian ban was responsible for its defence, while an independent Varaždin Generality was established from Ivanić to the Drava River, as the second part of the Military Frontier, which had no connections with the Croatian Banate according to the Austrian system of governance. The Austrian Parliament that was held in Bruk on the river Mura in 1578 set up the Court War Council, which was immediately superior to the Croatian Ban and both generalities. The seat of the Croatian ban was placed in Varaždin for practical reasons, but he had only 50 horsemen and 50 infantrymen under his direct control. The Military Frontier had a typical government and a special status for all its inhabitants, who were relieved of serfdom. The Karlovac part of the frontier encompassed the Senj, Ogulin, Bihać, Slunj and Hrastovac captaincies, while the Slavonian part had the Križevci, Koprivnica and Ivanić captaincies. The population of the Banska Krajina enjoyed the same status as those in the Military Frontier, which meant that the ban there played the role of an Austrian commander. The establishment of the Military Frontier additionally spurred further Serbian colonization in the area, as well as the gradual territorial suppression of Turks.

Enjoying the status of free soldiers, the Serbs were directly subordinated to the Austrian emperor, or, more precisely, to his frontier generals. That brought them in direct confrontation with the Croatian and Slavonian feudal chiefs, on whose abandoned estates they had been settled. The conflict had an additional national and religious dimension and, on the basis of that, the remainders of the Croatian gentry – completely devoid of people or serfs – began to develop an anti-Serbian hatred that would later evolve into full-blown hysteria. The Croatian-Slavonian class parliaments ceaselessly insisted that the newly-inhabited Serbs be imposed with serf duties, while the ranks of the Roman Catholic Church required that they be converted to Catholicism. The biggest plots of land were in the possession of the Catholic Church prelates. The Zagreb bishops were most prominent for their disputing of the Serbian privileges and their insistence on the feudal chiefs' right to return to their land, even though it had been abandoned for more than half a century. They organized a conspiracy and, in 1628, forced general Trauttmansdorff to meet their demands, considering him the biggest obstacle to turning Serbs into serfs. The endeavours to abolish Serbian privileges represented the backbone of all the activities of the Croatian-Slavonian Class Parliament during the entire nineteenth century and it systematically impaired Austro-Hungarian relations, as both Croatia and Slavonia were treated as Hungarian states. In order to meet the requirements of the Croatian, Slavonian and Hungarian feudal chiefs, the ruler established a special Serbian committee in 1615 with the sole aim of reducing the Serbs to serfdom, but the body failed in its task, save for

Slavonia. In 1552, Virovitica fell under Turkish rule and a sanjak was established with its centre first in Čazma, then Pakrac and then in Cernik. The Turkish frontier was set up at the Kupa and Čazma rivers, while the Sultan established a military frontier, or Serhat, in the area, leading to the mass colonization of Serbs from various Serbian lands, bestowing the status of privileged border guards on them. Austria also colonized Serbs on their side of the border, mostly during the Long War between 1593 and 1606. The colonization of Serbs near Zumberak was initiated by Ferdinand I in 1526, freeing them of land taxes, customs duties and the commodities tax.

The first preserved official decree on privileges for Serbian refugees from Turkey dates back to 1535. The Serbs came upon a totally empty and burned land. The Croats had died in Turkish raids or collectively emigrated deep into Austrian territory. The surviving Croatian noblemen aimed to impose feudal duties on them and Kranjci and Croats who lived to the north, acted with hostility and Serbs avoided interfering with them. The Austrian king guaranteed the inhabited Serbs that the land they had acquired "would be passed on to their heirs according to the terrier to be adopted, but only as long as they were obedient and in the service against the enemy at their own cost and without any delay or refusal. The privileges were given to them for a period of twenty years, during which time they were freed of all feudal duties towards the landowner, such as tribute, tax, tithes and statute labour. Once the twenty-year period expired, they and their heirs would be entitled to hold, use and enjoy the named assets and land (as inheritance) under the condition that they paid one Hungarian forint of lease money annually to a certain institution in Kranj (as Zumberak at that time belonged to Carniola, as one of the inheritable Austrian lands, only to be later affixed to Croatia) or to whomever was determined, while they would be obliged to pay tithe, tax and statute labour" (The History of the Serbian People, Book III, Volume I, page 432).

The king's decree of 1538 that was issued in Linz guaranteed new Serbian settlers numerous privileges in terms of the disposition of war loot. The king issued another privilege in Brno in 1539, individually granting privileges to certain Serbian leaders. Then Turkey and Austria competed over who would colonize the most Serbs along their borderline. The Turks achieved the highest density of the Serbian population in the area between Pakrac, Požeško polje and Voćin, causing the area to be quickly named Lesser Wallachia or Lesser Serbia. Given the fact that the Austrians had frequently betrayed them when it came to fulfilling promises, the disappointed Serbs often returned to the Turkish territory. The first mass return took place as early as 1542, which forced the Austrian king to intervene urgently and pacify his new Serbian citizens. The King confirmed the Uskoci privileges in 1564 and 1565, while he also issued a great number of personal endowments and even noble titles. Serbian requirements were satisfied for a long time, which enabled the Austrians to use the Uskoci squads to quell the Croatian Peasant Revolt of 1573. Towards the end of the 16th century, pillaging raids of the higher army squads intensified on the both sides of the Austro-Hungarian border, in which the Turks had more success, meaning that the Serbs from the frontier were even more necessary to the Vienna Court.

causing a significant uprising among the Serbs of the Varaždin Generalate, who threatened to emigrate to the Turkish territory.

In 1628, the Court in Pozsony ruled in favour of the old ownership rights of the feudal chiefs in Križevci County. That was supported by Hungary's highest parliamentary body but, in practice, it was inapplicable due to the resolute Serbian resistance. Bearing in mind that the inhabited Serbs brought life into the barren regions of Slavonia and that the security of the southern borders was directly dependant on meeting their demands, at the proposal of the Austrian Court, the emperor handed out Serbian privileges and statutes concerning magistrates, the judicial system, land-owning, military and private and public infringements to the Serbian national representatives – led by Prior Maksim Predojević – on 5 October 1630. The Serbian people in Slavenska Krajina were given the status of an autochthonous political body and were recognized their “autonomy of principalities – a patriarchal and democratic institution adapted to the special socio-political conditions in the Military Frontier. The entire region of the Military Frontier between the Drava and Sava rivers was divided into three districts or captaincies – Koprivnica, Križevci and Ivanić – together with a number of municipalities. Parliaments and assemblies represented a democratic display of self-governance, though their holding was allowed only if municipal princes or judges with two or three assistants were to be elected. There was a district prince or supreme judge at the head of every district, while there was a Grand Prince – or Ober-Prince – elected by all municipal princes, with two or three assistants from one district. Apart from the ober-princes, there were elections for eight delegates and also for the headquarters of the Krajina captaincy or district. The elections for the municipal princes and assistants were conducted every year on Đurdevdan, while the district and captaincy princes were elected the following day. Together with the district prince as the president and eight delegates, the municipal princes comprised the Captaincy or District Court. All these members of the newly-elected municipal government or magistrate took an oath of allegiance to the King of Hungary and his lawful heirs” (page 471). The princes additionally assumed independent judiciary or police authority, while they also maintained public registers. The general of the Military Frontier had appellate authority in verdicts of the district courts. The statutes of the Slavenska Krajina were immediately applied in the Karlovac Generality.

Although they did not deal with the issue of religious and church rights, the Serbian privileges and statutes on the territory of the Military Frontier seemed very attractive to the Serbs who were living outside its territory, and even to Croatian peasants, all of which led to new revolts and a self-proclaimed extended area of their jurisdiction. Emperor Leopold proclaimed a new privilege act on 19 October 1660, which confirmed the frontier's self-governance. Irregularities in the application of the statute and abuse by officials led to revolts in the Slavenska Krajina in 1665, which was led by Grand Judge Stefan Osmokruhović, but this was quelled bloodily. This would relatively weaken the Serbian positions and spur Roman Catholic pro-Zealot work and forceful conversions. In 1670, the Serbian Orthodox bishop of Marča, Gavriilo Mijekić, was imprisoned in a

dungeon until his death as he objected to his own toppling two years earlier. Pavle Zorčić was forcefully appointed as a Uniat bishop and was on the throne from 1671 to 1685, ceasing all relations with the Patriarch of Peć. The Serbian people could never come to peace with that and their political strength and military significance swiftly grew with a new mass resettling from Bosnia after Turkey's heavy defeat in Vienna in 1683. When the Austrian army soon conquered the entire territory of Slavonia, they found an almost entirely Serbian population, which was soon joined by Serbs from Bosnia and Srem in great numbers.

Once the area was captured by the Austrian army, the Serbs had already lived in high concentration in the area between the Kupa, Una and Sava rivers. After the 1690 war, their population was even denser as they were joined by the newcomers from Bosnia. The territorial division was into principalities with princes as governors.

The electing of princes was only confirmed by the commanders of Austrian military strongholds. There were no Croats in the area. The Bishop of Zagreb was the leading feudal chief and the border of his estate had not been explicitly determined in relation to the Military Frontier. Minor Croatian noblemen and peasants living north of the Kupa, aimed to get hold of some estates on the other side of the river and that made them engage in constant clashes with the Serbs. The Croatian ban, the feudal class and the Bishop of Zagreb on one side and the Petrinjska Krajina military commander on the other were in permanent confrontation. As a rule, the Serbs were on the side of the military commander, as he was protecting them from feudal shackles, while they were striving to directly join the Varaždin Generality. As a result, the Serbs revolted in 1695 after the decision to consign Kostajnica to the ban's authority. The Petrinja governor and the General of Varaždin, both Germans, supported the Serbs in this. In order to pacify the Serbs and prevent further revolt, Croatian Ban Count Adam Bećanji guaranteed religious freedom for them in 1696 but sporadic clashes continued due to the constant aspirations of Croatian feudal chiefs to reduce the Serbs to serfdom. New conflicts broke out in 1700 and the Serbs engaged in armed battle with the Croats and openly threatened Vienna that they would move on to the Turkish side of the border. Emperor Leopold reacted to this in 1703 by deciding to subordinate the area between the Kupa and the Una directly to the Vienna Court chamber when it came to economic-financial issues, and subordinated it to the Croatian ban in governmental and spiritual issues. The military garrisons and strongholds remained under the direct jurisdiction of the Court War Council.

The Serbs were subjected to the Ban's authority, but did not become serfs and were discouraged from further resistance by the increased presence of Austrian military troops. However, when the border guards were deployed to quell Francis Rakoczi's revolt in 1704, the Bishop of Zagreb used their absence to inventory their houses and change their status to serfdom. The Serbs opposed this, causing the unbridled Catholic prelate to commit flagrant acts of violence, seizing Serbian land and banishing numerous families to Turkey. Serbian protests were so strong that Ban Palfi was forced to abolish all efforts to enforce serfdom and to guarantee the previous rights to the Serbs of the Banska Krajina, issuing a decree in 1708.

By doing this, the Ban aroused the anger and hostility of the bishop and the Croatian noblemen, but enjoyed the support of the Austrian Court, for whom the Serbian soldiers were of key importance. They could not so easily deny their bravery and skill in warfare. The Karlovac Generality, Lika, Krbava and the Varaždin Generality all had similar problems, although not as drastically acute. After the Vienna War, a new Serbian population inhabited the area. Serbs performed their military service and vassal duties directly to the Court Chamber, but the leasing of tax collection led to constant abuses, aggravated by the habitual tyranny of greedy officials. Lika was in constant turmoil, especially in 1693 and 1696. In 1702 and 1708, Lika Catholics also sparked a full-blown revolt as conversion had not improved their social status. Orthodox and Catholic Christians were fairly cooperative there and Vienna was forced to affiliate Lika and Krbava to the Karlovac Generality in 1712 and thus recognize the status of both religious groups as *krajišnici* (Translator's note: frontier men). Conversely, the Serbs successfully resisted the pressure of the Croatian noblemen and the Roman Catholic Church in maintaining their rights, but a huge political handicap for them was the fact the state border was being moved far from their region. The tyranny of government officials and lawlessness were in full bloom there as well. Bowing down to the Croatian classes, the emperor abolished the Varaždin generality in 1703, but was forced to postpone the realization of that decision due to a Serbian revolt. Moreover, the Varaždin *krajišnici* had become a valuable asset for the emperor in crushing Rakoczi's revolt and he promised that he would reaffirm the previous privileges.

In the new Austro-Turkish war of 1716, the Serbs of the Banska Krajina, Karlovac and Varaždin generalities fought against Bosnian Turks, guarding the border at river Sava and successfully repelling all Turkish insurgencies. They barged in Turkish territory in a counterattack, inflicting heavy casualties upon the enemy and relieving the bulk of the imperial army in their offensive campaigns on the main front. The war brought new substantial migrations of Bosnian Serbs to Lika, Banija and Kordun, while the Banska Krajina was expanded to Kozara in the Treaty of Passarowitz, causing Serbs to massively inhabit the emptied area as well. Serbs were most jeopardised by the fact that the ban and the Parliament most frequently appointed their officers from the ranks of the Croatian noblemen, who did not hide their hostility towards Orthodox Christians and triggered Serbian riots and revolts with their pompous, arrogant and inhumane attitude. Serbs performed military duty for free, while the Croatian soldiers received regular wages. The 1728, new regulations caused widespread dissatisfaction with the overbearing duties it prescribed and sparked uprisings in Kostajnica and Zrinjska Krajina. The rebels were joined by Orthodox and Catholic serfs of the Bishop of Zagreb, who typically treated peasants extremely cruelly.

The Croatian vice-ban, Count and General Ivan Drašković, brutally quelled the revolt of 1731, burning villages, pillaging and slaughtering civilians. The following year, the revolt in Lika, which had been smouldering for a whole decade, was bloodily crushed, while riots continued in the Varaždin Generality, mostly because of forceful

conversion and the introduction of contribution. This situation continued until the next Austro-Turkish war of 1737, when the Serbian border guards were once again prominent soldiers in clashes against the Bosnian Turks. With every war, their position improved, though their military credits were quickly forgotten during peacetime. The Serbian *krajišnici* were essential to Empress Maria Theresa during the Austro-Prussian war between 1740 and 1748, and many of them died on the Central European battlefields. Instead of gratitude, once the war had ended, the reorganization of the Banska Krajina and both generalities began, which would spark a new Serbian revolt. According to the new regulation of 1749, the Banska Krajina was divided into the Kostajnica and Glina regiments, which led to the demotion and degradation of Serbian national officers and the utter humiliation of soldiers and priests. A formidable number of *krajišnici* then relocated to Turkey, as the Catholic yoke of serfdom was much harsher than that of the sultan. A new revolt began in Banska Frontier as early as 1751, which was crushed by a swift intervention. However, a widespread uprising of *krajišnici* was sparked in the Varaždin Generality in 1755, and were compelled to negotiate with Vienna. The Austrians used trickery to capture the revolt's leader Petar Ljubojević, a *krajišnici* captain, causing Serbs to be left leaderless and, consequently, some of their leaders were slain and Ljubojević was sentenced to life imprisonment. The Serbian people's self-governance was abolished, together with the titles of *ober-prince*, prince and vice-prince, while all authority was delegated to Austrian officers and non-commissioned officers, militarizing the Varaždin generality completely. The position of the Serbs was seriously hampered in Croatian feudal estates, their own private frontiers, where they enjoyed the status of *bandijeralac*. They were entirely stripped of their rights and reduced to serfdom, while proselyte work was full-blown once again and forceful conversions were conducted, proving that Vienna was never serious when it guaranteed religious freedom.

Serbs were politically stripped of their rights in Banska Frontier and in the Varaždin and Karlovac Generalities; they were subjected to severe military discipline and imposed state duties, while subjected to ceaseless conversion to Catholicism, but they were not incorporated into the feudal system of the Croatian Banate within Hungary, which stimulated the development of the Serbian civil class, which rapidly evolved in the latter part of the eighteenth and at the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. Serbian merchants stood out with their entrepreneur spirit and economic skills, arousing new envy among the stagnant Croatian parasitic classes, but they were comfortable with the new capitalist air that was spreading across the entire Austrian Empire. The Serbs displayed enormous economic vitality and national consciousness, willing to allocate funds for their own churches and cultural and educational needs. Serbs never showed any hostility towards the Croats and even helped their anti-Hungarian activities. They jealously guarded their national identity, but supported everything that hindered Hungary's ambitions, either when it came to the Vienna Court or the Croatian bans. The Serbs were always aware of the interests of the entire Serbian nation, while they also harboured pan-Slavic aspirations. They always sincerely lamented the fact

that their Catholicized compatriots had tuned renegades, ever hoping they would revive the estranged Serbian national identity. As the newly-liberated Slavonia was annexed to the Croatian Banate, after which representatives of the military frontiers were present in the Croatian-Slavonian Parliament, the Serbs' activism in the institution grew. At the session of June and July 1848, there were 52 Serbs from Croatia, Slavonia, Srem and the military frontiers in the Parliament out of a total of 104 deputies. The entire Parliament was half-Serbian and half-Croatian, even if we neglect the fact that there were many Serbs among the Catholics. The Orthodox Serbian representatives from the ranks of the border guards, merchants and intellectuals enjoyed massive support from their Roman Catholic compatriots, resulting in a much higher number of Orthodox people in the Parliament than their ratio within the Banate frontiers.

The period of Bach's absolutism did not jeopardize the Serbian national rights and it spurred cultural and educational development, the use of the Cyrillic alphabet, etc., as Vienna needed Serbian support in their conflicts with Pest. Serbian and Croatian political relations were significantly damaged after the abolishment of the Serbian Voivodship, but also by the issue of Srem's incorporation into the Banate. Conflicts were increasingly serious and hostilities would not cease due to the dominant Croatian national exclusiveness and Roman Catholic prejudices, which engrossed Croatian politics, introducing flagrant chauvinism as a dominant feature. The Serbs were hit by political divisions into unionists – proponents of cooperation with Pest – and centralists, who leaned towards cooperating with Vienna. All the Croatian political leaders persistently refused to recognize the Serbs' status as an equal nation, claiming that the Serbs were an integral part of the Croatian political nation, although the Parliament proclaimed full equality to Serbs for practical reasons on two occasions – in 1861 and 1867. Lured by Strossmayer's promises, Serbs joined his National Party in 1867 and became active in pursuing an anti-Hungarian and anti-agreement policy. Enjoying Serbian support, the National Party won the Parliament election in 1867 and achieved a revision of the agreement in 1873, after which it once again decided not to recognize the Serbs as an equal nation, breaking all previous promises and guarantees. The Serbs then renewed their oppositional struggle against the Croatian craftiness and treachery, but seemingly failed to gain any valuable experience and long-term lessons from the deceit.

The National Party was soon renamed the Croatian People's Party and worked hard together with literally all the other Croatian political and Roman Catholic church elements on diminishing the Serbian national name, language, the Cyrillic alphabet, history and culture. Especially fierce Serbian-Croatian political clashes broke out over the issue of the fate of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Serbs did not oppose the abolishment of the Military Frontier in 1881, as they were hoping to acquire more efficient political unity with their compatriots from rural areas of Croatia and Slavonia, especially because the Catholic border guards felt like Serbs to the last man and publicly said so. However, their

fast denationalization under constant pressure and brainwashing simply could not be averted, while the theory of a single Croatian political nation of the region of Croatian Banate and Slavonia was aggressively promoted by all institutions and public voices. A second systematic persecution of Serbs began, which would culminate in the Jasenovac genocide. Ban Ivan Mažuranić was a particularly prominent anti-Serbian campaigner, who definitively separated and confronted the Serbian and Croatian national movements, while limited concessions of Mažuranić's successor Ban Pejačević in 1880 only insignificantly mitigated the passionate political confrontation. On the other hand, a negligible number of Serbs – rich merchants, lawyers and priests – showed readiness for a policy of compromise and obedience, but those could never evolve into true national leaders. This small-minded mentality was despised and publicly slated in the Serbian freethinking press and publishing. As it had become evident that the common Serbian and Croatian political parties were no longer possible, Serbs founded the Independent Serbian Party in Ruma in 1881, while the following year they started *The Serbian Voice* as a party publication. The *Serbian Voice* was short-lived, but it was succeeded by *Serb Defender* in 1883, printed in Zagreb and with the same political platform. Upon the abolition of the Military Frontier, the Catholics of Slavonia attempted to nominate Serbian Orthodox candidates at the first Parliament election of 1883, but the candidacies were violently annulled. The Independent Party won only two Parliament deputies at the election, while the compromisers (here also named *notabiliteti*), won 26 deputies using diverse manipulations and fraud. That same year, the Serbs massively participated in major anti-Hungarian demonstrations, seeing an opportunity to acquire their own national goals, while some of the leaders renewed their forlorn hopes of political pacification and cooperation with the Croats. Towards the end of that year, all the Serbian deputies united in the Serbian parliamentary club, naming Jovan Subotić as the president.

The new Ban Khuen-Hedervary was tolerant and constructive towards the Serbs, accepting their pleas for equality on principle and supporting their ambitions of preserving their national identity. That sparked even larger outpourings of Croatian hatred, especially from the *pravaši* and *obzoraši*. The Serbs were conciliatory and even accepted a double membership of *klubaši* (Translator's note: members of the National Party) in the Croatian People's Party, showing that they did not want endless inter-national confrontation. Serbs won 30 deputies at the general parliamentary elections of 1884, while the Croatian People's Party won 40, as much as the *pravaši* and *obzoraši* (Translator's note: members of the Independent National Party) won combined. Considerable Serbian parliamentary potential and cooperation with the Croatian People's Party led to the introduction of a Serbian Act in 1887, which guaranteed church autonomy, allocated proportional Government financial aid for religious purposes and regulated the official use of the Cyrillic alphabet. The ban stalled the ratification of the act for three years in order to allow time to blackmail Serbian deputies. Elsewhere, the Independent Serbian Party was dissatisfied with the utter formalism of the legal articles which left

many issues unaddressed. The Independent Party proponents from Croatia and Slavonia were growing increasingly cordial to the Vojvodina Radicals, which resulted in them operating as a single party with two names and two separate sections between 1887 and 1896. Nonetheless, the partnership could not exist without internal disputes and public debates.

The Independent National Party broke off the partnership with the Radicals in 1896 and soon began a rapid process of approaching the Vojvodina Liberals. The great conference of the Serbian Independent Party in Zagreb in 1902 adopted a new party programme, with Svetozar Pribičević participating in its making. He was a persistent advocate of cooperation with the Croats – and he would not be dissuaded from this politically condescending approach even by the persistent Croatian treachery, or by the great anti-Serbian demonstrations in Zagreb in 1895 due to the hoisting of a Serbian flag on an Orthodox church during the Emperor's visit, or the Frankists street riots and the persecution of the Zagreb Serbs in 1898 caused by Zmaj's literary jubilee, or the anti-Serbian rampaging of the Frankists mob in 1900. The biggest anti-Serbian riots, bandit activity and pillaging took place in Zagreb in 1902, clearly proving that the Serbs could not find a normal life wherever there was a Croatian majority. With Bogdan Medaković as president, Pribičević became the secretary of the Serbian Independent Party and the editor of the party publication which he renamed *New Serb Defender*. He propagated a new course in Serbian politics and a pro-Yugoslavian orientation. A coalition was offered to the Croatian parties willing to go into political agreement with the Serbs at the party conference in 1905.

An agreement was reached beforehand with the Radicals on joint campaigning, while the *nobiliteti*, protected by the regime, perished with the departure of Khuen-Hedervary. Regarding the cooperation with the Croatian parties, the Independents and Radicals agreed that cooperation would not be possible with the Frankists alone. A Croatian-Serbian coalition was consequently formed, joined by the Serbian Independent Party, the Serbian Radical Party, the Croatian Progressive Party, the Croatian Party of Rights, the Joint Croatian Opposition for Slavonia and the Social Democratic Party. The coalition won 37 seats – the same number as the regime proponents - while the Frankists and the Starčevićs won 21 seats. A Serb named Bogdan Medaković was elected president of the Croatian Parliament. The pro-regime Croatian People's Party disbanded and a portion of its deputies joined the coalition. However, it soon became obvious that the Serbs only strengthened the Croats with this coalition in their conflicts with Hungary, and that they actually neglected their own national interests. The first one to realize that was Jaša Tomić, and new clashes soon occurred between the Serbian Radicals and Pribičević's Independents. As a result, the Serbian People's Radical Party officially quit the Coalition in 1907. The Serbian support for the Croatian demands created plenty of trouble for the Hungarian authorities, while their anger once again solely affected the Serbs, as 53 prominent Serbian politicians were arrested and tried for high treason as framed culprits, based on forged evidence. An even bigger scandal erupted at the

a) Serbian Dalmatia

According to the Treaty of Karlowitz of 1699, the territory encompassed by the Venetian authorities in Dalmatia was expanded considerably, while nearly the entire region of Dalmatia was still occupied by Venice after its reduction in 1701. It was an area of mixed Serbian, Croatian and Romanian population, but the colonized Serbs represented a vast ethnic majority in many areas. On the whole, the numbers are not that significant, as the entire Republic of Venice met its doom in Napoleon's time with only 250,000 inhabitants. In 1726, the entire area of Dalmatia, including the islands, had only 37,750 people, which meant that the onset of Serbian colonizers changed its ethnic profile quickly, despite the systematic process of Catholicization. According to Gerasimo Zelić, Venetian Dalmatia had 50,000 inhabitants in 1785, while the Proveditor General Amiz Marin said in his report of 1795 that there were 40,000 Orthodox Serbs living under Venetian rule. Apart from Serbs, at the time of the Cretan War in around 1660, the mass of Serbian people coming in were accompanied by a certain number of Bulgarians, who soon transformed into Serbs, as they did not differ ethnically from Serbs, while their religion was identical. Bulgarians had previously joined the Serbian migrations – after the fall of Serbia and Bulgaria under the Turkish reign. That led to a situation, towards the end of the 18th century, where four fifths of the Dalmatian population were Orthodox Serbs, while the remainder were Catholic Serbs who assimilated the small number of Croats and Romance people. The bulk of the Croats had emigrated to the far north and to Italy long before, which meant that the ethnic group had almost entirely vanished from Dalmatia, only to be artificially revived by the Roman Catholic Church who forced the Catholicized Serbs to declare themselves Croats. Apart from the Turkish invasion, Dalmatia was often threatened by famine and plague, causing a great number of Serbs to resettle in Slavonia and Srem.

The arable land in Dalmatia was granted on a permanent and inheritable basis to the colonized Serbs by the Venetian authorities, committing them to compulsory military service, while the land could not be passed on or given away. That is how a distinct Venetian military frontier and the tithe as a basic tax duty became introduced. During the collection of the tax, the authorities often performed arbitrary estimates of real income, which bred discontent among the people, leading to Kuridža's Revolt in 1704 in Bukovica, Kotari and the Biograd coastline. The outcome was the imprisonment of the revolt's leader, Petar Jagodić Kuridža, for more than forty years. The people were subjected to statute labour during the building of important military forts and roads. However, besides the violence manifested in the fiscal policy, the Venetian authorities allowed Serbs considerable local autonomy, at the centre of which were people's councils with normative and judiciary authority, as well as police authority in dealing with criminal cases. The Council

Comment [K.B.5]: Translator's note. We were unable to find source for translation of this name, therefore we left it in the Serbian original

comprised municipal brigand captains, princes, captains and judges. At first the autonomy was complete, but later it was implemented under the severe scrutiny of the authorities. The Serbs served in the national militia in great numbers and their presence was strong in the regular military too, even in the officer ranks.

In terms of the administrative division, the Venetian military frontier was divided into districts, *serdar* lands and villages. Districts were also called frontiers, and there were ten of those: Makarska, Imotski, Split, Sinj, Knin, Trogir, Šibenik, Nin, Zadar and the Zadar islands. The head of a district authority was the governor, and later the *kalučel*. The frontier militia was sent to wars outside the Balkan Peninsula. Serbian Orthodox eparchies were under the jurisdiction of the Philadelphia Archbishop in Mleci, who operated within the Patriarchy of Constantinople before accepting the union. The Serbs then refused loyalty to him and turned to the bishops of the Patriarchy of Peć, whose activity was strictly limited and obstructed by Venice. As Venice was caught in the revolutionary spirit under the influence of the French Revolution and Napoleon's conquests, riots spread across Dalmatian cities and, because of the agony of the Venetian authorities, the Austrian army interfered. Soon afterwards, Napoleon abolished the Republic of Venice and Austria was ready to occupy Dalmatia and turn it into its province. Dalmatia remained in status until the Peace of Pressburg in 1805.

While under the Austrian military reign, Serbian national representatives and Orthodox priests began forging plans together with leading Catholic friars on the annexation of Dalmatia to Croatia and Hungary, aiming to concentrate all the Serbs under the Habsburg rule. The engagement of Maksimilijan Vrhovac, the Bishop of Zagreb, is proof that the Masonic lodges had an enormous influence on the creation of this political concept. This attitude was supported by Metropolitan Stefan Stratimirović and the Bishop of Pakrac Kiril Živković. However, the Peace of Pressburg put an end to all these schemes and Dalmatia was annexed to Napoleon's Kingdom of Italy. The French authorities, unlike the previous Venetian and Austria ones, assumed a positive attitude towards the Orthodox Serbs and they historically found themselves in a role of equal vassals for the first time. The Serbian Orthodox Church was free to perform its mission, while the Catholic clergy were forbidden to interfere with its affairs. Nonetheless, the Serbs reacted to France's attempt of forceful mobilization with an uprising in 1809, which was particularly contributed to by the resolute attitude of the Serbian people in refusing to wage war on Russia. The uprising was spearheaded by Prior Dubajić and Brigand Captain Borčilo but, after initial enthusiasm, the uprising soon subsided. That same year, a French-Austrian war began, during which the Austrian army temporarily conquered a number of Dalmatian cities, but soon afterwards the Treaty of Schonbrunn renewed the French authority. Napoleon annexed Dalmatia to Istria, Carniola, Boka, parts of Carylthia, Croatia and the Serbian Military Frontier, forming Illyrian provinces directly subordinated to France.

Upon the fall of Napoleon, Dalmatia was captured firmly by Austria and its Emperor Francis I insisted on the policy of Uniatism. The Serbs

would face considerable trouble in terms of organizing secular and religious education, as well as all other cultural activities. In the period of Bach's absolutism, after the revolutionary year of 1848, the Serbs found themselves once again under fierce repression from the imperial regime due to pro-Serbian, Russophile and pan-Slavic activism. The persecution of the Dalmatian Serbs – prominent Russophiles – was particularly strong during the Crimean War between 1853 and 1856. People were banished for merely mentioning the Russian tsar. However, the Serbian defiance could not be subdued and Great Russian ideas and Russophile feelings would become even more significant when the Serbian United Youth expanded their organizational structure to the Serbian coastline. Serbian national consciousness was raised in the majority of the Dalmatian Catholics, causing the Orthodox and Catholic people to jointly form the People's Party, with activists also from the ranks of the Catholics who declared themselves ethnic Croats.

The People's Party first won the municipal elections in 1869 and then the 1870 Dalmatian parliamentary election. With historical hindsight, this is a rare example – possibly the only one – of a successful political cooperation, not only between Orthodox Serbs and Catholic Serbs, but also between Serbs and Croats in general. Stjepan Mitrov Ljubiša became the president of the Dalmatian Parliament, as an already prominent national leader of the Boka Serbs. The Dalmatian Serbs aided the Bosnian and Herzegovinian uprisings fervently, which soon led to clashes with the Croats and the collapse of the Serbian-Croatian coalition. Soon the Serbian People's Party was founded, as was the *Serbian Paper*, but there were confrontations among the Serbian political leaders – Nikodim Milaš, Sava Bjelanović and Lazar Tomanović. In 1890, the Serbs won the municipal elections in Dubrovnik, which aroused considerable Croatian hatred. In 1894, the coalition of the Serbian Party and the Autonomous Party had an overwhelming win at the Dubrovnik election over the Croatian People's Party. The Serbs were led by Frano Gondola-Gundulić, who was reappointed as the mayor. Later on, the Autonomous proponents, pursuing a pro-Italian policy, fled to the Croatian side under the severe influence of the Roman Catholic Church, while the Catholic clergy were strictly forbidden Serbian activism. The Serbian policy shifted under the influence of Svetozar Pribićević, and again with the Zadar Revolution of 1905. The Serbs supported the annexation of Dalmatia to Croatia and Slavonia under the condition that the full equality of the Serbian people be recognized. In that respect, the Serbian and Croatian parties reached an agreement in the Dalmatian Parliament that year, but it became obvious very soon that the Croats were unwilling to engage in any serious and permanent agreement and that their political representatives were never to be trusted.

b) Bosnia and Herzegovina under the Austro-Hungarian Occupation

The Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina was initially managed by a special commission of the Foreign Affairs

Ministry, while, starting from 1880, the duties were performed by the Bosnian Bureau of Joint Treasury. Legal acts and the budget had to be approved by both the Austrian and Hungarian governments before being proclaimed by the ruler. The National Government was typically colonial after the abolition of the temporary frontier. Bosnia and Herzegovina were formally ruled by a National Government, but it was directly subordinated to Vienna and usually with a general as its president, who was simultaneously in charge of the army and the police, as well as the Treasury. Both the Orthodox and Muslim Serbs put up resistance to the newly-appointed government, while a full-blown uprising broke out in Herzegovina in 1882, spearheaded by Vaso Buha and Salko Forta. The cause of the uprising was the military law and mobilization based on the compulsory military duty regulation. The rebels would not hold out long though, as the Orthodox Serbs directed their hopes towards Montenegro, while the Muslims did theirs at Turkey, but an interesting fact is that they were suppressed by the Austrian army under the command of a Serb – General Stevan Jovanović.

The relations between the Orthodox and Muslim folk were mostly hampered by the issue of land ownership, with the *bey*'s aspirations towards retaining big plots of land and the system of serfdom, supported by the new government. This sparked frequent peasant riots, while workers' strikes and protests soon took place once the quick-paced industrialization had taken its toll. The occupying authorities systematically suppressed any demonstration of national individuality and political organization. Austria dreaded the Serbian national propaganda and the contacts the Orthodox Serbs and Muslims had with Serbia and, conversely, they used all their assets to perform even partial denationalization and conversion into Catholicism. The Serbian language and the Cyrillic alphabet were persistently suppressed, while a senior Austrian state official personally persuaded the Metropolitan of Sarajevo to accept Uniatism. Starting from 1882, Benjamin von Kallay began the implementation of a project to artificially establish the Bosnian nation, but the permanent national and political effervescence could not be stopped. The Serbian Royal Government led a policy of subtle support and financial aid for the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Serbs, while the Serbs caused shockwaves with the First Imperial Memorandum of 1896, in which they demanded church and school freedom from the Vienna Court.

The now mature Serbian national movement was spearheaded by Vojislav Sola from Mostar and Gligorije Jeftanović from Sarajevo. Unlike the First Imperial Memorandum, which was drafted by the Vojvodina Serb Emil Gavrilo, the Second Imperial Memorandum, demanding that the authorities cease imposing their own regime-abiding priests, was drafted by local Serbian national leaders. The Third Imperial Memorandum of 1901 was a failure, as the Serbs had thoughtlessly sought support from the Patriarch of Constantinople, but the Holy Synod in Constantinople had already been bribed by Austrian diplomats and led it to openly oppose the Serbian demands. The Fourth Imperial Memorandum of 1902 offered the authorities a fairly moderate and compromising solutions, while Vojislav Sola soon drafted his Eleven

Points, to which the government replied by recognizing the Serbian nation and language in 1903 and renouncing Kallay's artificial Bosnian nation project. What followed was the Church Educational Act of 1905 and, that same year, a political newspaper, *Serbian Word*, was founded.

The Serbian political movement soon split into three independent wings. Šola and Jeftanović were the leaders of the moderate trading wing, Nikola Stojanović led the intellectual youth, while Petar Kočić spearheaded the most radical nationalists, causing himself and his associates to be constantly persecuted, arrested and convicted. The dissenting Serbs were unprepared for the proclamation of the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina of 1908 and the 1910 National Constitution, which proclaimed it as a separate province under the joint rule of Austria and Hungary. The National Parliament was elected according to religious, national and social principles, while the executive power was entirely in the army's hands as of 1912. The annexation instigated the formation of a larger number of illegal nationalistic organizations, with utterly radical goals and assassinations as their primary means of political struggle. The most prominent of these organizations – Young Bosnia – organized the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, successfully carried out by Gavrilo Princip on Vidovdan in 1914. The murder of the Austro-Hungarian heir to the throne was the cause of the most massive Catholic and Muslim persecution of the Serbian people in Sarajevo so far, and afterwards the cause of the beginning of the WWI.

9. Serbian Dubrovnik

According to original historical accounts, the Romance town of Epidaurus, the site of modern-day Cavtat, was jointly devastated by the Avars and the Slavs, while the fleeing population established a new town in the early 7th century named Ragusium, and later Dubrovnik. The inhabitants were Romans who spoke Latin, although, over time, they increasingly adopted Italian as a more modern and lifelike variant of Latin. All central authority, jurisdiction and cultural institutions maintained Latin as the official language until the end. The Serbs from the surrounding areas gradually inhabited the territory of Dubrovnik, while certain Serbian rulers granted or sold parts of their territory to Dubrovnik, as the state was already gaining Serbian ethnic features. Many international contracts were signed in the Cyrillic alphabet and in the Serbian language. Ever since the start of the 14th century a distinct branch of Serbian literature started to develop in the area, which exuded the Serbian national spirit and a Roman Catholic view of life. On rare occasions, the Serbian language was called Slovenian or Illyrian. The unique Serbian national identity was never in doubt, but it had a highly developed consciousness of belonging to a state, whose independence had been guarded jealously for centuries, as economic and political interests demanded. The republican state organization and a genuine freedom of the people were of special value in this matter, as they were a rare commodity in the neighbouring feudal states.

In the first period of its history, from its founding until 1526, Dubrovnik was a vassal state enjoying great autonomy. Until 1204, this aristocratic republic recognized the Byzantine rule, after that Venetian rule until 1358, followed by Hungarian rule until 1526, and since then it was a free and independent state in the literal sense of the phrase. The territorial scope of Dubrovnik changed over time, expanding into neighbouring Serbian regions. After the Roman population had abandoned them, Serbs inhabited the islands of Brač, Hvar, Korčula, Vis, Mljet, Šipan, Lopud and Koločep. Gradually some of them were incorporated into the Republic of Dubrovnik. In 866 and 867 ancient chronicles tell that Arabians and Saracens besieged Dubrovnik after they had devastated Budva and Kotor. The Byzantine fleet provided help and crushed the siege. As a token of gratitude, the people of Dubrovnik used their ships to transport an army of Zahumlje and Travunia Serbs in 869, who had come to the aid of the Christian rulers in order to liberate Bari from the Saracen reign. In his book *On the Administration of the Empire* Constantine Porphyrogenitus tells that the people of Dubrovnik paid the Zachlumian governor 21 *nomismata* (Translator's note: silver coin), while they paid the Travunian governor 36 *nomismata* of tax for the Dubrovnik vineyards in their territory, which they were leasing. The region included the areas of the Dubrovačka River, Zaton, Poljice and the Žrnovnica parish.

Waging wars with the Byzantine Empire, Macedonian Emperor Samuel pillaged and burned Dubrovnik and Kotor between 986 and 990. In 1000, the partially restored Dubrovnik once again recognized the Byzantine authority through the Doge of Venice Peter Urseolo II, at the commission of the Byzantine emperor who named him the governor of all of Dalmatia, which was bitterly opposed by the people of the Neretva. The people of Dubrovnik participated in the Byzantine campaign against the Arabs in 1032, while a Byzantine Strategos Katalon Klazamenit stayed in Dubrovnik in 1034, leading war campaigns against Vojislav, the Prince of Duklja. Dubrovnik chronicles record that Bodin, King of Duklja, attempted in vain to conquer Dubrovnik at the beginning of the 12th century. Returning from a Crusade, the Doge of Venice Domenico Michele took over Dubrovnik without a battle in 1125, claiming it from the Byzantine Empire. In 1165, Dubrovnik again recognized the central Byzantine authority, housed a Byzantine garrison in one of their towers and hoisted imperial flags on the city walls. Venice conquered Dubrovnik in 1171 after a long battle in a war against the Byzantine Empire. The Doge of Venice ordered that the Byzantine imperial tower and the walls facing the sea were to be destroyed and he named an occupying prince to govern the city. Grand Prince Stefan Nemanja besieged Dubrovnik in 1185 during his war on the Byzantine Empire, which motivated the people of Dubrovnik to demand that they fall under the rule of the South-Italian Norman King, which lasted until 1192, when they returned under the reign of the Byzantine Empire and Emperor Isaac II Angelos returned the military personnel and his judiciary representatives to the city. One of the articles of the Emperor's bull that Dubrovnik had accepted and vowed to

respect stated that Roman Catholic priests in Dubrovnik were obliged to utter three praises a year to the Byzantine emperor. As an integral part of the empire, Dubrovnik gained the right of free trade throughout the Byzantine Empire. During all those years and centuries, this ancient Serbo-Norman city kept its name of *Ragusa*. The historical sources mention Dubrovnik for the first time in 1215 in a charter from Grand Prince Stefan, son of Nemanja, while the term Dubrovians appeared somewhat earlier – in Ban Kulin's Charter of 1189. Some sources indicate that the Serbs had named it Dubrovnik much earlier after *dubrava*, zhupa - the thicket and other undergrowth surrounding the city. There was a separate Serbian suburb of Dubrovnik, away from the city walls, separated from the Dubrovnik island by a shallow sea and swamp land. Once the swamp had been dried and the narrow canal backfilled, conditions were created for the expansion of the city core and the strengthening of the Serbian element as opposed to the Roman.

Dubrovnik was awarded an arch-diocese while, according to a bull from Pope Benedict VIII from 1022, the Archbishop of Dubrovnik was the Metropolitan of Serbia, Zahumlje, Travunia, Kotor, Bar and Ulcinj. It is the oldest document kept in the Dubrovnik Archive. It records that Dubrovnik went into another war against the Arabs in 1023 in the vicinity of the island of Corfu, fighting on the side of the Byzantine fleet. After the definitive church schism, the people of Dubrovnik opted for the Roman Catholic denomination, but aimed to prevent a too significant influence from the church in dealing with state affairs. There was an intense clash over this issue in 1074 and Bishop Vital was imprisoned, while another bishop was appointed in his place without Papal approval. Pope Gregory VII was infuriated with such a treatment.

Venice again conquered Dubrovnik in 1171 during the war against the Byzantine Empire, but the Byzantines recaptured it the following year. As a token of gratitude for Dubrovnik's loyalty, Emperor Manuel I Comnenos awarded the people of Dubrovnik the status of citizens of Constantinople. In 1185, Stefan Nemanja besieged Dubrovnik and, at one point, penetrated the city walls and looted the Papal bulls on the extension of the church authority of the Dubrovnik archbishop, as the cause of the conflict was the fact that Nemanja had aimed to abolish his church jurisdiction over parts of the Serbian state territory. Stefan Nemanja and his brother, Prince Miroslav of Hum, signed a peace treaty with Dubrovnik in 1186, while the people of the city were represented by Prince Krvaš and Archbishop Tribun. Dubrovnik pledged obedience and allegiance to the Serbian sovereign by signing the treaty. The treaty was ratified by the Grand Nobility Council and the National Parliament. Dubrovnik was practically incorporated into the Serbian state through this agreement, while its citizens gained full state-forming rights in the entire region. Moreover, the city retained its internal autonomy.

Dubrovnik recognized Byzantine sovereignty in 1192. Hostility against the Serbian rulers resurfaced in 1196 due to the same cause, given that Nemanja's son Stefan aimed to acquire Metropolitan church authority for the Bishop of Bar, which Dubrovnik opposed, aiming to see their own bishop remain in charge of all Serbia. The conflict was short-lived and the

Comment [K.B.6]: Translator's note. We were unable to find source for translation of this name, so we left it in the original Serbian version

Pope recognized the authority of the Metropolitan of Bar in 1199, exempting the Ston and Trebinje dioceses, which remained under the rule of the Dubrovnik archbishop. The Venetian fleet used trickery to capture Duke Damjan Juda of Dubrovnik in 1205, who was disputed by many in Dubrovnik as he was a self-proclaimed duke. He committed suicide on a Venetian ship, while the Venetians conquered Dubrovnik without a fight and, for the next 150 years, they appointed their own governor as duke for two-year tenure. Since Venice presented ever increasing financial requests to Dubrovnik, Dubrovnik revolted in 1231 and neglected the assumed duties. They were supported by Serbia. The following year they once again bowed down before Venice and pledged allegiance. Dubrovnik was involved in a three-year war with the Serbian King Stefan Uroš I as of 1265, while in 1266 it was hit by inner rioting against Duke Ivan Kvirini, who was banished from the city of Dubrovnik but they failed to summon the strength to set themselves free from Venetian reign. Venice imposed a city statute on Dubrovnik in 1272, according to which the duke was entitled to name his own deputy as vicar, as well as to form the Lesser Council by electing its members – five judges and six senators. The Lesser Council was a distinct form of government and it further appointed all the other civil servants, but also the members of the Grand Council. It was not until 1320 that the members of the Grand Council all became adult noblemen. That limited the duke's tyranny to a certain extent and created conditions for the Grand Council to openly oppose the duke from time to time. It was regulated that, in the case of such a dispute, the final verdict would be given by the central Venetian authority.

b) Hungarian Central Sovereignty

Civil riots, as an expression of national revolt against Venetian rule, took place again in 1285. Venice worked towards increasing customs and duties, which were imposed on the Dubrovnik merchants and relatively autonomous authorities. In 1325, there was a clash between Dubrovnik and the Serbian King Stefan Uroš III Dečanski, which was eventually settled with Venice's mediation. Nonetheless, a new clash broke out as early as 1327. Dubrovnik refused to join Venice in the defence of Korčula in 1331, an island that was threatened by Bosnian Ban Stefan Kotromanić. However, they participated on the Venice side in quelling the Zadar revolt of 1345, which broke out aided by the Hungarian King Louis. The revolt was crushed in 1348, while that same year was marked by a plague epidemic that had spread across Europe. Louis forged an alliance with Genoa, while Genoa substantially enlarged the Venetian fleet, resulting in the Hungarian army managing to conquer a number of Dalmatian towns in 1357. The following year, Venice permitted full freedom of trade and Venetian civil rights to Dubrovnik, but that was merely a sign of their weakness and their wish to retain at least Dubrovnik when facing a Hungarian invasion. The Treaty of Zadar in 1358 regulated that Venice must renounce Dubrovnik, while Dubrovnik immediately sent their emissaries to the King of Hungary in an attempt to obtain as favourable vassal conditions as possible, the nature of which was never in question.

The absolute sovereignty of the Hungarian king was recognized and an annual tax of five hundred gold coins was determined, which Dubrovnik was to regularly pay along with the formulated duties, in case of subsequent wars. The King of Hungary pledged to respect all Dubrovnik's previously regulated privileges, as well as to defend Dubrovnik from Raška and Bosnian sovereigns, but also to redirect the Hungarian duties that had been paid to them until then.

Regarding the privilege issued to Dubrovnik by the Bosnian Ban Matej Ninoslav in 1235, the extreme pro-Croatian historian Vinko Foretić – at times ready to make unpersuasive assumptions or search for Croatian elements where there were none, both historically and ethnically – still admits: "From the ethnical point of view, it is important that Matej Ninoslav calls the people of Dubrovnik 'Vlachs', which means that, at the time, the majority of population was still of Romance origin. The inhabitants of Bosnia – which at that time comprised the original territory of Bosnia together with Usora, Soli and the original part of the Lower Regions – he referred to as the 'Serbs', which is understandable, as the Bosnia of those days and within those borders was an ethnically homogenous Serbian land, while to the west of it – on the territory of present-day western Bosnia – was Croatia with an exclusively Croatian population. A new concrete article, which cannot be found in Ban Kulin's charter, prescribed that in the event of a dispute over debt, a Bosnian Serb creditor should sue a Dubrovnik Vlach before the Duke of Dubrovnik, while a Dubrovnik Vlach creditor should sue a Bosnian Serb debtor before the ban (*The History of Dubrovnik until 1808*, book I, Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, Zagreb, 1980, page 81).

Dubrovnik's position under the Hungarian rule was much more bearable than under the Venetian rule. Whenever Hungary waged war on the Serbs, that did not necessarily bind the Dubrovnik population to engage in military efforts. During the period between 1358 and 1363, the population of Dubrovnik faced the most trouble with the Serbian regional chief Vojislav Vojinović, the Governor of Travunia and Konavle, but were in cordial relations with Balšići of Zeta. With the Treaty of Onogošt of 1362, Tsar Uroš renewed all Dubrovnik's previous privileges. Since 1368, Travunia and Konavle were ruled by Nikola Altomanović, who soon came into conflict with Dubrovnik, but they remained in good relations with Tsar Uroš and King Vukašin Mrnjavčević. However, Altomanović had grown so powerful in the meantime that Dubrovnik agreed in 1372 – after the deaths of Uroš and Vukašin – to pay him the traditional "St. DMITAR's tribute". The following year, Altomanović was defeated in a clash with Prince Lazar and Ban Tvrtko, meaning that the St. DMITAR's tribute passed on to Đurađ Balšić, who had conquered the areas outside Dubrovnik. He solemnly pledged to renounce the tribute once the Serbian empire was restored. Dubrovnik had positive relations with Ban Tvrtko as well, while he abolished their customs duties with the Bobovac charter in 1375. Tvrtko seized Travunia and Konavle in 1377. With the 1378 charter, Tvrtko renewed all the privileges that Dubrovnik had enjoyed under the previous Serbian rulers, while from then on they paid him the St. DMITAR's tribute as the crowned King of Serbia. The duty

remained in power until the definitive collapse of the Bosnian state.

Between 1378 and 1381 Dubrovnik participated in the war that the Hungarian King Louis waged together with his allies, Genoa and Padua, against Venice. He himself felt threatened, as Kotor had already fallen into Venetian hands, while the Dubrovnik population directed their military deployment towards Kotor with great enthusiasm, emphasizing the reasons of age-old rivalry. In doing so, they disrupted their relations with King Tvrtko, who aided Kotor. War operations ceased once Kotor broke away from Venetian rule and joined the King of Hungary. However, the hostility towards Tvrtko continued as a result of his intention of building the town and port of Herceg Novi. Dubrovnik aimed to retain their monopoly over the salt trade at all cost. In that respect, Dubrovnik initiated alliances with Dalmatian townships on several occasions, but with little result, save for the elimination of Adriatic pirates. The Turks penetrated into the valley of the Neretva river for the first time in 1386, which motivated Tvrtko and Dubrovnik to repair their relations. The relations were also relatively good with Tvrtko's successors Stefan Dabiša, Jelena Gruba and Stefan Ostojica. Moreover, the Dubrovnik population took the side of King Sigismund of Hungary against the Croatian rebels, led by Stjepan Lacković, who were in league with Ladislav of Naples. A war between King Ostojica and Dubrovnik broke out in 1403, after Dubrovnik refused to return the coastal lands to the Serbian Bosnian sovereign.

Once Ostojica was toppled and succeeded by Tvrtko II, relations with Dubrovnik improved, which was contributed to by regional Serbian feudal chiefs Sandalj Hrančić and Pavle Radenović. Dubrovnik now resorted more frequently to a very clever means for bringing all the Serbian feudal chiefs around their own interests by giving them Dubrovnik noble titles, houses in the downtown city and the right to asylum, as their political positions were typically unstable. In 1409, Dubrovnik defeated the fleet of Ladislav of Naples in a great naval battle at Korčula in 1409, but they refused the demand from King Sigismund of Hungary to engage in war against Venice, to whom Ladislav had sold all Dalmatian cities and the entire coastline. Through the mediation of Stefan Lazarević and his influence in the Turkish Court, Dubrovnik obtained numerous trading privileges from the Turks. Sandalj Hrančić consigned his part of Konavle to Dubrovnik in 1419, while Radoslav Pavlović consigned his own, as confirmed by King Stefan Ostojica. Radoslav Pavlović soon repented and asked for his part to be returned and eventually came into conflict with Dubrovnik in 1430, defeating their army and thus starting the three-year Konavle War. As Radoslav had already been a Turkish vassal, the Sultan supported him, but next year, probably as a result of bribery, he sided with Dubrovnik. The Sultan changed his mind again in 1432 and ordered that peace be made based on the current state.

In 1441, Dubrovnik deputies were exposed to pressures from the Sublime Porte to have Dubrovnik pay duties to the Sultan, as well as the neighbouring Christian sovereigns, which they adamantly refused to do. Nonetheless, in 1442, an international treaty was made, according to which Dubrovnik was obliged to give the Sultan 1,000 gold coins every

year and, in return, they would earn the right to free trade and all their merchants who had been previously arrested would be freed and their confiscated goods returned. Over the years to come, Dubrovnik participated in the anti-Turkish wars of Christian states, but without any significant success, which caused them to continue to bargain with the Porte at the same time. When Herzog Stefan Vukčić Kosača jeopardized Dubrovnik's salt trade monopoly by setting up a market in Herceg Novi, their mutual relations became extremely strained. In 1451, a war broke out in which Dubrovnik was defeated, while the Herzog of St. Sava entered Konavle with his army. He captured 400 soldiers of Dubrovnik and besieged the town itself. Dubrovnik put a price on his head, offering fifteen thousand gold coins and 300 more in annual allowance, a house in the city worth 2,000 gold coins and a Dubrovnik citizen's right to whoever killed the Herzog. However, the Herzog returned Konavle to Dubrovnik at the Sultan's request in 1452. The fall of the Serbian despotate and Herzegovina under Turkish rule caused sheer panic in Dubrovnik. The city was preparing itself for a decisive defence and craved help from anyone. In 1458, however, they reached a permanent agreement with the Sultan and from then until the collapse, Dubrovnik paid the Turks annual duties on a regular basis. The Porte, as well as the entire Turkish state authority hierarchy – from the centre to its peripheries – proved extremely convenient for displaying their skill at bribery, a craft Dubrovnik had long mastered.

According to the terms of the Treaty of Buda of 1503, it was specially regulated that Dubrovnik, which was still under formal Hungarian sovereignty, should continue to pay duties to the Sultan, but that new duties could be placed upon them. Sultan Selim I issued an imperial firman in 1513, written in Serbian and in the Cyrillic alphabet, in which he solemnly affirmed all Dubrovnik's previous privileges. When Sultan Suleyman II went to war on Hungary in 1521, Dubrovnik instantly refused obedience to the Hungarian king and forbade his emissary from entering the city. When they were informed that same year of the news that the Turks had seized Belgrade, they accompanied the effort with a fusillade from all fortresses. After gaining victory in the Battle of Mohács in 1526, Turkey completely removed any formal trace of Hungarian sovereignty. From that day on, the city was exclusively a Turkish vassal but, despite great privileges in the Turkish Empire, they retained strong bonds with the Italian and Spanish states, spreading their trading activities across the Mediterranean.

c) Vassaldom to the Turkish Sultan

Dubrovnik refused to pay annual duties to the newly-appointed Hungarian king Ferdinand of Habsburg in 1527. Prior to that, they had sent presents to the Turkish Sultan accompanied by a written note by messenger, saying the present had been sent by "the prince and the nobility of Dubrovnik – his most faithful taxmen and servants – as a token of our allegiance and the great celebration that the entire city is experiencing due to his successful and magnificent victories, kindly

announced to us with his letter, which filled us with joy and comfort that suits our allegiance and his good mercy towards us, for which we pray ceaselessly to the God Eternal to bless him with long life and endless victory over his enemies” (V. Foretić, op. cit., book II, page 8). Dubrovnik hardly spared their compliments for Ferdinand, but they would not give him any money. Moreover, in his new war campaign, Sultan Suleyman appointed Janos Szapolyai as the governor of the major part of Hungary in 1529, but now he emerged as a pretender to Dubrovnik’s annual tribute to the Hungarian king. Two kings with identical demands, while the people of Dubrovnik avoided the duty using great diplomatic craftiness and trading skill. In order not to provoke Turkish anger, they even attacked and persecuted some of their own noblemen, revealing they had been acting as the Christian kings’ spies - primarily Ferdinand of Hungary.

In 1538 Ferdinand of Habsburg recognized Janos Szapolyai’s title of king over all the regions of Hungary dominated by Turkey, among which were Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia. Two years afterwards, Szapolyai died, shortly after the birth of his son, John Sigismund. In 1541, sultan Suleyman eventually annexed all the Hungarian lands to his empire, leaving Szapolyai’s successor the Dukedom of Transylvania as a vassal governance. Dubrovnik assured the Sultan of their immeasurable joy at his war victories over Ferdinand, while they used this opportunity to break away once and for all from any formal or legal connection with Ferdinand’s state. The people of Dubrovnik were much more suited to the status of Turkish vassals. Although they paid higher annual tribute, their republic still enjoyed an incomparably higher degree of independence. The Turks treated it as a vassal state - one they persistently protected from both Hungary and Venice. The idyllic relations were marred only by attempts by the King of Spain to use Dubrovnik ships in his anti-Turkish conquests. Meanwhile, Venice frequently invaded Dubrovnik territory, blockaded the city, looted ships and persuaded their Christian allies to take over Dubrovnik. However, despite continuous problems and occasional crises, Dubrovnik trade was blooming.

Relations with Turkey were hampered to a certain extent in 1565 due to an unsuccessful Turkish siege of Malta and founded suspicion that Dubrovnik ships were incorporated in the Spanish enemy fleet. The authorities were forced to introduce regulations that limited the merchants’ freedom when acquiring and building ships, coupled with a ban on renting them to belligerents. In 1566, Marin Držić organized a coup conspiracy, aiming to abolish the aristocratic rule and balance the authority of the noblemen and the civil class, both in the republic and its power structure, as well as assuming an openly anti-Turkish course in foreign affairs. Držić was supported in this scheme by Florence. The appearance of the mighty Turkish fleet in the Adriatic Sea prompted the conspirators to abandon their plans. When the War of Cyprus began, in which Turkey strove to capture the island from the hands of Venice, the Venetians expressed their ambition to conquer Dubrovnik while forging an alliance with the Pope and the King of Spain. The Pope personally neutralized the turmoil, while the fall of Cyprus forced Venice to deal with other problems. Dubrovnik seized the opportunity to congratulate the

Turks on another great victory. After the defeat of the Turkish fleet in the Levant in 1572, Dubrovnik also congratulated the commander of the Christian fleet John of Austria. In those days, the territory of Dubrovnik was also threatened by the Senj *uskoci*.

Dubrovnik’s cordial relations with Spain aroused the anger of the English and so, in the latter half of the 16th century, the English emissary in Constantinople spread long and systematic stories of intrigues at the Porte, which Dubrovnik had to explain away as best it could. He showed absolute allegiance to the Turkish sultan, while the bribing of Turkish chiefs was most effective. The government of Dubrovnik was in trouble in the early seventeenth century, as pressure was put on it by Christian sovereigns to join anti-Turkish campaigns and Balkan movements in various ways, but Dubrovnik was reluctant to leave the comfort and benefits of being under the auspices of Turkey, especially taking the ever-present Venetian danger into account. Venice would not allow a single armed ship of Dubrovnik to set sail and they created diverse obstructions and limitations for merchant ships. An anti-Dubrovnik revolt, aided by Venice, was provoked on the island of Lastovo in 1602, but Dubrovnik quickly sent in 500 soldiers and neutralized Venice’s attempt to disembark at Lastovo. The revolt leaders were sentenced to death, while some of them fled to Korčula, which had already been conquered by Venice. As early as the next year, those same rebels managed to disembark at Lastovo, take over the island and enable clear passage for the Venetian army. Dubrovnik continued their war campaign using diplomacy and gaining the support of the energetic Turkey and Spain. Venice was forced to abandon Lastovo in 1605, while Dubrovnik punished the local population severely and pillaged them, even destroying the island’s fortress.

At the time of the Venetian-Spanish conflict of 1617, Dubrovnik was threatened by Venice and Turkey, who condemned it for its cordial relations with Spain, but Dubrovnik simultaneously dreaded the sight of the Spanish fleet in the Adriatic, as it did not know its true intentions. Venice forcefully sailed into Gruž, pillaging the Dubrovnik coastline, also aiming to get their hands on Lokrum. In 1620, they established a total naval blockade of Dubrovnik and confiscated all its ships, but soon faced an invasion of African pirates, who were only repelled from Naples by the Spanish fleet in 1623. However, the Venetian tyranny over Dubrovnik and the systematic obstruction of their merchant activities continued through the following years, especially when it came to the acquisition and trading of corn. Venice took over Lokrum in 1631, but abandoned it soon afterwards. It was not until 1635 that an agreement between Venice and Dubrovnik was reached, under which Dubrovnik committed itself to pay nominal customs duty, while in return they gained the right to relatively free trade. Dubrovnik would undergo a new revival starting from 1645 – namely after the end of the Cretan War between Turkey and Venice – which was sabotaged by the jealous Venetians, while the Turks also forbade Dubrovnik to wage wars against Venice in 1652. Turkish pirates from the sea and bandits from the land began to emerge, especially Turks from Herceg Novi. The issue of the *hajduci* remained unresolved for a

long time to come.

To make matters worse, Dubrovnik was hit by a devastating earthquake in 1667. According to various estimates, between one and two thirds of the city of six thousand inhabitants died that day. The city was in a state of chaos, lawlessness and pillaging. The prince and most members of the Lesser Council were killed as well. After a couple of years, the surviving noblemen regrouped and began to renew the government. People were forbidden from leaving town, which hampered the survivors' hopes for resettlement. The Turks behaved extremely fairly in the matter, monitoring the situation so that no army attempted to capitalize on the earthquake and the fire and capture Dubrovnik. Venice remained quiet, as foreign affairs did not favour the capture of the city, although their restless presence around it was looming and threatening. In order to oppose the citizens' demands to reform the political organization by abolishing the aristocratic republic and establishing a national government, several of the most prominent civil families were granted nobility, causing the dissatisfaction to subside.

Venice aimed treacherously to capitalize on Dubrovnik's misfortunes and assert supremacy in trade with Turkey, even by sending organized gangs of bandits to the territory of Dubrovnik, making the overall turmoil even more unbearable. The Porte, resorting to traditional bribery of its chiefs, decided to protect Dubrovnik by making it the only port through which Turkish trading would be conducted. In order to spite Dubrovnik as much as possible, Venice spread false rumours of plague epidemics on several occasions, so as to discourage any merchants from using the city ports. Serious problems in relations with Turkey surfaced when the greedy Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa devised a plan in 1678 to demand a huge amount of money from Dubrovnik for its thirty-years-long unauthorized collection of customs duties from Turkish merchants. Given the fact that the people of Dubrovnik were exempt from paying such duties on Turkish territory, the danger arose that Turks could capture Dubrovnik, but the following year a war between Russia and Turkey broke out that attracted the complete attention of the sultan. Dubrovnik was still forced to pay a certain amount – much smaller than the initial demand – to the Grand Vizier. After great hardship and troubles, blackmail and the arresting of emissaries, the situation calmed in 1682, but with Dubrovnik suffering huge financial losses. As early as the following year, Kara Mustafa suffered a heavy defeat during the siege of Vienna, leading to Dubrovnik dispatching three emissaries to urge the Austrian emperor and the King of Hungary Leopold I of Habsburg to assume authority over the Republic of Dubrovnik.

A treaty was signed in 1684 to regulate this, which renewed the old Hungarian duty with delayed effect, once the Turkish army was displaced from Dubrovnik's surroundings and with a clause on secrecy, so that Turkey would not be agitated further. They continued to pay duties to Turkey as if nothing had happened but, as of 1686, they also paid duties to Hungary until 1699. While Austria was preoccupied with the war on Turkey, Venice once again jeopardized Dubrovnik in various ways, preventing the import of food, obstructing its trade and preparing

themselves to seize Popovo polje and Trebinje from Dubrovnik, which they succeeded in doing at one point. After the Treaty of Karlowitz, they were forced to abandon their positions and Dubrovnik was once more surrounded by Turkish territory. It was of the utmost importance for the people of Dubrovnik to avoid being in direct territorial contact with Venice. Moreover, the Turks reduced the annual duty considerably.

Dubrovnik established a relationship with the Russian Tsar Peter the Great in 1709, calling the famous sovereign their compatriot, bonded by a mutual language. However, when the Tsar called on them to enter the war against Turkey in 1711, Herzegovinian and Montenegrin Serbs accepted to the last man, but the people of Dubrovnik assumed a neutral position. Count Sava Vladislavić visited Dubrovnik in 1717 at the Russian Tsar's request and demanded that an Orthodox church be built in the city, which Dubrovnik refused, while, as usual, offering a torrent of humble compliments to the Tsar's emissary and a renowned Herzegovinian Serb. Over the decades that followed, Dubrovnik managed to reduce the Venetian pressure and duties on transport across the Adriatic to the minimum, aided immensely by Turkey's diplomatic help. They increasingly declared themselves as vassals of the Turkish Sultan, as this brought them huge financial benefits from trading privileges, but also military safety, despite the occasional threats from Turkish *aghass* and *beyss*.

d) The Twilight and Collapse of Dubrovnik

Halfway through the eighteenth century, Dubrovnik was increasingly hit by decadent processes and tendencies, especially in political, cultural and moral aspects, as a result of its obsolete aristocratic political system and distinctive inbreeding within the noble families. Members of the new and old gentry came into conflict. The conflicts culminated in 1762 with a clear division into two factions, while the following year it led to a complete blockade of government institutions and utter anarchy in the city, but without any riots or upheaval. Soon, a portion of the members of the party of the old noble families joined the new ones and authority was established once more, but the painful precedent shook the political confidence of the small republic. The procedure of drawing lots was introduced in the election of new civil servants, which proves the extent of the mistrust, even after the compromise.

At the time of the war between Russia and Turkey, the Russian fleet appeared in the Adriatic in 1770. As many of Dubrovnik's ships were engaged in transporting troops, war equipment and food for the Turks, the Russians began intercepting their ships, demanding complete neutrality. After the Dubrovnik ships continued to be used on the Turkish side, Tsarina Catherine proclaimed Dubrovnik an enemy territory. A huge number of Dubrovnik ships that were put at Turkey's disposal were destroyed or severely damaged by the Russians. The efforts of Dubrovnik's emissaries at the Petrograd Court were in vain, as hostilities did not cease until the Treaty of Kucuk Kaynarca, according to which Russia gained the right to a free route of its merchant ships through the

Alexander and Napoleon entered into the Treaties of Tilsit in 1807. Dubrovnik then, under French occupation, engaged in intensive diplomatic activity in order to salvage the republic. The Chief of Staff of the French army, General Marion, announced the decision in 1808 that the Republic of Dubrovnik was abolished, which was immediately ratified by Napoleon himself

Bosporus and the Dardanelles. Dubrovnik agreed to have a permanent Russian consul in the city and received no reparation for the destroyed ships and property. They had lost a total of fifty ships.

The appearance of Napoleon Bonaparte on the world historical stage was of crucial importance for the Republic of Dubrovnik. First, Austria claimed all the Venetian estates on the East Coast of the Adriatic, according to the Treaty of Campo Formio. Both France and Austria promised full protection for the independence of Dubrovnik. There was political turmoil in the city itself and divisions into proponents and the opponents of the French Revolution heritage. The following year – 1798 – France coerced a huge amount of money from Dubrovnik as a loan that they never intended to repay. The incident rocked the foundations of the Republic. In 1799, a revolt broke out among the dissatisfied Konavle peasants, who could no longer tolerate serfdom and the tyranny of the nobles, whose appetite was growing, as their affluence could not be compared with the civil class turning to naval affairs and trade. The peasants were infuriated when the authorities proclaimed the mandatory purchase of a certain amount of salt from the government. The government asked the Austrian and Turkish authorities to exercise a military threat at the Konavle border in order to discourage and pacify the peasants, which had only partial success. In the eastern regions of Konavle, open demands for merging with Austria were present, while there was also suspicion that Austria had initiated the revolt in the first place. The following year, the revolt subsided and its leaders fled. Their property was confiscated and two of them were killed. The forced sale of salt was halted and the legal status of the peasants was regulated to a certain extent.

Dubrovnik's relations with Russia deteriorated once again in 1803 after the Parliament's decision to allow Orthodox priests to perform their service only twice a year in the Serbian Orthodox church, erected in 1790 outside the city walls. Each visitor was allowed to stay no more than eight days per one visit. The church was used by the Russian consuls and other vassals of the Tsar. The dispute was dealt with relatively in 1804, while a Russian imperial coat of arms was placed on the Orthodox church. However, a new danger presented itself in the shape of Emperor Napoleon, who was granted the territories of Istria, Dalmatia and Boka Kotorska from Austria according to the Treaty of Pressburg. Russia was quicker though and, together with the Montenegrin Serbs, they captured Boka in 1806. As the French fleet was much weaker than the English or Russian one, the French decided to take the mainland route and approach Boka across the territory of the Republic of Dubrovnik. Russia demanded absolute neutrality from Dubrovnik, while the French demanded a huge financial loan. Napoleon decided to occupy Dubrovnik and cut short its diplomatic manoeuvring. The Boka Serbs instantly entered Konavle and began clashes with the French. The Russians immediately joined in, repelled the French and drove them back to the city walls, which marked the beginning of the Russo-Serbian siege of the city, aided by the naval blockade. On their departure, they took all Dubrovnik's ships from the Gruž port. Fighting continued in the area of Konavle. Emperors

e) Engel's Research into the History of Dubrovnik

Johan Kristian von Engel published his *History of the Republic of Dubrovnik* in Vienna in 1807, a year before Dubrovnik's downfall. His book was translated into Serbian by a Catholic from Dubrovnik, Vicar Ivan Stojanović. It was published in Dubrovnik in 1903 by the *Serbian Youth of Dubrovnik* in their *Serbian Library of Dubrovnik*. The book was printed by the Serbian Printing House of Dubrovnik, owned by A. Pisarić. In 1923, a second edition was published in Dubrovnik and a third, as a reprint, was published in Cetinje in 1998 by Svetigora. Although the inhabitants of Dubrovnik have never been prone to theocratic state organisation, prohibiting the overly enthusiastic interference of the Roman Catholic Church in state and political matters and have never been picky about Islam or any other religion, Engel explains in the preface to his book that the Dubrovian aversion toward Orthodoxy is due to some prophesy of Saint Frances of Assisi from 1220, according to which Dubrovnik should survive until the Orthodox start to live there, i.e. until the Orthodox priests start serving there.

Engel states that the Serbs populated Zahumlje and Travunia between 630 and 640, in the vicinity of Epidaurus, which was razed to the ground in 656 by a naval attack of the Saracens while in conflict with the Serbs. However, Duke Solimir of Travunia allowed a portion of the surviving Roman population to settle in the area of the Serbian groove, the Serbs referred to Dubrovnik. The Roman settlers from Epidaurus called it Raguza. Engel emphasises in a note that, "In Montenegro, there is a small village today that is also called Dubrovnik – because of the forests around it" (p. 6). The old Serbian name for oak was *dub*, so it was probably an oak wood. In the following centuries, Dubrovnik was built and expanded and a greater number of Roman inhabitants from other Dalmatian cities settled there, because they were becoming more and more threatened by the Avars – and, later, by the Croats. The constant fights of the Roman and Byzantine Emperors over the domination of the eastern Adriatic littoral area contributed to that. The original organisation of Dubrovnik was typically Roman, patrician and Latin was spoken. "Until the 11th century, Italian in particular was spoken in Dubrovnik. Only later could the Serbian-Slavic settlers, who came in greater numbers, prevail and introduce the sort of a common mixture of Italian and Slavonic that lives in Dubrovnik even now" (p. 7). For the first fields and vineyards that they tilled and cultivated, the Dubrovians had to pay an annual tribute in the amount of 30 gold coins to the rulers of Travunia and Zahumlje. "Paying this tribute freed the Dubrovians, at the same time, of Slavic interference in its internal affairs. The mutual commercial relation with these Serbian

peoples was equally beneficial to both sides, which means that Dubrovnik has profited from its position for seafaring and trade down the Littoral area” (p. 7).

In Engel’s work, we find the information that the zhupans of Travunia and Zahumlje sent their troupes to Apulia around 868 to help the Byzantine Emperor Basil in his fight against the Saracens using Dubrovian ships. At the time of the invasion by the Bulgarian Emperor Boris around 890, who razed almost all Serbia and Travunia, the son of the Zhupan of Travunia, Pavlimir, took refuge in Dubrovnik with a great number of nobles, priests and rich people, which suddenly expanded the city, the fortifications and the land of the merchants. “Out of his gratitude for his warm welcome, Pavlimir built the church of Saint Stephen the Protomartyr, who was especially honoured by the Serbs, in the town centre. According to Emperor Constantine’s news, the relics of Saint Pancras are buried there. After some time, Pavlimir returned to his homeland, but he decided to leave more Travunians in Dubrovnik, who got married there and settled. Therefore, the Roman-Italian and Serbian-Slavic blood mixed at that time. The dialect of the Slavs of Dubrovnik is still very similar to Serbian even now” (p. 10-11). Furthermore, we also find the information in Engel’s work that “Stjepan Vojislav, the restorer of Serbia and her liberator from Byzantine supremacy, presented Dubrovnik with Župa, Rijeka, Gruž and the whole littoral area to Orašac – a fertile region – in around 1040-1050, out of his friendship with the Dubrovians. It is said that Stjepan’s son, Mihajil, was also generous toward his allies, the Dubrovians. He gave them the islands of Koločep, Lopud and Šipan” (p. 16-17).

When the Dubrovians ousted their Bishop Vitalius in 1073 and put him to prison due to his violence and immorality, which Pope Gregory opposed, the Serbian ruler Mihailo intervened with the Pope and managed to convince him to allow the Dubrovians their wishes and appoint their priest Petar as the new bishop. The historical archives recorded that the Dubrovians warmly congratulated the Hungarian King Ladislaus and sent him envoys with luxurious gifts when he vanquished the Croatian feudalists and killed King Petar Svačić. They acted the same way when the next Hungarian King, Coloman, occupied the largest part of Dalmatia in 1105, including Zadar. Engel then states that, in the 12th century, when the Serbian rulers definitively chose the Orthodox version of Christianity, many Catholics from Serbia moved to Dubrovnik. The same thing happened during the time of the spread of Bogomilism in Bosnia.

The case of Despot Đurađ Branković is also characteristic – he took refuge in Dubrovnik in 1440. According to Engel, the Turkish Sultan demanded that Dubrovnik hand him over, promising that they would be able to keep all of the Despot’s gold, that they would be exempted from Turkish tribute for ever, that they would expand their territories and would enjoy the protection of the Sublime Porte. If they didn’t, he threatened to raze the city to the ground, but the Dubrovians did not accept that blackmail, sending Đurađ Branković to Hungary via a safe route. “Murad himself started to respect the Dubrovians, because they preserved their tradition of hospitality so steadfastly; he held that a state

where loyalty and confidence are held in such high esteem, deserves to live forever, however small it might have been; however, he did not despise the large sum of money offered by Dubrovnik as compensation” (p. 77).

Engel describes in detail the disasters that struck Dubrovnik – the epidemics of plague in 1526 and the earthquake in 1667, but also the smothering of the Slavic and Serbian spirit when the Jesuits prevailed in the late 17th and the beginning of 19th centuries. Jesuit intellectual prohibition was so strong that printing books in Serbian was forbidden, as well as reading French literature. Furthermore, in 1724, the Senate ordered the public burning of the Jewish holy book Talmud. That year, the request of the Serbian noblemen and a Russian Count Sava Vladislavić to build an Orthodox chapel next to his house, in his own garden, to bury his old and ailing mother was denied.

While he was translating Engel’s *History of the Republic of Dubrovnik*, Ivan Stojanović supplemented the book with his own book *The Latest History of Dubrovnik*. He describes the circumstances in Dubrovnik under French occupation, the Russian-Serbian siege of the city, the deference of the inhabitants of Korčula and Brač to Dubrovnik, etc., in detail. When Napoleon was defeated, the Dubrovians were hoping to restore their republic, considering that Austria had not occupied the territory of Dubrovnik and it was not mentioned as Venetian-Italian territory in the Treaty of Pozsony. The citizens and the villagers rebelled against the French in 1812, incited by the British, who liberated Lastovo, Šlano, Šipan and Lopud and restored the laws of Dubrovnik there. The British made a false promise regarding the restoration of their independence and some of the most prominent Dubrovian nobles secretly cooperated with the Austrians. When the Austrian General Milutinović showed up with his army, he tricked the Dubrovians by hoisting the flag of Dubrovnik in Gruž, together with the Austrian and the British. The Senate met in session in January 1814 and decided to take concrete diplomatic and military measures in order to restore the state independence. The Dubrovians rebelled against the French and made them surrender and started cheering to the republic, they put Dubrovian flags on the fortified walls. However, the Austrians and the British entered the city and took over administration. Stojanović gives special attention to the fact that almost the entire Austrian army was composed of Croats, who showed excessive intolerance to the symbols of Dubrovian independence. To add insult to injury, the army was commanded by an Orthodox Christian, General Milutinović. All nobles were arrested and the Catholic priests publicly swore loyalty to the Austrian Emperor in March. The Dubrovian ambassador was banished from Vienna in 1815, without even letting him contact the participants of the Congress of Vienna, which definitively granted Dubrovnik to Austria. The Austrian Emperor thus acquired one more title – the Duke of Dubrovnik.

The Austrians included the citizens in the city structure because the noblemen boycotted them completely, laughed at them and satirised them. However, the joy and will for life was killed in the patrician families and they surrendered to passive resistance and spiritual stagnation. Lamenting

the faith of Dubrovnik, Stojanović emphasises the Serbian ethnic character of the ancient city. “By blood, the Old Senate was almost entirely comprised of Roman families and it found itself, surrounded by the Serbian people at the end of 15th century and the beginning of 16th. History says that these two peoples were divided; each with its own flag: the Serbs with the flag of Saint Srd and the Romans with the flag of St. Zenobius. When the Serbian tide came, the Roman tribe that governed, became aware that it would be good if the two peoples mixed their habits and customs into one people, to abandon St. Srd and St. Zenobius and consolidate under a third saint, St. Vlah” (p. 275). He then says that the Old Roman families became Serbianised completely, which was the first case in history where the rulers adopted the language and the customs of their subjects. “The Dubrovians, acquiring the neighbouring villages, received their languages and, in that way, the Romans of Epidaurus and the Serbian villagers gradually became the people of Dubrovnik with the same authorities, the same religion and the same language. They did not want to be called Serbs, Croats, Dalmatians or Italians. Why do the real Dubrovians considered themselves to be Serbs today, while the authorities try very hard to make them call themselves Croats – well, we shall talk about that when we reach the third epoch, which is the epoch of the stench and decomposition of this glorious corpse” (p. 297).

Don Ivan Stojanović especially insists on the differences between the Dubrovian people’s mentality and the Dalmatians, referring to the foreign authors who testified about that, citing the most interesting observations. He especially criticises the imposition of Croatian expressions in schools, which confused the pupils and the older people could not help them, because those expressions have no connection with Serbian-Dubrovian speech, as he formulates it expressly. Because of the official Austrian insistence that the Dubrovians declare themselves Croats, people came to resent them. As always, cowards and sycophants would heed that, while those who were proud and honourable still pointed out that they were Serbs. However, on that basis, rifts within families or relatives took place. Ivan Stojanović opposes the attempts to bring up the Serbs and the Croats under a unique, artificial denomination – the Illyrians - but also to their mutual differentiation based on the Orthodox and the Catholic faith. He openly accepts the attitude of Vuk Karadžić, citing his words extensively, that the Croats are members of the Chakavian and the Kaikavian dialects and the Serbs of the Shtokavian dialect.

Writing about Don Ivan Stojanović, the prominent Serbian literary critic Pavle Popović published an essay on the Dalmatian Serbian national movement in the *Serbian Voice* in Zadar in 1919: “While in northern Dalmatia and Boka, the movement was traditionally connected with faith and Serbdom, in Dubrovnik the movement appeared clean and emancipated from other views, almost despite these views. That is where the Catholics declared themselves to be Serbs and there the Catholic Serbdom emerged. The appearance is rare, but natural. Although the majority of Serbs are Orthodox, the Orthodoxy is not the only feature of the Serbian tribe. A Catholic can be as good a Serb as an Orthodox. Faith is faith, ethnicity is ethnicity. But its appearance seemed dangerous to

some and the movement had enemies. Among the numerous enemies, priests were almost the most dangerous – Catholic priests, of course. The Catholic clergy looked upon the emergence of the Catholic Serbs as a transitional form between Catholicism and Orthodoxy and saw in it a danger to Catholicism. The Catholic Serbs would become Orthodox Serbs in time – that was what the clergy was thinking and they immediately placed themselves in the ranks of the enemies of the Serbian movement. This prejudice should have been broken and it should have been demonstrated that there is no danger; it should have been testified by strong argument that Serbdom was not a threat to Catholicism; one prominent Catholic priest should have declared himself as a Serb”.

People did not have to wait long for that Roman Catholic priest, because “Don Ivan Stojanović did just that - among the first and the most distinguished. Dum Ivan was a historian and a philosopher. He knew about the past of his Serbian people and he was a man free of prejudices. And he saw that, according to history and everything else, Dubrovnik is Serbian territory and that its inhabitants are Serbs. When he realised that, he was free-minded in his opinion that he dared to discern the difference between nationality and religion and did not have to hold on to the prejudice that Catholicism and Serbdom cannot go together. To arrive at that conclusion, he had to have knowledge of domestic history and courage. Dum Ivan had both. Because of that, this situation was possible – for him, a high-level Church official and Catholic, to call himself and feel himself to be a Serb. But Don Ivan was not satisfied with that. On the contrary, from day to day he was becoming a greater Serb. As his appearance caused the enemy to use intensive methods, Don Ivan fought against them and, in that struggle, he was becoming more and more arduous in his belief. Regardless of whether the attacks came from the Croats or from the clergy, Don Ivan defended his Serbian standpoint with more conviction and energy. His opinion became conviction, the conviction became feeling.”

A Short History of the Republic of Dubrovnik, by Prince Lujo Vojnović of Užice (New York, 1962), presents the key events in the history of Dubrovnik in chronological order and the author insists on the closeness of the Dubrovians, as an ethnic symbiosis of the Romans and the Serbs, with the neighbouring Serbian tribes, with special sympathies. He explains that the Dubrovians refused a proposal from the Russian Emperor Peter the Great to build an Orthodox church in the city “because Dubrovnik, a great friend of the Orthodox element in the Balkans, had a strict principle in its politics: that the absolute unity of confession was a prerequisite for political unity and, therefore, they must refuse to have another cult on its territory, because it feared external political influences - especially from the Bosnians and Herzegovinians, the subjects of the Sultan” (p. 137). Vojnović sees the causes of such attitude in the narrow Latin mind, in the atrophy of Balkan trade and in the fanaticism of the Jesuit church circles.

f) The Dubrovian Historian Mavro Orbin

The Serbdom and Pan-Slavism of Dubrovnik, as a dominant national self-determination, was expressed in its most complete form by the Benedictine abbot Mavro Orbin, whose ancestors moved from Kotor. His life's work *The Kingdom of the Slavs*, published in 1601, was designed to be "the history book of the whole Slavic tribe, so to speak, from the legendary biblical moments until the downfall of the Balkan medieval states and a poetical glorification of their past glory, as well as a polemical, passionate and even biased, apology of their historical actions, as well as a philosophical outlook on the centuries to come" (Miroslav Pantić: *Mavro Orbin – Life and Work*, the preface to the Mavro Orbin's book, *The Kingdom of the Slavs*, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1968, p. 14). Two years after publication, the Roman Catholic Church put Orbin's work on the list of prohibited books because, as an author, he was led by a desire for more complete and more truthful research and made references to heretical sources. "Orbin does not write an unbiased and objective, but an engaged and interested history, he wants his book to be an inspired and exalted ode to the "Slavic nation" and its virtues – heroic, moral and intellectual; he wanted to develop an extensive and epic picture for Romanic and Germanic readers – frowning with enmity but impressed at the same time- of a past full of heroic deeds, glory and triumph, unappreciated and unknown only because the Slavic people did not have anyone to paint such a picture because they were always engaged in wars" (p. LXVII).

Critical historiography did not exist in Orbin's time. Historians were more or less reliable in revealing facts, but an engaging approach to the targeted objective and the freedom of behaviour, with competition in literary acrobatics, went without saying. Orbin deems all the Slavs to be one nation and bases that on the identical origin and the identical language. In the first part of the book, the author gives the most space to his imagination; in his historiography and the historiographies of his predecessors, who connect the Slavic genesis to biblical times. The prehistoric life of the Slavs is a great mystery for modern science because of the lack of the written sources. Orbin's fiery patriotism, lyrical ardour and narrative pathos cannot impress the critical scientific spirit, but can have a great impact on the intellectual life and the social consciousness of his time, directly influencing a large number of subsequent spiritual workers. The propaganda of the Slavs was favourable for the Roman Catholic Church at the time, which wished for an all-encompassing uprising of the Christians of the Balkan against the Turkish authority, which would have helped the penetration of Catholicism into that area. Mavro Orbin is a devout Catholic who considers the Orthodox variant of Christianity to be a schism and feels sincerely sorry that the greatest Serbian medieval rulers persisted in their devotion to Orthodoxy.

Despite all the objective objections to the bad Italian, unskilled composition, unreliable data and the almost total copying of the Priest Dukljanin, the significance of Orbin's work should not be underestimated. "Orbin's visionary enthusiasm sometimes becomes poetry – though uncouth, in places even rustic and naïve in its own way, but heartfelt and sincere - and the polyphony of his words, heavily ornamented and

baroquely dynamic, had to have a powerful grip on its readers in the past centuries. Owing to those features, Orbin's work became not just a textbook of the Slavic history, but a textbook of Slavic patriotism" (p. LXXVIII – LXXIX).

In the second preface, after Pantić's, Radovan Samardžić emphasises that Orbin was the writer of the entire Serbian history. He elaborates extensively on the general European intellectual activities that influenced Orbin, but also a picture of the circumstances in the Serbian lands under Turkish occupation, where mass rebellions take place increasingly frequently, not only among the Orthodox Serbs, but also among the Muslims. "The Dubrovians are witnesses to how the Bosnian Muslims, expelled from the Sublime Porte by the sudden conversion of the Arbanasi to Islam, increasingly speak about their own land, people, language and blood in the middle of Constantinople and stick to the old Serbian traditions more and more stubbornly. The deep inner strength of these general waves, which did not have a bed to flow along into a movement, maybe best reveals the growth of historicism – the widespread and almost rapid revival of the works on biographies, annals and genealogies, on copying preserved documents, on translations and compilations; the emergence of new painters with wonderful realistic frescoes, the rejuvenation of oral traditions by translating the old songs and poems and the emergence of new ones. The intellectual basis for the re-emergence of the Serbs, as an ethnic mass, on the historical stage, meant one more confirmation and take over of medieval heritage. Mavro Orbin was inspired by all this to write his history; he and his work directly belongs to all that, in his own way" (p. CXXIII).

The work of Mavro Orbin was written in the urban environment of Dubrovnik, which already had a developed notion of their Slavic identity and the sense that they belong to Serbian history. Therefore, Samardžić refers to him as the witness to the epic renaissance of the Serbian people and states that Stojan Novaković said of the Dubrovians that they were "the first to succumb to the charm of the political poetry that reverberated after the fall of the Serbian state and nobility. All that was talked about and sang about among the people was known in Dubrovnik, which, in its own way, became crazy about the works that described their own people, for the heroes its people cared about and counselled were their assistants and bankers. They started to be proud of their past (p. CXXVI). Instead of the hagiographies, which prevailed until then, Orbin applied the new principles to Serbian history, vacillating, to tell the truth, between the traditional and the critical approach. His work is more worthy because of the influence it had on the people of his time, then because of its contents.

Orbin presented Slav prehistory based on legends and romantic enthusiasm, initially with reference to the Priest Dukljanin imagination, while all that was founded on real historical facts was almost completely related to the Serbian political and state past. Out of the total of 290 pages of the contemporary edition (which was shortened by the first and second chapters), ninety pages relates to Bulgarian history, a total of three pages relates to Croatian history and almost two hundred pages relate to Serbian history. Orbin gives profuse information on the ruling Nemanjić dynasty,

stating that a forefather of Nemanja was the Priest Stefan from a place called Luka in the region of Hum, who had the son called Ljubomir. A village in the vicinity of Dubrovnik is named after him today, the former name of which was Trnovo). Ljubomir was a distinguished warrior and, because of that, he became the zhupan of the region, which was named after him. His son was called Uroć, whose intelligence and courage were a match to his father's glory. Uroć had a son called Desa. Desa's sons were Miroslav, Konstantin and Nemanja.

Orbin and other Roman Catholic writers, whose works represent significant medieval historiographic sources, often express themselves in the form of lamentation because almost the entire Serbian nation belongs to the 'schismatic' Orthodoxy. Only in modern times have the wisest Serbian intellectuals given a precise answer to "a very important and delicate question – why Orthodoxy was better than Catholicism in the Serbian past - or why did Orthodoxy become so close to our psyche. The reasons for that, in our opinion, were as follows: Catholicism is more uniform, centralised, universal and dogmatic. There is not just one Eastern Church, but many, each with its own hierarchy, using the language of their respective peoples in their rituals and their provincial-national characteristics. In the West, the Roman Church took over all the power, centralised it in its own hands and gave the whole organisation a uniform scheme and uniform language – its own language, so that all Western churches look like old Roman colonies, as someone accurately observed. The church had its own separate politics, founded on principles of world domination and a certain spiritual cosmopolitanism and it was totally independent of the national and state formations. All hierarchy was directly subordinate to Rome and acted, most often, in line with instructions received from Rome. Therefore, because of its zeal, it often came into conflict with certain national trends, which Rome did not tolerate and which seemed dangerous or damaging to Rome. The will of Rome had to be unconditional and its principles sanctified and undisputable, which should have been conducted without compromise" (Vladimir Corović: *Movements and Works*, Geca Kon, Belgrade, 1921, p. 27).

The Serbs needed a national church that would strengthen the national state authority, expand its borders and power and develop the state-building ideas and national ideology. For that reason, the Serbian Church grew into the most authoritative national institution, which has been led by the principle of the state cause, searching for the optimal variant of its reconciliation with Christian moral principles and theological doctrine. "That what makes the Serbian Orthodoxy and the Serbian faith is not Orthodoxy or religion in general, but is what is connected to that faith - all the spiritual heritage of old, all the traditions and beliefs" (p. 34). This is why, for a Serb, a centuries' long struggle for national and state independence was the struggle for the Orthodox faith, which was enriched by his national being and refined by its heroic ethos at the same time. The devotion to the faith was represented by the capacity to resist all temptations, to bear suffering and resist the enemies of the tribe and clan. Therefore, in the Serbian version of Orthodoxy, the whole nation is the church and the national church is completely identified with the nation.

Serbian Macedonia encompasses only 37% of the total Macedonian territory and is concentrated mostly in the basin of the Vardar. The Bulgarian and the Greek part – Pirin and Aegean Macedonia - only exist today as a geographical region, with respect to the fact that the process of the systematic assimilation of the Macedonian population has been finalised there, as well as their assimilation into the Bulgarians and the Greeks. Only the part of Macedonia that was liberated from the Turkish yoke by the Serbian army exists today as a political entity, an independent homeland of the Macedonian nation. It cannot be said that the Macedonians are Serbs in the full sense of the word, but they are surely the ethnic group that is closest to the Serbs. The Serbs and the Macedonians are like twin brothers – they are not the same, but they are very similar. The name "Macedonian" was borrowed by the Slavs from the people of the ancient state of Macedonia, which was founded in the 7th century BC. The original Macedonians are people of Greek ethnic structure with a great deal of Illyrian and Thracian ingredients, as well as of some other prehistoric peoples the tribes that mixed and assimilated. Half way through the IV century BC, Macedonia took the leading role among the ancient Greek statelets and her ruler, Philip II, became the undisputed master of the Balkans. His son, Alexander the Great, embarked on a world conquest, going from victory to victory, each more amazing than the last, penetrating rapidly to the eastern- and southernmost part of the known civilised world at that time. His magnificent rise had a very brief duration and Alexander died in 323, most probably of poisoning.

Alexander's war efforts brought back rich booty for his soldiers and spread the Hellenistic culture but, at the same time, it weakened Macedonia, which overstrained herself far beyond her real capabilities. The Macedonian people died in his military campaigns in masses or settled in the conquered territories as the governing element, which also demographically weakened the parent state. The death of the ruler brought the rapid disintegration of his empire. The Gauls plundered Macedonia, took almost the entire population into slavery and devastated the whole territory. Macedonia recovered at the end of the 3rd century BC but, in the beginning of 2nd century, it was conquered by the Romans, who took it over in 168 and plundered it meticulously. In 148, Macedonia officially became a Roman province and several uprisings against the Roman occupation were crushed bloodily. The administrative status of Macedonia in the next few centuries changed from time to time and, at the time of Emperor Diocletian, it was merged into the diocese of Moesia, which encompassed the territory of modern Serbia, while Constantine incorporated it into the Praetorian prefecture of Illyricum. At the end of 3rd century AD, mass barbaric invasions started again. Macedonia was first devastated by the Costobocs, then by the Visigoths in the 4th century and then, in the 5th century, the Huns left it almost without a population. The Slavs also took part in the devastation of the eastern parts of the

Balkans, who were denominated in Byzantine sources as the 'Sclavenes', dominated by the Huns. In contrast to the Huns, the Sclavenes started settling the conquered territories more frequently.

a) The Slavic Settlement of Macedonia

In question here are the South-Carpathian Slavs, who were concentrated mostly from Djerdap to the confluence of the Danube. The Sclavenes belong to the same Slavic group as the Russians, the Ukrainians, the Belarusians and the Serbs, which had differentiated significantly before the settlement from the Czech group, which includes the Czechs, Polish, Slovaks, Croatians and Slovenes. A larger portion of the Sclavenes was subdued by the Bulgarians in the 5th century, who were assimilated by the Sclavenes, but who imposed their name and ruling classes on them. There was no assimilation of the Bulgarians into the Sclavenes in the territory of Macedonia, so that was the first ethnic differentiation of the Macedonians from the other Sclavenes. The second element of differentiation was the settlement of a limited number of Serbs in the vicinity of Thessalonica at the beginning of the 7th century. Since they were very close to the Sclavenes, those Serbs were quickly assimilated by them. Together, they also assimilated the remnants of the previous inhabitants of Macedonia. A different fate befell the Sclavenes north of the Danube however. They were assimilated by the much more numerous Romanians – and the today's Romanians originate from that ethnic mixture. The whole of the 6th century was marked by constant mass invasions of the Sclavenes from the eastern half of the Balkans to the Aegean Sea and Epirus in the west, while the western part of the Balkans was being rampaged by the Huns or the Avars.

The Byzantine resistance was becoming weaker and less successful and the Slavs' war booty was increasing, which increased their military power and increased their appetite for conquest. The systematic Slavic settlement of Macedonia lasted from the eighth decade of the 6th century to the second decade of the 7th century. "The Dragovites settled Southernmost, in the direction of the Bistrica River, and to the west from Thessalonica and Bar. Right next to them, the Velegesites settled and, to the north, between Ohrid, Bitolj and Veles, the Berzites (*Brsjaci*) were located and their name is preserved among the people to this day. In the vicinity of Thessalonica lived the Sagudates and, to the east of this city, toward the Struma River and on the Chalkidiki peninsula, lived the Rinhines. The *Strumjani* settled in the valleys of the Struma and Strumica rivers and the *Smiljani* were to the east of the river Mesta. A portion of the Dragovites later settled in Polog." (*The History of the Macedonian People*, Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, Belgrade, 1970, volume I, p. 73-74). For a century, the Slavs tried to take Thessalonica and encircle the entire Macedonian area, but all their attempts ended in failure, even when the Avars joined the siege.

Although they completely populated Macedonia and formed dense conglomerations of population in favourable areas, the Slavs continued to live in the clan/tribal organisation of social life for a long time, without

any serious attempts at forming a state. The clan/tribal military democracy had gradually transformed into the national municipalities, which became economic and political entities over time. The territorial organisations of the Slavic clan/tribal communities in Macedonia were called *sclavinias*, as in other Slavic territories. They were ruled by archonts or exarches, which is indicative of the standard Byzantine terminology, equivalent to the Slavic term prince or zhupan. Formally, the *sclavinias* recognised the supreme Byzantine emperor's authority but, in practice, they had a high level of autonomy and even practical independence, which was reflected in the wars against the Byzantine towns at a time the empire was weakened considerably. This state of affairs lasted until the campaign of Emperor Constantine II, who subdued the *sclavinias* and subjugated them to the executive central government in 658. Several Slav rebellions followed, but they were all crushed.

In 811, the Macedonian *sclavinias* joined the Bulgarian Khan Krum and the Avars. Together they defeated the Byzantine army of Emperor Nikephoros and executed him. The *Sclavinias* participated in Krum's campaign to conquer Constantinople in 814, but they remained relatively independent and without direct Bulgarian interference in their internal affairs. Krum died during that campaign and the subsequent period of peace lasted for several years. In 821, the rebellion of Toma the Slav began and the Macedonian *sclavinias* joined him in the siege of Constantinople but, after the failure of the rebellion, they fell under stricter Byzantine rule. In 836, a new Slavic uprising started but, after it was crushed, Byzantium was able to discontinue the *sclavinias* and expand its administration to cover the whole territory of Macedonia, within its system of themes. At the middle of the 9th century, the Bulgarian khagan attacked the whole territory of the *Slovan* tribe and, after 852, Khan Boris conquered the whole territory of Strumica and Bregalnica and crossed the Vardar to its right bank, penetrating Macedonia as far as Ohrid. Pursuant to the peace treaty between Byzantium and Bulgaria from 864, a greater portion of Macedonia came under Bulgarian rule, which was totally consolidated in the whole of Macedonia under the Bulgarian ruler Simeon between 893 and 927. At the same time, this is the period of the definite Christianisation of the Slavs, the creation of the Slavic alphabet and the enlightenment work of St. Cyril and St. Methodius, Clement and Naum, Presbyter Constantine and Chernorizets Hrabar, but also the work of priest Bogomil from the foot of the Babuna mountain and the emergence of the Bogomil movement, which would spread across Bulgaria, Macedonia, Raska and Bosnia. The Bulgarians destroyed the old clan/tribal social relations and introduced the purely feudal system on the territory of Macedonia.

b) Macedonia at the Time of Samuil

One of the most powerful magnates of the Bulgarian state at the time of Emperor Petar was Nikola, who was of Armenian origin. After Petar's death, Nikola's sons David, Mojsije, Aron and Samuil rebelled in 969 to seize the throne. In order to prevent that, Byzantium helped Petar's son Boris become the Emperor of Bulgaria, at a time when the Russians were

advancing from the east and the rebellion raged to the south of Sofia. After the Byzantine army defeated the Russian Prince Svjatislav in 971, Byzantine Emperor John I Tzimiskes overthrew Boris from the throne and took him captive in Constantinople, annexing Bulgaria to Byzantium. Nikola's sons lay low until the death of Tzimiskes in 976 and started a new rebellion, this time against the Byzantine rule. The four brothers ruled as a tetrarchy, but then David and Mojsije died in different places. There was a conflict between Aron and Samuilo, in which Samuilo won and liquidated his brother and his family, except for one son. Being a very capable military leader, Samuilo conquered large territories of Macedonia, Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia very soon thereafter. He declared himself the Bulgarian ruler and established his capital in Prespa. In 986, Samuilo defeated Byzantine Emperor Basil II at Trajan's Gate, near Sofia. Having used the inner Byzantine turmoil and fights for the throne, he continued with his successful conquests and occupied all of Raška and Duklja, tricking the Serbian King Jovan Vladimir and taking him prisoner in Prespa. He burned Kotor and Dubrovnik, then devastated Bosnia and Dalmatia, as far as Zadar.

As a prisoner, Jovan Vladimir married Samuilo's daughter Kosara and Samuilo declared him king and returned Serbia to him and to his uncle Dragomir of Travunia. In 995 Samuilo besieged Thessalonica and, in 996, he was defeated by the Byzantine army deep in Greek territory. Directly after that defeat, Samuilo declared himself emperor, as soon as Pope Gregory V gave him the royal crown. Soon, Samuilo was betrayed by his daughter Miroslava and his son-in-law Ašot, to whom he had entrusted the administration in the region of Drač and they fled to Constantinople. Basil II razed many of Samuilo's fortresses in the area of Sophia and sent the army to march across the Marica River. In the third attack in 1001, the Byzantine army took over Serbia, which opened the way for them towards Thessaly. In 1002, they took Vidin as well, but the majority of their troupes had to turn to face the Arabs who threatened Asia Minor. In that same year, in a counterattack, Samuilo took over Adrianople and plundered it systematically.

Basil II personally started to chase Samuilo's army, attacked him suddenly at the right bank of the Vardar near Skopje and forced him to flee. As the commander of Skopje, Samuilo appointed the formerly castrated Roman Emperor Petar's younger son, who surrendered the city to the Byzantine leader. Samuilo's son, driving away his wife, the Hungarian princess, provoked a fight with the Hungarian King Stephan I who defeated Samuilo. Considerably weakened, Samuilo was defeated by Basil II at Belasica in 1014. Samuilo managed to escape to the fortified town of Prespa and Basil II blinded 10,000 of his imprisoned soldiers, leaving each hundredth one their eyes so that they could lead the others to their leader. When Samuilo saw his blind soldiers, he collapsed from grief and died in two days – his rule lasted for 38 years. The country survived even after Samuilo's death, encompassing all the Serbian territories as far as the Cetina, almost all of Macedonia and a larger part of Bulgaria, Albania, Epirus and Thessaly. Contemporaries called that country Bulgaria, although the Bulgarians represented a convincing minority of

the population. Although all the Serbs and the Macedonians lived in his country, with some of the Bulgarians and the Greeks, Samuilo wanted to preserve the Bulgarian state-building traditions. In Samuilo's time, the Archbishopric of Ohrid was established and the archbishoprics of Dubrovnik and Drač were located in his country. As far as church was concerned, he made it as independent as possible and necessary to an independent state. Given that the Christian Church at that time had not been definitively divided, he could find support from the Roman Pope and could oppose the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

Emperor Samuilo was succeeded by his son Gavrilko Radomir. Basil II continued with his attacks, but he managed to win over Jovan Vladislav, Samuilo's brother and Aron's son, whose life was once spared by Gavrilko Radomir. Jovan Vladislav killed Radomir in a hunt in 1015 at Ostovo, executed his wife and blinded his eldest son. Jovan Vladislav then called Jovan Vladimir to Prespa on false pretences and murdered him. The Archbishop of Ohrid, David, actively participated in this plot. Emperor Basil II did not trust Jovan Vladislav's oath of allegiance, so he began a war against him, taking over Pelagonia and Ohrid. Vladislav's army attacked him from the rear and defeated him in Pelagonia, which prevented the further realisation of Basil's plans. The action of the Byzantine army in 1016 in the vicinity of Sofia was short lived, as well as the breakthrough to southern Macedonia the following year, in which Vladislav was defeated. When the Byzantines retired in 1018, Jovan Vladislav began retaking Drač and was killed in the siege, probably by his own subjects. Upon Jovan Vladislav's death, Basil II entered his country peacefully and all the cities surrendered to him, as did the regional military leaders. In return, he declared them Byzantine nobles and gave them new duties. The emperor was kind to Vladislav's widow and children, as well as toward other relatives. Byzantium peacefully restored her authority in all the Serbian countries, except for Srem, the ruler of which, Sermo, remained unyielding. He was soon murdered by Constantine Diogenes, a strategos of the nearby region, on the emperor's order and Diogenes took his place and role. By the beginning of 1019, Basil II managed to pacify, annex and change the military and administrative organisation of Samuilo's great country, so he returned to Constantinople with a huge trophy. The Macedonians were subject to Byzantine feudal duties. Certain autonomy of the Ohrid Archbishopric was maintained, but the Patriarchate of Constantinople took great care that the Greeks were always on the throne of the archbishopric.

The tax reforms and the transformation of the barter system into a monetary economy as early as 1040, led to the major insurrection of Petar Deljan, Gavrilko Radomir's son with a Hungarian woman who had been chased away while pregnant when her husband fell in love with a beautiful slave girl from Larissa. The Hungarian king helped the rebels, so the insurrection was most violent in the Belgrade and the Morava region – the purely Serbian areas in the Hungarian vicinity. From Belgrade to Skopje, the numbers of the insurgents were growing and Skopje fell easily. The Byzantine army underwent riots, even open mutinies, and a soldier named Tihomir was declared Emperor. In order to avoid a discord

among the insurgents, Tihomir was soon murdered and the people thought the only emperor was Petar Deljan. Soon, Petar conquered Drač and headed towards Thessalonica. The Byzantine emperor, who went there for medical treatment, fled. The insurrection spread deep into Greece and the insurgents seized all the Serbian and Macedonian territories, as well as Bulgarian. The insurgents were soon joined by Jovan Vladislav's other son, the Strategos Alusian. Petar entrusted him with the operation of conquering Thessalonica, but the insurgents were defeated there. Petar and Alusian fell out, so Alusian poisoned Petar Deljan and surrendered himself to the Byzantine emperor. After that the royal army crushed the uprising effortlessly. A lot of Macedonians were taken as slaves and the country was devastated. The feudal duties became harder and the Byzantine administrative apparatus stronger.

In 1066, a Macedonian insurrection broke out in Larissa, but it was soon crushed. A much more significant insurgence took place in 1072, led by Đorđe Vojteh, with Skopje as its base. Upon the direct call of the rebels, Mihailo, King of Zeta, sent his son Konstantin Bodin with his three hundred horsemen to help. The overjoyed insurgents in Prizren proclaimed Bodin as emperor, under the name of Petar. Under Bodin's command, the insurgent army devastated the Byzantines near Prizren. After that, Bodin divided the rebel forces in two; sent one part, under Duke Petrilo's command, towards Ohrid while he went with the other part toward Niš. Petrilo took over Ohrid and Devol without any problems, but he was defeated in front of Kostur. In the other part, Bodin had more significant results, but he stopped on hearing of Petrilo's defeat. Facing a large Byzantine army, Đorđe Vojteh surrendered Skopje and Bodin was defeated and imprisoned at the Kosovo polje. Vojteh died from torture and Bodin was taken to Constantinople, where his father saved him with the help of the Venetians. The uprising was still smouldering, to be finally crushed in 1073.

In 1082, the Normans, led by Robert Guiscard, encroached into Macedonia via Drač and conquered almost all of it, inflicting several serious defeats on the Byzantines, but in 1085 they were chased away. The Macedonian people then suffered double pains - from Norman plunder and the Byzantine lust for revenge. After the Normans retreated, the endangered Macedonians were helped by Bodin, who had succeeded his father on the throne in the meantime. At the news of Bodin's successful penetration into the Ohrid region, the Macedonian Slavs relapsed into their rebellious mood. From the north, the Byzantines were attacked by the Zhupan of Raška, Vukan. Emperor Alexios I Comnenos (who sent his army against the Serbs unsuccessfully in 1091, 1093 and 1094) – failing to win the battles, he reached a compromise. There were no massive uprisings, but there were also no repressions.

In 1096, the Crusaders invaded via Albania, bringing misery to the Macedonian farmers and stealing everything they could. The Crusaders' plunder lasted until the end of 1096. The next crusade was crushed by the Byzantines in 1107 and 1108 in Debar and they were thrown out of Albania, but it required a huge mobilization of the Macedonian people.

In 1185, the Crusaders completely annihilated the Byzantine authority

in Macedonia, taking over Thessalonica. The Macedonian feudal lord, Dobromir Hrs, rebelled against the central authority, while Stefan Nemanja, the Zhupan of Raška, attacked the Byzantine territories on the upper course of the Vardar and the Struma, destroying a large number of fortresses, including the fortress of Skopje. After the departure of the Crusaders, Dobromir Hrs was imprisoned but the emperor later released him and proclaimed him the ruler of Strumica. Soon, Dobromir rebelled again and became independent, capturing the important fortress of Prosek at the entrance to Demir Kapija. Here, in 1199, a huge attack by the Byzantine army was annihilated. The emperor had to accept an agreement, so Dobromir remained a feudal lord on his arbitrarily expanded territories. Soon Dobromir Hrs rebelled again, but he was defeated after huge successes in the beginning. In 1203, Prosek was taken over by the Bulgarians. In 1204, the Crusaders conquered Constantinople, tore Byzantium apart and established the Kingdom of Thessalonica (led by Boniface of Montferrat) on the majority of the Macedonian territory and started to plunder without scruples. The Bulgarians spread to Skoplje and Ohrid, and they attacked and devastated Ser in 1205, which was in the Crusaders' hands. In 1207, the Bulgarian Emperor Kaloyan besieged Thessalonica, but died during the siege. A nobleman named Strez fled from his son Boris and controlled a good part of Macedonia, for which undertaking Serbia offered crucial assistance. Soon, he made peace with the Bulgarians and, in 1212, with Serbian and Bulgarian help, he attacked the Crusaders in Pelagonia but without success. In 1241, he died, probably of poisoning. Immediately after that, Ohrid and Skopje fell under the authority of Epirus, which Serbia and Bulgaria could not have prevented. In 1230, the Bulgarians defeated the Epirus army at Klokotnica, which brought them power over Thrace, Macedonia and a part of Albania. The Bulgarians lost their domination over Macedonia in 1341 when Emperor Jovan Asen II died, and also because of the Mongolian threat. The Nicaean army conquered Macedonia and kept her until 1258 - i.e. until the invasion of the Serbian army, which liberated Skopje, Prilep and Kičevo. The restoration of Byzantium in 1261 led the restoration of its power over Macedonia.

In 1282, King Milutin of Serbia took over the Upper and Lower Polog, Skopje, Ovče polje, Zletovo, Pijanec, Poreč, Kičevo and Debar regions. Soon, the joint forces of Milutin and Dragutin reached the upper course of the river Struma and Kratopolje. For the next forty years, all the annexed territories remained within the Serbian state. Stefan Dečanski then continued the expansion, taking over Stip, Črešće, Veles and Prosek, controlling the middle reaches of the Vardar and Bregalnica rivers, opening the way towards Thessalonica. In 1328, the Serbian army reached Ohrid. The Byzantines temporarily returned several smaller places but, in 1334, King Stefan Dušan continued the conquests and captured Ohrid, Zeleznec, Prilep, Cemren and Strumica. In 1343, the Serbs took over Kostur, Lerin and Voden, and, two years after that, Ser and Dervent. Dušan's Serbia encompassed almost all of Macedonia, except for Thessalonica. After Dušan's death, the Serbian state gradually declined and, on the Macedonian territories, Empress Jelena, Uglješa and Vukašin

Mrnjavčević, Ćesar Vojihna, Duke Hlapen, Despot Oliver, Sevastocrator Vlatko, Konstantin and Jovan Dragaš, Sevastokrator Branko (Grgur's son) etc., were becoming independent as feudal lords. After the Serbian tragedy in the Battle of Marica in 1371, Vukašin's son King Marko and the Dragaš brothers became Turkish vassals, Vuk Branković controlled the Skopje region and, in the Ohrid region, Grand Zhupan Andrej Gropa became independent. The Turks were invading Macedonia from time to time, plundering, killing and taking people into slavery. Between 1383 and 1392, the Turks took over all of Macedonia without problems and kept it under their rule for more than five hundred years.

c) Macedonia under the Turkish Slavery

A considerable number of Macedonian people moved to the north before the Turks, deep into Serbia, and a great number of Macedonian people were taken as slaves. A certain number of Turks from Asia Minor were settled as support for the military/administrative apparatus. The Turkish settlements were mostly established on the important strategic roads and there was a military garrison in each larger city. The town population was more subject to Islamisation and, very soon, almost all the cities had a Muslim majority. Numerous Jewish colonies were formed, as well. The Orthodox Christians were second class citizens and the Turkish feudal organization formed a solid religious barrier between the two antagonistic classes. At first there were many Christian landowners, but that did not last for long, given that the Serbian feudal families easily became Turkish. The church remained one of the great feudal landowners, but the largest temples were transformed into mosques and the building of new churches was prohibited. In the 17th century, the Roman Catholic propaganda was becoming stronger and even the four archbishops of Ohrid Porfirije, Atanasije, Avramije and Meletije - secretly propagated the attempted introduction of the Greek Roman rite. Their attempts ended in failure because the people, despite all their troubles, remained faithful to Orthodoxy and their hopes to escape from Turkish slavery were attached to the homogeneous and co-religious Russia.

Because of the unbearable feudal taxes, blood tax and constant harassment, the farmers of the Mavrovo and Prilep regions rebelled in 1564, which was crushed by the Turkish army the next year. For centuries, the *hajduk* way of living represented a frequent phenomenon and, very often, the *hajduk* units were reminiscent of military units in their numbers. The greatest Macedonian uprising against the Turks was the Karpoš's rebellion in 1689, which was stirred by the invasion of the Austrian commander Piccolomini near Skopje and by the fact that the Serbs had already rebelled in all the Serbian territories. Skopje was taken and burned to the ground. Piccolomini's successor Holstein annihilated the Turks at Stip and one Serbian unit of the Austrian army entered Veles. Those towns were also plundered and burned down and the Austrian army retreated with the trophies. The more the Turks were suffering defeats on battlefields, the more unbearable they were for the common people. Karpoš, the leader of the *hajduci*, started the rebellion between Skopje and

IT-03-67-T
Kyustendil, but it soon spread to the Niš, Leskovac, Pirot, Prizren and Vranje regions. Kriva Palanka represented the *haiduk* stronghold. The Austrian Emperor recognised Karpoš as the king of Kumanovo. The defeat of the Austrian army and the large concentrations of the Turkish forces vitally jeopardized the rebels and they retreated towards Kumanovo where, with major sacrifices, they were defeated. Karpoš was captured and publicly impaled in Skopje. The rebellious territory was plundered and burned down, a lot of people were murdered and even more were taken prisoners. A lot of Macedonians, together with some Serbs, took refuge to the north of the Sava and the Danube, and some even reached Russia. However, the frequent Turkish defeats in 18th century brought a weakening of the central powers, some of the local feudal lords escaped the centralised authorities and bandit activities started to flourish, such as the *haračlije* and *krđalije* gangs, which added to the misery of the Christians - and often also of the Muslim population. The Turks strove to settle as many Arbanasi as they could - the massacres they committed against Christians were the most bestial. A particular blow to the Christian population was the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć and the Ohrid Archbishopric in 1767 and subjugation under the Church jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which implied the domination of the Fanariot vladikas, Greek priests and the denationalisation of the Church organisation.

The First Serbian Uprising at the beginning of 19th century shook all the Turkish dominions in the Balkans. The internal crisis of the universal Islamic empire was reflected through the weak foreign policy, military failures and interior turmoil. Centrifugal tendencies strengthened again, the feudal lords became independent, the administrative system was sinking into self-will and banditism became a mass phenomenon, either as a form of mutiny of the enslaved peoples or as criminal activities for the privileged ranks of society, who broke free from any control. The increased state spending caused a growth in tax liability for the farmers and led to utter lack of their motivation for the production growth. This only produced the aspiration to get to the city in any way they could and enjoy the city life. A sudden influx of the village population changed the ethnic structure of the Macedonian cities, restraining their former ethnic character and stirring the development of artisan trade, mining and trade, as well as the emergence of a stronger bourgeois class, which would revive the free national and religious consciousness, but also show political ambitions. Many Macedonians played a significant part in both Serbian uprisings and, in 1822, they themselves rose in the Njeguš Uprising, which included the voden and all the villages as far as the confluence of the Bistrica, threatening Thessalonica. The Turks crushed this insurgency cruelly and many insurgents fled to the liberated parts of Serbia. The Turkish rule was forced to introduce certain reforms to the *timar* and *čitluk* feudal systems (Translator's note: forms of feudal real estate in the Ottoman Empire) to somewhat mitigate the discontent of the Christian common people. The reforms caused real mutinies among the Turkish feudals and the first half of 19th century was marked by the crushing of these by the central authorities – in which the Orthodox

d) Decades of the Insurgencies

Macedonia was seized at that time with a deep political differentiation of the population. While the Muslims connected their existence with the Turkish rule and only saw their future in that, the Macedonians were seeking their perspective in getting closer to the Serbs and numerous Aromanians decided on the Greek option. Through great bribery of the Turkish leaders, the Bulgarians managed to obtain a decree on the establishment of the Bulgarian Orthodox exarchate in 1870, which was independent of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The Macedonian Episcopates of Veles, Skopje and Ohrid were merged into the Bulgarian eparchy by force, as were the Serbian, Nis and Pirot episcopates. Instead of the Greek language, which had had a preferential status, Bulgarian was imposed and the Macedonian intellectuals reacted by forming the people's schools and libraries, collecting and publishing popular Macedonian literature and writing and publishing a large number of textbooks in Macedonian, some of which were printed in Belgrade. Gradually, favourable circumstances emerged for the Macedonian language to grow into the literary language.

All the aspiration and the economic status, the systematic persecutions of the self-willed Turkish authorities and bad crops years, led to the Great Razlovski Uprising in 1876 – the immediate cause of which were the repressive measures at the time of the Russian, Serbian and Montenegrin war against the Turks, as well as the stirring of Islamic religious fanatics, which led to the murder of the French and the German consul in Thessaloniki. Then there was a *coup d'etat* in Constantinople and Sultan Abdülaziz was ousted from the throne and executed amid allegations that he had a mild attitude toward his Christian subjects. The leader of the Razlovski Uprising was DMITAR PATORGİJEV BEROVSKI, who had lived in Belgrade for a long time and distinguished himself in the battles against the Turks, who bombarded the Serbian capital in 1862. The Turks crushed this uprising, but BEROVSKI, although wounded in the head, escaped with his closest companions from the Turkish encirclement and continued his engagements in the war. The civilian population was subjected to Turkish revenge and plunder, which further increased the desire for resistance. Already in the following year, the haiduk movements broke out in the form of support of the Russian and Serbian war efforts. The main role was again played by DMITAR BEROVSKI. Many Macedonian volunteers joined the Russian or Serbian army. The Russians, the Serbs and the Macedonian insurgents penetrated deeply into Macedonia.

Pursuant to the Treaty of San Stefano, Russia and Turkey agreed to territorially expand and recognise the state independence of Serbia, Montenegro and Romania and to render Bulgaria a vassal and an autonomous state within the Turkish Empire, which would encompass many Serbian and Macedonian national territories. The Russian army was stationed on the Bulgarian vassal territory in order to facilitate the establishment of the autonomous institutions of administration. The

European Forces opposed that and the Treaty of San Stefano was revised in 1878 at the Congress of Berlin, though Macedonia remained under the Turkish rule. The Macedonians were mostly affected by the fact that a huge number of Muslim *muhajir* moved out of the Serbian and Bulgarian areas and settled in Macedonia, changing the ethnic structure of the population and making the liberation efforts even more difficult. The Muslim refugees were regularly revenged on the Macedonian Christians. A huge number of villages were plundered and burned. The activities of the Shqiptar gangs, who plundered and even endangered larger cities, were increased. The Macedonians had no choice than to join the anti-Turkish companies and save their lives in that way. At the end of 1878, the Kresnenski Uprising broke out in the Struma region. The leader of the Uprising was a Russian Cossack named Ataman Adam Kolmikov and the chief of staff was DMITAR BEROVSKI. The British government assisted the Turks in crushing the uprising and in the swift transport of troops. The leaders of the uprising fell out and the Bulgarian agents liquidated Vojvoda Stojan Karastojlov, while BEROVSKI narrowly escaped. This led to disorder in the ranks of the insurgents and it was easier for the Turks to crush the uprising in 1879.

In the second half of 1880, the south-western parts of Macedonia were immersed in the Brsjacki Uprising – the conspirators started the uprising by liquidating the greatest Turkish criminals. The insurgents liquidated many bandit groups but their leader, Stevan Petrevski, was tricked and poisoned by the Turks in 1882, while other prominent insurgents were sentenced to long-term prison sentences. The end of 19th century was marked by increasing tensions and contradictions between the Serbian, Bulgarian and Greek interests in Macedonia. The Greek influence was limited to the Kutsovlahs and Aromanian population and the establishment of Greek schools for their needs. The Bulgarians controlled the church organisation via their exarchate and connected the educational and cultural institutions to it, intending to force the Bulgarian language and national consciousness on the population. The Serbs also considered the Macedonians to be their compatriots and wanted to eventually annex Macedonia to Serbia, but the Serbian propaganda was more subtle and books were printed in the Macedonian dialects, Macedonians were given various incentives in the liberated Serbia, etc. The Roman Catholic propaganda grew stronger as well, owing to the Macedonian resistance to the Bulgarianisation of the church and the variant of the Greek-Catholic restoration of the Ohrid Archbishopric. The presence of the protestant missionaries was felt more and more and the national and religious differentiations between the Macedonians were increasingly becoming more complex and precarious.

Subsequent to various conspiratorial initiatives, the Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation and the Central Macedonian Committee were established in Thessalonica in 1894. The chairman of the Committee was Hristo Tatarev and the secretary general was Dime Gruev. In an ideological sense, their leaders were mostly under the influence of the Russian populists, but also the anarchists, Mazzini's *Young Italy* and Garibaldi and his followers. The organisation proclaimed the autonomy of

Macedonia and the awakening of the self-protective consciousness of the Macedonians as its goals and, from the organisational standpoint, it insisted on Macedonian ethnic exclusivity, although there were many intellectuals educated in Bulgaria. In the start of the bitter struggle against the Bulgarian exarchate organisation and her politics, this remedied all the initial Bulgarophile delusions most efficiently. That motivated the Bulgarian government to intensify its own propaganda and guerrilla activities, demanding that the Turks restrain Serbian propaganda at the same time. In order to counteract the Macedonian revolutionary organisation, in 1895, at the congress of all Macedonian emigrant associations in Sofia, the Macedonian committee was established with pronounced pro-Bulgarian aspirations. The Bulgarian guerrilla companies did not achieve any significant results, but managed to exacerbate the status of the Macedonian people under the Turkish rule and discredit its position in the world public opinion. This would motivate the Macedonian revolutionaries to insist even more on the autochthonous status and independence of their movement at the Congress of Thessalonica in 1896.

Strained financial circumstances forced the revolutionaries to resort to terrorist methods for obtaining money, mostly by kidnapping rich Turks for ransom. The most successful feat was the kidnapping of the American missionary Miss Stone in 1901, which was staged by the prominent revolutionary Jane Sandanski. This generated a large amount of money for the Organisation and much international publicity – though bad publicity. Often they would resort to the violent collection of 'voluntary' contributions from rich Macedonians. The Organisation had become well-armed and soon began establishing guerrilla companies. The revolutionary movement was becoming more numerous and teachers played the most prominent role in it. Pro-Bulgarian leaders posed less and less competition. Illegal press blossomed, but the revolutionary propaganda still remained undeveloped due to the minimal number of copies printed and the illiteracy of the majority of the Macedonian people. The Organisation started building rudimentary forms of parallel authorities, even a secret police, judiciary and tax system. Certain municipalities broke free from the exarchate domination and became totally independent in the religious sense. The Turkish authorities sometimes broke into the illegal structure of the Macedonian revolutionaries, which led to mass arrests, torture and liquidations. Competing revolutionary organisations were founded, such as the socialists, but they did not manage to achieve a more significant foothold among the people. The *Vrhovisti*, as the activists of the pro-Bulgarian Supreme Macedonian Committee, with their seat in Sofia and led by the Bulgarian generals, organised the killing of Macedonian revolutionaries, incited the skirmishes of the Bulgarian and Macedonian guerrillas and, with their premature and reckless *Gornjodzumajski* Uprising of 1902, provoked the additional Turkish reprisals against the Macedonian people.

The internal Macedonian revolutionary organisation systematically prepared for armed rebellion, but, while its main leaders had to retreat into deep anonymity or take refuge abroad. The agent of the Bulgarian government and secret *Vrhovisti* exponent Ivan Garvanov got hold of the

function of chairman, although the absent Goce Delčev, Djordje Petrov and Jane Sandanski opposed that. This led to an internal schism and, after the Thessalonica assassinations and diversions, the Turkish authorities arrested a great number of Macedonian national fighters. Soon, Goce Delčev died in the vicinity of Serez, in a skirmish with the Turkish army, and the Turks arrested Ivan Garvanov in Thessalonica. The uprising began in the Bitola region on 2 August, on Saint Elias Day, in 1903, while the best organisation was presented by the insurgents in the region of Kruševo, under the leadership of Nikola Karev. Kruševo fell to the hands of the insurgents and became the main stronghold of the *Ilinden* Uprising (Translator's note: the St. Elias Day Uprising) and the Republic of Kruševo. The Republic formed a provisional government and began organising life in the liberated areas. However, the uprising did not have a mass character, except in the region of Bitola and in the Thessalonica, Skopje and Adrianople districts. Therefore, it was reduced to intensive guerrilla warfare actions. In the district of Seres, there was a skirmish between the Macedonian national and *Vrhovisti* companies. In order to crush the uprising, the Turks engaged a mass of 170 thousand soldiers and almost five hundred cannons. Despite the great courage of the fighters in the fighting, which lasted for three months, the uprising was broken. The angry Turks committed a major massacre of Macedonian civilians after that. Almost ten thousand people were killed. But the tragedy of the Macedonian people achieved great international attention, increasing the animosity toward Turkish rule.

In order to mitigate the difficult position of the Macedonians, the emperors of Russia and Austria imposed the so called Mürzsteg Reforms in 1903, which were put into effect the next year and implied the control of the European forces over the activities of the Turkish administration. In 1904, an agreement between Serbia and Bulgaria regarding the division of the spheres of interest in Macedonia intensified their infiltration of guerrilla companies into Macedonian territory. The Bulgarian guerrillas and *Vrhovisti* were under the command of the Bulgarian general Cenev and their activity became massive in 1905. The *Vrhovisti* entered into a fight with the companies of Jane Sandanski and suffered a heavy defeat at the hands of the Macedonian nationalists in the Melnik area. In 1904, the Serbian government began the Chetnik action and intensified their activities in 1905, especially in the Kumanovo, Skopje, Palanka, Kratovo, Brod and Kičevo area. The Serbian Chetniks engaged in intensive battles with the Bulgarian guerrillas and *Vrhovisti*. The most prominent Serbian Chetnik vojvodas were Gligor Sokolović, Jovan Babunski, Jovan Dovezenski, Vasilije Trbić and others. The Greek guerrilla companies were active in the Thessalonica area. During that time, the internal Macedonian revolutionary organization was going through a crisis, problems, conflicts, disputes and altercations with the *Vrhovisti*, convening a large number of congresses and trying in vain to recover their former political strength and a foothold among the Macedonian people.

A new significant moment in the Macedonian political circumstances was ushered by the Young Turks movement in 1908, which the Macedonian Christian population joined in enthusiasm. The centre of the

Young Turks was in Thessalonica. The revolution managed to topple Sultan Abdülhamid II and bring Mehmed V to the throne, but the consolidation of the Young Turks in power significantly exacerbated the position of the Macedonians. Disappointed and systematically persecuted, the Macedonian national revolutionaries established the People's Federative Party, which changed the course of actions from primarily armed struggle to parliamentary activities. The main leaders of the party were Dmítar Vlahov and Jane Sandanski. Directly after the congress of association, the Bulgarian agents made a second attempt to assassinate Sandanski, who was seriously injured. Vlahov soon became a representative in the Turkish Parliament.

The party was soon immersed in fractional conflicts and, in 1910, Vlahov excluded Sandanski, attempting to distance himself from the revolutionary elements. The extraordinary congress then excluded Vlahov, but the Young Turks movement soon prohibited the party. In that same year, the Serbian organization, which had two representatives in the Turkish Parliament, was also excluded, as was the Association of Bulgarian Clubs, which did not have a Parliamentary status. The pronounced violence of the Young Turks' course provoked even more intensive Chetnik actions, but also terrorism against the Muslim population. In Turkey, the internal conflicts were also intensified, leading to real political chaos.

e) The Serbian Liberation of Macedonia

In 1912, Serbia and Bulgaria made a military pact and agreed on the division of Macedonia. Greece and Montenegro soon joined this pact. On 18 October 1912, the allies declared war on Turkey. The Serbian army severely defeated the Turks near Kumanovo and soon took over Skopje, which was saved from being destroyed in the war by foreign consuls who talked the Turks into leaving it without fight. The Serbs defeated the Turks again near Bitola and forced them to run. The Serbs liberated almost the entire Vardar Macedonia. The Bulgarians gained territories on the Aegean coast and the Greeks entered Thessaloniki. A large number of Macedonians joined the Serbian army, but also the Bulgarian one in its zone of operation. The Second Balkan War broke out in 1913 over the boundaries in Macedonia and Bulgaria was defeated in it, losing a enormous amount of territory: after the peace of Bucharest, the division of Macedonia became definite. Serbia could not cancel the military government in its part of Macedonia because it had to suppress the Albanian unrest, most of Muslims emigrated to Turkey and WWI had already broken out. 50,000 Macedonians were recruited into the Serbian army and they fought heroically on every front. Although the allies asked that Serbia sacrificed Macedonia so that Bulgaria could be won over, the Serbian government would not agree to that at any cost because they considered, felt and accepted Macedonia to be an integral part of Serbdom in the true sense of the word.

When Serbia found itself in a highly difficult situation in 1915, Bulgaria entered the war and, after difficult fighting near Krivolak, took

over the Serbian part of Macedonia. The front line was formed on the Serbian-Greek border and it was held by the Bulgarians in the north and by the Anglo-French troops in the south. The Bulgarian troops also took over the eastern part of Aegean Macedonia, forming a front at the Struma River. In 1916, the Serbs and French liberated Bitola, formed a new line and continued position fighting. The Bulgarian and German occupying forces treated the Macedonian population brutally and put it through severe reprisals. "For the entire period of the occupation, the Bulgarians and their German allies performed requisitions of all sorts – human and cattle food, massively confiscating and slaughtering cattle, taking material and cultural wealth out of Macedonia, massively sending the population into coerced concentration camp labour, recruiting and mobilising the Macedonian population capable of serving the army and forcedly included them into the war, massively interning and deporting civilians and committing pogroms and massacres in many settlements. These were the basic and daily traits of the multi-party occupation of Macedonia. Thousands of Macedonians succumbed to hunger, disease, physical exhaustion and war devastation at that time" (*The History of the Macedonian People*, Book II, p. 368). In several incidents of coerced weapon confiscation from the people, a large number of Macedonians were shot and dozens of villages were burned, but this could not suppress the guerrilla resistance to the occupying forces. Great numbers of forcedly mobilised Macedonians deserted from the Bulgarian army and there were also several armed rebellions in units and these were quelled ruthlessly. After the breakthrough of the Thessaloniki front in 1918, the Serbian part of Macedonia was liberated and, in 1919, the area of Strumica was included in it, with approximately 60,000 inhabitants.

It was only after WWI that Vardar Macedonia was entirely integrated into the other Serbian countries inside the Yugoslav state. War devastation caused a deep economic and social crisis and the authorities clumsily performed an agrarian reform that, together with the unquestionable influence of the Bolshevik revolution, led to the penetration of destructive Communist ideology. The state bureaucracy did not have an ear for the ethnic, cultural and linguistic individualities of Macedonia, especially the average level of education of the population, while the Bulgarian government continued inserting *Komita* gangs, subjecting the remnants of the former VMRO (Translator's note: the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization) to its immediate control. In the western areas, the Albanian killing gangs were still active. The strongest standpoints in the Macedonian territory were held by the Radical, Democrat Parties and the Turkish-Muslim Dzemiet Party. The Communists had significant successes in the local and parliamentary elections, until the Communist Party of Yugoslavia was prohibited by the Proclamation as subversive and instrumentalised by foreign forces. The central power cancelled the found feudal relations and the Turks, a lot of local Muslims and some Albanians emigrated to Turkey. Based on the agrarian reform, 40% of the total agrarian fund was given to the Macedonian landless and poor peasants and the remaining 60% was inhabited by the landless peasants from the thickly inhabited areas, since

Macedonia was poorly inhabited, below the Yugoslav average. In 1921, in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, there was an average of 49 inhabitants to a square kilometre and, in Macedonia, there were only 31. The Radical Party publicly expressed its willingness to use the Macedonian dialect as official in the work of the state administration, although there were no serious attempts to shape this language in a literary way and regulate it. There could not be any mention of special national oppression, simply because the regime was guided by the concept of integral Yugoslavism, so putting up Serbian flags was prohibited as a misdemeanour.

The tragedy of historical fate led the Pirin Macedonians, who resisted Bulgarisation the most, to confront the Supremacists and follow Sandanski into the Bulgarian state. The Macedonians were most numerous and most ethnically compact in the Pirin area. Right after the end of WWI, a strong autonomist movement was restored there and it insisted on the preservation of all Macedonian national and territorial and it had a significant position among the Macedonian emigrants – intellectuals. Bulgaria and Greece held a convention on the exchange of population aside from the Peace Treaty of Neuilly, and this meant that the Macedonians and Bulgarians from Aegean Macedonia and Thrace moved into Bulgaria and the Greeks from Bulgaria moved to Turkey. The Macedonian refugees emigrated all over Bulgaria, facilitating their denationalisation. The Supremacists formed the autonomist VMRO, which acted in connection with the united VMRO from the Yugoslav territory, deluding the people that it wanted a unique and autonomous Macedonia, but it had the support of the Bulgarian secret services and protected the great-Bulgarian interests, using only terrorist methods of action. The government of the agricultural leader Aleksandar Stambolijski had a quite mild position toward the Macedonians and their aspirations and developed friendly relations with Belgrade, wanting pan-Yugoslav unification. After three years of its existence, the royal circles performed a military upheaval in 1923, murdering Stambolijski and a lot of his followers. In 1924, the government of Prime Minister Cankov organised the liquidation of almost every distinguished Macedonian national leader. Over the following ten years, the actual control over Pirin Macedonia was given to the VMRO terrorists, who scared and terrorised the population. Bulgaria became a country of legalised terror and, in the process of Bulgarianisation, several thousand people were killed in Pirin Macedonia, while a great number were forcedly moved to the hinterland of Bulgaria. At the end of this decade of violence, when the autocratic shackles began weakening, there was a new military overthrow in 1934 that established the barren dictatorship. The new regime dismantled the VMRO terrorist gangs, but continued a markedly anti-Macedonian course, systematically suppressing all forms of the expression of Macedonian national identity.

Before WWI, only 30% of the population of Aegean Macedonia were Macedonians. There was the same percentage of Turks and somewhat fewer Greeks and approximately 15% other nationalities. In the 1923 Lausanne convention, Greece and Turkey agreed on an exchange of population. Almost all the Turks left and the Greeks from Asia Minor

IT-03-67-T

came, so this area became prevailingly Greek in its national structure. Around 50,000 Macedonians out of a total of 330,000 moved to Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, which reduced their part in the Aegean structure to below 25%. Given that twice as many Greeks as emigrated Turks soon came – 640,000 in total – the percentage of Macedonians became even lower. The Greek authorities persistently avoided their obligations from the signed international agreements concerning the protection of minority rights and it tried to enforce the denationalisation and assimilation of the Macedonians using more subtle methods. When the Greek government showed a willingness to treat the Aegean Macedonians as a Bulgarian national minority in 1924, there were some severe disturbances in Yugoslav-Greek relations. “At the request of the Macedonians from Aegean Macedonia, the Yugoslav government especially insisted that they be recognised as Serbs or as the Serbian national minority in Greece” (*The History of the Macedonian People*, Book III, p. 233). The Greek government changed its mind and, in 1938, it recognised the Aegean Macedonians as members of the Serbian national minority in their state. During the Metaxas dictatorship in 1938, the use of the Macedonian language was prohibited in Greece, even in private life, through a special law and the members of the Macedonian national minority were discriminated against in every way.

After the Fascist fragmentation of Yugoslavia, a greater part of Macedonia, Pomoravlje and areas around the Nišava and Timok rivers were occupied by the Bulgarian army. The western part of Vardar Macedonia was occupied by the Italians and included in Albania. In the Bulgarian occupied zone, a military-police system completely imported from Bulgaria was installed. The Bulgarians did not trust the local Macedonians at all, so they brought the most state officials and appointed them to significant positions in occupational management. A special occupational legal system was also instigated, based on pure repression and the performance of judicial power by military courts. The Bulgarian occupying forces were not capable of forming a Quisling rule and, therefore, the most they accomplished was the organisation of a network of informants and denunciators. A propagating action was systematically led, with the aim of the denationalisation and Bulgarisation of the Macedonians, especially through the absolute instrumentalisation of the educational system. The Communist uprising was weak in Vardar Macedonia, reduced to occasional diversions and attacks, until the capitulation of Italy when the conditions were created for the formation of a free territory, including Debar and Kičevo. The Chetniks of Draža Mihajlović also had no greater success until 1943, when they grew stronger and formed the Chetnik Corps of Vardar with four brigades. The Partisans and Chetniks were confrontational even in Macedonian territory, weakening each other. The Communists believed that the Chetniks were a much greater danger than the occupying forces. However, the Communists paid special attention to the building of an organisational infrastructure in almost the entire territory, so they were prepared for the great increase of Partisan troops after the Western allies supported Tito, the Red Army came to the Balkan Peninsula and the

498/57440

German forces started retreating from the Aegean Sea. The fights against the German and Bulgarian occupying forces became increasingly intense. Even during the war, the Communists proclaimed the Macedonian federal unit inside Yugoslavia and realised their will immediately after the war.

11. The Restoration of the Independent Serbian State

a) The First and Second Serbian Uprisings

Although Dubrovnik and Montenegro had a certain semi-independent status for centuries, they were still peripheral areas of the Serbian ethnic mass, so it was quite natural that the restoration of a modern Serbian free and independent state started with the uprising in the Belgrade Pashalic that began in an assembly of national leaders in Orašac on 14 February 1804, under the leadership of Karađorđe Petrović. The rebels immediately started burning Turkish hans and killing seghans, liquidating all the organs of Turkish government in the villages. After around ten days, the *dahis* asked to negotiate, so Karađorđe met with Aganlija, without reconciliation and with a conflict that spontaneously occurred and in which the *dahi* leader was wounded and several of his followers murdered. The uprising spread rapidly and Belgrade was cut off. The Serbs won the first major fight near Obrenovac, in Beljin and on Svileuva. Valjevo and Rudnik were taken over and then Čačak and large areas in the Morava and Homolje regions were liberated. In March, the Serbs won three great battles against Alija Gušanac, on Duboki Potok near Cuprija, on Gilj and Umovi near Svilajnac and then at Požarevac in May. Previously, Kragujevac was liberated and two battles near Batočina were won. Jagodina was also liberated. Turkish defeats multiplied at great speed, which showed the strength of the uprising and the wild Serbian desire for freedom and vengeance for their slain princes. Almost all of the Belgrade Pashalic was liberated and Belgrade itself was taken over.

The Turks asked to negotiate again with Austrian mediation and the rebels first held their assembly at the beginning of May in Ostružnica and designated the deputation for negotiations in Zemun that began soon afterwards, but failed even faster. The Austrians refused to cooperate with the Serbian rebels, but Russia supported them immediately. Protopope Mateja Nenadović led the delegation that went to Russia and came to Sankt Petersburg on St. Mitar's day. The Serbs limited their requests to gaining a wide autonomous status under the sultan's sovereignty and the Porte sent Bosnian Vizier Bećir-pasha to chase the *dahis* away and calm the Serbs. The Belgrade squads chased the *dahis* following the pasha's order and Milenko Stojković caught them on the Danube island of Ada Kale and killed them. The squad commander Alija Gušanac took over the rule of Belgrade but he refused to establish a regular and legal state, so the Serbs continued their occupation. Even the subsequent mediations of the Porte were failures and the Serbs started organising their own organs of government, ceasing the payment of state taxes.

The new national assembly was held in Pećani in April 1805 and the request was made for autonomy and the removal of all Turkish soldiers

IT-03-67-T
from Serbia, guaranteeing the security of the Muslim civilians that remained. After this, the rebels liberated Karanovac, Trstenik and Užice in a rapid attack. The sultan sent the regular army under the command of Hafiz-pasha and it was defeated near Ivankovac by Milenko Stojković and Petar Dobrnjac. Even with the military successes, the political position of the rebels was not favourable because of Napoleon's war success, so Russia suggested a compromise with the Turks. The assembly of the national leaders in Smederevo at the end of 1805 concluded that it was necessary to take over Belgrade, but also to maintain intense negotiations with the Porte. The new assembly in Ostružnica at the beginning of 1806 sent a plea to the sultan to accept their requests and declare a general amnesty. At the same time, the fight with the Turks continued and the liberated territory was expanded even to areas outside the Belgrade Pashalic, reaching Leskovac and Novi Pazar at one point. In June 1806, Napoleon sent a letter supporting the sultan's intention of destroying the Serbian rebels with military force and the Porte sent a great army led by the Pasha of Skadar, Serasker of Rumelija and the Bosnian vizier. A jihad against the Serbs was declared. Karađorđe beat the twice as larger Turkish army at Mišar and, not long after, the Turks suffered a hard defeat near Deligrad. At the end of this year, Belgrade also fell into Serbian hands.

In 1807, Russia also entered the war against Turkey, which gave the Serbs new encouragement. After the mission of Petar Ičko, the Porte tried to calm the Serbs with the firman from January 1807, giving them great concessions, but the Serbian leader refused and sultan's emissary Suleiman-pasha and the drafters of the firman were murdered on their way back, which interrupted further negotiations. In new fights, the Serbs reached Vidin and surrounded Kladovo. In June, the Russian army entered Serbia and helped the Serbs defeat the Turks in Štubik and Malajnica and liberate almost entire Timok Frontier. The Serbs surrounded Niš, threatened the Turks in Leskovac and took over all of Toplica. The uprising spread to Semberia and entire area of Podrinje. There, with direct French help, the Turks forced the rebels to retreat over the Drina River. In August, Russia made a truce with Turkey and it also related to the Serbian front. By the end of this year and through the entire following one, the rebels consolidated their power, forming political and legal institutions. Then, in March 1809, the Russians and Serbs entered the war with the Turks again. The liberated Serbian territory rapidly saw victory after victory, until its first defeat on Kamenica near Niš due to the Turkish supremacy in number and discord among the Serbian dukes. At Čegar, Stevan Sindelić died along with 3,000 fighters and the Turkish army quickly penetrated down the Morava River, conquering the territory between the Morava and Timok rivers. The Serbs soon consolidated, inflicted several significant defeats on the Turks and forced them to retreat from the rebel Serbia when the Russian army crossed the Danube River and jeopardised the Turks in Bulgaria.

In 1810, the Serbs recovered from the previous fights and Turkish raids, obtained ammunition and prepared for new temptations. Almost 5,000 Russian soldiers came to Serbia and helped the Serbs liberate Kladovo. The Serbs and Russians joined forces and severely defeated the

Turks near Varvarin and then Karađorđe beat the Turks at Mišar and pushed them over the Drina River. The Russians also participated in the fighting. The following year, 1811, passed with constant conflicts between the Serbs and Turks in the direction of Niš and Vidin. The Serbs and Russians entirely defeated the Turks on Gramada. After these great military successes on the Serbian fronts in 1812, the Russians started peace negotiations with the Turks and made a peace treaty in May in Bucharest. This treaty guaranteed significant autonomy to the Serbs, but they had to agree to the return of Turkish troops into the cities. The Serbs were not satisfied with this, but Russia's hands were tied because of the coming war with Napoleon. Karađorđe called for a new assembly in August in Vračevšnica, which accepted the peace terms, but the Turks then asked for complete capitulation, which the rebels persistently refused. This situation lasted until the mid 1813, while the Turks hesitated waiting for the outcome of the Russian-French clash. Napoleon's successes inspired them to prepare a new invasion on Serbia and Karađorđe still refused to apply all the clauses of the Bucharest agreement and rapidly prepared for a new war. The *vožd* (Translator's note: leader, chief) issued a Proclamation in which he invited the entire nation to a crucial fight with the powerful Turkish army, which was coming from three directions. The Serbs frantically defended themselves before the Turkish invasion, inflicting severe losses on the enemy. The Turkish invasion could not be permanently stopped however. Karađorđe hid in Zemun and the rebels left Belgrade and Smederevo without a fight. The Turks took a great number of Serbian women and children into slavery and killed all men capable of military service. In the hinterland, some rebel leaders still resisted in many fortresses. They were substantially demoralised by the news of Karađorđe's escape into Austria. In October 1813, the Turks again conquered the Belgrade Pashalic completely, robbed and burned it entirely.

After this victorious euphoria and jihad raids, the Turks proclaimed an amnesty on the surviving rebels a few weeks later and invited the refugee Serbs to come back from Austria. After the social and military circumstances were somewhat stabilised, at the beginning of 1814, the Turks started collecting weapons and enforcing a true police terror over the Serbian civilians. They increased the taxes and robbed the returnees. This is why there was an uprising in September of the same year in the district of Požega under the leadership of Duke Hadži-Prodan Gligorijević, who was joined by Serbs from neighbouring districts. Prince Miloš refused to join them, so they defeated the founders of the Obrenović dynasty together with the Turks in the battle near Knić. In spite of the victory, the rebels realised they did not have good odds for success, so the leadership went to Austria and the people went home. Nevertheless, the Turks still had atrocious vengeance, killing and putting to the stake three hundred distinguished Serbs. In the meantime, Napoleon was defeated and the Russians were again able to protect the Serbs. On 22 April 1815, Duke Miloš Obrenović raised the Second Serbian Uprising in Takovo. The Serbs immediately took over Čačak, spreading the uprising in every direction in the Belgrade Pashalic and they managed to withstand a strong

Turkish attack at Ljubić. Significant Serbian victories followed at Družetići and Palež, and then at the Morava River and in the liberation of Čačak. The most Turks were killed at Jelica, while the rebels got hold of a lot of their arms. Then the successive Serbian victories started, in Batočina and on Crni Vrh, in Požarevac and Ranovac, near Vinča and Grocka, at Dublje. In a short while, the entire Belgrade Pashalic was liberated, except for the cities of Belgrade, Smederevo, Sabac, Užice and Soko.

In the mid 1915, the Russian tsar ordered the mobilisation of his Transdanubian army at Prut, placing military pressure on the Turks and forcing them to negotiate with the Serbs. The Rumelian governor and European Serasker Marashli Ali-pasha and Bosnian Vizier Hurshid-pasha received an order from the Porte to negotiate with the rebel leaders. The Serbs demanded the highest degree of autonomy and Russian diplomacy supported them. Therefore, in 1816, the sultan issued eight firmans that regulated the Serbian position inside a specific semi-autonomous status quite favourably. An electoral administrative body was formed under the name of the National Office and the representatives of all twelve districts were a part of it and it was presided over by Prince Miloš. It was here that the first conflicts between the Serbian leaders occurred because of the constant rivalry, especially between Prince Miloš and Petar Moler. Miloš won and, under his false accusations, the Turks strangled Petar Moler at the Kalemegdan fortress. Miloš rapidly established personal management with a despotic character, creating his own private monopolies in commerce. The peasant tax obligations were too high and new dissatisfaction appeared among the people. At the beginning of 1817, the first rebellion against Miloš's unscrupulous autocracy was raised by Prince Sima Marković. In the summer of that same year, Miloš Obrenović organised the murder of Karađorđe Petrović, who secretly returned to Serbia, planning a great Balkan uprising with the Greek hetaerists. Miloš sent vožd's head to the sultan in Constantinople as the proof of loyalty and submission.

The 1817 assembly of national leaders on St Mitar's day proclaimed Miloš as hereditary prince of Serbia, which meant the introduction of a monarchy. Stevan Dobrnjac and Marko Todorović Abdula raised another rebellion in the Požarevac area in 1817. In 1825, in Jasenica, there was Đak's rebellion, led by Miloje Popović Đak. In 1826, Đorđe Čarapić also raised a rebellion. All these rebellions were quelled bloodily by Miloš and all his actual or potential adversaries were eliminated. On the other hand, with constant Russian support and help, he managed to lessen Turkish tax obligations. With the Academic Convention from 1826, the Russians forced the Turks to respect all the clauses of the Bucharest treaty. Having won the new war that began in 1828 in the Adrianople agreement, Russia forced the sultan to issue a hatt-i sharif on complete Serbian national autonomy and the inclusion of the six remaining districts: Miloš's title of hereditary prince was recognised and, in the following year, all this was more completely regulated in a new hatt-i sharif. The Serbs gained the right to their own army and state government and the sultan ordered that all Muslims should leave Serbia, except for the garrisons in six cities.

b) The Establishment of Serbian Constitutionality

Although the hatt-i-sharif foresaw a specific Council of National Leaders as an organ of the government, Miloš persistently avoided its constitution, continuing to strengthen his personal power using unscrupulous means. In 1835, in Kruševac and Jagodina, Mileta's rebellion broke out. The prince managed to make a deal with the rebels, agreeing to hold a National Assembly that lead to the Sretenje Constitution in February, which was markedly liberal-democratic in character. It anticipated the independent judiciary system, gave the legislative power to the National Parliament and the executive power was in the hands of the prince and Council. With the support of Russian and Austrian diplomacies, Prince Miloš abolished the Sretenje Constitution after few weeks. In every possible way, he tried to prevent the political influence of the national leaders and they kept resisting his autocracy. The people soon named them the defenders of the Constitution and Russia sent special emissaries to mediate between the prince and the defenders of the Constitution on two occasions, in 1836 and 1837. When the prince connected with the British consul in Belgrade in 1837, the Russians openly took the side of the constitution-defenders. In the 1838 hatt-i-sharif, the sultan proclaimed a new constitution for Serbia, according to which the prince had to share the legislative and executive power with the Council, whose first president was the prince's brother Jevrem. In 1839, Miloš was forced to appoint new members of the Council and ministers from the lines of the constitution-defenders, but he did not have the honest intention of actually sharing the power with them. However, he slowly lost the levers of power one by one. His brother Jovan Obrenović attempted a rebellion against the Council, but this attempt was cruelly crushed by Toma Vučić Perišić. In 1839, Miloš was forced to leave Serbia and his underage son Milan was proclaimed his successor and the prince's governorship consisted of Jevrem Obrenović, Avram Petronijević and Toma Vučić Perišić. The sick Milan soon died and the constitution-defenders ruled for the following twenty years.

Eight months after Milan's death, his brother Mihailo, who was in exile with his father, returned to Serbia. Before his return, Mihailo visited the Turkish sultan in Constantinople and, after arriving in Belgrade, a National assembly was held and sultan's decision on the confirmation of the rights of the electoral prince, with no hereditary read in it, which pleased the constitution-defenders. Since Mihailo was also a minor, in spite of his opposition, Toma Vučić Perišić and Avram Petronijević were appointed as his personal assistants. Reacting to this, the followers of the Obrenović dynasty managed to incite the people to begin unrest in various parts of Serbia. When a mass of peasants came to Belgrade to support Mihailo, Vučić and Petronijević handed in their resignations and hid under Turkish protection in the Belgrade fortress. The prince then decided to move the capital to Kragujevac. The constitution-defenders were most afraid of the possible return of the old Prince Miloš and so, through the mediation of the sultan's emissary, the calling of a National assembly was agreed with Mihailo. Mihailo's ministers started the persecution of

IT-03-67-T
constitution-defenders' predecessors, but they also implemented very unpopular tax laws, causing dissatisfaction among the people.

In 1842, Vučić's rebellion broke out and a part of the regular army joined it. The confrontation between Mihailo's and Vučić's followers happened in the vicinity of Kragujevac. The prince was defeated and his army retreated, shattered. Mihailo fled to Zemun. The constitution-defenders formed a temporary government and called for a National assembly that elected *vožd's* son Aleksandar Karađorđević as the new prince. The Turks supported this and so did the French and English consuls, but Russia opposed it as the international patron of Serbia. A new National assembly was held at Russia's insistence and it confirmed Aleksandar's election. The constitution-defenders bureaucratised the state structures but Obrenović's followers were not standing idle and constantly formed conspiracies, some of which were discovered. In 1844, the Katan rebellion broke out and, in 1846, Mirča's rebellion. On his part, Prince Aleksandar persecuted Russophiles and the exiled Toma Vučić Perišić exposed himself as the greatest Russophile. Most of the constitution-defenders were Turkophiles. For a full five years, neither the prince nor the government dared to call a National assembly but finally, on its St Peter's day session in 1848, the followers of the exiled Toma Vučić Perišić prevailed, so the constitution-defenders were divided into the followers of Perišić and of Karađorđević. Prince Aleksandar was in constant conflict with the Council and he proved quite an uneducated and incompetent ruler. During the Serbian-Hungarian war north of the Danube River, Serbia helped its compatriots in every possible way. Its international position was significantly weakened by the defeat of Russia in the Crimean War, while the peace conference in Paris decided that the protectors of Serbia, aside from Russia, would be Great Britain, France, Austria, Prussia and Sardinia. The constitution defenders' rule was merited for the enactment of several important system laws, especially those of a proprietary character.

In 1857, Tenka's conspiracy was discovered, led by Council President Stefan Stefanović Tenka. The actors were convicted and received severe sentences, but the dissatisfaction of the people grew and the influence of Obrenović's followers became stronger and more noticeable. Perišić and Milutin Garašanin joined in the confrontation with the prince and the political organisation of the liberals also began, with nationalism and the request for the permanent formation of a National parliament as the state institution being the main tenets. The Prince did not dare call an assembly for a full ten years. The Council was forced to call the National assembly for the 30th November 1858. Following the initiative of the conservative opposition and the followers of Perišić and Garašanin, the national assembly decided on 11 December to overthrow Prince Aleksandar Karađorđević, but Perišić and Garašanin could not prevent Obrenović's followers from prevailing in the vote on the motion to restore Miloš Obrenović to the Prince's throne. This Saint Andrew assembly was significant because it legalised its permanent status and guaranteed the freedom of the press with legislative norms.

Having returned to power, the aged Prince Miloš tried to restore the old

autocratic rule, but the liberals who dominated in the National Parliament and the conservatives in the Council opposed him. The 1838 Constitution was abrogated and Miloš independently appointed the members of the Council, while he treated the ministers as personal clerks. He captured Toma Vučić Perišić and ordered that he be poisoned in prison. Miloš soon showed his old manipulative political abilities. First he got close to the liberals against the conservatives and then, after a short while, he reoriented against the liberals. He managed to establish an absolutist rule, but he died in September 1860. He was succeeded by his son Mihailo, trying to continue his father's absolutist policy, but he also showed that he was a great nationalist. He wanted to put the conservatives and liberals into the government, but Garašanin would not agree to that, nor did Jovan Marinković, so the ministers became less important politicians. In the government, conflicts immediately broke out between the Minister of Justice Jevrem Grujić on the one hand and the conservatives of the Minister of Internal Affairs Nikola Hristić and the Prince's commissioner Filip Hristić on the other. In mid 1861, Grujić left Hristić's government and, at the end of this year, Filip Hristić also demissioned. Mihailo appointed a Conservative Ilija Garašanin as the new president of prince's government, while Nikola Hristić kept the department of the police. The Liberals crossed over to the bitter opposition.

The regime of Prince Mihailo systematically persecuted the Liberals, arrested, imprisoned and forced them to emigrate. When the County court sentenced the performers in the Smederevo conspiracy to mild punishments in 1863 and the Great court, with Jevrem Grujić as one of the judges, freed them of all guilt, the prince's government brought a retroactively valid law sentencing all judges of the Supreme court to three years in prison and, as an additional punishment, they lost all civil rights for the following ten years. On the other hand, Mihailo led a very ambitious policy of Serbian national liberation and strengthened the national army, causing increased suspicion on the part of the Turks. In 15 June 1862, there was an incident at the *Čukur-česma* (Translator's note: a drinking-fountain) in Belgrade, when a Turkish soldier severely injured a Serbian boy. This led to a mass confrontation between the Serbs and Turks and, two days later, the Turks bombed Belgrade with artillery from Kalemegdan. On this occasion, the representatives of the protectorate forces held a conference in Constantinople, in which Russia and France supported Serbia and Austria and Great Britain supported Turkey. It was decided to destroy the Turkish fortresses of Užice and Soko and to remove the entire Muslim population from Serbia. In 1866, a military alliance between Serbia and Montenegro was signed and, in May 1867, Mihailo managed to achieve the removal of all Turkish garrisons from Serbia with the help of substantial forces. In the same year, Mihailo dismissed Garašanin because he opposed his intention to marry a close relative named Katarina. This replacement caused great dissatisfaction in Russia. Jovan Ristić, a distinguished but moderate Liberal, became the president of the new government. Mihailo soon removed him from office and appointed Nikola Hristić, highly unpopular among the people, as president. Princess Persida Karađorđević, the mother of the exiled Prince Aleksandar, organised a conspiracy against Mihailo and the

The Temporary Governorship took over the power then, made up of Jovan Marinković as the President of the State Council, Rajko Lešjanin as the Minister of Justice and Đorđe Petrović as the President of the Court of Cassation. Minister of Defence Milivoje Petrović Blaznavac proclaimed Milan Obrenović as the new Prince - Jevrem's underage grandson - so Garašanin was removed and the Great National Assembly was put in the position only to confirm this proclamation. The new Prince's Governorship was established and it consisted of Milivoje Petrović Blaznavac, Jovan Ristić and Jovan Gavrilović, which meant that the Conservatives were completely removed from power and that its top relied on the Liberals and the army. The Liberal political direction was affirmed in 1869 after the enactment of a new Constitution that preserved the centralistic state organisation and divided the power between the prince and the national representatives. The National parliament was made of elected members with a three-year long mandate and it held regular sessions each year. A number of MPs were appointed by the prince, up to one fourth of them. The ministers were only accountable to the prince. All citizens who paid any tax had the right to vote. Milan took over the rule as prince in 1872 when he came of age and he appointed Milivoje Petrović Blaznavac as the president of the government. Jovan Ristić became the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Blaznavac, a key figure in the regime, soon died. Failing to achieve Liberal-Conservative cooperation, the prince trusted Jovan Ristić with forming the new government. At the end of the following year, Ristić was removed from office and the new, now Conservative government was formed by Jovan Marinović, who tried to present himself as much more advanced and free-spirited than the Liberals, who were politically worn-out by constant compromising. Marinović tried to attract the Liberals who were Ristić's opponents as well. The prince was not pleased with the sudden release of political life after the 1869 Constitution and he tried to change it. Milutin Garašanin was the most supportive of the Conservatives, while the Liberals were strictly against this and they had the majority in the National Parliament. The newly formed Socialists and Radicals started an even harsher political confrontation with the Conservative government. In the Parliamentary elections in 1874, the Liberals won the majority and then the first Radical MPs appeared. Marinović then resigned and the new government was formed by a young-Conservative named Aćim Čumić, immediately starting a severe conflict with the National Parliament. He was defeated in this conflict and resigned and, in March 1875, Prince Milan dissolved the National Parliament and appointed a clerical government. This year, in the Negotin Frontier, the radicals raised a brief rebellion over the arrest of their leader Adam Bogosavljević.

Blaznavac and Prince Milan greatly disturbed the Serbian relations with Russia, leading a markedly Austrophile policy. The misunderstandings were only partially cleared up with their official visit to the Russian emperor in 1871. The 1875 uprising of the Herzegovinian and Bosnian Serbs caused great patriotic turmoil in Serbia. Having returned from Austria, the prince demanded that the Prime Minister

Danilo Stevanović immediately stop the war propaganda and sending volunteers. Stevanović refused and demonstratively resigned. In August this year, the Liberals won the Parliamentary elections. The prince then made a deal with the Liberals and Steva Mihailović formed the new government with Jovan Ristić as the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The government publicly prohibited sending volunteers to Bosnia but secretly sent them in even greater numbers. In October, the prince toppled the government, accusing it of a war-inciting policy. The new cabinet was formed by Ljubomir Kljajević, including the young-Liberals and young-Conservatives. The Liberals protested over the prince's breaking of the Constitution. Among the attack against the government and the state bureaucracy, the most distinguished were three Radical MPs, Adam Bogosavljević, Milija Milovanović and Jevrem Marković. In 1876, the Radicals organised great demonstrations in Kragujevac, demanding the introduction of local self-government. The regime responded with increased police torture, arrests and the convictions of political opponents.

c) Gaining State Independence

The bad internal political circumstances forced Milan to change his policy again, so he ordered the army to start preparing for war. The great forces requested that this be stopped. The Liberals and Radicals were for war against Turkey and the Conservatives were against it. Even the officers wanted the war. In May, the prince toppled Kljajević's government and restored Mihailović and Ristić. On 9 June, the agreement on the alliance with Montenegro was signed and its main goal was to liberate the entire Serbian people from Turkish slavery. On the last day of June, Serbia declared war on Turkey and, two days later, Montenegro did the same. Several thousand volunteers came from Russia led by General Cherniaev. However, the first war activities of the Serbian army did not provide the expected results. The Turks were too strong, had more modern weaponry and quickly started a counter-attack. Then the Serbs won a significant victory near Šumatovac, close to Aleksinac. Prince Milan asked for a truce through the great forces. All the weaknesses of the Serbian army, which had not been at war for six decades were shown - its weaponry was outdated and the officers were untrained. In September, a truce was made after another Serbian victory at Bobovište. General Cherniaev was against the truce so the Serbian government changed its attitude. The animosities were renewed in October and the Turks rushed into Đunis, breaking the first Serbian defence line. Đunis fell and the Russian emperor sent an ultimatum to the Turkish sultan to establish a truce immediately, threatening the immediate cessation of diplomatic relations. The Turks agreed and firing was ceased. Serbia had great losses in this war, but it did not manage to expand territorially.

Still, the war had significant political results because it intensified the Eastern question and made the direct implication of Russia inevitable. In February 1877, Serbia and Turkey signed a peace treaty that ordered the restoration of the previous conditions. The prince called for elections for the Great National Parliament, hoping that this would lead to the political

defeat of the Liberals. The elections were held on 20 February and the Radicals won them, which shocked and frightened Prince Milan. To avoid the dismissal of the regime, Ristić, Milojković and Grujić thought of suggesting that Prince dissolve the Great National Parliament as soon as it accepted the peace treaty. The prince did so, completely surprising the Radicals and keeping the Liberal government with gratitude, rejecting the former combinations with the Conservatives and Marinović. The economic, financial and social situation in Serbia was critical and the authorities continued to forcedly charge for the war loan and introduce new taxes. Under these conditions, there was a new Russian-Turkish war in April 1877, in which the Russian emperor, aware of its internal situation, asked Serbia not to interfere. In June, the Russian tsar admitted Prince Milan and Jovan Ristić to Ploesti and told them that they could only enter the war after the Russian army crossed the Danube River. In July, he said that Serbia could enter the war and sent financial help. However, the imperial military envoy stated that the Serbian army was not yet capable of war activity. This is why there was only a partial mobilisation for the pressure on the border. The reorganisation of the army was rapidly performed, but its inclusion in the war was also postponed because of the military rebellion in Topola near Kragujevac in December 1877, which happened after a battalion of the national army refused to obey. The rebellion was organised by Karađorđević followers and it was quelled after three days. The authorities falsely accused the Radical leader Lieutenant-Colonel Jevrem Marković of being connected with the rebels, sentenced him to death and executed him by firing squad. Six more convicts were shot and a large number were sentenced to imprisonment.

Serbia then began a new war against Turkey and the military plan set its army the goal of cutting off the possible routes of help from Albania and Bosnia to the Turks, whom the Russians had forced to Bulgaria. At the same time, the Serbs liberated Kuršumlja, Pirot and Niš. The Turks only managed to regain Kuršumlja in their counterattack, but only for a short while. The Serbs freed it a second time, and also Bojnik, Lebane and the Grdelica gorge. The successful war operations were crowned by the liberation of Vranje. On 31 January 1878, in the Peace Treaty of Adrianople, Serbia was given independence. With the peace treaty in San Stephan, Russia created Great Bulgaria, which included the Serbian cities of Pirot and Vranje and the entire area of Macedonia. Serbia refused to retreat from the liberated territories. In the Berlin Congress of the great forces, which began in June 1878 and lasted for a month, Austria-Hungary was allowed to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina and put its military garrisons all over the Sandžak of Novi Pazar, while Serbia and Montenegro were recognised as independent states. Serbia preserved Pirot and Vranje and Montenegro received a significant territorial expansion. The international-law recognition of the independence of the two states was a turning point in Serbian history. In the following decade, the political life of Serbia was marked by fierce political fights for freedom and democracy and the most prominent in them was the Serbian National Radical Party.

III. Serbian Religion

1. The Old Serbian Religion

Natko Nodilo, a distinguished Dalmatian intellectual of the 19th century and a true supporter of the Yugoslav idea, published nine of his studies from the area of mythology, tradition, culture and religion between 1858 and 1890 in *Work*, the yearbook of the Yugoslav Academy of Science and Arts. These were later printed as a book under the title of *The Old Religion of the Serbs and Croats* (Logos, Split 1981). Nodilo primarily studied the old folk speech, songs and stories, building a capital scientific work, the entire research apparatus of which testifies that this was the old Serbian religion. The author demonstrated his attitude that everything that was Serbian was also Croatian and vice versa. However, a great number of his statements were related to the pan-Slavic pre-Christian culture and civilisation.

As opposed to the Greek Olympic world of gods, the Slavic gods were not anthropomorphic, nor were there many of them. This testified to the seriousness of the religion and the essential supremacy of the spirituality it contained. Until the Nemanjić dynasty, the Serbs were massively faithful to their original religion, but they jealously preserved its elements even after they converted to Christianity. This was also a favourable foundation for the spread and strengthening of the Bogomilians, not so much in the Nemanjić state (from which they were fiercely banished) as in Bosnia, which was much more religiously tolerant, especially in the Neretva Princedom or Pagania. The Bogomils was close to the Serbs because of their religious mildness and their insistence on good and evil as the two supreme and mutually opposed cosmic principles. Still, Christian ideological intolerance pushed the greatest part of the cultural and spiritual wealth of the people into hopeless oblivion. The Catholic Church was incomparably more fanatical and perfidious.

Still, many religious achievements and testimonies of the primordial collective identity of the Serbian people remained. As Nodilo said, “the religious understandings, once instilled in the national soul, were its everyday need and nutrition and therefore they would somewhat oppose a radical change of religion. When the old ancient folk religion was altered by another, the gods hid either in rituals or in adapted songs or in narratives that people used to pass the time or grandmothers used to lull the children to sleep. The people gladly remained within the far horizons of the threshold of their beliefs. These horizons were far away, but they were full of magic. The gods of nature pleased the folk heart and soul because they were significantly similar to people. In the visible world, according to the degree laws, they rise and set, live and die, so every natural religion was like a living history, with the gods’ victories and defeats, with shifts and endings, where the entire interesting drama unfolds” (p. 9).

The old legends of gods in folk songs turned into the histories of folk heroes or saints. The eternal fight between good and light against the darkness in the old religion transformed, in the folk mind, into the fight

against the enemy, villains and oppressors - primarily the foreign conquerors. Regarding this, Nodilo pointed out: “This was the most perfect transformation. Who would doubt the presence of the first, supreme god Vid in Jakša and Vojin in our Pollux - and Castor in the two Jakšić brothers, in Pojezda and Prijezda? Who would immediately notice the gods’ south winds in the nine Jugović brothers? Who could simply distinguish, from the heroic and lovely face of Miloš Obilić, the many traits that remind us of the great and sad god of the Moon?” (p. 10).

Nodilo believed that the deification of the light was the common foundation of the religions of all the Arian nations. As he explained it: “The fire that feeds, warms, cheers the family in the sombre and cold shade of night and radiates purity and righteousness into the human souls; old men next to this fire, to the family home, already at rest, but still alive and protecting their family, who experienced the secret spark of life; the view of the sky and its great ever-changing fire, which beat the cold and the dark and breeds fruit from the earth, to the joy of the great national family of human foragers; and the most significant atmospheric phenomena that aided the eyes in general: this was the central substance of the Arian religion” (p. 26). The Slavs, as an Arian people, also considered the god Vid as the essence and incarnation of light and warmth. Referring to the testimony of the well-known researcher Helmold from the 12th century, who studied the Baltic Slavs and their greatest sanctuary, dedicated to Vid, on the Island of Ruegen, Nodilo concluded that, in relation to Vid, the other deities were not gods in the true sense of the word, but demi-gods, whose specific counterpart were the present-day Christian saints.

Helmold drew the conclusion that the old Slavic religion was actually monotheistic because one god was the absolute master of earth and sky and the other gods unquestioningly obeyed. The size of the crops and the success of war operations depended on Vid’s will. A large *česnica* (Translator’s note: Christmas bread) was served in mass feasts in his honour and this is still common in the present-day Christmas rituals of the Orthodox Serbs. Vid was the incarnation of goodness and sternness. He helped, brought luck and saved. As a good god, Vid was associated with the right hand and the evil god was in the left. “Nothing could be given with the left hand because this was the evil arm; only the right one gave good luck. Good and bad luck, of one or the other god, the advanced on the right and the backward on the left, permeated the entire speech of our people to the furthest depths” (p. 39).

Vid had other names, depending on the occasion for which he was invoked or the role and endeavour that he was expected to perform. In this way, he appeared in the role of Jakša, Vojin or Strahinja. He was Perun of Thunder when he took revenge for perjury and Veles in old age, with one eye and bad sight. The Dubrovian St Vlaho was actually Veles in the spiritual protector of the Serbian city. Even the Velež Mountain near Mostar got its name from him. Nodilo pointed out to the Serbian folk songs about the hero Strahinja, who was invincible and who had godlike characteristics, illustrated the traditional legends of the warring endeavours of Vid. Later, we will see that some authors put Svetovid and

Perun into a father-son relationship.

The Slavic religion was based on the opposition of good and evil. The good god helped, but also punished. The black god brought only evil. The constant conflict between good and evil was the supreme cosmic principle, the basis of every morality. Vid saved you from any evil, healed any pain, and this is why the old-Slavic word for healing wounds and diseases was *vidati*. *Uvideti* means to understand or comprehend, because Vid enlightened the soul. Only those who looked could see - only those who had eyes - so the entire visual perception of the world created by God and given to men was performed through Vid, testing his capability and responsibility. Long before converting to Christianity, the Slavs distinguished heaven and hell and they also connected morality with the variant of afterlife that would happen to the individuals. Hell was marked by the colour black and heaven by a heavenly blue, actually the colour blue in a bright light. As opposed to the Christian belief of one son of God, Vid had two sons, known as the two young Jakšićs or two Vojinovići in folk tradition. There was also a daughter named Zora or Danica. The two soon symbolised the Sun and Moon, without which there was no life, and Danica symbolised the planet Venus, the most visible light in the evening and morning skies. Their mother was Živana, Vid's wife, the goddess of earth. As Helmold pointed out, Vid was "the heavenly emperor" for the Slavs, "the God in the heaven, the God of all gods" who "ruled over others", "that originated from his blood" and "became his maturity as demi-gods" (p. 148). Vid's children were eternally young. The Sun revived the human soul and purified it from sin, so a Serb always said their prayers facing towards the east. Most of the present-day Serbian Orthodox rituals and holidays were a heritage of the old religion, while the myths and legends were extremely similar to the German ones and often had astonishing similarities with the Greek and Roman ones, but their ultimate origin was in the Indian Vedas, making them a remarkable testimony to the joint origins of all the Indo-European, Arian peoples.

Nodilo especially deliberated the assumption of some scientists that the supreme Slavic god was Perun the Thunderer. However, most convincing was the testimony of the contemporary and witness Helmold, according to which the lord of the sky was Vid. In all odds, the thunderer was the heavenly duke, governor, the main executor of Vid's will - his archangel. According to some sources, Perun could also be Vid's son, especially in comparison with the relationship between the German Odin and Thor. The legends of the three sons of Vid and Živana also indicated this. He was the protector of people and justice and the terror of all evil forces, giants, devils and witches - the followers of the outlawed Crnobog. The mystical Lightning transformed into *Ognjena Marija* (Translator's note: Fiery Mary) in the national mind. She was the main among the spirits and a sister of Perun the Thunderer. As Nodilo said, "the gods were usually related to the parent, the supreme Svantevid or Vid" (p. 466). The spirits were the numerous supernatural beings who were primarily enchantingly beautiful. "The fairy courts, playgrounds, singing courts were built not only in the clouds and mountains, but also in the hideous

abysses, in the deepest sea, in the high stars. There was not a place in the air, on the earth and in the water which the spirits did not inhabit. They were also distinguished by their type: some were persistently white and good and, in contrast, some were black and evil - and some were neither good nor evil, depending on their current will" (p. 464).

The old Serbian religion was preserved most in the old funeral rituals and the cult of ancestors, the belief in the immortality of the soul that, for forty days after death, wandered the earth and then ascended to heaven. As opposed to Christianity, which considered a deceased whose body would not decompose after death to be a saint, the Slavs believed that the soul was liberated and approached heaven only after the body decomposed, so the distinguished deceased, usually tribal elders, were burned after death. An Arab travelogue writer noted that, even among the Serbs, it was customary to burn the wife alive along with the distinguished husband who had passed away, which was typical of all the Arians in ancient times. The common Serbian saying on someone's death, "May God save his soul", demonstrated the wish that the supreme god would liberate their soul from the earthly body as soon as possible.

Nodilo found evidence for his claims almost exclusively in the Serbian folk tradition and oral literature, primarily songs and narratives, and, for his part, he pointed out: "In this activity, the Serbs were the same as the Croatians, and the Croatians were the same as the Serbs. The mutual synonymy was complete for us. Many claim that there were many signs that the Serbs and Croatians were two separate peoples when they arrived here, each with their own language, rituals and religion to a certain extent. The Serbs - Shtokavians - could have originated from the pure handsome Avars, while the Croatians - Chakavians at first - seemed to be of partly Leh origin. But, be that as it may, whether the Croatians and Serbs were two peoples or one at first, with two different names, with their older Chakavian and new and limitedly developed Shtokavian, Croatianhood and Serbdom permeated each other and grew together from ancient times, so that science could not ethnically distinguish what was Croatian and what was Serbian" (p. 2). The author obviously had great difficulties because there was nothing left of the Croatian culture and collective national memory and because the original Croatian language was almost entirely forgotten. By seizing almost all the Catholic Serbs and artificially including them in the weakened and thinned Croatian national corpus, the Croatians thought they had full rights to share all the Serbian history and participate in the achievements of the Serbian culture, tradition, spirituality, literature and art. What was Serbian was mutual because, otherwise, the Croatians would not have anything.

Veselin Čajkanović performed the most comprehensive synthesis of the collected scientific material and incomplete research in the field of the old Serbian religion. He persuasively proved that the old Serbian religion was older than the antique one and that the Serbs remained faithful to it until the present day, as could especially be seen in the nature of the celebration of Christmas and the nameday, the rituals of godfatherhood and hospitality and in the wedding and funeral rituals. At their root was the primordial cult of the ancestors and, after the acceptance of

Christianity, only the surface, manifesting form was altered so that the Christian saints took over the role of the former deities. Čajkanović demonstrated this in the example of St Sava, to whom national tradition ascribed a proneness to anger and a readiness to punish severely, which was a divine characteristic from the old religion. St Sava took over the role of miracle maker, generous giver and strict judge - often too rigorous. Further on, there were councils of the saints, sacral feasts, descents into the underworld and treating the goodfatherhood as the closest family relation. The greatest Serbian national God was the mythical progenitor of the entire nation, as Čajkanović stated: "One of the primary things under the jurisdiction of the national God was certainly to make sure that his people had inner peace, or to avoid mutual bloodshed. 'The peace of God' and general reconciliation were obligatory at Christmas because, as we would see later, among other things, this was the holiday of the national God" (*On the Supreme God in the Old Serbian Religion*, Srpska književna zadruža, BIGZ, Prosveta, Partenon, Belgrade 1994, p. 57).

Čajkanović rejected Helmold's thesis, accepted by many scientists, that Crnobog was the incarnation of evil - the devil. This was actually the God of the underworld - Dabog, the god of the dead, whose role in the religious system was correspondent with that of the archangel in Christianity. His opposite, the White God, was not in confrontation with him in the good-evil way, but in the sense of the world of living and the world of dead. In Christianity, he was most preserved in the character of St Sava, who was, among other things, the protector of rights and justice and the cult of the holy chain was also connected with his cult. In Čajkanović's opinion, the chain was a fetish linked to the celebration of the supreme Serbian God. A horse and a wolf usually accompanied him and they had a special significance in Serbian mythology. In this direction, Čajkanović also solved the greatest riddle of the Kremna prophecy, saying: "The man on a white horse from the Kremna prophecy, who should bring freedom and happiness to all nations, this could be none other than the former supreme deity of the Serbian people, its greatest national God. Apart from the fact that this was quite natural and logical - because who would go before the people and fight alongside them for victory if not their national God?" (p. 139-140). According to Čajkanović's words, Dabog was the same as Svetovid or Trojan (Triglav). The prayers to Svetovid or Dabog, were performed in the form of toasts for Christmas, the namesday or a wedding. "We were the least able to create a clear image of the idols and places for performing the cult. Idols certainly existed; the human figure was only implied in the cross; the cross in our houses could originally have been the idol of our supreme God" (p. 159-160). This God was often called Tsar Radovan among the people in the early Christian times.

Čajkanović also claimed that the inhabitants of the Isle of Ruegen or Rujan considered Svetovid or Dabog not only the supreme but also the only true God, while all the others were only demi-Gods. He agreed with a large number of earlier researchers that Svetovid was the common supreme God of all the Slavs, though he had various different cult names.

In the book *Slavic Mythology* (Grafos, Belgrade 1984), Louis Leger

stated that the Slavs opposed the imposition of Christianity and they even sacrificed a bishop to the God Radgost in the town of Getra. The Christians were the cruellest towards the Baltic Slavs, or the Lusatian Serbs, who were almost completely annihilated in mass killings or Germanisation. The greatest temple dedicated to Vid on the Island of Rigen was completely destroyed in 1168, at the same time as the city of Arkona. The Roman-Catholics then performed the first great historical genocide against the Slavs. Leger noticed that the word God was identical in all the Slavic languages and with the same conceptual meaning, which was the proof that it originated from pre-Christian times, which agreed with the old-Persian and old-Bactrian languages - and in Sanskrit, *bagha* meant happiness, or well-being.

The Russians most often called Vid Veles or Volos and, in a contract mentioned by Leger that was made with the Byzantine Empire, they entered the following oath as a special guarantee: "If a ruler (prince) or someone from the Russian people breaches what was written here, may they die of their own weapon, may they be cursed by God and Perun as a heretic" (p. 58). This God put first in the oath was Veles and his relationship with Perun, according to the manner that their names were stated in this ancient document from 907, was reminiscent of the relationship between the Old Testament God Jehovah and his son Jesus Christ. Nodilo, Čajkanović and Leger wrote on the same problem but they drew quite different conclusions, which was evidence of the complexity of the old Slavic religion and, at the same time, the indicator of the lack of original, autochthonous records since the basic problem of the original Slavic civilisation was the lack of a script and any written expression. Out of the newer authors, the research of the Polish scientist Henrik Lovmjanjski *The Religion of the Slavs* (Biblioteka XX vek, SlovoGraf, Belgrade 1996) attracts attention, although he was burdened with the prejudice of the Marxist world view, but he processed a limited number of historical sources and rich scientific literature, which enabled him to achieve significant results in the theoretical positioning of the Slavic religion within the entire Indo-European culture and civilisation.

Concerning the religious issue, Lovmjanjski divided the Indo-European peoples, or Arians, into two cult circles - north and south. The north one included the Germans, Celts, Balts and Slavs, who preserved the old Indo-European heritage. The South one was made up of the Romans, Greeks, Indians and Iranians, who had significant Eastern influences and had a longer and more tumultuous religious evolution. He pointed out that many authors denied the existence of polytheism among the Slavs, but some, like Schmitt, exaggerated in this direction, claiming that there was no ethical duality expressed in the polarisation of good and evil among the Slavs, but that religious thought is reduced to demonology. It is especially interesting to us that it was demonstrated here how the Mediterranean polytheism indirectly affected the Slavs and it was obvious that it was subsequently ascribed to them as the original characteristic of their religion. The concept of God and the word used to denote him was brought from the old homeland and certain authors at least did not argue on this point. When one said God, this said everything, so there was no

need for a closer determination. But, when God was addressed in awe or in terms of endearment - when concrete prayers were directed to him - then this was done with several different names, depending on the nature of the help that was expected from him. It is interesting that Lovmjanjski only linked the polytheistic religion with the peoples that had state organisation. In addition, he cited the author Ms Cabalska who, in his opinion, exaggerated the importance of the act of burning the body of the deceased, though the most important thing for our main thesis in this study was her constation that "the ritual of burning was followed by a unique ideology, connected with the determined world view, with the basis of a belief in the almighty maker and master of the world. The highest deity, whose existence was confirmed by all religions, linked with the ritual of burning, was understood in a monotheistic manner, as the only God that resided in heaven" (p. 57).

Later researchers ascribed polytheism to the Slavs, although it was foreign to the Slavic national spirit from ancient times. As Lovmjanjski concluded, the polytheism "originated in the ideological-political confrontation with the Mediterranean circle and was a product of the Slavic thought that reacted to the new phenomena, characterised by dynamism and with different forms in different Slavic countries, different expressed directions of cultural relations, which was why it deserved the special interest of historians. Concerning the polydoxy, it caused interest as a reflection of the traditional Slavic world view, with naturally conservative forms and content and, at the same time, it was tolerant regarding religions that facilitated the passive reception of borrowings, primarily from Christianity" (p. 63). The key evidence for this claim was the text by a well-known antique writer named Procopius who wrote of the Slavs that "they considered one God, the creator of the thunder and lightning, as their supreme God and sacrificed to him in the form of oxen and other sacrificial animals; they knew almost nothing of destiny, nor did they find it at all significant for human life; however, when they were threatened by death, whether by illness or war, they would pledge to their God to give him sacrifice if he saved them and, when the danger passed, they fulfilled their promises and believed that this sacrifice was to thank for the preservation of their life; in the same way, they paid respect to the rivers, nymphs and other demons, gave them all kind of sacrifices and, during the sacrifice, they would get premonitions" (p. 64). Even the Arabic writers Ibn Rosteh and Al-Gardezi from the 10th or 11th centuries said that the Slavs prayed to one God, raising their heads to the sky and calling him "Lord".

In some Bulgarian and Russian documents, Svarog was mentioned as Dabog's son, but this was already a matter of terminology altered under foreign influence, which corresponded more to Perun, son of Svetovid, in the Slavic tradition. The two basic deities, "Perun and Svarog, were different versions of the same original deity of the Indo-European sky" (p. 76). Alexander Gilferding also basically confirmed this attitude, referring to the contract that was made in 944 by the Russian ruler Prince Igor, where it was obvious that the Christians swore to God and the Slavs to God and Perun. A part of the contract read: "May anyone on the Russian

side who wanted to disrupt this friendship, anyone who accepted Christianity, be affected by the vengeance of the God almighty, may they be condemned to death in this and the next life and may those who were not baptised remain without God's and Perun's help, may they not be guarded by their own shields and may they be cut by their own swords, die of their own arrows and other weapons and may they be slaves in this and next life" (p. 77-78).

Lovmjanjski believed that the Russian Prince Vladimir, who is believed to have converted Russia to Christianity, made religious reforms with the aim of "turning the Slavic prototheism into Slavic monotheism for the sake of ideological confrontation with the monotheistic systems of their Christian, Islamic and Judaist surroundings" (p. 86). It was obvious that the Slavs did not have a polytheistic phase in the religious development. Their original prototheistic religion was only modernised in the spirit of the time and under the influence of neighbouring civilisations. Besides, there was testimony to which Lovmjanjski referred, according to which Georemini concluded in 1324 that the Lithuanian and Christian Gods were identical. We had already seen that the religion of the Baltic peoples was identical to the Slavic. Blindly following the dogmatic schematism of their sources, Christian theologists subsequently ascribed polytheism or paganism to the Slavs. "Even around the mid 11th century, this solution to the question of the religion in Russia was incomprehensible to the Russian clergy that treated Vladimir as polytheist, in accordance with the scheme of a pagan religion understood as sacrilege or polytheism. This idea, that originated on the basis of Bible reading, influenced the deformation of the tradition of local paganism that was without any developed elements of polytheism in reality" (p. 86). One should bear in mind here that the Christians called both 'idolaters', meaning those who did not know of Christ and polytheists pagans. *Paganus* in Latin meant peasant and *pagus* village, but the basic term could be used here to denote a hinterland province - backward surroundings. Vladimir removed wooden statues and started building churches, but this did not alter the essence of the folk beliefs. After all, the traditional Slavic polydoxy was preserved throughout the following centuries as the original cult of creation or nature, which included the cult of the dead, demonology and magic. The uninformed lightly called various good and bad entities 'gods' and artificially drafted the presupposed image of the polytheistic old Slavic religion. As Lomjanjski noticed, various writers embellished, imagined and fabricated for centuries, making up for ignorance with inappropriate assumptions.

The Slavs most often performed religious ceremonies in open areas, but they also often built wooden temples with a grand statue of Svetovid in his four images, or as Triglav, or Trojan, which was symbolically taken over in the Serbian Orthodox cross. The cross was not an original Christian religious symbol and it represented the symbol of the old Serbian faith that was worn in religious processions, symbolising Svetovid and his four images. "The basic form of cult was the sacrifice in the form of sacrificial animals, food and drink... It was clear that sacrifice was followed by corresponding prayers and that, after 'the official part',

‘the social part’ followed, connected with consuming the offerings, singing the ritual songs, dancing and general rejoicing, which made the religious festivities very attractive to the participants, leading to the fact that the people, even after the denunciation of old beliefs, would not give up the ritual feasts and games because, in all odds, they ascribed magical meaning to them” (p. 170). The three heads of Svetovid should not be literally understood in a material or anthropomorphic sense. Instead they are the symbols of power in three empires - earthly, celestial (heavenly) and the underworld. “This form of belief did not create conditions for ‘missionary’ activity and the group character of the religion meant that it did not aspire to be the guardian of morality that was controlled by the group, so ethics had a unique ‘secular’ character. The religion, deprived of the control of morality, did not develop the concept of reward and punishment in a future life for earthly actions, nor did it develop the eschatology and the phenomenon of the souls of the dead causing fear because of their aggression or were treated as the objects of a cult that protected the living. And, in the end, the characteristic trait of the religion of the Slavs, typical of other group religions of peoples before literacy, was the absence of priests – because of numerous fortune tellers – which was connected with the simple forms of cults that did not have temples or statues that were known only in polytheism” (p. 175). Decisions on religious questions, just as political ones, were made in councils - in smaller communities of members, mostly the most distinguished people and tribal leaders. Religion was considered not only religious but also a legal order, so the conversion to Christianity meant the acceptance of another law and order.

Christianity brought script, entrance into history to the Slavic peoples, but also the establishment of a feudal social organisation. The priests tried to remove the scarce material traces of the old religion, such as the wooden temples and statues, but this was impossible to remove from the national mind. The Christian doctrine was based on the principle of world unity - its natural and supernatural sphere that were both subjected to the unique God’s will. “Out of the two versions of this doctrine, the one developed was the one designed for the intellectual elite of the time, while the popular one was available for the wider masses and was easily accepted by the Slavs, which was also shown by the rapid recruitment of the disciples with the aim of forming the lines of the Slavic clergy, especially inside the Slavic mission, or the use of the maternal tongue because the only difficulty in the formation of the clergy of the Latin ritual was the foreign language. Most believers were interested in the functional aspect of the new religion and not in the doctrine - primarily in its earthly function, which coincided with the identical function of group religion. Given the religious liberalism of the Slavs, there were also no obstacles for the use of the Christian cult in this field. Sources from the early Middle Ages, in comparison with data from later folk sayings, confirmed that the intervention of the Christian sacrum in the issue of earthly help was not understood as the action of replacing a factor that liberated the interested man from worries, but as the intervention of a friendly force that followed actions and affirmed a man’s activity. This

2. The Serbian Orthodox Church

a) The Acceptance of Christianity

The most serious and most comprehensive history of the Serbian Orthodox Church was written by Đoko Slijepčević as a political emigrant, published in 1962 in Germany. The second edition, in three volumes, was published by BIGZ from Belgrade in 1991. In principle, Slijepčević called the old Serbian religion polytheistic although he admitted that there was very little relevant data and, quoting the Byzantine writer Procopius, he pointed to the celebration of one God as the only master of the world. Through Brickner, he referred to Idrisius, an Arabic writer from the 9th century, who testified that the old Slavs addressed one God, turning to the skies and calling him Lord. He was the creator of the world, the lord of the thunder. Therefore, in contrast to Slijepčević’s conclusion, Constantine Jireček and Jovan Radonić were right when they claimed that the Slavs celebrated one God and gave him sacrifice. Radoslav Grujić also claimed that the Serbs believed in one supreme God like all other Slavs and, beside that, in a whole range of beings lower than him with certain miraculous supernatural characteristics. It was therefore obvious that all the uncritical acceptance of standard Greek prejudice against paganism as the common characteristic of all the Barbarian peoples – of which, therefore, the Serbs and Slavs were a part – was at least oversimplified and out of place. The previous belief in one God facilitated the Christianisation of the Serbs, but also their preservation of many religious customs and rituals, the oak-log and prayers, humanity and goodness and the respect for the family home.

Having arrived in the Balkans, the Serbs mixed with a native population that was previously Christianised but, as Slijepčević pointed out, the Christianisation was performed slowly, gradually and quite superficially because of the linguistic barrier contained in the fact that the church books and prayers were exclusively in Latin or Greek. In the 8th century, a Slav, a certain Nikita, became the ecumenical patriarch. However, most Serbs found themselves in the territory under Roman ecclesiastic-administrative jurisdiction and the Byzantine Empire only took them over in the mid 8th century during the iconoclastic disputes. The Christianisation of the Serbs was still performed without any significant resistance, since Byzantine rule left them a high degree of political/legal self-government. It often happened that large groups of Serbs eventually simply forgot that they were Christianised, so the process repeated after several decades until it was finally finished in 879, at the time of Prince Gojniković, grandson of Vlastimir. Success was achieved primarily thanks to the missionary work of Cyril and Methodius and the creation of the Slavic script based on the Greek alphabet. The introduction of

ecclesiastic liturgy in the Slavic language was crucial for the acceptance of the Christian religion in specific symbiosis with their own.

The 9th century was also the period of the definitive prevalence of Christianity and the beginning of the conflict between the western and eastern church centres over domination in the Serbian countries. At the time of the definitive schism in 1054, this problem was additionally complicated after the appearance and expansion of the Bogomil heresy. Stefan Nemanja had these problems expressed in his own family because he could not keep his oldest son Vukan away from Catholicism. In addition, the Bogomil rebellion questioned not only the ecclesiastical organisation but also the entire state structure, its legal order and political values. This is why Nemanja was ruthless towards them and many were killed and most were banished from the state in a confrontation that, at times, had the characteristics of a true civil war. In this confrontation, many material traces of the old Serbian religion suffered and the situation was additionally complicated by the disunited church organisation and the inherited division of the Serbian countries between the Archbishoprics of Split and Drač. Bar soon became the new ecclesiastical centre, while Byzantine Emperor Basil II Macedonian formed the Bishoprics of Trebinje, Zahumlje and Bosnia, separating them from the archbishopric of Drač. Two years later, Pope Vitalian I subjected them to the Archbishopric of Dubrovnik. The Serbian bishopric from Ras remained subjected to Drač and, in all odds, the previous three bishoprics belonged to it territorially and organically before that. After the Archbishopric of Ohrid was founded, a part of the Serbian countries became a part of it. The Archbishopric of Split was under papal rule and those of Ohrid and Drač were under the patriarch of Constantinople. In 1067, the Archbishopric of Bar was formed by the pope and, ten years later, he recognised Mihailo Vojislavljević, ruler of Zeta, as king, since his father had liberated significant Serbian territories in a successful uprising against the Byzantine Empire. In this way, for the first time in history, the Serbs received a relatively independent church, although it was a Roman-Catholic one. This independence did not bother the pope at all. It was even useful for him because it enabled him to stretch his power again over the Serbian countries that had got away from the Roman church three hundred years ago. "Zeta remained not only the state, but also ecclesiastical centre of the Serbs for a long time and its influence was noticeable, sometimes to a greater, sometimes to a lesser extent, even under the rule of Nemanjić, who preserved contact with the popes. There was something fateful in the fact that the two sons of Stefan Nemanja Vukan and Stefan, baptised first in the Catholic ritual, were followers of the Catholic and Orthodox Serbian Church respectively" (p. 47-48).

Stefan Nemanja himself was originally baptised in the Roman-Catholic ritual and then in the Orthodox one. After he came to power, he moved both his political and religious state centres into Raška and this was possibly crucial for the prevalence of the Orthodox influence among the medieval Serbs. However, Nemanja's son Rastko - St Sava - played the key role in the definite formation of the Serbian Orthodox Church, which was for centuries the main bearer, not only of the spiritual idea but also of

the state-forming ideology of the entire Serbian people. Very educated from the earliest age, having become a monk in the Russian monastery of St Panteleimon on the Holy Mountain at a time when Russia was a Mongolian slave, Rastko contributed to the preservation of the Russian monk brotherhoods and, at the same time, he was entirely dedicated to spiritual studies and questions of church organisation. In this regard, he paid the most attention to strengthening Serbian patriotism and the search for the firm church establishment of the pan-Serbian state-forming concept. He persuaded his own father to renounce court luxury at the peak of his power and glory, become a monk and join his youngest son. They moved to the Vatoped monastery and the ecumenical patriarch and the Byzantine emperor entrusted them with the restoration of the devastated and abandoned Hilandar, which they turned into a Serbian monastery that would be the main hotbed, not only of Orthodox spirituality but also of original Serbian nationalism, the freedom-loving tendency and state independence for centuries.

At the crossing between the 12th and 13th centuries, the consequences of the Crusade conquest of Constantinople and Vatican efforts to catholicise the entire Balkan area were expressed in all of Serbia. The Roman Church first managed to divide the brothers Vukan and Stefan, separate Raška and Zeta again and, in the end, make Vukan banish Stefan from the Rascian throne and allow the mass wanderings of Roman-Catholic missionaries over all the Serbian countries. There was a civil war in which the Bulgarians helped Stefan regain the Rascian throne and then he asked his youngest brother St Sava to return to Serbia. St Sava came with their father's relics and he was additionally motivated by the fact that the monasteries of the Holy Mountain fell under the jurisdiction of the Roman-Catholic bishop. His greatest political success was the reconciliation of the quarrelling brothers and, at the same time, he personally demonstrated the love of the homeland as one of the highest spiritual values and, therefore, inspired the devoted fight of tens of thousands of Serbian nationalists over the following centuries. Here began his dedicated state work, in which he invested enormous energy that accumulated and sublimated in years-long ascetic sacrifice, monkish patience and concentration, with supreme intelligence and expressed political talent.

As Slijepčević pointed out, "since the return of St Sava to Serbia, the Studenica monastery became the centre of Serbian ecclesiastical and spiritual life. Everything started to revolve around St Sava, whose image gained more fullness and whose personality had increasing importance. In the eyes of the people, to whom he became increasingly close and walked among the lowest and poorest, the legend of St Sava as an omnipotent saint whose prayer was miraculous began to form. His strict monkish life, intensified by his retreat to a cell in the Studenica monastery, his missionary travels among the people and his restless activity for faith made that the people see in him a teacher and a saint" (p. 65-66). He immediately and correctly realised that an independent Serbian Church was necessary for the long-term independence and unity of the Serbian state. This is why he was angry with Stefan's increasingly expressed

approach to the pope and the acceptance of the Roman-Catholic King's crown, seeing in this a danger for the preservation of the Serbian national identity and, in the long run, the denationalisation of the state.

b) The Serbian Archbishopric

In 1219, St Sava went to Nicaea to Emperor Theodore I Laskaris and ecumenical Patriarch Manuel Saranten and achieved the definitive autonomy of the Serbian Church, of which he became the first Serbian archbishop, or the archbishop of all the Serbian and littoral countries, as was the title of the Serbian kings. The autocephaly of the church, based on the right to choose bishops independently, formed the canonical basis and political conditions for the rapid identification of Serbdom with Orthodoxy, although the Nemanjić dynasty never tried to completely suppress the Catholicism in the littoral areas. Immediately after he returned to Serbia, St Sava initiated a state assembly in which Stefan Prvovenčani was re-crowned, this time with the Orthodox King's crown. The formation of new Serbian bishoprics and the complete reorganisation of the Serbian Orthodox Church followed. The centre of the Serbian Archbishopric was originally in the Žiča monastery but, in 1253, it was moved to Peć, before the invasion of the Bulgarians and Cumans. St Sava "performed the organisation of the new archbishopric according a well-thought plan. The extension of the centres of the five bishoprics to the border areas of the Serbian state then showed that, apart from purely religious matters, St Sava also considered national reasons: these protruded eparchies were not just defensive bases but also missionary standpoints, directed both toward the Bogomils in Bosnia, the Roman-Catholics in the Littoral area and the Hungarian state of that time" (p. 92).

During his five-year long rule, Stefan's son King Radoslav, the son-in-law of Byzantine Emperor Theodore Angel, had second thoughts concerning the issue of re-submission to the Archbishopric of Ohrid, but St Sava successfully opposed even the idea of this, although Radoslav was very close to Sava's bitter opponent, Archbishop Dimitrije Homatijan of Ohrid. Since St Sava stayed in Palestine for a while at that time, it seemed that Radoslav could succeed in his Greekophile intentions, but he encountered enormous national dissatisfaction. Since there was quickly a conflict between the Radoslav and his younger Vladislav, St Sava again calmed the hatred and intolerance among them. There was soon a shift on the throne, supported by the fact that Theodore Angel was defeated by Bulgarian Emperor John Asen II and the new emperor was the father-in-law of Vladislav Nemanjić. St Sava did not like this, but he still crowned Vladislav in 1234. Soon after, he removed himself from the highest ecclesiastical throne and hieromonk Arsenije was elected the new archbishop, prepared for this position by St Sava. St Sava travelled to Palestine again, in all odds because Bulgarian Emperor John Asen requested that he seek the consent of the Jerusalem, Alexandrian and Antiochian patriarchs that the Bulgarian Church gained a patriarchate, which he successfully performed, while the emperor himself previously obtained the consent of ecumenical Patriarch German II. Returning from

Palestine, Egypt and Antiochia through Constantinople, St Sava came to the Bulgarian capital of Trnovo, where he was received very cordially by the Bulgarian emperor, but he fell ill and soon died in 1236. The next year, his relics were transferred to Mileševa monastery, although the emperor wanted to keep them in Bulgaria. He gave in when King Vladislav himself came to Trnovo. The cult of St Sava was so strong among the Serbian people and so disturbing to the Turkish occupying forces that, led by Sinan-pasha, they burned the saint's relics in Vračar in 1594 or 1595. The cult of St Sava was developed in the Serbian national mind into a specific national variant of Orthodoxy that included a cultural and political identity.

In the following century, the Serbian Church successfully developed on the foundations laid by its progenitor. In 1272, Byzantine Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos again tried to subject the Serbian and Bulgarian countries to the Archbishopric of Ohrid, but this was proclaimed more in impotent anger than with any chance of being realised. This ruler was a great supporter of joining Orthodoxy into a union with the Roman-Catholic Church, but the Serbian archbishop and Bulgarian patriarch would not even agree to send their delegations to the Unionist Council in Lyons in 1274, so the proselyte hopes of Pope Gregory X failed. Jelena, the wife of King Uroš I and a devoted Catholic, constantly wished for Union, as did her sons Dragutin and Milutin when they became kings. Milutin made four attempts to achieve this, the most serious being in 1308, but the Serbian archbishops at the time had so much authority that not even the king's will could be realised on this matter. From St Sava through to the proclamation of the patriarchate, the Serbs had eleven very competent archbishops: Arsenije, Sava II, Danilo I, Janjićije I, Jevstatije I, Jakov, Jevstatije II, Sava III, Nikodim, Danilo II and Janjićije II. Some of them were toppled from the Archbishop throne for political reasons, mostly alongside shifts of the monarchs, but none of them abused the national or church interests. Most of them were proclaimed saints after their death.

c) The Serbian Patriarchate

The 1346, the State Assembly in Skopje proclaimed King Dušan as tsar and the Archbishopric as a Patriarchate. Nothing significant changed concerning the church status in the Orthodox Christian world, because autocephaly was acquired quite regularly long ago, so its canonical rank remained the same. The Bulgarian Patriarch Simeon, Archbishop Nicholas of Ohrid, representatives of the Holy Mountain and a Greek bishop who was the archpriest of a part of Dušan's Empire under the jurisdiction of the ecumenical patriarch participated in the council proclamation of Archbishop Janjićije as the first Serbian Patriarch. Bulgarian Emperor John Alexander also attended the ceremony. The conflict with Constantinople broke out because of the submission of the former ecumenical bishoprics under the jurisdiction of the Serbian patriarch and the removal of Greek metropolitans who showed animosity toward the Serbian emperor. For this reason, in 1352, ecumenical

Patriarch Callistus anathemised Tsar Dušan, Patriarch Janićije and, in effect, the whole Serbian state, church and people. Although distinctly politically motivated, the anathema shook Dušan's authority and the self-confidence of the Serbian gentry at a time of medieval prejudice and installed noticeable disquiet, tearing doubt and unrest into the minds of the main national leaders. Many Serbian monks and ecclesiastical officials considered that Dušan was wrong. Dušan asked for reconciliation with the Ecumenical Patriarchate, but he did not live long enough to see it. His widow, Empress Jelena, continued his efforts and, because of the Turkish danger, the Byzantine Empire also wanted reconciliation. In 1364, Patriarch Callistus came to her court to negotiate the removal of the anathema. He died there and the anathemised Serbian priests performed the funeral service for him. The anathema was removed from the Serbian Orthodox Church and the Serbian people, Tsar Dušan and Patriarch Janićije in 1375 after great efforts on the part of a distinguished monk of the Holy Mountain, old man Isaiah, who led the Serbian delegation to Constantinople.

Patriarch Janićije lived until 1354. Sava IV was elected his successor on the patriarch throne and he lived until the removal of the anathema. The third Serbian Patriarch Jeffrem was elected in 1375 by an electoral council in which Lazar Hrebeljanović and Đurađ Balšić contested over ecclesiastical supremacy. As a reclusive monk without any political ambitions, Jeffrem was a compromise solution. As soon as the church affairs calmed down, due considerably to his moral authority, Jeffrem resigned and, in 1379, Spiridon was elected patriarch, who died some time after the battle of Kosovo. In this tragic situation, Jeffrem was returned to the position of patriarch and resigned again in 1383 and Danilo was elected patriarch. After Danilo's death, in 1389, Sava V became patriarch. In roughly 1407, he was succeeded by Patriarch Kirilo. In 1420, Nikon was elected patriarch and, after him, Patriarch Nikodim II, but the historians were not capable of setting the year of the election more precisely. In 1455, Patriarch Arsenije II was elected, but there were no authentic records on what happened to him because of the destruction of Serbian state and church.

The chaotic post-Kosovo situation in the Serbian state and society was directly reflected in church affairs, although the economic flourishing under Despot Stefan Lazarević brought some life. Serbia became the refuge for a mass exodus of Greek and Bulgarian monks who fled from Turkish occupation. The number of monasteries grew and spiritual life, writing and the copying of books intensified. At this time, the famous Resava orthographic and literary school was founded. The period of the rule of Đurađ Branković was also characterised by rich ecclesiastical literary creation. The spiritual strength and creative energy accumulated at this time would be significant in the subsequent centuries of slavery, when the Serbian Orthodox Church took over the national role of the broken Nemanjić state. The Church was long prepared by the development of the principle of conciliarity in the election of the highest church officials, nurturing loyalty to the state as one of the main spiritual values, renouncing participation in the fight for political power and helping the

rulers to strengthen the central power in relation to the arrogant regional aristocrats, but also with the expressed kind disposition that all kings and tsars of the Nemanjić line showed towards it. The rulers of the Serbian medieval state did not show any Caesar-Papist tendencies, not imposing themselves as the supreme church leaders, as was the case with some other Orthodox states. On the other hand, the church officials also never had any Papist ambitions.

It is supposed that Patriarch Arsenije II died in 1463, four years after the fall of the Despotate and the same year that Bosnia fell into Turkish slavery. This was a time of dreadful ravaging of the Serbian countries, the slaughter and persecution of people and the demolition of churches and monasteries. Wherever they encountered even the slightest national resistance to their conquering pretensions, the Turks were revenged cruelly. Thousands and thousands of people were taken into slavery and the country was almost abandoned and thoroughly plundered. It was only when military operations were moved far to the north and a firm administration established in the occupied territories that the life of the Serbian people became somewhat normalised. The organisational structure of the Serbian Orthodox Church fell apart, but religious life continued through the enthusiasm of priests and the loyalty of the people, whose national identification was even more equated with the religious one. On the whole, there was no coercion to become Turks, periodical blood tribute aside. The structures of the Serbian state government and former ruling circles were completely destroyed, but the church and monastery life gradually renewed. In some places, the bishops remained and the Turks allowed the restorations of old churches and monasteries, though prohibiting the building of new ones. Religiously, the greatest part of the former Serbian state territory fell under the jurisdiction of the Archbishopric of Ohrid, but most archpriests did not, like the metropolitans of Zeta and Herzegovina who acted independently or the metropolitan of Belgrade who was under Hungarian rule. Historical science was not capable of investigating this issue in more detail, but there was absolutely no evidence that the Serbian Patriarchate was ever formally cancelled in the almost a hundred years of this period. Since it was not possible to elect a new patriarch in these highly difficult historical times, many Serbian bishops almost instinctively connected with the Archbishop of Ohrid, who spread his territorial jurisdiction in a quite informal manner, assuming seniority based on the formal superiority of title and function.

d) The Restoration of the Serbian Patriarchate

From 1528 to 1541, Metropolitan Pavle of Smederevo tried to restore the Serbian Patriarchate. With the support of some distinguished Serbs and the quite benevolent attitude of the Turkish authorities. He took over the Patriarchate of Peć in 1531 and arbitrarily proclaimed himself the Serbian patriarch. He managed to make the Serbian Church independent but then, invigorated by his previous results, he took over the Archbishopric of Ohrid, uniting it with the Serbian one and, this way,

actually cancelling Serbian church independence again. Having Archbishop Prohor of Ohrid toppled and arrested, Pavle prompted the counteraction of the ecumenical patriarch against him, which led to Prohor's liberation and re-positioning on the throne and to the anathemising of Pavle. However, the Serbian archpriests would no longer easily agree to the domination of Greek ones, especially because the Turkish authorities were increasingly kind to the Serbian people and their church aspirations. Because of the persistent support of Grand Vizier Mehmed-pasha Sokolović, Turkish sultan Suleiman the Magnificent enabled the restoration of the Patriarchate of Peć in 1557 with Mehmed-pasha's brother Makarije Sokolović, who was probably the archimandrite of Hilandar. Patriarch Makarije immediately and wholeheartedly undertook the enormous job and successfully renewed the principles of conciliarity, the canonical order and the unique organisational structure of the Serbian Orthodox Church. Under his management, the church became the wide national representative and bearer of the specific political autonomy of the Serbs. He stuck strictly to the ethical principle and renounced some southern eparchies in which a compact Greek population lived. Thanks to him, all the Serbs were united again, although not free, and the restored Patriarchate was the extension of the state continuity in their minds.

The Patriarchate of Peć was the key factor in the restoration and renaissance of the Serbian national identity and state-forming traditions. Having achieved great successes, Patriarch Makarije resigned from the throne near the end of his life and, in 1571, Antonije, former the Metropolitan of Herzegovina, was elected as the new patriarch. Antonije died a few years later and, in 1575, Patriarch Gerasim took his place. In 1586, he was succeeded by Patriarch Savatije, Makarije's nephew and the Metropolitan of Herzegovina. Around 1589, Jerotej became the patriarch and, in 1591, Filip. All these patriarchs followed the road paved by Makarije, relying on the Turkish authorities, expressing general political loyalty to them and gaining increasingly visible benefits and perks for the Orthodox Serbian people from this. They were usually elected to the patriarch throne at a very old age, meaning that they did not remain in this position for long, but their ecclesiastical policies were identical.

In 1592, Jovan Kantul was elected Serbian Patriarch and he abandoned the policy of cooperation with the Turkish authorities and, filled with the ideals of Serbian national and state liberation, made connections with West-European states. Under the influence of the anti-Turkish Christian alliance formed by the Vatican, Spain, Venice and Austria, this rebellious spirit caught almost every Serbian country. Serbian bishops were sometimes personally at the head of the rebels. In these years, the Turks oppressed the Serbian population more intensely, but the greatest revolt was caused by the burning of the relics of St Sava. The Turkish army ravaged, plundered and murdered everywhere. Patriarch Jovan expected concrete military help from the Catholic countries but Pope Clement VIII only thought of how to abuse the unfortunate Serbian fate. In 1599, he officially asked Jovan for the Serbs to accept union. Clement's successor, Pope Paul V, started the systematic Uniatism in the

Montenegrin littoral area, which Patriarch Jovan opposed wholeheartedly, but he participated in the 1608 assembly of the national leaders in which the Duke of Savoy was proclaimed the Serbian king. As with many other Serbian national leaders, Jovan was apparently bitterly disappointed by the policy of the Western forces.

The Serbian Orthodox Church still survived however, through all national sufferings, the execution of priest and the burning and plundering of churches and monasteries. In 1613, the Turks caught Patriarch Jovan and hanged him in Constantinople. In 1614, Metropolitan Pajsije of Novo Brdo, was elected the new patriarch. A wise and very educated man, loyal to Serbdom and Orthodoxy and deprived of any misconceptions concerning the charitableness of the Catholic states, Patriarch Pajsije tried to fix the relations between the Serbian Orthodox Church and the Turkish authorities and, at the same time, he fiercely strengthened the national and political relations of the Serbs with Russia. With his temperance and realism, Pajsije managed to stabilise the position of the Patriarchate of Peć and was entirely dedicated to organising efforts and enlightenment and the restoration of churches and monasteries. Pajsije died in 1647 and, in 1648, Gavriilo Gajić, Metropolitan of Raška, was elected the new Serbian patriarch. He repeated Jovan's mistake by cooperating with Roman missionaries and causing new suspicions in Turkey. In 1654, in the Krušedol monastery, Patriarch Pajsije of Jerusalem paid him a visit. In 1654, Gavriilo travelled to Moscow to ask for cooperation in the fight against the Turks. In Moscow, he was cordially received by both the emperor and patriarch and he soon decided to stay in Russia, sending his escort back to Serbia with the message that they should choose a new Serbian patriarch. In 1655, Maksim was elected patriarch and then, in 1659, Gavriilo returned to Serbia and caused conflict with Maksim, wanting to regain the patriarchal throne. The Turks arrested and hanged Gavriilo.

In 1674, Maksim retreated because of illness and Arsenije III Crnojević, a young and very agile man, was elected patriarch. Since the Turks were defeated in 1683 near Vienna, at the initiative of Pope Innocent XI, an alliance of Austria, Poland and Venice was formed in 1684, named the Holy League. In 1686, Russia and Poland made an anti-Turkish alliance and the Turks suffered a serious defeat in the battle of Mohacs in the same year, which motivated the Banate Serbs to start an uprising. After the conquest of Belgrade in 1688 by Maximilian Emanuel, the Turks were suppressed all the way to Niš. At the same time, the Venetians penetrated Montenegro. The Turks vented their anger about their numerous defeats on the Serbian civilian population, robbed churches and harassed the patriarch, who had to flee to Cetinje. He returned to Peć after the entire area of Metohija was conquered by General Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, who demanded from the patriarch that the Serbs join his army. The Serbs raised in a mass uprising against the Turks. In 1689, Piccolomini died of the plague and the Turks thoroughly prepared a counter-offence, defeated the Austrians near Kačanik in 1690 and advanced unstoppably north, re-conquering Smederevo and Belgrade. They were defeated near Slankamen in 1691, in

a battle in which the Serbs also participated under the command of Jovan Monasterlija. Afraid of Turkish retribution, Patriarch Arsenije III organised a mass exodus of Serbs over the Danube River and the Turks murdered a great number of the who remained in Kosovo and Metohija. On the 21st August 1690, the Austrian emperor guaranteed privileges to the Serbs inside his empire. The 1699 Peace of Karlowitz ended all the patriarch's hopes of returning to the throne in Peć and preserving the unity of the Serbian Orthodox Church. For sixteen years, he conducted a difficult fight to secure the respecting of falsely guaranteed national and religious rights for his people and he died in Vienna in 1706.

After the departure of Arsenije III in 1691, Kalinik I was appointed patriarch of Peć and he frenetically tried to sort out the circumstances in the Church and facilitate life for the Serbs that remained under Turkish rule. Some bishops rejected him, arguing that he was appointed by the Turks and that he was not elected according to the conciliarity principal but, regardless of this, Kalinik I acted like a true Serbian patriot, a true Orthodox and a bitter opponent of the Roman-Catholic proselytism and uniatism. He died in 1710 and, in 1711, Atanasije, the former Metropolitan of Skopje, was elected the new Serbian patriarch. After his death in 1712, he was succeeded by Patriarch Mojsije Gajović, Metropolitan of Raška. He performed the archpriest duties devotedly and conscientiously, but he was removed from the patriarchal throne in 1718, when the monk Timotej from the Holy Mountain bought the throne of the Serbian Patriarchate for a large sum of money. Timotej came into Peć with the sultan's brother, to the horror of all Serbian church officials. All the eastern patriarchs also protested and, in the same year, they held a council in Constantinople in which Timotej was anathemised and the Serbs had to give even more money back to the sultan so that the Porte would banish the counter-canonical usurper. Mojsije continued to restore his patriarchal mission and, while doing so, he kept in close contact with the Metropolitan of Karlowitz to preserve the spiritual unity of the Serbian people.

In Mojsije's expressed will, Patriarch Arsenije IV Jovanović Šakabenta became his successor in 1725. When Russia and Austria entered the war against Turkey in 1737, Šakabenta joined their war efforts, which encouraged a great Turkish pogrom against the Orthodox Serbs and the patriarch had to escape to Sremski Karlovci with a group of bishops, where he died in 1748. After him, the Turks brought Greeks to the patriarchal throne following the criteria of who could pay the most. The first was Janićije Karadža, who was Chrismated in Constantinople and ordained on the direct order of the Porte, with the explanation that the Patriarchate of Peć was disorganised. He appointed Greeks as Serbian bishops and seized money from the people, showing his exclusive motives. In the end, he thoroughly robbed the Patriarchate of Peć and escaped to Constantinople with substantial loot. In 1746, Atanasije II Gavrilović, former Metropolitan of Skopje, became the patriarch. After his death, he was succeeded by Patriarch Gavril II, based on the sultan's firman. He immediately showed great greed and covetousness. It was assumed he was also Greek. He appointed Greeks as bishops for money,

tyrannised priests and destroyed the church organisational structure. A similar thing happened under the imposed patriarchs Gavril III and Gavril IV. For a short while, the patriarchs were the Serb Vićentije Stefanović and the Greek Pajsije II, but they left almost no trace. Gavril IV was toppled in 1758 and another Greek, Cyril, was imposed as patriarch.

In 1763, Vasilije Brkić-Jovanović became patriarch. The Turks soon overthrew him and imprisoned him on Cyprus, from which he escaped to Montenegro and travelled to Italy with Prince Dolgoruki to join Russian Admiral, Count Aleksey Orlov, as Đoko Slijepčević meticulously noted. In 1771, he went to Vienna, but he was banished from there at the decision of the Austrian authorities. He went to Russia and died there. In 1765, the Greek Kalinik II became the Patriarch of Peć, hated by the people as all other Greeks before him were. The Turks did not trust Serbian archpriests anymore and the Greek ones were highly inefficient. The Ecumenical Patriarchate persistently acted in the direction of expanding its territorial jurisdictions and got carried away with the idea of the Hellenisation of the entire Balkan Orthodox population. In this sense, it acted practically and systematically in an anti-Serbian way because the Phanariots never truly reconciled with the Serbian and Bulgarian ecclesiastical independence. Besides, the Archbishopric of Ohrid also bothered them a lot. The formal suggestion to the Turkish sultan to cancel the Patriarchate of Peć was made by ecumenical Patriarch Samuilo. Sultan Mustafa III issued a *berat* in 1766 on the cancellation of the Patriarchate of Peć based on this request. All the remaining Serbian bishops were removed and Greeks were put in their positions, so the Serbian Orthodox Church under Turkish slavery became the exclusive instrument for plundering the Serbian people to the benefit of the greedy Phanariots. The Metropolitanates of Karlowitz and Montenegro did not accept this and they became independent. The inhuman treatment by many Greek bishops directly motivated many Serbs to turn Turkish or Catholic. The Slavic liturgy, literary and educational work died out. Many local priests protested and denied obeisance to the *vladikas*, so the Phanariots persecuted them with the help of Turkish soldiers.

e) The Serbian Church in Austria and Hungary

The Serbian Church was territorially divided in the Peace of Karlowitz from 1699, when some of its eparchies found themselves in Austria and others remained in Turkey and the direct meddling of the Turkish sultans and their appointment of the patriarch of Peć, especially the arrival of Greeks on this throne, contributed to a much quicker break-up of the remaining connections between the key parts of the same time. The connections were much stronger at the time of the parallel activity of two patriarchs, Arsenije III and Kalinik I. After Arsenije's death, the court of Vienna insisted that the Serbian eparchies in Austria cease any connections with the Patriarchate of Peć and that they proclaim the Serbian Orthodox Church in Austrian Countries to be autocephalous. Vienna hoped to enforce the Union more easily and Catholicise all the

Serbs under its rule. Kalinik I saw through the Austrian intentions and he tried to prevent them with his 1710 act in which he sanctioned the Metropolitanate of Karlowitz as an autonomous area inside the Serbian Orthodox Church. He confirmed the organisational fragmentation to preserve the ecclesiastical spiritual unity. This is why the arrival of the Greek patriarchs to the throne in Peć in the following decades led to the break-up of real connections but, in the mind of the people and priests, it did not disturb the indivisible church entity.

As a consequence of the 1718 Peace of Požarevac and the 1739 Peace of Belgrade, an act of Emperor Charles V recognised the autonomy of the Belgrade Metropolitanate with four bishoprics, Temišvar, Vrnjci, Rimnik and Valjevo. In 1721, Patriarch Mojsije of Peć issued a synod gramata on the recognition of this autonomy. In 1726, in spite of the opposition of the court of Vienna, the ecclesiastical-national council proclaimed the unification of the autonomous Belgrade and Karlowitz Metropolitanates under Metropolitan Mojsije Petrović. In 1737, Patriarch Arsenije IV came to this throne and significantly contributed to the increase of church authority. Since Belgrade fell into Turkish hands again, the Metropolitanate of Karlowitz was territorially limited north of the Sava and Danube Rivers, formally remained autonomous and essentially autocephalous. In the second half of the 18th century, twelve eparchies were under Austrian rule and nine eparchies were under the Austrian archbishop, while the Metropolitanate of Cetinje was considered autonomous because it acted in the free Serbian territory. It was hardest for the Dalmatian Metropolitanate because the Venetian authorities did not allow the existence of a Serbian bishop in its territory at all.

A great number of Serbs lived in the territories of Austria and Hungary even before the great migration. The 1481 decree of Hungarian King Matthias testified to this, because it privileged the Serbs by exempting them from paying a tax to the Roman-Catholic Church, which was a general obligation of the Hungarian population. The seven privileges of King Sigismund and 25 from his successors followed, so the Serbian ecclesiastical life simply thrived in these areas. At the time of the great migration, Emperor Leopold I gave the Serbs the four acts on privileges, guaranteeing them national rights and ecclesiastical-national self-government. These privileges were confirmed and expanded in the following decades by Emperors Joseph I, Charles VI and Maria Theresa. The privileges primarily guaranteed the right to a separate territory, independent national representation and the free elections of archbishops. The ecclesiastical leader of the Serbs was also the secular leader, which showed that the theocratic model of Serbian autonomy had taken over from the Turkish Empire. This always caused enormous odium among the Hungarian aristocratic class and the Roman-Catholic prelates, who never renounced their proselyte ambitions and who had difficulties adapting to the legal order of Austria and Hungary at this time. However, as the actual danger from Turkey weakened, the authorities systematically narrowed and cancelled privileges, which led to fierce political fights and even the cruel persecution of Serbian national leaders.

A year after the death of patriarch Arsenije III, the Serbian

Ecclesiastical-National Synod in Krušedol in 1707 elected Isaija Đaković as his successor, but he died in 1708. At that same synod, the Krušedol-Karlowitz Metropolitanate was formed with the status of an autonomous church area of the Patriarchate of Peć, with jurisdiction over all the Serbs under Habsburg rule. This is why Isaija was not elected patriarch but metropolitan, he did not insist on autocephaly but pledged loyalty to the patriarch of Peć in all spiritual matters. Isaija's two immediate successors, Stevan Metohijac and Sofronije Podgoričanin, held the position for a short time, less than a year, before Vićentije Popović was elected metropolitan in 1713 and, for the next twelve years, strictly followed the policy of the firmest possible connection with the Patriarchate of Peć. He was succeeded by Metropolitan Mojsije Petrović of Belgrade in 1726, uniting the two autonomous metropolitanates. The court of Vienna was already deep in the process of limiting the secular power of the Serbian metropolitan, but it also started interfering with the election of the bishop, proclaiming that this also needed the emperor's approval. In 1731, Vićentije Jovanović became metropolitan, continuing the energetic fight of his predecessors for the preservation of privileges and strongly opposing Uniatism. In favourable political circumstances, he managed to get the emperor's license in 1735 to found the Serbian cavalry regiment, of which the metropolitan himself was the commander and who appointed the officers. It so happened that, immediately after the death of Metropolitan Vićentije, Patriarch Šakabenta emigrated to Sremski Karlovci after the Austrians and Serbs were defeated in a war against the Turks. With the consent of all bishops, the patriarch assumed the duties of metropolitan.

At the time of Patriarch Arsenije IV Šakabenta's death, the Austrian authorities already suppressed the Serbian secular autonomy, reducing it exclusively to church autonomy. When Isaija Antonović was elected metropolitan in 1748, he was forced not to mention loyalty to the Patriarch of Peć in his oath and, after less than six months, he died. In 1749, Pavle Nenadović became the metropolitan of Karlowitz, in the midst of state persecution of the Serbian priests. Pavle managed to fix and advance the state in the Serbian Orthodox Church, gain the trust and benevolence of Maria Theresa and make the position of the entire Serbian people a bit more bearable, at least for a short while. He stopped the emigration of the Serbs to Russia and bitterly fought against all attempts to submit Serbia and destroy their national entity.

According to Đoko Slijepčević, "in front of his own people, who admired him as their national and religious head, Nenadović stood like a great oak which sustained blows from all sides, but they could not break him or make him give up. The worst thing was persistent, consistent and often very hypocritical intentions of the Court to impose Catholicism on the Serbian people" (*"History of the Serbian Orthodox Church"*, volume II, p. 42, editors' note). Imposing Catholicism was carried out openly, using violent methods. The furious Empress would not allow Metropolitan Pavle Nenadović to convene a religious-national assembly for several years. The approval arrived only in 1768, when the Metropolitan had died, leaving in spite of all, an established church organisation and a well-developed educational system.

Upon Pavle's death, the people and the clergy elected the Bishop of Bačka, Mojsije Putnik, as Administrator of the Metropoly, while the Empress insisted on appointing the Bishop of Vršac, Jovan Đorđević. At the Assembly held in 1769, under open pressure from the Imperial Commissioner, Đorđević was elected the new Metropolitan, since the court circles liked him for his personal weakness and acquiescence. In 1770, the Empress issued the first regulation that formally restricted Serbian privileges and thus the role of the Metropolitan was reduced strictly to performing church functions. Serbian Orthodox holidays were also rigorously restricted. The Serbs were not satisfied with the weak resistance of their own *vladikas* (prince-bishops) and the latter were accused of conspiracy with the Austrian authorities. Jovan Đorđević passed away in 1773 and, the next year, the already compromised Bishop of Timisoara, Vićentije Jovanović Vidak, was appointed Metropolitan under the Court's influence. The authorities started reducing the number of Serbian monasteries and limiting the number of monks. Monk rules were prescribed by the Greek Catholic monks. In accordance with the second regulation, dating from 1777, the Empress also appointed archimandrites of the monasteries. She tried to force a Jesuit catechism on the Serbs. The people, in revolt even physically assaulted the *vladika* for his lack of spirit and increased fears from imposing the union. Then Metropolitan Vićentije came to his senses and openly presented all the complaints of the Serbian people's representatives and church circles to the Empress, referring to the behaviour of the authorities. The Empress punished the Metropolitan in 1779 with a reprimand, threatening him with strict sanctions if he continued dealing with secular authority issues. Then she issued a Declaration in the form of a law on the Administration of the Metropolitanate of Karlovac, in which she increased the restrictions ensuing from both regulations. Based on this Act, the people voted, but the Emperor confirmed and appointed the Metropolitan and the state authority strictly controlled the material affairs of the Metropolitanate. The Assembly was obligatorily attended by an Emperor's commissioner, who imposed the will of the authorities. Neither could the Synod sessions be held without the approval of the Emperor and, for each tour of their respective eparchies, the *vladikas* had to previously obtain an approval from the Court. It was also prescribed that the assembly had to consist of 25 representatives of the army, citizens and clergy, whereby all were granted authorisation by the Emperor's commissioner. The Declaration was amended in 1782 through a consistorial system, which pertains in particular to the regulation of the church courts and the intention of putting it under the full control of the state authorities, and in a much less favourable position with respect to the Roman Catholics and Greek Catholics.

In 1781, Mojsije Putnik was appointed the new Metropolitan and he continued to fight to maintain the church-national autonomy. That same year, the new Emperor Joseph II took over the throne and he showed much more understanding for the Serbian problems and requests. That same year, the Emperor issued a Charter on Religious Tolerance and thus the efforts of Metropolitan Mojsije in the fight against the imposition of

Catholic religion was much more successful than that of his predecessors. As the elected successor of Mojsije Putnik, the young Episcopo from Budim Stevan Stratimirović was appointed Metropolitan in 1790 and, soon afterwards, he became one of the most significant characters in the entire history of the Serbian Orthodox Church. A supreme intellectual with an erudite education, a true patriot and a skilful diplomat, Stratimirović was able to gain the trust of the Vienna Court, without ever abandoning the interests of the Serbian nation and church, nor giving up on the traditional Serbian sentiment for Russia. He revived the church educational system, set up church funds, intensified the delivery of Russian books and the publishing of Serbian publications, regulated the material position of the clergy and improved the living conditions and organisation of the monastic orders. He stabilised all the episcopacies and ensured the appointment of *vladikas* in dioceses that had remained without head representatives for years. Stratimirović had a conservative spirit, impeccable in national terms, yet he was highly learned and modern in spirit regarding organisational issues. He particularly insisted on the education and moral virtues of the Serbian clergy and their role as precious national educators. However, his major achievements were in the fight against the imposition of Catholicism, as he dedicated himself to that goal with enormous energy. He managed to repulse all attempts at imposing a new Gregorian calendar on the Serbs, which would prescribe the joint observance of Christian, Orthodox and Roman Catholic holidays on the same day. In a secret memorandum sent to the Russian Emperor in 1804, Metropolitan Stratimirović presented his concept of the Serbian state that should be created with Russian support and which would encompass all the Serbian countries, while its sovereign would be a member of the Russian imperial dynasty. If the Austrians had come into possession of that document, the Metropolitan would have certainly been executed. He also had an enormous influence on the rebel Serbia and its princes and dukes, being their vigorous diplomatic representative at the Vienna Court. He was suspicious of the phonetic and grammatical reforms of Vuk Karadžić, primarily due to the fact that Karadžić's main patron was Jernej Kopitar, a renowned opponent of the Orthodox religion and a Roman Catholic proselyte.

In 1837, after Stratimirović's death, the Electoral Assembly elected the Bishop of Bačka, Stevan Stanković, as the new Metropolitan. He was a proved opponent of the Union and a renowned orator, but he died after four years. Until the appointment of Josif Rajačić, in 1842, the Bishop of Pakrac, Georgije Hranislav, was the Administrator. Josif Rajačić was the Bishop of Vršac and also a renowned opponent of the Union, as well as an opponent of the Hungarian influence that was being imposed at the time. Incited by the Serbian people, who were embittered by national oppression, he convoked an Assembly of national representatives in Sremski Karlovci in May 1848, where Serbian Vojvodina was proclaimed, colonel Stevan Šupljikac was appointed Duke, and Metropolitan Josif Rajačić was appointed Patriarch. This appointment was confirmed in December of that same year by the Austrian Emperor. Serbian Vojvodina encompassed the territories of Srem, Baranja, Bačka

and Banat. Since Šupljikac passed away soon afterwards, the Emperor grabbed for himself another title, namely that of the Grand Duke of the Serbian Dukedom. Rajačić inherited the established internal church relations and so he focused mainly on the educational, cultural and political aspects. His work was hindered by the pro-Hungarian *Vladika* Platon Atanacković, who was transferred from the Episcopal throne of Budim, regardless of the opposition to this decision by the Patriarch. The act of proclamation of the Patriarch was not executed in accordance with the canonical church rules, but it inspired huge national enthusiasm and patriotism. Moreover, Metropolitan Stratimirović himself expressed an opinion in one of his acts that there were legal prerequisites for the renovation of the Serbian Patriarchate, due to the fact that Patriarchs Arsenije III and Arsenije IV had escaped the Metropolitanate in Karlovac at the time. From the internal state and legislative point of view, the new Serbian Patriarchate was based on Article 20 from 1848, which regulated the issue of church and school autonomy. The Serbs had been arbitrarily transforming the Church assembly into a popular representative office with a political character and, soon afterwards, they started forming political parties that were substituting the earlier supremacy of the church hierarchy in the political life.

When Serbian Vojvodina was abolished in 1860 and Patriarch Rajačić died in 1861, considerable confusion among Serbs was created with a clear differentiation of two political tendencies - in which the church hierarchy should either continue to lead the political affairs or become subordinated to political leading representatives of the Serbian people. It was only at the Church-National Assembly in 1864 that the Bishop of Timisoara, Samuil Maširević, was appointed the new Patriarch. The next year, a new Assembly was convoked, where the fight continued with a renewed fervour between the newly established politicians and the high church representatives over supremacy in secular issues. The following Assembly in 1869 was entirely dedicated to the issue of organising church autonomy, while the lack of leadership ability of Patriarch Samuilo was noticed to the full extent during its preparation, along with his lack of competence in direct confrontation with Svetozar Miletić and Jovan Subotić. The Patriarch dismissed the Assembly prior to the schedule, but it still marked the end of the supremacy of the Church in Serbian national politics. When Patriarch Samuilo died in 1870, the Bishop of Budim, Arsenije Stojković, acted as administrator for two years. He failed to settle the church issues but he improved relationships with the political representatives of the people. He convoked the Assembly in 1870, where the leading role was taken by Svetozar Miletić and Jovan Subotić, who established a new hierarchy of the church power, while the Synod was only in charge of religious issues and the Assembly, which was ruled by the politicians, dealt with church administration. In 1872, administrator Arsenije was replaced by Nikanor Grujić. At the Assembly held in 1874, Arsenije Stojković was elected Patriarch, which provoked the immediate opposition of the Emperor. Consequently, Prokopije Ivačković was elected Patriarch, but he resigned in 1879 and a favourite of the Vienna Court, German Anđelić, was appointed

administrator. At the Assembly session held in 1881, Arsenije Stojković was re-elected Patriarch, but the Emperor once again refused to confirm his election, thus demonstrating his own superiority over the Serbian autonomous assembly. At the repeated session held that same year, Teofan Živković, Bishop of Gornji Karlovac, was elected Patriarch. The Emperor again refused this appointment and defiantly appointed German Anđelić as Patriarch in 1882, who was obstructed in return by his own compatriots. He died six years after his appointment.

In 1890, Georgije Branković, Bishop of Timisoara, was appointed Patriarch and he conducted a long-term battle against Hungarian anti-Serb pretensions. Despite the fact that he was constantly forced to enter into various political conflicts, Patriarch Georgije managed to resolve the conflicting state of affairs within the Church and to improve the position of the clergy, the church education system and, in particular, secular education. He was open-minded and generous with regard to investment for educational and cultural purposes. He died in 1907, to be succeeded the following year by the Bishop of Budim, Lukijan Bogdanović, at the Third Assembly after the decision of the Emperor to refuse the appointment of the Bishop of Vršac, Georgije Zmajević, and after the Bishop of Bačka, Mitrofan Sević, did not accept the Patriarch's position. Patriarch Lukijan suffered a hard blow in 1912, when the Hungarian government revoked a number of legal regulations, which almost completely compromised the institution of the Serbian church and national autonomy itself. The following year, Lukijan lost his life in Austria, under suspicious circumstances. Up until the end of the First World War, the administrators were the Bishop of Gornji Karlovac, Mihailo Grujić, and the Bishop of Pakrac, Miron Nikolić.

f) The Serbian Church in Montenegro

In 1219, Saint Sava founded the Zeta Episcopacy, which gained the status of a Metropolitanate in 1346. The Metropolitan regularly had one bishop there as an assistant, who, as a rule, became his successor. Both of them were proclaimed by the Patriarch of Peć. The tradition of exercising the secular authority of the *vladikas* of Cetinje was initiated in 1485 when Ivan Crnojević, before leaving the country, transferred his secular power to Metropolitan Vavila, who in fact represented the supreme head of the Montenegrin tribes in the subsequent historical period, as there was no real state yet at that time. Therefore, such a theocratic form of power was specific with respect to all others. At first, the *vladikas* were elected alternately from different tribes, though gradually such election was attributed by an unwritten rule to the Petrović brotherhood. The Metropolitan, as the first among equals, in fact only presided over the assemblies of the tribal heads and made decisions in an unusually democratic atmosphere that was not typical for that time. The almost exclusive subject of discussion was a persistent battle against the Turks, but it also covered the pacification of conflicting tribes and brotherhoods. However, the unity of spiritual and secular power was firmly established and multilayered, according to the synthesis of the Serbian national

awareness and the Orthodox religion. The first great victory over the Turks was won by the Montenegrin Serbs near Lješko polje in 1604, headed by *Vladika* Danilo Petrović.

After the great migration, the *Vladika* of Cetinje, Danilo Petrović, was not proclaimed in Peć by Patriarch Kalinik I, but he had to go to Sečuj, where he was proclaimed *vladika* by Patriarch Arsenije III. However, the ties with the Patriarchate of Peć were not disrupted. Danilo himself, apart from the title of *Vladika* of Cetinje, held the title of the Duke of the Serbian Country. The power vested in him was founded on the moral authority of the Serbian Orthodox Church and on his personal reputation. The authority of his predecessors and successors depended on and was adapted by the same issue. His greatest political success was definitely the expulsion of the Montenegrins who accepted the Islamic religion, following which the Serbian people in Montenegro were eventually saved from the most perfidious form of extinction.

By abolishing the Serbian Patriarchate in 1776, the Metropolitanate of Cetinje began its existence as an independent church, without ever accepting the jurisdiction of the Supreme Patriarch. *Vladika* Sava Petrović was at the Metropolitan throne at the time and he claimed support and assistance from the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, but without refusing the primacy of the Metropolitanate of Karlovac until the Patriarchate of Peć was being restructured. The Metropolitanate of Montenegro never had any pretensions of autonomy, but the Russians considered it autonomous due to its position, since the heads of the tribes and the people elected the *vladika*, while King Nikola proclaimed it autocephalous by the power of his sovereign authority on 30 December 1903, on the occasion of proclaiming the Constitution of the Holy Synod, which was meaningless from the point of view of the Church canons. The *vladikas* of Cetinje attributed to themselves the titles of the Metropolitans of Zeta, Skender, Montenegro and the Coastal Area after *Vladika* Danilo's jurisdiction in the Coastal Area was confirmed by a special Duke's Decree of the Venetians, in 1718.

Vladika Petar I Petrović Njegoš was proclaimed *vladika* in 1784 in Sremski Karlovci, while his successor Petar II was proclaimed in Russia. "Both of them, one a saint and the other a genius, put significant efforts into trying to incorporate Montenegro, an underdeveloped and poor country, into the progress of European civilisation, which had a certain influence in their mountainous region, and to create a decent national community out of the tribes whose heads were not always able to see beyond the borders of their own local community. In compliance with their position and the church role, the *vladikas* and heads of the church, they had to be statesmen and rulers rather than church officials who were devoted only to their church affairs" (p. 234). Spiritual, national, political and military affairs simply could not have been separated. "Even the Metropolitans were forced to make war, thus they used to take up arms and lead their people in fierce and hard battles. But also simple warriors, in a certain sense, acted as priests: religious sentiment and devotion to the sacred memories of their ancestors and the fear that Islam might spread

IT-03-67-T
and become prevalent in their country incited the Montenegrin warriors to fight and inspired them with epic bravery and heroism" (p. 234).

Upon the death of Sava Petrović, Arsenije Plamenac was appointed the new Metropolitan, proclaimed by Patriarch Arsenije Brkić, who was in Montenegro at the time and thus accepted the proposal of the false emperor Šćepan the Little. However, Plamenac died soon afterwards and Šćepan was killed, leaving Petar I without serious rivals. He immediately started working on settling the issues referring to the church and the state, the formation of schools and the establishment of any kind of legal order, reconciliation of the conflicting tribes and the eradication of blood vengeance. He also had to fight against the Turks and in 1785 Mahmud Pasha Bushati burned down the Monastery of Cetinje. Petar I named his nephew Rade Tomov as heir in the testament, leaving him before death with an oath to pray to God and adhere to Russia. Nevertheless, the heir in line with the testament was confirmed at the Assembly of the heads of tribes, despite the fact that Austrian agents were trying to prevent it in various ways. Governor Vuko Radonjić was left tragically alone and so, in the same year of 1831, Montenegro obtained a new *vladika* and lord. Formally, in 1833, Njegoš was proclaimed Bishop in Russia. He often used to neglect church affairs, dedicating himself entirely to political and literary activities. He invested a huge amount of creative energy into awakening the Serbian national spirit, by acting as a volcano of revived patriotic and state aspirations for the entire Serbian people. "His faith in God, the creator and ruler of the Universe, was very deep, although not always in accordance with the dogmatic theory of the Church. Inspired by an insatiable desire for learning, Njegoš disregarded the respect imposed on him by the Church as the Bishop, but he never wanted to oppose the Church, not even when his opinion was not in line with the dogma. He was well aware how much the people he ruled were deeply devoted to its Orthodox religion, thus he did everything in his power to defend it and guard it" (p. 270).

Njegoš nominated Danilo Stankov as his heir by way of a testament, and the latter was proclaimed Montenegrin sovereign in 1851 at the Assembly of tribal heads. The following year, the National Assembly proclaimed the Montenegro Principality and the Russian Emperor confirmed the appointment of Danilo Petrović as secular Prince on 18 July 1852. Thus the state authority was definitely separated from the church. Nikanor Ivanović was appointed the new Metropolitan only in 1858 in Russia, but he proved to be a bad choice and very unpopular with the people. Prince Danilo refused to see him when lying on his death bed, while his successor, Prince Nikola, forced Nikanor to step down from the Metropolitan throne. Ilarion Roganović was appointed the new Metropolitan, proclaimed in Russia in 1863. He dedicated himself to church affairs and was respected for his honesty and kindness. However, he had no particular education and did not interfere with political issues. When Ilarion died in 1882, *Vladika* (Prince-Bishop) Visarion Ljubiša was appointed his successor by the will of the Prince, but he died already in 1884. Mitrofan Ban then became Administrator and was ordained Metropolitan the next year in Saint Petersburg. He intended to resolve the

church affairs and enforce more discipline among the clergy, and he was also keen on literary creation. He remained the head of the Metropolitanate until the reunification of the Serbian Orthodox Church. In fact, he passed away several months afterwards. During his mandate, the Constitution of the Holy Synod defined the Montenegrin Metropolitanate as autocephalous, which had been acknowledged by the Russians back in 1851 and published by Rallis and Potlis in their famous Syntagma in 1855. However, it went without saying that such an agreement was only valid until the renovation of the Patriarchy of Peć, but all the church officials were aware that such a definition was down to political reasons and not in compliance with the church canons.

g) The Serbian Church in the Liberated Part of Serbia

The Belgrade pashalic was named Serbia long after the Serbian insurrections, but it was never forgotten that this was just a small part of the former Serbian state that still had to be liberated completely. After the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć, there were two eparchies – one of Belgrade and the other of Sabac – which were under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Patriarch and headed by the Greek pruinice-bishops who cooperated closely with the Turkish authorities. In times of insurrection, they used to run from the country, while the Belgrade Metropolitan Metodije was strangled by the Turks in 1801. His successor, Leontije, was a spy who reported the Serbian princes to the Turkish officials. Nevertheless, Karadorde kept him in Belgrade and he established close ties with the Russian representative Rodofinikin. When insurrection broke out, he fled with the leader to Srem in 1813. However, upon leaving for Vlaška in 1809, the National Assembly elected the Archimandrite Melentije Stefanović as the new Metropolitan but, the following year, his title was re-formulated into that of a deputy. Melentije then went to Russia, where he was proclaimed Bishop, which proved impossible from the point of view of Church law. Nevertheless, with no consecration, he acted as the *vladika* of Sabac. Upon the breakdown of the First Insurrection, Dionisije II was appointed the new Metropolitan from Constantinople and he remained on the throne for two years.

In 1815, Prince Miloš requested that the Patriarch of Constantinople appoint Archimandrite Melentije Nikšić as the Belgrade Metropolitan, and the Head of the local church Gavriilo as the *Vladika* of Sabac. The Patriarch appointed Melentije as the *Vladika* of Sabac, while the Greek Agatongel was appointed the Belgrade Metropolitan. In 1816, Prince Miloš, suspecting Melentije's political ambitions, ordered the *vladika* assassinated. He was slaughtered in his sleep and replaced by Gerasim Domnin. Both Agatongel and Gerasim were obedient to Miloš. In order to settle the situation in the Church and its financial status, Miloš passed a Regulation on the Clergy in 1816 and, in 1823, he passed a Regulation on Bishops. The National Assembly in 1822 formed a Consistorium that enabled the Prince to execute a direct influence on church proceedings, even though it was contrary to the canons. Neither Agatongel nor Gerasim answered the invitations to participate in two

church assemblies convoked on this occasion, but Miloš continued acting as Head of the Church. Soon afterwards, Agatongel became the Supreme Patriarch in 1826. He was replaced in Belgrade by Metropolitan Kiril, who died the following year, to be succeeded by Metropolitan Antim, who was also Greek. He proclaimed Miloš a hereditary prince in 1831 and then retired due to old age.

Miloš was persistently trying for years to obtain church autonomy for the Serbs in the newly liberated principedom and he had the significant Russian support in these efforts. Through the Hatt-i Sharif in 1830, the sultan prescribed that the Serbs elect their own metropolitans and episcopos, who would then be proclaimed by the Patriarch of Constantinople, with their presence not being obligatory thereto. Serbia then became an autonomous principedom under the sovereignty of the sultan and under the protection of the Russian tsar. That same year, Archimandrite Melentije Pavlović was elected the first Serbian Metropolitan, while Nićifor was elected Episcopo of Užice and Gerasim was elected Episcopo of Sabac. The following year, the patriarch proclaimed their titles officially. In 1831, a concordat was signed, in which the patriarch consented to the Serbian Church autonomy with purely formal relations with the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

Metropolitan Melentije was patiently restoring the canonical order in the Belgrade Metropolitanate. He established the Holy Assembly of Bishops, disciplined the episcopos, passed the church constitution and successfully cooperated with Miloš. He died in 1833. For the next 26 years until 1859, Petar Jovanović, originally from Srem, was the Metropolitan of Serbia. He was a very intelligent and educated person and a skilful organiser. He strengthened the canonical order and practically revived the Church, established the Church courts and priest schools. At his proposal, a Law on Church Authorities was enforced in 1847, which definitively separated the church organisation from the state administration. He was developing the civil educational system as well and he even wrote several textbooks on different subjects. He remained on the metropolitan throne even at the time of the Prince Aleksandar Karadordević, which irritated the Assembly of Saint Andrea. The Assembly forced him to resign, based on slanderous accusations. The furious Miloš simply did not want to find Petar in Belgrade, while the political poltroons were eager to fulfil his wishes at any cost.

In 1859, the Holy Assembly elected the Bishop of Sabac, Mihailo Jovanović, the new Metropolitan, which was confirmed by the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Serbian prince. Metropolitan Mihailo was a true successor of Metropolitan Petar, a capable and persistent fighter for the national cause, an ascetic and scientist, a great Russophile and church organiser, an honourable and a kind man. He was a major opponent of the spiritual pro-Western policy and the Austro-Hungarian politics. He bravely involved himself in the internal political disputes and confronted King Milan. He also disputed with Mihailo, because of his intentions to divorce Princess Julija and marrying his niece Katarina Konstantinović. Atheist ideas appeared in the flourishing political life, proclaimed mainly by Svetozar Marković and Vasa Pelagić, as well as

the pleas to separate the church from the state and the school, assaults on the social role of priests, etc. On the other hand, many priests began to express their political party orientation and participate in the activities of parties. The Holy Assembly of Bishops was forced in 1883 to prescribe that no priest could become a member of any political party, or participate in party conventions or other activities.

After the Congress of Berlin, where Serbia obtained the full state sovereignty and independence, the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate proclaimed the full autocephaly of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Serbia on 20 October 1879. At the same time, Metropolitan Mihailo established very close connections with the Serbs from all the occupied Serbian countries by supporting and stimulating them to continue the fight for the national cause. He wholeheartedly supported refugees, founded the Serbian Red Cross and strengthened the ties with the Russian Church, Government and various other institutions to a maximum extent. It all provoked the suspicion of Prince Milan and the Vienna Court. Progressive opponents accused him of being close to the liberals, while "he was, above all, a man of the Church and religion, devoted entirely to the Orthodox Russia and pan-Slavic ideas" (p. 389). By conducting an extremely Austrophile politics, Prince Milan imposed the enforcement of the Tax Law in 1881, as he knew it would encounter fierce opposition from the church hierarchy, due to the fact that it would cause the sale and purchase of clergy titles and destroy the internal church structure. Stojan Novaković, as Minister of Education and Church Affairs, appeared as the mere implementer of the unscrupulous will of the prince. When the Holy Assembly of Bishops opposed the introduction of taxes on the distribution of church titles and blessings, Stojan Novaković initiated hearings of all *vladikas*, one by one, as if they were his subordinated state employees. The minister also penalised the metropolitan by issuing him a fine and, when the latter refused to pay it, the fine was compulsorily enforced. He was officially qualified as a rebel and the progressive government submitted a decree to Prince Milan for his signature that dissolved Metropolitan Mihailo from the position, appointing the Episcopope of Negotin, Mojsej, Acting Metropolitan. The other episcopopes opposed to the autocracy of the state authorities at first, but in a direct confrontation with the prince at the Government session, they were frightened and desisted. However, they reorganised themselves soon afterwards and opposed the prince again, insisting on the return of their Metropolitan, who had unanimous respect and support.

The Government hit back even harder. The new law established the electoral body for election of metropolitans, where the secular officials, such as the ministers, members of parliament, presidents of the State Council and the Court of Cassation had the majority, and the king approved the election. After the 1st February 1883, all the episcopopes demonstratively resigned and the Serbian Church was left without the archpriests. Stojan Novaković claimed that the episcopopes had not been dissolved and he invited them to convene an assembly on several occasions, but it was all in vain. The electoral body convened without

any episcopopes and a new metropolitan was elected - Archimandrite Teodosije Mraović - but the body was not able to proclaim the episcopope officially. At the persuasion of the Vienna Government, the official proclamation was held by the Metropolitan of Karlovac and Patriarch German Anđelić. Teodosije tried to convoke a Holy Assembly of Bishops but the episcopopes boycotted him, causing the Government to proclaim the dissolution of Jeronim, Viktor and Mojsej. Three Archimandrites of Vojvodina were proclaimed Episcopopes of Niš, Šabac and Žiža. The Patriarchate of Constantinople confirmed this non-canonical and purely political establishment of a new church hierarchy in 1884. Teodosije divorced King Milan and Queen Natalija in 1888. In the following two years, all three bishops who were proclaimed by force died, which the people interpreted as the Divine providence.

The authorities continued to harass the overthrown Metropolitan Mihailo even in his civil life. In 1883, he went to Constantinople, where he was warmly welcomed, and from there he went to Jerusalem and then to Hilandar. He tried to permanently settle in Constantinople, but that was forbidden to him at the request of the Serbian Government. He had similar success in Varna, so he went to the Bulgarian town of Rousse where he became a friend of the banished Nikola Pašić and with other renowned radical emigrants. They were agreeing on how to overthrow King Milan. In 1884, Metropolitan Mihailo was invited to Kiev and the following year he went to Moscow. He remained in Russia until 1889. He used to spend a lot of time there with Nikola Pašić and their personal friendship deepened, which had a significant influence on Pašić's further intellectual and political growth. When King Milan abdicated, the new government of Sava Grujić accepted his proposal and granted amnesty to Nikola Pašić. Immediately afterwards, it persuaded Metropolitan Teodosije and *Vladikas* Nikanor and Dimitrije to resign and asked Metropolitan Mihailo and *Vladika* Jeronim to return to their thrones. The church status soon returned to normal, the canonical hierarchy was restored and the relationship with the state was settled. Certain controversies still remained on several issues, but without causing devastating consequences. Metropolitan Mihailo died in 1889 at the height of his power and respect of his contemporaries.

The Episcopope of Niš, Inokentije Pavlović, was elected Mihailo's successor and, following the proposal of King Aleksandar Obrenović, he managed to reconcile the canonical and non-canonical episcopopes, while the government gave medals to all of them. Episcopopes Dimitrije and Nikanor, who had been replaced earlier, were appointed to the vacant posts at the Eparchies of Niš and Šabac. After the death of Inokentije, the Episcopope of Vršac, Dimitrije Pavlović, became the new Metropolitan. He had demonstrated himself to be a true patriot, in particular during the Annexation crisis, the Balkan wars and the retreat across Albania, which together qualified him to become the first patriarch of the restored Serbian Patriarchate in 1920.

h) The Serbian Church in the Occupied Serbian Countries

In the period between the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć and the World War I, life of people in Serbia and the church situation in all the other Serbian countries were extremely difficult. In ancient Serbia and in Macedonia, the situation was worsened by the Phanariot *vladikas* and the Turkish incitement of the Bulgarian church expansion, calculated to support the estrangement from the Serbian nation. The Serbian government opposed this by diplomatic activities, funding the Serbian schools and supporting the Serbian priests. In parallel, it tried to carry through the appointment of Serbian *vladikas* in as many eparchies as possible. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the *vladikas* were also mainly Phanariots, who remained a bad memory for the Serbian people as ordinary robbers. The priests were poorly educated and they were also systematically harassed. Among the rare exceptions were the Metropolitans of Sarajevo, Venedikt Kraljević and Amvrosije. The former initially expressed developed national consciousness and rebellious mood, while the latter expressed a Christian solidarity with the oppressed compatriots of the same religion. Almost all Serbian priests decisively stood by their people, jointly experiencing different historical temptations and many of them were becoming the leaders of numerous national insurrections. After the Austro-Hungarian occupation, the Greek episcopos were gradually replaced by Serbian ones. Antim, the Metropolitan of Sarajevo, requested from the Vienna Court in 1878 that all Serbian eparchies in Bosnia and Herzegovina be subordinated to the Metropolitanate of Karlovac. As the Minister of the Interior, Count Andraszy was interested in this issue but he concluded that the consent of the Patriarch of Constantinople on this issue was indispensable. The Patriarch of Karlovac, German Andelić, was also engaged on this issue. In 1880, a concordat between the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Patriarchate of Constantinople was signed, which regulated the church state of affairs in accordance with the already established canonical rules in the Monarchy. The emperor was granted the authority to appoint episcopos, while the Ecumenical Patriarch would only previously confirm whether they fulfilled the canonical prerequisites or not. Three episcopates were preserved. That same year, Antim was retired and Archimandrite Sava Kosanović was appointed metropolitan and proclaimed in Sarajevo in 1881. Soon afterwards, Metropolitan Sava entered into a fervent conflict with the occupying authorities, leading to his resignation in 1885 as a protest against the official support to the proselyte assaults of Archbishop Stadler and his politics of religious hatred and intolerance.

In 1888, Leontije Radulović was elected the first Metropolitan of Herzegovina of Serbian nationality after the occupation. He died shortly after the appointment, and was succeeded in 1889 by Archimandrite Serafim Perović. After him, Petar Zimonjić was appointed episcopo in 1903. As far as the Bosnian eparchies are concerned, during the occupation, the Serb Dionisije Ilić was *Vladika* of Zvornik and Tuzla, remaining in this position until 1892, when he was replaced by Nikolaj Mandić. In 1900, the eparchy of Banja Luka was established. After Sava Kosanović, Georgije Nikolajević was Metropolitan of Sarajevo until

During the existence of the Patriarchate of Peć, the Good Bosnian Metropolitans held the entire region of Dalmatia under their jurisdiction. The Austrians granted approval for their part of the Dalmatian territory, back in the era of Arsenije III, to belong to the Metropolitanate of Karlovac, but the Venetians expelled *Vladika* Stevan Ljubibratić from their territory in 1722, initiating a new cycle of the compulsory imposition of Catholicism. In 1762 in Venice, the Philadelphia Orthodox Archbishopric was established, to which the Serbian Church in the Venetian part of Dalmatia was formally subordinated, with the Roman Catholic bishops starting to take part in its administrative issues. Previously, in 1759, the authorities issued an order that all Serbian priests that were not Venetian citizens had to leave the country immediately. However, the Serbs had their own church officials, who continued their activities in a semi-legal manner. In the majority of cases, these were Archimandrites, but sometimes even parish priests. In 1710, the supremacy of the Ecumenical Patriarch over all the orthodox Serbs in the Venetian Republic was acknowledged by law and, the following year, Sofronije Kutuvali was appointed Bishop of Venice and Dalmatia. At first his vicar was Nikanor Bogunović and then it was Gerasim Zelić, both of whom were renowned Serbian national and church fighters. During the period of the French occupation, Napoleon appointed the former *Vladika* of Sarajevo, the adventurer and vagabond Venedikt Kraljević, the Episcopo of Dalmatia and Boka Kotorska. Upon the re-establishment of the Austrian authority, Kraljević agreed with the emperor to impose Catholicism on the Dalmatian Serbs and he had already engaged four Catholic priests to act as teachers. The people and the clergy objected to that and so the Metropolitan Stratimirović and the Russian Tsar himself were forced to act, but with little success. Hence, a group of monks made a plot and Episcopo Venedikt Kraljević, who was appointed outside the set canonical rules, was gravely wounded and run off to Italy. However, he still ran the eparchy until 1828, when he was officially retired. The next year, through the emperor's decree, the Dalmatian Orthodox Serbs were subordinated to the Metropolitan of Karlovac. Josif Rajačić became the new Dalmatian Episcopo in 1829 and, over the following years, he dedicated himself with huge energy to the fight against the imposition of Catholicism. For that reason, by the emperor's decree from 1833, he was transferred to the Eparchy of Vršac, while the supporters of religious unification became furious in their assaults on the Dalmatian Orthodox people. Rajačić's successors continued fighting under the most difficult conditions. In 1870, the Eparchy of Boka Kotorska was formed, and then, together with the Eparchy of Dalmatia, it was separated from the Metropolitanate of Karlovac. Hence, in 1873, they became a part of the Metropolitanate of Bukovinska and Dalmatia. Their Holy Synod was formed, which used to meet in Vienna, while its headquarters was located in Cernovice. After Rajačić, the Dalmatian Episcopos were as follows: Pantelejmon Živković, Jerotej Mutibarić, Stefan Knežević, Nikodim Milaš, Dimitrije Branković,

whereas the Bishops of Boka Kotorska until the WWI were Gerasim Petranović, Dositej Jović and Vladimir Boberić.

i) The Unification of the Serbian Orthodox Church

The unification of all the Serbian countries after the WWI created preconditions for a definitive unification of the Serbian Orthodox Church after more than hundred and fifty years. Representatives of all the church structural units met in Sremski Karlovci on 31 December 1918 and on 26 May 1919, and the assembly of the bishops formally reached a decision on unification. At the second conference of church representatives, held over 25-28 May of that same year, which was presided over by the Montenegrin Metropolitan Mitrofan Ban, the Central Holy Assembly of the United Serbian Church was elected, headed by Ban. After some hesitation, the Metropolitan of Bukovina and Dalmatia, Vladimir Reptu, granted a canonical release to two Dalmatian eparchies and, on 18 March 1920, the Holy Synod of the Constantinople Patriarchate granted a canonical release to the metropolitanates which were under its jurisdiction until then. On 17 June 1920, Regent Aleksandar Karađorđević issued an act on the proclamation of the episcopal decision to unite the Serbian Orthodox Church and the official unification was proclaimed on 12 September 1920 in Sremski Karlovci. Following this decision, the Holy Assembly elected Dimitrije Pavlović, then the Metropolitan of Serbia, as the first patriarch on 28 September 1920. The regent and the government refused to approve that decision, and thus, on 23 October 1920, an Act on the Appointment of the First Patriarch of the United Serbian Orthodox Church and a Temporary Regulation on the Serbian Patriarchate were issued. The Regulation prescribed that the Electoral Assembly was in charge of electing the first patriarch, based on a proposal containing three candidates, which was formulated by the Holy Assembly. Besides the archpriest and a certain number of other priests, among the members of the Electoral Assembly were numerous state officials, not necessarily of the Orthodox religion and the list of members was made by the Minister of Religion. The Minister had the right to suggest that the king convene the Electoral Assembly, which would elect the patriarch by secret voting, whereas the king would confirm the election upon the proposal of the Minister of Religion. Hence the patriarch was not only subordinated to the king, who was the bearer of the supreme legal and legislative authority, but also to the Minister who was solely a member of the executive authority. Pursuant to this regulation, a new Electoral Assembly was convoked on 12 September, where Metropolitan Dimitrije was re-elected patriarch.

The ceremony of ordaining the patriarch was prescribed by the Minister and the solemn proclamation was only held in 1924 by King Aleksandar, who demonstrated the supremacy of the state authority over the church with the entire ceremony. The Serbian Patriarchate was first recognised by the Russian Patriarch Tikhon and the Patriarch Meletius IV of Constantinople, then recognition followed from all the other Orthodox patriarchs.

The state control over the Serbian Orthodox Church was more rigorous and stringent than it would be in the Roman Catholic or Islamic religion, even though all religions were equal in principle. The Minister of Religion completely managed the church affairs, with the exception of interference in liturgical affairs. Pursuant to the Law on the Serbian Orthodox Church, the church was separated from the state only in the financial aspect. The State authority continued to exercise control over church property, funds and foundations and it had the right to expropriate them, whereas the king's word was decisive in the appointment of the patriarch and bishops. The control over the church educational system was entrusted to the Ministry of Education, which prescribed the curriculum. There was also a special church tax, collected by the State on behalf of the Church. In 1931, pursuant to the law, the Constitution of the Serbian Orthodox Church was enforced. In the meantime, the Ministry of Religion was abolished and its competences were transferred to the Minister of Justice. The church autonomy was now purely formal. The employees of the church bodies and institutions were degraded to the ranks of public employees and so, on taking over positions, they had to take an oath to the king. The patriarch was essentially in the rank of assistant minister, even though he should have been directly next to the king, at least ceremonially. Such disharmony was partly moderated by the regulation that prescribed that the patriarch was a member of the Crown Council, which put him formally in the rank of minister. Furthermore, the king appointed twelve civilians as members of the Patriarchate Administrative Council. That body was entitled to pass bylaws, and it was a kind of state authority body concerning the church issues. The lack of any real autonomy was compensated for by a permanent constant financing of the Serbian Orthodox Church through budget. However, the same right was also granted to other religious communities.

The dissatisfaction of the church circles with the treatment they were submitted to by the State authorities was present for some time and it culminated during the concordat crisis in 1935, when the anger was unjustly focused on Milan Stojadinović although the text itself had been prepared in advance, under the direct supervision of King Aleksandar. The subsequent assessment of the Holy Assembly was that the concordat had significantly changed the position of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the state, infringing the principle of equity and elevated the Roman Catholic Church to the rank of the governing and the state church, while all other religions were degraded to the level of the simply tolerated ones. It was emphasised that even the state sovereignty was jeopardised, due to the fact that, in certain issues, the Vatican was being imposed above the State authority of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and the state undertook excessive financial obligations towards the Roman Catholics. At that point, the Church hierarchy let itself be dragged into political conflicts and instrumentalised by the opposition. The crisis culminated following the sudden death of Patriarch Varnava, with suspicion of him being poisoned. Varnava Nastić had been very respectable and held in high esteem among all the Serbian people as a patriarch. He was

appointed to the throne in 1930 from the post of Metropolitan of Skoplje, following the death of Patriarch Dimitrije. In 1938, the then Metropolitan of Montenegro and the Coastal Area, Gavriilo Dožić, was elected patriarch. Patriarch Gavriilo was a true patriot and a brave man, who fiercely opposed the accession of Yugoslavia to the Tripartite Pact. The Holy Assembly of the Serbian Orthodox Church supported the coup d'état of 27 March.

Out of the three thousand Serbian Orthodox priests, one third lost their lives in the WWI. However, the true Golgotha of the Serbian Orthodox Church and of the entire Serbian people begun in the WWII. In the April War, Patriarch Gavriilo found refuge in the Monastery of Ostrog after he refused to flee the country with the Royal Government. Due to him being linked to the coup d'état, the Germans had him arrested and imprisoned in the Gestapo prison in Belgrade soon afterwards. He was later transferred to the Monastery of Rakovica and, in 1943, to the Monastery of Vojlovica near Pančevo. In 1944, Patriarch Gavriilo and *Vladika* Nikolaj Velimirović were taken to the German concentration camp at Dachau. The Serbian Orthodox priests were oppressed the most in the territories that were under Croatian, Hungarian or Bulgarian occupation. The patriarch was replaced in Belgrade by the expelled Metropolitan of Skoplje, Josif Cvijović. Serafim, the Bishop of Raška and Prizren, died in the Albanian prison in Tirana, while the Croats had cruelly assassinated the Metropolitan of Sarajevo Petar Zimonjić, the Bishop of Banja Luka, Platon Jovanović, and the Bishop of Gornji Karlovac, Sava Trlajić. Gorazd Pavlik, Bishop of the Czechoslovak Orthodox Church which was part of the Serbian Orthodox Church, was also assassinated. Genocide against the Serbian people started, followed by the systematic destruction of the Serbian Orthodox religion. In 1942, the Croatian headman, Ante Pavelić, proclaimed a Legal Regulation on the Foundation of the Croatian Orthodox Church and he even proclaimed it autocephalous. In doing so, he was directly supported by Vatican, which was hoping to facilitate the unification. Pavelić appointed Russian refugee Germogen, the former Archbishop of Ekaterinoslav and Novomoskovsk who was anathemised by the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church and banned from performing liturgies, the head of the non-canonical church. Certain Spiridon Mifka was proclaimed Bishop of Sarajevo. The false

proclamation of Mifka was carried out in Zagreb in 1944, by Germogen and Bishop Visarion Puiu, as an official emissary of the Patriarch Nikodemus of Rumania. Very few Serbian priests accepted the new church hierarchy of the Ustasha regime, yet strictly formally, and those traitors to the Orthodox religion were simply despised by the Serbian people, even though that people were suffering their own Golgotha.

j) The Serbian Church during Communist Oppression

After the war, Patriarch Gavriilo wanted to return to the homeland and even the new communist authorities were interested in this, since

they counted on taking off the edge of the opposition of the Serbian Orthodox Church to the atheist regime. At the end of 1946, the patriarch returned to Belgrade. He found the church in a very difficult situation. A large number of priests had been assassinated during the war and many churches and monasteries were destroyed or burnt down. There was no concord or unity among the clergy either. The majority of them had chosen the national movement of General Draža Mihajlović during the war operations, while some of them followed General Milan Nedić and a certain number joined the movement of Dimitrije Ljotić. However, the ones who collaborated with the communists were not in the minority. The Holy Synod had appealed on several occasions for Serbian concord, unity and the avoidance of the fratricidal war. Priests were obliged to dedicate significant attention to charity activities, supporting the poor and finding a safe haven for refugees, as well as supporting the families of prisoners of war and internees. In revolutionary outrage and hysteria, the communists assassinated many Serbian Orthodox priests, though some of them were executed by the occupying forces under suspicion of collaboration with the Chetniks or Partisans.

After an extremely cruel and intolerant attitude towards the church and the religion in general, the communists changed their tactics in the middle of 1942 and introduced military priests into their units. They took part in religious ceremonies, celebrated church holidays, organised church conferences, etc. Upon taking over power, they continued maintaining idyllic relationships with religious communities for some time, restored religious education, they carried *badnjak* (Translator's note: an oak log which is cut and burned in the hearth as a part of Serbian Christmas tradition) at public manifestations, they kissed the holy cross and accepted the holy sacrament. However, the executions of certain priests began soon afterwards, as part of an action for elimination of real or supposed anticommunists. In the organised actions of members of the SKOJ (Translator's note: Young Communist League of Yugoslavia), physical assaults were organised against *vladikas*, archpriests and monks. Religious services were systematically hampered and the people were intimidated in order not to take part in the services. Charity fundraising in parishes was prohibited and lots of churches were demolished. Religious processions on the city streets were banned, church municipalities were deprived of cemeteries and numerous church buildings were confiscated, as well as huge areas of agricultural land through the agrarian reforms. Traditional Serbian flags were removed from church towers, where they were displayed during the patron saints' days and singing of the anthem of Saint Sava was prevented. Besides this, indiscipline and disobedience of certain priests was being intentionally incited, aimed at artificially introducing the organizational chaos among the church ranks. In particular, separatist ideas were being encouraged on the territories of Serbia and Montenegro, since Tito wanted to federalise the Serbian Orthodox Church based on a model already applied in the state structure. As early as March 1945, the partisans insisted on the formation of an initiative committee for the establishment of the Macedonian Church, or at least the restoration of

the Archbishopric of Ohrid. On that occasion, the state authorities prevented Metropolitan Josif from travelling to Skopje to solve the problem on the spot.

The Constitution from 31 January 1946 proclaimed a strict separation of the church from the state. Having the state take over the administration of the registry of births, marriages and deaths and the official entering into marriage made sense but, on the other hand, persistent atheist propaganda as a basic characteristic of the official state policy represented one of the most devastating blows to the freedom of consciousness and conscience. In legal terms, the Ministry of Justice had the authorisations to maintain relationships between the state and the religious communities. Also, special religious commissions were formed at all the horizontal levels of power, the main task of which was to exercise political control and ideological supervision of the church. For some time, upon the return of the Patriarch Gavriilo, it seemed that the situation would improve, especially when he held a series of meetings with the highest state officials, including Broz. However, the communist leaders used to tell one thing to the patriarch, and then changed the story behind his back, trying to ruin the church unity. Gavriilo made lots of bitter public statements in that regard, until his persistent fighting was interrupted by his sudden death, in 1950. The funeral service was attended by three of his fiercest opponents, renegade priests and communist spies Vlado Zečević, Đorđe Kalezić and Milan Smiljanić, who were a disgrace to the religious order for their devoted serving of the communist ideology and the openly anti-Serbian regime.

Tito undertook all the necessary measures to prevent the appointment of Metropolitan Josif as the new patriarch. Under pressure of the communist authorities, the representatives of the Macedonian Church separatists and the unrecognized Association of Orthodox Priests' Organizations of Yugoslavia, as established communist agents, participated in the session of the Assembly, and thus, shortly after Gavriilo's death, Episcopate Vikentije Predanov, who was too obliging and obedient towards the state authorities until his death, was elected patriarch. However, he never desisted from the key issues, but was constantly delaying the final solution, primarily in regard to the Macedonian question. In 1955, while trying to find a compromise solution to preserve the church unity, the Holy Synod, accepted that, in three southern episcopates, the *vladikas* would be elected from the local area and that the Macedonian dialect would be used in the church administration. It seemed that it would be a durable solution to the problems artificially created by the communists in the Eparchies of Skopje, Ohrid-Bitolj and Zletovo-Strumica. Even the religious services were introduced in the Macedonian language and only the liturgy remained in the Church-Slavic language, but the stamps only contained the inscriptions of the Orthodox Episcopate and the Republic of Macedonia, without specifying that it was part of the Serbian Orthodox Church. Nevertheless, the election of the local episcopate in 1958 had to be postponed due to the fact that not one of the candidates fulfilled the canonical preconditions. For example, married men were proposed for

IT-03-67-T

vladikas. Undoubtedly, Vikentije was defending the Church interests but, in the third volume of the *History of the Serbian Orthodox Church*, Đoko Slijepčević raised a key question of "whether the Church had to negotiate with a group of non-disciplined priests in the first place, who had taken a wrong path and remained decisive in disobeying their canonical episcopates and the decisions of the Holy Synod. If there had not been negotiations and if all had remained in line with the attitudes of Patriarch Gavriilo and Metropolitan Josif, the whole issue could have been put on hold, and the regime would not have been able to resolve it without Church participation. Abandoning this line of thought opened up the possibility of a series of misinterpretations and abuses by the people who changed tactics but not their final goal" (*op. cit.*, volume III, p.209).

Tito decorated the patriarch in 1958 with a Medal of the Yugoslav Flag of the First Order, thus expressing satisfaction with his work. Soon afterwards, Vikentije died and the same year German Đorić, Episcopate of Niš, was proclaimed the new patriarch. From 4 to 6 October 1958 in Ohrid, the communists organised a national-religious assembly, where the Macedonian Orthodox Church was unilaterally proclaimed and where the Episcopal Vicar Dositej Stojković arbitrarily proclaimed himself its head. On that occasion, a constitution of the non-canonical church was passed as well, in which its was highlighted that the Macedonian Orthodox Church was in canonical unity with the Serbian Orthodox Church, through the Serbian patriarch, who would be mentioned by the Macedonian Metropolitans in the liturgy. By leaving for Macedonia directly afterwards and by a cordial visit to the self-proclaimed Metropolitan, German practically supported this separatist act. The Serbian Orthodox Church granted autonomy to its Macedonian part. That same part claimed for itself that it obtained autocephaly upon proclaiming it arbitrarily in 1967, after the Holy Assembly had refused such request. Besides the regime, the communist priest association stood by the schismatics.

That association was formed during the war by partisan priest Vlada Zečević and its title contained the Orthodox determinant, but not the Serbian one. Its basic function referred to the dissemination of the communist ideology without its atheist component, political control of the priests and organised opposition to the episcopates who were not approved by the regime. These associations were first consolidated within the republics after the war and then, in 1949, a central association was formed on the Yugoslav level. In order to strengthen its personal authority, Tito acted as if he issued an order to legally regulate the issue of the priests' social insurance upon the proposal of the leaders of the Association. At first, all episcopates opposed the organising and actions of such an association. However, they were not able to handle this issue due to the direct interference of the state authorities and they managed to have it split into eparchy committees, i.e. to decentralise the structure in order to easily neutralise it. Nevertheless, the communists continued the implementation of their concept, so the association became a transmission of the ruling party and, in their regulation acts, it referred to

democracy, self-management and the delegate system. The priest association was providing its strongest support to the regime regarding the request to accept the separation of the Macedonian part of the Church. Even though the patriarchs held discussions with the leaders of the association on different occasions, the Holy Synod never recognized the association itself.

k) The Overseas Church Schism

The great migration of the Serbs into the countries overseas gradually created preconditions for establishing new eparchies of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the Diaspora. The first Serbian Orthodox church-school municipalities on the American continent were under the jurisdiction of the Russian Bishops so, in the framework of the Russian Exarchate, the first Serbian Eparchy was formed in 1905. The first eparchy under the jurisdiction of the Serbian patriarch was formed in Chicago in 1923 and its administrator was Bishop Nikolaj Velimirović. As early as in 1926, Archimandrite Mardarije Uskoković - a highly educated man, a true fighter for the Serbian national cause and a renowned Russophile and pan-Slavist - was elected the US-Canadian Bishop. He invested considerable energy into the formation of a robust church organisation and he built the Monastery of Saint Sava in Libertyville, Illinois, USA. Mardarije died in 1935 and, the following year, Irinej Đorđević was elected bishop. Two years afterwards, in 1938, Damaskin Grđanički was elected the new bishop and, the same year, Dionisije Milivojević followed. In the framework of the US affiliate of the Serbian Orthodox Church, upon the initiative of Jovan Dučić, the Serbian National Defence was formed in 1941, while the nephew of Dučić, Mihailo, was elected its president.

The post-war communist regime considered the US Bishop Dionisije as an obstacle, since he had compromised the control established by the regime over the Serbian Orthodox Church in the homeland. The Holy Synod, presumably acting on a request by the authorities, sent a delegation in 1951 consisting of Bishop German Đorić and Dušan Glumac, aimed at assessing the situation and gathering information on church status in the Diaspora. At that moment, the first serious conflict arose between Dionisije and the Holy Synod. Dionisije sensed at the time that his replacement was imminent in Belgrade, while in emigration such an act was especially prepared by the followers of the Ljotić's movement. Slijepčević dismissed such claims as a renowned member of the Ljotić's movement and he praised the work of Bishop German, the future patriarch. He was rather critical towards Dionisije, even completely losing his unbiased scientific attitude in that matter. The following year, right after he managed to improve the relationship with the church headquarters, Dionisije criticized the archbishops in the homeland for not having more decisively opposed the communist priest association. He confronted the autonomy concept itself with determination, not to mention the church autonomy of the Macedonian Orthodox Church. For this reason, he never accepted the decisions of the

IT-03-67-T

Holy Assembly in 1957 and, several years afterwards, he described the Serbian Bishops in the homeland as spineless persons. Dionisije insisted on the autonomy of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the Diaspora. Notwithstanding the fact that he was a US citizen, he was not able to visit his homeland to attend the assemblies due to the oppressive acts of the communist regime towards its ideological opponents.

In 1963, the Holy Assembly reached the decision that US-Canadian Eparchy would be divided into the Mid US, West US and the East US-Canadian Eparchy. Firmilijan Ocokoljić, Grigorije Udicki and Stevan Lastavica were elected bishops. Dionisije was banned from performing priest activities and church legal proceedings were initiated against him. Dionisije neither accepted the division of the eparchy, nor the obligation to answer before the church court, defying the central church authority. The outraged Bishop Dionisije made a series of nervous moves, one after another, which was convenient for his opponents. When Dionisije was dismissed from the power, he held a church-popular assembly in Libertyville in November 1963, where he separated his eparchy from the Serbian Orthodox Church and proclaimed Irinej Kovačević his Assistant Bishop. The Church schism was thus complete. The following year, the Holy Assembly dismissed Dionisije from function and had him return to the secular order. However, he continued managing the major part of the Serbian Church organisation in the USA, supported by the former King Petar II Karađorđević and the President of the Serbian Cultural Club "Saint Sava", Slobodan Drašković. Soon afterwards, a Free Serbian Orthodox Church was declared, followed by the splitting of a number of emigrant organisations with respect to determining the orientation within the church schism. The Serbian people in the Diaspora were divided, provoking a huge spite that resulted in fierce conflicts and animosities, but it also brought a competitive spirit into the building of churches and monasteries. It was also transferred to Australia and Western Europe as soon as the first eparchies had been formed there. The schism was only overcome by agreement following the death of Patriarch German and upon the collapse of the communism in the homeland.

3. Christian Schism as the Main Cause of the Serbian Tragedy

a) The Church in the First Millennium of Christianity

Notwithstanding the fact that the Serbs had only accepted Christianity gradually between the 6th and the 9th century, their further historic destiny and tragic collective experience was marked by this new religion and its schisms, which would often take an explicitly political character. The complete history of Christianity had its Serbian reflection, but the activities of the Western Christian Church and its Roman Bishops represented an essential evil for the Serbian people - an emanation of the Antichrist, of all that which was directly contrary to the original Christian philosophy, theology and ethics. For centuries, the

472/57440

Roman Catholic Church represented a leading political force in global terms and it was always more or less an open enemy of the Serbian people. It created a need for the elaboration of the entire historical development of the organisational church structure of Christianity, which is presented here in brief, relying upon the already classical work by Professor Jevsević Popović, *General Church History*, translated from German and published for the first time in Serbian in 1912, in Sremski Karlovci (Phototype edition "Prometej", Novi Sad, 1992).

Christian theologians consider that God directly formed their church as a human community that would communicate directly with him. That was the original ancient union of the people with God from the Old Testament times, which was renewed and improved by Jesus Christ, shaped into the current form as a New Testament religious community. Thus the church history in Christianity began with his activities. The Old Testament period could be the subject of research of the general history of religion, or the history of monotheistic religions. Therefore I draw the conclusion that the Christian theology does not negate the earlier human orientation towards God, which is entirely natural, since man is considered the most perfect God's creations.

Christianity originated at the periphery of the Roman Empire, as the most powerful and dominant state of the ancient world, which had already abandoned the republican state order and was transformed into an empire that possessed all the characteristics of an eastern-type despotate. The emperor's throne had very often been occupied by tyrants and lunatics, psychopaths with furious and bloodthirsty inclinations. In those cycles of successions and inaugurations, the role of Praetorian Guard was getting stronger. Palestine had a specific autonomous status within the Roman Empire. The emperor's power was represented by a Roman procurator. Contrary to the Romans and the other peoples of the empire, whose religions were polytheistic, the Palestinian Jews were monotheistic. The Roman-Greek mythology with utterly naive antropomorphic and highly morally relativised concepts of divine creatures fell significantly behind the level of civilisation progress and spiritual scope. It led to a certain crisis of religious spirit and an inclination towards foreign religions or mysterious cults. The Persian cult of Mitra as a black god and the doctrine of the Persian religious reformer Zarathustra from the 8th century B.C. were particularly attractive and intellectually convincing. Moreover, the Indian monotheism expressed in the holy poems known as the Vedas was of significant importance. The Jewish monotheism had the most pronounced national component, expressed through an egoistic prejudice on the part of the Jews that they were the only chosen Divine people to whom, allegedly and by the will of God, all other peoples would be subjugated. Their religious dogma insisted on the expectation of the appearance of a Messiah who would execute such will of God. The

Roman countries were dominated by the Greek language and Greek culture - especially philosophy, where the most prominent was the doctrine of Plato, who reached the monotheistic religious concept by thinking, founded on the notion of kindness, truth and beauty, to which

the people grew closer by developing their own moral virtues – wisdom, courage, common sense and justness. Delusions on this issue lead to sin and atonement for those sins. The Plato's idealism represented the precise part that was missing from the egocentrism of the Jewish religion, while the role of Christianity was precisely in that qualitative synthesis, followed by the insertion of Aristotelian realism, logic and the systematic approach. The New Testament was a direct continuation of the Bible on the one hand and, on the other, it represented its innovation, governed by the ancient Greek humanism and ethics. All the events related to the birth of Jesus are identical to the Old Testament messiah predictions. The Son of God and the Son of Man commenced his missionary and messianic activities in his 30th year of age by preaching the Kingdom of God, to which he greeted the believers as to his own church or his own community, where he would treat them as a good shepherd treats his sheep. Jesus chose twelve most faithful and able followers to be his closest collaborators, apostles and founders of the Church.

Jesus Christ transferred all authorities granted to him by the God his father to the apostles and promised them support of the Holy Spirit in order to help them perform their mission. Therefore, they represent the foundation of the Christian church and the pillars of its religious, educational and administrative function. Jesus, taking care of discipline, prescribed that his followers, if they ignore warnings, could be excommunicated from the church. He refused to adhere to the encountered relationships between the different social classes and interests of the priests' caste, but also to the wishes of the people to be proclaimed king. He announced his passion on the cross to his followers, at the request of the Jewish priests, as well as the resurrection after his death. He was betrayed by one of his apostles, Judas Iscariot, for thirty silver coins and the death sentence of the autonomous Jewish court was executed by the Roman prefect Pontius Pilate. The Jewish high priest Kayafa was particularly irritated by the miracles that Jesus performed, by successfully healing seriously ill patients, by feeding a huge number of people with a small portion of food or by resurrecting the dead from the grave. As soon as he was arrested, Jesus was immediately abandoned by all the apostles and Peter even renounced him. Jesus was crucified on the cross and buried afterwards. Even though the Romans had placed guards on his grave, Jesus resurrected on Sunday, on the day of Passover, and he reappeared before his apostles. He ordered the apostles to set off round the world, to testify about his resurrection and to preach the new religion. Right away, they faced fierce confrontations from the Jews and polytheists who claimed that Christ's resurrection was simply the deceit on the part of the protagonists of a failed political revolution.

The Apostles elected Matthew to take Judas's place as a new apostle. With considerable enthusiasm, they continued their missionary activities and the Holy Spirit transferred the knowledge of all foreign languages to them. Just like Jesus, they started achieving miracles, mainly healing the seriously ill, but the Jews again persecuted them fiercely. However, Jesus appeared before Saul, one of the most

renowned and diligent persecutors of the original Christians, and he made the latter convert into a devoted Christian who changed his name into Paul and became an apostle. The original controversial issues were resolved by the apostles at their assemblies. One of the first problems of a theological nature was the relationship of the converted Jews and heathens towards the previous Jewish religious tradition. That problem was solved with a compromise. The ex-polytheists were not obliged to obey the Moses' doctrine and they were pledged only by the New Testament. However, making difference in some places between the ex-Jews and the ex-polytheists was a seed of the first inter-Christian schism and a basis for disputes between the apostles Peter and Paul. Peter considered Moses' doctrine to be still obligatory for the Christians, while Paul renounced it.

In the 1st century, Christianity spread over the entire Roman Empire, while its main opponents and persecutors were prevailingly Jews, until the Emperor Nero set Rome on fire in 64 A.D. and later accused the Christians of having set the fire. It led to the first mass anti-Christian persecution, in which, according to the legend, both Peter and Paul perished. Roman Catholic theologians insist that the Roman Church was founded by the apostle Peter, who was its first Bishop, while Irenaeus, the renowned chronicler from the 2nd century A.D., said that the first Roman Bishop was named Linus. In regard to the claim expressed by the Roman Catholic historians and religious philosophers that it was the apostle Peter who founded the Roman Church, Jevsević Popović said that "they have to do so, as it is the foundation of the papal institution, bearing in mind that only in the role of alleged successors of Peter may the popes request from the Roman bishops jurisdiction supremacy and authority over the entire church, which was allegedly transferred by Jesus to the apostle Peter. Besides, it is part of the apostles' role to visit all peoples and appoint their bishops, rather than to settle down themselves in certain places as bishops, which we have not noticed with the apostles" (p. 200, 1st part).

The apostles used to establish church municipalities in the framework of the united Christian Church. These municipalities were named apostle churches soon afterwards, out of which the five most prestigious and renowned were those of Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch, Ephesus and Alexandria. The municipality of Jerusalem was the most significant at first, since that is where Christ was crucified and resurrected, and from where the apostles started spreading Christianity all over the world. Its bishops were close relatives of Christ but, between 66 and 70 A.D., the Romans destroyed Jerusalem and, later, the activities of the Jerusalem Church were obstructed by the appearance of two schismatic sects, the Nazarenes and Ebionites. "According to the Bible and the most ancient traditions, the Roman Church was first founded by the ordinary believers, disciples and collaborators of the apostles" (p. 226). Many of them were relatives, acquaintances, or disciples of the apostle Paul. There is no historic evidence that the apostle Peter ever came to Rome, as he decided to preach Christianity to the Jews. If he ever came to Rome, it could have been together with

Paul, when the Roman Church was already active. After the first Roman Bishop Linus, the second was Anacletus and the third was Clement. Up until the second half of the 4th century A.D., no one even mentioned Peter, either as the first bishop or as one of the Roman Bishops at all. The heretical author Pseudo-Clementine was the first to write on Peter's coming to Rome - and the fact that he was executed there - in the second half of the 2nd century A.D.

b) The Political Pretensions of the Roman Bishops

At the time of the Roman Bishop Liberius in 354, a chronological catalogue of the Roman bishops was written, which stated that "Peter, after having laid the foundation of the Roman Church in the 2nd year of reign of the Emperor Claudius (42 A.D.), was also the first Bishop of Rome for 25 years, after serving for seven years as the Bishop of Antiochia. This later tradition, according to which the Roman Church was first founded by Peter in the 2nd year of the reign of Claudius and Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, as allegedly supported by the Acts of the Apostles, was the source of the pretensions on the supreme jurisdiction of the Roman bishops. Namely, the Acts said that Peter, after his miraculous liberation from the prison of Herod Agrippa, left Jerusalem for another place - and that "other place" supposedly meant Rome. The Roman bishops based their pretensions on the fact that they had proclaimed themselves Peter's successors, claiming that Christ had granted Peter this supreme jurisdiction, i.e. supreme authority over the other apostles and over the entire Church. Thus, the supreme authority was also transferred to the Roman bishops as Peter was the first Bishop of Rome. These pretensions were often contradicted and the Byzantine Church claimed the opposite: that Peter was indeed the first among the apostles and that he had supremacy of honour, but in no way did he have supreme authority or supreme jurisdiction. Consequently, his successors, the Roman bishops, were also not entitled to any kind of supremacy. The fact that Peter had never even been to Rome was never suspected by the Byzantines, since they also had accepted the tradition *bona fide*, as it was established by the end of the 4th century. Only the Protestants get the credit for having scrutinised that tradition and drawn the conclusion that Peter, even if he had ever been to Rome, could only have done that at the end of his life. Thus, it was impossible that he was the founder and the first bishop of the Roman Church" (p. 230).

According to one of the basic Christian theological paradigms, after his resurrection, Christ continued to invisibly execute supreme authority over his church, through the Holy Spirit. He transferred the visible church power to the apostles, while the church consists of all believers as a united community. The apostles represented a specific church government, which was entitled to teach the religion and issue orders and warnings to prevent the believers from wrongdoing - and, if they did so, the government was entitled to excommunicate them from the church. Hence, such authority was only spiritual. Each apostle executed power within his own competences. To an individual apostle, a group of

apostles represented a higher instance of spiritual authority and all the apostles as a whole represented the highest instance. The Protestants consider that the original church organisation was more democratic and implied the direct spiritual authority of the church communities, while the Roman Catholics, who recognize that the pope (i.e. the Bishop of Rome) is “the successor of the apostle Peter and represents the visible head of the entire Church, claiming that Christ provided the Church with its monarchic organisation by not granting supreme power to all the apostles, but only to Peter, whom he proclaimed the head of the church, and the work of all the other apostles depended on him. The Roman Catholics simply call this higher power supremacy. However, by that, they do not mean just supremacy of honour, priority of honour, but also the supreme jurisdiction - supreme authority, predominance, higher power - with Peter as the ruler, head of the apostles and of the church. Today, they even imply a strict monarchic power” (p. 266).

It is evident that the Roman Catholics “in regard to supremacy do not attribute any significance to the words which Christ used on two occasions to suppress the disputes among apostles over dignity, and thus any aspiration for supremacy. Namely, he said that who wishes to be the first among them, needs to be the last and servant of them all. He said that believers and apostles should not call anyone on the earth their (general) father or (general) master or leader, since they only have one (general) father in heaven” (p. 267). Roman theologians have based their theory on supremacy on three fragments from the Acts of the Apostles, namely when Christ calls Simon the apostle Peter (rock), announcing him the right to hold the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. In fact, this referred to all apostles, when he prophesied to Peter that in one night he would renounce Christ three times, as well as when Jesus, after resurrection, asked Peter whether he had restored faith in him. After receiving an affirmative, Christ ordered Peter to graze the Christian lambs. Where Jesus forgave Peter, the followers of the Roman Pope sought evidence that Christ had appointed Peter above all the other apostles. Peter lost his apostle’s dignity, but Jesus showed mercy towards him and restored his apostle’s title. “If Peter had really obtained supremacy from Christ, namely the supremacy of power, he would have exercised it, and the other apostles would have adhered to such supremacy; the Acts of the Apostles and the apostle’s prophecies would have contained some trace of it – some trace that Peter had exercised such supremacy and that he was acknowledged by the apostles. However, there is no such thing in the Acts. On the contrary, it is evident that the apostles, having heard that lots of people were converted in Samaria, sent Peter and John there to give the Holy Spirit to the baptised. Hence, they treated Peter and John the same. If Peter had been the head of apostles and had supreme power, the apostles wouldn’t have the right to assign him and to send him to Samaria, as they had in the case of John. Instead they would have sent some of the other apostles. Furthermore, it is evident that all the apostles discuss important cases together and make decisions together - not just Peter himself. The Acts show that Peter, upon returning from his second trip through Palestine,

even had to justify himself before other apostles for having baptised Cornelius, a heathen, and proclaimed him member of the church. We see that afterwards, when Peter arrived in Antiochia to support the narrow-minded Christians from Judaism against the Christians from atheism, Paul asked him for explanation, according to the Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians, and he was strictly reprimanded for not having respected the Gospel. In the Epistles of Paul, it reads that Paul stated against those who were questioning the equal dignity of his apostolate, that he (Paul) was in no way less important than Peter and the other apostles. It is also obvious that Peter, in his first epistle to the other seniors or presbyters, called himself a co-senior or co-presbyter. Therefore, there is no evidence that Peter had been either undertaking or attributing himself any kind of supreme jurisdiction or that the other apostles had acknowledged him as such” (p. 270-271).

Jevseviće Popović continued with a more detailed analysis and refutation of the religious/legal basis of the monarchic pretensions by the Roman bishops. First he listed all the arguments of the defendants of the papal supremacy, expressed through rhetorical questions: “Why then does Peter always appear on the list of the twelve apostles in the first place, and once explicitly as the first among them? Why does Peter, when Christ addresses the apostles, speak often on behalf of the other apostles, and why does Christ sometimes speak to Peter in person, while he is talking to the apostles? Why does Peter, after Christ’s ascension to heaven and after the descent of the Holy Spirit, preside the apostles’ meetings? Why did the fathers called him the head of the apostles, coryphaeus of apostles, prince of apostles?” (p. 271). All these questions are followed by a detailed and convincing answer. “The truth is that Peter was mentioned always first on the list of apostles, that once he was explicitly called Primate, the first, that in most cases he was speaking on behalf of other apostles and that Christ, in his talks with the apostles, sometimes addressed Peter, and in particular it is true that the church fathers called him the head of the apostles or prince of the apostles. However, all these facts have their natural cause in the history of the apostles and in the personality of Peter. In fact, Christ first invited Peter of all the apostles to become an apostle. Also, Peter was the oldest of the apostles and he was very diligent, full of love and devotion towards Christ and towards the Gospel. For this reason, Christ gave him the name of honour - Peter, which means a man as a rock. This was a natural reason for him to always be mentioned as the first, since he was the first one invited to become an apostle, for him to speak on behalf of other apostles in the majority of cases, and to be addressed about something that referred to all the other apostles since he was the oldest, the first invited, and the apostle most devoted to the strong faith. He was the most decisive and renowned among the 12 apostles, but he was also the most renowned among his equals (*primus inter pares*). Paul did not say that Peter alone was the church pillar - these were also Peter, John and Jacob. However, due to his old age and the nature of his duty – which was the first among all – due to his diligence regarding strong faith, he had always been respected. For this reason, he was named the prince and head

of the apostles, but in no way did he have higher authority with respect to the others, since we saw that the apostle Paul was also called the apostle of the world and prince of apostles, not just because he had higher authority, but due to the fact that he was famous all over the world for his successes and excellence among other the apostles” (p. 271-272)

The Acts of the Apostles were an indubitable testimony of the original church organisation posed by Christ. “Peter had no higher power than the other apostles; he got no supremacy, least of all in the sense of any monarchic power. If he had any kind of supremacy, since Ciprianus, Bishop of Carthage (+258) actually spoke about Peter’s supremacy (*primatus Petri*), then it was only the natural supremacy of honour, for which the old church respected him to a great extent. However, a theory was gradually developed in the West that was opposite to the older church dogma, stating that he had been granted higher authority by Christ – supreme jurisdiction. Such a theory had been first developed in the 5th century in Rome. The Roman bishops, who had already proclaimed themselves his successors, deducted supreme jurisdiction for themselves – supremacy of authority – and, later on, even a monarchic authority over the entire Church” (p. 272).

Besides the twelve apostles, Jesus chose seventy or seventy-two assistants from the ranks of his disciples. They acted as apostles in a wider sense of the term. Apostles had no successors, but they transferred church management to the bishops, presbyters and deacons. They were proclaimed in an official ceremony and evocation of the Holy Spirit. Bishops were granted apostolic authority within the church, but they could not pretend to apostolic spiritual authority. Bishops, presbyters and deacons were the class of priests or clergy within the church, while the other class is represented by the believers, i.e. the people or laics. The bishops were elected by a few neighbouring bishops, clergy and the people. The official proclamation of the bishops had to be carried out by at least three existing bishops, although there were specific historical cases when only two bishops participated in such ceremonies. Bishops and all other priests were getting married before the proclamation, but only once, with no possibility of obtaining a divorce. The introduction of celibacy only begun in 306 in Spain, upon the decision of the Synod of Iberia.

All bishops were fully equal among each other and, within one state, they used to convene in the framework of a united synod or council. Gradually, the right to convene synods became transferred to one of the bishops – the Primate– the first among equals or the metropolitan, since it was usually the bishop of the capital of the individual country. It also reflected an aspiration to organise the church in a territorial sense with state organisation as a model. The metropolitan supremacy is only honourable, presidential and in accordance with human laws – not divine law. The Bishop of Rome was at the head of the capital church of the Roman Empire, but he was only the Metropolitan of the Central and Southern Italy. He was not satisfied with supremacy of honour, dignity and respect, which was consequently spread throughout the entire

Christian Church. “Instead, abusing this supremacy in to the Roman imminent aspiration for power, he acted sometimes as if he had general supreme jurisdiction. However, the rights of this supremacy in the first period were not acknowledged to him since his arrogance was regularly rejected. Nevertheless, judging by the reputation he was already using, surpassing all the other bishops as well as by his own arrogance, the Latin theologists wanted to draw the conclusions that he had already had general supreme jurisdiction in this period and that he had already executed supreme authority over the entire church. However, even though the Roman bishops in this period often had their arrogant attempts decisively rejected, it did not prevent the fact that later on, in the second period, their incessant aspiration to supreme jurisdiction, assisted by favourable circumstances, won in the West and so, from that moment, the Roman Church began to rule over the entire Catholic West” (p. 294).

Jevsevijs Popovic had refuted in detail the arbitrary thesis of the Roman theologists and their deliberate interpretation of fragments from the studies of the old church philosophers. Some of those were based on alleged dreams, the poetic expression of love towards the church, apologetic speeches by orators inspired by the occasion, nostalgia for the pre-Christian period of the pagan Pontifex Maximus and similar gleaned quotations of a few church personalities without particularly expressed church authority. However, this was all was convincingly refuted by the fact that, in the first three centuries when the Christianity was spreading, the Bishop of Rome had absolutely no supreme jurisdiction whatsoever. There are incomparably more serious testimonies on the indisputable attitude on the part of highly respectable church writers that there could be no one above bishops in the Christian Church. If the Bishop of Rome sent an epistle to the Corinthians on one occasion, in order to settle all the unrests occurring there, that was an appeal, not a proof of jurisdiction. When a certain Byzantine leather-worker was excluded from the church on decision of the Bishop of Rome, that punishment was inflicted while he was living in Rome. The excommunication of the Asian Church in the 2nd century remained a unilateral act of the Roman Bishop Victor and, without the support of other churches, the Roman Church soon withdrew that act. A series of other autocratic moves remained with no effect, which showed the extent to which the attempts of the Roman Church to dominate the Christian world remained unsuccessful. There is no relevant proof of the thesis that the Roman bishops were at least practically executing the supreme church power in the Christian world. However, a large amount of original data testifies to the practical equality of the bishops in all church issues, as well as on the impossibility for the bishops to interfere with each others’ management of the affairs in the bishop’s diocese, without explicit previous consent.

Even in this first period of Christian Church history, which dates back to Constantine’s Edict on the proclamation of Christianity as the state religion, there were various heretical doctrines and schisms. The heresy was the specific opposition to the general church dogma, while

its moderate form was called heterodoxy. Judaist heresy was created by insisting on the general mandatory nature of the Moses' doctrine in the Christian Church and by denying Christ's divine nature, considering him solely a Messiah - an ordinary man. Followers of these two fractions were called Nazarenes and Ebionites. The Gnostics insisted on the basis of the Plato's doctrine and on the dualism of god and the substance, but they also took over Zarathustra's doctrine on a good and evil god, whereby the evil god had created the substance and the man while the good god aims to instil soul and sense into that same man. According to those, Christ is a good god, whose material shell was only apparent, while his true role was to liberate people from the control of the evil god Demiurg from the Old Testament. One could contribute most to this end by a strict asceticism. Some Gnostics were in a conceptual symbiosis with the Ebionites, while others fell into antinomism as contempt for all moral codices or libertinism, which implied unrestrained behaviour. In Persia, in the 3rd century, Manichaeism was developed as a specific kind of Gnosticism, which connected dualism with pantheist Buddhism, by preaching Jesus as a divine hero of light who fights against the evil of the darkness. The founder of the sect, Manichaeus, considered himself the Comforter, whose role was to complete Jesus' work by helping people to liberate their inner light and by convincing them of the necessity of the ascetic life.

The next heresy that appeared was the Monarchianism, which was purely Christian and it was manifested in a dynamic and modalistic form. The Dynamics preached that the Son of God and the Holy Spirit were forces of a unique God's face, while Jesus was a man born in a supernatural way, who had a divine mission. The Modalists considered that God represented one face, with three modalities of revelation and so, accordingly, God the Father himself perished on the cross. These heresies were quite widespread, causing acute theological disputes and internal church conflicts in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Beside them, there was a small sect of tnetypsychites, who considered that the human soul dies with the body, but it would be resurrected during the second coming of Christ. There was also the sect of Jerachytes, which strictly fought against human sensuality and strictly prescribed refraining from marital obligations, meat and vine as a basic prerequisite of salvation. A schism was provoked in the 2nd century by Montanism, with its rigorous obligations and expectations of the arrival of Paraclitus, i.e. the comforter. The Hypolitans were equally rigorous. However, they were never impressed by Paraclitus, preaching instead the higher divine essence of the Father, and the lower one of the Son and the Holy Spirit. Rigorism would consequently assume the highly fanaticised expression of the so-called Novatianism, as well as in other sect schisms that arose from personal clashes between the bearers of high church functions. All these schisms were of limited duration, and the heretical dogmas that inspired them were gradually disappearing in the period when the basic Christian Church dogmas took their definite shape.

c) Christianity as a State Religion

The second period of general church history started in 323, when the Emperor Constantine proclaimed Christianity as the state religion for the entire Roman Empire, after he converted to Christianity himself in 313 (although he was only baptised in 337). His successors prohibited polytheistic religions, even though the Emperor Julius the Renegade tried to restore those religions in 361. However, he was assassinated two years later. The Roman State took over the complete care of the further development of the church and entrusted the bishops with judicial authority. The priests' rank enjoyed numerous privileges but the rulers dominated the Church as a whole and they acted as its supreme heads. In the 4th century, monasticism suddenly begun to flourish, based upon the original hermits and on asceticism. Some of the monks' ranks soon transformed into specific sects, perverting the original sense of the movement itself. Fanaticism, on the one hand, and the expression of political ambitions, on the other, became normal occurrence. Under the influence of monasticism, married bishops disappeared as early as in the 5th century, while celibacy became mandatory for all priests in the west. In time, the participation of people in the election of bishops was limited and eventually it became just a polygon for testing the strength and influence of the rulers and the highest priest ranks.

From the 4th to the 6th century, five ecumenical councils were held, regularly convoked by the Roman emperors and gathering together almost all the Christian bishops. "The Roman Catholics were trying in vain to prove that the Bishop of Rome played a part in convoking these councils and, even though it was mostly true that the emperors used to convoke these ecumenical councils in agreement with the most renowned bishops, the Roman ones above all" (p. 496). The ecumenical councils adopted around one hundred general mandatory church canons. The First Council was convened by the Emperor Constantine the Great in Nicaea, Vitinia, in 325, the Second by Theodosius I in Constantinople in 381, the Third by Theodosius II in Ephesus in 431, the Fourth by Martian in Chalkidona in 451 and finally the Fifth Council was convened by Justinian I in Constantinople in 553. Almost all the bishops participated to four of the councils, while only the Eastern Roman bishops took part in the others, but the Western Romans consequently accepted all the decisions made thereto and that is why the council is considered ecumenical. "The Bishop of Rome did not participate in any of these five ecumenical councils. He was represented at the first, third and fourth through his envoys and had no representatives at all at the second and fifth councils. Rome only subsequently received and approved the conclusions of the last two councils – in particular, the conclusions of the Fifth Ecumenical Council were approved with a certain hesitation [...]. At all those councils were presided by one or more renowned bishops or sometimes the envoys of the Bishop of Rome, as the first bishop in the Roman Empire, during discussions on the internal affairs of the church. That was not always the case, even though the majority of Roman theologists wanted to prove that the Roman envoys presided over all the councils where they participated. Besides, the Roman theologists were intentionally trying to prove that

Comment [K.B. 7]: Translator's note. We were unable to find any source for the translation of this term. It is possible that there is a mistake in the original text

the conclusions of these supreme councils only gained global significance after they had been confirmed by Rome. On the contrary, the conclusions of these councils were only enforced as state laws, upon the confirmation of the emperors” (p. 496-497).

Beside the ecumenical councils, a large number of particular synods, i.e. councils or assemblies, were being convoked, but some of these became generally accepted canons. Furthermore, a metropolitan system was developed and thus each province of the Empire had its own metropolitan, 120 of them in total, who stood at the head of the bishops in their own provinces. The supreme metropolitans held the title of primate of the territory that was under their respective jurisdiction. Soon afterwards, in the East, the supreme metropolitans were called patriarchs, but this title was only acknowledged to five of them, namely to the Metropolitans of Rome, Alexandria, Antiochia, Constantinople and Jerusalem. The others held the title of exarch in the East or primate in the West. All the supreme metropolitans – i.e. the patriarchs and exarchs – were called archbishops. In the West, all the episcopates were named bishop’s dioceses afterwards, and the metropolitans were named archbishops and some of them even temporarily bore the title of patriarch, such as the Patriarch of Aquileia or, after relocation, the Patriarch of Venice. In the East, the episcopates were known as eparchies. The metropolitans used to convoke and preside over synods and the decisions reached at these councils were binding for all members. All the supreme metropolitans were equal in their rights. Gradually, in the West, due to the power of Rome and the frequent incapacity of the province to defend itself from barbarian invasion, more and more often the Roman Patriarch usually referred to as the pope) was often known and acknowledged as supreme metropolitan, while the bishops were considered his vicars. After some time, even the Patriarch of Constantinople took him as a model – as second in the ranking of honour – which was confirmed at the fourth ecumenical council. Besides the five patriarchates, a significant number of autonomous churches outside the field of authority or of any patriarch had an autocephalous status. Thus, for example, the Armenian, Persian and Georgian Church had their own Catholicos as supreme metropolitans.

Due to the general political circumstances in the west, substantial material fortune and central imperial geographic position obtained huge power for the Roman Church, which was materialised in the 5th century, when it placed its authority above the emperors of the Western Kingdom. Because of his significant reputation, the Bishop of Rome was often called upon to intercede in the serious Eastern Church disputes as well, and his word and authority was even decisive in the most delicate theological questions and concerns. The Roman bishops were gradually becoming more powerful and so, from the 5th century onwards, they requested that supreme jurisdiction be acknowledged to them over every other Christian churches, not being satisfied any more with honourable supremacy alone, which was not being denied to them by anyone. This provoked six major internal church disputes - three jurisdiction disputes on the territories of Illyria, Africa and Gallia and three disputes with the

Patriarch of Constantinople over the rank of patriarchate, supreme jurisdiction and ecumenical title. In particular, the ambitions of the Roman Church heads were nourished by the overthrown eastern episcopates, who turned to them for help without hesitating to humiliate themselves in order to achieve their goals. “The major obstacle to the aspirations to Roman supremacy over the East was the rival to Rome, namely New Rome or Constantinople. For this reason, Rome used every occasion they could to assault the Bishop of Constantinople. The Bishop of Rome was trying hard to diminish the influence of his eastern rival and make him harmless. The latter was especially dangerous since Constantinople became a new capital of the empire and its bishop became not only the archbishop or patriarch, but he also obtained a rank next to the Bishop of Rome. Rome could fear that once it would be said that Constantinople was the first capital, while Rome was the second, meaning that the Bishop of Constantinople was the first in rank and the Bishop of Rome was the second. For this reason, the Bishop of Rome was defending himself from the start against the growing reputation of the Bishop of Constantinople. The Bishop of Rome was especially protecting the Eastern Illyric Church, which he had subordinated to his power earlier on and which he was afraid to lose to the Bishop of Constantinople – particularly as of 379, when the Eastern Illyric became a political part of the East” (p. 524).

The Roman bishops did not hesitate to openly forge the canons of the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea, in order to artificially provide arguments for their requests. However, “when the Roman Church was not necessary for their political goals, the Constantinople emperors sometimes stated that the Constantinople Church held the highest rank but, when they wanted to please the Roman Church, they would add: ‘after the Roman Church’” (p. 525-562). On the occasion of the so-called Acacian schism over the reconciliation of the heretic Egyptian Monophysites with the Church, an open schism arose between Rome and Constantinople that lasted from 484 to 519. Rome sent 60,000 soldiers to Constantinople to force acceptance of its own requests, but the results were short-lived. The Eastern Church fought back soon afterwards when, in 588, the Council in Constantinople proclaimed

Patriarch Ioannis IV the supreme or ecumenical patriarch. The title itself was also purely honourable “but Rome interpreted it differently, since at that time Ioannis IV presided the Synod, which had administer justice to one patriarch (Gregorius, Patriarch of Antiochia – note V.Š.). Rome observed that the Bishop of Constantinople was granted supreme jurisdiction over the entire church, to the disadvantage of the interest of the Bishop of Rome who claimed that supremacy for himself!” (p. 530). The Roman Bishop Gregory the Great proclaimed the title of the Constantinople Patriarch to be diabolic and blasphemous. Regardless of this, from that day onwards, the Constantinople patriarchs were called ecumenical, meaning general or universal.

In that period of church history, some old heretical dogmas were revived and new ones appeared. The African Donatist Schism emerged over strictly personal issues concerning the bishops’ election, but it

escalated into many years of bloody conflicts. Other serious problems were caused in the IV century by Arianism, the followers of which negated Christ's divine nature. This was the motive to convoked the Council of Nicaea. The Arian heresy was diversified into several variants, of which the most influential provoked the so called Roman, Antiochian and Luciferian schism and, later on, the schism of Apollinaire and Macedon and the Priscilian schism. Some rationalist and fanaticized sects followed and, later on, Monophysitism appeared at full strength as a dogma on the only one nature of Christ, contrary to the traditional Christian dogma on his dual (human and divine) nature. During one period, the Monophysits gained the rule over the Patriarchate of Alexandria, Antiochia and Jerusalem. Monophysitism remained a permanent orientation of the Coptic Church, as well as of the churches of Ethiopia, Mesopotamia and Yermenia.

d) The New Monotheistical Factor of Islam and Further Confusion in the Christian Church

Popović defined the third period of general church history as from the appearance of Islam in 622 until the definite Christian schism in 1054. In the 7th century, Islam became the predominant religion in Persia, the Middle East and the North Africa, leading to the reduction of Christianity to a secondary religion in these areas. Later, it endangered Europe by advancing towards Constantinople and by a breakthrough in Spain. The Western Roman Empire fell apart. The sudden rise of the Frankish state and its falling apart lead to the formation of a large number of independent states. The crowning of Charlemagne in 800 as the Roman Emperor introduced a practice where the Roman Pope assigned the ruler's crowns, making him superior to the secular authority. Eastern Europe was conquered by the Slavs, who started forming their own states. In the Balkans, the Bulgarian empire was established first, followed by the Serbian empire. The Christian Church was thoroughly suppressed during this period from the southern parts of the Mediterranean, but it spread rapidly towards the west, north and east, Christianising the Germans and Slavs. From the organisational point of view, a gradual abandonment of the synodal system and the principle of unity occurred, aimed at strengthening the eastern patriarchal system and western papism.

In Constantinople, Emperor Constantine the Bearded convoked the Sixth Ecumenical Council in 680, to solve the monothelistic dispute over the unity of Christ's will, which originated from an attempted reconciliation with Monophytism. The Emperor Justinian II the Slit-Nose convoked the Seventh Ecumenical Council in 692, which adopted 102 canons. At first, the Western Church rejected these canons, then acknowledged them to a certain extent, then rejected them again. Subsequently, this council was denied the ecumenical character. In the following decades, Rome decided to recognise this council after all as a continuation of the Sixth Council. The Empress Irina, with her minor son Constantine V, convoked the 7th Ecumenical Council in Nicaea, in

787, which was decisive on the issue of controversial dispute over icons and 22 canons were enforced thereto. The Eighth Ecumenical Council was convoked by the Emperor Michael III, in 861 in Constantinople, in order to resolve a dispute over the patriarchal throne, between the replaced Patriarch Ignatios and the new Patriarch Photios. Even though the Roman envoys participated to this council, they subsequently denied its ecumenical character. In the agreement with the Bishop of Rome, the Emperor Vasileus Macedonian, in 869, convened the Eighth Ecumenical Council, which commenced with only 12 bishops present, though 102 bishops gathered by the final session. At the assembly, 27 canons were adopted and the Roman supreme jurisdiction was acknowledged. However, the same emperor convoked the Eighth Ecumenical Council again in 879. On that occasion, 383 bishops and papal envoys annulled the previous assembly and adopted three canons, "as one of those, not contradicting the honourable supremacy of the Roman throne, proclaimed the equality of jurisdiction of the Constantinople throne with the Roman one" (p. 729). The Roman Church had originally acknowledged this council, but it changed its decision after two years and revoked the recognition, proclaiming the annulled council from 869 as the only valid one. Thus, the Eastern Church considered the Eighth Ecumenical Council from 879 as final one, while the Western Church considered the council from 869 as final. Thus, the Ninth Ecumenical Council could never be convoked. After the schism, both the Eastern and Western Church convoked various councils that were named ecumenical, simply by ignoring each other.

In the western fraction of Christianity, the pope dominated the secular rulers of Rome, while the emperor was demonstrating a growing autocracy over the subordinated church in the eastern fraction. In this period the Bulgarians, who received Christianity in 864, originally opted for the Roman bishops but, in 869, their ruler Boris changed this decision, expelled the Latin archbishops and subordinated the Bulgarian church to the Constantinople Patriarch, who had founded it in the first place. In 893 A.D., Boris's son Simeon accepted the king's crown from the Roman Pope and redirected the Bulgarian church towards the west. However, in 932, Simeon's son Petar changed this decision once again and renounced all the connections with the pope and the Constantinople Patriarch acknowledged the Bulgarian Archbishop and the church autocephaly. In this period, the autocephaly of the Georgian and Cyprian churches was restored, at the level of a archbishop's diocese.

In Western Europe, almost all the bishop's dioceses were gradually subordinated to the Roman Pope and the pope was constantly trying to obtain supremacy over the Eastern patriarchs. "Bearing in mind that the Roman bishops, as the supreme church heads of the entire west, had influence on the secular governments as well, a theory was created that God had established two kinds of rule in order to rule the world. In metaphoric terms, these were two swords, a spiritual and a secular one, the first of which was given to the pope and the other to the rulers. However, the secular sword was sanctified and given to the rulers by the pope, and it is being given as the assistance to the spiritual sword. This

theory established by Roman theologians was being defended throughout the Middle Ages. The thing that was attributing significant importance to the Roman Pope in that period, both in church and secular issues, were two circumstances dating back to the first half of this period. Firstly an intimate alliance on the part of the Roman Pope with the powerful Frankish dynasty of the Carolingians, and secondly a collection of forged documents in favour of papal jurisdiction, a collection of the so called Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals, which was distributed at that time” (p. 737). Pipin the Short, founder of the Carolingian dynasty, was devoted to the pope, which enabled him to get to the throne in a legal manner, from the point of view of the church. After the expulsion of the Langobards, which suppressed the Greeks from large parts of the Italian territory, he entrusted the liberated estates directly to papal management, which would represent the beginning of the Papal state.

The forger of the Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals was trying to prove that the Bishop of Rome had the supreme church legislative and executive power allegedly from the beginning of the Christianity, that he was the judge in all bishops’ proceedings, that priests did not belong to the jurisdiction of the secular power, etc. For centuries, that forgery was imposed as an authentic document, especially in the process of limiting the metropolitan authority and the direct subordination of the western bishops under the authority of the Roman Pope. This lasted until the 16th and 17th centuries, when protestant theologians proved convincingly that was in fact a forgery. “The Roman divinity students and theologians were trying to defend the authenticity of these planted Decretals at first, but the forgery was indisputably proved and they were forced to cease doing so, only saying that the intentions of the forgers were not bad. They also claimed that they contained nothing of benefit for the Bishop of Rome, since he already possessed what the forged Decretals were attributing to him. It might be true that he had such authority, but the forgery significantly contributed to the strengthening of that authority, as an ancient origin was being attributed to that authority, claiming that, in terms of authority, the papal practice was like this from the very beginning of the Church. Consequently, any objection to that claim was being revoked *a priori*” (p. 741).

e) The Age of Roman Church Pornocracy

This forgery served as a church-law standpoint for Pope Nicholas I to threaten to excommunicate Lotharingian King Lothair II, unseat the bishops loyal to him and crush the resistance of Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims. He also tried to be the judge in the dispute between two Patriarchs of Constantinople, Ignatios and Photios, which sped up the schism. However, at the end of the 9th century, papal authority significantly decreased since the Roman aristocrats fought over the secular power and the side that was stronger at the time ordained someone they confided in as pope, regardless of whether the man had actual merit or competence. In 882, Pope John VIII was murdered. However, the worst was yet to come. “In 896, Pope Stephen VII

260

exhumed his predecessor Formosus (891-896) to try, convict and severely abuse him and, in 897, Stephen VII himself was strangled by the opposing party. But worst of all was the dignity and reputation of the Roman Chair in the 10th century, which is called the Dark Ages in western church history. In the first half of this century, lecherous women from the local aristocrat family, Theodora (first the wife of Roman senator Theophylactus, then the wife or lover of Marquis Adalbert of Tuscany) and her daughters Theodora and Marosia (Maria) ruled in Rome. These magnificently beautiful, cunning and daring Roman women (to agree with church historian Jose) combined the love of power and lust so that it is uncertain what was more important to them and they put their lovers, sons and grandsons in the papal chair for over half a century. In 904, Marosia was fortunate enough to raise her lover Sergius III (904-911) to the papal throne. But in 914, it was Theodora’s turn and she managed to appoint her lover, Archbishop of Ravenna John X, as the Pope (914-928). But Marosia had him strangled in 928 and, in 931, she put the son she had with Pope Sergius III in the papal throne as John XI (931-936). However, she also had a legitimate son, Marquis Alberic, who took over the rule of Rome in 932 and tyrannised his half-brother and the succeeding popes until his death in 954, after which his son Octavian (therefore the grandson of Marosia), a child of 16-18 years of age, came to the papal throne under the name John XII. His rule ended in disgrace in 963 when he was found dead in the bed of a married woman, which caused the legend that he was killed by the devil there. The period between 904 and 963 in the history of the Roman Chair is known as the age of pornocracy (the rule of the harlots)” (p. 742-743).

Then the German King Otto I the Great entered Italy and declared himself the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. In the following years, the new emperor and his successors continued the conflicts with the Roman aristocracy with the “popes now taking the emperors’ side, now the side of their opponents, which is why they were appointed and unseated in turns” (p. 743). A short break occurred at the time of German Pope Gregory V and French Pope Sylvester II between 996 and 1003. “However, after this, first the Roman party leader Crescentius II, son of Crescentius I, who was executed by Otto III in 997 and grandson of Pope John X and Theodora, and then, from 1012, the party of the Counts of Tusculum started filling the papal throne with their men. Among them, the greatest disgrace to the papal throne was Benedict IX (1033-1046) who was raised to the throne as a child of 12 by the party of his father, Count Alberic of Tuscany, the descendant of Marosia. He possessed every possible improvidence. He was frivolous and full of vice, he also thought about getting married, he sold his office in 1045 to Archdeacon John Gratian, who occupied the throne as Gregory VI, but then he took it again by force and generally acted childishly. Between 1045 and 1046, Rome had no less than three popes since the Romans appointed Antipope Sylvester III in 1044. This was the drop that made the cup overflow and weak King Heinrich III (1039-1056) came to Italy with a strong army to finally make some order. The council that he held in 1046 amid his army

Comment [S8]: Translator’s note. Possibly wrong spelling, no church historians of this name were found

261

in Sutrio near Rome, dethroned all three popes: Benedict IX, his Antipope Sylvester III and Gregory VI. Then the German bishops occupied the papal throne one after another” (743-744).

In the Roman church history of the 11th and 12th centuries, the story of the appointment of a woman, Joan, as pope in the 10th century (between popes Leo IV and Benedict III) has a prominent place. The story goes that “the woman pope was a girl from Mainz who was seduced by her lover and taken to Athens, where she acquired great knowledge. Then she came to Rome dressed as a man and, as a man, became a curial secretary and, in the end, the pope; she ruled under the name John Anglicus VIII for two and a half years before she gave birth to a child and died during a procession. In the 13th century, this legend could be read in chronicles and later even the popes believed in it. It is said that this was why John XX (1276-1277) named himself John XXI, so that the woman pope would get her place in the line of Peter’s descendants” (p. 745).

The insistence of the Roman bishops on the recognition of their status of highest legislators, teachers and judges in the overall Christian church lasted for centuries but in the two hundred years since the dispute concerning the toppling of Patriarch Ignatios of Constantinople, the definitive schism was getting closer and closer. The schism was also facilitated by the tragic weakening of the Patriarchate of Constantinople due to the imperialist despotism and brutality in a century-long dispute over church icons. It was also hastened by the further progress of Italian-Greek international intolerance (or at least envy). In time, there was a differentiation in theological learning, religious cult and church discipline. The Westerners insisted that the Holy Spirit emanated from both the Father and the Son, while the Easterners believed that it originated only from the Father, our Lord. The Roman Church held the 50 apostolic canons to be obligatory, while the Eastern Church recognised 85. At the time of the dispute concerning the Christianisation of Bulgaria in 866, Patriarch Photios formulated five basic objections to the Latin church hierarchy: “1) They fast on Saturdays, 2) They separate the first week of the forty days of Lent from the rest of the Fast because they eat milk, cheese and indulge in other pleasures then, which certainly meant a reproach to beginning the Western forty days of Lent on Wednesday instead of Monday, 3) They despise and reject Eastern priests who live in legitimate marriage, while their priests live in concubinage and fornication, 4) They do not recognise the Chrismation given by the presbyter and, and this is the worst, 5) They forge the Symbol with false interpretations and teach that the Holy Spirit emanates not only from the Father but also from the Son, therefore, from two principles” (p. 781). In 867, the Council of Constantinople decided to topple and excommunicate Roman Pope Nicholas I. Emperor Michael sent this ruling to Western Emperor Louis II to enact, but the Pope died before it arrived.

The matter got more complicated when Basil the Macedonian murdered Emperor Michael III in 867 and reached the throne, but Patriarch Photios would not give him communion until he repented.

Basil toppled Photios and returned Ignatios to the patriarchal throne, seeking support from pope in this act, something that the pope could barely wait for. The Greek bishops were ultimately humiliated but they soon came to their senses and the conflict with the Roman episcopate continued. In 906, Nicholas Mysticus, Patriarch of Constantinople fiercely opposed the fourth marriage of Emperor Leo VI the Philosopher, but the emperor unseated him with the support of the pornocratic Pope Sergius III, whose envoys declared the emperor’s fourth marriage valid. However, there had been a burst of dissatisfaction in Constantinople and the church schism ensued, meaning that only a few recognised new Patriarch Euphremius. In 912, the emperor repented on his deathbed and returned Nicholas Mysticus to the position of patriarch. In 920, there was a special council in Constantinople that declared the fourth marriage prohibited leading to a tetragamy dispute with the Western Church. The animosity deepened when the co-ruler of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Romanus I, got the support of Pope John XI to topple the legitimate Patriarch Tryphon and bring his 16-year old son Theophylactus to the throne, who identified with the Roman popes from the age of pornography in his promiscuous life. Although there were several attempts at reconciliation, the conflict flared up with stronger and stronger arguments. Constantine IX Monomachus tried to reconcile the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Roman pope invited the papal envoy to Constantinople in 1054, but they came full of rage and anger, accusing the easterners of sectarianism and, on July 16, they caused an incident in St Sophia’s church, anathemising Patriarch Michael Cerularius and hastily leaving Constantinople. The immediately convened council in Constantinople decided to anathemise those who cast it. The schism was deepened completely and unbridgeable.

f) The Great Christian Schism

The fourth period of general church history, according to Popović’s periodization, lasted from the great schism until the fall of Constantinople in 1453. The most significant success of the Eastern Church in this period was the Christianisation of Russia, but it suffered severe blows from the Turks and Mongolians. The Latin Church was in full expansion at the time. Pope Urban II summoned the Christians to a crusade for the liberation of Christ’s grave from the Islamic Saracens and in return promised the indulgence of all sins to the participants. The propaganda of the Roman-Catholic priests was highly successful and, over two hundred years, there were seven crusades. The first crusade started in 1096 and led to the liberation of Jerusalem and the formation of the Christian kingdom in 1099, which lasted until 1187. Jerusalem was liberated again in 1229 and retained until 1244. However, in 1291, the western

Christians lost all the conquered territories and this signified the end of the crusades. However, the fervent and belligerent Christian spirit increased the power of Roman popes. “The Roman Church still managed to spread at the expense of the Orthodox Eastern Church

during the crusades. The crusaders came to the lands of the eastern Christians with the conviction that they were schismatics and heretics that should either be converted or annihilated and the chroniclers of the crusades cold bloodedly told how the crusaders burned some Christian cities because their inhabitants were persistent 'heretics'. Where the crusaders came to power, the Latin Church was established and the Eastern one suppressed where possible. When the crusaders came to power in Antiochia and Jerusalem, a Latin patriarchate was immediately founded in both cities and the Greek patriarch was suppressed; also, Latin bishops and archbishops were appointed and the Greek ones were banished; the same happened with the priests – wherever it was possible and where it was not, the eastern priests were at least subjected to the Latin bishops and those who would not obey the Latin spiritual leaders were punished severely. In 1225, on the island of Cyprus, 13 Greek monks were burned because they refused to acknowledge the Latin archbishop and obey him" (part II, p. 24-25).

In 1204, the fourth crusade was even redirected to Constantinople, which was conquered and thoroughly robbed, while the emperor and patriarch escaped. The Latin Empire was formed, with a Roman-Catholic emperor and patriarch. Venetian Thomas Morosini was appointed patriarch. Only in 1261 did the Byzantine Empire regain Constantinople. "However, after the restitution of the Greek Empire in Constantinople and after the end of the great crusades, the Latin hierarchy could not survive in Constantinople, Jerusalem and Antiochia; it had to return to the west; but the Roman Chair never ceased believing that the Latin Church existed in the east *de jure* and kept consecrating patriarchs, archbishops and bishops for it, who, of course, had to remain in the west because there was no room or area for them to work in the east" (p. 25). This way, the Roman Church nurtured a large category of high priest ranks whose bearers were called "patriarchs, archbishops and bishops in the territories of the heathens, heretics and schismatics – in other words: patriarchs, archbishops and bishops in enemy lands, or titular patriarchs, archbishops and bishops; these days there are 3 patriarchs, around 80 archbishops and around 350 bishops; according to the status from 1908, there are 456 bishops of all ranks" (p. 25).

The Roman Church spread Christianity through North and Central Europe with fire and sword, persistently trying to take over the territories under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. It tried to bring the Serbian and Bulgarian Churches under its control and even temporarily succeeded. In the first half of the 13th century, the Greek patriarch whose headquarters was in Nicaea because of the crusade conquests, acknowledged the Romanian-Bulgarian Empire and gave its archbishop the title of patriarch with the permanent residence of the newly founded patriarchate in Trnovo and the Bulgarian-Slavic church language because the Bulgarian element was more dominant in this state. When Dušan raised the Serbian archbishopric to the rank of patriarchate, he received the permission of Bulgarian patriarch and the Archbishop of Ohrid, but the Patriarch of Constantinople anathemised it, which was later revoked and the patriarchate was recognised. The first

Russian church was the Metropolitanate of Constantinople with its centre in Kiev. The Eastern Church acted under far more difficult conditions than the Western one and the Turkish invasion considerably disturbed its organisational structure.

The Western Church was substantially regenerated after the direct intervention of the German rulers. The pontificate regained its power, got rid of the supremacy of the Italian aristocrats and, according to the 1059 synod decree, the pope was elected exclusively by a collegium of cardinals – papal advisories who make a consistory – but the election depended on confirmation from the German emperor, at least for a while. Pope Gregory VII, who mercilessly applied the principle of celibacy and liberated the clergy from any layman interference in the election of bishops and monastery fathers, openly expressed the intention "of creating a unique theocratic universal monarchy out of the whole Christian world, with the pope at the head as an envoy of God, above rulers and nations and to enforce the laws of divine rule" (p. 70). Some feudal lords soon subjected to him and recognised him as liege and Popović states that "Dimitrije Zvonimir, King of Croatia and Dalmatia, gave his kingdom to Gregory VII as a fief so the Roman Chair became his liege" (p. 1076) in 1076. The pope immediately came into conflict with German Emperor Heinrich IV and they toppled and cursed each other until the emperor appointed Antipope Clement III, entered Rome and was exiled from there by the Normans. Banishing the German emperor, the Normans robbed Rome and the embittered citizens expelled them together with Gregory, who called on them for help. Gregory's successors succeeded in depriving the secular lords of the investment of high church officials.

g) The Great Crime of the Crusades Incited the Unionist Ambitions of the Roman Popes

The crusades enabled the popes to present themselves as the supreme secular lords of west Christian states, even imposing the obligation on their rulers to kiss the Roman bishop on his feet. The road to the establishment of full theocracy and universal papal monarchy was open and the popes wanted to wage wars against unsubmitive rulers. Just when the popes had defeated the German emperors after many years of fight in 1295, Pope Boniface VIII came into conflict with the French King Philip IV the Fair. In a 1302 papal bull, Boniface VIII stated that "every one who wants to achieve bliss must believe that the pope received full power over each creature from God and that God gave two swords to the church, the spiritual sword that pope carries and the secular sword that pope can give and take away from secular rulers" (p. 77). After this, however, the king declared the pope a madman and, the following year, sent an army that caught Boniface and exposed him to such severe disgrace and harassment that he died unable to withstand the humiliation. The following pope was the French Clement V and the king did not allow him to leave France so, in 1309, Avignon was determined as his centre and remained such for the next 70 years. Philip the Fair

also destroyed the Templar knights, who appeared on French territory after being exiled from the countries under Turkish occupation. The Western Church was entirely instrumentalised for the enforcement of French state policy at this time.

In 1377, Gregory XI succeeded in returning the Papal Chair to Rome but he died immediately afterwards. The new pope, Urban VI, suppressed the French cardinals who formed a majority. Dissatisfied, they decided to elect a new pope, Clement VII, and went with him to Avignon in 1379, which led to the great western papal schism that lasted until 1417. Each pope had his supporters and successors. In 1409 in Pisa, there was an attempt to surpass the schism by toppling both popes and electing a new one in the form of Alexander V and his successor John XXIII. The Western Church then had three popes. Two councils were called to solve this schism, one in Pisa in 1409 and the other in Constance in 1414 that lasted for four years and where all three popes of the time were unseated and Martin V was elected. Inside the Church, there were more and more open requests for reforms and the limitation of papal authority, autocracy and privileges. In Basel in 1431, a council was convened for that purpose, and Pope Eugene IV tried to avoid it by beginning dialogue on union with the Byzantine emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople. Using this excuse, he declared the transfer of the council to Ferrara, which the participants of the Basel Council did not accept and so the pope excommunicated them. Then the Basel Council participants proclaimed Eugene IV a schismatic and heretic and elected Felix V as the new pope. In Basel, Eugene formed a union with the Greeks and the participants of the Basel Council soon dispersed. The papal supremacy was still severely disturbed.

On several occasions, the Roman bishops attempted to subject Eastern Christianity to their rule even after the great schism. The Byzantine emperors and patriarchs, burdened with the highly unfavourable foreign-political circumstances, agreed at times to discuss this topic. When Byzantine Emperor Michael Palaiologos regained the capital Constantinople, he faced the impervious and aggressive plans for the renewal of the Latin Empire. To prevent them, he unwillingly agreed to a union and, in the mid 13th century, negotiated with three popes, Urbano IV, Clement IV and Gregory X. The Greek Orthodox clergy fiercely opposed this but the emperor suppressed Joseph I and sent his predecessor German III, who stayed on the patriarch throne for only three months, to the council in Lyon. In 1274, a union was declared in Lyon and then the emperor overthrew Joseph I and appointed the new patriarch, John Bekkos. However, in spite of the imperial violence, the Byzantine clerical circles entirely boycotted the union. Since the emperor failed to enforce the union, in which the papal legates assured themselves, Pope Martin IV excommunicated Michael Palaiologos in 1281, declaring him a schismatic and a fraud.

Byzantine Emperor Andronicus III Junior also negotiated the union because he needed western help in the fight against the Turks, but the negotiations failed because the Pope of Avignon, Benedictus XII, requested absolute submission. In 1369, John V Palaiologos personally

came to Rome and converted to Roman-Catholicism but he only managed to embitter his people and his unionist plans failed. Manuel II also negotiated union without success in 1418. John VII Palaiologos got the furthest in the unionist endeavour. The high officials and envoys of almost every Eastern Orthodox Church participated in the unionist council in Ferrara in 1483, aside from Emperor John and the patriarch Joseph II of Constantinople. However, theological disputes were very long and exhausting and the patriarch died while they still continued. The emperor's pressure was even greater then so the Orthodox theologists gave in to the Roman-Catholic insistence. The admission of papal supremacy was disputed most with great threats and bribery; some eastern bishops and envoys escaped from the council. The Decree of the Union was announced in Florence in 1439 but, immediately after the return to Constantinople, most church officials declared, when confronted with the dissatisfaction and rage of the people, that their signatures on the Union document were extorted and that they actually did not accept the union. The Russian, Romanian and Georgian churches openly rejected the union, while the Serbian church did not even send envoys to the council. The emperor appointed Metrophanes II as the new Patriarch of Constantinople and he removed every episcopate that was against the union, but the people fervently boycotted every unionist liturgy. In 1443, the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antiochia met in Jerusalem, rejected the union and declared the overthrowing of Patriarch Metrophanes of Constantinople and the unionist bishops. Metrophanes died that same year and, in the following two, the emperor could not appoint a new patriarch. In 1445, he appointed Gregory III Mammas, who also enforced the union, but he was toppled in 1450 by the eastern patriarchs. When the emperor died in the meantime, his successor Constantine XII was not a particular supporter of the union, but the Roman bishop pressured him to continue the unionist endeavour. The Greeks, however, showed greater aversion toward Roman Catholicism than toward the Turks. After the fall of Constantinople in 1453, Gennadius was elected patriarch and he was a fierce opposer of the union, so the Roman ambitions failed.

h) The Long-Lasting Crime of the Inquisition

The animosity toward different opinions or religions has been shown occasionally by all Christians. However, what was manifested by the Roman-Catholic Church during inquisition eradicated all traces of the original teaching of Christianity. It turned into its essential doctrinal opposite, practically a negation of it and a manifestation of force and power, unscrupulousness and the triumph of evil – the manifestation of the Antichrist, Lucifer, Satan in the form of the Roman bishop and the realizers of his villainous will. The evil was a product of the endless thirst for power, uncontrolled ruling ambition and the absolutisation of church dogma turned into a political ideology. If the opponent could not be matched with adequate argumentation, then it could be with stones and stakes. The Western Church developed into a totalitarian super-state

that praised infinite human humility as an ultimate virtue. Those who are different should not exist. This criminal mind had already materialised in the slaughter of the civilians of other religions in the crusades, where the victims were not selected – where there was no difference between the Mohammedans and Orthodox Christians. After all, the main motive was always robbery and religious fanaticism was its ideological shell. The supreme religious ideals served as an excuse for the misdeeds for these rascals, while the monarchical principle of church organisation and the guarantee of indulgence destroyed every traditional moral principle.

The Roman-Catholic Church was the supreme feudalism, always hungry for new income and prone to consistent increase in purely secular demands. The monopolisation of ideas and all the spheres of intellectual creation led to the brainwashing, the rule of mediocrities and the domination of frustrated and complex-ridden monks. Human thought was shackled to demean the intellect and avoid curiosity and to nip every potential doubt in the bud. Religion became the main purpose of life and the people became its slaves. In the persecution of heretics, people were killed in masses – sometimes even randomly – because the inquisitors stuck to two rules. The first said that it was better that a hundred innocents should die than one guilty one should escape and the second said that it was not a problem if innocent people died in the persecution of heretics since God would clearly distinguish the guilty from the innocent in the next world. Science was accepted only if it was a direct extension of the theology and if it positioned itself inside its doctrinal boundaries.

The inquisitors encouraged ordinary people to become informers and offered a three-year long pardon of sins and even a part of victim's property to those who revealed heretics. The informers were awarded according to their merits and those who concealed already notorious heretics were punished brutally. Informers could also testify anonymously and the inquisitors also accepted the testimonies of minors and the mentally challenged. Evidence was not necessary. Bare suspicion was sufficient. No one was released from prison since it would mean recognition of the inquisitor's error. Those who were tried had to be convicted. The most important thing was to psychologically break the prisoner and the investigations sometimes lasted for years until the suspects admitted their guilt and confirmed the impeccability and omniscience of the inquisitors. They tried to conduct bloodless torture and to graduate it from easier to harder. "According to this gradation, one of the easier tortures was the squashing of fingers. The accused's fingers were put between two iron plates with screws in the middle and on the sides. They would tighten the plates with these screws until they crushed the wrist and bones and blood started flowing from under the fingernails. The Spanish boot was a very famous and widely used apparatus. During torture, feet were placed in iron casts with a screw in the middle. This screw was then slowly turned and the cast around feet would slowly tighten until it broke the joints. Perfidious torturers would also gladly hit them with a hammer. Stretching the arms from behind was a method of torture in which man's arms would be tied behind his back, wrapped

tightly several times with a rope and then stretched with a winch so that the arms would be parallel to the head. They would hang in the air like this for some time – usually until a few paternosters or some other prayers had been said – and then they would be rapidly lowered down and again pulled up a few times in a row. They would question them in this position and, if the victim remained persistent, they would perform a 'minor' modification of this form, or tie weights to their feet while hanging or sometimes use a lit candle to burn them on sensitive parts of the body (underarms, soles and around genitals)" (Vera Savić: *Inquisition*, Science Book, Belgrade 1954, p. 37-38).

A special Roman-Catholic invention in questioning a sinful human soul was "the wooden horse", an invention worthy of a Frankensteinian imagination. "The apparatus consisted of a horizontally positioned beam, about a meter long, which stood on four legs put slightly aslant. In the middle of this fairly wide beam was a pyramid about two palms high. The accused would be forced to sit on the very peak of the pyramid. Weights would be tied to his arms and legs. Not many could sustain this torture; they either confessed everything that was asked of them immediately or they passed out, or even died. During the performance of this torture, the accused would be sprinkled with 'holy water'" (p. 39). However, as the peak of papal ingenuity, they used the torture device called the wheel. "They would stretch the accused's arms and legs on the movable staves on the wheel.

They would keep stretching as much as possible, then turned the wheel" (p. 39). The Spanish inquisitors managed to perfect the wheel and created the *corda*. "This device was similar to the wheel although it looked completely different. It was a kind of bench. The man was put on it and the extremities of his arms and legs were tightly tied to the bench. There was a special binding for the thighs. The ropes were tightened through a specific device and they would cut into the flesh to the bone and stretch the body at the same time" (p. 39).

The Spanish Jesuits delighted the Roman arch-villain with the peak of Roman-Catholic religious revelation when they introduced water torture. "A special ladder was built for this purpose, with sharp edges and thorns everywhere. The accused were tied to this ladder, simply bound around with a rope. Their head, completely tilted back, was tied to a stave with an iron neck brace so that they could not move. After this, they would use iron pliers to open their jaw, shove a cloth into their mouth and pour water slowly on it. Since they had no air, they were forced to breathe faster and faster so that they not only swallowed water (around two litres) but the cloth also slowly entered their oesophagus. This torture was strictly in the spirit of the 'humane' rules of the Catholic church, which ordered that the torture must be performed without spilling blood" (p. 39-40). Apart from all this, the more lucrative the confiscated property, the more thorough the inquisitors were. However, the wealthier "heretics" could also bribe them if they offered a satisfactory sum of money in time.

It is interesting to see how the present-day Roman-Catholic theologians try to justify the inquisition as a means to defend God, the

church and religion, discipline the believers and priests and preserve religious dogmas. To them, the annihilation of every belief, religious ritual and organisation that was not in accordance with the rules of the Roman-Catholic church was justified. Until 1232, everyone who severely disobeyed the church norms had been simply shunned from the religious community, although certain Roman emperors persecuted heretics in almost the same way as the Christians were persecuted before. In the 12th century, there were also many cases of the imprisonment and murder of so-called heathens. When Pope Gregory IX institutionalised the inquisition in 1232, he already had significant experience, his own and that of his predecessors, in the mass killing of heretics. In 1209, the Crusade army destroyed town of Béziers on the Rhone River in France and murdered around 30,000 of its inhabitants after the papal legate told the soldiers to kill everybody and that God would recognise his own if there happened to be innocents among the murdered. This happened at the time of Pope Innocent III, who rejected burning as a method of destruction, but Gregory IX introduced it as an official means of annihilating the Albigensians and Cathars, the dualist heresy that was assumed to have originated from Bulgarian areas. It was not a coincidence that the pope entrusted the cruel inquisitorial violence to the beggar orders of Dominicans and Franciscans who were absolutely faithful and ruthless in their fanaticism and ready to submit the local rulers and other feudalists to the papal will.

Another famous tenet of the inquisition came from German areas and said that a hundred innocents should be burned without hesitation if at least on guilty one was among them. In church trials, the accused did not have the right to a defender and the witnesses gave their statements incognito. Aside from the real or alleged heretics, the victims of the inquisition were the Jewish all over Europe, the Muslims in Spain, the Templars in France, free-spirited scientists and critics of immorality in the highest church hierarchy in Italy, the reformers in Germany and Bohemia etc. All over the countries with Roman-Catholic religious affiliation, thousands of alleged witches and wizards burned at the stakes. Stating a great number of chilling historical examples and admitting them as errors and misconceptions, while at the same time expressing repulsion at the inquisitory methods based on secret reports and the rejection of confrontation between the accuser and accused as if they came from the Jesuit retorts that were capable of defending every Roman-Catholic crime, French authors Guy and Jean Testas conclude: “The medieval inquisition was a special court that the Church established to shield itself from the dangers that threatened it and that consequently jeopardised the entire society. Inside Christianity, it played the same role as the crusades had outside. Respecting the truth, it should be said that its excesses were not as great as is commonly believed. Even the most hostile authors feel the need to enter some elasticity into their judgment, even regarding the Spanish inquisition. When speaking about witches, we pointed out the respectable attitude of some inquisitors. We gladly admit that the secular courts were even more cruel; that defending the faith meant defending the state and that religious wars caused

incomparably greater slaughter” (Guy and Jean Testas: *Inquisition*, Christian Present, Zagreb 1982, p. 199). The murder of several hundred people and several centuries of fierce persecution of every freedom-loving thought are only excesses, just like Jasenovac!

In 1059, the rule that only cardinals could elect the pope was introduced and this also made the influence of papal consistory grow. The fourth Lateran council in 1215 decided on the persecution and investigation of heretics, for which special episcopal courts were in charge. However, in 1232, the right to try heretics was transferred to the Dominican monastic order that the pope controlled directly. “This is how the papal inquisitorial tribunals formed, especially in France, Italy and Germany, and they had great privileges and power. They could try anyone, incarcerate them, torture and summon criminals, the dishonest and the guilty as witnesses and not reveal their names; they could convict people not only to church punishment (repentance) but also to property confiscation, lifelong incarceration and even death. But the execution of the death penalty was in the hands of secular rule so that principles would be apparently maintained: ‘The Church does not lust for blood’” (Popović, volume II, p. 87-88). The Dominican inquisitors were called the hounds of God because of their strictness and cruelty and bloody rebellions were raised against them.

From 1455 onward, the Roman popes increasingly looked up to their predecessors from the 10th and 11th century. Calixtus III became famous for his unbelievable nepotism. Paul II introduced a jubilean indulgence every 25 years that freed believers from every earthly sin for a substantial sum of money, but he also declared a crusade against the Bohemian king. Sixtus IV, like his predecessor, was a greedy bully, a seller of church titles and positions, a conspirator and intriguer and, apart from this, the order-issuing authority behind the most horrifying Spanish inquisition. Innocent VIII had many extramarital children and he was devoted to financially securing them as through they were from an imperial family. He introduced the witch trials and, in agreement with the Turkish sultan, he kept sultan’s ambitious brother in prison for a large sum of money. According to the testimony of church chroniclers, Alexander VI Borgia was the most negligent and unconscientious pope. He also had many extramarital children and he maintained an incestuous relationship with his daughter Lucretia, who also became the mistress of pope’s son and her brother Cesare. Pope Alexander VI persuaded his son to poison a cardinal but he accidentally ate the poison himself and died. Julius II was at war with Germany, France and Italy between 1503 and 1513. The subsequent Pope Leo X Medici openly said that the Christian religion was a hoax and that the people should be cheated since they wanted to be cheated in this way. This behaviour simply had to lead to a specific inter-church revolution that gave the hardest blow to Roman bishops.

i) The Protestant Reformation

The Protestant reformation was started in 1517 by a learned

theologian Martin Luther, who was embittered with the market sale of indulgences. He quickly got wide public support in almost every German state and especially from the humanist intelligentsia. The like-minded started a thorough criticism of the clergy and the abuse of the church for secular purposes. After unsuccessful attempts at an agreement, the pope issued a bull in which he proclaimed Luther's beliefs heretical, after which Luther called the pope the Antichrist in 1520. Then he devoted himself to a thorough reform of theological teaching and church dogmas, declaring a definitive breakaway from Roman-Catholicism. In a 1545 brochure, Luther proved that the devil himself founded the Roman pontificate. The following year, the religious wars between the Catholics and Protestants began, or rather between the mid-European states in which one or the other prevailed. The religious wars were especially bloody in the following, 17th century and they especially devastated the German countries. The wars lasted until the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 that partially instilled a spirit of religious tolerance, but the disputes between rulers concerning this issue continued.

The German Lutheran reformation had a strong impact on neighbouring countries. Ulrich Zwingli and John Calvin performed a specific church reform in Switzerland. In Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland, this was done by the will of the rulers. There were many competitions and often even conflicts between the two basic reformatory Protestant currents – the Lutherans and Calvinists.

In the second half of the 16th century, there were eight religious wars in France. Bartholomew's night in 1572 is remembered for the massacre of 20,000 French Protestants – the Huguenots. On the other hand, the Anglican Church in England, very similar to the Calvinist, was formed when the former devoted Catholic, King Henry VIII, asked the pope for a divorce. The pope denied this and, when the king divorced and remarried anyway, anathemised him and excommunicated the Archbishop of Canterbury who gave the approval for the new wedding. Separating the English church, the king passed the Act of Supremacy, which meant that the ruler was the head of church at the same time. However, the inquisition in Spain nipped every attempt or mere idea of reformation in the bud by burning thousands of people at the stakes. There were internal disputes and division even inside the reformed churches, new religious sects were created prolifically, especially in the North-American continent, which would make the question of a general Christian church organisation absurd.

The Roman-Catholic Church recovered very slowly and heavily from the blows that the Protestant reformation inflicted upon it. The Jesuit monastic order, organised in the first half of the 16th century by the former Spanish knight Ignatius Loyola, had the key role in the fight against the Protestants. The Jesuits defined the purpose of their establishment through their goals and the commitment that every member must "defend, spread and strengthen Roman-Catholicism under the lead of the pope and deny Protestantism and everything else that is not strictly Roman-Catholic among the brethren of the same religion and

heathens with words, script, inner and outside mission, or the education of youth, sermons, religious secrets, caring, etc." (p. 317). The order quickly gathered the most radical religious fanatics, formed a strong and disciplined organisation and made a significant impact on the political life of Catholic countries. Their religious unscrupulousness was promoted as the ultimate political principle that the end justified the means. In the mid 18th century, the Jesuits "got hold of every influence in the church and state and smothered every free movement in science, the church and social life with their ruthless aspiration to raise the Roman Catholicism, pontificate, their order and their teaching to the absolute authority – so much so that they became detested not only among the heathens but also among those of the same religion, even in the clergy, secular and monastic areas" (p. 319).

The Jesuits became so oppressive and unbearable that, in the mid 18th century, Pope Benedict XIV requested on his deathbed the disbanding of the Jesuit order. Soon the Jesuits were banished from the French and Portuguese territories and the Spanish put them on ships and left them on the coast of the papal state. In 1773, Pope Clement XIV officially cancelled the Jesuit order but they soon poisoned him and so, in 1814, Pope Pius VII reinstated it. In the 19th century, the Jesuits were banished from Russia, France and Germany where their conspiratorism became unbearable to the local rulers. However, the constant struggle against the Protestants brought new life into their church structures and aroused them from passivity, decadence and resignation, making them fight incessantly for survival. The Jesuits devotedly persecuted every free-spirited human thought so that many intellectuals ended up at the stake. In 1563, the Council of Trent ascertained a list of forbidden books and the Roman-Catholic church strictly persecuted their publication, distribution and even reading. In a perfidious and unscrupulous Jesuit-Unionist action in 1724, Cyril III, a Unionist and a Jesuit disciple, managed to usurp the Antioch patriarchal throne, but the Orthodox believers soon banished him. During the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, Roman proselytism demonstrated that it would not hesitate to commit the severest crimes in order to achieve its goals. In the 19th century, a hatred of anything non-Catholic was systematically developed and, in the 20th, out and out genocide became an option.

The autocracy of the Roman popes, the unscrupulousness of church circles in the plunder of material goods and confrontation of free-spirited ideas became so intolerable that the 1789 French bourgeois revolution not only had an anti-Roman-Catholic but also anti-Christian attitude in general. Pope Pius VI rushed to curse the revolutionary ideas but the revolutionists invaded Italy in 1798 and created a Roman republic out of the papal state, captured the pope and took him to France as a captive where he died the following year. In 1800, a new pope was elected on Austrian territory. Napoleon formed a concordat with the pope but soon after this, he proclaimed the separation of the church from the state and, in 1809, he also cancelled the papal state before reconciling with the pope again. After the fall of Napoleon, the pope ordered the Jesuits to wholeheartedly devote themselves to the restoration of monarchism and

the suppression of liberalism. This reactionary church movement lasted throughout the whole of the 19th century and was called Ultramontanizm.

During 1869 and 1870, a church council was organised in Rome under the leadership of the Jesuits and it proclaimed the impeccability of the popes regarding all issues of faith and morality. This caused the absolute abhorrence of the entire European civic public. The church circles retaliated by nurturing a specific pope cult among the common, uneducated people. The Roman pope was fiercely opposed to the movement to unify Italy and excommunicated its leaders, but the resistance of the papal state was broken specifically in 1870 when the city of Rome itself was taken away from the pope and designated the Italian capital.

j) Villainous Roman-Catholic Proselytism on the Serbian Territories

In a thorough study entitled *The Roman Office and the South-Slavic Countries* (Serbian Academy of Science, Belgrade 1950), Jovan Radonić shows how the pontificate reacted to the European Protestant movement with the help of the Jesuits, trying to suppress the eastern schismatics and put them under his control at the same time. It all began after the Council of Trent, which was held from 1545 to 1563 with interruptions and which introduced the centralisation of church, giving supreme legislative, judicial and also absolute executive and financial power to the pope and, aside from this, the exclusive right to call ecumenical councils and give legal validity to their decisions. This meant that the entire church power would be in the hands of one person. Since the North European Protestants were quite well-organised, the pontificate thought it would achieve faster success working among the threatened and shattered Balkan Orthodox, then continuing this trend and working towards the Protestants. This is why it was especially important for the popes to suppress every appearance of reformatory ideas among the Balkan Roman-Catholics using any means available. The key role in this endeavour was intended for the Dubrovian Catholics, although the wiser among the Dubrovians originally resisted the interposition of this role to its city. The combination of hints of the existing liberation fight against the Turks and winning people over to the union by diminishing religious differences and masking the political ambitions of the Roman-Catholic church was served to the Serbs especially skilfully. The Balkan orthodox felt they needed help in the fight against the Turks and the Roman office blackmailed them into accepting the union first in order to get that help.

At the beginning of the 17th century, the Roman-Catholic missionaries found very good relations between the Orthodox and the Catholics in the Serbian national territories. There were many mixed marriages, mutual assistance in religious rituals and even cases of two altars in some churches, where priests of Eastern and Western religious ritual took turns. The religious animosity between the Christians was an unknown phenomenon and the Serbian national identification was

IT-03-67-T

absolute with a large amount of anti-Turkish solidarity. As Radonić said, “if there had been more cooperation from Rome and high Catholic clergy, there would not be such a deep breach between the two religions with the same people. Concerning mixed marriages, the Congregation of Propaganda was unyielding, certainly bearing in mind the clause of the 1060th canon [...] The Congregation ordered that the Archbishop of Zadar should make energetic efforts to prevent the Catholics from engaging in mixed marriages, on one hand so that they would save their souls and on the other since these marriages were condemned by the Ecumenical councils [...] The Congregation of Propaganda was also against Catholic altars in some churches [...] The priests of Roman law must not perform rituals in Orthodox churches” (p. 21). The Roman Catholics called their own church councils, in which the Eastern churches did not participate after the great schism the Ecumenical councils.

The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, established in 1622 after a papal bull and consisting of the most influential cardinals, tried to gradually win the Orthodox Christians over, “leaving them the Orthodox ritual and the Slavic liturgy. The conversion of the Orthodox to the Latin ritual was not opportunistic since the schismatics of the eastern church could conclude that the Roman Church wanted to cancel the Greek ritual and, therefore, they could end up hating the Latin Church” (p. 40). The Venetian and Austrian authorities, apart from the Dubrovian ones, also applied themselves to this Catholicisation. In Croatia and Slavonia, the local Roman-Catholic bishops saw their chance in the eastern-rite conversion of the Serbs to turn them from free border-men into serfs, to impose the usual feudal taxes and corvée on them. In 1611, the Roman-Catholics managed to win over the Serbian Orthodox episcope of Marča during his stay in Rome and he acknowledged the papal supremacy by preserving the church-Slavic language and the Orthodox rituals. Austrian Emperor Ferdinand II, frightened by the rebellious behaviour of the border Serbs from the generalates of Karlovac and Varaždin, avoided fulfilling the request of the papal nuncio in 1262 to banish all Serbian Orthodox priests. On the other hand, the Patriarch of Peć toppled Episcopo Simeon in 1628 because of the union, so the situation grew more complicated and the emperor thought that these problems threatened the south borders of his state.

In 1630, already very old, Episcopo Simeon resigned and the Austrian War Council appointed Prior Maksim Predojević as the new episcopo. Ferdinand II only informed the pope about this, without asking for confirmation of the appointment. It turned out that Maksim only pretended to be prone to Unionism, defrauding the emperor and the military command, as well as the papal nuncio. After returning to the monastery of Marča, he went to Peć so that the Serbian patriarch would consecrate him as an Orthodox episcopo, demonstrating that he was a fervent Orthodox, loyal to the ancestral faith. The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was furious with Maksim, but it failed to appoint the Ruthenian Nikifor as the Episcopo of Marča because the Austrian military authorities opposed this, unwilling to upset the brave

457/57440

Serbian warriors. In the meantime, there was a shift on the imperial throne and, in 1637, the devoted Benko Vinković was appointed Bishop of Zagreb, who energetically restored the proselyte efforts, trying to win over the young Austrian ruler. "The work on the Union should be approached carefully, the new Bishop of Zagreb said. At first, the Serbs may keep their church rituals and, when they are better trained in the Roman-Catholic faith, they would easily abandon their Greek ritual. This happened in Istra, the Diocese of Senj and Vinodol, where the Serbs, having abandoned the old faith and rituals, were no longer called Serbs (Vlachs) but Croats [...] The Serbs should be allowed the use of old calendar for now until they were better trained in the Roman faith and its rituals, when they would abandon the old and accept the new calendar on their own" (p. 72).

Not managing to win over Episcopate Maksim to the union with smooth-talking, Bishop Vinković started a fierce campaign with the Austrian authorities, demanding that Emperor Ferdinand remove the Orthodox episcopate. "On the 3 February 1639, Bishop Vinković turned to the Congregation in Rome. After stating the whole history of the appointment of Maksim as episcopate and accusing him of not only preventing the spreading of the union but also leading Catholics to convert to schism and accept the Orthodox rituals, he asked that the Congregation influence the emperor to invite Maksim to Vienna and keep him there or to send him to Rome and do what he promised. At the same time, the Bishop of Zagreb asked that a episcopate who knew the Greek rituals but who was Catholic from these areas – a subject of Hungary who knew Serbian and the Cyrillic – be appointed in Maksim's place. He would preach to them and teach Catholicism in a school for children and a seminary for priest preparation. The emperor would recommend the new episcopate, the suffragan of the Bishop of Zagreb, to his border generals and captains" (p. 72-73). The bishop complained that "Maksim called the Catholics heretics and the pope the Antichrist, did not allow his flock to enter Catholic churches and listen to the sermons of the Catholic priests. Episcopate Maksim forbade his flock to confess, to receive the holy secrets from Catholic priests and, aside from this, he forced the Catholics to celebrate holidays according to the old calendar" (p. 73). However, the foreign political circumstances were favourable to the Serbian episcopate so the Roman office could not eliminate him. He remained on the bishop's throne until his death in 1642.

In eastern Serbian areas, especially in the territory of Belgrade, the Roman-Catholics were also divided although they were few. There was great conflict and animosity between the Franciscans and the Jesuits, but also between these orders and the Dubrovian colonisers. Many reports by Roman missionaries wrote that the Bosnian Franciscans, in spite of their merits for spreading Catholicism in Bosnian territories, were extremely ignorant, "cunning and evil" (p. 89). In 1632, Archbishop Petar Masarek of Bar travelled through Srem, Slavonia and Baranja in 1632 and reported: "In the parishes with Franciscan friars, the churches were neglected and mostly without roofs, because the friars only looked after their own interests, ruthlessly robbing their flock" (p. 90). The Roman

emissaries constantly tried to persuade the Patriarch of Peć to join the union but, at the same time, they attacked the Orthodox border, counting on faster results there. This is how the Paštrović family in particular was attacked and the emissaries were encouraged by the statements of certain Orthodox priests who, in times of trouble, made it clear that acceptance of the union was possible if the preservation of the Eastern ritual was guaranteed. The proselyte action was especially disrupted by the mutual animosity of the bishops, the envy of priests and the lack of education of the monks.

After much persuasion and assurance, flattering and promises, Episcopate Mardarije of Cetinje went to Kotor in 1638 to negotiate the union. At the same time, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was preparing the publication of Serbian liturgical books with undetectably altered content in accordance with the Roman theological dogmas. An already recruited Orthodox monk was also prepared to be a unionist bishop if the negotiations with *vladika* failed. The plans were disturbed by the dissatisfaction of the Montenegrin Serbs with the bishop's befriending of the Roman-Catholics and by a greater Turkish distrustfulness. Mardarije avoided travelling to Rome, although he sent a delegation of several monks, trying to obtain some material gain from this befriending. He also made a request for a salary in the same amount as all the Roman-Catholic bishops in the Turkish territory received. In 1640, Mardarije performed an act of confession of faith that the papal legate Leonardi asked from him and, at the same time, he committed himself in a letter to the pope to go to Peć and persuade the Patriarch of Peć to join the Roman-Catholic Church. A several-month long imprisonment by the Turks because of the conflict between the Serbs from Cetinje and the Turkish converts from Podgorica also influenced Mardarije to join the union. He stalled as much as he could, but when Leonardi had him tight in his grip, he tried to use him as a precious means for imposing Uniatism on all the Serbs. Mardarije still avoided the promised visit to Peć, excusing himself using the plague epidemics, and so Leonardi went without him in 1642 to try to cajole the Serbian Patriarch Pajsije. As Radonić said, "the *Vladika* of Cetinje, who easily signed the religious confession proscribed by Pope Urbano VIII for the easterners, could not go to Peć. It was as if he felt that the negotiations with Patriarch Pajsije would not go easily, so he sent his Archdeacon Visarion. It appears to me, Leonardi reported to the Congregation, that Mardarije was not completely devoted to Catholicism" (p. 171).

Patriarch Pajsije received the papal legate Leonardi kindly and had long and thorough negotiations with him, but he would not concede regarding canonical and doctrinal issues, accepting only the honourable supremacy of the pope. On the other hand, he showed some good will since he did not order stricter disciplinary measures against Episcopate Mardarije, because he hoped that the Roman church might send him some significant material help. Leonardi returned to the Serbian littoral area very displeased with the failed mission, but he brought several emissaries of the patriarch with him in case there was an invitation for the continuation of the talks in Rome. However, the pope had other

concerns at the time because he was waging wars in Italy so the Serbian monks were returned to Peć after a month of waiting and Archdeacon Leonardi was appointed the archbishop of Bar in 1644 because he turned out to be a desirable proselyte, a skilful diplomat and a good connoisseur of theology and the Serbian language. But, since the Congregation of Propaganda firmly insisted on the papal jurisdictional supremacy and even claimed that Constantinople had become a slave of Turkey because it broke the union, the negotiations with Patriarch Pajsije were definitively cancelled.

At this time, the Venetian policy toward the Orthodox was also prejudiced, perfidious and hostile, but also patronising and sycophantic when the Serbs could defend some of its political interests. In the 16th century, there were already conflicts between the Roman pope and the Venetian Latin patriarch concerning the relationship with the Orthodox or control over them in certain territories. In the mid 15th century, the Republic of Venice formed the Latin patriarchate to subject the Catholic Church in its territory to state supremacy and avoid direct submission to the pope. After this, it also tried to subject the Orthodox Church organisation under its state rule to the patronage of the Latin patriarch, especially the Unionist Greeks. In 1606, Roman Pope Paul V Borghese issued an interdict as a church punishment for the Republic of Venice, which meant the cessation of all church rituals other than baptism, confirmation, confession and communion of the sick and dying. Then the state ordered the clergy to ignore the papal interdict and continue the regular practice of all church duties and it also banished all Jesuits from its territory. Relations with the Orthodox Church were soon regulated and Patriarch Partenius II of Constantinople recognised the right of patriarchal exarchate over all the Orthodox churches of the Republic of St Marko to the Philadelphian metropolitan in Venice. However, the Serbs never agreed to this form of church control and they still recognised the Dabro-Bosnian metropolitan as the exarch of the Patriarch of Peć and the Prior of the Krk Monastery as his trustee in Venetian territories. But the Roman-Catholic priests practically shoved the massively emigrated Serbs all over Dalmatia with considerable hatred and, according to their decidedly intolerant attitude, the Orthodox Serbs “had to either subject or leave. But this hostile attitude of the Roman-Catholic clergy, which created a deep gap between the Catholic and Orthodox parts of our people, clearly said that Orthodoxy in Dalmatia awaited hard times and that the Roman-Catholic church would put all its efforts into the conversion of the Serbs” (p. 197).

In the mid 17th century, Don Ivan Božanović, a Roman-Catholic missionary serving in the Split territory, also dealt with the sale of Christian slaves which is why even the Roman-Catholic priests repeatedly complained to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. “The slaves were exported to Italy, where Napoli was one of the main slave markets. As even the Roman-Catholic prelates participated in the slave trafficking, would it be strange if missionary Don Ivan Božanović also participated? It was enough to issue a false certificate that a captured Christian was Turkish to be bought by a Roman-Catholic

prelate and then sold again at a greater price” (p. 201). It happened at this time that the Serbian Orthodox Metropolitan Epifanije of Dalmatia “principally admitted the supremacy of the Roman pope in hard times, as did the others before him. He did this because he did not feel safe in a foreign territory and because, asking a monastery in Dalmatia for his believers, he also expected other material benefits from Rome” (p. 206). The Roman-Catholic propagators energetically tried to present the episcopo’s letter with this content as acceptance of the union, which had no realistic foundation. Radonić also states records that the Roman-catholic priests were furious that the Serbian refugees persistently refused to pay taxes and treated the pope with utter contempt.

In 1642, Gavriilo Predojević, cousin of Maksim, was elected as the Episcopo of Marča, which the emperor confirmed. However, he also ordered him to go to Rome and be ordained as a Unionist bishop there after the statement of the confession of the Catholic religion. However, Gavriilo also went to be consecrated by the Patriarch of Peć. Since he died in 1644, the border Serbs rushed to elect Vasilije Predojević as his successor to prevent the usual Roman-Catholic backstage tricks. However, as soon as the emperor confirmed him, Episcopo Vasilije betrayed his people and went to Rome where he expressed his willingness to accept the union. The pope did not confirm him for certain canonical reasons and Vasilije returned ashamed to the position of the Archimandrite of the Marča Monastery. Vasilije died in 1648 and his successor Sava Stanislavić continued to oscillate between Peć and Rome but, under pressure from leading Serbs, he finally turned to the Patriarch of Peć. Sava had many problems with the Austrian generalate and the selfish and corrupted Archimandrite Simeon rebelled against him, ready to submit to the pope if he seized Sava’s episcopal throne. Sava incarcerated him and had him whipped, sending a clear message to the pope of his opinion on his superiority. In 1662, because of the threat of war, the new Episcopo Gavriilo Mijakić did not go to Peć to be consecrated but to Archbishop Sava Bistrički of Moldova in Jaša. In 1668, Emperor Leopold toppled Gavriilo and appointed Pavle Zorčić, a Unionist and Jesuit recruit, as the new episcopo. Gavriilo was suspected of involvement in the conspiracy of Zrinski and Frankopan, put in chains and imprisoned – and he soon died in prison.

Therefore, a forced union of the Slavonic Serbs in the Episcopate of Marča was conducted. “Contrary to the prior *vladikas* of Marča, the new Episcopo Zorčić gave his confession of faith on 8 April 1671 before the bishop and the canons of the permanent church. The new episcopo primarily swore loyalty and obeisance to the Roman church and the pope, “whom I recognise and consider the head and teacher and shepherd of all patriarchs and other priests and all Orthodox Christianity.” The new episcopo especially emphasized that he would pay no attention to the will of the border Serbs regarding filling the empty position of the Episcopo of Marča since this opposed the canons of the Catholic Church and the king’s right to appoint episcopos, which he would teach to his people” (p. 227). The traitorous Zorčić recognised the Archbishop of Zagreb as his superior, at the same time calling the

Serbian patriarch a schismatic subjected to the Turkish sultan and he swore he would not accept any orders or charters from him or make any agreements with him. He also promised to bring all Orthodox Serbs to the union. "The life of the new Episcopo of Marča was difficult and insecure. The people hated him with all their hearts. They rebelled against him and he was protected by the imperial power. The rebellious people was led by several monks, 14 of which were convicted to life imprisonment and sent to the island of Malta to row on galleys for their entire lives. Lavished with the mercy of the court and imperial gifts, the new Unionist episcopo could not live in Marča but he spent the most of his time in Zagreb, where he bought a house in which he located the theological seminary, founded in 1678 by a great adversary of Orthodoxy, the Bishop of Đur, Count Leopold Kolonić, later Archbishop of Esztergom and a cardinal" (p. 228).

In the first half of the 17th century, there was intense and very successful proselyte action among the Banat Serbs Krašovani. However, the bishops of Belgrade and Prizren had almost no results. The efforts of the Roman Curia were directed more toward the Archbishopric of Ohrid and partially toward the Patriarchate of Peć, but the War of Candia halted proselyte action in the middle of the century. Characteristic of this period was the case of the Bishop of Drač who deceived the pope that approximately 15,000 Roman-Catholics lived in the territory of Ohrid so the pope appointed an archbishop for them. The archbishop did not find a single Catholic in Ohrid. The Roman-Catholic activity was interrupted by constant conflicts between the priests, their greed and their covetousness - and the Turks also had a much stricter attitude toward the Catholics during wartime, treating them as spies and the fifth column. Even the successor of Pajsije, Serbian Patriarch Gavriilo, continued negotiations with the Roman-Catholic Church, but it was all quite futile concerning the papal goals, or even winning over Episcopo Mardarije. The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith realised that it had to change its approach and tackle the realisation in a planned and systematic manner. "From its previous experience in the Balkans, it realised that sudden, almost forced action only created stronger resistance and that nothing more permanent could be achieved this way. It came to the conclusion that much more could be achieved through schools and education. In its opinion at the time, this was the road to prepare the appropriate grounds for the union. Now more careful and distrustful, the Congregation almost felt that the Serbian motives for union with Rome were neither honest nor purely religious. After all, it worked on the union as much out of political motives as out of religious ones, maybe even more so. The most important thing for it was to subject the Orthodox to the pope's jurisdiction and in this lay the importance of recognising papal supremacy" (p. 305).

In 1654, the Turks caught Metropolitan Pajsije, whom Patriarch Gavriilo sent to negotiate with the pope, and skinned him alive. It was not quite clear to them that the Serbs negotiated so in order to get some material help and that they actually never considered truly accepting the union. The Roman-Catholic prelates realised this before they did. That

year, a false act of Synod of Morača was sent to the Roman pope and Radonić said that the papal envoy Pavlin Demsky actually drafted it by "somehow obtaining the stamp of Metropolitan Jefimije or perhaps by forging it, as did adventurer father Dominik Andrijašević before him" (p. 320). In this way, he tried to regain the Congregation's trust with an invented success, since it was evaluating his missionary work more and more negatively. The Council of Morača was not even held in 1654. It was only true that the prior Maksim of Morača travelled to Rome this year. In 1672, the monks of the Zavala monastery also travelled to Rome and the Herzegovian Metropolitan Vasilije Jovanović Ostroški had good relations with Archbishop Andrija Zmajević of Bar, which was quite natural since they were two prominent Serbs. The Roman-Catholic prelates tried to interpret every kind word from Serbian Orthodox episcopos and monks as acceptance of the union, but everything failed in the end. Only the efforts to convert people individually or in groups to Catholicism by abusing their already unbearably difficult living situation had significant success. Patriarch Maksim of Peć, the predecessor of the famous Arsenije III, showed a great amount of animosity toward the Roman-Catholics that had not been present before. There were priors who recognised the papal supremacy but mostly without even understanding what it was all about, so this did not disturb the essence of Orthodox religious life and church organisation. Patriarch Arsenije III Černojević even paid an official visit to Archbishop Andrija Zmajević in Perast, where he was very well received. But Zmajević's suggestion that the patriarch agree to the union remained without a specific answer. Patriarch Arsenije III soon sharpened his attitude towards the Catholics, as could be seen from the elegies of Archbishop Petar Bogdani in Skopje to the Congregation that the schismatic patriarch "made the Catholics reap his fields, acted arrogantly and tyrannically with the Catholic clergy and forced it to accept the schism in the end [...]. Further on, he forced Catholic priests to give him a certain annual tribute and punished them if they did not pay, so he closed the Catholic churches and forbade service in them with the help of the Turks" (p. 370).

At the time of the Turkish defeat at the gates of Vienna and the rapid advancement of the Catholic European armies towards the south of the Balkans, in 1688, Archimandrite Isaija of Athos asked the Russian tsar to save the Orthodox in the Balkans because if the Roman-Catholics conquered the Balkan countries with Constantinople, "they would put the Orthodox Christians from the mentioned lands in even greater danger than Turkey did and the Orthodox-Greek religion would die and disappear because the Romans would turn all the monasteries and churches into their own and force some into their damned union" (p. 394). As soon as the Turks were banished from the territories north of the Danube River, the Jesuits began intense Serbian Catholicisation. Several tens of thousands were catholicised in the first wave, including a certain number of priests and monks led by Prior Jov Rajić of Orahovac. He was given the title of bishop as a merit. The great Serbian migration would lead to the ultimate religious antagonism and, in the following decades, the Roman-Catholic clergy would devotedly direct every action concerning the reduction of

Comment [59]: Translator's note. The source for translation of this name has not been found. Suggested spelling was given here

Serbian imperial privileges, especially those related to the freedom of the Orthodox confession and church autonomy. The Austrian encroachment into the Balkans and the stabilisation of the demarcation lines on the Sava and Danube Rivers inspired new proselyte action in Bosnian and Dalmatian territories. The Roman-Catholic Cardinal Leopold Kolonić publicly denied the right of the Serbian patriarch to perform canonical visitations in Austria and Hungary, claiming that only the Unionist bishops of Munkachevo, Eger-Oradea and Platen or Svodnik had this right. The cardinal especially pointed out that the boldness of the patriarch went “so far that he tried to dissuade the *Vladika* of Marča from joining the union. Finally, he threatened the patriarch into accepting his superiority, although he would not take the oath of obeisance” (p. 415). Previously, the same Unionist Episcopate of Marča, Isaija Popović, complained to Bishop Mikulić of Zagreb that the border Serbs threatened his life unless he gave up the union. “The cardinal states the example of town of Pécs to show how harmful these canonical visitations of the patriarch were. The Serbs in this municipality and in surrounding villages officially accepted the union years ago but, after Arsenije’s efforts, they refused it. Arsenije would perhaps do something even more dangerous if the cardinal had not warned him in a strict letter that he would have him imprisoned if he showed up in his diocese” (p. 416).

Cardinal Kolonić demanded that the patriarch’s jurisdiction be reduced exclusively to the island St Andrew under Buda. But, the patriarch and Serbian Orthodoxy were preserved from the Roman-Catholic hatred and animosity by the fact that the Court of Vienna still needed the brave Serbian warriors, so the emperor could not upset and annoy them too much. Still, from time to time, the Austrian state authorities showed that they had not given up their ambition to catholicise the Orthodox Serbs. In 1696, at the request of the Unionist Episcopate Petronije of Pakrac, Orthodox Episcopate Jevrem Banjanin (who was previously prevented violently from taking over his Eparchy of Great-Oradea and Eger) was arrested. Jevrem was subdued and, in 1698, he accepted the union, turning to Hungarian Roman-Catholic primate Cardinal Kolonić. The Serbian people were embittered by Jevrem’s conversion and he was also disappointed with the treatment by the Roman-Catholic high ranks so he abandoned the union in 1701 after returning from Rome. He was arrested again and put into a prison in Buda. Since Patriarch Arsenije did not forgive him, Jevrem went to Patriarch Kalinik I in Peć and he appointed him his exarch.

Patriarch Arsenije had the most trouble in Srem and the narrower territory of Slavonia where the Unionist Episcopate Petronije Ljubibratić schemed. In 1701, Emperor Leopold I imposed the maintenance of Serbian religious privileges by ordering that only the Roman-Catholic religion could be professed in the newly liberated Hungarian territories, but that the Orthodox rituals would be possible so that the Serbs would not rebel although they would be ecclesiastically dependent on the Catholic bishops. He limited the patriarch’s jurisdiction to the area of St Andrew, prohibiting him from performing canonical visitations and collecting church taxes. In 1703, the Emperor forbade Arsenije from

calling himself patriarch but, that same year, the Rákóczi Uprising forced Leopold to withdraw all restrictive measures against the Orthodox Serbs. Arsenije instantly intensified his activity, managing to persuade Bishop Petronije Ljubibratić of Pakrac to renounce the union, which was unthinkable before. Cardinal Kolonić was furious when he heard the news. In 1705, the patriarch ordained Sofronije of Podgorica as the new Slavonian episcopate and thus gave a strong blow to Roman-Catholic proselytism. In 1706, Emperor Joseph I officially recognized Arsenije’s title of patriarch.

After Arsenije’s death, Cardinal Kolonić tried with all his might to prevent the election of his successor. The Jesuit Gabriel Hevenesi, Kolonić’s confessor, wrote to the emperor “that the moment after the patriarch’s death was suitable for converting schismatics to the union. In Jesuit Hevenesi’s opinion, it was the best not to allow the position of archbishop to be filled. Because, if there was no archbishop, there soon would not be any episcopates appointed by the patriarch and, when there were no episcopates, there would not be any monks and the beheaded people would easily convert to the Roman-Catholic religion” (p. 462). However, Jesuit conspiracies could not prevent the Serbian Orthodox Electoral Council, although the court circles tried to exclude the border-guard Serbs from Lika, Banija and Varaždin from its jurisdiction. The council decided that a metropolitan should be elected so that the organic church relationship with the Patriarchate of Peć would remain preserved. Isaija Đaković was elected metropolitan and the Catholic proselytes saw him as the greatest danger.

From time to time, the Orthodox Serbs fought back. When the Venetian authorities forbade Patriarch Kalinik I to perform canonical visitations in their territory persuaded by Archbishop Vićentije Zmajević, he complained to the Grand Vizier. In 1708, the Grand Vizier “ordered pashas to banish Catholic missionaries from Serbia and the neighbouring areas as foreign subjects and that Catholics should be put under the patriarch’s jurisdiction and pay the prescribed taxes the same as the Orthodox” (p. 747-745). Archbishop Petar Karadžić of Skopje and Archbishop Pavle Joškić of Sofia had to flee their residences. All the efforts of Archbishop Zmajević and Venetian and French diplomats to recall the Vizier’s decision were in vain. The archbishop finally intervened through his brother, the Russian Vice Admiral Matija Zmajević so the Russian ambassador to Constantinople, Count Peter Shuisky, gave 400 ducats to Patriarch Kalist and persuaded him to give up the taxation and persecution of the Roman-Catholics. Count Shuisky mediated to confirm the truce between the Orthodox and Roman-Catholics with an agreement that he sent to Zmajević. “Patriarch Kalinik I promised not to persecute the Catholic clergy and flock or ask them to pay taxes, although he had the right to that according to the sultan’s order. The patriarch further committed himself to not interfere with the performance of Catholic religious rituals anywhere, just as the westerners promised to the patriarch not to interfere with the Orthodox rituals. The patriarch then asked that the Catholics to promise not to ask the Orthodox to accept the Catholic religion, not to enter Orthodox churches and

Comment [S10]: Translator’s note. Unknown geographical location

perform spiritual functions and, finally, not to seize and appropriate Orthodox temples under any excuse” (p. 477). The Congregation did not approve the parts of agreement that forbade proselytism and the new Russian ambassador Count Pyotr Andreyevich Tolstoy and Count Sava Vladislavić also participated in the attempts to soften the attitude of Kalinik I, but only the death of the patriarch in 1710 finally cooled the tempest down.

Under the influence of the local Franciscans, Episcopo Janićije Martinović of Arad-Ineu started leaning towards union, but Colonel Jovan Tekelija opposed him, revealing in public his affair with a woman and proclaiming him unworthy of the title of *vladika* and proclaiming him excommunicated from the church. The Franciscans of Arad swore that Janićije was not physically capable of love with women, but both Orthodox priests and the imperial general supported him. Tekelija and Janićije soon apparently reconciled, but union remained on the episcopo's mind and he recognised the pope as his supreme leader in 1713. However, he could not carry out the confession of faith, so the union was not realized.

Going to war in 1716, the border-guard Serbs filed a complaint to Emperor Charles VI against the Unionist Episcopo Rafail Marković of Marča and their arguments most notably testified to the morality and character of Unionist priests in general. “The *vladika* ate fish with butter over the entire Eastern fast and even forced priests to do so before him. This act appalled both the people and the priests, some of which he had imprisoned and whipped, threatening to send them to galleys as slaves because they condemned this. He closed the church in Pisanica and the believers from this village spent the Easter holidays without any liturgy. The *vladika*'s canonical visitations were hard on the people because he took a large escort with him, meaning that the people had great expenses. What is more, if he liked something in a house, the *vladika* would take it by force. The *vladika* relentlessly imposed fines and seized property after deaths and the monks had to give him the exact count of these because there were very few priests in the parishes since they could not sustain the episcopo's taxes. If the family of the deceased could not pay seven forints for the funeral, their immovables were sold for next to nothing. Many previously wealthy houses fell to ruin because their oxen and horses were sold. The *vladika* even charged heavy funeral taxes for the families of those who died at war. The Unionist *vladika* was also relentless with the priests. On the border of Koprivnica, he seized everything that was left behind by the robbers from the family of the murdered and robbed priest. Further on, the *vladika* mercilessly imposed fines on marriage [...] The priests who returned ordained by the metropolitan, he punished with large fee of 100 thalers, calling the metropolitan a Turk who professed a dog's religion. The *vladika* also robbed the church in Marča [...] And even the personal life of *vladika* was full of vice. In his residence, he kept a woman whom he dressed in expensive clothes and who he even gave his episcopal ring to. When he left Marča, he gave her six oxen, making sure that she even had a groom. For all these reasons, the border guards of Križevo could not put up with

Marković as *vladika* or allow him to perform spiritual functions in their area. What is more, they would not even allow monks ordained by him to go to church and perform God's service until they got the metropolitan's blessing for this” (p. 487-488). Since the emperor denied their requests and even said that he would not put up with another Orthodox *vladika* beside the Unionist one, The Serbs of the Generalate of Varaždin rebelled in 1718. The rebellion was quenched, but the Serbs still refused the union.

In the first half of the 18th century, an interesting case was that of Nikodim Busović, who was consecrated as a Dalmatian Orthodox episcopo by the Unionist Philadelphian archbishop after Nikodim publicly chose union and converted. Immediately afterwards however, Episcopo Nikodim went to the Serbian Patriarch Arsenije III, denied the union and asked for forgiveness before returning to Dalmatia to defend Orthodoxy from the frantic Roman-Catholic proselytes. He also participated in the 1706 rebellion of the Serbian people against the decision of the Venetian general proveditor to submit the Orthodox Serbs to the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Split. He also had to escape to the Holy Mountain of Athos for a while. The Venetian government again proclaimed the attitude that it would not put up with any religion other than Roman-Catholic in its territory. It had to soften its attitude soon though, so after Nikodim's death it recognised the Herzegovian *Vladika* Savatije Ljubibratić as the Serbian Dalmatian episcopo. It also allowed mixed marriages and the construction of an Orthodox church in Čitluk near Mostar. The building of Orthodox churches was prohibited in other Venetian areas. However, the 1713 transfer of Vićentije Zmajević to the position of the Archbishop of Zadar showed that his hatred of Orthodoxy was only growing more and more intense and sick (although he was aware of his Serbian nationality), which could be seen from his letters. The older he got, the less he could control his intolerance. His rage reached its peak when he found out that the Serbs had proposed four candidates for Dalmatian Orthodox *vladika* at the invitation of the Venetian authorities. Among them was Stevan Ljubibratić whom Zmajević hated most of all and who had been banished from the Venetian territory several years before.

Zmajević asked for papal intervention in a coded letter and this was probably why the Venetian senate gave up the appointment of the Orthodox metropolitan. In 1735, the Venetian proveditor again ordered that every Orthodox priest must be under the jurisdiction of the Catholic bishops, but they gave this up again in the following year, afraid of a new war with the Turks. Matija Koroman, Zmajević's successor to the throne of the Archbishop of Zadar, continued the same anti-Orthodox policy, but it was immediately evident that he was far more theologically and politically versed. Koroman especially insisted on the Russian danger, since the Orthodox Serbs and Russians spoke the same language. He requested that the Venetian authorities prohibit Russian church books. In 1750, the order that the Orthodox priests be appointed by Catholic bishops was renewed and the Serbs reacted by holding a council at which they elected Simeon Končarević as their *vladika*. At Koroman's direct

request, the government banished *Vladika* Simeon. In 1760 and 1762, Russia intervened to protect the Orthodox Serbs who complained that Latin priests had visited Orthodox churches with military escorts, “that they submitted the priests to their obeisance, issued written confirmations to rectors when they occupied a position in the church and imprisoned, shackled and sentenced to the galleys everyone who refused to obey the papal orders and state decrees” (p. 617).

Approximately ten years after the demilitarisation of the Tisa-Mureş section of the Austrian border in 1741, about 25,000 Serbs emigrated to Russia. In 1748, this was immediately preceded by the request from the Empress Maria Thereza to draft a new plan for the realisation of the union, to which her personal Jesuit confessor wholeheartedly dedicated himself. The Illyrian court delegation, as the key creator of the plan in agreement with the papal nuncio of Vienna, included the prohibition of the Orthodox priests interfering with Unionist church affairs at crucial points in the plan. “Serbian bishops were prevented from performing canonical visitations and individuals, sometimes even entire areas, were forcibly converted to the union. This was the time when the Serbs of Zumberak were forced to accept the union that Episcopo Danilo Jakšić of Upper Karlovac heroically opposed, helped by the meritorious and competent Metropolitan Pavle Nenadović” (p. 625). In the second half of the 18th century, the Court of Vienna in particular tried to suppress the Russian cultural influence over the Serbian people and to bring their church under the complete guardianship of the state. Serbian books were censored and the import of Russian ones was strictly prohibited. The Unionist bishops had even more intense state support and emperors stated their request that all Serbs be catholicised more and more openly, especially after the establishment of concordat in 1855 which meant that Austria-Hungary completely accepted the exclusive jurisdiction of Rome in religious issues.

IV. Serbian National Symbols

National symbols of a people can basically be classified into the basic and the derived. The basic ones are the flag, coat of arms and anthem. Lazo Kostić wrote a special brochure on the Serbian flag and he pointed to the thorough study by Alexander Soloviev concerning the coat of arms. He did not deal with the Serbian anthem, but the study by Milivoje Pavlović appeared recently and it is quite well documented, although burdened by Communist ideological prejudice. Concerning the derived national symbols, Kostić dealt more thoroughly with Serbian ranks, orders and medals, while Serbian numismatics and philately still await a meticulous and thorough researcher.

1. The Serbian Coat of Arms

Alexander Soloviev wrote the most thorough study of the Serbian coat of arms and the Serbian emigration published it in Australia in 1958. Over forty years passed before this book was printed in Serbia

(Alexander Soloviev, *History of Serbian Coat of Arms and Other Heraldic Works*, Faculty of Law and “Dosije”, Belgrade, 2000). Soloviev considers the state coat of arms to be a holy emblem that is “an embodiment of the idea of homeland, the idea for which an individual should live and work and for which he would die” (p. 21). He considers the question of the coat of arms and flag to be an issue of state-law and historical science. From the 12th century onward, the coat of arms was a hereditary symbol of a ruler in European heraldry, but it originates from the totemism of the original social community. Heraldry, as the science about coats of arms, originated at the time of the crusades when the aristocratic symbols had a much greater importance than usual, as a significant mark distinguishing the members of certain orders of feudal armies. The coat of arms was carried on the shield and helmet. The original Serbian word for the coat of arms was *znamenje* (Translator’s note: emblem).

The cross with identical bars that spread to the edges of a shield was a product of Byzantine tradition, even since the age of Emperor Constantine the Great. On various occasions, certain figures were added between the bars, for example, small crosses in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. In the 13th century, Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos introduced the cross with four letter Vs as a specific sacral tetragram after the liberation of Constantinople from the Crusaders. In the 17th century, there was an interpretation that these four letters meant “the emperor (*basileus*) of all emperors rules over all emperors”, but there are also assumptions that this referred to Christ as the emperor of all emperors or that these were the first four words of a prayer to God to help the emperor. The appearance of these letters had several variants. According to documents from the 14th century, Thessaloniki had a red flag with a golden cross and four golden firesteels between its horizontal bars and this was considered to be the flag of the entire Byzantine Empire. These firesteels now resemble the letter C more than V. Soloviev assumes that the Serbian state took over this emblem at the time of Tsar Dušan, only that the cross in its flags was white or silver instead of golden. “In any case, the oldest authentic exemplar of the Serbian cross with four firesteels was related to the family of Prince Lazar: it was on the great chains of the chandeliers in the Dečani Monastery, a 1397 gift from Princess Milica and her sons” (p. 42).

Soloviev found the form of the Serbian coat of arms known today in the 1595 heraldic miscellany by Korenić-Neorić. “It was painted in colours – a white cross on a red shield and four golden firesteels turned away from it with a triangle in the middle” (p. 43). It would later appear in the same form in multiple historical sources together with the specific coats of arms of certain feudal families or church officials. In the mid 18th century, the Austrian Empress Maria Theresa recognised the Serbian coat of arms to the Metropolitanate of Karlovac, but also to the distinguished Serbian officers who received nobility for their war credits. This was also the prevailing symbol of Karađorđe’s insurgent army, mostly combined with the so-called tribal coat of arms – a boar’s head pierced with an arrow. The bicephalic eagle of the Nemanjić family

appeared more often then, as did the Russian variant of this eagle. Prince Miloš made an order concerning this issue and, in 1819, proscribed the red shield with a large white cross and four firesteels as the Serbian coat of arms. In 1825, Miloš ordered new stamps in Vienna and the Serbian coat of arms “had a definitive, very beautiful shape on them: under the prince’s cape, with a real Christian prince’s crown, there was a shield girdled with a two-branch wreath” (p. 58) and, according to article four of the Sretenje Constitution, “the Serbian national coat of arms had a cross on a red background and, between the bars of the cross, four firesteels turned towards the cross. The coat of arms was girdled with a green wreath, on the right of an oak tree and on the left of olive tree” (p. 59). Since the great forces energetically disapproved of this liberal constitution, Miloš went to Constantinople where he won the right to show the Serbian coat of arms, but without the prince’s crown, and the national flag consisting of the “three national colours, red at the top, blue in the middle and white at the bottom” (p. 62). This was also confirmed by the sultan’s ferman of 1838, issued at the same time as the ratification of the “Turkish” constitution. At this time, the prince’s crown was restored to the top of the coat of arms.

Concerning the heraldic origin of the bicephalic eagle, it is most often believed that it was originally a symbol of the Emperor Constantine, which he used to mark the Roman power over both East and West, but Soloviev thinks that it appeared only in the 11th century as an ornament on court clothing and then later became the royal emblem. “But the mere sign of the bicephalic eagle was connected through its origin to Asian peoples; it was a product of the Eastern imagination that loved to create fantastic deities in its beliefs and art – animals like sphinxes, lions and bulls and multi-headed and multi-armed deities” (p. 66). It appeared with the Sumerians, probably as the symbol of Gilgamesh or the deity of the sun and later in Egypt, Ethiopia and Babylon, from 2500 B.C. onward. In later times, the bicephalic eagle was present on the Saracen coats of arms, from which the Crusaders transferred it to West-European territories. The Serbs and Russians took over the bicephalic eagle from the Byzantine tradition and it replaced the older, Roman single-headed one from the time of Julius Caesar as the symbol of Zeus’s ruling power. In Serbian frescoes, the oldest golden bicephalic eagles can be seen painted on the red cloak of the great Prince Miroslav of Hum, Nemanja’s brother, on the walls of the St Peter and Paul’s church at Bijelo Polje. The bicephalic eagle later appeared on the stamp of Miroslav’s son Andrija, imprinted on the contract signed with the Dubrovians. It was also present on the clothes of King Stefan Prvovenčani in a fresco in the Monastery of Žiča and on the red cloak of King Radoslav in the fresco in the Monastery of Studenica. After this, the bicephalic eagle was also present on the ring of Queen Theodora, wife of Stefan Dečanski, and, in Tsar Dušan’s time, it was the most important emblem of the Serbian ruler, also present on imperial flags. It first appeared on coins in the currency of Despot Jovan Oliver. “From the time of the proclamation of the Serbian empire, almost every aristocrat carried ‘imperial eagles’ on their clothes, especially if they had

IT-03-67-T
high court ranks” (p. 84).

The bicephalic eagle is also a common symbol with both King Vukašin and Prince Lazar, maybe more as an ornament than as an emblem, but King Tvrtko treated it as the official coat of arms of the Serbian kingdom and the Nemanjić dynasty, which could be seen from the stamp on the 1395 charter by Bosnian King Stefan Dabiša. As a truly heraldic symbol, the bicephalic eagle stabilised at the time of Despot Stefan Lazarević, especially on his shield and money. The Branković family partially kept the bicephalic eagle, but they primarily used a lion as their own symbol. In its last stage of existence, the Byzantine state used the bicephalic eagle increasingly often as the official emblem. “From the end of the 15th century, this eagle became the coat of arms of Orthodox Russia as the successor to the Byzantine empire” (p. 88). The Crnojević family also accepted the bicephalic eagle, as did the Serbian despots in Hungary. In 1743, Montenegrin Metropolitan Sava carved the old Serbian bicephalic eagle into his stamp, thus renewing the nation-building tradition of the Crnojević family. In 1804, it was on Karađorđe’s stamp. After the kingdom was proclaimed on 22 February, its coat of arms was legislated on 20 June 1882. “The coat of arms of the Serbian Kingdom was a white bicephalic eagle on a red shield with the king’s crown. On top of both heads of the bicephalic eagle, was a king’s crown and underneath each claw was a single lily flower. On its chest was the coat of arms of the Serbian kingdom, ‘a white cross on a red shield with a firesteel in each corner of the cross.’ The coat of arms was covered with a crimson ermine cape and on top of it was a king’s crown” (p. 93). After the proclamation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenians, the Ministerial Council prescribed a new form of the coat of arms in a 1919 decree. The bicephalic eagle remained on the Serbian coat of arms but it also received the Croatian checkerboard and the hastily drafted Slovenian coat of arms with the three six-pointed stars of the counts of Celje and the alleged Illyrian crescent. The Communists cancelled this coat of arms and prescribed new ones. The federal and republic ones were modelled after the Soviet Union and only the narrowed Serbia kept the shield with firesteels but without the honourable cross.

Soloviev wrote that almost every Slavic flag came from the Russian tricolour flag of Peter the Great. It is assumed that Tsar Peter was inspired by the Dutch flag during his considerable travelling, but he gave the Russian one an original form and, during the visit of a naval fleet to Constantinople in 1699, the imperial white-blue-red flag was officially put up for the first time on the war ships. Apart from the official state flag, he also introduced the white war flag with Andrew’s cross. Both Russian flags were given to the Montenegrins during the 1806 stay of the Russian fleet of Admiral Senyavin in the Bay of Kotor. At the request of Prince Miloš, Soloviev wrote, “in October 1835, the sultan’s ferman ratified “the tricolour flag with horizontal stripes; red, blue and white for the Serbian nation”. These three colours were already familiar to the Serbian people because these were the Russian national colours, only in reversed order” (p. 372). Montenegro made the Serbian tricolour

2. The Serbian Anthem

In many nations, ceremonial songs had an expressively suggestive, almost magical power as a concentrated expression of patriotic, nationalistic or religious emotions for as long as anyone can remember. The harmony of poetry and music – the message and the rhythm in which it was expressed – have a mysterious and difficult to explain effect on those who approached it with their whole heart, identified with it and felt love. The anthem has an even stronger effect than the coat of arms and flag. Every performance of the national anthem is a ceremony on its own, a factor that creates a special mood, pride, zeal and enthusiasm. Through this, personal political aspirations and passions become collective. An anthem is a song whose beauty is not its only and primary goal. It is directed to the realisation of a political interest and is, therefore, an instrument of political fighting, mobilisation, stimulus, spiritual inspiration and incentive. It brings out creative potentials and the willingness to sacrifice. It makes an additional connection between generations; it is their strongest cohesion factor as the manifestation of the idea of national unity and historical mission. It aspires to become intransient, super-historical and metaphysical.

The expert poetic shaping of an anthem rests on certain rules that are common for all nations and all times. “The verses should be simple and easily comprehensible but, at the same time, poetic and enchanting. The text of an anthem cannot be propagandistic, but it still has to express the deeper meaning of the fight and the efforts of millions, sometimes as a whisper (in a prayer-anthem), sometimes as a scream (in a march-anthem). It is desirable that these words give an impression of lightness no matter how difficult it was to form them; however, their main purpose is to increase the awareness of power, strip bare the fear and multiply hope. It is expected that the melody of an anthem is acceptable to the heart and mind, imagination and ear. To be full of symbolism but still non-turbulent. It should have the regularity of a march and to “carry”; however, it cannot suppress the words. To become a general song, the melody of an anthem must linger in the ear and the mind together with the words; painlessly and permanently, like the wrinkles on the face and the frowns on the forehead” (Milivoje Pavlović: *The Book of Anthem*, New Book, Belgrade 1986, p. 17).

The first Serbian song with the character of an anthem, *Arise, Serbia* (Translator’s note: *Vostani Srbije*), was composed in 1804 by Dositej Obradović, inspired by the heroism of the First Serbian Uprising. At approximately the same time – or maybe even some time earlier – the most popular Serbian formal song *The Hymn to St Sava* was composed, though its author was never determined with certainty. It is known only that its first version was written in the church-Slavic language. The composer Kornelije Stanković, who expertly shaped and edited its melody in 1858, believed that it was a folk song. In 1860, Luka Sarić from Novi Sad composed the song *Hey Serbia, Dear Mother* (Translator’s note: *Oj Srbijo, mila mati*), which was very popular and the

At the request of Prince Milan Obrenović, the manager of the National Theatre in Belgrade, Jovan Đorđević, wrote the drama *Marko’s Sword* and, in it, the anthem *God of Justice* (Translator’s note: *Bože Pravde*) with Davorin Jenko composing the music. The song quickly became very popular among the Serbian people and, in 1882, on the occasion of Milan’s coronation as Serbian king, Đorđević remade the lyrics and the new version became the official national anthem. At the time of dynastic shift in 1903 and over the following six years, a new anthem was unsuccessfully sought to fit the Karađorđević family and, in 1909, the hymn *God of Justice* again became official. The creation of the Yugoslav state led to the artificial construction of a new anthem from parts of *God of Justice*, the Croatian *Our Beautiful Homeland* (Translator’s note: *Lijepa naša*) and the Slovenian hymn *Go Ahead, Flag of Glory* (Translator’s note: *Naprej, zastave slave*).

During WW I, another two Serbian patriotic anthem-like songs were composed. Stanislav Binički composed *The March to the Drina* (Translator’s note: *Marš na Drinu*), which became very popular among Serbian people under the Communist dictatorship, as an expression of untamed pride and renewed spite. Miloje Popović only wrote the words to this melody in 1965. The song *There, Far Away* (Translator’s note: *Tamo Daleko*) was composed spontaneously and it survived among many generations of Serbian patriots with a formal and oathlike tone. In 1870, Prince Nikola I Petrović proclaimed the ceremonial song *To Our Beautiful Montenegro* (Translator’s note: *Ubavoj nam Crnoj Gori*) by Jovan Sundečić as the first anthem of Montenegro and it was sung before the prince for the first time by Serbian Choral Association *Unity* from Kotor. In 1867, Prince Nikola composed the unofficial national anthem entitled *There, Over There, Beyond Those Hills* (Translator’s note: *Ovamo, namo, za brda ona*) and it quickly became beloved to all Serbdom.

The unofficial, almost spontaneously accepted anthem of Communist Yugoslavia was the formal song *Hey Slavs* (Translator’s note: *Hej Sloveni*). It was composed in 1834, at the time of the awakening of the panslavist national and romanticist awareness in the great state in the circle of Catholic Slavic nations, which was certainly a typical historical paradox. The author was the Slovak Samuel Tomášik and he expressed his idealistic vision of panslavic unity and freedom in very beautiful verses, motivated primarily by the difficult position of his own people enslaved by the Hungarians. Tomášik’s verses were adapted to an old Polish melody *Poland is Not Yet Lost While we Live* from 1797. Aside from the Slovaks, the song *Hey Slavs* was accepted with enthusiasm by the Czechs and Polish, and then by almost all the other Slavic nations. As an anthem, it was first played at the First Slavic Congress in Prague in 1848. It is recorded that, when the Hungarian authorities arrested Svetozar Miletić in 1876, a great Serbian national fighter and prominent panslavist, the State Attorney of Buda and nephew of Samuel Tomášik committed suicide so that he would not be the performer in the staged court trial in which the Serbian patriot was

sentenced to five years in prison with a relentless public campaign led against him.

In 1839, the Panslavic anthem was translated into Serbian by Pavle Stamatović, a prominent literary writer and politician with a Great-Serbian and Panslavic orientation and published in the almanac *Serbian Bee*. Every subsequent translation had its own characteristics so that the hymn was sung in different versions. Between the two world wars, the song *Hey Slavs* was accepted as the encouragement anthem and, in Poland, as the national anthem with altered lyrics. Without an official decision, during the Yugoslav Communist revolution, this anthem was played at the AVNOJ (Anti-Fascist Council of National Liberation of Yugoslavia) meeting and the Partisan verse-mongers added new content, inserting Tito and Stalin. It was also played during the proclamation of the Communist republic. During the several decades of the Communist dictatorship, there was a constant search for a new official anthem that would praise Tito's ideology, while *Hey Slavs* was officially believed to be of a temporary character. On several occasions, there were public contests without success. After the fall of Yugoslavia and the improvised enactment of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the formal song *Hey Slavs* was proclaimed as the anthem of the Yugoslav state for the first time, although significantly shortened and reduced to the narrowed Serbia and Montenegro.

The collapse of Communism and the failure of the Yugoslav experiment encouraged the renewal of the Serbian national identity, pride and tradition. The establishment of a parliamentary democracy and a multi-party system quickened the rejection of rigid ideological prejudices, so the old Serbian anthem *God of Justice*, which had been ignored, forgotten and forbidden for decades, rose again in the full strength of its heroic instinct and the celebration of the ideals of justice and freedom. With very slight changes in the lyrics, removing the prince or king as a conceptual and political anachronism, it became the official anthem of the Republic of Srpska, impatiently awaiting the day of the unification of the entire Serbian people and of all Serbian countries into a unique Serbian state in which the *God of Justice* would be reasserted as the anthem of Great Serbia.

V. The Creative Thought Components of the Serbian Nationalism

The Serbian language is the basic means of the manifestation and expansion of the ideology of Serbian nationalism. It developed coincidentally with the Serbian national spirit, encouraging it and absorbing its influence to successfully express the breadth of the Serbian soul and depth of the individual effort of every thoughtful person. The primeval Serbian ethnic community that rose from the Slavic national sea, and also the political history, religion, culture and symbols were primarily the results of the collective action and thought. This was not enough to build a comprehensive national ideology because of the lack of the component of individualism, creative thought, the mind and the

spiritual efforts of individuals who set an example, lead with their intellect, penetrated the new and the unknown, first understood the will of providence and the dialectic of history, adapted to them but also corrected their negative aspects and consequences. The war leaders, attack front-men, successful statesmen and competent church heads, the creators of spiritual values in the areas of literature, art, science and philosophy all shaped the spirit and point of Serbian nationalism stronger than ever, taught and educated others through patriotic values, going forward and enlightening that which originally seemed dark and obscure. God chose them by giving them the talent and will, their parents taught them patriotism and moral scruples and they put considerable intellectual efforts and spiritual energy into giving their homeland and Serbdom works of non-evanescent value that shed light for centuries on the generations that followed and made the torch of Serbian national identity, pride and dignity inextinguishable. As long as this spiritual strength and inspiration exists, the Serbian aspiration for freedom and democracy, national unity and a state that would include all national territories is a realistic political program and the following generations would not give it up.

1. The Beginnings of the Modern Serbian Literary Language

Language is the primary characteristic of an ethnic substrate, the manifestation of national entity, the proof of its individuality and an irreplaceable prerequisite for national self-awareness. Its development is a specific sublimation of national history, the indicator of the speed and intensity of the process of constant splitting or bonding, branching and perfecting. The entire culture is based on language. It is its principal means of expression and the tool to most successfully enrich society. A language constantly changes, develops or dies. Since it cannot change in the same way and following the same pattern in every situation and since it is influenced by different sources and abounds in specifics, dialects form inside a language that are similar to a greater or lesser extent. The introduction of a literary language leads to the gradual extinction of dialects and the strengthening of the spiritual unity of the people. However, the intensive scientific study of dialects is very significant for the comprehensive enlightenment of the history of a language and is, therefore, one of the main pillars of any national linguistics. At the same time, the development of dialects was influenced by political history, communication with neighbours, foreign conquerors and occupying forces, economic development, cultural creativity, church affairs, assimilation of the remains of the old Balkan population etc. Through detailed analysis of dialects, each of these influences can be measured precisely. The constant mass migrations of the Serbian population prevented the appearance of some more serious differences in dialects that often remind us of the differentiation of specific languages, as can be seen, for example, in the German and French territories.

As with all the other Slavs, the Serbs were a people who acquired literacy late, which makes the study of the historical development of the Serbian language more difficult. The first literate Serbs did not write in their mother tongue but in Greek and Latin. In 863, the Byzantine Emperor Michael sent two learned Thessaloniki monks, Cyril and Methodius to Moravia, between the Bohemia and Slovakia, to prevent the Frankish and Latin invasion among the Slavs there by translating their church books into the Thessaloniki dialect of Old-Slavic that all the Slavic peoples could probably understand at the time. The script that they formed according to the Greek model was called Glagolitic alphabet. The Byzantine Empire soon lost influence over Pannonia and the northern areas, but the Slavic liturgy and literacy spread among the Slavs who followed its cultural pattern and variant of Christianity. The Cyrillic script soon appeared as a more practical and formal variation of Glagolitic alphabet and was even more adapted to the Slavic language. At the time, the Thessaloniki dialect was very close to the East-Slavic group of peoples, who did not have any difficulties in its reception in literature and, soon, the Serbian, Russian and Bulgarian dialects of Old-Slavic differentiated and later came its Romanian church redaction. Glagolitic alphabet was kept for some time longer in peripheral Serbian areas and also in Croatian Chakavian, from which it was ruthlessly suppressed by the Roman-Catholic church and, therefore, disappeared. The Serbian and Croatian variants of Glagolitic alphabet were different because the Serbian one had the so-called rounded form and the Croatian angular. The Roman-Catholic church turned more to the church-Slavic liturgy during every Unionist attempt and, in the proselyte action in Ukraine, it tried to use the somewhat modified Glagolitic alphabet. In a similar manner, it formed the Ikavian dialect as a Chakavian characteristic during every breach of its missionaries into Serbian Orthodox areas, such as Herzegovina, Bosnia, Like, Slavonia etc [...] Even in places where Ikavian was never spoken, something written in Ikavian could be found.

a) The Serbian Language in the Family of Slavic Languages

All the Slavs - and therefore also the Serbs - spoke the Proto-Slavic language that originated from Proto-Indo-European, from which the Germanic, Roman, Baltic, Celtic, Greek, Armenian and Indo-Iranian also originated. Several thousand years B.C., Proto-Indo-European was spoken in an unidentified and imprecisely determined territory of Eastern Europe and Western Asia and there is no clear evidence of this because there was no literacy. As this original ethnic community fell apart, specific dialects emerged and transformed into specific languages. Even Proto-Slavic can only be approximately reconstructed through comparative linguistic examinations, but this is much easier after the Slavs became literate in the 9th century, only a few hundred years after the break-up of the original Proto-Slavic ethnic and social community.

The Serbs came to the Balkans with a language that was very similar

to the languages of the East-Slavic group of peoples, but its vocal and grammatical features changed under the linguistic influence of the assimilated Balkan natives, which led to the fact that Serbian "sounded a bit like a Slavic language spoken in a non-Slavic way [...]. Among the phenomena that are scientifically interpreted in this way, the most important is the complete disappearance of the Slavic softening of consonants, the same that, for example, gives a characteristic sound to Russian" (Pavle Ivić: *The Review of the History of Serbian Language*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci – Srem, 1998, p. 14).

As a basis for pan-Slavic literacy, Cyril and Methodius used the Southeast-Macedonian dialect, which was still very similar to Proto-Slavic at the time and is, therefore, called Old-Slavic in linguistics. The Serbs, Croats and Sclavenes (the present-day Bulgarians and Macedonians) settled in the Balkan Peninsula with dialects of Proto-Slavic already formed. Serbian, Bulgarian and Macedonian belong to the East-Slavic group and Croatian, Slovenian and Czech to the West-Slavic. The linguistic demarcation line between the Serbs and Bulgarians is very clearly marked in the territories from the Timok confluence, along the present day Serbian-Bulgarian border to Osigovo, then through North-Eastern Macedonia toward the Ovče polje and Skopje, south of Tetovo to the Albanian ethnic area. The differentiation from the Croats was also strict and could be found on the line where the Chakavian dialect, characteristic of the Croats, and "Kaikavian met, regardless of whether it concerned, as it is claimed lately, the Posavina Croatia or Pannonian Croatia" or Slavonia. This is a dispute that the Croats and Slovenes need to settle among themselves.

Aleksandar Belić believed that there were more linguistic epochs between the Proto-Slavic and Old-Slavic and that the branching of Proto-Slavic began before the 7th century. The Slavs came to the Balkans with linguistic distinctions and the process went in the reverse direction over the following centuries, leading towards a certain homogenising since "the part of the Proto-Slavs that later formed the South-Slavs lived in close mutual relations that not only led to the balancing of the differences that they could have brought from Proto-Slavic but also to a combined direction of development for many features" (Aleksandar Belić: *Comparative Slavic Linguistics*, volume I, p. 248). Belić went on to say that, chronologically, "between the Slavic languages on the Balkan Peninsula and the Proto-Slavic language lies the epoch of their mutual development outside the Balkans. During this epoch, they already ceased to represent the Proto-Slavic unity" (p. 248). The closest of all Indo-European languages to this Proto-Slavic language were Lithuanian, Latvian and the extinct Prussian and altogether they were a part of the Baltic-Slavic linguistic community. All things concerned, the unique social community of the Slavs fell apart right after the 1st century and then began the process of more intense differentiation within the Proto-Slavic language. The special value of Old-Slavic is that it was the first of the Slavic languages to become the language of literacy and that its written traces are the closest to the Proto-Slavic language and a precious means of

its reconstruction, at least partially. Its influence on later literary development made it the priceless, common literary treasure of the Serbs, Macedonians, Bulgarians, Russians, Ukrainians and Belarusians, though a lot less of the Czechs, Slovaks and Croats (as they became shackled very early on in the Roman-Catholic ideology) and almost not at all of the Slovenes and Polish. Although he pointed to the mutual relations between the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Belić was convinced that these dialect distinctions between the Shtokavians, Kaikavians and Chakavians appeared before the arrival in the Balkans. "This does not yet mean that some dialects were already Kaikavian, some Chakavian and some Shtokavian in the present meaning of these words, but it is indubitable that many other features, apart from the mentioned pronoun, developed in the areas marked by the different forms of this pronoun. Today, it is quite clear to me that all Kaikavian dialects at the time, both those that would later form the basis of the Slovenian language and those that would form the basis of the Croatian Kaikavian dialect, lived a joint life. But it is also clear to me that, at the time, the Chakavian dialect was related more closely to the Kaikavian than it was later" (Belić: *The History of Serbian Language*, same publisher, p. 14). Kaikavian includes the entire present-day Slovenian language and the Croatian Kaikavian dialect that only gained the Croatian national attribute in the 17th century. It is unquestionable "that the Chakavian dialect is always called the Croatian language" (p. 14).

On the other hand, Shtokavian was partly appropriated by the Croats much later. "As the Shtokavian dialect later spread to one part of the territory or because it was partly in the vicinity of the Chakavian and Kaikavian speaking areas from the ancient times, mixing with them and creating new dialect traits, certain representatives of the Shtokavian dialect (especially Catholics) called their dialect Croatian" (p. 14). Therefore, the situation was highly paradoxical because "this shows that the Slovenian language meant a part of the Kaikavian dialect, Chakavian and a part of Shtokavian and, finally, that the Serbian language meant most of the Shtokavian dialect. Accordingly, the names Slovenian, Croatian and Serbian do not represent specific linguistic terms and the names Kaikavian, Chakavian and Shtokavian dialects do. This also means that the names Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian are actually political or historical, although national today, and they formed a certain national identity within their boundaries over time, but these boundaries do not correspond to linguistic ones" (p. 14-15). Linguistic boundaries are the most convincing parameter for ethnic ones and, therefore, the modern Serbian nation was at a great ethnic loss since the Catholic Shtokavians, Bosnian, Herzegovinian and Sandžak Muslims and the inhabitants of Northern Macedonia were separated from its ethnic substrate. Inside the Croatian political nation was a huge ethnic surplus, even if we ignore the problem of the Kaikavians. The number of the original ethnic Serbs - Catholic Shtokavians - was much larger than the total of the original Chakavians and Kaikavians, who were much closer in the original homeland compared to their later more clear differentiation from the Shtokavians. Concerning the dialects, Serbian can be divided into the

Middle-Shtokavian and Neo-Shtokavian dialects. The Middle-Shtokavian dialects are the dialects of Timok, South-Morava and Kumanovo-Kratovo, while the Neo-Shtokavian dialects are the Eastern Ekavian, Southern Iekavian and Western Ikavian groups. The Ekavian dialect can be divided into the more archaic dialect of Kosovo-Resava and the more modern dialect of Šumadija-Vojvodina. Iekavian can be divided into the older Zeta-Sjenica group and the newer Eastern-Herzegovinian group. Ikavian also has older and younger variants. It is interesting that, in the early times, Ikavian prevailed among the Serbs that converted from Orthodoxy to Catholicism and the missionary activities of the Roman-Catholic friars had a crucial influence on its spreading. Only the Šumadija-Vojvodina and Eastern-Herzegovinian dialects became the two equal variants of the modern Serbian literary language. In ethnic-linguistic sense, Shtokavian was a dialect when compared to Proto-Slavic, but a specific language compared to all other contemporary Slavic languages. In its entirety, Shtokavian was Serbian, Chakavian was Croatian and Kaikavian was Slovenian to the extent in which the Slovenians could be ethnolinguistically distinguished from the Croats. For the sake of a simplified comparison, the difference between Chakavian and Kaikavian could be placed at the same level as the difference between Serbian and Macedonian, and even the Serbian and Bulgarian languages in some features. The beginnings of Serbian literature at the time of the Nemanjić dynasty were beneficial to the further development of the Serbian language through two parallel processes. The Serbian version of the Church-Slavic languages appeared through a specific Serbian-Slavic linguistic expression and the Serbian folk language started being used in a written form since it was simple compared to the learned and elite nature of the former. Church-Slavic gradually received its sacral character through sacral use and its partial unintelligibility and mystique also contributed to this. The Serbian redaction removed semi-vowels and nasal vocals from this language and diglossia was the least expressed among Serbs because Church-Slavic was actually only the archaic folk speech. *Dušan's Code* was written in the folk language with very few Church-Slavic expressions. In ruler charters, the more formal part, the preamble, was usually written in Serbian-Slavic and the purview in folk language. The Orthodox clergy nurtured the Serbian-Slavic language over the entire 16th and 17th centuries, using it in liturgies and church administration. Since there was no literature outside church circles, the most of literary works were still written in this language, but this also showed limitations in linguistic expressions and the increasing intrusions of folk elements into the Serbian-Slavic documents. This led to a permanent version of its phonetics and orthography that was adapted to the more and more simplified variants of the folk dialect. Coincidentally, the direct application of the folk language in the writing of various documents was increasing and the large number of documents by the Paštrovići, Grbljani and the inhabitants of Boka and Herzegovina testify to this.

The beginning of the 16th century saw a clear distinction between the

Ekavian and Iekavian dialects. Ekavian branched into two variants, the South Prizren-Morava and the North Šumadija-Vojvodina dialects. Ikavian was formed through the original degenerative additions of Iekavian speech in the north-western Serbian areas in contact with Chakavian. Concerning the script, Cyrillic absolutely prevailed and Latin script was only used in the border areas and littoral area. Also, the Bosnian Arab script was used among the Bosnian Muslims. The constant Serbian migration led to the expansion of the Eastern-Herzegovinian Iekavian dialect to Bosnian Krajina, Dalmatia, Lika, Kordun, Banija and a part of Slavonia, where the former Croatian, Chakavian and Kaikavian population was killed in wars or fled before the Turks. As opposed to the earlier Greek and Latin, the Serbian language was significantly influenced by Turkish, Arabic and Persian and later by German and Hungarian.

The Serbian-Slavic language was used in literature until the mid 18th century and the folk language prevailed after that, but mixed variants can often be found in the written traces. Whenever there was a certain formal tone, Serbian-Slavic was more appropriate, but when the text dealt with the essence and explanation of the issue, the richness of the folk language was irreplaceable. Besides, the folk language absorbed foreign words and expressions more easily, especially expert words that simply could not be avoided. At this time, the shaping of the modern Serbian literary language began, especially in the works of Gavriilo Stefanović Venclović.

The process was halted at the beginning by a sudden prevailing of Russian-Slavic in Serbian literature and Venclović's reform of orthography had no chance of success. The penetration of the Russian-Slavic language was caused by the fervent efforts of learned Serbian men opposing the Eastern-rite conversion and Catholicisation. Lacking their own books, schools and printing-houses, they turned to the Russian schoolbooks and church literature. Russian-Slavic is the Russian version of Church Slavic and had an identical lexis, morphology and syntax to Serbian-Slavic, while the differences were almost exclusively phonetic in nature. But, in practice, the Serbian pronunciation of Russian-Slavic led to new versions through its adaptation to Serbian phonetics. Since the Bulgarians accepted Russian-Slavic, it soon prevailed as the only current variant of Church-Slavic. Elements of Russian-Slavic appeared more and more often in literature that was primarily written in Serbian folk language. The domination of Russian-Slavic created conditions for a more significant application of the Russian literary language in Serbian literature, especially in historiographical works. In these cases, the insertion of certain Serbian folk expressions was frequent. Over a few decades, a mixture of Russian-Slavic, Russian literary and Serbian folk languages was created, scientifically known as the Slavic-Serbian language. It contained two important elements, insisted on at the end of the 18th century, the element of intelligibility and the element of sophistication, primary for the civil class and the already mature intelligence. Slavic-Serbian was also a form of resistance to the Austrian authorities, which insisted on the suppression of the Russian cultural influence and tried to oppose it by forming the Serbian folk language. The grammar of the

Slavic-Serbian language was never formed, but its short development showed an increasing prevalence of the elements of the Serbian folk language compared to the Russian literary and Russian-Slavic languages. Although the Serbs had expressed diglossia until recently, the Serbian people never felt the Old-Slavic, Church-Slavic, Serbian-Slavic, Church-Russian, Russian literary or Slavic-Serbian languages to be foreign, but markedly their own - high, noble, sophisticated, aristocratic, consecrated, even sacral. Most people could not use or even clearly distinguish them at certain epochs, but they still looked at them with awe and love, proudly identifying themselves with their sound and melody from the depths of their national soul, seeing in this a proof of the existence and guarantee of the eternity of their own national identity.

Since the 1770s, the Court of Vienna systematically urged the printing of books in the Serbian folk language and this was also followed by widespread action against the social role and influence of the Serbian Orthodox Church, with the encouragement of Uniatism, so the Austrian authorities caused severe resistance to the Serbian national leaders. Only after the 1781 imperial act on religious tolerance and the later abandonment of the obligatory introduction of the Latin script, was the heated situation partially calmed down. The turning point in the prevailing of the folk language happened when Dositej Obradović decided to publish his main work *The Life and Adventures* in it. Dositej was directed by the principle that, through the democratisation of literary languages, this language could be put into the service of national interests. In the literature of that time, the Šumadija-Vojvodina dialect of the Serbian folk language prevailed and its wider use brought up the question of the necessary reform of alphabet and orthography. However, even at the beginning of the 19th century, a significant number of Serbian literary writers still wrote in Russian-Slavic and Slavic-Serbian, lacking any other serious literary-linguistic standardisation. In 1810, Sava Mrkalj made a significant attempt to reform the Serbian orthography. With the support of the Austrian authorities, Vuk Stefanović Karadžić soon performed a thorough reform, often encountering embittered resistance in church and civic circles in the Serbian society. Karadžić compiled the first complete Serbian dictionary, introduced new orthography and reformed Cyrillic, making it the most perfect script in the world. He soon made the first grammar of the Serbian folk literary language and he took the Eastern-Herzegovinian Iekavian dialect as the basis of his reform, though he later recognised Ekavian as an equal variant. Karadžić considered all Shtokavian variants to be purely Croatian and a language that was, in its entirety, the main feature of the national entity of a people. In the mid 19th century, his conception prevailed.

b) The Essence of Serbo-Croatian Linguistic Confrontations

The encroachment of the Germans into the eastern areas of present-

day Austria, the Hungarian conquest of the broad Slavic mass of Pannonia and the prevalence of the Latin variant of Romanian over a high percentage of the Slavic population in Romania deprived linguistics of many links that would shed more light on the branching of Proto-Slavic into the present-day Slavic languages and especially on the already discussed differentiation of the Eastern and Western Slavic branches in ancient history. The crossing belts were destroyed, whole branches disappeared and new ones appeared testifying to strong later influences. The direct territorial connection between the Croats and Slovenians and their West-Slavic relatives was interrupted, as was the connection between the Serbs and Slavines with East-Slavic or Russian relatives. "Several details in the northern and western Slovenian dialects and even in the Chakavian dialects in Istria and its neighbourhood, spoke of the ancient links with the West-Slavs. The areas of certain other appearances of this kind spread over the entire area of the Slovenian language and over the wider Kaikavian and Chakavian territories. This can only be interpreted with the hypothesis that the zone of crossing spread from the Czech territories over present-day Austria to present-day Slovenia and Croatia, but that it was interrupted by later events so that the parts that remained included in the Slavic South continued to develop exclusively in the South-Slavic direction" (Pavle Ivić: *Serbian People and Their Language*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad, 2001, p. 16).

Over the following 11 centuries, the Slovenians and Croats were under a strong influence from Serbian language and so their linguistic evolution went in this direction. The remaining Serbs in the territory between the Elbe and Vistula Rivers were under an even more pronounced influence from the Czech and Polish languages and Lusatian-Serbian became one of the West-Slavic languages after a centuries-long evolution. None of the two remaining dialects, neither the Upper-Lusatian nor the Lower-Lusatian, have any specific similarities with Serbian in its entirety or with its dialects today. "This means that, at the time when the Serbs in the wider sense of the name were still together, the dialectic differentiation of Proto-Slavic was not yet in evidence. After all, there were traces of the Serbian name in other places where the Slavs live or lived in toponymy or historical sources. We find these remains of a Serbian presence in ancient times in some parts of Poland and among the extinct Slavs in present-day Germany, as well as in Greece and Aegean Macedonia and even in the name of the town of Srb in Lika, which is older than the settlement of the Serbian population that now lives there" (p. 17-18). On the other hand, "the geographical map suggests that linguistic divergence existed even at the time when the Slavs came southwards in parallel currents, some through Pannonia and others through Dacia (meanwhile crossing the territory in the arch of the Carpathians, present-day Transylvania), later coming to the Byzantine border, some west of Đerdap and others east of it, mostly independently of each other because they were separated by the mountains that leaned over Đerdap from the north" (p. 20).

Ivić points out a whole range of present-day isoglosses that appeared

on the former boundary between the Serbs and the Slavines (the ancestors of the present-day Bulgarians and Macedonians) from "the confluence of the Timok River over the eastern skirts of the mountain along the Serbian-Bulgarian border to Osigovo and then in a wide arch throughout the North-Eastern Macedonia to the Ovče polje and Skopje, then farther south of Tetovo toward the Albanian ethnic border around the Sar Mountain" (p. 19). However, the only clear differentiation from the distant past was in the linguistic contrast between the East-Slavic and West-Slavic branches. Since the Serbs inhabited the Morava valley in great numbers and penetrated south, there was a mixture of the Serbian and Slavonian languages in the territory of Macedonia, forming the basis of the modern Macedonian language and its twelve dialects that are the transition between Serbian and Bulgarian.

The Slovenian-Kaikavian language was closest to Czech, judging by the characteristic isoglosses, although the earlier transitive forms historically disappeared. The similarity of Chakavian is somewhat lesser, but there is also a variant difference between the North-Chakavian and South-Chakavian in the degree of closeness. In all odds, differences between Slovenian-Kaikavian and the Czech language are of later origin and it is not at all certain that there were any divergences between the Croatian and Czech languages at the time of the Croatian settlement. Differences in dialects were intensified proportionally to the geographic distance and the weakening of communication. On the other hand, the geographic closeness and intensification of communication logically lead to linguistic confluence. Slovenian and Kaikavian are congeneric and the differences are of later origin. "All indications show that the thorough similarity of the Croatian Kaikavian dialects to Slovenian must be older than the political partition and this suggests that the ancestors of the Kaikavians and Slovenians formed a single linguistic group at the time of the settlement. The circumstances after the settlement, especially those that occurred through state-law isolation, could not be favourable to the creation of the attitude that the Kaikavian area is closely linked to the Slovenian language and, at the same time, deeply differentiated from its Shtokavian and Chakavian neighbourhood, in spite of the closer political connections with this neighbourhood" (p. 37). Croatian Kaikavian developed in Western Slavonia, the so-called Pannonian Croatia that was only politically annexed to Croatia in the 10th century. In the last two centuries, many linguists artificially treated Kaikavian as a dialect of Serbo-Croatian language, actually of Serbian to which Kaikavian and Chakavian were added so that it could be taken over more easily.

Chakavian was the original Croatian language, which spread over the entire territory of the original Croatian state from eastern Istria to the Cetina River and the Adriatic islands along this coast (along with the relicts of old Roman language that long survived in isolated social groups). Chakavian only occasionally penetrated south of the Cetina River. "In the Middle Ages, there were certainly many transitive Chakavian-Shtokavian language types along the Croatian-Bosnian border, often moving through various turns in history" (p. 41). Northern Chakavian had an Ekavian

pronunciation; Middle Chakavian represented the Ekavian-Ikavian combination, while the Southern one was more Ikavian with an increasingly significant influence from the surrounding Serbian Shtokavian. Chakavian was otherwise closer to Shtokavian than Kaikavian, but the mutual closeness of Kaikavian and Chakavian was incomparably higher than any of these two languages were with Shtokavian. Only further evolution closed the gap between Chakavian and Shtokavian, distancing it from Kaikavian. "Chakavian as a whole, especially in its north-western part, presented a lot of ancient links, mostly lexical, with the Kaikavian and especially Slovenian linguistic sphere" (p. 42). Linguistic innovations regularly appeared in the Shtokavians. "The Chakavian dialects as a whole are deeply archaic – or evolutionarily passive, which basically means the same thing. There were barely any specific general-Chakavian innovations that is, such that would encompass the main Chakavian dialects without being common with some of the neighbours. On the other hand, the Shtokavian innovation hearth proved to be one of the most active in the South-Slavic area" (p. 43).

As Pavle Ivić claims, "the basic political formation in which the Shtokavian dialect type developed is medieval Serbia" (p. 43). This original Serbian political formation included Raška, Travunija, Duklja, Zahumlje and Bosnia - most of the Serbian national territory. The political cohesion of this area was hard to preserve, but its national entity was unbreakable until the almost historically parallel periods of Islamisation and Catholicisation. And almost all of Slavonia was markedly Shtokavian and the territorial border with Kaikavian and Chakavian can be seen there, which is also the Serbian ethnic border. The Podravina dialects were Ekavian like those in Vojvodina, while the Posavina dialects were Iekavian as were the Bosnian ones, though the remains of Ikavian could be seen in certain places. The southernmost Shtokavian dialect was Prizren-Timok and, further south, were the Macedonian dialects, which were clearly differentiated from the Bulgarian language in the 10th and 11th centuries. "So it happened that the most of the Macedonian dialects were almost equal in their vocal inventory to the main Serbian dialects and markedly different from most of the Bulgarian dialects" (p. 50). The inclusion of Macedonia in the Serbian state, the intense settlement of the Serbs as feudalists, courtiers, soldiers, administrators etc. and the deep church and cultural influences significantly contributed to this. "The linguistic influence that introduced a lot of traits in common with the Serbian neighbours into the Macedonian dialects was not equally strong in every part of the Macedonian territory. This influence was the strongest in the northern and north-western areas and the further south and east it went, the weaker it was. The zone of its significant impact was coincidental with the territory of the present-day SR Macedonia. In the areas of the Pirin and Vardar Macedonias, it was weak and in the most distant areas, for example around Thessaloniki and in the Mesta valley, it was never expressed" (p. 51).

In Dalmatia and on the islands, a variant of Roman survived for a long time - the so-called Dalmatic - until the end of the 19th century. The Dubrovian dialect of this language died at the end of the 15th century and

the fact that not a single text written in it has been preserved sounds shocking, given that the Dubrovian patricians wrote in Latin and Italian. The constant arrival of Serbs from surrounding areas changed the ethnic essence of Dubrovnik. "The Dubrovian dialect of our language was a branch of the Eastern-Herzegovinian dialect from its closest vicinity. Formed when the Dubrovian surroundings belonged to the Serbian state, this dialect type still acquired a certain characteristic form, accepting the Catholic Church (and, to some extent, generally cultural) lexis and certain secondary innovations that spread from Chakavian areas through naval communications" (p. 86). The Roman heritage in Dubrovian culture and tradition influenced the Serbian language and produced a certain number of characteristic innovations exclusive to Dubrovnik and its close vicinity. Some of these innovations repeatedly penetrated the Eastern-Herzegovinian dialect in the Trebinje area and the Popovo polje, or the area that had centuries-long frequent communication with Dubrovnik.

Concerning the Kaikavian Croats, Shtokavian and the Serbian language was imposed on them as a literary language so they tried to preserve their own in everyday life and partially in literature and art. "The inhabitants of Zagreb used Kaikavian as a normal means of communication at home and on the street, Kaikavian also spread among the emigrants from Shtokavian and Chakavian areas, or at least to their children. On certain occasions, not being able to use Kaikavian was considered a proof of inferiority, a visible sign that the person was not from the nation's capital" (p. 105). If there were any valuable poetic works lately in Croatian literature, they were written in Chakavian, like Nazor's, or Kaikavian, like Krleža's. "For people whose mother tongue was Kaikavian or Chakavian, the literary language based on Shtokavian originating in Tršić was seen as a task to master in school or through life, but not as something authentically theirs [...] The most intimate things were difficult to express in any way other than using the closest instruments of expression - those that were carved into the mind at the earliest age of life. However, in Serbian literature, this linguistic breach in an author's personality was not usual, primarily because the average deviation of the Shtokavian folk dialects from the literary language was actually quite limited, so that the literary language was not seen as a linguistic instrument very different than the dialect at home" (p. 108).

Regarding the Croats, "from the second half of the 16th century until the triumph of Illyrism in the 19th century, they had an epoch of literary production in the Kaikavian dialect that was at first usually called Slavic and then, from the 1660s, Croatian, as the Kaikavian authors had previously called the Chakavian dialect" (p. 154). Beginning in the 15th century, all the Croatian literature in the coastal area was Chakavian, though having some older traces of literacy. But neither Chakavian nor Kaikavian "generated any serious prose that would deal with the problems of man and the events in society in a more serious manner, there was no (or barely any) scientific or expert prose, and almost no business or legal texts – and let's not mention how long it was (actually until the 19th century) until any true literary prose of permanent value appeared" (p. 156). Under the influence of the Serbs that settled in waves, there were

some Dalmatian authors who abandoned Chakavian, accepted Shtokavian and combined it with Ikavian, but they only left traces in poetry and mostly took over Serbian national themes. They usually do not speak of a Croatian identity, only of Slavism or Slovism. “Most of the writers in question did not feel Croatian and they used this name for the inhabitants of certain other areas that possessed the Croatian identity and their own, distinctive type of literary language” (p. 161).

Only later - decades and centuries later – were their ethnic communities artificially, forcedly assimilated into the Croatian nation and the national stamp of Croatian literature was put on their literary works. Wherever the Croats emigrated in larger groups during the Middle Ages, they left traces of Chakavian and their thickest concentration, in Gradiste in Austria, testified to this. They never spoke Shtokavian until they figured out how to incorporate the Serbs, Catholic and Shtokavian into the Croatian national corpus and completely suppress their Cyrillic script and the remains of their original national identity. In Bosnia, the Catholic ideologists referred to Cyrillic, the traces of which could not be erased, as *bosančica* or “Bosnian-Croatian Cyrillic”. “Actually, this allegedly special alphabet was a variety of Serbian Cyrillic writing that was transferred from Serbia into Bosnia at the time of Tvrtko I and then further to the neighbouring part of Dalmatia, which had a somewhat individual development in these areas” (p. 164).

The existence of the Serbian national church strengthened the awareness of national unity and made it, balanced and steady among the Orthodox Serbs. The Catholic Serbs were haunted by their conversion and additionally estranged, but these, regularly Shtokavian, never pleaded Croatian and instead nurtured various forms of regionalist expression from Banat and Bačka, through Baranja, Srem, Slavonia, Bosnia, Lika, Dalmatia and Herzegovina, to Dubrovnik and the Boka Kotorska Bay. The terms were different, Krasovian, Bunjevci, Šokci, Slavonian, Bosniak, Slovin, Dalmatian, Latin, Dubrovian, Bokelj, etc. But their awareness of their Slavic affiliation and their, respect and admiration for Serbian history never abandoned them. In 1832, Count Janko Drašković presented the idea - wholeheartedly accepted in 1836 by Ljudevit Gaj - that Shtokavian be accepted as the new Croatian literary language. In order to make this happen more easily, the Croats temporarily gave up even their national name, calling themselves Illyrian and counting that this would help win over the Catholic Serbs, as well as hoping that it might attract the Orthodox Serbs and Bulgarians and make Zagreb the unique centre. “Regarding the Slovenes, the Illyrians took them very seriously, all the more so since the Slavic language did not seem at all distant from the forefathers of Illyrism, Kaikavian by birth. Individuals on the Slovenian side also honestly wanted to approach Illyrism. Vraz’s episode was the most significant in this sense, but not the only one. But the linguistic bridges to the Slovenians were burned by the Illyrians themselves when they abandoned Kaikavian” (p. 193).

Since they did not have any serious deal with the Bulgarians and the culturally and politically advanced Serbs remained firm, the Illyrians

focused on the Catholic Serbs who had so far seen any Croatian national affiliation as foreign. The Court of Vienna and the Roman-Catholic church strongly supported this. “The awareness of national unity started spreading fast. When the Illyrian name was later abandoned and the Croatian one re-embraced, the territory under this name was already far wider. The process continued throughout the 19th and the first decades of the 20th centuries, intermittently until the interwar epoch [...] The Catholic Church that had developed the characteristic of being national during the 19th century, often appeared as the bearer of the national idea. The patriotic parish priests spread the Croatian name to such distant places as the Catholic enclave in Eastern Kosovo where the dialect of South-Morava was spoken, or to the Krasovians deep in the Romanian Banate, whose language had a Timok basis” (p. 194). There are no similar examples of national affiliation according to religious criteria in Europe and, until the middle of the 19th century, the scientists and intellectuals all believed that the Serbs and Croats were mutually different in language, not religion.

The Croats also accepted Serbian Iekavian as the basic dialect for literary language. “There was something striking, at the first sight even paradoxical in this acceptance of Iekavian in Zagreb. For example, in the territory of Croatia at that time, Iekavian was spoken only by the Serbs and occasionally by the Croats in their vicinity or under their influence. The areas where the Catholic population autochthonously spoke Iekavian to a considerable degree – the Dubrovian littoral area, parts of central and eastern Bosnia etc. – were far outside the Croatian borders. Even in these distant areas, Catholics with the Iekavian dialect were not especially numerous. They formed only a tenth of the Catholics who spoke our language. Most of Catholic Shtokavians spoke Ikavian dialects and these Ikavians existed even among the Illyrian (Vjekoslav Babukić, Ignjat Alojzije Brlić), but their dialect was not taken as the model. Other motives clearly won over” (p. 200).

The Illyrians were ready to make a literary agreement with Vuk Stefanović Karadžić in Vienna in 1850, which would proclaim the form of a unique literary language and orthography. There were still some Croatian writers, mostly from Zadar, who insisted on Ikavian pronunciation and one of the greatest detesters of the Serbs, Ante Starčević, wrote in the Ekavian variant of Shtokavian. In 1867, the Croatian Parliament officially named the language “Croatian or Serbian”, proclaiming it the official language of the triunity. The Croats decided to consistently accept Vuk’s linguistic-literary heritage, as “Vuk’s solutions fascinated with their firm inner logic, while other combinations had elements of compromise or quick-fixing. Finally, the language of Vuk, Daničić and Vuk’s folk songs became a classical model for writers whose Shtokavian feeling was insecure, either because they were Kaikavian or Chakavian or because they were exposed to the influence of German in their youth which was still common in Croatian cities (and often imposed in schools in Croatia)” (p. 204-205). Following the order of the Croatian government in 1892, Ivan Broz created the official Croatian orthography based on Vuk’s phonological principles. In 1901, Broz and Iveković published the *Dictionary of Croatian Language*, accepting all the

Comment [K.B.11]: Translator’s note. Gradiste is a town in Serbia, there is no town of this name in Austria, possible mistake in the original

Serbian and neglecting the traditional Croatian words. Soon after, there was a strong anti-Serbian political offensive aimed at destroying the Serbian national individuality in the territories that the Croats appropriated. First they accepted the Serbian language, then went to destroy the Serbs. Even concerning the language, a divergent process was formed so that what was taken from Serbs would be as different as possible from the original Serbian in the future. Then came a period of the invention of new words or of artificial borrowing, mostly from Czech. However, all these new-fangled distinctions remained exclusively on the linguistic surface because not even the Croats are capable of building a new artificial language on a Serbian basis.

In 1930, the integralistic efforts of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia led to the unification of orthography and the acceptance of orthographic reforms by Aleksandar Belić. In 1939, the Croats restored Boranić's orthography after forming the Banate of Croatia. Both of these were consistent with Vuk's tenets, only Belić, as a top scientist, corrected Vuk's inconsistencies and illogicalities while Boranić blindly followed Vuk's every concrete solution. What was a natural linguistic problem area in the Serbian literary language, transformed into the basis for international differentiation and confrontation between the Serbs and Croats. The Croats wanted to be as linguistically different as possible at all cost and this desire blinded them so much that they used highly irrational methods. "When animosity or petty distrust of the vital strength of their nation rules people, they will even harm it believing that they are saving it" (p. 220). The independent State of Croatia published a long list of prohibited Serbian words, proclaimed an even longer one with new, changed, Croatian words and, apart from this, introduced the quite impractical "etymological" spelling. After the war, the Communists proclaimed the equality of the eastern and western variants and therefore, made the specific linguistic duality official.

In 1954, the Novi Sad agreement was made on the equality of both scripts and dialects in respect of the original texts of authors. Work on a common orthography, terminology and dictionary of literary language was initiated in the cooperation of the *Matica srpska Society* and the *Matica hrvatska Society* (these two societies are in charge of cultural and publishing activities). This work was done with many embittered polemics and the new orthography was published in 1960, favouring Boranić's solution over Belić's. The first two volumes of the dictionary were published in 1967 and were not very well received in Zagreb. Serbian linguists gave in again because they were in such a bad position under Tito's dictatorship. In 1969, the conclusions of the two societies were accepted in this sense and, soon afterwards, *Matica hrvatska* denied these conclusions, insisting on its maximalist requests. The cooperation was interrupted and *Matica srpska* continued the work independently. In March 1967, a great number of Croatian linguists and literary writers accepted and proclaimed the *Declaration on the Name and Position of Croatian Literary Language*, insisting that Serbian and Croatian be proclaimed separate literary languages in the text of the Constitution because of the alleged former inequality and with the obligation that the Serbs in the territory of the Croatian federal unit use what was decreed as

the "Croatian" literary language. Since the church union failed in their denationalisation, the linguistic one was imposed on them.

2. The Development of Serbian Literature

With the basis of Slavic literacy created by Cyril and Methodius, conditions were formed for the beginning and development of Serbian literature. Its beginnings are connected to the process of translating Old-Slavic, mostly church texts so that the sparse reading audience could understand them. In this way, the Biblical and later Christian texts became the prevailing aesthetic and poetic factors that linked Serbian literature with the main trend of dominant world literature at the very beginning. The more original works were hagiographies and panegyrics. Many foreign texts were significantly adapted during translation, such as some anti-heretic polemics and apocrypha. The reception of characteristic works of early Byzantine literature was performed. The most important autochthonous work from the 12th century, the *Libellus Gothorum*, was later altered and adapted according to the concrete needs into the only preserved Latin version. It is obviously a chronicle from different sources and with an uneven level of factographic reliability, by an imaginative author who did not see much difference between actual events and his own imagination while synthesizing the found manuscripts. This work is better known in literary history as *The Chronicle of the Priest Dukljanin*. Its factographic value is negligible and its literary questionable, but it still bred serious and long-lasting scientific debate.

a) The Nationalism of Old Serbian Literature

Serbian literature in the true sense of the word appeared in the state under the Nemanjić dynasty, when first independent works with Serbian themes were written by gifted authors - strong personalities who were capable of combining universal values and concrete national aspirations. The main literary centres were in the most significant monasteries - Hilandar, Studenica, Žiča, Mileševa and Peć - where considerable copying activity still went on at the same time. The ultimate Byzantine and Slavic ranges were achieved by Serbian writers through the development of two original Serbian cults, the holy Nemanjić dynasty and autocephalous Orthodox Church. In this way, Serbian literature primarily expressed the national self-confidence and state independence insisted on in hagiographies and ruler historiography, but also in the hymn poetry. Literature had clearly expressed social, political, church, philosophical, ethical, didactical and pedagogical goals. The aesthetic side was measured by the depth of the literary comprehension of reality and by the beauty of its literary expression. Literature received a sacral character from its Byzantine sources. It was guided by a divine inspiration that used the literary writer as only an instrument of a higher will. Therefore the deep-rooted awe of a written text. Therefore the lack of awareness of the authorship and the author's rights among the people of that time. It was a

common understanding that a current writer had the right of the unlimited use of previous works. There was no clear boundary between creation and copying and, even in the process of simple rewriting, the scribe had the right to make insertions in the text following their current motivation.

The entire literary heritage is seen as a whole that was incessantly reworked, filled, perfected. The ideals of the lack of change and constant additions were combined. What already existed was the subject of altering, making the literary works actually timeless, from the 10th until the 17th centuries, they were formed as a collective product of its kind and represented a specific expression of the national and cultural identity of the Serbian people. There was no clear borderline between the past and present. Abstraction was very prominent, as was the imitation of typical models and insisting on the harmony of syntheses. The beauty of expression was more important than the content, emotionality was more important than factography and the ruler's ideology determined the basic sense of literary creation. St Sava set the foundations of this literature. Among his purely literary works, he wrote *The Hagiography of St Simeon*, *The Epistle from the Travel to the Holy Mountain* and sermons to the saints that marked the beginning of Serbian hymn poetry. Venetian and Hilandar charters by Stefan Prvovenčani had literary value, as did his *Hagiography of St Simeon*. The author(s) of the Prolog and Hilandar hagiographies were unknown and the works of the monks named Domentijan and Teodosije had a special importance. A large number of hagiographies were written about St Sava and they sometimes express the mysticism of the authors but mostly the political program of shaping the ideal form of the Serbian medieval state. The cult of St Sava originated inside the literary school of Mileševa, but soon grew to be pan-Serbian. Sava's literary work and the overall literature of Nemanjić Serbia of the 13th century was the beginning of the ideology of Serbian nationalism and the directing its principal values and goals, so further development was only building and perfecting.

Nationalism was unquestionable and highly expressed in all Serbian literary works of that time. "Serbian sovereignty, in its constant affirmation of autonomy and climbing the hierarchical ladder of the international order from the semi-independent župa in the 12th century to the empire in 14th century, played a great role in the development of old Serbian literature, apart from the Christianisation and Byzantinisation of the people. The littoral princedoms and the Kingdom of Duklja until the 12th century - and even more so the state of the Nemanjić dynasty from Stefan Nemanja at the end of that century - strengthened Serbia as a political factor in the Balkans and created the preconditions for the independent development of the Serbian people. The awareness of 'homeland', regardless of all its feudal characteristics and foundations, unified the nation into a more permanent cultural community, which was most powerfully expressed in literature. No less than the Russian, the old Serbian texts were characterised by a high degree of patriotism, awareness of the spiritual community and the unique interest of the people. The legitimacy of the Nemanjić dynasty followed by the state-law tradition of Prince Lazar [...] and his sons, then Branković and every other Serbian

despot until the 16th century, significantly determined the old Serbian literature, even thematically. Those texts that were Serbian in their theme and stylistic traits, those texts that were immediately recognised as Serbian in the general heritage of Byzantine-Slavic literature and were in the service of this important integrative factor in the medieval history of the Serbian people. Rulers' biographies and sermons, with eulogies, canons and other texts, were the principal and characteristic part of Serbian medieval literary heritage, formed around this idea and determined by this factor" (Dimitrije Bogdanović: *The History of Old Serbian Literature*, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade 1980, p. 92-93).

A true thriving of Serbian literature happened during King Milutin. A great number of new, talented authors appeared, alongside the translation of many sacral and Byzantine works, inside the Hilandar literary circle, aside from the exceptionally original writer Teodosije, who was capable of sensibly expressing personal experiences and impressions in his hagiographies, eulogies, sermons and canons - especially in *The Hagiography of St Sava*, *The Sermon of St Sava* and *The Sermon to St Simeon*. He edited and reshaped the texts of his predecessor Domentijan but also independently wrote the best work of medieval Serbian literature *The Hagiography of Petar Koriški*. Archbishop Danilo is the main author of *The Hagiographies of the Kings and Archbishops of Serbia* and he independently wrote *The Hagiography of King Milutin* and *The Hagiography of Queen Jelena*, in which different literary genres were combined. Danilo II was the most prominent follower of the hesychastic spiritual trend, which aspired for enlightenment of the soul and the realisation of divine beauty through utter ascetics. Danilo's works were supplemented by his disciple Grigorije Korički with hagiographies of Danilo, Stefan Dečanski and Dušan, renewing the narrative expressionism of Teodosije, especially in the dramatic descriptions of the famous Battle of Velbazhd or the defence of Hilandar. Patriarch Jefrem was the author of an excessive amount of poetic work, primarily molében canons and verses with acrostics. Monk Siluan wrote quality epistles, but he was also important because of his correspondence with the monks of the Holy Mountain. Grigorije Raški and Jakov Serski were also poets. Old man Isaiah left precious historiographical records, the translator of many great works of Byzantine theology and a follower of the Neo-Platonic philosophical trend.

After the Battle of Kosovo, a new period in the development of Serbian literature ensued. The heroic and martyr cults of Lazar and Obilić were added to the Orthodox spirituality of the Byzantine type and the apologetics of the holy Nemanjić dynasty. Literature was more committed than ever to carrying an expressed national program dimension. Genealogies and chronicles were written as new literary genres and a patriotic historical awareness was developed through them. Patriarch Danilo II Banjski wrote *The Eulogy*, *The Hagiography of Prolog*, *History* and *The Sermon to Saint Prince Lazar*, in which he praised Lazar's martyrdom as a victory of the celestial kingdom over the earthly one. The widow of the Serres Despot Jovan Uglješa – the Nun Jefimija – wrote *The Eulogy to Prince Lazar* and a lament over a lost child. Apart from a few

unknown authors, *The Letter on Saint Prince Lazar* by Andonije Rafail Epaktit was significant. Stefan Lazarević also wrote valuable literary works, primarily *Funeral Lament for Prince Lazar*, the epitaph on the pillar of Kosovo and *The letter on Love* in the form of a specific poetic epistle, a lyric hymn on spiritual love. A significant number of learned men escaped to Serbia at that time, primarily Greek and Bulgarian monks, who made a significant contribution to the literary flourishing. Episcopo Marko of Peć wrote *The Hagiography of Patriarch Jefrem* and *The Sermon to Archbishop Nikodim*. The translation of *The Chronicle of Joannes Zonaras* from the Greek was also very important.

During the Serbian Despotate, the creation of literature continued at full intensity, even in the last years before the fall. Apart from the monastery, city literature also developed, especially in Belgrade and Smederevo, and also in Novo Brdo. The most important literary writer of this time was Constantine the Philosopher from Kostenets, Bulgarian by origin. He initiated a grammatical and orthographical reform with his work *A History of Letters*. He wrote *The Hagiography of Despot Stefan Lazarević*, which was significantly different to previous hagiographies and represented a true secular biography with elements of a memoir and abounding in geographical descriptions. Also significant was the description of the transfer of the relics of Saint Apostle and Evangelist Luke from Rogos in Greece to Smederevo, and also Camblak's earlier description of the transfer of the relics of St Petka Paraskeva to Serbia, which certainly had an overall national importance. After the fall of Smederevo, the relics of St Luke were moved to Zvornik and then to Jajce. In the *Miscellany of Gorica*, the correspondence of Jelena Balšić, daughter of Prince Lazar, with minister Nikon was preserved and the Serbian princess showed a high degree of general education, especially the understanding of theological issues, as well as an emotional, moderate and skilled narrative style. Nikon himself wrote the noticeable *History of Jerusalem Churches*. In Novo Brdo, Vladislav Gramatik, Dimitrije Kantakuzin and Konstantin Mihailović distinguished themselves as secular writers. Classical works of late Ancient times include *Alexandrida*, *The Novel on Troy*, the history of Tristan and Isolde etc.

The fall of Smederevo was a turning point in the development of Serbian literature. Documents were announced as a special literary genre that was used by scribes to leave a concrete testimony about the events of their time, the tragic fate of the enslaved homeland, violence and oppression. They were full of wailing, curses, laments and open hatred of the occupying forces. Konstantin Mihailović from Ostrovica wrote the very impressive *Memories of a Janissary* in the form of a memorandum whose goal was to incite the Christian rulers start a war against the Turks. Clearly and lucidly, with a whole set of examples, he presented a complex characterology of the Turks. In Srem, there was a renewal of traditional church literature dedicated to the Branković family. In 1493, Đurađ Crnojević founded the first Serbian printing-house in Cetinje and it managed to print five books before the fall of Zeta prevented it from working further.

Apart from written literature, oral folk literature developed throughout

medieval Serbian history, perpetuated exclusively in human memory and perfected from narrator to narrator, taking some of the talent and imagination of each of them. Most of these works were forgotten immediately after they were told and only the best, the most beautiful and most remarkable survived, spread and developed. The creators were always gifted individuals and their contributions added up, though the authorship was quickly forgotten in the collective memory. The one who reproduced the work always added something personal, reshaping the original. This way, the works were perfected, but also often spoiled. Every valuable work appeared in several specific variants. It is obvious that the Serbs brought this kind of creation from their original homeland. However, works of this kind were recorded for the first time at the end of the 15th century as accidental and rare documents. This is why most of this literature is lost forever and only certain echoes of it reached us. Hundreds of tales, fairytales, poems, proverbs, riddles, adages etc. were created and then disappeared. It is assumed that the oldest epic poems were the so-called *bugarštice*, with a slow monotonous melody and lamenting intonation, which sang of heroic endeavours, deaths and suffering. They had twelve to sixteen syllables.

At the time of the great migration, a significant number of chronicles, documents and inscriptions were written and they testified to the Turkish atrocities and the Serbian national tragedy in a concise and impressive way, presenting shocking details with lots of drama. They had great documentary value and were often the only historiographical sources for the analysis of individual events. Aside from that, they abounded in memoir-type facts, which gave them a personal touch from the literary writers. The most significant are the works of Stefan Ravančanin and Atanasije Daskal Srbin. The mass settlement in Serbian Pannonia strongly encouraged the writing of historical tractates with the function of defending the acquired Serbian privileges and to oppose Roman-Catholic action. These documents strengthened the national identity, raised the fighting spirit, encouraged national unity and nurtured the idea of the final restoration of Serbian sovereignty after the liberation of all Serbian countries. The 2,681 page long Slavic-Serbian chronicles by Count Đorđe Branković is the impressive beginning of modern Serbian historiography, but also a grandiose work of memoir literature. Patriarch Arsenije III made attempts at travelogue literature.

b) Renaissance Serbian Literature

The Serbian literature of the 16th and 17th centuries was fundamentally static and followed the traditional genre and poetic patterns of the Nemanjić era. In the long run, this meant stagnation and regression, a great discrepancy with the European cultural development of the time. However, this did not mean that the Serbs were becoming decadent, only that they intentionally preserved their medieval form of literary creation so that Serbian national identity, sovereign tradition and national unity would be preserved as much as possible. Under the conditions of the harsh Turkish occupation and the actual hopelessness of their own

political and social position, the most important thing for the Serbs was not to lose their own identity and this was why they jealously preserved everything that reminded of the old glory and offered at least a distant perspective of its restoration. Although Serbian printing-houses appeared occasionally, books were still mostly copied in the monastery scribe offices. Fresh breath was given to literary creation exclusively through the Russian ecclesiastical influence, helped by the benevolence and marked Serbophilia of Tsar Ivan IV the Terrible and his successors, the Tsars Feodor, Boris, Mikhail and Alexis, through to Peter the Great. The most important original creator from this period was the Monk Longin of Dečani-Peć who wrote a large number of akathist poetic works modelled after Byzantine hymns, in which he celebrated martyrdom for the Orthodox religion, but also markedly expressed his love of the homeland and Serbdom. Patriarch Pajsije Janjevac also expressed Serbian historical and national identity in his ecclesiastical works, expressing the tragedy of the Serbian national destiny. He was the creator of the cult of Stefan Prvovenčani and Tsar Uroš. In this period, the famous *Genealogy of the Jakšić Family*, *The Chronicle of Grabovnica* and the chronicles of Jovan Svetogorac and Nikifor Fenečanin were written, which plastically depicted the general pain of the Serbian national tragedy. Mihailo Kratovac and Damaskin Hilandarac left a great number of letters and documents, while Gavrilko Trojičanin with his *Manuscript of Vrhobreznica* of 1650 tried to codify the old Serbian historiography, forming a new editing of the Serbian chronograph, genealogy and chronicle.

Humanism and the renaissance in literature only influenced the peripheral areas of the Serbian people, primarily Dubrovnik and the Serbian countries under Venetian rule. This contributed to continuing the systematic education of the members of the higher social classes but, at the same time, the Latin spirit unstopably penetrated, sometimes more and sometimes less, partially disturbing the Serbian national identity. In Venetian territory, there were many poets that wrote sonnets according to the Italian model and mostly in the Latin language, although the Serbian language was used in literature in Dubrovnik from the beginning of the 15th century. In Venice, Božidar Vuković printed a large number of Serbian books, writing his own prefaces and additional texts in which he expressed Serbian national pride and grief over the enslaved homeland. The books from his workshop left an indelible imprint on Serbian publishing in the first half of the 16th century. The publisher and printer of Serbian books in Venice was a Catholic from Kotor, Jerolim Zagurović. Kotor was one of the distinguished centres of Petrarchan poetry, in which Serbian poets also made attempts at writing more and more in Italian.

The Dubrovian literature was created in an originally state-political independent city, in markedly Catholic surroundings but in the pure Serbian language ever since the Serbian ethnic element prevailed over the Roman and finally turned it Serbian. It was autochthonous, because it did not have any continuity with the medieval literature of the Nemanjić epoch, but the first Dubrovian literary creators, mostly poets, were under the substantial influence of the Italian cultural surroundings in which they were educated. The previous period of writing only in Latin or Italian

made direct perception of the Renaissance achievements easier and the proficiency in these languages would prove to be a significant advantage for the Dubrovian intellectuals even after the end of the 15th century when the entire city-state switched to Serbian. This was the time in which Šiško Menčetić Vlahović and Core Držić appeared, the followers of Petrarch's love lyrics. At the beginning of the 16th century, Nikola Mavro Vetrančić appeared as the writer of a large number of lyric poems, one epic poem and several dramas. As a monk, he did not sing of love but of morality and religion, but he also expressed patriotic spirit, calling for resistance to the Turkish invasion. Andrija Čubranović made the funny and satirical tone of poems that were often improper more decent with his *Jedupka (Gypsy)*. Nikola Nalješković and Marin Držić became famous as the authors of cheerful comedies. Nikola Dimitrović wrote witty epistles, while Dinko Ranjina shaped Petrarchan verses in accordance with the diction and content of Serbian folk poems and Dinko Zlatarić wrote poems for certain occasions.

At the beginning of the 16th century, the most important Dubrovian poet was Dživo (Jovan) Gundulić. He primarily wrote dramas with Romanticist and mythological content and his most significant work was the epic *Osman* and a large number of lyric poems, such as *The Tears of the Prodigal Son*, *The Shy Lover* and *Dubravka*. Gundulić's contemporary Dživo Bunić Vučićević was a lyricist of purely love poems and Džoni Palmotić wrote dramas, epic poems and satires. Stijepo Đorđić Džiman left a significant love song entitled *Dervish* and, at the end of the 16th century, Ignjat Đorđić distinguished himself with a large number of funny and ironical love poems and later turned to moral and religious poetry in his old age. Đorđić, "in Dubrovian literature, was like the last flame of a candle before it dies out. These are not empty words but pure truth; everything that was done after him was weak rumination and imitation of older poets – the Dubrovian literature fell apart like the old Dubrovnik did, partly because of foreign threats and partly because of internal disputes. It fell apart politically and economically until it died completely at the beginning of our century" (Milan Rešetar: *The Anthology of Dubrovian Lyricism*, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade 1894, p. 19).

The reception of the Baroque style in Serbian literature happened in Serbian littoral cities where the differentiation of Serbian literary creation into the Orthodox traditional and Catholic West-European variants was complete. Although the Catholic variant showed an incomparably greater tendency to denationalisation, the influence of Dubrovian literature was crucial for the prevalence of Serbian folk language in it throughout the 17th century. A specific Dubrovian-Bokelj symbiosis occurred. The 1654 poem by Andrija Zmajević, *The Battle of Perast*, left a strong impression from this period. Although he conducted proselyte policies as a Roman-Catholic church official, he never forgot his Serbian roots and he sometimes performed religious services in Orthodox temples. He learned Church-Slavic and the Cyrillic alphabet, pointing out that they were "used by our entire nation". In 1671, Pope Clement X appointed Andrija Zmajević the Archbishop of Bar and Primate of the Kingdom of Serbia. He soon gathered an entire poetic

circle around him. Looking up to Mavro Orbin and Dživo Gundulić, Zmajević wrote apologetically on Serbian national history and, at the same time, encouraged and supported the war of liberation against the Turks. A large number of poets appeared who wrote love or religious poetry and there were also significant chroniclers.

In the 16th century, there was a true thriving of Serbian folk oral literature in the full diversity of its lyric and epic forms. Lyric poems included love poems as the most numerous, then ritual Christmas and *dodole* (Translator's note: calling for rain) songs, laments, toasts etc. The Dubrovian Petrarchan writers preserved a lot of this Serbian national creation in their works, especially Džoni Palmotić, Nikola Nalješević, Marin Držić, Dživo Gundulić and others. Lyric folk poems naturally fit into Renascent and Baroque literature. This was shown especially effectively by Hanibal Lucić and Petar Hektorović from Hvar. The epic folk poems from the 16th and 17th centuries left a very strong impression on the European travellers in Serbian countries and they left many more detailed documents. The epic poem *Osman* by Dubrovian Baroque poet Dživo Gundulić was written in the spirit of the then prevailing Serbian epic folk poems so it can be seen as a sample of its successful reconstruction. Its basic characteristics were heroic pathos, strong historical awareness and national enthusiasm. It celebrated freedom and heroism, bravery and dedication, national unity and solidarity and it most often sang of the endeavours of Marko Kraljević and Miloš Obilić. Džoni Palmotić introduced Miloš Obilić as a heroic character in two of his dramas and, with him, a whole range of Serbian rulers. The epic folk ballads, the so-called *bugarštice*, were mostly preserved thanks to the works of Antun Gledević and Ignjat Đurđević, the late Baroque poets from Dubrovnik.

Most works of Serbian oral folk literature of the time have been irreversibly forgotten and lost. However, the best quality works and those most appropriate for the national spirit were continuously perfected and adapted, whether they were poems, stories, legends, fairytales or proverbs. Therefore the significance of Nikola Ohmučević, a Dubrovian naval captain from Slani, Marko Marulić, a poet from Split, and Andrija Kačić Miošić, an abbot from Makarska, who documented and preserved a large amount of Serbian folk poems, is only increased. In the 18th century, many literary men appeared and they documented Serbian folk poems and other form of oral creation with great enthusiasm and many anthologies were made. However, many open and embittered opponents of Serbian folk creation appeared, especially among the Roman-Catholic priests who believed that they could contribute to the suppression of the Serbian national identity of newly Catholicised Serbs by agitating against the achievements of the collective national mind.

c) The Baroque Style in Serbian Literature

While the Dubrovian and Bokelj variant of Serbian Baroque literature was in the Serbian folk language, in Serbian Pannonia, Serbian-Slavic and

Russian-Slavic were also used. The increasingly powerful use of folk language was an adequate Orthodox reaction to the challenge of the offensive Catholic anti-reformation. The baroque creation of the 17th and 18th centuries led to a true renaissance of Serbian literature. Under various European influences, Serbian poetry was rich in form and themes. National and patriotic poetry received a new quality and more modern expression, drama and rhetoric developed. The greatest writer of the Serbian Baroque, Gavrilko Stefanović Venclović, left an enormous body of literary work, mostly unpublished. He completely expressed the Serbian national and political identity of his time and depicted the degree of cultural development and intellectual achievements. His social philosophy was highly emancipating and paved the way towards the later enlightenment period. Serbian intellectuals of the time were caught in a true euphoria of Russophilia and Panslavism and many set out extensive historiographical research based on the available sources. Their founder was certainly Mavro Orbin from Dubrovnik, followed by Andrija Zmajević, who used the Cyrillic script while writing in the Serbian folk language as a Roman-Catholic bishop of Bar and the Serbian prim-ate. In 1676, he published his most significant work *The Sacred, Famous and Virtuous State*. Then came Atanasije Daskal Srbin with his writing *On the Serbian Tsars* and, at the turn of the centuries, Count Đorđe Branković with his famous *Chronicles* covering 2,700 pages. Then came Hristofor Žefarović, with his 1741 *Stematografija* etc. In 1770, Zaharije Orfelin finished a comprehensive two-volume monograph on the Russian Tsar Peter the Great. At the end of the 18th century, Jovan Rajić published a four-volume Serbian history, in which he also extensively wrote on Bulgarian and Croatian history. These extensive works had an enormous practical-political value because their authors composed them as specific memorandums to the governments of the great powers that they were trying to win over for a more active approach to the Serbian national question and freedom-fighting aspirations. Orfelin also wrote *The Book Against the Roman Papacy*, indicating another dark force that was destroying the Serbs even more than the Turks.

Serbian baroque rhetoric had a special importance in this time, "turning from the foreign baroque models and addressing a quite specific audience in its happier moments, exposing the live but, in reality, cruel image of this audience, although not always complete and finished. The only images of the Serbian people at this time were preserved in oratories and speeches of this epoch, in Venclović's sermons to the Šajkaši on the Upper Danube, in Rajić's speeches to the border-men, in the speeches of Dionisije Novaković in front of the elite Serbian youth in the Academy of Novi Sad and in some epistles with strong traces of rhetoric art that preserved traces of apparently un-recorded but preserved speeches of *Vladika Danilo Petrović Njegoš of Montenegro*" (Milorad Pavić: *The Birth of New Serbian Literature*, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade 1983, p. 76).

As a style in Serbian literature, rococo appeared in poetry at the end of the 18th century, but there were no significant poems. In the enlightenment period, classicism and pre-Romanticism asserted

themselves and, apart from the formerly prevailing Russian and German, the Italian poetic influence was also very strong and the French was also followed, primarily thanks to Dositej Obradović. Trieste was asserted as the new Serbian cultural centre. Following the western models, Serbian educators spread the apologia of common sense, opposing the prejudice and limitations of conservatism and traditionalism. The Austrian authorities openly supported these tendencies, believing that they would significantly contribute to a decrease in the Russian influence on the Serbian intelligentsia. Following some great baroque models by Venclović, Orfelin and Rajić, Simeon Piščević established the Serbian enlightenment and its dominant figure was certainly Dositej Obradović. This was the time of the first Serbian theatres and the dedicated activity of Joakim Vujić and Jovan Sterija Popović. A large number of literary magazines, chronicles and almanacs were founded and, in 1832, Prince Miloš Obrenović founded a National Library in Belgrade. Serbian classicists followed the Latin models, but the centre of their activities was the renewal of the Byzantine humanist tradition that was so obvious even in the Serbian baroque creation. In the area of poetry, the highest classicistic achievements were by Atanasije Stojković and Lukijan Mušicki. In his literary work, Mušicki actually revealed the entire national program and gave a literary direction to a great number of his literary followers. The highest achievement was through the literary value of his works and the patriotism expressed, especially in his historical tragedies. This was also the time of the restoration of Serbian rhetoric in which Sava Tekelija and Nikanor Grujić became especially famous. The first novels, satires, biographies and essays appeared, which definitively completed Serbian literature in terms of genres.

Pre-Romanticism was nurtured in Serbian literature in parallel with the classicistic style and it had all elements of historicism and sentimentalism. The leading representatives were Stevan Stratimirović and Milovan Vidaković. Jevtimije Popović published positions on Serbian history and Gavriilo Kovačević on the Serbian revolution. Still, the most important literary pieces that pre-Romanticism gave the Serbian literature were the memoirs. Serbian historical drama continued to develop as a part of this style and, among others, Sima Milutinović Sarajlija was very successful in this area.

d) The Literary Expression of the Serbian National Romanticism

Late Serbian Romanticism was most noticeably marked by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić and his reforms of the literary language and orthography. Based on the re-discovered folk literature, Romanticism turned literature into the ultimate expression of the bulging Serbian nationalism, liberation aspirations and the desire to restore the unique Serbian state that would include every Serbian national territory and all parts of the Serbian people. The Romanticist foundation proved a fertile ground for the development of democratic tendencies and ideas of social justice and it reached its peak in the period of Realism. Romanticism

produced the greatest names of Serbian lyric poetry, such as Branko Radičević, Đuro Jakšić, Jovan Jovanović Zmaj, Lazo Kostić, Stefan Mitrov Ljubiša etc. Then came the marvellous prose of Laza Lazarević and Simo Matavulj. With his entire epic opus, Petar II Petrović Njegoš grew to be an unquestionable giant of Serbian Romanticist literature. This was the time of the great creative inspiration of the poets Jovan Ilić, Stevan Vladislav Kačanski and others. The historical records of Dimitrije Davidović, Sima Milutinović Sarajlija, Milovan Vidaković, Jevta Popović, Aleksandar Stojaković, Danilo Medaković and Jovan Hadžić were inspired by the same motives. The travelogue prose of Ljubomir Nenadović was also highly significant, as were the memoirs of his father, Matija Nenadović.

The literature of the Serbian Romanticism was the most direct expression of the national-liberation aspirations and goals of the Serbian people in the first half of the 19th century in the recently liberated small Serbia and all the other occupied Serbian countries, especially those under Austrian rule. Literature was generally one of the most efficient means “of raising national awareness, the love of brethren, praising their national importance and predicting a brighter future for their people. This nation-raising and folk component was the constant driving force that made Serbian literature of the 20th century assert itself as an original national literature” (Dragiša Živković: *European Frames of Serbian Literature*, part three, Prosveta, Belgrade 1994, p. 12).

e) Realism and Modernism in Serbian Literature

The realist literary style was nurtured in parallel with the Romanticist for a long time and many authors made attempts in both of styles, therefore a clear boundary between them cannot be distinguished.

A specific symbiosis of both styles was obvious in many works and, in certain cases, the Biedermeier style was seen as a sentimental and pathetic variant of Romanticism though, as opposed to the Classicism, it rejected stylistic puritanism and broadened the genre range of literature in general, including study-book material, history and publicism. The mixture of stylistic characteristics and genre elements was a marked turning point in Serbian literature at the end of the 19th century. Biedermeier broke the rigid forms, liberated the shapes and manner of expression and encouraged a terseness of the spirit and thought. Aside from Sterija, who made attempts at different styles, the most significant name in the Biedermeier style in Serbian literature was Jakov Ignjatović. Ignjatović rejected modernism, enlightenment and timid sentimentalism and insisted on a humorous note that did not tolerate the pathetic, though that did not mean that it was insensitive or did not aspire towards modern civic ideals.

The marked realists, Milovan Glišić, Janko Veselinović, Svetolik Ranković and others, recorded many elements of Serbian folklore, ethnographic knowledge and folk understanding of village life into their narrative and novelistic prose. Apart from the novels and tales that were the basic literary expression of Serbian Realism, Branislav Nušić gave it a

taste of political comedy, while its only significant poet, Vojislav Ilić, incorporated elements of the new styles of Parnassianism and symbolism. Political publicism rapidly developed and its most significant authors greatly contributed to the expansion of the idea horizons and linguistic patterns of Serbian Realistic literature. Many authors found fertile grounds for the introduction of new literary styles under the shield of Realism. In this way, Laza Lazarević developed his individual variant of symbolism and Simo Matavulj gave precedence to the Naturalist view of world, with an excess of grotesque and mystical scenes. Borisav Stanković, Ivo Ćipiko, Petar Kočić and Milutin Uskoković started writing as Realists, but then headed down the path of post-Naturalism, Impressionism and Symbolism. Stevan Sremac made the highest achievements in humorous narration and Radoje Domanović in political satire. In the period of Rationalism, literary criticism rapidly developed and Ljubomir Nedić was the most successful in it insisting on the national character of literature and taking an active role as fervent patriot.

In the epoch of Realism, Serbian literature definitely made up for its historical lag and was among the most developed European literatures of the time. With a new Modernist movement that would dominate the first third of the 20th century, it would confirm this status and adapt to the worldly tendencies of artistic individualism that were propagated by the leading ideology of liberalism. This was the time of the ruthless breaking of the patriarchal mind and culture. Serbian Realism was also an expression of the sudden restoration of national identity, liberated from the hidebound state of the Obrenović family and political decadence. Jovan Skerlić, Bogdan Popović and the *Serbian Literary Herald* significantly contributed to the modernisation of Serbian national culture, but they were soon forced to deal with the rotten cosmopolitanism of the spiritually underdeveloped and psychologically neurasthenic petty bourgeoisie, which was revamped after WWI by the military deserters and the sons of wealthy military contractors. However, the pluralism of ideas and spirit spread through all aspects of culture and led to the constant confrontation of styles and the questioning of all values.

The poetry of Serbian Modernism reached its peak in the works of Jovan Dučić and Milan Rakić, as well as Aleksa Šantić and Veljko Petrović. A strong mark was also left by Sima Pandurović, Vlada Petković Dis, Milutin Bojić, Ivo Andrić and others. Svetozar Ćorović distinguished himself in prose and he created the bridge to Modernism in his novel *Stojan Mutikaša* by adding psychological and moral components to the traditional realistic fable in a modernistic way. In his works, Borisav Stanković developed psychological subjectivism almost to its highest possibilities. In 1906, Dragutin Ilić created the literary school of the so-called Belgrade novel with his novel *Hadži Diša*, giving an artistic sample of later treatments of the urbanisation issue. Veljko Milićević announced the avant-garde, while Miloš Crnjanski appeared with his *Journal on Čarnojević*, manifesting in the literary sphere a specific philosophy of melancholy failure. Isidora Sekulić added the previously unknown variant of intellectualism and solitary aesthetics to individualism and psychological subjectivism.

In this time of the very dynamic development of “the linguistic idiom of Serbian poetry, with a rapid shift of everyday speech into the literary language, the credits of Serbian modernists with Dučić at the head are almost inestimable. Dučić purified and enriched the Serbian literary language, liberated its concealed and locked inner semantic fields, brought it back to life, restored its fullness, picturesqueness and auditory lightness, lifted its powerful and never-ending creative force from the depths and created an upper perspective toward further, even more sophisticated and denser poetic expression. He performed this elevated work believing that he was fulfilling the primeval oath of a poet because the poet “was the most remarkable and complete type in a race”, “the measure of the racial genius, sensibility, ideology” – “the poet was the purest chunk of their land.” (Predrag Palavestra: *The History of Modern Serbian Literature*, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade 1986, p. 255).

After WWI, Serbian literature suffered a deep crisis due to the faddish noise of the war loafers who were separated from the traditional system of values of Serbian national literature by French exile and on whom the feelings of absurdity, defeatism and hopelessness were imposed as a basic spiritual expression. At first, those who would later be the greatest Serbian literary names, Ivo Andrić and Miloš Crnjanski, succumbed to this melancholy. The tententious Realism and Modernism were replaced by expressionism, futurism, Dadaism or by domestic self-proclaimed styles like Sumatraism, Hypnism and Zenithism. All this branching of styles was primarily referred to as post-war modernism in literary theory, so that it would be differentiated as clearly as possible from the pre-war era. The term avant-gardism later became common and that included surrealism, aside from expressionism. The expressionists followed German and the Surrealists French models. “Expressionists were more concerned with the cosmic position of man than the historical situation. They tried to discover the instinctive forces in men more than the objective forces that determined their social being. They expressed their interest in men in general for their ‘eternal’ passions and aspirations, for their position in the universe” (Jovan Deretić: *The History of Serbian Literature*, Nolit, Belgrade 1983, p. 494).

The prevailing literary form was poetry blended with prose through the negation of classical verse. Aside from Andrić and Crnjanski, a significant part in the development of expressionism was thanks to Stanislav Vinaver, a poet and essayist, Todor Manojlović, Rastko Petrović, Ljubomir Miletić and Milan Bogdanović, who all turned away from expressionism in their later phases, denying all its values and returning to Realism. In his mature phase, Crnjanski wrote a great poetic and historical novel *The Second Book of Migrations* and *The Novel of London* with an autobiographical character that depicted the tragic fate of emigrants in an ultimate literary manner. Crnjanski overgrew expressionism and formed his own personal style that could be later called Sumatraism, but it is not possible to find any serious literary followers of the style.

As a specific reply to expressionism, folklore modernism appeared, with Momčilo Nastasijević as the main representative, then Neo-

Romanticism with the successful poets Rade Drainac and Risto Ratković. On the other hand, Dragiša Vasić insisted on the combination of realistic and expressionistic elements. In spite of its aggressiveness and irreconcilability, expressionism was not capable of definitively imposing itself as the basic style of Serbian interwar literature, instead soon burning out its overambitiousness. All the most important literary writers of this period were redirected to a more modern variant of realism that would insist on the synthesis of the traditional and the contemporary. Branislav Nušić, Jovan Dučić, Veljko Petrović, Isidora Sekulić, Bogdan and Pavle Popović continued their long affirmed work on this basis. Poetess Desanka Maksimović, a narrator inspired by the Macedonian area named Anđelko Krstić, the novelist of the great Serbian war-historical épopée Stevan Jakovljević, the Montenegrin folklore naturalist Dušan Đurović, a member of Young Bosnia from Sarajevo and convict from Zenica named Borivoje Jevtić, Herzegovinian Muslim Serb Hamza Humo, the writer of remarkable tales with Jewish themes Isak Samokovlija, the urban novelist from Belgrade Branimir Čosić, the essayists and literary historians Petar Kolendić, Mladen Leskovac and Milan Kašanin appeared in full shine.

Ivo Andrić, unquestionably the greatest Serbian literary writer of all times, started his literary work as a follower of expressionism, but he soon redirected to traditional realism adding certain modernist components and a psychological historical basis to it. He made an exceptional synthesis of the literary heritage of his paragons Njegoš, Vuk, Matavulj and Kočić, giving it a new quality and an almost perfect literary expression. The historical fate of the Serbian people, individuals of all religions, local collectives and crucial events in social life were blended in a highly harmonious and shrewd way with the cool calmness of a literary genius, but always committed on the side of justice, the weak and humiliated, homeland and freedom, a great number of Andrić's tales and several novels, especially *The Chronicle of Travnik* and *The Bridge on the Drina*, made the entire Serbian literature famous worldwide.

Losing the battle with the restored realism and its powerful literary surge, the avant-gardists soon transformed into supporters of a specific form of committed literature that they called surrealist. Its first phase was marked by Marko Ristić, Milan Dedinac, Dušan Matić and Aleksandar Vučo, later joined by Oskar Davičo and Koča Popović, giving immoral and traitorous attributes to the general image of surrealism. The followers of this style declared themselves as the protagonists of a specific literary revolution, detesting reason and aesthetics. They tried to apply psychoanalysis in literature without coming to their senses even when they became fit for the Freudian psychiatric sofa themselves as patients. They emphasised the inability to make boundaries between the rational and irrational as the basic value. The negation of national identity, pride, dignity and goals led them directly into the arms of Marxism and Communism, and many surrealists later appeared in the role of the basest servants of the Communist regime and irreconcilable persecutors of everything that was different, free and unsubmissive. The surrealists wrote and published many works, but none of significant importance or worth remembering.

Just before WWII, the movement of social literature appeared as a sub-variant of realistic literature, begun by the writers gathered around the magazine *New Literature* and the publishing house of the same name – primarily Pavle Bihali, Otokar Keršovani and Veselin Masleša. The authors of this movement declared themselves the new realists and followers of the Marxist point of view and Stalin's concept of socialist realism. Literature was subjected to the Communist political program and put into the service of preparing for revolutionary upheaval. Leading surrealists soon joined the social literature movement but, immediately afterwards, a fervent ideological confrontation concerning the optimal level of utilitarianism in literature broke out. The doctrinary bigotry of the social writers killed their talent and gave an artificial political expression to creative inspiration. However, even in these surroundings, some important names appeared, such as Vladimir Dedijer and Rodoljub Čolaković, who distinguished themselves in the field of journal documents, as did the truly great Serbian Branko Ćopić. "Traditionalism, national spirit, realism and commitment were the main elements of Ćopić's poetics. Although he lived in an epoch of great literary changes and frequent oscillations between the traditional and modern, Ćopić did not essentially change much. He remained faithful to his committed national realism until the end [...] Ćopić was an epic talent, a narrator with a lyric and humorous strain" (p. 611-612). The most important poets of this literary orientation were Skender Kulenović and Tanasije Mladenović and, among the memoir writers, Gojko Nikolić.

After WWII, the conflict between the realists and modernists renewed, but the general conditions of literary creation under the Communist dictatorship and ideological repression were very bad. Literature slowly and painfully liberated itself from the shackles, many writers were persecuted and often sentenced to imprisonment. Still, the freedom-loving spirit was gradually set free and realised its creative potential through plenty of individual styles. This was primarily a period of the rapid development of the novel as a dominant literary form and, in spite of the rather bad social and political climate, a significant number of authors reached a permanent and actually indelible affirmation, usually as a part of the renewed realistic style. Mihailo Lalić combined a realistic and modern psychological approach, retained the original partisan attitude, but successfully avoided the ideological simplification of themes. Dobrica Ćosić gained official popularity with a novel with partisan themes, but the true literary glory came only after he became a dissident and returned to the values of Serbian nationalism to a certain extent. Vladan Desnica wrote novels with existential themes with meticulous intellectual analysis of an essayistic character.

One of the greatest Serbian writers of all times, Meša Selimović, composed a work with a powerful philosophical monologue and unsurpassed thought concentration. The skilled narrator Antonije Isaković crowned his literary work with quality novels in which he subjected the Communist movement and the principle of function of Tito's regime to critical analysis. Boško Petrović was a master novelist of the Serbian national fate. Vojislav Lubarda, Živojin Pavlović, Slobodan Selenić and

Dragoslav Mihailović wrote very significant works and the giant of Serbian literature Borislav Pekić had a special place. Then came the very talented novelists Milorad Pavić, Milovan Đanolić, Žarko Komanin, Iso Kalač and a large number of younger Serbian literary creators.

Regardless of the fact that the history of Serbian literature could easily be periodised and grouped into old, folk and new, all three components were the inevitable constitutive elements of the whole Serbian literary tradition through which the national identity was manifested, developed and defended, national interests were defined and national masses were mobilised for their realisation. Even the old Serbian literature performed the literary-linguistic integration of the Serbs, Russians, Ukrainians, Bulgarians and Macedonians and, although later development became increasingly independent, the basic line in the spirit and values is also manifested today to a significant degree. From the inside, Serbian literature was entirely unique and originally distanced from Croatian to the extent that Shtokavian was different to Chakavian and Kaikavian, though the Croats started to write in Serbian later, tendentially spoiling it at the same time by inventing new and coined words. But, even when Serbian and Croatian writers could not be distinguished by language, the distinction in spirit, values, the understanding of men, society and history, the understanding of freedom, honour, dignity etc. was unbelievably pronounced. After all, the continuity of literary development among the Serbs was unquestionable and easily recognised, while it did not exist at all among the Croats. In the entire new Croatian literature, one can feel the syndrome of naturalised foreigners writing in English, French or German. When a significant literary work accidentally appears within the Croatian national boundaries, it can be classified as Serbian literature according to all its basic characteristics.

Serbian literature always had an expressed self-confidence, especially an awareness of the proper national affiliation, whether it was written in the old-Slavic, Church Slavic, Russian Slavic, Slavic Serbian or folk literary language. The name, source and tradition were never questioned until the 20th century and the Communist dictatorship, which stole authors and works from Serbian literature, artificially proclaiming alleged Montenegrin, Bosnia-Herzegovinian etc. literatures. However, the original historicism and disfunctionality – the regular thematic treatment of the national fate in its masterpieces – made Serbian literature highly original and independent, while the influences of the more developed literatures of the great European nations added more modern stylistic traits and renewed the wealth of its expressive forms. The reception of foreign experiences did not threaten the autochthony of Serbian literary creation. What was faddishly and servingly directed to the West was soon abandoned and forgotten as infamous. Serbian literature could never be pure art, freed from national goals and social functions, but its direction and functionality came from the national heart and not from the will of power-holders. This is why the greatest works were written in conflict with the authorities, domestic or occupying. Serbian literature was also the component of historical existence and duration and the first, oldest

3. Serbian Art Throughout the Centuries

a) Visual Art

Serbian national art from the pre-Christian era has scarcely been preserved, and that mostly through folk attire. In the 9th century, Serbian church art came into being under the influence of the Byzantine art deep inside the territory and of the Latin art in the Adriatic coast. Churches were built with central and elongated bases. After the Christianisation of the Serbs, the first builders were of Roman origins and they started renewing the old-Christian and early-Byzantine church edifices and building new ones in the same style, following the identical building pattern with more or less imagination. The Serbian builders learned the craft from them and soon outdid the skill of their teachers. Apart from the dominating Romance in the first period, some pre-Roman patterns were also present. The developed wall fresco-painting was common for them, while the icons from this time have not been preserved at all. In Serbian territories, a synthetic combination of Roman and Byzantine styles occurred, which was quite synchronised with the south-Italian practice. After the arrival of Stefan Nemanja to power and the unification, spreading and strengthening of the Serbian state, Serbian medieval art flourished in the true sense of the word, performing the creative reception of the highest Byzantine and West-European accomplishments and synthesising them at the same time. Concerning architecture, the building of St Nicholas church in Toplica and St Tryphon in Kotor were of crucial importance. The elements of both were the beginning of the famous Rascian school of church architecture. Nemanja also built magnificent monasteries, such as Đurđevi Stupovi and Studenica, where the combination of the architectural skill of Greek and littoral builders and their Serbian followers became fully manifested. Nemanja's example was precious because there were more and more church and monastery *ktitors* from the aristocracy of different ranks, so the building of monasteries became a means for gaining social prestige and moral reputation. After Studenica and its sculptures, there was a development in sculpting in which the stone-carvers from Kotor were unexcelled. In fresco-painting, successful compositions of live colours and often gold-plate appeared. The reliefs from Studenica also show South-Italian, Apulian inspiration and are therefore the creative expansion of the traditional Byzantine style. The rich diversity of styles created a new, supreme quality. In Nemanja's time, there was a quite clear differentiation between the Orthodox and Roman-Catholic variants of wall painting since the Orthodox paid much more attention to the theology of frescoes and the ideas that they presented. A special branch of painting developed in the decoration of liturgy books. The most beautiful monument of this type was certainly the *Miroslav Gospels* and its calligraphy produced a specifically Serbian national type of Cyrillic letters.

Every significant Nemanjić had magnificent endowments built

during their lifetime and they attract attention even today with the skilfulness of the construction and the vividness of style. St Sava built the Church of Christ's Ascension in the Žiça monastery where the original centre of the archbishopric was and motives from the Holy Mountain are predominant in the architectural expression. Cathedral temples as the headquarters of bishops were built or restored, or added to following the Žiça model and architectural patterns. Prince Miroslav of Hum restored and completed the St Peter's church in Bijelo Polje and it had two bell-towers like St Tryphon's church in Kotor. Archbishop Sava I introduced the custom of building bell-towers in the shape of the towers on cathedral churches. King Radoslav expanded his father's endowment in Studenica and Vladislav built the Mileševa Monastery with the crypt of St Sava in its narthex. The *ktitor* of the Morača monastery was Vukan's son Stefan. A true novelty in the artistic and architectural sense was the church of St Trinity in the Sopoćani Monastery, the endowment of King Uroš I. His wife, Queen Helen of Anjou, built Gradac on the Ibar River modelled after Studenica and significantly different than Sopoćani. The combination of the Roman-Gothic style appeared in the Davidovica Church on the Lim River, which was built by Dubrovian masters following the order of Vukan's second son, Zhupan Dmitar, whose monkish name was David. King Dragutin was the *ktitor* of St Ahimije church in Arilje, the Cathedral of the Moravica bishops. The general characteristic of the Serbian medieval monasteries was that they were fenced in with protective walls. Apart from building Orthodox monasteries, the former Queen Jelena, an Orthodox nun, also built four Franciscan monasteries in the littoral area, in Kotor, Bar, Ulcinj and Skadar, following the Italian Umbrian-Tuscan pattern. She also built the Orthodox monastery of St Nicholas in Skadar.

Throughout the entire 13th century, iconography, icon-painting and book decoration developed intensely. At the beginning, patron saints of the Nemanjić dynasty appeared on frescoes most often and then their dynastic genealogy, aside from the classical ecclesiastical images. These three painting branches featured the highest artistic achievements in their time. "In the 13th century, iconography was unquestionably the leading painting work. It was most suitable for the expression of complex theological thoughts, the spirituality of Serbian church, new state ideas that were nurtured in the court and the aesthetic ideals of the highest social rank. It also rose thanks to the greatest painters who worked in Orthodox countries at the time [...] Iconography and icon painting went hand in hand and book decoration lived a separate life. Their relation with the models remained the same as in Nemanja's time: some were inspired by the Byzantine art, kept track of all events at the centre of Orthodoxy and contributed with the exquisite value of their works to Serbia becoming the central country of the Byzantine manner of expression; others were still inspired by the old-Slavic books or the works of Nemanja's time, borrowing motives from Latin, Italian or littoral Romanic manuscripts whenever necessary" (Vojislav J. Đurić and Gordana Babić-Đorđević: *Serbian Art in the Middle Ages*, Volume I, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade 1997, p. 172).

During the 14th century, supreme art and its products were no longer only a privilege of the ruler and the highest state and clerical officials but also of the lower gentry, clergy and merchant class. True art workshops developed and they included jewellery, vessels and fabric design in the artistic sphere, aside from architecture and painting. Milutin's royal court became the main centre of the arts, the meeting place of talented creators who enjoyed generous financial support from the ruler. Renaissance painting with a classical form, related to the age of Palaiologos, would soon become common in Serbia. Milutin restored the church of Hilandar and, according to some old records, he built or restored forty churches. Among them were Gračanica, the Church of Bogorodica Ljeviška in Prizren, the St Stephen's Church in Banjska etc. King Stefan Uroš III trusted the construction and artistic decoration of the Dečani Monastery to Archbishop Danilo II personally and a complex wealth of classicistic style can be seen here. A number of the finest masters, sculptors and painters from all the Serbian countries, mostly from the littoral area, worked on this monastery. Tsar Dušan raised the magnificent Church of St Archangels near Prizren as his own mausoleum, with pretences that this temple surpassed every other before it in architectural and artistic sense. The most important foundation of Tsar Uroš was the Church of Saint Bogorodica in Mateič.

The Serbian state crisis after the battles of Marica and Kosovo seemed to have motivated the aristocrats of the time to turn to the building of endowments even more. The concentration of aspirations and talents produced a new quality of originality, on which the highly developed Architectural School of Morava rested entirely. The painters of the Ohrid school iconographed the churches of King Marko, while the artists of Jovan Zograf decorated the Church of St Andrew that was built on Treska by Marko's brother Andrijaš. The Balšić family built four monasteries at the Lake Skadar. Those were Starčevo, Beška, Bogorodica of Krajina and Moračnik and they followed the architectural models from the Holy Mountain, Vardar and Morava. Building the Praskovica Monastery in Paštrovići, Balša III made the littoral masters entirely follow the Rascian builders, so this became the pattern for a number of smaller temples in the territory of Kotor, which marked a powerful turn toward the Nemanjić models. Prince Lazar raised Ravanica and Lazarica as his most significant endowments. Princess Milica built the Ljubostinja monastery. A large number of painters lead to the variety of stylistic methods for painting frescoes and also the uneven quality of the iconographies. Stefan Lazarević proved a great connoisseur of art by building the Church of St Trinity in Resava, and its frescoes outdid every other of that time in the skill and talent of the creator. Resava was the peak of Serbian medieval architecture and painting, but also the last phase of their development, after which there was a centuries-long standstill and the destruction of what was already created.

Regarding Bosnia, art developed there only after Tvrtko was crowned, through his efforts to ascertain himself in every field as a worthy successor of the Nemanjić family. He founded several Catholic churches in the Franciscan spirit and his successors also mostly built Catholic

temples as their endowments. In the areas of Hum and Dabar, Orthodox churches and monasteries were built intensely, modelled after Rascian ones. In Tvrtko's time, Vlatko Vuković and the whole Kosača family dedicated themselves to being *ktitors*. Sandalj Hranić built the church of St Stephen at Šćepan-polje. Herzog Stefan built the Church of St George in Sopotnica near Goražde. Herzog Hrvoje built an underground Bogomilian church in the rocks in Jajce. The royal palaces in Jajce and Babovac and the reliefs of royal tombs had a special architectural importance. The decoration of Cyrillic books was somewhat more developed, while few wall frescoes were preserved. Carved tombstones, characteristic of the members of the orthodox and Bogomilian religions, were the most remarkable autochthonous Bosnian artistic creation. A great number of these was preserved and they are called *stećci* (Translator's note: vertical tombstones) and some authors believed that they were also used by the Roman-Catholics, though the shapes and illustrations of these tombstones were still characteristic of Orthodox tombstone art and were a specific transmission of unattainable high church art into a simple folk one.

The Turkish occupation radically interrupted the continuity of Serbian artistic creation. It would be continued north of the Sava and Danube Rivers and Despot Đurađ Branković was especially committed to this, as were his descendants. Under Turkish rule, certain churches and monasteries were occasionally renewed and iconographed following former models and patterns and, aside from this, the representative icons were made and transcriptions of the ancient church books were decorated. The Turks prohibited the building of new temples or the expansion of old ones during the restoration. Even where there was construction in the 16th century, mostly in Herzegovina and Pomoravlje, highly simplified architectural solutions were applied and functionality was what mattered instead of monumental aesthetics. The most representative artistic achievement of that time was the Tvrdoš monastery near Trebinje, built in 1510, probably by the skilled hands of Dubrovian builders. In this period, woodcut-icons appeared and, some time later, the decoration of printed books had great importance, with the most prominent being Božidar Vuković and his son Vincenzo, famous Venetian printers of Serbian books.

It was only after the restoration of the Patriarchate of Peć that a great renaissance in Serbian art occurred, especially in architectural painting of wall frescoes, icons and golden church dishes. The tradition of the *ktitors* was also restored. The main centres of artistic creation were Metohija and Herzegovina, but the artistic enthusiasm of the ecclesiastical hierarchy caught the entire Serbian national space. Architectural work was mostly done by littoral builders, fresco and icon painting by monks and goldsmithing by laymen craftsmen. The architectural traditions of Raška and Morava were the most often followed during the construction, restoration or reconstruction of churches and monasteries. Decorative sculptures and other forms of the decorative shaping of the stone appeared at certain places but, viewed as a whole, this was not an important *ktitor* or architectural activity. In the wall paintings, St Sava and Stefan

Nemanja were most often shown, followed by other rulers from the Nemanjić dynasty and Serbian archpriests, which showed a very high level of national identity and insistence on sovereign traditions and church independence. Especially colourful were the iconostases from this time and miniatures in copied books and decorations in the printed ones, wood-carvings and various forms of applied arts drew attention.

In the 17th century, major construction projects in church architecture slowed down. Mostly small and simple temples were built and even decorative sculptures were increasingly rare. In fresco-painting, there was a specific symbiosis of Serbian and Greek painting schools. There was a substantial progress in icon painting and the artistic processing of iconostases in general. The making of manuscript miniatures, wood-carvings, golden artefacts, manual embroidery, leather book binding, intarsia etc. still continued, though with a slightly reduced intensity. The Austrian-Turkish war and the great Serbian uprising at the end of the 17th century caused a drastic interruption in the development of all kinds of arts. The great migration that ensued caused a long period of consolidation.

In the 18th century, the focus of Serbian cultural life would be transferred north of the Sava and Danube Rivers, where a good social and artistic foundation had been created in previous centuries and materialised through an impressive number of Orthodox churches and monasteries. While raising them, the Serbian spiritual leaders breathed the characteristic Nemanjić spirit and national-liberation aspirations of the last members of the Branković family into them. At that moment, an additional influence of the highest achievements of west-European culture could be sensed and this culture broke every previously founded creative prejudice in the sphere of art and introduced plenty of specific styles of expression and the wealth of forms and content characteristic of the Baroque. The newly developed Serbian civic class made a crucial contribution to the Baroque modernization of Serbian art, narrowing in this way the influence of the church on artistic creation. It is interesting that, even at this time, the Russian variant of the reception of Baroque stylistics prevailed among the Serbs, mostly in painting, creatively applied in the modernized forms of traditional Eastern-Orthodox iconography. The late Byzantine painting formula and elements of Islamic decoration were still present and they emphasized the specific traits of the Serbian Baroque. This preserved a certain link with the old fashioned manner of artistic expression in the Serbian countries that were still under Turkish rule, but individual creators there, in discrepancy between the modern and traditional theory, engraved more and more present personal talent with their works. Serbian painting of that time reached its highest artistic achievement in the works of Hristifor Žefarević, Jova Vasiljević and Stefan Tonecni, followed by a large number of their assistants and disciples who expressed a more and more present personal originality. The Baroque emancipation of Serbian painting was performed in relation to the previously rigidly understood form, although it was still primarily related to the church motives in frescoes and icons, but it also significantly influenced church architecture.

Copperplates of the Serbian ruler and saints in the books printed in the 18th century were a great inspiration for the Serbian painters concerning the widely awakened nationalism and were a specific reference and reminder in their iconographical efforts. "In the 18th century, the icons with group lockets of Serbian saints, composed in the form of the old scheme of the Nemanjić family tree that was, according to Venetian Srbljak, faithfully repeated by our icon-painters, also originated in these books. The rapid penetration of images of the Serbian saints in the 18th century significantly changed the original thematic conclusiveness and iconographic rigidity of our iconostases. From the 1760s onward, Serbian saints were almost regularly included, to a greater or lesser degree, in the themes of our iconostases; they sometimes occupied the entire third zone. Now we could find them in the iconostases even in the line of royal icons in the side arches and there were also examples of them replacing the usual images of great Byzantine theologians on royal doors" (Dejan Medaković: *Serbian Art in the 18th century*, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade 1980, p. 158).

A great number of creators and the relatively favourable social conditions simply had to lead to supreme results. Teodor Dimitrijević Kračun is believed to be the best painter of the Serbian Baroque and his work was compared to El Greco's by many. Kračun also produced supreme achievements when he made attempts at Rococo style, which did not last long in Serbian visual art, but was significantly contributed to by Kračun's successor and continuator Jakov Orfelin, whose rationalist components paved the way for the coming Classicism. Manifesting his pro-Western artistic affiliation, Mojsej Subotić combined the elements of four basic painting movements up to his time, Romanesque art, Gothic, Baroque and Rococo, in his works. The most important artist of the Serbian Baroque was the distinguished portrait painter Teodor Ilić Češljarić. The founder of Serbian classicism in the true sense of the word was Stefan Gavrilović, who was engaged at the beginning of the 19th century as the painter for the uprising Serbia, painting the coats of arms on its flags, inspired by the heraldic models of Žefarić's *Stematography*. The highest achievement in the Classical artistic style was made by Arsa Teodorović, through whose painting school a great number of distinguished Serbian artists of the 19th century passed.

At the end of the 18th century, the influence of the Baroque was also felt in the Belgrade Pashalic. Hadži Ruvim took over the developed Serbian copperplate north of the Danube River - its basic spirit and themes - and applied it in his wood-carvings and drawings. He founded the first family painting school whose members dominated in the Serbian art of the post-revolutionary autonomous principedom of the time. At the same time, there was a large number of artists from outside Serbia who rushed to Belgrade following their national enthusiasm. During the reign of Prince Miloš, there was a true flourishing of Serbian visual art. The leaders of the uprising competed over the renovation of old churches and monasteries and building new ones, renewing the tradition of the kitors and endowment-building. Architecture became more and more modern and the classical style prevailed. The Serbian principedom followed the

main artistic flows of the Metropolitanate of Karlovac. Aside from Todorović, Pavel Đurković asserted himself as an expressed Classicist and a supreme master of portraits. As the first significant woman painter in the history of Serbian painting, Katarina Ivanović commenced her work in the short-lived Biedermeier style and then, in the mid 19th century, stepped strongly into the Romanticism. The Classical-Biedermeier style in Serbian art was brought to its peak by painter Konstantin Danil. Classicism in Serbian art long resisted Romanticism, bounding and limiting it. The founder of Serbian Romanticism in the true sense of the word was Dimitrije Avramović, whose works reminded many art critics of Rembrandt. He was also the creator of Serbian caricature, politically committed and lithographically multiplied. Uroš Knežević tried to restore the Classical approach with his original style. The works of the greatest quality in Serbian Romanticism were made by Pavle Simić, Novak Radonić, Đura Jakšić and Steva Todorović. In this period, continuing after the successful graphical progress in Vojvodina in the 18th century, graphic also developed in the principedom and reached its peak in the lithographies of Anastanas Jovanović. Jovanović was also the first Serbian artistic photographer and he became world famous for his works. Serbian sculpture also finally appeared.

At the end of the 19th century, the realistic style prevailed in Serbian visual art and Belgrade definitively took over artistic supremacy from Vojvodina. The founder of Serbian Realism was Miloš Tenković and the greatest achievements of this style were the works of Đorđe Krstić, Uroš Predić and Paja Jovanović. They raised the Serbian historical painting, distinguished in the period of Romanticism, to perfection. Their works were the supreme visual artistic expression of Serbian nationalism. "What is more, thanks to their long lives and their remarkable meticulousness, Uroš Predić and Paja Jovanović had both the knowledge and skill to turn their painting into a pattern of visual attraction, success and mastery, becoming even the leading figures of Serbian art of the new age for a long time. What is more, this supremacy that they gained at a certain moment was not essentially jeopardised, even by the appearance of a whole range of modern artists who, at the beginning of this century, tried to end the long rule of the academic realists that Uroš Predić and Paja Jovanović were for a good part of their work" (Dejan Medaković: *Serbian Art in the 19th Century*, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade 1981, p. 191-192). At the turn of the century, the Impressionist style appeared with Marko Murat, Stevan Aleksić and Rista Vukanović as its protagonists. Serbian Realism and the beginnings of Impressionism were related to German models, but the mature Impressionists turned more and more to the French Impressionist School of painting. The most important names among these were Nadežda Petrović and Milan Milovanović and the reliance on French art made the reception of the later symbolist, fauvist and cubist styles in Serbian painting easier.

This was also the time of bolder sculpting endeavours - monumental and decorative works in a branch of art that was neglected for centuries under the influence of Orthodox dogmas. Đorđe Jovanović achieved the greatest quality of sculpture. In 1890, he made the allegorical figure

“Great Serbia”, which was imagined by the sculptor through the idealised image of a beautiful woman in movement that reminded of Baroque restlessness. He was also the author of a large number of figures of great Serbian historical persons. Jovanović also did medals and plaques for certain occasions and also the sepulchral sculptures. His works strictly followed the academic rules of Neo-Classicism, which insisted on measure, clearness and harmony. Serbian sculpture also reached its peak in the works of Simeon Roksandić. At the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, there was an expansion of modern architectural expression in Serbia aimed to make up for the centuries-long lag and also to reaffirm the traditional characteristics of Serbian national architecture.

b) Serbian Music

The restoration of an independent Serbian state created conditions for the rapid development of music as a precious and irreplaceable element in the culture of a people with a marked national individuality. The collective national feeling led to the formation of a prestigious Serbian national music school that easily gained an international reputation and authority. Kornelije Stanković, the first Serbian educated composer, is believed to be the founder of Serbian artistic folk music and he dedicated his short life to the adaptation of Serbian musical heritage, giving it a more modern expression and a more successful promotion of the national spirit. He collected and adapted both church and secular melodies and, aged 21; he performed his *Liturgy* for the first time in Vienna in 1852. In 1863, he founded the Choral Association of Belgrade and became its conductor, but he died soon afterwards. Kornelije Stanković was the first Serbian musician who realised that “the culture of a nation and the most subtle element in it, its art, can and should inspire and elevate with the spirit and creative instincts of that nation” (Petar Konjović: *Musical Experiments*, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade 1965, p. 86). Stanković reached for the essence of the Serbian national spirit and national aspirations, showing that even Serbian church singing had a primarily national character, expressing principally the collective national mood and not religious spirituality and religious asceticism.

Stevan Mokranjac continued the creative efforts in this direction and created a grandiose work. He was especially dedicated to smaller vocal forms. “Mokranjac viewed folklore as the nature that surrounded him and the man with whom it was connected in every way. Being a Realist, he approached this element the way a peasant approached his field. Therefore, there was something much closer in his methods and treatment of this element than what we could find among the folklorists – preserver and harmonizer as Kornelije Stanković primarily was, the first who showed this road and work in the Serbian people” (p. 39). In the folklore creation of the Serbian nation, Mokranjac was most interested in the spiritual impulse, driving force and motivation. This is what he defined and studied, something in which he put his entire self and then transferred to his own composition with a modern expression, his famous *Rukoveti* (Translator’s

note: works of hand). Mokranjac was a composer and not a musicologist, but he showed a talent for the theory of music and the scientific study of music and his basic position was that the Serbian artistic music could only be developed on the basis of folk music. He did not exclude the foreign influence in advance, but nor did he find them crucial and he gave supremacy to Russian and other Slavic influences. Mokranjac had a special ability “to pick what was typical from the mass of folklore material, to blend his materials organically and style them, to show a clear musical thought even through vocal forms in a manner impossible even for larger, purely instrumental forms; this means the logical sorting of the given material, its analysis and its development in order to finally blend it into an entire form” (p. 87).

Mokranjac subordinated the piano as the basic musical instrument to solo singing and choral accompaniment, while his contemporary Josif Marinković went a step further, giving a much greater emphasis to the piano and to instrumental accompaniment in general. Marinković primarily adapted the single tone folk melodies performed by a male or mixed choir and he named them *kolo* or choir suite. Like Stanković and Mokranjac, he also investigated the sources, discovering the miraculous strength of the Serbian national spirit, strengthened cultural traditions and combined all this with his own personal experience, national pride and patriotic zeal. The adaptation of the found secular folk songs saved many of them from being forgotten and Mokranjac especially collected them in almost all Serbian countries.

On the other hand, the expert adaptation of these masters of Serbian musicality produced quality scientific results in the study of the Serbian national church music. Three styles were differentiated, the Hilandar style with an expressed Greek influence, the Nemanjić cult of spiritual singing simplified after the loss of state independence and national freedom and the nascent Belgrade style with its rich Baroque variant of Sremski Karlovci. There were also characteristic oscillations, such as Bosnian, Herzegovinian, Montenegrin, Dalmatian, Lika, Slavonian, Macedonian etc. Aside from Mokranjac, Tihomir Ostojić and Dušan Kotur were also successful in this line of work and they affirmed purely scientific criteria and methodology in their works.

The next generation of Serbian music creators was marked by Miloje Molijević, Vojislav Vuković, Petar Konjović and Stevan Hristić with works that rounded out the national concept of musical creativity and musicology. Milojević was a master of the composition of solo-songs based on the ultimate Serbian poetic works, like those of Ilić and Dučić. Josif Marinković had also adapted the verse of Vojislav Ilić earlier, but only Milojević gave them the non-material fluidity of the pure art of Pushkinesque heritage. His choral compositions were also very successful. In the first phase of his work, he was under a deep influence of Stevan Mokranjac, while he later appeared as the direct continuator of Josif Marinković, although Stanislav Binički, Petar Kostić and Isidor Bajić built their works into this continuity as well, although without such magnificent strength. The peak of Milojević’s musical composition was the adaptation of choral patriotic songs. In his records, Milojević claims

4. The Affirmation of the Serbian National Spirit in Scientific Research

a) The Institutionalisation of Serbian Science and Culture

The national renaissance and the restoration of the Serbian state at the beginning of the 19th century created the conditions for the modernisation of education and the beginning of scientific activity. Serbian intellectuals developed history and linguistics as serious scientific disciplines, which was also the main expression of the national aspirations in the sphere of intellectual creation, characterised by a markedly critical spirit and approach, unburdened by prejudice – by the theological shackles of doctrinarian dogmas that hindered the development of European science for centuries. In 1808, the Great School was opened in Belgrade thanks to the enthusiasm of Dositej Obradović. A few years earlier, Atanasije Stojković published a study-book in physics in three volumes. With his restless dedication, Vuk Stefanović Karadžić paved the road for the development of a whole range of scientific areas aside from philology, such as ethnology, folkloristics, legal history, etc. In 1826, the Matica Srpska Society was founded in Novi Sad and it soon became one of the strongest and most respectable institutions of Serbian culture. Prince Miloš began financing the education of talented young Serbian men in prestigious European universities but he also proved himself as the Maecenas of intellectuals and artists. In 1827, Grigorije Vozarević opened the first bookstore in Belgrade. *Novine Serbske* (Translator's note: Serbian Newspapers) began regular publication in 1834 and, in 1838, the Lyceum was formed in Kragujevac as a higher educational institution. In 1841, it was transferred to Belgrade and, in 1863, it was transformed into the Great School. In 1841, the Society of Serbian Letters was founded. Legal and political sciences began developing according to the Russian model and soon became the foundation for modern historiography. Apart from the most significant works of world literature, scientific and expert books were increasingly translated into Serbian.

After the 1847 reorganisation of the Society of Serbian Letters under the rule of Aleksandar Karadordević, it was divided into linguistic, historical, Orthodox, philosophical and naturalist departments. In 1864 however, Prince Mihailo Obrenović suspended its work because the Serbian scientists and leading intellectuals would not succumb to his political requests. In that same year, its work was restored under the new name of Serbian Learned Society in a Prince's decree. The regime used this decree to remove unwanted members who severely hurt the intellectual enthusiasm of the time, but its critical spirit of scientific creation was soon recovered. In 1869, the Society published the *Serbian Biography*, organised by Stojan Novaković. As Prince Mihailo had been

that the Serbs already developed a national musical ideology apart from the national style in artistic music and he spoke affirmatively about this in several articles on musical nationalism. Milojević said: "We have a strong current of national stylised or naturalist distinction. The accents of impressionism also influenced this nationalism." Speaking often of nationalism, it appears as though Milojević gave two interpretations of the term 'nationalism' in relation to this musical creation: the contextual one, which meant pathos and feeling; and the stylistic one, which meant a realistic and naturalistic interpretation, the development of the idea related to the homeland. And, in his own compositions, we have many examples of both understandings of his nationalism" (p. 248).

Miloje Milojević precisely formulated his conviction that "a composer was actually nationally/artistically oriented and did not use the raw material of national melody (as the folklorists did) but created from himself, having enriched his spirit with elements of musical folklore" (p. 250). He went further, concluding that "nationalism is not folklore. Nationalism is a purely artistic concept, psychologically and technically [...] this is a purified artistic position used by various creative talents who awakened the folklore elements of national music [...] Folklore is colourful, nationalism is marked, expressive [...] This is achieved when an cultured artist with a deep sensitive (psychological) strength manages to organise new melodies through the styling of motive elements, melodies that are his own, highly artistic, with the importance of developed musical themes (that is, the basis on which the architecture of the musical form is developed, from which the acoustic thread of this form spans out) [...] This language does not serve colourfulness but content; not the surface but the depth" (p. 251). Miloje Milojević believed that every high intellectual or artist, after the process of education, had to return to the home – the national soil – through his creation because this was the only way to create works of permanent value and to express the national spirit, experience and goals, aside from individual urges and feelings.

Another important Serbian composer and musical writer from the first half of the 20th century, Vojislav Vuković, was passionately devoted to the study of Russian and Slavic music, feeling his Serbian nationalism as an inseparable part of that. During WWII, Vuković was executed by firing squad in Belgrade under suspicion that he collaborated with the Communists and this liquidation unquestionably gave a serious blow to Serbian musicology and art in general. The third distinguished creator of this time was Petar Konjović, a powerful individualist, but devoted to the collective national feeling of the Serbian people. He was a strong supporter of national realism, like his great predecessors, and also an emotional Russophile in the sphere of music as well. In this spirit, he invites as an opera composer: "Let's meet the musical drama of the great Russian masters because they should enrich the best in us and make it grow" (p. 9). Stevan Hristić joined Konjović and Milojević in the development and nurturing of Serbian instrumental, chamber, symphonic and opera music. These were all versatile musical personalities who practiced composing, conducting, writing essays, expert and historical

murdered, the regent's regime restored every previously removed member and its activity was expanded to the area of art. In 1886, the Serbian Royal Academy was founded and, in 1892, the Serbian Learned Society became a part of it. The Serbian Royal Academy included the National Library and Museum.

In the last decades of the 19th century, the Serbian education system simply flourished. The system of lower, higher and extended schools was developed, kindergarten programs were organised and one of the basic principles that teachers were obliged to follow in their professional activity was insisting on the patriotic education of the younger generations. Four years of elementary education became mandatory and, apart from the state schools, the founding of private ones also became possible. The most important secondary schools were eight-year gymnasiums, classical and "real." Gymnasiums were obliged to nurture Serbdom, moral and character. The Lyceum was first renamed into the Great school and it had a Law School, Philosophical and Technical Faculties. Then, in 1905, it transformed into a University. As general-educational institutions, the main role of the gymnasiums was the preparation for studies. Aside from that, there were also secondary schools and schools of higher education, such as theological, teaching, female, commerce, agricultural, craft, music schools etc. After the University Foundation Act, this high educational institution was supplemented by the Theological and Medical faculties. Serbian science very soon affirmed itself in the entire world and produced several unquestionably great men who would invaluablely indebt all of mankind with their work.

For the topic of our study, the fate of two top scientists, Ruđer Bošković and Mileva Marić, was especially important. Ruđer Bošković was acknowledged worldwide and an absolute scientific authority, but the Serbian enemies systematically tried to forge his origin and take him away for the Serbian national entity, trying to artificially add him to the new-fangled Croatian science, of which Ruđer Bošković might not have known at all. Since they did not have a single great man of the human spirit, the Croats unscrupulously snatched Serbian ones. No one could take Mileva Marić away from Serbdom or deny her membership in the Serbian national collectivity, but they stole her scientific work and assigned it to her ambitious, but scientifically untalented and intellectually inferior husband, Albert Einstein. They also tried to steal Nikola Tesla, Ivo Andrić, Meša Selimović and many other intellectuals of whom any nation would be proud to have, but this perfidy was shown most intensely in the case of Ruđer Bošković and Mileva Marić.

b) The Great Serbian Mathematician and Astronomer Ruđer Bošković and his Unquestionable Serbian Origin

The first true Serbian scientist in the modern sense of the word was Ruđer Bošković, born in 1711 in the village of Orahov Do, three miles from Zavala in Popovo polje, Eastern Herzegovina. He achieved the top scientific results in the field of mathematics, physics, astronomy and

geodesy and he was also successful in philosophy, theology and psychology. He thoroughly and with faultless arguments criticised the mechanicism of Isaac Newton, but he also accepted his principle of time and space relativity. He rejected Leibniz's principle of pre-stabilised harmony and substantial reason, opposing them with the treatment of space as the principle of actual relations. His fundamental work was *The Theory of Natural Philosophy*, published in 1758, which significantly advanced the theory of atoms, as explained here by Andrija Stojković, "by founding the dynamistic atom science that understood the attraction and repulsion as a unique natural force [...] In this way, the atom is understood as the source of all actual relations and, as opposed to Leibniz, the diversity in nature was explained with single-type elements, between which were an attractive-repulsive force dependent on distance. What was original in relation to Leibniz was that Bošković was the first to make the distinction between the reason and cause and did not form the principle of continuity and space by invoking the substantial reason (like Leibniz), but he found them primary" (A. Stojković: *The Beginnings Of Serbian Philosophy*, "Dijalektika", Belgrade 1970, p. 153).

The ancestors of Ruđer Bošković were the Rovčani from the hills of Montenegro, a great Serbian tribe that celebrated St Luke as their namesday and inhabited the mountainous area between Nikšić, Podgorica and Kolašin. At the time of the original Serbian state, the Rovca was a part of zhupa Morača and the Serbs, having arrived in the Balkans, found a small number of Vlachs there, who left trace in the folk tradition as the Macura family. They were soon turned Serbian by the Serbian Lučani tribe that moved to Rovča from the Zeta plain. Even so, the area of Rovca was poorly inhabited due to the harsh geographical conditions and, together with zhupa Morača, they were one of the ten zhupas of Podgorje of which the *Libellus Gothorum* wrote. In the 15th century, the Nikšić family settled there and there were only brief mentions of their history in folk legacies since there were no written traces. "A large number of these stories about the progenitor of the Nikšić tribe, preserved in an even greater number of variants, say that Nikša was a nephew of Prince Stevan, a son of Vukan Nemanjić, whose sister was married to Ban (or Duke) Ilijan (Ilija) in Grblje, who rebelled against the Nemanjić family for which they killed him. Vukan's son Stevan, who raised Monastery Morača in 1252, did not have any descendants so he gave the monastery and Župa and Rovca to his nephew Nikša to inhabit with his family. In Nikšić zhupa, there was a legend that Nikša was a son of the Grbalj ruler, Vladimir Grbljanović who was known as Ban Ilijan. Another variant said that Duke Ilija of Grbalj, son-in-law of the Nemanjić family, rebelled against Tsar Dušan for unknown reasons and he had him killed and his son, the orphaned Nikša, who was partly of Nemanjić blood, sent to Herzegovina, to Onogošt zhupa to manage it" (Stevan Popović: *Rovca and the Rovčani in History and Tradition*, Universitetska riječ, Nikšić 1990, p. 43).

All variants of the legend said that Ilija's Nikša came from Grblje to Onogošt, but that some see the conflict as the reason in relation to the Balšić family. In Onogošt, Nikša found Ban Ugren Jerinić and confronted

him for power and Nikša's son Gojak killed his father's adversary Ugren and fled to Rovca. "In Boka, in the village of Krtole, belonging to zhupa Grbalj, on the road that led from Tivat toward the sea and Pržno, in the village of Niković, from the St Gospojina Church in Bjelovina, there was a conical hill covered with copsewood called Nikšina Glavica. Behind Nikšina Glavica, a short distance away in Gošić village, there was St Luke's Church, which the people said was from the 12th century (St Luke was the namesday of the whole Nikšić family). There were churches of St Luke in Kotor and Risan" (p. 44). Many folk stories and songs from the Nikšić area preserved the memory of the Grblje origins of the Nikšić family. They became relatives of Serbian Lučani, Riđani and Drobnjaci tribes and, aside from the Gojak's Rovčani, Nikša's descendants were the present-day Trebješani, Župljani and Potujani. In 1448, Rovca and Morača were the border areas of Stefan Vukčić Kosača's Herzegovina and were later a part of the Herzegovinian Sandžak.

Gojak had four sons – Bulat, Vlah, Šćepan and Srezoje. In the second generation, Šćepan's son Duka moved to the Nikšić zhupa. The Nikšić family had 14 houses in Rovca and they founded 37. In time, they became relatives of every native family and they took over the tribal leadership in the beginning. Families and brotherhoods rapidly branched or they remained a compact whole for centuries and showed a monolithic unity.

Isolated from the main strategic roads, always willing to participate in wars and uprisings and without having large tax obligations as cattleholders, the Rovčani bred rapidly and the Srezojević brotherhood was the largest among them. Gojak's fourth son Srezoje had four sons – Radonja, Radič, Luka and Vukašin. Prince Ivaniš Radonjin Srezojević was the head of the entire Rovca tribe at the beginning of the 17th century. But, then there was a mass emigration, mostly of Srezojević family members, but also of those from the Bulatović, Vlahović and Šćepanović families. "The Rovčani moved over Nikšić to Popovo and the areas around Stoc, Šapljina and Mostar. Popovo was inhabited early by the Šćepanović-Bošković family, named after Boško Stoškov Šćepanović. A part of this Bošković family emigrated at the beginning of the 17th century over Kolašin to Zatarje and the Bošković family in Popovo settled in Orahov Do near the Zavala Monastery, from which they later emigrated, mostly to the area around Stoc in Dubrave, where there are around 70 of their households today. The part of the Bošković family in Orahov Do was later Catholicised and called Kristić, while the other part was called Tomićić. One of these, Nikola Matijašev, moved to Dubrovnik in the second half of the 16th century, where he practiced commerce. His son was the world-famous scientist, Ruđer Bošković. The Bošković family around Stoc - in the villages of Crnići and Aladinići - were also Catholics, though some Orthodox were in the area around Šapljina and Mostar. They all preserved the tradition that they moved from Montenegro over the Nikšić and Riđan families and that their ancestors first inhabited Popovo, except for the Kristić family, which came from Western Bosnia, influenced by the clerical propaganda. Alongside the Bošković family and at the same time, the Ivanišević-Srezojević family came from Međurečje with Prince Ivaniš Radonjin, whom they were named after. Tradition says that 70 members

of the Srezojević family moved with Prince Ivaniš. The Ivanišević family settled in Poljica, Popovo, and were a large family with branches: Ljepava, Mostarica, Setenčić, Gligić, Runde, Pende and others. All of them (except Pende) celebrated St Luke's day - as did the Šešelj and Calaka families from Zavala and the Milić family from Veličani and they moved there from Orahov Do and they were all known as 'Lukians' (celebrators of St Luke)" (p. 278-279).

The Šćepanović family descended from Gojak's Šćepan, who had five sons – Vuk, Vlatko, Božidar, Staniša and Radoje. The brotherhood of Šćepanović was divided into the Drašković, Puletić, Bošković and Mutapović branches. All except the Drašković branch emigrated from Rovca. Aside from Sima Milutinović Sarajlija, *hajduk* Veljko Petrović and Petar Dobrnjac, Ruđer Bošković was still in part the greatest member of the Rovčani family who became famous far away from Rovca. He was born in Dubrovnik in 1711 and died in Milan in 1787. His father Nikola "practiced commerce. Nikola's father was named Matijaš and he lived in Orahov Do in Popovo, which could be seen from the approval that his father gave him for Nikola's wedding" (p. 302). Academic Milenko Filipović and distinguished researcher Ljubo Mičević ascertained that, at the time of the Catholicisation of the Bošković family in Orahov Do, "Ruđer's father, Nikola, went to Dubrovnik as an Orthodox" (p. 303). Rejecting the Catholicisation, the parts of the Bošković family named Šešelj and Milić moved to Veličani. Although the Šešelj family soon moved from there to Do, a part of Veličani that is still called Šešeljevina. Since the Bošković family moved to Popovo Polje at the beginning of the 17th century, this great migration was a consequence of the failed Serbian uprising against the Turks at the end of the 16th century, led by Duke Grdan of Nikšić. "Professor Darinka Zečević (anthropogeographer, worked in the SASA, died in 1970) recorded a legacy preserved in Rovca on the migration of the Rovčani, from which Ruđer Bošković descended, to Popovo 350 years ago and on the simultaneous migration to Kolašin on the Ibar River (the announcement of Professor Branislav Nedeljković). Therefore, numerous families in Popovo celebrated St Luke's day, the namesday of the Rovčani: Bošković, Ivanišević, Ljepava, Batinić, Šešelj, Milić and the other branches" (p. 304).

Concerning Ruđer's father Nikola, "it is known that he moved from Orahov Do in the second half of the 17th century, where he joined the service of Rade Gledović, who sent him to Novi Pazar where was a strong Dubrovian settlement. He earned some property there, returned to Dubrovnik and married the daughter of a Dubrovian merchant, Baja Betera, Italian by origin, with whom he had eight children: five sons (the youngest Ruđer) and three daughters (the youngest, Anica, had a poetic talent and was in correspondence with Ruđer as long as he lived) [...] in old age, Nikola wrote his *Old-Rascian Memories*, in which he described the famous Serbian monasteries: Sopoćani and Đurđevi Stupovi near Novi Pazar, Studenica, Patriarchate, Dečani, Trojica near Pljevlje and others, which clearly showed his origin" (p. 304).

When he turned 15, his father sent Ruđer to Rome to be schooled in the *Collegium Romanum*. In 1736, he published his doctoral dissertation

On the Sunspots. His works in mathematics, physics and astronomy attracted more and more attention in scientific circles. Although he was forced to enter the Jesuit order, Bošković stood out with his free-spiritedness. He was the founder of simple atom science and, in his capital work *The Theory of Natural Philosophy*, he unified the Newton's principles of gravity, cohesion and fermentation into a unique principle, built the law of forces, significantly advanced the sphere of geometry, studied mechanics, geophysics, optics, geodesy, hydrology, archaeology and also poetry. He was also famous for his geometrical method using infinitely small units and, in geodesy, for the theory of instruments and the theory of errors. On several occasions, he was trusted with important diplomatic relations, he made very close connections with the French encyclopaedists and soon became a French and British academician. In 1760, with all the privileges that he had as a famous scientist, Bošković "spent a lot of time among diplomats. There was also the Russian envoy Galicin. Bošković and Galicin realised that they were "of the same nationality" and that they spoke "two dialects of our common language" (Agatha Truhelka: *Ruder Josip Bošković*, Croatian Society of Natural Sciences, Zagreb 1957, p. 64).

After he had taken off his monkish robe and distanced himself from the failed Jesuit order, Bošković permanently settled in Paris in 1774 and obtained the Act on Naturalisation and a noble officer status, proclaiming himself "the nobleman of Luke", remembering that his Orthodox family celebrated St Luke as their namesday. French citizenship solved Bošković's every financial problem, but he then intensified many scientific polemics and became exposed to the vanity of vindictive colleagues who could stand anything but other people's success.

c) The Widely Known Giants of World Science

A large number of Serbian scientists gained worldwide reputation, authority and general acknowledgement based on their intellectual efforts and scientific results achieved, in spite of the highly limited conditions for the research work. Some went abroad and became famous, but homeland and Serbdom were never forgotten. The Serbian Academy of Science and Art made a registry of 216 great names, commencing the publication of their biographies and bibliographies through the efforts of the Board for the Study of the Lives and Work of the Scientists in Serbia and Scientists of Serbian Origin (*The Life and Work of Serbian Scientists*, Volume I-V, SASA, Belgrade, 1996-1999). Aside from Ruder Bošković, the most significant results were achieved by Josif Pančić, Mihailo Idvorski Pupin, Nikola Tesla, Jovan Cvijić, Mihailo Petrović Alas, Milutin Milanković, Jovan Tucakov, Sima Lozanić etc. Especially impressive was the fate of a top scientist Mileva Marić-Einstein, who sacrificed her scientific work to the ambition of her unworthy husband.

Josif Pančić (1803-1862) was a Catholic Serb from Bribir, who converted to Orthodoxy after coming to Belgrade in 1849. He made his highest scientific achievements in the areas of botany, zoology, mineralogy and geology, primarily studying the nature in Serbia and the

Balkans. Since he was a subject of Austria-Hungary and a Serbian nationalist, he went to the US as a twenty-year old and dedicated himself to the study of physical chemistry and electrotechnics, achieving great results in research into the sources of alternating current, the application of x-rays and mathematical solutions for the transfer of alternating telephone currents in lines, etc. Nikola Tesla (1856-1943) was born in Smiljane near Gospić, in a family of an Orthodox priest, but he also achieved his greatest success in the US, where he proved himself as one of the greatest geniuses in the history of mankind. He invented the induction engine, studied alternating currents and built the polyphase system, especially systems that enabled the use of high frequency alternating currents and super high voltages. He invented gas pipes as the predecessors of present-day fluorescent lamps, the inverted magnetic field, electric oscillators, the remote control of automatic machines, the high-frequency transfer of radio waves, dedicating himself entirely to research into the possibility of the wireless transfer of electric energy. He registered several hundred patents, but not even modern science can understand and completely get to the bottom of Tesla's grandiose work.

Jovan Cvijić (1865-1927) was born in Loznica in a family that carefully nurtured the memory of its Herzegovinian origin. He founded the Serbian geographical science, researched the karst and mountainous areas of the Dinarides, Old Serbia and Macedonia, successfully practiced anthropogeographical and ethnographical studies, wrote works on glaciology, set out the hypotheses on the Pannonian Lake and the origin of the Balkan straits, built the geomorphology of the Balkan Peninsula, established ethnopsychology as a special scientific discipline and also set a scientific foundation for the Serbian geopolitics. This unrivalled scientist still radiates an enormous intellectual influence and is an unquestionable academic authority. Mihailo Petrović Alas (1868-1943), born in Belgrade, was doubtlessly the greatest Serbian mathematician, who especially studied the classical mathematical analysis of differential equations. Milutin Milanković (1879-1958) became famous for inorganic and organic chemistry, chemical technology, electrosynthesis, analysis of mineral water, drinking water, mineral resources, meteorites, radioactive minerals and the advancement of agriculture and industry. Jovan Tucakov (1905-1978) was the founder of Serbian pharmacognosy and a thorough researcher into healing plants and ethno-pharmacological and ethnomedical problems.

When such a narrow choice of names is made, one always leaves out some very significant scientist, but this was only done in this monograph for the sake of more impressionable illustration and statement that Serbian scientists were traditionally and almost without an exception distinguished patriots and great nationalists, who never neglected the necessity of serving the homeland and loyalty the Serbdom. They selflessly put all their life's energy into making their own Serbian origin famous all over the world and they saw the high recognitions, diplomas, awards and medals as the deserved trophies of their nation that proved that it can be a competitor in the intellectual game with the incomparably more populous and wealthier nations. A Serb always respected the book and knowledge,

brains and intelligence, even giving them a sacral character, so in the periods of free development, the Serbian state paid special attention to the nurturing of scientific youth, sacrificing gladly enormous amounts of money for its education. Sometimes, it made a mistake by not realising their talent on time and intellectual potential, but the sons of the homeland were not grudge-bearers. They quickly forgot the injustice and showered Serbian with immense love. Some were persecuted, some died for the Serbdom, died at the Warfield, but never gave up the ideals of free Serbian state that would include all Serbian countries.

d)The Stolen Glory of Mileva Marić-Einstein

In the entire history of world science, there has probably been no greater theft and deception than the appropriation of another's scientific results that Albert Einstein committed, presenting the actual work of his wife Mileva Marić as his own. Mileva showed signs of aptitude in the area of mathematics and physics in her youth and her biographers Đorđe Krstić, Desanka Đurić-Trbuhović and Dragan Milićević testified to this. She was born in Titel in 1875 with a hip deformity and this physical flaw caused her many problems in life. Her father made sure she had a quality education and she learned German well while she was a child. She always stood out as the best student in class – the child wonder. Because of her illness and frequent moving due to her father, she had to make pauses in her education on several occasions, but her results were always excellent. In 1896, she entered the Politechnikum in Zurich, passing the very difficult entrance test with an excellent result. During her studies, she met Albert Einstein, who was attracted by Mileva's knowledge and hard-working nature, while she, without any previous emotional experience and with a physical defect, could not resist his sweet talk. Feeling a bit socially inferior in the Swiss environment, Mileva agreed to help the communicative Albert with his limited intellectual abilities in his studies, gradually and naively accepting his courting and subjecting to his highly expressed personal self-interest. "Teaching and tutoring Albert slowed Mileva down in her studies. She did not notice this because she was led on by her evil fate. Albert's knowledge was 'thin', porous and transparent. He did not have well-formed working habits, he was dependent, unstable, always in the clouds. With his modest knowledge, he could not understand the essence of high-quality lectures that the best European authorities on physics and mathematics gave" (Dragan Milićević: *Mileva Marić-Einstein – The Universal Genius*, Belgrade 1999, p. 41).

Mileva successfully established direct communication with her professors, scientist of worldwide reputation and Nobel Prize winners, while Albert often skipped classes. Mileva's seminar papers caused overall admiration. In 1897, she moved to Heidelberg to listen to the lectures of the leading world experimental physicist Philip Lenard, but she returned to Zurich after six months because she could not resist her love longing, so she wasted time tutoring that selfish mediocrity. Mileva's closest friends clearly saw Albert's selfishness and unfairness, but she did not react to their remarks and advice. "Passionately in love, Mileva was

not capable of feeling that Einstein did not love her and that true love meant concrete action in the various forms. She was not aware that he also had to be concrete in his demonstration of love. She loved and gave. Einstein benefited a lot from her love. He came to the studies with a weak, porous knowledge. As he later admitted to a biographer Carl Seelig: he did not have the working habits for regular studying, he did not attend classes regularly [...], and apart from all this, he finished his studies on time?!" (p. 55). Mileva neglected her work on her own graduation thesis and dedicated herself to writing of Albert's and the preparation for exams. She was preparing the Special Theory of Relativity in parallel to being exposed to the hate of Albert's parents and then her beloved left her pregnant. Therefore, she failed her degree finals the first time she took it, which her enemies used to falsely present her as a bad student. However, her professors invited her to stay at the Faculty as an assistant, but no one even thought of offering the assistantship to Albert.

When Professor Weber rejected Albert Einstein's doctoral dissertation as bad, Mileva Marić confronted her mentor and demonstratively pulled her own, already approved dissertation from processing. She retreated to her home, basically becoming a housewife and continued work on shaping the theory of relativity. "She was indeed skilfully manipulated, in more than one way and in various situations. Not just anyone can force a well-mannered, honest, hard-working and extremely intelligent woman, who would not hurt a fly, to become an embittered quarrelsome woman. This man had to be a master. Only an expert could control someone so strong and brilliant. Mileva never before tried to solve any of her problems unreasonably and forcedly. Under Albert's influence, she became a quarrelsome woman. There was an important difference in that that Albert quarrelled with the professors over his failure and Mileva over someone else's. In her state of 'blind', unreasonable infatuation, Mileva became a pawn on the chessboard of her life. The man whom she loved so much pulled all the moves" (p. 67).

Mileva Marić started working on the theory of relativity in 1897, painstakingly trying to explain the basic data to the untalented Einstein, who had a bad memory and an even worse capacity to understand. Sticking to the naïve woman like a tick, he soon started treating her work as collaborative. "He did not 'marry' Mileva in 1903, but the special theory of relativity and other scientific works that she created" (p. 131). In 1905, he fully appropriated this work from the woman he had never loved, but he managed to subject her and take full advantage of her. "Einstein soon realised the greatness and significance of the Theory, both for him and for world physics. This was his lifetime opportunity. He knew it was only a matter of time before this Theory would make its signer famous. He saw himself in all this incoming glory. He was thrilled by the very thought that he would become the first physicist in the world. This is why he managed to control himself so that Mileva would not notice his true feelings" (p. 132).

In that 1905, Einstein gained worldwide fame, but he kept Mileva because she persistently worked on the General Theory of Relativity and, at the same time, wrote other recognised works for him. He confided to

his friends that his wife was stinking and disgusting, but that he had to put up with her presence in his life and to pretend to be kind and agreeable, which was most difficult for him. The eternal failure in education and immoral parasite kept using the woman in love with him and, while she was developing the General theory of relativity, Einstein started a love romance with his cousin in 1911, promising to chase away his wife and children as soon as Mileva finished the work she had started. Cold-hearted with his own children, he systematically destroyed all traces of Mileva's scientific efforts and success, burned a great number of letters that presented him as unscrupulous and perverted, as were his parents after all. "Herman and Pauline Einstein did not recognise Mileva's and Einstein's children as their grandchildren. They did not visit them once, take them into their arms and play with them. These children were non-existent, dead to them. This was a rare and unbelievable situation. It was extremely rare and incomprehensible for a normal mind that grandparents could hate the children of their only son. What sort of brains were those? Where were they brought up and created since they could hate the children of their own blood?" (p. 204). Following the example of his parents, Albert Einstein also showed an unparalleled hatred and intolerance to his children, treating them pitilessly and proving his moral deformity and spiritual emptiness. Such a monster in the psychological and social sphere could by no means be a genius in the scientific one.

Not only did Einstein destroy all traces of Mileva's work on the special and general theories of relativity – the original manuscripts in her handwriting – but he also almost entirely erased the memory and all the official documents concerning the existence of their daughter Liesrel and the data on Mileva's doctoral dissertation. Mileva still kept Einstein's letters and, based on their contents, some facts can be reconstructed precisely. For example, his inquiry about a 1901 child, therefore, before Mileva's labour, which happened at the beginning of 1902 and his hesitation to marry a girl who had many problems with her family and the city milieu of Novi Sad because of extramarital pregnancy. After Liesrel was born, Einstein insisted that the mother took her to Novi Sad without entering her into the register of births. In Novi Sad, Liesrel got scarlet fever and died. It was only at the beginning of 1903, that Albert and Mileva got married and, in 1904, had a son, Hans-Albert. The secret of Liesrel's existence and her tragic fate was only discovered after thirty years. Their third child, a son named Edward, was mentally ill. Gaining worldwide fame with Mileva's works, Einstein chased away his wife and both sons in 1913 and married his cousin. He never took care of Edward either, he never sent a penny for his treatment and sustenance and he did not see him for over twenty years, from 1933 until his death in 1955. Edward continuously accused his father of being responsible for his difficult mental situation.

To make her keep silent about the big secret until the end of her life, Albert gave the entire sum of the Nobel Prize money to Mileva in 1922. However, there were already writings in Germany saying that his work was plagiarism, that he was simply not capable of creating something that magnificent. Many pointed out Mileva's unquestionable contribution and

German female associations were especially dedicated to this. Since Albert Einstein had already committed himself to the world Zionistic movement, his fellow countrymen tried to disqualify every logical and argumented disproof of Einstein's authorship of two great physical-mathematical theories as anti-Semitism. But, from the moment he chased away his wife Mileva until the rest of his life, Albert Einstein was not capable of writing a single new scientific work. He was reduced to a witty verbal juggler and eloquent playboy populizer of science, being strictly careful not to enter into serious theoretical discussions in the presence of prominent scientists who would easily and simply recognise his quackery. Einstein gave simplified lectures to the people who did not understand anything anyway and who only came to listen to him because of the media spectacle that the skilled public promoters regularly prepared for him.

5. Serbian Philosophical Thought

The complete national identity and self-awareness of a people cannot be imagined without its specific approach to philosophy and a characteristic part in its development as the highest form of human mind activity, actually, of pure reflection and its emancipatory effect on the very existence. Even today, Serious ideology, especially of a national kind, cannot be imagined without an essential philosophical foundation and continuity of reflective efforts with the purpose of understanding and explaining the self, one's nation, history, tradition, present and future, the theological exposition of the mind and practical efforts of national collectivity, the system of values and its continuous critical questioning. National philosophy is most necessary for the nationalistic ideology in this sphere of questioning because ideology is usually not prepared to capable of questioning itself. Critical questioning leads to the constant re-evaluation of values, their intensification, polishing and perfection - actually to the insertion of new life force in the confrontation with historical challenges and competitive threats.

Serbian philosophy developed for centuries in highly unfavourable conditions, often falling behind the highest European achievements, but it achieved its own integrity and continuity because it rose from the depths of the national soul, with a markedly common sense approach, a naturally high intelligence quotient and with a feeling of measure and sense - but it was also ambitious in its aspirations for great achievements and, at the same time, with the expressed willingness of the thinkers to sacrifice for the national good, to subject their own existence to philosophical principles and ideological goals. In the sphere of philosophical reflection, the Serbs proved their own spiritual, intellectual and emotional abilities and, in practical thought creation, they built what they achieved into the national ideology and theology, constantly shaping its national symbol and characteristic traits. This is why it was difficult to make boundaries between philosophical, theological and ideological content in the beginnings of our reflection of the pure mind. Its essential characteristic was the original synthesis of the traditions of the old Serbian religion,

culture and folk legacy and Christian teaching in the variant of the Eastern Church, Byzantine political philosophy and state ideology. It was never deprived of the noticeable Western influence, but the Serbs insisted on their own, nationally characteristic approach, alongside all the reception of advanced foreign influences.

St Sava was the unquestionable founder of philosophical thought, the establisher of the Serbian ethnic ideal that insisted on the constant fight for an individual's achievement of moral perfection in the free Serbian national state. "With his personal example and teaching, Sava defined the necessity of the limitation of our traditional individualism with social utilitarianism that demanded that personal interests be sacrificed for the interests of the community – from the village to the state community" (Andrija Stojković: *The Beginnings of Philosophy among the Serbs. From Sava to Dositej on the Basis of Folk Wisdom*, Dijalektika, Belgrade 1970, p. 41). Personal asceticism contributed to the development of St Sava's critical rationalistic spirit, which was rare in the world of his time. He was a specific state apologist and the creator of the concept of a national Christian church and, at the same time, he was a national educator and a great supporter of schools and education. He never separated religion from morality and patriotism. Morality saved the soul and patriotism fulfilled the purpose of a collective existence.

One primarily served God with his humanity, honesty, righteousness, hard-work and fight for the truth and patriotism, as the supreme virtue, subsumed and included all these individually. He found the inspiration for the concept of moral perfection in the works of antique Greek philosophers, successfully combining them with Christian teaching. The Serbian interpretation of Orthodox theology and the state-forming ideology as a practical expression of Sava's life theology in the Serbian nationalism that had existed for centuries before as a matter of heart and reason of the Serbian ethnic collectivity was a precious theoretical foundation that would constantly be built on in the following centuries, relying on the legacy of St Sava and persistently nurturing the his cult.

The Serbian humanistic-rationalistic spirit inspired by St Sava stood far apart from the West-European one and it was not a slave to astrological prejudice, religious fanaticism or magical delusions for a single moment, which could be concluded from all the literary and artistic works of the time. Thanks to that, the Serbian people did not know the tradition of witch and wizard burning or vampire exhumation. The philosophical thought of St Sava was not subjected to theology, but was quite interested in synchronising religion and meaning, trying to advance both at the same time. The reception of the Byzantine freedom-loving spirit, which did not hesitate to reaffirm the antique Greek philosophical thought with Serbian thought efforts, as could be seen from the large number of literary works, made the western scholastic affectations seem entirely foreign, although the scholastic also left certain trace in Hilandar documents. These achievements of thought were the only ones that could be the ideological torchbearer in the later dark centuries-long period of Turkish slavery. The Serbian philosophical attitude toward the meaning and content of life, its duration and existence and, most of all, the firmly

expressed and consistently built ethical principles were also the inspiration of later lonely writers, but primarily of the massively accepted folk literary creation. This literature was the link that unbreakably connected St Sava's original philosophical thought with modern thought efforts. The continuity of state-forming ideals and moral codex was unquestionable, the same as the nationalistic ideology with an expressed freedom-loving potential. Through the words of anonymous creators, the national spirit also added incredible optimism for life, a fighting zeal and the heroic ideal of sacrifice for faith and religion to medieval Serbian humanism and rationalism. There was no reconciliation with historical troubles and tragic national destiny, so fighting activism was praised and life identified with freedom.

In the mid 18th century, conditions were in place for the Serbian philosophical renaissance, in parallel with the literary one and based on the foundations of European enlightenment. Makarije Petrović Mirijeovski, Spiridon Jovanović, Zaharije Stefanović Orfelin, Pavle Julinac and Atanasije Stojković (as the first Serbian doctor of philosophy) appeared as the first true Serbian philosophers in the modern sense of the word. Their works were not especially original, but they were highly significant for the reception of contemporary Russian, German, French and English philosophical thought. Serbian enlightenment reached its peak in the works of Dositej Obradović, especially the books *The Life and Adventures of Dositej Obradović* from 1783, *Common Sense Advice* from 1784 and *Ethics* from 1803. Dositej chose the principles of practical philosophy with an anthropological-humanist orientation: he based rationalist ethics on the logic understood as the beginning of every serious philosophy in order to reach metaphysics, its ideas of entirety, the aesthetic perfection of the universe and social utilitarianism. He considered scholastics as a supernatural religion and the theology of revelation and common sense was natural. According to Dositej's words, if God created man so that there would be someone to celebrate him, this means that God exists if man exists as a reasonable being. Otherwise, there is no one to be aware of God's existence, but man also finds the reason for their existence in God and only through him do they become completely conscious. The essential goodness, happiness and virtue are only achieved through a constant fight for the truth. Dositej was convinced that goodness was eternal and evil only existed because of human ignorance and so it would gradually disappear with the advancement of knowledge. Man's constant self-cognizance and moral perfection was the safest road toward God. In addition, Dositej Obradović was a supporter of enlightened absolutism, which showed that his political views were idealistic.

During the thousand-year long unsystematic development of Serbian philosophy, the "reflective appearances of Sava and Dositej and the highest achievements of our national thought and reflection surpassed the boundaries of Serbia and the Balkans with its importance and entered European thought. This importance was primarily in the aspiration for independence, for a nuance of the independent management of world and man, in a specific synthesis of the polarity of the empirical and rational, the realistic and ideal, the practical and reflective - a synthesis

that (in spite of our expressed proneness to extremes) did not know of extremes in this area with any more permanent and deeper importance: for the extremes of mysticism, radical empiricism or radical rationalism and speculation, uncritical optimism or nihilistic pessimism knew nothing of empty scholastic disputes but were mostly concrete and creative, even with certain unquestionable idealistic raptures, therefore it was an integral part of all national life and its social awareness" (p. 155-156).

Although blind western faddishness uncritically followed and artificially imitated every European influence, ignoring the Serbian national tradition, national orientation and its insistence on the autochthony of Serbian thought and spirit, culture and tradition, completely prevailed in the Serbian philosophical thought of the 19th century, and cultural creation in general - capable of taking on supreme world ideals and values without jeopardising this autochthony. The most convenient road for the Serbian collective mind and its supreme individual advances was that of the rationalism and critical observations of the enlightenment, with a significant influence of literary classicism and sentimentalism. Proving itself in a revolutionary-rebellious atmosphere, the massive Serbian freedom-loving spirit tried to affirm itself in the sphere of pure reflection that philosophy represented, the same as in nation, literature and art. But, as a driving force, the romanticist enthusiasm never left it, nor did the traditional Russophilia and Panslavism as the guiding idea. Dositej Obradović liberated it from the excessive conservatism and prejudice that captured and bounded free thought and Vuk Stefanović Karadžić restored an incredible nationalist zeal. He was the first to understand that the successful armed activity of the Serbian national revolution must be followed by a cultural one as an inseparable part and direct extension of the rebel heroism. Following the path of St Sava and Dositej, in many polemical writings, Vuk came down especially harshly on the supporters of the concept that made Serbian culture imitative. He was for the reception of just the positive European heritage, approved and verified, that would not jeopardise the Serbian cultural autochthony and, with it, the national entity, identity, aspirations and goals. On the other hand, Vuk was a fervent fighter against misconceptions, prejudice and outdated patriarchal principles, against ideological dogmas and political rigidity. Contrary to the empty and overblown pseudo-intellectual cosmopolitanism, Vuk dedicated himself to the idea of Serbian populism with a political expression was that later articulated by Pašić's Radicals.

Vuk Karadžić was a marked anti-clerical - an opponent of religious fanaticism and sterile asceticism and supporter of the principle of religious tolerance and the brotherly unity of the Orthodox, Catholic and Muslim Serbs, but also an honest Orthodox who, believing in God, did not question the belief in the immortality of the soul and God's reward or punishment for a man's earthly actions. He found the source of an incredible potential of Serbian critical spirit in the emphasised peasant individualism that was emancipated enough not to forget the collective awareness, values and unity. In addition, he was a marked moralist, social utilitarian and evolutionist. At the basis of his comprehension of

ethics was will, emotions and rationality, though a man also needed science and education to be a true patriot. Truth and justice, the purpose of human existence, are achieved through reflective activism and political fighting, based on a true devotion to man, nation and freedom - to honesty, diligence and humanity. At the same time, he kept the traditional ideals of love, faith and hope as the irreplaceable preconditions for the necessary optimism for life. There was no greater individual benefit for an individual man than the overall recognition of his national community for the results of his creative efforts. This brought true glory and there was no greater pleasure than that. Vuk Karadžić certainly inserted a democratic component into Serbian nationalism which would never again be renounced by the learned nationalists, with the exception of some negligible marginalists. Serbian nationalism was ambitious in its goals and projects, but it was not limited by any narrow-minded one-sidedness.

The beginnings of pure philosophy among the Serbs were based precisely on these idealistic foundations, the concordance and controversy of Dositej and Vuk, the Serbian variant of natural law theories by Jovan Stejić and also Jovan Filipović and Jovan Sterija Popović. However, the philosophy of natural law in its autochthonous Serbian reception and in combination with the supreme reflective expression of Serbian nationalism appeared in the literary works of Petar II Petrović Njegoš, apart from knightly traditions, honour and pride, and he especially affirmed Serbian national unity as the highest value. He believed "that a man could overcome their difficult fate through heroic acts that would bring together the future generations and inspire them to new endeavours in an entirely earthly sense: for a fight for freedom and independence. Drawing his ethical views from the deepest national aspirations for freedom and independence, Njegoš subjected his metaphysics to a realistically national-political task, but his ethics and his physics also had universal importance" (Dragan Jeremić: *On Philosophy Among the Serbs*, Plato, Belgrade 1997, p. 27). Njegoš's philosophical searches often seem desperate, but always had an expressed national and moral sense, so some authors treated his reflective success as a specific philosophy of practical idealism. "In this sense, his philosophy was the highest reflective achievement of the national and social aspirations of the Serbian people for liberation from the centuries-long Turkish oppression. And blended with a highly valued poetical expression, it was also one of the highest achievements of philosophical thought among the Serbs" (p. 27).

The first half of the 19th century was also marked by Uroš Milanković as a representative of the philosophy of historical idealism, but also an ideologist of national progress and democracy in its advanced liberalistic variant, based on the theory of national sovereignty and social contracts within a state with a primary ethic function; Svetozar Miletić enriched Serbian nationalism with republican and secularist ideas; Vladimir Jovanović established modern Serbian liberalism and sociology as a serious science; Lazo Kostić seemed a fervent republican and leading ideologist of the United Serbian Youth; Kosta Branković developed the theory of the social-ethical function of a state; Dimitrije Matić was an ardent Young Hegelian who corrected his teacher, giving supremacy to

the freedom of an individual over the apologetics of a state; Mihailo Ristić was the most prominent Kantian who worked on the synthesis of abstract moral principles; Milan Kujundžić was the first to elaborate on the essence of the concept of the rule of law and the freedom of thought, speech and artistic creation. This was the time of the complete reception of fundamental philosophical knowledge from the areas of ontology, gnoseology, axiology, ethics and aesthetics and many authors showed a special interest, as could be seen, in practical philosophy - especially the philosophy of history and social theory, from which political economy, sociology and politicalology derived.

Zivojin Žujović was the first in Serbia to take over and popularise the basic principles of materialistic philosophy, especially insisting on the principles of social Darwinism and historical determinism. A clear polarisation among the Serbian philosophers formed based on the eastern or western idealistic sources they followed in their spiritual creation, which was precisely defined by Pera Todorović in the following way: "Paris sent empty speakers and pseudo-liberals to Serbia; Vienna – political frauds; Berlin – some obscure people; and only St Petersburg, a few bright spirits, men of action and character and with serious education" (Andrija Stojković: *The Development of Philosophy Among the Serbs 1804-1944*, Slovo ljubve, Belgrade 1972, p. 146). At the end of the 19th century, the abandonment of speculative philosophy and the reorientation to natural philosophy supported by the specific cult of natural sciences became increasingly obvious. This created space for a more significant influence from French spiritual culture and political philosophy, encouraged the penetration of democratic ideas concerning free elections, parliamentarism, the principle of power division and the multi-party system. Marxist and socialist theoretical world views were increasingly propagated by Svetozar Marković, Mita Cenić and Vasa Pelagić inside natural realistic philosophy.

On the opposite side were the natural-scientific positivists, among which geographical determinist Vladimir Jakšić, natural-scientific materialist and historical idealist Josif Pančić, synthetist Vladimir Jovanović, social mechanist Mita Rakić, scientific critic Mihailo Vujić, dialectic evolutionist Lazo Kostić, eclectic Miloš Milovanović, mechanical nihilist Stevan Radosavljević and others were especially distinguished. Ljubomir Nedić, University supporter of formalist logic and rationalist-emotionalist aesthetics, had great importance to the further development of Serbian philosophy and literary criticism also reached the philosophical level at the beginning of the 20th century, especially in the works of its two leading representatives, formalistic positivist Bogdan Popović and sociological positivist and primarily nationalistic ideologist Jovan Skerlić. All great Serbian scientists of their time also made significant philosophical breakthroughs, such as mechanist Kosta Stojanović, materialistic dialectic Nikola Tesla, author of the general mathematical phenomenology Mihailo Petrović Alas or scientific philosopher Jovan Cvijić. Distinguished law and political theoreticians Zivojin Perić, Slobodan Jovanović, Toma Živanović and others were also important. In the philosophy of history, a limited success was achieved by

Božidar Knežević reached the highest degree of systematic shaping of the philosophy of history with his synthetic approach to philosophy as the art of the mind in the history of the universe. He put justice above truth and gave supremacy to axiology and ethics over logic. Understanding history as the greatest philosophy, Knežević believed that true philosophy was "unique among the sciences in that it interprets the origin and order of all things in the universe and philosophy is actually history there: its constituents were all special sciences in specific parts of the world and history synthesises them as the science above all sciences - and, therefore, true philosophy - and determines the place in the universe of every phenomenon" (p. 286). Meanwhile, he followed the principles of materialistic determinism, accepting the monistic world view and its objective laws of order and the proportion of things in the history of the universe and humanity. He did not accept the thesis of the repetition of world history and he insisted on continuous evolution until the peak in the development of nature - human thought and social life - is reached, after which inevitably comes dissolution until everything gradually returned to its original state. This is organised by the primeval spirit, God, who represents the perfection of truth, harmony and reason and is not limited in space or time. Knežević's ontological efforts in the attempt to make the values objective and build a system of moral judgments were especially significant. "While Dositej brought general European philosophical culture and cosmopolitan ethics to the Serbs, which they could assimilate with their positive traditions, and while Njegoš built this ethics and thought into our heroic and liberating patriarchal ethics and thought, giving them unorthodox Orthodox religious cosmic views and justifications, Knežević brought the cosmopolitan and cosmic and our national views to the Serbian and Yugoslav cultures and thoughts in reflective and poetic forms with his upward invasions. Alongside Sava, Dositej, Vuk, Njegoš, Svetozar, Pančić, Skerlić and Cvijić, he was a significant ideologist of our national thought" (p. 300).

The most original philosophical system inside Serbian thought efforts was built by Branislav Petronijević, based on the successful reflective synthesis of Spinoza's and Leibniz's metaphysics, inspired by Berkeley's and Hume's epistemology. Petronijević was the first Serbian philosopher after Ruđer Bošković to gain worldwide reputation, in the complete self-isolation from the general social events of his time, entirely devoted to speculative philosophical reflection on absolute knowledge, logical judgments and axiological principles, ethics and aesthetics, successfully studying the history of philosophy, psychology, mathematics and palaeontology. He gave the most significant and truly original contribution to universal philosophy in the field of metaphysics, "from mono-pluralism and relative coscientialism, monadology, negation principles, the solution of the problem of existence, discreet intensity, amorphous finitism, over the doctrine on two world stages, deduction of the quantitative-qualitative structure of reality, the doctrine on the two

arch-principles of being to the hyper-metaphysical doctrines on the universal and objective values of the principle of substantial cause, the objective impossibility of the general, the identity of the logical and realistic and the deduction of the existence and structure of a being that does not assume anything” (p. 308).

Of all Petronijević’s followers, the most significant results were achieved by Ksenija Atanasijević, who soon got her reflective independence and based her approach to metaphysics on a pessimistic and logistic orientation. “She moderately agnostically believed that the supreme truth would remain forever unattainable to humans; that the efforts of metaphysicists were futile, which meant that all that a man could do was to be satisfied with practical philosophy that did not seek for the scientific-logical proofs but the achievement of a practical goal – consolation. The Christian ethics of consolation that leads to tranquillity in the anticipation of eternal life, outlined by this and the work of Anica Savić-Rebac, our greatest woman thinker, still had a specific emotional-rational metaphysical foundation. She was not a pure mystic but (similar to Miloš Đurić) demanded a synthesis of the mystic and rational” (p. 377).

Miloš Đurić contributed the most to Serbian national orientation in philosophy, creating a successful ideological synthesis of Serbian nationalism and antique Hellenic wisdom. He successfully theoretically outlined the Vidovdan philosophy of Serbian nationalism and the Serbian ethics of heroism and, on the other hand, he “permanently directed his thought with inspirations from the Hellenic world as directions in the fight of the Serbian people for political and cultural affirmation” (p. 348). As Stojković pointed out, “by connecting the Hellenic and our national wisdoms, Đurić represented ‘the Kosovo ethics’ of humanism and the fighting spirit, tragic heroic optimism, heroism and sacrifice for the community [...] with the elements of the ideals of the supreme man of Dostoevsky and other teachings with which Đurić wanted to give a cosmic dimension to our national ethics” (p. 487). Đurić’s Serbian nationalism, Russophilia and Panslavism were based on universally human ethical values, confronted with the rapidly deteriorating contemporary Western culture, which he found Faustian, but were also full of hope for the projection of Slavic messianism with primeval love of freedom and humanity that was not poisoned with Western decadence.

Within the Serbian Orthodox theology of the 20th century, two great thinkers of significant theological achievements appeared. The theological and philosophical thought of Nikolaj Velimirović was markedly nationalist, combat-activist and anti-Communist. “Having passed through many schools and suffered the influences of Christianity, Russian Orthodoxy and the mystical thoughts of Buddhism, Brahmanism and Confucianism - a range of thinkers from Socrates, Christ and Buddha to Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Nietzsche and especially Dimitrije Mitrinović - he was a great erudite whose imagination and emotions prevailed over an otherwise powerful intellect” (p. 396). On the other hand, the ascetic and mystic thinker Justin Popović developed a wholesome world view that was entirely “directed against western papism as the cause of the modern ‘agony of humanism’ by transferring the foundations of Christianity ‘from

an eternal God-human to a evanescent man’ and directed against the Eastern-Orthodox ‘humanism and realism’ whose ‘prophet and apostle’ for him was Dostoevsky. He believed that ‘a Serb of St Sava found the roads to salvation’ on the roads of Orthodox humanism” (p. 412).

In the period between the two world wars, Serbian philosophical thought achieved a full maturity that could be seen in the appearance of rounded individual systems, the analysis of all the segments of a philosophical problem of ethics and the attainment of a standard European level in their elaboration. After WWII, Serbian philosophy fell into a deep crisis due the suppression of the freedom of creation under the Communist dictatorship and the official imposition of the Marxist world view as the only allowed one. An enormous amount of spiritual energy was wasted for decades on scholastic rumination on the basic Marxist dogmas and the competition of academic groups over the question of orthodox beliefs. Traditional philosophical thought was painstakingly and slowly restored and it has still not fully recovered.

Chapter II

HOW THE CROATS SEIZED THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE

1. The Emigrant Fate is Always Tragic

The tragedy that happened to the Serbian people in the mid 20th century halted our social and state development and directed it into the dead end of history. The Communist revolution bloodily quelled every freedom-loving and democratic thought, idea and project, imposed a dictatorship and literally liquidated everyone whom the new power-holders even assumed could eventually oppose the insanity and anarchy.

Hundreds of thousand of Serbs sought salvation in emigration. Many war prisoners from German concentration camps refused to return to the country after they were liberated. Thousands of fighters for the betrayed alternative resistance, a large number of civilians and intellectuals, but also members of occupying administrative and political apparatus rushed towards the western borders to seek refuge, mostly overseas.

In their circle, a large number of emigrant political and cultural organisations and publicist activity developed but, in time, there was a specific fatigue of the material. Rich and successful people quickly blended into the establishment of western countries, leaving patriotism to the poor. The number of people who persisted in freedom-loving activities and patriotism constantly decreased because they often had to wander in permanent material shortage.

Still however, although sometimes they even lacked bread, they created and left grandiose intellectual and publicist work as a legacy for their people. Among them, the highest pre-war position was certainly occupied by Professor Lazo Kostić of the Law School in Subotica. He invested enormous energy into patiently digging through key archives and libraries, collecting a grandiose amount of scientific material and giving over eighty books to his people, in which he processed every

current and historical problems related to the Serbian national question in detail, about which no one could speak in the homeland for decades in fear of life.

At the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s, as a young assistant senior lecturer of the Faculty of Political Sciences in Sarajevo, I encountered some of Kostić's books for the first time, read them in secret and spread critical observations and patriotic views. All of his works are quite applicable today so I decided to present them in more detail to the readers of *Great Serbia* in several instalments and, at the same time, impelled the company Information and Business System of Zemun to prepare the collected works of Professor Lazo Kostić for print as a part of its publishing activity, hoping that a fair contract with the heirs of his authorship rights would be made. This was unquestionably an intellectual opus that would have a long-term significance for the development of our legal, political and sociological thought and be an encouragement for the further thorough historical research.

2. Biographical Records

Professor Doctor Lazo M. Kostić was born on 15 March 1897 in the village of Krtole near Kotor, in Serbian Boka, to a priest family that belonged to the respectable Plamenac brotherhood. He finished a six-year elementary school in his place of birth and the first four grades of a classical gymnasium in Kotor and Zadar, but then ended up expelled from all schools because of his nationalist activity and opposition to the Austrian anti-Serbian policy. He continued his gymnasium education in Cetinje and completed it in Sremski Karlovci. In 1919, he entered the Law School of Belgrade and graduated with the highest marks. As a state scholarship holder, he defended a doctoral dissertation on public law at the Faculty of Economy in Frankfurt am Main in 1923. He soon defended another doctoral thesis entitled *Parliamentary Elections and Statistics*. He worked as a secretary of State Statistics for a while, from 1926, he was elected an associate professor of public law and statistics at the Subotica department of the Law School of Belgrade and, in 1938, he became a regular professor at the Economic-Commercial High School in Belgrade. When the 1941 April War started, he was in the position of dean. He published a large number of scientific and expert works and his course-books of Administrative Law in three volumes, Constitutional Rights and Statistics were especially significant. He was a prominent member of the Radical Party.

Under German occupation, on 1 May 1941, Lazo Kostić accepted the position of traffic commissary in the Commission Directorate of occupied Serbia but, on the 21 June, he showed great personal courage when he resigned in protest because the German occupying forces did not prevent the Croatian genocide against the Serbian people. He believed that the occupying forces should be passively resisted but he soon connected with the resistance movement of General Draža Mihailović and joined his armed forces near the end of the war, in spite of his bad health due to a serious heart condition. He was not employed

during the occupation and he supported his family solely through the sale of his assets.

Near the end of the war, he escaped to Italy with several of his fellow-fighters, and immediately afterwards to Switzerland, where he remained for the rest of his life, sustaining himself by working in a factory and suffering all sorts of humiliation and molestation. He never renounced the citizenship of his country and, when he attained the refugee status and a regular monthly income in the amount of \$50, he began scientific research with a fanatical zeal, digging through the Library of Zurich and preparing an enormous amount of scientific material for a number of books on national problems. Many emigrants helped him print his works or collect newspapers, magazines and books. He never had any profit. Everything he would earn after publishing a book, he would invest in the following publication and he personally lived in a very ascetic manner. It is assumed that he published over 2,000 articles in various emigrant papers, mostly in *Canadian Serb-Defender* and *Brotherhood* from Toronto and *Freedom* from Chicago.

It is certain that no one in Serbian historiography ever collected as much scientific material as Professor Kostić, who personally translated texts from German and Italian literature, insisting on the strict authenticity of the original and the precision of the citations. Even those who attacked him the most in the newspapers could not deny the authenticity of the documents. In his late years, he lived in a nursing home, but he wrote until his last breath. He died on 27 January 1979.

3. The Recognition of Distinguished Serbian Emigrants

Although he was kept a secret in his homeland for decades, in emigration, professor Kostić gained respect of distinguished contemporaries and, in the book *The Statements of Recognition*, published in Munich in 1966, he presented selected letters from the most prominent Serbian national fighters that he had received on various occasions. In this way, Uroš Seferović, PhD, wrote that Laza Kostić was of the greatest value to Serbian emigration. On 6 June 1986, Vidak Celović said to him that: "This rabble barks at you, but dogs bark after a good horse runs by and raises the dust and no one notices a hack. You have made your name eternal in Serbia and the following generations are to judge your actions." On 17 July 1956, Major Petar Martinović Bajica called him "the most active fighter with a pen against the Communists and Ustashas" and, on 2 January 1958, Milutin Bajčetić wrote: "Many times have I thanked God for giving you the strength, reason and dedication to heal the painful Serbian wounds with your pen, for which we, the Serbs, are to blame a lot and are great sinners of the troubles that fell of the Serbdom."

On 21 August 1962, the distinguished Serbian politician and former Member of Parliament Omer Kajmaković spoke to Laza Kostić: "I believe, without any exaggeration that you did more for Serbdom than any other emigrant Serb, even more than certain groups and organisations of Serbs abroad. The efforts you made and the material

you collected and arranged in the time and troubles that have happened to us – your works are a unique case in our historiography. You cleansed the name of the Serbian nation from the perfidious slanders of Croatian separatists with the weapons of historical facts.” On 10 May 1958, Alija Konjodžić wrote to him, saying, among other things, that: “There are few Serbian toilers and especially scientists who followed nothing but the interests of the Serbian people in their work, as you did.”

On 16 December 1960, Dušan Sedlar said to Professor Kostić: “You serve Serbdom and give a capital value to the documentation in your books and it will one day have crucial importance to the decision of what is Serbian and how far it extends.” On 6 September 1961, a meticulous and devoted Serbian emigrant of the younger generation, Đorđe Đelić, wrote: “It is Serbian luck and blessing from God that a knight of your kind and strength is our leader in spirit, morality, character and identity today.” On 11 February 1957, Milan Gavrilović, PhD, pointed out in a letter to Laza Kostić that: “Your scientific work is unquestionably very useful to the emigration, but I am sure that it will be even more useful as soon as the country is liberated.” There were hundreds of such testimonies and statements to the man who dedicated his entire life to the Serbian national idea, the fight for liberation and the unification of the Serbian people.

4. World Linguistics on the Traits of the Serbian Language

On the occasion of the hundredth anniversary since the death of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić in 1964, Lazo Kostić published a brochure *On Serbian Language. Statements of Foreigners* in Hamilton, Canada, in the edition of the Serbian National Defence. In the preface, Kostić said: “Vuk did not create the Serbian language, he did not even create the Serbian literary idiom, he did not modify it, he did not add or subtract a word. But he fixed this language and this meant a lot. After him, there was no more oscillation in the writing. He approved and proclaimed the best Serbian dialect, Herzegovinian, as the general Serbian dialect. He pointed out this dialect, in which almost every folk song was written. He gave it an outer literary form, establishing and simplifying our writing” (p. 7).

The founder of modern Slavistics Jozef Dobrovsky, who was a Jesuit and head of the Catholic Faculty of Theology, claimed that the Serbian language was the only direct and unquestionable descendant of old-Slavic, while other Slavic languages did not develop from it at all, but separate from it. He explained this in the following way: “Cyril was from Thessaloniki and, in this way, he learned and spoke Serbian in his youth” (p. 14). Jernej Kopitar also wrote on this at the beginning of the 19th century: “It is, therefore, seen that the dialect of two brothers – apostles, who had to learn it in their childhood in their birth place of Thessaloniki, was the old-Serbian dialect that was there to rise as the literary language of the Slavs” (p. 14).

Admiring the Serbian language, Jacob Grimm wrote in the preface to Vuk’s *Grammar of the Serbian Language*: “Could many nations of the

educated world, whose literature is now fully flourishing, enjoy a language so rich in words and forms, so picturesque and noble as this abused language of shepherds, the Serbian language, that sounded so pleasantly southern under the south skies” (p. 21). Grimm considered Serbian to be the most beautiful and most perfect Slavic language and also piqued interest of the greatest German poet of all times, Johann Wolfgang Goethe, who ascertained in 1824 that: “The Slavic language was divided into two main dialects, northern and southern. Russian, Polish and Czech belong to the former; the Slovenians, Bulgarians and Serbs belong to the latter” (p. 22). In 1829, Russian officer Otto von Pirsch stated: “Amid its mild sound and development, the Serbian language had the same place among Slavic languages that Italian had among Roman languages” (p. 25). The greatest German Slavist of the 20th century, Gerhard Gesemann wrote in 1930 that: “A Dinarian was a born speaker, who was a master of his national language”. This language is full of sound, enriched by four musical accents, lapidary, grammatically and synthetically unusually clear, expressive and picturesque, with a powerful wealth of words full of spiritual and actual nuances, used in all the registers of tribal and peasant eloquence in a noble, logical manner, but still with pathos and dignity” (p. 27).

The famous travelogue writer Felix Philipp Kanitz admired the Serbian language: “regarding melody, the Serbian language is the Italian among the Slavic languages, according to the statements of the most famous philologists of all nations [...] the Serbian language is exactly the same in villages and towns. It is slang free [...] the Serbian language is rich but, at the same time, short and energetic, with speech construction very simple; especially suitable for public discussions [...] the Serbian language stands out with its characteristic ability to form the great wealth of its linguistic treasure (plenty of expressions) and poetic spirit that even an ordinary peasant developed in everyday talk through the number of epithets that have become typical, symbolically used expressions, assurances, wishes, oaths and proverbs [...] The Croats also took Serbian as their written language instead of their folk dialect, approximately 35 years ago” (p. 28).

In 1840, French geographer Ami Boué wrote: “Among the Slavic languages, Serbian is what Latin is in relation to the languages derived from that. In this way, a Serb can more easily understand Russian than a Russian can understand Serbian” (p. 30).

Lazo Kostić’s dispute *Vuk and the Germans* was added to the study on Serbian language and, according to the statements of foreigners and its author, it connected the colossal literary success of Vuk Karadžić with the fact that Vuk worked in Vienna, in German surrounding. Had Vuk created in Hungary, where the Serbian cultural centre was located, conservative priests would quickly and easily have suppressed his reforms of language and orthography. His chances for success were even weaker in the Serbian principedom or some other Serbian country. All Slavists, except Russian ones, published their scientific works in German and Vienna was their main centre. Vuk befriended the greatest world intellectuals of his time and their influence on his work was very

clearly expressed. However, he also brought Serbia closer to Europe this way. As a Russian Slavist and Professor of Warsaw University, Platon Kulakowski said: The historical records of Vuk Karadžić could be seen as the beginning of the recognition of the Serbian people in Europe, because there were very few records that spoke of Serbia and the Serbian dialect before him. The name of the Serbian people, completely unknown until recently and forgotten over the centuries, gained sympathies for the newly established principedom in Europe. In this view, he also might have done more than any other Serbian writer before and after him” (p. 56).

5. The Theft of the Serbian Language

Lazo Kostić began his dispute published in 1964 in Baden, Switzerland, under this name, with the statement that the Croats were the only nation in the world that did not have their own language, invoking a famous ethnographer Guillaume Lejean, who stated in his book *The Ethnography of European Turkey* that there were no two Slavists with same opinions on the question of what the Croats were, which language they spoke and how they were geographically dispositioned. Vatroslav Jagić himself, the most famous Croatian Slavist, commented on the attitude of Jozef Dobrovsky, who “maintained that only the Kaikavian dialect of Croatia was Croatian according to the factual relations of that time, everything else was either Illyrian or Serbian for him” (p. 6).

Pavel Jozef Šafárik agreed with Dobrovsky and stated in his works that Serbian was spoken in Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slavonia and Dalmatia: “And for him, only the three former counties of provincial Croatia where Kaikavian was mostly spoken were unquestionably Croatian” (p. 6). On the other hand, Jernej Kopitar believed that the Kaikavian Croats were pure Slovenians and accepted only the littoral Chakavians as true Croats. He also considered all the Shtokavians to be Serbs, so he said: “Under Serbian (the language), we here imply what was sufficiently unhistorically called Illyrian [...] The area of the Serbian dialect spread from Istria, over Dalmatia, Croatian Krajina, Bosnia, Serbia and Bulgaria to the colonies of emigrants from these countries in Slavonia and South Hungary” (p. 7). Kopitar considered the Croatian language to be a sub-set of Slovenian and all the authors of that time agreed that refugees from Croatia that had spread over Austria and Hungary actually spoke the Croatian language.

This view was confirmed by Vatroslav Jagić in the study *Slavic Languages*, in which he wrote: “The Chakavian dialect of Northern Dalmatia, Istra and the islands was called Croatian from ancient times [...] In Northern Croatia, north of the Kupa and Korana Rivers to Mura and to the east, over Sisak to Virovitica, the Kaikavian dialect prevailed from ancient times, very close to the language of the western neighbours of Styria, but still not identical. The people now call it Croatian and, until the end of the 17th century, the entire area between the Sava and Drava Rivers was called Slavonia; the Latin-Hungarian form of the name corresponded to the term ‘Slavic Kingdom’ or ‘Slavic’, therefore the name ‘Slavic language’, as it was exclusively called in the printed works

of the 16th and 17th centuries. Perhaps this dialect sometimes spread over Virovitica under the same name; however, during Turkish rule, the present-day Slavonia received a new population that came from the other side of the Sava River and spoke Shtokavian. This is why the Kaikavian dialect was now limited to the north-western part of the former *Regnum Slavoniae* that has carried the name Croatia since the 17th century [...] The Shtokavian dialect of Northern Dalmatia and Bosnia (with the exception of Dubrovnik and Boka) received the same name (Croatian) for religious reasons so that it would be different to (the languages of) Eastern Orthodoxy, whose members were called Serbs” (p. 10-11).

Kostić also listed a number of authors from the 17th and 18th centuries who made a clear distinction between the Serbian and Croatian languages, identifying Croatian as Chakavian and locating it in the littoral Dalmatian and Croatian areas in the north, which Dalmatia neighbored. Bosnian, Slavonian and Dubrovian dialects were clearly different and identified as Serbian. Bartol Kašić, Johannes Lucius, Pergošić, Vramec, Anton Verantius and Juraj Križanić all wrote about this. In the 17th century, Johannes Lucius wrote: “However, the Dalmatians and their neighbouring Slavs did not call the language Slavic but Croatian or Serbian, according to the dialect in question” (p. 12). Kostić said: “At the time, the Dalmatians called their language (Chakavian) Croatian, but even then, according to Lucius’s testimony, there were Serbs in Dalmatia and its surroundings in the mid 17th century. Because apparently only Serbs called their language Serbian?” (p. 12).

Even then, Chakavian as a Croatian language was different to Kaikavian, which was historically called Slavic and was actually Slovenian. In the 19th century, Ivan Kukuljević wrote on this, mentioning Bishop Petar of Zagreb who lived from 1610 until 1667: “Petretić always called his Kaikavian dialect, or as he said: ‘the dialect of Zagreb’, the Slavic language, knowing quite well that the true Croatian language lay over the Sava River and especially beyond the Kupa River.” The Croats were very clearly territorially located south of the northern Sava River and south of the Kupa River. This was in accordance with other historical sources, which testified that the Croats lived in the territory of present-day Kordun, Banija, Lika, Bosnian Krajina and Dalmatia above Šibenik, from which they fled in front of the Turks and almost disappeared historically.

This same historian Kukuljević spoke in Parliament of the Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia: “The language spoken by our Croatian people beneath Okiš, around Samobor, in Zagorje and the Torovo field was not purely Croatian according to linguistic laws, although it is called this way [...] This Slavic name was given by our entire people in the 17th and 18th centuries” (p. 12-13). Another particularly significant Croatian historian who primarily studied literary history was Dragutin Prohaska, whom Kostić quoted: “Catholic Bosnian writers almost always called their language ‘Bosnian’ and they quite rarely called the language of those who lived in Dalmatia or special Croatian territory ‘Croatian’ [...] He mentioned friar Divković who called his language ‘Bosnian’ and the Cyrillic script Serbian. Then the writer continued: “The Orthodox Bosnians were especially called Serbian: there were numerous proofs of this in Serbian

Orthodox literature” (p. 13).

At the beginning of the 19th century, a nobleman from Split named Petar Markije formed the Slavic Academy and said of the Slavic language that it was the general mother tongue in Dalmatia and, during entire existence of the Academy, “not a word was heard or published of the Croatian language in it” (p. 13). Somewhere around that time, Modrušić wrote a tractate in which he stated: “If you ask old or young people which language they spoke, all except the soldiers, who were used to following Croatian military commands from leaders, would answer: Rascian or Slavonian. And if you name it Croatian, they would mock you and make fun of you in the territory with the same name” (p. 14). As Kostić commented, “they called their language Serbian (Rascian) or Slavonian. Only the veterans occasionally said they spoke Croatian because they were instructed in this way in the army. If someone else said so, the people would ridicule them” (p. 14).

Kostić also stated the records of a professor at the University in Buda and a Catholic priest, otherwise a poet and archaeologist, the Slavonian Matija Petar Katančić who wrote at the end of the 18th century that: “The Croats – and I say this from personal experience – called us Thracians (Rascians) and Illyrians, who were significantly different in dialect to them, the Vlachs” (p. 14). Therefore, every Shtokavian, whether Orthodox or Catholic, was called a Vlach: “In the same book (Buda edition 1778), Katančić wrote that the Montenegrins, Serbs, Bosniaks and Serbs in Hungary spoke the same language as the Dalmatians and differed from the Croats (p. 108).” It was not at all a coincidence that Vatroslav Jagić said that the Kaikavian Croatian dialect was “a legitimate language that had an independent position in literature for all of four centuries” (p. 15).

Aside from Miklošić, Stanko Vraz also wrote in 1843 that Chakavian alone was the true Croatian language and that it was spoken in the littoral area, the area of Zadar and in the littoral and Dalmatian islands. In 1886, Ivan Broz, a famous philologist, also wrote in the book *Examples of Croatian Literature*: “In 1857, Đuro Daničić, the best connoisseur of the Croatian language aside from Vuk, wrote a dispute in which he showed the distinctions between the Croatian and Serbian languages, considering the Chakavian dialect to be the Croatian language and the Shtokavian dialect the Serbian language, while the Kaikavian dialect was the characteristic dialect of the Slavic language. Constantly dealing with the Croatian language, this great scholar studied every phenomenon in the Croatian language and its history as no one before him had” (p. 15).

In 1858, Father Grga Martić, a famous Bosnian Franciscan, said in a letter to the Society of Serbian Letters that the Bosnian language was Serbian and the famous Dalmatian scientist Natko Nodilo claimed that the Serbs were Shtokavians and the Croats were Chakavians. Even Fran Kurelac, a follower of Ljudevit Gaj and a great linguistic authority, believed that the Serbian language was Shtokavian, the Slovenian Kaikavian and the Croatian only Chakavian. According to Baltazar Bogišić’s words, it could be questioned whether the true Croats were Kaikavians, Chakavians or the inhabitants of Hungary and Burgenland, but he could not imagine them outside these territories.

In the work *Travels Through Herzegovina, Bosnia and Old Serbia*, the famous Russian diplomat and historian Alexander Fyodorovich Gilferding noticed how strong the Serbian national identity was among all Orthodox Serbs, regardless of where they lived, while he said of the Serbs of the Catholic religion: “A Catholic Serb denied everything Serbian because it was Orthodox and they do not know of the Serbian homeland and the Serbian past. For them, there was only a narrow provincial homeland; they called themselves Bosnian, Herzegovinian, Dalmatian, Slovenian, according to the territory in which they were born. They did not call their language Serbian but Bosnian, Dalmatian, Slovenian etc. If they wanted to generalise the concept of this language, they called it ‘our language’. For example, they asked foreigners: ‘Do you speak our language’. But they could not explain which language was ‘our language’. Therefore, they did not know how to call the language by its true name because they did not have a general homeland or general national name outside their narrow area, they had only one homeland: the Roman-Catholic Church” (p. 17).

A Croatian philologist, Marsel Kušar wrote in a similar way: “The Slavic Serbo-Croatian dialect that prevailed in Dalmatia was called the Croatian language by the people there, in the entire north and middle Dalmatia and on the islands of this part of Dalmatia. In South Dalmatia from the Neretva River and all the way to the end and also on the islands of Korčula, Lastovo, Mljet and the smaller ones around Dubrovnik, the Catholics responded to the question of their language with just ‘our language’ [...] (while the Orthodox, according to Kušar, always said they spoke the ‘Serbian language’)” (p. 18). A great number of authors wrote that the Croats forgot their national name centuries ago, lost their historical memory and their national identity. Between the two wars, the Croatian politician and publicist Milan Banić wrote: “Not only did the Serbs penetrate into the western-most parts of Croatia but Serbdom injected fresh blood into Croatia, inserted a part of its firmness and activism into its mentality, liberated the Croatian national soul and imposed their language, their folk songs and most of their customs and habits on Croatia” (p. 18).

Even foreign authors expressed similar attitudes. For example, the German Slavist Ernest von Eberg wrote that Serbian was spoken all over Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro, Dalmatia, Slavonia and the eastern part of Croatia, while Rudolf Rost wrote that the Croatian language was spoken only in the counties of Zagreb, Kričevo and Varaždin and that it was a lot closer to Slovenian than Serbian. Johann Christian von Engel, Ludwig Albrecht Gebhardi and Nikola Tomazec had similar opinions. And in the book *Dubrovian Literature*, the Dubrovian Catholic prebendary don Ivan Stojanović pointed out: “A famous historian named Engel scolded Zlatarić for calling the language of Dalmatia Croatian, saying that it was completely wrong, since this language was purely Serbian and that the Croatian name was mentioned only because Dalmatia had political links with Croatia through Hungary for a while” (p. 21).

Until the Illyrian renaissance, the Croats did not have a literary

language at all and it was quite unclear to them what the Croatian language actually was, but not a single author considered Shtokavian to be Croatian, but an exclusively Serbian language. All historical documents show that, until the 17th century, all Shtokavians called themselves Serbs and the chakavians Croats. Only in the 17th and 18th centuries, the Catholic authors tried to blur the essence of the Serbian language, calling it Illyrian or Slavic. On the other hand, in the 19th century, when the Illyrian renaissance gained its full momentum, a large number of European Slavists considered the Croatian language to be one of the Serbian dialects - like Miklošić, Leskien, Frederick Gustav, Einhoff, Johann Severin Vater, Rosen Friedrich, Karl Bruckmann, Wiegand or Pierre Larousse. It appeared to us in accordance with what was written in the *Dictionary of the Italian language* by Nikola Tomazeo: "The Serbian language [...] was one of the four idioms, not dialects, of the Slavic peoples [...] It was spoken in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Zagorje Dalmatia and Serbia. The Croatian dialect and their race were only degenerations" (p. 27). See: Nicolo Tommaseo e Bernardo Bellini – *Dizionario della lingua italiana*. Volume quinto, s.v. Torino 1929, where it says: "Il dialetto croato, comme razzala, e una degenerazione."

Why was the Croatian language historically destined to fail? As opposed to Serbia and Bulgaria, where the folk language was generally accepted even by the feudal lords and the Slavic language became the language of liturgy and literary creation, in medieval Croatia, Latin was the exclusive official language, so that, in the 200 years of Croatian existence from Ljudevit Posavski to Petar Svačić, there was not a single written trace left of the Slavic language - not even an inscription in stone.

After the loss of state independence in the 1102 *Pacta Conventa*, Latin was also the only official language until the beginning of the 19th century and when, in 1805, at the Vice-regency Council of all Hungary, a decision was made that the Hungarian language was obligatory, the Croatian Parliament disagreed, demanding to keep Latin because, as Ferdo Šišić wrote, "all laws and records were written in this language - which was as ancient as this kingdom and its constitution and, if it was abolished, a culture and nation that could not understand its rights and laws would fail" (p. 35). But still, in 1827, the Croatian Parliament decided that the Hungarian language would be introduced in all schools as obligatory, so that the children would study it every day.

a) The Foreign Leaders of the Illyrian Movement

Immediately before WWII, a German publicist, Gilbert in der Maur, wrote: "Serbian folk did not accept the language of the Ottoman masters. In Croatian and Slovenian areas it was different. The "educated" spoke German, Latin and even Hungarian. The upper class limited to the foreign court nobility did not care at all about the folk and folk language" (p. 42). The Croatian language was neglected for centuries until it was forgotten, more impressively than in the case of the Scots, Welsh or Irish. This is why it seemed easier to the leaders of the Illyrian renaissance to accept another complete and developed literary language - Serbian - as their

own. This was so grotesque that, in 1852, Antun Mažuranić wrote: "The most respectable of our men could not speak even ten words in our language harmoniously and with sophistication [...] Even a few years ago, almost no one knew of the older Dubrovian literature and even those who did could not understand it. Most learned Croats did not know that the Croats and those who called themselves Croatian did not recognize the Croats from other territories" (p. 44).

Before the Illyrian renaissance, not a single Croatian spoke the Shtokavian language, but the Catholic Serbs did. The leaders of Illyrism did not want to call this language Serbian for political reasons, but it seemed inappropriate to present it as Croatian, so they turned to an incredible mimicry, presenting themselves as members of an extinct Balkan people - the Illyrians. It appeared covenant to them to put both the Croats and Serbs under the term Illyrian, primarily aiming to denationalise the Catholic Serbs. The leaders of the Illyrian renaissance "were mostly foreigners; the main actor, Ludwig ('Ljudevit') Gaj was a German, born in Croatia, but with German as his mother tongue (his father emigrated to Croatia)" (p. 45). In 1846, Gaj completely openly spoke about his accomplishments. "The entire world knows and recognises that we raised the Illyrian literature; however, it never crossed our minds to confirm that this was not Serbian but the Illyrian language, so we are proud and thankful to great God that we Croats share the literary language with our Serbian brethren" (p. 46). He sincerely regretted that Pavle Riter Vitezović did not write his eight-volume Serbian history in folk Serbian, but in the Latin language. In a discussion with Ante Starčević, Ljudevit Gaj further said: "How can we argue about what was national and what was not for the Serbs; the Serbs, to whom there was nothing, from the altar to the shepherd, that was not national. The Serbs, from whom we must learn the language in its wisdom and wealth and customs in their excellence and purity if we want to restore the Illyrian life" (p. 46).

Gaj's main associate, Ivan Derkos, was even more open concerning the linguistic and orthographic reforms of Illyrian and, in 1832, he wrote "that the Croats would attract the Serbs with this language, not only those in Hungary (Vojvodina) but also those around the Sava River (in Serbia) because their language would not be different to the common language of the three kingdoms (i.e. Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia)" (p. 46). Šime Ljubić, the Croatian historian and theologian, wrote at the same time that: "The present-day Croats, who are few, determinedly renounced their mixed origin (language) after Gaj asked them to do so ... and they seriously accepted the so-called Serbian linguistic moods and forms ... until the break in the teaching and public life" (p. 47). Sometime later, in 1885, Ignjat Weber-Tkalčević said in an assembly of the *Matica Hrvatska Society*: "that some Croatian writers increasingly accepted the manner of writing that was usually called Serbian and which was Shtokavian, and he only called this language Croatian because some Croats used it today" (p. 48).

In the wake of WWI, Croatian publicist Milan Marjanović wrote: "Gaj had to act very carefully and controlled so that he would not lose the

possibility of any action. He first introduced a unique phonetic orthography for the Latin script. In the first year, he used this orthography but the Kaikavian dialect, because he knew that he had to win over the Croats from the old Croatian Provincial first. In the second year, Gaj introduced Shtokavian in the newspapers and literature. In two years time, he wanted to begin publishing papers using both Latin and Cyrillic scripts and then to take only the Cyrillic for the western part of the nation. This plan failed, especially because the censorship of Vienna prohibited publications in Cyrillic script and Gaj could not ruin the entire act of national awakening because of this, lose his place in Vienna's good books and cause the Hungarisation of the entire western part of the nation and put the part that would possibly join the Serbs in the position of the Hungarian Serbs" (p. 49).

Right before WWII, another significant scientist, Vladimir Dvorniković, wrote: "Kaikavian Zagreb became a fanatical guardian of the classical - Vuk's Herzegovinian Iekavian speech, one for which a true Kaikavian had no trace of inborn feeling or ear" (p. 49). At the beginning of the 20th century, Croatian writer Ivan Krnic publicly advocated the acceptance of Ekavian by the Croats and Josif Smodlaka PhD., a Dalmatian Croatian politician, wrote that only one thirtieth of the Croats, or three to four percents, were born Iekavians.

b) The Croats are an Artificial Nation

The political goals of the Illyrians were directed towards gathering the old Croatian lands in which a complete alteration of the ethnic structure of the population had been performed for centuries. The Croats went far north from Dalmatia, the Bosnian Krajina and Slavonia and these areas were gradually inhabited by the Serbs and many of them denationalised, converting to Catholicism because the Serbian national identity was only preserved inside the borders of the shattered and dissipated, but spiritually strengthened and unyielding Serbian Orthodox Church. After the Illyrian name was prohibited by the 1843 imperial decree, the conditions were already made for Illyrism to turn into Croatiandom and for the systematic incorporation of all Catholic Serbs into the Croatian national corpus. The present-day Croats are obviously a completely new and artificial nation made of denationalised Serbs and they had very little in common with the original Croats – about as much actually as the born Chakavians and Kaikavians today are a part of the general Croatian population.

In 1867, the Dubrovian prince and distinguished Serbian intellectual Medo Pucić wrote in the Italian magazine *New Anthology* that "if a dialect was sufficient to determine a nation, then the Slavs from Croatia and Slavonia belonged to the Serbian branch in Slavonia and the Military Frontier and to the Carniolan branch in Civilian Croatia. However, the Croats, having formulated their views of the future, accepted the Serbian language as official, Serbian literature as their own, Serbian land as their native one, only giving them the Croatian name" (p. 55). Another great Dubrovian Serb and Catholic priest, Ivo Stojanović, wrote in 1990: "Didn't the great Croatian writers themselves, like Broz, Gaj, Preradović,

Mažuranić and others, recognised that they should turn to Serbian sources for the literary language, mostly to the Dubrovian literature that was the first Serbian daughter" (p. 55). In 1890, Marko Car, a Serbian Catholic writer from Zadar, wrote a study on Slavic literature and art in Latin and pointed out: "The Illyrian language, shattered in different anarchist dialects beforehand, harassed with five or six different orthographies, identified itself with the essential language – the Tuscan among the Slavic languages – that is spoken in Belgrade, Dubrovnik and Cetinje today" (p. 55-56).

The emperor's friend and political leader of littoral Serbs, Sava Bjelanović, wrote that "the Croatian Gaj received help in Belgrade in 1848 and borrowed the Serbian language from the Serbs and took it to his Zagreb. Belgrade also gave its Daničić to Zagreb, who wrote the monumental *Dictionary* and who also called the Serbian language Croatian, for the love of accord but against scientific truth and his own belief. Now the Croatian writers had to learn the language from Serbian books and the *Matica Hrvatska Society* had to cleanse its books – full of mixtures and German coin words, Zagreb Slavicism and an unintelligible patchwork of new words – on the Serbian basis, sooner or later" (p. 56).

Milovan Milovanović PhD, a professor at the Belgrade University and Serbian Prime minister, wrote in the 1895 study *The Serbs and Croats*: "Having realised that the Croats could not be idle in the matter of the creation of an independent literary language under the current circumstances and that, even if its creation succeeded, this independent Croatian language would not have the necessary conditions to retain its independent character permanently, Ljudevit Gaj and his friends decided to entirely accept the Serbian literary language as the Croatian literary language" (p. 56-57). Even the Protopope Dimitrije Ruvarac of Zemun, brother of the famous historian Archimandrite Ilarion, stated in his 1895 book *This Is What We Blame You For* that "the present-day Croats, or 'Kaikavians' and 'chakavians' that we consider the only true Croats today, although the former are more Croato-Slovenians and Croato-Carniolans than pure Croats, accepted the Serbian language as their literary language." They were significantly different to the Serbs of the catholic religion who now declared themselves and felt Croatian, "although they were not actually and they called themselves *Sokci*, Slavonians, Dalmatians, Bosnians until recently" (p. 57).

c) The Political Goals of Illyrism

In 1942, even the great Serbian poet Jovan Dučić wrote in Chicago that Ljudevit Gaj got carried away with the Serbian language, national uprising and Vuk's reforms, so he formed "the idea that the Croats should also take over the Serbian literary speech, following the pattern of Vuk's folk songs. In Zagorje, the Croatian language was Kaikavian and on the islands it was Chakavian, so Gaj thought that the Croats should accept Serbian Shtokavian. Dalmatia and Slavonia already used this speech because the Serbs settled there over a period of several centuries. This acceptance of Serbian Shtokavian, Gaj thought, would untie the

Croatian lands. And since all Dubrovian literature was written in Serbian Shtokavian, as were the Serbian songs, the acceptance of the Serbian literary language would mean the annexation of Dubrovnik to Croatia instead of leaving it to the Serbs [...] This was the principal act of the Illyrism” (p. 58-59).

Dučić completely saw through the Croatian literary-linguistic policy. “To avoid any misunderstanding, it is necessary to say that the Croats did not perform this moral renaissance, taking a foreign literary language for their own (which is certainly unprecedented among nations), without any great spiritual reason. The Croats did not write anything of significance in Kaikavian (which the Slovenians consider their own national language). In Chakavian, that is only considered unquestionably and exclusively Croatian in philology, they could not go far because it did not show the possibility of further development” (p. 59).

In the book *The Memories of My Life*, published in Belgrade in 1926, the greatest Croatian philologist Vatroslav Jagić expressed surprise that the Serbs protested over the Croatian acceptance of the Serbian language as their literary language, saying: “It goes without saying that I found it funny when the Serbian part objected to the Croats (actually the Illyrians between 1834 and 1848), saying that they unjustly appropriated Serbian language as literary – instead of being happy for this concentration that was awakened and supported among the Illyrians by the Dubrovian culture” (p. 59). However, Jovan Dučić was not naïve: “It should be well known that Serbian Shtokavian was soon to serve to the Croats, not only so that they would have a beautiful and logical language but also to gather all the other Shtokavians, meaning Serbs, around Zagreb as the main Shtokavian cultural centre [...] The proof is that a famous Illyrian, Ivan Derkos, immediately called for such a gathering of all Shtokavians around their cultural centre in Zagreb. And the old Count Janko Drašković especially invited Bosnia into this circle, not mentioning Serbia or any other Shtokavian Orthodox country” (p. 60).

On 29 January 1950, Branko Mašić, a Serbian emigrant from Kordun, explained the background of this historical galimatias in a concise manner in *Canadian Serb Defender*, also exposing the Austrian-Latin mercenary role and Jesuit methods of Ljudevit Gaj, Janko Drašković, Franjo Rački and Bishop Joseph Georg Strossmayer, who took the Serbian language so that they could seize the Serbian national treasure and cultural achievements as the foundation for their proselyte project. “The Croats were the West, Europe, Austria, the Vatican, a thousand-year long culture.” And the Serbs were the East, semi-Asians, Byzantines (in the worst sense: something like the Gypsies), Turkish subjects, Balkans, savages. In addition, they were renegades from the ‘all-saving’ Christian faith, heretics, schismatics. And if anything worthy was found among this ‘Greek-Eastern rabble’, it was like when a savage came across a jewel. He would give it to someone else he met for next to nothing or reject it. This was why the holy duty of the ‘thousand-year long’ ‘cultural’ nation was to take from the savage what he could not appreciate and use properly. Therefore, they only grant him mercy and put

humanity in debt by taking over this Serbian language and then, of course, with ‘full’ right and ‘high’ self-confidence proclaim it nothing other than - Croatian. Therefore the frantic megalomania and chauvinistic claims, publicly in newspapers, that the Serbs stole from the Croats their – Croatian language!!!” (p. 61).

The essence of the Illyrian renaissance was immediately clear even to foreign scientists. In this way, in the second half of the 19th century, Russian-Polish Slavists Pypin and Spasevich wrote in their *History of Slavic Literature*: “The Croatian writers, among whom was primarily Ljudevit Gaj, took as their literary language the dialect in which the old west-Serbian culture developed and which was very significant for the entire Serbdom in the west and east because of its efficiency. The specific Croatian dialect was left to its fate and books for the common population were rarely printed in this dialect” (p. 62). Sometime later, a great Russian Slavist Platon Kulakowski wrote in the book *Illyrism*: “The leaders of the literary renaissance of this nationality renounced the processing and development of their local dialect and accepted the, although similar, still foreign dialect that was significantly different to their own native dialect, the dialect of a neighbouring nation, in the name of a literary and political mission” (p. 63). In 1909, Peter Alexeyevich Lavrov wrote on the same topic: “It should be kept in mind that, even though the Croats accepted the Shtokavian dialect of the Serbian language as the literary language, its southern Herzegovinian speech, their literary language was still different to Serbian. It had many expressions that the Serbs did not use, a more difficult style and many coined, artificial words” (p. 63).

Even the ethnographer Friedrich Samuel Krauss from Vienna concluded in 1908: “When we speak today of the Croato-Serbian or Serbo-Croatian language or literature, we should mean the Slavic dialect of the Serbian tribe and the literature written in this dialect” (p. 64). Writing on the characterology of the Serbs and Croats and the Illyrian renaissance, Gerhard Gesseman, a Czech Slavist, concluded: “Without the deep influence of the Dinarian compatriots, whose written language and general political ideology the Croats took over, it goes without saying that this development would not be possible” (p. 64).

The famous historian and archaeologist Felix Philipp Kanitz from Vienna published the book *Serbia* in which he pointed out: “Approximately 35 years ago, even the Croats raised the Serbian language to their written language instead of their national dialect” (p. 64). The Italian Slavist Domenico Ciampoli did not fall behind with such constataions and wrote in his book on Slavic literature that “Zagreb [...] became the centre of Illyrism with the goal of awakening the national-Slavic identity, to appropriate Serbian as the common language” (p. 65).

In 1879, the French Slavist Celeste Courier published *The Comparative History of Slavic Literature* in Paris and stated, among other things, that: “It was evident that the true Croatian dialect did not have a literature and could not have a future because it did not represent any vital interest. It was only after 1830 that Croatia gave birth to a new literary life that revived this country and even the surrounding Slavs because it was based on the nationality in the community of interest. This renaissance

was caused by the reception ('adoption') of the Serbian language that had produced such beautiful classical literature. This adoption chased the Croats out of the isolation to which they were sentenced by the use of their local, underdeveloped idiom; and this adoption positioned them in the community of ideas with the Dalmatian Serbs who could rightfully be proud of their rich classical literature" (p. 65). Courier also spoke of evidence proving that Ljudevit Gaj was not guided by any patriotism but by the directions of Prince Metternich who opposed the inflated Hungarian nationalism and self-confidence, their rejection of Latin as the official language and the introduction of Hungarian in all territories that were under its sovereignty at the moment of entrance into the imperial-royal union with Austria, which meant that these pretensions included both the territories of Croatia and Slavonia.

In 1878, in Paris, Élisée Reclus published *The Universal Geography*, in which he said that the Croats "accepted Serbian as the national language because their own idiom was different only in provincialisms of no importance and also under the prevailing (preponderant) influence of Serbian literature" (p. 66). Kostić pointed out that this opinion was not in just this author's works at the time, but also in every encyclopaedic edition, giving the example of the best German pre-war lexicon *Brockhaus*, in which it said: "Ever since the entire Croatian speech area accepted the Serbian dialect as the written language in the 19th century, the different alphabet remained as the only distinction between 'Croatian' and 'Serbian'" (p. 66).

Many Serbian writers grasped the political goals of Illyrism in due time and rejected it as a variant to which they would succumb the finally awakened Serbdom into a Romanticist national trance. The Croats did not insist on the Illyrian renaissance for long. They ended it as the first, successfully realised phase and, according to the orders of their foreign mentors, turned to Yugoslavism and this fraud. Unfortunately, the Serbs did not realise in time, so they paid dearly for it.

d) The Abuse of Language

Probably the most impressionable testimony to the political consequences of the Illyrian movement and primarily Yugoslavism were the 1955 words of Juraj Krnjević PhD.: "Approximately 120 years ago, Croatia was very small. Zagorje and the surrounding areas, this was Croatia [...] Where *kaj* was spoken, that was Croatia" (p. 75). Even when they took over the Serbian language, the Croats systematically tried to spoil it. "The old Croatian mania to replace foreign words with 'Croatian' ones was well-known. In this way, not only did they form grotesque words that were not present among the people and which were foreign to them, but they also twisted the sense of foreign words. For example, they are the only ones in the world to say *sveučilište* for university, which is incorrect and senseless. From the very beginning, the word university meant *universitas*, that is, the community of lecturers and students, teachers and pupils, which had public-law significance in the corporative and guild community. The Croats thought it meant the entirety of

knowledge. The entire world says telegram, but they say *brzjav*. Instead of tax they say *pristojba*, instead of mark they said *biljega* etc. In their 'free' and 'independent' state, they especially commenced the 'purification' of words from Serbian and foreign, international expressions. In this way, they called the radio *krugoval*, propaganda *promidžba* etc. They did not even want German words, even when their entire intelligentsia spoke better German than 'Croatian', so they said Wiener steak instead of schnitzel, *tucipukovnik* instead of *schlagobers*." (p. 77).

At the beginning, the Croats did not call the stolen language Croatian but Illyrian, our own or Slavonian and then Yugoslav, but, as Ruvarac noticed, "when they realised that the Serbs would not accept this name as their own either, they started claiming that the Croatian and Serbian nations were one by language and that it did not matter whether it was called Serbian or Croatian and, at first, they started writing and saying 'Croato-Serbian' or 'the Croatian or Serbian language' – and then also abandoned this name long ago and now said and wrote that only Croats lived in the Triunity and therefore, there were no languages other than Croatian" (p. 82).

In our time, this idealistic and political confusion led to a highly paradoxical and absurd practice and the final conclusion of Laza Kostić just became relevant: "Although they accepted the Serbian language (Shtokavian-Iekavian dialect) as their literary language, the Croats never felt it to be their own and never understood the spirit of the language or gained a feeling for it. Besides, partly because of ignorance and of being accustomed to the foreign language and partly because of the aspiration to forcibly create 'their own language' through intentional distortion, the Croats actually formed a grotesque version of the Serbian language over time and corrupted it all the more by applying German syntax and linguistic spirit to it. In this way, literally translating from German to corrupted Serbian, the present-day Croatian language was formed. This way, in Croatian speech, literature, press, etc., a language difficult to understand and comprehend was created – a true grotesque that gave an excess of material for those who were in the mood for making jokes even with such lamentable results of the distortion of Serbian language" (p. 88).

6. The Centuries-Long Separation of the Serbian and Croatian Nations

In the brochure *The Centuries-Long Separation of the Serbs and Croats*, Kostić shattered the illusion of the ignorants and Yugoslav Romanticists on the Serbian-Croatian closeness, friendship, love, accord, union etc. Kostić stated that the Serbs and Croats actually did not know each other or have anything in common for centuries and cited unquestionable scientific authorities on the matter. Stojan Novaković, in his time, noticed how different the Serbs and Croats were historically, culturally and religiously – that they never even attempted a joint action, political manifestation or tendency for unity and community. On the

matter of their relations, he discussed the historical clash of the Byzantine and Roman civilisations that was emphasized by the Serbian fight against the Turks and the migration to the north. In a similar way, in 1918, Vladimir Corović wrote: “We were foreign to each other, no matter how related we were. The Serbs had more spiritual and literary connections with the Bulgarians and Russians than with the Croats. These were two completely different cultures, different spiritual needs of the higher and lower classes of both societies, different goals that they had” (p. 9-10). Corović also bore in mind the modern theories on the national issue, which stated that anthropological, ethnographical or linguistic character was not crucial for the determination of a nation, but rather the awareness of belonging to a certain community. The Serbs and Croats were separated by special national ideologies and visions of future. The 19th century also stressed and deepened these differences regardless of the artificial linguistics.

In 1895, this was expressed in a concise manner by Milovan Milovanović: “In the past centuries, during the old Serbian and Croatian states, before the Turkish and Hungarian invasions, the Serbs and Croats did not join in the state unity or had any awareness of any joint national community [...] According to their past as historical facts, the Serbs and Croats were unquestionably two nations. The non-integral language and, together with it, the unity of race, religion and rituals could not create a national community if the group of people that spoke this common language was not bound by any common heritage of memories or feeling, conscious or instinctive, of the necessary need of a joint life, joint preservation of their survival and joint work on their cultural and economic progress” (p. 12). Sava Bjelanović had much more practical experience with the Croats and he could go a step further in understanding the Croatian intentions and behaviour. “These enemies of Serbdom began preaching about community with the Serbs while they needed them; and finished it by denying the Serbs and destroying the Serbian names when they had the chance for such a great endeavour. First they were hypocrites; later they were impertinent and dishonest” (p. 15-16).

Milan Gavrilović wrote in emigration on the blind Croatian anti-Serbian hatred that was most impressively dated recently from Ante Starčević and continued over the entire 20th century. “A Serb was considered the main threat to the realisation of the wish of this Starčević’s harsh nationalism, even today. And this is why a Serb was considered an enemy, an enemy that should be destroyed. This enemy could not be defeated unless you hate them. This feeling gradually became stronger, gradually became hatred, gradually reached its peak, the heated hatred. And the heated hatred was blind, completely. It did not even see its own interests. The main goal for it became the destruction of the enemy regardless of whether this destruction might cause their own” (p. 22). Right before the beginning of WWII, Vlatko Maček depicted the nature of this hatred very clearly to the London paper *News Chronicle*: “If the Serbs went left, we would have to go right. If they went right, we would go left. If there was a war, there would be no other option than to go to the side

The behaviour of the Croatian emigration in the US also showed that the policy of Ante Pavelić and his genocide over the Serbs were no exception or deviation from the general Croatian intentions, since it pretended to be anti-Fascist during the war. Its main leader was the prominent pre-war politician Juraj Krnjević, so Milan Gavrilović pointed out that “there was basically no difference between Krnjević PhD and Pavelić PhD. The only difference was that there was no slaughter of the Serbs because there could not be any in emigration, but I do not know how that would go. However, if there was no slaughter of the Serbs in emigration, Krnjević PhD tried to perform a general slaughter of Serbian interests in emigration. In this, he was in the exactly same line as Pavelić PhD” (p. 24-25).

In the previous century, the life of the Serbs in Croatia became most difficult under the management of ban Ivan Mažuranić, the first pure Croatian in this position and who, by the way, stole the epic *The Death of Smail-aga Čengić* from Njegoš and printed it under his name. Mažuranić prohibited the Serbian name, flag, Cyrillic and religious education.

At the beginning of this century, French historian Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu also wrote on the Serbs and Croats: “If they spoke the same language, meaning with only slightly nuanced dialects, they still did not write the same; one took the Latin alphabet from Rome, the other preserved the alphabet called Cyrillic, the same as the Russians and Bulgarians. And the difference in calendar and alphabet was more than symbolic, they were like a flag, the outward sign of the existing differences in institutions, customs and laws. The Croats and Serbs, in a way, turned their backs to each other: one looked toward the West and the other toward the East. Their national civilisation was coloured differently, according to the fact that one reflected the Byzantine, Greek and Bulgarian culture and the other Roman, German and Hungarian culture” (p. 54). In 1918, the Swiss E. Ehrlich wrote of the Serbs and Croats, saying that “they spoke the same language but were actually two different races, therefore, two nations entirely separated by: faith (the Serbs Orthodox, the Croats Catholic) and customs and alphabet (Cyrillic and Latin); and they were far from being a community whose members lived well together” (p. 57).

The German publicist Hermann Wendell described the psychosis of Zagreb at the beginning of WWI: “The tempest of WWI incited once again every opposition that existed among the South-Slavic peoples until the true fire. After the murder of Franz Ferdinand, Sarajevo and Zagreb echoed with Croatian shouts against the Serbs; the pan-Croatian True Right Party issued the code that the head of the Serbian nation should be bashed [...] At the beginning of August, the members of the True Right Party and Radić’s Peasant Party sent a telegram to the ruler proclaiming war ‘against the perfidious enemy of elevated dynasty, our monarchy and especially Croatianhood’ and stating that they did so ‘with highest pride’” (p. 68).

While the Serbs proclaimed the national unity of Serbs and Croats in WWI, swearing that they would liberate their Croatian brethren from

the Austrian-Hungarian shackles, the Croats performed monstrous atrocities and slaughter all over Mačva and other occupied parts of Serbia. One of the leading German intelligence agents Wamper Hagen wrote in Zurich in 1950 that, in Austria-Hungary, “there was never a Croatian national movement against the Habsburg dynasty”; the Croatian nationalists who wanted the exclusion of Croatia from the Austria-Hungary did not have mass support among the people” (p. 73). In 1918, through the decision of the Croatian Parliament, it was proclaimed that it was not motivated by the desire to unite with Serbia and that individuals thought that the cooperation with the Serbs was necessary for Croatia to move from the defeated side to the winning side and, in April 1942, “the Croatian peasants, armed by Maček before his trip to Belgrade, crossed into the German depot with unfolded flags. These troops had great merits for the disarmament of military units loyal to Belgrade” (p. 74).

7. An Essay about the Serbian Flags

Lazo Kostić published the book *On Serbian Flags* in Munich in 1960 as a result of patient and long-lasting research. The author ascertained that the term *zastava* (Translator’s note: flag) is a new Slavic word and that the word *znamenje* (Translator’s note: auguries) was originally used because flags primarily appeared in the army, where they distinguished military units. Upon the fall of the mediaeval Serbian state, the expression *barjak* (Translator’s note: banner), a word of Turkish origin, was used. The expression *zastava* was only spread in the 19th century among the Serbs of Vojvodina. It primarily determined the place at the head of a table and, in Russian, it meant entry into a town, a tower or a kind of a guard.

During the Middle Ages, the Serbs did not have any generally accepted official or national flag. Each governor and almost every feudal lord had their own, specific flag. In the ancient documents, it was recorded that the flag of King Vladislav was made of red and blue homespun cloth, while the flag of his son, Zhupan Desa was white and blue. The flag of Tsar Dušan was a white-coloured flag with a bicephalic eagle and the coat of arms was a white cross placed on a red base. The crusader-banner dominates in a Kosovo series of Serbian epic national songs and it is further handed down through the *hajduk* and *uskok* tradition and liberation wars in cooperation with European armies. In the battles against the Turks or the French in Montenegro and Boka, some Russian imperial flags were found. In the First Serbian Uprising, there was no unique flag, but the seniors were given a free hand to create their own, defining the shape, colour and symbols. In his *Memoirs*, Protopope Mateja Nenadović wrote that, upon his order, on 15 February 1804, the white-red-blue banner was taken out of Brankovac Church. The flag of Karadorde was initially red, than blue and afterwards white-green. On his flag, one side was embroidered with a white cross with four firesteels and the other had the face of Serbian King Stefan Nemanjić. That whole series of various flags was enriched by a still larger number of Russian flags.

The first official determination of the Serbian flag is included in the Sretenje Constitution, which says: “The national Serbian colour is true

red, white and steel-blue” (p. 57). In his book “*The history of Serbian coat of arms*”, Alexander Soloviev wrote that, in the Church of Kragujevac, “not only was the Constitution established, but the colours and coat of arms of Serbia as well” (p. 57). On 9 February, *Serbian Papers* published the following: “These (colours and the coat of arms) should be dedicated as well: they are introduced in the “pennon” of white, red and steel-blue silk, cut in three tongues with a cross in the middle, having four fires between the points” (p. 57). The Sretenje Constitution was soon removed from force because Russia strongly opposed it and Prince Miloš did not find it suitable as well. In December 1838, he personally managed to obtain the sultan’s command concerning the Serbian flag, of which *Serbian Papers* wrote on the 28th January 1839: “When the illustrious prince of ours was in Constantinople, he put his efforts to obtain the national banner, consisting of three national colours, red on top, true blue in the middle, and white below” (p. 59). The design of the flag was created by the Serbs themselves and it was a variation of the Russian flag, with the colours inverted. With this command, the flag was proclaimed the augury of the vassal Serbian state but it was very quickly accepted generally by all the Serbian people, and the Radical Constitution of the year 1888 definitively recognized it as the national flag. “Since King Milan [...] seniors of the Serbian army were wearing the Serbian cockard, sub-officers the colours of the flag alone and officers had the initial of the governor among those colours” (p. 61).

In Austro-Hungary, the Serbs were recognized the right to raise their flag, even during the period of Bach’s absolutism. “For the Croats, that flag was a constant thorn in their side, and if anyone looks at their newspapers from the second half of the last century and the beginning of this one, they would come upon unseen examples of intolerance and chauvinism. The constant hatred they felt against the Serbs as people was also expressed towards this Serbian attribute (as it was towards the other Serbian landmarks: the Serbian writing)” (p. 71). When 53 of the most distinguished Serbs from Croatia and Slovenia were put on trial in Zagreb in 1909 in the well-known high-treason process, the Attorney General also charged them with popularizing the pennon of the Kingdom of Serbia as generally Serbian and ecclesiastic auguries. Among other things, the indictment contained the following: “In that period, neither the Eastern - Greek Church on the territory of the Kingdom of Croatia and Slovenia, nor any other church on earth had their own ‘ecclesiastical’ banner, nor their own ecclesiastical coat of arms, the first in three colours red-blue-white, and the latter in the form of a “red” cross split in four fields with a white shield, of which each field had the letter “S” and a shield was crowned with a crown. Until that time the people of the Greek Eastern Church did not even have an inkling of the idea that their church alone has its own insignia – its banner and its coat of arms, which the priests of that church, by the time, popularized among them as ‘ecclesiastical institutions’ and a testament of their religion. They held them dear as a ‘Serb in his faith’, as a ‘Serbian pennon’, as ‘Serbian coat of arms’, which they truly were from ancient times [...] When the Serbian name was spread among the Greek Orthodox inhabitants in the aforementioned countries, and they were

raised as 'Serbs, the 'Serbian banner', the 'Serbian coat of arms' and 'Serbian alphabet' began to also spread among the folks under the explanation that they were the institutions and traits of their Greek Orthodox Church; and, after they were spread, that coat of arms and banner started to be presented to people, to 'Serbs at their faith', as Serbian emblems and they are trying to prove that they moved from the Kingdom of Serbia under that emblem and that it is identical to people living under the Serbian name in the Kingdom of Serbia, because they also have the 'Serbian banner', the 'Serbian coat of arms' and 'Serbian alphabet', which is, together with the Christian names, an exclusive characteristic of the one and entire Serbian people and folks." It might sound like a paradox, but in the Austrian part of the double monarchy, the position of the Serbs was incomparably better and they had an unquestioned right to use their language and national freedom.

After the Congress of Berlin, when Austro-Hungary occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Serbs reaffirmed their flag and would not let it be modified with any other sign. However, the explanation that it was ecclesiastical helped them a lot. "On that fatal day in Vidovdan, 1914, Sarajevo was full of Serbian flags that had never been flapping more proudly. While all other flags had to manifest loyalty and devotion to the house of Habsburg and the archduke, the Serbs were hanging flags with the pretext of greeting the heir to the throne, but the real reason was Kosovo, to avenge Kosovo, because of the 525th

Anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo. That is the reason why there were far more of these flags than usual – the Serbs knew they were raising them for that reason and the others understood why the Serbs were raising them as well. On that day, the whole of Europe knew and the whole world learned why the Serbs were raising their flags with such pride in the year 1914." (p. 78-79)

In Montenegro, Prince Danilo formed a Christian Army as a regular army and, for the pennon, he settled on white linen with a red cross in the middle. The second solution for the flag of Prince Danilo was red linen with a bicephalic eagle, a crown and a lion. It was carried in the Battle of Grahovo on 1 May, 1858, during King Nikola troop war flags were mainly red with a white cross in the middle. The main battle flag was called the ceremonial pennon and it was only taken into war when the king took part in the military action. "That pennon was made of the Serbian tricolour flag with a two-headed eagle and a lion under its feet" (p. 80). The 39th Article of the Nikoljdan Constitution established red, blue and white as the national colours, which means that the official flag of Montenegro was identical to the flag of the complete Serbian nation. "It was often pointed out that the national costume of the Montenegrins, the Herzegovinians and the inhabitants of Boka reflected the Serbian flag: red embroidered waistcoat on the chest, than blue trousers and white knee socks" (p. 81).

In the year 1918, the triumph of Serbdom brought the Serbian flag to brilliance. "But alas, that is when its fall begins as well; it is covered up, it is neglected, replaced with other emblems. There came moments when Serbdom gave it up, even felt ashamed of it, when they gave nothing for

it, as if it belonged to someone else, even to an enemy. Afterwards, a partial sobering prevailed, followed by another rejection, pushing aside. The new state, of a different name and national structure, inevitably brought it" (p. 82). The war had not even been finished when the political discussions about a new flag for the joint state were begun and the decision was made to take an inverted Croatian flag, which was proclaimed the official state flag on 28 February 1919, at the Assembly of Ministry Council. The decision was inserted into the Vidovdan Constitution and, from 3 September 1931, into Imposed Constitution of King Alexander. When Alexander proclaimed the dictatorship, he banned the raising of the national flags. Only the Serbian Orthodox Church resisted this and preserved their flag with a cross and four firesteels, but strict regulations limited it to church buildings only. The Croats only respected those legal rules in the beginning. "The further we went and the more Serbs and Slovenians abandoned their national emblems, the more the Croats were emphasising theirs. Finally, apart from the state buildings, the Yugoslav flag could not be seen anywhere that the Croats lived, only the Croatian one, and that mainly on occasions of national celebration, which were taking on an anti-Serbian character" (p. 89).

When the Banate of Croatia was established, that flag was legalized throughout its territory. The Serbian flag was again legalized in occupied Serbia under the regime of General Milan Nedić. Both the Nedić's State National Guard and The Serbian Mercenary Corpus of Ljotić exclusively used the Serbian flag. The Chetniks of Draža Mihajlović were carrying the Serbian, Yugoslav and the traditional flag of the Chetniks – the black one with a skull. After the war, the communists federalized the state in a predominantly anti-Serbian way; although Montenegro and the reduced Serbia were given the Serbian flag, now it was with a red communist five-pointed star. "We used the Serbian flag as a banner and augury for just one incomplete century, one tenth of the Serbian national history. However, for that short period, we became familiarized with it, became stuck to it, aligned under it, suffered together with it and triumphed together with it. It really is true that our latest national history cannot be separated from the Serbian flag" (p. 97).

8. The Origin of the Serbian National Name

In the year 1965, the Melbourne Community Board of the Serbian National Defence for Australia published the brochure by Dr Lazo M. Kostić entitled "*On the Serbian Name – The Opinion of Foreigners*" which appeared as a polemic with Ante Starčević, who was mocking the Serbian name, claiming that it also meant itching, that it was the name of nomadic clans who suffered from scabies and itch, so the Serbs actually meant "itches". In contrast to the "father of the Croatian homeland", who compensated for his slow-wits and lack of education with impudence, impertinence and brutality, Kostić began serious research work and collected a great number of etymological and onomatological interpretations by foreign authors. He did not evaluate the exactness of any particular views and nor did he explain possible coincidences. The

only important thing for him was that it was drawn from serious authors, and nowhere did he find that the writers gave evidence of the nonsense presented by Starčević and nor could he confirm the assumption of some old authors that claims that the word Serb originates from the Latin expression *servus*, which means slave.

What he also learned during his researches was not favourable to the Croats at all. Ferdo Šišić, quoting Archdeacon Thomas, said that Croat means *hajduk* tramp, and one Hungarian Jesuit from the 18th century said that the name originates from the Bulgarian Khan Kuvrat, to whom they were subordinated. Also, Jireček said that it is of Iranian origin. The linguist Rudolf Muh is of the opinion that the word Croat originates from the German expression *hrvatna*, which means “with antlers” i.e. “ram”. In the Iranian language, *haurvat* means a stock keeper or a herdsman. In his old Iran dictionary, Hristijan Bartolomej stated that the word *ksrvant* means horrible or spooky. In his work *The Origin of Aryan*, published in 1883, Karl Penka says that the Croat signifies one that belongs to someone else, or a slave. In the Lithuanian language, that word is used to express an angry and wild man.

In his *History of Slav Literacy*, published in Prague in 1865, the famous slavist Pavel Jozef Šafárik stated: “The original, old homeland of the Serbs were the Eastern Carpathians and Red Russia. The part of Serbs that were situated in the Carpathians received a local name – *Hrbati*, *Hrvati*, *Horbati*, *Horvati* from the mountain *Hrbi*, now *Horbi* – which they kept even after they moved” (p. 7). Austrian ethnographer Karl Baron Chernick wrote: “The name Croat is derived from the Slavic word *hrb*, which means a hill; Dobrovský derived it from the word *hrb*, which means a log” (p. 7-8).

The expression Serb is pronounced differently in almost every language and, as Jireček stated, the Serbs used to say “*Srblin* or *Srbli*, while Đura Daničić determines the expression from the old Indian word *sarb*, which means “defend, protect”. The Croat historians themselves disapproved of Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ claim that the Serbs got their name when they became the slaves of a Roman Emperor. Joan Lucius from Trogir wrote: “Those who are truly dealing with the Slavic idiom know that the Greeks and, according to them, the Latins were talking nonsense when they derived the word Serb from *servitut* (slavery), although they were neighbours of the Serbs; those who the Slavs called *Srbliji*, were called *Serbli* or *Serbuliani* by the Greeks, to avoid the hardness of pronunciation and the land where the Slavs lived was called Serbian, which the Greeks also found difficult to pronounce, so they said *Servia*” (p. 15). In the debate *About the Name Croat and the Name Serb*, Ferdo Šišić says “it makes no sense”, because he claims that the Serbs came to the south with that name, so they already had it before they arrived seemingly to serve the Roman emperor. Also, there are also Lusatian and Russian Serbs, who were never enslaved to any emperor” (p. 15).

In 1808, the Czech Slavist Josef Dobrovský, wrote to Jernej Kopitar: “*Srb*, however, is nothing more than *Sarmata* shortened and altered” (p. 17). Šafárik’s interpretation is the widest accepted in science: “The sense

of the national name *Srb* is clear: that word means nothing more than the nation *gens*, for which the Indian word *serim* (*natio*), originating from the same root, is totally suitable. This way of marking is so fitting with the nature of people in their childhood that we can often see it in some other nations as well” (p. 17). In the year 1883, the Czech Slavist Pervolf stated: “The general name is *Srb*, *Srbín*, *Srblijin* [...] In Serbian, collective is signified as *Srpčad* [...] *Srbadija*, Serbian folks” (p. 18). If we accept the interpretation of Šafárik, Alojz Vaniček explains the name *Serboi*, *Sirboi* as from Ptolemy, *Serbi* from Pliny etc. He finds that the prefix *su* means the creation of something and the Serb is the first “born”, depending on the plural and/or collective – *red* (*gens*, *natio*)” (p. 19). The Czech Slavist Jaroslav Sutner claims that the original significance of the word Serb is the human ancestor, people, nation.

The opinion of the ethnographer Johann Kaspar Zeuss is also interesting, because he brings the German expression *Suevus*. “*Suevi* or *Suebi* is a big German clan from the coast of the Eastern Sea, from where they were spreading to the west and south. Even Caesar mentioned them. Today, it is preserved in the name *Švaba* (Translator’s note: Bosh). Zeuss is of the opinion that the word Serb appeared in the similar way, if not the same like *Švaba*! (p. 19-20). In 1848, German religious historian Karl Eckermann claimed: “Serb means folks” (p. 20). Another German historian, Heinrich Leo, wrote the following in 1857: “The Serbs, the common name for all Slavs south of Ljutica (Vilca), comes from the Sanskrit base *Sarb*: go, run, slide, the German: *strom*, *stroemen* and the Latin *serpere*. This old name *Sarbi* means, Serbs, Vends, like nomad clans constantly on the move and it must have been given to them in the ancient times, either from someone else or from them themselves, while they were still living a nomadic life” (p. 20). The French Slavist Cyprien Robert published a book called *The Slavic World* in 1852, in which he said: “As for the exact meaning of the word Serb, the scientists still have no consensus (he is mentioning various legends) [...] Whatever those folk legends are, it seems very probable that the name Serb originally meant armed Slavs” (p. 21).

In the year 1904, the Indo-Germanist Felix Sampson wrote that the word *serb* or *smirb* meant son or the closest relative. It originated from the old Serbian word “meaning a man who is free, but not a noble, peasant or countryman, a fellow in the country community”. At the same time, *pasierb* and *pastorak* is not a clear and full member of the community; while *sibru* is a real member. With a metathesis, he changed *sibru* to *sirbu* or Serb. That expression can also be applied to both parts of the Slavs with the Serbian name. *Srb*, *Srbín*, *Serbian*, *Serb*, *serbski*, *serpski*” (p. 22). Rudolf Kleinpaul, in 1919, explains the origin of the word *Deutsch* (Translator’s note: eng. German): “This name has something striking, although it does not stand for itself, but has its pendant in the name of the Serbs, not only for the Slavs in the Balkans, but also for our Vends or Sorbs (he is referring to the Lusatian Serbs, LNK), which Šafárik also derived from the expression people (*Srb*). Because it (that expression) does not contain any characteristic that would differ their names from those of other peoples; he simply totally ignores other peoples” (p. 22). Vladimir

Dvorniković, in the year 1939, in “Characterology of Yugoslavs” quoted the claim of Nika Župančić that “either *Srb* is originating from the language of aborigines, from the “language of Lesgians, in which *sur* (*sar, ser, sir, sor*) means a man, with a plural suffix *bi* we get *Ser – bi*, which would mean ‘people’ or ‘nation’ (p. 23). In his book *The Serbs and the Albanians*, published in Belgrade in 1925, Šuflaj pointed out: “The best interpretation of the puzzling name of *Serb*, it seems, can be found in one of the numerous languages of the Caucasus hills, which remained a real museum of the remains of various pre-Indo-European peoples living somewhere in the wide Scythian meadows. According to that language, which creates a plural with the help of the suffix “b”, the name *Serb* would simply mean “*people*” (p. 23). In 1936, The law historian from Bucharest named Kaushansky wrote: “Serbs means the same as relatives; that is how all Slavs were called, their western neighbours called them Vends” (p. 23). That *Serb* originally means a relative was also the opinion of the German slavist Reinhold Trautman and the Russian etymologist Max Wasmer, who later lived in Germany. In his book “Slavic antiques”, Šafárik claimed: “The ancient native name of the all the Slavs, or at least of the majority, was *Serbs or Serbi* (p. 26). He confirms this with strong research and explanations, saying: “This name reaches back to the most ancient times. We find it mentioned in its original, real, native form in Pliny (before 79) and Ptolemy (before 175) in a number of other peoples populated between Volga, *Najotis* and Don [...] From that, we can clearly see how wide the use of the name *Serb* was, even then. That is strongly confirmed by the Bavarian geographer; according to him, the land of *Serviana (Srbliana)* was so big, that all the Slavic peoples originate from it, as they themselves confirm” (p. 26).

Following his attempts to explain the meaning of the word *Serb*, in his book *The Slavic world*, Cyprien Robert claimed, just as Josef Dobrovsky, Karl Eckermann and Anselm Banduri did, that: “In the beginning, all the Slavs were called Vends or Serbs. I will not make further research in order to find out which name preceded; I will limit myself to claim that the name *Serb* means the same as *Vend* and it was used to name the whole race. Ptolemy mentioned Serbs (*Serboi* or *Sirboi*), the people who, as he says, were living between the Ra (Volga) and the Nephrite Mountains behind Val and Orinej. Following the example of Ptolemy, Pliny also marked the Serbs or *Servi* as the inhabitants between the Don and the Volga, in the vicinity of Val and Meotica. These Serbs from Russia suddenly appeared in the 9th century as a big nation. Finally, around the year 950, Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus mentions, among the peoples of Scythia, the great nation of the Serbs that can be divided in two branches: the White Serbs or free ones and the Black Serbs or the subjugated” (p. 28).

The fact that all the Slavic peoples were primarily considered and called Serbs is also claimed by the German ethnologist Kohl, the Slavist Pervolf, the historian Friedrich Riss, the linguist Zeuss, professor Gregor Křek and many others. Also, Jacob Grimm, Josef Dobrovský and Pavel Šafárik persistently suggested that the name *Serbs* was a general one and that it is the most appropriate and famous, as it is accepted by all the

9. Discussion on Constitutional Issues

In the summer 1942 and with a help of Dr Gojko Grdić, assistant-lecturer of the Economic-Commercial College, Prof. Dr Lazo M. Kostić received a message from the headquarters of General Draža Mihailović, who asked him to work on the project of the new Constitution of our state. Kostić accepted it, but under conditions that the word was about the Serbian state, because he could not imagine living together with the Croats anymore, at the same time bringing out his vision of the split, as well as the political and legal base on which the Serbian country would be built. The Belgrade Legal Board of the Ravna Gora Movement rejected his project because the opinion of the pro-Yugoslav oriented lawyers prevailed. However, later and while in emigration, Kostić continued to think and write about this topic, although his study “*About the Serbian Constitution*”, with the subtitle “*The Legal Principles of the Future Serbian Democracy*”, was never completed. However, it was published post mortem in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1990, thanks to the enthusiasm of the California architect Gradimir Hadžić, who arranged the manuscripts, and the dedication of the publisher of the “Institute for Balkan Issues”, which was managed by the late Đorđe Celić, a prominent Serbian national fighter.

At the very beginning, Kostić was clear about the fact that the constitutional text was relatively easily written, but difficult to maintain in practice. “The maintenance of the constitution implies its maintenance in its entirety and in details, in form and content, actively and passively (by both those who apply it and those whom it is applied to). The first are asked for loyalty and objectivity, impersonality and impartiality in the application of the constitution. The second are asked for voluntary obedience, an understanding of its importance and its necessity for society. Everyone was expected to give full attention in order to prevent offence and a spontaneous reaction in case it happens” (p. 6).

Serbia does not have any constitutional continuity for each new constitution represents a total negation of the previous one, thus establishing one totally new order. This discontinuity is so visible that no new constitution has been adopted in the way proscribed by the previous one. Elements of illegality in modifications were forced by the fact that, by the Second World War, no constitution was amended, which means that there were no amendments planned in the regular legal way. “We were passing new constitutions more easily than new laws. The latter ones at least kept a certain form and, even if the king himself was passing them, he did it based on proposals and with the counter-signature of some of the ministers. The constitutions were adopted with a simple proclamation” (p. 7).

Such a practice could not avoid having negative consequences on the spiritual and legal development of the nation and the state, and the people stopped treating the constitution as the highest legal act, a legal sanctity to which all the highest state officers including the governor himself swear allegiance to. The application of the law represents dynamic repairs inside

Comment [K.B.12]: Translator's note. The river of this name has not been found. Suggested spelling is *Naiotis*

the governmental body and the constitution is the fundament of the state – it is the foundation of the social system that all citizens should respect, especially if it was established by their own free will and if its contents reflect their wishes and will in the legally-political sphere. Constant changes to the constitutional text, especially if they are not made in a legal way, devalue the significance of the constitution as such in the conscience of the people, make the strength of its form relative and devalue the principle of duration. Something that can be abolished or modified relatively easily, cannot provoke respect, either of such system of legal norms in general, nor individually. As an example, Kostić takes the Imposed Constitution from 1931, which was neither respected nor applied by its creators. He found many provisions quite unclear and too widely defined, meaning that, in the majority of cases, specifics were left to the laws. “Because there were a lot of such provisions, the whole constitution was, wittily, said to be “within the limits of law.” Such provisions were simply offensive, unworthy of one colonial people. But even those provisions that were not within the limits of the Law were not applied in the majority of cases” (p. 8). As an illustration, Kostić mentions the fact that none of the ministers have fulfilled their constitutional obligation to respond to the interpellation of a deputy, nor did the members of parliament protest about that, because they themselves did not pay much attention to the constitutional forms. The press in the kingdom was controlled and conducted, while public opinion was allowed to dwindle to apathy and resignation. When King Alexander abolished the Vidovdan Constitution, not a single serious lawyer protested and, when the Cvet Ković-Maček Agreement and the establishment of Banate of Croatia trampled down the constitution from 1931, only professor Kostić loudly protested, in several columns, trying to prove the “flagrant violation of the constitution and the legal system in general”. All constitutional texts determined that the courts are to function according to the law; they started to apply the provisions in a timely way, but never the constitutional norms. Not even one governmental body controlled the application of the constitution, which means that everyone could violate its provisions without any subsequent punishment. Not only the people, but the civil servants and the lawyers did not stick to the constitution at all. What seems shocking, even in our current conditions, is the fact that “during the period of validity of the last constitution, for example (of the year 1931), constitutional law was not lectured at any of the Faculties of Law in the country except for that in Subotica” (p. 9). It even happened that high-ranking state officers, while taking an oath, held in their hands a constitution that they had never read before.

That is why the constitutional conscience did not exist. In order to “form it, it is necessary to know the constitution in every detail, to know its content, its sense, significance and goals. Our citizens lacked all that and they were the ones for whose protection that constitution was passed. The authorities, who had to keep vigil in order to keep it respected, also lacked it” (p. 9). It is true that the constitutional text comes as the result of the relation of social forces at one moment, the moment when it is created, though that does not mean that each shift in forces must

immediately be reflected in constitutional provisions, because the constitution itself must be the factor of social stability and, as such, it must not be changed until some radical changes in social relations take place. On the contrary, it loses sense, and the citizens lose their faith in it and lose elementary respect and seriousness.

The procedure of changing the constitution must be much more complicated than a change of law. “Constitutions are not perpetual and they must be revised from time to time, just like the foundations of a building must be checked so to see whether they are capable of enduring a new burden and modifications in other parts. But the constitution must be standing. That is its essence and its character. If it was passed correctly (meaning with the participation of people), it must be taken by both the majority and the minority, by those who were for such a constitution and those who were against it” (p. 10). Only extended application can show whether some of the constitutional solutions are good or not. That does not mean that the provisions cannot be criticized and practical defects discussed. In order to keep the constitution in force and in the conscience of the people, it is necessary to present its contents to as many citizens as possible through media and the system of education. Kostić is of the opinion that we should find a good way to check how well the civil servants really know the constitution and that the ceremony of taking oath must have a solemn and impressive form, both for the public and for the one who is giving it. In order to be truly respected, the constitution must be passed in an appropriate way, without usurping the authorities, without brutal violations of the principles of legality and legitimacy and without breaking an oath. It is necessary to establish institutional control of the constitutionality of the law and the violation of the constitutional norms should be sanctioned as a serious criminal act.

a) The Constitutional Court

Since the constitution, as the highest legal act of a state, establishes the authorities and distributes authorizations and competences, it separately regulates the actions of the legislative authorities as it represents its only limiting factor. All other legal acts, if they are opposite to the constitution, do not have legal validity and cannot be applied. The principle of constitutionality represents the general legal principle and it is followed by the presumption of constitutionality i.e. the implication that each law is in conformity with the constitutional norms, until the opposite has been proved. That prevents the arbitrary proclamation of laws as unconstitutional in order to excuse their violation. So, in order to prevent the authorities from violating the constitution by abusing legal norms, Kostić pleads for establishing the Constitutional Court as an arbitrary governmental body that will authoritatively, independently and definitely confirm whether other legal acts or some of their norms are in conformity with the Constitution or not. If they conclude that they are unconstitutional, the respective legal norm will not be applied, because it will not be valid and will not be considered adopted.

The Constitutional Court must be the only body that will question the

constitutionality. It does not need the direct interrogation of the parties and it does not need to hear witnesses or to collect evidence unless they find it necessary. It is necessary to make decisions in a council or magistracy, because a judge can hardly investigate various cases of the collision of the legal norms by himself. The members must be professional and prominent lawyers with rich practical experience and theoretical knowledge – not politicians. The court must be strictly separated from all other governmental bodies and totally independent in its practice. The members of the court must not participate in any political actions or be susceptible to political influences.

Kostić is advocating the idea that the Constitutional Court must have certain side duties as well as control of the constitutionality of laws, in order to be able to put the highest ranking officers on trial as a criminal council and to verify the mandates of the deputies, even an election, to solve disputes about administration and judicial power, legislative and executive, and also to be the body that will suggest the nomination of the highest ranking officers. It must not have political and advisory functions and the administrative functions must be reduced to a minimum. According to Kostić, active authority for instituting proceedings for evaluating constitutionality can only be given to limited number of subjects and the court cannot move the initiative, officially and by itself. That right should be vested in legislative bodies, which means both the Houses of Parliament, but also deputy fractions of the parties and then if the regular courts accept the initiative of the parties in dispute, because the parties themselves could not do it because of possible intentions to obstruct regular court proceedings. Kostić also includes the special courts, such as military, ecclesiastical and the courts for the protection of the state, as well as the extra courts that are formed on special occasions caused by certain constitutional disorders. That power should also be vested in administrative bodies, through their ministers as the heads of departments, high-rank bodies of regional and local self-government and institutional self-government, chambers, trade associations and ecclesiastical authorities in the form of personal self-government.

Since the list of authorized factors for placing the initiative before the Constitutional Court is so limited, they do not need to previously prove their special interest in ascertaining the unconstitutionality of statutes or some other general legal acts, if those acts threaten their rights or legitimate interests. They have active legitimacy, first of all because of their legal validity and public authority, for the constitutional system is the source and base of their legal existence. It is their right and obligation, not only to protect the constitutional foundation of their existence, but also the constitutional system in general. Besides, nothing can define the timelines for denying of the constitutionality of the law. Preclusive timelines are necessary because, with the long duration of the certain constitutions, their norms can be theoretically interpreted and/or practically implemented in different manner due to altered social circumstances, thus denying some legal texts that were not disputable in an earlier period. However, if the Constitutional Court once decided on the denial of the certain norm, reopening the case with the same

IT-03-67-T
argumentation would not be possible.

Kostić finds that there is both formal and essential unconstitutionality. Formal unconstitutionality exists if one law or by-law was not passed in the way proscribed by the constitution. Essential unconstitutionality is established if one part of the law, paragraph, article, sentence or word comes into collision with the text or sense of the constitution and, when unconstitutionality is ascertained, the legal norm in question cannot be applied anymore. Professor Kostić advocates that each constitutional indictment in a previous procedure should be announced completely, so that every citizen or legal body could lodge a complaint within a certain period of time; upon the expiration of that term, the council who is to pass sentence will be assigned. “When the defined term has expired, the President of the Constitutional Court assigns a senate (board, department) that will solve the case and there will be separate four-member senate for each case, where the chairman will be the member who is oldest in rank and the referent will be elected by the senate itself. If the majority of members agree to accept one solution (which means at least three members), it will be considered valid and, as such, proclaimed public in the body of the court with the appointment of the referent, amendments, separate opinions, etc. There can be no secrecy. If the votes are divided, the president will appoint three extra members as an extension of the senate. Now the decision will be brought by a majority of votes. Several senates can act in parallel and at the same time, each judge can be a member of an unlimited number of senates, as can the president” (p. 23).

Kostić suggests the forming of the Serbian National Institute as the main advisory body, which will previously discuss all governmental decisions and evaluate them exclusively from the national point of view. The view of this body would not be binding for legislative bodies, but it would need to be acquired first, no matter what it is like. In more delicate cases, the opinion of the Serbian National Institute could have the characteristics of confidentiality, so that its publication would not place inadmissible non-institutional pressure on deputies regarding the forthcoming decisions. The members of the Institute would be delegated by autonomous institutions of a national importance. The Institute “must be a steady, safe, strong and legal institution, one of the characteristics of the legal and constitutional system and one of its most important and obligatory integral parts” (p. 27-28). As for the other advisory bodies, Kostić only envisages the existence of the economy council as generally governmental and lets the ministries form other constitutional bodies within their competence.

The development of the Serbian constitutionality has shown all advantages of the one-house parliament and all important decisions were made there. The senate existed only twice, and it was instituted by an imposed constitution, without having significant results in public life. However, Kostić finds that the House of Lords should be envisaged in the future Serbian constitutional system, because it represents a barrier against the introduction of a dictatorship, because the state cannot be homogenous anymore, but nationally differentiated, and because the introduction of “female suffrage” unbalanced the overpower of the male

defending element” (p. 32).

Kostić is convinced that “the more interests in parliament, the less need for out-of-parliament solutions. The parliament should represent a realistic ratio of strengths in the country and, where those strengths are multiple and complicated, that postulate will fill the parliament with the House of Lords and the House of Commons more easily than a one-house parliament” (p. 32).

b) Voting Rights

In democratic states, there is an equal and secret voting right in elections for the National Parliament. The differences are most distinctive in the form of the electoral system, whose two basic possibilities are proportional and controlling and/or giving an opinion regarding party lists or the personality of candidates. The constituent assembly should establish a legal age for using civil rights. Kostić personally does not define the precise age, but he warns that there should be some more limits than the communists give, as they tendentiously move the limit, believing that the inexperienced youth is the most reliable.

Kostić shows a bias towards female suffrage, but he is aware of the fact that it cannot be abolished anymore so he is venturing into the search for a more complicated possibility for the electoral system that would reduce the number of women in the representative body to the minimum. He finds that 2/3 of the deputies should be elected by electoral counties using the majority principle, taking into consideration the fact that those will mainly be women, due to their higher proportional share in the total population. One third of the deputies would be elected proportionally, according to party lists in wider electoral units, from the line of full-age men, as the basic condition for standing would be military service served. In that case, the candidates would not have to live in the territory of their electoral unit, so the prominent politicians who mainly live in the capital could be candidates in various units. They will not have to agitate very much personally, because the party apparatus will do it for them, so they will be more dedicated to governmental and professional work. Alongside such an arrangement, comes the degree of binding the deputies to the party. “Elected candidates will be strictly bound to the party that elected them. If they leave the party, they will lose their mandate. That is logical, because they mainly get the mandate owing to the party. As for the persons chosen in the county system, they may change parties of their own free will, although in practice, they will be party oriented as well because they will belong to party clubs in the parliament, and they will remain loyal to them”. (p. 34). The combination of two electoral systems also means a compromise that can satisfy both those who insist on party orientation and the opponents of the party discipline of the deputies.

The terms House of Lords and House of Commons have already been anachronous for a long period of time, but they have a firm position in political and legal theory. The House of Lords establishes a balance with the House of Commons, so they also differ in the way their members are elected. In order to make his own attitude towards the way the House of

Lords is completed clear, Kostić starts with a method of elimination, stating that the principle of inheritance is not suitable for us, for we do not have nobility. He rejects the principle of delegation, because Serbia must not be a federal state. Appointed senators are alienated from the people and they usually belong to court or party cliques. The holders of other governmental and social functions are out of question for the role of a senator because that would break the principle of power sharing and the representatives of the economy interest groups like senators, etc., in the world did not come up to expectations. The only thing left is to elect the senators as well. However, in his proposal for the method of the election, Kostić shows some personal, totally conservative and obsolete understanding. He urges that one half of the senators should be elected by men over fifty, which must be the age of the candidates as well, being of the opinion that old age implies self-command, tranquillity and prudence, which would prevent quick and unthinking experiments in governmental affairs. Further, Kostić thinks that one forth of the senators should be intellectuals, which will be elected exclusively by the principle of the representation of various scientific and professional institutions. Here we have the possibility that female intellectuals can choose and be chosen. The last quarter of the senators would be made of holders of awards for patriotic merits who would be over 50 years of age, and the right to participate in their election would be vested in all those awarded, regardless of age.

It is precisely here that we can see the weaknesses of Kostić’s work, and any modification of the principles of the equal voting right is unsustainable from the point of view of elementary democratic principles. Kostić is not even trying to hide his conservative attitude and he is consistently saying that: “for me, the strictly implemented equality of the voting rights has always been the biggest flaw in the democratic instrument in general and the biggest disadvantage of the democratic government” (p. 39). He is consciously making a correction in favour of the elite, regardless of the fact that it practically means that some citizens will have a tripled voting right in political process. Besides, he showed his aptitude for the corporative system of the political system of the state, probably under the influence of Mussolini’s or Ljotić’s ideological works, which he never accepted in total.

c) The Sharing of Power

In practice, the principle of sharing the legislative, executive and judicial power will always make one of them superior to the others. In the parliamentary system, the legislative power is dominant and the government is practically its executive body. Besides, it appoints the judges and decides on amnesty. However, if the parliament is electing the government, and if the selection is from its own circles, within which the selection is done so that the best deputies enter government, making the government into a concentrated reflection of the parliament in miniature. The parliament will still have the widest and the most extensive competences, but its decisions will be formulated in the government in

advance, the government will decide about everything and it is essentially concentrating the power that the parliament formally has, which is obvious in the example of the Great Britain.

According to Kostić, other basic form of the relation between regulation and execution is called a dualistic system, where the administrative and legislative powers are strictly separated, as in the United States of America. The people are directly electing both the president of the republic and the parliament. The parliament is passing the laws and the president is governing, they are not dependant on each other but they can cooperate without attempts to subjugate each other. Kostić believes that none of these systems is good in their pure form, so he is in favour of a combination, which he formulates as moderate parliamentarism.

In Serbian and Yugoslav parliamentary tradition, ministers were almost always elected from the line of deputies and Kostić is of the opinion that such symbiosis was fatal for governmental administration and for the National Parliament as well. "From the beginning it was good, while the state was governed by hardened national fighters who knew what the country needed and who were discussing and debating governmental problems while they were still the opposition. After them, worse and worse epigones came until the state administration, especially in the period of pseudo-democracy, finally fell into the hands of totally incompetent mediocrities and ignorants. It is no wonder that the state collapsed and one can only be surprised that it has survived even today, under such a dilettante and corrupt government" (p. 42-43).

Kostić insists on the fact that the primary characteristics of the members of parliament and the members of administration should differ greatly. As for the election campaigns, demagogues are always the most successful and the supreme administrators must constantly prove their competence, since in their line of work the flattering mostly means nothing. That is why he is of the opinion that the positions of the deputies and ministers must be strictly separated. Ministers must be experts, which does not exclude their party level of organization. Political parties are one of the basic instruments of a democracy – a system without the parties is always a dictatorship. "Each important party that aspires towards the leadership of the state must have an appropriate team of experts. It must be ready to take over the power and one of the main requisites of that capability is governing staff. Here, we should distinguish between "the state structuring" parties and the small, mainly opposing, spiteful and breaking parties" (p. 44).

According to this "the parliament must always remain the main body of one state, in which all the strings will be pulled and all roads lead, but not a body that is doing everything by itself. It must remain the controlling body. It becomes grotesque and strange when the ministers – members of the parliament – are voting for their own confidence. The parliament must be limited to control of the administration – real and efficient – and that is why the acting and active administration must be strictly separated physically from the parliament, which is its controlling body. It will be able to perform all its duties freely and without being disturbed, without

IT-03-67-T
referring to the responsibilities and independence of the parliament" (p. 44-45). In Serbian and Yugoslav parliamentary practice, the assemblies were convoked by the king and the government, so the deputies had no initiatives at all and they were quite often surprised by convocation and dissolving of the assembly or the scheduling of the elections. All the most negative parts of the British Parliamentary System were becoming the most expressive in our own.

Kostić insists on the establishment of a few regular convocations, in which the parliament would automatically convene, and as for the special assemblies, they cannot be convoked by the government, only by the special parliamentary board. The government would not be able to open the sessions of parliament and the parliament, following its internal regulations and practice, could completely emancipate itself from the executive power. "The parliament becomes supreme immediately after the elections (people are supreme only on the very day of the elections). Nobody can repel obedience to the sovereign or, at the very least, the government executive. On the other hand, the reputation and prestige of the sovereign must not be violated or offended, as in the absolute monarchies where the majesty of the monarch cannot be offended. That is why the Government and the area of its competence must give the impression that Parliament alone was making decisions. By undermining the reputation of the Parliament, the existence of the democratic state will be undermined too. And that is certainly something that no democratic government must wish" (p. 48-49).

d) The Establishment of Interpellation

The system of interpellation, as a form of the parliamentary control of the executive power in Yugoslav political life, did not function at all. The government was regularly ignoring it and so they never appeared on the agenda. Kostić finds that one of the reasons why this parliamentary valve did not function is the lack of precise definition of its rights and obligations. As they were normatively regulated, it was emerging that each deputy had the right to an unlimited number of interpellations in one convocation and that the ministries were obliged to respond to all those interpellations within one session. If that had functioned, the Parliament would have needed to sit without a break and to deal only with that subject, while the opposition would have a very functional means of legal obstruction at their disposal. "As soon as one provision comes to be formulated in a way that would obstruct its full application, not even the parts of such a pointless provision which could generally be applied are not being applied" (p. 49). Since the ministers had tasks that were impossible to solve, they were constantly breaking the constitution and nobody had any idea to call them to account. The absurdity of one legal norm was a witness to the illogical nature of one legal system and, as such, it was breaking down the authority of the constitutional system. Since nobody is capable of doing the impossible, the ministers were free from that obligation as well, so they were getting rid of it even in situations where it could have been fulfilled.

In order to have the establishment of interpellation reaffirmed and restore its meaning and purpose, Kostić suggests that the power of interpellation is given to a certain number of MPs only, where it must be significantly different from the rights that each Member of Parliament has towards the certain MP issue. Interpellation is being submitted in order to call the governmental body to account for violating the law or public interests, so they are given a certain period of time to give a written opinion before having the parliamentary debate on that issue and before the Parliament gives an opinion regarding guilt. The more MPs to stand behind interpellation, the bigger its significance as the institute of control over executive power. Kostić finds that the mentioned number must be the same as the census for creating the party parliamentary fraction.

Further, the right of interpellation is only important for opposition MPs, because the MPs of the governing party can use the feigned procedure for unimportant cases, in order to make the institution itself lose its sense. If the MPs of the parliamentary majority submit interpellations, “they are mainly fraud-ridden because, according to the very party discipline, they must not call members of their own or coalition party to account, if the competent party instances would not let it happen. It mainly happens that the minister is previously informed and that he approves the submission of interpellations, sometimes even making suggestions because he thus get the opportunity to publicly clear up or explain some of his acts that are being criticized, either loudly or by whispering (p. 52). However, the parliamentary majority cannot be deprived of those rights, owing to the principle of the equality of MPs, so Kostić sees the solution in forming two parliamentary boards, a minority and a majority, which would previously discuss the interpellations and also, in the alternating days in a week when the interpellation will be discussed, invite a debate according to the principle of the governing majority or opposition.

The suggestion of a vote of no confidence in the government is, by its nature, always urgent and very serious, so the right of MPs to submit it must be limited by census. Kostić believes that a MP who signs an unsuccessful proposal twice in one convocation or three times during his mandate, should be deprived of his mandate, in order to provide that such an initiative is initiated only when the mistakes of the government are so visible that they make its survival from the aspect of the parliamentary majority untenable or when there is no real possibility of pulling the government down, bearing in mind the modified ratio of strengths in the parliament. Besides, Kostić insists on the need to limit the duration of discussions, he is considering the right of the government to put into question its own confidence in the parliament by themselves and he is pushing ahead the fact that they continue to execute their function even after resignation, if they have received a no confidence vote, all until the new Government has been elected

It is very interesting that Lazo Kostić made the issue of governmental form relative, without showing whether he is in favour of monarchy or republic, although his total surroundings in emigrant environment was characteristically in favour of the monarchy, often respecting emotions

more than common sense. Yet, he is overemphasising the function of the head of state, attributing him the right that makes him the head of the governing power, to whom the ministers are subordinated. He finds that the government, at the same time, must enjoy the confidence of the head of state and the legislative body. “If we trust that the state system functions correctly and without stoppages, than the head of the governing power will constitute such a government, which will at least have a serious chance to force its way in voting confidence. Any different treatment of the head of the government would represent the abuse of power” (p. 65). In order to achieve that, the head of the governmental power will previously consult the president of the legislative body, the heads of the political parties and perhaps all the other important political persons. The consultations must be confidential and only the consulted persons may announce to the public what they find it necessary to say related to the consultations performed. Kostić is especially critical towards the Serbian and Yugoslav political practice that was strengthening the role of the king to the detriment of the authorities of the parliament, which was leading to grotesque situations. “The king was expressing his wish to introduce this or that person into the government. The mandatory had less and less resistance, because each mandatory was increasingly his creature. The king was indirectly influencing the participation of these people in elections, because it is hard for someone who is not a deputy to become the minister. Finally, we were arriving at sheer servility and the total list was created following the wishes of the court. Here, I point out the court, not the king. Because this was the time of regency and the king did not want to be personally involved all the time. New court favourites appeared, not knowing how, and these were figuring in all the lists of all the governors. They were the direct undertakers of our democracy (p. 70).

Chapter III

THE SERBIAN CATHOLICS

1. The Historical and Social Circumstances of the Activities of the Catholic Serbs

Prof. Lazo M. Kostić, PhD published his political-historical debate *The Catholic Serbs* in Toronto in 1964, in the edition of the Canadian branch of the Serbian Saint Sava Cultural Club. It represents a sincere and sentimental testimony to the respect towards the Serbian patriots of the Catholic faith, who disdained all the attractive proposals, mainly from the Austro-Hungarian authorities, to achieve the highest state and social privileges based on their religious orientation and the possible denial of national roots. "Many of them were punished, imprisoned, pursued, but they would not separate from Serbdom, nor would they deny it. As a child, I admired them very much: when watching them, I saw the apostles, patriarchs, tribunes. Each of them seemed to me so great, so unreachable. And I am very happy that finally, at the end of my life, I have the opportunity to recompense on behalf of the Serbdom: to mention them, to bring them out of oblivion, to express posthumous gratitude" (p. 6).

Historically, Serbdom is tightly integrated with Orthodoxy and its specific manifestation, which contains nation-building components and it is called tradition of Saint Sava. Orthodoxy gave the highest contribution to the maintenance of the Serbian nation and abandoning the Orthodox faith has, throughout the centuries, meant breaking away from the Serbian national being. For the plain and uneducated folks, the identification of Serbdom and the Orthodoxy was almost absolute. However, in the manuscripts from the 17th and 18th centuries, there were numerous testimonies of the Serbs of the Catholic faith who were keeping their national identity and the *Bunjevci* and *Šokci* were officially

called the Catholic Raci by the Austro-Hungarian authorities, which means the Serbs. The expression Raci is one of the old names for the Serbs and obviously manifested in the name of one of the oldest Serbian states - Raška. As Kostić stated, around the middle of the 18th century, in the year 1744, the Bishop Matija Karaman wrote to Roman Congregation for the Propagation of Religion regarding the issue of the Serbs in the Venetian part of the Dalmatia: "Because there is a certain number of Serbian Catholics, they would like their Episcopate to be a Serb of the catholic faith" (p. 10). He is quoting a certain T. Pašić, a Serbian *vladika* of the Catholic faith. "Collectively i.e. massively, Serbdom was declared by those Catholics who suddenly became aware of the fact that their ancestors were Serbs, that they are of Serbian origin, that blood and nationality do not mix, so they will stay the same as their ancestors were, because they cannot be anything else. That was especially the case in areas that were Serbian even in the 7th century" (p. 11). Besides, what outbalanced things was the discovery written about by Lujo Bakotić, the prominent Serbian Catholic, in his book *The Serbs in Dalmatia*: "From a clearly national point of view, we were taking care of the fact that the Serbs were the Serbs even before they were Christianized" (p. 11).

German Jesuit Ratering was of the opinion that all the Serbs were primarily Catholics and later accepted the Orthodox faith and Kostić emphasises that it had no importance at all, up until Christian disunion took place in 1054, after which Catholicism prevailed, but than Saint Sava Nemanjić brought Orthodoxy to supremacy. Later on, the majority of Serbian Catholics had Orthodox ancestors, but there were some exceptions as well, because certain noble Serbian families of Dubrovnik were originally Catholic. "Even where the ancestors of these Serbs were Orthodox, and where that could be proven without doubt, nobody checked and/or reverted it and thus returned to Orthodoxy. They remained good, quite eager Catholics. Since religion is just an aspect and not an essential characteristic of nationality, because of "dear brother of whichever faith", because their ancestors were Catholics for some longer period of time than their pre-ancestors were Orthodox, because not only the foreign power but the local as well (in Dubrovnik). executed conversion, etc., all of these people remained faithful to their religion. There was a lot of clergy among them, even prelates, and because of all that, the Serbian Catholics, whom they wanted to be equated with, had no objections to remaining Catholics. On the contrary, the Serbs had every reason to help it" (p. 12).

Along the whole Serbian coast, from Skadar to Šibenik and Ravnı Kotari, the older natives were mainly Serbs, while the indigenous population were mainly Serbian, as witnessed by cherishing the tradition of the Christian Patron Saint's Day, which is an exclusively Serbian characteristic preserved until today in spite of the transition to Catholicism. Don Ivan Stojanović, a Catholic Prelate of Dubrovnik, was telling his fellow-citizens: "You are Serbs, in your kin, and in your customs; Serbdom is your only salvation; religion does not keep you from being the Serb, not in the least" (p. 12). Even for those who lost their Serbian national consciousness over the centuries, nothing that was

foreign prevailed. They called their language "ours" and, as they were different to the pre-inhabitants of the Roman cities, they were identified as Slavs. During the last century, in times when the national consciousness was awaking, Serbian Catholics from the south Adriatic were declaring themselves Serbs, while in northern Dalmatia, Croatian expansion was emphasised and the religious circles were imposing identification of Catholicism with the Croatian nationality. In Boka Kotorska and Dubrovnik, there were no Croats at all by the end of the 19th century.

The prominent Serbian Catholic Marko Car published the column *Vladika Rade and Serbian Catholics* in Brankovo kolo, in the year 1902, writing about his friendly relations with the Serbs from Boka, who were Catholics – especially Conte Josif Ivanović. He says: "The family of Conte Ivanović belongs, even today, to the Catholic faith, which does not prevent its members from "cherishing the honest Serbdom" as good people and the natives from Boka. Unfortunately, their cherishing of Serbdom has become very difficult nowadays, and extremely abhorrent in the eyes of those who serve that religion and who use it to achieve certain political purposes, as is the case for the Catholics from Boka in general. Like today in Boka Kotorska and Dubrovnik, when a Catholic has the heart to declare himself a Serb, that person is laying himself open to many troubles and enters a direct fight with the priests of the same religion, who are, almost all, fighters for the anti-Serbian propaganda that is being carried out there" (p. 15).

According to the geographically-statistical description of Boka Kotorska from the Calendar of Cetinje called *Grlica* for 1838, "in Boka, Serbs of the Orthodox faith had their own ships [...] and the Serbs of the Roman-Catholic faith had one third of that" (p. 16). In 1849, Vuk Karadžić wrote: "All over Boka, there are around 34 thousand souls, all real Serbs as they can only be; one fourth of those are of the Roman law, and all the rest of the Greek" (p. 16). On the invitation to join Ban Jelačić in Croatia, which was sent to them by the Croatian-Slavonic Council from Zagreb, 400 of the most prominent inhabitants of Boka, held a meeting on 13 July 1848 in Prčanj, which was mainly Catholic, in the yard of the Catholic Franciscan Monastery, hosted by Antun Sbutega, the Captain of Prčanj. However, they all declared themselves as Slavs/Serbs and sent their response to Zagreb and to the *vladika* in Cyrillic letter" (p. 16). Kostić gives some other striking examples. "The Municipal Council of Kotor, again a municipality with a Catholic majority (at least three quarters) proclaimed the prominent son of Boka Kotorska Captain Josip Đurović from Prčanj as its honorary citizen in 1861 and granted him a diploma, in Serbian Cyrillic letters and in Italian, in which he is praised as "hardworking and tireless in pushing the development of Serbian-Slavic people." He was a Catholic, just like the Mayor of Kotor was" (p. 16). On the occasion of helping the Herzegovinian rebels and the declaration of war that the Montenegrin Government announced against Turkey in 1875, "The Slav reading-room" from Dobrota sent a telegram to Prince Nikola on 17 December, saying: "People of Dobrota, neighbours of meritorious Montenegro, cry

out with enthusiastic hearts: in a good moment, our Prince, did the sword shine in your chivalrous hand. Let the enslaving chain of our brothers be cut and your Serbian glory repeated!" The telegram was signed by Captain Vido Kamenarović. I think that all the members of the reading-room were Catholics, without exception. But they were emphasising their Serbdom and longed for Serbian glory" (p. 17.).

In his book *The Dictatorship of King Alexander*, Svetozar Pribićević wrote: "Around 1860-1870 in Croatia and Slavonia (especially Slavonia), there were Catholics who declared themselves Serbs and who were emphasising their Serbian nationality in the Croatian Council (for example Brlić); even among the Catholic leaders of the Herzegovinian insurgents, who were fighting against the Turks, there were convinced Serbs. Sometimes both Catholics and priests declared themselves Serbs. But identifying the Orthodox faith with the Serbian people soon became so strong that any Serbian activities among the Catholics became impossible and the name Serb was limited to Orthodox people only" (p. 17). In 1854, Andrija Torkvat wrote that "in the whole Illyrian triangle, there were Serbs of the Roman-Catholic and Greek law" (p. 17.). In Zemun, on the occasion of the 1000th Anniversary of Saint Cyril and Methodius, a Serbian flag was flapping from the Catholic church. The high-ranking Croatian civil servant and writer Ognjeslav Utješinović Ostrožinski openly wrote in 1840 that he considered himself a Serb.

Until the Austro-Hungarian occupation took place, Bosnian Catholics had no Croatian national consciousness at all, which was also confirmed by Croatian historians Vjekoslav Klaić and Antun Radić, PhD. One of the dukes of the Herzegovinian uprising, a Catholic priest named don Ivan Musić, wore the Montenegrin folk suit, just like the Orthodox dukes did. Prince Nikola called one of his 12 Herzegovinian mercenary battalions *The Battalion of Herzegovinians of the Roman Law*. In 1862, Franciscan Catholic theologian Toma Kovačević held not only the Bosnian Orthodox, but the Catholics and Muslims as well to be Serbs. As he says: "In Bosnia, there are 130 thousand, and in Herzegovina 30 to 40 thousand Catholics. They are living under the control of the Bosnian friars – monks, among whom there are some good patriots and there are some who would like to turn to Orthodoxy, though right now is not the time for that" (p. 19). He warns: "The Croats want the Bosnian Krajina, which can be seen from the speech given by members of their Council. This Krajina is inhabited by a hundred thousand souls, but not a single Croat" (p. 19).

Herzegovinian Franciscan friar Grga Škarić was urging the people to "wake up from the death of slavery and to prepare themselves for the general unification of all Serbs, so to join their brothers in the Kingdom of Serbia" (p. 20). As Kostić quotes, Škarić wanted to revive the Serbian national spirit and to assure the Catholics "that freedom and independence can only be achieved if the hatred is destroyed and if all the separated Serbian branches are united" (p. 20), producing the plan in 12 items. "Item number five says that people should be told that all our ancestors were of the Orthodox faith up to the 14th century and, until then, they were happy and had our lords and governors, after which the

Franciscans arrived and split the people into two parts." Under one item, friar Grga recommends that the people are told that the word Serb does not only indicate religion, but one nation of the same language, same nationality, customs, homeland, freedom and independence – and of the same rights. Under item eight, he takes Serbia under his defence and calls the claim of the Catholic priests who say that Serbia wants to convert people into the Orthodox faith untrue; he explains that Serbia gives the freedom of conscientiousness and religion and that it is only longing to liberate us from slavery and tyranny and to unite the people, because that is the only way to get released from bondage. Under item nine, he expresses his aspirations to awake all the Catholic and possibly Muslim popularity and sympathy for Serbia [...]. Under item ten – to take an oath of loyalty and devotion to Serbia, in case of general movement, and that the Herzegovinian Catholics are ready to join their eastern Serbian brothers in the fight for freedom for their people and homeland" (p. 20).

In 1869, friar Grga Škarić arrived in Belgrade and handed a memo to regent deputy Jovan Ristić that began with the following words: "The people of Herzegovina are Serbian people, without any other mixing aside, which they can prove with their customs, their dialect and their ancient sagas from their great-grandfathers; what also reminds them of that are the ruins of the ancient towns and the institution of the old Serbian nation – their great-grandfathers who were defeated and destroyed by Asian barbarism; moreover, the grave stone and drawings witness that Serbian dust is resting there –

the ashes of their grandfathers that fell for the sake of the freedom of their people and homeland" (p. 21). Friar Grga Martić, the main leader of the Herzegovinian Catholics up to 1905, also declared himself a Serb. "In 1842, in *The Serbian National Papers*, he published *The Description of Herzegovina*, in which it was written: "The language of the Herzegovinians is a dialect of our Serbian language." The same year, in Skoroteča, he complained about "Church-Slavic words in our Serbian literary language." He explains that, as a young man, he had difficulties in understanding those words and he continued: "When it was so difficult for me, as a Serb, how could it have been for a foreigner?" He ended the column with the words: "Let's forget all kinds of mixtures, but let the Serbs cherish Serbdom in the Serbian way" (p. 21).

In the Kingdom of Serbia, great scientists such as Josif Pančić, Generals Đura Horvatić and Franasović, families of well known intellectuals like Đaja, and so on were prominent Serbian Catholics. A lot of the *Bunjevci* of Bačka declared themselves Serbs such as writer Mara Malagurski and sculptor Ana Bešlić, but there were also *Bunjevci* who declared themselves Croats. In his book "*The Serbs in Dalmatia*", Lujo Bakotić wrote: "One characteristic of the Dalmatian phenomenon were the Serbs of the Catholic faith. There were and there still are some Serbian Catholics, even in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but they are very rare. In Dalmatia, they are quite numerous. They are mainly intellectuals but there are also workers and peasants. They are everywhere in Dalmatia: In Knin, Šić, Imotsko, Makarska, Šibenik, Split, Kašteli and

on the islands, but they are most numerous in Dubrovnik and the in the area around Dubrovnik” (p. 23).

In 1878, during the Congress of Berlin, around five and a half thousand Catholics lived on the Montenegrin coast. “For these Catholics, Prince Nikola managed to conclude a concordat with the Vatican that was relatively favourable (among other things, they were allowed to give the divine service in the Slavic language). Their goal, the goal that the Montenegrin Government reached, was that one part of the Catholics, lead by the Catholic Archbishop of Bar as the Serbian primate, were kept for Serbdom. The negotiations for the concordat were led by Count Lujo Vojnović, a Serbian Catholic from Dubrovnik and the Minister of Justice of Montenegro. He led them well, fairly and patriotically” (p. 24). Pope then confirmed the ancient title of the Archbishop of Bar as Serbian Primate with a decree. Even today’s Bar Archbishop Milinović was a Serbian Catholic from Perast. In Rome, Milinović and Vojnović both objected to the Croatian description given to the Institute of Saint Jerome, of which the prominent Russian historian Pavel Rowinsky wrote: “Their effort was crowned with full success. Pope issued an official notice that established the name “Illyrian” for the Board, explaining that this name was understood by all Serbian Catholics from all parties, so that they claim rights for the Institution as well. Besides, the Montenegrin delegates managed to ensure that the Serbian language is lectured at the Institute in Cyrillic. Montenegro triumphed and had reason to do so, because never have I heard of another example in the history of papacy where the impeccable pope changed his resolution. It is impossible not to admire the decision of pope to make a concession to Montenegro and the Serbian Catholics” (p. 25).

In Boka Kotorska and the region of Dubrovnik, Austro-Hungarian authorities were obstructing and perfidiously preventing the manifestation of Serbdom, so open demonstration of Serbian national feelings were emphasized the most by the intellectuals, while the common people were mainly languishing in ignorance under the general influence of the Catholic clergy and the gendarmerie, but that was all because the inhabitants of Boka Kotorska and the inhabitants of Konavli still had their Christian Patron Saint’s Day that the Catholic priests were performing as the *prekada* (Translator’s note: traditional ceremony) as well. In 1913, Savo Nakićenović wrote: “Catholics from Boka differ from those from Konavli. The inhabitants of Boka are still proud to be from Montenegro and to be Serbs, which is what a lot of inhabitants of Konavli are hiding; The Boka Catholics admit that they used to be Orthodox, which the inhabitants of Konavli would not do; the Boka Catholics keep all their native customs and Christian names, while the inhabitants of Konavli mainly threw them away; all Catholics (from Boka) gladly go to Orthodox churches and take vows. They even sing in the church choir in our churches” (p. 27). Putting a special emphasise on the example of the catholic Dobrota, Nakićenović points out: “All the old villages are ruined. Today’s inhabitants are all Montenegrins or Herzegovinians who fled from the Turks to these parts since the time of Battle of Kosovo, and here they were forcibly converted by the

IT-03-67-T

Venetians. They always had a reputation as good Serbs and heroes; they do not mind the religion. Their lives and customs are like those of the other Serbian inhabitants of Boka” (p. 28).

On the other hand, “everything that had some origin, reputation and national pride in Dubrovnik at the end of the last century and the beginning of this one, all that was Serbian. So, in 1890, the Serbian Party won the municipal elections and the party was “convoked in Dubrovnik by Serbian Catholics, as they were in the majority” (Lujo Bakotić, quotation, page 9). That was the biggest political sensation of that time in our countries” (p. 29.). The Czech Lubor Niederle, qualified by Kostić as the greatest Slavic ethnographer at the beginning of this century, wrote in 1911 that: “Religion is one of the basic characteristics for making the difference between the Serbs and the Croats: the Croats are Catholics and the Serbs are Orthodox and Muslim. However, this characteristic is not absolute. There are many Catholics who declared themselves Serbs and who the Serbs consider their own. Those are, for example, the Catholics of Dubrovnik and Boka Kotorska, or *Šokci*, *Bunjevci* and *Krašovani* (Translator’s note: the Croatian association of emigrants) of Hungary” (p. 32). At the beginning of this century, Austrian novelist Hermann Bor wrote that Dubrovnik was mainly inhabited by Serbs. In his book *The National Statistics* published in 1914, the most recognized Croatian statistician Josip Lakatoš complained that “not even the Austrian signature differentiated the Croats from the Serbs, so that is why we cannot make an accurate border between the number of Croats and the number of Serbs. In Bosnia, on the other hand, it was quite possible to calculate the exact number of Croats, but in Dalmatia it was not, because there were again Serbian Catholics in two counties, Dubrovnik and Kotor” (p. 32-33). Even two Serb-haters, the English Seaton-Watson and the American of Slavic origin Luj Adamič, pointed out the Serbian nature of Dubrovnik. However, while what the first one was wondering about its strength, vigil and sacrifice, the latter claimed that those were Croats who demonstratively claimed to be Serbs.

Serbian Catholics almost everywhere lived integrated into Serbian Orthodox, except for in Dubrovnik, where there was hardly anyone of the Orthodox faith. However, the Serbian Catholics organized various associations and it was they who were publishing the papers and who held the meetings and national manifestations under Serbian auguries. The most attractive association was the Serbian Academic Youth of Dubrovnik. In Vienna, they were becoming members of the Serbian Academic Society *Dawn* which encompassed Serbs from all other areas. In 1905, the great Serbian historian Vladimir Corović published a history of that association in which he said that the “Serbian Catholics were generally the most passionate” and that “the Serbian Catholics from southern coast were the most exclusive Serbs among the academic youth of Vienna” (p. 34). Talking about the Serbian papers in Dubrovnik, the most intensive Serbdom was in *Dubrovnik*, *Slavonian*, *Srđ* and *Serbian Dawn*. In 1909, in Dubrovnik, they established Matica Srpska, which published sixteen books with national topics up to the

WWI. The Serbian Printing Firm was active as well.

The tumultuous and lavish celebration of unveiling the monument to Ivan Gundulić, the greatest poet of Dubrovnik, on 29 June 1893 had a generally Serbian character. Such intense and impressive enjoyment of Serbdom finally made the foreign poets consider the Dubrovnik literature Serbian. "They noticed that nobody but the descendants of those writers can give better description and they were almost all expressing their Serbian feelings" (p. 39).

After Trieste and Zadar, Dubrovnik became the first centre of the Dalmatian Serbs from the coast. "Orthodox Serbs made up 90 percent of the Serbian element on the coast and they gave the leadership to catholic Dubrovnik, where they were very rare (if there was any, those were mainly Herzegovinians). In Zadar and Kotor were the head offices of the Orthodox episcopates. The head office of the Orthodox theological school, which was the best of that period, was in Zadar (ecclesiastical law was lectured by Nikodim Milaš, the best canon supporter of all Orthodoxy). Mainly Serbian MPs were elected to the Council of Empire in Boka and Knin, as for the Dalmatian Congress in the very south of "Dalmatia" (in Boka) and in the highly continental north. However, without exception, all these Serbs gave the leading role to Dubrovnik, which was catholic but Serbian" (p. 40). During the WWI, many of the Serbian Catholics were arrested, sentenced and interned, all because of Serbdom, but "that could not shake their Serbdom, nor did any of them betray Serbdom because of that" (p. 40).

The Austrian publicist, Baron Leopold Hlumetzky, who was employed in public service for a certain period of time, wrote a book about Franz Ferdinand in which he witnessed how the archduke and the heir to the throne hardly accepted the cold and rejecting welcome in Serbian Dubrovnik and resignedly confided to him: "Yet, how loyal the Croats are and how the Serbs differ from them" (p. 42). In 1909, the same Hlumetzky wrote on the second occasion that: "We must not forget that Dubrovnik has been the focus of great Serbian movement for years, which especially includes municipal intelligentsia" (p. 43).

However, the Serbs in Dubrovnik regularly had a pan-Slavic note, which was clearly emphasised in the speech of the Serbian Catholic Vlaho Matijević, PhD in 1893 beside the grave of Meda Pucić: "Just as the late Medo loved all the Slavs with his noble and patriotic heart, just as he was singing about Slavic unity – and yet, as a man from Dubrovnik, he knew that he cannot be anything other than a Serb. So the youth of Dubrovnik was giving a hand to Slavs but, at the same time, never forgetting that they were Serbian and they that they had to keep their nationality" (p. 48). But under Austrian domination, the people of Dubrovnik strongly resisted every thought of an administrative union with Croatia and it was difficult for them to accept union with Dalmatia as well, because they never even had any territorial connection with it. In 1851, the German travel writer Johann Ferdinand Neugebauer wrote: "Dubrovnik is the most Slavic town in all Dalmatia, but it its greatest fear is joining with Croatia, who finds it cruel, though Dubrovnik is really a very educated place" (p. 54).

When the court clique of Prince Pavle Karađorđević and the worst ever Serbian government lead by Dragiša Cvetković signed creation of the Banate of Croatia in 1939 – which was within incredible borders that even included Dubrovnik, although it had actually never before been a part of Croatia – Dubrovnik was flooded with astonishment and consternation. The revolt was so strong that even the prominent pro-Croatian politician from Dubrovnik, Pero Čingrija sharply opposed the unity and the separation from the Serbian background from which the people of Dubrovnik originated. The communists confirmed the mentioned occupation in 1945 so, from a cultural place of the highest rank, Dubrovnik fell into lethargy as the worst province.

In his afterword for Engel's *History of the Republic of Dubrovnik*, don Ivan Stojanović said, among other things, that: "There in not a family in Dubrovnik (apart from those who arrived from Italy) which does not originate from Herzegovina or from some neighbouring village. The old Senate, almost entirely constituted from Roman families, was besieged by Serbian people in the 15th and 16th century" (p. 61). That gave a very clear picture of the differences in ethnic structure of the Dalmatian towns and Dubrovnik, which Stojanović also specifies: "In the Dalmatian towns, under the Venetian government, a spirit was born from the mixture of Italian (Greek/Latin) culture with Croatian blood and nature. In free Dubrovnik, the spirit was born from the mixture of the same Italian (Greek/Latin) culture and the Serbian blood and nature" (p. 61). In *The Literature of Dubrovnik*, don Ivan Stojanović was speaking even more strictly about the mass of Serbs who, after the Battle of Kosovo, settled all over the lands of Dubrovnik and, in addition to Engel's book, he penetrates into events from the pre-Kosovo period. The people of Dubrovnik, after getting the surrounding villages, took their language, so the people of Dubrovnik gradually arose from Romans from

Epidavar and the Serbian peasants, united in the same power, the same religion and the same language. They did not want to be called either Serbs nor Croats, nor Dalmatians, nor Italians. Why, nowadays, real Dubrovians take themselves to be Serbs and the Government is pushing the idea of calling them Croats, which will be discussed when we reach the third époque, the époque of the stench and decay of this famous corpse. To prove that we are telling the truth, it would be enough to open the collections of the Serbian writings, collected by Miklošić, Archbishop Nikolajević and Meda Pucić. There, in each epistle, the Serbian kings call the Dubrovians their "relatives" and each epistle starts with: "Greetings to the prince and the gentry of Dubrovnik, our relatives" (p. 61).

Just like Konstantin Jireček, who established that the Dubrovians according to their neighbours and ethnography, cannot be "other than Serbs", don Ivo Stojanović further says, in his book *The Literature of Dubrovnik*, that: "All surrounding villages, without exception, remained the same and clear from any other influence and all kept their initial and original Serbian character until today, which can be recognized in their customs, folk songs, national costumes, etc. [...] Who are the peasants

of Dubrovnik? Serbian people living in the town surroundings” (p. 63). At the same time, “the nobility of Dubrovnik, with their wise politics, took the language and some forms of life from the Serbian people, because the aristocracy of Dubrovnik was much less numerous in comparison to the people. Since the peasants of Dubrovnik were much stronger in number than the gentry and citizens, in order to make one nation out of all the peasants of Dubrovian land, they took their Serbian language and kept their own culture and everything” (p. 65). This was also related by Matija Ban, according to whom “Serbian poetry had to be born in this town, around the ninth century, because it is written in the book of history that the people of Dubrovnik used to sing about the heroism of the Serbian knights and so one Prince of Neretva asked them to glorify his people with their songs as well” (p. 69-70). Another famous Dubrovian, the well known lawyer Valtazar Bogišić, explained the roots of his family: “the Bogišić family, just like the whole district Konavli, from where they arrived and which even Porphyrogenitus mentioned among the Serbian districts, were Orthodox; but when they fell under the Republic of Dubrovnik in the 15th century, the friars also arrived, who introduced Catholicism” (p. 70).

Also, Milan Rešetar, an inhabitant of Konavli, Catholic and University Professor of Slavistics from Vienna, wrote that the official correspondence in Dubrovnik was in Serbian and the rarity of old charters in the archives and collections was explained as follows: “Out of all the governmental creations in the Serbian lands, only the Republic of Dubrovnik resisted the Turkish flood, so the only preserved things were those that found safe shelter in the Archive of that Republic” (p.70). After a professional analysis of the linguistic characteristics of the language in which the official documents were written, Rešetar says that it “must be concluded that this unique (always the same) dialect used by the scribes of Dubrovnik [...] can only be a Serbian dialect spoken in Dubrovnik” (p. 71). We must also bear in mind the fact that the first official language was Latin. “In Dubrovnik, they only started to write in Serbian at the end of the 15th century” (p. 72).

In 1878, after he left the catholic monastery, Serbian writer Ljudevit Vuličević, a Catholic priest and Franciscan friar whose deed is now almost forgotten, published a book *My Mother*, of which Veljko Petrović wrote that it represents one of the most beautiful works of Serbian poetry in prose. To what extent Vuličević was imbued with Serbdom can be best seen from the following quotation from his book, dedicated to the free sons of Serbia: “Serbian sons, love your mother, because it has the treasury of kindness and the power of sacrifice. Our mother was our only teacher; the whole world was attacking Serbs, overwhelming and covering us from all sides and our mothers were consoling us and teaching us well. They sing us the folk songs and tell us wisdom in proverbs; they tell us stories and events that our poor people went through; our mother grows the noble and sweet feelings in our hearts. If the Serbian sons love their mother and care about her, they will love their homeland as well; if the Serbian youth skilfully and diligently, with their minds and their hearts, understands the tireless and noble love of

the Serbian mother, they will really understand the strength of the Serbian people, which is slowly but steadily developing into an unlimited circle of its infinite cleverness” (p. 74). He calls his native town on the Serbian sea, Cavtat, “a Serbian flower, which wonderfully blossoms beside Serbian Dubrovnik” (p. 75). And the following words of Ljudevit Vuličević – as if they were written nowadays, as if they were defying the modern Serbian enemies with their haughtiness, their arrogance, unscrupulousness and cruelty: “People are ascending with a song; their ideal is the strength in that song. That shining Serbian ideal will not be darkened by the evil wish of a bad malevolent. And the Serbs will not stray while it lasts. We will show the power of our spirit when the time comes. The world has suppressed us and it still does, but the hope in the Serbian souls will never fade. That sad Serbian song comes out of the sadness of the Serbian heart, but the sadness is growing and strengthening our souls. [...] Serbian people, I would give anything, believe me, for your independence, for your freedom; I would give this rotten and wretched life” (p. 75-76). Another Catholic friar who was dealing with ethnology, Vid Vuletić-Vukasović, points out that the surrounding of Dubrovnik was Zahumlje and Travunija and, in his study *The Folk Embroidery in Dalmatia*, published in 1899, he said of Dubrovnik: “It was a lone Latin town, surrounded by nothing but Serbian lands and vineyards, so it is no wonder that the Latin people became assimilated with the Serbian and even now preserve national customs” (p. 77.).

As for the district of Konavli, Vuletić-Vukasović, who was born in Brsečine, writes that “in the Middle Ages, it was a good district, mainly inhabited by the Serbs and belonging to the principedom of Travunija or Tribunija. In 1427, the gentry of Dubrovnik took Konavli and shared this beautiful district among themselves, so it very quickly became the most beautiful and charming district of Dubrovnik. They preserved Serbian national customs, like they are today; and everyone admires them, especially owing to the celebration of the Serbian Christian name and the original Serbian embroidery” (p. 77).

Also, Count Lujo Vojnović wrote about Dubrovnik as one of the Serbian countries and considered the old literature of Dubrovnik to be exclusively Serbian. In his book *Dubrovnik – One Historical Walk* from 1907, he points out: “The oldest famous Latin poet of Dubrovnik is El. Cerva and the oldest Serbian poets are Šiško Menčetić and Đora Držić” (p. 79). In 1901, a Catholic parson from Orašac in the Bishopric of Dubrovnik, don Andro Murat, wrote the following verses during his visit to the Savina monastery near Herceg Novi:

“Serbian Boka, clean Serbian Bosporus,
A holy talk of the Serbian soul,
For what are the lies of anti Serbian anger,
When your faith is as hard as Lovćen” (p. 79).

Beyond that, among the prominent Serbian Catholics, the most significant role in public and scientific life was played by lawyer Valtazar Bogišić, historian Antun Dabinović, comparative linguist Henrik Barić, economist Mijo Mirković, philologist Milan Rešetar,

professor Luko Zore, philologist Petar Budmani, academic Petar Kolendić, literary theoretician Vinko Vitezica, historians Antonije Vučetić, Ilija Sindik, Vice Adamović, Božo Cvjetković and Antonije Farčić, writer Matija Ban, poet Ilija Okrugić, storyteller Božidar Džaja, literary critic Marko Car, novelist Ivo Cipiko, poet Šibe Miličić, publisher Antun Fabris, journalist Jovan Džaja, newspaper directors Kristo Dominković and Miko Vaketi, politician Stijepo Kobasica, journalists Nikola Vučetoć, Čivo Višić and Nikola Petković-Ciko, biologist Josif Pančić, nature historian Ivan Đaja, agronomist Aleksandar Đaja, pharmacist Siniša Đaja, botanist Lujo Adamović, botanist Josif Veselić, nature historian Branimir Maleš, mathematician Vinko Đurović, painters Marko Ignjat Job, Cvijeto Job, Paško Vučetić and Vlaho Bukovac, lawyer Ignjat Bakotić, grammar school professor Jakov Grupković, publishers Jovo Matlić and Vinkentije Butijer, politicians Jovo Mihaljević and Kažimir Luketić, pharmacist Matej Šarić, lawyer Baldo Gradi, Vlaho Matijević, Luko Markiz Bona, Mato Grainić, Rudolf Sardelić, Catholic priests Marko Vučković, Niko Luković, Bar Archbishops Nikola Dobračić and Simo Milinović, don Marko Anšić, Đuro Perušina, Niko Živanović, Ante Anić, Serbian general, minister and ambassador Đura Horvatović, Serbian general, minister and adjutant Milana Dragutin Franasović and many other officers, ship owner Božo Banjac from Dubrovnik and the Račić ship business family from Cavtat. The daughter of Nikola Pašić married Serbian Catholic Štefi Raičić. Ivo Andrić, the most famous Serb Catholic of his time enjoyed a special glory.

The national movement of Serbian Catholics was very strong before the WWI. The whole Montenegrin coast and Dubrovnik were completely Serbian, as was the largest part of Dalmatia. The resistance of the Roman Catholic Church towards reviving the Serbian national consciousness was very weak and the majority of Catholic priests were open in their glorification of Serbdom. There was a similar situation in Bosnia, Herzegovina, Slavonia and Vojvodina. The situation was even more favourable for the Serbian Catholics when, in 1914, the Kingdom of Serbia concluded the concordat with the Vatican, when the Roman-Catholic Church introduced the Slavic divine service, Serbian religious songs and the prayer for the Serbian king. Members of the National Movement of Serbian Catholics were not driven by any material interests, but exclusively by their emotions, historical memories and tradition, and the public opinion in Serbia was very tolerant and generous in religious matters. The severe sufferings of the Orthodox people in the WWI in the territories under Austro-Hungarian control, as well as the pursuit of the most prominent Serbian Catholics only hardened the Serbian national solidarity. In 1918, the Serbian army was welcomed with huge enthusiasm in all Serbian areas where the brothers of Latin faith lived and the mood spread to Catholics who had never before that expressed their Serbian national conscience. "If Serbia had then kept the areas guaranteed by the *London Treaty*, it is quite possible that at least half of the citizens would have turned to Serbdom. It is quite understandable that the Government would then lead a clear Serbian

policy and loudly promote Serbdom" (p. 111). The basic conclusion of professor Kostić is that Serbdom did not need to be imposed on the Catholics, because they were taking it naturally, primordially and consciously.

Yugoslavia and the imprudence of King Alexander Karadorđević ruined everything however. Lazo Kostić also illustrates the stupidity of the king by telling anecdotes that, after the creation of the joint state, "one citizen of Dubrovnik introduced himself to King Alexander as a "Serbian Catholic from Dubrovnik" and the king responded with the words "Orthodox Croat from Belgrade" (p. 111). During the first ten years of the existence of the Yugoslav state, there was real democracy and true chaos. "Municipality administration was led by a whole mass of people, especially by those who were spiteful, dissatisfied and ineloquent. They were favouring all the enemies of the regime and defaming its followers. There came a time when it was shameful to be with the "regime", with "Belgrade", with the Serbs, let alone to identify with Serbdom or to declare yourself a Serb. The demagogy of Stipan Radić and many verbal mistakes did their job. The most obvious evidence showed that, from Konavli – undoubtedly of Serbian origin and a later addition, under whose wing the first Serbian Catholics on the Adriatic developed – came the most warm-blooded and rebellious Croats, the least friendly towards the Serbs. It was more difficult still in Boka, because the huge majority was of the Serbian Orthodox faith but the Croatian nationality was gaining power over Serbdom among the Catholics. There were hardly any new catholic Serbs. Even those in Bar and Ulcinj started to change their minds and some of them, when they left their native towns, were becoming Croats. Nobody sustained any damage from that, and it was in no manner forbidden. So why not try to be interesting, perhaps even be a hero?" (p. 112-113).

After the WWII, the situation became unbearable. People who were declaring themselves Serbs were regularly exposed to prosecution and, in Montenegro, not even the Orthodox could declare themselves Serbs if they wanted to avoid unpleasantness, including threats to personal and professional existence. "The Orthodox were marked as 'Montenegrin' and the Catholics as Croats!" (p. 113). Dubrovnik was included in the Croatian federal Unit, flooded with Croatian national propaganda and the forgery of historical facts, all in order to destroy the root of Serbdom that lived there. That was helped by the fact that, during the centuries of Austro-Hungarian occupation, the old gentry of Dubrovnik had died out because, after they fell to the enemy, the noble families agreed not to make any further descendants by stopping their sons from getting married. The process was finished by deafening communist ideology and the official propaganda of the "brotherhood and unity", which was based on extremely anti-Serbian foundations. However, according to statistics from 1953, there were still 8,813 Serbian Catholics and around 4,709 of Montenegrin Catholics. It is certain that many of them declared themselves as Serb atheists, if they were members of the Communist Party. "Many of those who spent the War in Serbia turned to the Orthodox faith. For example, the former deputy (Dubrovian) Stjepo

Kobasica, declared that he could not stay faithful to a religion that was exterminating the Serbs [...] then Count Alexander Vidović from Šibenik, Nikola Petrović-Ciko from Boka, etc. I, myself, was the godfather to two men who were taking the Orthodox faith (Dušan Hope from Dubrovnik and Petar Guće from one Adriatic island)” (p. 115).

The regime of Pavle Karadorđević and Josip Broz Tito separated Dubrovnik from the Serbian centre and united it with the Croatian Banate or social republic, although it never belonged there. A real flood of historical, political sociological, linguistic and literary counterfeits appeared and the Serbs under the dictatorship simply remained quiet, while the poltrons were competing in their flattering obedience and servility. In 1967, there was a major public scandal. The Department of Yugoslav Literature of the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade, in a review of the literature, they came across the old book by academic Pavle Popović entitled *The Review of Serbian Literature*, which looked at the literature of Dubrovnik as something originally Serbian. Students had been studying from that book for decades, but now the political top echelons needed the affair in order to hit the Serbian national being once again and to give the Serbian communist bootlickers another opportunity to prove their ideological orthodoxy, through unscrupulous beating of the history and culture of the Serbian people. The front-liners of the Central Committee of the Association of Communists of Yugoslavia were competing at throwing stones at Serbdom and sacrificed great quantity of cultural heritage by pushing it into the jaw of a greedy Croatian dragon. In Croatia, in the process of organizing the alleged Yugoslav encyclopaedia, a huge group of falsifiers was lead personally by Miroslav Krleža. Systematically, everything belonging to Dubrovnik was given Croatian attributes. They were grabbing Gundulić and Ruđer Bošković, Valtazar Bogišić and Vlaho Bukovac and the whole Bunić family, whose Italian surname was de Bona, in spite of the fact that Luko Markiz Bona was a leader of the Serbian Coastal Party. Even Marin Držić, whose Serbdom was almost proverbial, was called on his gravestone the greatest Croatian comedy writer of the Renaissance. Today's Catholics in Dubrovnik are made to declare themselves Croats. The censuses are artificially concocted and the results were projected into the far history. Serbian communist courts were banning books and publications due to their presentation of the truth, and the papers *Politika* from Belgrade was the leader in killing the national consciousness of its people and serving its enemies. However, from time to time, through Belgrade and Zagreb papers, you could have read about the difficulties that communist agents had in coming face to face with the old song of Dubrovnik: *At the top of Srdj the fairy cheers – Hello Serbian Dubrovnik!*

2. The Serbdom of Dubrovnik

All the above was the reason why Prof. Dr Lazo M. Kostić agreed to write a book entitled *The Violent Appropriation of the Culture of Dubrovnik*, which was published in 1975 in Melbourne. It consists of two

The issue of the language of old Dubrovnik was a very complex one. Originally, it was the specific Vlachian-Romanic dialect, while the official language was Latin. As the Slavic element strengthened, so the Serbian Language spread, but the differences between the patricians and plebeians were still visible. The patricians spoke the Serbian language interwoven with Latin words and expressions, while the common people spoke more correctly, in the sense of the language itself. In diplomacy, all texts intended for the western countries were written in Latin and Italian and, for the eastern countries, it was done in Serbian and Cyrillic. Primary literature was in Latin and later in Italian and Slavic. The Slavic language was not of a unique expression and it differed due to time and external factors from author to author. From time to time, there were even some Chakavian and Ikavian. However, Milan Rešetar unambiguously claims that the unique dialect of the scribes of Dubrovnik “can only be the Serbian dialect spoken in Dubrovnik” (p. 22). That explains the fact that only the Serbian inhabitants from Zahumlje and Travunija were settling Dubrovnik, gradually assimilating, in the ethnical aspect, the old Roman population. He names certain characteristics of the Dubrovnik *ragusanizam* (Ragusa is the old name for Dubrovnik) and adds: “The *ragusanizams* mainly developed after the 15th century, so this dialect was certainly closer to Herzegovinian in the 14th and 15th centuries than in the 16th and 17th centuries” (p. 22.) This attitude was published in Vienna in 1891 in the Archive of Slavic Philology and, in 1894, Rešetar gave even stronger specifications in his foreword for the book *The Review of the Lyrics of Dubrovnik*: “In the history of our national life in general, especially in the history of literature, Dubrovnik has a totally separate position, arising like an island that is preserving some Roman elements overtopped by the Slavic flood, Dubrovnik nowhere completely equalized with its Serbian surrounding: political independence was very much helped by ethnographical separation and, when the old Roman town turned Serbian, at least in its language, by moving Serbs and assimilating the natives, Dubrovnik again preserved its individuality” (p. 22-23).

Academic Aleksandar Belić also wrote that the colonization of Dubrovnik was mainly done from Trebinje, Hum and Neretva, so it is obviously Serbian, but it was also partly done from the islands and the north of Dalmatia, thus bringing certain characteristics of Chakavian. “Anyway, as Dubrovnik was connected to the sea and with the people from the islands accordingly, some joint features developed later (the pronunciation of the consonant *i* as *n* at the end of the word, with the nasalization of the preceding vocal, etc). On the other hand, as the literary work of Dubrovnik began in the second half of the 15th century, when the Chakavian literary language was in its full development, it is quite natural that the first writers from Dubrovnik were inclining to that literate language” (p. 23). He uses this fact to explain the Chakavian dialect used by Šiško Menčetić and Džora Držić, who were still writing with a good Herzegovinian dialect. “Writers like Ivan Gundulić (1588-

1638) were paying a lot of attention to the purity of language and trying to use native words instead of foreign ones. But even they were still using a lot of archaisms of various kinds” (p. 24). In one debate with the academic Radonjić, who, in conformity with the official aspirations, spoke of South-Slavic influences on Dubrovnik, professor Henrik Barić pointed out: “Why avoid the fact that those are clans of the natural Serbian hinterland of Dubrovnik. I do not want to say that there was no Chakavian element, especially that belonging to the workers and craftsmen of Dubrovnik. It is hard to say which one is older, Chakavian or Shtokavian, but there is no doubt that the latter was incomparably stronger, meaning stronger in number and stronger economically, and that it was the one that gave its profound Slavic nature to Roman Dubrovnik” (p. 25).

In his book *The Oldest Dialect of Dubrovnik* from 1951, Milan Rešetar says that “Vajan Belić and Barić are both mistaking if they think that it must be taken into consideration that, before the first poets appeared, one part of the population of Dubrovnik was Chakavian and that some of its Ikavian dialect was taken into the vernacular of Dubrovnik and, according to Belić, into the poetic language of Dubrovnik as well. I firmly reject the latter because, in order to believe that, we should re-consider the history of Dubrovnik, which certainly does not know whether the tradesmen, seamen or fishermen, settled Dubrovnik in crowds, which is why I still claim, as I did 50 years ago, that the people of Dubrovnik never spoke Dalmatian Chakavian-Ikavian speech, either partly or completely, but always only the Herzegovinian Shtokavian-Iekavian” (p. 25). Rešetar also thought this in 1889, when he wrote: “The people of Dubrovnik were never Chakavinas, because the Serbian language arrived in Roman Dubrovnik from old Zahumlje and the old Travunija, where Shtokavian was always spoken” (p. 26).

When we talk of the colonization of Dubrovnik, the most striking data in the archive researches was given by historian Vjekoslav Klačić, who did not refrain from using basic forgeries in order to support Croatian pretensions. However, in this case, he states the existence of an old chronicle that “contains a census of the gentry families of Dubrovnik and for each was said where they came from. The census includes 154 families who moved from: Zeta 11, from Zahumlje 15, from Kotor 22, from Travunija 30, from Bosnia 7, from Albania 8, from Zadar 6, from Serbia 4, from Bulgaria, from Split, Trogir, and Osor one and from other countries 47” (p. 26).

In his book *The Literature of Dubrovnik*, Ivan Stojanović wrote: “In the beginning, Dubrovnik was a compound of two elements, Roman and Slavic. From the fall of the Serbian Empire in Kosovo, Serbs spread out, not only through Dubrovnik, but over Neretva to Dalmatia” (p. 27), thus demonstrating the fact that many Serbian families entered the Senate of Dubrovnik, which was surrounded by Serbian people. “And, in their private lives, Roman families, whether the noble ones from the Epidaur of Askri (Kotor) or the middle class ones who arrived from Italy or Dalmatia became totally assimilated with Serbdom” (p. 27). After he translated Engel’s famous *The History of the Republic of Dubrovnik*, Ivan Stojanović printed it together with his detailed additions, in which we can

find the following: “How did the people of Dubrovnik hold themselves, who did they belong to? Was it the Slavs who were the first to settle Dubrovnik? To judge by the literature of the historic poets, it could well belong to the Croatian clan, for the sake of Chakavian, but according to surroundings and ethnography, they cannot be anything other than Serbs. The Serbian influence, through the number of the first settlers and their political relations with the neighbouring kings, bans, and župans, was so strong, that even in literature it took over Shtokavian and Iekavian more than in the other parts of Dalmatia.

Jagić recognizes Serbian supremacy and the power of Shtokavian, which pushed Chakavian out of literature. Miklošić again thinks – which is much more appropriate, that Chakavian was never known in Dubrovnik, but that they were just writing in such a way to be in harmony with other writers from Dalmatia” (p. 28). Ivan Stojanović is even more expressive and precise in his conclusion that “the first Dubrovnik, on the rocks of Saint Maria, was established by people of Roman nationality, who later accepted Serbian language, as we said, while the northern part was filled with a population

of the Slavic-Serbian nationality, who assimilated with the Romans into the Dubrovians. There is not a single reason to call our fathers the Croats. The surrounding countries that they held throughout centuries belonged to bans and kings of the Serbian nation” (p. 29).

In 1938, another Catholic, Lujo Bakotić, PhD wrote: “as for the Serbs living in the territory of the Republic of Dubrovnik, it is known that the people of Dubrovnik, aside from the town itself, gained the rest of territory almost all from Serbian rulers. All that territory was situated with people of the Orthodox faith” (p. 29). All Serbian families who came to the territory of Dubrovnik in their escape from Turks took the Catholic faith. In 1808, German historian Gebhardi stated: “Upon the fall of the larger Avarian state, *Sorabski* or Serbian settlers surrounded their town and settled the closest land, even the location of the old Epidaur in their own favour, under the supreme rule of the Greek state” (p. 31).

Engel claims that the name Dubrovnik was given by the Serbs and that they spoke Italian, until the 11th century, when the Slavic element started to overpower. “As the town was enlarging, its citizens could not live from hunting and fishing alone, so they started to spread around and cultivate fields and vineyards. In order to be able to do it safely and undisturbed, they paid 30 gold coins to the Župan (district perfect) of the Serbian Travunjani and the same amount annually to the Župan of Zahumlje, because the area of Dubrovnik was between the two. Payment of this rent released the inhabitants of Dubrovnik from any interference in their inland administration. The common commercial traffic was quite useful for both of these Serbian populaces” (p. 31-32).

Russian historian Viktor Vasiljevič Makušev gives another interesting piece of data: “If the Italian language was the language of science and the official language, the people of Dubrovnik were paying a lot attention to improving it, by forbidding women from studying foreign languages” (p. 32). Turkish travel writer Kol also writes about Serbian Dubrovnik and German Baron Otto Rainsberg and Ida von Diringfeld say that the

nationality of Dubrovnik is neither Italian nor Serbian, but both together. The well known English historian and diplomat Arthur Evans wrote that Stradun separated Serbian part of the town from the Roman and that it was filled “when, in the 13th century, antagonism between the Serbs and Romans began, and when the Serbian language became mother tongue of the descendants of the refugees from Epidaur” (p. 33). He says that, from the beginning of the 15th century, the mother tongue of the inhabitants of Dubrovnik was the purist form of the Serbian language. A similar thing was recorded by French writer Louis Leger and German historian Hans Helmont, as well as Norbert Krebs and Konstantin Jiriček.

Kostić finds that it is yet possible that a small number of Chakavinas, who were undoubtedly Croats, lived in Dubrovnik, just as all surrounding area was Serbian. Primarily, Dubrovnik only consisted of the town/polis and the closest suburbia, and gradually it was acquiring the closest Serbian surrounding, so the Chakavians were never able to define its basic character, because they were not very numerous. Engel says: “Stefan Vojislav, who renovated and liberated Serbia from Byzantine rule around 1040 to 1050, perhaps out of the friendship towards the people of Dubrovnik, gave them the valley of Zupa, bays of Rijeka, Gruž and Melfi (?), as well as the whole coast as far as Orašac – the fertile area. It seems that Mihajlo, the son of Stefan (1050-1080), was also generous towards the people of Dubrovnik, who were his allies. He gave them the islands of *Koločep*, *Lopud* and *Šipan*” (p. 36-37). Konstantin Jiriček quotes that, by the end of the Middle Ages, the Serbian language was prevailing in Dubrovnik and Kotor, due to the old city families dying out and the arrival of many new ones, with territorial expansion and intensification of the commercial traffic, so Kostić concludes: “Dubrovnik could only have, at least in the beginning, a mixed ethnical character. When they developed the city ramparts and spread in all directions except towards the sea, it was increasingly and expressively Serbian. The Republic of Dubrovnik was undoubtedly Serbian, according to the majority of its inhabitants” (p. 38).

In the beginning, people of Dubrovnik spoke a specific Roman language that represented a mixture of Vlachian and Latin, while the gentry was using the pure Tuscan language, which was significantly different from the Venetian dialect spoken in towns in Dalmatia, which were under the rule of Venice. From the very beginning, the Serbian language was unofficially introduced as accessory and for the administrative rule in the annexed areas and, from the beginning of the 13th century, as Rešetar says, “the official correspondence between the Republic of Dubrovnik and Serbian lands, was exclusively in Serbian” (p. 41). It was recorded that one Dubrovian from Hvar addressed the Senate of Dubrovnik in a Cyrillic letter in 1688. There were special scribes for the Serbian language, called *dijaci* (Translator’s note: well educated people) of the Serbian language, as opposed to the Latin *dijaci*. All documents were carefully preserved in records and, as pointed out by Vatroslav Jagić - a Croatian and a professor from Vienna - “Serbian language is expressing gratitude to the Republic for this highly developed concern about archives, which preserved its oldest and the most valuable pearls” (p. 43). Jagić never mentioned the Croatian language as possibly spoken in

The people of Dubrovnik often called the Serbian language they spoke “ours”, Slavic, Dubrovian and sometimes Illyrian. Milan Rešetar discovered that, in 1512 in the Venetian Republic, they printed one of the oldest printed documents of Dubrovnik – *The Serbian Prayer Book* – and that was printed in Cyrillic. Afterwards, they printed the Prayer book for the Catholic Mass, which August Leskin, one of the greatest slavists of the 19th century, called *The Dalmatian-Serbian Liturgy Prayer Book*. Even where the language is called Dubrovian, it was written in Cyrillic. There are some testimonies according to which the Latin language was called Vlachian, which is purported with preserved charters by the great Bosnian Ban Matija Ninoslav, who called his subjects Serbs, and the inhabitants of Dubrovnik Vlachs. Anyway, the Croatian language is not mentioned anywhere, not even by Bartol Kašić from Pag, who lived in Dubrovnik for a long time at the beginning of the 17th century. Only modern falsifiers are inserting Croatian attributes wherever they can, even when it seems quite grotesque. Although Kašić believed he was a Croat, his real name was Bartolomej Kasio and he used expressions like Dubrovian, Dalmatian, Bosnian, Slavic and Illyrian, but never the Croatian language.

There was not a single word about the Croatian language in the 18th century, nor did the books mainly speak about Illyrian or Slavic. Ardelio Della Bella says that the Serbian alphabet was Cyrillic, in which Illyrian and Slavic was written, and he quotes such claims in his Illyrian-Italian-Latin Dictionary, first published in 1728. He is apologising for publishing the book in the Latin alphabet, because the Slavic alphabet was not unique and consisted of four variants: Old Russian, Modern Russian, Serbian or Illyrian and Jerolimski or Glagolitan.

Originally, Dubrovnik could be neither Serbian nor Croatian. It was Roman. It became Serbian only later, because the Serbs were living all around it and it was spreading to their territory and included Serbian inhabitants. Serbs were settling it, so it gradually lost its Roman characteristics and assumed Serbian ones, in their specific expression. Essentially, it could never become Croatian, but that was violently imposed with alchemic ethnic experiments of the Catholic Church, in the first half of the 20th century, with the disastrous failures of the regime of Karađorđević and a concentrated anti-Serbian communist dictatorship.

In 1066, the Senate of Dubrovnik sent a congratulation card, in Serbian, to the Turkish Sultan Selim II, the son of Suleiman the Magnificent, on the occasion of his acceding to the throne. In 1638, they announced an advertisement in the Italian language with a Serbian addition, so that everyone could understand it better, as was explained in Italian part of the text. Both texts were officially filed in the Italian language and with the explanation that the original was in Serbian. The laws that were proclaimed in public squares were also in the Serbian language so that everyone could understand them better. In one old manuscript dating from the beginning of the 18th century, kept in the Franciscan library in the Vatican, the first sentence that Kostić quoted is in Italian, while the second one follows in Serbian: “In one Serbian book, where the apostles and gospels that are being read throughout the year are

in Serbian, and afterwards it says, also in Serbian: "Let it be known when Dubrovnik started to be built, from the town Cavtat in 626 of the *Isukrst* (Jesus Christ)" (p. 63). That is crucial evidence that Serbian language was used in Roman-Catholic churches as well.

During the last period of the Republic of Dubrovnik, there was a huge number of testimonies to the use of the Serbian language. "In the papers kept in Dubrovnik, which were thus saved for Serbdom, they mention the Serbian name hundreds, if not thousands times: either in defining the ethnical affiliation of the surrounding people or in defining the language they speak or the writing they use. In Italian, just as in Latin or Serbian, one is always coming across adjectives (sometimes substantives) like Serbian, etc. but never Croatian. And, based on that, the Croats of both today and of the last century concluded that Dubrovnik was Croatian! Those papers mention many other nations and their countries, far from Croatia, but never or almost never the Croats" (p. 66-67). In his book *The Serbian People and their Language*, professor Pavle Ivić was even more precise and he explained that there were "in total, four or five mentions of the Croatian language in Dubrovnik, or Dubrovnik itself in the circle of Croatian towns, and only among poets and on special occasions such as courteously addressing someone from the Croatian side, in the headlines of in printed books that might obtain wide public or a poetic tirade where the comparison between Dubrovian and the Croatian actually has the aim to emphasise the advantage of the Dubrovian[...] Anyway, there are examples in which Dubrovian authors mention the Croats, but in a way that clearly indicates that the Dubrovians are not included... on the contrary it often happens that "the Dubrovians, starting from the end of the 15th century and until the beginning of the 18th century, called their language Serbian (*lingua serviana*) and most often in official acts that needed to determine that the national language of Dubrovnik was different to the Italian or Latin language of the documents that contain these definitions" (p. 67).

The founder of modern Slavistics, Catholic friar of the Jesuit order and university professor, the Czech Josef Dobrowsky, wrote to Jernej Kopitar in the beginning of the 19th century saying: "I am little interested in geographical names. Dubrovnicans, Macedonians and Bosnians are all Serbs. Kranjci, Bezjaci and Panonian Croats are of Croatian origin" (p. 75). Some time later, in his life's work *The Slav* from 1834, Josef Dobrowsky categorically claims: "The borders between the real Croatian and Serbian (Illyrian) language in Dalmatia could only be explained by a Croat who is quite skilful with both these dialects. If someone should call the Dalmatic-Illyrian (Serbian) language *Horvacki* (Translator's note: Croatian), as Zlatarić did in the foreword to his poems (Venetians 1597), that one should know that it is incorrect and that it is due to political relations with Dalmatia. Dalmatic-Illyrian and Serbian are still the same language for me. I am quite familiar with the fact that Dalmatic and Serbian are not the same dialects. But, basically, they both belong to the same language group, regardless of various provincialisms and other insignificant variations, just like inhabitants of both countries are of Serbian origin" (p. 75).

In 1822, the Slovenian Jernej Kopitar wrote: "The Serbian or Illyrian

dialect is spoken in Serbia, Bosnia, Montenegro, Dubrovnik Dalmatia, Istria, Croatian Krajina, Slavonia and Serbian settlements in southern Hungary - four to five million people, half of which is of the Greek rite (Kopitar wrote this in Latin and the review is in German), but the divine service is performed in the Slavic language" (p. 77). Another great Slavist, younger than Dobrowsky (which does not make him less significant) published *The Serbian Grains for Reading* in 1833 in Pest and in German language, in which he said: "It is a historically and linguistically proven fact that, just as the Serbs in Serbia, Bosnia, Slavonia, Herzegovina, Montenegro and Dalmatia, in total make one branch of the big Slavic tree, regardless of whether they belong to the Eastern or Western Church, in the same way their language represents only one dialect, although with many insignificant variations" (p. 77). In 1858, in Vienna, the Slovenian Franc Miklošič, also a well recognized Slavist, published *The Serbian Monuments* in Latin, in which he included all the Dubrovian documents, charters and letters written in the Serbian language and later found in a book written by the Czech Konstantin Jiriček with the same title. Jacob Grimm, Johan Severin Vater, Louis Leger and Josef Karasek shared similar attitudes.

During the WWI, Count Lujo Vojnović wrote of the old state of Dubrovnik: "That is a strange republic, which edited its records in Latin and afterwards in Italian, but whose senators were having discussions in Serbian, did their correspondence with the Serbian principedoms in Serbian, and marked their houses (families and clans) with Serbian names. In Serbian, they edited and coded the secret directions sent to their ambassadors. Intolerant in the sense of religion, they kept the Slavs across the hills aside and out of its borders; but they sent the enticements to their homeland in Serbian and justice was pronounced in Serbian as well" (p. 81). In 1883, a well known professor of the Zagreb University named Natko Nodilo, whose roots were in Split, concluded that: "In Dubrovnik, if not from the very beginning then certainly from times immemorial, they have been speaking Serbian, both the commoners and the gentry; as at home, so in public life. It is true that the minutes and records of various councils were in Latin and that there were sometimes discussions in Venetian and Kaikavian during the reign of Venetian princes, but that was all because of them" (p. 82).

The well known French geographer and ethnographer Ami Boué, who dealt especially with studies of the Balkans, wrote in 1840 that the Dalmatians, Morlaci, Dubrovians and Bokelians were undoubtedly Serbs, which was explicitly confirmed in 1857 by Baron Karl Tscering, a founder of Austrian Statistics. Statisticians Adolf Ficker and Bracheli share this opinion. In 1872, the German ethnologist Kohl wrote: "Flourishing and famous in the Middle Ages, Dubrovnik was a Serbian commune. They called it 'Serbian Athens' and its gentry families are still searching for the roots of their genealogical trees in the mountains and the meadows of Bosnia and Serbia even today" (p. 83).

In 1834, Vuk Karadžić concluded that the Dubrovian language is a real Herzegovinian language with a difference in letter *h*. Also, the Dubrovians

do not say *deca* but *djeca* (Translator's note: *deca* and *djeca* both mean children) and there are too many Italian words. In 1864, Otto von Reinsberg-Duringsfeld said: "In the beginning, Latin language was the language of the inhabitants, but in 1450 it was in use here and there, but spoilt with the spreading of the Slavic language. On the contrary, Serbian, as the language of women, children and servants, kept its predominance in home use. Afterwards, one mixed language developed out of multiple usages with foreigners (in commercial, social and literary traffic) and that was the dialect of Dubrovnik, which arose from Serbian and Italian and which was spoilt just like the written Slavic language of Dubrovians kept its classical purity" (p. 91). In 1875, Arthur Evans wrote that the most beautiful Serbian language can be heard in Dubrovnik. That is why the words of Juraj Bjenkani in his letter to Mihovil Pavlinović from 1879 sound tragicomic: "According to the letter of Pucić and the letter of Vrčević, etc., according to the words of Vid Kamenarevi, who was here, and the honourable priest Vulović from Kotor who also passed by, I say that even if Klaić wanted it, at least his choice in Dubrovian would be difficult; wherever he goes people find themselves Serbs" (p. 101).

The well known Croatian philologist Ivan Milčetić, published his notes from a 1874 trip through Dalmatia in 1905: "Among the educated Dalmatians, I found Dalmatians and Slav-Dalmatians... Slavjani, našinci (Dubrovians), and Serbs (Bokielians and some Dubrovians) but nowhere Croats" (p. 102). And perhaps the most interesting testimony was given by a group of Croatian propagators in Dubrovnik around the middle of the last century, thanks to which professor Lazo Kostić came upon following precious statistical data: "During the turbulent year of 1848, Dubrovnik was publishing a paper called *L' avvenire (The Future)*. In there it was written that "the Croatian papers were written in Italian", because the coastal "Croats" did not speak "Croatian". The director was Ivan August Kaznačić. In one issue, printed in October that same year, he presents "the statistics of the Slavic people", in which there were the rubrics *the Language* and *the Dialect*. They cited "Illyrian" as the language of the southern Slavs and as dialects there were: Bulgarian, Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian i.e. "*Kranjski*" (*karniko*, and in brackets *vendo*, i.e. *Vendish*). People of the Serbian dialect included the Orthodox (2,880,000) then almost one and a half million of Catholics (1,490,000) and 550,000 Muslims. The Croatian dialect included only 801,000 people, all of them in Austria, meaning nobody in Bosnia [...] In the column *The Turkey*, it was explained that the Serbian dialect was spoken there by almost a million and a half people (1,490,000) but nobody spoke Croatian. That was a period when Bosnia and Herzegovina were under Turkish rule. So they, the "Croats" of Dubrovnik, said it themselves, at least a hundred years ago. That was the general opinion of science and journalism at that period in time and it was not easy to resist it" (p. 102).

However, the key objective of the Croats was not the old and vanished Dubrovian language, but the appropriation of Dubrovian literature. Since it was proved with arguments that the language spoken in Dubrovnik could only have been Serbian and that conclusion was corroborated by unambiguous evidence from the greatest world authorities from the area of

Slavistics and historiography. Lazo Kostić concluded that Serbian literature could only have arisen out of the Serbian language, because literature is the main emanation of one language, its product and its highest expression - the work of people who not only wrote in the Serbian language but also belonged to the Serbian people. The confrontation of opinions between Serbian and Croatian theoreticians of the second half of the last century and the first half of this one, which concerned the ethnical definition of Dubrovians, their history, culture, and literature, was highly stimulating for intense, comprehensive and detailed scientific research. The objective and impartial results were always leading to a clear Serbian identification, but under the Ustasha's regime of Pavelić and the communist regime of Tito, there was a forcefully spread claim in textbooks, journalism, technical magazines and politically-advertising public papers that declared the literature as Croatian, and any opposition could bring the protagonist to legal sanctions. The half-century dictatorship of the communists and the ideological monopoly simply distorted the conscience of the people and educated the young generations with lies and forgeries. Time took its toll and texts in the most exclusive foreign encyclopaedias were subjected to quasi-scientific revisions. The orchestrated tumult of the official Croatian national ideologists and communist officials, together with the bootlicking relations of the Serbian deputies and oppressors of their own people, were artificially changing social customs, science methodology and the theoretical contemplative substrate. Even Serbian scientists with moral dignity, while never exactly admitting that Dubrovian literature had a Croatian national character and not being allowed to openly call it unambiguously Serbian, were retreating into some kind of independent definition and identification, insisting on its wide Yugoslav framework.

However, according to the opinion of such scientific authorities as Nikola Tomazeo, Jernej Kopitar, Matija Murko, Milan Rešetar, V.V. Makušev, N. Bahtin, Arturo Kronia, Giovanni Maver, etc., the literature of Dubrovnik does not have any significant literary value because, essentially, it makes an inept imitation and compilation of Italian renaissance authors, primarily Dante, Torquato Tasso, Boccaccio and others, with the addition of some local colours. It is important for the Croats, because they had no other literature and, the more convincingly they appropriate it, the better their evidence would be of not taking their modern language from Serbs, but from a serious resource. Kostić lays out the complete argument, demonstrating that, although originally a lawyer, he mastered the basic categories of the theory of literature and, after exhausting elaboration of the leading scientific authorities, he drew the following conclusion: "The literature of Dubrovnik in Serbian was at its best in the beginning, which was around the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century. Instead of improving, it had a disastrous setback later. That was not only a setback of the beauty and value of the literature (mainly poetry), but of the language as well. Instead of developing the language over the generations, it was constantly wakening. Later they increasingly wrote in Roman, which was mainly a mixture of Latin and Italian. That mixture was practiced even in Slavic texts. They especially put Latin

verses into the texts of other authors, mainly in new Latin, which was quite far from the classical Latin language” (p. 122-123).

According to all aforesaid, old literature of Dubrovnik does not enrich Serbian literature very much. It is far below the level of the Serbian folk songs of that period which is not a reason for us Serbs to deny it and leave to Croats. It is ours and even if we could dispute with someone over its cultural nature and characteristics, those would exclusively be Italians, because Dubrovnik is the key point of contact between the Serbs and the Italians. Even the Croatian historian Vatroslav Jagić quotes Šima Ljubić, a professor from Rijeka who published *The Mirror of the Yugoslav History of Literature* in 1865 saying, among other things: “The same *Duklian* chronicle, the oldest monument of our language and written, without doubt, by Serbs in a Serbian country, and the works of the oldest writers of Dubrovnik and Kotor, who were Serbian or at least brought up in the Serbian dialect, such as Šiško Menčetić, Đora Držić, etc” (p. 127).

In 1913, Karl Kadlec, a Professor of the University of Prague and an expert in the history of Slavic law, wrote that not only was important “whether Dubrovnik was under the direct rule of Serbian governors, but we must also know that the culture of Dubrovnik was partly Serbian and partly Italian. Some historians, in their study of Serbian history, also include the history of Dubrovnik. Historians like, for example, Majkov. “The situation is similar to that of Bosnia” (p. 128). In 1867, the Russian slavist Viktor Vasiljevič Makušev wrote: “In Dubrovnik, three literatures bloomed at the same time: Latin, Italian and Serbian. The Latin language was used in scientific compositions, in solemn speeches and also in poetry; that was, according to its predominance, the diplomatic and legal language. Italian was mainly used for compositions of a practical character and for poems with topics taken from common life. The Serbian language was limited to family life, poetry and folk narration” (p. 129-130).

In 1837, German philologist Ernest von Edberg published *The Historical Review of the Slavic Language and Literature*, in which he says: “The western Serbs were divided into small countries, of which some had a kind of aristocratic-republican system. Here, we will only mention the Republic of Dubrovnik, the cradle of the Dalmatian branch of Serbian literature” (p. 130). However, one chapter of his book is called: *The Literature of the Dalmatians or Serbs Belonging to the Roman-Catholic Church* with a sub-chapter called *The Profane Literature of the Dalmatians or Catholic Serbs*. In 1851, German travel writer J. Kohl pointed out that the “national life and poetry of the major part of the Dalmatian inhabitants is exactly the same as that of other Serbs” (p. 130). The Austrian ethnographer Baron Tscering and the Hungarian historian **Schwiker** consider the literature of Dubrovnik to be Serbian.

French literary historian Celeste Courier wrote in 1879 that the literature of Dubrovnik, after the invasion of Turks, started to represent a “new blossom of Serbian literature that was expelled from its homeland” (p. 131). Slavist Louis Leger explicitly claims that Gundulić is a Serb and historian and geographer Jacques Ansel, in studying Serbian oral

literature, says: “Apart from this national literature, which, in its oral tradition, goes from teller to teller, from generation to generation, there is also scientific literature that permanently survived in Dubrovnik, where, in the 16th and 17th centuries, Serbian gradually replaced the Italian language, as the language of the elite, rich traders and counts” (p. 132). In 1853, Nikolo Tomazeo wrote: “Serbia was liberated from the Turkish yoke before Greece; Dubrovnik had three literatures: Latin, Italian and Serbian, more independent than Italian, and Dubrovnik gave to Italy Baljivije and Bošković” (p. 132). Impressed with the texts of Tomazeo, Kostić asked a question: “How can it be that Croatian literature did not appear during the life of the Croatian state? There are hardly any signs of Croatian literacy dating from that period, while the medieval Serbian State left us a whole series of literary works, charters and even the magnificent *Dušan's Code* written in Serbian!” (p. 132-133).

In 1924, Romanian historian Nikolae Iorga wrote that there were three Serbias and three Serbian literatures, and here we will briefly explain what he thought of the third one, Dalmatian Serbia. “During the whole period of the Middle Ages, this Dalmatian Serbia had Latin literature, which belonged to Serbs in terms of race. But the modern époque gave a whole series of products of the same literature, which is not Latin anymore: now it is the Serbian literature of Dalmatia and, first of all, the literature of Dubrovnik” (p. 133). Kaushansky, a professor of the Slavic Law at the University of Bucharest, also considered the old Law of Dubrovnik from the 11th and the 13th century to be Serbian, regardless of the fact that all legal acts were written in Latin: “Out of the old monuments of the South-Slavic law, we should further mention the legislation of a flourishing Serbian town, the small Republic of Ragusa (Serbian Dubrovnik)” (p. 133).

Lazo Kostić points out that all the significant Serbian historians of literature like Pavle Popović and Tihomir Ostojić took the literature of Dubrovnik to be Serbian, as did the Serbian Catholics Milan Rešetar and Petar Kolendić. He especially admired the academic Kolendić, because “even after the war, he called the language of Dubrovnik Serbian, and therefore its literature” (p. 135). In 1850, Dr Jovan Subotić from Srem, published a discussion entitled *Some Basic Points of Serbian Literature* in Vienna in the German language and quoted: “The second part of the Serbian history of literature includes the literature of the Republic of Dubrovnik and encompasses the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries. Just like the freedom of Serbian people, its literature hid inside the walls of the small but smart and happy Dubrovnik. What helped it a lot was the new invention of printing and the consequential easier transfer of ideas. Fine Serbian poetry ascended to the highest level of artistic supremacy. Its first master and represent was Ivan Gundulić (1620) with his tireless *Osman*. Names such as Držić Menčetić, Palmotić and Đorđić overwhelmed this period of Serbian literature. In the poetry of Dubrovnik, there is a quite visible influence from the Italian masters. The progress of the Turks towards the Adriatic on one side and the spreading of the Venetians towards Zagorje pushed this small Serbian republic into a dangerous

Comment [K.B.13]: Translator's note. We were unable to find the Hungarian historian of this name in any of our sources

corner and the thundering of weapons quieted the Serbian muse” (p. 137). Even one of the fathers of Serbian social-democracy, Dušan Popović, wrote in 1917 within the then current discussions among the Austrian social-democrats: “In the Middle Ages, the Serbian Republic of Dubrovnik was not only an important trade centre, but it also produced poets, scientists and philosophers of European reputation” (p. 137). Jovan Cvijić unambiguously considered the Dubrovians to be Serbs and the literature of Dubrovnik Serbian, and as for Dubrovnik itself, he called it a “happy union of the Latin and Serbian spirit” (p. 138).

One of the greatest Serbian poets of all times, Jovan Dučić, wrote in 1893 that: “A monument to the great Serbian poet Ivan Fr. Gundulić is unveiled; the name of the Serbian people, especially the name of the liberated Serbian Dubrovnik, was mainly praised by the writer of *Osman*, Serbian nobleman Ivo Franjin Gundulić, whose great name is now celebrated on the occasion of the 400th Anniversary in Dubrovnik, the place of his birth, on 14 June, this year[...]The holy ashes of this great Serbian poet Gundulić peacefully rests, happy that his magnificent memory is celebrated today by all Serbian people. A few more days and Serbian Dubrovnik will be adorned with a shining and magnificent monument to its glorious son and the greatest Serbian epic poet [...] During the times when Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Montenegro fought with their eternal fiend, the gentle Dubrovnik was flourishing with education and the Serbian books were spreading [...] Dubrovnik was a cradle of great spirits – Serbian poets and writers [...] There cannot be prettier and dearer memories, but the memories that remain in the souls of those who once saw such celebrations and remembrances, which the Serbian patriots take on their return from the clear and sunny Serbian coast [...] Let anyone who can, follow this love, which the great Serbian son and poet Gundulić cherished for Serbdom, and the love that joined Serbdom and the very love which he took with him to the cold grave” (p. 138-139).

Even the greatest Croatian slavist, Vatroslav Jagić who, in his youth, claimed that the literature of Dubrovnik was Croatian, when he came to a certain point of his life, he was trying quite hard to correct his juvenile fallacies, presenting the attitude that the literature of Dubrovnik was common to both the Serbs and Croats. In the editions of his works after the Second World War, all his attitudes were censored, but professor Kostić patiently unearthed them in the first editions and in the archives. Something similar happened to Matija Murko and Imbro Tkalac Ignjatijević and, as for Bishop Josip Juraj Strossmayer, on 13 June 1893 he cried out and said: “We, the Croats, who were the first to publish Dubrovian and Dalmatian writers, we had to be at the head of it from the very beginning and we had to give it a Croatian significance. Now, when the Serbs did it, whatever we do in that sense will only be a shadow of that brilliance, which shines over Serbdom in opposition to the Croats” (p. 143).

The topics of the old literature of Dubrovnik are generally Slavic and Dubrovian. “Many Dubrovian poets of all centuries were inspired by the events and personalities of Serbian history, but none of them by any event from Croatian history. Neither did they mention their false kings, nor their

historical heroic deeds” (p. 153). Professor Kostić convincingly supports his conclusion with the opinion of Jovan Dučić: “Never did Gundulić, nor Vojnović after him, sing about the Croats, nor did they call themselves or their town Croatian. The Croats, however, lay claims to Gundulić and Vojnović, just as they stole Serbian folk poems, of which even Jagić felt ashamed” (p. 154). And all the *bugarštice*, which they were trying to attribute to Croats for a long time, have exclusively Serbian national themes in their content. Commenting on the work of the Dubrovian historian Mavro Orbinije entitled *The Kingdom of Slavs* Pavle Ivić, in his book *The Serbian People and Their Language*, wrote: “That kingdom will be embodied in the medieval Serbian State. We know that such a penetration into Serbian things was neither literary nor artificial, we know it from the Serbian poems that were noted down during that period in Dubrovnik and around it, in which we find Prince Lazar and Princess Milica, Miloš Kobilović and Vuk Branković, the brothers Jugović and Strahinja Banović, Marko Kraljević, Despot Vuk and many others well known from the later anthologies of Karadžić” (p. 158). Through a comprehensive analyses of *Osman* by Gundulić, Lazo Kostić concluded his study on the Serbdom of Dubrovnik: “Gundulić not only knew and recognized Serbdom, but glorified it as well: he expanded it towards fantastic borders, more so than any poet and literate of the Slavic south did, more than any national singer” (p. 161).

3. The Serbian Sea

In 1963, Professor Lazo Kostić published a book entitled *The Serbian History and the Serbian Name* in his own *Serbian Thoughts* edition in Melbourne, indicating that the Serbs, upon arrival in Balkans, formed their first countries by the sea, and developed their own culture under the influence of other civilized peoples. He immediately finds the basis for his thesis in the works of well known scientific authors and so, from the very beginning, he quotes the German historian Konstantin von Höfler who, in 1882, provisionally defined the borders of the first Serbian statehood: “For a long period of time, it seemed that Serbia paid much more attention to events by the Adriatic sea – from Drač to Dubrovnik and from Dubrovnik to Zadar – than to events on the left bank of the Vardar, which had represented the border of Serbia for a long period of time, if we can speak of only one Serbian state” (p. 8). Also, the well known Romanian historian Nikolaus Jorga, one of the most famous Balkanologists, wrote in 1922 that the first Serbian military-political formation of a territorial character appeared in Boka and its background and spread towards the south, thus including Bar and Ulcinj, and to the north, towards the gates of Dubrovnik. Duklja was the first formed, with expressive western influences. Jorga claimed that, two years later, Serbia primarily had three parts: “Inner Serbian Byzantine, directed first towards the Danube and finally to Constantinople; then the Serbia of the Adriatic Coast and finally Dalmatian Serbia. From old Zeta, which later took the name of Montenegro, and from Kotor, they formed the first Serbian empire, which was neither Byzantine nor Orthodox nor eastern, but Catholic in its

religion, Latin by office and western by direction. The Counts of this area, the Princes (Jorga marks it, in Serbian, *LMK*), became kings by the will of the people. Then they turned their eyes on the king's crown and The Holy See gave it to them" (p. 9-10). The fact that Duklja, or today's Montenegro, was the location of the first Serbian state is also declared by Konstantin Höfler and Pierre Marge.

During the times of Prince Mihailo, the cultural orientation was pro-western and it dates from the year 900. Rattinger calls the coastal Serbs southern and divides them into four clans – Neretljani, Zahumci, Travunci and Dukljani (inhabitants of the Neretva district, Zahumlje, Travunija and Duklja). He thinks that the first one was state of Zahumlje and then of Duklja. Šafárik locates the Serbian sea coast in the area from Bar to the confluence of the Cetina, which came to the confluence of the Drina during the reign of Nemanja. Russian historian, Apolon Aleksandrovič Maikov was of the opinion that Zeta was the first Serbian state, which included Duklja and Dalmatia. Konstantin Jireček gives us a more specific picture of the situation in the 11th century: "In that period, the Serbs had two centres with two dynasties. One was the house of Stefan Vojislav, ruler of the Coast, Duklja, Travunija and Zahumlje. As this region luckily repulsed the attack of the Byzantines, it became a real national force in the 11th century. The continental and primary land of Serbs was under the reign of another dynasty, which, by the end of the 11th century, with its constant attacks on Greece, totally overshadowed the Coastal rulers and, by the end of the 12th century, it totally repressed them, even in Duklja" (p. 11-12).

The rulers of Zeta were the first Serbian kings. The Byzantine chronicler Georgius Cedrenus states that the first Serbian king was Jovan Vladimir and that his dynasty was the best famous under the rule of Stefan Vojislav, also mentioned as Stjepan Dobroslav Vojislav. In the last century, Croatian historian Franjo Rački wrote about King Bodin, whom he called Budim, as a descendant of Stefan Vojislav: "Having the power over his patrimony of Zeta, Travunja and Hum, he spread the borders towards the north-west to the upper Bosnia. Thus Buda again united the Serbian countries within the Zeta, Raša, upper Bosnia and Drim rivers, becoming the lord of the ancient Serbian Zhupanias" (p. 14). Regarding this Rački wrote that the activities of the Serbian people moved from Bojana and Morača towards the east, to the area of the Drina and Morava rivers, and that during the period of Stefan Nemanja, Serbian people took over the primate over the Balkans. The Serbian state saw a sudden development in the period when Croatia was largely diminishing, which Rački formulated in a very picturesque way: "When the sun of Croatian people was setting, the Serbs were watching their sunrise" (p. 15).

Jovan Cvijić also wrote that the first Serbian state of Zeta formed on the Coast, but that it also possessed northern Albania and had its capital in Skadar. Stojan Novaković and Čeda Mijatović held similar views and the academic Nikola Radojčić indicated in 1936 that it was wrong to start studying of the history of the Serbian state at the period of Stefan Nemanja, because his state was only a prolongation of the previous

Serbian formations. During that period, some coastal towns, mainly inhabited by a Roman population had some kind of local autonomy. The continental expansion of the medieval Serbian state never neglected the coast and the question of continuity was interpreted from its history, in legal sense. Even Saint Sava, as quoted by Lazo Kostić, was asking for legitimacy for their origins in Duklja and in the heritage of Duklja, all in order to crown his brother. Domentian said that he asked for a crown "in order to crown his brother for the kingdom by the first patrimony of their kingdom, in which their father was born [...] in the place called Diokletija, which was called the Great Kingdom from the very beginning" (p. 16).

Fran Miklošić, Stojan Novaković, Nicolae Iorga and Konstantin Jireček all speak about the Serbian royal title of the Nemanjić, as the right for succession over the throne of Duklja and later, in conformity with feudal tradition of their time, they put various lands under their reign under the king's title. All Serbian rulers, up to the fall of the despotate, were addressed as lords of the coast or the western parts, which was later taken over by the Bosnian king Tvrtko, pointing out that he was the heir to the throne of his oldest ancestors, the Serbian nobility. And all his heirs were called the lords of Serbia, Bosnia and the Coast, gradually adding the latest conquered territories.

There is some written data that refers to the 9th and 10th centuries. "The first historian of the Serbs in the Balkans, Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus (the first half of the 10th century) says that "the Serbli do not live only in Serblia, Zahumlja and Terbunija, but also in Paganja. Another place where the Serbian archonts (princes) reigned was Paganja, "if Serbian ruler Peter (around 891 to 917) had Paganija and the land of Neretljana in his hands" (p. 22). Höfler writes about the oldest period of Serbian history: "Serbia had four main parts: Serbia, Zahumlje (Herzegovina), Zeta or Duklja (mountains around the Lake of Skadar) and Trebinje; there was neither a centre of the state, nor was there a common headman (ruler), there was neither a state nor a patriarch, just as the courageous pirates on Neretva lived independently and had their own ways" (p. 22). The Serbs of Neretva did not take up Christianity for a long period, so they were called Pagani and their area Paganija. In 1880, Stojan Novaković wrote: "Although Paganija or Neretva and Humska joined later into Humska, from the ancient times those two areas must not have been mixed. Those Neretljani or Pagani, who were famous for their piracy and stubborn attitude to the old pre-Christian religion, were not the same as the Humljani, inhabitants of the area by the left bank of the Neretva. At the very beginning of Serbian life and history in this country, those were two areas with two independent authorities, two centres and two histories" (p. 22). Ferdo Šišić, one of the most significant Croatian historians, wrote in 1928 that the "Neretljanska region fell apart yet at the beginning of the 11th century (certainly before 1020), but only one part, the larger - namely the districts of Rastok, Makar and Dolje - was annexed to the Kingdom of Croatia, from the islands of Brač and Hvar, while the second, smaller part, from the islands of Korčula and Mljet, went to the Zahumska district" (p. 22).

The Serbs of Neretva were undoubtedly the first Serbs who entered history. In Zadar, in 1872, Dalmatian historian Boglić wrote about them: "Terrifying, courageous, bold, thirsty for battles and wars, delighted with living and the will for independence, the Serbs of Neretva had a liberated (their own) government and, by the sea that hugs our shores, they did not sustain the foreign power" (p. 24). Farlati says of them: "The Serbian clan, wild and sour" (p. 24). The Neretljanski Priest Ljubo Valčić published the book *From the History of the Neretva Country* in 1901 in Mostar, in which he says: "This strong and, in the first three hundred years, independent Serbian republic that stretched to the Cetina, was filling the sailors of the Adriatic sea with fear" (p. 24). Further on, Vlačić says: the Neretljani were called Serbs by all historians and by all the Venetian chronicles. Lucius, in his history (b. 3, ch.14, 5), and Rački in his book *The History of the Slavs* (p. 17), calls them Serbs. Šime Ljubić also admits that the Neretljanska Coast is Serbian and he says: "In 1443, on the Serbian coast, there was a huge fire burning between the Venetians and Stjepan, the Duke of St. Sava (*The Review of Croatian History*, p. 109). Đurađ Vojislajić, the Duke of Lower Lands, a nephew of Hrvojin, considered and called his people the Lower Serbs (Miklošić, *Monumenta Serbika* 320, 445, 467) (p. 24).

In 1843, Paul Jozef Šafarik wrote that the first certain data about the Serbs appeared with the Neretljani, long before Duklja was formed: "At the beginning of the 9th century, their power was so increased that they became a source of fear and terror for the Venetians; that is why Doge Jovan Participacius attacked them at sea and offered a treaty (around 820). Doge Tredoniko renewed a treaty with Drosak who was possibly the Zhupan of Neretlja (around 836). But the Neretljani still made trouble at sea and, in 840, they defeated Tredonik in one maritime battle. Their courage at sea soon turned to piracy and they robbed and captured the envoys of papa Adrian, on their return from the Synod in Constantinople. All the acts from this Synod fell into their hands (869-870) [...] Doge Ursus Participacius fought against them but without success... In 917, the great Zhupan of Serbia put them under his rule; but no doubt they were liberated once again because, in 932-948 they behaved freely and forcefully fought the Venetians" (p. 23). Further on, Šafarik talks about the Serbian Neretljani: "Their favourable position above all at sea, between the confluences of the Cetina and the Neretva, the power they reached through possession of the island [...] they stopped the Venetians from humiliating them, but finally Doge Petar Ursul II gave them the mortal blow in 997, just as he did to their Croatian allies, and, from that moment, their power gradually started to collapse. In the 11th century, they were completely under the iron hand of Venice" (p. 23).

The Serbs from the Neretva District and their allies of that time, the Croats, had common frontiers at the river Cetina, which flows into the Adriatic near Omiš, thus making the first territorial border between the Serbs and the Croats. In 1930, the German scientist Steinitzer claimed that the Croats had always been under foreign rule, regardless of the form of that rule. "Differently to Dalmatian Croats, the Dalmatian Serbs who lived

south of Neretva, preserved their full independence. Protected by the nature of the land, they and, above all, the Neretljani (inhabitants of the Neretva district), stood out with their courageous piracy, which forced the Byzantines and Venetians to release themselves from this trouble by paying tribute. Only at the end of the 10th century did the Venetians stand up against the Neretljani, who lost the islands of Hvar, Korčula and Lastovo to the Venetians in 998 and had to retreat to their rocky continental nests" (p. 24-25).

In 1042, in a battle near Bar, Vojislav, the prince of Zeta, together with his sons Gojislav and Radoslav, defeated the incomparably more numerous and powerful Byzantine army. The testimony of this great victory can be found in *The Chronicle of the Priest Dukljanin* or in the *Libellus Gothorum* - which represents the oldest work of Serbian literature and historiography, dating from around 1200 - from which even Ferdo Šišić draws the conclusion that, "in Zeta, the Serbian Catholics had Slavic profane books, meaning literature, even before Stefan Prvovenčani and St. Sava - and the Hungarian historian Ludwig von Thallóczy concluded in 1898 that: "Another important circumstance is that *The Chronicle of Priest Dukljanin*, with all its variations, saw daylight in southern Dalmatia where old Serbdom, with the sea and with their homes, left a lasting impression on literature. There is no comparable example" (p. 26).

The Croats were falsifying and appropriating *The Chronicle* or *The Libellus Gothorum* in all possible ways, about which the academic Nikola Radojčić wrote in 1951: "In its writer, in its place of origin, in the people whose past is mostly described there and in the official state formations whose development is being described there, *The Libellus Gothorum* is a local Serbian source. However, Serbian local sources were mainly written in the old Church-Slavic language, in Serbian redaction, but this source was kept in Latin, which perhaps, at least partly, does not represent the language of the original but only of the translation [...] *The Libellus Gothorum* is mainly a historical source for the period of Serbian history where the powerful Zeta was at the head of the Serbian states [...] Such a small part of *The Libellus Gothorum* was dedicated to Croatian history that one Croatian translator had to insert Croats into the segment he was translating where he did not find them in the original, thus justifying his intention to demonstrate that *The Libellus Gothorum* totally pertained to Croatian history. Croatian historiography of the Middle Ages mainly included *The Libellus Gothorum* owing to additions made in one part of the translation that concerns the death of King Dimitrije Zvonimir. However, the only relation between the legend and *The Libellus Gothorum* is turning the beginning of the book into a introduction. There is nothing else" (p. 27).

During the period of the dynasty of Nemanjić, the centre of Serbian literacy was the Chilandar monastery, but the Serbian coast would again shine in a cultural sense when, in 1493, they established the first Serbian printing firm in Rijeka Crnojevića. Even Jagoš Jovanović, a historian and, according to Lazo Kostić, the creator of the Montenegrin nation, wrote the following: "the Printing firm of Cetinje or Obod was quite short-lived. It

functioned for only two years (1493-1495), yet that was the most important event in the cultural history of the Serbian people, because it was the first Serbian printing firm, the second among all the Slavic peoples” (p. 27-28). The English historian of art, Cecil Stewart discovered that the church of St. Lucas in Kotor, the memorial of Stevan Nemanja from 1196, forms the basis for all Serbian medieval monastic architecture from stylistic point of view. Even the oldest church portrait, which is kept in Ston, represents Serbian King Mihailo who was son of Vojislav, the Prince of Trebinje.

The Serbian coastal nation-building tradition was also in mind of prince Nikola when, in 1901, in the National Parliament of Cetinje, he proclaimed himself king: “I receive the royal dignity, which belongs to extended Montenegro by historical rights and by its own merits, and I am fully convinced that, apart from one Serbian kingdom in the Trans-Danube area, all the great forces will bless this Coastal Kingdom as well” (p. 29).

Even Jireček claimed that the old Serbian state did not have one unique Capital town. Rulers used to move from one palace to another, depending on the weather and other conditions. Thus, one of the royal palaces of Stevan Nemanja was in Kotor. The constant movement of rulers was the reason why medieval charters were issued in various places in the then Serbia. Through detailed analyses, Kostić showed that it was an established practice in European feudal states because only by constantly moving could rulers manage to visit all their territories, because the feudal system implied a decentralized state and, in such way, rulers were evenly apportioning the costs of supporting the numerous court suite.

Historical sources relating the Serbian Coast witness that Prince Mihajlo had the Capital city in Kotor and Prepratina near Bar. Occasionally, the Capitals of Duklja were Skadar and the Castle on Prevlaka, which was the headquarters of the Episcopate of Zeta during the times of St. Sava. Apart from Prevlaka, the Balšić family used to spend a lot of time in Budva. In 1186, Kotor and Boka were annexed to Raška and were the pride of the State of Nemanjić for the next two hundred years. In 1950, historian Jovan Radonić wrote: “During the period of Serbian rule (1185 to 1420), Kotor was one of the most significant towns in the Serbian medieval state and its influence was especially strong during the reign of Tsar Stefan Dušan” (p. 55).

After the rule of the Nemanjić Dynasty, the Balšić family was chaired in Skadar, Ulcinj, Bar and Budva – and also on Prevlaka. In 1930, Niko Luković, a catholic *canonicus* (Translator’s note: high ranking catholic priest) from Kotor wrote: “Stefan Nemanja fortified Kotor and built himself a palace there. There were also palaces of the Mihailo, King of Duklja the Bosnian Duke Sandalj Hranić and his nephew Herzog Stefan, than the Lord of Zeta Stefan Crnojević and his son Ivan” (p. 57). In Bar was the headquarters of Despot Đurađ Branković, from 1440 to 1441, when the Turks conquered this Serbian Despotate for the first time. Herceg Novi used to be the capital of Herzegovina, during Herzog Vlatko, younger son of Herzog Stefan, which is spoken of by Konstantin Jireček and Antonije Forčić, a Serbian Catholic from Korčula. In Zagreb, in 1887, the Austrian officer Vrbanić, wrote the following in the German language:

“Herceg Novi use to be one of the most important towns of the *hercogštva* of St. Sava, which started here and ended at Cetina, spreading far inside the continental area” (p. 59). The town was founded by King Stefan Tvrtko and its first name was Saint Stefan, than Novi and finally Herceg Novi under Herzog Stefan Vukčić Kosača, who upgraded it.

After the fall of the Serbian lands under Turkish rule, the Serbs lost control over the Coast. Afterwards, they assisted the Venetians in their fights against the Turks, and all in order to take over the Coastal towns. Only in 1813, did the Montenegrin and Boka leaders create *The Convention of Dobrota*, which concerned the establishment of a joint state. After they banished the French, Kotor was earmarked for the Capital and Vladika (Orthodox Bishop) Peter was the first to move his headquarters there, from 27th December, 1813, to 1st June, 1814, when he was informed by the Russian Emperor that the whole of Boka was handed to Austria.

Besides comprehensive study of state-legal history, Kostić was dealing with the territorial authority of various levels of Ecclesiastical Organization. With the territorial expansion, the Serbian state became multinational and included lands with Greek, Bulgarian and Albanian inhabitants. Serbian areas were inhabited by Vlachs, the descendants of the ancient dwellers of the Balkans. As cattle-breeders, they settled in mountainous areas and they did not normally mix with Serbs, although they also belonged to the Orthodox religion. Later on, they were completely assimilated by the Serbian majority, giving them a new, profound impression.

Dušan Silni self-willingly proclaimed himself a tsar, thus causing the resistance of all the neighbouring countries. Only the Bulgarians immediately recognized him and Bulgarian Patriarch Simeon participated in his coronation, together with the Serbian Patriarch Joanikije. The Byzantine Empire called Dušan an insolent usurper and the Ecumenical Patriarch Kalist anathemized him. He denied the proclamation of the Serbian Patriarch as well. The oversized expansion of the Serbian state was certainly one of the crucial reasons behind its rapidly approaching disaster. Dušan could not have perceived it. He was driven by the idea of conquering Constantinople, as though obsessed. That was written about by Stojan Novaković, in 1912: “Incapable of encircling the whole horizon of their époque and making a precise assessment of their own power and the power of their enemy – especially of the moguls of Anatolia, who followed the same goal but were more compactly organized – Serbs of the 14th century let themselves be seduced by transparency and thus became nothing more than Turkish passkeys... the deed of Milutin and Dušan disappeared immediately after the death of the latter. After the death of Stefan Dušan there was not only a lack of spirit for connection and integrity but, above all, a lack of unity spirit [...] The very idea of the existence of such a big empire was neither with folks nor with moguls of that period, but it stemmed from Dušan and the dynasty of Nemanjić [...] Their personal power kept it alive; with their death, the idea disappeared [...] Today, we should only look back to the past in order to avoid the mistakes they committed and to see the examples that we should avoid” (p.

Vladimir Ćorović wrote in a similar way: “Dušan created an empire that was not Serbian, but mixed, created from Serbs, Greeks and Albanians. His biggest objective was to conquer Constantinople and to be the heir of its empire. Tsar as he was, he was the ruler of entire Balkans, not only of his nation, the Serbs. That conception included several seeds of the later evil. Serbian physical power was not enough to keep it all for the good, especially if the ruler was a man of a weaker spirit and less capability” (p. 85). Dušan neglected Bosnia and the Serbian Adriatic, and if he had managed to become the Byzantine Emperor, that would have been the end of Serbian people. Lazo Kostić says: “The Nemanjić Dynasty could rule the Byzantine Empire, but the Serbs could not. And I prefer the Serbs to the Nemanjić Dynasty” (p. 90).

Kostić published several texts regarding this topic in the emigrant press and ran into reproach and disappointment among national romantics who thought that heart can stand for brain in political issues. What would happen if he started writing about King Alexander Karađorđević, who repeated the fatal mistakes of Tsar Dušan, and again ruined Serbia in this century? Hotheads in emigration simply could not understand it, up to the second half of this century. The Karađorđević family was the basic sense of their lives. We already saw it in the text on Serbian flags, which were forbidden during the Dictatorship of Alexander, so Lazo Kostić took quite a distanced view of the king-martyr, who first spoilt our country and than fell victim to its enemies.

All of the Adriatic Coast from Cetina to Drač, originally belonged to the Serbs and belonged to their lands, and then the territories were gradually conceded, as the state and dynastic goals of the Nemanjić family were directed towards the south. Only the town of Dubrovnik was constantly independent and then it started to expand, thanks to donations from Serbian rulers. From the ancestors of Bodin, it received Župa, Gruž, Rijeka, then the islands of Koločep, Lopud and Šipan. Here we talk of Mihailo and Vojislav. In 1333, Dušan gave them Ston and Pelješac. Around 1230, King Radoslav gave them Lastovo, and Tsar Uroš gave them Mljet. Ljubo Vojnović wrote about this in 1907, expressing a strong recrimination towards the imprudent tsar: “The sea will stay in hands of the Adriatic municipalities/states with arranged relations and a strong aristocracy fed by the Latin civilization. Venetians and Dubrovnik rule the Adriatic – and they will keep it like that as long as possible – and the Serbian state and its autonomous parts, like Bosnia, are progressively distanced from the sea, they are distanced from the warmth and culture that the waves bring, from a society with maritime power, in which the collective European soul is being elaborated. Not even Tsar Dušan – especially not him – would care about the sea, but flushed with continental politics and the ghost of distant Constantinople, he inaugurated Serbian policy, which is even today reflecting the Macedonian ghost, in the changeless orientation of the Serbian state far from maritime orientation, which alone established the capability for life of the modern states” (p. 103).

The real meaning of the cession of Ston and Pelješac was rent. The

Dubroviens committed to pay taxes, which Tsar Dušan directed towards a Serbian monastery in Jerusalem, and later to monasteries of the Holy Mountain of Chilandar and St. Paul, who were taking taxes until the French occupation of Dubrovnik. Upon reception of Dušan's Charter, the Dubrovians committed and/or took the obligation that Orthodox Priests would give Divine Service on Ston and Pelješac. However, at the first historical opportunity they broke this and executed conversion to Catholicism. In the *Commemorative* of the Catholic Friars from 1394, it can be seen that the land of The Cape of Ston or Pelješac, “before it fell under the rule of the Dubrovnian nobles, it was susceptible to *Schismatics* and *Patarens* for almost 300 years, not a single word mentioned the Catholic ceremony, but there were monks and priests of *Raška* (Serbia) ... However, as Catholics, the nobility of Dubrovnik introduced the Roman religion and, due to that, appointed the aforesaid friars and built them a place to live. Those friars, with some mercy of God, converted people and Christianized them, as they are today converting those who come to this land from Schismatic countries” (p. 112-113).

Dr Nikola Zvonimir Bjelovčić, a Catholic from Pelješac, wrote in 1922: “In 1371, they (the Dubrovians) wrote to the Hungarian-Croatian king; “our peasants who live on Poluotok came from Serbia and, since they were Orthodox and *Bogomils* like their Zhupan Nikola Altomanović, we converted the majority to Catholicism.” In 1386, the Dubrovians moved Serbs from Serbia and eastern Bosnia to Ston and its surroundings, of which they informed their former rulers. In their escape from the Turks, these Serbs were coming to the Coast. In the 15th and 16th century, there were several cases where Serbs, especially from Herzegovina, were settling on the Peninsula in their escape from Turks. These new settlements again brought Serbian commoners to the peninsula of Rat and the Bogomil and Orthodox faith were renewed, which lasted almost to the end of the 17th century on the Peninsula” (p. 115). Konstantin Jireček says that the Catholics did not only implement conversion but also inquisition, at the beginning of the 15th century when the Dubrovians took over Konavli. Serbian medieval rulers addressed the Dubrovians as relatives in their charters and letters. On the other hand, Prince Lazar was proclaimed Dubrovnian with a Chart, as were all his descendants. And the Montenegrin Bishops always addressed the Dubrovians as brothers of the same kin and clan, regardless the religious differences. On 1st September, 1763, Metropolitans Sava and Vasilije asked for financial help from the Dubrovians in writing and with the following explanation: “If you could do a favour to our church and the Montenegrin people, with a certain sum of *aspri* (Translator's note: silver coins), just as the Serbs help Serbs and their neighbours” (p. 129). On the second occasion, on 25 July 1775, Metropolitan Sava Petrović wrote to the Senate of Dubrovnik: “Your glorious republic knows that all Serbian dignity and glory collapsed, so there is nothing left but you, like one flower for the whole world [...] so the Serbian land can be proud of you” (p. 129).

Modern history says that Bosnia and Herzegovina have their coast in Sutorina and Neum. Lazo Kostić was trying to find out how that came to

be. In the Morean War, Turkey lost all possessions on the Serbian part of the Adriatic Sea and let it to the Venetians. Now the Venetians surrounded Dubrovnik from all sides, which the nobility of Dubrovnik did not like at all, so they gave the Turks some regions of their territory, in the north and south, in order to separate them from the Venetians. In 1927, Ferdo Šišić wrote: "Being afraid of their neighbouring Venetians, the Republic of Dubrovnik ensured, in concluding The Treaty of Požarevac, that Turkey got a narrow piece of territory in the north and south, so Turkey reached the Adriatic sea on two sides in 1718. These two points are: Neum-Klek in the north, below the confluence of the Neretva and Sutorina rivers in the south, at the entrance to Boka Kotorska. Both of these enclaves count as part of Herzegovina even today" (p. 131.). A similar thing was written by Milan Rešetar: "In 1684, Dubrovnik returned under the supreme power of the German Emperor as the Hungarian King and, with *The Treaty of Karlovac* of 1699, they managed to be separated from the Venetian area with a narrow region of Turkish land in the north and south" (p. 131). The Dubrovians preferred to be surrounded by Turks than to share a direct border with the Venetians, with whom they shared the religion. Now the Venetians could not threaten their land without causing a new war with the Turks. As emphasised by professor Kostić: "The Dubrovians knew what they were doing. They were not led by religious sentiments, but by state interests" (p. 136).

Kostić quotes some columns by one Dubrovnikan feudal lord, Count Antonio di Sorga, which he published in 1839 in French, as a former Mayor of Dubrovnik under French occupation. Sorga says that, at *The Congress of Berlin* in 1815, the Dubrovian Deputy was prevented from speaking and was thrown out of the meeting room as he was preparing to propose the unification between Dubrovnik, Boka and Montenegro, into one federal state. "That was the official proposal of the gentry and citizens

337

of Dubrovnik who, only couple of days before, formed a Republic, and even then, at *The Congress of Berlin*, they wanted to come out as its representatives" (p. 141). In 1914, Vladan Đorđević quoted that a similar project was undertaken by the Montenegrin Metropolitan Peter I and forwarded to Petrograd, asking that, after defeating Napoleon as the whole world's enemy, "these provinces should be united into one state: a) Montenegro with Podgorica, Spuz and Zabljak; b) Boka Kotorska; c) Dubrovnik; d) Dalmatia" (p. 143). It also included the following: "This union of the former provinces of the Slavic-Serbian empire should be established under one common name from eternal times [...] The greatest title of the Russian empire should be added the title of the Slavic-Serbian Tsar" (p. 143). According to Kostić, history and blood were leading the Serbian brothers of various religions to crave unity.

Chapter IV

NJEGOŠ AND SERBDOM

1. Introduction

In Belgrade, in 1995, they published a book written by Vasko Kostić entitled *A Montenegrin, Serbian Great Man* which was about Professor Dr Lazo Kostić. The author says that, in the early fifties, Kostić was signing his texts with the pseudonym of Dr. L. P. Popović, which would mean Lazo Popov Popović because his father was a priest (in Serbian, *Pop* means priest) and because he belonged to branch of the Kostić family who called themselves Popović, as it was a family tradition that many of its members were priests. Kostić used this pseudonym due to many revenge threats from the Ustashes in the first few decades after the Second World War, when the numerous and well organized, aggressive and unscrupulous Croatian emigration often resorted to acts of terrorism.

Vasko Kostić published a lot of, until now, unknown biographical data about Lazo Kostić, his rebellious youth, his escape from the Austro-Hungarian army in the WWI, desertion, forming the Serbian guard in Boka Kotorska, when he stood out as a liberator of the Radičević Fortification, etc. He finished the Faculty of Law in Belgrade in two years. As a University professor, at the meeting of *The Serbian Cultural Club* in 1939, he opposed the provision on sanctioning of *The Agreement Cvetković – Maček* and formation of Banate of Croatia in the most qualified and substantiated way, and with the support of Slobodan Jovanović and Slobodan Drašković. His meticulous and consistent legal analysis was undeniable.

During the period of his stay in a refugee camp in the first period of his emigration, there was no possibility for Lazo Kostić to deal with serious scientific work. What he had with him were the works of Njegoš and he was reading them and thinking about them. That was the period in which his original attitude towards the greatest masterpiece of Serbian literature of all time was formed. In 1963, Kostić expressed it strongly and in a few sentences: "One can write about Njegoš as a man, as a state official, as a patriot (a Serb) and so on. And all that is useful. However, the most useful thing would be to offer new interpretations of his works and/or certain attitudes presented in the mentioned works. That has been done for a hundred years and will be continued for a long period of time.

The works of Njegoš are so great that it is worth the effort to research each detail and explain each, even the least significant thought given in his poems. And the history of literature showed that there are a lot of points where Njegoš would need commenting on.

That comment does not always need to be given exactly (for each referring verse), for it is even better and more efficient in a systematic explanation of the certain basic attitudes and comprehension of the writer and his characters. That is how we acted in all discussions about Njegoš, and we still do so. The poems of Njegoš deserve the greatest attention and care by all men of letters. Whoever gives a useful contribution to their clarifying and propaganda, he is doing a useful work for Serbian science and the nation, because those poems are our constant pride and joy. With them, we can stand beside the first peoples of the world and they will never embarrass us. For that reason, it is both an honour and pleasure for all those who can deal with Njegoš.”

The worst problem that Lazo Kostić encountered was publishing. He always had several manuscripts ready for printing, yet he was spending a lot of energy trying to find sponsors to publish it. Those who loved books did not have the money. Those who had money, as a rule, were not interested in books at all. The rapid gaining of fortune created greed and greed is one of the worst social and psychological diseases. That is like a curse, there is never enough. Something simply forces us to gain more and more, not exactly knowing what to do with the existing fortune. Greedy people are never ready to help materially in the creation of scientific and cultural works.

2. The General Approach

Njegoš was Lazo Kostić's basic preoccupation during the first couple of years of his emigrant life. In 1952, in Chicago, they published his book *Analysis and Interpretations from the Works of Njegoš*, on the occasion on the 100th anniversary of the death of this Serbian poet. Some parts of this book were written in camps, lacking any other literature but the original works about which he was writing, so he says that his work is a spontaneous result of reading. All supplements were being published in various Serbian emigrant papers and calendars but they undoubtedly represent a compact whole. The approach of Kostić towards Njegoš is not from a literary but from a legal, social, economical, political and ideological point of view. He analyses the reasons for studying Turkish converts, the forms of government in Montenegro, the mutual relations of the Montenegrin rulers, as well as relations between the Serbs and Turkish converts, religious ceremonies and national customs – and, above all, the characteristic distinctive features, the understanding of morals, freedom, lawfulness, justice, tyranny, etc.

In Melbourne in 1958, Kostić published a book entitled *The Legal Institutes in Poems of Njegoš*, in which the author studies the institutes of the state legacy through analysis of the relations between the Serbs and Turks, the acts and procedures of rulers and negotiations with the Turks. He was studying elements of International Law, mainly through the customs of giving shelter to foreigners and the procedure of the redemption of slaves. The work of courts, the execution of the death penalty and the institution of revenge form the basis for studying the criminal-legal aspect, while private law can be seen very little in the

In Munich in 1963, Kostić printed a book entitled *The Religious/Folkloristic Attitudes of the Poet Njegoš* in which he explained the idolatry of the cross and God's anger, national curses and oaths, prayers and pleadings, justice and injustice and the clerical and monastic caste, the role of the archpriest and patriarch and the specific theocratic system in Montenegro. In edition of the Educational Library of the Serbian National Defence in Canada, in Hamilton 1963, they published a book by Kostić called *Njegoš and the Montenegrins*, on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the poet's birth. Also, in Melbourne in 1976, they published a brochure entitled *Njegoš and Antique* in an edition of *Serbian Thoughts*. Lastly, also in Melbourne, in 1981, they posthumously printed the series of culturally-historical discussions entitled *Remembering the Antique*. In all these works, Kostić proved one of the best connoisseurs of the work of Njegoš in general.

3. Basic Studies

In discussions about his main preoccupation with *Gorski Vijenc* – the study of Turkish converts – Kostić noticed that it was one of the rare historical events that had no economical background at all. Filip Višnjić and all other folk narrators regarding the confrontation with Turks and the First Serbian Uprising, show a very expressive economical motivation for the riot – high taxes, punishments, robberies. The motives of studying in Montenegro are idealistic. A small country, surrounded by the enemy on all sides, insisted on unity of religion and ideology and a patriarchal morality, mentality, cultural inspirations and patriotism. That is why it was not a primary goal to deport or exterminate Turkish converts but to return them to the religion of their great grandfathers.

Converting would mean openly stepping into the service of the enemy. The return to Christianity, as a problem that could be the worst threat to the state, was being solved and that is why there is not a single word of additional maltreatment, harassment or reproach because of former behaviour. There was neither material blackmail nor material promises if they would or would not agree to return to the religion of their great grandfathers. Domestic Turkish converts anyway did not have any privileged position, nor did they belong to the gentry. They were mainly living on their master's properties and paid one tenth of their incomes, so their social position was not much different from the position of the Orthodox.

And when the research was completed, there were no scenes of robbery, capture or material self-interest. Turkish converts were liquidated, their homes and mosques destroyed, as Kostić pointed out in his first book: “the Montenegrins took over the study of Turkish converts in one very unpleasant moment for the Turks, when they were defeated near Vienna and when their cart turned upside-down. While the Turks were strong, the Montenegrins had no idea of cleaning their land of non-Christians. They took advantage of the moment of Turkish weakness. But they chivalrously offered the Turks the opportunity to

convert to Christianity or to move away. They very clearly indicated what was waiting for those who stayed in the country as Mohammedans. Not even then did they use their property. No analogy with the acts of the Ustas has two centuries later" (p. 22).

Through the works of Njegoš, we can see the forms of state affairs and decisions of obviously sovereign national power. At the beginning of the 18th century, the state power of Montenegro laid out a union of clans and districts, which were then divided into clans, villages and *katuni* (Translator's note: shepherds' settlements). Kostić thinks that all this was giving the image of a confederacy. "One belonged to the higher community as much as he wanted to. Each component could deny obedience at any moment and, for a moment, formally separate or join someone else" (p. 24). The central power was not efficient, so crucial state functions were executed at lower levels. There were no written agreements about the union of clans.

Each member of the union defined his own obligations and when he would respect them and when he would not. Apart from the legal side, they were also applying social norms that do not have legal authoritative origins and cannot refer to the authority of physical compulsion. They are on a lower level of development than even the common law is.

The only constant body of the central power was the *vladika* and the original source of his authority was his clerical vocation. Although it represented a symbol of state unity and faith, he did not have free hands in passing legal acts. At the Assembly, he was the first in honour, but where rights were concerned, he was equal to all the others. His judgements and decisions were only accepted owing to the force of arguments after discussions in which everyone was freely participating, and not because of his position. All principals had equal positions in the Assembly, regardless of their rank and title. They were elected by the folks and exclusively according to their own personal merits and quality. Decisions were unanimously adopted at the sessions of principals. Only then did they make sense and become generally binding, non-fulfilment was only sanctioned by moral sanctions. Assemblies were only convoked on special occasions so there were no regular sessions and no official taxes.

During that period, the State Government of Montenegro was a specific combination of the monarchy, aristocracy and democratic rights of the armed nation. The principals had the most important and essential role, but they did not represent aristocracy in the real sense of that word. Kostić finds it totally wrong to call the Governmental System of Montenegro a theocracy and he has a right. There was no ecclesiastical rule. They would first elect one of the members of the ruling house, who would enter the monastic order and become an episcopate only upon election. So he would first become a governor, and only later the archpriest. During the period of Šćepan the Little, people took over the judging role. Both the *vladika* and the principals were unable to control it. They followed the false tsar, because they recognized some generally human values in him. It was then that they made a significant step in the legal shaping of the state. In that time, democratic elements were possible

owing to the small territory with only some thirty thousand Orthodox inhabitants, during the period when *Mountain Wreath* was taking place. "Because of the title itself, nobody could aspire to some greater social importance. If one wanted to stay respected, he would have to repeatedly prove his manly qualities and heroism. Once received, the title was giving no guarantee" (p. 45).

The mutual relations of the heroes can be seen in the work of Njegoš, as can their mutual respect regarding the Serbs, their innocent jokes and naivety and, in contrast, their intolerance towards the Turkish converts, contempt towards traitors and the feeling of danger from leprosy, which could devour both society and people. Kostić points to the quantifications of Njegoš, which are lyrically overemphasized, artistically and ideally functional, but cannot represent relevant historiography data. Specific features of Orthodoxy, full of pagan motifs, can be clearly seen in the works of Njegoš. The Serbs did not quite understand the essence of Christianity and Orthodoxy, but what they knew was enough for their national and religious identification, especially for building the national conscience. Their epic glorifies their sacrifice for religion and homeland, and it affirms the spiritual power of curse and oath. It presents human characters the way they are, but with narrative exaggerations characteristic of the climate of Dinara. If people are good, than they are the best – if they are bad, they are certainly the worst. That is the attitude of the common people, and Njegoš presented it very well in his poems.

What proves to us that Kostić really comprehensively studied the work of Njegoš is a discussion on the punctuation that he used and of some mistakes in later editions that were changing the meaning of the text. He was quite extensively dealing with the explanation of archaic and less-known expressions and, in several places, he corrected the great Slavistic authority and interpreter of Njegoš, Milan Rešetar. That is the moment when Kostić proved himself an erudite in the true meaning of the word. As he was discussing the attitude of Njegoš towards tyranny, he realized that it was all about confrontation with self-will, force and atheism. The rule that offends human dignity and natural rights must be overthrown. And all foreign rule is such, especially when it was imposed with bloody violence.

Montenegro was under Turkish slavery for several centuries, but it had an actual economy due to the configuration of the territory, because Turks simply did not like visiting impassable gorges very often, for that would put them at risk and the results, in a material and political sense, would be too insignificant to compensate for the casualties from fights with rebels. "The very basic plot of *Mountain Wreath* indicates the dependence of Montenegro. It is about studying the Turkish converts, who were not only infiltrated, but so spread around that they made up the majority of the inhabitants of Montenegro. Those converts lived in the Capital as well, and directly beside the border with Venice (in Ceklići), which means almost everywhere. And Turkish converts only lived in the areas that were under Turkish power. Outside the Turkish territories, Christians did not turn Muslim and nor would that be reasonable. Our

people condemned even those who were turning Turk in areas ruled by Turks and put pressure on them. The shame would be even worse for those who would turn Turk without real trouble and need” (p. 161).

If it was not for studying Turkish converts, there would be no independence of Montenegro, because the Turkish government was counting precisely on those who turned Turk. While Turkey was strong, the converted Turks were fully protected. When they weakened, the opportunity arose to take the “rotten apple out of the barrel”. “Neither Njegoš nor the other governors of Montenegro had any legal or systematic education, but their moral judgements were impeccable and they wholly understood justice and righteousness, which was neither slaving in slave-holding nor slaving from a feudal point of view. Slavery is something we never had and feudalism was destroyed with the fall of the Serbian medieval state and nobody seriously thought of renewing it. In the people’s conscience, feudal relations were increasingly related to the essence of Turkish occupation, whereas each Serbian peasant was laying claims to the Nemanjić dynasty, neither more nor less. This built steady foundations for the feeling of democracy and democratism, which simply could not have been seen among other European peoples, so they really had reason to feel envious.

In Montenegro, of all human virtues, heroism was the most highly regarded. It was origin related and one was always known by remembrance of the behaviour of his ancestors, insisting on handing down heroism through generations and the only social differentiation was based on that. It took on such proportions that lately, the favouring of “noblemen”, especially in governmental affairs, turned totally upside-down. “The Montenegrin wants to be a hero, but not an anonymous one. He is ready to die with his faith in freedom, easier than anyone else, but he will die very miserably if he knows that his deed will pass unnoticed. He craves glory, either dead or alive. If he is assured that glory is waiting for him, there are no limits to his self-sacrifice: he goes to battle as if he went to a wedding, he dies with a smile on his face” (p. 178). We find a similar situation with awards and recognitions. “The Montenegrin is satisfied with awards and recognitions of the most ideal type. He did not expect to be awarded like today’s Anglo-Saxon aviators, nor did he expect to get land or a house of the defeated like the German knights did; neither did he long for loot like others, nor ask for power over his own folks, let alone over others, if he won the war, as is required and forcefully realized by his modern descendants. He was asking for nothing material and that was the sanctity of his sacrifice” (p. 178).

The first book that Kostić wrote about Njegoš caused an extremely strong response among the Serbian intellectuals living abroad. Later works were followed by less fanfare, for the simple reason that the intellectuals were gradually dying and the intellectual classes of the nationalistic emigration was simply not replenished by any new flows from the homeland and the descendants of emigrants were systematically assimilated and distanced from their own nation. Lazo Kostić quoted several strong statements and opinions as he was quoting columns from the Serbian emigrant press. So, the former minister Jovan

Donović says: “After the book written by Jovan Dučić, which was published by *SNO (Srpska Narodna Odbrana – Serbian National Defence)*, this is the most serious literary work by a Serb in emigration.” *Vladika* (Bishop) Nikolaj Velimirović points out: “I read the book of Dr. L. Kostić while it was still being proofread. It is quite original and quite different from any other book written about Njegoš. It is a serious social-legal study that, with fine analysis, illuminates the people and circumstances in old Montenegro. I learned a lot from that book and I believe others will learn too”.

Dr Đoko Slijepčević, well known historian and pre-war university professor, was of a similar opinion: “The whole of Kostić’s book stems from the writer’s intimate love he cherished for this great poet. The offspring of one old clergy family, in which they lived with the colours of Njegoš – Montenegrin by origin [...] the writer, both inside himself and in the heritage taken from home, has serious predispositions to correctly understand what makes the work of Njegoš so special and so extraordinary in our literature [...] This book of Prof Kostić is serious, well written and full of spiritual perceptions and, as such, makes quite a contribution to studying the works of Njegoš in a totally new direction.” A university professor from Wisconsin, Dr Mihailo Petrović, wrote: “The comment of Kostić regarding Njegoš comes from a generation that has lost almost everything but faith [...] Yet it was not just faith that wrote this scientific study. As a jurist, the writer enriched his work with bold and courageous analysis and objectivity. As a man of culture, he was able to draw on an abundant treasury of knowledge and from a refined style [...] Dr. Kostić undoubtedly threw new light on many aspects of Njegoš, owing to his disciplined analytical ability and knowledge about the Montenegrin milieu [...] Apart from his objectivity, which is worth all admiration, the author approached the subject with an ardent love and the profound engrossment of a refugee who strongly feels the value of a way of life which [...] does not exist anymore.”

4. Legal Institutes

As he was studying the legal institutes in the poems of Njegoš, Kostić was aware of the fact that detailed analysis of the works of this greatest Serbian poet and correlation of his thoughts into one unique system with the development of internal logic, expressed coherence and consistence, can be the only thing to offer an answer to questions relating to vast *oeuvre* of this literary great man. Therefore, Kostić’s second book in the sequence on Njegoš represents a comprehensive, brilliant and most detailed discussion.

Talking about the form of government that was preferred by the Serbian national and political conscience of that time, it is quite understandable that they would choose a monarchy because the other form was not understood under the conditions of Turkish domination or the liberation wars. Venetia was far away and its republican system was not understandable. Our common people, filled with epic and romantic emotions, found it hard to understand that a ruler’s power could be

limited. That indicates that the surrounding Serbs did not even understand the governmental system of the Republic of Dubrovnik. Only scholars could have understood it and they were very rare. On the other hand, since both cases were aristocratic republics, in which democratic rights are limited to a very narrow group of citizens, the distance to other people was huge as well.

However, there was also a huge gap between the monarchist conscience of the Montenegrin Serbs and their behaviour in everyday life. In their minds, the royal ruler was considered untouchable but hardly anyone would accept that in reality. The autonomy of the clans and districts was an unbridgeable barrier for the *Vladika* of Cetinje, as a practical monarch. His state prerogatives were considered only a temporary attitude until the Serbian Empire was renovated in all its glory, light and brightness.

That is why such an environment accepted the false Tsar Šćepan the Little. Part of the empire among the Serbian people always implied that the tsar was of our blood and language. "The Montenegrins accept the monarchy, but only one type of monarchy – i.e. empire – which will be highly respected by the state, but whose titulars will not take away people's rights. They want a tsar, because that is the only thing that can compensate for Kosovo, but a tsar without power and, even more certainly, a tsar who will not collect taxes – a tsar who is almost nothing. Because they, the Montenegrins, know that an empire can increase international reputation and domestic enthusiasm, but no empire will make the Montenegrin cliffs richer. The truth is that the tsar that the Montenegrins were longing for, will sometimes be a generally Serbian tsar, because the Serbs cannot have two tsars and they already must have one. If Montenegro gets him now, that will prove that destiny had turned its face towards the Serbian people and that they will revenge Kosovo and the old Serbian glory. That is where such longing for a tsar on Cetinje was coming from" (p. 28).

It can also be seen in *Mountain Wreath* that Njegoš is indicating the duality – the profane and spiritual power of the Turkish Sultans – a devil with two swords and two crowns. This is where we can see the contrast with civilized Europe of that time, which had largely realized the principle of a strict differentiation between state and religious power. This is one of the moments when the contemporaries of Njegoš among the Serbian people could not theoretically understand but, due to the chivalrous code, they simply implied it in their hearts. It is not in the least by chance that the successor to Njegoš, Danilo, definitively solved the issue by proclaiming himself the Prince of Montenegro and refusing to enter a monastic order and become a *vladika*.

In his poems, Njegoš is visualizing the Montenegrin attitude towards the persecuted and asylum-seekers of all kinds. Montenegro gave shelter to everyone and to the fighters for freedom and justice, hayduks and anti-Turkish rebels most gladly. This is where we can fully observe the liberating tradition and democracy that Europe of the present time had not reached yet. There is no force and threat that could shake the liberating spirit and the feeling of honour and integrity that demands

IT-03-67-T

helping people in trouble and defying oppressors. Heroism and bravery can have a extremely witty feature, like the motifs of exchanging captured Turks for Mačva sows and fat oxen, instead of taking gold and other valuables. Taking a sow for a Turk invigorates the heart as it represent spiritual food and heroic satisfaction, so they contemptuously throw away the bag of golden coins, for which a thousand sows could have been bought. If the Turk is a slave to his religious bias that makes him terrified of pigs, the fact that he is worth one sow, owing to which he is released and saved, gives him the best possible lesson. The liberation conscience of the Montenegrins is horrified by the Turkish legislative system, yet it cannot understand the Venetian one. In Turkey, the full expression of self-will and arrogance of power can be seen – and pronouncing sentences according to the current caprice and mood of the one who is in charge. In Venice, there is a legal system and law but also incomprehensibly cruel treatment of the convicted, as well as obvious inhumanity. As for the Montenegrin Serbs, they prefer the death penalty to galley slavery, for they cannot see the economic base for such a system of penology. A chivalrous conscience justifies the death penalty for each severe crime, but it is quite mild and merciful towards criminals committing a lower degree of crime. That is why there were no prisons in Montenegro. Being a foreign phenomenon, they are disgraceful and unworthy of human beings.

At the same time, there is the analogy of revenge as the supreme moral act. That is where the proverb "one who does not take revenge, does not take consecration" comes from. "For the Montenegrins, the basic task of their state being is revenge for Kosovo and revenge for all the evils that Turks committed against Serbs" (p. 125). Poor extinguished Serbdom, the destroyed medieval Serbian state in humiliating slavery under the Turks, all of whom puts the sense of life, fighting and sacrifice on a pedestal. "The Montenegrins live "with great difficulties", they suffer and are poor in everything, they live with the hope of revenge and because of revenge itself. One generation comes after another, definite revenge is postponed (though partial is always taken), and each generation hopes for complete revenge. Otherwise, they would not live and their life would become totally senseless and uninteresting. Revenge is the mission of the Montenegrins, their essence and the main objective of their state independence" (p. 125).

On occasion of the publication of Kostić's second book on Njegoš, Josef Matl, a professor of Slavistics and a prominent scientist from Graz, announced: "I especially respect the fact that one so experienced and recognized as an expert... read and studied this new topic. This is the first time that the issue of Njegoš was introduced into complete cultural, social and nationally-historical problems." Professor Vlado Vlahović, as one of the best connoisseurs of Njegoš, wrote: "The two books by Lazo Kostić announce a new direction in the presentation of Njegoš and confirm that there is still a lot to say, which is still intact. Will Kostić continue in this direction or not, that is something I do not know, but one thing is sure – this is a brand new way of studying Njegoš [...] The novelty that Kostić brings mainly indicates the fact that he is a lawyer

and that he is observing material from a legal and/or social science point of view; also that he is Bokelian, living under Lovćen, only from the other side... So Kostić is the best one to direct the study of Njegoš in a new and fresh direction... Kostić is not just an interpreter of Njegoš, but his promoter as well. Both his books not only represent studies on a scientific basis, but they can also be national textbooks, which can be popular and spread among the people just like the works of Njegoš are – those works that were the foundation for these two books.”

5. The Religious-Folkloric Attitude

The book *The Religious-Folkloric Attitude of the poet Njegoš* is a direct continuation of two studies, *From the Works of Njegoš* and *The Legal Institutes in Poems of Njegoš*. Kostić starts from the fact that Njegoš, although a celebrated *vladika*, was not only involved in ecclesiastical affairs, but in national and governmental affairs as well. Even when he deals with religious issues or discusses religious ideas, it is obvious that Njegoš fully understands and accepts the specific combinations and unique expression of the basic elements of Christianity and the pagan Slav heritage, which is so characteristic of the Serbian people in total. At the same time, religious ideas are symbols that mark modern events and enrich original poetic expression.

So, for example, the cross represents the symbol of suffering and conscientious sacrifice. This augury appears in the form of two crossed lightning strokes in the sky, as a sign of forthcoming heroic events or national suffering. The cross is a symbol of the whole Serbian people and represents the basic differentiation from the most dangerous enemy – the Turkish converts. “The *Luna*, or crescent, which is really the symbol of the Mohammedans, just like the cross is the symbol of Christianity, but those two became confronted and that conflict will last until one of those two symbols disappears” (p. 21). However, we must bear in mind that “When a Montenegrin says a cross”, he only means the Orthodox cross ... Catholic is “Latin” (the Montenegrins did not know about the protestants) and Latin is not Christian. In Boka, all the inhabitants are divided into Christians and Latins and not a single Serb will declare as Orthodox, only Christian, which makes him very different to the Latins (who, according to that, are not Christian)” (p. 22).

As he was explaining God’s Punishment that came upon Serbs, Njegoš indicates that it came upon the whole nation although they did not all deserve it, they had not all sinned, only the nobility, the landowners and tsars, because they had inner negotiations, disputes and conflicts, because they were discordant at the most critical historical moment. Njegoš often swears and curses even more often. In the whole world of Serbian literature, there is probably no more compelling curse than the following: “*Hasty and greedy Turkish converts, may Serbian milk put leprosy upon them*” (p. 60).

Kostić performs a detailed etymological analysis of the curse and the oath, and indicates their common origin. They are one of the basic

IT-03-67-T
outlines of the works of Njegoš, which indicates that curses and oaths played a big role in everyday life. The point is strongly expressed through subsuming national understanding in general: “The Serbs were suffering for a long time, for centuries, under Turkish tyranny. Somebody had cursed them – nothing else. Suffering came as a consequence of a “bad curse.” But the curse was conditional; it stops with the uprising and liberation of the Serbs. It was all inaugurated by Karađorđe, “the father of Serbia”. The curse lost its importance, the condition was fulfilled so it disappeared. But Njegoš and, through him, the whole of Serbdom, cannot wait until the moment when it will disappear, they are pushing it out: go away, Satan, so that our eyes see no more of you! They are scared that it might have failed to see what happened, see that there is no place for it anymore: that the Serbs fulfilled their oath and there will be no more curse upon them” (p. 84).

Kostić makes a detailed analysis of the essence and the meaning of the prayer, plea, begging and crowing in the works of Njegoš and in Serbian folk life in general, and thus enters into a quality ethnological and anthropological discussion. Njegoš is also interpreting absolute divine justice and righteousness and he is opposing injustice and reflects this contradicting relation with earthly conditions. Justice is related to freedom and injustice is related to slavery, betrayal and humiliation. The wife of Ivan Crnojević is capable of cursing her own son Staniša because he turned Turk and committed deception and betrayal.

Bearing that in mind, we must understand the Montenegrin Serbs who were astonished and disappointed when they realized that, on one occasion, the Turks had captured the Ecumenical Patriarch Esperius and put him into their service, utilising him to calm the rebelled folks and convince the Christians of the necessity of obeying the Turkish Sultan. “Njegoš did not ask for such a scene, it was imposed and certainly unpleasant, that is why he describes it and lives it with such consideration. But, as a characteristic of the Phanariot, it is quite welcomed and precious, especially in comparison with the Serbian archpriests. They were all rebels against the Turks, their relentless enemies, active fighters when needed and patriots at the price of death. They do not even accept peace with Turks, they do not even accept inactivity (which, for e.g., was the only thing asked from the Patriarch of Peć), let alone active help of the Turkish administration and politics. The Phanar is completely in service of the Porte. But to have a situation where the very head of the church and the highest ranking Orthodox Archpriest walks along the border as an ordinary agent of Turkish rule, that went beyond the belief of the then Montenegrins and the contemporaneous readers of the works of the *vladika*. And it really seems to have been like that, or at least approximately” (p. 205).

In contrast to the Ecumenical Patriarch Esperius and his vassal souls, the Serbian priests in the works of Njegoš are first of all patriots and fighters for freedom, and they successfully involve this fight in the basic meaning of the Orthodox faith. “The Montenegrin priests, as presented by Njegoš, could only appear in Montenegro and in Serbdom. As soon as one reads what they say and do, one would know that they are neither

Greeks nor Russians nor Bulgarian. They are irreplaceable, they are a species” (p. 207).

Almost every priest mentioned by Njegoš, had distinguished himself in the battlefield as well. He may be illiterate, uneducated and common but, as a rule, a great fighter and much more skilful with a sabre than with a censer. “It was not only the lay priests that cherish such fighting spirit and patriotism, but all the clergy, both profane and spiritual, and more or less dedicated and reverend. They all serve their people. If they can, they serve their religion at the same time, which is good and which will be a ‘sideline’ of their business. If they cannot serve both faith and people at the same time, they neglect their duties towards faith. They approve murder and bless murderers and commit murder if necessary (Priest Miša Trebješanin, Protopope Žutković, etc.) [...] The clerical rank does not release them from national duty. It sets new obligations that are not distanced from general and national ones. It imposes the obligation of being a teacher, a headman, a leader, but does not release them from being a fighter, a hard-worker and a participant in national affairs. The altar is just an additional battlefield and, at the same time, it is an award, an honour to one who proved himself as a national fighter. That obliges him even more to stay with his folks and to keep his dignity” (p. 207).

So, among Serbs, there was no clergy class or caste. Priests are originated directly from the people. They think and feel just like the people they belong to, so they work and act, fight and die heroically. “The *vladikas* undoubtedly cared for preserving the unity and homogeneity of their people, first of all because their power and reputation depended on that. But they never preached some purity of faith. And they mainly saw their role as preserving the Serbdom. They were missionaries of Serbdom and protectors of the Serbian interests” (p. 218).

Here, Kostić additionally supports his argument for his thesis that Montenegro, at this time, was not a theocratic state: “Although the Orthodox *vladika* truly resided in Cetinje as a spiritual person with the title of the Archpriest, his subsidiary bodies were not priests, nor was the system of theocracy further developed. Apart from the *vladika*, no other priest had any power. He could have been a headman, a *serdar* or a duke, but only owing to his personal merits, not spiritual or even anti-spiritual. Lower clergy titles were not connected with secular titles” (p. 218). Kostić used detailed analysis of the historical opportunities, the common law, ideological sense and the special position of the clergy for the base and final conclusions regarding the form of the political regime in Montenegro: “The regime of the *vladikas* and Metropolitans from Cetinje was certainly some form of the rule, *sui generis*, which does not have a direct parallel in the neighbourhood, let alone further afield. It cannot be categorized among the familiar state-legal institutions. As for the history, that is not even necessary” (p. 224 – 225).

6. The Characterology of Montenegrins

In a short study entitled *Njegoš and the Montenegrins*, Kostić

supplemented three of his earlier extensive books. Here, he dealt first with the Montenegrin relations towards other nations. Montenegro had only two neighbours – Turkey and Venetia. They lead constant wars with Turks and, as for the Venetians, they alternated between conflict and cooperation. As for other countries, they mainly knew Russia, whose cult was systematically built up. This situation lasted until the beginning of the 19th century, when the Napoleonic wars started. The Turks were ontological enemies and there simply could not be any reconciliation. “It is well understood that there can be no love between the Montenegrins and Turks [...] They hate each other, they growl at each other, they will come to blows with each other whenever the opportunity appears, if they have not already done so” (p. 10).

Njegoš has a totally negative approach towards the Turks, regularly attributing the worst human characteristics to them. He occasionally mentions their heroic qualities, but only when giving descriptions of Montenegrin heroism, because that can only be achieved if the force of the enemy is respected. According to Njegoš, the Turks are a flock of a cursed kind, the harpies of Had, the human plague, the devil’s brood, the dog’s brood, monsters filled with evil and injustice, whose tracks stink with brutality. “The Montenegrins praise the Bosnians and the Albanians as excellent soldiers, sometimes together, sometimes separately. They never spoke a single bad word about their military abilities and they very often spoke well” (p. 11). Their military qualities are recognized, most of all, because they are of Serbian origin, all Bosnians and inhabitants of northern Albania. Naturally, among the Bosnian Turks, they mention the Herzegovinians as well. So Njegoš narrates in *The Song of Freedom*:

“Montenegrins assailed
With natural worthiness
Like to the first Turkish armies.
Yet a *Bošnjak*, Herzegovinian,
A real Serb of Turkish faith:
Never will he withdraw
From the place of battle
Without flesh and blood.
Already too much blood,
For three white days and three nights
Holding his position” (p. 12).

The real Turks despised the Bošnjaci (Translator’s note: Bosnians), taking them for some second-grade category of compatriots. Originally, Bošnjak was a mocking term. Njegoš sincerely regrets for the Serbs who were deceived and lost their national identity and, in *The False Tsar Šćepan the Little*, he emphasizes:

“The Bošnjaci, our own brothers,
Who are blind, so cannot see a thing.
The Koran removed their eyes,

The Koran blackened their cheek;
 No soul or honour have they
 That would not, but die for Koran,
 This miserable sanctity of theirs.
 Of liberty and of nation,
 They know nothing,
 For they put them all to the grave” (p. 13).

He treats the Albanians similarly:

“The Albanian, is neither wine nor water,
 Has no freedom and no nationality,
 Knowing not of honour and honesty
 And sells himself to the one who offers more;
 He will do it all for money,
 Sell his own mother and slaughter his father.
 That knight, Skenderbey Đuro,
 Who had no resemblance to them
 (it was Đuro’s uncles that he resembled,
 The Balšić, the Princes of Serbia),
 Yet it was this glorious knight,
 That never again will they have,
 That they sold to the Turks for money.
 So that Đuro escapes not by night,
 From his bed, so somehow strangely,
 They wanted to behead him,
 So he was sold to the Sultan for money.
 We did not help Skenderbey
 in his fight against Turkish power;
 The Albanians will never know
 That they are the worst our enemy” (p. 15).

The opinion of Montenegrins towards the Venetians is also always negative. They consider them cowards, ugly, without pride and without bravado. Their houses are claustrophobic and smelly. Their courts are inhumane and they extremely dedicated to spying on each other. They act as if they were converted Turks. They are ready to betray the Montenegrins at any moment, even to mercilessly hand their children to the Turks, if they by chance look for shelter in the territory that is under the control of the Venetians.

In order to present the bad historical experience that the Serbs had with the Latin world – with Latin shrewdness, mendacity and insincerity – in the best possible way, Kostić gives an extensive quotation from the emigrant writer and professor Vuk Bjelopavlović: “The proverb ‘Latins are old cheaters’ was created under the influence of national experience that lasted for centuries. That Latin cheating was emphasized in many of the folk poems, and nor is it left out of fine poetry and literature in general. According to them, the Latins are still weak, often ridiculous, capable of malice whenever they have the opportunity for it, looking for

IT-03-67-T
 the easiest way to achieve their goals, using all means. The Serbian nation was the target Latins with whom, as already stated, they did not engage in battles, and the Turks, with whom they were in constant war. The first were trying to use Serbs and conquer them religiously and politically, without fighting and using cunning; the second, the Turks, were already enslaving... In comparison with the Latins, Turks were the whole spear ahead. In one of his stories, Ljubiša said: “My grandfather taught me that the Venetians were more cunning than the Turks, and that he was going to Venice and Constantinople, and went down their ropes.” Such a judgment of the Latins created the idea that the Latin religion was much further from the Orthodox faith than it was from the Turkish. It was not unnatural that a Montenegrin who was asked to name the religion he mostly appreciated after his own, would say: “That is the Turkish religion, my Lord, for, if I converted to the Turkish religion I would hope to come among people, but converting to the Latin religion would only make me meet inhuman people” (p. 19-20).

The Serbs had the most positive opinion towards the Russians, although there were some bitter experiences from their common war with Turks, where Russians the were concluding treaties without observing the interests of Montenegro. There was also a very high degree of identification with Russia, which is the same as us, only incomparably bigger and, unfortunately, too far away. That is why we always say:

“If Russians were our brothers,
 There is no force in the whole world
 Which could separate us.
 Even if they were not our brothers,
 But the very devils from hell,
 Still, they are dearer than Turks” (p. 22).

The Serbs in Montenegro were constantly armed and always ready for the battle. Mobilization was always general, upon the first battle cry. If someone, by any chance, deserted, hid or avoided participating in the war, he would be disdained and excluded from the public community. Also, the Montenegrins did not accept the humiliating eastern ceremonial obedience. They were very proud when addressing the Prince and the Metropolitan. With their pride and bravado, they even imposed royal dignity. There is much more pride to be the ruler of brave, proud and honourable men, than a lord over slaves and the subservient.

Sharp-witted people, as all the Montenegrins are aside apart from their expression of heroism, are impressed by seeing someone speak and narrate, brightly and cleverly. In Montenegro, one can “be free to speak, and to speak nice, for those speeches give life meaning. Generations are fed with them and, if there was nothing else, that alone would be enough to make life in Montenegro interesting. Talking can replace all other amusements and even compensate for all the hardships of life” (p. 41). The high-point of narration is the epic singing with *gusle* (a Balkan

string instrument). The poem was “mainly improvised, or at least sang and interpreted differently and modified by each narrator. The Montenegrins recognized leadership and priority for the one who was better at composing the poem. It is understood that priority was only recognized in that field. Not everyone would dare to take the *gusle* in their hands. As soon as a better narrator appeared, others would step back. Narrators were highly appreciated, but only if they could “sing with the *gusle*.” However, this quality did not give them political importance and a prestigious social reputation. But good “conversation” and good narration would elevate the individual above others and make him socially higher and more important” (p. 42).

Through his works, Njegoš describes the position of women in the Montenegrin patriarchal society. Women are protected and what is appreciated is their loyalty to the family, but also courage, if she happens to express it somewhere. They are not dominant, yet they are not humiliated. They are removed from public affairs and they do not attend male sessions, but they are given the opportunity to express their attitude. Also, men are not interfering in things that are considered female affairs.

Kostić is especially comprehensive in dealing with the phenomenon of laments, where the role of women reaches a supreme social significance and represents a constitutive element of heroic epics. “A woman from Montenegro and Boka become an arbitrator (that word primarily meant a judge whose judgment is lead by his emotions and not by written laws) for both the dead and the living. Nobody finds her judgement indifferent and nobody can contradict her. During the performance of a lament, that is formally impossible; afterwards it would be anachronous and inappropriate. Finally, it is not fair for a man to criticize a woman, let alone for her to be beaten by anyone other than her own man. The word of a woman remains untouched. So, women, at least some women in Montenegro and the Serbian Coast, have unusually strong weapons in the social life of those people: they have the characteristics of an individual that has no appellate and which can bring each individual and each clan up or down. In the country where the spoken word is the strongest “characteristic” of both individuals and the whole collective, this represents a powerful and lethal weapon. Women living in other parts of Serbia or abroad have nothing comparable” (p. 62).

Kostić ended this forth book from the serial of Vladika Rad with a discussion entitled *Njegoš and Serbdom*, saying: “People always considered the greatest Serbs to be those who brought the biggest glory upon Serbdom. This is certainly what puts Njegoš in the foreground. He lived for Serbdom and only for Serbdom. He loved Serbdom more than anyone else. His reservoir of love was all directed towards Serbdom and he had nobody who was dearer and closer. Nobody, neither before nor after him, gave a more beautiful and more striking depiction of Serbian pain and suffering. Nobody put a stronger emphasis on Serbian aspirations, nor did anybody give a better formulation of Serbian ideals. Njegoš was a Serb, and an ancient Serb. If ever one entire nation could have been incorporated in just one man, this would certainly be Serbdom

IT-03-67-T
incorporated in Njegoš” (p. 64).

Here Kostić comes across the essential problems of our time when, after Serbdom had been swearing in the name of Njegoš for a hundred years, almost disastrous events arose. “Suddenly, there was a turnabout in his homeland, not spontaneous and organic, but decreed and violently imposed. The Montenegrins separated from Serbdom and proclaimed themselves a separate nation. The Yugoslav communists made the decree that the Montenegrins are really an individual nation, different to the Serbs. Since terror and strong-arm tactics which does not support opposition stood behind this decree, all the Montenegrins had to obey it, although not sincerely and without being convinced. The situation, however false and temporary, was painfully real, which Njegoš formulated in advance with his peculiar and unsurpassable verses: “The clan would all deny themselves!” (p. 64-65).

Under the terror of Tito and the communists, “one must not call Njegoš a Serbian poet, only a Montenegrin and Yugoslav. *Mountain Wreath* is published without a dedication to Karađorđe and mainly in the Latin alphabet, etc.. Njegoš is separated from Serbdom, his Serbian feathers are being plucked and they are trying to take away his Serbian heart. Never in the history of literature was there a more miserable attack on the thoughts of a dead poet. Neither the Middle Ages nor even the Inquisition were capable of doing it. They were destroying and burning the works of opponents, but they did not falsify them. It was such a vulgar falsification that black was proclaimed white and white was proclaimed black. A hundred years after his death, Njegoš had to suffer slaughter, distortion and the total abuse of his thoughts. Nobody, for example, must present any idea that would prove the Serbdom of Njegoš. On the other hand, Njegoš was called a “revolutionary” and a forerunner of communism” (p. 6.).

Kostić neither believes that such denials can last for a long time, nor that they can live thorough history. “Proving the opposite, proving that Njegoš is a Serb, above all a Serb and nothing but a Serb, was unusual” (p. 65). There is no doubt that “Njegoš did not only emphasize his Serbdom in a positive sense but, more than any other Serbian writer and even more than the folk singers, he pronounced an anathema upon traitors to Serbdom” (p. 66). The testament of Njegoš is expressed most precisely and convincingly in the verses of: *The False Tsar Šćepan the Little*.

“Each converted Serb,
Who simply hugs someone else’s faith,
May God not forgive him
For he has blackened his cheek,
Not wishing to be called a Serb
This Serb has chosen, to be
Someone else’s slave” (p. 67)

That is why it is no wonder that the communists “have a major problem with Njegoš. He is the strongest representative of liberty and the most prominent holder of Serbian unity. He devoted his entire

spiritual life to the cause of liberty and unity. He himself burned out in those efforts. His philosophical achievements were crowned the head of Karadorde and the Serbian people with a halo of heroism and martyrdom” (p. 67). For this reason, “the fire of Njegoš from Lovćen is the strongest defender of all the sanctities and moral inheritance of the Serbian people. He burns them (the communist monsters) with his liberating fire and tells them not to “give the empire to inhumans, but to call them names before the whole world” (p. 68).

7. Comparison with Antique Examples

In the Chronicle *Serbian thought* for the year 1974-1975, which was published in Melbourne in 1976, Lazo Kostić published his study *Njegoš and the Antiquity*, in which he indicated the analogy between the verses of Njegoš and the Ancient Greek philosophers. Regardless of the absence of any geographical or timely continuity, Kostić believed that there were significant similarities between the social circumstances in Montenegro during the period of the Turkish occupation of Serbian lands and the Homeric period of Greek history. Before Kostić did this, Gladstone tried to make a comparison between “Montenegrin heroism and the heroism of the fighters of Thermopolis and Marathon, which it can even excel because it was performed “with significantly less battle equipment and material means, whereas the enemy was incomparably braver and more horrible” (p. 6).

The communist ideologist Milovan Đilas claimed that such a comparison makes no sense, and he ferociously jumped on Isidora Sekulić who supported it. On refuting the claims of Đilas, Kostić quotes the testimony of Johann George Kohl, a German writer and travel writer, who says that such a comparison with antiquity was even made by Njegoš himself and he once told him: “I hope that we can offer you many interesting things and I imagine that here you will very often be reminded of Homer and conditions of people which he describes” (p. 7). So Kohl added: “I should say that all these words that the *vladika* pronounced were ones that gave tone and direction to the whole flow of my thoughts during my short stay and pilgrimage in Montenegro, and from which almost everything resembled some comment of Homer” (p. 7).

Even the Austrian Consul Alexander von Warsberg and the German writers Richard Foss and Hermann Bar were pointing out similarities and coincidences of Montenegrin folk life and ancient Greece. Professor Gerhard Gesemann made a direct parallel between Ancient Sparta and Montenegro. Kohl saw coincidence in folk customs, the sense of liberty, blood revenge, the adornment of weapons, the glorification of death in battles, way of preparing food, the cut and look of clothes, national headmen, their position and characteristics, the respect for oratory skills, the contempt of shrewdness, the constant wars and the heroic folk poems.

In treating war and battles, Kostić found coincidence between the attitudes of Heraclites and Njegoš. Two sharp-minded yet uneducated

men, separated by more than two thousand years of history, thought about the same things, had coincidental observances and meditations and came to similar conclusions about the world around them. Contradictions in nature and society, as well as constant conflicts of opposition, make a basis for the essential harmony in which the world is resting. Njegoš despises the masses; he underestimates it, underrates it and scorns it, which is where Kostić sees similarities with Plato. Kostić’s book *Remembrance of Antiquity* is a testimony to the author’s preoccupation with antique, philosophical thoughts and democratic tradition. He starts from Pythagoras’s idea that man is a measure of all things, thus stressing the importance of the subjective relation of a man with the world around him. It is well understood that the relationship is subjective and relative and the same time, which means that it differs from one personality to another. But one will always change his attitude depending on his position and the life he leads. The theory of individualism leads to human liberation, yet it must not be abused for the sake of revitalizing the truth and morality.

Kostić still deals with the idea of the condemnation of greed and gluttony for material values and the insistence on wisdom, sobriety and moderation as virtues. The Ancient Greeks avoided physical work. They appreciated idleness that they could dedicate to philosophy, as well as competition in spiritual and sporting disciplines. Here Kostić again makes a parallel with Serbs, whom he also says that they do not like physical work. Further, he discusses the physiological relationship of the beginning towards the whole, the magic and religious meaning of the number seven, the symbolic meaning of the rod in various variations, the institution and ceremony of marriage, extravagance, especially of gifted people, such as scientists, writers and artists, the love motives of ancient poetry, etc.. He brightly compares the tradition and practice of various peoples with the Serbian experience and customs and, with this study, he completes his research cycle on the work of Njegoš.

8. The Violent Wreathing of Serbian Writers

In Milwaukee in 1975, in the edition of the Serbian National University (which was named by him), Kostić published a book entitled *The Violent Wreathing of Serbian Writers* in which he dealt with the spiritual and cultural dismemberment of the Serbian people through the project of the artificial Montenegrin nation, which was perfidiously implemented by the Yugoslav communists who wanted to destroy the Serbian national being more efficiently.

In the foreground of the inauguration of the project, there was a certain self-styled writer named Radoslav Rotković, a combatant of the regime association of writers. “Primarily they sent just one person to battle, and for several reasons. First of all, it was a test balloon, to see the reaction of the court and the public. If that did not work, all the shame would only be upon one. That is why they chose one Montenegrin novice, one “Turkish convert”, and the opinion was that perhaps the active identification for conducting the dispute would be more suitable

for an individual than for the whole collective, better for a physical than legal personality” (p. 2). Kostić additionally stresses the attempt at posthumously separating Njegoš, Stjepan Mitrova Ljubiša and Marko Miljanov from Serbdom, as well as the fact that there appeared a real “escalation of Montenegrin independence and Montenegrin nationalism in cultural and other fields. They were even trying to prove the existence of a separate Montenegrin language - even that Vuk stole the language from the Montenegrins and proclaimed it Serbian (a certain Nikčević, a prominent ‘educational worker’ from Montenegro). They would not have a joint economy with Serbs, they wanted their own and independence, if possible, but not at all joint with Serbian” (p. 4).

More than 20 years ago, Lazo Kostić was able to make a detailed, complete and comprehensive analysis of this pseudo-historical engineering. “We cannot call it a general phenomenon in Montenegro. On the contrary, it encounters increased resistance in the country itself, or – as they like to say – in the “republic.” It seems that even the supporters of the joint Serbian culture are more significant in number and worthiness - that they are, as Catholic Ecclesiastical Law says, *pars major et senior*. But the supporters of independence or the anti-Serbs among the Montenegrins are much more aggressive, louder, more unscrupulous and more ferocious. They are better heard and put all their efforts into making it happen. They speak without fear or censorship, whereas the mouths of their opponents are at least semi-closed... Supporters of the independent Montenegrin culture are as insolent as they are illiterate” (p. 4-5). These dirty games were actively participated in by the pro-Tito oriented regime from Belgrade, which was persecuting true Serbian patriots and which was promoting traitors and corrupted souls. Kostić reproaches the Serbian emigration because of the mild and inadequate reaction to such occurrences, which is a result of underestimating the real danger coming from the violent separation of the Montenegrins from the Serbian national corpus.

Lazo Kostić particularly studied the famous polemics of Pavle Zorića and a certain Montenegro-oriented follower Milorad Stojović from 1969, in which Zorić gave such strong, clear and stressing argumentation that it shook the highest communist ranks of that period. Zorić drew a very striking conclusion concerning the psychological nature of the polemical and narrative arrogance of Stojović, which impressively testifies to the generally miserable attitude of the official ideological conscience of that time: “He showed a type of spiritual mentality compared with which, it seems, there is none more dangerous for literature: an aptitude towards the discussion of literary issues on the level of political deceptions. Such an interlocutor always counts on elements of fear in his opponents. He hopes that his opponent will get nervous at the mention of the name Dragiša Vasić. What he cares about is not a basic discussion, but a demagoguery.

He replaces literary facts with political facts, understood in a vulgar manner, and believes that parables will prove that Njegoš does not belong to Serbian poetry. Stojović asks me: where could I situate the whole group of authors from Montenegro if I deny the existence of autonomous

Montenegrin literature? Not to cause confusion and in order to deprive the question of Milorad Stojovića of any pathetic uncertainty, we will give a very short answer: in Serbian literature, where a significant number of the mentioned names already feel right [...] The best writers of Montenegro always had the conscience of belonging to Serbian literature and nothing can make significant changes to that” (p. 7).

The appearance of Montenegrin desertion did not have any serious opponents. Alienators “were screaming at Serbdom and the Serbs whenever they had the opportunity to do so, not only in their “republic” but even more in the Belgrade press, which had to keep open its columns for the attack on the people who read it and supported it. The Montenegrin headmen in Belgrade were providing a smooth operation, without stoppages and protests. Yet the *Đetići* (Montenegrins) were not satisfied. They asked that neither historians of Serbian literature, nor Serbian scientists, nor university professors could contradict them. If they say that black is white, everybody must accept it, if they say salty is sweet, everyone must accept that too.” “*Woe is the one who believes not!*” When the Montenegrins puff up their “people” and their “culture” as much as they want, nobody from the Serbian side said a word to them or contradicted them. First, they could not have done it (because they would be prosecuted); secondly, they did not want to. But they do not accept Montenegrin megalomaniac and annexation desires. They are quiet. But now, this is what makes the *Đetići* (Translator’s note: Montenegrins) go mad. They want all the Serbian writers and all the scientists - all the professors and academics - to adopt the claims of this Rotković and others - to deny their best scientists, to muddy their history and people, to repudiate their ancestors and culture, etc.. They will do it themselves, according to the communist recipe. When they saw no other way, they wanted to solve it by means of the court. Besides, they very much desired - if not even more so - to steal from the Serbs and take for themselves. Whatever it may be, just do not make it Serbian. That is why they were promoting Macedonian independence, more than anyone else, and that is why they agreed to let their Metohija join Albanian Kosovo, only to overpower and terrorize it. They help the Croats in laying claims to, for instance, the Literature of Dubrovnik and all that goes to the detriment of Serbs. They are trying to humiliate the Serbs so much that they say that Njegoš, Šubić, etc., were not theirs but that previous Serbs were stealing them from the Montenegrins. Not only do they want to spoil their treasure, but to embarrass the thieves as well. They want the Serbs to present themselves as thieves” (p. 8-9).

Separating Njegoš from Serbdom is really incredible. “The fact that he “wrote and breathed” in the Serbian manner, the fact that he gave marvellous expression to all the supreme moral values of the Serbian people, the fact that he came from the land that cherished the cult of Kosovo with religious values and where the cult of Obilić was fascinating people and dazing them with heroism - and where the *Mountain Wreath* of Njegoš was taken as a kind of national Bible in all the Serbian lands, its verses quoted from Gorski Kotar to Bitolj – all this is of no importance to these mules sitting in their high positions. The

most important task is to blindly follow the party that burns away the Serbdom in the Montenegrins and makes them into some kind of special anti-Serbian nation” (p. 11). When they noticed that the public was mocking them, the Montenegrin communists addressed the Constitutional Court of the communist Yugoslavia, with a request to proclaim Njegoš a Montenegrin and not a Serbian writer.

This case is truly grotesque to the end, especially if one bears in mind that the President of the Constitutional Court was a well-known pro-Tito oriented tyrant named Blažo Jovanović. In their public appearances on that occasion, the submitters of the constitutionally-legal initiative referred to Marx and Engels. They would even try to fit the whole of Njegoš into that Marxist Theory, although even the laymen knew that Marxism, as an ideological base for one of the most dangerous totalitarian projects of the 20th century, was extremely anti-nationalistic. So Kostić emphasizes that, based on the contents of the literary works of Njegoš, Marx and Engels “despised and anathemized Njegoš, because he was a nationalist and a chauvinist of a kind that can hardly be found nowadays anywhere, and which are sentenced to several years of imprisonment in the present Yugoslavia. He is “a person of backward views, a reactionary dazed with religious darkness.” It would be logical that the Montenegrin communists repudiate him, yet they lay claims to him and would not give him anyone else! They are proud of him and yet they curse his studies and declarations! How can this go together?!” (p. 14).

Brilliantly and with meticulous analysis, Kostić discusses all the possible legal repercussions of this Constitutional process, which actually uncovers crucial elements of communist ideology, which unscrupulously tramples over all the most important legal principles if it evaluates that they are not useful and utilitarian. However, this time, the bite was too large for the pro-Tito oriented regime at the top of its strength and power. Instead it was a huge public embarrassment and a comic plot and opera heroes, brought to the awakening of the sleeping Serbian national conscience. Many writers started to speak openly, in spite of the prohibitions concerning papers and books and other repressive measures. At the same time, there was a development of national drama regarding the demolition of the chapel on the grave of Njegoš on Lovćen and the building of a pagan mausoleum, which struck directly at the heart of the Serbian people. Fortunately, real farce was not achieved, but the second part turned to a big tragedy when the pronounced Ustasha Ivan Meštrović, with the total help and support of the regime, mocked one of the greatest Serbs of all times.

Since they did not manage to take over Njegoš as an exclusively Montenegrin writer, away from Serbian culture and tradition, they proclaimed him a generally Yugoslav writer and a writer of all humankind. “Could they distort Njegoš, perhaps the most nationalistic writer of all humankind, more than they did in this way? Does he belong to everybody?! This would mean that he is homeless, without homeland, belonging nowhere! [...] Those who wanted to make Njegoš their own, finally made him belong to no-one. When they wanted to put him on a

He, who was a governor of one proud nation, the loudest poet and the representative of Serbdom, was now neither more Montenegrin nor less Serbian - just the same as Slovenian, Macedonian, Croat, Albanian, Turk or Gipsy! He, who saw his mission as fighting against Satan, now was proclaimed Satan himself. Everyone can freely choose which nation they will belong to, everyone but him, the most authentic of all the Serbs, the representative and top of the nation” (p. 38).

On the other hand, Njegoš cannot be considered a generally Yugoslav poet. “He had neither heard of the Slovenians, nor did this nation exist up to 1848, (they appeared after *Mountain Wreath*). “The Macedonian nation was created in 1945 and, going by the manuscripts of Njegoš, he hardly ever recognized them as a nation. In that time, only two “Yugoslav nations” existed: the Serbs and the Croats. He was declared Serbian [...] Njegoš did consider himself a Montenegrin, he even ruled that country, but he never separated Montenegro and the Montenegrins from Serbdom. He was “the integral Serb”... As for the Croats, he mentioned them only twice in his works. The first time was in *Mountain Wreath*, when he was describing “Dalmatians and brave Croats” rotting in Venetian galleys. Deduction of his Croatian roots from these origins would be the same establishing his “Dalmatian origins.” The second time was in *The Serbian Mirror*, where he said “and the mercenary Croat soldiers” (p. 39).

In order to present the degree of this absurdity, we will make a slight digression from the basic topic we are dealing with. The problem concerns the national being of the Croats and the Slovenians. The Croats, as a nation-building people, left the historical scene in the year 1102, while the Slovenians recently and suddenly appeared, just like in a fairytale.

The Slovenians never had their own state. Occasionally, their historians or political ideologists would try to attribute state characteristics to the Carantanian union of Slovenian tribes, whose headmen were proclaimed at the Gosposvetsko field, but this has nothing to do with the present Slovenians. On the other hand, they are trying to appropriate some Czech governors by equating Slavic with Slovenian. In this way, they appropriated Prince Samo, who ruled from 623 to 658, in the state that arose in the northern Czech mountains, in the district of Krhonosa, and which spread all the way to the Adriatic Sea at one point. Prince Samo stood out in the significant successes he achieved in the war with the Avars. Around the year 745, the same area was ruled by Duke Borut, a Bavarian vassal. Christianity was violently imposed on his people. Around 770, his position was enjoyed by Prince Hotimir, who tried to fight against the Bavarian power on several occasions, especially against their policy of Germanization and their violent religious conversion. Around 876, Moravska, Slovakia and Pannonia were ruled by Prince Svatopluk. He lost Pannonia in wars against the Hungarians. The land of prince Hotimir fell under Frankish rule and one part of it was ruled by Prince Svatopluk.

None of these rulers had anything to do with the present Slovenians.

The Slovenian path through history was totally unnoticed and, in that sense, especially regarding the origins and national conscience, they are still a scientific mystery. At the beginning of the 9th century, the largest part of the present Slovenia was under Posavska Croatia and its ruler Ljudevit Posavski. The Croats spoke Kajkavian and their first state was mainly under the supreme Frankish rule, after which the Avars pushed them back. This is where the shocking similarity between the Croatian and Slovenian language - or actually the Kajkavian identity - comes from. In their withdrawal from the Turkish invasion, the Croats were moving towards the north, and subsequently lost their national conscience. The only thing left was the idea of belonging to the Slavs. That is where the name of Slovenians comes from in the new century. During the period of the Illyrian renaissance, in the territory of Croatia, Slovenia and Dalmatia (which was under the influence of the Vienna Court), people accepted the Serbian literary language, while in the territory that was under the direct Austrian Administration, they promoted Slovenian. The Croats were actually divided by the language barrier and they lost a good sense of ethnical solidarity, which they were trying to compensate for by taking over the Serbian Catholics into Croatian National Corpus. In the second Croatian state of the Early Middle Ages - Coastal Croatia - they spoke the Chakavian dialect and, because the Croatian national mass was being pushed back, it was mainly preserved on the northern Dalmatian islands of Istra and Kvarner.

Further on, Kostić simply played with the regime falsifiers and manipulators. "If Njegoš is, for e.g., 'above all, our Yugoslav writer', as Branko Ćopić says, than everyone could include him in their national literature - the Slovenians and even the 'Macedonians.' If he is a generally Slavic writer, than the Slovaks, Lusatian Serbs, Czechs, Poles and Russians can include him in the history of their literature as well. If he belonged to humankind in general, than he would also be a part of German and French literature, as well as the literature of Senegal, Kenya, etc." (p. 39-40).

Kostić explains the theft of Stjepan Mitrov Ljubiša, a major Serb from Budva, with origins in Paštrović and Grbalj - which actually happened twice. The first theft was performed by the Croats, and this was followed by commentaries and explanations. But afterwards, those who did it brutally and violently acted as Montenegrins. "They simply wrested it and ordered that Ljubiša must not be considered a Serb, instead placed among the 'Montenegrin writers.' They neither give any arguments, nor do they need to do so. They have the power and that is enough. The power will order: *owe to the one who obeys not*" (p. 42).

The Croats were appropriating Ljubiša even though, as a prominent writer, he was one of the most influential political leaders of the Serbs in Austro-Hungary - and all that because, at a certain moment, he was urging that Dalmatia should be joined to Croatia so that the Dalmatian Serbs could join those who lived at the territory of Croatia. During that period, Dalmatia was far more inhabited by Serbs than by Croats, but Serbian politicians were captivated by the idea that they could realize

political cooperation with Croats, for the sake of general welfare. "The fact that hardly any Croats lived in Dalmatia can be demonstrated by one notice dating from that period, which was written by an eminent Croatian writer. This recognized Croatian cultural 'deputy' and philologist Ivan Milčetić (he was born on Krk 1853 and died in Varaždin in 1921), published one study about Nikola Tomazeo in 1905 in the *Croatian Kolo*, which was an annual edition of the Matica Hrvatska, in which he described the situation at the beginning of the 19th century.

According to his words (p. 311), during that period, among Dalmatians there was the slogan "Slavs yes, but Croats never." He continues, with his own perceptions: "The truth is that, among the Croatian intelligence raised in Italy, the Croatian name was not particularly favoured, so even Tomazeo did not blacken it. As for Italy, the Croatian name was not very popular among the border guards who, in fighting for their emperor, unfairly called their own people the slaves, suppressors and executioners of someone else's freedom. That was the situation in 1874, when I was flying over Dalmatia, in all directions. Among the educated Dalmatians, I found Dalmatian Slav-Dalmats (they were autonomy-oriented and against unification with Croats), *Slavjani Našinci* (Dubrovians) and Serbs (from Boka and some Dubrovians), but hardly any Croats" (p. 44).

When they realized that the Serbs could keep themselves nationally and politically within Dalmatia, as an Austrian province and in parallel with the majority of Serbs who lived in territory under Hungarian control, both Stjepan Mitrov Ljubiša and *Vladika* Stefan Knežević from northern Dalmatia, became direct opponents of the unification of Dalmatia with Croatia. The fact that there could not be any serious and sincere cooperation with the Croats was well understood by the Dalmatian Serbian politicians in 1878, when the Croats strongly supported the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and which the Serbs bitterly and jointly opposed.

Even the Bishop of Kotor, Pavko Butorac - well known for his extremely Ustasha attitudes - announced in 1838 in Zagreb that Stjepan Mitrov Ljubiša was "a writer and Serb from Boka who, in 1861, was fighting against the idea of unification between Dalmatia and Croatia. In 1870, he was swearing upon his Christian name (St. Dmitar) that he would put all his efforts towards this unification and collected many personal reproaches in 1873, until the moment when, in 1877, in the Dalmatian Council, he openly stood up against unification, claiming that all Dalmatia, especially Dubrovnik and Boka, had no right to be annexed to Hungary and, consequently, to the Croatian Crown" (p. 46). In their infinite hatred and anger, the Croats organized that Ljubiša was deprived of his deputy mandate in the Dalmatian Council without any legal basis.

At the session of the Earthly Council for Dalmatia in Zadar, which was held on 30 January 1877, Stjepan Mitrov Ljubiša declared: "I never belonged to the National Party, but ever since Kosovo, I have belonged to this unlucky but heroic and proud Serbian nation, which is even respected and honoured by its own enemies" (p. 49). The prominent Serbian Catholic Marko Car wrote in 1924 that Ljubiša grew up "in the

region where the Serbian people have perhaps preserved their heritage and customs in the best way... There is no writer who loved the Serbian language more than he did and who respected its originality more than him [...] His stories are undoubtedly among the most sincere documents of human nature in general and also of Serbian national character... As an artist, Ljubiša could have been surpassed by far by the latter Serbian narrators, but as a good connoisseur of the national soul, as an interpreter of the folk humour and philosophy and as a painter of the national past and national language, Ljubiša remained unique” (p. 57).

Searching through the whole ocean of literature, Lazo Kostić constituted his scientific conclusions regarding the national orientation of Stjepan Mitrov Ljubiša in an extremely well-documented way, writing: “All writers, all literary historians and critics, not only emphasize the fact that Ljubiša belongs to Serbdom, but also his enthusiasm for Serbdom, his son’s love, which cannot be replaced. He never called himself a Montenegrin, nor did he ever spend his time with Montenegrins, nor aspired towards Cetinje. Today, they do not only appropriate him, but want to call him a stealer of Serbs, to whom he belonged to body and soul and who want to keep him, to prevent the dead from denying him and him from cursing them from his grave. Apart from the violence against the dead Njegoš, and even before him, this attack of the Montenegrin communists not only shows their blind hatred towards all that is Serbian, but also their instinct for violence, falsification, decrees and legal sentences, which they use to make the Serbs accept the lies instead of the truth, and falsification as a correct solution” (p. 57).

Lazo Kostić took on the obligation to defend another Serbian great man from communist appropriation - the Duke of Kuči, Marko Miljanov. In his works, Miljanov regularly called the inhabitants of Kuči Serbs, Never Montenegrins, because the idea of because the idea of Montenegrin nation, both historically and biographically was limited to four districts only: Districts of Katun, Crnik, Rijeka and Lješ. Such is the scent of Serbdom in the works of Marko Miljanov - such an expressive Serbian character - that no normal person for decades had any idea of proving something that was the solid fact. As Kostić emphasized, “nobody had any idea to write about the appearance of a separate ‘Montenegrin nationality’ and ‘Montenegrin culture’. He would look like a madman: trying to prove that milk is white. But when the Montenegrin falsifiers and ruffians tried to prove that the milk is black, here I took on the task that I will use to prove that it is not black but white. That they are nothing but black sheep and scamps” (p. 78).

To make this tragedy greater, they wanted to force that great writer Mihajlo Lalić away from Serbian literature while he was still alive. It is true that Lalić was a confident communist, but his original patriotism cannot be denied, so he boxed the ears of the regime of the time by choosing inclusion in the working constitution of the Serbian Academy of Science and Art.

9. The Defence of Marko Kraljević

In 1968 in Bern, the Serbian National-Cultural Club of Switzerland published the second reprint edition of Lazo Kostić’s discussion *In Defence of Marko Kraljević (The Repulsion of a Croatian Attack)*. The reason lay in Croatian literary attempts to present Marko Kraljević in as negative a moral context as possible, and all in order to slander the entire Serbian nation through his bad features. Certain verses from Serbian national poems were inflated, others were inverted in their meaning and wrongly interpreted - and all that was followed by tendentious explanations of historical events. Kostić had the objective of, through collecting the relevant documentation, offering good arguments to the Serbs so they can contradict the Croatian meanness and deceptions.

As an illustration of the methods that the Croats were using, he gave a quotation from the book *Croatia and Serbia*, written by a certain Ustasha emigrant Vlaho Rajić: “So Serbian poems praise Marko Kraljević as their greatest hero - the same hero who cuts the breasts of a girl who accommodated him. Marko, who is a personification of unfaithfulness and betrayal; Marko who serves Vlachian Duke Mirčeta or the Sultan of Constantinople as the opportunity requires; Marko the troublemaker and heavy drunkard, the rude bandit. But Marko Kraljević acts as a precise personification of Serbian national life, as it was under Turkish slavery, deception, unfaithfulness, betrayal, cruelty towards the weak, towards the defeated - and on the other hand serving the stronger, with no need for a cultural life, greedy with food and excessive with liquor” (p. 6).

Kostić emphasizes the most rigorous responses to the Croatian attacks, which were given in Serbian emigrant journalism by Adam Pribičević and Rade Korać. Pribičević showed that one of the main slanderers, Ivan Meštrović, did not understand Marko. At one time, he was hounding him as an “embodiment of crude, elementary force, without brain, heart and soul” (p. 7). On the other hand, the Serbian people take Marko Kraljević as “a moral value: a rightful judge; a defender of his people and faith against aggressors; a prisoner of social justice and a protector of all the oppressed. He will not take from anyone, he defends only what belongs to his people. In the highest branch of his spirit, he takes into his big heart all that is alive and fights for it like he fights for his people” (p. 7). This is why he cannot symbolize violence and animal criminality, as the Croats see it, claiming that the Serbs are systematically tyrannizing them.

Our epic hero is a symbol of honesty and high moral values, which come from the spiritual being of national poetry. “What is the value of Serbdom if not to serve all humankind in its eternal aspiration towards the divine order on earth? So Marko is not a Serb in his phrases, but he defends the oppressed, brings judgements against his own father and uncles and/or himself; he serves his old mother as a good son; he risks his own life for his guests; he will be faithful to his friends as long as he is alive; he has profound and ardent social feelings and he even expresses it towards his dear blood-brother Beg Kostadin and dies together with him; he wails upon the dead Musa Kesedžija: ‘Woe on me to the dear God, why I killed a better one.’ Has any hero in the history of the world ever

pronounced such noble words?” (p. 8).

Dr Rade Korać, a university professor, gave a similar opinion, not through analysis of historical facts, but of Serbian national epics and he drew the following conclusion about Croatian national morality: “Just like the thousand year slavery under the Hungarians and their own landowners, who, for the sake of their own better life, identified themselves with the Croatian people and started to call it a thousand year culture, so today they want to adopt the Ustasha criminally-pathological immorality as morality” (p. 10).

Marko became a Turkish vassal, obeying this huge force and trying to soothe its severity, just as was done by many other medieval feudal lords. Only the Croatian Count Petar Zrinjski voluntarily offered to serve the Turkish Sultan, for his own benefit. Bulgarian writer Constantine the Philosopher noted that, before the battle at Rovine, Marko Kraljević confided in Konstantin Dejanović, telling him that he would like the Christians to win, even if he himself had to die. In poems, we can find repentance for committed sins and attempts at redemption, which makes an incredible critical relation within the poetry of that time. Marko can be terrified too, he may get shaken or angry. He is a sinful being and not a prophet, but the national poet makes him radiate the pride and the original national democracy, which was not familiar in the Europe of that time. Nobility does not only reflect in relations with people, but towards animals as well.

Kostić quotes a great number of German, Italian, and French authors - as well as Russian, Czech and Polish - who wrote about Serbian national poems and specially appreciated the ethic code from the epic poems on Marko Kraljević. To make the irony of destiny even bigger, many Croats used to admire Marko Kraljević and the perfection of the Serbian national genius - especially Vatroslav Jagić and Vladimir Dvorniković. Lazo Kostić noted that “both Croatian scientists, most relevantly in their profession, claim the same thing: the bad qualities of Marko are the consequence of spreading those poems towards the north. It was only when he approached the Croats or was even among them, that Marko become a caricature and obtained bad qualities... not so much from the Croats, for Marko remained a Serbian hero and a Serbian myth, but more from Serbs who were under the influence of the Croats. Finally, all Marko’s bad qualities returned to the Croats like a boomerang, from the most competent Croats” (p. 24).

However, my further research revealed that Vladimir Dvorniković was only a Croat on his father’s side, while his mother was an Orthodox Serb. He identified himself much more as a Serb and, throughout his life, he wholeheartedly and fervently advocated the Yugoslav idea.

As an epic hero, Prince Marko (Kraljević) was not just popular among the Croats – they also wanted to appropriate, steal, snatch him. Thus, for example, the “father of the homeland” Dr Ante Starčević considered Marko Kraljević to be a “pure Croat”, shocking Czech sociologist Joseph Holeccheck into writing (for the Narodni Listi of 1901) that, “All that was good in the Serbian people was adopted by Starčević to be Croatian, to the extent that he even adopted Emperor Dušan and

IT-03-67-T
Prince Marko” (p. 33).

When, on the occasion of a theatrical performance of the role of Prince Marko by Petar Preradović in Vienna in 1892, the Zagreb magazine Vijenac wrote that Marko Kraljević’s personality “reflected the Croatian life, its types and customs”, while the Serbian magazine *Bosanska Vila* reacted sharply: “Yet again the insatiable beast pounces upon another piece of our, and yes I emphasize, of our own Serbian legacy and pride, to snatch it with its greedy claws and drag into its horrible nest... Yet again, the half-bred Vijenac of Zagreb, in its Volume No. 23, stooped to steal and appropriate, among others, our greatest popular hero and idol, it even [...] endeavours to steal and Croatize our Marko Kraljević, sending signals to its theatre troop to depict him in this musical-theatrical display as a popular Croat hero. It is nice and easy, brothers – or even better, non-brothers – to decorate oneself with somebody else’s feathers; but beware, in spite of these feathers you may be left naked, as the dark and mercurial land between you and us, on which you so boldly and groundlessly build glory and grandeur, is becoming clearer” (p. 33).

366/57440

Chapter V

SERBIAN BOKA KOTORSKA (BAY OF KOTOR)

1. General Remarks

Lazo Kostić wrote the following three books on Boka Kotorska: *On the Serb Character of Boka Kotorska*, *Boka and Bokelji*, and *The Centenary of the First Uprising of Krivošije*. In the preface to the first book, published by the author in Zurich in 1961, he elaborates on his spiritual motivation: "I worked on this book with a particular fervor, a religious disposition. I did it for two reasons: firstly, the book endeavours to prove the Serbian national character of the area I was born in, where I spent my childhood and every vacation and where my forefathers lived for three centuries with one and only one calling: to preserve the Orthodoxy and Serbdom of their lands [...]. Secondly, my father dealt with a similar issue for a long time and collected a vast library on the subject. He wrote the history of Prevlaka, which was once the seat of the Zeta Eparchy, i.e. the history of the Metropolitanate located in his parish, thus essentially writing the history of the Orthodoxy and Serbdom of Boka Kotorska" (p. 3). The Serbian Boka Kotorska was faced with two threats: the Croatian ambition to usurp it and falsely represent it as theirs, and attempts by the Montenegrin Communists to obliterate any trace of Serbdom in Boka Kotorska.

By 1918, the Croats incorporated their pretensions towards Boka in their request to have Dalmatia ceded to Croatia and Slavonia, for Boka and Dubrovnik, as territories under Austrian rule, had already been administratively attached to Dalmatia. Croatia and Slavonia were integral parts of the Hungarian component of the dual Monarchy. There was, however, some overt insistence that these Serbian lands should be annexed to the administrative region of Croatia, and on 29 April 1861 the Croatian-Slavonian Council in Zagreb submitted a request to the monarch of Austria-Hungary to have "the Kingdoms of Croatia and

Slavonia joined with the Kingdom of Dalmatia, Dubrovnik, Kotor and the Islands of Kvarner" (p. 13). Also, the most popular Croatian historian, Vjekoslav Klaić, claimed that Boka was Croatian, referring to a single verse by Kačić-Miošić that says that Boka is the pride of the Croats. A Serb scientist born in Lika, professor Vasilije Đerić, debated with this historian in his book entitled *On the Serb Name in the Western Areas of our People*, saying that "Had V. Klaić cared for the truth, he would have added here a thought similar to that of Iv. Kukuljević, 'rambles the diligent Kačić', and quoted the passages by Kačić himself speaking to the contrary." Kostić goes on to say: "Đerić quotes the same friar Kačić, who claims that the Croats had settled only as far as the Cetina River" (p. 13-14).

After WWI, Boka Kotorska became a part of the Zeta area, and, subsequently, of the Zeta Banate. However, as soon as they felt safe from Italian, Austrian and Hungarian aspirations, the Croats revived their historical disputes and megalomaniac appetites. They demanded the division of the state, the creation of a Croatian administrative unit that would have statehood and the annexation of many Serbian territories to that unit. Although the capitulatory agreement of 1939 did not place Boka under the Croatia Banat, the leading Croatian politicians considered it as only the first phase, an interim solution until all their ambitions were satisfied. Kostić refers to the authentic testimony of journalist Simo Simić in a book entitled *The Christianisation of Serbs during WWII*, saying "It was stated there that Maček was surprised by the offer of Belgrade" that the concessions proposed, "and saw the weakness of the partner in it." That is why he immediately requested the inclusion of Bosnia-Herzegovina, a part of Vojvodina and the entire Boka Kotorska in the future Banate of Croatia. The political outburst of VI. Maček received general support from the Croatian clergy and the Ustashas. Thus began a campaign for the Croatian territory that would have to be recognized by Belgrade" (p. 14).

The ambitions of this nature were also obvious from the fact that, after the Banate of Croatia had been established, the bishops of Bačka and Kotor were invited to Croatian Bishops' Conferences, but not the bishops of Belgrade, Bar and Skopje. The Archbishop of Zagreb, Alojzije Stepinac, visited Boka Kotorska in February 1941, stating there that every stone in Boka smelled of Croatia. Later on, during WWII, as soon as Italy capitulated, Pavelić addressed the Germans with a request to have Boka attached to his improvised state, about which the Croats could not speak publicly while the territory was under Mussolini's occupation. "The outcome of the War was not beneficial to their cause. Although Boka was taken from Serbia, it was not given to Croatia" (p. 15).

Croatian ambitions of this vein fell silent for a while, though they were carefully cherished among the emigrated Ustashas. Lazo Kostić published over twenty texts in the Serbian emigration press, sharply debating with the Croat forgers. Croatian authors systematically equalized Catholicism with Croatianism, the most resonant of them being Vlaho Rajić and Dominik Mandić. They were joined by Juraj Krnjević

and a host of politicians previously identifying themselves as pro-Yugoslav. Krnjević was even bothered by the building of the Belgrade-Bar railway, as he believed it jeopardized Croatian interests. "Not only do the irresponsible quasi-scientists plead for the Croatandom of Boka, it is also being done by responsible Croatian politicians who justify it shamelessly. They fail to provide any reasoning behind their 'justifications', they do not mention any 'titles' to their ambitions towards Boka; sticking to their old practice, they believe it sufficient to just place a request and have any 'rights' thus well founded" (p. 17-18).

The Croats do not accept the essence and meaning of moral, political and historical responsibility. They are willing to unscrupulously steal something that is not theirs, to forge historical facts, and they do not even stop short of the worst crimes in order to achieve what their ideologists defined as the national interest and what the Catholic church blessed as the primary religious task. Kostić, reacting to the Croatian perfidy, believed that in the attempts to preserve Yugoslavia, one cannot resort to a policy of constant concessions and weakening the Serbian position, and that "Serbia has to open its eyes and have its own sea, the beautiful, ancient Serbian sea, without which the Serbs cannot survive" (p. 20). Thus, he also defines the aim of his book, which proves in a well-founded and convincing scientific way that "Boka was Serbian, and is today Serbian and only Serbian. In this way, it becomes unnecessary to reject the currently imposed Montenegrindom of Boka. If the Serbian character of Boka is affirmed through its Montenegrindom, then the book has nothing against it; if, however, the Montenegrindom negates its Serbdom, as is the current practice in the communist Yugoslavia, then the arguments provided in this book will affect Boka's Montenegrindom in the same manner as its Croatandom. Beside being Serbian, Boka cannot know and will not know any other nation" (p. 21).

2. A Historical Retrospective of Kotor

Based on Sava Bjelanović, who especially underscored Stjepan Mitrov Ljubiša's emphasis on "Boka being of the Serbian Nemanjić and Balšić families and then of the Venetians, sometimes more or less independent; - and, pursuant to the bilateral agreement, it willingly surrendered to Austria; hence, it was never Croatian" (p. 21), Kostić cited Russian historian Apolon Aleksandrovich Maykov, who wrote in his *History of the Serbian People* in the second half of the nineteenth century that "For a long time before the House of Nemanjić, the nucleus of Serbia was Zeta, which in its narrower sense was called Dalmatia and Duklja (Doclea). Serbia ruled in Zeta [...] Zeta was its major part and the most potent in matters of state [...] Zeta was the highest corner of the South Serbia [...] Although it was by the sea, containing the Bay of Kotor with one of the most beautiful harbours in the world, Zeta had what non-coastal countries have, for above the plains that fed its people enabling them to survive without maritime trade, there ruled the mountains connecting it with the rest of Serbia. Its economic and commercial importance for Serbia was surmounted by the significance it had in

In his lectures at the Sorbonne at the beginning of the twentieth century, Nicola Jorga, the greatest historian of Romania and one of the most authoritative Balkanologists of all time, stated the following among other things: "the sources relating to the first centuries of the Serbian state, was established on the Adriatic coast under the influences I attempted to analyze, and much later found its centre and crystallization point in the inner part of Raška. The organization of the Serbs began at Duklja on the Adriatic side and was influenced in all its relations by the lifestyle of the Latin West; the Serbian state focused on and eventually consolidated itself in the inner area of Raška" (p. 23).

Even the Croatian historian Ferdo Šišić, researching the genesis of the geographical term of Dalmatia and the political issue of its unification with Croatia, showed that neither Dubrovnik nor Kotor had belonged to Dalmatia. He stated as follows: "While Kotor belonged to the Serbian state of Duklja as early as the eleventh century, Dubrovnik, which never belonged to Croatia or Serbia, knew how to rise to the level of an independent area" (p. 24). The Court of the Duklja ruler Mihailo was situated in Kotor and this coastal town was certainly within the state of Mihailo's father Stefan Vojislav. The Byzantine sources also unequivocally refer to these lands as Serbian towns, Serbian places and the Serbian area. "The Byzantines most frequently referred to the coastal rulers as Choton Serbon Archon, meaning the Prince of the Serbs, the Leader of the Serbs or something to that effect. Boka was under the coastal Serbian rulers until those of Raška rose to power; afterwards it was ruled by them" (p. 24).

At the time of the House of Nemanjić, Kotor was administered by Prince Trifun, but the central power of Grand Zhupan Stefan Nemanja was undisputable, as emphasized in all the official documents of the Borough of Kotor. Vukan, the son of Nemanja was given the title of the king of Primorje by the Pope. The Serbian royal title also read "The King of all Serbian Lands and Coastal Areas". According to the preserved written documents, King Milutin was called the Ruler of Areas from the Adriatic Bay to the Grand Danube. The titles of the Serbian archbishops and the patriarch contained the names of all the Serbian and coastal areas and were unchanged even during the Turkish occupation. Kostić further states: "Kotor, along with the larger part of Boka, had three consolidated historical periods: Serbian, under the House of Nemanjić, Venetian and Austrian. The first period lasted almost two centuries, the second almost four, while the third period lasted more than one century. In between the above consolidated periods, Boka changed its rulers every year or two" (p. 26).

In his study on the mediaeval organization of Kotor, Ilija Sindik provided a summary of the history of Kotor from the time it definitively broke away from Byzantine rule; "It is positively established that, since 1186, Kotor belonged to mediaeval Serbia and remained under its rule until 1369 or 1370. In September 1369, Emperor Uroš called Kotor his town but, in June 1371, Kotor was under the rule of the Hungarian king.

Kotor left the Serbian state of its own volition as the disorder in the Serbian state after the death of Dušan was felt in the vicinity of Kotor. The emergence of Balšići fighting over their town particularly worried the inhabitants of Kotor, who sought a strong protector, which I think they found in the person of Louis, the King of Hungary. In 1378, the Venetians conquered Kotor, only to return it to Hungary pursuant to the Peace Treaty of Turin (1381) [...] When, after the death of King Louis (1382), Hungary faced unstable times, the citizens of Kotor asked the Bosnian King Tvrtko for his protection. Thus it was that in 1385 the Bosnian period of the history of Kotor began. The town remained under Tvrtko's rule until his death in 1391. [...] After the death of Tvrtko, Kotor was completely independent until 1420, when it fell under the rule of the Venetians. The period of independence of Kotor was marked by great struggles against the neighbouring Serbian dynasties of Balšić, Sandalj Hranić and Crnojević; all of them were fighting over Kotor. Besides, due to the incursions of the Turks, the political circumstances changed drastically not only in Serbia but in the entire Balkan Peninsula. That is why the citizens of Kotor again sought the protection of a powerful state, this time choosing the Republic of Venice (1420)" (p. 26-27).

Before Serbian rule, Kotor was under the rule of the Byzantine Empire. Thus, there is absolutely no mention of the Croats. Originally, the inhabitants of Kotor were of Roman descent, which were subsequently assimilated by the Serbs. Around the middle of the eleventh century, the town of Kotor, as a typical mediaeval town with its autonomous power structure, placed itself under the protection of the Serbian state, thus becoming part of it and preserving its inner autonomy. In researching and systematizing the data by Di Kanza, Schlitz, Dukljanin and Raphaeli, Josif Đelčić described this historical turning point in his late nineteenth century study in the Italian language as follows: "The Byzantine army once again battled the Serbian phalanx not far from the town of Kotor, but this was for the last time: the victory of the Serbs, famous in the historical records of the times, shed true light on the virtue of the Serbian nation. On that memorable day (1043), forty thousand Byzantines found their death, seven army leaders in their midst. Such a great success reinforced the Serbian pride. The citizens of Kotor, having seen that the Empire was thus approaching the brinks of disaster, and that the power of the neighbouring Serbs was increasing at their (Byzantine) account and becoming far more dangerous (for the inhabitants of Kotor), thought that the most important thing was to avoid the risk of capitulation by asking for their protection. Indeed, they gained the desired protection, thus continuing to be governed by their own laws, independent of any foreign influence, and what is even more important, exempted from the taxes and duties that were a heavy burden on the majority of the Municipality. The historians from Raphaeli onwards claim that the town of Kotor was subjected to the Serbs and they deemed it a subject city. However, the term protection of that period was not synonymous to rule, nor was the spirit of the time such that the Serbs would understand it in the manner Cromwell and Napoleon understood it

IT-03-67-T
later. This can be factually proven" (p. 27).

In his voluminous book on the Turkish part of Europe, French geographer Ami Boué wrote in 1840 that "As early as the ninth or tenth century, Kotor was an independent Republic. In 1115, King Đorđe of Serbia bestowed it Školj, Luštica and the plain of Grbalj [...] Radoslav confirmed the gifts in 1250 [...] Afterwards, the Serbian King Uroš and Queen Helena on several occasions gave the Republic a half of Gornji and Donji Grbalj, Mirac, Dobrota, Ledenice and Bijela, as well as Kruševica as far as Fiumere. [...] In 1361 Dušan confirmed these gifts [...] Thus, Kotor was a republic under Serbian protection and kept the inhabitants of villages as its subjects. It had civil and criminal laws [...] In 1368, when Serbia was divided into four areas of uneven strength, the Republic shook off the Serbian protection and connected with King Louis of Hungary. This was followed by great battles and Boka changed its rulers frequently: from Hungary to Bosnia to Balša, until Venice captured the territory finally, keeping it until 1797" (p. 28).

3. Boka Kotorska in Serbian States

On the subject of the other Boka towns, in 1911 Francesco Madirazza wrote the following concerning Risan: "In the ninth century, it passed into the hands of Serbian lords and, in the fourteenth century, it fell under the Bosnian state. – In 1451, King Stefan Tomaš ceded it to the Republic of Dubrovnik. – The Turks conquered it in 1539 and the Venetians, destroying all the fortifications, seized it in 1648 only to surrender it again to the Turks. – In 1687, it was finally taken over by the Venetians" (p. 29). In a study entitled *Boka and Zeta*, published in the Herald of the Society of Serbian Letters in 1875, Nićifor Dučić, a renowned historian and one of the most learned Herzegovinians of his time, remarks that "Risan, Herceg Novi, Krivošije and the entire space in-between, all the way to the sea, were governed by the lords of Travunija and Herzegovinian until the Turks took hold of Trebinje, Risan and Herceg Novi. Only later were these two Serbian towns taken by the Venetians – Risan in 1649, and Herceg Novi in 1687 – when the Venetians, with the help of the local and particularly Montenegrin Serbs, drove the Turks out of Boka" (p. 29). Josif Đelčić also wrote of Budva: "Similar to Kotor, Budva and Paštrovići were two separate, autonomous boroughs, though smaller and not as old as Kotor and Budva was not even fully independent at all times [...] After the fall of the Byzantine Empire, Budva fell under the rule of the Raškans, then the Serbs [...] In 1367, the Perast people surrendered it to the lords of Zeta. Balša ceded it to Venice in 1398."

Francesco Madirazza also gave an account of Budva: "It is certain that the Serbian King Dušan visited Budva and there, in Our Lady's Church, ratified the borders between the territories of Kotor and Budva, which met at the Trašta cove [...] On 10 March 1420, Venice promised Budva to Đorđe and Lješ Đurašević, the barons of Zeta. Đorđe Branković however took possession of Boka Kotorska and made an agreement with the Venetians (11 December 1425), whereby he got hold

of Budva and made it his residence, but only for a while. Stefan, Sandalj's nephew and heir, rose up with his old aspirations, but eventually came to accept the peace terms on 23 August 1443. – Thus Venice, with the final occupation of Budva, completed the conquest of Boka Kotorska” (p. 29-30).

Both Delčić and Madirazza report that Paštrovići was under the direct protection of the Serbian kings and despots, from Stefan Nemanja to Stefan Crnojević. Archimandrite Ničifor Dučić notes that even when Kotor passed into the hands of the Venetians, “Grbalj still remained under the control of not only Balšić, but of Crnojević as well. [...] Not until the second half of the fifteenth century, around 1456, did Ivan Crnojević cede it to the Venetians for a certain financial compensation. The remainder of the coastal boroughs between Kotor, Grbalj and Budva – namely Maine, Pobori and Brajići – were equally governed by both Zeta rulers and Montenegrin *vladikas* (prince-bishops) until 1718, when they were handed over to the Republic of Venice [...] Finally, two monasteries – Stanjevići and Pobori – were in the possession of the Montenegrin *vladikas* until 1838” (p. 30-31).

In an essay on Paštrovići and Grbalj titled *Dušan's Legislation*, Ilija Sindik wrote in 1951: “Grbalj was within the Nemanjić State until 1307, when King Milutin surrendered it to Kotor. In 1420, Grbalj passed into the hands of the Venetians along with Kotor. After the rather turbulent fifteenth century, witnessing the rebellions in Grbalj and a temporary occupation by Baošić and other Serbian lords from the hinterlands of Kotor, Grbalj was taken by the Turks in 1497, who kept it for 150 years. In 1647, Grbalj once again succumbed to the Venetians, though this time not as part of the Borough of Kotor; it was directly subordinated to the Venetian authorities. The Turks seized Grbalj for the second time in 1702, keeping it only until 1715, when it fell into the hands of the Venetians for the third time. This status did not change until 1797” (p. 31).

As noted by Kostić, Sindik described the situation in Boka Kotorska at the time of the Venetian and Turkish dominance in detail: “The north-west part of Bosnia (from Risan to Herceg Novi) was held by the Turks, the central part of Boka, including Kotor, was ruled by the Venetians, Grbalj was in the hands of the Turks, Budva and Paštrovići were held by the Venetians, while Bar and Primorje [the coastal area] south of it belonged to the Turks. A coastline of little more than 100 kilometres was thus split into five separate areas, three belonging to the Turks and two to the Venetians” (p. 32).

In the post-Nemanjić period, Tvrtko got hold of Kotor as a Serbian king since “he, as such, laid claim to Kotor, believing that the town belonged to him” (p. 32). Moreover, Constantine Jiricek in his *History of the Serbs* particularly emphasized that: “Bosnian rulers held Serbian royal titles until the fall of the Bosnian state” (p. 32). Even Nikola Đorić, a Croatian historian, in 1925, lamented that the Serbian King Tvrtko I turned “his greedy eyes to yet another memorable coastal harbour (besides Dubrovnik) - to the town of Kotor itself. Bearing in mind that just several years before, this town was the most precious pearl in his

predecessors' crown and the most significant commercial seaport of the Nemanjić state, becoming their most important duty, as he stated himself: ‘*Padšaja se vzdignuti a razoršaja se ukrepiti*’, he turned zealously to materializing his dreams of subjecting Kotor to his rule” (p. 32-33).

What grieves Đorić even more is the fact that an original document is preserved, wherein Tvrtko claims that Kotor belonged to his predecessors, namely past Serbian rulers, and that he obtained it for eternity, thanks to his sister who became the Hungarian Queen. “Kotor was Serbian before, and it will be Serbian now,” resounded Tvrtko. Kotor would thus be Serbian by and through Tvrtko. On page 15 of the same work, Đorić mentions a somewhat earlier document of Dubrovnik, in which Dubrovnik citizens begged the Hungarian King Louis “to urge the Serbian King (Tvrtko) to prohibit the import of food to Kotor” (p. 33). In a similar way to Tvrtko, the Balšić family also referred to their predecessors – Serbian rulers – and took pride in their kinship with the Nemanjić family. In 1386, Đurađ Stratimirović Balšić notes he was elevated among his kinsmen by the grace of God and thanks to “the prayers and devotion of my forefathers, Simeon Nemanja, the first Serbian peacemaker, and Saint Sava” (p. 33).

As soon as Despot Stefan Lazarević unchained himself from Turkish dominance after the battle at Angora, in which the Turkish sultan was defeated and taken prisoner, and he [Lazarević], as his vassal and ally, had an opportunity to become independent, the despot put efforts into returning to the Adriatic Sea and entirely restoring the Serbian state. “Balša declared Despot Stefan Lazarević his heir and the Despot sent his army to take possession of Balša's land. The Venetians resisted but were finally forced to give up a large part of the present Boka to the Despot (based on the peace treaties of 1423 and 1426)” (p. 34). An account of this was given by Constantine Jiricek: “The Serbs retained Drivast, Bar and Budva [...] The Serbs also kept hold of the southern side of the Bay of Kotor with Luštica and Bogdašići, as well as Saint Michael's Parish. However, the Parish of Grbalj, a part of the Kotor area, was given back to the Venetians. Thus, Serbia once again seized a piece of the coastline from the Bay of Kotor to the Bojana River, which was interrupted only by the smaller areas of Paštrovići and the town of Ulcinj” (p. 34).

Despot Đurađ Branković, whose official title was “Ruler of the Serbs and the Seacoast and the Danubian Area”, also waged war with the Venetians in order to preserve the Serbian sea. As further revealed by Jiricek, “the battles with the Venetians were continuous. Đurađ's army, commanded by Duke Altaman, plundered the houses and vineyards all the way to the gates to the town of Kotor. The Serbian army was supported by Crnojevići, Paštrovići residents of the Grbalj Parish, and villagers from the Kotor surroundings. [...] The Despot's representatives in Primorje, near Luštica and across Novi were Vuk Biomužević and the Metropolitan of Zeta” (p. 34). When even Smederevo fell into the hands of the Turks for the first time, Novo Brdo and the Zeta coastline, as integral parts of the Despotate, withstood the Turkish force.

When the Serbian state was taken into Turkish slavery, the same fate befell the Serbian coastline and Boka was liberated only at the end of

WWI. "In 1918, the Serbian army arrived in Boka and was welcomed with indescribable enthusiasm. After precisely five centuries, Boka was once again Serbian. If it were up to the Boka residents, it would have remained Serbian only, as I know not of any Boka Serb who was in favour of Yugoslavia" (p. 38).

4. Changes in the Ethnic Composition of the Population

As maintained by Josif Đelčić, the most notable Boka historian, the Serbs arrived in Boka in 638. Prior to this period, Boka was inhabited by the Romanized ancient inhabitants of the Balkans, who had gradually assimilated the Serbs. The most relevant historical data on the subject is contained in one of the most remarkable works by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *On Ruling the Empire (De administrando imperio)*, in which he more than clearly states that "the Adriatic coast and its hinterlands were settled by the Croats in the north, up to the Cetina River, and by the Serbs in the south. The Serb tribes however were not of the same denomination and the following four groups can be distinguished: the Neretva, Zahumlje, Trebinje and Duklja tribes" (p. 39). One of the most significant Croatian scientists, Tomislav Maretić, also wrote on the same subject in his book *Slavs of Yore (Sloveni u davnini)*, published by the Matica Hrvatska Society in 1889, in Zagreb: "Porphyrogenitus maintains that the Zahumlje, Trebinje (including Konavle) and Neretva tribes are all ethnic Serbs, but does not say whether the Duklja people were ethnic Croats or Serbs (he must have forgotten to put it down or he did not know). Nevertheless, if we know that the Duklja tribe was the southernmost tribe and that the ethnic Croats inhabited the area up to the Cetina River, then it is most probable that the Duklja tribe was of the same nationality as the Serbs" (p. 39-40).

Caspar Zeiss, whom Kostić regards as one of the most distinguished German linguists of the first half of the nineteenth century, published a book entitled *Germans and Neighbouring Peoples* in 1837, in which he notes the following among other things: "The Serbs occupied a rather significant area: they spread from the area of the Moesia Slavs (Bulgarians) to the west inhabited by the Croats and, in the area south of these (Croats), through mountains, they seized a long stretch of the coastline. The Serbs also held that Slavic land, which was named Bosnia after the Bosina River (quotes Porphyrogenitus verbatim in Greek). On several occasions, Constantine emphasizes that the Slavs who inhabited the coastline south of the Cetina River were Serbs that came from the north during the rule of Emperor Heraclius, saying that they were pagans calling themselves the Neretva people and settled the area around the Neretva River, the Zahumlje people around Dubrovnik (Constantine calls them the Zahumlje Serbloi), inhabitants of Travunija, Konaval, Duklja and of the entire territory up to the area where the Montenegrins today represent the furthest Slavic people in the direction of the Arbanasi (Albanians). That the Serbs inhabited these areas was known to the Franks as well" (p. 40). In a treatise of 1886, the Austrian historian

IT-03-67-T

Wilhelm Tomasek states the following: "Isklavonija, Slavonia was the name referring to the coastline from Boka to Ulcinj, which was mostly inhabited by the Serbs" (p. 41).

All scientifically noteworthy historians agree that, as of the seventh century, Boka was predominately inhabited by Serbs, and their opinions differ only in their estimation as to whether Kotor was still predominantly inhabited by the non-Slavs, whom the Serbs found there when they arrived in the Balkans. Josif Đelčić also wrote about the clear distinction between the Serbs and the Croats at the time of the arrival in the Balkan Peninsula: "Unable to subdue the Avars alone, Heraclius sent the Croats and the Serbs to Dalmatia and they, being victorious, divided the land between themselves. The Serbs took Dalmatia Ultramontana (on the other side of the mountain), which was later called Raška and Bosnia, and Upper Moesia, which was later called Serbia after them. In the division of Dalmatia Cismontana (the opposite side of the mountain), the Serbs got the southern part, which was then split into four communities: Naron (Pagania), which spread from the Neretva River to the Cetina River; Zahumlje, from the territory of Dubrovnik to the Neretva River; Duklja, from Drač to Kotor; and Travunija, from Kotor to Dubrovnik and toward the hills" (p. 41).

In 1898, Ratering, a German scientist and Jesuit theologian, put forward an assertion that the Serbs were originally Catholics and that Kotor was inhabited by a Serb population since this town did not have to pay tribute to the Serbian rulers like other towns indisputably settled by ancient Roman inhabitants. Ratering also indicates that the Cetina River represented the strict demarcation line between the Serbs and the Croats, accepting the regionalization of the Serbian coastal areas suggested by earlier scientists, except that he calls the entire territory Serbian Dalmatia.

The number of Romans found in Serbian coastal towns was insignificant and they gradually assimilated into a rather large Serbian ethnic group. However, during the first decades and centuries they retained their social dominance and, over a long time, their state and legal traditions had a decisive influence in the region. When studying the entire region of Kotor, historian Ilija Sindik discovered that "in the mid-fifteenth century, the Romans accounted for only a ninth of the Kotor population, presuming that the one hundred noble families that lived in Kotor were all of Roman origin" (p. 43). As Jiricek stated, "in the Middle Ages, the highlanders moved mostly towards the Adriatic Coast and, as of the eleventh century, they expanded towards the east, until great successes over the Greeks lead to new migrations to the south. This trend was interrupted in 1371 by the Turkish war of conquest. The population afterwards withdrew to the north and west, namely toward the Danube River and the Adriatic Sea" (p. 43-44).

On several occasions, the coastal towns were destroyed by earthquakes and their residents were decimated by plague epidemics. New blood always arrived in these towns from their Serbian environs, so the change in the ethnic composition of the population came about as a long and inevitable process. Constantine Jiricek gave a detailed picture of

some of the features of this process: “Being under pressure of numerous burdens and duties, the people migrated to the west, to Dalmatian towns, where new settlers were received with open arms. No one had to pay any taxes on Dubrovnik land. The only thing a new resident in Kotor had to do was to register himself with the Registrar. The villagers were free to settle the town and no one had the right to leave the town for one of the surrounding villages. In the fourteenth century, Kotor was inhabited by settlers from Brskovo, Podgorica, etc. Concerning the neighbouring villages, e.g. a settler from Gacko is mentioned in around 1330. [...] The migration to the coastal towns was also encouraged by the fact that young people of both sexes temporarily lived in these towns as servants. [...] The female servants in Kotor for the most part originated from the present Montenegrin mountains. [...] Similarly (to Dubrovnik), Kotor had organized guilds. Numerous apprentices from neighbouring countries are mentioned in the fourteenth century in reference to both towns. In Kotor, young Slav apprentices learned from the goldsmiths and shoemakers. [...] The coastal towns were inhabited by quite a few foreign masters, who introduced the craft of faraway lands to the domicile people” (p. 44). Turkish historian and geographer Haji Khalifa (Katip Celebi) recorded in 1650 that the residents of Podgorica, Skadar and Kotor were Serbs and Arbanasi (Albanians).

Commenting on Jiricek’s report, Lazo Kostić concludes: “Jiricek does not mention anything about any Croat on the Serbian coastline; there were people from everywhere, but none of them from Croatia. The villages were predominantly settled by Serbs and the two towns were settled by the Romans with a continuously increasing number of the Serbs. An inevitable process of assimilation and absorption occurred. The process went easily and quickly in the villages; the Slavs (Serbs) rushed ahead unbridled, with an elemental force, like a torrent, and those they spared were assimilated. The situation in the towns was very different: the Romans resisted, making it hard to push them out, let alone assimilate; the Roman component was saved by technical means (boats), money (wealth), culture and authority” (p. 45). As recorded by Čedomilj Mijatović in his study on the Balšić family, “the coastline itself [...] towns such as Bar, Ulcinj and Budva [...] were mostly settled by the Latin people, some of them descendants of the old Roman colonies, some settlers from Italy” (p. 45).

The number of Serbs in towns gradually grew and, as Jacopo Coletti writes in his book *Illyricum Sacrum* in 1817, “Budva was filled with the Serbs, of Slavic origin though, but followers of dogmatists and Greek ritual, which was also called Raškan (Serbian)” (p. 45). Jiricek gives the following details of the pre-Serb population of the coastal towns: “Quite different from these Romanian highland shepherds were the Roman citizens of the Adriatic Coast, for the most part craftsmen, traders, fishermen and seamen, called the Romans or Latin people, or Vlasi in Serbian. By the end of the Middle Ages, the Serbian language was predominant in both Kotor and Dubrovnik as a result of the disappearance of the old town families and the arrival of many a new one, the territorial expansion and the strong trade connections inland. In

northern Dalmatia, during the rule of the Republic of Saint Marco, the Venetian dialect suppressed the old Roman dialect, whose last traces disappeared in the nineteenth century on the island of Krk” (p. 46).

Ilija Sandik, a Catholic Serb, Boka historian and Serbian academician, provides even more details in his account of this process, as well as Jovan Vukmanović and Petar Serović. The same topic was also discussed by Jovan Cvijić in his book *The Balkan Peninsula and Southern Slavic Countries, Basics of Anthropogeography*: “In Turkish times and later, Herzegovinians and Montenegrins inhabited Boka in such quantities that they completely assimilated the old population of Zeta, many Arbanasi (Albanians) and, be it rarely, the Venetian population in the towns” (p. 47-48). Kostić adds the following data: “It must be noted that the Venetian authorities posed virtually no hindrance to the new Serbian element being settled in Boka. Thereby, the authorities strengthened their economic power and increased the number of subjects” (p. 48). Sava Nakićenović and Jovan Erdeljanović corroborated these claims with considerable persuasive data, while Cvijić himself unequivocally claims that Boka is a purely Serbian area.

The emigrants from Albania were also of pure Serbian descent, of Orthodox faith, with a family patron saint and speaking Serbian with a certain Arbanasi (Albanian) accent. Conducting anthropogeographical and ethnological research on Paštrovići, Jovan Vukanović emphasized the following: “Many of the autochthonous clans eventually moved in different directions, to be replaced by emigrants mainly from Old Serbia, spreading Serbian tradition and strengthening the national consciousness in New Serbia” (p. 49). Kostić complemented him with the following: “Serbdom did not lose any of its composition through migrations. Serbs came to the Serbs” (p. 49). Of all the parts of Boka, Grbalj was the “largest, purest and most compact Serbian borough [...] Throughout history, Grbalj was the most rebellious, most Orthodox and most Serbian” (p. 50).

During the Austrian occupation, a number of foreigners of different ethnicities came to Boka; some veteran officers and non-commissioned officers also settled there. Since they were mostly of Catholic faith, only they could be artificially Croatized under the influence of the Roman-Catholic clergy. However, as ethnicity was not recorded in censuses but only in spoken language, there is official data that the emigrants stated their mother tongue to be German, Czech, Slovak, Polish, Ukrainian, Slovenian, Italian and Rumanian. They were mostly military personnel and Austrian citizens. After World War One, none of them were expelled from Boka but, over time they or their descendants “with almost no exception, became Croats” (p. 53).

5. The Religious Issue

It is almost undisputed among scientists that the Serbian population of Boka and other coastal areas was Catholic until the time of Saint Sava. Marino Torsello, a Venetian contemporary of Stefan Dečanski, wrote a book entitled *The History of the Roman State*, in

which he offered some data on the King of Serbia who “rules over Primorje of the Adriatic Bay, which spreads over an area of about 250 miles, and whose inhabitants accept the Roman Church; however, all other peoples on the continent, who even stand by this king more vigorously, follow the Greek sect and ritual” (p. 53). In the PhD thesis he defended in 1924 at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland, the Serbian Metropolitan of Zagreb, Damaskin Grdanički, noted the following: “The inhabitants of the southern coastline of Nemanja’s state continued practicing the Latin ritual [...] The Serbian southern provinces were indeed dependent on Rome” (p. 53).

Kostić indicates that such a situation did not last long since a definite Christian schism only took place in the mid-eleventh century and, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, Saint Sava already received the recognition of the autocephalous Serbian Orthodox Church and founded one of the first eparchies at Prevlaka in Boka. All those who felt as Serbs returned then to their mother church, and such was the majority of Boka, mostly villagers. It seems that Boka instantly decided on Orthodoxy and has remained loyal to it to date. Catholicism was limited to the town and its closest surroundings. This is confirmed by the Pope’s letter of November 1367, wherein he writes to Dubrovnik, Zadar, Naples and Drač at the same time, warning them of the reproachable position of the Kotor Catholics. The Pope recommends to them “the eparchy of the Kotor bishop, which stands unsafe surrounded by the heretic Serbs and Arbanasi (Albanians)” (p. 54).

In 1934, in Požarevac, Miodrag Purković published a historical study entitled *The Popes of Avignon and the Serbian Lands*, based on which Kostić concludes that the Serbian Catholics were attached to their state despite the fact that the relations between the Serbian rulers and the Pope were rather poor at the time. “The residents of Kotor were mostly Catholics, and good Catholics at that. Yet, in the collision of interests of the Serbian state and those of the Catholic Church, they predominantly gave advantage to the Serbian state and its King. They sometimes resisted and even came into conflict with the Curia itself. It was recorded that the residents of Kotor opposed having Sergio Bolizza as the Bishop since this appointment was inconsistent with the laws of the town of Kotor. They appealed this matter to the King Stefan Dečanski (in 1328), referring to him the Bishop’s brother Marin, a well-known lord, for punishment. The Pope consequently excommunicated and anathematized Kotor. Yet Kotor did not relent. The Bishop transferred to Pulj then pleaded with the Pope to absolve Kotor as he himself had already pardoned it [...] Neither of the Catholic sources mentions any hesitancy on the part of the Kotor residents because of the excommunication since they considered loyalty to their state and obedience to their laws more important than their religion and loyalty to the Pope” (p. 54).

Such circumstances and such an anti-Rome disposition were also characteristic of all the other coastal towns. “Thus, in Bar for instance, in May 1247, one could hear exclamations like: ‘Who is the Pope? His Lordship our King Uroš is our Pope.’ At the time of his administration of the Bar Archdiocese, King Uroš declared that ‘His Excellency the Pope

and the Church of Rome had no authority whatsoever over his kingdom.” The king’s brother Vladislav, who ruled over Zeta and Trebinje, would even use “offensive and unimaginable words, referring to the Pope and all his cardinals as dogs” (p. 54-55).

The Venetian administration was marked by the intensified and systematic implementation of aggressive Catholic proselytism, which grew ever more uncompromising and mean. “Of all the areas in the central Boka that were always under Venetian rule, the Luštica Peninsula (Krtoli and Luštica boroughs) was the only area that did not succumb to this proselytism, nor did Paštrovići in Ivanbegovina. However, all other areas in the immediate surroundings of Kotor and on both sides of the mountain of Vrmac were converted to Catholicism at the very beginning, firstly Dobrota with Perast (Orahovac was not converted as it was under Turkish rule), then Prčanj and Stoliv, Muo and Škaljari, Lastva and Tivat with the upper villages of Bogdašići and Mrčevac. It is beyond doubt that all the older families in these areas were Orthodox. On the other hand, there were no traces of Catholicism in the areas under the Turkish rule and the reunited Boka was thus once again predominantly Orthodox” (p. 55). In order to reduce the number of the Serb population, the Venetians systematically settled numerous Serbian Orthodox families in other parts of their state. Hence, in his study *The Roman Curia and Yugoslav Lands between the Sixteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, Jovan Radonjić offers data on an order by the Venetian Government dated 29 May 1671 to move a rather large number of Serbs to Istria.

Nevertheless, the catholicization did not proceed without difficulty, which is evidenced by numerous preserved letters from Catholic priests complaining of a continuously growing number of Orthodox and a decreasing number of Catholic population in the Serbian coastal areas. The numbers from the period right before the Austrian occupation indicate that two thirds of the Boka inhabitants were Orthodox and one third Catholic. In 1836, Vuk Karadžić wrote: “The entire area of Boka numbers about 33 thousand souls, all of them as true Serbs as can be; a quarter of them observe the law of Rome, while the rest observe that of Greece” (p. 60). Similar data was also offered by Sima Matavulj, although he used Austrian statistics, which is probably more reliable since it was based on periodical censuses; this data points to a ratio of two to one in favour of the Orthodox population. However, one must take into account that Boka was the largest Austro-Hungarian naval base and, at all times, 10 to 20 per cent of its population were non-commissioned officers and soldiers.

Boka is abounding with Orthodox shrines. A report of 1768 by the Proveditor of Kotor is preserved, in which he complains about Saint Luke’s Church in Kotor holding services in the Serbian language and goes on to say: “This church has four Serbian tutors, two from the town and two from Grbalj [...] As necessary, the church convenes the Serb councils, usually in this church, without registering them or asking for any approval from the higher authority” (p. 69). As recounted by Lazo Kostić, “The Proveditor urges that this should be brought to an end since these councils might endanger the public peace, and the population is

rebellious and represents the greatest enemy to Latin law” (p. 70). Kohl, a German travel writer, gives an account of the Orthodox monasteries in Boka as keepers of the tradition and memory of Stefan Nemanja and other notable Serbian emperors and kings. He also describes a tombstone found around the monasteries and churches, with the coats of arms of numerous outstanding Serbian families and princes.

While the Catholic churches display Roman, or Latin features, “the Serbian liturgical books, which are preserved in few Boka Orthodox churches, provide proof of their ancient Serbian character. Such is the case in the Monastery of Savina, which prides itself on the Savinska krmčija/Savina Codex, so admired by scientists, and the Church of the Shroud of the Holy Mother of God in Bijela. There are many that are Serb [...] Even foreign books, the Russian ones for instance, contain many Serbian scripts” (p. 71). And all the priests were Serbs. In 1894, Nićifor Dučić writes, in his *History of the Serbian Orthodox Church*, that “The Episcopacy of Zeta, later the Metropolitanate, which has to date preserved its Serbian hierarchy originating from its foundation in 1219, namely from the time of Saint Sava, is the only such example in the history of the Orthodox Church” (p. 72). Kostić further adds: “Never has a foreigner sat on the see of the *Vladika* of Zeta, let alone a Phanariot. Not only the non-monastic clergy, but the monks as well, from the lowest to the highest ranks, were Serbian. All of them were local sons, mostly from Boka with few exceptions, and all were Serbs with no exception, all proto-priests, and hegumens, and archimandrites. As a rule, the priests came from the same families, priest dynasties, priest houses, as is customary elsewhere among the Serbian people” (p. 72).

In his book *The Bogomils* from 1867, Božidar Petrinović writes that all the Serbs in Boka Kotorska were Catholics converted from Orthodoxy during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The Serbian Catholic Đelčić praises the religious peace and tolerance during the rule of the Nemanjić dynasty. Kostić summarizes this issue, saying: “Even without consideration of the Serbian interior, one is certain beyond doubt: there was no Orthodox proselytism in the Serbian Primorje during the rule of the Nemanjić dynasty or pressure on the coastal Catholics to accept Orthodoxy (and before the House of Nemanjić, there was no Serbian Orthodoxy)” (p. 73). A long, persistent and systematic campaign of Catholicizing began under the Venetian rule.

6. Catholic Proselytism during the Venetian Rule

As Jiricek shows, “when the Serbs were pushed from Primorje, the Venetians became enemies of the Serbian clergy. As early as 1446, the Bishop of Kotor was given an award to expel the Slavic priests (by pressure) and replace them with the Latin ones, but to do it slowly, in a convenient manner, by no means sharply and swiftly” (p. 75). In his *History of the Serbs*, he offers similar data on another occasion: “the pressure upon the Orthodox is visible (not only in Dubrovnik), but in the surroundings of Kotor as well. In July 1446, the Kotor Municipality wrote to the Venetians that there were Serb priests in its area who were

against our faith and schismatics. So they pleaded with the Republic to have the Rector and the Bishop of Kotor expel the Orthodox priests and bring in the Latin priests in their stead. The Senate of Venice decided to confidentially inform the Rector and Bishop that they agreed to replace the schismatics with the Latin priests, but gradually and very carefully, in the manner they find most appropriate.”

Even the Doge of Venice, in his Ducal of 22 May 1455, commended Bishop Bernard of Kotor, who deserved honour for “returning hundreds of schismatics and infidels to the Catholic faith, the populace who converted and was baptized by his own [Bishop’s] hands, most of them in Saint Peter’s at Gradac, under Mrčevac of the Kotor Diocese” (p. 75-76). A letter by Stefan Crnojević addressed to the authorities of the Republic of Venice in 1453 was preserved, wherein the protection of Serbian churches from Kotor to Lješ was requested. The authorities warned the Kotor and Arbanasi (Albanian) Rectors to refrain from harming the Serbian churches and priests. In a different passage, it is mentioned that Paštrovići refused uniatism, so the Congregation for the propagation of the faith referred to them as the arrogant people in a Serb sect under a Montenegrin *vladika*.

Similar events were described in detail by Jovan Radonić, based on his research of a large number of documents from the Vatican Archives. “The work on uniatism in Paštrovići was not abandoned even after the unsuccessful action of the Archbishop of Bar, Marino Bozzi [...] the Congregation entrusted uniatism in Paštrovići to an able missionary, Don Đorđo Vučković, a Canon of the Saint Jerome Institute. He was to work in coordination with the Bishop of Kotor Vićentije Buća [...] Beside Vučković from 1692, as a missionary and friar Serafin Miseričić also worked there, again in agreement with the Bishop of Kotor. Friar Serafin worked on uniatism in Luštica, Lješevici and Krtoli, zealously and with apparent success at first, but he soon got tired of his work [...] Bishop Buća, however, worked diligently and dedicatedly on the uniatism of the Orthodox [...] He admits that the work was not easy, yet thinks that certain results could be achieved” (p. 77).

As opposed to the latent aggression of the Catholic religious circles, the Venetian authorities took care not to upset the Orthodox Serbs much - at least not directly - because it had to count on their allegiance in the numerous clashes with the Turks. The Vatican Archives are full of complaints from the Catholic priests of Boka Kotorska against the Venetian authorities from the periods when they were rather tolerant towards the Orthodox, when they enlarged the state of Venice with the help of the Serbs and increased the numbers of Serbs within. “In a memorandum to the Senate of Venice in 1722, Archbishop Zmajević wrote that the Serbs were everywhere and, “with all their force, attack the Catholic Faith, saying ‘filthy Latins, filthy faith’. Even Muhammad had a better opinion of the Latin faith than the Serbs, so why not call them heretics. There are still living women in Boka who can testify to having to convert when they married Serbs; can that happen in the state of a god fearing and religious prince?” (p. 81).

As stated by Radonić, “Archbishop Vićentije Zmajević carefully

followed the strengthening of the Orthodox in Boka Kotorska. On 23 August 1723, he wrote from Zadar to the Secretary of the Congregation, vividly depicting the situation of the Catholics in Luštica and Krtoli [...] where the schismatics were successfully suppressed. However, in the wars at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries, many Orthodox people settled those areas from the upper lands and overwhelmed the Catholics in numbers, thus threatening their eternal salvation” (p. 82). That the situation was similar in all of Dalmatia in the eighteenth century is shown by Nikodim Milaš, citing the Catholic Archbishop of Zadar, Matija Karman, who, in 1750, in his extensive report, complained to the Venetians about the Serbian Orthodox religious enthusiasm and spiritual development that threatened the Catholic ambitions, in the end recommending some strict measures in order to carry out the religious conversion of the Serbs and turning to God “to rid us of the Serb danger and prevent our offspring from returning as schismatics in a Serb Dalmatia, but rather as Catholics in the Venetian Dalmatia” (p. 83).

However, the Dalmatian Proveditor of Venice reported to his higher authorities in a rather objective manner, stating that all that the Latin Bishops had been doing for half a century (i.e. since the beginning of the seventeenth century, L.M.K) to impose their jurisdiction upon the Greek Serbs, served no other purpose than to augment displeasure towards them; public terminations proved useless - even the prison sentences, chaining and expulsion from the country, which were practiced to punish disobedience and disrespect expressed towards the bishops. The bishops’ main preoccupation was to protect their holy personages and maintain their episcopal rights [...] The Dalmatian Bishops say that it would be a great deed to clean the entire province of the Greek Serbs, or at least to expel their monks and have them replaced by the Franciscan fathers [...] and as a model of such an act, the examples of Polish and Austrian houses were given. But this proposal cannot be viewed as anything other than the fruit of apostolic zeal, which has nothing in common with human wisdom” (p. 84).

The Venetians acted in a much more delicate manner than the assertive bishops. They accepted converts into public service and gave them privileges and, in years of famine, they encouraged conversion by delivering food supplies. Truth be told, it was prohibited to build new Orthodox churches at the coast, or to organize processions outside the churches. At some stages, the Venetian officials did have a brutal approach, much like the Catholic priests. ‘Understandably, the new converts lead the way: Turkish converts, worse than the Turks!’ (p. 87). Kostić corroborated this with the descriptive texts by the French priest Pisanio, by the German writers Gedlich and Schtiglitz and by French scientist Ami Boué”.

7. The Unwavering Serbdom of Bokelji (The Inhabitants of Boka)

Through numerous concrete examples, Kostić shows that “in the Vatican documents, no lands where the Serbs lived were so ostentatiously described as Serbian as Boka Kotorska. The religion is never referred to as Orthodoxy; sometimes it is called schismatic or Greek, and most frequently Serb or Serbian. Every writ of the Vatican reveals that Boka Kotorska breathed and felt in a Serb manner. And everyone who reads these documents can see that de-Serbization of this area has been requested, as well as its Catholicization” (p. 88-89). Thus, he extensively quotes the nobleman of Kotor Mariano Bolizza, a letter by Urban Cerri to Pope Innocent II, a report by the Archbishop of Zadar Matija Karaman and the work of Marco Antonio Pigafetta, all of which represent the most credible historical documents from the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In the nineteenth century, there is even more of this evidence. The German travel writer Kohl says that South Dalmatia is completely Serbian, the Austrian ethnographer Baron Tschering states that the Bokelji are Serbs, the French publicist Jean Ubicini claims that the territory of Boka Kotorska is completely Serbian, the German travel writer Paserge speaks of Boka as an area of Greek-Catholic Serbs, etc. The German travel writer Heinrich Noe, describing Dalmatia and Montenegro in 1870, states that Boka “resounds with the ‘wildest sounds of Serbian war cries’ - everywhere memories of hatred, battle, blood and fire can be seen, the ‘heroic bitterness of the Serbs and the destructive rage of the Ottomans’, above this sea wilderness flies an enormous eagle, who, as the Serb poems speak of the black raven, feeds on the eyes and entrails of the perished warriors” (p. 90-91).

Italian writer Antonio Baldacci elaborates on and justifies the Austrian construction of numerous fortresses in Boka Kotorska, “for, if the Russian fleet entered Boka, the surrounding Serbian areas of Herzegovina, Montenegro and Bokelji (inhabitants of Boka) themselves so in favour of the Montenegrins, would easily join with the universal and powerful mother of the Serbs” (p. 91). The French travel writer Pierre Marc published a book in Paris in 1912 entitled *A Journey Through Dalmatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Montenegro*, stating therein that “These Slavs of Boka, these Serbs, remained Serbs more than anywhere else; this is a particular population that holds the Montenegrins dear much more than the Dalmatians” (p. 91). Also, the French biographer Emile Oman wrote in 1915 that the entire population of Boka was Serbian. As Kostić concluded, “it is clear that foreigners in a foreign land would not refer to Bokelji as being Serbs, had they not identified themselves as such” (p. 92).

The inhabitants of Boka always considered themselves to be Serbs, declaring themselves as such in both private life and official documents. Kostić here refers to an impressive number of historical documents, primarily from the Venetian archives covering the centuries of Serbian life in that area. All of the sources clearly show that “Bokelji never renounced their Serbdom, nor did they wanted to compromise with it” (p. 96). All scientists and ethnologists considered both the Orthodox and Catholic population to be Serbian. “The Orthodox inhabitants had a rather developed national consciousness, while the Catholics had no

mention, no trace of a Croatian consciousness. Such a consciousness did not even exist in Dalmatia at that time, let alone in Boka“(p. 96-97). A Serb from Vojvodina, Arsa Pajević, described his journey through Boka at the end of the last century, emphasizing that: “Herceg Novi was always the forehead, the pride of all Bokelji, as it was here that the real Serbian falcons were born, the ones who had their origins in the times of the old Serbian glory and the Dukedom of Saint Sava’s in that land“(p. 97). Jovan Cvijić also wrote that “the inhabitants of Boka have a highly developed national consciousness, reinforced by the richness of Serbian historical traditions” (p. 97). In a great number of his poems, statements and other texts, King Nikola of Montenegro underscored the rather pronounced Serbdom of Boka and its inhabitants.

On the basis of such a detailed analysis and numerous arguments, Kostić draws the following conclusion: “It is not only the Orthodox Serbs of Boka who were always aware of their ethnicity and of spiritual belonging to Serbdom; to an extent, it was also the case with the ancient Catholic inhabitants of Boka. Before WWI, a large part of the Catholic elite of Boka felt and declared themselves Serbian. In this sense, the academic youth was especially prominent. It seemed that the movement would assume vast proportions, that all the Catholics of Boka would realize and admit that they are Serbs [...] Thanks to the decreed Yugoslavism of the first Yugoslavia and the even more ardently decreed Montenegrindom of the second Yugoslavia, a confusion emerged, during which we immediately lost the Serb Catholics (with a few exceptions)” (p. 98).

In the last century, imbued with Serbian nationalism, the inhabitants of Boka rebelled three times against Austrian rule. “The Serbdom of Boka manifested itself in a thousand ways. For example, when a prince or king of Montenegro passed through the area, he was welcomed with delight and saluted just because he was a Serb and a Serbian ruler. [...] On the other hand, when, at the end of the last century, Boka was visited by Austrian heir presumptive to the throne Franz Ferdinand, he himself complained of an unusually cold welcome” (p. 98-99). The Austrian publicist Leopold von Flumetzky left a rather impressive testimonial on the political circumstances in 1908, describing the unpleasant experiences of the Austrian spy Nastić who was despised and hated by the Serbs for his ideological and propaganda fabrications.

As explained by Flumetzky, “during Nastić’s journey, the Dalmatian Serbs once more showed their true face as supporters of any movement in favour of the secession of Dalmatia from Austria. Nastić, who, in his brochure titled *Finale*, revealed the revolutionary tendencies of the propaganda actually stemming from Serbia, was exposed to unthinkable insults by the local inhabitants when on his way from Herceg Novi to Mostar, inspired by the agitators of Greater Serbia; they saw a ‘spy’ and ‘traitor’ in Nastić. How much must the propaganda of Greater Serbia have undermined the area, being spread so unhindered and unpunished for more than a decade across South Dalmatia, and how much must it have influenced the way of thinking of the population, when it identified with the interests of the Serb dynasty and the revolutionary movement of

IT-03-67-T
Greater Serbia to such an extent that it stigmatized as a spy and traitor the one who revealed a part of the revolutionary plots of Greater Serbia” (p. 99).

Additionally, Bokelji often defied the Austrian power by using national symbols. “Almost every place had a Serbian library, a Serbian agricultural cooperative, etc. Many had Serbian singers’ clubs; the oldest singers’ club of the Serbs seems to be Jedinstvo. In the eve of WWI, many places had their Serbian Falcons’ Associations named Dušan Silni (Dushan the Mighty). In Kotor, there was a Serb Guard, etc.” (p. 100). In its Yearbook of 1953, the Maritime Museum of Kotor describes the execution of a Navy Captain Milan Srzentić in 1914, at the Spanish Fortress above Herceg Novi: “At the execution site, he removed the blindfold from his eyes and cried out, directly before being hit by gunfire, ‘Shoot, you blood-thirsty beasts, long live Serbia!’” (p. 100).

Kostić also provides data on the situation during WWII, stating the following: “During the previous war, the Serbs of Boka again showed outstanding courage, both those who stayed in Boka and those outside. None of the Serbs ever hid their origins. I personally know of no case where an inhabitant of Boka, who was captured by Germans or Italians, stated he or she was not a Serb so as to be released. It had been done by others, but never by the Serbs of Boka. In Boka itself, there were both nationalists and communists, the former being far more numerous. But neither of them ever renounced their Serbdom under any situation, nor did they request any state structure that would be separate from the Serbdom [...] After the war, a hitherto unknown nationality was imposed upon them, but no one accepted it intimately and voluntarily (p. 100).

The situation in Serb emigration is similar. Bokelji would not give up Serb nationalism and patriotism. “The Serbs of Boka in emigration hold a pure and unadulterated Serbian line; not only is there no one outside that line, but there are hardly any indifferent ones. Everyone is a Serb, a pure fire! That is why, fortunately, I have not noticed any of them participate in a public display that would sin against their Serbdom. Quite the contrary, they are seen and heard in every Serb manifestation, they work and take action. There are very few workers among them, less than from any other part of Serbdom. Some succeeded in rising to leading positions among the Serbian emigration. Not a single inhabitant of Boka changed his religion when emigrating; or rather, there are Catholics who became Orthodox but there are no examples of the reverse. They keep the faith and nationality of their fathers like no other group of Serbs. I have not found any other area from which the Serb emigration originates that has remained so faithful to the Serbian letters as Bokelji” (p. 100-101).

8. The Serbian National Characteristics of Boka Kotorska

Kostić begins his section on the preservation of the Serbian national characteristics in the Bay of Kotor by quoting Simo Matavulj, who stated that Vuk Karadžić, “in his works, famed that pure Serbian nest where language, attire and customs were preserved in their purest form” (p.

(book) entitled *The Holy Land, Famed and Powerful of the Church's Journal*, in Cyrillic. Zmajević wrote Latin and Italian, but when he wrote in the Serbian language, he used Cyrillic" (p. 107-108). Most importantly, in his text, Zmajević strongly emphasized that he wrote in the Serbian language and used Serbian letters.

When, upon abolishing the Republic of Venice, Austria took control of the Bay of Kotor, its generals and administration officers wrote of the Serbian language as the language of the population that fell under their rule in all official letters. "An extensive and elaborate Grammatica by the Austrian Emperor Franz Joseph I on the establishment of the Archdiocese of Boka Kotorska and the appointment of a new Bishop therein (Gerasim Petranović), written in 1874, 'was written on parchment in the Serbian language, in Cyrillic letters, and was thus signed. It is kept in the Episcopacy.' A memorable thing: the Emperor of Vienna passes an official decree within his competence in the Serbian language and signs it in Serbian. Otherwise, he would offend the Bokelji. What a difference from that Serb-hater named Josip Broz Tito!" (p. 111).

After all the Serbian lands adopted the Serbian flag, based on the Russian one but with a reversed order of colours, "I think I am not exaggerating when I claim that nowhere in the Serbdom of the second half of the nineteenth century were there more flags flapping in the wind than in Boka. They were at churches, in private homes, at weddings, school holidays (Saint Sava) and especially at numerous 'feasts' that were celebrated in turn across all of coastal Boka. Every occasion was used to raise the Serbian flag: deaths, births, weddings and family patron saint celebrations."

Lazo Kostić also makes a digression here, probably because in searching through the documentation and sources on the main topic, he came across an interesting piece of information in a 1928 work by the German geographer Hasinger. Hasinger eloquently elaborates on the historical retrospective of the ethnic development of Dalmatia and the diligent Kostić takes this valuable opportunity to corroborate the theories and arguments published in his previous works. As an emigrant, he actually printed his books in the form of an irregularly published personal magazine, so he could not completely systematize the study material he gathered.

Among other things, in his study on Dalmatia published in a respectable geographic magazine of the University of Fribourg, Hasinger wrote the following: "The multi-layered situational relations of the Dalmatian country influenced the formation of its nationality. The Illyrian tribes represent the oldest historically known foundation. The Celtic blood got mixed in there, the Greek colonists inhabited the coastal towns, the Roman conquerors brought their language and culture and the German and Avarian campaigns were carried out through that land. The Venetians settled in the coastal towns and the Turks attacked from the hinterlands, but the most unwavering was the Slavic heritage of the ninth century, Croatian in the north and Serbian in the south. This heritage was decisive for today's South-Slavic linguistic and ethnic character of the country. [...] With all that, in south Dalmatia one stands on the very

101). It is true that the inhabitants of Boka accepted certain Italianisms, but to a much lesser extent than Serbia and Bosnia accepted the Turkisms. The lexical and syntactic features of the language remained completely preserved. "Certainly, there are many dialects in Boka, more than anywhere among the Serbs, and in such a small area. This is proof of the autonomy and individuality of the boroughs of Boka. In some places, the earliest forms of the old Serbian language were preserved, (such as the silent 'a' in Krtoli), while the pure Herzegovinian dialect is spoken in the Novi and Risan areas. The differences between dialects do not imply purer or less pure Serbian, but denote the different pronunciation (intonation and accent) of certain words" (p. 102).

This was emphasized by the German Baron Otto Reinsberg in 1864, who added that: "Italian is spoken only in the larger towns, among the educated persons; in domestic communication, only Serbian is used because the inhabitants are all of Slavic origin, with the exception of a small number of Catholics. Generally speaking, no other area is as significant to the Serbian language as Boka, since a great number of old Slavic words can be found there that are not common anywhere else anymore, while the pronunciation, which in Slavonia, Dalmatia and Bosnia allows one to differentiate between the members of the Roman and Eastern churches, is the same amongst the Greeks and Catholics of Boka" (p. 102).

Kostić provides a series of illustrations for the fact that "the language spoken by Bokelji is called Serbian by all writers, both old and new, domestic and foreign, Bokelji and non-Bokelji" (p. 103). In the abundance of local and foreign authors, of particular interest seems to be the work of the Croatian writer Simo Ljubić, who states that "the works of the oldest writers of Dubrovnik and Kotor were of Serbian origin, or at least done under the influence of the Serbian dialect, such as the works of Šišo Menčetić, Đorđe Držić, etc." (p. 103).

The Serbs of Boka have used Cyrillic letters since the times of the Nemanjić dynasty and the Cyrillic inscriptions are the only traces of Serbian literacy, bearing in mind that there are no written texts preserved from the pre-Nemanjić periods in that area. Catholic priests tried hard to destroy or obliterate all the Serbian cultural monuments they could get hold of, but there were so many that their endeavours eventually had to be unsuccessful. Even in Catholic churches, on the recently discovered frescoes, all the text in the Serbian language was written in Cyrillic, while the Latin letters were only used in the Italian texts. "The Orthodox Serbs wrote only in Cyrillic and only in the Serbian Language (some in Slavic-Serbian and some mixed with the vernacular). There were no exceptions, nor could there be any; a person who wrote differently would be considered to have renounced his religion and ethnicity. Even the Turkish authorities, like the population under the rule of Turks in Boka, wrote in Serbian Cyrillic. [...] Even the Latins printed Serbian books if it was profitable in their commercial calculations" (p. 106-107). Certainly, the Catholic Serbs wrote all Serbian texts exclusively in Cyrillic.

It is rather impressive evidence that the prominent citizen of Perast, Bishop of Bar Andrija Zmajević, wrote that "as early as 1675, a treatise

border between the Eastern and Western European cultural being, today as in the time of the East and West Roman Empires. A significant majority of Dalmatians lived with the West for a long time; they write in Latin letters and are of the Catholic faith. Yet, in its southernmost parts emerge the domes of the Orthodox churches and there begins the rule of the Cyrillic letters” (p. 111-112).

9. The Continuity of the Serbian Legal Mind

Kostić corroborates his analysis of the Serbian character of Boka Kotorska with the preservation of the old Roman statehood and legal traditions, the legal forms and legal customs, and with the continuity of the legal consciousness of the Serb people. He views the Serbian legal continuity of the inhabitants of Boka from organizational, normative and institutional standpoints. “The organizational aspect is manifested in retaining the old forms of social structure (such as *Župa* or *Knežina* - parish, *Opština* - municipality, etc.), and their ancient way of functioning. The normative or complementary continuity is reflected in the reliance on the exact or similar text of the legal regulations of the past, in the maintenance of the same substantive law, the same norms and even in the formal references to these norms (Carostavnik - tsars’ chronicles, Starostavnik - miscellany, etc.) in order to express this continuity more clearly. Institutional continuity is understood as the uniformity of the legal institutions or the legal institutes of the old-established Serbian law and the customary laws of Boka. This uniformity does not have to originate from the same norms and sometimes its origins are even unknown (as is the case, for example with *zadruga* - cooperative). Some of the institutes may have emerged in the post-Nemanjić period, but they are nevertheless ancient and markedly Serbian” (p. 113-114).

For centuries, the basis of the legal life of Kotor was the Statute conferred on this town in 1301, under the rule of the House of Nemanjić, wherein it is stated that the town’s Prince was appointed by the King of Raška. The Statute of Budva was adopted during the reign of Tsar Dušan. In his *Characterology of the Yugoslavs*, Dvorniković writes that “even after the Nemanjić dynasty, there remained legal and state rudiments of an age-old state, some small autonomous units, *župas* or *’knežinas’*, such as Paštrovići near Budva, Grbalj in Boka, etc. Those *župa* atavisms, not only of the Nemanjić areas but also of other Yugoslav regions, survived in some places even until the beginning of the nineteenth century!” (p. 115).

Francesco Madirazzi wrote that “even after the Venetian rule, Paštrovići retained their old municipal structure and the people’s and citizens’ court granted to them by Stefan the Serb in 1266” (p. 115). On the other hand, Baron von Reinsberg Düringsfeld writes that the customs of Paštrovići, “which were the customs of the ancient Serbs, were, in spite of different rules, preserved in a pure and unadulterated form, no less than their national independence and their own laws. They retained their special court, which was guaranteed to them in 1266 by the Serbian King Stefan, and the work of which could not be interfered with (p. 116).

The French Catholic priest abbot Paul Pisani wrote in 1893 that “the inhabitants of Boka, furnished with privileges that granted them almost complete independence, never wanted to see the Venetians as their masters, but only as their protectors. [...] The proximity of Montenegro allowed them to apply pressure on the Senate of Venice, to gain through fear what they could not gain through negotiations. [...] Taking advantage of the Venetian conflicts, Bokelji attained the widest freedom as a reward for their loyalty (especially due to the “Russian illusion standing behind the nineteenth century Montenegro) [...] The Venetians needed Boka as a winter harbour for their Levantine fleets, the right to keep soldiers in the fortress, the proveditor and a few Venetian magistrates; that was all that the Senate of Venice demanded, and it gave an almost complete autonomy to the Boka citizens in all other matters” (p. 177).

The French writer and diplomat Adolph d’Avril provides even more precise data in 1876, saying that “the Republic of Venice never sought to impose its dominance on the Slavs of Boka; it was usually satisfied with having Kotor and Budva under its rule, wherein it kept its proveditors (subordinated to the ones of Zadar). The inhabitants of Boka retained their laws and customs. Civil and criminal proceedings were conducted in the language of the country. The magistrates were local, chosen by the populace on a yearly basis, while the inheritable functions of magistrates were only those existing in Serbian times. These leaders were free and proud, acting as grand individuals (he mentions the princes of Grbalj). By no means would they demand money from their subjects. On the contrary, the Venetians gave the money to them. Many estimable persons would receive pensions. The Venetians only requested that they defend the border from the Turks, which was gladly done by the Bokelji” (p. 117).

In 1423, Paštrovići entered into a contract with the Venetian Admiral Francesco Bembo, specifying the conditions under which they would accept the Venetian protection, thereby preserving the widest internal autonomy. The old Serbian laws, statutes and customary law thus became the legitimate legal sources of the Venetian state in a part of their territory. In fact, in all aspects, Paštrovići was a completely independent area, save for the election of their prince, which was confirmed by the Doge of Venice. Moreover, Grbalj kept its local self-rule in the times of the Venetian and Turkish dominance. Both Prčanj and Perast, and all other places had more or less similar forms of self-governance. The Serbian councils were held in all Serb settlements, as was the case in the age-old Serbian tradition. Only under Austrian rule would the Serbian local autonomy be systematically limited.

10. The Serbian Tribal and Clan Structure

Beside the territorial form of self-organizing, the Serbs retained their personal organizational structure for a long time, which was particularly present among the inhabitants of Boka. Jovan Erdeljanović summarized it in his 1921 study entitled *On Certain Features of the Formation of*

Tribes among the Serbs: “In the areas inhabited by the Dinaric tribes, from Lake Skadar and the Bay of Kotor, there are four Serbian areas where tribal life has been preserved until recently and still exists there partly as the only such form among the Slavs. These four areas are: 1) Eastern Herzegovina, from the Neretva River to the areas close to the Bay of Kotor [...]; 2) Boka Kotorska, around the Bay of Kotor and south-east thereof; 3) Old Montenegro, bordered by Herzegovina, Boka, Lake Skadar and the Zeta River valley (and only a small part of Krajina in Montenegro, between Lake Skadar and the Adriatic Sea); and 4) *Brda* (Highlands). [...] Over the centuries, strong tribes and their clearly developed tribal organization were fully formed in these areas of the Dinaric Serbs, partly from the old Serbian tribal composites and partly [...] from new tribal cells. From the ramified Serbian clans and tribes - and sometimes in their blending with the Serbianized autochthonous inhabitants - there emerged the first, the oldest layer of the Serbian people who, living their tribal life for centuries, deeply instilled in themselves the ways of such a lifestyle” (p. 126).

Constantine Jiricek also dealt with this issue in his endeavour to explain the social and legal nature of the tribes. “In relation to its neighbourhood, each tribe comprised a separate political entity (a member of a tribe was known as a *plemenik*). Each tribe had its own authorities. It convened its councils and judicial meetings in designated places under blue skies. [...] A tribe would have its common enemies and friends and would man its own army. In the army, the soldiers were deployed by clans [...] A tribe draws its origin from one family or one man. Even each clan (a member of a clan is called a *bratstvenik*), which is divided into families or houses and spreads over one or more villages, has its progenitor, whose name the members of the clan use as surname [...] Through the procreation of clan members, a new clan separates from the original one” (p. 125-126).

Based on this knowledge of the tribal and clan system, the renowned Slavist Franc Miklošić draws even more insightful conclusions. “Hence, the institutions we find among the Montenegrin tribes are of a broader, general significance, because we may discern in them the initial structure of Slavic municipal organization and the Slavic state. Everyone is equal in Montenegro; even the poorest can say to everybody, “I am no worse than you, nor am I of less noble origin.” The lords are no different from the rest of the Montenegrins, neither in their attire, nor in their lifestyle. [...] In such a system, the patriarchal cooperative is of great economic significance. [...] Blood revenge is no less important, since it protects the body and life when the state fails to undertake this protective task [...] The people are divided into tribes, the tribes into clans, and the leader of a clan is its heritable prince” (p. 126-127).

Valtazar Bogošić wrote in 1906 that the customary law of Grbalj and Paštrovići was not local in its character, as it had its origins in the legal system of the medieval Serbian state. Alexander Soloviev determined that under Venetian and Austrian rules, the Serbian coastal areas had a judicial system governed by the Code of Tsar Dušan. The *Perast Proclamation against Cursing*, of 25 August 1624, explicitly provides

that the trial council should enter judgment pursuant to the “laws of King Stefan”. Boka is also characterised by all the other significant Serbian institutes of customary law - such as cooperatives, patriarchal inheritance forms, blood brotherhood, godparenthood, etc. In the Serbian legal consciousness, the courts of the people were always more important than the state ones. There is also blood revenge, reconciliation, stoning as a form of punishment, etc.

11. Serbian Customs and Cultural Traditions

In 1924, Marko Car wrote that Boka was an area in which the Serbian people could best preserve its folk-tales and customs and where “every third man was a natural-born poet and orator” (p. 138). Stjepan Mitrov Ljubiša provided an impressive account of the essence of the Serbian customs: “The most fascinating customs of the Serbs are closely associated with their religious rituals and it would be hard to imagine that the one who detests these customs or practices them indifferently is a good Serb, be he of the Turkish, Catholic or Orthodox faith. These customs have saved the national consciousness of the Serbs and on them this consciousness will feed” (p. 139). It was Boka that most tenaciously treasured and cherished these ancient customs of the Serbs and hence Kostić says: “The customs of Boka are the customs of the Serbs and Serbdom, and most of them have been preserved from ancient times. They are Serbian either because they were cherished in that form by the ancient Serbs or because the general Christian customs of the Balkan people were complemented by a Serbian touch that made them unique, or because the Serbian national character was impressed upon the general customs of the peoples belonging to the same civilization” (p. 139-140).

Krsna slava, the celebration of a family patron saint, is a custom existing only among the Serbs and, in Boka, it is practiced by both the Orthodox and the Catholics. In one of his stories, Ljubiša makes the following comment on the behaviour of some Catholic Serbs: “They forget their kind and roots, they shun from and are ashamed of their flock, they hate their language, tradition and customs, they only paint eggs, celebrate the *slava*, and burn *badnjak*, either to better deceive us or because they do not wish to defy God” (p. 145). Ivan Stojanović, a great Serb and Catholic priest from Dubrovnik, wrote the following in his book entitled *The Literature of Dubrovnik*, which was published in Dubrovnik in 1900: “The South Slavs were divided into several tribes [...] the Slovene, the Croatian, the Serbian and the Bulgarian. All of them had more or less the same customs but, as conveniently observed by Bogišić, only the Serbian tribe practiced the *slava*. Nowadays, some attempts are made from the opposite side to extinguish this Serbian custom, mostly in the area of Konavle” (p. 143). Wedding ceremonies and dirges, especially the folk poems and the *gusle* (musical instrument) tradition, the Montenegrin traditional costumes and the custom of bearing arms were cherished in the Serbian Boka more assiduously than in many other Serbian areas.

12. The Indisputability of the Serbian Character of Boka Kotorska

In 1975, in Windsor, a city in Ontario, Canada, Laza Kostić published a brochure (run off on a mimeograph machine) entitled *More on the Serbian Character of Boka Kotorska, Supplements and Addenda*, disclosing the data he obtained in his further scientific research, which was unknown to the Serbs at the time, and in any case it had not been collected and systematically presented in one place before Kostić. The author emphasizes that he was particularly motivated by a desire to make his works useful to the Serbs and detrimental to their enemies, primarily thinking of Croatian greediness and their attempts to snatch all that was Serbian, vast lands, culture, tradition and even Boka Kotorska.

Kostić even got hold of a book written by the French publicist Xavier Marmier in 1853, entitled *Letters from the Adriatic and Montenegro*, which *inter alia* reads as follows: "The first reliable records of the Serbs' settling in Europe date from as early as the mid-seventh century. During this period, the Serbs reached the banks of the Danube River, spreading quickly across the principality that preserved their name (Serbia, L.M.K.), through Bosnia and to the Bay of Kotor" (p. 8).

Kostić further presents certain newly found data from the Venetian archives, that confirms that the Venetians always considered the Bokelji as Serbs. He points to the reports of Proveditors Vincenzo Dona from 1736 and Marco Querini from 1742, the documents by Doge Alvise Mocenigo from 1776, etc. All these historical documents testify to the Serbian inclination of Boka, though the Croats simply do not care for that and take the fabrications, witticisms and statements by political manipulators as scientific facts.

Boka once again showed its pure Serbian soul during a short period of the Russian administration, at the time of the wars against Napoleon, which is confirmed by both Petr Andreevich Tolstoy and Charles Yriarte. Neither did the inhabitants of Boka accept Njegoš's insistence in 1848 to unite with the Croats and Jelačić, as they longed to be united with "all the Slavonic-Serbian countries once they become independent and free themselves from any foreign interference by the imperial crown" (p. 19). The archives of Kotor house numerous documents that point to the Serbian nature, the Serbian religion and the ethnicity of the inhabitants of Boka. They even used the old "Serbian" calendar until WWI.

In Boka Kotorska, Vuk Karadžić found a diligent associate and vigorous collector of folk sayings in the figure of Vuk Vrčević, who compiled the folk riddles of Boka and published them in 1857, in Zadar, under the title *Moral and Entertaining and Wittily Didactic Serbian Riddles*, later also compiling *Serbian Folk Puzzles*. It was Constantine Jiricek who established that the *bugarštice* were indeed Serbian folk poems, although they were often publicly represented as Croatian. Jiricek noted the following: "In the 16th and 17th centuries, the fifteen-syllable poems were said to be sung in 'a Serbian manner.' The same expression is used by Hektorović (the Serbian manner) and Križanić (the Serb mode and style) [...] After Guilferding and Miklošić published a few

IT-03-67-T
essays on these poems in 1878, Bogišić published a collection of 76 poems, 36 of which were from the areas around Kotor and Dubrovnik. The 17th century was already marked by the decline of this poetry, which still lingered only in Primorje, particularly in Perast near Kotor [...] Historically, these poems describe the periods from Tsar Stefan Dušan to the Venetian conquest of Herceg Novi [...] The religious themes, such as the glorification of monks and the magnificent Holy Mountain of Athos, clearly point to the influence the Orthodox Church had on these poems" (p. 34).

In 1784, Dositej Obradović wrote that "there is a spirit of freedom among the Serbs. Whoever wishes to see this, let him go to Montenegro, Paštrovići, Risan and Krivošije" (str. 45). It was not a coincidence that Metropolitan Stratimirović wrote to the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs Adam Czartoryski "appealing to him for Serbia's freedom from the Turkish suzerainty, and its unification with Srem and Kotor!" (p. 45).

13. The First Uprising of Krivošije as the Greatest Historical Exploit of Bokelji

In 1959, Laza Kostić published a brochure in Hamilton entitled *The Krivošije Uprising of 1869*. He worked on this issue for another ten years, developing the initially small work into an extensive study under the title of *The Centenary of the First Uprising of Krivošije*, which he published in Munich in 1970. It was the attempts of the Austrian authorities to abolish the old privileges and autonomies of Boka that lead to the Krivošije uprisings. Though these privileges and autonomies were not the same in all areas, they had existed everywhere since the time of the medieval Serbian state and had always been a thorn in the side of the Venetian and Austrian authorities, and often of the Vatican dignitaries as well.

In 1912, in his book entitled *Legal Monuments of the Medieval Serbian States*, Stojan Novaković explained the legal nature of those autonomies, stating that "in medieval Serbia, there were some truly and completely autonomous areas that, being only under the supreme reign of the Serbian kings, ruled with complete self-governance. Those were the towns in Zeta and Primorje, such as Kotor, Budva, Bar, Ulcinj, Skadar and Drivast, which all had their Statutes. The civic rule, as granted by such statutes, went a long way and the statutes, whether of local or foreign origin, were recognized by the Serbian sovereigns through a contract or on an occasion of accepting the supreme reign over such towns. The towns always included their lesser or greater surrounding areas, which were likewise ruled by the town authorities. Moreover, certain tribes and parishes of Primorje, such as Grbalj, Paštrovići, Krajina, etc., also had their autonomous decrees by which their homes were governed. [...] Additionally, there existed the word *pravina*, which subsequently faded from the language and which denoted the local rights that belonged to the villages. As the villages and hamlets had their *pravinas*, such was the case with the tribes, areas,

monasteries and towns” (p. 15).

Novaković notes that such a situation prevented the establishment of an absolutist and autocratic system in continental Serbia as well, which means that it actually refined the legal mind and improved the legal system of the Serbs. We have seen that almost all of these rights of autonomy were preserved even under the rule of the Venetians, who refrained from force and brutality when they attempted to abolish some of them, resorting instead to treachery, fraud and bribery. Bearing in mind that not all the areas of Boka had always been under the Venetian rule, it should be noted that as the new areas fell under its authority they received additional privileges through the legal acts of Venice.

The people considered the autonomy and privileges in the spheres of the judiciary and the election of local lords as the most important. The Venetians also avoided performing any territorial restructuring. As the autonomies were so developed, some local inhabitants and even foreigners on their journey through the areas referred to them as states. In certain Italian sources, the term *state* actually denoted *državina* – the right of possession, which has a different legal meaning. Even the Turkish state allowed the Christian population to form *knežinas*, as the lowest levels of informal local governance, since it simplified the functioning of the state’s territorial apparatus. It was easier to avoid direct interference with the social life of a village, as long as the tax obligations towards the state and the local feudal lords were fulfilled.

At the Congress of Vienna, Austria explicitly undertook to preserve the local rights and privileges in the Venetian territories that were annexed to it, but in practice they were tolerated only in those places where they could not be immediately eradicated. As Austria was a well-structured state legally, it attempted to install its own system of local self rule over its entire territory. The competences of the towns were significantly reduced but the village communes retained an important status and, in the area of Boka, they were legally equated with the others in the territory of the empire. Kostić states that the local self-governance in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians was reduced more than it should have been, even more so in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, to be eventually completely abolished under the communist regime.

The communists “completely ignored, neglected and took no care of” the local self-governance. They controlled everything from the city of Titograd. In the towns and villages, as was the case elsewhere but combined here with an animosity toward the coastal region, they appointed the worst village hooligans as local leaders, the lumpenproletariat and criminals who paid no heed to the laws, morals, ancient customs and established practices. [...] They interfere with religion, nationality, etc. They control everything. Not a single inhabitant of Boka, or at least those born of Orthodox parents, may personally state their ethnicity. The lads from ‘Titograd’ determine it in our stead. One is not allowed to go to church. There is nobody at the gate to prevent the entering, but churchgoers are registered and it pays back horribly. Understandably, it only happens to the Serbs, to whom they deny their Serbiandom. [...] The Montenegrin communists will

celebrate the centenary of the Krivošije uprising, after they have robbed it of every Serbian trait, but they will not admit that the status of the freedoms and ancient local rights is a hundred times worse today than a hundred years ago. Never in known history, never since the Serbs settled in Boka, have they been more deprived of their rights than today!” (p. 44-45).

In a religious sense, the Serbs had enjoyed a certain personal autonomy for centuries. “The first two centuries of Venetian rule were marked by a dreadful proselytism in Boka, where a large number of people converted to Catholicism. However, some areas did not relent and their inhabitants remained loyal to the Orthodox faith” (p. 45). The following data describes how tragicomical it sometimes was: “The Catholic Bishops of Kotor, helped by the Venetian authorities, did not recognize these people and their priest as Orthodox, but they conducted canonical visitations of the Orthodox eparchies, forcing the priests to accept the Catholic creed, etc. But as soon as they would leave the eparchy, both the clergy and the people would completely ignore these Latin visitations and the instruction therefrom. They professed a true and untainted Orthodox faith” (p. 45).

In 1718, the Republic of Venice legally recognized the formal jurisdiction of the Bishops of Cetinje over the Bay of Kotor. This spiritual authority increasingly took on a secular form as the people did not actually differentiate between spiritual and secular rule; such a difference had not existed in Montenegro for a long time. This further weakened the connections with the central Venetian authority while, in practice, it led to the frequent conflicts of competence. Thus, on 15 September 1740, the Provveditor of Kotor complained of the insubordination of the Grbalj inhabitants, whose only authority was the Montenegrin *Vladika*, “as they are of the same Serbian rite [...] they endeavour to break away from the (Venetian) civil and criminal judiciary and would have their *vladika* decide not only on matters of conscience but on the life and property of all believers under his episcopate” (p. 48).

Such a situation was far from easy for both the Venetians and the Austrians, as may be concluded from the texts by an episcopal vicar named Gerasim Zelić, who was himself perplexed by the look and conduct of the Orthodox priests he encountered in the beginning of the 19th century: “Wherever there is a war or tussle, the priest is the first leader; if the communes quarrel or fight, the priest leads the way; should one kill with a rifle, he says it is nothing; his conscience does not guide him, he still serves the holy liturgy as before. There would help no holy apostles, no seven holy councils’ canons, let alone the metropolitans, bishops and their vicars. [...] Even the above mentioned Metropolitans of Montenegro could not steer the insubordinate clergy and their people into churchly benefaction. [...] If one commune fights with another, the priest is there worthy as the chief, as the one to lead the fighters. If any of the laics say a bitter word to another, or curse him, they would call each other to battle, and the priest needs be the first in front of them. [...] A large number of *Illyrian* priests shaved their beard, moustache

and hair [...] No priest would leave his house, or enter the church without his long rifle and bearing two side-arms [...] and a yataghan. So, many a priest is no different from the lay, except when in church and clad in the ecclesiastical vestment” (p. 51).

During the occupation, Austria guaranteed to Russia that it would respect all the rights of the Boka inhabitants, especially that it would not introduce taxes on military duty, that the Bokelji would participate only in the defence of their borders and that they would be able to bear arms freely. It was rather hard for Vienna to accept these conditions and it was faced with even more difficulties on the ground. What the Austrian officials could not grasp however, was the situation they encountered in Krivošije, a mountainous area above the town of Risan. Krivošije had complete freedom of conduct, and almost complete independence. It did not recognize any higher authority, nor did it execute anyone's decisions. The inhabitants of Krivošije only respected that which had been theirs for centuries, the social relations and rules of demeanour in accordance with the Serbian customary law. Even the *Vladikas* of Cetinje had a hard time with Krivošije.

On the eve of WWII, a judge named Đura Subotić described the lifestyle of Krivošije in the following manner: “Earlier, in the time of the First Uprising of Bokelji (1869), there was only one ill-kept, old Turkish road from Risan to Grahovo and only goat and mule trails led through the rest of the Krivošije areas. The soil reclaimed from under the stones and woods was not sufficient to feed the populace throughout the year so the primary occupation of the villagers was cattle breeding, which was dealt mainly by the women and children, as the men were fighting in companies across the then Turkish Herzegovina, attacking the dungeons, sheep-pens and shepherd houses of the Turkish aghas and bays, bringing spoils, heads and weapons. They had no levy or duties imposed, except that they provided prebend to the priest, whom they needed for baptisms, weddings, family patron saint celebrations and other religious rites, as well as to read the written texts and write letters as a literate man, be it for weapons and ammunition requests for fights against the Turks or to send messages and replies to the Kotor authorities. The village chief, or *knez*, decided on lesser disputes together with a group of elected respectable men, while a “court of good men” was established for the more important ones, which usually included the priest whose duty was to write the “sentence” in the sense of the judgment. The nearest formal authority above them was represented in the figure of the “captain” in Risan; during the Venetian rule it was the Proveditor of Kotor, whose authority included Krivošije only on paper; under the Austrian rule it was the *circuo*, i.e. the district administrator” (p. 86-87).

The Austrians attempted to confiscate weapons from such a proud and libertarian population and to impose military duty on them. Thus, in 1869, they provoked the First Uprising of Krivošije, which quickly spread to other parts of Boka. “The uprising was of short duration, narrow in its geographical scope and minor in the number of insurgents. Nevertheless, its reach and historical importance defined it as a great event in Serbian history, as one of the most famous Serbian exploits in

IT-03-67-T

their entire history” (p. 122). The uprising included the areas of Krivošije and Grbalj, as well as Maine, Pobori and Brajići of the Kotor borough. The imposition of military duty was opposed by both Catholic and Orthodox inhabitants, but it was only the Orthodox that participated in the uprising. An additional motive for resorting to arms was the Austrian prohibition of the use of Cyrillic letters in the schools of Boka.

Through statistical calculation, Kostić showed that the number of insurgents could not have exceed a total of two thousand, against which rose a force of 22,000 Austrian soldiers with the most advanced weaponry of the time. The word of the Austrian defeat echoed strongly across the whole of Europe, causing awe and admiration for the Serbs of Boka and reserving a place for Krivošije and Grbalj in the world's encyclopaedias. The Serbian victory was so convincing that the Austrians had to accept all the requests of the insurgents as formulated by Krivošije: “The inhabitants of Krivošije and other inhabitants of Boka shall not serve in the Austrian army; 2) Austria shall rebuild their burned houses; 3) they shall bear arms freely; 4) they shall be guaranteed complete amnesty” (p. 202). It became sensational world news, a powerful empire practically capitulated before a handful of Serbian insurgents. Rudolf Kiesling later wrote that the Peace of Knežlaz “showed a shameful inability of a great power to force a handful of rebels to obey the law” (p. 209).

In 1938, writing on the history of the uprising of the inhabitants of Boka, the Russian scientist Kondratieva indicated the effects this defeat had on the Austrian army: “The Austrian army was completely disheartened. The morale of the soldiers plummeted and the officers reported that they fell ill from the ‘Krivošije fear’. Officers of the Austrian regiments requested to be transferred to other ones” (p. 211). As emphasized by Kostić, the whole Serbian nation “welcomed it as an all-Serbian victory and identified it with the greatest and most significant victories of Serbian history” (p. 214). And Knežlaz suddenly became a famous geographical term. “Until 1870, no Serbs knew of Knežlaz, nor did anyone in Boka know of it. It is neither a town, nor a village, nor a settlement of any kind; it is neither a river, nor a mountain. It is an insignificant locality in Krivošije, a wasteland with an oak under which the peace was concluded. The superior officers of Austria, led by General Rodić, the Governor of Dalmatia, had to climb up to Krivošije and there, under the blue sky, they *de facto* accepted all of the rebels' conditions. Therefore, Knežlaz must be included in all Serbian history books and encyclopaedias. It is the pride of Krivošije, the pride of the inhabitants of Boka, the pride of all the Serbs” (p. 214).

14. A Final Study of Boka and its Inhabitants

Kostić's book entitled *Boka and Bokelji, Primarily as Described by Foreigners*, was published posthumously in Detroit in 1979. In it, the author presented the compiled study material and his personal viewpoints - almost everything that he had left after publishing his previous books on Primorje. He begins the study by explaining that the

350/57440

Comment [K.B.14]: Translator's note. The word has not been found in any of the sources, this is the suggested spelling

name Boka originates from the Italian language and means the mouth; then he turns to a detailed geographic description of the entire area. The name of Boka became accepted in the first decades of Venetian rule, while in the medieval times its only designation had been Serbian Coastal Area; it chiefly included the coastal belt from the town of Drač to the Neretva River, though, in a somewhat earlier period and occasionally in later times, it spread all the way to the river Cetina.

After detailed linguistic analysis, Kostić concludes that the name Boka, though initially inappropriate and of foreign origin, has become favoured among the Serbian people over time. "Ethnically, Boka belongs to the Serbian coastal region and geographically it belongs to the Adriatic coast, the Eastern Adriatic. The fact that it was once forcibly included into Dalmatia and today into Montenegro is not recognized by us in its nomenclatural sense. In particular, we do not recognize it because the use of the above two terms was intended to refute the Serbian character of Boka. But Boka is only Serbian and no one else's. Curiously enough, the specificity of Boka and its Serb character is always contested from the same direction. Once it was southern Dalmatia and now it is the Montenegrin coastal area. The former did not remain and nor will the latter one" (p. 20). Naturally, Kostić does not think that, for this latest usurpation, "all of the Montenegrins are responsible, only the Montenegrin communists. King Nikola used to sing songs of praise to Serbian Boka" (p. 21).

After WWII, the communists of Montenegro and the Titoist regime of Belgrade unscrupulously attempted to squeeze all the reputable inhabitants of Boka, both the living and the dead, into an artificial Montenegrin nation. The case of the famous painter Petar Lubarda remained recorded by his sharp reaction and public refusal to be presented as a Montenegrin artist; he explicitly declared himself as a Serb by nationality. There is no odium, however, towards the Montenegrins on the part of the inhabitants of Boka. Quite the contrary, they are very much alike, but they are not some artificial nation. "Boka is doubtlessly ethnically and geographically closest to Montenegro and it does not want to separate from it, but to return with it, even through it, to Serbdom. Montenegro separated it from Serbdom and therefore Montenegro should bring it back to Serbdom. This is the standpoint of almost all Bokelji" (p. 46).

In his renowned *History of the Serbs*, Constantine Jiricek quoted Marino Sanudo Torsello who was specific on the issue of the size of the Serbian coastal area: "The King of Serbia, who holds the coastal lands of the Adriatic bay, stretching over about 250 miles" (p. 54). As calculated by Kostić, "it would mean that, at the beginning of the 14th century, the Serbian coast was approximately 436 kilometres long. The coast was almost a straight line, as the Serbian Adriatic had very few islands, thus eliminating the possibility of calculating the circumference of the islands into the length of the coast" (p. 55).

At the celebration of the 50th anniversary of King Nikola's reign, the president of the then Montenegrin government, Dr Lazar Tomanović delivered an impressive speech emphasizing, *inter alia*, the following:

"And Your Majesty immediately continued the holy struggle in the two great wars of vengeance and the liberation of the Serbian people. In the latter, You personally led the brave army of Yours to Veles, and over the mountain of Sutorman to the Serbian sea and the River Bojana, on all the battlefields and with radiant élan, into legendary battles and great victories, thereby expanding Montenegro into the parts of Zahumlje and Raška; and further through the flats of Zeta, the cradle of Nemanja and the dear 'land of our grandfathers' of the entire House of Nemanjić; and to the Serbian seacoast, opening for Montenegro the free ways across the Serbian sea, their connection with the rest of the World" (p. 56). This speech was published in the official state magazine, the *Montenegrin Gazette* of 19 August 1910.

Kostić further shows that all the significant statements of the nineteenth century Serbia longed for its return to the sea. In the Balkan Wars, the Serbian army broke through the north Albanian mountains to the Adriatic and Montenegro, liberating the town of Skadar with its help. But, in order to hinder the Serb intentions, the European great powers artificially constituted the state of Albania, a state that never and nowhere had existed before. "When WWI broke out, all the Allies recognized the right of Serbia's access to the sea. Some of them recognized more, some of them less territory at the coast, but Serbia's access to the sea was recognized by everyone. Even the USA President Wilson, in his famous Points (the so called 14 Points) of 8 January 1918, stated verbatim in Point 11: "Serbia should be accorded free and secure access to the sea" (p. 60). This right of Serbia had also been recognized by the Treaty of London of 26 February 1915, wherein Serbia was promised the entire coast up to the town of Split, including the town itself.

Laza Kostić was considerably delighted with the construction of the Belgrade-Bar railway after a hundred years of planning and much hesitance - and in spite of Croatian intrigues and distractions. He was convinced that it will "be beneficial for Serbdom as a whole and that it will materialize the century-old objective of Serbian access to the sea. Ethnically, it is Serbian: both Bar and Boka are equally Serbian, but they are not such in the legal and statehood sense. That is what we want them to be. We have to admit that, of all the projects for the railway, this one was the purest Serbian, for it only passes through the areas of Serbia and Montenegro - through pure Serbian lands. Now, it should be given the formal Serbian attribute, to have it pass only through Serbia, through the Serbian state. This will happen when Serbia and Montenegro become the same country again. Then the whole of Boka will cling closer to Montenegro, as it will again become a part of Serbia through Montenegro. This is what I wish more than anything" (p. 64).

Elsewhere in the book, Kostić quotes a number of itineraries by certain German, French, Italian, Russian and Serbian authors who admired the beauties of Boka Kotorska with exceptional literary talent. He copies a few of the most beautiful songs, especially those by Dučić and Santić, dedicated to this pearl of the Adriatic; additionally, he emphasizes certain characterological elements of the inhabitants of

Boka, based on texts by French, German, and other authors. Kostić ends his book with an essay on the Čelović family from Risan, thus paying tribute to his long-time friend and benefactor, Vidak Čelović from Detroit.

Chapter VI

NATIONAL MINORITIES AND ARTIFICIAL NATIONS IN SERBIAN COUNTRIES

1. A General Approach to the Issue of National Minorities

In several of his studies Laza Kostić elaborated on the issue of national minorities in the Serbian countries and artificial, invented nations, as well as the relations the Serbs had with the Hungarians and the Jews, also making comments on the fabricated communist censuses and attempts to break up the Serbian Orthodox Church by suppressing the national characteristics of Serbian cultural life. The bulk of the brochures on this subject were printed in Canada by the “Saint Sava” Serbian Cultural Club, as part of the publication *Serbian Problems – A Series of National Texts*.

One of Kostić’s demographic and ethnographic studies, *National Minorities in the Serbian Lands*, was published in 1961 in Toronto. As Kostić himself put it, his approach was based on the statistical model, the most reliable and the most convenient model for studying such social phenomena. The restoration of the Serbian state at the beginning of the 19th century was conducted under nearly disastrous demographic circumstances. As a consequence of the numerous wars, Turkish violence and epidemics, the densely populated country of the pre-Turkish period was reduced to a rather sparsely populated territory. The great migrations of the Serbs and the process of the Turkish conversion had almost fatal consequences upon the Serb national substratum.

The horror of this situation is best proved by the Austrian data on the census conducted in Serbian areas from Belgrade to the West Morava River, which were under Austrian control at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The census established that this wide region numbered as few as one hundred thousand people, or 2,456 families. 412 villages were populated, while 342 were deserted. After the Turks had once more taken control over this territory, it was settled by a great number of Serbs from other areas and the number of people living here reached five hundred thousand. The suppression of the First Serbian

Uprising led to new mass migrations. Not until the rule of Miloš did these demographic circumstances stabilize to a certain extent, thus opening the process of a continual population growth as a result of both the birth-rate and the inclusion of the inhabitants of newly liberated territories.

During the time of the Turkish occupation, the Orthodox Serbs predominantly lived in villages, while the towns were mostly settled by the Turks and Turkish converts, but also by a certain number of Greeks, Aromanians, Bulgarians, etc. Following the liberation, the Turks and Turkish converts systematically left Serbia, making way for the mass settling of Serbs from the still occupied Serbian territories. “In Serbia, the majority, the vast majority of its people live outside its territory. Scientists believe that the ancient Serbs accounted for less than ten percent of the Serbian population” (p. 14). Jovan Cvijić wrote on this subject as follows: “No matter where they came from, these settlers did not group according to their original areas, save for some parts of western Serbia. Their blending and assimilation with the old populace was all the more tighter. [...] The power of all the Serbian lands, the Dinaric, Kosovo and Vardar lands, is concentrated in Sumadija” (p. 14). As Kostić added: “Both ethnically and spiritually, Serbia indeed stood for the entire Serbdom” (p. 14).

The existing minorities were quickly absorbed. “Naturally, the Bulgarians were the first that were assimilated. Their language was similar to Serbian and their faith the same. Besides, they were still not aware of their national distinction” (p. 14). This process was in no way forced and nor were there any administrative interventions in that regard. Felix Kanic, a historian, claimed that “no other nationality has so easily blended with the Serbs as the Bulgarians, as a result of the similarity between their languages and faith” (p. 15). The easiest to assimilate after the Bulgarians were the Greeks and Aromanians settled in towns and who, according to Kostić, comprised only one percent of the population, but who on the other hand had significant financial power and influence on public life. “Despite the fact that the Greeks and Aromanians are two distinctive nations, they did not represent two different worlds in our towns, but only one, single world. The Aromanians either spoke Greek or did their best to speak it; they would intermarry and jointly argue for the same political and financial causes. Both peoples were Orthodox and, as the Greek liturgy no longer existed, both voluntarily and spontaneously abandoned all their individual traits and blended with the Serbs. The assimilation was complete and quick, involving no trouble whatsoever” (p. 15).

The process of national adaptation extended to the Jews as well. “However, in their case it was the process of nationalization that took place, not assimilation. They were in many ways different from the Serbs, in their faith, race and tradition, and language as well (as most of them spoke Spanish at home). The process of nationalization was a lengthy one, though spontaneous and thorough. The Jews themselves would say that the Serbs were “of Moses’ faith” and would be offended if anyone claimed otherwise. Their number was as low as that of the

Nevertheless, the liberation of Old Serbia and Macedonia in 1912, gave rise to serious problems as “the number of Serbs was greatly reduced and in some areas they were completely pushed out of their ancient settlements. We came across considerable national (ethnic) minorities, which were hard to assimilate. There is no doubt that success would have been achieved in many ways had Serbia lasted, either the one from 1918 or the enlarged one. However, these areas had been governed by the Serbs for less than three years, only to be reoccupied again by the enemy who favoured the minorities (as they favoured everything to the detriment of the Serbs), who eventually found themselves in Yugoslavia, which brought additional minorities by the million. The Paris Peace Treaties (of Saint-Germain and Trianon) then envisaged international guarantees for the protection of minorities (though not directly the minorities in southern Serbia)” (p. 16).

2. The Vlachs in Serbian Areas

The issue of the Vlachs in Serbian areas was also carefully considered by Laza Kostić. According to the censuses, their number was dropping continuously, which suggests the increasingly stronger identification of their descendants with the Serbs as the only explanation of the striking disproportion in statistical indicators. Kostić further emphasizes that besides national and political reorientation, the statistical disproportion was due to the methodology used “given that the former statistics, applied both in Serbia and Yugoslavia, did not include the question of nationality but of mother tongue. All those who stated that they spoke Vlachian at home, as their mother tongue were considered Vlachs. This is a so-called objective criterion, i.e. identifying the symptoms of a phenomenon rather than the phenomenon itself. On the other hand, communist Yugoslavia has adopted the subjective criterion: everyone has the right to state his nationality as he wishes, regardless of the language he speaks. It appears that the Vlachs have used this criterion to a considerable extent to identify themselves as Serbs. Now that they are recognized as a minority for the first time and given the right to their own schools, etc., they do not wish to identify themselves as the Vlachs but as Serbs” (p. 19). To make it even more paradoxical, this process was conducted under a communist regime with an extremely anti-Serb disposition. “The present regime is reducing the number of Serbs wherever possible, boasting of the rights of minorities, which it was allegedly the first to recognize. All of a sudden, the number of Vlachs in Serbia was been reduced by half in every new census - quite a thought-provoking phenomenon and proof that the Serbs are not national enslavers as depicted. As long as the Serbs ruled, the Vlachs were Vlachs. Once the Serbs lost the rule, the Vlachs became Serbs. Unbelievable, but true!” (p. 19).

Kostić found the first more reliable data on the number of Vlachs in

Serbia in a text pertaining to 1850 by Jovan Gavrilović, published in the *Herald* of the Society of Serbian Letters. Gavrilović established that there were 105,000 Vlachs living in Serbia. In his travel book published in Berlin in 1830, Prussian guard officer Otto von Tuih notes the following: "The Vlachs came to Serbia at the invitation of the Serbian government to settle and cultivate land in the eastern areas" (p. 18). In 1840, the Frenchman Ami Boué writes as follows in his book entitled *The European Turkey*: "There are about 50 Vlachian settlements in Krajina and about 30 almost entirely Vlachian villages in the area around Ključ, where they (the Vlachs) gradually replaced the Slavs, as indicated by the names of the hamlets" (p. 18). The census conducted in 1953, established that there were only 28,022 Vlachs living in Serbia.

Kostić further points to the objective historical reasons behind such a social phenomenon: "Apart from the subjective reasons and the Vlachs' desire to assimilate with the surroundings, it is beyond doubt that the rapid industrialization of the country, which partly embraced the Vlachian areas and drew the Vlachs from their original settlements and mixed them with the Serbs, contributed to such a situation. Should this tendency continue, it will not be long before the Vlachs's existence in Serbia becomes just a historical reminiscence. As strange as it is, we can only take pleasure in this phenomenon. It is not a new population element unknown to us, which can disappoint us. It is a group of inhabitants that have lived with the Serbs and among the Serbs for at least a century or even a century and a half, who have formally shared their good and bad fortune with them, suffered and rejoiced with them. Inseparably joined by territory and fortune, they are now one, ideologically, mentally and nationally" (p. 21). In his book *The Kingdom of Serbia and Serbian People*, Felix Philip Kanic, who was to a certain extent prejudiced against the Vlachs, appears to admit the following: "Protected by equal rights and the confirmed freedom of all the Serbian citizens, the character of the Vlachs in the Serbian lowlands seems to have significantly improved" (p. 21).

Unlike Kanic, whose opinion he quoted, Kostić is full of respect for and in high regard of the Vlachs. His words simply reverberate with positive emotions. "The Vlachs are a worthy element loyal to the state, who best manifested their loyalty in this war. Attempts made in 1941 by several renegades hidden in Turnu Severin to create an irredentism among the Serbian Vlachs for the benefit of Rumania, had no success whatsoever. It failed to take root with the Serbian Vlachs, although the occupying authorities would have undoubtedly favoured it. The movement led by General Mihailović on the other hand received the full support of the Vlachian people. Nowhere in Serbia did these insurgents feel safer than among the Vlachs as they would not betray them at any price. It was moving to see how these people, proud to be part of the rebels, cooperated closely with the movement of General Mihailović (p. 21).

The Vlachs have never been a problem in Serbia. The Serbs have always considered them their closest kinsmen and an inseparable part of their own people. "We can only sincerely embrace the current obvious

IT-03-67-T
attempts of the Serbian Vlachs to completely assimilate themselves with the majority of the population, to be the same in every aspect. We have never attempted to force such assimilation (which is proved by the fact that they have preserved their language and other individualities although isolated from their motherland for more than one hundred years), nor will we attempt to obstruct it. In the Serbs' most difficult moments, they proved that they were spiritually close to us. May they be very welcome. At a time when many parts are falling off the Serbian national building and Serbian national body, we sincerely welcome this attachment of the Vlachs and their approach to Serbdom, which seems to be complete and unstoppable (p. 21-22).

Kostić particularly insists on the fact, based on the comprehensive data of the 1953 census, which shows that 200,000 inhabitants stated that their mother tongue was Vlachian but, at the same time, 170,000 of them maintained that they were Serbians by nationality. As Kostić concluded, "it is yet another confirmation that they are free to use their language and that their national orientation will present no disadvantage. It further proves that this people has not been ruined or lost without trace, as the enemies of the Serbs would like to conclude from the existing statistics. They remain Vlachs by language and Serbs in their feelings (p. 22).

3. The Aromanians (*Cincari*)

As a special phenomenon, the *Kutsovlachs* or the Aromanians, inhabited all parts of Serbia at the time of the Turkish occupation, increasingly growing in number and spreading towards the south in the liberated Serbian state. Though quite different from the Vlachs, the *Kutsovlachs* are in essence of the same descent and speak the same language. In Macedonia, they were also called the Arvanites or Arvanitovlachs. The name *Kutsovlachs* comes from the Greek. They were also mentioned by Constantine Jiricek: "Today's Macedo-Romanians call themselves the *Aramani*, though the Slavs have always referred to them and the Italians as the Vlachs" (p. 22).

As noted by Laza Kostić, the Aromanians "also lived in the old Serbia, but only in towns where they mixed with the Greeks, so that it was sometimes hard to distinguish them. They inhabited Vojvodina as well, where their percentage was perhaps even greater than in Serbia. They even lived in Bosnia (Petrakis, Hadži-Kostić, Jeremić, etc.), although they were all Serbianized. For decades, some of the most notable Serbian statesmen and diplomats have come from among the Aromanians. Dr Dušan J. Popović, a professor of history and sociology at the Belgrade University, wrote about them in his book *O Cincarima (On the Aromanians)* (two editions published between the wars)" (p. 22-23).

Nowadays, the clearly identified Aromanians only live in the southern Serbian lands and that is why Kostić calls them the Southern Vlachs. Although the official Yugoslav statistics included all the Vlachs as a single category, Kostić insists that, in their language, the

Aromanians were “quite different from the Serbian Vlachs, even more so in their national consciousness. One can by no means allude to a common national cohesion or a feeling of ethnic unity. Never in the course of history has any connection between them existed, an ethnic one least of all” (p. 24). According to all the censuses conducted in the twentieth century, the number of citizens in southern Serbia who stated that they spoke Vlachian has never exceeded 10,000.

Kostić provided a systematic and clear summary of their ethnic substrate, origin and name: “The Southern Vlachs are commonly known either as Vlachs with an adjective added or Romanians, again with some determinator. *Kutsovlach* literally means a limping or lame Vlach, though the words that are added to this name are easier to comprehend. The Serbs are the only nation that calls the Aromanians the *Cincari* (though some of the neighbouring peoples adopted that name as well). The name is most probably derived from the word *cinc*, meaning five in Aromanian, which sounds unusual to the Serbian ear. The Italians in Germany and Switzerland are similarly called *Cinquelli* (“little *cinque*”), as they so often hear this word from them (*cinque* – meaning ‘five’ in Italian). The Aromanians represent the ethnic remnants of the Roman colonists and they are scattered across the entire area of the Balkans. However, they were mostly grouped in the part of Turkey that is today’s border area between Serbian Macedonia, Greek Macedonia and the Albanian Epirus (Bitola, Struga, Korçë, Kastoria and Voden). From this area, they mainly moved to the towns and quickly became denationalized (becoming Greeks in Turkey and Greece, and Serbs and Bulgarians in the liberated lands of Serbia and Bulgaria). Essentially, there are no Aromanians in these towns anymore. But in some settlements in Macedonia, they remained grouped as they were initially. Until recently, there were Aromanian nomads in Serbian Macedonia itself. Those were the so-called *Gromočlije* (who had moved from the mountain of Gramos (Gromoč) in southern Albania). They lived in our eastern Macedonia, dealt mostly with cattle breeding and had no connections with their ethnic counterparts in western Macedonia. After each of the two World Wars, the Yugoslav authorities permanently settled them across western Macedonia. All those Aromanians are officially (i.e. statistically) designated as Vlachs” (p. 23).

Through linguistic analysis, Kostić reaches the conclusion that “not only is the Aromanian or ‘South Rumanian’ language significantly different from the Daco-Rumanian language, but South Rumanian diverges into two rather different dialects (as is the case with the ethnically close Rotoromanian of Switzerland). The language is divided into the following dialects: *Arumanian*, spoken by the Aromanians who live in Macedonia, Bulgaria and Albania; and *Megleno-Rumanian*, spoken by the Aromanians who lived in Greece until the end of WWI, when the Rumanian government moved them to Dobruja” (p. 24). The Aromanians are “divided, and live in all the Balkan states, as a ‘vanishing minority’ in each, and with no connections between each other” (p. 24).

Jovan Cvijić refers to the credible travel writers who claimed that, in

the last century, there were about half a million Aromanians, while in Cvijić’s time they were reduced to approximately 150,000. He goes on to say that the Aromanians are “like ethnographic islands situated in the basic population mass of the Slavs and the Greeks, mostly in the south-eastern part of the Peninsula and chiefly in Macedonia, Epirus and Thessaly” (p. 24). Until recently, the largest number of them lived in Albania. In both Bulgaria and Serbia, they advanced to the highest positions of public and social life, earning distinction and prominence.

In 1885, in his study entitled *On This and the Other Side of the Danube*, the Belgian scientist de Laveleye also wrote about the Aromanians, stating that “Outside their country of origin they can be found throughout the Orient. However, nowhere are they strong enough to form an individual group, save for the village of Slovik near Tuzla, the areas in Istria at Montemaggiore and Lake Cespital and in a few other places. What a pity that there are not even a few thousand of them in Bosnia. It is they who, even more than the Jews, contribute to the increase of wealth, for they are not only fine merchants, but workers, too” (p. 24-25). Among the Aromanians, there was the largest number of migrant workers and it was noticed by their contemporaries that they easily mastered the languages of the peoples in whose environment they worked and earned a living. Until recently, some of them led the life of nomads. All attempts of the Rumanian authorities to instil a Rumanian national consciousness in them were to no avail, while it was noted that they were most easily assimilated by the Greeks; their number was largest in Greece anyway.

The Aromanians were forcibly denationalized in Macedonia after WWII, much like the Serbs. Their particular connection with the Greeks was noted by Jovan Cvijić in 1921: “The Aromanian oases in the Balkan Peninsula may have a certain national and political significance only if they remain connected with the Greeks, as they are near them and under their influence. The Rumanian propaganda had no great success, but the Greek influence was somewhat weakened by it. In spite of this propaganda, and in reaction against it, the Aromanians of Macedonia still assimilate with the Greeks. Besides, in recent decades, there have also been cases of Macedonian Aromanians who abandoned their ethnicity by becoming Slavs. However, the latest of this as a regular occurrence was with the Aromanians who stay for many years working among the locals, or permanently settle in Serbia and Bulgaria. They particularly disappear through mixed marriages. Finally, the Aromanians often have no or few children” (p. 25).

Many authors claim that the Aromanians once comprised the most cultured ethnic element of the Balkans, though they never had any specific culture of their own. Cvijić says that in some parts of the Balkans they were the primary vehicle of Byzantine culture, to which they also imparted their own personal touch. Kostić goes on to conclude: “Generally speaking, they are a very positive people, whom we have a lot to thank for. A large number of our writers are of Aromanian blood and origin, all of our satirical authors among them (Sterija and Nušić), let alone the diplomats and politicians. There were some outstanding

heroes among them as well. Suffice it to mention Janko of Ohrid, who 'goes through the World looking for fights and where there is a fight he shall make it right.' He is also called Cincar-Janko. He did not shun a conflict or battle" (p. 26).

Interestingly, among the Serbian people, only certain leftists and, later, the communists were not supportive of the Aromanians. Some of the leftist novelists even showed overt hostility towards them, including Dr Mirko Kosić, whose study *The South Slavic Issue*, printed in Zurich in 1918 in the German language, was discovered by Laza Kostić in his research conducted at the Swiss libraries. In his ideological blindness and enslaved by Marxist viewpoints and the communist prejudice, Kosić wrote that the Balkan bourgeoisie "has a considerable amount of Aromanian blood, that of the usurers and speculators, which infested almost the entire bourgeoisie of the Balkans in its form of town *Kutsovlachs* or Aromanians. This blood drives the already excessive business politicians and pirates that have assailed the Balkan parliamentary concessions. Such a bourgeoisie, thirsty for plunder, exists in the majority of the Balkan states" (p. 26). However, the Balkan peoples have never suffered greater plunder than that by the leftists - not even under the Turks.

4. The Rumanian National Minority

Of the Rumanian minority that inhabited Banat, Lazo Kostić said that its language was as different from the original language of the East Serbian Vlachs as Serbian is different from Slovenian. Their Rumanian national consciousness was also highly developed. In 1921, a total of 74,000 of them lived in Serbian Vojvodina, but this number gradually decreased over the ensuing years and decades. Kostić noted that approximately the same number of Serbs lived in the Rumanian part of Banat, quoting the data provided by the German geopolitician Karl Braunias, published in the *Geopolitics Magazine*, who claimed in 1926 that there were 52,570 Serbs living in Rumania. This partly reduced figure did not include the Rumanian Catholic Serbs, or the so-called *Krashovani*. Kostić makes a digression here: "I have been suggesting for decades that an exchange of the populace should be organized. I proposed it for the first time in the 1923 edition of the magazine *New Life (Our National Policy)*. Banat would then become one of the purest Serb areas in general and the population of Vojvodina would be less foreign by three percent and more Serbian by the same percentage. This issue is of enormous importance, even more so in the light of the danger of denationalization of all the Serbs that live in Rumania [...] It should be remembered that the Serbs in Rumanian Banat were evicted at the time of the dispute between Yugoslavia and the Cominform and relocated far from the border. They lived in most horrible conditions, to which many succumbed. The anti-Serb clique that rules in Belgrade shows little interest in them" (p. 27-28).

Kostić further refers to the opinion of Jovan Cvijić, given in his study *The Northern Border of the South Slavs*. Among other things,

Cvijić says the following: "In order to facilitate the creation of national states that are as pure as possible in the ethnographic sense, it would perhaps be best if an exchange of the population from both sides of the border could be organized, by supporting voluntary relocation and even the exchange of property. This would enable the political grouping of the population in the areas where the population is heavily ethnographically mixed" (p. 28).

We believe that such an idea is rather unrealistic and unnecessary today as far as the Rumanians are concerned. The Banat Rumanians do not wish to move to Rumania since they live much better in Serbia than they would in their motherland. Besides, we Serbs do not have any reason to desire their leaving, considering that the Rumanians are quite loyal citizens with whom our state has never had any problems. Moreover, the Rumanians get along well with their Serb neighbours, and indeed mixed marriages are becoming more common here. As regards the Serbs in Rumania, particularly those in the Timișoara Banat, the Serbian government should encourage and support their relocation to Serbia. Bilateral agreements with the Rumanian government should enable them to adequately sell their property in Rumania and Serbia should ensure conditions for normal life and work. Unfortunately, Serbia is not even able to take care of the western Serbs who fled before the Croatian knife. The greatest problem lies in the bureaucratic indolence and irresponsibility.

Referring to the Munich University professor Georg Stadtmüller and his 1950 study pertaining to the history of South East Europe, Kostić summarizes the origin of all the types of the Vlach population in the Balkans: "Having conquered the Balkan Peninsula, the ancient Romans romanized the majority of the autochthonous Illyrians and Thracians [...] On coming to the Balkans in the 7th century, the Slavs encountered largely romanized Illyrians and Thracians. The Latin language of the Balkan type pertains to the language spoken by the ancient Romans or the romanized population in the Balkan countries. This language provided the basis for the so-called Daco-Rumanian, spoken in the territory of the present Rumania; Istro-Rumanian (spoken in several villages of Istria); Megleno-Rumanian (spoken in the hills of Karanova, north of Thessaloniki); Aromanian (spoken in various districts of Macedonia and Albania) and, finally, the so-called Dalmatian, a dead language that was spoken by the Roman population in our coastal areas, including Dubrovnik, and which would have in some way represented a link between modern Rumanian and Italian had it not been for the Serbian language that suppressed it" (p. 28-29).

Of interest to us at this point is the Dalmatian language, in view of the fact that it had been present in almost all Serbian coastal towns and developed long before the arrival of the Serbs and Croats. "Before they conquered the coast and islands, the Roman population who lived there had already developed a distinct language, the so-called Dalmatian, one of the eleven Romance languages. This language was spoken in the area from Rijeka to Kotor and Bar and, judging by the toponymy, it spread as far as the present-day border between Yugoslavia and Albania - and

naturally to the islands. The Slavic language was brought into this area later on. The same goes for the Venetian dialect, which has no direct connection with Dalmatian. When did the Dalmatian language develop and when did its extinction start? The first references to this language are made by the Crusaders in the 12th century. Nevertheless, the extinction of this language began rather early under the influence of the Slavs and the Italian settlers. It appears that it gradually reduced to isolated oases. There is no doubt that the Venetians in Zadar squeezed it out rather early; in Dubrovnik, it survived until the 15th century, while it remained alive the longest on the island of Krk, as the last man who spoke it as his mother tongue, Antonije Udina, known as Burbur, died in 1898. His death marked the extinction of the Dalmatian language and signs of its existence remain only in our coastal toponymy and words adopted into our dialects” (p. 29).

5. The Serbian Assimilation of the Autochthonous Romance Population in the Balkans

The hinterlands of Dalmatia were settled by the *Morlaci*, who were quite different from the Dalmats. Constantine Jiricek and Vladimir Corović offer similar definitions for this people. Jiricek notes the following: “The Byzantines called the mountain shepherds the black Vlachs or *Maurovlachs* because of their clothes; in the twelfth century, Dukljanin refers to them as the *Morovlachs* or Nigri Latini, while the Dubrovnik archives use the terms Moro-Vlachs, *Morolaki* and, as of 1420, the shortened term *Morlaci*.” Corović wrote the following in *The History of Bosnia*: “Unlike the coastal, ‘town’ Vlachs, the mountain Vlachs from the hinterlands were called (in Dalmatia) *Crnogunjci*, Black Vlachs, *Maurovlachs*, *Morlasi* and *Morlaci* for their clothes and their dark complexion” (p. 30).

It is evident that the Vlachs once inhabited all the present-day Serbian territories. The Serbs neither killed them, nor enslaved them, nor expelled them. Their communities lived separately at first, but subsequently began blending increasingly with the rest of the population. The Serbs, being greater by far in number and more vital, assimilated the Vlachs but also adopted their ethnic characteristics. Therefore, one should not be surprised by the fact that all of us Serbs have been referred to as the Vlachs throughout the course of history. We are indeed Vlachs. The Vlach blood runs through our veins too, the blood of the ancient inhabitants of the Balkans. Nonetheless, we are primarily Serbs as the Serbian ethnic mass was predominant in the process of blending.

Safarik wrote on the name of the Vlachs in his *Slavonic Antiquities*, published in Leipzig, in 1843: “Among the Slavs, the name ‘Vlach’ is much older than the Vlach people itself, who developed only in the 5th or 6th century as a mixture of the Goths, Romans and Slavs; it (the name) is considerably more general and widespread, as it was always used to denote the Italians and the people who lived there, including the Celtic and Gallic population” (p. 31). Jiricek additionally notes the following:

502

“The medieval Serbs always referred to the descendants of the Romans living along the Danube as the Vlachs, who were for the most part shepherds [...] Quite different from all the Roman mountain shepherds were the Roman town people living on the Adriatic coast, mostly craftsmen, merchants, fishermen and seamen, known as the Romans or Latins - or *Vlasi* in Serbian” (p. 32).

In his letter to Jernej Kopitar, Dobrovski points out that: “The Goths, Thracians, Gauls, Italians, all of them are pure Vlachs, *Vlahen*; namely, the *genus* of the Vlachs is incorporated in many peoples whose languages are related to Latin as grandchildren are to their grandfather” (p. 33). Afterwards, the Serbs referred to all the cattle breeders of the mountains as Vlachs. In the time of the Turkish occupation, this name became a general term used for all the Orthodox Christians. Jiricek adds that the Vlachs withdrew from the Turks to the north and north-west and, since all of them were Orthodox, the Croats got into the habit of referring to all the Orthodox and particularly the Serbs as the Vlachs.

The Austrian ethnographer Chernick noted that at the time of the settling of the *Uskoci* (the Croat ambush soldiers in the Austro-Hungarian army) in Croatia and Slavonia, the name Vlachs was used “only for people of the Serbian tribe: Bosnians, Serbians, *Rašani*, etc., but always the ones of the Greek faith” (p. 37). As Kostić claims, based on the above, the Croats “have both officially (e.g. in the ‘High Treason Process’ of 1908) and privately always drawn and sometimes still draw the conclusion that all the Orthodox people who emigrated to Croatia were Vlachs. This is a general version that has been adopted by the entire Croat people and is still taught in Croatian schools (see, e.g. *History Study Book for the Third Year of Gymnasium*, by Olga Salcer, Zagreb, 1953); this is what Maček claimed in his *Autobiography*; this is what friar Dominik Mandić wrote on in his book published in Buenos Aires in 1956 (*The Origin of the Vlachs*), etc.” (p. 37).

6. The Islamization and Albanianization of the Serbs

The process of the liberation of the Serbian territories and the expansion of the Serbian state led to the withdrawal of the Turkish and Muslim populations. However, this created new problems in the unliberated Serbian lands, particularly in Bosnia, Old Serbia and Macedonia. “A large part of the ‘Turks’, among which were many Islamized Serbs, moved to Bosnia and thus increased the number of Muslims there. These Muslims were particularly hostile towards the Serbs and, even without them, Serbia magnetically attracted the deprived Serb serfs of Bosnia to its bosom. Thus, the ethnic cleansing of Serbia brought with it our serious ethnical disadvantages to Bosnia-Herzegovina. The lands that had a safe and absolute majority of Serb Orthodox population became lands with a relative majority; the indisputable Serbian lands hence became disputable ones” (p. 49). Montenegro was faced with a similar problem. After the Balkan wars, much of the Turkish and Muslim population still remained in the Serbian lands, particularly after WWI.

503

Until approximately the end of the 19th century, all Muslims in the territory of the Turkish state were considered Turks. They were treated as such by others and they saw themselves solely as Turks. The process of awakening the Serb national consciousness among the Bosnian Muslims began as late as the first years of the twentieth century. With regard to the official census data, Kostić points to a paradox that seems unbelievable at first sight. According to the census of 1921, there were 150,000 Turks in Yugoslavia, while according to that of 1953, the number was 239,000, even though a considerable number of the Turks emigrated in the period between the two censuses. Kostić shows that this was due to the fact that many Muslims and Albanians declared themselves as Turks in order to secure the right to emigrate to Turkey. However, the treatment of such cases was unequal and motivated by the markedly anti-Serb politics of the central authorities. "Though every government must respect the will of the pleaders, and accept as Turks even those who are not Turks, no government is obliged to issue a passport to every such individual. And here we have two quite different practices. In Macedonia, they issue passports to everybody with no exceptions and recommend that everyone who is able to do so should emigrate. In that way, they achieve ethnic purity in Macedonia. On the other hand, in Kosovo and Metohija the government will not issue passports to those who declare themselves Turks. This is because the power is in the hands of *Shqiptars*, i.e. Albanians, who will not allow the weakening of the position of the non-Serbs" (p. 56).

It should be noted here that the category of Turks also included the emigrants who were settled here by the Turkish authorities over the centuries. They were originally of different ethnicities, but always Muslims, so that the assimilation with the Turks was not difficult for them. Some ethnicities preserved their separate identity, such as the *Ćerkez*i (Adyge people). The *Arbanasi*, or Albanians, were settled in the territory of Old Serbia in large numbers after the Great Migrations of 1690. There had been no Albanians in this area prior to this period and then they came like a torrent. "The ethnically clean and ancient Serb territory was thus becoming increasingly Albanian as well. There were many Serbs who remained there, but their strength and numbers were continuously shrinking, they were persecuted, mistreated and their national expression was not to be visible. As a result, they soon started leaving this territory. Until the time of Serbia's resurrection, migrations had been individual and hardly noticeable. Then they became massive. Old Serbia was being denationalized; the Serb area was reducing, the Albanian one expanding. The Turks wanted to make a natural Albanian barrier against the further advance of the Serbs to the south and a natural rampart against Serbian influence. That is why they settled more and more Albanians at the borders with Serbia" (p. 63).

Kostić also refers to the cases of the Albanization of Serbs, which occurred intensively for centuries, so that in modern times there have been a lot of Albanians who spoke Serbian; in the racial sense, this can be seen in the number of blond-haired children born to Albanian parents. "Linguistically, they fall under the category of the Serbian language; in

IT-03-67-T
terms of their ethnicity, they are in the category of *Shqiptars* (Albanians), which is what they feel themselves to be (being of the Muslim faith and living among the Albanian Muslims)" (p. 64).

446

Laza Kostić further adduces interesting data hitherto unknown to our broader public. In the time of the Great Migration "along with the Serbs, some Catholic Albanians fled and settled in our area of Srem, where they were subsequently denationalized (Croatized). In 1737, approximately 500 Catholic families of the Albanian Klimenta tribe settled in the Srem villages of Hrtkovci, Nikinci and Jarak. The Klimenta tribesmen, just like the other Christians, had joined the Austrian army when, advancing against the Turks, it reached the town of Novi Pazar and, as the campaign failed they withdrew together with the Austrian army. Over time, they assimilated with the Croats so that, in 1910, only 37 individuals out of 2,565 inhabitants of Hrtkovci village spoke Albanian, while in the village of Nikinci this number was approximately 18 out of the total of 1,776 inhabitants" (p. 67-68).

Ami Boué and Jovan Cvijić both called attention to the phenomenon of the Albanization of the Serbs. Boué wrote in 1840 that "Generally, such Albanians are nothing but a bastard race, extensively mixed with Serb blood, as is the case with the Greek Arvanites in Epirus. They inhabited the places that were left by the Serbs during the emigrations of 1690 and 1737. Their *fis*, or tribes [...] are numerous [...] and all originate in the mixed Albanian and Serbian alliances" (p. 68). Cvijić explains the process of Albanization of the Serbs in detail by way of the mimicry of the Orthodox Serbs: "The first sign of mimicry in these regions was the adoption of Albanian attire. Then ensued the adoption of their manner, behaviour and the language itself, to the extent that, on the road and at the market, the Serbs could not be differentiated from the Albanians [...] This external mimicry was used by the population as a shield from torture and violence. However, it led to the direct adoption of Islam and Albanization. There are some families that are only half-Islamized (in the surroundings of the town of Peć and in Gora near Prizren), in which only the males converted to Islam while the females remained Orthodox. [...] Understandably, the need for mimicry disappears as soon as a Serb has become Muslim; what is more, [...] he becomes the most evil persecutor of his brothers" (p. 68).

Kostić elaborates on this problem in the following way: "There is a host of Albanized Serbs; when this part of the territory was liberated by the Serbian army, there were many of them who had not been assimilated completely but, according to my knowledge, none of them returned to their forefathers' religion and their old nation. The assimilation had been as thorough as it have been. We cannot count on using this ethnic base anymore. I find it impossible that today's Albanians, or rather a part of them, would return to Serbdom. It could only be done if they moved from the Albanian world, which they do not wish and it would not be right on our part to force them to do so. However, they have completely integrated over there and each subsequent attempt to make them different would not only lead to their

isolation but probably to their physical ruin” (p. 68).

The Albanian attacks should be systematically fended off and Kostić particularly insists on the settling of the Montenegrins and the inhabitants of Lika as a realizable method. “The Montenegrins are the only ones who are capable of responding to the Albanian terror with equal measure, and only they would be respected by the Albanians” (p. 69).

7. Serbian Vojvodina

Serbian Vojvodina and its Minorities, a demographic and ethnographic study published in 1962, in Toronto, represents a direct sequel to Kostić’s earlier monograph. Kostić is not driven by the ambition to write a history of Vojvodina, but by a desire to present to the public data that cannot be found anywhere else or is prohibited by the regime in the homeland, giving himself the explicit and concrete tasks to “Offer data that is entirely unknown, insufficiently known or unavailable to Serbian readers; if possible, to present things generally new to our national science, particularly things that others cannot or are not allowed to write. This especially applies to publishing and interpreting statistical data that is not easily available to the people, since they do not know where to find it and have even more difficulties in explicating them” (p. 6).

Serbian Vojvodina was created on 1 May 1848, at the Assembly of Serbian People. The decision reached there had the force of a constitutive act, which was confirmed on 18 November 1849, by the King’s Decree. The Assembly appointed Metropolitan Rajačić as patriarch and Stevan Šupljikac as the Serbian duke. Upon issuing the King’s Decree, the Austrian emperor added another title to his crown – The Grand Duke of the Dukedom of Serbia. The official name was Vojvodina Serbia and Tamiš Banat, and its territory was delineated in such a way that no part of it bordered the Principality of Serbia as they were separated by the military frontier. At the time of its creation, Serbian Vojvodina had about one and a half million inhabitants. Croatia and Slavonia at that time had 865,000 inhabitants, while Dalmatia with Boka and Dubrovnik numbered 405,000 people. The entire area of the military frontier comprised about one million inhabitants. Serbian Vojvodina did not last long though. By the Emperor’s Decree of 27 December 1860, it was again annexed to Hungary but it still had enormous influence on the rise of a national consciousness among the Serbian people.

A new opportunity for the Serbian people, this time an opportunity for complete separation, arose only at the end of WWI. The Great Assembly of Serbs, Bunjevci and other Slavs in Banat, Bačka and Baranja made a decision on 25 November 1918 to join the Kingdom of Serbia. The Serbs of the former Serbian Vojvodina wanted full integration into Serbia, without being treated as a different or special entity. Two weeks before that, Srem independently made a similar decision as it had a different legal status in Austria-Hungary. This

decision was reached at the Conference of the representatives of different councils of Srem, on 11 November 1918, in Ruma.

The insistence on the direct annexation to Serbia was also followed by the urging of all these provinces that Serbia should represent them at the Paris Peace Conference. The communists were the ones who, after WWI, reinitiated the process of separating Vojvodina from Serbia, dividing the country into republics and provinces. Furthermore, the territory of Vojvodina was even reduced as they took Baranja and West Srem and adjoined them to Croatia, although these areas had never before been part of Croatia and the Croats were not in the majority there. “They did not even give it the name Serbian Vojvodina, as it was officially established by Vienna. It was just Vojvodina, which would be the same as if Croatia was called simply Banovina (banate or province!)” (p. 31).

The Serbs had lived in Vojvodina since their arrival in the Balkans - predominantly in Srem. It was recorded that Saint Sava, having decided to relinquish his position as Archbishop, proposed Arsenije from Srem as his successor. As stated by Jiricek, even the Serbian despots had vast lands in Southern Hungary. The Serbian ethnic mass was supplemented in several historical stages. Although the process of Uniatism was rather aggressive in the territories under Hungarian control, the Serbs had a chance to preserve themselves in the areas where they were compact, mainly in Srem.

The Austrian statesman, Baron von Bartenstein wrote in his Memorandum to Joseph II that the Serbs had been settling as an organized people: “It was not about receiving evicted fugitives, or giving them some deserted land; rather, it was an attempt to encourage the firmly settled and affluent people who were not hindered in practicing their religious rites, to move from Turkish dominion into the sovereignty of ours, which entailed risk to their life, property and goods. Since the very beginning, these Serbs have been referred to as a nation with its own spiritual and lay hierarchies who, *per modum pacti* (i.e. by way of a contract), headed towards this area” (p. 40). On the other hand, Austria endeavoured to settle as many inhabitants of other nationalities in order to avoid having the Serbs in the majority. “Never in known history has the area of today’s Vojvodina been without Serbs - or rather without a considerable number of Serbs that gave Vojvodina its national character. Everything of value and merit in Vojvodina was Serbian” (p. 41).

In 1930, the German Slavist Gerhard Gesemann, who extensively studied Serbian literature, wrote the following on the Serbs’ settling in Slavonia and Vojvodina: “Great swarms from Macedonia and Old Serbia moved mostly to the southern border areas of Austria and Hungary, where they worked as farmers and merchants and fought as the famous frontier army, and Serbianized Slavonia and Vojvodina. [...] The colonists in Hungary were mixed with their compatriots from Macedonia. This conglomerate - which by no means lacked in the Dinaric component, this mixture of the old Serbian national romanticism, Byzantine avarice and the Macedonian diligence, a

mixture of resilience, practical cunning and the opportunistic, instinctive faculty of adaptation - would soon draw the Serbian nation from their spiritual Middle Ages, Balkanism and patriarchy and transform it into a Central-European culture" (p. 44).

As written by Jovan Skerlić, while Serbia was pillaged and Montenegro bitterly struggled for survival, the little "that was left of the spiritual life of the Serbian people was treasured until the end of the eighteenth century among those few hundred thousand refugees who had settled in the desolate plains of the southern Hungary. Those Serbs began a new cultural life and it was there that the complete Serbian thought and written word would dwell for some hundred and fifty years" (p. 45). As Kostić added, "Vojvodina and Novi Sad were considered the main and intransigent representatives and defenders of Serbdom as early as at the end of the nineteenth century. Though there were two free Serbian states, the spiritual life of the Serbs emanated from Vojvodina. [...] However, the most striking thing is the fact that the Serbs of Hungary created a uniform Serbian language. It is beyond doubt that they had brought different dialects, which melded over time into a standard idiom" (p. 45).

8. The *Bunjevci* and *Šokci*

The *Bunjevci* and the *Šokci* are two distinct ethnic groups. Though they are rather similar to each other, they carefully cherish their respective individualities. The *Bunjevci* live in Bačka, whereas the *Šokci* are settled across a somewhat broader area of Vojvodina, Slavonija and Baranja. Their territorial layout is specified by Kostić in the following manner: "The *Bunjevci* live only in the north part of the Bačka area, specifically in Subotica (which is their metropolis) and to the south and north of the town. The ones that settled further in the north inhabit the so-called Baya Triangle, which is the part of Bačka that remained under Hungarian rule. On the other hand, the *Šokci* live mainly in Baranja and in the south part of Bačka (along the Danube). They also live in the Hungarian part of Baranja, perhaps in greater numbers than in our part of Baranja (while there are fewer *Bunjevci* in the Baja triangle than in our country). The *Šokci* were much more numerous in earlier times. The entire Catholic Slavonia used to be called *Šokadija* (the land of the *Šokci*). Some Catholic Slavonians refer to themselves as the *Šokci* even today" (p. 60-61).

According to the first Hungarian statistical review of 1840, out of the total of 1,605,730 inhabitants in Croatia and Slavonia, 777,880 were Croats, 297,747 were *Šokci* and 504,179 were Serbs or, as they were still called, the *Raci*. The table provided in the statistical review shows that there were no Croats in the parishes of Požega and Virovitica; they were inhabited exclusively by the Serbs and the *Šokci*, as was the case with the Srem part of the military frontier. It has been recorded that the *Šokci* also lived in some parts of Bosnia and that the *Bunjevci* inhabited certain areas of northern Dalmatia, which points to the fact that these terms were initially used to designate the Catholicized Serbs, especially

if it is considered together with the fact that even today it is common to say of the Serbs that converted into the Catholic faith that they turned into *Šokci*. The Roman Catholic clergy has never expressed any substantial level of confidence towards the *Šokci*. They were largely despised and it has been recorded that a Hungarian Catholic canon named Sandor Ronay wrote the following about the *Šokci* in a Budapest magazine: "The *Sokac* represents a perfect contrast to the *Bunjevac*. [sic] He is a European Indian who lives in several villages by the Danube and is of the same faith and language as the *Bunjevac*, save for some differences in the dialect. The *Šokci* are god-fearing people, but they have no morals" (p. 60).

There are some written documents on the *Bunjevci* and *Šokci* dating back to the end of the seventeenth century and, as noted by Kostić, who extensively relied on the research conducted by Aleksa Ivić, there were five thousand *Bunjevci* in Bačka in 1687. "The Austrian authorities referred to them solely as the 'Catholic *Raci*', both in the German language and in Latin" (p. 62). In 1953, the German publicist Paul Flesch, originating from Bačka, published a book in Germany, under the title of *The Golden Bačka*, wherein he emphasised that "a total of 88 Latin, German and Austro-Hungarian monographs and historical documents show that the *Bunjevci* settled in Bačka in 1687 as the Catholic Serbs" (p. 62). This fact is further corroborated by the most prominent Serbian historians who dealt with the history of Vojvodina - primarily by Aleksa Ivić, Jovan Radonić and Dušan Popović.

In his book entitled *The Great Migrations of the Serbs*, Popović notes that the Catholic Archbishop Imre Csáki, in his letter to Emperor Charles III in 1718, claimed that "there are Serbs of both the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox faith, though the former are fewer in numbers and very poor" (p. 62). The *Bunjevci* lived in a rather compact community and had a good internal organization. "The leaders of these Rascian Serbs requested to be settled in Subotica, Baja and Szeged, all being important places with fertile soil. It appears that almost all of them settled in Bačka, as they were afterwards found in Subotica, Sombor, Senta and Baja and in the vicinity of Bačka, in the town of Kalocsa. There are no *Bunjevci* in Szeged and they have remained in the areas they settled initially until today" (p. 62).

It is an uncontested fact that "all ethnographers, both Hungarian and German, consider the *Bunjevci* and *Šokci* to be the Catholic Serbs. This is particularly true for the Vienna ethnographers Schering and Ficker and the Hungarians Hunfalvy, Kalety and Schiker. For example, Hunfalvy, the most widely recognized Hungarian ethnographer, states that around 1870, in the entire territory of Hungary (i.e. including Croatia and Slavonia), there were 2,405,700 'Serbo-Croats', of which '942,923 are the authentic Serbian people of the Eastern Greek faith and about 70,000 are the Catholic Serbs (the *Šokci* and *Bunjevci*)', which amounts to a total of 1,012,923', as explicitly stated by Hunfalvy" (p. 63-63). In 1847, the German travel writer Grünhold wrote for the *Abroad* magazine that, "the royal free town is predominantly inhabited by Catholic and Orthodox *Raci* and has 25,000 citizens" (p. 63). The

same author says the following about Baja: “a vast and poorly constructed area of the town called ‘the Sands’ is inhabited almost exclusively by the Bunjevci, which are commonly referred to as Raci or Rajici” (p. 63).

At the end of the last century, the German geographic magazine *The Globe* published data on several occasions showing that the Bunjevci and Sokci are Serbs of the Catholic faith. In 1875, a text entitled *The Sokci and Bunjevci in Hungary* was published in the magazine, saying *inter alia* that, “the Bunjevci and Sokci fall into the category of the South Slavic tribes living in Hungary. They have hitherto been referred to as Hungarians in all the censuses, in spite of the fact that they speak a Slavic language – or, more precisely, the Serbian language; very few of them speak a language other than Serbian. Both of these tribes are rather uncultured and extremely bigoted. The Bunjevci only differ from the Sokci in their attire, though they (the Bunjevci) are generally more energetic than the Sokci and more handsome. Their outward appearance is unmistakably Serbian” (p. 63).

The French publicist Henry Gedau wrote in 1876 that “the Slavs of Dalmatia and Istria are often classified as Croats. The difference between the Serbs and the Croats is historical, not ethnic. The Orthodox people that use Cyrillic letters are usually called Serbs while the Catholic people that use the Latin letters are referred to as Croats. However, certain scientists such as Picot consider the Slavs of Catholic and Latin Dalmatia and Istria to be the Serbs, as their dialect unites them with the actual Serbs, much like the Sokci and Bunjevci of Hungary (approximately 60,000), although they are Latin Catholics who use Latin letters in their language” (p. 64).

In his book entitled *The Ethnography of the Balkans*, published in Darmstadt in 1889, one of the most authoritative German ethnographers of the 19th century, Lorenz Diefenbach, even more explicitly and unequivocally states that “there are about 200,000 Bunjevci and 50,000 Sokci in Hungary and both of these tribes speak Serbian. The former group is characterized by a cleaner and more handsome Serbian type, spiritual agility and attire and it is likely that they came from Dalmatia at the beginning of the eighteenth century; the most significant town where they live is Subotica” (p. 64). In his book entitled *The Slavic Race*, published in 1911 in French, the Czech ethnographer Lubor Niederle wrote that “religion is one of the primary distinctive features by which the Croats differ from the Serbs; the Croats are Catholics and the Serbs are Orthodox Christians and Muslims. However, this feature cannot be taken as categorical. [...] There are a number of Catholics who consider themselves Serbs and are seen as such by the Serbs. For example, the Catholics of Dubrovnik and Boka Kotorska, and the Sokci, Bunjevci and Krašovani of Hungary” (p. 64-65).

In his book published in 1914 under the title *The Balkans*, Albrecht Wirth claims that “In Hungary, the Catholic Serbs are called the Bunjevci and Sokci” (p. 65). In a lecture held at the Royal Geographic Society in London in 1916, the English politician and geographer Arthur Evans stated that “there are approximately 70,000 Catholic Serbs

IT-03-67-T
(Bunjevci) in Subotica and its surroundings; they came there from Herzegovina” (p. 65). In 1954, in his book entitled *Ethnography*, the German ethnographer Hugo Bernatzik published a large photograph with the following caption: “The Sokci men and women in their festive attire. The Sokci are Catholic Serbs who live in the areas of Bačka and Banat” (p. 65). Nowhere has any foreign scholar ever written that the Bunjevci or Sokci are Croats. Simply put, such a claim would be entirely frivolous.

One must admit that, over time, the Serbian national consciousness has gradually faded among the Bunjevci and Sokci. Nonetheless, this does not mean that the phenomenon has somehow influenced the genesis of a Croatian national consciousness, rather that it has led to the expression of their individual characteristics. In relation to the Bunjevci and Sokci, the Croats were a completely foreign ethnic element. “Both the Bunjevci and the Sokci are fanatical Catholics, completely loyal to their faith and clergy that are, on the other hand, extremely Ultramontane. It was religion that largely separated the (Orthodox) Serbs from the Bunjevci and Sokci. It hampered mixed marriages between them. However, an event that took place at the end of the last century (1899) must be mentioned here. In that year, the village of Santovo, located in the Baja Triangle and numbering several hundred inhabitants, converted to the Orthodox faith. Truth to be told, the reason for their conversion lay more in their anger and bitterness towards the Catholic clergy than their inclination towards Orthodoxy. But the case was rather symptomatic, bearing in mind that there were many Protestants in Hungary (almost the entire gentry were of Calvin’s faith), and the inhabitants of Santovo had not chosen to convert to the privileged Evangelical Church, but decided to accept the unfavoured Orthodox creed - specifically the Serbian Orthodox faith (though the Rumanian Orthodox Church also existed). This proves that their dislike of Orthodoxy was not that deeply rooted” (p. 66).

The Bunjevci have lived with and among the Orthodox Serbs, and cooperated with them in all the aspects of life. They acted jointly at the local political level of Subotica, at the district level of Bačka, as well as at the state level in Pest. Vasa Stajić wrote extensively on this issue, dealing *inter alia* with the problem of the Magyarisation of the Bunjevci. In the 19th century, the Bunjevci themselves referred to their language as Rascian, which is confirmed by their principal leader, Catholic Bishop Ivan Antunović, in his *Treatise on the Nation, Religion, Spirit, Civil Life and Economy of the Bunjevci and Sokci of the Danube and Tisa Areas*, published in Vienna in 1882: “At the time I was in the Parish of Almas, where the word of God was spoken in three languages, the language was inscribed on plaques above the pulpit. The Bunjevci plaque read ‘the Rascian language’, which did not please the prince of that time, Andrija Jagić, who was otherwise a rather honest and rich man, so he asked me to change the inscription to read ‘the Bunjevci language’. I did not wish to do that, as I myself knew that the Bunjevci would say to each other: ‘We speak Rascian’” (p. 66).

In the same book, Bishop Ivan Antunović addresses the Serbian

people in the most beautiful words: “May you be heartily greeted, our Serbian brothers. The words I hear and read shall never shake my deepest beliefs that we were born of the same father and the same mother - blood of the blood, bone of the bone. It is testified by our bodies, their shape and their humours, our faces and our nature, our customs and traditions in both joy and grief, by the way we eat and drink and the way we lead public and private lives; it is reflected in the way we run our households, in the way we think and feel in times of war and peace and in the same names and surnames that we bear” (p. 67).

In 1918, when Serbian Vojvodina publically proclaimed its will and decision to join with the Kingdom of Serbia, “the Bunjevci played a significant role in it. The Great People’s Assembly that made the decision was officially called ‘The Great Assembly of the Serbs, Bunjevci and other Slavs in Banat, Bačka and Baranja’. The Assembly had several presidents, the first being Dr Babijan Malagurski, a Bunjevac from Subotica. Out of a total of 757 members of the Assembly, 578 were Serbs, 84 Bunjevci, 3 Šokci (they did not have their intelligentsia), 62 Slovaks, 21 Russniaks, 6 Germans and 1 Hungarian” (p. 67). It was recorded that one of the most zealous propagators of unification was the Catholic parson Blaško Rajić, who delivered a magnificent speech at the Great People’s Assembly, stating inter alia the following: “I shall not proceed by stating what Serbia has done, as the whole world speaks about that today; instead, on behalf of my oppressed people, my people that have suffered and, until today, been condemned to annihilation (applause and exclamations, ‘Long live our brother Bunjevci!’), on behalf of all of us I shall publically, before this Great Assembly, thank Serbia and its irreplaceable army for delivering us from the tyrannical yoke and death” (p. 67).

Based on this and other data, Lazo Kostić draws the following conclusion: “Though the Bunjevci and Šokci could not completely identify themselves with the Serbs, there was no mention of their Croatiandom before the establishment of Yugoslavia. There were no Croats among the Bunjevci, not a single one, not until the time of unification with Yugoslavia. Right before WWI, a handful of their educated men emerged and started to propagate Croatiandom. Notably, the issue was never brought up as a separate one, but always in relation with Serbdom” (p. 67).

At the first parliamentary election of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, a Bunjevci-Šokci political party won several seats in the National Assembly and formed their parliamentary caucus. There were also Bunjevci in some Serbian political parties, but not in the Croatian ones. Mara Malagurska, the most prominent Bunjevac writer and famous for her novel *Vita Danina*, publically declared herself a Serb, as did the renowned painter Ana Bešlić. As Kostić concluded, “had it remained Serbia instead of Yugoslavia, the hitherto indeterminate or undeclared Bunjevci and Šokci would without doubt have become Serbs and the Serbs of Boka and Dubrovnik would have remained Serbs and would have been joined by many Dalmatians. The Vatican Concordat with Serbia, entered into in 1914, legitimised the assimilation with the

IT-03-67-T
consent of the highest Vatican clergy” (p. 68).

The process of the Magyarisation of Bunjevci began before WWI, while the process of intensive Croatisation was under way after the war, and even more so after WWII. As Bishop Antunović complained during his tenure, the process of denationalisation chiefly involved the educated men, while the national consciousness and specificity of the Bunjevci was safeguarded by the farmers. The process of Magyarisation is almost completely finished. In his expert statistical analysis, Kostić presents data that shows that there were a total of 100,000 Bunjevci in Bačka and Baranja after WWII. The officially endorsed Croatisation decreased this number by half and many of the Bunjevci resorted to the category of undenominational Yugoslavs in order to avoid declaring themselves as Croats.

9. Other Slavic Ethnicities

Vojvodina is home to all the Slavic peoples, except the Belarus and the Lusatian Serbs. The number of Croats used to be the lowest of all the Slavs in this province. As Kostić explains, they “were almost nonexistent in today’s Vojvodina. There were virtually no Croats in Banat and Bačka. In Baranja, which unfortunately is not a part of Serbian Vojvodina, there were some Croats, but mainly in this area which remained Hungarian, while the area of Baranja that joined Serbia was inhabited by the Šokci, not the Croats. There were some Croats in Srem, mostly Croatised foreigners, whereas in part of Srem that the dictators of today’s Yugoslavia gave to the Serbs, their number is several times smaller than the Serbs” (p. 73-74). If we exclude the Croats that were colonised there after the World Wars, all the other citizens that declare themselves Croats certainly originate from the Bunjevci, Šokci, Germans, Slovaks, Hungarians, Czechs or Albanians. The basis on which Croatisation was accepted has always been the Catholic faith.

The local Russians are mostly descendants of refugees from the time of the October Revolution and they have most easily adapted to the Serbian national corpus. After WWII, there were approximately 3,500 Bulgarians in Vojvodina and they also quickly integrated with the Serbs. There were some Poles in Bosnia. As for the Czechs, there are about three and a half thousand of them and they emigrated in the latter half of the 18th century. They, too, rapidly mix with other nations, as they are spread across the entire territory and chiefly live in the cities. Their traces will soon only be visible in their characteristic surnames and family memorabilia. Further, there are a large number of Ukrainians and Russniaks living in several close communities with their own schools and teachers. Accordingly, they have a chance to preserve their respective ethnic characteristics.

The largest Slavic national minority in Vojvodina is the Slovakian one, totalling approximately sixty to seventy thousand. The Slovaks are mainly settled in the towns of Bački Petrovac, Kovačica, Bačka Palanka, Stara Pazova and Zemun. They primarily live in compact communities

and have a strong national consciousness. They have schools in their own language and their own secondary school, newspapers, radio and television. A vast majority of them are Protestant Evangelists. They have traditionally fostered very friendly relationships with the Serbs. Throughout history, they have often been subjected to the process of Magyarisation, even in the territory of Vojvodina.

The Hungarians comprise the largest national minority in Vojvodina, though this was not the case initially. Most of them were settled here after the Austro-Hungarian Agreement of 1867. According to data compiled by Dušan Popović, there were no Hungarians in Banat in the first half of the 18th century. They started settling in the towns of Bačka at about 1730. Lazar Stipić, an ethnic Bunjevac and librarian of the Subotica Municipality, used to say: "Take a look; the best land in Vojvodina is in the hands of the Serbs, then the Germans, and the worst is owned by the Hungarians. Those who came here first got the best land" (p. 81).

After the end of WWI, there were approximately half a million Germans in Yugoslavia. Almost all of them were evicted after WWII. There are no more than a few tens of thousands remaining and they mostly live in cities where they are assimilated through mixed marriages. Some of them used to declare themselves Croats or Hungarians.

10. The Serbs and the Hungarians

Lazo Kostić elaborated on the relationship between the Serbs and the Hungarians in a separate book printed by the same Toronto publisher in 1975. The book entitled *The Serbs and the Hungarians* was intended to be the first of the series under the name of *The Serbs and the Neighbouring Nations*. Unfortunately, it was the last book to be written by Kostić, who was driven by the conviction that Serbia could not stay limited to the then Socialist Republic of Serbia, that it would have to expand to include the entire Serbian national space, and that even then a part of the Serbs would remain outside their mother country. Such a situation dictated the need to develop friendly relations with neighbouring nations, improving the existing ones and converting enemies into friends in order to reduce their number as much as possible.

In this book, Kostić notes that the Serbs have two true and dependable friends among their neighbours: the Rumanians and the Greeks. Throughout history, we have never waged war with Romania and we only fought against the Greeks in the Middle Ages, when Greece was a part of the Byzantine Empire. We are connected with these two nations through the same religion, the same enemies and the same historical fate. Within the previous 120 years, our relations with Bulgaria have been very poor and we need to invest our maximum efforts in their improvement. As a result of its participation on the side of the enemy in the Second Balkan War and two world wars, Bulgaria was punished by territorial losses. Hence, it would be wrong to show any further vindictiveness on our part. As Kostić concludes, the

Kostić further noted that our efforts need be focused on improving our relationship with the Albanians, believing that it would be possible as the Albanian dukes had been the protectors of Serbian monasteries and other sanctuaries for centuries. However, Kostić did not have enough time to explain how this could be achieved, so this idea has remained in the realm of wishful thinking. On the other hand, Kostić was completely right to insist on friendly relations with the Italians, bearing in mind that we have no unsettled accounts with them and have common enemies. Historically, we have had many connections with them and, during WWII, they saved more than half a million Serbs from the murderous Croatian hands. The geopolitical positions and economic and political interests dictate our extensive cooperation. "If they expressed any new pretensions towards the right side of the Adriatic coast, which could not be excluded in some new political constellation, we would be the last to be aspired towards. The first in line would be the Croats and Albanians, and then the Slovenes" (p. 9). Our national and state policy should be based on a firm friendship with Italy. Kostić emphasises that the Croats, as the most uncultured and barbarous nation of Europe, are our centuries-old and incorrigible enemies.

Over the course of history, the Serbs have both made alliances and engaged in conflicts with the Hungarians. Together we waged wars against the Turks and lived together in the same territory. The crimes committed by the Hungarian occupying forces in WWII are their most troubling legacy. Kostić also believes that we need to develop close and friendly relations with the Hungarians. As far as the Slovenes are concerned, Kostić could not have predicted that the Slovenes would act hostile toward the Serbs at the beginning of the nineties.

Beyond any doubt, the Croats can never be our friends. "They will not rest as long as one last Serb is alive. It is only a waste of time and strength to attempt anything in that direction. Our basic preoccupation should be contrary to such efforts – and that is the principal reason of this statement of facts – to be safe from the other sides when the time of conflict with the Croats comes. It is insane to doubt that we can handle them alone. We are twice as large in numbers, and twice as powerful; they could not conquer us even with the help of Hitler, even at the time when he was confronted by the Serbian armed force, then by several hundred and later several thousand rebels with no weapons or training. We would never be afraid of them if we were to confront each other alone, but we have to make sure that we are not attacked from other sides" (p. 13). Kostić further cites the conclusions of German geopolitician Floris Lichtreger, who analysed the extremely unfavourable geostrategic position of Croatia, squeezed between Serbia, Hungary and Italy, to the great advantage of the Serbs.

Regarding the Hungarians, the most important thing that the Serbs should bear in mind is their age-old wish to gain access to the sea. We Serbs must do everything in our power to help them reclaim Rijeka as the largest Hungarian seaport. Hungarian politics will sooner or later have to return to the famous statement by Louis Kossuth, in which he

said that he did not see Croatia anywhere on the map. Ever since the Hungarians arrived in the Balkans in the 10th century, our destinies have been historically interwoven. Our kings and their kings have quarrelled and reconciled, confronted and established family relations between them. German historian Edgar Hesch published a book in Stuttgart in 1968 entitled *A History of the Balkan States*, stating therein that, since the very beginning of the formation of the statehood of Raška, the Serbian parishes found a natural ally in the bordering Hungary and this support helped the Serbs endure many a Byzantine campaign without much harm” (p. 38).

Kostić further wrote that even the Serbian Despotate survived thanks to its reliance on Hungary. In the Battle of Mohacs of 1526, the Hungarians and Serbs fought side by side against the Turks. Even Belgrade itself had been included in the Serbian state for the first time during the time of King Dragutin, when the Hungarian king bequeathed the city as the dowry of the Hungarian Princess Katherine, who then became the Queen of Serbia. Afterwards, there were several military conflicts between the Serbs and the Hungarians over Belgrade and the plain of Mačva. Belgrade was subsequently given to Despot Stefan Lazarević by King Sigismund of Hungary, only to be returned to the Hungarians again in order to have them recognize Stefan’s nephew Đurađ Branković as the legitimate ruler of Serbia.

For almost a century, Belgrade was a virtually unassailable Hungarian stronghold in the Turkish way. Many bloody wars were waged over it and the Serbian people sang of and glorified the Hungarian heroes as their own, including John Hunyadi who is known among the Serbs as Sibirjanin Janko. After Serbia had fallen under Turkish rule, a huge number of Serbs moved to the south of Hungary, joining those who had settled there a long time before and mostly entering into the Hungarian military service. The rulers of Hungary wholeheartedly welcomed the Serbian migrations that strengthened their southern borders. As early as the 15th century, the Serbs comprised the majority of the population of Srem and Banat. They were granted considerable privileges as the subjects of Hungary, due to their military contribution. Such a status enabled the Serbs to preserve their national tradition and enhance their cultural life, as well as improved their economic position. All of that would be of great significance at the time of the awakening of their national consciousness.

Such a national symbiosis of the Serbs and the Hungarians has brought many Hungarian words into the Serbian language and vice versa. “This mutual influence that the languages have had on each other is a rare phenomenon, only known to have occurred to some extent in our nation between the Serbs and the Albanians. We have perhaps thousands of Turkish words in Bosnia and not much fewer in Serbia and the Old Serbia. However, the Turks do not have our words in their language. They never borrowed any words from us. Likewise, we hardly have any fewer words taken from the Italian language in our Coastal Region, but they (the Venetians, from whom we took these words and under whose rule we were) have no Serbian words in their vocabulary.

At the northern borders of Serbian territory, we have taken over a multitude of German words and expressions, particularly ones denoting technical terms, tools, household appliances etc. Nonetheless, the Germans use no Serbian words [...] as the members of all those nations were only conquerors who did not live among us in large numbers. On the other hand, we were interwoven with the Hungarians. The best proof of that is that we adopted many of their expressions and vice versa. A linguistic interdependence is the ultimate proof of not being subordinate to one another” (p. 51).

In recent history, the Serbs and the Hungarians engaged in some serious conflicts in 1848, during the Hungarian rebellion led by Louis Kossuth. Simply put, our respective national interests collided on that occasion. However, in his *Emigrant’s Texts*, Louis Kossuth left a testimonial about his encounter and conversation with Prince Mihailo of Serbia in 1859, during which the Prince spoke overtly of his sympathy for the Hungarian struggle against the Austrians, considering the Austrians a threat to Serbia. He expressed his wishes for Hungarian independence and their good political relations with the Serbs.

At the Congress of Berlin in 1878, the Austrian Minister of Foreign Affairs - Hungarian Count Gyula Andrássy - provided a valuable and perhaps decisive support for the Serbian efforts to retain Niš, Leskovac, Prokuplje, Pirot and other towns. There was a threat that those Serbian areas would be given to Bulgaria. Another Austrian minister of foreign affairs, Hungarian Count Gusztav Kalnoky, helped the Serbs avoid territorial losses after the shameful defeat in the war against Bulgaria in 1885.

In the previous century the Serbs were systematically persecuted in Croatia, especially during the time of Ban Ivan Mažuranić, the one who stole the epic *The Death of Aga Smail Čengić* from Njegoš. Not until the Hungarian Count Khuen-Hedervary was elected Ban “would the Serbs feel any relief; it was the first time that they would feel at home there. It is said that Khuen secured the majority in the Croatian-Slavonian-Dalmatian Council thanks to the Serbs”, which is certainly consistent with the facts. Be it for that or some other reasons, Khuen showed benevolence towards the Serbs and acknowledged their individuality, i.e. their letters, their flag and the Serbian name itself. Prior to his rule, the Serbs had never been granted all these rights and treated as equal citizens” (p. 68-69). It was the least difficult period in the life of the Serbs of Slavonia and Croatia.

Ante Radić, the founder of the Croatian Peasant Party and the brother of Stjepan Radić, wrote the following in 1901 in the text entitled *The Croatian Serbs*: “The Serbian gentry – be they as they may – are angry with the Croats and they stick with the Magyarons who have now legally recognised their Serbian name.” In other words, Ante Radić at least understands the Serbian position. I am not saying that he justifies it, but he does not condemn it. Why would the Serbs be with the ones who deny them their name and nationality, and against the ones who recognise it? - that is what Ante Radić most probably thinks” (p. 69). In the book entitled *Here is What we Hold Against You*, published in

Zemun in 1895, Dimitrije Ruvarac praises Khuen-Hedervary for having allowed “the Serbs to raise their flag of the Karlovac Metropolitanate and the Serbian Patriarch, i.e. to expose the Serbian flag at their churches and during their celebrations” (p. 69).

What Khuen-Hedervary introduced as an obligation in the schools of municipalities with a Serbian majority – the Serbian language and Cyrillic letters – was deemed a crime against the state upon his withdrawal. It was included as one of the counts against the prominent Serbs during the High Treason Process of 1908. The Minister of Finance and the Administrator of Bosnia-Herzegovina Benjamin von Kallay was also in favour of the Serbs, at least at a certain stage. He even published his *History of the Serbs* in 1877. Afterwards he busied himself with the idea of creating a Bosniak nation and their Bosniak language. Moreover, Professor Stefan Burijan was also a friend of the Serbs, in his capacity as the Minister of Finance and, automatically, the Administrator of Bosnia, as the two functions were legally connected from 1903 through 1912. “He had a clearly Serbofile politics; he relied on the Serbs and appreciated them most, which he overtly admitted in his memoirs. The Croats are very embittered because of that” (p. 74).

In the periods of Kallay’s and Burijan’s administrations in Bosnia, “Serbdom was much freer and more protected than it is the case today, in the state which is allegedly their own and under the rule of two Croats, Josip Broz and Branko Mikulić. In Burijan’s time, the Young Bosnia movement and Serbian nationalism flourished and burned with all their vehemence. Bosnia would then become the cradle and fertile grounds for the overall Serbian extreme nationalism. If nothing else, all of this was tolerated by Burian” (p. 74).

On several occasions, the Hungarian politicians and diplomats would substantially alleviate the Austrian aggressive pretensions towards Serbia and, as confirmed by some of the participants in the events, they had twice persuaded the highest political circles to abandon plans for military attacks. One of the most prominent friends of the Serbs was Count Tisza, who was among the leading Hungarian politicians of the 20th century. Even Tisza’s political rival, Count Theodor Bacsany, had a pro-Serb orientation. In his memoirs, the count refers to a message by Nikola Pašić, stating that “his aim for the future is by no means a ‘Yugoslavia’ but a ‘Great Serbia’”. This Great Serbia would only include the areas inhabited predominantly by the Serbian speaking Orthodox population. Pašić had no intention of creating a Serbian Austro-Hungary by including the numerous foreign ethnicities that would confront each other in every town and every village” (p. 79-80).

During WWI, the differences between the Austrian and Hungarian treatment of the Serbian people were rather perceptible. In 1914, Hungarian Prime Minister, Count Istvan Tisza, opposed the declaration of war against Serbia and, as the war proved unavoidable and after it ended, he was against any annexation of the Serbian territories and endangerment of their territorial integrity. In 1923, Austro-Hungarian General Alfred Krauss published a book in Munich on the reasons

behind the defeat in WWI, complaining therein about Count Tisza, who could not be “persuaded to undertake something against the Hungarian Serbs, in spite of the fact that their allegiance with the enemy was bordering on certainty” (p. 94). Moreover, he harshly criticised the Croatian hatred and persecution of the Serbs in the territory of the Banate of Croatia. Adam Pribičević believed that Tisza’s attitude was decisive in preventing the Croats from harming the Serbs in WWI as they would later do in WWII. Besides Count von Tisza, Prince Ludwig of Windisch-Grätz, Count Theodor Bacsany and Count Michal Koraly were also among the Serbian friends.

Following WWI, the official relations between Yugoslavia and Hungary were rather poor and Hungary was additionally frustrated by the defeat in war and the loss of its territories. In order to prevent Hungarian revanchism, Yugoslavia, Rumania and Czechoslovakia entered into the Little Entente; Regent Horthy offered the Ustasas a base at Yanka Puszta, which deepened the mistrust between the nations. On 12 December 1940, a treaty of permanent peace and eternal friendship was signed in Belgrade by Yugoslavia and Hungary.

When it was decided that Hungary should breach the pact and participate in the German aggression on Yugoslavia, Hungarian Prime Minister Count Pal Teleki committed suicide on 3 April 1941, leaving behind a memorable demonstration of his uncompromising honour, pride and dignity. Before he died, Teleki sent a letter to the HSH Regent of the Kingdom of Hungary Miklos Horthy, stating the following: “We broke our word given through the treaty of permanent piece out of cowardice. The Nation is aware of that and we have thrown away its honour. We have allied ourselves to scoundrels, since not a single word is true about the alleged atrocities. Not against the Hungarians, not even against the Germans. We will become body-snatchers, a nation that reached the last level of humiliation. I could not live with that. I am guilty” (p. 117).

The Hungarians took part in the German aggression and occupied a part of Yugoslavia, namely Bačka and Baranja. They persecuted the Serbs, they evicted and murdered them. In January 1942, the murder campaign was massive, especially in Novi Sad. According to some data, approximately 10,000 Serbs and an unknown number of Jews and Gypsies were murdered. The central government subsequently attempted to shift the blame on the local Hungarians. The crimes were stopped after a strong reaction of the Hungarian Parliament. An investigation was conducted, resulting in the prosecution of some of the perpetrators. However, the ones who had been sentenced to death were enabled to escape and join the German SS troops.

Since WWII, the relationship between the Serbs and the Hungarians has been fairly good, save for some sporadic tensions between the previous communist regimes and the non-critical siding with the Croatians on the part of the first Hungarian post-communist government. The Hungarian minority is granted the maximum civil and ethnic rights, as is the case with the Serbs in Hungary.

Kostić's book *The Serbs and the Jews* was published posthumously by "The Serbian Renaissance" in 1988, in Southport, a town in the Australian state of Queensland. In the Preface to the book, the author unfolds the motives that prompted him to write this work: "We need to show both ourselves and our Jews - and the Jews of all the world - that we are interested in them, that we indeed treat them with understanding and sympathy, that we have always been and still wish to remain their friends. The Serbs are one of the rare peoples in the world that have lived in peace with the Jews - indeed, one might almost say, in love, throughout history and since the Jews settled in our areas" (p. 8-9).

Sporadic references to the Jews in Serbia date from as early as the Middle Ages. For example, they were mentioned in the charters issued by Tsars Dušan and Uroš. However, it was not until the 16th century that the Jews appeared in larger numbers, i.e. after they had been evicted from Spain. They settled in the towns under Turkish occupation, while the Serbian Orthodox population lived mostly in the villages. As a result, there was no significant interaction between these two peoples until the time Serbia was liberated from Turkish rule. The relationship between the Serbs and the Jews remained good in the liberated Serbia as well. There are no records of any type of discrimination against the Jews, no anti-Semitic behaviour or pogrom against the Jews. The tolerance and fairness in the relations between the Serbs and the Jews, including the absence of any sort of hatred, made the situation in Serbia quite different in comparison to other European experiences. "The Jews from Serbia were proud of being 'the Serbs of Moses' faith'. Their men of letters and artists were true Serbs. There existed a genuine symbiosis in the lives of these two peoples" (p. 14). Even the notable communist Moša Pijade declared himself a Serb in the 1931 census, which was quite an undesirable attitude under the dictatorship of King Aleksandar, who officially fostered the idea of integral Yugoslavism.

A dark shadow on this historical tradition was cast by Dr Jozua Frank, a Croatian politician from Osijek and a converted Slavonian Jew, who supported Ante Starčević and his chauvinism by organizing the persecution of the Serbs and forming Frank's Legions, which were the forerunners of the later Ustasha. However, he was an exception and all of his followers were Croats. He himself renounced Judaism, and nothing good can be expected from someone who comes to hate his own people. "The reaction of the Serbs towards Frankism was therefore not aimed against the Jews themselves, but against the Croatian extremists, the 'negaters' of the Serbs. Not a single Jew suffered any consequences as a result of this reaction of the Serbs, since the Serbs have always known how to distinguish the wrongdoers" (p. 15).

With the exception of his son Ivan, Frank did not have any followers among the Jews in Croatia. Not even Heinrich Friedjung, a Jew who organized the famous Friedjung's anti-Serb process in Vienna in 1909, was able to provoke any prejudice on the part of the Serbs against the Jewish people. In contrast, Croatian history abounds with examples of

IT-03-67-T
anti-Semitic disposition. This was also confirmed by the English writer and politician Elizabeth Dyckeman, even though she always favoured the Croats and derogated the Serbs. In her memories from Zagreb, written during the thirties, she recorded the following: "One can already feel the spirit of anti-Semitism here, which Belgrade has never had. Over there, the Sephardy Jews are highly appreciated" (p. 17-18).

The German publicist Johann Georg Reismüller wrote in a similar fashion: "Religious hatred has never taken root in Serbia. They did hate the Turks as oppressors, but they did not hate them in a religious sense. The tolerance of the Serbs is best illustrated by the fact that they have never had any occurrences of anti-Semitism that are worth mentioning. Nothing made them so seriously resentful of Hitler's Germany in the thirties as the persecution of the Jews" (p. 18). Moreover, English publicist George Mike stated as follows: "It is not the Serbs' custom to persecute the minorities. They do not know of anti-Semitism (whereas the Croats do)" (p. 18). Davičo explains it by saying that it is because "the Serbs are not corrupt and are simply not an 'anti-Semitic' people'!" (p. 19).

Unlike the other European nations, the Serbs do not have any derogatory names for the Jews. In the Serbian state, the Jews have always been equal citizens and they have always enjoyed religious freedom and all political and cultural rights. During the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, the king would regularly appoint one Jew as senator, and it was always the Chief Rabbi. "In Switzerland, in the heart of Europe and its most liberal country, the Jews did not even have the right to choose their own profession until the first half of the 19th century and, until 1874, they did not even have freedom of movement and were not allowed to settle in all parts of the country. Similar, if not worse circumstances were also characteristic of other European countries. In the first half of the 19th century, Serbia was considered the Jews' El Dorado, as Serbia has always been the Land of Freedom" (p. 30).

In WWII, the Germans and Croats outlawed both the Serbs and the Jews. On the other hand, Aćimović's Commissariat Administration and Nedić's government refused to enact any anti-Semitic laws whatsoever. "Not only has the Serbian administration in the occupied Serbia refused to enact a law against the Jews, but it did not take any part in their extermination. It was all done by the Germans, on their own initiative and through their own institutions" (p. 32). Many Serbs risked their lives and the lives of their families trying to save the endangered Jews, by hiding them, feeding them and presenting them as their relatives in their own households.

Milan Nedić personally made it possible for a large number of Jews to flee to the Italian occupied zone, where there was no anti-Semitic persecution, saving merchant Gabaj, engineer Samoilo Jakovljević, Rebeka Amodaj, Dr Ana Alajić, Dr Marija Išah, Jakov Almuli, Oskar Davičo, etc. among others. General Nedić tacitly approved the joining of a certain number of Jews to the Chetnik Movement led by General Draža Mihailović. This group included, among others, the lawyer Avram Mevorak, Oto Komornik, engineer Josif Šlezinger, Ljiljana Flam, etc.

The Chetnik detachments saved the Jews whenever they had a chance and the Serbian Orthodox Church organized the issuance of false documents of origin in order to save them from raids conducted by the occupying forces.

What is more, General Milan Nedić personally saved the President of the Belgrade Jewish Community, Dr Fridrih Popes, and his Secretary Moris Abinun who, by the way, directly cooperated with the communists. Nedić and his associates also came to the aid of Zlata Kikel, Avram Baruh, engineer Stanislav Josifović, etc. Numerous Jews were also saved from the Banjica Camp again thanks to General Nedić. Furthermore, not a single case was recorded in which the Chetnik detachments of General Draža Mihailović did not protect a Jew that turn to them. Even General Mihailović's personal physician, Dr Tibor Goldvaj, was a Jew.

As written by one of the most famous Serbian publicists in emigration, Vukašin Perović, "it is widely known how many Jews were saved by the Partisan units during the war and how many of them were saved by the Chetniks. There was no Chetnik command 'from the mountain of Avala to the Adriatic coast' where the citizens of Jewish descent could not find refuge. The Jews were even a part of the command of the Herzegovina Chetniks, to which I personally belonged; their names were 'Serbianized' however, just like the names of the Jews among the communists and who would take on rather famous, 'great Serbian' names. A good deal of these people would later assume quite important positions in the communist Yugoslavia, either as high ranking military commanders, directors of powerful enterprises or diplomats" (p. 43-44).

Unlike the Serbs, who treated the Jews in the most humane and friendly manner in a time of major historical disasters and tragedies, "the Croats treated them completely differently; they competed with the Germans in committing horrible crimes against the Jews and even boasted about being better in that than the Germans themselves" (p. 55). As testified by Jozef Konfort, who was lucky enough to survive the Jasenovac Camp, no one in the occupied Yugoslavia did so zealously and "diligently execute the orders on the complete extermination of the Jews as the loyal servants of the evil master Hitler - the Ustashes headed by Ante Pavelić" (p. 58). The Croatian people and the Roman Catholic Church in Croatia never protested against or opposed the criminal politics that were applied against the Jews, or the same politics that were applied against the Serbs. The Croatian people and the Catholic Church supported Pavelić to the end.

The Serbian people can only be proud of the fact that not a single Serb in Serbia killed a Jew or participated in the German pogroms. This is confirmed by numerous historians as well as official archive documents. Kostić also refers to a book by Gerald Reitlinger *The Final Solution: the Attempt to Exterminate the Jews of Europe, 1939-1945*, and goes on to say the following: "In a section about Serbia, he mentions all the persons, decision makers and executors of the extermination plan. There was not a single Serb among them; they were all foreigners who

were the principal culprits for the killing of the Jews in Serbia. The executors were also Germans, and there were no Serbs among them. The writer presented the situation impartially, as it would have been difficult to invent the names even he had wanted to do so" (p. 65).

On the other hand, "the situation in Croatia was quite different: all the crimes against the Jews were committed by the local authorities and local government bodies, the most important perpetrators being the relatives of the Jews (to make the irony even more striking)!" (p. 65). In order to illustrate this, Lazo Kostić quotes Reitlinger: "Pavelić, who had the murder of King Aleksandar in 1934 on his conscience, was a ruthless man of immense energy; neither the Germans nor Italians could bridle him in any way. The anti-Semitism he was preaching was nothing but a bait for the national socialists, as he himself was married to the daughter of a Jew named Lorenčević; Marshal Kvaternik, who was responsible for the Ustasha terror, was himself married to the daughter of Josip Frank, a former nationalistic leader in the Hapsburg Monarchy" (p. 65).

In addition to the things the Serbs and the Jews had in common and that historically made them closer, Kostić also writes about the negative episodes and their actors that cast a dark shadow over the relationship between the Serbs and the Jews. He begins by pointing to the fact that the Serbian people had nothing to do with Tito's anti-Israel politics and proceeds to analyse the corrupt behaviour of two notable Jewish intellectuals who seriously wronged the pride and dignity of the Serbian people. The two intellectuals were Eli Finci and Oskar Davičo.

In his scholarly culturological treatises, Finci even avoided the use of the Serbian name, either negating the Serbian characteristics in some of the greatest works of art and cultural achievements of our people, or degrading and offending them. He derogatorily referred to Serbian pre-War literature as the "Kajmakčalan literature". He would severely criticize publishers who printed studies on Serbian icons, frescos, monasteries, saints and the Nemanjić dynasty. Both of them would offend and humiliate the Serbian people with the full support of the anti-Serb political leaders. Davičo personally provoked several serious public scandals, a number of polemics and enormous dissatisfaction.

Other prominent intellectuals buried him with their counterarguments, but then the party committees turned up and decided in favour of the utter human wretchedness and immorality, which was so often reflected in the figure of Davičo. Davičo's hatred of the Serbs was immense; it was "the hatred of Serbdom, the worm's hatred of the eagle, the hatred of the manure heap towards the sky, the hatred of a fake altruist and cosmopolitan as a cover for his moral emptiness and cultural nakedness before the magnificent Serbian culture" (p. 140).

Eli Finci especially attacked Jovan Dučić after the first post-war edition of his collected works in the homeland. Moreover, he even openly advocated the revision and falsification of Dučić's works in order to eradicate "Dučić's chauvinistic disposition and his overt support of backward social and political views" (p. 151). He even publicly admitted that what hurt him most was Dučić's question: "Where will my Russian brothers find a wailing wall big enough for them to weep for all that was

in their lands and souls – completely innocent souls – that was destroyed by the soldiers of Karl Marx, who were even more horrible than the the legionaries of Emperor Titus, the destroyer of Jerusalem” (p. 152).

Nevertheless, Lazo Kostić has never associated the behaviour of Oskar Davičo and Eli Finci, who, by the way, have always maintained that they were Serbs, with the behaviour of all the Jews, nor has he allowed it to disrupt the relations between the Serbs and the Jews in general. On the contrary, in criticising such individuals, Kostić has always been rather precise: “There are as few as two or three rascals of the former Jewish families who take it as their life’s work to derogate, degrade and embarrass the Serbs and all of their cultural achievements, although they are ‘Serbs’ themselves, but avoid saying it. They are ‘Serbs’ only when it comes to denouncing the Serbs. This is due to the general tendency and pressure exerted by Yugoslav dictator Broz. It is interesting to note that, as far as I know, none of these rascals have ever condemned anything Croatian, not even the evils the Ustashes committed against the Jews and the Serbs, since they would come into conflict with ‘Comrade Tito’ by doing so. All their anger was directed at the Serbs and Serbian culture, at the things the Serbs held dearest and in which they took pride before the whole world” (p. 170).

In order to avoid any doubt, Kostić goes on to emphasize the following: “We repeat that these are just individual cases, and we shall not allow them to endanger, let alone destroy our traditional relations with the Jews. We have set out *in extenso* all the statements given by both Davičo and Finci, not because we wanted the other Serbs to turn against them, but because we wished to give the material to the fellowmen of these unworthy individuals to renounce them and distance themselves from these outcasts. As always, I myself remain a true friend and admirer of the Jews” (p. 171).

Kostić further employs statistical analysis to show that, before WWII, there were about 75,000 Jews in Yugoslavia. Eleven thousand of them survived the war, which implies that roughly 60,000 of them were killed by the Germans and the Croats and bearing in mind that about 4,000 of these Jews found refuge in other states. He finishes his study with a general estimation of the role the Jews have played in the history of humankind, pointing out that there is not a single area of activity to which the Jewish scientists, artists and other experts have not provided immense contribution.

12. The Communist Creation of Artificial Nations

A demographic and ethnographic study entitled *New Yugoslav Nationalities* was published in Toronto in 1965, as Volume Four of the series of writings under the title of *Serbian Problems*. The study begins with an analysis of the different meanings of the term Yugoslavism, which Kostić grouped into four basic categories. The first meaning is a pure political one and it primarily refers to the Serbs who honestly wanted Yugoslavia to be a state union of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Their pro-Yugoslav inclination did not generally diminish their Serbian

IT-03-67-T

patriotism, as they believed that the Yugoslav framework would provide the best protection of Serbian interests and the best security against various outside dangers, and which would enable their strengthening through integration with the nations that were ethnically closest. They were divided into those who wanted the Yugoslav idea at any price, those who accepted it only if it entailed fulfilling the Serbian national expectations and those who accepted it under condition that it should be accepted with equal zeal by the Croats and the Slovenes.

The second meaning of the term refers to the legality of the state and its international legal status, which is reflected in Yugoslav citizenship regardless of ethnicity and which is largely accepted by foreign countries, which tend to treat all our citizens in a simplified manner. The third meaning is the ethnic one and would thus include the Bulgarians although, as a nation, they have never lived in any Yugoslav state union. This is why the term South Slavs would be more appropriate in this case instead of the term Yugoslavs, since the existence of a state with the name of Yugoslavia has significantly reduced its practical meaning. The fourth meaning refers to all those who declare themselves members of the Yugoslav nation, this being their only national designation and identification. This type is characterised by a radical rejection of Serbdom, as the Serbs were falsely accused of propagating their hegemony through the idea of Serbdom. Kostić believes that the insistence on integral Yugoslavism is one of the principal reasons for the decline of the Yugoslav state. Kostić harshly condemns the Serbs who renounced their own nationality in favour of the Yugoslav idea, particularly those in the Serbian Diaspora who were enthralled by this delusion. He says that the category of these advocates of the integral Yugoslavism is “comprised of the rejects, renegades and traitors, i.e. the national deserters. [...] There should be individuals like them, though. There have been such people throughout history and among all the nations. They have always been rightfully despised and denounced. However, our Yugoslavs, the exclusive Yugoslavs, have recently become audacious and, if I may say so, brazen. They proudly emphasise that they are not ‘chauvinists’, for they reserve this term only for those who remained Serbian, who remained faithful to the teaching of Saint Sava and to their forefathers. Who are these people that exalt themselves and discredit us as Serbs? They exalt themselves for changing their nationality and becoming renegades; they discredit and insult those who have stayed loyal to their ancestors and their history” (p. 9).

13. The Invention of the Montenegrin nationality

The communists invented the Montenegrin nation in order to reduce the total statistical number of Serbs in Yugoslavia, to take away a significant part of Serbian territory from its motherland and to finally push the Serbs away from the Adriatic Sea. The principal promoters of this ideological creation were Milovan Đilas, Radovan Zogović and Jagoš Jovanović. “One thing is certain: the Montenegrin nationality was proclaimed at the insistence of the Montenegrin communists themselves.

It was not imposed from the outside; it was instituted at their own request” (p. 18). Kostić quotes Radoje Knežević in this regard, stating that “During the previous war, Đilas was one of the most prominent Partisan leaders. When the Yugoslav state started to emerge in 1945, Đilas was one of those who stood out in their fanaticism and imperviousness to any kind of criticism. It was he who, under the Comintern guidelines for the federal restructuring of Yugoslavia into a multinational state, invented the definition of a separate Montenegrin nationality as something unconnected with Serbdom” (p. 19).

Đilas himself wrote that “in their tribal tradition (i.e. origin), the Montenegrins feel [...] like the Serbs [...] but, in the national sense, they put forth something that is particularly theirs, Montenegrin. That is why they find it rightful and natural to be called the Montenegrin people (nation)” (p. 19). It was recorded with how much vehemence Đilas bore down on Isidora Sekulić for considering Njegoš a Serb. Enslaved by the Marxist dogma that a nation as an ethnic category emerged no earlier than in the capitalist era, when indeed many European peoples passed through the phase of national awakening, Đilas still admitted that, in the time of Njegoš, “there indeed had not been any difference between the Serbs and the Montenegrins. The emergence of nations and their national (bourgeois) consciousness is a phenomenon of later times, at least in Montenegro, and it could only be in its initial stage at the time” (p. 19).

Nevertheless, he claims that the forming of the Montenegrin nation had commenced much earlier and that the process was streamlined and completed by the Montenegrin communist intelligentsia. “The lords and the monarchy, of which only the Koljenovići traditions have remained, hindered the social progress with their aristocratic privileges. Since they were against unification with Serbia [...] these lords found themselves in the comical historical position [...] of developing the national consciousness, the individuality of the Montenegrin nation in order to preserve their semi-feudal class privileges. The category of national consciousness belongs a priori to capitalism and the bourgeoisie. [...] However, the local bourgeoisie was not capable of performing their historical role. Thus, the Montenegrin nation has not been formed by the bourgeoisie but, due to its late development, it emerged as a result of the struggle against the bourgeoisie. [...] The main force of the Yugoslav communist and labour movement in Montenegro lay in its new intelligentsia, which sprang from the objective Montenegrin (and Yugoslav) circumstances and partly established itself in the revolutionary labour movement of our other states (mostly in Belgrade), bringing the new ideas into Montenegro and awakening the Montenegrin national consciousness in the rural areas” (p. 20).

Đilas claimed that the Montenegrin bourgeoisie had not been capable of crating a separate Montenegrin nation, as it had shared the consciousness of the Serbian bourgeoisie. That prompted Kostić to conclude that “It would be facetious to say that Serbia and Montenegro had the same bourgeoisie and the same bourgeois consciousness. But to claim that the same bourgeoisie implies the same nation would be rather

illiterate. The bourgeoisie was exactly the same in Hungary and Croatia, yet they did not form a joint nation. Neither did the Czechs and the Austrians” (p. 20). Đilas thought that “in the third stage of the development of capitalism, the Serbian bourgeois consciousness could not have been anything other than oppressive and chauvinistic, even in its ‘poetical’, ‘philosophical’ and other forms” (p. 20). He confronts Isidora Sekulić with such ideological arguments, stating that “It is quite understandable that the Serbian bourgeoisie and all its intellectuals and political representatives considered Montenegro to be not only Serbian, but the ‘classical’ Serbian land. [...] All of Isidora’s book on Njegoš is replete with expressions that confirm the above claims with respect to Montenegro (she does not mention Macedonia and Bosnia, so it is not possible to see whether she calls them by the traditional name of the ‘Serbian lands’), expressions which confirm the above mentioned and that seem like phantoms in today’s realities” (p. 21).

Zogović, who was even worse than Đilas, wrote about Njegoš and the invented Montenegrin nation in the following manner: “Njegoš was a ruler of Montenegro, the creator of a Montenegrin state that was centralised and secular in its nature, and the first poet from Montenegrin soil. He lived in a time when the process of forming the Montenegrin nation had just begun and when the Montenegrin tribes, traditionally of the ‘Serbian faith’ and origin, felt themselves to be both Serbian and Montenegrin; however, due to their individual social, cultural and state life, they would evolve into a separate Montenegrin nation and everything that had historically and culturally been hitherto created in their territory naturally became the legacy of the Montenegrin nation and a part of their social and cultural history. In that sense, not only does Njegoš represent the richest legacy of the Montenegrin nation and culture, but his work is the most powerful literary expression of the specific Montenegrin psychology, of all that makes a nation what it is – and that had been felt and depicted by Njegoš while still in its cradle. Finally, in its form and in all the aspects that make certain literature distinctively national, Njegoš’s literary opus is profoundly and universally Montenegrin. All the above facts are indisputable and make Njegoš a Montenegrin writer, or rather a founder of the individual Montenegrin literature, the writer of its first and so far the most remarkable chapter” (p. 22).

Jagoš Jovanović, the third notorious operative and executor of this pseudo-historical contrivance, was the most unscrupulous of them all. As his name meant absolutely nothing in the nation and its literature, he did not have to worry about his moral and intellectual standing. He did not have to spare brutality in executing the treacherous orders of his party’s Central Committee. He started with the theory that all of Montenegrin history was headed towards the shaping of the Montenegrin individuality and the Montenegrin nation. Since he had no scientific proof for this theory he had to resort to pure falsification. In 1948, as the official historiographer of Montenegro, he was entrusted with the task of publishing an abominable compilation of stupidities under the titles of *The Creation of the Montenegrin State and*

In order to prove that the entire history was centred around the development of the Montenegrin nation, Jovanović writes on the Zeta Slavs and the Slavic tribes of Zeta, avoiding making any mention of the Serbs and even failing to state that the House of Nemanjić was a Serbian dynasty. He grieves over the fact that the development of the Montenegrin nation was slower than that of the Serbian one, adducing as paramount evidence of the existence of the Montenegrin nation a letter by the dismissed and disappointed Montenegrin minister Niko Hajduković who could not accept the loss of his ministerial privileges. It was typical of all these unconfirmed intellectuals, who failed in Belgrade, to return to Montenegro and insist on its ethnical individualities. Since they were not capable of pretending to be big fish in deep waters, they turned to the small pond to act like sharks – growling sharks. I wonder whether they were called sea wolves because of their growling or their barking.

Niko Hajduković, facetious and wretched as he was, wrote in the English newspapers of the “proof that the Montenegrins and the Serbs are two different peoples, so one of them has no right to impose its will on the other. Instead, they have to reach a consensus on all issues of mutual interest”. Naturally, they would not have spoken like that had the Petrović dynasty managed to assume the ruling position over the whole of Serbdom, had King Nikola succeeded in his ambition to sit on the throne of all the Serbs. The above proves how much trouble we endured due to dynastic struggles and intrigues. Another communist forger, Rodoljub Čolaković, writing on the Third Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, stated that at the time “there had still been no mention of the Montenegrin nationality as the Montenegrin communists had been both quantitatively and qualitatively too weak to impose such a thing. As soon as they were given significance, even predominance in the Communist Party, they demanded a national and state separation from the Serbs” (p. 23-24).

The most renowned Serbian historian of the Church, Đoko Slijepčević, wrote about an attempt on the part of a group of Montenegrin Orthodox priests to break away from the Serbian Orthodox Church in 1945, certainly under the influence of the communists. As he said, “A group of priests headed by Petar Kapičić, who identified himself as the ‘president of the association of priests’, held an assembly in Nikšić on 14 and 15 June 1945, and sent therefrom a resolution to the Holy Synod in which it was demanded that the Orthodox Church in Yugoslavia be organized in such a manner that ‘all the Orthodox be equal regardless of their ethnicity’” (p. 24). As they were not successful in this attempt and as the Serbian Orthodox Church remained faithful to Serbdom, the Montenegrin communists, blinded by their helpless fury, sentenced Metropolitan Arsenije of Montenegro to sixteen years of imprisonment.

Kostić subsequently turns to the theory that Montenegrindom is defended by its age-old individuality and retorts in the following

manner: “This can be used as an argument for defending a state-establishing or administrative entity, but not with regard to a nation. Otherwise, the Serbs could be divided into a dozen nationalities and thus split the moral unity of the Serbs, which has represented a unique ethnic example in Europe” (p. 24-25). The tradition does not have any significance here either, as it was discontinued in 1918 and nothing of that tradition has been revived save for secession from Serbia. “Before all and above all, the Montenegrin tradition is Serbdom, and that was banned in the National Republic of Montenegro.” Besides that, it is the Orthodoxy that went such a long way that the highest representative of the Orthodoxy, the *Vladika* of Cetinje, was acknowledged as the head of state; the most frequent symbol was the cross (as proved numerous times by Njegoš); moreover, it is the gentilial (clan) system, etc.” (p. 25). The governance system has been changed, as was the case with the administrative division and the capital city; even the name of the capital has been changed. “Therefore, there is no continuation of the tradition and loyalty to history; it was all a pretext to separate Montenegro from Serbia and have it de-Serbianised in order to have a sixth of the federal country’s power in the hands of a federal unit barely covering a twentieth of its geographic area” (p. 25).

Kostić further elaborates on the logical inconsistencies of this anti-Serbian swindle. “Many things could be based on the history of Montenegro, on its heroic history. However, its leaders and ‘managers’ ignore all of that and construe the alleged Montenegrin ethnical individuality based on the fundamentals of history, which is a forgery beyond comparison. In the history books, the Montenegrin nation got its existence retroactively. In order to avoid the term Serb, the history is replete with the term Montenegrin, even though the geographical name of Montenegro is not more than four centuries old” (p. 25-26). Sometimes it borders on tragicomedy, as “They separated Montenegrin history from the Serbian one and it will eventually lead to the point when the Montenegrins will not be allowed to participate in the Serbian past. This is where forgery leads. The purpose of establishing the Montenegrin nationality was to divide and weaken Serbdom. The success has been significant but, at the same time, it will lead to divisions and dissent among the Montenegrins. Even now some of them are Serbs and some are ‘Montenegrins’, both within the country and abroad. This means that their ethnic unity has been broken as well” (p. 26).

In the times when Montenegro was an independent country, there was no mention of the Montenegrin nation. It was not until King Nikola realised that his throne was shaking that he would blow the trumpet of Montenegrin individuality and even cause the famous Christmas Rebellion of his supporters. In the book published in Berlin in 1922 under the title *The Ruler*, Herman Wendel wrote of King Nikola’s tragicomic attempts after WWI: “Granted, Nikola, whose court was maintained in Neuilly near Paris, attempted to rescue what could be salvaged. He turned to Wilson, invoking the right to the self-determination of the ‘Montenegrin nationality’ – not a small deal! He

had a few protectors within the influential political circles of London; he drowned Europe in his lies concerning the forcible Serbian 'annexation' of his country; he had a Montenegrin legion armed in Gaeta; he organized armed attacks by bandits on Montenegro, yet he was only a king of spades in the card game played by the Italians against Yugoslavia on the Adriatic coast. [...] Montenegro would, by itself, be an 'independent' box of state games, having the population of a mid-sized German city, all of them Serbs of the purest blood, a laughable sight" (p. 27).

In a book titled *The Montenegrin Issue*, published in 1926, also in Berlin, it is emphasised that even those who doubt the national unity of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes "acknowledge immediately that the inhabitants of Montenegro are, by their origin, language, faith and heritage, the purest Serbs; speaking of a 'Montenegrin nationality' or a 'Montenegrin nation' would be as wise as proclaiming the 'Lippe-de-Lipembit nationality' or the 'Sax-Altenburg nation' and directing them against the Germans. For centuries, while the Serbian majority was under the yoke of Turkish rule, the falcons of this inaccessible nest were the vanguard of all Serbdom and the mountain of Lovćen was sung about as the stronghold of Serbian freedom" (p. 27). Another German scientist, Gerhard Gesemann, wrote the following in Berlin in 1928: "The Montenegrin *vladikas* had to work strenuously for years in order to instil the feeling of the Montenegrin state in their tribes and leaders, while they had a fully developed universal Serbian national awareness" (p. 28). Thus, the Serbian national feeling was above the state.

The Croats themselves delightedly accepted the thesis that the Montenegrins are not Serbs, but are still divided into those who claim that the Montenegrins are a separate nation and those who take the Montenegrins as Croats. The latter group of Croats found its basis in the ideas of the Montenegrin Ustasha Šekula Drljević and Savo Štedimlija. In one of the issues of the Novi Sad *Flag*, Hamdija Kapidžić, a historian from Sarajevo, came across a report from Cetinje dated 20 June 1866, which particularly attracted his attention since he despised the Croatian pretensions to Bosnia-Herzegovina and which he published in his book in 1953. Inter alia, the report reads as follows: "Moreover, some of the Croats have taken the liberty to prove that there are no Serbs in Montenegro and that Montenegro is inhabited mostly by the Croats! Oh, how bizarre are these stalwarts, how bizarre are these historians, how bizarre is their evidence, and even more bizarre is their infatuation, folly and audacity! – Only Mr Kurelac could have uttered such falsehood and indeed stupidity in his book *The Fluminescence*! There is no history that can testify or prove that any Croat has ever lived in Montenegro. In cherishing its age-old and dear Serbian name, its freedom and its independence, that very same Montenegro has for five centuries shed as much blood as all the Croats now have together" (p. 30).

Initially, there were not many Croats that considered Montenegro as their own. "Previously, those were just sporadic, lone voices, especially the voices of the fantasists of 'The Red Croatia', which has never existed.

The free Montenegrin state maintained such a Serbian leaning, was

of such substance and had such a state maxim (*raison d'être*), that even the worst Croats did not dare to challenge its pure Serbian character [...] Naturally, all of this changed when the Montenegrins themselves – on the one hand, the separatists led by Drljević and his company and, on the other, the communists led by Đilas and his followers – raised the question of Montenegrin nationality as if it were not certain, or not clear – as if it were suspicious, wrongly represented, etc. All these attempts to open a discussion about the issues that are sacred and indisputable ultimately resulted in unexpected and unwanted consequences" (p. 30).

In one of his books published in Zagreb in 1944, the Ustasha ideologist Kerubin Segvić boasted that, on 12 September 1941, he was trying to persuade Umberto, the Italian heir to the throne, that the Montenegrins were Croats, telling him in that sense that "the Montenegrins are not correctly represented in the ethnical sense. They are nowadays considered to be Serbs since they are of the Orthodox faith. However, two or three centuries ago, they were Catholics and Croats, they recognised the authority of the Bishop of Rome, their clergy was under the jurisdiction of the Catholic Archbishop of Bar. Serbism, as an ethnical idea, infiltrated Montenegro eighty or ninety years ago under the Russian influence and their Orthodoxy. The only characteristic of this nationalism is the Orthodoxy. However, the Montenegrins have not yet fully accepted Serbian national thought" (p. 31). Segvić went on to say that he was happy that the Italian heir to the throne was a descendent of Croatian blood, since his mother Jelena was the Montenegrin princess and "since Montenegro was part of Croatia, if not politically, then certainly in the ethnical sense [...] They (the Montenegrins) were Croats and Catholics until a few centuries ago. As regards their Serbdom, it is a political accomplishment of the Russians [...] Serbdom started spreading in Montenegro as late as 1852, when some Orthodox man, Milutinović, a court teacher, came there [...] Nevertheless, the common people in Montenegro do not refer to themselves or their language as Serbian" (p. 31). In Krleža's *Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia*, Ivo Frangeš claims that in the stolen Njegoš's epic *The Death of Aga Smail Ćengić*, Ivan Mažuranić summarized the bloody past of the Croats and other South Slavs in their centuries long struggle against the Turks" (p. 31).

Savić Marković Štedimlija and the Ustasha emigrant writer Dominik Mandić also wrote of Montenegro as "The Red Croatia". Both of them claimed that the Croatian identity of the Montenegrin geographical names, their folk customs and their tradition was indisputable. Mandić additionally claims that the Montenegrins refer to their language as Croatian, and that the administrator of the Montenegrins in Istanbul was known as "Croat-pasha". Mandić finishes his preposterous statements with the conclusion that "the majority of the common people in Montenegro, given their historical subconsciousness, have continually opposed Serbianization, requesting that their name and state be recognized as Montenegrin [...] The Croats should sympathize with today's Montenegrins and support their struggle for independence as the Croatian blood runs through their veins" (p. 32).

There is one thing that the Croats cannot comprehend however. When their greatest poet, the persecutor of the Serbs and thief Ivan Mažuranić, deceived Njegoš, took his epic and published it under his own name, it did not even occur to him to make some changes to make it more convenient and favourable for Croatian megalomaniac pretensions. As Montenegro was geographically divided into only four districts, Njegoš's clear distinction between the Montenegrins and *Brđani* (Translator's note: the Highlanders), remained in the epic and it has remained there until modern times. Seven hills jealously preserved their individualities and the Montenegrin national consciousness simply did not exist there in any form. These seven hills were: Bjelopavlići, Piperi, Rovčani, Moračani, Vasojevići, Kuči and Bratonožići. It was recorded that the great Kuči hero, Priest Spaho Božov Popović-Drekalović, condemned his fellow-tribesmen, saying: "Kuči brother, do not be renegades and traitors to the Serbian blood, but unite with Montenegro" (p. 36).

The Drobnjak and Nikšić tribes were Herzegovinians and Jovan Cvijić wrote on this as follows: "The original Montenegrin state was made up of the Montenegrin tribes united under the Njeguš dynasty. It was enlarged in the 19th century, particularly in 1878, when it included several tribes of the Brda (the Highlands) and Herzegovina, which we called the Rascian tribes. Even though they were divided into tribes, these new subjects were clearly different in their mentality from the original group [...] Their mentality was closer to that of the inhabitants of Sumadija and they wanted to unite with Serbia. The original moral unity of Montenegro was thus broken" (p. 37). Cvijić goes on to say the following: "Although today's inhabitants of Boka originate from Montenegro and are therefore rather close to the Montenegrins, they do not entirely belong to the same group as the Montenegrins" (p. 38).

In his study, Lazo Kostić considered the problems of the artificial Montenegrin nation and concluded with the following words: "If Milovan Đilas explains that the creation of the Montenegrin nation is due to their 'having something special, something that is their own, Montenegrin' – something different from the Serbs – the inhabitants of Boka could use the same if not a stronger argument that they are different from the rest of Montenegrins in the same way. That is why, in the censuses, many inhabitants of Boka say that they are Bokelji by nationality as they are afraid of saying that they are Serbs, but the state statistics always transfers them into 'the Montenegrins'. It is reasonable to expect that other members of the Montenegrin 'components' would say something similar if they were allowed and if that would not be punished, and 'Montenegrindom' would vanish into the soap bubbles from which it was created. That is why Montenegrindom is preserved through the most horrible terror, which does not stop short of convicting Serbian priests to sixteen years imprisonment because they attempted to promote or just hint at the Serbdom of these areas" (p. 38).

14. The Artificial Creation of the Macedonian Nation

The communist regime issued a decree to proclaim and sanction the Macedonian nation in practice, which from then on came to be a category that was included in all the official statistical reports, though its language was not recognized among the Slavist scientific circles. As Kostić noted, "there can be no allusion to any consolidation of this ethnicity, either within the country or abroad. It is not an easy process; you cannot create a nationality by just tapping a magic wand. There are many prerequisites that need to be met, tradition being the main one" (p. 42). At the beginning of this century, when the idea of creating the Macedonian language was entertained for the first time (with the Turkish occupation still in place), it provoked a sharp reaction from Vatroslav Jagić, a renowned Slavist, who, in his book *The Slavic Languages* published in 1909, went on to say the following: "The proposal that has recently been put forth to create the written language of the country from one dialect of Macedonia, even if suggested with honourable intentions, must be decisively dismissed as an unnecessary dissipation of spiritual strength" (p. 42). Aleksandar Belić was also of the opinion that there were three South-Slavic languages: Serbo-Croat, Bulgarian and Slovenian, while the Old Slavic language was extinct and the Macedonian language never existed.

In his capacity as a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Jevrem Grujić wrote in 1878 to Jovan Ristić, an unofficial Serbian representative at the Congress of Berlin, that: "Hundreds of the inhabitants of Veles have prepared and signed a petition in which they plead for unification with Serbia, as they have 'always felt themselves to be Serbs'" (p. 43). Macedonia was also inhabited by quite a number of Bosnian and Serbian Muslims, who were retreating from the north along with the withdrawal of the Turkish authorities. Jovan Cvijić wrote on this subject as follows: "There is virtually no settlement or town in Old Serbia and Macedonia that does not have a mahal inhabited by a Bosnian *mujahidin* [...] One cannot say that they have been moved to lands that are entirely strange to them or essentially different" (p. 43). Under the communist dictatorship, all of them were forcibly reassembled around a new, artificial nation. To make it even more paradoxical, the Bosnian Muslims were also promoted to a separate nation. The Macedonian Muslims were not a part of this nation, though they spoke the same language, they were of the same descent and cherished the same tradition as the Bosnian Muslims.

Beside Jovan Cvijić, numerous other scientists have long since confirmed that the areas of Skopje, Kratovo and Tetovo were not part of the "geographical term 'Macedonia' but of Serbia". In *The Historical and Geographical Lexicon*, printed in Basle in 1727, it is also specified that Skopje was in Serbia and that Macedonia was south of this town. The territorial scope of Serbia was also precisely described in *The Universal Lexicon* published in Leipzig in 1740, according to the general understanding of the scientists of that time: "Serbia, or *Servia* in Latin and sometimes known as *Serblija*, is a fairly large fertile province in Europe, which the Romans called the Upper Moesia. It borders Bulgaria in the east, Bosnia and Dalmatia in the west, Albania and

Macedonia in the south and the Danube and the Sava rivers in the north, which separate Serbia from Transylvania and Walachia. It seems that this province was named after the Serbs. [...] It is divided into four sanjakates or districts: Belgrade, Smederevo, Skopje and Kratovo. The province has good gold and silver mines. [...] In a broader sense, the country of Serbia is divided into Primorje (the coastal area) and Mediterranean Serbia. The country was originally called Hum and is today called Herzegovina. It used to spread as far Dalmatia and Albania. This other country (the inland part, L.M.K) is divided into two areas. One is situated east of the Drim River and is called Raška, or the land of the Rascians. The other is situated west of the Drim River and borders Croatia in the west; it is called Bosnia” (p. 46).

Besides this, the official titles of the Catholic dignitaries also testify to the fact that Skopje was without doubt considered a part of Serbia. Vjekoslav Klačić, the most prominent Croatian historian and a confirmed enemy of the Serbian people, on one occasion described the arrival of certain Orthodox priests in Vienna, coming from an area that was occupied by the Turks: “The then Catholic Archbishop of Skopje and the ‘Administrator of all Serbia’ named Petar Bogdan was among them. He originated from Macedonia and later studied sciences in Rome as a cadet of the congregation that propagated the Catholic faith. Having earned a doctorate of philosophy and theology, he was afterwards appointed Bishop of Skadar and Administrator of the Archbishopric of Bar. In 1677, he was appointed Archbishop ‘of all Serbia’ with the see in Skopje” (p. 40).

Moreover, even when the Patriarchate of Peć was reduced to its smallest territorial scope, it included the eparchies of both Skopje and Štip, while the Patriarchate of Ohrid only encompassed the territories south of Tetovo, Skopje, Veles and Štip. Our well-known expert in the ancient history, Nikola Vulić, established that “even in ancient times, the northern area of southern Serbia, from Vranje to Veles, was not a part of Macedonia. This area was called Dardania and was a separate state” (p. 49). The German scientist Gerhard Gesemann wrote on this subject in a similar fashion in a collection of treatises entitled Macedonia, authored by leading German scholars: “The northern parts of the present-day southern Serbia [these are his exact words] did not belong to the state of the old Macedonians or to the original Roman Province of Macedonia (146 BC). These areas were occupied by the belligerent Dardanians, one of the numerous Illyrian tribes, and were named after this tribe. Their seat was in Skupi, near the present-day Skopje, which was named after this old settlement” (p. 49).

Kostić further adds his own findings: “The toponymy left traces of Serbdom in these areas, e.g. the names of the villages in present-day Macedonia, such as Srbinovo, Srbica and Srbjana, which are confirmed to originate from the Middle Ages. The village of Srbinovo is situated near Gostivar, in the valley of the Lakavica River, while the villages of Srbica and Srbjanai are situated in the area of Kičevo. Today, Srbinovo numbers about 120 households, Srbica 170 and Srbjani 100 households. Srbinovo and Srbica are inhabited by the Shqiptar population, while the

village of Srbjani is settled by both the Macedonians and the Shqiptars” (p. 50). Kostić is well aware of the fact that the process of national identification in Macedonia has not yet been completed and that this issue is rather complex. In the Serbian part of Macedonia, forced de-Serbianization has been carried out for decades, unlike the Bulgarian and Greek parts, where there are simply no advocates of a separate Macedonian nationality. Scientists and scholars have always referred to the Macedonian population as either the Serbs or the Bulgarians and no one has ever seriously taken this population as a separate nationality.

Likewise, the existence of the Macedonian nation is not recognised by either the official Bulgarian or the Greek authorities. The Bulgarians claim that the Macedonian people are exclusively their fellowmen. “The Macedonian nation was created by Yugoslavia, or its anti-Serb clique. The positions of both Greece and Bulgaria prove that Serbia, if it existed, even as a communist state, would never have recognized a separate Macedonian nation. It was only Yugoslavia, headed by its anti-Serbs, that was bold enough to do so” (p. 59). The largest number of Macedonians was relocated to Bulgaria, both from the Serbian part and even more from the Greek part of Macedonia. All of them have completely integrated with the Bulgarians and they are undoubtedly Bulgarians today. “Those who left the Serbian lands earlier are also integrated for the most part. They keep the Serbian surnames whenever it is possible and declare themselves to be Serbs if at all possible. The new emigrants keep their Macedonian names and their national attitude, but not for long, as it would contradict the principles of sociology if they could preserve themselves without discrimination among a heap of people close to them in language, of the same religion and with the same customs. They will declare themselves as Serbs whenever they have a chance to do so” (p. 61).

The situation among the Diaspora is particularly interesting. “There were no Macedonians among the old emigrants since all of them declared themselves either as Serbs or Bulgarians. Most likely, there were more Bulgarians but the Macedonian emigration in the overseas countries was anyway rather weak. The Yugoslav authorities are now sending Macedonian agents, even priests or bishops (e.g. Australia) to carry out political missions. In Sweden, a newspaper was published in mimeograph print under the name *The Free Macedonia*, and the people who were acquainted with the situation believe that the newspaper was published by secret Macedonian agents from Yugoslavia” (p. 61). Serbian nationalism was criticised both in the country and abroad, whereas all the other nationalists were encouraged by the communists. According to their deviant minds, it is chauvinistic to say that Skopje and Kumanovo are Serbian towns, that the Macedonian churches and monasteries are legacies of the Serbian rulers, etc. However, the Macedonian pretensions to some Bulgarian or Greek territories are not chauvinistic, regardless of the fact that these territories are largely populated by people originating from these two countries, and much less by those who would maybe declare themselves as Macedonians.

A rather significant part of the Serbian population in Vojvodina

originates from Macedonia. Also, numerous individuals from Macedonia have made an immense contribution to the Serbian culture and preservation of the Serbian national consciousness. Kostić names just a few of them, such as Hristifor Žefarović, a renowned heraldist originating from Ohrid, Anastas Jovanović, a great painter originating from Vraca, Kosta Abrašević, a social lyricist from Ohrid, Anđelko Krstić, a famous narrator, Momčilo Nastasijević, a well-known man of letters, Petar Džadžić, a literary critic from Bitola, etc. Though he originated from the area of Lake Prespa, Branislav Nušić would always say that he was a mixture of Serbian, Vlachian and Albanian blood, but that he mostly felt himself to be a Serb nonetheless, never mentioning that he was possibly Macedonian. The patriotic poet Vladislav Petković Dis also originated from Kumanovo. Jovan Jovanović Zmaj would take pride in the fact that his great-grandfather had come from Macedonia. Nikola Pašić, Branko Radičević and Jovan Sterija Popović all originated from Macedonia.

15. The Communist Project of Creating a Muslim Nation

The Yugoslav ethnic statistics contained a category of the ethnically undecided Muslims or ethnically undecided Yugoslavs, which for the most part included the Muslims. Apparently, their national consciousness was not sufficiently developed and discernible and they usually identified themselves by their religion. Although the communists established six republics and validated the artificial Macedonian and Montenegrin nations, they did not dare inaugurate the Bosnian nation. Truth be told, there was an attempt to create the Bosnian nation in the 19th century by the Supreme Austro-Hungarian Administrator Benjamin von Kallay. As stated by Vladimir Ćorović, Kallay's goal was to "encourage a separate Bosnian patriotism in order to suppress the attachment of the people in Bosnia-Herzegovina to the liberated Serbian states" (p. 70). Between the two World Wars, the German author Ernest Aurich wrote as follows: "Baron von Kallay made an attempt to pass the external identification of Bosnia onto its internal affairs, trying to create a unique Bosnian consciousness in spite of the ethnical fact that Bosnia was inhabited by three different peoples [...] His idea for such a state meant that the Croats, the Mohammedans and the Serbs were to be blended into one undivided whole and, if such an idea succeeded, he would entrust the Croats and the Mohammedans with the leading role" (p. 71). Similar ideas were also advocated by Archduke Franz Ferdinand: "They should first be thrown together into the same melting pot and then the Croats should be allowed to surface" (p. 71).

As stated by Kostić, "the reaction of all the Serbs was more than sharp. They would play jokes in the Serbian press on Kallay's 'Bosniandom' and the 'Bosnian language'; the whole nation stood up as one in defence of Serbdom. The voices of criticism could be heard among the Croats as well, though the Muslims mostly kept silent, apparently satisfied with such a combination. This hateful and ridiculed

idea faded with the fall of Kallay" (p. 71). The Serbs accounted for 90 percent of the Bosnia-Herzegovina Partisans, so the idea of creating the Bosnian nation could not take root among them. "The Croats, headed by dictator Broz, played the leading role in the formation of the new state; they independently established its national and legal components, believing that the majority of Muslims would convert into Croats and that they would gradually, without much effort, gain a new Croatian unit. That is why they left them the freedom to nationally declare themselves as Muslims" (p. 71).

Nevertheless, the process of development of the Muslims' national consciousness went in the opposite direction to the predictions of Tito's clique. More and more Muslims would say that they were Serbian in nationality. After the census of 1961, the Titoists were already bewildered and rather worried. They started thinking of a new arrangement that would prevent further development of the Serbian national consciousness among the Muslims. On the other hand, the number of Muslims who declared themselves as Croats was dropping continuously. Even the prominent Muslim intellectuals that opted for Croatiandom, began publicly expressing their disappointment. They would not become Serbs, but they would return to their Muslimism and identify with it once again. The communists then began searching for a new ideological basis on which they would constitute the Muslim ethnic specificities.

In his Appendices to the Issue of Nationality, published in Sarajevo in 1963, Enver Redžić, a leading communist official, was one of the first who publicly spoke on this issue. "Based on the ethnographic research conducted so far and bearing in mind the historical development, I believe that a thesis can be proposed that the Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina represent a specific ethnic unit, which is sufficiently different from both the Serbs and the Croats but which, at the same time, has many characteristics that point to its similarity to these two peoples" (p. 84). In several speeches he delivered at the end of the fifties, Tito himself expressed a wish that Bosniak individualities should be encouraged, which represented a basis for the newly proclaimed Muslim nation soon afterwards. This was followed by a campaign to create, at any price, the cultural specificities of Bosnia-Herzegovina, which was primarily evident in literature.

16. The Communist Destruction of the Serbian Orthodox Church

In 1963, the "Saint Sava" Serbian Cultural Club of Chicago published Lazo Kostić's book entitled *The Systematic De-Serbianisation of the Church of Saint Sava – The Legal and Political Aspects*. In this book the author continues to analyse the actions of the Titoist regime that were aimed at destroying the Serbian national being. The Serbian Orthodox Church was continuously targeted, and not only within state borders (although the regime would have loved to push it within the confines of the imposed borders of the Republic of Serbia). The radical

revolutionary coup of the communists recklessly and instantaneously destroyed many Serbian traditional institutions, while the Church was gradually undermined and suppressed and the regime tried to use it as an instrument, as it did not dare to destroy it by a single decree. The attack on the church hierarchy was devised rather cunningly; many priests were executed by firing squad, a number of them was sentenced to long-term imprisonment and some of them were recruited to serve the communists against the interests of the Serbian people and their church. They even organised and forcibly carried out the separation of the Church's Macedonian wing and planned to do the same with the Montenegrin one.

While Patriarch Gavriilo was in emigration, the Serbian Orthodox Church was headed by Metropolitan Josif Cvijović who withstood all the communist pressure and temptations. The communists organized public rallies and staged physical attacks against him, but the metropolitan did not relent to their requests, as he always had a valuable excuse on his side: the far reaching decisions of the highest level of the church hierarchy cannot be made in the absence of the Head of the Church. The regime then wanted to persuade the Patriarch to return to the country as soon as possible. Since the clergy and the entire Serbian people truly wanted this, the Patriarch soon repatriated, but he would also not make any significant concessions to the communists. He steadfastly cherished the tradition of Saint Sava, the canonical unity of the church and its establishment. Gavriilo, as a confirmed patriot and German captive was more than the communists had bargained for. Moreover, Tito soon parted ways with Stalin, which put the Yugoslav dictator in a position to curry favour with the western powers and pretend that he guaranteed freedom of religion in his country.

Be that as it may, in 1950, "Gavriilo died unrelenting; he never betrayed the Serbian pledge, nor did he let down his people or the Church entrusted to him. Gavriilo had become Patriarch before the communist regime, so the regime had to accept it and bear with him. However, after his death, the regime believed that it would be much easier to occasion the election of a loyal person than to exert pressure on a head of the church who was a priori against the regime. So the regime applied tremendous pressure on the Election Council in order to appoint a patriarch who would be loyal to the regime" (p. 10). The communists believed that Episcopope Vikentije would be the best choice for the position, but they were greatly disappointed. "Perhaps he was more relenting than Gavriilo, but it must be noted that he carried himself properly in the fundamental issues of the Church. [...] The death of Patriarch Vikentije proved that he had stood as an unwavering guard of the Serbian Church, its canons and its historical mission. He expired just as he was most pressed to relent on the issue of the 'Macedonian Church'. He passed away unbending. Indeed, not a single important pillar of the Serbian Orthodox Church had been destroyed under his patriarchate" (p. 10-11).

Kostić further states that the communists could only carry out their intentions after their favourite, German Đorić, had been elected Patriarch. "The regime was triumphant upon the election of Patriarch

German and, going by his subsequent conduct, it seems that they were right. The new Patriarch left too much evidence of his loyalty and support to the regime. The 'Macedonian Orthodox Church', so much opposed by the Serbian Church hierarchy for more than 13 years, was instituted within less than 13 weeks of German's tenure on the 'ancient throne of the Serbian Patriarchs [...]'. Truth be told, the hand of Patriarch German was unseen in the entire action, but his subsequent behaviour and some other circumstances point to his complicity almost beyond doubt" (p. 11). Kostić is convinced that, in the entire history of the Serbian Orthodox Church, there has been no one who harmed its interests and the pledge of Saint Sava as much as Patriarch German. "Every new decree of his confirmed that the basic principle and the highest law that governed this Patriarch were not the welfare and unity of his Church. He had some other objectives, some other, higher sanctity. He identified himself with the regime. Moreover, he identified the Serbian people with the communist horde; he identified the pledge of Saint Sava with the preposterous antinational Marxist doctrine. There is plenty of evidence to support this claim" (p. 11-12). In the first years after the war, when the Church was in a most difficult position, the patriarchs held their ground perfectly. However, when the pressure of the communist regime largely relaxed, Patriarch German would zealously respond to all the requests of the regime, although he was in a much better position to resist it successfully than his predecessors had been. Since they had a patriarch that suited them, the communists then turned to the process of breaking the religious, national and moral solidity of the church hierarchy. "The regime realised that it needed to bend and break them in order to be successful in its designs. It did not hesitate to do anything that seemed timely and suitable for influencing the high clergy and leading them down its demonic path" (p. 13).

The secret police gathered intelligence on the character traits of various *vladike*, looking for their weak spots and grounds on which they could influence them through blackmail, promises and privileges. The church leaders who suffered the most oppressive measures were Episcopope Varnava Nastić, Metropolitan Arsenije Bradvarević and Episcopope Vasilije Kostić. The first two were sentenced to long-term imprisonment for a verbal offence and the third was almost lynched in the streets of Banja Luka. "The objective of all this violence, both judicial and public, was to frighten the rest of the high clergy and make them more adaptable. Nevertheless, this goal was far from realised until the throne of the patriarchs of Peć was assumed by German. When he was ordained, the regime achieved all that it had desired" (p. 15). The pressure and intimidation, combined with persecution and retaliation, bore fruit and the general resistance of the Assembly of Bishops significantly weakened; there were even some priests who worked directly for the secret police.

Moreover, the regime devised a plan to establish an association of priests within the Socialist Alliance, which was a vehicle of the Communist Party. The Association did not have any Serbian attribute whatsoever and it gathered priests who were openly in favour of the

communists. These priests received various privileges in return, primarily money and apartments. The majority of high clergy did not recognise the Association and some of them prohibited their priests from becoming members; however there were also some bishops who attended the sessions of the Association. The Assembly of Bishops adamantly refused to recognise the Association officially, arguing that it did not have any Serbian denominator in its title and that it was not organised by eparchies but on the level of the republics. "Certainly though, this Association of Orthodox Priests had several fanatical supporters in every republic, all of them either communists or their puppets. Even though the majority of priests were sceptical towards the Association, when all the social benefits of the clergy were conditioned on membership in the Association, it was joined by a multitude of priests, though half-heartedly and perfunctorily. Only the chief priests would continue to stand out, as was the case with Protopope Milan Smiljanić, who was one of the most abominable traitors of the Serbian Church" (p. 16).

In contravention of the Constitution of the Serbian Orthodox Church, Patriarch German promoted Milan Smiljanić to the rank of protopresbyter-stavrophor, the greatest honour that can be conferred to a lay priest. "Nowhere has it been promulgated that associations of that kind were recognised during the tenure of Patriarch German. But it is beyond doubt that the Patriarch himself acknowledges them, as he sends his emissaries to attend the sessions of the Association, responds to their pleasantries and takes Protopope Smiljanić with him whenever he travels abroad. He maintains the closest contacts with this illegal and non-canonical Association, with this group of undisciplined renegades from the regular Church establishment. It is yet another proof of his rather dubious conduct and loyalty to the Church entrusted to him" (p. 17).

In spite of the pressure exerted by the regime, all the attempts of the communists to create a Montenegrin Orthodox Church would quickly come to naught and they would soon reorient to the creation of a Macedonian one. During the WWII, the Bulgarian occupying authorities expelled all the Serbian *vladike* and the communist regime prohibited their return after the war. A series of nerve-racking negotiations were conducted for years in order to reach a compromise. In 1957, it seemed that a compromise had indeed reached. Patriarch Vikentije and the Macedonian Initiative Board agreed that the church administration should remain governed by the Constitution of the Serbian Orthodox Church and that the Macedonian language should be used in the local church administration of bishops elected from among the clergy originating from Macedonia. However, this agreement was immediately followed by proposals to ordain individuals who did not meet any of the basic requirements as bishops, even individuals who were married. In spite of showing a great amount of good will, the Assembly of Bishops had to reject such proposals. The "Macedonians" doubtlessly counted on the refusal, as they wanted to have proof that 'Belgrade' would not accept their candidates and the 'Macedonians' in general. Afterwards, when they usurped their rights and elected the candidates for bishops

themselves, they did not insist on the individuals they had initially proposed. They 'chose' ones who were not married, but were unqualified and lacking an education in theology. Thus, they violated the canons and annulled the Constitution of the Serbian Orthodox Church" (p. 23).

Since the communists were unable to force the Assembly of Bishops to succumb to their demands, they resorted to overt usurpation of authority and organised a session of the 'Macedonian Church and Laity Council' in October 1958. The *Politika* magazine, as the regime's instrument, reported on 5 October that "the Council is attended by 208 delegates, Orthodox priests, monks and believers elected in a regular procedure by the church bodies and organizations" (p. 23). The treacherous Protopope Milan Smiljanić also attended the session. It was at this meeting, which largely resembled the sessions of the Communist Central Committee, that a church coup of sort was performed. "The decision was passed with acclamation to re-establish the Ohrid Archiepiscopacy, as well as to elect the Metropolitan of the Orthodox Church and that the Macedonian Orthodox Church should be united with the Serbian Orthodox Church under its Patriarch as the Head of the Church" (p. 24). Patriarch German did not say a single official word against these decisions. "Quite the contrary, immediately after the session of this usurpative 'Council' and throughout his tenure, the Patriarch acted in furtherance of its decisions, beginning with the ordaining of the bishops elected thereat and by bringing his guest Patriarch Alexius of Moscow and all Russia to Ohrid to participate to the confirmation of this decision" (p. 24). Moreover, he did not convene any church collegium bodies to discuss the current situation.

Under the rule of Tsar Dušan, the Eparchy of Skopje had been elevated to the status of Metropolitanate and it bore the attribute of *prvoprestona* (Translator's note: the principal see), meaning that it is the highest in the hierarchy and above all the other Serbian Orthodox Metropolitanates. In 1346, Archbishop Nikola of Ohrid participated in the ceremony of coronation of Tsar Dušan. The tumultuous history of the Metropolitanate of Skopje saw it under the church authority of Peć, Ohrid and Constantinople but, whenever the Serbian Patriarchate existed, it was under its jurisdiction. On the other hand, the Archiepiscopacy of Ohrid and the Patriarchate of Constantinople were always Greek. At different periods of history, before it was elevated to the status of Metropolitanate, the Eparchy of Skopje had been Bulgarian and Byzantine. It was never Macedonian and nor did a Macedonian Church ever exist in history. "And the Serbian Orthodox Church has existed ever since it was established by Saint Sava in 1219. It has always existed without interruption. Its geographical scope and see has changed over time, as have the states in which it existed, but it has always existed, sometimes even illegally; it also left evidence of its historical and legal continuity" (p. 27). During the Great Migration under Patriarch Carnojević, the church also spread into Austria and Hungary, finally consolidating itself in 1921 when the Third Serbian Patriarchate was established.

Most importantly, the Serbian Orthodox Church has always been a markedly national church. "There was never any need to determine the personnel structure of that Church by decree; it has always been composed of the Serbs and only of the Serbs. It has been national in such a way that no state borders and area names could influence its denomination. The Church was not only Serbian in Serbia but even in Turkey, Hungary, Montenegro and Primorje. Its believers were the Serbs, no matter whose subjects they were" (p. 28). On the other hand, not only was the 'Macedonian' Church nonexistent in history, but there was never any attempt to have it created. One cannot claim that such attempts were prevented as no one undertook anything to that effect and no one pleaded or suggested or even hinted that it should be established. The 'Macedonians' took advantage of the current weakness of the Serbs in order to proclaim their 'Church' in contravention of the canons and the law. However, nobody even thinks of having the eparchies outside Yugoslavia annexed to that church. For the sake of comparison, the Serbian Orthodox church has its eparchies in Hungary, Rumania, Albania, America, etc. As is the case with the 'Macedonian nation', the 'Macedonian Church' can spread only as far as the bayonets of the Yugoslav Militia can reach" (p. 28).

Curiously enough, the Croatian politicians, who would almost regularly emerge as pioneers of new and fresh ideas for destroying Serbdom, came up with a proposal for resolving the issue of the Serbian Orthodox Church. "It would resolve the matter if the activity of the Serbian Orthodox Church should be limited to the Republic of Serbia, as this Church is actually the Church of Serbia, while every federal republic should establish its own church. The recent creation of the Macedonian Church seems to be the first step towards a suitable solution" (p. 29). The former Ustasha minister Ivica Frković had a similar approach: "The Serbs cannot have their religious leader outside the territory of the State of Croatia. The Serbian Orthodox Church must have its chief administration in the State of Croatia, its head must have his see here and he must be independent of the Patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Serbia" (p. 29). Pavelić also attempted to establish a Croatian Orthodox Church.

Considering that the church is a form of human community, it must be legally regulated in order to function pursuant to certain legal norms and within a certain legal system. The church law is a separate branch of law that is constituted on the basis of the legal principles and legal institute of the religious communities. This law deals with the traditional principles that bind the church structure and hierarchy even today, internally referred to as the canon law. The way in which the "Macedonian Church" was established infringed all these principles and tenets, as well as the canon law in its entirety. Thus, in a legal sense, the "Council of Ohrid" represents a destructive act of usurpation, which is referred to as schism and strictly penalised in the canon law. "It is clear that the schism is an illegal act as it is not envisaged and regulated in any legal system. No church would consider something of that sort to be possible, nor would it even think of legitimising it through an

established procedure. From the standpoint of every church organization, a schism is beyond the bounds of possibility" (p. 36). It was an open attack on the very existence of the Serbian Orthodox Church. Its jurisdiction was usurped and stolen. Therefore, the act of the "Council of Ohrid" is legally void.

As Episcopate Nikodim Milaš explains in his systematic work entitled *The Orthodox Church Law*, it is impossible to create a new church diocese or to elevate an existing diocese to a higher status without a pertinent decision by a church council organ of the church in whose jurisdiction the action is taking place. Every action of this kind must base its legitimacy on an existing higher norm. "Hence, it is clear that there is no legal validity in anything stemming from the decision of the Council of Ohrid, in anything undertaken in legal sense pursuant to that decision and in accordance with the events that occurred at the Council; no ordainment, honorary recognition and decision of that 'Church' has any legal validity because its foundations are legally void and usurpatory [...] If something is legally void, it cannot produce any legally valid consequence" (p. 39).

Thus, neither the purported Archbishop Dositej nor Bishops Kliment and Naum were "elected by the church hierarchy, as dictated by the church regulations, since the Church recreates, ramifies, inherits and continues in and of itself. There must be no outside interference, as was the case with the 'Macedonian vladikas'. They were 'elected' or imposed by the lay authorities of Macedonia, with the consent of the highest state bodies of Yugoslavia. Not a single Orthodox Church has a precedent like this, including the Serbian. They were faced with a *fait accompli*" (p. 40). The church law is utterly clear, precise and unambiguous in this sense: "An episcopate appointed and instituted in a diocese by a state authority and without the decision of the church shall be deemed an illegal episcopate and not recognized by church law. If such an episcopate must be tolerated while under the protection of the state, he shall be immediately deposed or even excommunicated as soon as possible, i.e. as soon as the Church is granted the freedom of decision" (p. 40). This church regulation is so precise and absolute that no subsequent acknowledgment of the election by an authorized church body can render it legally valid. "In accordance with the universal legal principles, the postulates of public law and the specific rules of the canon (church) law, everything that was decided at Ohrid and everything that was subsequently concluded pursuant to the decision of the Council of Ohrid is legally null and void" (p. 41).

The first and foremost condition for the recognition of a new formation within the Orthodoxy is the consent of the "Mother Church", i.e. the church from which the new church community separates and becomes independent. In the case of the "Macedonian Orthodox Church", that could only be the Serbian Orthodox Church and its Holy Assembly of Bishops. Bishop Milaš is adamant in this sense: "The competence in recognizing the independence of a local church belongs to the cathedral authority, especially to the council of the church that the local church that intends to proclaim its independence or self-rule is an

integral part” (p. 42). Such an act must be published in the official gazette of the relevant church. Kostić emphasized this since he obviously feared that the Assembly of Bishops might secretly make such a decision under pressure from the communist regime. The conduct of Patriarch German was particularly problematic and questionable because he tacitly accepted all these illegal actions and acted as if they did not concern him at all.

Pursuant to Article 1 of the Constitution, “the Serbian Orthodox Church is one, indivisible and autocephalous.” In its *Tomos* of 30 March 1922, the Patriarchate of Constantinople ceded to the Serbian Orthodox Church its hitherto canonical eparchies of Skopje, Raška and Prizren, Veleš and Debar, Prespa and Ohrid, as well as a part of the Metropolitanate of Voden; the Polijan Episcopate was given to it pursuant to the Treaty of Bucharest of 1913 and the Metropolitanate of Strumica by the Treaty of Neuilly in 1919. Kostić posed a new question in this regard: “Is the Serbian Church allowed to surrender to someone else that which was clearly given to it? To give something that the Ecumenical Patriarchate certainly would not yield to them? Does it not constitute a fraud that makes all legal acts stemming from it suspicious and even void?” (p. 53).

Even if the separation had been completely legal and proper, it would have required the recognition of all the existing Orthodox Churches. “If this church did not have an Orthodox attribute, it would not need any recognition. However, it wants to remain of the true faith, Orthodox and equal among all the other Orthodox Churches. There is a community of Orthodox churches and, though it is a loose association, it is visible and active, carefully supervising its dogmatic and organizational legality. It is not possible for a church to sneak into the organisation and gain an equal position. All the local churches must approve of a new member and even determine its legal prerogatives, i.e. establish whether a church is autocephalous or autonomous and who is its head (whether it is a patriarchate, metropolitanate or archbishopric, etc.). There can be no usurpation, no coups, violence, threats and no communist state government which could hide the legal irregularities. The situation is clear here and everything is conducted in accordance with unambiguous acts and in the manner established centuries ago. If such criteria are not met, no internal documents may act as a substitute for the recognition; such a ‘church’ does not belong to the Orthodox community and is nonexistent from an international standpoint. The other churches, the real churches, ignore its existence” (p. 55).

In 1219, the Ecumenical Patriarch issued the *Grammata* ordaining Sava Nemanjić as the Archbishop of all the Serbian lands and giving him the right to ordain bishops, priests and deacons. In addition, Sava received a written blessing granting the Serbs the power to nominate and ordain the archbishop. All these autocephalous and autonomous Serbian churches were fully recognised by the Mother Church in accordance with the prescribed procedure. For example, the Metropolitanate of Karlovac was recognised by the Patriarchate of Peć, from which it separated in 1710 pursuant to the *Grammata* by Patriarch Kalinik of Peć.

When the Patriarchate of Peć was subsequently abolished, the autonomy of the Metropolitanate of Karlovac was recognised by the Patriarchate of Constantinople, as well as the autonomy of the Metropolitanate of Cetinje. Before Serbia gained full independence in 1878, the Orthodox Church of Serbia was autonomous within the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In 1879, the Patriarchate granted it independence and equality with all the other local churches. In 1922, these three parts of the Church reunited into the Serbian Orthodox Church, which was individually recognised in writing by all the other Orthodox churches.

Something that has been legally void from the very beginning, as is the case with the “Macedonian Orthodox Church”, cannot be legally formalised and established over time. This “Church was created in secrecy, through violence and by avoiding the competent church authorities. It is a true example of usurpation and an illegal act. The successors of this Macedonian clergy will never be able to claim that their church was created in good faith and without legal obstacles, or to claim in full confidence that everything was regular” (p. 75). There will be no help for the support shown by the politicaster *Tanjug* agency and the *Politika* magazine, which try to equalise its status with the Serbian Orthodox Church and even refer to Patriarch German as the Patriarch of the Serbian and Macedonian Churches, though they stop short of calling him Patriarch of the Orthodox Church in Yugoslavia. The communists have always compensated for their ignorance and stupidity with audacity and rudeness. Kostić elaborated on these ideological efforts by the individuals who would use the faith only as a means of manipulation and who would think that the church organization may easily be reduced to an instrument of daily politics.

17. The National Aspects of the Censuses

In 1973, in Berlin, Lazo Kostić personally published a statistical, demographic and political study entitled *An Overview of the Census of Nationalities in Yugoslavia*. He was principally motivated by the biased and unprofessional interpretations, analyses and explanations of the census that had recently been conducted in his homeland, which reflected the anti-Serb nationalistic pretensions and the usual communist abuse. Kostić took it upon himself to consider this issue impartially and scientifically in accordance with all the rules of statistical method. In his introductory remarks, Kostić defines his basic scientific principle of impartiality: “Understandably, I look at these things as a Serb, but I will not utter a single sentence in favour of the Serbs that is not based on my objective analyses. Injustice done to the Serbs might hurt me more and I will certainly dedicate myself to such an issue more than other things, but I will never attempt to fabricate the figures and their meaning even if they are detrimental to Serbdom. Such fabrications and lies can be helpful temporarily, but can in no way have a permanent effect” (p. 3).

Kostić began his analysis with methodological objections to the procedures that resulted in the irregularities and false figures. In their original form, both the forms and instructions that were used in the census

were, based on the principles of statistical methodology and demographic statistics. However, upon their publication, political pressures were exerted to make certain changes that were not in compliance with the basic scientific premises and the common practice that was applied internationally in censuses. "Proposals were constantly put forward from Zagreb to make changes; a horrible pressure of a kind never seen before in any census was applied to adjust this or that to their political objectives. The entire structure, which was designed correctly and for the right purpose, was thus shaken and practically demolished. Owing to these circumstances, the last census that was conducted in Yugoslavia became the subject of severe criticism and could be considered unsuccessful in advance" (p. 6-7).

Firstly, they transferred the right of interpretation and changing the instructions from the federal statistics bureau to the republic one, consequently violating the principle of equal treatment and uniform methodology. In this way, the basic comparability of data was rendered impossible since it would only make sense if the figures compared were arrived at in the same way - by applying the same methodology. Hence, the resulting data is of no use, not only because of the failure to apply the international methodology, but also because it varied from one republic to the next. The census was not conducted in the same way in all areas and it was carried out under circumstances filled with national hysteria and the desire to inflate the results as much as necessary for them to accomplish their national and republic aspirations.

The quantitative data on some nationalities was inflated through uncompromising pressure and open falsifications. Serbia and Vojvodina were the only ones that did not question the methodology of the census and did not issue any separate instructions to the census clerks. They also did not attempt to influence the citizens' choice of nationality. The international practice is completely different. Even the most decentralized states use a centrally established methodology, forms and data processing. In our case, something quite unbelievable happened, i.e. the autonomous provinces of Kosovo and Vojvodina published the results of the census long before the other federal units. In this way, the central processing of the data was called into question. In the absence of a unique census procedure, it was impossible to officially challenge or verify the truthfulness of the data or to order the repetition of the census in the areas where irregularities were established.

To make it even worse, Slovenia obstructed the definitive publication of the final results when its state bodies openly indicated that they would use the census data to establish a register of citizens, even though the practice of using the data for any administrative or fiscal purposes was strictly prohibited by the basic principles of statistical science. The entire census material "is simply turned into figures and is presented only in this form. The material must exclusively serve statistical purposes. In earlier times, when the data was processed manually, many states would tear off the first line of the form that indicated the name of the person (the census unit) since this data represented a statistical secret" (p. 10).

What is more, difficulties also arose in relation to the census clerks

who visited households, carried the census forms, explained how they should be filled in, filled the forms for illiterate individuals and then took them to the collection centre. In some federal units, they were almost universally nationally biased and were furnished with strict instructions on how to increase the number of citizens declaring themselves members of a certain nationality; they would also suggest to people how to declare themselves. The census clerks in Croatia, Bosnia, Montenegro, Macedonia and Kosovo behaved like national agitators. Kostić described examples of the manipulation of the answers to some tendentious questions in a rather graphic and ironic manner: "It is highly improbable that even half of the population of Yugoslavia would answer to a questions like: 'What is your nationality?' or 'Your nationality?' The census clerks had to simplify the questions in order to make them more familiar to the people. E.g., in Bosnia, if they wanted to hear a certain answer, they would say: 'Hajji, are you a Muslim?' and the individual would obligatorily say: 'Of course I am.' A census clerk in Montenegro would say: 'Are you a Montenegrin, Grandpa?', and the answer would be: 'What else!' As expected, the clerks would then register the first individual as a Muslim and the second as a Montenegrin. Possibly the Montenegrin would have given a different answer if he had been asked whether he was a Serb or a Montenegrin" (p. 11).

Kostić further pointed out that "of course, there were cases when the census clerk would not even ask a person about his nationality, just as he would not ask him about his sex, whether he was married or not, where he came from, etc. The clerk would see it for himself and register what was obvious, doing the same with the nationality if he believed that the nationality of a person was 'clear'" (p. 12). Moreover, the census clerk "could even put down an answer that was different to what he received to his question. In some instances, this could be controlled, in others it was impossible" (p. 12). A large number of Serbian speaking Turks, Roma (Gypsies) and Muslims were forced to declare themselves as Albanians, or the clerks would simply register this answer without even asking these people anything. It was such a drastic and frequent phenomenon that it was even publicly acknowledged in its milder form.

According to a report published in the *Politika* newspaper on 24 June 1971, in order to hush the sharp protestations, cover up the irrefutable evidence and relativize the obvious problem, Veli Deva, the chairman of the Committee and the then leader of the communist Shqiptar separatists, said at the session of the Kosovo Communist League District Committee, "that the census was in general very successful, even though there was some pressure exerted upon the Muslims, Gorani, Turks and Roma to be registered as Albanians. Veli Deva added that similar pressure was undoubtedly exerted by individuals of other nationalities as well" (p. 13). Kostić went on to give "a series of other examples that prove that the public of that time reacted sharply to the apparent irregularities and falsification of the census figures in Kosovo and Metohija. However, those results prevailed and were officially untouchable".

Additional instructions given by the federal units were also quite varied regarding the treatment of cases where a citizen declared himself by

a region instead of a nationality. In Croatia, all such individuals were classified as Croats, irrespective of whether they declared themselves Dalmatians, Slavonians or inhabitants of Baranja, Lika, Kordun, Banija, etc., while such persons in Bosnia-Herzegovina were registered as Muslims if their names implied that they might be of the Islamic faith - or included in the 'undeclared' column if their names were unquestionably Christian. The category of Yugoslavs was also treated differently. It was encouraged in areas where they were convinced it would be to the detriment of the Serbs, while it was suppressed in areas where there was a fear that it might endanger the desired number of members of the newly formed artificial nations. Based on Kostić's estimations, the Yugoslav statistical data decreased the real number of Serbs by two million.

Computer-assisted data processing opens up greater possibilities for successful falsification. While mistakes made in manual processing can be identified and corrected, this is completely impossible in mechanical data processing. That is why modern procedures require more professional, ethical and conscientious staff to be engaged to process the data. The computer can be programmed to classify every tenth Serb as a Croat and, upon completion of the processing, such an instruction can be removed from the computer memory. The fact that the census also included people that were temporarily working abroad compromised this operation even more since, in the civilized countries and according to the international principles, "a census is based on the so-called present population. Each individual that is present in the territory of a municipality on the critical date (the census date), hour and minute, is registered regardless of where he actually lives and where he exercises his civil rights. This principle has been applied in all civilized countries for centuries and, as far as I know, no contemporary censuses have yet violated this principle. There are quite significant reasons behind such a principle. The first and most important of these is aimed at avoiding double registration, i.e. the registration of one person in two places. This must be strictly avoided. That is why guests at hotels are registered, as well as travellers, etc., but not persons who have been living in a place for decades but who were not there at the critical moment" (p. 6).

However, the Yugoslav census even included people who moved away, if that would help achieve the intended political objectives. There were some extremely paradoxical cases of certain municipalities with a drastic decrease in the number of their inhabitants actually showing a rapid growth in population and a statistical surplus that was beyond comparison. "If 'persons temporarily working abroad' are registered, then all the people on holiday, travelling or visiting places other than their place of residence, etc. should also be registered [...] The people on holiday are thus registered in the municipality of their permanent residence as well as in the municipality where they were found on the census date. Who knows how many such double registration cases occurred! The total number of citizens can thus be presented as larger than it actually is by several million" (p. 29). Not to mention that a few of those citizens who claimed to have temporarily worked in Australia would never come back. Also, the censuses of all European countries include our *gastarbeiters* who were in

IT-03-67-T

these countries on the census dates, meaning that this behaviour on the part of the Yugoslav statisticians exaggerated the figures at a European level. "The accepted principle is to get answers from the census object itself. The instructions envisage who should provide answers on behalf of children, mentally challenged people, etc. but the instructions do not specify who should provide answers on behalf of 'the temporarily absent'. This is left to the decision of the census clerks themselves. And who can guarantee that the data obtained is correct?" (p. 29).

Kostić indicates that the results of the census conducted in Bosnia-Herzegovina are nothing short of scandalous. According to the census of 1931, the Serbs accounted for 44.5 percent of the population and, according to that of 1948, they accounted for 41.6 percent of the population. As 72,000 Serbs or three percent were of the Muslim faith, the Orthodox Serbs must have accounted for 38.5 percent of the population, or six percent less than in the census conducted seventeen years before. This further testifies to the extent of the crimes the Croats committed against the Serbs. "A change of one percent in the population over one decade is a phenomenon going against nature" (p. 35). According to the census conducted in 1871, the Serbs accounted for 37.2 percent of the population. However, the data from the census of 1961 shows that their number dropped by almost thirteen thousand, while all the other ethnic groups grew in number. The numerical indicators of the Croats show that they did not suffer at all in Bosnia during WWII. The scandal suggested by Kostić was created by "the enormous number of the Muslim ethnic group, which grew in number rapidly and completely unbelievably" (p. 36). The data of the first census conducted by the Austro-Hungarian authorities upon their occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina shows that the Muslims accounted for 38.8 percent of the population. However, due to their systematic relocation out of Bosnia-Herzegovina, their number was dropping continually and in 1910 it was reduced to 32.3 percent. In 1921, there was 31 percent Muslims in Yugoslavia and, in 1931, they accounted for 30.9 percent of the population in the entire territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

This data was based primarily on their religious denomination, since it would never occur to a normal person to consider them a separate nation. However, Kostić said that he was relieved when he discovered that the communists had declared the Muslims a separate nation as he had feared that they might try to do something by far more harmful and ruinous to the Serbs, i.e. recognize the Bosnian nationality. We were actually saved because the Croats in Bosnia-Herzegovina would not give up approximately 700,000 of their fellow men who also needed to fit into the artificial Bosnian ethnical project. "Through this action of theirs, we actually saved more than a million and a half Serbs. Those who can keenly observe the situation in the country will feel the same relief. It would be ideal to have all the Muslims as Serbs, or at least a larger part of them. However, the authorities have not been working on this but quite the reverse, trying to distance them from the Serbs as much as possible" (p. 39).

During Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Serbian population was pretty much stable. The Muslims were moving away and

the Catholics were increasingly settling here from all parts of the empire. Nevertheless, the number of Muslims in communist Yugoslavia grew rapidly and they would soon become the most numerous. Serious statisticians and demographers find this fact unbelievable and inexplicable. In any case, their number could not have been based on the birth rate or their relocation from Sandžak, since the total birth rate in Bosnia-Herzegovina, which was 34.1 per mil in 1960, dropped to 20.9 per mil in 1971 as a consequence of fewer births and increased migration of young people. The post-war decrease in the number of Serbs was clear and was primarily due to genocide, though also to the colonization of Vojvodina. On the other hand, the numerical indicators show that the Muslims suffered practically no losses during the war tragedy. There were many more Croats among the registered *gastarbeiters* and the number of Muslims among them was the smallest. When we exclude this data, the sudden increase in the number of Muslims becomes even more striking, particularly in view of the fact that they are greater in number than the Serbs.

The number of declared Serbs in Montenegro increased six fold over 22 years, which further testifies to the fact that previously there had been considerable falsification of the data. The census of 1948 showed 91 percent of the Montenegrins, while the census conducted in 1971 showed 67 percent of them. However, in Croatia "doubts are the greatest, since the development of the situation there has been abnormal and the political and party structures are involved in everything beyond measure (more so than in any other Republic); they would distort the data both officially and privately [...] Croatia inflated the figures more than anyone expected, more than could be imagined" (p. 56-57). The number of citizens of the Croatian nationality was artificially exaggerated. It was as if the census clerks competed to register as many Croats as possible, registering as Croats "any other person who would appear to them to be a Croat, without declaring so. It was the same with the regional censuses: all these people knew that they could declare themselves as Croats but did not want to do so" (p. 63). However, no matter what they wanted, they were registered as Croats. None of the citizens had any possibility of checking the veracity of the data recorded about them in the census form. They unscrupulously applied the principle that "anyone who was born in Croatia was *ipso facto* a Croat, even if his father was an Albanian and mother a Hungarian, and especially if one of the parents was a Croat" (p. 64).

About half a million Serbs survived the war in the territory of the Croatian federal unit and their number grew continually thereafter. Between 1949 and 1953, the number of Serbs increased by 444,616, in spite of the mass colonization of Vojvodina. In the period between 1953 and 1961, the number of Serbs increased by 36,575 persons. Although there were no mass migrations at the time, the census results indicated that the number of Serbs in Croatia allegedly increased by only 1,735 persons in the period between 1961 and 1971, while the number of Croats in the same period increased by 173,370 persons, which is precisely one hundred times more than the number of Serbs. We are talking about a national structure where the total number of Croats is five to six times more than

the number of Serbs according to the official Croatian statistics. What is even more interesting is that we are talking about circumstances where the fertility of the Serbian women was higher than that of the Croatian women. The total number of Serbs was thus reduced from 15 to 14 percent. The Croats created a real statistical nightmare when it comes to national minorities.

The statistical number of Macedonians also grew at an unbelievable rate. In the period between 1953 and 1961 their number increased to 71.2 percent of the Macedonian population. "Increase in the number of one nationality by more than 5 percent over a period of eight years is, in principle, impossible. It is even more improbable in view of the fact that the minorities in Macedonia have a higher birth rate than the Macedonians themselves. As regards the manipulations, they were so obvious and, if one wants to engage in forgery, he should at least try to make it seem credible. These unexpected and impossible fluctuations give rise to doubt" (p. 72).

Nevertheless, the most striking example was the growth rate of the Albanian population in Kosovo and Metohija. According to the official statistics, there were 498,242 Albanians in 1948, 524,559 of them in 1953, 646,605 in 1961 and 916,767 in 1971. It is a fact that horrible terror was enforced against the Serbs in the province, as well as that the Albanians have the highest birth rate; however, these figures are still unbelievable. Kostić finds it particularly curious that "they rushed to publish the results in Kosovo before all the other republics and provinces of Yugoslavia. Those who, without doubt, have the most incompetent personnel and the fewest machines for calculation and processing, were the first to publish the data - and that in the place where the clerks had the most difficult tasks (due to the largest number of illiterate individuals and the most underdeveloped postal service network)! Why is that so? It was obviously done with the view of preventing any subsequent correction and to remove the grounds for objections and complaints concerning their preliminary data. They would now take offence at any objections to the regularity of the procedure" (p. 96).

The Albanians quickly achieved what they had in mind. "Their lies and forgery would remain the formal truth" for a long time, "on which they would base further requests for participation in the government, and even their separation, should it come to that. The Serbs were in a terrible situation, which was far worse than that of 1912, and there was no positive resolution in sight" (p. 96). The notoriety of forgery is reflected in the example of the Turks, whose number was literally cut in half between 1961 to 1971, although there were no significant emigrations at that time. Only 14,593 Gypsies were recorded in the census, in spite of the fact that local and some of the more objective foreign observers estimated that their number exceeded 200,000.

18. Kostić's Vidovdan Speeches

Not much has been preserved of Professor Lazo Kostić's verbal addresses. In 1958, he personally published a brochure of his *Vidovdan Orations in Canada and America* delivered in that same year. The

brochure was printed by *The Canadian Serb Defender* magazine of Hamilton. He delivered his first speech in Canada on 22 June, under the working title of *Serbdom is in Danger*. After WWII, the sense of reality was lost in the heights of glory, power and self confidence and the internal and external threats were ignored, which would cost us dearly. The Serbs were caught by surprise in 1941 and pushed to the brink of extinction. A period of constant decay ensued and Kostić hoped that the bottom was already reached in the fifties and that a quiet and gradual recovery could begin.

Kostić saw the greatest danger from the Croats, who have divided the roles amongst themselves. Some of them are preparing to continue the physical extermination of the Serbs, while the more moderate ones are dealing with negation of the Serb ethnic character in certain geographic areas by falsifying the historical facts. And the naïve Serbian Yugoslavs still turn a blind eye to this process and accommodate the Croats. “To say the least, our Yugoslavs attempt to conceal the Croatian misdeeds of the recent past, to ignore them and consign them to oblivion. They are not angry with the Croats for subordinating them, but with us for mentioning it. They even refute our claims, saying that not everything happened the way we described it. They are trying to shift all the blame onto a handful of Ustashas. Even individuals whose family members were victims of the Croatian crimes, speak only of the Ustashas, whose name they write with a capital letter” (p. 5).

Kostić was always resolute in the conclusion he quite correctly drew – that the entire Croatian people is responsible for the atrocities the Ustashas committed against the Serbs. Certainly, legal science insists on the strict individualisation of criminal responsibility; however, it is not criminal responsibility that is in question here but the civil, political, moral and historical responsibility. Only the perpetrators are criminally responsible, including the principal culprits, the instigators and the abettors. However, the communist regime largely avoided persecution of the criminals and enabled the principal perpetrators to find refuge abroad. The communists preferred to apply repressive measures only against the Serbs, and mostly for crimes they invented. Civic responsibility would entail material compensation for all Serbian property destroyed by the Croats. The moral responsibility would extend to all the individuals who created the conditions under which the crimes were committed and to the ones who observed those crimes tacitly or even delightedly. And it was the entire Croatian nation that created the atmosphere of hatred and revenge between the two World Wars.

Kostić saw the principal mistake of the Serbs in their unification with the Croats. The creation of that state union was the mistake from which all the other mistakes stemmed. “Be that as it may, all these mistakes taken together cannot justify the Croatian atrocities that even the worst nation of the world would be ashamed of. They could have seceded if they believed the time had come, but they should not have murdered and mistreated hundreds of thousands of innocent people (the elderly, women and children)” (p. 9). Unscrupulous as it is, the Croatian Diaspora even refers to the regime of the communist dictator Tito as the

regime of Great Serbia. “And there is nothing in the world that Josip Broz hates more than the Serbs and Serbdom. He surrounded himself with all the archenemies of the Serbs; he collected them from everywhere in order to harm the Serbs as much as possible. If any purported Serbs come into his service, they must renounce their Serbdom and all the Serbian sanctities” (p. 10).

In 1953, even the American magazine *The Catholic World* accused the entire Croatian nation of the crimes committed during WWII, though it tried to defend the Roman Catholic Archbishop Alojzije Stepinac who was irrefutably an associate of Pavelić. This Catholic magazine *inter alia* wrote as follows: “Unfortunately, the Croats refused to forget the past and proceeded with the massacre of hundreds of thousand of the Serbs [...] Concisely put, these crimes were the crimes of the Croatian people lead by Ante Pavelić, and Stepinac did everything in his power to put an end to them” (p. 11). When a Croat from California tried to oppose this generalisation, the magazine editor retorted in the following manner: “Nuremberg has not resolved the issue of the collective guilt of the German nation and I would not claim that all the Croats are individually responsible for the crimes committed by the Pavelić regime. However, we may say that a nation, as a collective entity, is responsible for accepting a government and the crimes committed on its behalf” (p. 12).

In his memoirs published in 1959, Hitler’s high ranking politician Hermann Neubacher wrote that “After the disintegration of Yugoslavia, the Croats launched a military campaign of revenge and destruction against Orthodox Serbdom, which was one of the most brutal actions of mass murder in history” (p. 12). Kostić’s following words were indeed prophetic: “It is beyond doubt that the Ustashas will not reappear. They have been too compromised under this name before the eyes of the whole world, so they would not insist on it. Now a new name can emerge and its followers and members will be of the same people as the Ustashas were. The phenomenon of the Ustashas is but a manifestation of this in the struggle against Serbdom” (p. 12).

According to Kostić, next to the Croats, the Serbian Yugoslavs are the greatest danger for Serbdom. If Yugoslavia had not existed, the Croats would not have had a historical chance to commit such massive crimes, the artificial nations would not have been invented and, most probably, the communists would not have risen to power. “In the opposition to Serbdom, we have been faced with two different processes concurrently, super-integration and disintegration. Thus, we must be something more than the Serbs, while, at the same time, whole parts of Serbdom have to renounce and negate their Serbian nature. Why is that so if the objective is super-integration? If it is the Yugoslavism that needs to be achieved? Why can’t these groups become Yugoslav through their Serbdom? Because there is always the threat that the Serbdom might come to its senses and stop the process of de-Serbization. In order to avoid that and to have the Yugoslav pill easily swallowed, they had to resort to weakening Serbdom, to dividing it and presenting it as decrepit” (p. 17).

In his speech, Kostić voices much criticism of his fellow Serbs. “Generally speaking, Yugoslav ideas of all sorts are propagated by the Serbs in a dishonourable manner, by concealing the truth, by deception and lies. And, most of all, by toadying to the Croats, because the Croats are against Yugoslavia and it needs to be made acceptable for them. It is done largely against the Serbian national and vital interests” (p. 19).

In his speech delivered on the same occasion in Chicago on 29 June 1958, Kostić lyrically expressed the grandeur of the heroic myth of Kosovo and its importance in the Serbian national tradition. Adducing a great deal of evidence, he showed that the Serbian nation in the modern sense of the term had been formed as early as the Middle Ages and that the Serbian national consciousness had been developed at the *Vidovdan* Council. “The notable history of the Serbs did not begin with *Vidovdan*; in a way, it ended on this day. However, *Vidovdan* has saved this history from oblivion; it has helped it to remain in our spiritual sight, in our intimate selves. *Vidovdan* has made it live in our memory and has preserved it there. It took the disaster and grief that ensued after *Vidovdan* to make the glorious days of our past shine in our eyes in contrast to the then miserable existence. Everything that had previously been grand and beautiful seemed much more glorious and splendid to our forefathers and even to us today” (p. 28).

Kostić’s entire speech was emotionally charged, replete with epic glorification of Serbdom and perceptive elaboration on the historical fate of the Serbian people. His oration, delivered before the Serbs overseas, was prepared at the peak of his study of the Serbian character of the Bay of Kotor, as can be seen from the data used in the explanation of the fundamental national values, the Kosovo myth and the cult of sacrificing oneself for the fatherland. Kostić’s words echoed as a dramatic warning to all the Serbs to rid themselves of the two horrible delusions of this century as soon as possible - the Yugoslav idea and communism - and to prepare themselves for a final confrontation with the Croats, the nation who centred its whole existence around hatred of the Serbs, lies and thievery.

Prompted primarily by the threats that were looming over the Serbian Bay of Kotor in the form of the persistent Croatian pretensions towards it and the Montenegrin attempts to eradicate every trace of Serbdom therein, Lazo Kostić published his book entitled *On the Serbian Character of the Bay of Kotor* in Zurich in 1961, which will be extensively analysed elsewhere in this book. The only relatively older text, with which the Croats seek to corroborate their historical rights to the Bay of Kotor, is the verse by the Catholic friar Andrija Kačić Miošić, according to whom the “Bay of Kotor – [is] the pride of Croats”; it was the argument that Vjekoslav Klaić used to delude himself with. However, even Kostić himself stated in other works that the Croats only settled as far as the Cetina River. In the last century, after the defeat of Napoleon, Austria took over all the Venetian territories and annexed Dubrovnik and Bay of Kotor to Dalmatia. The Croats then engaged in a fierce political struggle to have Dalmatia ceded as an Austrian province to the so-called *Trojedinica*, the Kingdom of Croatia and Slovenia under

Following WWI, the Croatian pretensions took on a different form and issued requests to have the country restructured on the federal principle. Since they were not given the Bay of Kotor in the Cvetković-Maček Agreement, they continued their public requests in the emotionally charged press and the euphoria, because of the unbelievable pliability of the Serbian politicians of the time. After WWII, the Croatian ideologists did not overtly express their territorial pretensions towards the Bay of Kotor under the communist regime, though they did use perfidious and treacherous methods to gradually develop in the official publications a theory of the identification of the Catholic faith with the Croatian nation. The situation was different in the Diaspora, because the Croats were always better organised than the Serbs. They were supported by the western governments and the Catholic clergy, and they had more funds at their disposal for propaganda activities. A friar named Dominik Mandić was a particularly diligent writer, though he never attempted to corroborate his theories with any relevant scientific arguments. He reckoned that Klaić’s fairy tale of the “Red Croatia” would provide a sufficient framework for further Croatian pretensions and that a constant repetition of a lie would lead to its general acceptance. Unfortunately, the political circumstances of the communist Yugoslavia proved that the lies could hold the consciousness of great numbers of people enslaved for decades.

The Croatian ideologists were never concerned with morals and the truth. “Additionally, they mostly count on the weakness of the ‘Serbians’ and the rest of the Serbs who find it most important to preserve Yugoslavia, and who will acquiesce to the weakening of the Serbian position regardless of how great a sacrifice it might be” (p. 20). Professor Kostić engaged resolutely in a number of polemics and the Serbian emigration press of the fifties and the sixties is full of his texts where he described the Croatian lies and forgery in a systematic, convincing and well argued manner.

19. The Serbian National Pledge of Patriotism

In 1962, as a special issue of the Bulletin of the Serbian National and Cultural Club of Switzerland, Lazo Kostić published his treatise entitled *Foreign Opinions on the Serbian Liberation and Unification of 1912-1918* in mimeograph print. He compiled a selection of the most impressive and compelling testimonials to this magnificent exploit, which certainly have a lasting value. In 1915, the French historian Ernest Denis published a book entitled *La grand Serbie*, in which he wrote the following on the Balkan Wars: “the Serbian accomplishments are explained by the scientific superiority of the high-ranking officers and the moral value of their soldiers” (p. 1). Later in the book, Denis said that “According to the letter a German male nurse wrote from Belgrade on 26 November 1912, ‘It is the fact that every citizen here is a patriot that makes this people so grand. When mobilisation is conducted with such unusual speed, when the troops overcome the most

difficult stages with no objections and complaints, when they cross the impassable trails, the flooded fields and the canyons they thought were impossible to overcome, when the wounded endure their pain with witty humour and courage that leaves the foreign doctors awestruck, it is because all of them, from the simple soldier to the general and commander, know what they are fighting for” (p. 1).

In 1914, in his extensive work entitled *The Balkans*, German publicist Albrecht Wirth wrote the following about the Balkan Wars: “The victory at Kumanovo is the greatest victory the Serbs have won in almost six hundred years. It has certainly lifted the spirits of a nation that has suffered so many misfortunes [...] The enemy fought well and it was not an easy task to suppress it. Therefore, the Serbs can rightfully be proud of this first and decisive feat” (p. 3). As the Norwegian Colonel Engel emphasised, “We arrived here with little respect for them and we are returning full of admiration. We saw a peaceful, confident and patriotic people. We encountered the best soldiers in the world - the courageous, obedient, earnest soldiers who willingly sacrificed their lives for their country and the national idea” (p. 4).

In 1913, Adolph Fischer noted an interesting detail regarding the nature of the Serbian army: “The pool of officers is not separated from the soldiers with a different lifestyle and habits. There is no gap between them. We would often have seen officers and soldiers sitting together at the same tables in taverns [...] Serbia knows not of the class distinction that divides the peoples of Central Europe into separate groups. Serbia is a country of small farmers; it is a democracy in spite of its monarchical structure” (p. 4). Even Dr Hans Vogel was truly astonished: “In every war and in every army there are indolent soldiers but, to the honour of the Serbian army, I must say that it did not know any cowardice and desertion at the frontlines and before the enemy” (p. 5).

French publicist Auguste Gauvin emphasised the following with regard to the first Serbian victory in WWI: “These Serbs, towards whom the people of Vienna and Budapest showed only despise and condescension in their preparation to crush and exterminate this insignificant nation, they made the flags of Franz Joseph I flee before

them [...] We are witnessing the resurrection of the Great Serbia in the Christian East” (p. 7). Gauvin was generally full of admiration towards the Serbian nation and its army. Another French publicist, Edward Shire, wrote the following in 1917: “Through its heroic conduct during the last war, its wonderful respect of the given word and its solemn martyrdom that proved the unwavering moral strength of its recent renaissance, Serbia leapt into the first ranks of the solidarity of nations fighting for the freedom of the world against the Teutonic hegemony. Its nobility of conduct and ethnic bravery demonstrated in times of suffering [...] are generally welcomed with sympathy. Since then one wonders what miracle of the internal life of this persecuted and oppressed nation taught it to preserve its moral integrity in spite of the adverse circumstances. It is a unique phenomenon of national psychology. Meanwhile, the great geniuses formed nations of various ethnic elements, having their specific missions in mind. Here we can see

the subconscious national soul acting unwaveringly with its homogenous ethnic elements, making the entire nation act as heroes towards the realisation of its true ideal” (p. 9-10).

French General and Serbian honorary Field-Marshal Franchet d'Espérey was certainly qualified to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the Serbian Army: “Who are these heroes who can boast of deserving one of the greatest medals of the world? They are farmers, almost all of them; they are the Serbs who are tough in distress, who are sober, modest, unbending; they are free people, proud of their race and masters of their fields. Gathered around their king and their flag in the struggle for the freedom of their country, these farmers easily turned into the bravest of soldiers, the most persevering and the best troops” (p. 11-12). In this book Kostić also presented a number of German testimonials. One of the most impressive of these is the opinion of Franz Thierfelder, expressed in 1935: “Many times, the participants in that warfront would tell me how deeply touched they were by the Serbian courage, by their knightly conduct towards both the winners and the defeated, by their persistence and soldierly comportment. We observed their patriotism and heroic conduct during the war; at any rate, no withdrawal in the entire war was ever conducted with so little character of defeat as the march of the Serbian Army to the Adriatic Sea” (p. 17).

In his appeal entitled *A Word about Serbia*, published in the press in November 1914, the Russian writer Leonid Andreyev stated *inter alia* that “The war started in Serbia and the first victims of this great struggle of nations were the Serbs; history shall not forget that, it shall remain recorded. Starting with that Serb who perished as the first victim of the war, through to the one that was killed yesterday, the Serbs are dying every day, every hour, even now – this small and lonesome heroic people has been fighting for four months [...] Unbelievable! Before the eyes of the entire world, almost advertising it on the posters and with pure and unsurpassed cynicism, the Austrians intend to turn this whole little country into an endless execution site of a thousand square kilometres, they want to turn all the trees into gallows for each and every Serb, they want to turn every head into the hands of the executioners. Unbelievable! [...] The entire history of this nation has been a life of hardship and misery, the life of labour workers who hold the shovel in one hand and raise the other to protect their head; a life that is the continual martyrology of freedom fighters, a never-ending procession of the crucified, the crucified and the crucified. This people has not had a moment of rest for centuries, it has known not of the fortunes of simple security – is it any wonder that it has not had time to accumulate riches, to pave its roads and to build the Gothic Wertheim Castle and the Victory Avenue? It is true that these people are poor and barefoot, their hands are full of blisters, their bodies are covered with scars and their souls are full of endless sorrow – instead of sending their children to school they have to fight for their freedom, for their life. This nation must be helped, must be helped! [...] Help the Serbs who are silently shedding their blood” (p. 20).

IT-03-67-T
held several places under their barbaric control, where they robbed, burned and abused men and women, afterwards abandoning their duty and heading towards Poland, where they were met and defeated by the Hungarians” (p. 7).

In the same book, under the chapter entitled *Croatian Misrule in the Lands of the Margrave of Durlach* (who did not even participate in the war), it is described how the Croats murdered, looted and burned everything as far as the border with Württemberg. “Alas, they ravaged everything; they broke barrel bottoms, cut through mattresses and threw the feathers out; they cut off the heads of the children and chopped them into pieces; if they caught the parents, they would torture them horribly before killing them” (p. 7). The chapter indexed as *The Croatian Rule in Brabant is Worse than the Turkish Rule*, reveals that the “Croats behaved barbarically. They smashed crates and chests, they horribly tormented and abused people, sparing neither the clergy nor the nobles; they burned some places and shamefully devastated fields of crops. In the land of Bezbek (the friendly land), they committed atrocious crimes. Some Croats tried to snatch a child from the arms of a woman to have it burned alive [...], since she held on to it firmly, they cut her fingers and slit her husband’s throat. They became so infamous for their misdeeds that the people will remember them for generations [...] The farmers withdrew from their villages before them. Certain soldiers from the hills across the Somme River surrendered to them as they (the Croats) promised to spare their lives, and yet they chopped their arms and legs off and cut them into pieces” (p. 8)

Comment [K.B.17]: Translator’s note. We were unable to find this reference in our sources, no additional references found

Chapter VII

A THOUSAND YEARS OF CROATIAN BARBARITY

1. The Thirty Years’ War

Kostić’s first brochure of the series entitled *Examples of the Thousand-Year Long Croatian Culture* was published in Chicago in 1953 by the Serbian National Defence Council of America. It deals with the Croatian feats in the Thirty Years’ War in the 17th century and, with this brochure, Kostić began his process of proving that the slaughter of Serbian women and children, the pillage and destruction of churches and monuments and the burning of Serbian books in WWII was not an accident or historical incident but a scientifically predictable result of the Croatian historical progress and the highest achievement of their cultural and civilizational development. “The Croats have not shown their atrocious nature within the last decade alone - a nature even the Hun and the Avar would be ashamed of. Their entire history is replete with horror, betrayal, thievery, plunder and the murder of the innocent and helpless. There is no contemporary nation - i.e. a nation currently existing - that history has spoken of in such a despicable manner as the Croats. Their misdeeds were described with an abundance of horror. Wherever they showed up, they disgraced their name and tainted everyone they cooperated with” (p. 5).

All the editions of the renowned *European Stage*, first published as early as 1653 in Frankfurt am Main, always included accounts of heinous Croatian crimes, their tyranny over the civilian population and their insatiable thievery. Thus, the description of the events of 1621 refers to a large mass of Croats “who, after the Battle of Prague, extensively pillaged not only the enemy but their allies as well, and who

a) The Tragedy of Magdeburg

Volume two of this monumental chronicle, printed in 1679, continues the description of Croatian atrocities. In 1630, “the Croats again pillaged and devastated everything with their inhuman acts (e.g. in Telder, Deckman, Well and the surrounding areas); they took some men and women with them and ripped off the noses and ears of some of them; they gouged out both eyes of a man and flayed both of his arms. They did not even spare the neutral persons and committed crimes against the subjects of Count Heinrich von den Bergh; they acted barbarically everywhere” (p. 8). In 1631, when the Swedish army disarmed a large group of Croatian soldiers of the Imperial Army of Austria, they found “belts full of gold and silver next to their skin, and plates of gold and silver stuck to their bosom, their foreheads, their horses’ bridles and saddles, and on their handguns and sabres” (p. 8).

After the conquest of Magdeburg in that same year, the Croats rushed into the town like vultures. “Then the pillage and ransacking commenced, accompanied by torture, the violation of girls and women and barbaric acts beyond comprehension. In the Church of St. Catherine, they mercilessly cut off the heads of fifty-three individuals, mostly women, where they were later found with their arms crossed on their chests. Some women were murdered by these tyrannical soldiers even during labour. One cannot describe the horrors, despair and anguish of

Comment [K.B.18]: Translator’s note. Suggested spelling was presented here, these towns have not been found

the sight [...] Besides horses and some cattle, they took a large number of women and virgins to their camp, as well as some men tied in chains. The women were abused there in their diabolic lust in such a gruesome manner that many of them perished, especially the young girls of ten or twelve, as even those would not be spared” (p. 9).

When the Croats withdrew after this drunkenness, debauchery and criminality, “on 10, 11 and 12 May, one could hear such woeful cries and whimpers of the remaining children calling their fathers and mothers in such a dismal state of mind that they were unable to say whose children they were. Some of them sat by their murdered parents, who lay in the streets in pools of blood, calling and crying: “Oh, father, oh mother!” Some of the children sucked at their mothers’ dead breasts and cried so mournfully that even the stones in the ground and the most savage tyrants would have mercy on them” (p. 10). Bensen quoted a report by Daniel Frei, a town clerk of Magdeburg, according to whom the allied soldiers warned the civilian population to beware of the Croats as they murdered everybody indiscriminately; the clerk himself testified that the “Croats rushed through the broken gate and slew every living soul” (p. 11).

Bensen further referred to a report by the shocked Chief of the Magdeburg Guild, who stated that “After many Croats crossed the shallow Elba River, they encircled our people and threw many of them into the water and murdered them; there happened a tragic slaughter and murder, the enemy did not spare anybody in his way, not even the women and children; there are no words to describe it” (p. 10). These events were described in a similarly graphic manner in the book entitled *The Swedish Arms* published in 1631 and in the historical document known as *The Letters from Zerbst* of 11 January 1631. *The Swedish Arms* reveals a series of new details of the Croatian crimes committed in Magdeburg, *inter alia* as follows: “Two soldiers found a small child lying in the street, crying; each of them grabbed it by a tiny leg and ripped it apart” (p. 11).

b) Europe is Appalled by the Croatian Blood Thirst

The chronicle entitled *The Swedish Soldier*, published in 1633 in French, refers to the sanguinary nature of the Croatians in several of its passages. Only a few examples will be quoted here: “It was especially the Croats who did not spare any lives [...] The disloyalty of the citizens was punished by the Croats who plundered, murdered and defiled everything that was in their way [...] In the town of Hollfeld along, the Croats lead by Captain Guttenberg cut three hundred men of the Meuffels Regiment into pieces [...] The Croats did not omit any kind of barbarity and it proved that they were creative enough to invent new ways of torturing the unfortunate citizens. Thus, they did not spare the effort to train dogs to thirst for blood and feed only on corpses. The inhabitants of Anneberg and Adorf were totally helpless against the despotic will of these dog catchers who abused them. Only cries could be heard and only fire and blood could be seen during their (Croats’)

stay. And, after they left, one could see only ruins and corpses and all the marks of endless despair [...] Shoppas had the same fate and served as a checkerboard for Croatian brutality, as the Croats bathed in blood there and found new ways to feed their joviality [...] Before their withdrawal, the Croats set fires all around Nuremberg and took the time to leave eternal, or at least long-lasting traces of their sojourn. Indeed, many people there claimed that this swarm of sixty to seventy thousand people that had been brought before Nuremberg, looking as though it would conquer the entire Empire, was not used for anything other than digging trenches and launching looting campaigns; sometimes they attacked chambers and they never honoured themselves with any conquest or any significant battle” (p. 13-14).

With regard to the Swedish-Croatian conflict at Hersbruck-Wertz, Historian Bogoslav Filip Kemnic wrote in his chronicle of 1648 that the “prisoners, whose lives the Croats had promised to spare, were eventually murdered by them in spite of the promise” (p. 15). Pufendorf, the renowned jurist and historian, wrote in 1868 on the cowardice of the Croats and the crimes they committed against peaceful villagers. In 1632, Eucharis Eleuterios published *The Light of Magdeburg*, wherein it states that the Croats would half-extract foetuses from pregnant women and throw them in the water alive. He described with graphic detail a whole series of other atrocities illustrating the tragedy of Magdeburg as a moving testimony to the sanguinary character of the Croatian nation. All those events were also described by Christoph Gottlieb von Mur in his book on the Thirty Years’ War published in 1790 in Nuremberg, as well as by many other historians of the 18th century.

Yet, the most comprehensive account of those events was provided by a Magdeburg pastor named Calvisius, who wrote in 1727 that “Before all, in the broad nave of the St. Catherine’s Church, the Croats barbarically severed the heads of thirty-three individuals, mostly women, who were kneeling and praying for their lives to be spared, so that they were afterwards found dead kneeling with their hands clasped! At the Church of St. John, the Croats slashed a large number of people with their sabres, both young and old, women and girls; they broke the arm of a priest, they cut a child in half on its mother’s breast and cut both the arms of the mother; up on the Church belfry, they murdered many people who sat on the narrow staircase thinking that they were safe from the enemy. Among others, they murdered the organist of the Church with a single slit to the throat, in the same way they murdered many different individuals in the attic of the house where the commander now lives, so that the blood would often trickle down the walls, the dried traces of which could be seen for years.

“Likewise, in many of the houses they refused to have mercy and spare the lives of women in labour or in the last months of pregnancy, despite being entreated fervently to do so; they murdered these women in such a cowardly and heinous way, as well as those who had infants at their breast. Some of the children, who were lying on the breasts of their dead mothers and whimpering sadly, were pierced with their long spears

and carried like that, alive and crying, through the streets like some heroic trophy. Several older citizens who had been captured in the camp used to say that a soldier bragged before his colleague that he had speared twenty little children who were on their mothers' breast, and killed them like that to get satisfied. His colleague appealed to his conscience, asking if he was not afraid of God's punishment for that and he replied that he was sorry not to have killed more children, because they were heretic children and did not deserve anything better! In the same way, many other soldiers took the heads of those they had murdered out into the streets and displayed them gloatingly on their pikes. It could also be seen that two soldiers found a child that lied next to its dead mother, grabbed him by his legs and ripped him into two pieces; they also pierced a distinguished lady of the city with their spears.

"Females that had been found there, be they women or young girls, were usually defiled, done shamelessly in the public streets. Sometimes they would fight each other like dogs (to take their turn) and they did not even spare the little girls of 11 and 12 years; some of them were so hurt and ravaged that they could not move from the spot and it seems that some of the women in the camp died from such abuse.

"At the camp, it was unfortunately noted that many of the officers would murder or give away or sell the women after the shameful acts had been committed, sometimes even sending them to the *commis* (which means everything that serves as supplies to the army). Others, from the ranks of the non-commissioned officers, applied certain powder to the genitals of some of the women, especially those who were not young and appealing, injuring them that way; moreover, they killed women in advanced pregnancy, some almost in labour, and made some jump alive into the water, saying: 'This is how one must deal with heretics!' It is no wonder that many fine girls who were hidden in the attics or under the beams and who saw the enemies shamefully abusing their friends, chose to be swallowed by the flames they watched with horror than to put their chastity and life in the hands of these hideous men and gruesome enemies" (p. 21-22).

c) Unbelievable Criminal Manifestations of the Croatian Mentality

Calvisius further depicted a series of other details that we are familiar with from testimony given by other, previously quoted authors, and went on to say: "It has been known that if a Croat sees a soldier with a girl and that if he (the Croat) cannot make the soldier give up his girlfriend peacefully, the Croat would promptly cut his (the soldier's) head with a sabre and take the girl for himself. Seeing these and similar atrocities, one lady of noble descent jumped into a well of her own will. Yes, these shameful acts were committed in various manners and they were so numerous that an honest man could not bear listening about them since even the elderly women were not spared from disgrace; they would put burning candlesticks into the private parts of many of these

women, tie their hands and legs and then use them as candlesticks while they lay in cellars. Among these men, there were especially rude soldiers, who seemed to have been especially trained in such atrocities, who would cut the genitals off dead men, put them in bags and take them with them. There are no words to describe the cries of grief in the streets (of the city of Magdeburg) as there were thousands of dead, and some still living men among them, some of whom had their hands and legs cut, or arms cut off at the elbows, some with parts of the skin or fingers taken off, etc.; they could not live, but they couldn't die quickly either. Small children crawled pitifully around their mothers who were either dead or barely alive, wailing and whining sorrowfully 'oh, father, oh, mother!', until a soldier who was passing by would kill both them (the children) and the parents, either out of pity or barbarity" (p. 23).

The slaughter was usually followed by thievery and festivities - excessive eating and drinking with which not even the Tatars or the Adyghe people could have competed. "Their eating and drinking in cellars was excessive beyond description; not only would the majority of the barely conscious soldiers defile the living, but they would also desecrate and defile the dead women lying in these cellars in an inconceivable manner. They would use the bodies of those who had suffocated in these cellars as benches, sit on them and toast each other. To put it simply, they behaved in a so unchristian manner that something like this can never be repeated" (p. 24).

From 1790 to 1791, Johann Christian Herchenhahn published three volumes of a historical study on the Imperial Supreme Commander Albrecht von Wallenstein, Duke of Friedland, in which he described the atrocities committed by the Croats in Prussia and Bohemia. "In Koeniggratz, the Croats would force the people into processions with unsheathed sabres [...] The Croats barged in and tortured the subjects of Dittmarsen in all possible ways, as well as taking away their property" (p. 26). In Pomerania, the Croats persecuted all the Protestants in the same way they would do away with the Orthodox several centuries later.

Even without the Croats, the Imperial army was sufficiently cruel in the places it conquered. However, all their atrocities could not be compared to those committed by the Croatian beasts of prey. "No sooner had the Croats heard of these acts of brutality than they rushed to Penkum to do away with what was left there. They broke down the gates, tore down everything in all the corners of the town and even unearthed the graves. They would torture citizens to death; forcing them to give up the money they had allegedly buried somewhere. They ravished the women and, though some of them tried to hide in the water, among the reed, the Croats searched for them and herded them like cattle to be desecrated. The men who tried to defend their wives and daughters were shot by rifles or killed with sabres. Elderly women and young girls of eight or ten years had to satisfy these bestial desires in broad daylight, in public streets, in churchyards or sacred places. When these vermin abandoned Penkum, there was not a single breadcrumb left there" (p. 27).

d) The Croatian Atrocities in Pomerania

The Croats equally ravaged and pillaged another Pomeranian town – Pasewalk. “All the cattle were driven out from the town and all foodstuffs were taken away from the citizens. The unfortunate people were brutally beaten and robbed even in the hospital. Pasewalk was stricken by extreme famine. Cries of grief and mourning could be heard from every corner of the town [...] They did not only kill those who bore arms, but also the defenceless. Women and girls were desecrated, and men were stabbed, shot or beaten. People were killed in the streets, and they were tortured in their houses with instruments of torture. [...] When they had satiated their thirst with blood, this barbaric company committed the worst crimes of all – the atrocious rapes. All the women, all the girls, even the young, all of them were indiscriminately defiled in broad daylight, in churchyards, in the streets, openly” (p. 28).

The Bohemian experience with the Croats in 1632 was no better. “Prague was besieged from all sides except for the Saxon one; many Croats could already be seen on the White Mountain. The town was thus deprived of food supplies and stricken with famine and severe misery. The Croats burned the village of Micheln near Prague, killing its inhabitants - men, women and children - or forcing them into burning embers. The wind carried the burning hay all the way to the Prague Bridge and the whole town was in danger of fire. Many other Bohemian villages and the properties of their lord were burned by the Croats, who showed their abominable anger and profligacy” (p. 28).

At the beginning of the summer of 1632, in the vicinity of Nuremberg, near the place called Stein, “the Croats tortured the villagers; the people in an area of several miles suffered the consequences of all these hardships and the high prices of victuals further increased their misery” (p. 28). In Schweidnitz in June 1633, “Friedlander, with the help of a hoard of Croats and light armies, made the entire environs insecure; the allies lived like besieged people. The Croats cruised all the way to Breslaw. They crossed the Oder River, cut off the heads of many people and drove cattle from the right bank of the river, which had until then provided at least some sort of security. The Croats caused great damage by their burning and ravaging; the fire could be seen continually pointing towards the skies from the burning villages. The unfortunate people had to flee, looking back on the property of their forefathers; a serious misery befell this whole area” (p. 29). Döderlein, in his *Historical Reports on Hauses Pappenheim*, a commander of the Croats, wrote that his soldiers had been worse than the Turks, “as if they had no respect for God and the people and no honour whatsoever, they treated both the young and the old bestially, especially the females” (p. 30).

e) What Schiller Wrote about the Croats

Johann Christoph Friedrich von Schiller, one of the world’s greatest poets, was a professor of history at the University of Jena. His most

IT-03-67-T
notable historiographic work, *A History of the Thirty Years’ War* published between 1791 and 1793, is included in all the editions of Schiller’s collected works. On several occasions, Schiller described the Croats as villains, robbers and heartless savages in this book. The most stirring of these descriptions is Schiller’s depiction of the Magdeburg tragedy when “the Croats burst into the wretched town. A scene of such atrocities ensued for which the history has no words and art no paintbrush to portray. Not even the innocent children, the helpless elderly - youth, gender or beauty - nothing could have stopped the anger of the conquerors. Women were abused in their husbands’ arms, daughters at the feet of their fathers and the gender that could not defend itself had the misfortune to serve as a double victim of their bestiality. They were not safe from this greediness even in the most secret and sacred places. Fifty-three women were found beheaded in one church.

“The Croats satisfied themselves by throwing children into fires [...] In their ceaseless madness, they would proceed with the atrocities until the smoke and fire finally put a stop to their savagery. In order to aggravate the confusion and ultimately break the resistance of the citizens, they set fires in various places as soon as they arrived. A storm developed that spread the fire through the entire town with such speed that it soon burned everywhere. There was awful disorder, cries and dead bodies, the striking of swords, dismantling of buildings and blood running in streams. The boiling atmosphere and the unbearable heat finally forced these monsters to retreat to their camp. This densely populated, sturdy and great town - one of the most beautiful towns in Germany - was reduced to ashes in less than twelve hours, save for two churches and a couple of cottages.” Schiller went on to describe the scenes that we have already seen depicted by other, older authors and in testimony of the eyewitnesses, saying that Tilly, the commander of the Croats, rode through the streets in the end only to report to his lord that such a victory had not been seen since the destruction of Troy and Jerusalem” (p. 31).

In Bohemia, as Friedrich Fester wrote in his study on Wallenstein as a leader and statesman, published in 1834 in Potsdam, Wallenstein himself was appalled by the Croatian crimes and, in 1632, ordered that “under penalty of being beaten, the Croats should no longer roam around the country” (p. 33). In his study, published in Berlin, the Catholic author Albert Heising tried to absolve General Tilly from guilt for the crimes committed by the Croats in Magdeburg: “Those were the old soldiers of Wallenstein, gone wild just like their commanders. Tilly had them under his control for a while, but it is impossible to establish discipline among these hordes in just a few months” (p. 33). This same Heising referred to the Croats as cannibals.

In 1858, in Schaffhausen, Heinrich Wilhelm Bensen published a voluminous study entitled *The Tragedy of Magdeburg*, in which he pointed out the following: “The Croats are the worst as, in their brutal savagery and insatiable thirst for plunder, they would grab anything that seemed to have value, and there were coins and silver in abundance, excellent chalices and other fine utensils. They can be seen wandering

around in small detachments, attacking and killing each other for spoils. Many of them are killed by their fellowmen in this way [...] Horrible and inhuman things are happening here and, to make this even worse, women are ravished and no one is spared - not even the most tender youth, nor noble virgin, wife or sick postpartum woman - in such a terrible manner that the Catholic League members are turning their heads in abhorrence" (p. 34-35). Bensen explicitly stated that the Croats had the most bestial characteristics. "There were a lot of children in the camp who had lost their parents in the demolition of their hometown. Everything they took out of the town, the Croats would sell in its vicinity. As early as 5 June, one could see tender children in horse carts that were being offered cheaply at the fair in Halberstadt; citizens would buy them at a low price and then immediately adopt them" (p. 35-36).

Besides this, Bensen described another crime of the Croats and the actions of a rector named Evenius: "He was sitting with his pupils when the angry soldiers barged in. He bought his own freedom and that of his son with a certain amount of money, but he could not save the poor children. They were all cut into pieces and put onto a heap, and their blood and brains splashed the walls of the classroom" (p. 36). In his book on General Tilly published in Stuttgart in 1861, Onno Klopp, another Catholic historian, wrote that General Tilly and General Pappenheim tried in vain to discipline the Croats. The only ones that were disciplined were the soldiers of German nationality, while no one was able to bridle the Croats.

Gustav Freytag published his *Pictures of the German Past* in 1863, in Leipzig, in which he stated that, in 1546, the Croats "caused a sensation in Germany when Duke Maurice of Saxony gave them to King

Ferdinand of Bohemia. Their outward appearance was not so unpleasant, though they had Turkish attire, sabres and *tarche* (small, angled shields), but they were known to be the worst savages" (p. 37). He went on to say that the Croats were the most despised people in the whole of Europe, that they were the ones who pillaged the most, that they had no moral scruples or human feelings. In 1862, in one of his studies, Friedrich von Hurter quoted the order that Commander Wallenstein issued to Marshal Holk on 25 January 1633, in which he warns him harshly in the following words: "As a consequence of the continual rambling and pillaging of the Croatian cavalry, our subjects are left with no means to cultivate their land. Therefore, officers who actually encourage such behaviour by their tolerance shall be subjected to corporal punishment or death" (p. 38).

f) The Croats as a Measure of Atrocity

In his *History of the Thirty Years' War*, published in February 1873 and 1874, Franz Keim wrote that the Croats were a measure of atrocity and emphasised that "the Croats have the worst conduct, falling under the category of an unbridled passion for looting; with inhuman severity and unbelievable avarice, they grab everything that seems to be of some value" (p. 38). Keim claimed that Croatian behaviour was on a par with

the barbarity of Nero and said of the Croatian culprits that they had competed amongst themselves in the blind fury of destruction. A similar description of the Croats is provided by renowned historians such as Stacke, Gindely, Herbst, Oskar Jäger, Manuel, von Hurter, etc.

In his extensive *History of the Thirty Years' War* published in Berlin in 1893, Georg Winter noted that: "Everyone who found himself in Gernersheim - the citizens and soldiers, the women and children - all of them were slaughtered by the Croats who ceased being human when they conquered the city" (p. 41). Winter further said the following about the Croats: "If those hordes failed to find as many supplies, victuals and money as they had expected, or if they thought that some supplies had been hidden, they would not stop short of the worst torture of the citizens and they soon gained a dreadful mastery in that skill. They shot individuals in the knee and then flayed their legs, burned their knees, made incisions in their feet and poured salt into their wounds; they cut the shoulders off the people's bodies; there were even cases of children being thrown alive into furnaces before their parents' eyes. Moreover, as was the case everywhere where these hordes were in charge, numerous women were falling victim to the bestial desire of this renegade soldatesque. Women and young girls were defiled in front of their husbands and fathers, sometimes in the open streets; not even pregnant women were spared, who had their breasts cut off in their beastly vehemence" (p. 41-42).

The Croatians were treated similarly in the studies by Auguste Bouvier, Heilemann and Aladar Ballagi. A detail from Heilemann's analysis of the way this great European war was waged is especially interesting: "The prisoners were treated in a more humane manner by both the imperial soldiers and the Swedes than had been the case at the beginning of the War in the Netherlands. The prisoners were often exchanged, a man for a man, or a rank for a rank. For the remaining prisoners on one side or the other, a ransom was paid. Sometimes a large number of prisoners would be exchanged without any ransom. The imprisoned simple soldiers would be engaged in regular labour; the officers were quite often released upon their word that they would not engage in fighting against one power or the other for a period of time. The captured Croats however were sent to Sweden to work in mines as the Swedes did not consider them soldiers due to their misdeeds" (p. 42).

In his book entitled *Wallenstein Croatian Harquebusiers*, published in Budapest in 1884, Aladar Ballagi wrote the following: "Wallenstein's Croatian Harquebusiers earned such a bad name in the Thirty Years' War that the word Croat was a synonym for felon at the time [...] This army detachment was referred to as looting ruffian scum" (p. 43).

g) The Croatian Crimes as Presented in Literature

European literature also abounds with examples and descriptions of the Croatian atrocities committed during the Thirty Years' War and Kostić provided several quotations of these that he came across during

his work. Firstly, he quoted some details from Schiller's poems, especially from the dramatic poem *Wallenstein*. After presenting its synopsis, Kostić cited the following comment by Ballagi: "Obviously, it must be due to the generally known Croatian atrocities that Schiller described them in such an abominable way. According to his (Schiller's) description, every Croat is also a wrongdoer [...] Schiller chose to tie the very Croats themselves to the pillar of shame because the Poles and Hungarians still seemed relatively knightly to him compared to the Croats, whose hands were not only the instruments of savage thievery, but were smeared with the blood of women, children and the elderly. As the classic works of *belles-lettres* represent the main source of knowledge for the broad circles of readers, the memory of this people lives in the literature and the public mind through Schiller's depiction alone [...] since such a marvellous work of art so vividly described the Croats as villains" (p. 47). Ballagi went on to conclude: "What German and French literature knew about the Croats was only the fact that they had been in Wallenstein's service as his favourites and that they raged diabolically" (p. 48).

In his novel entitled *Herzog Wallenstein in Mecklenburg*, Julius von Wicked wrote that "The Croats did not enjoy the respect of the then Imperial Army, so that the heavily armed Walloon Cuirassiers, the Czech Harquebusiers (shooters), the Irish Dragoons, and even the simple infantrymen armed with muskets felt contempt towards this lightweight and unkempt mob who, though the first to loot, was often the last in combat" (p. 48). He went on to say that the Croats "are recklessly cruel and greedy and it is not without justification that they have the reputation of being the most wicked pillagers and most atrocious tormentors of the village people in the entire Imperial Army" (p. 48).

The Swedish writer Topelius spoke of the wild Croats and of curses in which the word Croat was synonymous with the words demon and damnation. In his historical novel *Simplicius Simplicissimus*, first published in 1669, Grimmelshausen also compared them with the devil. Moreover, in several passages of his novel entitled *Memoirs of a Cavalier*, Daniel Defoe wrote about the Croats as looters. The following quote by the renowned author of *Robinson Crusoe* is perhaps the most impressive: "I had seen the most flourishing provinces of Germany reduced to perfect deserts, and the voracious Crabats [Croats], with inhuman barbarity, quenching the fires of the plundered villages with the blood of the inhabitants. Whether this had hardened me against the natural tenderness, which I afterwards found return upon me, or not, I cannot tell" (p. 52).

h) The Croatian Savagery in Folk Songs

There are a number of traditional songs from the period following the Thirty Years' War that describe the Croatian crimes. In 1855 in Basle, Emil Weller quoted the following verses: "The Croats would cause pitiful damage with their looting, ravaging and all-consuming fire" (p. 55). An anthology published in Heidelberg in 1882 under the title of

Ditfurt contains several of these poems. One of them reads as follows: "Oh what a disgusting shame I have to express; I believe that even in Turkey no one would approve. Think in how many places your savage Croats shamelessly defiled the dead women" (p. 53). In another song, "when they turned the spears towards the demonic Croats, they jumped and shivered like fleas" (p. 53).

The third song paraphrased an order issued by Tilly: "Hey Croats, come right here, you cavaliers ride over here immediately! Soldiers, march forth now and quickly execute my order! Destroy by flame everything ye can and the rest by your swords; you must not miss anything but an empty shed. Shoot, throw balls of fire, be everywhere and in every place! Up there, up there, to the rampart you go and jump in, penetrate and crush! Cut everything, leave no infants alive. Beware and find where they are. Be well, my soldiers, you the cavaliers and infantrymen! I order you and recommend that everyone fight like a man. The town is in your hands; if you conquer it, leave no child alive in its mother's womb" (p. 54).

Ballagi also referred to similar songs dealing with the gruesome nature of the Croats. In one of them, the personification of Magdeburg addresses the Croats who destroyed it: "Your hands caused me a heavy wound; there is no part of my body that is not injured. Oh great and honourable Hercules, no doubt you have learnt of the ones who caused me such a terrible pain. Those were the Slavonian barbarians and the severe Croats" (p. 54). In 1681, a poem was published individually wherein Magdeburg, personified as a virgin, replies to the King of Sweden: "You guess well, you brave hero, the Slavs and Croats, the foul treachery and perfidy, burned me and destroyed so disgracefully [...] They left me with no honour, with no pride and with no town" (p. 54). Besides the dreadful Croats, immense crimes were also committed by the Poles, which disgraced the name of the Slavs in general.

Additionally, the poems by Martin Betziger include the following verse: "Often would a soldier and vile Croat put a sword on my hart and cut me to pieces even, but I could not die and no misfortune could ruin me" (p. 54-55).

2. The Silesian Wars

In the second book of the edition entitled *Examples of the Thousand-Year Long Croatian Culture* published by the Serbian National Defence Council in Chicago in 1955, Lazo Kostić presented the Croatian feats of the 18th century. In the preface he quoted the Bishop of Zagreb Alojzije Stepinac with a large measure of irony: "All things considered, the Croats and the Serbs are two different worlds, the North Pole and the South Pole that will never come close to each other, not even by the miracle of God" (p. 5). Speaking of the Orthodox Serbs and the Orthodoxy in general, Stepinac claimed that "There is no moral, no principles, no truth, no justice and no honesty" (p. 5).

Ivan Stipanović, another prominent Catholic priest and American Croat, wrote that the Serbs were thieves, scoundrels, bastards, asses,

tramps, bandits, vultures, beasts and idiots. During the same periods, i.e. in the fifties, the Croatian emigrant painter Jozo Kljaković claimed that severity, rudeness, lies, treachery and forgery are integral parts of the Serbian being and upbringing, while the Croatian political leader Bogdan Radica stated at the same time that “We, the Croats, have nothing to be ashamed of” (p. 6). Instead of using the language of hatred and profanities, Kostić replied with irrefutable historical facts and quotations from foreign authors who directly experienced and scientifically researched the historical actions of the Croats, from which it is plain and clear that the Croatian leaders improperly strived to ascribe to the Serbs those attributes that, according to universal justice, human morality and essential truth, actually belong to the Croatian people.

a) The Croatian Pandours of Franjo Trenk

In the 17th century, the Croats fought as Austrian soldiers in the Silesian Wars and the Pandours under the Croatian Baron Franjo Trenk were especially infamous for their crimes. “Their misdeeds were so notorious that they caused fright and terror wherever they appeared. People would flee and hide when they showed up.” Professor Jozef Stare wrote in 1882 that: “Besides the regular troops in the wars of the Austrian succession, Baron Franjo Trenk was rather notorious with his Slavonian volunteer hordes, the so-called Pandours, who once more made the name of the Croats sound terrible in German” (p. 12).

Kostić noted that the Croats had previously avoided being identified completely with the Pandours. However, he did not live to see the members of Tudman’s Guard clad in the very same Pandour uniforms. As Kostić stated, “In the Seven Years’ War the Croats had the same luck as they did in the last one; they were able to impute their misdeeds to a partial notion. Earlier it was the Pandours and now it is the Ustashas. Had these elements played an honourable role, the Croats would have rushed to identify their entire nation with them. However, the separation of the Pandours and Ustashas from the Croats as a whole represents a mere falsification of history. We recognize and attribute all the glory of both groups to the Croats; the same must be true of their misdeeds” (p. 12). Let us remember the noisy television advertisements of several years ago promoting the *Trenk* brandy, bearing a picture of this villain on the label.

In his book about Trenk published in Dresden in 1928, Oskar Teichman wrote the following on the Croatian atrocities in the town of Cham: “The plunder of Cham can be compared with the pillage of Magdeburg, though the latter was on a more massive scale; both Trank’s Pandours and Tilly’s Croats were only semi-civilized people who were hard to keep on a leash once their appetite was awakened” (p. 12). In the voluminous *Memoirs of the Court of Austria*, cited by Teichman, it is stated that “The troops that the enemies of Austria found especially dangerous were the *Freikorps* of Croats, sanctioned by the Hungarian Parliament; the horrible Pandours from the Turkish frontier were even

IT-03-67-T
more dangerous” (p. 13).

In his extensive monograph on Frederick the Great, published in the period between 1858 and 1869, Thomas Carlyle provided a precise historical description of the Pandours: “The Pandour proper is a foot-soldier (a tall, raw-boned and ill-washed biped in copious Turk breeches, rather bearish in the top parts of him; carries a very long musket, and has several pistols and butcher’s knives stuck in his girdle; specifically a footman” (p. 13). This description is accurately supplemented in the prospectus of Schultz’ historical novel entitled *Pandour Colonel Trenk*: “Their oriental weapons, their picturesque attire and their general appearance were unique. Though they were superior to their enemy, they soon became the horror of all inhabitants due to their looting, savagery and terrible violence [...] it was primarily the prospect of looting and spoils that prompted them to leave their households” (p. 13).

An impressive account of the participation of the Croatian Pandours in the First Silesian War (1740-1742) was given in the official expert study published in three volumes by the Department of War History of the Prussian-German General Staff, in the period from 1890 to 1893. *Inter alia*, it stated that, in 1791, “Baron Trenk lined up a group of a thousand people in the area of the Slavonian border. This region was indeed suitable for recruiting volunteers as there dwelled the Pandours, who were a kind of local soldier, the Croatian and Slavonian nobles who proved very convenient for this purpose. A similar corps was gathered by Lieutenant-Colonel von Mentzel from the ranks of the Pandours, Croats and the rest of these plunder-hungry scum. None of these unrestrained hordes could be used in combat as a separate detachment due to their lack of discipline. However, in small-scale wars they would do some favours for the Army, which must be appreciated” (p. 14).

According to that same document, it was recorded that on 27 June 1741, General Neipperg sent “Trenk’s *Freikorps* to try and undertake an attack on the storages located around the suburbs of Schweidnitz. This detachment entrenched themselves in the woods of Cobten Mountain as the Slavonians had not yet dared to take any actions against the enemy; they were, however, ready to commit the most inhumane misdeeds against the populace. Trenk himself was held responsible, dismissed from command and replaced by Major Mentzel” (p. 14). It was further stated that, on 30 July 1741 at “about 4 o’clock in the morning, 1,000 Pandours and 400 Hussars, mostly from Trenk’s Corps, attacked the place from all sides. Major von Puttkamer had vacated the place in time. It vanished in flames and its inhabitants were robbed” (p. 14). Wilhelm Onchen wrote that, in that same year “the disarmed country was ruthlessly tormented and dried up by the Pandours and *Tolpatcheries* (Translator’s note: Hungarian infantrymen)” (p. 15).

b) The Croatian Massacres in Cham

In the above quoted study, Carlyle noted that, on 7 September 1742, “Trenk and his *Tolpatcheries* had appeared at Cham, a fine trading town on the hither or neutral side of the mountains (not in Bohemia, but in the

Upper Palatinate, old Elector Palatine's country whom the Austrians hate); and, summoning and assaulting Cham, over the throat of all law, had, by fire and by massacre, annihilated the same. Fact horrible, nearly incredible, but true. The noise of which is now loud everywhere" (p. 15). Carlyle further stated the following about Trenk himself: "A less lovely individual than this Trenk there was not in any War since the days of Attila and Genghis. A soul more worthy of damnation I have seldom known" (p. 15).

Describing the Battle of Dettingen of 16 August 1743, Carlyle stated: "The Austrians could not cross the Upper Rhine by any method. Nothing got across; except once or twice, for perhaps a day, Butcher Trenk and his loose kennel of Pandours, who went about, plundering and rioting, with loud rodomontade, to the admiration of the Gazetteers, if of no one else" (p. 15). In his book entitled *The History of the House of Austria*, the Englishman Coxe wrote the following about the Croats' participation in the First Silesian War: "These troops, under the names of Croats, Pandours, Slavonians, Warasdinians and Tolpaches, exhibited a new and astonishing spectacle to the eyes of Europe; and, by their dress and arms, by the ferocity of their manners and their singular mode of combat, struck terror into the disciplined armies of Germany and France" (p. 16).

Having reviewed the War Archives of Vienna, Oskar Teichman wrote that, in 1741, "Neipperg wrote a letter to Prince Karl von Lothringen wherein he thanked the prince for the reinforcement that had arrived, noting that for the time being he could not use Trenk's undisciplined gangs for anything and that they were only plundering the country" (p. 16). According to this author, in 1742, Trenk's detachment "had a very small number of men due to losses during the takeover of Linz and he was given an order to collect contribution with his men throughout Bavaria. The Pandours were particularly suitable for these tasks as, owing to their looks, they were the second most horrible of all the irregular troops of Maria Theresa - second only to Mentzel's Hussars. One must admit that Trenk himself gladly accepted this task, because the thirst for plunder that was intrinsic to every Pandour, was not foreign to their chief either [...] The appearance of these ruffians with wild eyes, untidy beards and dishevelled hair, bearing yataghans and wearing blood-red trench coats, had the desired effect" (p. 17). Entering the town of Deggendorf, the Croatian Pandours sang their favourite and most infamous song, the last two verses of which were quoted by Lazo Kostić: "Forward, brothers, burn everything. Disregard the laws, we are in the land of the enemy. In flame, inflame. May the old man and the infant squeal in our hands" (p. 17).

Teichman further wrote that "In the midst of all this, Khevenhüller seized Munich on 13 February (1742), on the same day that Prince-Elector Charles Albert was formally crowned Emperor in Frankfurt. Since his capital was in the hands of the enemy and his lands pillaged by the Pandours, Croats and Hussars, Charles Albert was actually an emperor without a country [...] The General (Bärenklau) acknowledged the courage of the Pandours (to Trenk) but complained that they had

behaved like burglars rather than proper soldiers of the Empress" (p. 17).

The tragedy of Cham, the town in the Bavarian forests on the Regen River, took place in September 1742 when the Pandours of Trenk tricked the citizens into entering the town, burnt it and started killing the people indiscriminately. "Many citizens managed to flee across the river and into the countryside. The horrible Pandours mercilessly butchered those who could not get to the bridge [...] While Trenk was chasing the Bavarian troops on the banks of the Regen, his glory was besmeared by the satanic behaviour of the Pandours and Croats who had remained in the burning town. Almost every man was slain; the women were defiled and thrown into the river if they tried to run for their lives across the burning bridge. The savage soldiers continued their debauch throughout the night" (p. 18).

In his *History of Maria Theresa*, published in Vienna in ten volumes from 1863 to 1879, Alfred Ritter von Arneth published a letter by Field Marshal Count Neipperg addressed to Franjo Trenk on 2 July 1741, wherein the Count *inter alia* wrote as follows: "I presume that you are aware of the fact that you were not invited here to loot the country and allow other unseemly behaviour, but solely for the purpose of inflicting damage and losses upon the enemy. However, so far you have not caused any damage to the enemy, whereas you have seriously harmed the country and its citizens with beatings, brawls, confiscation of money, etc., about which I receive frequent complaints from all sides, and which I wish to cease under the threat of strict responsibility. If you cannot exert enough authority to have your men respect and obey you, I do not know what darn use I can make of you here" (p. 19).

In Volume Two of the *History*, Ritter wrote that, "Although Trenk was of tall and handsome looks that could be appealing, and though he was not uneducated, his unbridled wildness largely resembled the savagery of his men and provoked profound disgust in the methodical Neipperg. Not without justification as, in spite of the strict orders he was given before every campaign, instructing him to use violence against the armed enemy alone and not against the helpless farmers, the contrary would actually happen. They robbed pedlars, burgled and burnt the houses and committed other gruesome acts" (p. 1). Von Arneth also wrote about the above mentioned events in Cham: "Trenk now took possession of a suburb, burnt it and then stormed through the town and conquered it. Fire spread quickly from street to street and a gunpowder storage exploded. But even more horrible than the burning inferno were the troops that raged against the crew and the misfortunate citizens of Cham. Heinous crimes of every sort were committed and many people were brutally murdered" (p. 19).

c) The Second Silesian War

The Second Silesian War, which was waged from 1744 to 1745, was also described in the official study of the German General Staff. The Croats again led the way in looting and atrocities against the civilian

population. The Croatian Pandours under the command of Colonel Patašić were called a mob, scum, villains, hordes, rogues and similar names. Their allies in the higher command were also full of contempt and repugnance towards this Croatian savagery. No one considered them human in the right sense of the term. No one could bear their presence and the regular troops treated them as an unnecessary burden. Yet, sometimes they were still used to frighten the enemy. Thus, the Austrian Commander von Laudon addressed the Mayor of Wroclaw at the beginning of August 1760, demanding the surrender of Wroclaw and threatening that they would be destroyed otherwise. "The bombardment is unavoidable and a general massacre by the Croats shall ensue; not even a child in its mother's womb shall be spared" (p. 23).

In the book entitled *Slavonia and Croatia*, published by Johan Čalopović in Budapest in 1744, it was described that after receiving the order to march on Lauterbourg, one day before the attack Trenk decided to "gather all his Pandours. Hundreds of them were missing and they could not be found anywhere. Early in the morning, they sneaked back in packs, with geese, ducks, sheep, hens, utensils, money and other loot [...] They spread horror and fear everywhere they went. Wherever they were seen, the voices of half-dead people would be heard: Run, children, here come the Pandours! May God have mercy on you! [...] At Hegenau, about six hundred armed peasants from the Sund (Sundauer) area fell into their hands. The furious Pandours murdered most of them and cut the noses and ears off the rest and sent them home maimed [...] When the Pandours and Croats were ordered to besiege the town of Saverne in Alsace, they managed to sneak into the town unseen and, in the initial assault, slew everyone who bore arms. Thereupon, they started looting and even forgot to open the gate to their friends waiting outside [...] Stories and news of their (the Pandours') adventures were spreading. For example, it was said that they did not cut the heads of people as the Hussars did, but they grabbed them by the hair and slit their throats like butchers. Also, it was said that they wanted to burgle a mill at Landau and, as the miller tried to defend himself, they hung him upside-down and cut him in half like a log" (p. 23-24).

Teichman referenced numerous details of the behaviour of the Croats in that war. The most striking example was the event related to the battle at the Bohemian town of Sohr, which took place in 1745. "The light troops committed atrocities against the women and the people who accompanied the army; however, Carlyle claims that [...] the Croats under the command of Nádasdy were the perpetrators, not the Pandours under Trenk who were charged with all the offenses following the investigation that immediately ensued" (p. 28). Trenk himself appeared before the court as a witness and he testified that the looting had already been underway when his Pandours showed up. "Under those circumstances, it was not possible to keep the Pandours restrained" (p. 28). However, instead of executing the combat tasks in the Battle of Sohr, Trenk zealously engaged in pillaging the Prussian king's camp and ignored the precise instructions that obliged him to partake in the combat. Trenk was subsequently cashiered from service and sentenced

to life imprisonment; when he heard the judgement of the Court Marshal, he exclaimed: "Woe is me that I ever fought for the honour and glory of Maria Theresa, that because of her I allowed the pillage of towns and the murder of the elderly and the children, and my Pandours. Yes, my misdeeds deserve to be punished, but not by you, Maria Theresa! France and Bavaria would be right to judge me, but not Austria" (p. 28).

Studying the second war between King Frederick of Prussia and the Austrian Empress Maria Theresa, French historian Duke Albert of Broglie wrote in 1887 that "In Dingolfing, not much more than several miles from Munich, the Croats and Pandours engaged in looting and atrocities that the Austrian General was not able to suppress; they spread fear and horror as far as the gates of the city" (p. 29). In the initial proceedings, Trenk had been sentenced to death, but the decision was subsequently reversed and he was sentenced to life imprisonment at the Spielberg Fortress near Brno. He had most horribly devastated the Bavarian town of Cham and the Silesian towns of Landshut, Hirschberg, Stidelberg, as well as many French towns. Von Arneth concluded his writing on Trenk in the following words: "His last will and testament also show that he was full of remorse for the crimes he had committed; it is specifically reflected in the entry whereby he founded a poorhouse. Those individuals who were able to prove that they had been maimed and pauperised at Cham and its surroundings during the last war had priority admittance, because Cham was where Trenk ruled most severely during the war of the Bavarian succession" (p. 30).

d) The Croatian Atrocities in the Seven Years' War

In the Seven Years' War, waged from 1756 to 1763, there were no more Pandours. However, the Croats took part therein and behaved in the same manner as before, since they were simply incapable of civilized warfare. In that war, the Croats numbered approximately 50,000 soldiers. The German General Staff also conducted an official study on this war, which was published in Berlin in 1901. Wherever the Croats were mentioned, it was in relation to looting. Thus, on 18 October 1756, when the assault at Teschen was launched, the castle crew "quickly grabbed their rifles and chased away the Croats who were pillaging the city" (p. 31). In the winter of 1756, the Croats sacked the town of Ostritz on 31 December and, somewhat later, plundered the town of Kratzau" (p. 31). Dresden suffered most horribly in their hands in 1760, which was followed by the sack of Berlin and Charlottenburg, as well as by the pillage of Schweidnitz on 1 October 1761.

Hermann Wendel, who otherwise looked benevolently upon the Croats, wrote in 1925 about the impression that German warfare had left in Germany, particularly "the volunteer detachments (*Freikorps*) and Trenk's infamous Pandours, who left such an unpleasant echo of the Croatian name that even in 1866 the exclamation 'Croat!' would cause fear and agitation" (p. 38). For centuries, the children were frightened with stories about the Croats. French publicist Emile Langsdorff wrote

in 1848 that: “One recalls the Croatian and Pandour corps, the groups of Hussars of Death as they were called, who earned such a terrible reputation in the wars of the last century” (p. 38).

The English historian Macaulay wrote in 1842 that “Bavaria was flooded with wild hordes of warriors from the blood-drenched frontier areas that divide the Christian world from Islam and comprise the eternal gap between the two. Then Western Europe heard for the first time of the names that spread fear, the names of the Pandours, Croats and Hussars [...] A pack of Croats had assailed Silesia” (p. 39). The Slovak Lutheran priest Ivan Čalopović noted that the Croats inflicted much harm to all the frontier soldiers, though the Serbs were never known for any crimes. “A dark and savage iron-eating people is associated with the name of the frontier soldiers. Many a horrible story of the severity of the Pandours and Croats are inseparable in the minds of populace from the notion of the frontier soldiers” (p. 40).

The Croatian crimes were elaborated in detail in all the literature dealing with the Silesian Wars. Voltaire mentioned them with disgust, while Ewald von Kleist stated the following in his verse from the *Ode to the Army of Prussia* of 1757: “And the looting you leave to the cowards and Croats” (p. 43).

3. The Savagery of the Croats in the 19th Century

In the third book of the series, published by the Serbian National Defence of Canada in Hamilton in 1956, Kostić addressed the monstrous acts that the Croats committed in the 19th century. In the preface to this book, Kostić named several Croatian authors who went beyond measure in their megalomania and lies. Vlaho Raić, among others, wrote the following during the fifties: “One of the oldest European peoples, the people who had its state and rulers of its own blood as early as the 9th century, people with great power of cultural creation and assimilation, a heroic and noble people in its essence”. Believe it or not, this quote of his referred to the Croats. Mate Frković would stress the following: “The Serbs were enslaved and the Croats were fighting and shedding streams of blood of their most worthy sons. The entire Croatian history of the time abounds with wonderful acts of resistance and victorious feats, bringing to light a character of not just an ordinary heroic fighter, but a hero and a fighter for freedom and defence of his country” (p. 5-6). The Croatian emigrant press was also full of such texts, prompting professor Kostić to dedicate himself even more zealously to searching for the historical truth and desecrating the Croatian lies.

What is more, Miroslav Krleža, the most recognized Croatian writer and a favourite of the Communist regime, republished his essays written immediately after WWI in that same period in the *Zagreb Republic*, which *inter alia* read as follows: “Vienna is in famine, there is no Austria. The world is taken over by the scum, those Balkan Gypsies who won the war. What a shame [...] And who defeated us? These despicable Balkan Gypsies who sit in jails, chew onions and spit all day, these illiterate scoundrels well worthy of the gallows” (p. 6). This is how

his progressive leftist treated the Serbs, expanding the epistle of the Catholic bishops of 1945, in which the supreme Catholic prelates claimed the following: “Peacefulness is the main attribute of the Croatian people’s soul” (p. 6). Such hideous statements by the Croats could not remain without a substantiated and comprehensive response.

Kostić engaged himself in providing such a response with an amazing zealousness and energy. He explained his boosted motivation with the following words: “I embarked on studying the Croatian past as I could not stop wondering how the Croats could commit such crimes against the Serbs in the 20th century. If they had never done something similar before, then it would be reasonable to presume that the Serbs must also have been guilty at least to some extent. However, to my utter surprise, I found out that the Croats have always been like that, ever since they were first mentioned in the history. Their entire ‘culture’ has been made up of lies and deceptions. This actually confirmed what we Serbs have always known, but what the foreigners unfortunately do not want to believe: the Serbs were innocent victims of a collective psychosis and the national character of the Croats” (p. 8).

a) The Croats as Pandours of the Reaction

This character of theirs was especially evident in 1848 when Europe was engulfed by national and social revolutions and the Croats collectively proved to be the best means of suppressing the revolutionary movements. “No other nation has proved to be so good at and so capable of suppressing revolutions. Unscrupulous actions were required here – to kill, destroy and knock down anything that was in the way. The Croats were the only ones who were indeed capable of behaving in such a manner. On the other hand, there was a danger that the army might join the revolutionaries, as happened in France, Germany, etc. In that sense, the Croats once again confirmed that they would never think of something like that. This is why the Croats were entrusted with the main role – the ‘Pandours of the Reaction’ and its executioners - as noted earlier. This small people was bold enough to send its Pandours to suppress revolutions on several sides. They did it in Italy, Hungary and Austria. The Croats did what no other nation and no other army in Austria could accept to do. They were always ready for monstrosities and lawlessness. At any rate, they inherited this trait from their ancestors” (p. 10).

In March 1848, the citizens of Milan rose up and threw the Austrian army out of their city. These were some of the most glorious days of Italian history but all the scientific works dealing with these events are full of descriptions of the monstrosities committed by the Croats, which cast a shadow on all the actions of the Austrian soldiers of other nationalities. The most detailed depiction of their atrocities was given in the book entitled *A Three-Year Archive of the History of Italy* published in 1851 in Capolago, Switzerland, from which Kostić quoted extensively. He first cited a case of a murder: “In the early evening hours, a patrol of the Croats took a young Milanese to the Citadel. As he

was resisting their force with his fists, these wild beasts strangled this poor youngster and hanged him on a lamppost in the market” (p. 16).

Scenes of larger scale violence and bestiality followed: “A furious troop barged in and seized the courtyard. There were about 2,000 Bohemians and Croats. They looked wild, they shot at the windows and in the air, destroying furniture in the house halls. If they would come across a closed door, they would smash it with an axe and break in. Some of them would beat unarmed individuals and some would even tear off their clothes. Others, even more bestial, climbed up to the roof and finding some boys there, they threw them down into the street. The raging soldatesque shed the blood of these citizens who showed no resistance. Those of us who witnessed these horrible scenes cannot think of them without feeling terrible pain and anger [...] Derogating our language, the Croats shouted ‘*subito piccare*’ (we will pierce you right now, L.M.K.). The wounded who could hardly walk, those who stumbled [...] were beaten with rifles or fists. These soldiers were so maddened that those who were far from the prisoners and could not beat them directly would throw pieces of bricks and mud at them” (p. 17).

The book continues with descriptions of scenes of individual torture and the following text: “At that moment, a detachment of Croats entered a house across the Brera bridge, where there lived a wine merchant. They set it on fire and killed several people, including the father and the son of the Bartolio family. The floor-makers were found burned and stabbed by bayonets eight or more times” (p. 17). The armed citizens organized themselves and made the Croats flee the town. “They arrested five Croats who were taken to the house of Trivulzio. The terribly disfigured bodies of a woman and three small children were found there. The same detachment saved a girl in Sambuco Street, taking her away from the hands of these monsters” (p. 17).

b) The Tragedy of Milan

Yet, the agony of the Italian citizens continued. The civilians fled in all directions, “convinced that they were not safe in their own homes from the shooting, breaking and bestiality of the Croats [...] Even in the times of Barbarossa the enemies did not engage in such barbarous acts. The Croats would kill entire families of seven or eight members, take boys and babies from their mothers’ wombs, kill children two or three years old, burn men and women alive [...] The Croats threw all those who lived in house No. 2189 in Porta Comasina out of the window. [...] In the Old Market, a group of Croat bandits, with many officers, noticed some citizens watching them from their windows. Believing that these people had laid an ambush for them, the Croats barged into the house, demolishing the doors with axes and fire and killed eleven persons - men and women - and wounded just as many of them. They pillaged and destroyed everything [...] They suddenly

broke into a house in the Old Market in Porta Comasina having first frightened the citizens with three cannon discharges and missiles that ended up in the rooms. As all the citizens - men, women, the elderly,

IT-03-67-T
children and disabled persons - withdrew into a room on the ground floor, they broke the doors and, with a salvo of several rifles aimed at these poor people, instantly killed seven, wounded eighteen and took 12 of them to the Citadel as prisoners. Being still insatiate, they pierced another two men with their bayonets on the way to the Citadel” (p. 17-18).

It is simply impossible to comment on the following detail: “A wounded Croat was on his way to the hospital; in a small pouch that he jealously kept to himself, two noblewomen’s hands with precious rings were found” (p. 18). All of this is highly reminiscent of the tragedies of Magdeburg or Jasenovac. Horrible scenes continued. “Most of the Croats took part in ravaging a great mansion, killing labourers, women and children [...] They cut the throat of a thirteen-year-old girl and did the same to some of the working women. An unfortunate man was taking his two boys by the hand thinking that the Croats would have mercy on them. Full of barbarity, they did not only kill these innocent creatures before his (their father’s) eyes, they cut them into pieces. After four hours of ravaging, these cannibals withdrew with enormous spoils of money, silver, goods, horses and carts” (p. 19).

Kostić persistently went on finding other examples of the Croatian culture and civilization. “Being no less brutal to material goods than to humans, the Croats engaged themselves in such acts of maddening barbarity that have hardly ever occurred, even in the time of the Vandals and the Huns. A horde of these monsters stormed every floor and every room of the house belonging to Giulio Fortisse, the owner of the textile factory near Porta Vercellina. Not only did they kill many of the tenants and take huge amounts of money, but they devastated the storage, destroyed the looms, tore off and sullied the fabrics and demolished and destroyed everything [...] The Croats dragged themselves to a tavern and, on seeing the landlord, they asked him to give them something to eat. As he did not have anything to offer, they tied him along with his son and fastened them to cannon, dragging them in different directions in the street. Thus, they had to drink their death in sips. As they were brought to another house, when they heard a baby crying, they took it from the cradle and, before the mother’s eyes, they put the baby’s hands to the wall and pinned it as if the child were a bat or some other creature and the mother fell dead after a single blow of the bayonet. [...] The day was breaking up when 200 hungry Croats broke the doors of a tavern named Gnocchi and burst in furiously. The owners of the tavern, Leopoldo and Luigia Gnocchi (four months pregnant), fell to their knees, clasped their hands on their chests and begged these monsters for their lives [...] After giving the Croats everything they had and when this couple thought that they had satiated the hunger of these wild beasts, the officers forcefully took the woman from her husband’s arms and ordered her to kneel down, putting bayonets behind her neck. They stabbed the husband before the woman’s eyes, trod on him and disfigured him, and then they torched the place” (p. 20).

Robert Campbell, the English Vice-Consul in Milan, wrote a detailed report with abhorrence of the events he witnessed and sent it to

Lord Palmerston. The report read verbatim as follows: “In the course of the day, it became apparent that the worst atrocities were committed by the Croats; entire families of women and children were found killed and mutilated by them in the most atrocious manner in various quarters of the suburbs” (p. 21) The Croats’ fellowmen of other nationalities were also appalled by their crimes. Many Austrian soldiers later gave detailed accounts of these horrible events and one of them described them as follows: “Some armed Croats entered from the market, shouting like beasts. Two or three of them pierced some unfortunate boys with their bayonets. Seeing this horror, some of our people took arms to punish these barbarians. But being alone, what could we do against so many battalions? Nothing but allow them to cut our throats in vain. We were all white with anger” (p. 21-22).

Immediately after the tragedy in Milan, a book was published consisting of the testimony of more than two hundred eyewitnesses of the Croatian crimes. As one of these eyewitnesses recounted, “During the night, some Croats that were crushed and forced to flee by a constant salvo from a detachment of citizens who stood guard at the Gate of Sant’Apollinare, took refuge in the gardens and plains of Quadronno. Foreseeing their flight, two brave men, Nova and Grilloni, hid themselves and when they heard a loud cry of a man begging for mercy, they ran towards the house of a gardener and arrested five Croats, taking them to the Trivulzio house. There they found mutilated bodies of a woman and her three small children. The same detachment of brave men saved a girl in the Sambuco street, taking her from the hands of these monsters, who were as despicable as they were fierce” (p. 22).

In another book of similar testimony, published in Milan on 28 March 1848, an eyewitness spoke as follows: “Many completely exhausted boys were found on the walls or smashed on the ground. Eight of them were tortured in this way – two were nailed to a counter, two were burned with resin, one was pierced with a bayonet and one was left hanging on a tree [...] before his mother’s eyes. Another was thrown onto his mother’s body who was breastfeeding him, to continue suckling. One was torn apart and then tied together with his own intestines, five of them had their heads cut off and were thrown before their dying parents, a foetus (embryo) was taken from a mother’s womb and impaled on a sword! [...] Women, whose eyes, tongues, arms and legs were cut, were later killed by bayonets after they had been abused in the most shameful manner (two women’s hands adorned with many rings were found in a pouch belonging to one captured Croat) [...] What is more, on top of the body of one brother, there laid the body of the other brother who was forced to kneel down and then pierced. Some were burned alive in lime, others were thrown alive into latrine holes or wells, others’ stomachs were covered with resin and burned, not to mention the killings in beds, rooms and shelters. Eight burnt bodies were found in a tavern at Porta Tosa and as many were found at Porta Vercellina and about ten mutilated and smashed bodies were found in a small room at Porta Ticinese. A woman was seen trying hard to flee and save herself, a man and his son were hanged together on the bastion

trees; Giovanni Piatti at Porta Ticinese - they killed his son and brother, burned the little boy of Maria Belloni. But the soul can no longer bear these memories [...] And, to those who admit the brutality of the Croats” (p. 24), the author also emphasized the responsibility of their commander, Marshal Radetzky.

In 1899, the Italian publicist Luzzio published in Rome a collection of excerpts from the Austrian press on the crimes committed in Milan. Only the most striking of these excerpts will be quoted here: “Despite the official denials, the rumours of Croatian barbarity were so consistent that they had to provoke abomination [...] The barbarity of the Croats displayed its fiendish evidence on old women and breastfeeding children [...] the musician Sulzer confirmed his wife’s statements on the most shameful atrocities of the Croats [...] The Croats outdid all the barbaric peoples” (p. 24-25). The European press wrote of this in a similar fashion.

Some new details can be found in a *History of the Italian Revolution* by Joseph Napoleon Riciardi, published in Paris in 1849: “However, the Croats were primarily characterized by their savagery. Wherever they went, they would mark their path by murdering people irrespective of the age and gender. Thirteen persons were found killed in one house, including a mother with two children in her arms – one whose head had been cut off and the other whose throat was slit by a bayonet. A Croat tore one child apart and nailed each half of his body to a part of the wall. Another soldier impaled a girl on a bayonet and carried her around. They pulled a two-month old foetus out of a woman and cooked it. A labourer was making resin balls when these savages, dressed in Austrian uniforms, fell upon him, tore his stomach, filled his viscera with this flammable substance and lit it. All the labourers who happened to be in Mr Fabrizio’s silk factory when these troops arrived were cut by the sword. In a tavern in the suburb named Santa Croce, a man was tied up with his son, body to body, and then both of them were killed by a single stroke. Another unfortunate man was tied to a beam where they burned him in the presence of his wife and children. Three villagers who were soaked in a bath of burning brandy died instantaneously” (p. 27). Similar descriptions can be found in a book entitled *The Lombard Revolution of 1887* and the memoirs of Atto Vannucci under the title of *The Martyrs of the Italian Liberation* of 1860, as well as in Riciardi’s collection of documents published in 1849.

c) Italian Civilians are in Utmost Fear of the Croats

Historian Carlo Cattaneo wrote as follows: “Broletto remained occupied by the Croats. There are no words to describe the impression left by these dark-skinned monsters, sullied with blood and drunken with wine and fury” (p. 30). The same author recounted the following in another of his books: “As the Croats burned and killed women and children and, every now and then, shot at the houses with no other intention than to frighten the citizens, people would speak of them as the Devil’s creatures” (p. 32). The same details were presented by the

French author Varennes in 1858. All of the significant authors who studied this period of Italian history spoke of the Croats with disgust as barbarians, murderers and robbers. As stated by Peran in his book in 1848, as well as by Riccardi, Cantarini and many other authors, the Croats were even referred to in the Venetian areas as barbarians and savages who would destroy everything just for the sake of doing evil. Riccardi for example wrote that the Croats “abused their victory in an uncommon way, i.e. they grabbed and plundered the country, killing those whom they had previously robbed, sometimes cutting their heads off, ravishing women, throwing the brains of killed boys at the walls of burning houses and shooting prisoners” (p. 36). They behaved similarly in Bologna, Padua, Udine and many other towns.

In every serious battle, the Croats held themselves badly and would usually run away and be the first to surrender. The crimes against civilians and the cruelty and brutality towards children can only be committed by cowards like them. Italian literature is also full of graphic descriptions of the people’s tragedy caused by the savagery of the maddened Croatian horde. A great epic of 1848 read as follows: “Oh, how these dirty Croatian wolves evoke the days of Attila! – Their ravishing and fires, slaughter and pillaging that would make their offspring’s hair stand on end! - Gluttons and drunkards to the core, they are the new Cacus, they flay the meat off our bones and voraciously swallow us, bit by bit, leaving us only our eyes so that we can cry” (p. 51). Cacus, by the way, is the mythological son of the God Vulcan and a great bandit.

d) Jelačić and his Croatian Outlaws

The army of the Croatian Ban Jelačić left an even more strikingly negative impression, which was discussed in the monumental collection of Hans Helmont entitled *A History of the World* published in 1903. The author of the text – professor Hans Suvideneck-Siedenhorst – noted that “Jelačić formed the Croatian National Army of 40,000 men, which, truth to be told, did not have any military value but was nevertheless able to intimidate people due to the number of its soldiers, their rough behaviour and adventurous armament” (p. 55). In a book entitled *Louis Kossuth and the Recent History of Hungary*, edited by Arthur Frey and published in Mannheim in 1849, it was stated that the Croats “have long since been known as belligerent, but are also villainous and inhumane in combat. Who would then not think of the Croatian hordes under Wallenstein, the Pandours headed by Trenk and ultimately Jelačić’s *serezans* (Translator’s note: the Austro-Hungarian frontier soldiers) under Vienna” (p. 55).

Frey’s book is especially interesting since the author provided a rather vivid description of Jelačić’s soldiers dressed in red dolmans – the word that Kostić translated as trench coats. “Anyone who had the opportunity to closely observe these beasts would have to admit that there was something demonic in their ghastly appearance that fills our hearts with horror. Let a man think of these villains – tall, thin

apparitions with savage and deformed traits, protruding cheekbones, a dark complexion, dishevelled coarse hair and with dark, bulging bloodshot eyes – this is how those red dolmans or red hood men looked. The same as them, just a little bit more ragged, were their companions in evil deeds – the green dolman men, whom the officers in Jelačić’s camp referred to as grasshoppers” (p. 56). In a book entitled *The October Revolution of Vienna* published in 1848, Jelačić’s Croatian army was referred to as a genuine horde of murderers.

In his *History of the Vienna Revolution*, von Pfannenbergl stated that the Croats slaughtered thousands of Viennese and consequently brought eternal disgrace upon themselves in the history. Frey also wrote that: “with their brutal pillaging of Vienna, their barbaric slaying of children, women and defenceless people, these savage ruffians have recently acquired a new historical name; the whole of Germany speaks of them with disgust, abhorrence and horror” (p. 58). The depiction of Jelačić’s *serezans* bodyguard is even more graphic in the book entitled *The Revolution, Siege and Conquest of Vienna in October 1848*, published in 1848: “Their armament is excellent and each of them bears a *hanjar* – a wide slaying dagger - with which he cannot chop off a head but can cut it with a speed that one must admire and with such a dreadful calmness” (p. 59).

In 1848 in Vienna, Albert Rosenfeld published a chronicle entitled *The Student Committee in Vienna in 1848*, wherein he stated that Ban Jelačić “knows how to earn the admiration and love of the Croats by turning a blind eye to their pillaging and cutting of people’s heads” (p. 66). In his book, published in 1869 in Leipzig, Joseph Helfert described the atmosphere in Vienna before the arrival of the Croats. “The news of the arrival of the horrible Croats threw the people into such panic that many of them fled leaving their houses and courts to the mercy of these men. The tidings of this misfortune reached Vienna at lightening speed, producing instantaneous dismay; all that the radical press had been saying for weeks of those ‘wild hordes’ and ‘pillaging scum’ of the Ban, all of that was now so real in their agitated minds. The most terrible stories were told of them, and the very shout ‘the Croats!’ would turn a bragging hero into a pale trembling man in those first days” (p. 73).

In suppressing the revolution of Vienna, Jelačić and his Croatian villains committed terrible atrocities against civilians from as early as the beginning of October 1848. In his book, Rosenfeld described a large number of bodies found in one garden. “One of them was stabbed four times in different parts of his body and had a rope around his neck, while on the other two there were signs of strangulation. Beside them was a fourth (body), whose mutilation provided proof that the troops committed horrible monstrosities that appal civilized peoples and distinguish them among the barbaric ones. The body was disfigured in the worst imaginable way – the tongue and ears were cut off, the skull was smashed, nails hammered through the hands, the stomach cut open; in short, there was not a single part of the body that was not mutilated” (p. 80). In his journal of Vienna, Atzerbach described “the body of a student that was found in the Belvedere when the soldiers had left. The

Comment [S21]: Translator’s note. We were unable to find author of this name in any of our sources. Suggested spelling

Comment [S22]: Translator’s note. We were unable to find author of this name in any of our sources. Suggested spelling

body was horribly mutilated, the tongue was cut off, eyes gouged out, mouth cut open to the ears, the nose maimed, the stomach slit open – the madness that turned the man into a monster” (p. 82).

Major fights occurred at the end of October and the historical literature abounds with descriptions of the crimes committed by Jelačić's *serezans*. Rosenfeld's descriptions are again the most graphic and only one of these descriptions, probably the most striking, will be quoted here: “A student that fell into the hands of the soldatesque had his tongue cut out, his mouth pulled apart, his arms and legs cut off and then they put a cartridge into his mouth and lit it, blowing his head off. – They cut the arms and legs off a house owner and his wife, gouged out the woman's eyes, maimed her breasts and then sewed those mutilated bodies into mattresses and burned them. This was the crime of the *serezans* [...] The bodies of women with maimed breasts and slit stomachs were found in many places. Women, girls and even children would be put to shame and then murdered. – Among thefts of all sorts, there was the abduction of a child. A *serezan* snatched an unusually lovely boy of eight or nine months, who was wrapped in the most beautiful blankets [...] An officer offered him ten forints for the child and another tried to persuade him in every possible way to give him the child, but he was relentless and said that he would rather roast the child and eat it than give it to any anyone else” (p. 83).

e) Vienna Pillaged by the Croats

Rosenfeld himself described with resignation how “the unfortunate town was heading for certain ruin, abandoned by its emperor to the mercy of the tyrant and the pillage of its savage hordes [...] The bitterness culminated with the news that was spreading over the town of the Croatian anarchy in the suburbs that they had taken” (p. 83). In his book about the Vienna revolution, Grüner indicated that “the news that the Croats barged in to the Leopoldstadt district increased the enthusiasm for combat instead of subduing it. They were burning, killing and pillaging (there); these horrible scenes made one's hair stand on end when speaking of them [...] Such barbarous acts could be expected of the Croatian troops [...] People would shoot at the assault detachments from some of the houses and, as a consequence, the Croats would kill and rob the citizens [...] It can be said that the defenders only had time to flee, partly towards the town and partly towards the Belvedere, thanks to the plundering mania of these bandit packs” (p. 83-84).

The following scenes are reminiscent of the experience of Magdeburg or Milan: “The Croats who broke into the Leopoldstadt District committed monstrosities that are too horrible to recount. They cut the breasts off a landlady of a pub in Schittelbad, tore her stomach apart and then threw her husband into a fire. Children and women were mercilessly killed, everything was plundered and demolished and what escaped the villainous hands of the enemy was burned. In a large house on the corner at the end of Jägerzeile, there was a huge cellar in which the owners stashed all their property and papers and where the residents

of neighbouring houses were hiding with the approval of the owners. However, everything, simply everything was burned the following day. The Croats broke down the doors and barged into apartments stealing whatever they found [...] Women and girls were put to shame and many of them were killed in their apartments and horribly maimed [...] There ensued an awful carnage with the soldiers committing the most atrocious acts, which could be seen on the maimed bodies of the guardsmen and labourers [...] They would even cut the hands off the dead bodies if there were rings on them” (p. 84-85).

In 1886 in Zurich, David Durler published his own memories of the Vienna revolution, complaining of the Bohemians who treated him badly when he was taken their prisoner: “Yet, I must point out that all of us can speak of our good fortune – if, instead of the Bohemians, the soldiers of the Croatian Corps had ravaged here, who were only half an hour away, all of us would have lost our lives in the most terrible way. Unfortunately, it is unquestionably true that men, women and children were mercilessly killed in their own houses and women's breasts were even put on bayonets and carried through Vienna in broad daylight” (p. 85-86).

In his historical study on the Vienna revolution, Pfannenberger added the following: “The prisoners were left to entertain the soldatesque. Cutting off ears, noses and male genitalia was always a prelude to an even more horrible death. Cutting the belly open, hanging, then cutting the rope to hang the person again, pouring hot lead into the throat or the wounds of prisoners - that is what counted as great deeds among the upright defenders of the Habsburg name [...] Children would be put on bayonets and thrown into the flames. The people fighters who were locked in the *Odeon* theatre were burned alive and if some of them wanted to surrender, they would be pushed back with bayonets into the burning building. The mistress of Schittelbad had both of her breasts cut off and her stomach slit open by bayonet. Her husband was pierced by a bayonet and thrown into the fire before her eyes. Women and children were mercilessly murdered for no other reason than the desire for killing. During the pillage of Leopoldstadt, they would cut fingers and ears off the people who wore rings and earrings if they could not take them off quickly enough. Countless women were defiled. A sixteen-year old girl died due to ravishing; she was raped by six Croats, one after the other” (p. 86).

Some authors noted that crimes like Croatian ones had not been recorded even during the time of Suleiman the Magnificent, who besieged Vienna in 1529, or during the siege of the city under Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa in 1683. In his *History of Vienna*, published from 1878 to 1880, Henrich Penn wrote the following: “The Turks, who were infamous as heathens and barbarians due to their inhumane treatment, had hardly done any more devastation than the Croats” (p. 91). Capolago wrote that “The principal vehicle of the victory of despotism were the Croats, the most disgusting of all the European races” (p. 93). After he had suppressed the Vienna Revolution in blood, Jelačić headed towards Hungary where he used identical barbaric methods, for which

4. The Croatian History is Replete with Savagery

After publishing a separate brochure on the most sanguinary of the Croatian mass crimes of the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries, Lazo Kostić provided a general review of the entire history of the Croatian nation in his fourth book, adducing new and well-documented details that shed a true light on this people. In the 8th and 9th centuries, all the historical sources refer to the Croats as barbarians. There is a series of examples showing that they murdered and destroyed everything in their way. Einhard wrote about the head of the first relatively structured Croatian state, Ljudevit Posavski, who “arrived again [in 819] and started pillaging everything; the ones who were alive and escaped fire, he cut with his sabre” (p. 13).

After being pushed back by the Franks, Ljudevit ran over to the Serbs and showed all of his moral grandeur there, as described by Constantine Jireček: “One of the Serbian dukes received him in his fortress, but Ljudevit treacherously murdered him and took over the fortress. However, Ljudevit did not feel safe there, so he left the Serbs and found refuge with Duke Borna’s uncle Ljudemisl, who had him killed after a while” (p. 13). In the book entitled *The Mirror of Illyria*, published in Zagreb in 1840, Croatian historian and Catholic priest Ivan Švarc interpreted the quotations by Greek and German authors, stating that “in 828, the Croats and the Bulgarians enslaved the entire area of Friuli and, in 829, they burned all the Frankish villages as far as the Danube [...] the enraged Croats and furious Bulgarians murdered them all” (p. 13-14).

Švarc morally condemned the Croatian crimes, referring to them as a renunciation of Christianity, stating the following: “Bearing in mind that they denied Christian law through so many years of killing and warfare, and as no one could bridle them by war, the Holy Pope of Rome intended to avert them from wrongdoing and pillage in a spiritual way if possible; thus, he sent the god-pleasing cripple Martin to incite clemency in them with his looks” (p. 14). As the acceptance of Christianity failed to civilize the Croats significantly, the pope was forced to subject them to a certain form of imposed rule, of which Ludwig Albrecht Gebhardi wrote in the book entitled *History of the Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia, Serbia, Rascia, Rama and the Free State of Dubrovnik*, published in Budapest in 1808. Gebhardi stated that, “The pope concluded a solemn covenant with his new spiritual subjects, took their lands under a form of protection of the Apostolic See and obligated the Croats to refrain from any pillage and aggressive wars” (p. 14).

a) Pillage and Murder as the Primordial National Character Traits of the Croats

Vladimir Dvorniković, a universally recognized scientist, quoted the renowned contemporary and chronicler of the Crusades, William of

Tyre, who testified to the following: “When the first Crusaders were passing through Dalmatian Croatia, many of them fell victim to the extremely savage people with barbaric looks and inclination to plunder and murder” (p. 15). There are several passages in the *Chronicle of the Priest Dukljanin* referring to the “infidel” Croats and depicting them in a negative manner; it is further stated that they had one good king – Zvonimir – but they were not worthy of him. They murdered him treacherously in 1089 at the Assembly held at Kninsko polje because he had proposed that the local lords engage in the crusades.

The Priest Dukljanin wrote the following about the event: “They attacked this good King Zvonimir like barking dogs would charge at a wolf; they did not even let him speak but, shouting loudly, they started to cut him, wounding his body and spilling the blood of their fine king and lord who, lying in his blood and heavily wounded, cursed the infidel Croats and their offspring before God and his saints and himself and his unseemly death, that the Croats would never have a lord of their own language, but always be subjected to the foreign one. He perished lying wounded and cursing the Croats” (p. 19). This curse was momentous, as the Croats would soon lose their state and the historical documents would mention them mostly in the context of continually offering their lands to the foreign rulers and then breaking the word given. The Croatian people soon started fleeing before the Turkish onslaught to Hungary, Lower Austria, Moravia and Southern Italy, so the Croatian frontier lands in the south remained completely deserted.

In the book entitled *The Serbian Breed in Croatia* published in Zagreb in 1876, the most significant Croatian national ideologist of all times, Ante Starčević wrote that the Croats roasted Serbs on a spit in 1569. “The most horrible death for this breed was death by hanging. The Croats either did not know that or they were overcome with rage, but they did not hang the culprits; the Senjani in Perušić impaled them on a stake and cooked them” (p. 24). A similar scene of impalement was described by Fran Binički.

Recalling an earlier study by Lorković on the Croatian nation and state, Vatroslav Murvar wrote the following in the book published in 1953 under the title of *Croatia and the Croats*: “The Croatian Assembly sessions of the 16th century were full of the gravest accusations against the Vlachs and *Martoloz*i (Translator’s note: Armatoles) [...] There is a whole series of Assembly conclusions that were passed against the *Martoloz*i and, in 1586, it was finally decided that any *Martolog* caught in the Croatian area would be impaled alive as an act of deterrence. The Croatian Assembly never passed any similar decisions against Muslims” (p. 24). In this way, the Croats attempted to prevent the Serbs from inhabiting the deserted Croatian areas in the south. The impalement of the Serbs in Croatia was only legally instituted and sanctioned because the Serbs were of a different faith.

b) The Abomination of the Croatian Concept of Civilizational Values

There is a great deal of historical information about the extremely cruel treatment of the serfs by their Croatian nobility, about their treachery, falsehood and the worst imaginable inhumanity. The more the Croats venerate some of their medieval lords, the more certain their criminal pedigree is, as is the case, for example, with Nikola Zrinski, who broke all the customs of hospitality and treacherously murdered Kacijaner, the great hero of the battles against the Turks. However, the most impressive is the example of the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec. Therefore, it is no wonder and surprise that this savage and cruel people so violently, wretchedly and cowardly entered the stage of history with their miserable participation in the Thirty Years' War.

Kostić adduced new details and documents about Croatian atrocities in the German lands, as well as quotation from the book by Dutch author Felix Rutten who wrote of the Dutch experience with the Croatian hordes: "Since the ancient times, the Croats have been proud of their courage, but we Dutch know the other side of the Croats as well. Namely, when the Austrian General Octavio Piccolomini came with his band to assist the Cardinal-Infante, although they had arrived as friends, they behaved worse than the archenemy; they raped, murdered and pillaged over the period from 1639 to 1641 that Piccolomini spent in Limburg. Those years are called 'the years of fear' and 'the years of the Croats', as recounted by Welters in the *Legends of Limburg*. Even today, when a gruesome murder or robbery is committed, it is said that it was 'done in the Croat way'" (p. 33).

Fighting against the Turks, the Croats mercilessly robbed the local populace; one of the preserved war diaries of 1717 shows that the imperial soldiers of Prince Eugene of Savoy, during their campaign in Mačva, "flayed the dead Turks from head to foot and made belts from their skin; the belts are purportedly good for cramps, rheumatism and post-partum women. These imperial soldiers also cut off all the body parts containing human lard and carefully put them in small pots, claiming that it is extremely beneficial for sprained ankles and contusions. They even search the intestines of the Turks, as they have the habit of swallowing ducats during combat to retrieve them in case of capture. Finally, it is a bizarre spectacle: seeing the men [...] dismembering the corpses and committing atrocities that propriety prevents one describing here" (p. 39).

During the French Revolution, the Croat soldiers were under Prince-Elector Maximilian, who later became the King of Bavaria; his contemporary Laukhard wrote the following in his book whose one whole chapter bears the subtitle *Croatian Terror*: "The Croats were promised a ducat for every French head they would bring. The promise alone is abominable in itself [...] and it rendered any humanity towards those who surrendered or were disabled in combat impossible. But why would a Croat worry about humanness? [...] Conscientious and zealous as they were to earn the promised pay for blood, the soldiers would sometimes even murder the peasants (the author refers to the German peasants - the allies, *L.M.K.*). They would wake them up in the night, purportedly to ask them something and, when the unfortunate peasant

opened the door to answer, they would grab him and take him away to cash his head as the one of the *Sans-culottes* (p. 41-42).

Kostić supplemented the documentation on the Croats' participation in the suppression of the Italian revolutionary movement and referred to the fate that befell Brescia in 1849, quoting the following passage from a book by Attilio Tosoni: "The unarmed people, women and children fell victim to the Croatian rage; the flames and blood exasperated the beaten and pillaged town [...] Among the list of victims, there is the name of friar Arcangelo, the seventy-five year old Franciscan from Brescia who was murdered in his house" (p. 44).

c) The Serbs are the Principal Object of Croatian Hatred and Fury

The conduct of the Croats in WWI obviously did not represent any historical novelty. Austrian officer and Vienna reporter Dušan Lončarević wrote the following in his book entitled *The Creation of Yugoslavia*, concurrently published in German in Zurich, Leipzig and Vienna in 1929: "The acrimony of the Croatian corps of the Austro-Hungarian army with which they fought against the Serbs, who defended themselves heroically on the blood-soaked battlefields of Serbia, was repeatedly emphasised with delight in the reports of the Austrian Supreme Command [...] As early as the first stage of the occupation of Serbia by the Austro-Hungarian military forces, the population of Serbia who remained in the country would painfully and bitterly learn that the Croats and Slovenians, so great in numbers, were their irreconcilable enemies" (p. 48). Tens of thousands of civilians, women and children were murdered by the Croats in 1914 in the territory of Serbia; Archibald Reiss described the following striking detail: "A Croatian soldier named Došen boasted that he had killed one woman, one child and two old men and invited his friends to come along and see his victims" (p. 49). The Swiss publicist Katharina Sturzenegger and the English publicist Lapenne also wrote about these events.

Until 1878, the Catholics of Bosnia and Herzegovina had no Croatian national consciousness whatsoever. As it was gradually imposed on them, they accepted the Croatian criminal instincts. In his *Ethnography* published in 1880, Lorenz Diefenbach presented the following information: "A horrible example of religious madness in Bosnia was the slaughter of all the inhabitants of the Orthodox village of Jurkovići by a Papist band of volunteers, whose leaders were given Turkish medals for this heroic exploit" (p. 51). They killed the Serbs as Turkish servants and subsequently received the Austro-Hungarian occupying forces with immense delight.

Kostić concluded this book with an overview of the Croatian culture and quoted the 13th century Archdeacon Thomas of Split, who interpreted the origin of the Croatian name: "They were called *Kureti* because they were volatile vagrants; they led a savage life roaming through the woods and hills" (p. 53). According to the Croatian historian Ferdo Šišić, in 1057, Pope Gregory VII called the Croats "hideous and

5. The Travesty of the Purported Thousand-Year-Old Croatian Statehood

After publishing four books on the thousand-year-long Croatian criminal culture, Lazo Kostić published his historical and political study entitled *The Truth about the Croatian Thousand-Year-Old Statehood*, printed in Chicago in 1976 by the American Institute for Balkan Affairs. In this study, Kostić revealed another variation of the Croatian ideological lies and deceit regarding the alleged Croatian statehood traditions. The first Croatian historian, Ivan Lučić claimed that even in the early Middle Ages the Croatian state was not fully independent. On the other hand, Ferdo Šišić stated that the Croats first appeared on the stage of history about 797, when they liberated themselves from Avar rule thanks to Charlemagne. However, they immediately afterwards became the subjects of the Franks under the Margrave of Friuli, who was the immediate superior of the Croatian prince. Pursuant to the Treaty of Aachen of 812, Dalmatian Croatia was ceded to the Frankish Roman Empire and Dalmatia was annexed by the Byzantines.

The Bulgarians soon occupied Panonian Croatia, only to surrender it again to the Franks who positioned the Croatian dukes as their vassals. In 879, during the period of Prince Zdeslav, the Croats fell under Byzantine rule and even their purported “King” Tomislav was actually the proconsul of the Byzantine emperor. Hundreds of falsifications have been published about the alleged royal crowning of Tomislav but science knows nothing about that; even Ferdo Šišić wrote the following in his comprehensive study entitled *The History of the Croats during the Period of the National Rulers*, published in Zagreb in 1925: “Based on existing historical sources, we cannot know who crowned Tomislav and where this act took place” (p. 10).

They did not even stop short of fabricating an assembly at the Duvanjsko polje and other phantasmagorias. Upon the acceptance of Christianity, Croatia came under the direct rule of the Roman pope and existed with a more or less limited sovereignty. From the ceremony of coronation in Solin on 9 October 1076, “the authentic text was preserved whereby King Zvonimir confirmed in writing his pledge of vassal subordination. In the presence of the papal legates, King Zvonimir undertook to execute all the vassal duties requested by the pope or his legates” (p. 11). As Šišić wrote, “the violent death of Zvonimir marked the beginning of the disintegration of the Croatian people and their state [...] The country was engulfed by anarchy and civil war, which prompted certain Croatian lords and the Romans of Dalmatian towns to invite King Ladislaus I of Hungary to the country” (p. 14). This is how the Croatian statehood ceased to exist.

Comment [S23]: Translator’s note. We were unable to find author of this name in any of our sources. Suggested spelling

cowardly heretics” (p. 54). In 875, Pope John VIII said of the Croats that they were “true sea bandits”; in 925, Pope John X stated that the Croats were “wild heretics”; in 1185, Pope Lucius III referred to the Croatian people as “assailants of the Holy Roman Church, tormentors of the clergy and robbers of the church lands and revenues”; in 1221, Pope Honorius III called them “foxes, rebels, heretics, bare-breasted witches and perfidious destroyers” (p. 55). In 1688, Everhardus Guernerus Hepelius wrote in Hamburg that the Croats “are considered the best soldiers of the emperor in his heritable lands, though they are very cruel and somewhat savage” (p. 55).

As Georges Perrot wrote in 1875, “Italy, Hungary and the rest of Europe know the Croats for their ignorance, superstition, crudeness and – dare I say – the savagery, particularly especially in the corps grouped around the Land Border; such a reputation is highly painful for Zagreb and the whole of civil Croatia” (p. 57). In his *Geographic Textbook* of 1882, Daniel stated the following: “The Croats, a people of crude nature, boast of being benevolent and sedulous; in war they are very useful as infantrymen, but they bear the sigma of an unbridled thirst for pillage, so it is very hard to hide a thing from the hands of Croats” (p. 57-58). It is not a coincidence that Marx and Engels referred to the Croats as the excrement of human kind. The Italian Count and Minister of Foreign Affairs Galeazzo Ciano wrote the following in his *Diary* of 1940: “I believe that a sound basis of agreement between Italy and Yugoslavia would be more valuable than agreements with a mentally ill and treacherous mass such as the Croats” (p. 61).

Immediately after WWI, probably in his moments of moral resignation, Miroslav Krleža wrote a drama entitled *In the Camp*, wherein he wrote about the Croatian soldiers in the following manner: “These brigades of ours, and our divisions that bear the gallows as their only flag! Where did we not slaughter and murder, in what church did we not feed our horses? Lombardy remained full of our gallows, we left the alleys of Vienna packed with rotten corpses; the barricades of Vienna we crushed; in Buda, Arad, at Kufstein, Spielberg, where were we not the butchers, gaolers, and judges? [...] Can you hear the voice on the cart? It is not a wolf, it is the voice of the Croatian camp! This camp shot girls in the streets of Milan, stood guard at the chamber-pots of the princesses of Vienna, hanged people in Buda, Vienna, Arad, Munkacs; this camp hanged this old woman, and this camp we are; it is me, it is you, it is us, yesterday, tonight, tomorrow, for a long, long time; the year of nineteen forty-eight was hanging before us just like this old women is hanging now” (p. 68).

Until recently, there was an inscription on a cathedral in Munich, which read “God save us from the plague and the Croats”. In 1848, the Croatian Assembly itself passed the decision to send emissaries to Bosnia and incite the Christians to unite with the Croats and to promise them that they would be allowed to burn, destroy and pillage” (p. 74). The decision was adopted at the 200th session of the Assembly and was recorded in the memoirs of Imperial General Neusteter, published in Zagreb in 1942. Therefore, it is no wonder that Jovan Dučić said the

a) The Croats under Hungarian Domination

The glorious period that ensued was marked by subjection to foreign rulers and unification with foreign states. As pointed out by Croatian historian Grga Novak, "The Croatian state as such ceased to exist in 1102, when the Croatian tribes recognized the Hungarian King Coloman as their own. It became a constituent part of the great Arpad state. The Arpads initially kept the promises made to the Croatian tribes that they would crown themselves as Croatian kings, but eventually they abandoned those promises" (p. 15). The Croats claim that they entered into a contractual relationship with the Hungarians, though the fabled *Pacta Conventa* was not preserved and the Hungarian historians categorically deny that it ever existed, maintaining that Croatia was taken and subdued with arms; this does correspond to the historical facts concerning the Croatian defeat at Gvozd and the murder of Petar Svačić in 1097.

Even if such an agreement did exist, it could only have represented an agreement on the terms of capitulation. Croatian legal historian Marko Konštrečić claimed the following: "If we analyse the *Pacta Conventa* based on the actual circumstances under which it was created, we can conclude that it was a feudal covenant between Coloman as the superior and the representatives of twelve Croatian tribes who, by this agreement, became his vassals. Consequently, the *Pacta Conventa* was not an agreement on the actual union of Hungary and Croatia, nor an international agreement on the union of two international legal entities, as claimed by the Croatian civil historians who had groundlessly interpreted this document as if it contained the elements and notions of the international state law of their time" (p. 16).

Ferdo Šišić explained how the alleged Croatian "statehood" functioned in practice: "The kings of the time exercised all their sovereign rights in Croatia: they would guide its foreign policy, appoint bans, grant privileges and donations, confirm the laws adopted by the Croatian and Slavonian Assembly, levy taxes and customs and command the Croatian army. All the other administrative, judicial, financial and military affairs were conducted by the Croatian gentry in agreement with the representatives of the King's authority in the country" (p. 16-17). Lajos Thallóczy, a notable Hungarian historian, wrote of this in 1916: "When Coloman 'acquired' this area, he became its master and king; what is more, he was a powerful and independent ruler of this people. All the legal and state matters that existed from the old times were transferred to the hands of Coloman who instituted the rule of the Hungarian state law. This did not destroy the Croatian nation as he left it its individuality. This conquest was thus not a conquest in the old sense of the word. Hungarian arms, the Hungarian king and Hungarian state law were actually the points of unification" (p. 17). Not a single word is mentioned about the Croatian state law.

Hungarian jurist János Karacsony was of the opinion that the inclusion into the Hungarian state was beneficial to the Croats. In his text entitled *The Croatian Aspirations* published in *The Hungarian*

IT-03-67-T
Review in 1886, he wrote as follows: "Far from wishing to subdue the Croatian nation, the Hungarian nation actually secured its existence. If the Croats had not become such close subjects of Hungary, the Serbs, who were advancing powerfully in the 13th century, would have completely absorbed them and destroyed their language and culture" (p. 17).

In 1882, in the same magazine, the Hungarian historian Imre Pesti criticized the Croatian historian Josip Stare who insisted on the Croatian-Hungarian crown and kingdom, saying that "Never was a Hungarian king crowned as Croatian king, nor did he need it, with the exception of Coloman who extended his state to the Adriatic Sea. Stare is now writing that the Croats invited Coloman to take the Croatian throne on condition that he would still recognize Croatian independence. These are old tales for children, which Stare did not make up himself, simply repeating what Kvaternik and other historians (?) of a similar conscience claimed before him, believing it and without ever thinking it through. Some additions to the text, the omission of an inconvenient expression, the smuggling of a falsified document, which one could get at any time from the notorious Dalmatian convents – and there you have the so-called Croatian state law of which the history knows absolutely nothing" (p. 18).

Croatia gradually blended into the state it had joined, losing its territorial integrity so that many of its parts were more under the control of the foreign regime. Slavonia was the first to become an integral part of Hungary, increasingly distancing itself from Croatia even though it was predominantly settled by the Croats. Dalmatia had virtually no autonomy and, though Zvonimir accepted it as a kingdom in the form of a fief granted by the pope, he subsequently had to recognize Venetian and then also Hungarian sovereignty, and then this territory became the subject of the years' of disputes between Hungary and Venetian Republic.

To make this situation even more tragicomic, in the 15th century, Ladislaus Angevin of Naples sold all his royal claims to the whole of Dalmatia to the Venetian Republic for one hundred thousand ducats. In 1941, in one of his studies on the Balkan Slavs, the German historian Max Braun wrote that, in the 11th century, "Dalmatian towns openly favoured the Republic of the lagoons and were more willing to accept even the sovereignty of Hungary than that of the Croatian kings" (p. 21). As early as the 15th century, the Venetians were in control of all the coastal towns and islands. Ferdo Šišić explained how, in the time of Matthias I Corvinus, "Croatia lost its last remaining island in 1440, when its ruler, Prince Ivo Frankopan, surrendered Krk to the Venetians in a treacherous and cowardly manner" (p. 21).

After the Battle of Mohacs, Hungary was also left without a ruler and its nobles accepted the Austrian emperor as the Hungarian king; the Croats then also "decided" to choose this emperor. The Turkish invasion resulted in a reduction of the Croatian territory. According to Ferdo Šišić, the Kingdom of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia "included a small piece of littoral area from Trsat to Bag, the border between Kranj and

Styria, the Drava River as far as Đurđevac, the town of Čazma, the area along the Sava River downstream of Sisak and the towns of Slunj and Otočac” (p. 22). Austria established the Military Frontier as a separate territorial unit along the entire southern border with the Turks. As early as the mid-seventeenth century, Croatia had no access to the sea. As Šišić added further, “until 1745, the vicinity of Zagreb, Varaždin, Križevac, i.e. the region of the Kaikavian dialect, was actually the entire territory of the proud Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia [...] The Croatian people no longer had any independent political individuality and self-rule. They sacrificed their blood and money for a foreign army and waged someone else’s wars” (p. 23).

b) A Provincial Status as a Basis for the Provincial Spirit

By the decision Croatian Assembly in 1790, after the death of Joseph II, Croatia became a Hungarian province in the formal and legal sense as well, since the Croats, as Šišić concluded, “though voluntarily, unreasonably relinquished their autonomy, by the ban’s law subjecting the ban’s authority to the supreme control and administration of the Hungarian Palatine and the Hungarian Palatine Government” (p. 26). The Croatian ban became just a vehicle of the Hungarian Government’s will. In 1830 in Zagreb, the Croatian Assembly reached the following conclusion: “The classes and ranks acknowledge the need for spreading the use of the Hungarian language in the kingdoms (Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia) since they want both Croatia and Slavonia to be more closely connected with the allied Kingdom of Hungary.

In his book *The Living Past*, published in Zagreb in 1957, the Croatian historian Vaso Bogdanov explained this unbelievable historical event in the following manner: “Bearing down so heavily on Joseph’s anti-feudal reforms, the Croatian feudal assembly of 1790 adopted a series of conclusions whereby the Croatian nobility [...] forever surrendered their rule over the country to Hungary, which was done with the hope of having their noble privileges forever shielded by Hungary. In order to preserve their feudal rights intact under the Hungarian protection, the Croatian gentry voluntarily sacrificed the national and state independence of Croatia and renounced its financial and political sovereignty” (p. 27). Had it not been for the Hungarian revolution of 1848, the Croats would hardly have freed themselves of the status of a mere Hungarian province. Having done some favours to the Court of Vienna in suppressing the revolutionary movement, the Croats managed to change their status to a certain degree.

The restructuring of the country into a dual monarchy brought the Croats once again under the exclusive rule of Hungary and, in 1868, the Croats and Hungarians reached an agreement under which Croatia “was recognized as a political nation – to which territorial integrity was recognized (with the exception of Rijeka), in addition to formal national recognition, as well as internal rights, education and theology, judiciary and autonomous affairs [...] but it was deprived of financial

IT-03-67-T
independence and its ban was actually subordinated to the Hungarian prime-minister” (p. 33). This is how the agreement was explained by Croatian historian Jaroslav Mladak under the entry *Croats, History* in the *Encyclopaedia of Yugoslavia*.

Hungary undertook to enter into all subsequent agreements with Austria with the direct participation of Croatia, but it never lived up to that promise, to such an extent that Croatia was not even asked for its opinion. The supreme legislative body of the monarchy was composed of the Austrian and Hungarian delegations contributing sixty members each, whereas the Croats had only five representatives in the Hungarian delegation. Such a miserable participation in the legislative power reflected on the executive one. Pursuant to the agreement, the Croatian ban was appointed by the Hungarian prime-minister, who only slightly pretended to be responsible to the Croatian assembly; beside the prime-minister, the Hungarian government had a minister in charge of Croatia. The Ban and the Minister for Croatia, both appointed exclusively by the Hungarians, were the only individuals who could represent Croatia in the affairs before the sovereign. Therefore, the Croatian Assembly could not have been a parliament in the true sense of the term. Such a miserable status was actually an award by the Court of Vienna for their zealous engagement in the suppression of the Hungarian Revolution.

In practice, the Croatian representatives were not allowed to speak in their native tongue at the Hungarian parliament, although it had been previously guaranteed under the agreement. The Croatian political life from the second half of the 19th century to WWI was the most facetious of all the European nations. The renowned English historian Seton-Watson wrote in his book *The Southern Slav Question and the Habsburg Monarchy*, published in Berlin in 1913, that “It is no wonder there was a saying in Croatia that King Franz Joseph once stated: ‘The Croats, they are rags’” (p. 42-43).

c) The Foreign Yoke as God’s Punishment

Kostić showed that the Croats have, throughout history, been subordinated to foreign authorities, that their feudal system lasted till the end of the 19th century and that their leading feudal lords were mostly foreigners. As late as 1825, the Croatian Assembly adopted a ban on the free movement of peasants from the land they cultivated as serfs in order to prevent industrial development. Every trace of national consciousness had long since been annihilated. As Wendel wrote, “The obligation of paying a levy and providing labour bound a mass of peasant people to numerous magnates and barons, who were the only ones that felt as *Natio Croatici* (Croatian people) and who would rather recognize their horses as members of their nation than their peasant subjects” (p. 44-45).

In addition to the Turkish penetration, the inhumane feudal treatment of the peasants was another important reason for their continual fleeing from and abandoning of the Croatian territory. Napoleon’s officers were appalled by the situation they found in Croatia at the beginning of the last century. Wendel wrote about that in the

following manner: “The feudalism that raged so vehemently in Croatia everywhere reminded Napoleon’s leaders of the French rule of the 15th century. In their motions submitted to the Governor, they constantly complained of the monstrosity to which the serfs were exposed, emphasizing that the power and influence of the nobles must be undermined and that the peasants needed help” (p. 47).

Wendel further noted that “at the time of the European Revolution of 1848, Croatia was the most feudal country of all the feudal ones; against the weak and insignificant citizenry and a mass of peasants numbered by slavery, there stood the land-owning nobility that considered itself the only constituent of the nation” (p. 47). Even after the Croatian-Hungarian agreement had been signed, there was never a single Croat in the Hungarian government, let alone the Viennese one. Moreover, all the church heads and bishops were foreigners, including Strossmeyer who was a German from Osijek. Until the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was established, Croatia had never introduced the general right to vote. At the beginning of the 20th century, out of a total of almost two and a half million citizens, only about forty thousand had the right to vote. In a magazine article published in 1960, Juraj Krnjević himself admitted that the first general parliamentary election to be “conducted on the basis of the universal right to vote” was the ballot of 1920; “there had never been such a thing in Croatia before this election, which was conducted in a rather independent manner. It was then that the Croatian peasants were first given the opportunity to express their will” (p. 63).

Another peculiar historical phenomenon and proof of the criminal Croatian culture was the experience of Prince Miloš Obrenović, who arrived in Zagreb in 1848, only to get imprisoned there. Ljudevit Gaj extorted a large sum of money from the prince in order to have him released. The European press wrote about the incident for years. For decades, all of Europe would be appalled by the Croatian inhumanity and the violation of civilized principles during the High Treason Process that was conducted against the most prominent Serbs in Zagreb in 1908-1909. When the Court of Appeals reversed the judgement, “it was noted in the disposition that the reversed judgement did not contain any detailed explanation of the acts and the circumstances under which the acts had been committed, only referenced certain unfounded conjectures. The interrogation was conducted in an illegal manner, the indictment was produced in contravention of the law and the Court itself abused its discretion. For these reasons, the interrogation process was deemed illegal, the indictment dismissed and the entire process declared null and void” (p. 81).

d) The Croatian Laws Prosecute Witches and Kill Sparrows

The primitive customs of victimising witches are found in many European countries, but the event that enriches Croatian history has been hitherto unheard of. The highest state organ of this country passed a decision to have the unfortunate women severely punished for their

purported guilt and for the superstitious madness of the executioners. Dušan Popović wrote about this in 1954: “In 1609, the Croatian State Assembly led by the Catholic clergy passed a legal act whereby the entire population of Croatia was obliged to pursue witches and report them to the competent authorities [...] All the authorities on the state, parish and local levels, and both the gentry and the populace, endeavoured to exterminate the witches [...] In 1686, the peasants in the Zagreb area murdered a large number of ‘the devil’s mistresses’ without any trial. In some villages, all the elderly women had to undergo a test in order to determine whether they were witches [...] Those who did not sink in water would be immediately stoned! [...] The examples of a ‘state’ assembly debate on this issue and their ‘conclusions’ thereon are unheard of in the rest of the world. It is also proof of the Croatian Assembly’s incapability of dealing with issues of crucial importance to the state. Witch hunts later became the primary task and principal function of all the other authorities.

In the old court records and other Croatian documents, there is a great deal of data related to the witch trials and the torture of witches. The persecution of witches began as early as the 14th century and reached its culmination in the 17th and 18th centuries. Witches were tortured in the most horrible manner; their fingers, arms and legs were broken; their arms were twisted and disjointed at the shoulder; they were tortured on the wheel until they confessed to their ‘misdeeds and connections with the devil’. They would eventually be murdered in various ways. Official records of the proceedings against witches have been preserved, e.g. of the witch trials at Grič (the upper part of Zagreb, which was a separate town until the mid 19th century)” (p. 90-91).

When not dealing with the witches, the Croatian State Assembly even prosecuted the sparrows. “Such a debate was on the agenda during the difficult times of war in 1752; legal article 10 was passed on this issue”. The hierarchy and ranks – as the representatives of the people of “the Triune Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia” were called until 1848 – adopted the earnest conclusion to exterminate all the sparrows as a harvest pest and every household (i.e. every serf house) was thereby obliged to submit three hundred sparrows along with the rest of the levy. A backdrop to this seemingly innocuous conclusion was a difficult financial situation during which the legislators ran out of ideas for tax imposition, for the person who did not surrender the required number of sparrows had to pay money for each sparrow he failed to catch!” (p. 91).

The manner in which the Croatian nobility, headed by Bishop and Ban Juraj Drašković, settled accounts with the rebellious peasants and their leader Matija Gubec earned a special place in history. Croatian historian Tadija Smičiklas wrote about this in his *History of Croatia*, published in Zagreb in 1882: “The noblemen raged terribly over the captured peasants. They hanged them on trees and next to the peasant houses. There was not a tree left without peasants hanging on it, sometimes as many as ten of them on a single tree. Their leader Gubec was caught alive. The infuriated gentry decided to crown him with a red-

hot iron crown in order to show the people what the 'king of men', as some of his rebellious brethren had started calling him, was made of. They crowned him at the Saint Marcus square in Zagreb and quartered his body" (p. 97-98).

The Croatian populace found the Turks much better than their own nobles and they often fled to Turkish territory. In 1891, the renowned German ethnologist Friedrich Samuel Kraus described the inhumane treatment of the peasants by the Croatian gentry: "Until 1848, surf had to kiss the count's rear if he had demanded it. This was a punishment for improper conduct. As late as 1840, Imperial Chamberlain Janković, landlord of Pakrac and Daruvar, dropped his trousers and made a peasant who was tilling the field for him perform this servile kiss in a peculiar place" (p. 99).

Incidentally, Antun Radić, the founder of the Croatian Peasant Party and brother of Stjepan Radić, did not say the following during his speech before the Croatian peasants: "People, do not be insane! You do not have any past; our past and our history are owned by the kings and nobles, by your lords. The ashes and dust of your ancestors could only speak of suffering and slavery, not of glory and pride. You have nothing in history" (p. 121).

6. German and Italian Evidence of the Croatian Crimes in World War II

Kostić's fifth book of the edition entitled *The Examples of the Thousand-Year-Long Croatian Culture*, has been published twice in the Serbian language so far and once in English under the title of *The Croatian Atrocities in WWII as Described by their Allies*. It was last printed in Melbourne in 1983 by the *Serbian Renaissance Library*. In this book, Kostić endeavoured to describe how Croatia's previous systematic and continuous acts of savagery were further concretized and led to the events that took place in WWII.

Persistently researching various archives and going through numerous libraries, Kostić compiled a vast amount of material and explained its significance to a degree in the preface to this book: "Understandably, the condemnation of the Croats by their allies is of primary significance and has more weight in the eyes of the world and history than the eventual condemnation by the enemies of the Croats and even by neutral parties. The national interests of such writers would require data of this kind to be concealed, not widely publicised. But they were members of great nations and distinguished writers who cared about the truth" (p. 4-5). It is beyond doubt that those were authors that the Serbs could not influence in any way and none of them sympathised with the Serbian people.

Kostić's perception of the apparent differences between the approach of the Italian and German authors to the Croatian genocide against the Serbian people is rather interesting. "The Italians, both official and private parties, military and civilians, they do it emotionally, with sorrow and condemnation. They are on the verge of tears! On the

other hand, the Germans submit dispassionate administrative reports without any trace of sympathy; when they count the dead it is as though they present the loss of horses or oxen. There is no condemnation on their part for the sake of humaneness. They do, however, condemn those phenomena because they interfere with the German policy of the economic exploitation of the Balkans" (p. 8). Kostić further noted that the Italians wrote about Serbian suffering with an expression of sorrow as if they suffered themselves. "They are imbued with compassion, pain and indignation. They condemn the crimes as if they were committed against their compatriots, their family members. The Germans condemn those crimes sharply, in a military manner, believing that they would harm their military campaign and the outcome of their struggle. They always report on the crimes as if it were a military conflict, a traffic accident or a natural disaster" (p. 9).

a) The Testimony of Hermann Neubacher

In his book entitled *A Special Assignment in the Southeast, 1940-1945: The Report of a Flying Diplomat*, published in Göttingen in 1956, a close friend of Hitler and the German military and civilian authority coordinator for the Balkans Hermann Neubacher wrote that, after the dissolution of Yugoslavia, "the Croats launched a military campaign of revenge and destruction that was one of the most severe actions of mass murder in all of world history; it was the Balkan revenge against the hated Balkans" (p. 16). Kostić strongly emphasized Neubacher's following quotation: "The pattern that the Ustasha leader Pavelić used against the Orthodox population resembles a religious war and evokes the most sanguinary memories: 'One third must become Catholic, one third must leave the country and the last third must die. The final point has been achieved. When the leaders of the Ustasha movement claim that they slaughtered one million Serbs (including infants, children, women and the elderly), I am of the opinion that it constitutes boastful exaggeration. According to the reports I have received, my estimate is that the number of the individuals slaughtered without resistance amounts to three quarters of a million'" (p. 16).

Neubacher further noted that Hitler himself did not agree with the Croatian crimes against the Serbian people, though this was owing to his belief that the nation was too big to be exterminated; however, it is a fact that the Germans kept a certain distance from the Croatian genocidal policy. One of the chiefs of the German intelligence service, Wilhelm Höttl, published a book entitled *The Secret Front* under the pseudonym of Walter Hagen in Zurich in 1950, in which he said that only a handful of Ustasas led by Pavelić took over power in Zagreb, but they had the support of almost the entire Croatian nation and immediately began exterminating the Serbs and the Jews. "As early as the summer of 1941, the terrible atrocities took on inconceivable proportions. The entire population of villages, such as Vojnić, and entire areas were systematically exterminated or their inhabitants were forced to flee to Serbia. Since the Croatian people had traditionally been identified with

the Catholic faith and as Serbdom is identified with the Orthodoxy, they started forcing the Orthodox population to convert to Catholics. This forcible conversion was a way of conducting Croatization” (p. 18-19). Kostić further quoted Höttl: “The Ustasha massacre of the Serbs, the consequences of placing the entire state power into the hands of Pavelić and his clique, and the systematic conversion of the Serbian Orthodox Christians to the Catholic faith made many individuals flee to the woods [...] The Ustasha massacre of the Serbs marked the beginning of endless atrocities” (p. 19).

Hagen wrote that the Germans protested on several occasions against the Ustasha atrocities and that some of their officials were too benevolent and sympathetic towards Pavelić. He provided a concrete example of their distancing from the Croatian crimes: “In 1942, when some of the Ustasha leaders in Slavonia committed terrible mass murder of the local population, General Gleise managed to have those terrorists removed from the eyes of the public. However, Pavelić had no intention of punishing the culprits and he kept them close to him and relied on their advice [...] Throughout the war, the Ustasha forces could not be trained in proper war conduct; the actions the German military forces undertook to appease the Ustashes were always hindered by some senseless incidents caused by the Ustasha formations; these incidents made people join the Partisans at a much higher rate than military actions managed to suppress” (p. 20).

Eugen Gerstenmaier, who later became the president of the German Bundestag, wrote the following in his war memoirs published in 1969: “The Orthodox circles of Serbia were deeply embittered by the Croatian conduct. The Ustashes forced tens of thousands of Serbs in Croatia to convert to Catholicism. The Orthodox people who resisted the conversion had their throats slit (this should be taken literally) or their property was confiscated and they were evicted from the country without any possessions. The German circles of Belgrade also informed me of their strong feelings against the bestial acts of the Croats, emphasising that their disagreement was exacerbated by the Croatian claims that the murders were conducted under the auspices or approval of the German Reich. Those Serbs that were expelled from Croatia with no belongings seem to be joining the Bolshevik rebels out of despair; if things progress in this manner, it is likely that the movement will be joined by the national circles who begin to lose their nerve due to the numerous reports of the atrocities” (p. 22).

Polemicizing with a Catholic priest and negator of the Croatian crimes, Jozef Matl, professor of Slavistics from Graz and a German captain during the war, wrote the following in 1958: “Relying on the German Wehrmacht, the Ustasha government endeavoured to murder and exterminate the Serbs of Eastern Bosnia and shift the blame onto the evil Germans. My intention stemmed from my official duty to pacify and normalise Eastern Bosnia, which was militarily and strategically under the authority of the German general in Serbia, in order to put an end to the increasing anarchy that was a consequence of the slaughter of the Serbian population by the Ustashes. We have evidence to prove this; we

IT-03-67-T.

know and saw with our own eyes what was going on over there in Bosnia [...] Moreover, another witness speaking contrary to your claims is a professor of the University of Vienna and professor of the Catholic Action, who was then a corps commander at the Drina River and who ordered that the Ustashes be fired upon from the Serbian riverbank when it was realized that those patriots wanted to throw Serbian women and children into the cold river. I saw the starving children who were saved by our soldiers and shared my last morsel of bread with them. Do you find all this Christian as a Catholic priest and doctor of theology? Or are you of the opinion that Catholic and Christian is only that which serves the Croatian political cause? You are welcome to continue depicting the Ustasha Croats as good and innocent lambs” (p. 24).

b) Gleise von Horstenau and his Documents

In this phase of his work, Kostić seems not to have had access to the preserved and (much later) published journal entries of German General Edmund Gleise von Horstenau; however, he was aware of it through his close acquaintances, who confirmed that von Horstenau dedicated much of his attention to the Croatian atrocities committed against the Serbs. This journal was recently translated into Serbian and printed in Belgrade and is already accessible to the public. Kostić quoted the following passage by Horstenau, taken from the book by the Munich author Karl Hnimecke: “For some time, the Croats indeed moderated their bestial persecution of the Serbs thanks to the intervention of Germany, and of the Italian soldiers even more so. Now they are sorry for what they have done: the terror against the Serbs should not have decreased for a single moment” (p. 27). Gleise’s notes were soon published by German historian Gert Fricke in 1972, and Fricke stated that von Horstenau described the Croatian acts against the Serbs as barbaric. The book claimed that “On the German side, the manner of persecution of Serbs by the Ustasha members is characterised as a shameful disgrace that will cause hatred between the Serbs and Croats for generations” (p. 31).

Gleise von Horstenau wrote that the Croatian Ustashes were infamous “for their frenzy, insubordination, greed and corruption. Besides that, the anarchy, robbery and murders are ceaseless. Not a week can pass without a cleansing action [...] and one is required to believe that whole villages, together with women and children, were actually enemy combat losses” (p.32-33). The book further reads that “The destruction of the Orthodox component continues to be the objective of Ustashes who even now, as they did before, want to resolve the issue of two million autochthonous (deep rooted with their land) Serbs in their notorious manner and continue with the mass murders; in just two villages near Banja Luka they murdered 2,300 people” (p. 33).

The book also contains plenty of evidence on the poor military quality of the Ustashes and the Croatian Home Guard (Translator’s note: *Domobrani*) who only caused trouble in serious combats; the chief German Commander for the Balkans, General Alexander von Löhner, openly demanded a thorough restructuring of the Croatian State, greater

294/57440

Comment [K.B.24]: Translator’s note. We were unable to find author of this name in any of our sources. Suggested spelling

German authority and a more tolerant treatment of the Serbs: “The measures of terror, mass arrests, convictions and murders in the absence of any signs of disobedience towards the state authorities led to insecurity, illegality and chaos in many parts of the country owing to the numerous incidents caused by the gangs. Life and property are no longer protected” (p. 36-37).

c) The Memoirs of Lothar Rendulic

In the memoirs of German General Lothar Rendulic, published in Heidelberg in 1951, Kostić came across the following text: “Advancing across Croatia, the German soldiers encountered practically no resistance and were actually welcomed as liberators. Croatia was constituted as an independent state and its leadership was taken over by Ante Pavelić [...] During a short period the German troops spent in various Croatian places, the Croats commenced the savage persecution of the Orthodox” (p. 40). On several occasions in his book, General Rendulic described how he personally urged them to stop this unreasonable persecution of the Orthodox populace.

In 1943, the SS Lt. General, *Obergruppenführer* Artur von Phleps recorded the following in his diary: “In the beginning, the Ustashas’ main preoccupation was to destroy the Orthodox, to butcher hundreds of thousands of men, women and children and to get hold of leading positions in the administration of the newly instituted state [...] These Ustashas are no better even today! Their major and minor leaders are not held responsible in either a military or moral sense [...] They are prone to conspiracy and pursue their own politics, becoming the dynamite of this state instead of being its backbone” (p. 43).

Phleps detailed plenty of quite specific data, even including the names of the Croatian criminals and their victims. Kostić quoted some of his statements and a description of “the Ustasha Captain Golubović, whose unit – a platoon of 40 men – was disguised as German soldiers; he issued an order that those ‘German’ soldiers should kill ‘a large group of Muslim refugees!’” (p. 44). On another occasion, the Ustashas attacked Pale near Sarajevo. “They were disguised as Chetniks and had the Chetnik cockades. Even the German who prepared the report was dressed as a Chetnik. According Sudar’s order, all other Ustashas had to remove all Ustasha insignia and ranks and, ‘if possible, dress themselves non-uniformly’ so that ‘this bunch of murderers would appear to ignorant people to be villagers, civilians, Chetniks or Germans’” (p. 44). Although Phleps himself was a zealous SS officer, he publicly protested against the Croatian crimes against the Serbs on several occasions.

On 7 February 1944, the German Naval Communications Staff in Croatia presented its assessment of the situation in the area of its responsibility, which *inter alia* read as follows: “A Croat of any social class is, by his nature, utterly unreliable in terms of politics. He knows nothing of a straight political line. He is always inclined to negative criticism, he is not certain about what he wants and pursues the traditional opportunistic policy [...] The Croatian armed forces cannot

be used as a reliable element at the moment. In the case of a massive landing of the enemy troops, one should count on their disintegration” (p. 45). The SS General Ernest Ficke wrote the following in his report of 16 March 1944, sent to *Reichsführer-SS* Heinrich Himmler: “The Croatian party of Ustashas is a Catholic, undisciplined and poorly trained group, fairly unreliable in combat and infamous for killing six or seven hundred thousand people of different religious and political persuasions according to the Balkan methods” (p. 45-46).

On 5 February 1942, General Bader, the German Military Commander in Serbia, submitted a report to his immediate superior, wherein he stated as follows: “Sharp differences between the Croats, Muslims and Serbs in Eastern Bosnia make this area the focal point of unrest in the whole of Serbia. There is no doubt that the Croats are trying to destroy the entire Serbian population” (p. 46). In this quotation, Bader unambiguously referred to Eastern Bosnia as a part of Serbia; he made no distinction whatsoever between the Ustashas and the Croats as such a distinction never existed and said of the Chetnik Duke Jezdimir Danagić that he “chiefly wanted to protect the lives and property of his countrymen and stop the Croatian carnage of women and children” (p. 46).

In the preserved testimony that Josef Fessl, Commander of the 2nd Motorized Army Ambulance, gave under oath before the American Marshal Court concerning the monstrous crimes the Croats had committed against the Serbian civilians, Fessl explicitly associated these crimes with the Croatian atrocities in the Thirty Years’ War. Fessl testified as follows: “The circumstances in this area were, in many respects, similar to those of the Thirty Years’ War, even more so as the same blood ran through their veins. They would attack wedding processions and tie people up with wires; a plaque with the inscription ‘Have a safe journey to Belgrade’ was hung around the necks of certain individuals who were later thrown together into the Danube or the Sava. Some of them were crucified and the same plaque was put on them; they were then thrown into the river” (p. 48).

d) The Germans are Appalled by the Croatian Blood Thirst

As early as the end of June 1941, a high official of the *Abwehr* – the German Military Intelligence Service – informed his headquarters that “around 200,000 Serbs fell victim to the Ustashas’ monstrous drive. Only the future can tell whether this number is too large or too small. However, it is clear even now that the Ustashas in Bosnia and Herzegovina killed the male part of the Orthodox population that used to be in the majority there” (p. 49). There are so many documents that describe specific crimes, the number of Serbs killed, the names of villages and towns, the names of executioners, etc.

For example, from the annex of von Phleps’ report, Kostić quoted the testimony “of a German soldier who, in 1943, was assigned and subordinated to the notorious criminal and Ustasha ‘Lieutenant-Colonel’

Sudar. He stated in shock that, in July 1943, Sudar summoned the entire Serbian population of a place called Sokolac. He and his horde forced the old men and women – between 250 and 300 people – to Sokolovići, beating them with rifle stocks and whips; he chased the rest of the population (about 700 men, women and children) to a stream at the back of the church and killed them all, committing sadistic atrocities that are beyond description. Sudar personally took part in the carnage. He poured petrol on the women's pubic hairs, burned them and then whipped these women until they became unconscious. He did this, for example, to the well-known innkeeper Joka and her daughter Milka. And then Ustasha Cureski slaughtered them" (p. 51-52).

In his book entitled *The Catholic Terror Today*, published in New York in 1968, Italian writer Avro Manhattan referred to a memorandum of a German officer from August 1941, prepared after this officer visited some parts of Eastern Bosnia: "All the Serbian villages we passed on our way to the hill of Javor near Srebrenica and Mountain Ozren were completely deserted. However, we would often find entire families slaughtered in their houses. We even came across barrels full of blood. In the villages between Vlasenica and Kladanj we found impaled children whose little limbs were cramped with pain; they were pinned like insects" (p. 52).

In 1952, German historian Walter Görlitz published one of his first great historiographic works about WWII, wherein he emphasized that one "of the first measures taken by the Ustasha regime was a terrible military venture to exterminate the Serbian Greek Orthodox population that had fallen under Croatian rule. The atrocities that took place on this occasion already threw this young state into civil war" (p. 57). In his *History of World War II*, Pletz spoke of the horrible savagery and the monstrosities that the Croats committed against the Orthodox Serbs. This professor of oriental studies at the Hamburg University openly accused the Roman Catholic Church of supporting the Croatian criminal state and forced Catholicisation.

In his *Illustrated History of the 20th Century*, published in 15 volumes, Ernst Nolte wrote in 1969 that "the Ustasha movement that emerged for a short time represented the first and the only unrestricted fascist product in the Balkans" (p. 58). Nolte himself was surprised by the enthusiasm and speed with which this Croatian fascist rule was established, so that "in just the first months of its existence, this new country achieved a total unity of state and party that would take years to develop in Italy and even in Germany" (p. 58).

Although Nolte considered that a true believer, "a Catholic Christian, must not be a fascist", he noted that, though the Ustasha movement gathered numerous prominent leftists, it was for the most part "closely linked to Catholicism, which expressed itself best through the cooperation with the friars and other priests" (p. 59). He further stated that "During the war, Croatia became an enormous church of conversion and, at the same time, a gigantic slaughterhouse [...] Pavelić 'resolved' the issue of the Serbs and the Muslims in the same forcible pattern that Hitler applied to the Jews, though it was not as perfect; the merciless

persecution of the Jews was just an aspect of Pavelić's pattern. Thousands of people were killed" (p. 59).

In 1956, Kurt Zentner published his *Illustrated History of the Resistance in Germany and Europe* in Munich. Kostić quoted the following lines from this book: "Since the Ustasha movement of Dr Pavelić assumed power in the new state of Croatia, they immediately took steps to persecute the Serbian population there [...] Pavelić and his Ustasha organization had already been supported for years by the Italian Government and the Vatican as the Ustashas were an extreme Roman Catholic movement [...] Almost two million Serbs lived in the Croatian territories. By the end of the war, more than half a million of them would be killed by the Catholic Ustashas, the majority of them murdered in the first year of 'the proclamation of independence' of Catholic Croatia" (p. 62).

Zentner provided plenty of specific data: "Hundreds of people were bound and thrown into the inundating Neretva near Mostar since they refused to be baptized as Catholics. In other places, Christians of a different creed were also bound with wires, shot and then thrown into rivers. This happened at the Una and Sava rivers. Elsewhere, priests would be executed in churches along with their parishioners. Numerous Serbian churches were either destroyed or burnt, often with the parishioners inside. Entire villages were exterminated – the residents were killed and their houses subsequently burnt [...] The Ustasha formations did not only commit atrocities against the males and able-bodied Orthodox men, but especially against helpless old people, women and children and they did it in the most bestial manner. It is estimated that the number of Orthodox people who were slaughtered and sadistically tortured to death by the Croats is approximately three hundred thousand. As a consequence of these brutalities, many Orthodox people fled to what was left of Serbia, where their stories gravely embittered the population" (p. 62-63).

e) The Croatian Technology of Death

In his book entitled *Collaboration or Resistance*, published in 1968, the Austrian historian Werner Brockdorff claimed that "Ribbentrop's special envoy in Croatia tried to achieve a political agreement in Zagreb with the Croatian leader Maček, but he soon realized that the influence of Ante Pavelić and his Ustashas was far stronger than anyone in Germany had expected" (p. 64). Brockdorff particularly emphasised the crimes committed by "the Ustashas and other Croatian formations in terms of the persecution and extermination of the Serbian population. The violence committed by them falls under the most abominable atrocities of the collaborationism in WWII" (p. 64). Brockdorff went on to add the following: "The Croatian Ustashas waged a merciless war against the Serbs. Entire villages were exterminated, hostages were executed and property burnt. Thousands of refugees would leave the Croatian areas every day for what was left of Serbia in order to escape the mass carnage" (p. 64-65).

Kostić extensively quoted Brockdorff, who described the May events in Ruma in 1941 in detail: “On the morning of 22 May 1941, about one hundred uniformed Ustashas barged into Ruma. They blocked the street and did not let anyone leave the houses. They systematically searched all the properties. At least three people were killed on this occasion. Then the Ustashas made all the Serbs gather in the square before the chapel. They brought about 190 or 200 Serbs to the cemetery under heavy guard; these were women, children and people of all ages. Mothers were ordered to let their children run. Many of them did so in the hope that, in this way, they would at least save their children. When the children had run about one hundred meters, the Ustashas started shooting at them as if they were hunting for rabbits. The mothers ran to their children and the Ustashas opened fire at them too. Three men tried to defend themselves, but their heads were smashed with spades. The men who survived were forced to dig a ditch along the cemetery walls. The Ustasha Commander said that it was a special honour for the Serbs to be joined in death. These people now had to look for their murdered relatives, throw them into the pit (ditch) and bury them. Each of these men worked hard until he fell to the ground and could not hold his shovel any longer. When the digging was completed, a Ustasha went from man to man and killed them all with bullets in the nape of their necks” (p. 65).

Brockdorff mainly referred to the official German data. “There were tens of thousands of registered killings; the majority of these people were murdered in a bestial manner – a document for the offspring maybe [...] In Milići, the Serbs were roasted alive. In Bratunac, they gouged out the eyes of the Orthodox priest Servac and hanged him upside down on a tree (legs utmost); the young Croats used him as a target for practice. In Doboј, one Serb [...] had his stomach slit open and his intestines taken out. Then they tied him to a stake, turning him around until his intestines were wrapped around the stake [...] The Ustashas established the Jasenovac Camp as early as the summer of 1941. An enormous number of internees died due to the terrible living conditions. They also engaged in mass, systematic killings, some of which was committed in a bestial manner [...] As early as July 1941, the Ustashas launched armed attacks against the Serbian population in Bosnia. The request from Zagreb to evict one and a half million Serbs who lived in the Croatian state at the time was becoming ever more urging. As such an eviction was impossible, at least at that time, they intensified their pressure on the Serbs, committing the already described atrocities against them in order to force them to flee to Serbia” (p. 65-66).

Brockdorff described the Croatian crimes in Herzegovina separately: “It seemed at first that this remote area of the new Croatian state would be spared from the barbaric wars of religion and extermination. However, mass apprehensions of the Serbs began suddenly on 28 June 1941. Hundreds of Serbs were brought to the banks of the Neretva River, bound to one another with wires, shot and then thrown into the river. Downstream of Mostar, heaps of bodies lay in a narrow strip of the river. The Ustashas used hand grenades to destroy these heaps. In Otoka,

IT-03-67-T
he Serbs were drowned in the Una River in a similar way or murdered and then thrown into the river. One of the most infamous collection points for the arrested Serbs was the Gospić Camp, where thousands of people lost their lives. The beginning of the persecution of the Serbs in Doboј was marked by the arrest of the Orthodox priest and the killing of the more affluent Serbs” (p. 67-68).

Brockdorff stated that most of the Catholic clergy “developed a bloody missionary zeal. The Franciscan order was the first to act hand in hand with the Ustashas, imposing repressive measures on the Serbs that ultimately led to their mass conversion into the Catholic faith. The Ustashas and the Catholic clergy thought incorrectly that Catholicisation would resolve the issue of nationality by itself, since Zagreb most zealously urged the Croatization of areas that were sparsely populated by the Croats [...] The church problem was just a part of the Croatization wave that was carried out by the Ustashas with complete brutality and unheard-of terror to the Serbian population. The ultimate goal was to evict or liquidate one and a half million Serbs from NDH (Translator’s note: the Independent State of Croatia).

Brockdorff also pointed out that the German military and political officials attempted to stop the Croatian crimes. “The truly merciless battle of the Ustashas against the undesirable Serbian populace resulted in terrible events; the German authorities in Zagreb tried in vain to intervene, especially Wesenmayer, Kashe and Troj. The details of these atrocities were abominable. Serbian churches were often turned into prisons where the Ustashas would slaughter the Serbian population [...] Entire villages were wiped out in the vicinity of Sarajevo. In the valley of the Brzica River and Jarak, the Ustashas killed 350 Serbs with axes and buried them in mass graves. All the Serbs were evicted from the area of the Plitvice Lakes as early as May 1941. Those who did not manage to escape in time were either mercilessly killed by the Ustashas, transferred to the infamous labour camp at Mount Velebit or to the salt-works in the island of Pag. The Jasenovac concentration camp was particularly infamous. Serbs and Jews were systematically killed there [...] As soon as the first monstrosities were committed, the Serbian population started fleeing in panic to what was left of Serbia. In the autumn of 1941, when three Italian divisions marched into Occupied Zone II, they immediately stopped the exodus of the Serbs, reinstated the priests, opened the Orthodox churches, restored property to the Jews, disarmed the Ustashas and threw them out of their own country” (p. 69-70).

f) The Bestial Instincts of the Croatian Ethnic Being

In the memoirs of Enno von Rintelen, the German military attaché in Rome, published in 1951 in Tübingen and Stuttgart under the title of *Mussolini as an Ally*, the author quoted historian Franz Thierfelder who established the following: “Dr Ante Pavelić became *poglavnik* (Translator’s note: the Head of the Croatian State), and used his Ustashas to incite hatred primarily against the Serbian minority in

Bosnia, which was literally slaughtered” (p. 71). In his notes that were preserved, Hitler’s associate Andreas Hillgruber claimed that Adolf Hitler stated that Marshal Kvaternik was “a criminal pretending to be a statesman” (p. 72).

He despised the Croatian leaders but did not decline their services as the Croats performed the dirtiest work for him, both in the Balkans and on the Eastern Front. German historian Fritz Karl analysed the negative aspects of the Croatian crimes with respect to the German war efforts and stated that “The Ustashes were not faced with a racially inferior element that would allow themselves to be slaughtered, but with the solid and proven border soldiers who defended themselves. The whole of Serbia cried with pain when the first thousand of refugees brought the news of the Croatian extermination methods” (p. 74).

Franz Borkenau, professor of history at the University of Zurich, wrote in 1952 about the criminal reasoning behind the Croatian hatred: “At the cultural level of this praiseworthy century, it would have seemed almost natural that the Ustashes, who were installed as the rulers of these lands in 1941 (*NB.* the west Serbian lands, *V. Š.*), forcibly deported all of this numerous population to Serbia. However, the new lords, *Poglavnik* Pavelić and ‘Marshal’ Kvaternik, knew of a better solution. Why strengthen Serbia by sending these people there? It was much better to slaughter this livestock right here. The process involved a special ritual. The squadrons of Ustashes would show up in Serbian villages and, if they did not kill them immediately, they requested that the populace immediately convert to the Roman faith. Thereby they would turn the Serbs into Croats [...] A large majority of the unfortunate western Serbs refused to convert as the Orthodox religion was everything to them. In such a case, the order would be issued to gather all the villagers in the church, the door would be locked and the church set on fire; the men, women and children would disappear in flames. Only the Nazi campaign of extermination of the Jews was marked by such atrocities” (p. 77-78).

German politician and publicist Jakob Altmayer noted in 1953 that “World history has known many butchers and mass murderers; however, no one was so cruel to ask that the eyes of his victims be served in baskets before him. This was the specialty of Pavelić and his Ustashes” (p. 78). On another occasion, Altmayer wrote the following in the *Vorwärts* newspaper: “The fanatic masses of Ante Pavelić, with crosses and church flags, stormed the country as some medieval arsonists. Their ideological slogan was not ‘Against the Serbs’, but ‘Against the Orthodox heathens’; it is a crying shame that many a Catholic priest gave their blessing to those ‘religious fighters’ by the grace of Pavelić” (p. 79). Detailed accounts of Croatian crimes committed against the Serbian people were also provided by German authors such as Johann Wuescht in the book entitled *Yugoslavia and the Third Reich* published in Stuttgart in 1969, Karl Hnilicka in the book published in Göttingen in 1970 under the title *The Withdrawal from the Balkans 1944-1945*, and Johann Georg Reichsmüller in his *Yugoslavia, a Multi-national State between the East and the West* published in Dusseldorf and Cologne in 1971.

608

In 1962, the prominent German writer and publicist Karlheniz Deschner openly accused the Vatican of instigating and abetting the Croatian crimes against the Orthodox Serbs and called the Ustashes the Croatian Fascist-Catholic movement. In his book entitled *A Critical Church History from the Beginnings to Pius XII*, Deschner noted that “It was demanded from the pulpit that the Catholics persecute the Serbs; the sons of Saint Francis of Assisi were especially zealous in the extermination process and their monasteries have long served as a collection yards for the Ustashes” (p. 87).

In another book, published in Stuttgart in 1965 under the title of *With God and the Fascists*, Deschner described in more detail the tragedy of the Serbian people and the “conduct of Vatican in WWII; from 1941 to 1945, again with the full support of the Catholic clergy, when 299 Orthodox churches were destroyed, 240,000 Orthodox Serbs were forcibly Catholicized and 750,000 Orthodox individuals were murdered, often after torture that makes one’s hair stand on end [...] In the areas where the Orthodox Serbs comprised the majority of the population, their churches were completely destroyed; where the Serbs were a minority, their churches were adapted to serve Catholic purposes. All of this shows that a well-devised policy was in place. The conversion of Orthodox churches into Catholic ones was indeed conducted pursuant to the orders of the Ordinariate (meaning the bishop, the diocesan). On the order of the Episcopal Ordinariate of Đakovo (No. 273342), Serbian Orthodox churches were converted in the following places: Bračevci, Majar Dopšin, Tenje, Dalj, Markušica, Kapdena, Kućanci, Paučje, Budimci, Poganovci, Bijelo Brdo, Borovo Selo, Trpinja, Palčtin, Bršadin, Cepin, Martinci, Cačanski Trnjani, Klokočevik, Topolje and Brod na Savi. All the property of the Orthodox churches thus came into the possession of the Catholic ones” (p. 88-89).

Deschner relentlessly adduced fact after fact illustrating the Croatian savagery: “As early as April 1941, all the Serbs were requested to wear a blue ribbon with the letter P on their sleeves, which was the marking for the Orthodox (Translator’s note: *Pravoslavci*), while the Jews were required to display the Star of David. The Jews and the Orthodox were prohibited from walking on the sidewalk. In every office, shop, restaurant, tramcar and omnibus the following inscriptions were hung: “No admittance to Serbs, Jews, Gypsies and dogs” (p. 90). Hundreds of Orthodox priests were murdered. “Bishop Platon and his confrere Protopope Dušan Subotić had their eyes gouged out while a fire was burning on their chests; their noses and ears were ripped off before they were given the final blow. At every corner, the Catholic clergy was urging the Orthodox to convert [...] Many of them turned Catholic that way, but many more of them were massacred [...] In Kosiñje, where the Ustashes herded 600 Serbs, a mother was forced to collect the blood of her sons in a bowl. In Mlinište of the Glamoč District, the former member of parliament Luka Avramović and his son were crucified” (p. 90).

609

When the atrocities were at their peak, Ante Pavelić held an official audience with Archbishop Stepinac and his entourage of Catholic Bishops. According to Deschner, well aware of the massacre of the Orthodox Serbs, Stepinac said the following to Pavelić: “Please accept our deepest and highest regards and pledges of loyal cooperation with a view to a prosperous future for our fatherland” (p. 90). Immediately after this audience, another hundred thousand Serbian women and children were murdered. Deschner continued referencing concrete examples, *inter alia* the case of the Glina Church that had been turned into a slaughterhouse, quoting the German author Müller, who wrote about this tragedy in the following manner: “The bloodbath started at ten o’clock in the morning and lasted for eight days. The butchers had to change their uniforms as they were soaked with blood. Afterwards, children were found impaled on roasting-spits, their limbs crimped with pain” (p. 90).

h) The Catholic Priests as Leaders in the Croatian Crimes

Deschner further emphasized that, compared to the Croatian horror and atrocities, “the acts committed by Hitler’s guard in the concentration camps look almost pale and faded [...] The Ustasas pushed red-hot rivets under the nails and poured salt into open wounds. They maimed all imaginable body parts. They took special pleasure in cutting the noses and ears off the still living victims and they gauged out their eyes. The Italians photographed an Ustasha who wore a chain of human tongues and eyes around his neck” (p. 91). Deschner’s work is a horror book containing irrefutable facts, evidence and documents.

He also wrote about the Croatian death camps, where the atrocities by far surpassed those of Hitler. “Children were slaughtered there in their thousands. Yes, even separate concentration camps were established for them: in Lobor, Jablanac, Mlaka, Bročica, Ustica, Gradiška, Sisak, Jastrebarsko and Gornja Rijeka. In 1942 alone, they interned 24,000 children, half of which were murdered. Over time, the state and church authorities certainly found it more useful to preserve the children however. As their parents were, in most cases, dead or imprisoned, the children could easily be converted to the only faith that offered salvation. The Catholic *Caritas* ran by Stepinac took the orphans into its care; their re-education was smooth insofar as many of the children had no relatives. Many of them were too young to be aware of their origin when they fell under the custody of the *Caritas*, too young to know of their villages and even their own names. Nowadays, there are numerous young people who live as devout Catholics and even as Catholic priests, without having the slightest idea whom they need to thank for being Catholics [...] Not a small number of those Serbian boys have been registered at the faculties of theology in Italy, Argentina, Australia and the USA” (p. 92).

Deschner was of the opinion that “it was not only religion that played a role in the Croatian massacre of the Serbs, but also racial

IT-03-67-T

differences; it is emphasized here as understandable in and of itself, although it does not in the least reduce the responsibility of the Catholic Church” (p. 92). He further stated that the *Catholic Weekly* magazine, published by Archbishop Ivan Šarić, wrote in 1941 that “Stupid and unworthy of the followers of Christ are those who want to fight evil with their gloves on” (p. 92). The Catholic priest and the leader of the

Catholic Action wrote in July of that same year that “Croatia must cleanse its system in every possible way, even with the sword” (p. 92).

Another Catholic priest, Dionis Juričev, openly advocated the view that only the Croats could live in Croatia and literally drew the following conclusion in one of his texts: “It is no longer a sin to kill a seven-year-old child if it transgressed against Ustasha legislation. Although I wear the priestly robe, I must often make use of the automatic rifle” (p. 92). The closest Sarajevo associate of Archbishop Šarić, Božidar Brale, personally “took part in the massacre of 280 Serbs on the Alipaša Bridge and danced a lively *kolo* circle dance around the murdered individuals” (p. 93).

According to Deschner, the Franciscan friars were especially competitive in committing atrocities. “Several friars assumed the executioners’ duty in the concentration camps. The Franciscan Zvonko Brekalo was an officer in the death camp of Jasenovac and was infamous for cutting the heads off numerous of people. As many as 120,000 Serbs lost their lives at that time. In the autumn of 1942, the camp was actually headed by Friar Miroslav Filipović-Majstorović, who was dubbed Fra-Satan and was assisted by a whole order of priests – Brkljanić, Matković, Matijević, Brekalo, Celina and Lipovac among them. Over the four month period of the Franciscan priest’s administration, 40,000 people were liquidated. During the single night of 29 August 1942, just one Franciscan scholarship beneficiary named Brzica cut the heads off 1,360 men using a special knife. Recounting the “terrible litany” of Franciscan crimes, Edmond Parrier stated that the list could “go on forever” (p. 94).

Deschner claimed that Archbishop Stepinac was principally responsible for the crimes: “Archbishop Stepinac earned ‘great honours’ as the primate of a country where, out of a total of two million Orthodox Serbs, 240,000 were forcibly converted to the Catholic faith and 750,000 were murdered often after being tortured terribly [...] Is Stepinac not more responsible than the Ustasha who wore two chains of human tongues and eyes around his neck?” (p. 94). With regard to Pavelić, Deschner stated that one of the chief criminals of the 20th century was blessed by Pope Pius XII himself. “On 5 May 1945, Pavelić and his family fled along with several thousand criminals, including 500 Catholic priests [...] Pavelić and Artuković, ‘heavily burdened with looted gold’ found refuge in the Monastery of St. Gulgen near Salzburg [...] Pavelić, who [...] did not feel entirely safe in Austria, arrived in Rome disguised as a priest, where he lived in a monastery under the names of Father Gomec and Father Benarec. In 1948, he reached Buenos Aires under the name of Pal Aranyos with 250 kilograms of gold and 1,100 carats of precious stones still in his possession” (p. 95).

Comment [K.B.25]: Translator’s note. We were unable to find author of this name in any of our sources. Suggested spelling

Kostić pointed to a 1961 study by Alfred Müller, in which the author described the overall papal policy of suppressing the Orthodoxy in the Balkans, noting that the Vatican clergy “entrusted this task to Austria, i.e. the Habsburgs, who overzealously dedicated themselves to this ‘religious’ and political assignment of the Empire, as was proven by the breakout of World War I. A special mission was given to the Croats, the fanatical Catholic people” (p. 98).

The Catholic Church was directly orchestrating the tragic events in the Balkans, “which would always be viewed as one of the most terrible chapters in church history. Such chapters are far from scant in the Christian history, but what happened here (in Croatia, as the subject of this study) was a relapse into the times of the religious wars that blossomed in the Middle Ages and during the Thirty Years’ War. It was quite clear that the old spirits that were considered to have been overcome by the enlightenment were still alive [...] The Croats understood their Roman mission quite clearly. When they were ‘liberated’ (quotes provided by the author) by the German and Italian troops, under their *Poglavnik* Dr Ante Pavelić they managed to create a proper Catholic state that indeed could emerge only once to write one of the most sanguinary pages of church history” (p. 99).

i) The Roman Pope Blesses the Croatian Crimes

Müller also claimed that the Pope personally blessed Pavelić and his criminals: “When Pavelić felt that his terrible rule was coming to an end in 1944, he was at least able to calmly attribute to himself the following contribution: even if both the state and I were to disappear, we will still leave behind a nationally unified Croatian area as our legacy. – The Serbian issue will then be resolved as there will be no Serbs. Pavelić’s *doglavnik* (Translator’s note: deputy) Viktor Gutić himself admitted the following: We will either win and these damn Serbs will forever be eradicated or, if Yugoslavia is once again unfortunately established, we have at least corrected the statistics in Croatian favour. They certainly did it to a great extent. And even that is not so important as there is still a difference between killing and murder. If Catholic fanaticism is added to the Balkan brutality, atrocities come as a certain result” (p. 100).

What Müller found difficult to understand was that no one among the Croatian people stood up to the genocide that was being committed against the Serbs. “Hundreds of Orthodox churches were demolished, hundreds of thousands of Serbs – women, men, children and the old were butchered like cattle, beaten, shot, burned and tortured; these crimes were most often committed in unison with the Catholic clergy. The time of the great ‘harvest’ had arrived and not one of those people protested against it” (p. 101). This man, whose country and people went through all the brutalities of Hitler’s dictatorship, found it impossible to understand the Croatian acts. “Nothing similar to the atrocities in Croatia has ever happened in Europe since the time of the Thirty Years’ War [...] And the pope honoured the main culprit by appointing him cardinal” (p. 101-102). Müller was even more astonished by the fact that

IT-03-67-T

there had never been any serious trial of the Catholic Croatian criminals.

On 17 October 1965, in reviewing the book entitled *Be a Catholic or Die* by Carlo Falconi in the famous German illustrated weekly newsmagazine *Stern*, Jürgen Holtkamp wrote as follows: “The last crusade in the history of the church happened only twenty years ago. Just as in the previous centuries, this crusade once again intertwined both religion and politics. In the period between 1941 and 1945, the Catholic Croats led by the Franciscan priests converted 240,000 Orthodox Serbs and killed about 700,000 Serbs, Jews and Gypsies. These abominable monstrosities were not committed by the Nazis, who opposed the church, but by the Catholic Croats of the fascist Ustasha movement. The whole world spoke of them with abhorrence. Only the head of the church, whose name was abused in these killings, did not utter a single word about these crimes. Pope Pius XII kept silent about the things that were happening in Croatia” (p. 104-105). All the bishops kept silent too. Not a single Roman Catholic bishop opposed the murders or Catholicisation of the Serbs. Lazo Kostić additionally pointed to the fact that the German press was full of texts in which the Croatian political emigration was referred to as corrupt, criminal, blackmailing and terrorist.

288/57440

j) Better Have a Croat as an Ally than an Enemy

Lazo Kostić paid special attention to the book authored by the Hungarian Laszlo Hory and the German Martin Broszat entitled *The Croatian Ustasha State, 1941-1945*, published in Stuttgart in 1964. This book contains a number of quite interesting details that shed light upon the Croatian people and the opinion that the most authoritative allies had on its political and military leaders. The authors stated that Sztójay, the former Prime Minister of the Hungarian government, said that Pavelić was “a brutal and hardcore Ustasha of common descent” and that Kvaternik was “a typical murderer” (p. 118).

Moreover, these authors described the persecution of the Jews in Croatia in detail: “The Ustasha government started seizing Jewish property with the enactment of the so-called Arian law of 18 April 1941. The beginning of June was marked by a series of legal provisions that significantly undermined the foundations of the Jewish existence in Croatia. The law adopted on 4 June 1941 ‘on protection of the national and Arian culture of the Croatian people’ excluded the Jews from all institutions and segments of cultural life (press, radio, theatre, film, music, sports, etc.). An order to have the Jews and their shops labelled with the Star of David was issued on the same day; four additional decrees were issued on 5 June 1941, which ordered the registration of Jewish property and expulsion of Jews from civil service and academic offices [...] (This referred to physicians, dentists, lawyers, veterinarians, etc. *L.M.K.*). As early as September 1941, they started expropriating Jewish property without any compensation, especially their industrial enterprises.

This period was also marked by the transfer “of undesirable Jews to

camps and forced labour compounds, which in many cases resulted in their physical liquidation by the Ustashes' guards. In the spring of 1945, the majority of the Jews in these camps were deported to Auschwitz. Several privileged men from a part of the Jewish community in Zagreb escaped this criminal program for the 'final solution of the Jewish issue', as well as a larger number of those Croatian Jews who resided in the Italian sovereign part or the Italian Zone of Croatia and those who managed to escape to that area" (p. 119).

In 1942, when a request was made to the Italian occupying authorities to hand over the Jews who had found refuge in their zone, Italian General Amico responded that "surrendering the Jews to the Croats would dishonour the Italian Army" (p. 119). Upon concluding their analysis of the Croatian crimes against the Jews, Hory and Broszat wrote as follows: "The horrible Croatian genocidal policy against the Jews, though exceptional in its perfection, was overshadowed in terms of numbers by the persecution of the Serbian, i.e. Orthodox population in the Ustashes' Croatia" (p. 119). The authors particularly addressed the issue of forcible Catholicisation: "It should also be noted that, with its measures of conversion and duress, the Catholic Church encouraged the Ustashes' crimes as it actually used them as an instrument for the execution of these measures. This was even easier since the Croatian populace was of a fanatical Catholic disposition" (122).

The authors further discussed the most appalling monstrosities the Croats committed against Serbian civilians, stating that "details of the merciless combat against 'the undesirable' population were provided by the refugees who survived these atrocities, the German offices in Croatia and the Serbian offices in Belgrade, as well as from neutral diplomatic observers. The statements on this savagery become depressingly authentic by their very consistency" (p. 122).

Hory and Broszat described in detail the events that took place in Glina in June 1941, where the Croats decided to kill 500 arrested Orthodox Serbs. "The following night, they were killed in the woods near Glina and then covered with earth [...]. Three days later that – the day before the fair – the Ustashes came from Zagreb and arrested 56 cattle merchants who came there to buy cattle. These merchants were also murdered in the same woods and also covered with earth [...]. As a consequence of these horrible events, all the residents of the surrounding villages fled to the woods and hid. The Ustashes then promised the villagers full freedom if they accepted to be baptized as Roman Catholics. Most of the villagers accepted this and left the woods to return to their villages. The act of baptizing was soon prepared and the villagers marched in closed columns towards Glina to be converted in the Serbian church. About 250 people came to be baptized and six Ustashes were waiting for them in the church. Upon their arrival, the church doors were shut. The villagers were then forced to lie down with their heads on the floor; the Ustashes pierced them with sticks similar to spears, which they held ready" (p. 125).

Similar events happened in many other places. The authors thus wrote that on Vidovdan 1914, in Mostar, "hundreds of Serbs were

brought to the banks of the Neretva River, bound to one another with wire and then shot; their bodies were thrown into the river. Similarly, the Serbs murdered in Otoka found their grave in the Una River and those murdered in Brčko in the Sava River. In Bihać, the Italian authorities discovered several hundred bodies of murdered Serbs. The prison in Gospić was a particularly infamous concentration camp for the arrested Serbs, where numerous Serbs lost their lives. In Doboj, the persecution of the Serbs started in June 1941 with the arrest of the Orthodox priests and killing of selected affluent Serbs. In Bernić, just as in Glina, an Orthodox church was used as a prison and a site for killing Serbian men and women. As early as the end of 1941, the Ustashes expelled all the residents of the Serbian settlements in the surroundings of Plitvice Lakes. The Orthodox churches were demolished in Perjasica, Veljun, Polej, Tržić, Stobolić, Krajik, Vojnić and Kestinja. In the valley of Brzica Jarak, the Ustasha commandos murdered 530 Serbs with axes and spades and buried them in mass graves. In the vicinity of Sarajevo, they eradicated and wiped out entire villages. Mass killing of the Serbs also happened *inter alia* in Vrace (near Sarajevo). Many of the arrested people were taken to the labour camps of Velebit and the salt-works on the island of Pag" (p. 125-126).

Dr Turner, assistant for civil administration to the Chief German Commander for Serbia, reported to the military commander of the Southeast on 3 September 1941 that an enormous number of Serbs – more than one hundred thousand – were expelled from the Independent State of Croatia: "These people, who in many cases witnessed the bestial killings of their relatives, have nothing to lose [...] According to the news that reached us, as many as 200,000 Serbs have already been murdered in Croatia" (p. 126). On 16 September 1942, Benzler, a German representative in Belgrade, reported on the Croatian crimes to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Berlin: "The persecution of the Serbs has not stopped to this day and serious estimations would establish that several hundred thousand people lost their lives" (p. 127).

Hory and Broszat drew attention to the Croatian death camp of Jasenovac: "The barracks camp of Jasenovac, a place particularly infamous for the mass killings of Serbs and Jews, was established in the summer of 1941 on the bank of the Sava River. Whenever Pavelić's government encountered serious protestation from the German soldiers regarding the evacuation of a large number of Serbs, the number of internees in Jasenovac (and other camps) would increase. Terrible sanitary and other living conditions, including various actions of killing prisoners, resulted in an enormous death rate that made Jasenovac known as a notorious extermination camp" (p. 126).

The Germans primarily disapproved of the Croatian atrocities against the Serbs because they encouraged Serbian rebellion and increased the number of Chetniks and Partisans. Thus, on 17 February 1942, the SS High Command in the Balkans reported to its headquarters in Berlin as follows: "The main cause of the intensified actions of the bandits must be the monstrosities that the Ustasha formations committed in the Croatian area against the Orthodox. Not only did the Ustasha

formations perform these atrocities against the male and able-bodied Orthodox, but in particular against the defenceless elderly, women and children, and in the most bestial manner. It is estimated that the number of Orthodox that were slaughtered and tortured in the most sadistic ways reached 300,000. As a consequence of these monstrosities many Orthodox people fled across the border to the remaining Serbian territory and upset the population extremely with their accounts” (p. 129).

The Germans were rather aggravated by the Croatian crimes against Serbian civilians, which disrupted their political and military stability in the occupied Serbian territories; in addition, they were for a long time dissatisfied with the military ability of the Croatian armed forces – the Ustashes and *domobrans*. In the summer of 1942, the Commander of the 718th German Division “was forced to disarm and arrest a company of the Ustasha Corps commanded by Colonel Francetić since, as stated in the official report, this company was rightfully suspected of once again committing violence and crimes against the Serbian population at Romania Mountain” (p. 130-131).

On the other hand, as pointed out by these authors, the Italians distanced themselves from the Croatian savagery even more directly. “In the annexed Dalmatian islands and coastal areas, the Italian authorities led by Governor Giuseppe Bastianini were benevolently disposed to the Serbian Orthodox minority as early as the spring of 1941 [...] The Ustashes’ terror against Serbdom (verbatim from the book, *L.M.K*) offered a chance for the Italian military authorities to emerge as protectors of the Serbian population outside the annexed Dalmatian area as well (p. 132).

k) The Italians are Appalled by Croatian Brutality

The issue of the Italian magazine *Il Tempo* of 9 September 1953 published an excerpt from the documentation of the Ministry of Defence, which directly pointed to the fact that the Roman Catholic priests personally and directly participated in the Croatian crimes against the Serbian people. The quote, taken by Kostić, reads as follows: “On 21 May 1941, three people came to the Commander of the ‘Sassari’ Division in Knin; one of them was the Franciscan father Šimić. They stated that the Zagreb authorities had designated them to take over the civil authority in this province. The Italian General asked them what the direction of their politics would be. Father Šimić was the one who answered this question: ‘Kill all the Serbs in the shortest period possible’. The Commander of the ‘Sassari’ Division could not believe his ears. He asked Šimić to repeat his answer and the father said: ‘Kill all the Serbs in the shortest period possible. That is our program.’ ‘It is rather curious’ – this senior Italian officer responded – ‘that no one understands the monstrosity of this proposal and that a priest, a Franciscan priest should come here to state something like this [...] It was not possible to dissuade them, especially because the order from Rome read that we ‘should not interfere in the local policy.’ And so they

IT-03-67-T
started” (p. 144).

This same Šimić was also mentioned by Professor Viktor Novak in his monumental work entitled *Magnum Crimen*: “In the district of Knin, the most terrible atrocities were committed by the Ustasha leader – Friar Vjekoslav Šimić. This ‘servant of God and St. Francis’ killed the Serbs with his own hands.” According to the statements given by sworn witnesses, which are kept in the Archives of the State Commission, “All the murders of Serbs were committed on his order and pursuant to his instructions. Moreover, he personally killed Serbs with his own hands. He would go with the Ustashes to Bosansko Grahovo, Kijevo and Vrhnik, take the Serbs from these places and kill them” (p. 144). Soon afterwards, the chief military vicar Archbishop Štepinac rewarded him with the clerical position as the ‘military spiritual guardian.’”

In his book entitled *The Combat in the Balkans and its Consequences* published in Milan in 1946, General Mario Roatta described the Croatian crimes as a materialisation of the ideological concept of racial fighting in the name of the Croatian race and Catholic faith. As stated by Roatta, the campaign of extermination of the Serbs “was characterized by the killings of tens of thousands persons, including the elderly, women and children, while other tens of thousands of individuals were allowed to die of exhaustion and torture in the so-called internee camps [...] The Italian troops (2nd Army) could not support these actions indifferently, if nothing else because of their ultimately humane feelings. That is why they immediately intervened wherever they happened to be (as, at first, they occupied only a part of the Croatian territory in their area of responsibility). In September 1941, as soon as the government in Rome approved the proposal of the Army Command, they proceeded with the occupation of the designated territory and took over civilian power everywhere. In this way, the Army saved the lives of numerous Orthodox Serbs (its commanders estimated that about 600,000 persons were saved)” (p. 146). Roatta’s Chief of Staff General Zanussi referred to the Croatian state as the “abortion-state”.

l) The Italians Cannot Stand the Bestial Mentality of the Croats

Italian Colonel Giuseppe Angelini published a book entitled *The Campfires of Croatia* in Rome in 1946, in which he presented his memories from WWII and elaborated on the Croatian crimes against the civilian population of Serbian and Jewish ethnicities. “Officers from the Corps told of the terrible episodes of cruelty they witnessed during the first two months before my arrival: thousands of Jews deported to the island of Pag to be slaughtered or buried alive; thousands of Serbs blinded and horribly tortured; entire families massacred regardless of age and gender. As proof of these appalling events, they showed me photographs depicting the atrocities committed against women and children” (p. 161).

Angelini further described how the Ustashes murdered Italian officer

Abatto in Metak when he tried to help the Serbs in danger. He also recounted an event where an Italian unit was informed about a large number of bodies found in the vicinity of Gospić; the unit commander Antoniccolo decided to go to the crime scene. “Having gone to the scene, he found about thirty corpses poorly dug into a sand pit, emerging from the ground with maimed limbs and swollen heads. In a ravine not very far from the scene, a large number of starved and terrorised children were gathering; they claimed to have escaped the massacre in the nearby areas” (p. 162).

Angelini provided numerous other details testifying to the bestial Croatian mentality. Marching through a meadow near Gospić, the same battalion found “a crying boy who could be eight or ten years old. In addition to several stab wounds located on different parts of his body, we saw dagger cuts on his ears that were still bleeding. He was kindly taken to the corps infirmary where he received medical aid. Since he was in a grave condition, he was referred to the civil hospital in Gospić, where he was received with apparent discomfort because he was a Serb; he was subsequently left to die due to poor medical care” (p. 162).

Colonel Angelini further wrote that “Captain Camaroli, who was accommodated with a family in Gospić, saw how all the members of the family disappeared one by one; they were imprisoned or slaughtered. The only ones who remained alive for a few more days were a hunched lady over 70 years old and a blond boy who greeted the Captain every evening on his way home and who came to him glowingly, hoping for a caramel that the officer never failed to offer. But one evening, on returning home, he looked for the boy in vain in the semi-darkness; both the little boy and the old lady were lying strangled in a corner of the yard” (p. 162).

The book contains many other such testimonials and details, describing “Ustashas who burned the corpses of several women and a boy only several months old, who was wounded in the throat by a firearm” (p. 162). However, the following fact he found beyond belief: “The organizers and executioners (perpetrators of the crimes) even dared to celebrate their murders with parties; in August, the son of the Gospić Lyceum Principal celebrated his thousandth victim” (p. 163).

Similar events were described by Colonel Umberto Salvatores, General Giovanni Esposito, General Gustavo Reisoli and even by an author of openly fascist orientation, the Blackshirts Colonel Maurizio Bassi, who described the Croatian crimes from the first days of the occupation in his memoirs published in Bologna in 1950 under the title of *Two Years among Tito's Gangs*: “The horrible wave of hatred against the Serbs that spread in its fiercest forms through vast areas inhabited by peoples of different faiths in the first days following the collapse, was a primitive reaction against the tyrannical and torturous regime that lasted for twenty years [...] It happened that the Croatian and Bosnian rivers were red with Serbian blood” (p. 171).

The author clearly detested the previous Yugoslav regime and unjustifiably called it anti-Croatian; however, his war scenes are realistic and impressive and his book contains a photograph of a Serbian girl with

m) To be a Croat is a Harsh God's Punishment

A book entitled *Yugoslavia in 1941*, published in Turin in 1953 by 2nd Lieutenant Salvatore Loi, contains a large number of original photographs under the following captions: “1. Persuasive evidence of Croatian atrocities. The Ustashas massacred Serbs inside the barracks and during the night or, before dawn, took them out on heavy carts covered in hay to sites designated for mass burials; 2. Serbs murdered at the Serb execution points.” (Kostić here described the photograph in the following manner: “A large number of disfigured Serbian corpses and a Croatian soldier who sadistically checks whether they are dead.”); “3. The forcible transfer of Serbs from the territory of the State of Croatia; 4. Evidence of atrocities committed by the Ustashas in Suvaja in the neighbourhood of the house of priest Spaso Devrlja”. (Kostić's remark: “The noose by which the protopope's little daughter was killed is visible; a bloody handprint of the girl's hand” is visible on the wall.); “5. The condition of Branko Ridanović, who managed to rescue himself from the pit; “6. A blow to the nape of the neck” with a photograph of the victim's body (p. 173).

Loi further stated that “The persecution took on an intense severity in the Muslim areas of Bosnia, of which one can freely say that, aside from the specific and picturesque colours of the ambience (minarets, mosques, household architecture and attire), were undoubtedly governed by uncleanness. Dirt in the streets, in the houses, in the body and in soul of the inhabitants” (p. 174).

Referencing a number of horrible individual examples of the Croatian terror, Loi went on to conclude that: “The Serbs were dying in hundreds. Many of them managed to escape, if they had time, and were then faced with days on end of unbearable life in the woods. Numerous crimes were of extreme severity, if one can grade the differences in this horrible field of massacre” (p. 175). Describing one case, the author stated the following: “In Gospić, a father who took his three little children for a walk as he did every day was stopped by two Ustashas. With ice-cold composure, he handed the kids over to a passenger, asking him to take them home to their old grandmother and, having pat the children on the head, firmly followed the two agents. Two shots were heard a few moments later, confirming that he was [...] justified” (p. 175).

In another case, “a four-year-old girl named Ivka V. was the only surviving member of her family. All her relatives were murdered by the Ustashas; they stabbed her with a bayonet in the back of the head and threw her unconscious among the bodies of her family members. A large dog that was very fond of the little girl managed to drag her to the nearby woods, where she was found by some refugees who took care of

her. The girl still had visible traces of those wounds” (p. 176).

Loi further described the Croatian genocidal spirit in the following manner: “As a rule, the massacres were done in the utmost secrecy, especially the large-scale ones [...] The Serbs designated for execution would first be collected at the barracks; when the night fell, a horrible procession of people would be taken out of the town. Depending on the terrain, they would either be thrown into pits or into graves that the victims had dug prior to receiving the signature blow to the back of the head while standing at the edge. As they were tied to each other with wire, some unfortunates would frequently be thrown alive into the mass graves” (p. 178).

The author emphasized that the Italian military command demanded “as many documents on the atrocities committed by the Croats as possible in order to have the criminals prosecuted to the fullest extent” (p. 180). It was said that the Croatian army did not deserve to be called an army in the true sense of the term. “They behaved like wild beasts searching for prey. They are the real culprits! Their barbarous misdeeds put the State of Croatia in a terrible situation and rendered it unable to control the revolution that had been caused by its own agents” (p. 181).

The Italian occupying forces were particularly shaken by the bestial murders of Serbian children, as described in several examples quoted by Loi. “A dozen Ustashas showed up on the balcony of a multi-storey building and watched several Serbs dying in agony in the square below; after a while, other Ustashas appeared, brutally dragging four boys, the oldest not more than eight years of age, who were crying and calling for their parents who had been murdered before their horrified eyes. The oldest boy was lifted off the ground by his hair and thrown from the balcony; some Ustashas standing in the square killed him before he hit the ground [...] Roars and cries of satisfaction followed this shameful act as the Croats had nothing human in themselves save for physical features” (p. 181). In a large number of cases, the Italians acted as saviours, literally snatching Serbian children from the murderous hands of the Croats.

Loi interpreted the testimony of an elderly woman who was found by the Italians as the only survivor in the burnt village of Suvaje, which had been devastated by the Croats not long before their arrival. The old lady said the following: “It was the other night. We heard a large number of automobiles full of Ustashas coming here. As a first precautionary measure they blocked all the roads and then divided the village into sectors and began the cleansing. They did it all very quietly. They knocked on every house door and took all the people aged 15 and above. They said they wanted to check their documents, and they did so with such seriousness in their voice that no one doubted what they said. After a while, they gathered them here – while talking, she pointed to several places where one could see freshly dug earth – and they lined all of them up in rows, the woman continued. Before they did anything, they ordered everyone to take off their clothes and shoes. Then one of them yelled wildly: ‘Are there any Catholics among you?’ About ten of our neighbours who had previously accepted the Catholic faith stepped

IT-03-67-T

forward. ‘Very well’, said one of those headsmen, ‘as you are our friends and brothers by faith, we will treat you well. We will kill you last!’

“Upon these words, savage laughter broke out among all the Ustashas. Our people started to grasp what was going on [...] and these Ustasha dogs started executing their plan. The torture of victims started under the faint light of several torches. Those who desperately attempted to carry out an impossible mission got a pistol bullet in the nape of their necks. The majority of them were butchered by knives. They were requested to shout ‘Long live Pavelić!’ but none of our people wanted to do that. They all fell saying their last goodbyes. Many of them dyed exclaiming ‘Long live King Peter!’ [...] Our poor children! Murdered treacherously, taken by surprise, not seeing the approaching evil! Indeed, who could have thought that such a thing would happen? Who of the villagers could ever be accused of any political responsibility or anti-Croatian activities? None of us ever showed any interest in political events. But, for these murderers, we were guilty [...] we were guilty of having been born as Serbs! [...]

The Croats did not waste their time coming over here and immediately start carrying out their atrocious plan. (Once they had killed the men), they raped almost all the women, married and unmarried, young and old. They tortured the children. They stole everything that was of any value and put it in their automobiles. The rest they destroyed. They murdered everyone; everyone. The women, the elderly, the kids. They enjoyed using the rifle stock to kill a mother and her child that hugged her around the neck. They hanged people, they ripped children apart, crushed their skulls with the rifle stocks and smashed them against the ground with all their force [...] Then [...] they poured gasoline over every fire they kindled. And the village burned while those dogs withdrew drunken with blood. The houses burned for the whole night with so many murdered and dying women and children inside them.

But, how I survived, that is what the gentlemen surely want to ask. I will tell you this briefly. In my yard there was, and still is, a large haystack. When those dogs arrived, I hid inside the stack; I could hardly breathe. I heard the gunfire, the desperate cries of our people and the cheerful screams of those murderers. After awhile it was even harder to breathe, as I sensed a strong smell of smoke [...] then I lost consciousness. I came to after a long time [...] I shouted, and they came to help me out. It was the Serbs who had arrived here several hours after the massacre; they arrived too late. And how did it happen that I survived? The fire did not catch in the hay because the yard was full of puddles of water, as there is a well from which many families took water; the soaked ground stopped the flames in their way [...] Here I am now, all alone, without my son, without my nephews. And I had about a hundred relatives here! I shall never part with this place. My parents and my fellowmen were buried here. I have no other purpose but to live close to them and wait for death to take me” (p. 186-188).

n) It is the Greatest Shame to be a Croat

In 1968, Italian officer Enzo Cataldi published his war memoirs entitled *Yugoslavia at the Door*, in which he described in detail the saving of Serbs from the Croatian carnage: “It seems that the Croatian slaughter of the Serbs, which was mentioned previously, took the lives of 356,000 Orthodox and several thousand Jews” (p. 190). The author proceeded with specific examples, providing “the names of Branko Dobrovljević, a Serbian priest from Veljun who was forced to dig a grave for his young son Stevan and witness his murder before they killed him too; Đorđe Bokić, Serbian priest from Namac; Dr Veljko Torbica; a sixteen-year-old girl of the Dukić family from Gospić; Branko Radenović who was thrown alive with his throat slit to a pit of dead bodies; Dr Spavo Lavruj from Suvaja whose skull was smashed, while his wife’s foetus was pulled out of her womb and thrown to the attic; (the names) of all those killed in Korito, Srb, Suvaja, Čapljina, Stolac, Gabela, Berković, Tasovići, Domanovići, Gračac, Gospić, Topusko, Vrgin Most, Golubinci, etc. – these are just individual examples of the gruesome carnage and killings: eyes were gouged out or burned by candle flames, noses, tongues and breasts were cut, nails and bones were broken, castrations (castrated genitalia), crucifixions, machine guns firing at the groups standing at the edge of pits, sexual assaults in the presence of fathers, husbands, brothers and sons” (p. 191).

Kostić further emphasized the details from the official reports of the Italian commands: “In Veljun, the district of Slunj, ‘the Ustashas’ captured a Serbian priest named Branko Dobrosavljević and ordered him to dig out a grave for his son, a student. When he finished digging, they brought the boy and started beating him with whips before the father’s eyes. When he lost consciousness, they brought him round, then cut off his arm, flayed the skin off his head and then wrapped it to stop the bleeding; then they beat him and finished him off with a hammer blow. The father was then forced to give a funeral service for his son named Stefan Dobrosavljević. The father lost consciousness three times during the service, but was whipped and forced to finish it. Finally, he was also killed by a single hammer blow” (p. 193). The following is a description an eyewitness gave to the Italian officers about the murder of Serbian priest Đorđe Bokić from Brežica: “‘The Ustashas’ (the Italians are the only ones who always put this word in quotation marks) tied Đorđe Bokić to a tree. They whipped him to death, cut off his ears, nose and tongue and then sawed off his chin (chin tissue). They burned his eyes with a candle and, on seeing that the victim was still alive in spite of all the torture, they slit his chest with a knife and fired a gun into the cut” (p. 194).

The examples that followed get more and more gruesome: “On 1 July 1941, Ante Pavelić made a solemn statement (apparently under pressure from the Italian government) that there would be no more carnage. As of that period, the slaughter was no longer counted. In Korito, the district of Gacko (it seems that certain names of the places are not correct, but I will quote them as stated in the Italian original,

IT-03-67-T
L.M.K.), in Serb, Suvanja, Čapljina, Stolac, Gabela, Berković, Tasovići, Domanovići, Gračac, zone of Topusko – Vrgin Most, Gospić and in a hundred of other places, Serbs were killed in their thousands.

However, the method was different now: mass torture in which the victims were tied three by three and thrown into pits; a machine gun was placed at the edge of the pit and fired at those who were still alive [...] In the evening of 6 July 1941, attracted by the terrible smell, some Italian soldiers who were passing the gorges in the area of Gračac discovered a pit full of decomposing Serbs. One man was still moving among them and they pulled him out with difficulty. Among other things, he told them about the atrocities suffered by Dr Veljko Torbica: ‘the Ustashas’ tied him to a bench and beat him terribly. Then they sliced long, thin pieces of his flesh, put the salt onto the wounds and stitched them. When they finished these monstrosities, they asked him ‘whether he thought the surgery was successful’. He could not answer their question as he was already dead. And he was punished by many whip blows for not answering the question. This event happened in a place not far from Gračac on 3 (perhaps 2) July 1941 [...].

“It is impossible to recount the monstrosities ‘the Ustashas’ committed against Serbian girls. There are hundreds of photographs that confirm these atrocities; those who survived the assaults, bayonet blows, the plucking out of their tongues, teeth, nails and nipples (all this was done after they had been ravished) were carefully gathered by our officers and taken to the Italian hospitals, where all these facts were documented [...] In Gospić, a woman was brave enough to go to ‘the Ustashas’ and ask them if they knew anything about her son who had disappeared three days before. This woman made the terrible mistake of bringing her twelve-year-old daughter along as the Ustashas asked her. At the woman’s protestations, the butchers gave her a small bundle as if to comfort her. Her son’s eyes were in it. This happened in Gospić; the victim was of the Dukić family and was sixteen years old [...] This is what the Croats did to the Serbs. Understandably, we cannot go on with these stories that make one’s hair stand on end; volumes could be written about them” (p. 194-195).

o) The Communists Systematically Concealed Croatian Crimes

All this was extracted from the General Staff Archives and published in the Rome daily newspaper *Il Tempo* on 10 September 1953, as a response to communist dictator Tito’s accusation that the Italians had committed war crimes. The Italians provided the most compelling arguments and showed who it was that was wallowing in the blood of the victims, adducing evidence of “the slaughter of entire Serbian communities committed by the Croats in 1941” (p. 196). The Italian sources continually and explicitly referred to these crimes as Croatian crimes.

Confirming the previously published testimony of the Chetnik *Vojvoda* Dobrosav Jevđević, the former high official of the Italian

occupying administration wrote the following in 1960 in the *Borghese* review: “Having been in a high position in Rijeka during the war and maintaining continuous contacts with the Army and Prefecture Commands, in order to corroborate what was written earlier by Duke Jevđević on the Croatian crimes, I hereby wish to state the following: the photographic evidence of the crimes committed by the Croats and some Slovenians against the Serbs and us is authentic and proves the extent of the barbarity of this people. What Malaparte wrote was true, as I myself saw heaps of gouged out eyes that had belonged to our officers and soldiers. Copies of each photograph were submitted to me, to the Second Army and to the Prefecture. All the documents must still be at the Ministry of Defence unless someone removed them on purpose. I have never heard of any such atrocities being committed by the Serbs, either against our soldiers or anyone else; quite the contrary, I frequently concluded that they were sympathetic towards the Italians and we did not feel any animosity or friction on their part” (p. 197).

The massacres committed by the Croats were also described by the former diplomat and advocate of the Mussolini regime Luigi Villari in his book entitled *Italian Foreign Policy under Mussolini*, while the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Count Galeazzo Ciano, spoke of the Croats and their overall conduct rather badly, often referring to them as bandits in his *Diary*. In his book published in Rome in 1944 under the title *The Revolution in Yugoslavia*, publicist Alfio Russo wrote about Croatia and its state crimes, which have no comparison in all of history. “The divers that were fastening the support pillars of a bridge on the Sava River emerged in shock from the water as the riverbed was covered with severed heads and mutilated bodies. ‘Kill, murder!’ the Ustashes screamed, filled with hatred against the Serbs. And they cut their heads off and threw them in the waters of the Sava that flowed gravely and lazily towards Belgrade” (p. 201). Upon reviewing all the available data, Russo went on to conclude that: “Neither the Fascists nor the Nazis have anything even remotely in common with the Ustashes, which are an extremely unusual and exceptional fauna. Their commander Evgenije Kvaternik is the Ignatius Loyola of the Ustasha movement” (p. 202).

Unlike the Italian officers, politicians and publicists, the Vatican circles zealously supported Pavelić and enabled him to flee disguised as a Catholic priest; even after World War II, they participated in the cover-up of Croatian crimes. Fiorello Cavalli published a book in Rome in 1974 that aimed to defend Stepinac; however, the facts presented therein actually supported the charges against the Cardinal as, inspired by the Vatican logic, the author, advocated Stepinac’s participation in the conversion of the Orthodox Serbs in the following manner: “When many of the schismatic priests were either killed or fled before the imminent threat [...] it became necessary to take care of the people without their spiritual leader in this newly developed situation, no matter how barbarically it had been provoked, because the Protestants and the Muslims were trying to use the opportunity for their proselytism, as it was well known that the objective of the Ustasha violence was the destruction of the schismatic faith rather than the propagation of

In his book entitled *Magnum Crimen*, Viktor Novak quoted two letters that Bishop Alojzije Mišić sent to Stepinac as internal information, apparently believing that the correspondence would never see the light of day and be available to the public. The crimes were listed therein with painstaking precision, while anger was expressed only towards individuals who openly spoke about them, as such boasting could damage the overall Croatian and Catholic objective. Bishop Mišić wrote as follows: “The people were chased like animals; they were murdered or thrown alive into ravines. Baljić – the Vice-prefect of Mostar (the equivalent of the deputy prefect of Kotor), a Muslim – has violated the rules with his loud voice. He should have kept silent instead of making such statements, as he stated that on a single day 700 schismatics were thrown into the pit at Ljubinja [...] Wagons full of (schismatic) women and children, girls and boys between ten and eighteen were expelled from Mostar and Capljina and taken to the railway station at Surmanci. Then they were ordered to disembark and taken to the hills where the mothers and children were thrown into gorges. All of them died that way. In the parish of Klepci, 700 schismatics from the nearby villages were killed. I would go a long way if I continued with this list. In Mostar alone, they were tied together by hundreds, taken outside the town and murdered like animals” (p. 210).

p) The Pope, too, is an Arch-Criminal

In Milan in 1965, Carlo Falconi published his remarkable book entitled *The Silence of Pius XII (Why the Pope has not Spoken about the Nazi atrocities in Poland and Croatia – Unpublished Documentation from the Warsaw and Zagreb Archives)*. His analysis of the conduct of the Croatian authorities regarding the legal prosecution of the Orthodox was followed by the description of several specific crimes: “However, the facts spoke much more than the words; the horrible events spread from mouth to mouth and their character of religious (anti-Orthodox) discrimination was continually evolving into racial (anti-Serbian) discrimination. The crimes started in the first days of NDH; for example, as early as the 28th April, several hundred Ustashes surrounded the Serbian villages of Gudovac, Tuke, Brezovac, Klokočevac and Bolac located in the district of Bjelovar; they selected 250 people, mostly peasants along with the priest Božić and the teacher Stevan Ivanković. Then they guided the column into a field and ordered the unfortunate people to dig graves; then they tied them with wire ligatures and buried them alive. On that same night, on the banks of the Danube near Vukovar, 180 Serbs were strangled and thrown into the river. A few days later, the mass apprehension of Serbs ensued in Otočac: 331 Serbs, including the priest and former Serbian representative in parliament Branko Dragosavljević and his son. The execution was carried out with axes in addition to the usual pattern of grave digging and binding of victims. The priest and his son were left for the final spectacle. The boy was ripped apart before his father’s eyes; the priest was subsequently

forced to hold a funeral service for his son's soul. After he completed the service, the priest was subjected to slow torture: first his hair was plucked, then his beard, and then he was flayed; the scene was far from over when they gouged out his eyes."

The event that took place in Glina on 14 May was even more abominable and needs to remain recorded as a monstrous symbol of the merciless slaughter that Pavelić's Croats committed against the Orthodox; several hundred Serbs from Glina and the surrounding areas were gathered and directed to the church, purportedly to attend a *Te Deum* matin and praise the Lord for the Constitution of NDH. When they arrived in the church, they found everything ready for an (Orthodox) liturgy and thought the programme might have been changed. The unfortunates did not see what was coming even when a military truck stopped at the church – the truck that brought their headsmen. They only realised that something unholy and horrible was going to happen when they saw a host of pandours entering the church wielding their knives and axes. An Ustasha officer asked who of the people present had converted to Catholicism; only two of them answered affirmatively and were immediately released. Afterwards, they locked the door and proceeded with the massacre (slaughter). The church turned into a dismal slaughterhouse for humans and it echoed for hours with screams and cries that gradually reduced to whimpers" (p. 215-216).

Falconi elaborated on the killing of priests in the following manner: "Three hundred priests and five bishops were murdered. But these numbers do not even begin to depict the gruesomeness that accompanied the murders. Dositej, the Ordinary (Diocesan) of Zagreb, was subjected to such torture that he lost his mind; the 80 year old Petar Zimonjić of Sarajevo was strangled; monsignor Platon of Banjaluka, also 80 years old, was shod like a horse and forced to walk before the public until he fainted; then his beard was ripped off and a fire kindled on his chest [...] Such expressions of sadism were nothing but variations of procedures used during the 'normal' mass executions; the sadism of strangulation or ripping apart (quartering) – the bodies were often hung in butcher shops and labelled 'human meat' for laughs – (the sadism) followed by burning houses and churches packed with people, etc. One must not forget the impaled children of Vlasenica and Kladanj and the games the Ustashas played next to the victims during their night orgies" (p. 219).

Following in the footsteps of Bishop Ivan Sarić of Sarajevo, who emphasised that the honourable, faithful and just battle against evil could not be fought in a noble manner and with the gloves on, Bishop Alojzije Mišić was delighted with the opportunity to conduct mass Catholicisation and complained that the overzealous Ustashas even liquidated the freshly Catholicized people. He stated the following (verbatim): "By the grace of God, an opportunity has arisen today as never before to save a large number of the souls of the good-natured people, the peaceful peasants [...] Unfortunately, some newcomers - youths with no education and experience who use fire and venom instead of reason and intellect - have dared to issue orders. As the newly united stand in the church and attend the mass, they capture those men

IT-03-67-T

and women, the young and the old, they push them outside like beasts and despatch them to eternity in great numbers. This cannot serve the holy cause of Catholicism and the Croatian interests. In a few years, everyone will condemn such acts of ignorance; on the other hand, we shall miss an opportunity that is beneficial to the Croatian cause and the holy Catholic faith: to become a majority in Bosnia-Herzegovina instead of remaining a minority" (p. 219-220).

In May 1941, Bishop Akšamić of Đakovo issued a manifesto to the Orthodox Christians of Slavoina and Srem urging them in the following manner: "The Bishop of Đakovo has so far received into the Holy Catholic Church thousands of citizens who were issued a certificate of good standing by the state authorities. Look up to these brothers of ours and submit applications for conversion to the Catholic faith as soon as possible. As Catholics you will be able to stay in your houses, cultivate your fields freely and raise your sons for God and for the State of Croatia. In the Catholic Church, you will secure the salvation of your immortal souls in accordance with the holy words of our saviour Jesus Christ" (p. 220). The Catholic clergy enthusiastically participated in looting and sharing property stolen from the Serbs and Jews.

Falconi provided a whole list of Catholic priests who had personally participated in the Ustasha crimes, stating that it was so common an occurrence that "no one can deny a phenomenon that was of such large proportions; even if only tens of individuals had been in question, it would still have made one's hair stand on end. It is understandable that cases such as that one of Franciscan Miroslav Filipović had first been of interest to pathology before becoming a subject of the history of crime. He was the commandant of the Croatian Auschwitz – the Jasenovac camp, where over 200,000 people found their death, many of them thanks to the impressive strangulation techniques of Filipović. With due consideration of the extent and common traits of the massacre, this phenomenon was so distinctive that it differentiated the style of the Ustasha atrocities from the extermination conducted in other countries during WWII. For example, it was impossible to imagine an Ustasha punitive expedition without a priest at its head spurring it on, usually a Franciscan.

"There were not a few of those crusaders *in sacris* (in the holy things, *L.M.K.*) who walked around bearing arms: Friar Anton Čevola of the Franciscan monastery in Split, visibly bearing a pistol over his tunic (robe); priest Božidar Bralo who even wore a mitre. What is more, there were not a few of those who went from words to deeds, thus setting a good example to their congregation. E.g. Božidar Bralo, the renowned protector of the infamous *Black Legion* division, was accused of participating in the massacre of 180 Serbs on the Alipaša Bridge; after the slaughter, he danced a funerary dance of a sort around the corpses with the Ustashas. Another priest, Nikola Pilogrić of Banja Luka, was responsible for other massacres. Similarly, the Jesuits Lipovac and Cvitan, the Franciscans Josip Vukelić, Zvonimir Brekalo, Justin Medić, Hinko Prlić and all those chaplains all murdered prisoners, burned homes and pillaged settlements, fighting at the helm of the Ustashas in

q) The World is Appalled by the Catholic Terror

Falconi defined the Croatian crimes committed under the Catholic crest as “one of the most absurd and revolting massacres in history committed outside the confines of war” (p. 223). The massacres, which the Vatican was well aware of and for the most part fully supported, originated from “a state that made racial and religious policy its cornerstone by invoking its thousand-year-old covenant with the Roman Church. They originated from the Bishopric that passed decrees guaranteeing religious freedoms and emphasised the gravity of the problem of converting the schismatics, which subsequently failed to raise its voice against the suppression of the rights of other religious minorities in the country and persistently turned a blind eye to the extermination of the sister church and the slaughter of her leaders. They originated from the clergy and religious orders (monastic orders), who were gravely compromised by the crimes a number of their members had committed. They originated from an unprecedented association of religious organizations and their leaders with the often amoral activities of a group such as the Ustasas; from the Catholic press that not only abounded with words of delight for the leader and his blood stained regime, but also theorized on their doctrines. Now, one cannot dispense with the question of the conduct of the Holy See and Pope Pius XII in particular. What exactly did the Vatican do to discourage the NDH government’s absurd requests for Croatian pan-Catholicism and what instructions were the Catholic clergy of the State given to resist it? Above all, what measures did the church employ to prevent, if nothing else, the racial and religious persecution combined with bloodshed, looting, violence, forcible transfer, etc?” (p. 223).

In his book entitled *The Catholic Terror Today*, Avro Manhattan condemned the Vatican even more harshly as being responsible for the Croatian crimes. “The transformation of the Catholic hierarchy into the actual Ustasha hierarchy had a horrible effect. It meant that the whole apparatus of the Catholic Church in Croatia had been placed at the disposal of some cruel individuals who were resolved to transform the newly established state into a compact political and military unit that would be cemented with the most secure guarantees of indestructibility. Such a policy not only related to the Croatian social, cultural and political product, but it also involved the eradication of everything that was ‘foreign’ to the Croatian descent and national religion. It required the complete elimination of everyone who was not a Croat” (p. 228).

Manhattan comprehensively described the functioning of the Croatian Ustasha state, which did not rely on any relevant legal principles. He further referenced the numerous crimes and torture at the camps, emphasizing the statement of an eyewitness of the mass murder of children: “At that time, new groups of women and children would arrive every day at the camp at Stara Gradiška. About fourteen days later, Vrbani (the camp commander) ordered all the children to be

IT-03-67-T

separated from their mothers and taken to a room. Ten of us were told to bring them wrapped in blankets. The children toddled across the floor and one of them stretched its arm and leg through the slightly open door so that it could not be closed. Vrbani exclaimed: “Push the door!” Since I did not do that, he slammed the door shut and smashed the child’s leg. Then he grabbed the child by its healthy leg and smashed it against the wall until it died. Afterwards, we continued bringing in the children. When the room was full, Vrbani brought poisonous gas and killed them all” (p. 213).

Manhattan also elaborated on the issue of Jasenovac, particularly on the incineration of imprisoned Serbs. “The burnings in Jasenovac took place in the spring of 1942. They wanted to replicate the Nazi camps of Germany and Poland, so Pičili came up with the idea of turning the brick works into a crematorium; he succeeded with his plan and the fourteen furnaces (seven on each side) were converted into a crematorium. Then the decision was made to burn them alive - simply to open the huge iron door and push them alive into the raging flames. However, the plan caused a violent reaction among the ones who were supposed to be burned. The people were shouting, screaming and physically resisting the action. In order to avoid such incidents, it was decided that they should be killed first and then incinerated” (p. 231-232).

The culmination of the Croatian Catholic terror was described by the author in the following manner: “The already terrorised population was shocked by another and perhaps the most abominable instrument that supplemented this horrible manhandling, torture and Ustasha-legalized murders: the ‘punitive expeditions’ carried out by Pavelić’s special militia – the Ustasas, which soon became so infamous that they could be compared with the most horrible monsters in human shape from the past. Those expeditions destroyed houses and villages, captured, tortured, pillaged and often slaughtered the inhabitants; as a rule, they did not even try to find an excuse or legal justification for their actions. They devastated entire areas, such as Bosanska Krajina, Lika, Kordun, Banija, Gorski Kotar, Srem and parts of Slavonia. Many small settlements, such as Vojnić, Slunj, Korenica, Udbine and Vrgin Most were completely destroyed, while mass slaughter was executed in many other places, e.g. Rakov Potok, Maksimir (near Zagreb), Vojnović Plateau at Bjelovar, the city square of Osijek and Jadovno in Lika. In the latter, the victims were tied with wire ligatures and brought in groups of twenty to the cliff of a thousand-metre deep abyss, where the Ustasas murdered only the first individuals in the line so that they drew the rest of the living people down with them” (p. 232).

Manhattan provided numerous other examples, the scenes of which were largely described by authors whose texts have been previously discussed. He wondered at the absence of humanness and was appalled by the originality of the executions as such methods were simply not registered in history. “The worst crimes were conducted by the intelligentsia, no matter how strange it might sound. The case of Petar Bržica is undoubtedly one of the most unbelievable cases in this category. Petar Bržica was a student of the Franciscan School at Široki

Brijeg, Herzegovina; he was also a law student and member of the *Križari* (Translator's note: Crusaders Catholic Organization). On the night of 29 August 1942, the orders for executions were issued at the Jasenovac concentration camp. The executioners placed bets on who would kill the largest number of prisoners. Using a particularly sharp butcher's knife, Petar Bržica slit the throats of 1,360 prisoners. As he was the winner of the contest, he was proclaimed the 'king of the butchers'. The award was a golden watch, a silver cutlery set and a roasted pig. Croatian physician Dr Nikola Nikolić was present at the camp and witnessed the event; he later testified to the authenticity of this appalling act" (p. 234).

Slaughter, mallet blows to the head, throwing people into pits, the incineration of live humans, hanging and quartering - all of this was painstakingly described by Manhattan. So far, Manhattan is the author who presented the Croatian crimes and Catholic terror to the western public in the most systematic manner. "On many occasions, the Ustashas slaughtered the entire population of a Serbian village, they mercilessly tortured and murdered even the children and eventually burned the villages. For example, having murdered almost all the inhabitants of the village of Sušnjari, the Ustashas took about twenty of the remaining children and tied them to the entrance of a large shed and burned it. Most of the children, whose average age was ten, were burned alive. A small number of the children who survived - terribly disfigured by the flames - were eventually killed. Four eyewitnesses of an event that took place in Gorevac testified as follows: "On 13 September 1941, children of approximately three years of age were impaled on stakes in the village of Gorevac. In some places, mothers would be impaled on stakes with children in their arms. They tied and sliced open the breasts of some young girls and they were forced to pull their hands through them. They cut off peoples the ears and noses, and gouged out their eyes" (p. 234-235).

Kostić further extensively quoted the descriptions of Croatian crimes committed against the Serbian people from the study by **Vittorio Gorecl**, published in 1958 under the title *The War of the Poor*, and from the texts on the Croatian genocidal persecution of Jews written by Corrado Colli and Roberto Biscaglia. In the book entitled *Kaputt*, published in Rome and Milan in 1948, the renowned Italian writer Curzio Malaparte stated that, during an audience with Pavelić, he noticed a basket on his table that seemed to be full of oysters and other seafood; the author was shocked when the Croatian *Poglavnik* explained that "It is a gift from my loyal Ustashas, it is twenty kilograms of human eyes" (p. 260). This basket of human eyes is the most striking proof of the thousand-year-old Croatian culture and speaks volumes about this criminal nation.

r) Croatian Crimes cannot be Forgotten

In 1975 in Melbourne, Australia, Lazo Kostić published a brochure entitled *Addendum to the Book of Croatian Atrocities in World War II as described by their Allies*, in which he presented data that he had come

across later, while the original book was quite advanced in the printing preparation process, which extended endlessly due to the virtually regular problems the emigrant writers were faced with. He analysed the book entitled *The Faith of Adolf Hitler*, published in Zurich in 1960 by Friedrich Heer, who also wrote extensively on the Croatian crimes and referred to Pavelić as the most horrible person of the 20th century. Heer specifically condemned the misdeeds of the Catholic Church, caused by blind religious hatred and the church's readiness to employ the filthiest and most perfidious means of proselytism. The author claimed that Hitler's psychological traits showed that he had been brought up in a strict Catholic environment. In 1974, another German author Klaus Liebe wrote about the Croatian crimes and the role that the Catholic clergy had played in the genocide committed against the Serbian people. He particularly stressed the fact that Archbishop Stepinac could have prevented the crimes if he wanted to do that, but instead he kept silent and waited for Pavelić to clear the terrain for him.

Kostić extensively quoted a large number of German and some French authors, often providing the citations in their source languages, though they mostly repeated the statements presented in the original book. Only the new details will be presented here, such as the excerpt from the report of the German Embassy in the Independent State of Croatia sent to the Reich Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 21 November 1942, which *inter alia* stated: "On the occasion of his promotion to the rank of Ustasha captain, senior police commissioner Tomić organized a large and rowdy party. The heavy drinking started immediately after lunch; when all the guests were totally drunk, Tomić started shooting with his pistol. Valuable oil paintings and crystal items served as his targets. Around midnight, some Ustashas were ordered to bring several Serbs from the prison to the café. The Serbs were stabbed with knives and the Ustashas sucked blood from their wounds" (p. 41-42).

In his report on the military and political situation in Montenegro, sent on 12 August 1941 to his Supreme Command, Italian General Pircio Biroli wrote the following: "In my opinion, of all the Balkan peoples, the Serbs are still the best in spite of their crude character. The Croats are mean and two-faced, true hypocrites and cowards as opposed to the warrior and knightly spirit of the Serbs and Montenegrins" (p. 53). In addition to a series of Croatian crimes described based on statements from the Serbs who survived by chance, the report on the combat situation in the area of Ključ that the intelligence department of the 6th Army Corps sent to its higher command also read that: "Of all the barbarities that were described, the most repulsive is the fact that the Serbs were forced to eat their own eyes that were gauged out prior to that" (p. 59). On the occasion of Ante Pavelić's death, the Italian *Corriere della Sera* published an extensive necrology in which Pavelić's following publicly spoken words were quoted: "the one who does not feel capable of slaughtering an infant in its mother's womb is not a true Ustasha" (p. 66). In the issue of 30 April 1959, the newspaper also recalled Malaparte's experience with the Serbian eyes on Pavelić's table.

From the abundance of archive material, publications and newspaper

Comment [K.B.26]: Translator's note. We were unable to find author of this name in any of our sources. Suggested spelling

articles, Kostić also quoted a number of Swiss authors. Thus, he referred to the text by Jacques Hissard, a correspondent from Split who published a book on the horror of war in Lausanne in 1944 under the title *As Seen in Yugoslavia*. The following examples are most horrible: “In the village of Stradanje, they cut open the womb of a Serbian woman who was four months pregnant, pulled out the foetus and sewed a live cat in its place. An old and retired Serbian teacher, the former principal of the school in Travnik, was pushed to the ground and a Ustasha cut him open with a stiletto from the throat down and ripped his heart out” (p. 76).

Chapter VIII

THE CROATS AS THE GREATEST EVILDOERS AGAINST THE SERBS

In 1957, Professor Lazo Kosić published his capital study entitled *Disputed Areas between the Serbs and the Croats*, printed in Chicago by the American Institute for Balkan Affairs. The book was reprinted by the AIZ Dosije in Belgrade in 1990 and will be quoted here from that edition. It deals with the issue of Serbian and Croatian territorial disputes in the areas of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia. In Kostić’s opinion, the Bay of Kotor, Dubrovnik and Srem are not disputable at all and represent purely Serbian territories, as he proved in his other works, while the problem of Bosnia-Herzegovina was dealt with separately in a number of his studies that will be discussed elsewhere in this book.

1. Territorial Disputes between the Serbs and the Croats

Kostić’s initial premise is based on the facts that the Serbian population in Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia settled in these areas “ages ago; that they came there to defend these areas; that they had been invited to settle there and that they behaved properly and successfully defended the frontier several times. Nevertheless, the Serbian population was persecuted and treated ungratefully; their privileges were recognized, only to be subsequently violated and ignored; they have recently been subjected to criminal treatment by the surrounding populations, etc.” (p. 12). Serbian rights to a large part of those territories stem from the above facts. “Nowadays, nobody even seeks corroboration in history in order to recognize these rights. In the civilized and cultured countries of the world, every individual is

protected by the legal establishment because he or she is human, while every community (national, religious, etc) is thus protected because of its realistic existence. Yet, the Croats do not respect this. They respect nobody but themselves (and they even poorly respect themselves) and they construe some preposterous 'rights' for each of their aspiration. It was not stated without reason that this nation had the largest number of 'parties of rights' in the whole world" (p. 12).

Throughout the 19th century, the science of Slavistics had no greater problem than the ethnic conundrum of the Balkans, particularly the problem of territorial situation and ethnic demarcation between the Serbs and the Croats. Irrespective of all the differences in views expressed by different scientists, the fact that all of them have associated the Serbs with a rather large territory emerges as a constant element of their conclusions, while the Croats have been confined to an extremely small area. "The term Croats is limited to a very narrowly defined 'group' in the territory of today's Yugoslavia. Some Slavists – mostly the north Slavs and primarily the Czechs – only recognize the population that speaks in the Kaikavian dialect as Croats. Others, for example the Slovenes, consider the Kaikavians (Translator's note: people who speak the Kaikavian dialect) to be Slovenes and limit the Croats to the Chakavian dialect alone" (p. 19).

Faced with such inconsistencies, Guillaume Lejean wrote the following in his *Ethnography of European Turkey*, published in 1861: "The Croats (*Horvat, Hervat*) do not comprise a clearly distinct element of the 'Yugoslav race', as there are virtually no two Slavists with concurrent opinions on the geographic layout of the Croats" (p. 20). Lazo Kostić summarized the above facts as follows: "Literally, there is not a single area of today's Yugoslavia that the renowned Slavists of the 19th century recognized as clearly Croatian. The great Slavists like Kopitar and others even contest the idea that Zagreb and its surroundings belongs to the Croatian nation. The only fact that all the Slavists agree on is that the pure Croats were those who left Croatia on the emergence of the Turks and fled far into Hungary and Austria – as far as Moravia. Nowadays, they have largely assimilated with the nations they live with. On the other hand, all the prominent Slavists of the 19th century acknowledge almost everything that the Serbs are trying to reclaim as undisputable Serbian territory, i.e. at least five sixths of what the greatest Serbian 'chauvinists' demand for their people" (p. 20).

Thus, Josef Dobrovský opined that, in our regions, only the Kaikavian dialect could be identified as the Croatian language and claimed that all other dialects were Serbian. Accordingly, he concluded that the Croats lived only in the *Hrvatsko Zagorje* area and its surroundings, while all the other areas of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia were inhabited by the Serbs. In his letter written to Jernej Kopitar, published in 1879 in the *Archive of Slavic Philology*, Dobrovský stated that "According to Salagius, the *Kranjci* (Translator's note: inhabitants of the region of Carniola, *Kranjska*), *Donjoštarjeci* (Translator's note: inhabitants of the region of Lower Styria, *Donja Štajerska*) or *Bezjaci* (i.e. Croats of Zagreb) are the Croats mentioned by Constantine

(Porphyrogenitus, *L.M.K.*), who split from the Dalmatian ones and withdrew to Pannonia. The Hungarian Slovenes are (newer) emigrants from Styria, Lower Carniola/*Donja Kranjska*, etc, though they say *ne* instead of *u*. Hence, the Pannonian Croats can be divided into: a) the proper Slovenes (of Zagreb), b) the Hungarian Slovenes and the Slovenes of Carniola, Styria and Carinthia. The Dalmatians are half Serbs (they use the Glagolitic alphabet), while the Cyrillic users are pure Serbs [...] Their geographic names are of little interest to me. Those Dubrovians, Macedonians and Bosnians are Serbs. The *Kranjci*, *Bezjaci* and the Pannonian Croats are of Croatian descent" (p. 21).

In his letter of 6 March 1810, Dobrovský further elaborated on this issue: "The true Croatian language is the Zagreb language; accordingly, all your Wends (Slovenes) are Croats, though you claim that the Croats are Wends. The country that is now called Croatia and spreads on both sides of the Sava River has never before borne the name of Croatia; yet it was inhabited by the Croats and they had the right to differentiate it from the area inhabited by many Slavonians who settled there and named it Slavonia [...] One gets used to geographic names and disuses the general terms, so the Bosnians do not want to be called Serbians, as is also the case with the Dalmatians. But are they not Serbs because of that? I am not familiar with the *Wasserkroaten*. Those could actually be Croatian colonies like those in Moravia (since 1650) and near Pozsony. They are also called Croats, but not the Eisenberg Wends" (p. 21).

Moreover, even the most significant Croatian historian, Ferdo Šišić, emphasized the following in his book *Bishop Strossmayer and the Yugoslav Thought*, published in Belgrade in 1922: "Abbot Dobrovský was the first to start building the ethnographic system of Slavic peoples on the basis of the linguistic similarities and, within that system, he divided the South Slavs into the following groups: 1) Wends (the Slavs of Carinthia, Carniola, Primorje, Styria, *Prekmurje* (Translator's note: the Slovenian region across the Mura River)) and the provincial Croats (i.e. all the Kaikavians)); 2) the Serbs, Bosnians, Slavonians, Dalmatians, Montenegrins and the inhabitants of Croatian Krajina, collectively called the Illyrians (i.e. all the Shtokavians); and 3) the Bulgarians. This categorization remained largely accepted until Miklošić (in the latter half of the 19th century). Therefore, the intelligentsia of the first quarter of the 19th century limited the Croatian name exclusively to the speakers of *Kaikavian* dialect – to the northern part of the Zagreb County as far as the Kupa River, all of Varaždin County (including *Međimurje*) and the western part of the Križevci County" (p. 22).

Jerner Kopitar did not accept all of the theses adduced by Dobrovský and debated with him in a series of letter, emphasizing the following: "Surely, I am as just to the Croats as Your Excellency is to the Slovenes, but the wrong name offends me (shocks me): we, the Slovenes should not be called Croats; rather, they should be called what they are – the Slovenes" (p. 23). Hence, Kopitar confined the Croats to the narrowest area: "The Croats of Pannonia, who separated from the Dalmatian Croats, cannot be found in Slavonia, Styria and Carinthia, but only in Krčalić, Istra and in Croatia south of the Kupa River" (p. 23).

In his *History of the Slavic Languages and Literature*, published in 1826, Pavel Jozef Šafárik explicitly referred to the Bosnians, Montenegrins, Slavonians and Dalmatians as Serbs. His scientific findings were thus not based on the religious differences between the Orthodox and the Catholics but on the specificities of the spoken dialects. In the book entitled *Serbian Anthology*, published in 1833 in Pest, Šafárik insisted that “it is a historically and linguistically established fact that, just as the Serbs in Serbia, Bosnia, Slavonia, Herzegovina, Montenegro and Dalmatia comprise just a branch of the large Slavic tree regardless of whether they belong to the eastern or western churches, their language also comprises just one dialect (not several dialects, *L.M.K.*), although it has a number of negligible variations” (p. 24). Šafárik further showed that the earlier Croatian State had also included parts of the Serbian territories, concluding that, “With respect to language, the old Croatia/*Horvatska* that was located south of the Kupa River, including the residential areas of Bihać in today’s Bosnia and Biograd in Dalmatia, had always belonged to the Serbian national and linguistic category. What the old writers from those areas called Croatian was a pure Serbian language, while the dialect used in the titles of the 16th century books that is now the so-called Croatian, is still referred to as the Slavonic language by the autochthonous inhabitants” (p. 24).

In the book entitled *Slavonic Antiquities*, published in Leipzig in 1843, Šafárik was even more explicit regarding the issue of the territorial distribution of the Serbs in the Balkans: “On the basis of the common linguistic traits of their language, all the Serbian tribes that settled between the Croats and the Bulgarian Slavs in the river basins of the Bosnia, Drina, Kolubara, West or Serbian Morava, Ibar, Neretva and Morača rivers, belonged to the same nation. Therefore, one can only speak here of different branches of the same powerful tribe and by no means of different peoples in the true sense of the term” (p. 25).

In the 1889 issue of the *Archive of Slavic Philology*, Vatroslav Jagić interpreted Franc Miklošić and stated the following as a Warasdinian Croat and serious scientist: “According to Miklošić, the Croatian/*Horvatski* language is spoken in Istria, Primorje (probably Croatian Primorje? *L.M.K.*) and in Dalmatia north of the Neretva; it is also spoken by the Catholics of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the former Military Frontier and Slavonia (Budmani XIII); moreover, it is spoken by the Croats settled in several counties of western Hungary, the *Horvats* of Lower Austria (the Leitha–Marchfeld and the Thaya) and by the Croats who live in Moravia. This category also includes the Croats of Southern Italy” (p. 26).

On the other hand, in his study on the Chakavian dialect published in 1891 in the same renowned magazine, the Serbian Catholic Milan Rešetar wrote that: “The Chakavian dialect was originally spoken not only in the entire area of Old Croatia (Northern Dalmatia, Croatian Primorje, Western Bosnia and Eastern Istria with the Kvarner Islands), but also in some border regions, parts of which would come under Croatian rule much later (probably in the 11th century) – such as Middle

Dalmatia and the Kupa River basin, while some parts of these regions would never be subjected to the Croatian authority (Pelješac, Korčula, Lastovo and probably part of Western Istria). As only the Chakavian dialect was spoken in Old Croatia, as the inhabitants of Old Croatia comprised the majority of the Chakavian speakers and because, in the first centuries of their history, the Croatian name is only mentioned in the historic and linguistic documents in relation to the Chakavian speaking regions, it is quite justifiable to conclude, as Miklošić did, that the Croatian language is identified with the Chakavian dialect and vice versa. On the other hand, since it was corroborated by all the earlier linguistic documents that only the Shtokavian dialect was spoken in all the areas that were part of the Serbian state, be it for a shorter or longer periods of time (Old Serbia, Serbia, Montenegro, Zeta, Herzegovina, Southern Dalmatia, Eastern and Southern Bosnia and Srem), and that the Serbian name was used for both the people and the language of those areas, often in the times when they were not even within the State of Serbia – one must again agree with those who join Miklošić in his statement that the terms Shtokavian and Serbian are analogous” (p. 27).

In his book entitled *The Slavs of Ancient Times*, published in Zagreb in 1889 by *Matica Hrvatska*, Croatian Slavist Tomo Maretić claimed that the original Croats were only the speakers of the Ikavian dialect; like the prominent Franciscan Matija Petar Katanić, the author found his principal argument for the precise projection of geographic distribution of the Serbs and the Croats after their arrival in the Balkan Peninsula in the works of Porphyrogenitus. Maretić stated that “Croatian land starts from the Cetina River and stretches to Primorje and as far as the border with Istria or the city of Albon (today’s Labin), while in the upper regions it covers a part of the province of Istria; it reaches the Serbian lands near the Cetina River and *Hlijevno/Livno* [...] The Cetina River empties into the sea below *Spljet/Split* but its flow meanders and it needs to be added here that only the lower stream of the river comprised the border of the Croatian State, while its other parts were in Croatian territory. This can be inferred quite clearly from the other records left by Porphyrogenitus and it enables us to conclude where the southern and northern borders of Dalmatian Croatia were located. It is quite obvious that the west side of it was bordered by the sea. The most difficult task is establishing the eastern border. One is certain that Croatia bordered with Serbia in the east, but the problem is to find out where Croatia stopped and Serbia began. They believe that Croatia was divided from Serbia by the Vrbas river, which flows through the middle of today’s Bosnia and empties into the Sava [...] Hence, the part of today’s Eastern Bosnian area of the Vrbas River was a part of the Serbian State. The northern border of Porphyrogenitus’ Serbia was clearly the Sava River, specifically the part from the confluence of the Vrbas to approximately the confluence of the Drina [...] Porphyrogenitus stated that the tribes of Zahumlje, Trebinje (with Konavle) and the Neretva were of Serbian ethnicity; he did not say anything about the nationality of the Duklja tribe/*Docleans* (he probably forgot, or he did not know) i.e. whether they were Croats or Serbs. Nevertheless, if we consider that the Duklja tribe

was the southernmost of the four tribes and that the proper Croats reached as far as the Cetina River, then it would seem rather likely that the *Docleans* were of the same nationality as the Serbs” (p. 27-28).

a) The Geographic Position of Serbian and Croatian Territories

Cyprien Robert, the most prominent French Slavist, stated the following in his book entitled *The Slavs of Turkey*, published in Paris in 1844: “The Serbian branch outside the Principality of Serbia includes Montenegro, Bosnia and numerous areas of Albania and Macedonia. Should any European power fail to divide them, the entire Serbian population that speaks one language will unite and subsequently form a single powerful state with two and a half million nationals [...] The Serbian race covers a third of European Turkey and the entire southern part of Hungary. The Serbian provinces of Turkey are: Bosnia, Herzegovina, part of Macedonia, the south-east of Albania, Montenegro and the principality that bears the proper name of Serbia. In the Austrian Empire, the Serbs live in Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia, part of Istria, the Military Frontier, Banat, Srem and along the Danube banks from Vienna to Szentendre near Budapest” (p. 29).

In 1847, Heinrich Berghans wrote that the Serbs “inhabit the entire region that borders with the Illyrians and Hungarians in the north, the Adriatic Sea in the west and with Bulgaria in the east. Specifically, the region includes the largest part of Istria, all of Dalmatia, almost all of the Austrian Military Frontier, part of Southern Hungary (including entire Slavonia, *L.M.K.*), all of Bosnia and the entire area of Serbia. Therefore, the Serbs are divided and subjected to Austrian and Turkish sovereignty. Their local names are: the Dalmatians, *Morlaci*, Montenegrins and Bosnians; these names do not imply linguistic differences as the Serbs of all those areas speak the same dialect” (p. 31).

In his book entitled *General Geography*, which saw several editions (and Kostić referred to the seventh and eighth editions published in 1883 and 1894), the author Adrian Balbi noted that the Croats “inhabit the provincial area of Croatia – the western part of the area once known as the Military Frontier, a small part of south-east Carniola, Eastern Istria with the Kvarner Archipelago and several colonies in Western Hungary, Banat, Lower Austria (the March border with Hungary) and Moravia (on the Thaya River). The Serbs inhabit the following areas: Dalmatia (known as the ‘Dalmatians’, ‘*Morlaci*’, ‘Dubrovians’ or ‘*Bokelji*’); a large part of Vojvodina and Banat, including the area of the former Serbia-Banat Military Frontier (Serbs, *Sokci*, *Bunjevci*); Slavonia and a part of the former Croatian and Slavonian Military Frontier (‘Slavonians’); an area in Southern Hungary (‘*Raci*’); and the south-east part of Istria (‘*Morlaci*’)” (p. 31).

In their work published in Stuttgart in 1928 under the title of *The Nations of Europe*, Michael and Arthur Haberlandt noted that certain territories that had previously been purely Croatian, intensively changed their ethnic structure and lost their basic Croatian characteristics, while

the Serbian areas preserved their national specificities. They presented a specific example, stating the following: “The heterogeneous and mixed Slavic population of Istria – the Croats, Serbs, the *Uskoci*, *Čiče* and Slavonized Rumanians – are, in terms of ethnographic significance, well behind the much more clearly pronounced Serbian nationality that is found in Dalmatia, as well as in Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia” (p. 32).

In the book entitled *The New Great Ethnography*, published in 1954, the Ethnographer Hugo Bernatzik noted *inter alia* that the family patron saint holiday or *Krsna Slava* was a markedly and exclusively Serbian characteristic and a criterion of differentiating the Serbs from the non-Serbian Slavic populations, adding the following: “Not only the Orthodox Serbs, but also the Catholic Serbs of Dalmatia, Bosnia and Slavonia respect a certain saint as the protector of their family, although this custom is increasingly fading among the Catholics” (p. 32). Austrian ethnographer Karl von Czoernig wrote in his *Ethnography of the Austrian Monarchy* that there were three demarcation lines between the Serbs and the Croats: the Istrian, the Adriatic and the Slavonian lines. He even went on to introduce the category of Serbo-Croats and used this term to refer to the Serbian Catholics, thus clearly differentiating them from the proper Croats. Therefore, Czoernig’s work shows that, beside a part of Istria, the author treated all of Dalmatia and Slavonia as exclusively Serbian territories.

The ethnic and territorial demarcation between the Serbs and the Croats was even more precisely described by the most prominent Austrian statistician Adolf Ficker in the book entitled *Population of Austria in its Most Significant Moments, Presented Statistically*, published in Gotha in 1860. The author noted that “the Kingdom of Croatia and its eight regimental counties of the Croatian-Slavonian Military Frontier belong to the Croats, while all the regions east of it belong to the Serbs; the extension of this positioned a demarcation line towards the north quite precisely divides the Croatian linguistic island from the Serbian one” (p. 34).

In his book, published ten years later, Ficker explained that the “real” Croats from the then Littoral Croatia Croatized the Kaikavian speaking Slovenes who lived in Zagreb and its broader surroundings, going on to elaborate on the existence of two categories of Croats – the Slovene-Croats and Serbo-Croats, the latter being the category into which the Serbian Catholics gradually evolved. “The fact that a significant part of the Croats were created from the Croatized Slovenes as late as the 16th century and that another part is even now and for the same reason more closely related to the Serbs justifies the differentiation of the Slovene-Croats and Serbo-Croats [...] Nevertheless, the Slovene-Croats also live south of the Sisak-Ivanić line, where they are mixed with the Serbo-Croats as far as Jasenovac across the confluence of the Una and the Sava rivers, as well as where their mixed composition directly borders with the Serbs along the Sava River.” As far as the Serbs are concerned, their division “into branches is conducted either by the territory they inhabit (Slavonians, Dalmatians, Dubrovians or

Bokelji) or by their religious denomination (Eastern-Greek *Raci*, Greek-Catholic *Sokci* and *Bunjevci*). Only the name *Morlaci* in Dalmatia still has an ethnic attribute insofar as it is used to designate the last Avars that had been Slavicized long ago” (p. 35).

On the basis of a detailed analysis of Ficker’s book, Kostić drew the following conclusion: “The part of the territory that the then Austrian administration and official Austrian science recognised as Croatian was less than miserable. It can hardly be seen on the map. What is more, in neither this nor any other area would the statistics and geography scientists find pure Croats, only their mixture with the Slovenes or the Serbs” (p. 35). It is corroborated by Brachelli, the renowned Viennese professor of statistics, who stated the following in his book entitled *Handbook of Geography and Statistics of the Austrian Empire*, published in Leipzig in 1861: “The Croats (as Slovene-Croats and Serbo-Croats) inhabit Croatia, the western part of the Military Frontier, a small part of south-east Carniola, Eastern Istria with the Kvarner Archipelago and several colonies in Western Hungary, Banat, Lower Austria and Hungary. The Serbs inhabit Dalmatia (known as ‘Dalmatians’, ‘*Morlaci*’, ‘Dubrovians’ or ‘*Bokelji*’), a large part of Vojvodina and Banat with the Serbia-Banat Military Frontier (‘Serbs’, ‘*Sokci*’, ‘*Bunjevci*’); Slavonia and a part of the Croatian and Slavonian Military Frontier (‘Slavonians’), a strip of Southern Hungary (‘*Raci*’), and the south-east part of Istria (‘*Morlaci*’)” (p. 35).

In his other book, published in 1876 under the title of *European Countries*, this same author was even more specific: “The Croatian linguistic tribe includes the inhabitants of Croatia, though members of this tribe are more numerous in the southern parts of Hungary, in Istria and on the Islands of Kvarner; they can be found in smaller numbers in Carniola and in some linguistic islands of Lower Austria and Moravia. The Serbs inhabit Slavonia (‘Slavonians’) and considerable parts of Southern Hungary (‘*Raci*’), as well as south-east Istria (‘*Morlaci*’) and all of Dalmatia (‘Dalmatians’)” (p. 36).

b) The Religious Differences between the Serbs and the Croats

In the text published in 1815, Jacob Grim completely identified the Croats with the *Kranjci*, i.e. with today’s Slovenes, while he claimed that Dalmatia, Slavonia, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Montenegro were inhabited by the Serbian population of Orthodox, Catholic and Muslim religions. In 1847, the German philologist Johann Severin Vater published his acclaimed work in the field of literature, grammar, vocabulary and other linguistic disciplines, in which he considered the following groups to be Serbs: “1) the Serbs in the narrower sense or the Serbians of the former Kingdom of Serbia, which is now known as the Vilayet of Serf, covering both sides of the Morava River and the areas between the Timok River, the Drina, the Balkan Mountains, the Sava and the Danube. A large part of them earlier moved to Austrian Slavonia and Southern Hungary. Almost all of them are of the eastern rite. 2) The

Bosnians, located between the Drina, the Vrbas, the Sava, Dalmatia and the Balkans. Many have converted to Islam but they mostly preserved their Slavonic language and customs. The majority of them, however, observes the Greek cult and very few of them the western one. 3) The Montenegrins, located in Turkey and Albania between the Montenegrin hills from Bosnia towards the sea coast as far as Bar; all of them are of the Greek rite. 4) The Slavonians, inhabiting the Austrian Kingdom of Slavonia and the Dukedom of Srem – some of them are of the Greek and some of the Latin faith. 5) The Dalmatians, along the Adriatic Coast, in the counties of Zadar, Split, Dubrovnik and Kotor, as well as on the coastal islands; almost all of them observe the Catholic rite. All of these peoples speak the Serbian language, with some minor differences in dialects [...] The proper Serbian language is divided into the following three dialects: *Herzegovinian*, *Resavian* and *Syrmanian*. The Bosnian dialect is virtually no different from Serbian. Slavonian is but a variation of the Serbian language. The Dalmatian dialect is significantly modified by the influences of neighbouring Italy, especially in its vernacular” (p. 38).

Other German scientists wrote in a similar manner; the historian of religion Karl Eckermann was primarily intrigued by the fact that the people who called themselves Croats spoke two different languages. The Croats who inhabited the areas between the Sava and the Drava rivers spoke Slovenian, while the rest of the people who declared themselves as Croats spoke Serbian. Major scientific authorities of the 19th century, such as the theoretician of literature Karl Braun and Professor Wigand, also wrote on the numerosness of the Serbian population in Slavonia, Dalmatia, Croatia and Istria.

Lazo Kostić further analysed the standpoints of the most significant Slavists on this issue. In addition to the inhabitants of Serbia and Montenegro in their book entitled *The History of Slavic Literatures*, the Russian historian of literature Pypin and his Polish colleague Spasovich included the following peoples in the category of Serbs in the narrowest sense of the term: the Bosnians, Herzegovinians, Dalmatians, Dubrovians, *Dićas* of Istria, *Uskoci*, the Frontier people, etc. Aware of the problem of precisely identifying peoples due to the mixture of national and religious belonging, they considered the Croats and the Slovenes to be the Serbs in a broader sense, adding the following: “The term Croat spreads well beyond its real tribal and regional sense, as even the Serbian inhabitants of Turkish Croatia, the north Adriatic coast and the islands are called Croats” (p. 39). The difference between the Croats and the Serbs is primarily their language: “The dialect of the proper Croats is the so-called Kaikavian. The Dalmatian literature [...], which is also frequently referred to as ‘Croatian literature’ (in a broader sense), was written in a different dialect, the so-called *Chakavian*. This dialect is significantly different to the proper Croatian dialect and the so-called Shtokavian or proper Serbian dialect” (p. 39-40).

c) The Appropriation of the Serbian Language and Literature

For centuries, the Croatian people had neglected the development of literature as it simply did not interest its intelligentsia. Regarding this issue, Kostić quoted the following passage from Pypin and Spasovich: "In its narrower sense, the Croatian dialect did not have a significant literature attached. Unlike Dalmatia, the narrower area of Croatia lacked the conditions for literary development. By joining with Hungary, Croatia became politically divided from Dalmatia and only maintained weak commercial relations with that region. Religion divided it from Serbia. Much like in Hungary, Croatia had the Latin language as its language of the church, government, literature and education. Its proper dialect first emerged in literature as late as the 16th century, when the Reformation reached the Croats and Slovenes" (p. 40).

The authors also concluded that the Croats adopted the Serbian language as their own, stating that: "Croatian writers, primarily Ljudevit Gaj, took as their literary language the dialect in which the western Serbian literature had developed and attained great significance for all of Serbdom, both in the east and the west. The specific Croatian dialect was neglected and books were rarely published in this vernacular. Serious political and social issues emerged in the light of the literary language (the Illyrian), which was supposed to unite all the branches of the Serbian tribe, both western and the eastern" (p. 40).

The renowned Dubrovian Catholic nobleman Medo Pucić was even more explicit on this matter. Under the pseudonym of Orsato Pozza, he wrote the following in an 1867 issue of the Tuscan magazine *The New Anthology*: "If a dialect is sufficient to determinate a nation, then the Slavs of Croatia and Slavonia belong to the Serbian branch of Slavonia and the Military Frontier, whereas the Slavs of civil Croatia belong to the Carniola branch. However, having formulated their views of the future, the Croats adopted Serbian as their official language, accepted Serbian literature as their own and embraced the Serbian country as their native land; they only attributed the Croatian name to themselves. Such a change of the name is of no consequence to the factual situation" (p. 40).

Many prominent European intellectuals of the 19th century not only considered the then Serbia and Montenegro as markedly Serbian lands, but also Old Serbia, Timisoara Banat, Bačka, Srem, Slavonia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Dalmatia and the Military Frontier. As Kostić noted, along with extensive quotations from their works, those were the French publicist De Clairval, the Italian Uicini, the French academician Taillandier and diplomat Auguste Dosole, as well as the writer René Millet who was the French Ambassador to Belgrade for a period of time, etc. As far as French authors are concerned, René Pimmou and René Henry are also fairly significant writers on this issue, as well as the acclaimed historian Ernest Denis.

In his book entitled *The War in Turkey*, published in Zurich in 1876, the Swiss military writer Ristow *inter alia* stated that "the tribes of Serbian origin and language inhabit the largest area by far in the western part of European Turkey. In the east, they spread as far as the Nišava and the Karaš or the old Strymon (Struma) River that empties into the

Elena Ghica, the prominent Rumanian publicist who published her works in French under the pseudonym of Dora d'Istria, wrote the following on the Serbian dialect in 1865: "The Serbian rebellion against Turkish rule, which took place at the beginning of our century, and the establishing of the Principality of Serbia as its consequence, have drawn western attention to one of the most significant peoples of the eastern peninsula. The branch of the Slavic race that bears the name of South-eastern Slavs has no representative more worthy of study than the Serbian nation (there is no more than a million of Croats) who (the Serbs) live in the Principality (of Serbia), Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina, certain counties of Bulgaria and Northern Albania, Metohija (older Serbia), Slavonia, Dalmatia and a part of Istria, as well as inhabiting some provinces of Austria, such as Bačka, Srem and Banat" (p. 43). Dora d'Istria noted that, in her times, there were six million Serbs.

Studying the basic strategic landmarks of Russian politics, the greatest German statesman of all times, Otto von Bismark, wrote about the Russian reliance on consanguinity and religious relations with other peoples and about Russia's attempts to "liberate the Greek Serbs and sometimes the Roman Catholics Serbs that, under different names, inhabit both sides of the Austro-Hungarian border" (p. 44). In 1908, the Professor of Magdeburg University Theobald Fischer wrote about the existence of Orthodox, Catholic and Muslim Serbs: "The Serbs, much like the Albanians, have the fateful characteristic of being partly Roman and partly Greek Christians – and again partly Mohammadans – in addition to being politically divided into two national states, Montenegro and Serbia, as well as Dalmatia Bosnia and Herzegovina, while a significant number of them also live under Turkish rule in Old Serbia" (p. 44).

d) The Numerical Ratio between the Two Peoples

Following analysis of the territorial distribution of the Serbs and Croats as maintained by the leading international scholars, Lazo Kostić addressed the numerical ratio between these two peoples. At a time when statistics had not yet been established as a science and statistical methods were not used in the modern sense of the word, such numerical ratios were expressed in terms of estimates based on birth records, travel journals, partial counting of the population, etc. When it comes to the Slavs, this issue was dealt with most thoroughly by Pavel Jozef Šafárik. His books were actually forerunners of the first real censuses and official statistics publications. All the estimates prior to Šafárik were extremely incomplete, though fairly indicative.

Jernej Kopitar thus wrote in 1817 that there were five million Serbs, half of which lived in the Turkish territory and the other half under the

Austrian rule; he also stated that more than a half of the Serbs who were Austrian subjects were Orthodox, while the rest of them were united, meaning that they were either Uniates or proper Catholics. If two and a half million Serbs lived under Turkish rule, Kopitar obviously considered all the Christians of Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Old Serbia and Macedonia to be Serbs. On the other hand, with respect to the Austrian territory, Kopitar considered all the Shtokavians to be Catholics. As regards the Croats, he limited them to the Chakavians only, while he considered all the Kaikavians to be Slovenes.

Similarly to Kopitar, in the preface to *The Grammar of the Serbian Language* by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, Jacob Grimm wrote in 1842 about the territories inhabited by the Serbs: "A population of about five million needs to be calculated in the following manner: three million non-Uniate Greeks (i.e. Orthodox, *L.M.K.*), one million of them living in Serbia, one million in Hungary and one million in Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro and Dalmatia; out of the remaining two million, two thirds live in Bosnia and are called Turks due to their religion though, in a thousand of them, not one speaks Turkish; the remaining third are Catholic who inhabit Bosnia, Dalmatia, Slavonia and Croatia" (p. 48-49).

Almost identical estimates were made by French ethnographer Ami Boué in 1840, Nikola Tomazeo in 1842 and the Slavonian Ignjat Alojz Brlić in his *Grammar of the Illyrian Language*, published in Offen in 1833. As Kostić observed, "in the very title of his grammar, Brlić considered that it was 'the Illyrian language' that was spoken 'in Bosnia, Dalmatia, Slavonia, Serbia, Dubrovnik, etc', never mentioning Croatia since they indeed spoke a different language in Croatia. As indicated at the beginning of this section, the above-referenced authors did not specify the number of Croats. However, in analysing the proposed number of Serbs, one can see that the number of Croats must have been rather small. According to all these authors, it does not seem that there could have been more than one and a half million of them" (p. 50).

In his work entitled *The Slavic Ethnology*, published in two volumes in 1842 and 1849, Šafárik offered the first scientifically based data on the demographic and geographic circumstances of the Slavs. His internationally recognized scientific work was highly appreciated by some of the most prominent Croatian Slavists and historians such as Vatroslav Jagić, Imbre Tkalac, Frano Kuralic, Mirko Bogović and others. Interpreting Šafárik's key data, Lazo Kostić gave the following summary: "Šafárik found that there were roughly 80 million Slavs. As many as seven and a quarter million of them were the present Yugoslavs (though he estimated that there were over three and a half million of Bulgarians). According to Šafárik, 5,294,000 of these Yugoslavs were Serbs, 801,000 of them were Croats and 1,153,000 were Slovenes or Wends, as he referred to them. As regards the Serbs, Šafárik established that 2,880,000 of them were Orthodox, 864,000 were Catholics and 550,000 were Muslims. In dividing certain nations into states, Šafárik assigned all the Croats and the Slovenes to the column of Austria. On

the other hand, he concluded that 2,590,000 Serbs lived in Austria, while 950,000 of them lived in Serbia, 160,000 in Montenegro, 100,000 in Russia and 1,490,000 or roughly a million and a half in Turkey. Hence, Šafárik established that the number of Serbs was seven to eight times greater than that of the Croats. With the exception of the Lusatian Serbs, Šafárik considered the Croats to be the smallest nation in the world. The populations of all other nations exceeded one million: 1,153,000 Slovenes; two and three quarters of a million Slovaks and the same number of Belarusians; a little more than three million Bulgarians as already mentioned; almost four and a half million Czechs; almost ten and a half million Poles; over 13 million *Malorusi/Ukrainians*; and over 35 million *Velikorusi/Russians*" (p. 51-52).

Similar data and conclusions were subsequently offered by Cyprien Robert in his book entitled *On the Slavs in Turkey*, the Hungarian Fenyés and especially the Swiss military historian Ristow in his *History of the Hungarian Rebell War in 1848* published in 1860. The official Hungarian *Geographic, Statistical and Historical Handbook*, prepared by Ungewitter, also specified that, out of one and a half million inhabitants of Serbian Vojvodina, more than 400,000 of them were Serbs, while there were only three thousand Croats. The *Bunjevci* and *Šokci* were shown as unquestionably Serbian, although the Srem, Sajkaška and Banatska Krajina that were home to an additional 200,000 Serbs were not taken into account.

The entire Military Frontier had one million inhabitants, while Dalmatia numbered 400,000 inhabitants. "At that time, the Kingdom of Croatia and Slavonia (provincial or civil, without Krajina/Frontier) had 868,456 inhabitants, hardly exceeding half the population of Serbian Vojvodina. Civil Croatia had 608,426 inhabitants and Slavonia 260,030. According to Ungewitter, these territories were shared by 631,081 Croats and 224,180 Serbs" (p. 56-57). As stated in the acclaimed Czoernig's *Ethnography of the Austrian Monarchy*, published in three volumes between 1855 and 1857 in Vienna, the entire Hapsburg state numbered 1,427,788 Serbs and 1,329,750 Croats. Czoernig counted all the Catholic Serbs as Croats and such a practice would later be largely used in the official Austrian documents. Czoernig statistically showed the Catholic Serbs to be Serbo-Croats and the proper Croats as Slovene-Croats. Out of a total of 1,330,000 Croats, 586,000 were Serbo-Croats or Catholic Serbs.

In the reports published after the first Austrian census conducted in 1857, the demographic structure was presented in terms of religion, though it indicated that about a million Orthodox Serbs lived in Austria at the time. However, Adolf Ficker, in his capacity as director of the official Austrian statistics administration, published a book in 1869 in Vienna entitled *The Nationalities in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, its Regions, Frontiers, etc.*, in which, as stated by Kostić, he "interpreted the data on nationality relying, as previously mentioned, on the scientific results of nationality categorization" (p. 61). As Ficker maintained, at the time of the census, the entire state was inhabited by 1,520,000 Serbs, 1,424,000 Croats and 1,260,000 Slovenes. It should be taken into

account that the process of identifying the Catholic Serbs as Croats was well underway and was supported by the official Austrian authorities. Nevertheless, it was obvious that, even according to their statistics, there were about half a million Catholic Serbs living in their state. In the entire monarchy, which did not yet include Bosnia-Herzegovina, there were about 100,000 more Serbs than Croats. Ficker further stated that 88.92 percent of the population in Dalmatia were Serbs, 10.84 percent Italians and 0.24 percent Albanians. There were no Croats at all in Dalmatia.

Kostić further quoted similar data subsequently offered by Lejean, Ubicini, Brachelli, Hofmann, Friedrich von Hellwald, Theobald Fischer, Edmond Plogy, Henry Gedau, Aleksander Hexy, etc., who frequently referred to Safarik. Kostić's reference to Spiridon Gopčević's book entitled *The Serbs and Serbia* published in Leipzig in 1888, is especially interesting. The book shows the intentions the Hapsburg crown had in relation to the Serbian people: "The Court of Vienna was frequently referring to the fact that a large number of Serbs lived under its authority, using it to motivate its renewed claims on certain territories (e.g. Bosnia-Herzegovina). However, the situation was the most interesting when King Milan, who had previously notified the interested powers of his intention, wanted to declare himself king. Milan wanted to declare himself the 'Serbian King' but Austria protested, claiming that more Serbs lived within its borders than in Serbia; consequently, Milan had to declare himself 'King of Serbia' rather than of the Serbs. The Vienna Emperor thought that, if anyone was entitled to call himself 'Serbian King', it was he" (p. 65).

e) The 20th Century – The Century of Fraud

The beginning of the 20th century brought about ever more brazen falsifications. These falsifications were primarily launched by the Croatian and Catholic circles, who were often supported by Western European authors, who acted under the strong influence of the Vatican propaganda. The falsifications were not so evident in terms of mere figures as they were in the systematic efforts to present the *Bunjevci*, *Sokci*, Catholic Slavonians, Dalmatians, Bosnians and Herzegovinians as Croats and impose the Croatian national consciousness on them, even though they never had such a consciousness historically and were never ethnically close to the Croatian people.

However, as Kostić stated, "the Croats achieved the greatest level of their national balance in Yugoslavia, where their number was increased to unimaginable heights while the Serbs, in comparison to the Croats, showed the weakest cohesion ever, only to suffer such losses in the second Yugoslavia that were unexpected even by the worst pessimists or fiercest enemies of the Serbs" (p. 72). The censuses conducted in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia did not register the nationality, only the language spoken and religion practiced by its population. The idea that was advocated was that the Serbs and the Croats spoke the same language. The declaration of religion represented a basis for the false

IT-03-67-T
representation of the Catholic Serbs as Croats; researchers would subsequently represent them in this way almost regularly. "Then came WWII and the communist rule. In WWII, hundreds of thousand of Serbs were killed by the Croats and their allies (the Croats murdered at least eighty percent of them however). And when the 'liberation' came, Serbdom was disintegrated through a decree. Rule was taken over by the worst enemies of the Serbdom: Josip Broz, Milovan Đilas, Moša Pijade and their clique. Their first decree was issued to disintegrate and break up Serbdom. Two new nationalities were established by this decree: the Macedonian and the Montenegrin. The decree generally advocated the following principle: 'As far as possible from Serbdom'. After they had taken over power, identification with the Serbian nation was despised to say the least. Then ensued what Njegoš described after Kosovo: 'The volatile and the greedy renounced their Serbdom' (p. 75). The census of 1948 was completely falsified by the pressure exerted on citizens not to declare themselves as Serbs and by misrepresentation of the final figures.

Deafening communist propaganda showered the public with statements about the most democratic and truthful census ever conducted. As Kostić commented, "everyone was indeed free to declare his nationality according to the given scheme – everyone but a Serb. Anyone in the entire state could say that he was a Croat, Slovene, Macedonian, Montenegrin, German, Italian, etc. but a Serb was not allowed to say he was a Serb in the two so-called republics – Montenegro and Macedonia. Such pressure was exerted there during the census that a person was rarely brave enough to declare himself a Serb. The census bodies were authorized to instruct such a person about the authorities' policy. I have authentic proof of this that specifically concerns Boka. My own family, my own mother, etc. were forced to say that they were not Serbs but 'Montenegrins'. The state cannot take pride in such performance or the statistics that tolerated and even encouraged such actions, let alone that this census was to be praised as a hitherto unachieved ideal" (p. 77).

Given the a huge percentage of the illiterate population and the justifications of the repressive regime, statistical abuse became a general rule that led to an unbelievable use of statistical science as an instrument, since statistics are suitable for numerical manipulations of all sorts. Kostić noted that the census clerks filled in the forms on behalf of the majority of the population, putting "a Montenegrin" or "a Macedonian" without the knowledge of the census subject" (p. 77). If someone declared himself Dalmatian, Istrian or *Bunjevac*, he would immediately be classified as a Croat, which was even admitted by the official analysts in their final study of the statistical data processing. "It was evident that the processing of the material was not only influenced in the field but later in the statistical institution as well, by the policy of reducing the Serbian national volume as much as possible. This practice was applied successively and 'the managers' did not hide it. When someone said he was a Dalmatian, Istrian or *Bunjevac*, he obviously wanted to distance himself from the Croatiandom that was imposed on

Comment [K.B.27]: Translator's note. We were unable to find author of this name in any of our sources. Suggested spelling

him. He did not want that, but what he had tried to avoid was subsequently registered next to his name in the Statistical Bureau. Many Italians were registered as Croats at the time. They would say that they were Dalmatians or Istrians out of fear, but the Central Bureau would register them as Croats” (p. 78).

f) Statistical Abuse and Manipulations

Statistically speaking, while the number of Croats was increased artificially, the number of Serbs was systematically reduced. “If a person stated he was a *Bokelj* (this answer was always put as the first in the publication as it must have been the most frequent), he did it in order to avoid declaring himself ‘a Montenegrin’. However, this thing that the census subject wanted to avoid was imposed on him in Belgrade. On the other hand, ‘a Serb-Montenegrin’ wanted to say that he was a Serb by nationality, but a Montenegrin by region. He even put the Serbian designation in first place. But in vain – he would be presented as a Montenegrin anti-Serb (in contrast to Serb). A similar thing would happen to a Serb-Gypsy. Though objectively he was a Gypsy, he subjectively wanted to declare himself as a Serb since, as noted in the Introduction (*NB.* the Introduction to the official census results publication, V.S.), for the first time in the history of Yugoslav censuses, each individual was given full freedom to declare the nationality he belonged to” (p. 78). As Kostić stated, the communist proclamations were always “lies, plain lies. Even if such freedom did exist, it was useless when the central statistical institution classified people however it wanted” (p. 78).

These cases are unprecedented in the history of statistics and they seriously compromised the Yugoslav statistical science as a blind servant of the Titoist dictatorial regime. Stating that, in view of the general political circumstances, the remaining Germans also declared themselves as Croats, Kostić made the following summary: “I believe that my statistical instinct will not fail me if I find that the census of 1948 showed at least 200,000 more Croats and almost a million less Serbs than actually existed by registering all their new compatriots (*Bunjevci, Šokci*, various Catholics of Bosnia, etc.) as Croats” (p. 79).

Similar statistical abuse and manipulations were also significantly exploited in Macedonia. Kostić pointed out that, without doubt, “in a free census in Macedonia, many people would have indicated their nationality as Macedonian, most probably the majority. However, it is beyond doubt that there would have been a lot of Serbs as well, at least one hundred thousand. There are too many indications pointing to such a conclusion. Nevertheless, the most anti-Serb census pressure was exercised in Macedonia, where many minorities were forced to declare themselves as Macedonians – just in order to inflate the number of this artificial nationality as much as possible and justify its national independence. (Similar things happened with ‘the Montenegrins’.)” (p. 79).

The most striking statistical manipulations were employed on the

IT-03-67-T

number of registered Gypsies. Kostić noted that he was surprised “that, out of a total of 72,000 Gypsies in the entire territory of Yugoslavia, 52,000 of them lived in Serbia alone. It all became clear after the comments made in the Introduction. In Serbia they would register each Gypsy as a Gypsy, but in other provinces they assigned them to the majority nationality. That is why ‘The People’s Republic of Croatia’ had just 405 Gypsies, with 264 of them living in Baranja. Accordingly, there remained only 141 Gypsies in the entire area of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia! There are more Gypsies in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Macedonia than in Serbia, but they were registered there either as Muslims or Macedonians. The official results thus showed that there were 442 Gypsies in Bosnia, while in reality there are tens of thousands of them. What is even more important, only the Serbian Gypsies are de-Gypsied if one may use the term, as most of them do not even speak their Gypsy language, while the Macedonian and Bosnian Gypsies are the most primitive and are completely separated from the rest of the population, without even being aware of nationality. The Serbian Gypsies were denied the right to declare themselves as Serbs even when they wanted to, while the Macedonian and Bosnian Gypsies were incorporated into nationalities they were not aware of” (p. 79). On top of all this, the authors of this introductory study lamented the fact that a large number of Gypsies in Serbia still nationally declared themselves as Serbs.

In the third chapter of his book, Lazo Kostić specifically addressed the issue of Dalmatia, to which the Croats constantly laid historical and ethnic claims; the more suspicious these claims became, the more brazenly they were propagated. As Kostić rightfully concluded, “as far as the ‘historical right’ is concerned, nowadays that has no meaning whatsoever, nor is it given any weight by acclaimed scholars. The theory of ‘historical rights’ was created as a response to the French Revolution. This theory proclaimed the national principle as the only authoritative principle in the foundation of a state: each nation is entitled to its state roof and all the scattered parts of a nation to their unification under one roof. However, the application of this principle could lead to the complete transformation and rearrangement of all the European states, especially the larger ones that defeated Napoleon. It would break and decompose all these states. Such an appealing idea as that of the right to self-determination, could not be opposed by the idea of sheer force. They opposed it however by the idea of fictitious and dubious ‘rights’ – by construing the theory of ‘historical rights’” (p. 85). There is not a single valid modern international legal document that refers to any historical rights whatsoever. “The 20th century put an end to this idea and there are only two nations in Europe, and most probably in the whole world, that raise the question of ‘historical rights’ today – the Hungarians and the Croats. Both of these nations do not have any other, clearer or more powerful arguments to support their territorial claims” (p. 85).

Lazo Kostić was of the opinion that “historical rights were as preposterous as they were immoral, as anachronistic as they were anti-

democratic” (p. 85). Regardless of their nature, the mere suggestion of Croatian historical rights regarding Dalmatia is utterly suspicious. “Even if these historical rights were indeed effective, the Croats could only lay claims to some parts of Dalmatia – not to the whole of Dalmatia; even so, their claims would be only in the fourth or fifth place, even in terms of those parts of Dalmatia that used to be under their rule (i.e. under Croatian rulers who would be the only ones that could claim these rights if they were effective)” (p. 85). The reference was made to the Greeks, Hungarians, Italians, etc. Kostić emphasized that he did not understand “how all these nations could be circumvented – those who preceded and succeeded the Croats and those who held the whole of Dalmatia for at least twice as long as the Croats held some of its parts – how can all of them be circumvented and their rights neglected, just to achieve this ‘right’ of the Croats?” (p. 85).

In his book entitled *The Political Letters of a Dalmatian*, published in Zadar in 1920, Luka Poduje, a Catholic Dalmatian, simply ridiculed the Croatian ambitions, considering the onetime Croatian step into some parts of Dalmatia a mere historical incident with no significant qualitative repercussions. Croatian claims are absurd and based on pure falsifications. As Poduje concluded, “a onetime Croatian intrusion into our province, which happened a long time ago, managed to create the alleged historical right to Dalmatia – with the help of cunning and perfidious mystifications” (p. 85).

Karl Gottlieb Hugelmann and his associates – renowned jurists and historians – were absolutely clear and precise in respect to the history of Dalmatia in their book entitled *The National Rights of Austria*, published in 1934, and Kostić quoted them extensively: “Since the end of the 4th century, Dalmatia has been a bone of contention between the East and the West. It eventually came under Byzantine rule and stayed within the Empire until it came into the possession of the Slavs. In the first half of the 7th century, the Croats settled in the north and the Serbs in the south of Dalmatia, the inland area of which was called ‘Croatia’ from then on, while the term Dalmatia was used to designate the littoral towns only. At the end of the 8th century, the Croats fell under Frankish rule, unlike the Serbs who had managed to maintain their independence. Afterwards, the Doge of Venice styled himself as ‘the Herzog of Dalmatia’. Only Dubrovnik remained free of the Venetian authority. A new Croatian kingdom was established in Dalmatia in the mid 11th century, when Zvonimir, the second heir of Stefan, received a feudal benefice from the Pope; nevertheless, Zvonimir had to recognize the sovereignty of the Republic of Venice in 1085. Then the Croats turned to King Ladislaus of Hungary and subjected themselves to his nephew Coloman. Since then (1100), the towns of Dalmatian Primorje were disputed territories between Hungary and Venice throughout the Middle Ages; only Dubrovnik and Kotor successfully preserved their independence. A part of Primorje subsequently joined King Béla III and the south of it was occupied by the Nemanjić dynasty. Yet, from time to time, the Venetians still managed to subject these towns to their rule; eventually even Dubrovnik had to recognize Venetian rule in 1358” (p. 86). The

Serbs ruled the territory south of the Cetina River for much longer than the Croats held the areas north of this age-old border line between the Serbs and the Croats on the Adriatic coast.

The 17th century, Dalmatian historian Ioannes Lucius had certain documents of priceless historical value in his possession, which were discovered much later among his belongings by Croatian historian Miho Barada and sent to Serbian academician and the most authoritative scholar of the medieval history Mihailo Dinić. He published the most significant documents from this collection in Belgrade in 1955 under the title *Three Charters from the Collection of Ivan Lučić*. One of these charters was the Charter of King Stefan Vladislav, issued on 23 June 1237 in Kovačići near Omiš. Another Croatian historian, Forčić, confirmed that this charter corroborated the fact that the Cetina River was the border between Serbia and Hungary at that time, while there was no mention of the Croats and Croatia.

Moreover, Anna Comnena wrote long ago about the Zeta rulers Mihailo and Bodin, as well as the dukes of Dalmatia; the rulers of the House of Nemanjić also had Dalmatia, Zadar, Split, Trogir, Dubrovnik and many other littoral towns in their royal titles, while these towns and the majority of the Dalmatian islands had never been a part of Croatia. These are commonly known facts that were confirmed by many Hungarian and Croatian historians. As the German scientist Max Braun wrote in his book entitled *The Balkan Slavs*, published in 1941, “The Dalmatian towns were openly sympathetic towards the Republic of the Lagoons and were more fond even of Hungarian sovereignty than the rule of the Croatian kings” (p. 88). The Venetians ruled Dalmatia for almost four centuries and then Austria subjected it to its direct rule with no ties with Croatia, which had a completely different status until 1918.

As Ferdo Šišić, the most prominent Croatian historian, wrote in the encyclopaedic entry on the Croats, “At the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th centuries, today’s term Dalmatia, covering an area as far as the Neretva River, was created in relation to Venetian rule. As the Venetian governance spread across the Adriatic coast and within the continental area (Zagorje), the name of ‘Dalmatia’ was becoming increasingly widely used. Dubrovnik and its territory was not considered an independent Republic, but a part of Dalmatia, as was the Venetian Bay of Kotor (as of 1420), which bore the name of ‘Venetian Albania’. It was not until 1485, when Austria subjected the entire Coast and today’s Zagorje bordering with Bosnia, Herzegovina and Montenegro to its rule that the official name of Dalmatia would spread to include all the areas from the delta of Zrmanja to Budva” (p. 88).

It is a universally accepted historiographic fact that Dalmatia was a conglomerate of a number of territories with different levels of autonomy and clearly defined legal systems. When Dalmatia was ceded to Austria pursuant to the decisions reached at the Congress of Vienna, there was no mention of any Croatian historical rights; when Bosnia was occupied by and subsequently annexed to Austria, the authorities of Vienna would only invoke Hungarian historical rights. The fact that the Ban of Croatia was formally called ‘Croatian, Slavonian and Dalmatian’

did not mean anything in practice as his rule had never included any part of Dalmatia.

g) Legal Science vs “Historical Rights”

The Dalmatian Serbs in particular have never been under any Croatian rule. “During Venetian times, and even under the Turks, the Dalmatian Serbs had significant autonomy. Even if the supreme rule was not Serbian, the local governance was in Serbian hands. This fact is corroborated by authentic documents from the Venetian times. The Venetians were rather cautious about infringing on these Serbian rights and customs” (p. 90). The largest part of the preserved documents refer to the *Morlaci* Captain Stojan Janković. The authentic legal decrees of that time show “that the self-governance was not a mere formality and that the Venetians could not simply impose their personnel and agents as leaders. It is clear that the supreme leaders of the *Morlaci* could appeal a decision of the Interim Proveditor and the military commander. The documents confirm that the areas were conquered by the Serbs themselves and that the Venetians received them as a gift. These *Morlaci* had no Serbian state in their vicinity to unite this territory with and Austria, with its even more reckless proselytism, could not find a fertile ground among the Serbian rebels” (p. 90). The Serbs of Dalmatia have never been serfs and slaves. Such a fate largely befell the Catholics on the Islands, who were completely deprived of their rights.

Modern legal science simply does not recognize any historical rights; even if it did, it would have to consider both the factors that affirm such rights, as well as the factors that negate them. For example, rebellions and uprisings negate the legitimacy and effectiveness of certain regimes, but those rebellions and uprisings are more frequently the means by which certain social groups express their discontent with the prevailing legal circumstances. When wars are added into the equation, it is clear that no historical rights can withstand the test of time, because such rights are static by nature; whereas history is by its nature dynamic, and is apparently becoming even more dynamical. When the Serbs settled in large numbers into the areas of Slavonia, Dalmatia, Lika, Banija and Kordun, they did not find any traces of Croatian historical rights. They found themselves in a territory that was firmly under Austrian and Venetian rule; and, if Austria and Venice had at a certain point decided to abandon those areas, there would not have been any Croats there to establish Croatian rule on the basis of some imaginary historical right. The Croats had already virtually disappeared as a people, and the catholic circles were yet to devise the revival of their national substratum through the catholicisation of the Serbian ethnic masses.

According to Constantine Porphyrogenitus, ever since the Serbs and the Croats settled on the Balkans in the 7th century, during the rule of Byzantine Emperor Heraclius, the border between them was along the rivers Cetina and Vrbas. No serious historian has ever contested this fact, and it was confirmed by Mavro Orbin and Andrija Zmajević on the Serbian side, as well as by Joan Lucius of Trogir, and by Croatsians

IT-03-67-T

Franjo Rački, Šime Ljubić, Toma Maretić and many others. All of the more significant foreign historians and Slavists also agree with this fact. As Kostić states, “The Croatian people did indeed live for centuries in continental Dalmatia north of Cetina, up until the 16th century and the emergence of the Turks. Afterward they fled for their lives, leaving their homes to be inhabited by others. The Croats were not expelled, but rather they left their homes on their own, fearing the initial onslaught of the Turks. Nikodim Milaš, who dealt with this issue most thoroughly, and who published his research in the book entitled *Orthodox Dalmatia*, states, “The fact that the people of the Roman Catholic faith, i.e. the Croats of inland Dalmatia, left their residences and fled before the Turks is confirmed by all the writers who have written about or who write about Dalmatia. They describe the Turkish onslaught in Dalmatia during that war as being horrible, and state that the entire Croatian people emigrated from the areas conquered by the Turks [...] All the Dalmatian Croats and their clergy fled before the Turks: some of them moved to the fortified coastal Venetian towns, while the majority settled in the peaceful Dalmatian islands where they still represent the exclusive population; many of them crossed over to Italy on galleys and found refuge mainly *nella terra degli Abbsurri*” (p. 94).

Milaš also refers to the works of Friar Zlatović and Venetian Andrea Barbato, who state that almost all the Catholics had been evicted, and that all the churches had been destroyed. “Concisely put, all the autochthonous Roman Catholics fled from the lands now occupied by the Turks, and deserted the entire continental Dalmatia, which had once been the cradle and heart of the Croatian State” (p. 94). As the Croatian historian Tadija Smičiklas writes, “only the towns remained, and as many people as could fit into them” (p. 94). Similar conclusions were drawn by Jovan Erdeljanović: “Practically all of the old Croatian population left the area, so that as early as the 17th century, many lands remained deserted or scarcely populated, despite emigration from other areas” (p. 94). The deserted lands were populated by the Serbs, and Milaš writes about this: “Dalmatian lands from the Zrmanja River to the Cetina that had been deserted by the Croats were subsequently populated mainly by the Serbian people from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and from Old Serbia as well. This had been the greatest migration of Serbs to Dalmatia, and all writers mention it” (p. 94). Milaš especially referred to Andrea Barbato, “who, in his report to the Venetian government, confirmed that several thousand Serbian families moved to Dalmatia in 1527 and occupied the entire area of the Knin Frontier, Bukovica and Kotari” (p. 95).

In his book entitled *The Historical Significance of the Serbs in Croatia*, published in Belgrade in 1940, Radoslav Grujić writes that the mass migrations of the Serbs to Dalmatia took place during much earlier dates. “One of our currently oldest known documents testifying to the importance of the Serbian migration to northern Dalmatia is the letter by Doge Francesco Foscarini of Venice written to Duke Alexander of Zadar and the local Captain Marco on 20 December 1428, in which the Doge emphasized that the emigration of the Serbs into our Dalmatian lands

268/57440

was very beneficial: not only for our rule, but also for our subjects and believers in those lands” (p. 95).

In the book entitled *The Balkan Peninsula and the Southern Slavic Countries* published in 1922, Jovan Cvijić states that it is a proven fact that “the first migrations from the Dinaric hinterland to Dalmatia took place as early as the 12th century, but the more massive and most important migrations, which included almost the entire population of the Dinaric highlands, occurred during Venetian and Turkish rule, and lasted until the end of the 18th century. The Orthodox were often brought there by the Turks in order to cultivate the land, and they crossed over to Venetian territory either individually or in groups [...] The Orthodox population settled in Bukovica, Ravni Kotari, around Knin and in the upper parts of the Cetina Basin; in Vrlika and the surrounding area there are even emigrants from Montenegro [...] There are also Serbian Uniates in these areas. Together with Senj, this is the most renowned *Uskoci* land in Dalmatia [...] Therefore, the chief process here is the replacement of the medieval population, that had settled in Dalmatia during the Migration Period, with a new Dinaric-Balkan population that emigrated here during Venetian and Turkish times” (p. 95).

Cvijić was even more specific in his book entitled *The Migrations and Ethnic Processes of Our People*, published in Sarajevo in 1922: “Almost the entire population of Boka Kotorska originates from Montenegrin and Herzegovinian emigrants. A significant part of the population inhabiting the surrounding area of Dubrovnik is of Bosnian and Herzegovinian descent; the population of the towns of Dubrovnik, Makarska, Omiš, Split and Šibenik is primarily of Bosnian-Herzegovinian origin; the inhabitants of Bukovica, Ravni Kotari and northern Dalmatia are also almost exclusively of Bosnian and Herzegovinian descent” (p. 95).

In the collection of documents entitled *Scripts on the History of the Orthodox Church in the Dalmatian-Istrian Bishopric Between the 15th and 19th Century*, published in Latin in Zadar in 1899, Nikodim Milaš uses precise sources to prove that after the Treaty of Karlowitz (Karlovcı) of 1699 and the Treaty of Passarowitz (Požarevac) of 1718, the Venetians encountered Serbian Orthodox populations in the newly acquired territories of Ravni Kotari, Bukovica, the Knin Frontier, Petrovo Polje, Kosovo Polje, the hinterland of Split, and the plateaus of the Cetina and Sinj as far as the Neretva River. Boško Desnica also published many documents that corroborate this fact in his two-volume book *The History of the Uskoci of Kotor* printed in Belgrade in 1950 and 1951.

Jovan Radonjić states the following in his book published in Belgrade in 1950, entitled *The Roman Curia and the Southern Slavic Lands Between the 16th and 19th Centuries*: “Serbian migrations into the Dalmatian hinterlands during the first half of the 16th century were so intense and frequent that this region gained an appearance of an almost purely Serbian land [...] The influx of Serbian refugees from the frontier of the Turkish Empire into Habsburg lands was far less intense than their emigration into the lands of the Republic of Venice [...] In the 16th and

IT-03-67-T

17th centuries, a Serbian wave flooded Dalmatian towns, their surroundings, and some of the islands such as Hvar, thereby strengthening the older, local population, while the more affluent and eminent Serbs settled into cities” (p. 98).

Interestingly, Radonjić referred to the Archbishop of Split’s request to the Vatican in 1622 saying, “that a good and dependable missionary should be sent to him so that the town of Split would not schismatise completely” (p. 98). The report by Apostolic Vicar Nikola Blašković submitted on 20 October 1692 to the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples (formerly the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith) has been preserved, and contains his proposal about how the Orthodox Serbs could be “discretely and gradually converted to the Catholic faith through Uniatism” (p. 98).

In his study entitled *Jeronim Paštrić, the 17th Century Historian*, published in 1946 in the *Bulletin of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts*, Radonjić describes how on 16 September 1742, at a session of the special board of the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples, a consultant identified “the areas where Illyrian is spoken, and included among them ‘the entire part of Hungary inhabited by the *Raška* peoples’, and then emphasized the need for learning the language used in a large part of Southeast Europe. He stated that the Serbs (*Serviani*) – the Schismatics of the Greek rite who speak Serbian – were especially numerous. They live throughout Croatia, Slavonia, Hungary, Bosnia, Serbia, Bulgaria, Thrace, Macedonia, Albania, Dalmatia, where they dwell mixed with the Catholics; and in Montenegro, their special homeland, in which there are no Catholics. The problem is, as the consultant further explained, that the Serbs are not only inhabiting areas in Turkey, but there are also many of them in the lands of the Austrian house and in the Republic of Venice, such as the Bishoprics of Kotor, Makarska, Trogir, Šibenik, Skradin, Zadar and Nin, where the number of Serbs by far exceeds that of Catholics” (p. 99).

Kostić also cites the text written in 1744 by Bishop Matija Karaman of Kotor, who was also referred to by Milaš. The text states, among other things, that: “During the War of Vienna, there was no Serbian Bishop in the vicinity of Zadar; yet the whole upper side was inhabited by Serbs who had at the time moved from Bosnia [...] After the last war, those same Serbs that had left Turkey settled into the region of Imot, although they knew that there was no bishop of their canon” (p. 101). In his work entitled *Illyricum Sacrum*, published in 1775, Farlati also states that Dalmatia was full of the Serbs, or Morlachs of the Greek rite. In that same year, Venetian Provveditor Jacob Gradenigo stated that the majority of the Dalmatian population was of the Serbian canon. In a large number of the 18th-century written addresses by the Dalmatian Orthodox population to the Doge of Venice, those Venetian subjects identified themselves as a Slavic-Serbian people of the Greek canon of the Eastern Church.

h) Ethnographic Relations in Dalmatia

One of the most recognized authorities of Dalmatian circumstances, Fran Peter, wrote the following in the first half of the 19th century: "As Dalmatia is a Slavic land, so is the language of the majority of the population Slavic, more precisely Serbian" (p. 103). In the book entitled *Travels in Istria, Dalmatia and Montenegro* published in Teil in 1851, the renowned German travel-writer Kohl elaborates on the issue as follows: "Apparently, the Serbs settled in the south (of Dalmatia) a long time ago; but when the Croatian authorities and nobility succumbed to the Hungarians, and even more so when the Serbs came into conflict with the Turks, the migrations of Serbian refugees to the coastal areas became more frequent, as they were pushed towards that territory by the Turks. Thus, besides the southern regions that had belonged to Serbia since much earlier times, the northern Croatian areas became increasingly – so to say – Serbianized. It appears that here, at the Adriatic Sea, something similar to what occurred in the North happened, along the Danube, where the Serbian *Uskoci* (refugees) founded a new Serbian land in today's Vojvodina. Accordingly, the Croatian tribe withdrew more and more, while the Serbian tribe established its rule in all of Dalmatia, especially in its central and southern parts. . . The inhabitants of Boka, the residents of the Dubrovnik region and its islands, the frontier residents of the Neretva and Cetina rivers, or the so-called Morlachs and *Uskoci*, are of especially pure Serbian origin, while Morlachs in the north areas of the Krka River are a mixture of Serbs and Croats, though the Serbs are predominant; on the other hand, the boarder guards of Zrmanja and Velebit must be considered as rather pure Croats, as well as the inhabitants of the islands where the Croatian tribe has remained preserved. . . The brave *Neretljani*, who, in the Middle Ages founded an unusual marauder state on the banks of the Neretva River and managed to maintain it during a twenty-year battle with the Venetians; the Montenegrins who still fight the Turks; the entrepreneurial *Bokelji*; the republicans of the Poljica canton, the sworn enemies of the Turks; and the Morlachs and *Uskoci* are all essentially part of the Serbian tribe" (p. 103). Kohl further states that the folk traditions and poetry of Dalmatians are completely the same as among the rest of the Serbs. While the Dalmatian hinterland is inhabited exclusively by the Serbs, the coastal region, according to Kohl, is also populated by Greeks, Romans, Venetians, Hungarians, Spaniards, Turks, Albanians, Frenchmen, Normans, Bretons, Germans, Lapydes, Illyrians, Liburnians, Celts and various Slavs.

Kostić further explains that the name Morlach "is derived from the Greek term *Mauro-Vlach*, meaning the Black Vlach, which is the name the autochthonous inhabitants of Dalmatia used to designate the emigrants who looked dark, of dark complexion. . . There is something derogatory in this term, but also something that intimidates and flatters" (p. 104). The name Morlachs was a synonym for the Serbs. Fran Peter wrote the following about them: "The name Morlach is generally used to denote the highland peasants of the (continental) Dalmatian hinterlands. Their number could be as high as 150,000 souls, two thirds of which are Catholics and the rest of which are non-Uniate Greeks [...] They have

IT-03-67-T
their settlements in the counties of Zadar and Split. They are unknown of in Dubrovnik and Kotor [...] They are pure Serbs and Bosnians. The mid 15th century should be considered the time of their emigration. It appears that they willingly broke away from Turkish pressure and moved to the Dalmatian highlands, where they believed they would be better off under Christian rule" (p. 100).

In a collection of works published in 1845, the English scientist Paton noted in an entry by the name of *Serbia* that the Dalmatian Morlachs were Serbs from the Adriatic coast. "In his character, the Morlach portrays many traits of the Southern Slavs; he is indeed a Serb of the Adriatic coast. . . Marriages by abduction in the old Serbian style still occur from time to time [...] The position of women under the Morlachs largely corresponds to the position of their sisters in Serbia. . . Many of their similarities with the Serbs originate from a common language, a common descent and even common customs" (p. 105).

Karl von Czoernig stated that the Morlach of Istria were also Serbs. In the book entitled *On the Origin of Bunjevci*, Jovan Erdeljanović wrote that "Ivan Lovrić, born in Sinj, in his work from 1776 notes that 'Those in Dalmatia who are called *Rkači*, i.e. Greeks, because of their Greek faith, are of the same ethnicity as the Morlachs of the Latin rite . . . they speak the same language and sing about Prince Marko Kraljević in their folk songs'" (p. 106). Kohl, Peter, Samitro, Johann Christian Engel and Count Lujo Vojnović all emphasized that the whole of Dalmatia sang about Marko Kraljević, and as Lazo Kostić noted, nowhere would a song "be sung about Zvonimir, Tomislav, Svačić and other Croatian rulers, be they real or imaginary" (p. 106).

During all the decades and centuries of Turkish occupation, the neighbouring countries gladly received the Serbian refugees. "The Serbs do not flee to the rear line to hide and save themselves, but to reorganize and better prepare for the battle. Before they are properly settled, before they are given permanent residence, their men are already on the front lines, in battle. They do not ask for a break, for rest, and often not even for equipment. They will get the weapons from the enemy. That is why Serbian migrations usually stop at the very borders. While the Croats fled from the Turks as far as Moravia, fearing to stay any closer, the Serbs did not want to part with the border. Patriarch Carnojević and his suite were pushed back into the far rear (that was an intentional action of the Catholics, with the aim of leaving the Serbs who were concentrated at the border without their spiritual leader, and without significant support in manpower), but he and his group always did their best to come closer to the border whenever they got an opportunity. Hence two significant consequences: every person, and every state ruler gladly accepted Serbian refugees, because they came to their areas not as beggars, but as fighters who defended their new masters more than they defended themselves. So, in this way the Serbs, perhaps unintentionally, expanded their ethnic territory instead of being lost in a sea of foreign religion, which would have been the case had they moved far away from their national core" (p. 107).

i) The Processes of Uniatism and Catholicization of the Serbs

Jovan Cvijić wrote about these processes in his book entitled *The Balkan Peninsula and Southern Slavic Countries – Basics of Anthropogeography*, more precisely in the second volume, under the subtitle *The Psychological Traits of the South Slavs*, which specifically notes the following: “The Dinaric people that settled in the Dalmatian Zagorje were not driven by economic reasons. They left the rich and fertile lands for areas that are, along with Montenegro and Lika, the poorest parts of the Balkan Peninsula. The reasons of their emigration are of moral nature, as they could not reconcile with bearing the adverse and violent rule that oppressed them; ignoring material interests, they left their homeland to search for a hospitable home. Thus they demonstrated the best traits of their character: endurance in struggle, perseverance in danger and deep faith in the future. They changed under the influences of the geographic environment and historical circumstances. Yet, their significant psychological features have been preserved[...] All the new emigrants that moved to the Adriatic region between the ends of the 15th and 18th centuries belonged to a patriarchal population, mostly from the *Erski/Herzegovinian* subtype, and the vast majority of them spoke the *Shtokavian* dialect [...] This was often the best element of the Dinaric population, which could not bear Turkish rule. Energetic and independent, [...] they preferred these indigent Karst areas to the prosperous ones [...] These settlers were imbued with the national ideal. . . . that was intensified by the democratic sentiment of the 19th century; thus, the Zagora, as well as Šumadija, is one of the areas with the most developed national consciousness [...] The Orthodox emigrants gave the valley between Drniš and Knin in the Dalmatian Zagora the name Kosovo, the name of the field in which the famous battle took place. In that Kosovo, all the Zagora Serbs gather every year on Vidovdan” (p. 108).

Following the mass migration to Dalmatia, the Serbs were subjected to a systematic process of Uniatism and Catholicisation, i.e. denationalization and de-Serbianisation that had a more fatal effect on our national substance than the process of Islamization in the territories under Turkish occupation. In the previously cited two-volume book, published in Belgrade between the two World Wars, Cvijić writes about this issue as follows: “When they settled there in the time of the Venetians, the Serbs joined the Greek Orthodox parishes that were found only in the coastal region. The Serbs of Dalmatian Zagora were under the authority of the archbishop of Dabar-Bosnia seated in Sarajevo, while those from the coastal region were under the archbishop of Philadelphia in Venice; when the Venetians occupied all of Dalmatia, the Orthodox believers remained under the rule of that archbishop for a long time. Left without their churches, they attended Catholic masses and were buried by Catholic priests. About the middle of the 17th century, they were allowed to build Orthodox churches” (p. 112).

Cvijić provides a whole series of examples showing the multitude of

IT-03-67-T

“areas in which the Orthodox population converted to Catholicism or Uniatism, particularly in the Dubrovnik area (Pelješac and much of Konavle), in Dalmatia (*Dicmo* above Split, the area surrounding Makarska, etc), in Croatia (Zumberak), and in many areas in Bosnia and Slavonia. This occurred much more frequently than recorded, because in the earlier times certain families that moved into the Catholic environment without their church and priest would often gradually accustom to the Catholic rites and accept the Catholic religion. . . . Conversion of Orthodox Christians into Catholics occurred in Dalmatia, especially during the 18th century, which can be seen in the Franciscan reports. . . . The Franciscans provided numerous examples of thousands of the Orthodox people being converted into the Catholic faith [...] Indeed, the Orthodox were converted to Catholicism in much larger numbers than can be corroborated by documents and historical sources” (p. 112-113). Jovan Radonjić and Nikodim Milaš wrote extensively about this. In their works, they reference a whole series of examples of Serbian resistance to Uniatism and their disdain towards the Roman Church, which to them seemed even less acceptable than Islam. Not mellifluous promises, real privileges, violence nor cruelty could shake the vast majority of Serbs.

Those who converted were ostracized by their relatives and compatriots and horribly morally stigmatized for having sold their faith for a morsel of bread. “In this battle, many others would have succumbed much more easily than the Serbs; many others would have taken the bait, as the Serbs could expect only benefits from Uniatism: they would have been favoured by the authorities, their children would have been schooled at the state’s expense, and they would have been given jobs in public services (such as foresters, game-wardens, tax officers, policemen, etc.). Externally, nothing would have changed in their religious practice, because the Greek Catholics have the same liturgy as the Orthodox, their priests have beards and they marry, etc. Their Eucharist is the same. Only one word in the Lord’s Prayer (Vjeruju) is different, which primitive people do not notice. They would not even know that the clergy is subordinate to the Pope. However, our old Dalmatians, like all Serbs elsewhere, mostly refused all these privileges and benefits. They wanted to remain loyal to their faith, the unadulterated creed of their forefathers for which they had once already changed their domicile. They found it easier to sacrifice their homeland than their faith, because they knew that only the pure Serbian Orthodox Faith of Saint Sava connected them with their ancestors, with their glorious past and nationality. That is why they considered their faith most holy, and were willing to sacrifice everything it” (p. 116).

Systematic proselytization would finally desist in 1848. “Wherever the Uniate Serbs found themselves in Serbian surroundings, they used every opportunity to return to their mother, the Church [...] In February 1849, a ministerial decree was issued, allowing everyone to convert from one Christian denomination to the other. On 4 March 1948, Orthodox Christianity in Austria was granted equal rights with other churches. The people took advantage of this legal framework, and under

265/57440

the state's protection, the large majority returned to the church in which they had been originally baptised. Uniatism withered almost completely away, although it was still supported by the Catholic Church" (p. 117). Nevertheless, the hatred towards Orthodox Schismatics was continually instigated by the highest Vatican circles. This hatred pervaded in every Croatian political move in the following hundred years, and culminated during World War II, fully revealing the criminal nature of the Roman Catholic Church, and the Croatian people as their blind and senseless tool.

Regardless of the high percentage of Dalmatian Catholics, all renowned and recognised scientists considered nearly the entire population of Dalmatia to be Serbian. Kostić presented all the historically relevant statistical data on the religious structure of this region. In the previously quoted book, Pypin and Spasovich state the following: "The ethnographic ratios of Dalmatia can be outlined as follows: about 400,000 Slavs of the general Serbian tribe, 80,000 of which are Greek Orthodox – the majority of them are Catholics, 65,000 of them being Glagolitic – there are also around 20,000 higher-class Italians living in towns, about a thousand Albanians, several hundred Jews, and there is a small number of Germans [...] The Orthodox are now called Serbs, while the Catholics (although they are also Serbs) are called Latins or even *Sokci*, simply accepting the name given to them by the Orthodox Serbs, i.e. both groups use the local designations" (p. 129). Therefore, it was not a coincidence that the German publicist Albrecht Wirth wrote the following in 1914: "In 1815, all of Dalmatia, whose population is predominantly of Serbian blood, was ceded permanently to Austria at the Congress of Vienna [...] The most beautiful Serbs, both men and women, live in Dalmatia" (p. 129). French historian Ernest Denis wrote that there were 600,000 Serbian Dalmatians, and stated in 1925 that, "The issue of Dalmatia is quite simple: there is no issue of Dalmatia; Dalmatia is Serbian through and through" (p. 129).

However, on this matter, the opinions of the most renowned Dalmatian intellectuals are certainly the most significant. Nikola Tomazeo of Šibenik, in the middle of the last century, more precisely in 1861, stated in the *Letter to Dalmatians* that "no lie would be more insane, shameful, blasphemous and futile" than to have the Dalmatians declared as Croats, renouncing their own nation and forefathers. Tommaseo further describes how great the differences between the Dalmatians and the Croats were, adding that they "were created by nature, history and ancient customs that cannot be erased in a single stroke. Denying those differences, pretending not to see them and acting as though they do not exist would only make them stronger than ever, causing them to develop into a conflict. Let us begin with the body structure and facial features, which are so different between the two tribes that the Dalmatian and Serbian tribes look more like Polish tribes than Croatian ones. Their way of life is different, as well as their attire, which is also history; more importantly, the pronunciation of the language is different, which has been so much more delicately preserved in continental Dalmatia, that it is like the Tuscan dialect of Italy

compared to the dialects of Genoa and Bologna. The language and dialect differences observed among continental Dalmatia and the coast and islands, which can sometimes be noticed even between the coastal and inner parts of the towns, do not make any part of this people closer to the Croats; these linguistic differences are an argument which proves that there were many migrations of Slav families over a long period of time. Inasmuch as this proof is at least plausible, it provides evidence that the inhabitants of Dalmatia are not Croats" (p. 129-130).

Similar statements were written by the eminent Serbian Catholics Antonio Cippico and Lovro Monti; no serious writers ever claimed that the Dalmatians were actually Croats. Both Cippico and Monti mainly wrote in the Italian language. In his book on the Slavs, published in Leipzig in 1908, Austrian ethnographer Friedrich Krauss, who was born in Slavonska Požega, stated that it was an incontestable fact that the language spoken in Dalmatia is Serbian, as had been established much earlier by every significant Slavist, and thoroughly elaborated by Pypin and Spasovich, and Nicolae Iorga.

Kraus writes that, "The Turks conquered the Balkans only politically, never socially. A significant part of the Slavs of the Serbian tribe fled to Dalmatia, Primorje, Croatia, Istria and the Dalmatian islands. Thus, an embankment against the Romanization of Dalmatia and Germanisation of Croatia was gradually built [...] On the other hand, the Croatian dialect started to merge with and gradually almost completely melted into the Serbian one, which showed more vitality and had a fuller sound. Nowadays, the terms Croato-Serbian, or Serbo-Croatian language and literature relate to the Slavic dialect of the Serbian tribe and the literature written in that dialect" (p. 132). Iorga too speaks about the purely Serbian language of the inhabitants of Dalmatia, and the Serbian character of Dalmatian literature, actually stating that "throughout the Middle Ages, this Dalmatian Serbia had the Latin literature that racially belonged to the Serbs. However, the modern epoch brought a whole series of products of that same literature which is no longer Latin – it is Serbian" (p. 132).

j) Use of the Serbian Language

Peter too concluded that, "As Dalmatia is a Slavic land, so is the language of the majority of the population Slavic, in other words Serbian. . . The highlanders speak it more purely [...] In Primorje, the Serbian language received much Italianism" (p. 132). French ethnographer Lejean states that Illyrian "is the name the Serbs of Dalmatia use for their Slavic dialect" (p. 132). There was no mention of the Croatian language, save for the municipality of Poljica in central Dalmatia, which is known in legal history for its Statute of Poljica. In 1906, the Serbian Catholic Milan Rašetar wrote the following about Poljica: "Since the Turks never succeeded in conquering this small municipality, due to its advantageous geographic position [...] and the courage of its inhabitants, its old Croatian population remained largely preserved, as can be seen in the language of the inhabitants, which have

remained faithful to their Chakavian dialects, in spite of being surrounded by Shtokavian speakers [...] Thus a thorough ethnographic account of Poljice is of great significance, as it is the only area of continental Dalmatia where the old-Croatian populace remained virtually intact” (p. 133)

As regards the alphabet in use, the conclusion that stands out most is that of Constantine Jiricek, who claims that “in Dalmatia in the latter half of the Middle Ages, the Slavic language was only written in Glagolitic letters or Cyrillic. The use of the third, Latin alphabet, was a novelty of the 15th century [...] Dubrovians also wrote in Cyrillic, not only in their correspondence with the neighbouring rulers, local officials and in the legal documents concerning the merchants of adjacent countries, but sometimes also in Dubrovnik itself, in subpoenas and instructions issued to those Dubrovians who spoke Italian poorly, in private correspondence, etc.” (p. 134-135).

Jiricek further writes that “the realm of the Cyrillic alphabet spread” across the entire Adriatic coast, “from the Bojana to the Cetina rivers and as far as the gates of the Roman coastal towns” (p. 135). To support the above claims, Jiricek provides a multitude of evidence and examples of Cyrillic documents from Makarska, Brač, Hvar, Korčula, etc. Moreover, he elaborates on the usage of the Glagolitic alphabet stating: “One specific area was the region north of Split, near Klis and in the Cetina valley near Sinj, where Glagolitic books were used in churches; however, in 15th century the documents of this area were written in Cyrillic, under the influence of the documentation of neighbouring Bosnia” (p. 135). What is more, Vatroslav Jagić, the most prominent Croatian intellectual of his time, expressly confirmed that Cyrillic was the Dalmatian script.

Not only was the Dalmatian literature written in the Serbian language and alphabet, but it was also replete with the motifs from purely Serbian history. This is best reflected in the two famous anthologies of poetry compiled in 1756 and 1759 by Catholic Friar Andrija Kačić-Miošić under the title of *Pleasant Conversation of the Slavic People*. Jovan Cvijić writes the following about Kačić-Miošić: “His collection of folk songs is a true lecture on Serbian legends and patriotism, and its many editions are proof of its influence” (p. 137). Lujo Vojnović writes, “This Franciscan was of prophetic genius [...] he was the first to collect Serbian songs in the 18th century and, along with Tommaseo, he deserves full acknowledgement and respect” (p. 137).

The renowned Italian historian of literature Domenico Ciampoli noted the following in his work entitled *Slavic Literature*: “Only Andrija Kačić-Miošić (as the other Dalmatian writers of the 17th and 18th centuries were poor imitators of their famous predecessors) deserves to be mentioned as the precursor to the Serbian Renaissance and the interpreter of the needs of the forthcoming century” (p. 137). Bearing this in mind, it is no wonder that the 19th century saw the awakening of an exclusively Serbian national consciousness across Dalmatia, which worried the Vatican and sped up the process of the implementation of its artificial Croatian national project, in order to permanently capture away

the already Catholicised Serbs and prevent the national unity of the Serbs, regardless of their religious differences, that would have disturbed the long-term strategic plans of the Roman Catholic Church and halted the realization of its proselytistic ambitions.

Yet, until the end of the last century, such Catholic actions in Dalmatia were sporadic and had no real effect. “On the contrary”, as Lazo Kostić emphasizes, “it appears that the distancing from Croatianhood and insisting on the individual, Dalmatian, characteristics were already predominant throughout the 19th century, and even more so at the beginning of this century, until the unfortunate creation of Yugoslavia had once and for all thrown the Dalmatian Catholics into the arms of Croats” (p. 140). Granted, there were authors that insisted on the ethnical individuality of the Dalmatians in relation to both the Serbs and the Croats, but no one in their right mind attempted to prove that the inhabitants of Dalmatia were Croats. In 1893, Luka Poduje described the Croatian political fraud in the attempt to appropriate Dalmatia; “When the falsely disguised offer for unification that the brotherly Croatia offered to Dalmatia was practically unanimously rejected, Croatia expressed delight at its recognition by public celebrations and applause, in spite of the noble and dignified protests by the chief of Dalmatian delegates, Count Borelli” (p. 141).

k) The Manifestations of Serbdom in Dalmatian Towns

When the political actions aimed at ceding Dalmatia to Croatia intensified at the end of the 19th century, they were understood to be motivated by the intention to unite all the Slavs of Austria. Although every insistence on Croatianhood had a markedly anti-Serbian tone, even the Serbian politicians were generally willing to support such a union, because they wanted to free the Slavic territories from Hungarian dominance. They were aware of the fact that Vienna traditionally respected the national individualities much more than the unitarily and chauvinistically oriented Pest. On 17 October 1905, the Serbs adopted the Zadar Resolution, which, among other things, states: “Concerning the request for the reincorporation of Dalmatia into Croatia and Slavonia on the part of our Croatian brothers, [...] the Serbian parties are ready to invest their efforts into the realisation of this request provided that the Croatian side removes the obstacle which has thus far prevented the Serbian parties of Primorje from declaring unification, i.e. provided that the Croats recognize the equal rights of the Serbian and Croatian peoples” (p. 145).

In the eyes of the western Serbs, whether they be Orthodox or Catholic, or often Muslim as well, Serbia had taken on the role of Piedmont around the middle of the 19th century, despite the fact that their national consciousness had been deeply buried under layers of historic oblivion. Some spoke of Serbian leadership, while others of South Slavic leadership, but they were thinking the same thing. As the Dubrovian Duke Lujo Vojnović testifies in the book *Dalmatia*, published in Geneva and Lyons in 1917, the western Serbian lands were

under the immense influence of this “small Serbia, still a vassal state of the Ottoman Empire but led by Prince Mihajlo Obrenović with patriotism, who attracted the constant attention of the Dalmatians and their brothers. I still very clearly remember those Serbophile *conciliabules* (secret and prohibited gatherings – *L.M.K*) of our fathers; the cult of Kosovo poems imbued with vows of revenge and unification; the portraits of Serbian rulers, from the Grand Župan Nemanja to Mihajlo Obrenović, that were jealously safeguarded in the apartments of Split, Šibenik and Zadar” (p. 145-146).

During the sixties of the 19th century, even don Mijo Pavlinović, who would later become a sworn follower of Starčević, sent an article to the famous Serbophile Natko Nodilo to be published in the *Il Nazionale* magazine, wherein he stated that, “Dalmatia should secede from Austria and join the Principality of Serbia, an article which the editor could not publish by any means” (p. 245). Prvislav Grisogono writes about this event in his text entitled *Useful Reminders*, in the *Message* almanac published in London in 1954. Nikola Tomazi’s and Francesco Borelli’s expressed desire that Dalmatia should be joined with Serbia need not much elaboration. However, it is interesting to mention that many Italian publicists at the very beginning of the 20th century were much in favour of the unification of Dalmatia and Serbia. Kostić quotes Giuseppe Prezzolini, who states the following in his book entitled *Dalmatia*, published in Geneva in 1917: “Serbia has an age-old and deep empathy towards us. We do not know Serbia, but we cannot say that Serbia does not know us. The Italian culture has spread far more than one can believe. Once Dalmatia is united with Serbia, the thousands of Slavs of the Latin and Italian culture will join with the Slavs that had been under Greek or German influence” (p. 147).

Regarding the future of Dalmatia, Lujo Vojnović insists that “one should not speak of ceding Dalmatia to Serbia or some other entity as if it were a case of transfer of territories stripped of their nationality and identity; as if it were a case of political compensation, commercial or strategic, after the model of the Treaty of Campo Formio. One should very well know that Serbia has no more legal claim to Dalmatia than does any other state. On the contrary, the union of this land with Serbia is dictated by the principle of nationality and the eternal laws inevitably stemming thereof” (p. 148).

The Catholic Church was failing in its efforts to suppress the pro-Serbian sentiment among the people, so Archbishop Vincenzo Pulišić, in a letter he sent to the Austrian minister of education and religious in March 1915, complained as follows: “According to all those well-intentioned, Serbism in this land presents the greatest danger for the religion and the state” (p. 148). He was particularly upset by the behaviour of those who returned from America: “Recently, many of the people who had been good Catholics and loyal subjects before their departure to America expressed great sympathy for Serbia upon their return to Dalmatia. [...] Therefore, emigration should be limited. . . . Meanwhile, the imperial and royal consuls should be ordered to supervise the political views of the emigrants, and prohibit political

On 20 November 1912, Vienna dismissed the municipal councils of Split and Šibenik, due to overt propagation of Serbian ideas by the mayors of these two towns. As a reaction to this gesture, all the representatives of the central and provincial parliaments, as well as all the members of municipal assemblies, gathered in Zadar at the end of November and passed the so-called Zadar Resolution whereby they expressed their admiration towards their Serbian brothers for their glorious victories in the First Balkan War. Thus it is no wonder that twenty thousand citizens of Split welcomed the Serbian army in 1918 with delighted elation. Kostić quotes certain passages from the speech of the then-President of the Dalmatian State Government, Josip Smodlaka, as he addressed the Serbian soldiers with the following words: “Brothers dearest to our heart, you deathless knights of Serbdom [...] we welcome you undefeatable falcons. Welcome, our liberators, our proud and dearest elite. Blessed be the hour when we saw you. Blessed be your every step! Blessed be the mothers that gave birth to you! Blessed be the cradle that rocked you! Blessed be the deserted homes of yours that were clad in black so you could help us see this golden sun of freedom that now shines on us all. How much we have longed for this hour” (p. 149).

During WWI, many prominent Dalmatian patriots were killed before a firing squad or hanged for having overtly expressed their love towards Serbia, as it was considered a grave crime in the eyes of the Austro-Hungarian authorities. As Kostić writes, “not a single Dalmatian sacrificed his life for Croatia in World War I. Nor did they willingly do so in World War II. Perhaps some of them got killed in the places where they thought they could commit atrocities without the risk of capture. But otherwise, some Dalmatians knew only to shout: ‘We are ready for our homeland!’ for Croatia, and they would flee when in danger (much like their bosses in ‘Pannonian Croatia’). However, those who were faithful to Serbia remained faithful till the end, and were aware of their faith, because Serbia represented the ideal worthy of laying one’s life for; Croatia represented nothing more than a hell of malice, slaughter and betrayal” (p. 150).

Many foreign writers understood the situation in Dalmatia and the ethnic structure of the Dalmatian population; in the book entitled *Nationalities of Hungary*, published in Prague and Paris in 1873, Henry Gedau writes that the Serbian national consciousness of the Dalmatians would fully awaken when the Kingdom of Serbia expanded to include their territory. The Austrian government realised that too, and almost regularly appointed generals of Serbian ethnicity and the Orthodox faith as the Dalmatian envoys, while Archbishop Vincenzo Pulišić of Zadar complained in 1915 to the Austrian minister of education and religion, saying, “the presidents of the Dalmatian State Assembly and the State Council were almost without exception of the Eastern Greek religion. As soon as the state was constitutionally structured, for a long time, the presidents of the State Assembly were Dr. Petrović and Ljubiša Vojnović, one after the other, both of them being of the Eastern Greek faith. Even now, when the Serbs do not have their own president of the

State Assembly because of the lack of an appropriate person to appoint, Vice President Vladimir Vitez Simić is of the Eastern Greek religion” (p. 151). Bearing in mind that the elections were autonomous, this fact shows that the political influence of the Orthodox Serbs was immense, even among the Catholics.

From Viktor Novak’s *Magnum Crimen*, Kostić quotes several excerpts from the letter that Friar Oton Knezović of western Herzegovina sent to Ante Pavelić at the beginning of 1945, hissing with hate for the Dalmatians’ disloyalty to the Croatian Ustasha State. Knezović concluded that “the coastal Dalmatian towns are a terrible mixture of old Latins, Vlachs, Italians, Slavs and Croats, and from this conglomeration emerged a peculiar type of people who have never been Croats, nor have felt for the Croatian state. Today, it is even more so. The Dalmatian towns are to us what the Montenegrins are to the Serbs: power, money and egotism above all. In the ancient times they were the greatest Croatian misfortune, and remained so in the times of Austria and Yugoslavia. Even today, they would rather serve any other devil before the Independent State of Croatia. As soon as the situation slightly changes, they yell out, saying that they are the greatest Croats; but after Badoglio’s capitulation, it was discovered that those Dalmatians in Sarajevo were also Italian citizens. In Zagreb, one could hardly bear their shouts and the ecstasy they showed for the Headman and Croatia, as they numbered as many as fifty thousand. Yet, when they were subsequently supposed to form a Dalmatian legion, only 150 of them volunteered. They love to smuggle goods, those bastards! Let the Herzegovinians, Bosnians and inhabitants of Lika fight for them; but they will occupy the first positions in all the branches of our life. . . . That is why after the war, the Dalmatian citizens should be resettled across Bosnia, Slavonia and Croatia – no more than three of them together – and the inhabitants of Lika, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Zagorje should be settled into the coastal towns and harbours, as they are more reliable and will create a pure Croatian offspring. Then Dalmatia will be Croatian” (p. 152).

I) The Historical Mistake of the Serbs

Even under the Treaty of London of 26 February 1915, whereby the Entente powers granted territorial concessions to Italy in order to have it join their side in World War I, the Allies recognized the Serbians’ right to considerable parts of the Dalmatian coast. Therefore, in addition to designating the Italian parts of Dalmatia, the Allies specified the documents that were signed by the authorized representatives of Russia, England, France and Italy: “The following lands on the Adriatic Sea are granted by the Powers of the Quadruple Entente to the regions of Croatia, Serbia, and Montenegro: In the north of the Adriatic, the entire coast from Volosko (Volosca) Bay, on the border of Istria, clear to the northern border of Dalmatia, including the entire coast now belonging to Hungary, and the entire coast of Croatia, the gulf of Fiume [Rijeka], and the small gulfs of Movi [Novi] and Carlopago [Karlobag], and also the

IT-03-67-T
islands of Veglia [Velja], Perviccio [Prvić], Gregorio [Sveti Grgur], Coli [Goli], and Arbe [Rab]. On the south of the Adriatic, where Serbia and Montenegro have interests, the entire coast from Planka up to the River Drin [Drim], with the chief ports of Spalato [Split], Ragusa [Dubrovnik], Cattaro [Kotor], Antivari [Bar], Dulcigno [Ulcinj] and San Giovanni di Medua, with the islands of Zirona Grande (Veliki Drvenik), Bua (Ciovo), Solta, Brazza [Brač], Jakljan and Calomotta (Koločep)” (p. 155).

The Serbs made a terrible historical mistake by not having adhered to the provisions of the Treaty of London. Instead, they formed a state union with the Croats and Slovenes, which simply ruined them as a nation. Even the then President of the USA Woodrow Wilson, who did not agree with the Treaty of London, held that Serbia must be given free and secure access to the sea. As Kostić points out, Italian Prime Minister Orlando stated the following on 19 April 1919 during the Paris Peace Conference: “From the beginnings of history to the Peace of Campo Formio (1797), Dalmatia was united with Italy, first as part of the Roman Empire and later as part of the Republic of Venice. . . . Dalmatian culture also momentarily gravitated towards Italy. Dalmatia was Italian until modern times [...] Italy does not ask, it begs for a part of Dalmatia to be given to it. Kotor, Split and Dubrovnik shall be left to Serbia” (p. 157).

American Admiral Robert Sherwood describes in his book the position of President Roosevelt on the future of Yugoslavia after World War II. Lazo Kostić provides that quotation: “The President expressed his oft repeated opinion that the Croats and Serbs had nothing in common and that it is ridiculous to try to force two such antagonistic peoples to live together under one government. He, the President, thought that Serbia should be established by itself and the Croats put under a trusteeship” (p. 158). The Serbs wasted such a great chance to consolidate their borders in order to include all the Serbian national territories, and Kostić concludes that “Croatia remained free thanks to the joint efforts of the English, the Vatican and the communists (as paradoxical as it is true); its borders expanded more than ever before and a Croat came to the helm of all Yugoslavia, and at the helm of the Serbs themselves. The latter was not to be credited to the Vatican, but to the Montenegrin communists who also managed to completely separate Serbia from the sea. Nevertheless, Serbdom did not abandon its legitimate rights to Primorje, nor will it ever abandon them, and it is a clearly confirmed fact that a significant part of Primorje looks forward to re-establishing its connection with Serbia, a connection that no one will ever be able to call into question. When someone wants something so sincerely and honestly, it comes true” (p. 158).

In the second part of his book, Kostić writes about the Serbs in Croatia and states that they showed up in that land no sooner than when Bosnia had been enslaved by the Turks, i.e. after 1463. Croatia had once covered the areas between the Vrbas River, Mount Velebit and Carniola. When the Serbs came there, retreating before the Turks, they found no Croats in that area. The Croats had already fled as soon as they sensed

danger from the Turks. “When the devastation ensued, their settlements were abandoned as *derelictae nullius*, and it is an old rule that such ‘deserted’ and ‘nobody’s’ things belong to the *primo occupanti*, i.e. to the one who first comes into their possession. This tenet, dating back to Roman law, has been preserved in all the civic codices of the world. The legal *titulus* of this occupation is therefore solidly set. But the moral *titulus* is even more solid and incontestable: the Croats had not at all fought to defend their lands from invaders. Not only did they not have Kosovo, but they did not put up a single fight. They just fled for their lives” (p. 160).

Croatian historian Tadija Smičiklas acknowledges this in the book entitled *The History of Croatia* published in 1882: “It is a real shame that the enemy was able to storm across our land so easily, as if nobody was there . . . the miserable people ran like sheep when wolves sneak into their flocks. The Croatian populace crossed the borders of their native country in groups of thousands and searched elsewhere for a better and more fortunate homeland” (p. 169) The ravishing was so intense that the parishes of Zagreb, Varaždin and Križevci were left with a total of only three thousand households paying the tithe. In the book entitled *The Historical Significance of the Serbs in Croatia*, Radoslav Grujić insists that one must admit that “the emigration and desertion of the serfs from Upper Slavonia and Croatia, as well as the quick and effortless devastation of these lands, was due not only to the onslaught of the Turkish army and their *hajduci*, but also to the extremely inhumane treatment of the serfs on the part of Croatian and Slavonian nobility. On 8 October 1561, Frontier Commander Colonel Lenković stated under oath before the Imperial War Council of Vienna that the nobility was tenfold more responsible for the fleeing of the serfs and destruction of the country than the Turks themselves” (p. 170).

Kostić believes that there is a lot of truth in Grujić’s claim. “However, without the emergence of the Turks, the serfs would not have dared to leave the fiefs of their lords. Perhaps it gave serfs the opportunity, and it was certainly the main reason for the devastation of Croatia. The chronicles of those times confirm that as much as a shout of ‘Here come the Turks!’ caused panic, and prompted the people to flee. The Croats moved hundreds or thousands of kilometres away, as they feared that they were still within the reach of the Turks. They escaped to the islands, to Hungary, Austria, Moravia, Istria and lower Italy!” (p. 170).

m) The Forms of Catholic Proselytization

In his extensive three-volume work in Karlovac from 1891 to 1893 under the title of *The Bishopric of Karlovac – Addenda to the History of the Serbian Orthodox Church*, Protopope Manojlo Grbić wrote, “the Serbian people was lured with various verbal promises and written privileges guaranteeing that we would be nobody’s slaves and serfs, and that all the lands we took over and defended from the Turks would be granted to us as our own property; that we would not pay tithes and

other taxes to the lands we so defended; instead we would defend the borders from the Turks [...] Such appeals and promises prompted a huge number of Serbs to move out from under the Turkish yoke and settle in the lands where they still live today. . . (Grbić provides details). May this convince some of our brothers who are led astray by the Croats that it pains us much when they arrogantly and unjustly claim that we allegedly came here like Gypsies to steal bread from the local people. Had the autochthonous Croats been able to defend these lands from the Turks, they would not have left them, and the area would not have been deserted. And had these lands not been left deserted, the Serbs would not have had a place here to settle [...] Our grandfathers came to these lands willingly and upon the invitation of their legal lords; they came here as heroes with weapons in their hands, and with the Holy Orthodox Faith in their souls. Their weapons helped defend these lands from the Turks and they were given to them as promised by the Emperor, for they had bought them with their blood” (p. 170).

Kostić also deals with the issue of the Armatoles – the Serbs in the Turkish military service that settled in the territories conquered by the Turks, and which comprised the majority of the crews in the Turkish garrisons north of the Sava and the Danube. They retained the Orthodox religion. This matter was scientifically and compellingly elaborated on by the Hungarian historian László Hadrovicz in his book on the Serbian people under Turkish dominance, published in Paris in 1947. A small number of Serbs in the territory of Croatia originate from the Armatoles, while the largest number of them are descendants of the *Uskoci*, the refugee fighters against the Turks. The rest of the Serbs inhabited the Croatian areas on the basis of agreements or permission to do so by the Austrian authorities; afterwards, when the Turks withdrew more to the south, Serbian migrations were even more massive.

As early as the 16th century, the Turks settled large masses of Serbs into the deserted area of Lika, bringing them there by force to cultivate the land and guard the borders. Significant details of these migrations are provided by Aleksa Ivić and Radoslav Grujić. Additionally, Adam Pribičević writes that in the 17th century, the same thing that happened in Lika occurred in Banija. “The Turks killed the Croatian population, took them away into slavery or drove them out, and Serbs settled in their areas” (p. 177). In Volume Sixteen of the *Serbian Ethnographic Bulletin* of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, published in Subotica in 1923 under the title *Migrations of the Serbs during the 16th, 17th and 18th Centuries*, Aleksa Ivić provides a precise timeline of the most significant migrations of the Serbs to the Croatian territory of the Austrian border, and stated that they took place in “1530, 1531, 1538; a series of migrations from 1600 through 1612, 1638 and 1639; 1655; 1658; and 1679. A new wave of migrations occurred at the end of the 17th century concurrent to the expulsion of Turks from Lika and Banija, and to the establishment of the Austrian military frontier along the Turkish border of Bosnia. These migrations created the situation that remained relatively unchanged until today” (p. 176).

Austrian commanders returned from almost every military campaign

in the Turkish territory with long columns of Serbs they had convinced to move to the territory under Christian control, and build a living embankment against further Turkish invasions. As Ivić notes, “there was a large number of inhabitants in the parts of Croatia and Slavonia that were in Turkish hands, as the Turks had settled Serbs into those areas. On the other hand, the Austrian parts of Croatia and Slavonia that were within the reach of Turks were deserted. Countless villages and hamlets, and many fortresses and towns lay destroyed and vacant for decades. At the end of the 16th century, the Austrian authorities decided to take advantage of the dissatisfaction and unrest that had been prevalent among the Serbian people by settling the Serbs into the deserted lands, in order to hinder the penetration of the Turkish companies” (p. 178).

In his book entitled *Contemporary Croatia*, the Croatian historian Milan Marjanović wrote the following in 1913: “In the Croatian lands, the Serbs settled the areas abandoned by their old Croatian inhabitants, the areas where the most powerful Croatian landlords had their largest estates and the places where the Croatian oligarchy had centred its political life [...] The Croats can never reclaim their ethnic loss. . . The autochthonous constituents turned a blind eye to the fact that the Serbian emigrants could not simply be moved from the territories they had soaked with so much of their own blood, nor could they melt into something that had a different tradition” (p. 184).

Nonetheless, the Serbs were faced with danger immediately after they had settled there. Lazo Kostić writes, “as soon as the Orthodox Serbs arrived within the borders of the Austrian state, before they could get used to the new environment, before they could rest and even before they could get properly settled in; the gruesome activity of their mandatory conversion, their forced changing of their creed, and their obliged acceptance of the Catholic faith would immediately ensue. . . This was allegedly done for the sake of salvation of their souls! The means and methods were different, but the end was always the same. Sometimes they would proceed in a refined and cautious manner, and at other times they would use treats and sheer force. Sometimes Uniatism was demanded, the recognition of the papal supremacy and the acceptance of the *Filioque* particle of the Creed; on other occasions it was demanded that the newly arrived Serbs convert immediately and completely and accept the Catholic faith and rite. Sometimes their priests were simply prohibited from settling and taking action, so that the people turned to the Catholic priests themselves, as they did not want their dead to be buried without a funeral service, their children left unbaptised and their newlyweds left without the nuptial blessing” (p. 184).

The campaign of Uniatism and Catholicization was conducted in a rather perfidious and systematic manner. Neither the current state interests nor the strategic objectives of the Vatican were neglected in this campaign. Kostić describes its complexity in the following words: “The actions of the proselytizers and their choice of the currently most efficient means depended on different circumstances, such as the number of refugees, the environment in which they were settled (whether it was purely Catholic or whether there were already some

Orthodox emigrants present, whether the area had an Orthodox church, priests and an organized hierarchy, etc), their resistance to conversion – which was carefully explored – and so on. Yet, more than anything, this campaign depended on the external political and military situation. If a war with the Turks was in progress or in prospect, than the activities would be minimized or even temporarily suspended, because the Serbian military help was then essential and the authorities did not want to embitter the Serbs. As soon as the danger was fended off for a while, the proselytization and inquisition measures were taken up again, becoming more frequent and more violent as the danger of a new war subsided” (p. 185).

Certainly, there were many instances that warned the protagonists of proselytization to be cautious. “They were also mindful of the Serbs within the Turkish borders, so that they would receive their help in military campaigns, or so that they would move to Austria themselves. They paid attention to the disposition of Russia, whose leadership frequently received complaints from Serbian refugees regarding the pressure their religion was exposed to. Russia took them under its protection whenever the political circumstances were favourable. They were mindful of many factors in their choice of methods and timing of their proselytization, but its very objective was never abandoned, nor could it be abandoned” (p. 185).

Kostić further shows how the circumstances of Uniatism and Catholicization were most difficult for the Serbs in Croatia and Slavonia, as these territories had been religiously homogenous prior to the Serbian migrations, whereas in Hungary and the territory of today’s Vojvodina, there was a significant number of Lutherans, Calvinists, Jews, Orthodox Rumanians and members of other denominations, so that the religious situation involved a tangible level of tolerance. On the other hand, the Croatian “local bishops, primarily the bishops of Zagreb, could by no means accept the activities of bishops of other denominations, let alone the schismatic faith, in ‘their’ territories and in ‘their’ dioceses. They were especially zealous and uncompromising in their proselytization. As Ultramontanists and ‘defenders of the faith’ (which was part of their official title), the central authorities of Vienna, the circles around the emperor etc., were intimately and completely in favour of the conversion process. However, they also had to take care of state interests, the military assistance of the Serbs, the external repercussions, etc, of which the Catholic hierarchy generally did not have to worry about. It always pushed for more efficient actions; Vienna slowed it down as much as it could. The local Catholic clergy had a strong supporter in the Roman Curia (the Vatican), which, through its diplomatic representatives – the nuncios in Vienna – endeavoured to secure as little resistance to the proselytistic activities of its bishops and missionaries as possible from the emperor and the government” (p. 185).

There are a great number of written documents testifying to this proselytistic action, as the Vatican diplomatic representatives and the members of the clergy submitted detailed reports on their overall activities. Seeking refuge in the Austrian territory, the Serbs “were

running before the Turkish terror that ignored their religion, and persecuted it to a lesser extent, only to face the stronger and more severe persecution of their faith upon crossing the border; they were even demanded to renounce the religion of their forefathers. Many of them wondered why they had left Turkey at all; some of them even returned to Turkey, and a great multitude moved from Banat to Russia” (p. 185). The Roman Curia would often tighten the rope to the point of snapping, and then gradually released the pressure, only to bear down again on the relatively relaxed Serbs with newfound force. “Where they could not demand direct conversion, they demanded that the Orthodox Serbs refrain from working on Catholic holidays and to work on their own holidays, to attend their masses, to accept the new calendar, etc. The Serbs sabotaged these provisions whenever they could, but the Croatian and Slavonian clergy persistently reinforced them” (p. 199).

In 1609, the Croatian Assembly adopted the decision whereby only the Roman Catholic Religion was recognized in Croatia. The Orthodox Religion was recognized in the territory of Croatia by Austrian Emperor Joseph II in 1781. According to the law, up until that time the non-Catholics were not allowed to enter into state services or acquire property, which was one of the reasons why the Military Border was administratively separated. Under the Law of 1741, both the Orthodox and the Protestant faiths were prohibited in the territory of Croatia, thus there was a bitter Serbian struggle for the definite annulment of that law, which lasted as a full forty years; although at the time of its adoption Empress Maria Theresa did not even want to recognize it, so only the restrictive measures concerning the prohibition of state employment and acquisition of property were enacted.

The culmination of proselytization in Croatia occurred during WWII. In addition to a million Serbs that had been murdered in a savage and atrocious manner, according to the report Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac sent to the Roman Pope on 18 May 1943, 240,000 Serbs were converted to Catholicism. For Stepinac, this was yet another argument for why the Pope should be in favour of the preservation of the Independent State of Croatia, as that would prevent the reversal of the conversion campaigns. Kostić’s comment on this fact is rather interesting: “This number of converts was officially recognized by the highest authority of the Croatian Catholic clergy. And how many of them remained after the war? Probably none; at any rate, so few that they can be counted on one’s fingers. None of them remained Catholic. The embarrassment of the Catholic Church is as great as its failure. The embarrassment of the Catholics is equal to the embarrassment of the Croats” (p. 198).

After WWII, the Croatian political emigrants, Vlatko Maček being one of them, claimed that the conversion of the Orthodox people was voluntary. Emphasizing this unbelievable criminal Croatian amorality, Kostić cites the renowned Serbian intellectual Omer Kajmaković, who wrote in the article entitled *The Purported Morality of Maček* published in the *Voice of Canadian Serbs* on 9 July 1953, that such a shameful reaction was caused by “Maček’s satanical – one could even say instinctive – need to deride the Serban tragedy of this war” (p. 199).

According to official data, 299 Orthodox churches were destroyed in the territory of the Croatian Ustasha State. Many were converted into Catholic churches, and Church property and money were taken by the Catholic priests. Kostić wonders “what would have happened if the Orthodox Serbs had committed only a hundredth part of such crimes against the Croats; only a thousandth, only a millionth part? The entire world press would have stigmatised them as the worst and most heinous barbarians. The world media do not hold the Croats’ crimes against them at all. We do not have Russia, but they have the Vatican” (p. 201). The psychological mechanism that functions in the minds of Croatian intellectuals is also interesting. “Indeed, there is a complex of denial of the facts among the Croats, as was concluded by their most prominent novelist Miroslav Krleža. It is the nation of ‘*fiscals* and ‘*crammers*’, as a Swiss magazine recently referred to them. And the ‘fiscals’, especially the Croatian ones, have the following holy principles: [...] if you did something, deny it, as the first rule of law reads – negate. That is their denial [...] They would not accept even the most obvious things and the most compelling evidence if they work against them. But this cannot make the truth disappear from the realm of facts” (p. 201).

In the 19th century, the Croatian nation was creating itself literally out of nothing, and that is why it systematically appropriated that what belonged to others, be it lands, culture, history or even a language. In the Serbian areas of Austria and Hungary, the Serbs were free to use the Cyrillic script, even in official correspondences. Nevertheless, this alphabet was systematically neglected, derided and often prohibited in Croatia. Croatian Ban Ivan Mažuranić was their first ruler to ban the Cyrillic alphabet; he is primarily known for having stolen Njegoš’s epic *The Death of Aga Smail Čengić* and printing it under his name. “The Croats stress that fact that he was the first “commoner ban” (ruling from 1873 to 1880). That means that before him, and mostly after him as well, the bans were noblemen. The majority of noblemen were not Croats, but Hungarians and Germans. The first “commoner ban” was actually the first real Croatian ban. And one of the first measures of this first real Croatian administrator was to outlaw the Cyrillic alphabet. It was such a thorn in his side that he prohibited its use in the entire area of Croatia and Slavonia (including Srem)” (p. 203).

Once again, only the territory of the Military Border would be excluded, as it was legally inaccessible to the Croats. The injustice done by the prohibition of the Cyrillic script was rectified by the new Ban, Hungarian Khuen-Hedervary, who occupied the position of Ban from 1883 to 1903; according to the writings of Adam Pribičević, he introduced “Cyrillic in all the schools and all the Serbian history text books; he made it a law that teachers must be of the same faith as the majority of students; he recognized our tricolour standard as the flag of our national and church autonomy; he left it up to the municipalities to introduce Cyrillic if they wished” (p. 203). Kostić adds that, “If it had been up to the Croats, there would be no Cyrillic alphabet, no Serbian history and no Serbian flag” (p. 203).

Throughout history, whenever they had hard times, the Croats would call the Serbs their brothers; they did so in 1848, 1918 and 1945. However, whenever they felt more powerful or whenever a strong foreign force would fall upon the Serbian people, the Croats were the first to strike with an unbelievable surge of hatred against the Serbian nation. Thus, it was not accidental that on 29 June 1914, immediately after the Sarajevo assassination, a Zagreb newspaper wrote, “In our circle, on our body, there are scores of ticks in the shape of Serbs and Slavo-Serbs. . . We need to get rid of them and eradicate them once and for all. Let this be our goal as of today. . . Murderer – your name is Serb! And you are a Serb, cursed be your tribe and your seed, that the wind has scattered on our Croatian soil” (p. 206).

After they had stolen the language, culture and history from the Serbs, the Croats declared that they were not at all of the Slavic descent, and that significant racial differences distinguished them from the Serbs. Ante Starčević accordingly claimed that the Croats were direct descendants of the ancient Romans. When they simply wished to radiate goodness and humanity, and for a moment refrain from their infinite hatred, they would address the Serbs in a manner that was best manifested in the 1892 issue of the previously quoted newspaper *Croatia*: “Therefore, there is no sense for anyone in our country to call himself a Serb. The one who accepts this name excludes himself from Croatianhood and loses all the rights to his motherland. He will make himself a worse wretch than those foolish ‘Vlachs’ who, being everyone’s servants, have no country of their own. He strips himself of the homeland and throws himself into a utopia – he becomes a complete wretch and withers in his abominable, ludicrous and illusory fight for an illusory Serbian empire. If these people had any consciousness and consideration, they would see for themselves that two peoples who speak one and the same language cannot live in one country. In Croatia, though they are of the Eastern Greek faith, they speak Croatian but refer to themselves as Serbs. We cannot and must not recognise them as Serbs. It is in their interest to have a country, to be members of the Croatian people and beneficiaries of Croatian law – they cannot and must not be anything else but the Croats [...] Therefore, when the Croatian side wishes to accept them in to Croatianhood in the same way they accepted the Croatian language, that is simply a demonstration of the Croats’ philanthropy [...] He who calls himself a Serb in Croatia is either a cunning speculator and evildoer who wishes to be a means against the Croats, or a misguided fanatic that blindly follows his malefactors” (p. 208).

Both the Serbian Orthodox faith and the Serbian nation equally distressed the Croats. As long as they existed, they would serve as a harsh reminder to the Croats that they had changed their faith and their nationality. Only the disappearance of Serbdom and Orthodoxy would enable the nouveau Croats to erase the historical memory of what they had been, and negate the evidence of their artificial transformation into

IT-03-67-T
what they became. “Violence against the Serbs was exercised by both the Croatian lords and the Croatian people, as much as they could and as much as they had the authority to. When the Croatian people was less influential and could do less, the lords would do it. When the people acquired more importance and more influence, than the people would do it themselves. Sometimes the people and lords acted in unison – both the state authorities and the masses” (p. 214).

If one analyzes the roots of the hatred between these two peoples by looking at their earliest past, it is evident that the religious differences were not the primary cause of this hatred as much as it was the envy of the Croats who, for the most part, lived as serfs, contrary to the emigrant Serbs that had never been serfs nor ever even considered accepting the status of a serf. Not only were they not serfs, but they were also not subordinated to the church hierarchy, nor obliged to join the mercenary army. The Serbs represented a sort of national army that would rally under the standard in cases of war.

Grujić writes of this in his book entitled *The Historical Importance of the Serbs in Croatia*, published in Belgrade in 1940 by the Serbian Cultural Club: “The Croatian noblemen, as well as the feudal lords of the wastelands inhabited by the Border Serbs did not lightly bear the fact that the Border privileges exempted the Serbs from all levies and all their authority. When fights would cease for a while, they would often ask the Emperor in their assemblies in Vienna to abolish the privileges granted to the Serbs, and to subject them to the authority of the rulers of the land. However, the Serbs would always adamantly oppose such requests, declaring that they did not come to Croatia to be slaves of its lords, but to chivalrously defend the country from the enemies and that they would rather leave the Border and go back to Turkey than accept the deprivation of the freedoms they acquired by spilling their blood and serving loyally [...] The military authorities, who were well aware of, and who appreciated what the Serbs did for their state, would always support the Serbs in defying the unjust requests sent to the emperors from the assemblies of the Croatian secular and church lords” (p. 230).

The Serbs acquired this status in the very first agreements and contracts dealing with their relocation, and later obtained the official privileges and formal benefits from the superior legal authorities. As emphasized by Kostić, these legal documents guaranteed that “the relocated members of the Serbian people would have a favourable living regime in the border regions of the Empire, as well as certain rights and authorizations that no one was allowed to contravene. These privileges were sometimes promised to them before their arrival in the country and would become statutory immediately thereafter, or in some cases after they had already arrived. These privileges were collective: they related to all individuals who were settled in the country, or who had settled before, but who were of Serbian nationality” (p. 231).

They acquired their highest status in 1759, during the rule of Maria Theresa. “A full century and a half before the French Revolution, when there was no mention about nationalities anywhere in the world, but rather only mention of nations as the subjects of authority, the Serbian

people had the status of a nation wherever they lived within the borders of the Monarchy. Their so-called personal autonomy was recognized as independent of the territory they settled (of course, within the entire Monarchy)” (p. 234).

In terms of their historical and legal importance, “those privileges are also the strongest counter-argument against allegations that we are a nation of intruders and imposed settlers within the borders of Austria, Hungary and Croatia: they prove that we are a nation that, as such, was called on to come and defend the country of those who were not capable of defending it. It made that land its own, just like it had before with the land in the South; with no fewer victims and with no less glory. That people did not come as beggars and vagabonds, but as heroes and warriors, for whose favour empires fought over. They came only in order to secure their faith and their nationality, which appeared to be endangered in the long-run, and not because there was no place for them in Turkey. They came against the wishes of Turkish authorities, and upon the expressed wishes of the Austrian authorities. They came mostly in organized groups, with their military and spiritual leaders. They came after the legal circumstances under which they would live had been examined, and in most cases set and confirmed as unchangeable” (p. 234).

Even Ferdo Šišić, as the most authoritative Croatian historian, stated that in the beginning, almost all the Serbs lived in the area of the Military Border. In his work *Illyrian Letters*, published in London in 1878, English travel-writer Arthur Evans offered the following testimony: “The old military frontier is settled by the warlike, but by no means uncultured, population of pure Serbian nationality; most of them are members of the Greek Church, descendants of the Serbian refugees who fled from the Serbian areas: Bosnia, Herzegovina and Raška. Even if there were Catholics among this population, their Catholicism took on a special national form” (p. 236).

The military frontier did not have any legal connections to Croatia, nor was it in any way under the jurisdiction of its civil authorities. The Serbs came there bearing their name, with their faith and tradition. “They observed the Serbian saints they built shrines for them [...] they held services to their name, they swore by them and they invoked them for help. They celebrated *Slava* as before, as today, as always; they celebrated the same saints. *Aprapos*, they brought with them, and preserved to this day, the entire complex of Serbdom and Serbian Orthodoxy – complex in both the positive and negative sense of the word. They brought with them and preserved all the traits of a Serb, primarily the folk songs and national enthusiasm that characterized these songs; their faith in the imperial past and imperial future; their faith in the Serbian mission; the Serbian heroism that was praised by all the writers since Byzantium to date; their strong and unfaltering character; desire for freedom and abhorrence of serfdom and fiefs; fortitude and endurance of the hardships that would have broken any other people” (p. 248). That must have greatly distinguished them from the Croats they found there, who had no rights, were stripped of their nationality, were

IT-03-67-T.
religiously primitive, and all of whose feudal lords were foreigners. Understandably, there were Serbs who afterwards converted into Catholicism in order to acquire hereditary titles, thus creating the counts and barons of Kukuljević, Drašković, Ožegović, Sladojević and many others.

o) Racism of the Ethnic Crossbreeds

It is no coincidence that the Croats are the only Slavic nation that insists on its racial purity, although such a category is scientifically impossible. This means that they are ill at ease with something – there is something that bothers them terribly. Their consciousness, or their subconscious, torments them because the blood in their veins is mixed with the blood of the peoples they would like to forget and erase from their historical memory, as the ethnic constituents of their contemporary nation. Kostić states the following regarding this issue: “The fact that the Croats, who first mixed with the Avars (or *Obars*), have a lot of Avarian blood is acknowledged by serious scientists: anthropologists, historians, ethnographers. This is an incontestable fact, as the Avars have not completely disappeared: they largely melted into the Croats” (p. 250).

In his book entitled *The Slavs of Yore*, published in Zagreb in 1889, the acclaimed Croatian scientist Tomo Maretić accepted this as a proven fact, and stated that, “Porphrogenitus wrote somewhere that in his time (in the 10th century), there were among the Croats still some remnants of the Avars, whose outside features can be easily distinguished from the true Croats” (p. 250). In the text *The Croatian Narcissus*, Adam Pribičević also deals with the issue of the Avars: “A lot of Avars remained in the western lands, from the Drina to the sea, and most of them are in Croatia. Many names of places and rivers are reminiscent of the Avars, even near Zagreb. The title of ‘Ban’ is a word of Avarian origin. In these areas people still say: ‘hit like an Avar’ (i.e. in an inhumane way) and ‘shout like an Avar’. Croatian philosopher Dvorniković wrote that all those groups were criminal, especially the Croatian ones. And if his judgement is correct, it points to the traces of Avarian blood. In those areas one can still see the Avarian facial features: square faces and pronounced cheekbones” (p. 250).

Kostić also quotes Vladimir Dvorniković, whose scientific authority and objectivity has not been contested by any serious scholar: “This cohabitation with the Avars, when they first appeared in the Balkans and at the gates of the Empire, must have left some traces. This two-hundred year cohabitation was more parasitic than symbiotic [...] and had to leave its characterological and anthropological marks. That mongoloid move [...] is visible even today, especially in the Pannonian area. The Avars must have been a brain-dead Mongolic race, impervious to any higher culture. They were a perfect example of deep rooted ‘barbaric mentality’: animalistic and greedy looters, avaricious collectors of wealth which they dragged like hamsters into their subterranean lairs, surrounded by walls and embankments, brutal parasites on the body and soul of their subjects, and as it appears, sadistic and severe tormentors”

(p. 251). Dvorniković should be taken seriously, especially since he was a Croat on his father's side.

In his most famous work, *The Characterology of the Yugoslavs*, Dvorniković spoke critically of the racial origin of his own Croatian people, and one needs to give him credit for that. He mercilessly concluded the following: "Something Laponoid and Mongolic can still be found in the Slavic-Nordic group, both in the area of the Polish Vistula and the hearth of Bohemia, as well as in Croatian Zagorje and Međumurje. . . The width of the face below the eyes similar to that of the Kalmyk people [...] can be found in every second or third peasant woman [...] Of Mongolic origin could be the sadistic cruelty that, hidden and oppressed among the masses [...] sometimes bursts out from the otherwise peaceful Slavoid-*Kajkavian*-Croat peasants, e.g. in hatred-provoked or superstitious lynchings" (p. 251) Of course the Croats, as well as the Serbs, assimilated all the Balkan peoples they encountered in the scarcely populated area they inhabited. But unlike the Croats, who assimilated the Avars, the Serbs assimilated the Vlachs.

Nonetheless, in all the areas of Croatia there are also descendants of Croatized Serbs; Radoslav Grujić claims that most of them live in the areas of Zagreb, Križevci and Varaždin where there are no longer any true Serbs. Many of the typical Serbian surnames have been preserved in these areas. Radoslav Grujić explains this as follows: "The individual Serbian settlements, without contact with the spiritual centres of their old homeland, and completely surrounded by Roman Catholics, soon had to change their old faith – according to the medieval principle that religion is in the hands of the landlord – and accept the Roman Catholic religion of the lands they had moved to; they gradually received all the ethnic characteristics, blood and language of the cognate autochthonous inhabitants – which increasingly affected both their dialect and their customs" (p. 256).

Catholic conversion of the entire areas of Lika, Žumberika and other territories has been previously discussed. Kostić further writes that, "The fact that all the Serbs who directly converted to the Catholic faith became Croats does not need much elaboration. The Croats are particularly proud of some of them, as is the case with Petar Preradović, for example. Alright, they have the right to do so. But then how can they call the Serbs who did not convert the worst kinds of names, and consider them bastards and human trash, and yet declare that those Serbs which became Croats are their flawless elite? Only the Croats could do such a thing. If one speaks of racial purity, then those who resisted religious and national conversion should be especially respected (for us, these principles are connected and unalienable)" (p. 256).

The Croats most extensively mixed with the Germans and Hungarian, but many Czech and Polish families that moved to the Croatian and Bosnian areas were also, over time, Croatized on the basis of their Catholic religion. Had these Czechs or Poles by any chance been Orthodox, they would have been naturally assimilated by the Serbs, as was often the case with Russians and Greeks. As Ljubiša Petrović writes (Kostić presumed that this name was a pseudonym of Branko Mašić),

"The conditions for conversion to Croatianhood were rather favourable; one only needed to accept the Croatian name and speak some Croatian. The rest, such as lifestyle, feelings and opinions – i.e. the parts of one's own culture and civilization – the assimilated units could invest all of that freely, as a contribution to the foundations of Croatianhood that were then virtually without content, without the unity of a spoken and written language, without literature and arts, and without any strong and individual culture and tradition [...] And thus a small South Slavic nation, which was practically without a history and unknown a century ago [...] started to progress rapidly and expanded far across its borders, . . . and especially within the last hundred years, the Croats and Croatia became a sort of privileged, Austro-Clerical national transformer with a Slavic label, into which every excessive refuse poured in and settled over the last decades [...] as well did the forcibly seized parts of other Austro-Hungarian and neighbouring Balkan nations." (p. 263).

The pedantic Ferdo Šišić, in his book entitled *Bishop Strossmayer and Yugoslav Thought*, writes, "citizenship of Croatia did not stem from its dialect, but rather it was formed through the emigration of foreign elements, which in some towns still have not died out or assimilated with our people" (p. 264). As noted by Dvorniković, "in the middle of Zagreb, it would sometimes occur that foreigners – Austrians and Styrians that did not even speak the language – would teach the local and pure Croats the real sense and meaning of Croatianhood" (p. 265). Despite the fact that they have fundamentally changed their ethnic substratum over a few centuries, the Croats continually invent new theories on their origin. "They deal with this matter more than any other nation of the world, and they simply cannot agree on where they come from or whose descendants they are. While it was previously considered a proven fact that they were Slavs, in recent decades they refute this premise and search for their non-Slavic origin. However, they still cannot fully agree. First they stated that the Croats are Goths, and now they claim to be Persians. Indeed, during the last war the Croats endeavoured to prove through 'their scientists' that they were not Slavs but Goths. That was the semi-official version used by the state leaders up until it turned out that Hitler could not win the war" (p. 265).

As regards Slavonia, the Serbs emigrated there even before the Turkish invasion. Hungarian historian László Szalay confirms this fact in his book entitled *On the Hungarian and Croatian Issue*, published in Pest and Leipzig in 1863, concretely stating that in the counties of Požega, Virovitica and Srem, there lived "mostly Serbs, even before the time of the Turks, and even more of them emigrated during the Turkish rule, as the Slavonians and Hungarians had largely deserted their settlements. This is why many geographic maps that were produced in mid 17th century have the designation of *Rašani* or *Raci* (from the word 'Raška'), particularly for the territories of Srem and Vukovar. After the area was re-conquered (he is referring to the liberation from the Turks, *L.M.K.*), it was only scarcely populated. However, the remainders of the Serbian population were strengthened by new Serbian colonies" (p. 271). This fact was also corroborated by Constantine Jiricek. The last

Serbian Despot, Pavle Bakić, perished in 1537 while defending Slavonia from the Turks

As reported by Aleksa Ivić in his book entitled *The Migrations of the Serbs into Croatia and Slavonia*, published in Sremski Karlovci in 1909, “the increased settling of the Serbs in Slavonia began only after the fall of Slavonian towns under Turkish rule. The Turks found Slavonia deserted – people had already fled in various directions and many were killed defending their land from the enemy. The Turks divided the conquered part of Slavonia into two sanjaks (the Sanjak of Požega and the Sanjak of Pakrac, which was later called the Sanjak of Cernica). In order to strengthen the frontier and secure their rule, they continually settled the Serbs from Bosnia and Serbia in both of these sanjakates” (p. 272). The next wave of Serbian emigration ensued after the expulsion of the Turks, the reason once again being the devastated land that needed to be settled by warriors. However, the greatest migration of the Serbs occurred under Patriarch Arsenije Čarnojević in 1690.

Immediately upon the final liberation from the Turks, Slavonia was subjected to systematic Uniatism; brutal and violent measures were applied, including imprisoning and killing those who presented the main threat. The goal was to force the Serbian people and clergy to accept Uniatism in all possible ways. As noted by the prominent Hungarian Protestant theologian Johann von Csaplovics, “the priests who remained loyal to the faith of their forefathers were, pursuant to the order of the convert Bishop, thrown into shackles and jails where they usually died of suffering and hunger. Konrad – the then Hegumen of Lepavina Monastery – was mentioned as one of many who lost their lives in this way. He was killed on the church doorstep with two rifle bullets by two soldiers who snuck up behind him while he was entering the church to deliver the service. Pursuant to the order of General Petatius, numerous clerics were whipped to death and thrown into jails, where they endured all sorts of torture” (p. 277).

In his book entitled *The Memories of a Youth Spent in Croatia*, published in Belgrade in 1925, Imbro Tkalac also wrote of the persecution of the Protestants: “Pursuant to the Croatian municipal laws, Protestants were not tolerated in Croatia. Protestantism was virtually eradicated during the rule of the three emperors named Ferdinand, even though the majority of the Croats had been of the Protestant faith in the 16th century. They eradicated it by fire, swords and seizure of property” (p. 278).

However, in spite of the proselytism, intensive Uniatism and Catholicisation, according to the *Statistical and Geographic Description of Hungary* published in Leipzig in 1834, “the number of Greek, non-Uniates is greater than that of the Roman Catholics. Based on the latest information, there are 284,000 souls of the Greek faith and 148,346 of the others (Roman Catholics). The non-Uniate Greeks (mostly Serbs) are the most numerous in the Petrovaradin Regiment and then in the Srem, Virovitica and Požega parishes. Their number is smallest in the Regiments of Gradište and Brod” (p. 283). What is most important here is the fact that, in the overview of nationalities, the Serbs were put in

first place, whereas the Croats were not mentioned at all.

It was no coincidence that Wolfgang Lentz, in his 1572 map of Hungary, marked the entire area east of Valpovo and Đakovo as Serbia. In 1573, the Catholic priest Gerčak wrote that Serbia started from the area of Mohacs. On the Hungarian map from 1596, the area of Srem east of Bosut was marked as *Rascia*. In 1807, David, the French Consul in Travnik, wrote that the Turks referred to Slavonia and Banat as Austrian Serbia. The Croatian name in Slavonia was not completely unknown though; even the Slavonian Catholics could not stand the Croats. Thus, on the 5th April 1698, the Slavonian friars wrote to the Bishop of Đakovo suggesting that he should prevent the arrival of the Zagreb priests, emphasizing the following: “All of us firmly, unanimously and decisively claim that we shall never accept any Croats or those sent by them, even if they are laymen” (p. 294). In 1707, the Franciscan Provincial Friar Marko Bulajić urged Emperor Joseph I to prevent the arrival of non-monastic clergy from Croatia who intended to seize their parishes. According to him, the Zagreb bishops would “bring Croatian presbyters, of whom this people is not at all fond and who speak the language of the people poorly” (p. 294).

2. Croatian National Megalomania

In 1955, Lazo Kostić published his brochure entitled *The Megalomania of a Small and Unscrupulous People* as part of the *Serbian Book* edition printed in Hamilton by the Serbian National Defence Council of Canada. It was actually the second volume of his *Serbo-Croatian Relations in Recent Years*, published under the pseudonym of Dr L. P. Popović. Lazo Kostić later incorporated Volume One of this book (entitled *Who are the Principal Malefactors against the Serbs*) into a larger work with his brochure *On the Responsibility for Murdering the Serbs in the Last War* and published them with extensive additions under the title of *Who is Responsible for the Crimes against the Serbs in the Independent State of Croatia (NDH)*. Through these works, the author endeavoured to establish “responsibility for the atrocities committed against the Serbs and pointed towards the dangers still lurking on that same side. Had this been done earlier, many evils would probably have been avoided. If one cannot undo the previous tragedies, at least future ones can be prevented” (p. 3).

The Croats have organized themselves well under the auspices of the Catholic Church and now they are running a clamorous national and political campaign in which the roles have been divided between the Croatian communists inside the country and the Croatian Ustahas in emigration, but their objectives have always been the same. Kostić was convinced that the response to the Croats should be of equal measure; through concrete examples, the Croats should be shown how the principles and measures they intend to apply against the Serbs would look when applied on the Croats themselves. All Serbian reactions have so far been inadequate owing to the proverbial Serbian benevolence and too often thanks to their naivety. The Croats have always advanced

maximalist and fantastic requests and then entered into bargaining with a huge space to manoeuvre. One striking example of this bargaining was the stratagem that resulted in the Cvetković-Maček Agreement.

The Serbs were so deprived of their rights under the communist regime that most of them did not dare enter into more serious inter-ethnic debates. In their megalomania, the Croatian national ideologists not only requested the integral territories of old Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia, but they strived to encompass all of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Srem, Bačka and Sandžak. Kostić insisted that the Serbs should not venture into this types of bargaining. “Should we cede some Serbian territories in order to gain other Serbian territories? Should we have the Croatians grant us our territories so that we could recognize other Serbian territories as theirs?” (p. 7).

Serbian territorial claims should not have been ignored for a single moment as the criminal mind, instructed by Jesuit logic, would not give up its intentions even when it appeared that there were no possibilities to achieve its principal goals. As Kostić stated, “many Serbs think that such absurd demands deserve no reaction. They find these requests preposterous and unworthy of attention. I believe that is incorrect. Between the World Wars when, through their Ustashas (and all of them thought the same), the Croats demanded that the Croatian border extend to the Drina and the Danube, not a single Serbs paid any attention to it. They all saw this as an impossible and trivial thing. And this Serbian attitude cost us about one million victims. What we believed to be impossible, as we had counted with normal people and normal times, they carried out as foreign mercenaries and traitors. They are not selective in their means when they want to harm the Serbs. We must bear in mind that we deal with a pathological people with a pathological and criminal mentality unsurpassed by any other nation” (p. 7).

The Croatian national megalomania is indicative of the morbid condition of the Croatian national spirit. “Megalomania can affect both individuals and groups, i.e. everything that has the capacity to grow and is not satisfied with its growth, everything that cannot satiate its drive for growth through normal and natural means. Hence, it is a morbid and pathological phenomenon. As small individuals strain to look bigger, the same is true of nations. Small, minute, insignificant and unknown peoples are not selective in their means to look greater, especially if their enlargement is not achieved on the battlefield, but through peace-time intrigues, lies and treachery. Then they tend to present themselves as the most serene, most dignified and untouchable entity” (p. 8).

The manner in which this unhealthy condition of the Croatian national spirit is manifested is rather simple. “Wherever there is a county with a hundred Croats, the Croats claim it as theirs. Yet, this is not enough; they simply proclaim entire ethnic groups as Croats, although such groups never even dreamed of accepting the Croatian nationality. In order to curry favour with them, the Croats proclaim them to be ‘the flower of the Croatian people’. In other places, they invoke their historical rights. They do not recognize any minorities in their *Triune Kingdom*. If there is danger of minorities demanding their national

rights, they (the Croats) just exterminate them whenever there is an opportunity to do it without risk or punishment. They set different principles as they see fit: at one time it will be the ethnic principle, another time it is the historical, geopolitical or strategic principles, whatever they deem useful” (p. 8).

As regards the Serbian nation, the Croats do not only strive to snatch as much territory as possible from it, but they also try hard to additionally harm the Serbs in every imaginable way. “They know that the Serbs are their most dangerous enemies with some bloody account to settle with them, so they struggle not only to expand their state but to reduce the Serbian national territory at the expense of any nation” (p. 9). Although the Croatian national consciousness was created fairly recently, it has expanded manifold from the initial three counties and engulfed many ethnic elements that were not at all related to the Croats – most often in Serbian national territory. “Nowadays, there is not a single Croat that would moderate his nation in its territorial requests towards the Serbs. Quite the contrary, every new Croat asks for more. They all want to gain as much as possible at the expense of Serbia, using different arguments and principles and sometimes no arguments at all. Their intimate principle is already marked by megalomania: they want the Serbs to shrink and they want to expand. Their motive force is their wish to see all the Serbs disappear. At any rate, it is understandable that a pygmy always desires the death of a giant. In every respect, they are the pygmies and the Serbs are the giants. It is understandable, but the fact that the Serbs still cannot see this is not understandable” (p. 9).

However, a realistic sociological and demographic picture of the Croats as a nation is more than devastating. “It is a small, miserable little nation. Their number is less than a half that of the Serbs, or Bulgarians, or Greeks. They are less than a third of the Hungarians or Rumanians and they equate to a negligible percent of the Italians or Germans. All their neighbours are considerably more powerful, save for the Slovenes. Aside from the Slovenes, there is no smaller nation in Western Europe, while they outnumber only the Albanians in the Balkans. And they (the Croats) would like to be on par with their neighbours. That is why they exterminated the Serbs on the one hand and, on the other, they assimilated foreign nationalities (the Germans, Hungarians, Slovaks, Czechs, etc.), i.e. all the Catholics living in their territory and some of them they globally proclaimed as Croats, as was the case with the Muslims, *Bunjevci*, *Sokci* etc., who had never been Croats in their entire history” (p. 9).

The facts are relentless and give the Croats considerable trouble in all serious political debates. “The fact that all of ‘its’ prominent people are of foreign descent is the best proof that the Croatian nation, as it is today, was for the most part created by the assimilation of foreign elements. Stanko Vraz is a Slovene; Preradović, Tadija Smičiklas etc. are Serbs; Strossmayer is a German and so is Tkalčić-Weber. A whole list of them could be provided here. Even the leaders of their political parties are foreigners. Ivica Frank is a German Jew; Dr. Maček is a Slovene, etc.” (p. 9-10). Once the exterior that was put on as an artificial

and false cape is removed, what is left is the sad truth that the Croats are “a nation with no history, no virtues and no accurate designation; they inflated themselves artificially and strive to become a great nation. They cannot see how facetious they seem in this endeavour! They do not realise that their foreign feathers will fall off at the earliest convenience” (p. 10).

a) The Communist Divisions of the Serbian National Corps

So far, the Communists have provided the Croats with the best opportunity to unleash their megalomaniac ideas by giving them a sort of formal legitimacy. The ideology of the Yugoslav communist movement was developed on the grounds of social demagoguery and justification of the proletariat as the traditional Marxist dogmatic standpoint and interpretations of the necessity of struggle with the aim of the destruction of the “hegemony of Greater Serbia”, which was the term concocted in the retorts of the Comintern. “In order to suppress this imaginary hegemony of Greater Serbia, entire areas of the Serbian national body had to be removed and new nationalities had to be created at the expense of the Serbs. Nevertheless, the communists counted on the Serbian vitality and held that it was not sufficient. They divided the remaining Serbs among all the federal units save for Slovenia. Some of them were prohibited from being Serbs and the others were territorially fragmented so that their unity could not be seen” (p. 11).

In order to have this policy bear as much fruit as possible, the Comintern circles imposed Croatian Josip Broz as the Head of State and positioned only those who were imbued with anti-Serbian feelings as his associates. “The War has fundamentally changed the national and moral relations in Yugoslavia. The Serbs were murdered everywhere and by everybody, though most of them were victims of the Croats. Alongside the Slovenes, they were the only people that fought against the occupier; they had more than a million victims; they were dispossessed, robbed, destroyed. The Croats, however, wholeheartedly welcomed the occupier; they imposed the war on their allies, murdered their own citizens of Serbian nationality and confiscated their property; during the war, they proved themselves as the most miserable marauders and servants of the occupier. It was not individuals, but the entire Croatian nation. And what happened? The communists rewarded them for their conduct. They enlarged their territory to a hitherto unseen size, uniting almost all the Croatian people into one federal unit and allowing national groups that had never been Croatian to declare themselves as Croats. What is more, they left about half a million of the surviving Serbs under the authority of the criminal Croats. They augmented the Croatian territory to include the areas surrendered by Italy as a result of the Serbian victims and the Serbian participation in the war; they were rewarded for having caused the war and waging it against the allies” (p. 11).

On the other hand, the Montenegrins were not allowed to declare themselves as Serbs, Macedonia was denied every trace of Serbian

IT-03-67-T

existence and Serbia itself was virtually reduced to the borders it had prior to the Battle of Kumanovo. Two autonomous provinces were extracted only from Serbia in order to distance them from and confront them against Serbia. “The communists led by Tito would like to prove that literally everything Serbia had before was not rightfully in its possession” (p. 12). Moreover, the *Šokci and Bunjevci* of Bačka were now allowed and compelled to declare themselves as Croats while, over the course of a hundred years of Hungarian statistical record keeping when they could freely declare themselves as Croats (as was the case with the Serbs who naturally declared themselves Serbs), not a single *Bunjevac* and *Šokac* had declared themselves as Croat. Now they were made Croats in order to intensify their national aspirations” (p. 12).

This was followed by a whole series of incongruities and ideological inconsistencies that fully revealed the communist concept of the development of the national issue in Yugoslavia. “Dalmatia was completely incorporated into Croatia as if it had previously been a Croatian county. However, both historically, mentality and linguistically, Dalmatia is rather different from the Banate of Croatia, much more than Vojvodina differs from Srbija ... That being so, couldn't Dalmatia and Istria have been granted at least some form of autonomy, bearing in mind that they lived under the same political and legal conditions for centuries? A federal unit of Primorje would have been a far more natural solution than was the case with Montenegro” (p. 12).

In order to make this principal paradox reach its unbelievable proportions, “even Baranja was annexed to Croatia; there were only about seven to eight thousand *Šokci* in Baranja and no Croats had ever lived there. Why did it then have to be separated from Vojvodina, which had already been distanced from Serbia in its turn? If this very rich area had to be added to Croatia, why was it not recognised as an autonomous region, bearing in mind that its ethnic composition was much more heterogeneous than in Banat and even in Bačka? Baranja had never been under Croatian rule, nor had the inhabitants of Baranja ever wanted to be in Croatia” (p. 12). On the other hand, “Srem was separated into two pieces and the eastern part was ceded to Vojvodina, again to satisfy the Croats although Srem gravitates towards Belgrade and Serbia. It is not part of Vojvodina in the narrower sense of the term” (p. 12). Vojvodina was established in the previous century as the Serbian Voivodeship or Serbian Vojvodina, but Tito strived to exterminate everything that was Serbian in it, both in a political and cultural sense.

That was not the end of it. “Montenegro was recognized as a separate ethnic and state entity, although the Montenegrins are the purest Serbian people and in spite of the fact that, in 1918, the Grand National Assembly of Podgorica decided of its own volition that Serbia and Montenegro should never again be divided” (p. 13). This recognition was formally “motivated by the century-old independence of Montenegro and its specific historical circumstances. Let us accept this argument for a moment. In that case, recognition of the individuality of Dubrovnik and its surroundings would be much more justifiable as the

independence of Dubrovnik was of a greater extent and lasted for a longer period of time. It has also always been a disputed area between the Serbs and the Croats. If it had to be added to the Croatian federal unit, why was it not at least granted autonomy?" (p. 13).

If there had been any freedom of speech and press and if they had any conscience, how would the communists explain "why an autonomous region was not created of Banija, Kordun, Lika and northern Dalmacia – purely Serbian areas that had suffered so much in the war and greatly helped the partisan movement (which was quite understandable as they were facing extermination by the Croats)? Or, why were these areas not ceded to Bosnia when the federal unit of Bosnia-Herzegovina had been created?" (p. 13). This was followed by further fragmentization of the Serbian national territory. "Macedonia was given some purely Serbian areas, while the purely Serbian Bay of Kotor was ceded to Montenegro, where no one was allowed to be a Serb anymore. There could be Croats, Italians, Albanians and all the others, but there must not be any Serbs. They recognized the individuality of Bosnia-Herzegovina, which is the only unit where the Croats live in compact communities outside Croatia. They did it again in order to please the Croats" (p. 13).

The plan was even more perfidious there. "It was requested by Šubašić and granted by Tito, who believed that the Serbian population had been depleted hugely by the Croatian murders, that all the Muslims that had once been called the "blossom of the Croatian people" would declare themselves as Croats and that both Bosnia and Herzegovina would afterwards fall into the Croatian lap like ripe apples" (p. 14). Since the communist regime served them so well by systematizing all the Croatian historical falsifications and tailoring the country's borders in accordance with them, the Croats had whole decades at their disposal to thoroughly prepare for the dissolution of Yugoslavia. All along, the Serbian national consciousness and pride were oppressed so harshly that the Croats were quite right to think: "If, having lost the war and after committing such atrocious crimes, we were able to enlarge our territories so much, then how much more we can expect in a more favourable constellation" (p. 14).

b) The Croats cannot be Trusted

Even when they gain a lot, the Croats are far from satisfied. They always ask for more. Under the Agreement of 1939, the royal regime warranted so many of their demands that all rational people found it unbelievable. The Agreement had hardly taken effect when Maček's clique started circulating the statements that they were not bound by it as they had further unrealized aspirations. "Advocates of the Agreement close to the Court and the Government (as many as could be counted using your fingers) were adamant that the Croatian appetites had been completely satiated. We who knew the Croats better were not convinced. And we were right. In the misfortune that had befallen us, there was one good thing: the Croats had quite clearly determined their course and they no longer hid their demands from the Serbs – demands that can only be

characterized as shameless and criminal (as they aimed at stealing the Serbian territories carried out through murdering the Serbian population of those lands). Each Serb who does not want to grasp this today is indeed responsible for what the Croats did to us and for what they still intend to do" (p. 15).

The only suitable response to Croatian demands of this type could be placing adequate counter-demands. If "the Croats can request all of Bosnia-Herzegovina in which less than one fifth of the population was Croatian, then we Serbs can much more rightfully demand the entire area of Croatia and Slavonia because our people comprised more than a quarter of the entire population there. This is just the national aspect of the issue; the other aspects, as will be discussed elsewhere, only reinforce our positions. Thus, the Croats would be left only with Primorje and the islands. Nonetheless, if they demand Sandžak, then we have ten times more right to demand all of Istria for ourselves, because there is at least one Serbian settlement in Istria and Sandžak has no Croatian ones. If they request Mitrovica and beyond, we shall ask for the islands and further. There is no other way to have the Croats come to their senses" (p. 16).

Any hesitance and forbearance can lead to catastrophic consequences for the Serbs. "If we remain silent to the Croatian demands and do not answer with equal measure, the world will gradually get the impression that the Croats are right. And they only wait for another opportunity to have a foreigner and enemy offer them all the requested territories on a plate. They will simply prove that these territories were always the object of their aspirations, that they never gave up on them and that the Serbs had nothing to state against it; they would do it by stating that it is not the Serbs who live there, but Vlachs, Gypsies, etc. We already know all of those Croatian 'arguments', and yet we tolerate them with some inexplicable consideration" (p. 16).

It is most important that we do not succumb to the Croatian treachery as they are a nation that cannot be trusted; one cannot trust their intelligentsia, their priests, their labour, their peasants, their women and their men. Whoever has Croatian national consciousness is, at the same time, full of hatred towards the Serbs. This consciousness and hatred complement one another. The hatred feeds the consciousness and the consciousness provides a basis for the hatred to grow. The Croats are an unseen phenomenon in world history: "How should one categorize this people and respond to it? They have never been impressed by the truth. They would not give us Serbian areas, the purely Serbian lands that we won by sword and ruled humanly. They demand for themselves territories that are not Croatian at all, but predominantly Serbian – territories they never conquered and could not rule even when they were ceded to them by foreigners, places in which they left traces of the most inhumane governance ever seen in modern times. And then we turn out to be the *Velikosrbi* (Translator's note: promoters of Great Serbia) when we request our lands, and they are the *Malohrvati* when they demand that which is not theirs and pillage and murder the population" (p. 18).

Pavelić's politics was continued by all the post-war Croatian

politicians, especially by the likes of Juraj Krnjević, who pretended to be true democrats and defenders of human rights. They would have recognized the rights of the Serbs had they [the Serbs] voluntarily renounced their homeland, their faith and national consciousness and given their cultural and traditional legacies to the Croats for adoption so they could freely present them as their ancient heritage. "It is clear that the Serbs could never accept Croatian ownership of the purely Serbian territories. They never wanted to make peace with the Austrian rule, which had even been compared to the Croatian governance. The same goes for the Muslims and the Gypsies – nobody wishes to accept the exclusive rule of the worst and most disgraceful race of that area. And then Krnjević would say that Pavelić's law shall be applied against them. I hereby warn the Serbs to mark these words of Krnjević, lest we are once again surprised" (p. 19).

The Croats expected the Serbs who would remain within the State of Croatia after its separation to be completely obedient; at the same time, they tried to justify all their activities aimed at toppling the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, although it was they who wanted a state union with the Serbs after World War I and saw it as their only salvation. As a guarantee of their goodwill, they invoked their dedication to western culture, democratic sentiment and the traditional Croatian "honour and morality"; to make it even more cynical, they recalled their political wisdom. "Indeed, it is the ultimate cynicism and quite worthy of the Croats. Entire Serbian areas would have to remain under the Croats, while not a single Croatian village would be under the Serbs. And the Croats would treat the Serbs under their governance as they have treated them so far. This treatment is indeed in accordance with both international and God's laws (God forgive me). We saw the true face of Croatian culture, honour and democracy in the last decade of this century. After nine centuries, they were twice given the chance to establish their own country and, on both occasions (first Pavelić and then Tito with Subašić), they established the cruellest dictatorships and organized the extermination of their own citizens" (p. 20-21).

c) Ready for Crimes

Historical experience has taught us that "precisely owing to this Croatian culture, not a single Serb should remain under Croatian rule. If they remain, ... Serbian guerrillas will emerge to protect their people and their ethnic territory; they will be supported by the Serbs from all the Serbian areas ... There would be no alternative to such a scenario. Either the Serbs would be left to the mercy of the Croats and their lives sacrificed, or they would have to defend themselves from the imminent danger. In such a case, an armed rebellion would be universally acceptable as a legitimate means of self defence" (p. 21). If they found themselves within the borders of any Croatian state, the Serbs would either be exterminated or they would have to declare themselves as Orthodox Croats. And that would be just the first stage until the renewed proselytism took effect. It is of primary importance to have the

Serbs renounce their national consciousness, thereby destroying their political and state consciousness. "And they demand that millions of Serbs subject to this or to an even worse regime. They demand it in their own right, as if they were cattle or slaves. They demand it without thinking that perhaps their opinion regarding their destiny should also be heard. And if the table is turned and the Serbs suggest a similar thing to the Croats, then they never cease complaining. And I repeat, the Croats will never come to their senses until their aspirations are countered with equal measure" (p. 22).

The Croats are not concerned with historical facts and statistical data, nor are they bothered by the public will that is expressed through the plebiscite. None of this would be in agreement with their demands. It is not only these purely Serbian territories that they aspired to; they first demanded Carniola, Styria and Carinthia, in which the same language is spoken as in Croatian Zagorje: "Once they realised that the assimilation of Slovenes was facing difficulties, the Croats turned to the Serbian lands with much more zeal. In order to achieve their goals more easily, the Croats invented the so-called Illyrian movement and accepted the Serbian language as their own, so that language would not be an obstacle for their Croatisation of everyone who spoke Serbian! This is yet another thing that is unprecedented in world history" (p. 28). But they did not stop at that. "Although the differences between the literary language of the Serbs and Croats had been annulled, there remained many other differences, such as alphabet, faith, etc. Again, they first resorted to treachery in these areas, then to violence. Gaj wanted to introduce the Cyrillic script but the Court of Vienna prevented that. Had he managed to instate the Cyrillic alphabet, their national proselytism would have been more successful. When this endeavour failed, the Croats simply prohibited the Cyrillic script whenever they had an opportunity" (p. 28).

The question of historical rights was annulled by the French Civil Revolution and only the Croats still invoke those rights, even though they could not find any strong foundation there as they left their former territories a long time ago and the Serbs have lived there for more than three centuries – in some places even as long as five centuries. "The Croats as a people cannot have any historical rights whatsoever, let alone the right to a territory of any kind as, in the Middle Ages, territories did not belong to any nation of people but to the landlords, magnates and kings. Also, in Austro-Hungary, the Middle Ages lasted almost until 1918. The Croatian nobility that held certain territories as fiefs had no Croatian blood. And if it had been, they could claim certain historical rights, but not the Croatian 'nation', which started to develop no sooner than the 19th century, just like any other central European people; it started to develop under different designations and could not find its path and even its name for decades – just another thing that makes the Croatian people unrivalled by any other nation" (p. 32).

Moreover, when the Croats insist on anachronistic historical rights, they do it quite inconsistently in a legal sense. "It is understandable that the Croats do not wish to and cannot present any general principles

because they would have to recognize these same principles towards other nations. No, these principles can only be applied to the Croats and only regarding the Croatian issue. All other previous and subsequent migrations and acquisitions should be ignored. It does not matter who lived in those areas before the Croats. They do not have any rights, as this principle has been established to serve the greatest and the most significant people – the cultured Croats. What came after them was only the usurpation and misappropriation of the Croatian territories. Such a psychosis was probably the reason why the Croats did not defend their territory” (p. 40). If this principle were universally accepted, all migrations of all peoples could be questioned with regard to their consequences. Appalled by such an inhumane attitude, Kostić put forth a new formulation of his previous statement: “Every people should feel the immorality and impossibility of their own megalomaniac demands on its back. Each nation should be reciprocated for what they want to do unto others” (p. 41).

Although they lost both World Wars, “the Croats assume a brazen and haughty attitude that is unmatched by any winner of these wars. Not only do they act as if they had won these wars, but as if they were the only victors” (p. 43). The more the historical facts are indisputable and devastating for them, the more they just ignore them. “In World War I, the Croats were the most loyal and steadfast army of His Apostolic Majesty of Vienna. No one was mentioned and commended more often in the reports of the Main Staff than the Croatian ‘Regiments’. They were described in the world lexicons as unwavering supporters of the Central Powers ... At the Paris Peace Conference, the presiding official Clemenceau stated that he would never forget that the Croats had fought for Austria with all their might until the last moment” (p. 43). The situation after World War II was quite similar. “When they lost the war, instead of answering for their crimes and paying reparation, the Croats were awarded with more territories. One should rightfully ask why this happened. The answer is quite simple: as they have no integrity, they once again snuck under the tail of the winner and joined his block. Once they were the enthusiastic Ustashas and now they are the enthusiastic communists” (p. 44).

To make this historical tragicomedy even more absurd, the Croatian “ministers in the royal government, legally brought Josip Broz to power. Tito gave them more in return than Prince Pavle and Dragiša Cvetković had given them earlier. They were even given Istria and the Kvarner Gulf. This is an unprecedented case: they had been responsible for the war with the western allies and were given foreign territories in return. The Croats again used the Serbian victims and their struggle to enlarge their territory” (p. 44).

Bearing in mind that they never won any wars, the Croats dismiss any idea that a victory could be a relevant factor for determining the borders between the states. “But they were never treated as a defeated party, as they had always prepared different national strategies – one of them would enable them to stick to the victor. Sometimes they are Austrians, sometimes Hungarians, Illyrians or Celts; sometimes they are

communists, Catholics, Slovenes and westerners, and sometimes they are even Croats; it all depends on the current political trends. And then, having snuck towards the victor, they gradually work their way up to become equal and eventually start issuing requests and demand compensations. They hold that victory in the war was achieved jointly in those areas where they had done everything they could to prevent it. Will the world ever see through this shameless game? (p. 45).

In the latter part of his brochure, Kostić simply ridiculed the Croatian national salute – “We are ready for our homeland!” In the Croatian Ustasha State, “when people would meet each other, they were not allowed to wish one another good health, or bless each other etc.. Instead, one of them would say that he was ‘ready’ and the other would reply ‘for our homeland’. That was the ‘salute’ of the ‘free Croats’ – their pride and specialty, which was immediately adopted by all of them. The Croats were also supposed to have some originality and contribute something individual and new to history. So they left this ‘salute’ and the massacres they had committed everywhere and at all times” (p. 46). As a matter of fact, they were nothing more than miserable imitators and a caricature of the German Nazis and Italian Fascists. “It was a real pleasure to see the Croats greet each other so nobly during the war; they would shake their fascist hands and reassure each other that they were ready for their homeland. Then they would exchange important looks, their faces would flush with blood and it seemed that they were indeed ready to sacrifice their lives for the ‘homeland’ at any time” (p. 48). They were resolute to defend Croatia – until the situation became grave.

d) The *Poglavnik* Fled Disguised as a Friar

The founders of the Croatian fascist state caused tragic consequences in practice, no matter how facetious they appeared. “Under the motto of ‘We are ready for the homeland’, the Croats murdered all the Serbs they found unarmed in their state, including women, children and the elderly. However, if they encountered a company of Serbian defenders and avengers of the people, these Croats, armed to their teeth as they were, would retreat and flee whenever they could” (p. 47). Kostić referred to a comical event that occurred at Kninsko Polje during some Croatian public celebration. “During a mass held in a church full of Ustashas ready for their homeland, someone shouted: ‘Here come the Chetniks!’ All of them immediately ran away, including the priest in his robe, the Ustashas and the Home Guard in their uniforms. There was no one left to see what those Chetniks looked like, although the Chetniks did not kill unarmed people. All of those ready for their homeland fled to find the nearest shelter. Most importantly, there were no Chetniks in sight. Someone had played a prank on the Croats to see how ready they were for the homeland” (p. 47).

Kostić quoted another example: “When the partisans attacked Croatia with the Russians covering their backs, the Croats did not spend a single defending themselves. The entire army simply surrendered and joined the opposite side, while the generals, commanders and their *uzglavnici*

(Translator's note: – deputy head of an organization) fled to German territory or sought protection from the Italians and Hungarians. The *Poglavnik* camouflaged himself as a friar. The Muslim *doglavnici* put on the chadars and veils worn by their women and fled as far as the Middle East. Then they remembered that they were not Croats but Muslims” (p. 47). There was total chaos in Zagreb in the spring of 1945. “Before the escape, all the ‘Croatian’ make-up artists were summoned to Zagreb and disguising and reshaping the ready-for-their-homeland Ustashas lasted for several days. One had his nose curved, the other had it straightened, their ears were jagged or flattened, etc. Once they were certain no one could recognize them, these *doglavnici* and *uzglavnici* ran for their lives and thus readied themselves for their homeland” (p. 48).

When the situation became tough, the brave Croatian “army ran so fast that even the bullets could not catch up with them. All of them sought safety and shelter outside the state borders, a little bit farther from the homeland they were always ready for. They shed their uniforms and presented themselves to the English and Americans as their allies, although they imposed this war on them and were always ‘ready’ to sacrifice themselves in the struggle for their homeland and against them. Marshal Pétain of France stood before the court and asked that he alone should be sentenced and his subordinates released because, as he stated, they acted pursuant to his orders. This was far from true, but the French gentleman could not have said anything else. The same was the case with General Nedić, who was not responsible for any deaths, let alone any Croatian deaths; he did not disguise and hide his name or whereabouts and he died as a hero. His brother also did not hide and he committed suicide although he had not collaborated with the enemy. On the other hand, the Croatian leaders, the highest representatives of the movement and the regime fled like women as soon as they had lost their German and Italian bodyguards. Not a single one committed suicide like Hitler and Goebbels did. Though General Mihailović and his brave fighters did not have a motto of readiness for the homeland, they all stayed in the country and fought till the end, unlike the Croats who once again showed what they had been ready to do for their country and how much they were worthy of it” (p. 48).

In this way, Kostić also warned the Serbian politicians against repeating the mistake of 1939, when incompetent people tailored the faith of the Serbs. We have to prepare for all possible scenarios of the resolution of the territorial disputes with the Croats; we cannot leave this task to ignorant people who would behave like Dragiša Cvetković or Cincar-Marković, who left many purely Serbian territories at the mercy of the Croats. “This could not have happened, even in Austria. For decades, they dealt with the issues of annexing Dalmatia to Croatia, the abolition of the Military Krajina, the status of Bosnia, the trialism, Serbian Vojvodina, etc. Indeed, the people had very little say in these issues but they were analyzed thoroughly and extensively. There could be no sudden and unexpected solution, as the people could not be transferred overnight from one area to another; they could not be moved

to a different administrative or state unit and have their political status fundamentally changed without even knowing that it would happen and that the authorities planned to do it” (p. 57).

The fact that such a thing happened to the Serbs shows that the then state authorities were devoid of any democratic spirit. Kostić thought that the events of the 27th March were a direct consequence of the popular dissatisfaction with the previous agreement with the Croats. The experience of World War II provided a horrible and irrefutable argument for all subsequent debates with the Croats. However, instead of having the Croatian crimes persistently stigmatised, the communist regime systematically concealed the traces of those crimes and contrived artificial comparisons in order to exculpate the Croatian people.

However, instead of a steady and continuous stigmatization of Croatian war crimes, the communist regime systematically covered their trails and created artificial symmetries in order to absolve the Croatian nation of any guilt. “In today’s communist Yugoslavia, one must not speak of Croatian crimes. Serbian crimes are emphasized there and even the Thessalonica process is referred to in such a way as to present the Serbs and the Serbian administration of justice in the worst possible way. Yet, the murders of hundreds of thousands of Serbs, including the helpless and the weak by the Croatian beasts – murders without any condemnation and justification – have been silently ignored. Furthermore, whoever mentions them gets punished” (p. 59).

Regarding Croatian pretensions on Bosnia and Herzegovina, Lazo Kostić replies: “History speaks for the Serbs, as do ethnography, statistics and heroic deeds. The morals speak for the Serbs as well – military and political. And all this speaks against the Croats. If there were no other arguments save for events from the last war, the Serbs should be acknowledged Bosnia within the boundaries of their innocent graves” (p. 66). But the most significant thing here, in case of any plebiscite, all variants in Bosnia and Herzegovina would be possible except joining Croatia, notwithstanding all Croatian courting of Bosnian and Herzegovina Muslims.

Kostić ends the brochure by drawing a series of lessons that should guide Serbian politicians in the future, particularly in finding common grounds with the Italians and possibly the Hungarians in relation to some future way of resolving the Croatian issue. Perhaps, the most important of all the lessons was that, in WWII, the Serbs suffered all the blows “because we protected the Croatian territory from external enemies. For example, if we had given Italy what, as monsignor Stepinac says, only the Croats had given it by plebiscite – territory where the Serbs hardly lived – we would undoubtedly have been spared the Italian assault. We would have been spared even from importing Pavelić and ultimately from all the Croatian atrocities. Mussolini would have probably been able to take Hitler aside so as not to attack us at all. In any case, we would have had incomparably fewer losses. But we considered that our national duty was to protect Croatian territory, although it cost us three times more Serbian victims than the number of Croatian people who generally lived there. To avoid scarifying the

3. Croatian Delusions and Forgeries

Kostić's brochure *Delusions and Distortion as a Foundation of Nationality* was published by the same publisher in Hamilton in 1959. In this brochure, the author deals with some particular Croatian forgeries, stating in the preface that “the Croats have surpassed all nations in the world in this respect. They invent history; present their vices as virtues, their defeats as victories, their poverty as wealth. They are proud of things others would be ashamed of” (p. 3). We Serbs would not mind this much if they “did not assign their shame to us, taking away our glory from us. And they have been doing this systematically for one hundred years now, both in the country and abroad” (p. 3).

Through the mouth of Ante Starčević, they even declared the Nemanjićs to be a Croatian dynasty. Actually, he claimed that all Serbs were Croats, if they were not Vlachs, martoloz, Racis, etc. In the papers we have mentioned, he writes about the Serbs as follows: “We are assured that those Croats who hate a glorious Croatian name because of faith, or would not accept it because Vlach slave blood still runs through their veins... the so-called Serbian clergy, which through fanaticism departed from Croatian national feeling, seems to be guilty of the misfortunes of the Eastern Greek populace. By teaching that he is a Serb, he puts everything else aside... This is where all evil lies, and neither us nor them will be saved unless they have given up the imagined Serbian national feeling and miserable Serbian propaganda once and for all. Let them be Croats” (p. 8).

In this brochure, Kostić pays special attention to unmasking Croatian attempts to appropriate Grand Vizier Mehmed Pasha Sokolović. Although in historical science it has always been indisputable that Sokolović was a Serb, Kostić presents discovered data that a high Turkish state dignitary had declared himself a Serb. After all, he re-established the Serbian Patriarchate in Peć and appointed his brother, Makarije Sokolović, as patriarch. Stating a large amount of data from famous scientists who had researched the origin and life of Mehmed Pasha in detail, Kostić wonders: “How on earth can Mehmed Sokolović be a Croat? How can ‘a sparrow hawk be hatched from a falcon’s nest?’ The Croats are appropriating him. However, with fire and sword they used to kill all the Serbs just because they were Orthodox. They would kill them, throw them into bottomless pits, butcher them; there would be no trace of them if they kept the old faith and if the Croats got hold of them. And now they claim that those were all Croats, even Mehmed the Grand Vizier, a native of Sokolovići” (p. 22-23).

Actually, Kostić copies his seventeen newspaper articles previously published in the Hamilton *Canadian Serb Defender* and the Chicago *Freedom* here. In these articles, he explained in more detail the issue of the nationality and denomination of Mehmed Sokolović, his native home, his life before becoming a Turk, his church service in his

IT-03-67-T
youth, his literacy, the origin of his surname, his closest relatives who left a significant historic trail, the destiny of the Sokolović family, Pasha's Christian name, his military career and the political significance of the Turkish empire, as well as the use of the Serbian language in the sultan's court and the diplomatic correspondence in Serbian. All the facts that Kostić writes about here have been universally known in Serbian historiography for a long time and have found a significant place in history textbooks for primary and secondary schools.

However, Kostić's articles were a pleasant refreshment for the emigrant environment of the fifties, particularly as the polemics of Croatian appropriation and the book by the Englishman Lambo who had presented Croatian lies as historical facts. Kostić ends this series of articles with an effective citation of Constantine Jiricek: “Mehmed Sokolović, who had only been known to date as a Turkish commander-in-chief and statesman, was also a Serbian patriot in secret ... The relation of Sokolović with the church in Peć shows that the awareness of the Moslem Serbs of the 16th century of a national and religious origin was not extinguished at all and that they tended to use their influence in Porta for the benefit of its national church, the only remainder of the old state organism” (p. 58).

In the next text of his, Kostić writes on the forgeries of the Croatian pseudo-historian, Pavle Riter Vitezović, who appropriated the Zeta ruler, the Holy King Vladimir, whom he named king of Croatia. After all, he also used to appropriate Hungarian King Laszlo, which even Vjekoslav Kralj considered “strange”. He also claimed that the Russians, Czechs and Moravians had originated in Croatia, saying: “The fertile Croatia, with as great a glorification as possible, had received to its shelter a shining pearl, which was revealed after six centuries. Long before that, the Czech, Lech and Rus had originated in you and founded three kingdoms. Now, Vladislav of royal blood was returned to you, that Apostle of Slavonia, full of credit in this world and in heaven. Hungary owes praise to your holy son as well. Oh thou Croatia, who enriched Sarmatia, Europe and heaven with glorious sons of yours!” (p. 61-62). Riter's book was published in Zagreb in 1700 in German, since the Croats had no literary or written language at the time. The translation was made later, by Klaić in 1914.

A contemporary Croatian historian, don Kerubin Šegvić, claimed during WWII that Štefan Prvovenčani (Stephen the First-Crowned) was a Croat and that all Croats were Goths. Rudolf Horvat wrote that the Croats had 245 rulers from the time of Ban Borna in 816 through to 1918, stating their names, although there is no historic trail for most of them. Other rulers were foreigners and occupiers. The Serbs could call the rulers of the Turkish Empire the Serbian-Turkish sultans with more historical grounds and credibility than the Croats can call their rulers Croatian-Hungarian kings or Croatian kings of the Habsburg dynasty.

After they appropriated Hungarian and Austrian rulers in such a manner, why should one be surprised when they contended for the literature of Dubrovnik, with the assistance of a communist decree. They could not care less that both Jernej Kopitar and Ernest von Eberg were

explicit in their attitude that Dubrovnik literature was undoubtedly Serbian, with Eberg even calling the Republic of Dubrovnik “a cradle of Dalmatian branch of Serbian literature” (p. 69). In the early Middle Ages, when the Croats had a state, they were not literate. All the more reason to want to appropriate all Serbian literature written in the Latin script – and even the one in Bosnian Cyrillic script, the so-called “*Bosančica*”.

Thus they appropriated a large number of intellectuals of Italian nationality from the Dalmatian Littoral area and the islands – such as Joannes Lucius or Nicolo Tomase who, apart from the Italian national consciousness, also cherished the Serbian one while he simply could not stand Croats. To tell the truth, there were Serb Catholics who honestly and emotionally advocated the bonding of Serbs and Croats and, although they kept the Serbian national feeling, they made great intellectual efforts to contribute to the Croatian cultural development also. They had a dual identification at the time, for example Petar Preradović (who was born Orthodox) and Ivo Vojnović.

After Petar Preradović had published his first book of poems, *Prvenći* (*First Fruits*), in 1846, he wrote to Vuk Karadžić: “The reasons for not writing these poems as a Serb and in Cyrillic script are various and it would take lots of time to list them. But, with God’s help which is not the case now, there will be time for that in the future” (p. 85). This letter by Preradović was published in *Source Materials for the History of Croatian Literature*. “Petar Preradović is undoubtedly of Serbian origin, born in a Serbian home, baptized in an Orthodox church, brought up in a patriarchal Serbian environment in his childhood. In the opposite case, we Serbs would not have appropriated him. He became a Croat (if he honestly did at all) through a catholic faith that was imposed on him by the Germans. That is why his destiny was that his granddaughter would become a German writer. In the latest German encyclopaedia Brockhaus, one may find lots of information on Paula von Preradović, stating in passing that she is a granddaughter of ‘a Croatian national poet and general Petar von Preradović. If there had been no granddaughter, the grandfather would not even have been mentioned’ (p. 86). The final conclusion that Kostić draws with respect to this issue is that “Petar Preradović may not be considered undoubtedly a Serbian poet or a Croatian one. He is a type of renegade that cannot find himself nationally. Therefore his granddaughter Paula is a distinctly German writer and the author of a new national anthem of Austria” (p. 86).

a) The Serbian Origin of the Vojnović Brothers

The father of Lujo and Ivo Vojnović – Kosto – was born on 29 February 1832 in Herceg Novi, in a family originating from Užice, being the descendants of a Serbian aristocrat from the period of the reign of the Nemanjić dynasty. Kosto was, naturally, an Orthodox and was christened in the Savina monastery but, after his father’s death, his mother took him to Zadar where he was converted to Catholicism. Sava Nakićenović wrote about his sons, Ivo and Lujo: “Both of them are

Roman Catholics. It is sad that this line of a famous Serbian family, whose ancestors loved the Orthodox faith more than anything in this world, which neither Bogomilism heresy, Jesuit plots, Mohammed’s Koran, nor attractive high positions for Turks, various titles, salaries and the promises of the Venetian government could shake – it is sad that he, as we saw in a simple case, had broken away from his ancestors’ faith and embraced Roman-Catholicism” (p. 88). Even so, Serbian national feeling broke out of Ivo Vojnović to the fullest in his middle age and so, in 1914, he was arrested in Dubrovnik and imprisoned as a Serbian poet.

The Croats also appropriated Valtazar Bogišić, Vid Vuletić Vukasović, Ljudevit Vuličević, Matija Ban, Milan Resetar, Marko Murat, Josip Berza and many other Serbian Catholics – even Stjepan Mitrov Ljubiša, although he was an Orthodox and prominent Serbian political leader. Valtazar Bogišić writes in his autobiography: “The Bogišići and the entire county of Konavle from which they had come from, which even Porphyrogenitos mentions as being within the Serbian county, had been Orthodox from ancient times but, after they were taken over by the Republic of Dubrovnik in the 15th century, friars came and brought in Catholicism” (p. 95-96). Vid Vuletić Vukasović was described by his close associate and ethnologist, Tihomir Đorđević: “Vid originates from a reputable and honourable Serbian family from Grac in Herzegovina, but he was born in the village of Brsečine near Dubrovnik on 16 December 1853, where his father had come in his youth. He practices Catholicism. He is a good son of his faith... but he still feels the old Serbian blood in his veins and the old Serbian feeling in his soul, which inspires him and leads him in his doings” (p. 97).

The Croats also tried to take away significant contemporary Serbian men of letters such as Ivo Cipiko, Vladan Desnica, Vojin Jelić, Čedo Prica, Dušanka Popović, Kosta Spajić, Ivo Andrić, Josif Pančić, Toma Roksandić, Pjer Križanić, etc. They even tried to take away the name and work of Nikola Tesla, for the enormous reputation he has worldwide. They often reached for Mihajlo Pupin as well. They do this in spite of the fact that the Croats themselves reduced Tesla’s family home to rubble during the WWII and killed many of his relatives. The Croats do not mind the fact that these distinguished intellectuals declared themselves Serbian and proved this in all their life-work. Neither did the prominent Austrian generals of Serbian nationality do better. The Croats tried to present Marshal Svetozar Borojević, Admiral Vuković, Generaloberst Pavle Puhalo as their fellow-countrymen.

Going back to the past, they claimed Stojan Janković as well. The international car ace Bill Vuković, an American of Serbian origin, was proclaimed a Croat in America, as well as Stepović, the first governor of Alaska. The forgeries are systematically made when printing scientific and literary works. The adjective “Serbian” is regularly omitted and the language is artificially Croatized. Even the titles of the works are changed so that they could be adjusted to megalomaniac national aspirations.

We already spoke of the stealing of national poems. This is how the

Croatian Professor Armin Pavić explains Croatian claims over Serbian literary works and men of letters in a preface to the publication of *Two Old Croatian Poems*, published by the Yugoslav Academy of Science and Arts: “Our poem could also have been written by a Serb from the flock of those who fled to Croatia from the Serbian despots after 1459... But this Serb, having moved from the country of Serbia to Croatian Srem and having become a Croatian citizen, lost by that the only label by which, as a Serbian citizen, he was different from the Croats and replaced it with another label under which, as a Croatian citizen, he was different from Serbs” (p. 122). So, the poems used to be Serbian before, but the Serbs who had written them had ceased to be Serbs and became Croats. Thus the poems they had written naturally became Croatian.

4. The Ustasha Ideology of Stjepan Radić

In Melbourne in 1976, Lazo Kostić published a second edition of the first volume from the series *Brave Croatian Husbands* under the title *Stjepan Radić towards Serbian National Feeling*. In this work, the author tended to break the rigid delusions about the personal characteristics of one of the most significant Croatian political leaders of the 20th century, “who changed his principles as he did his shirts, but he always hated the Serbs and worked against them. Sometimes he did that openly, sometimes more or less in secret, but he never did anything against it or denied it unless hypocrisy ordered it” (p. 5). Being traditionally naive, many Serbs, politicians and publicists in the first place, contributed to the creation of the peculiar enthusiasm for, or even the myth of Radić as a fighter for democracy and social justice – as an advocate of Yugoslav-hood, etc. Kostić points out that “no one could hide his wickedness like he did; even to pretend to be a friend to those who he had undermined all his life” (p. 6). After WWII, the Titoistic regime even presented Stjepan Radić and his brother as progenitors of the National Liberation Struggle of their own kind, very close to communists in terms of ideology.

The more time passed, the more Radić’s historical role was glorified, in parallel with the process of the systematic materialization of the legal and political conditions for the execution of Tito’s concept of breaking Yugoslavia apart at the particular expense of Serbia. “For a certain time in communist Yugoslavia, the name of Stjepan Radić was rarely mentioned, but not prohibited. It would appear in connection with charging the Serbs with something. For example, that he was killed by a Serb, although his countrymen are not now considered to be Serbs nor are they allowed to declare themselves as such. The books say that the Court was an accomplice in that horrible murder, even King Aleksandar himself. Only the Croats could say something like that, being themselves the greatest criminals of the century. It is idiotism without par. If King Aleksandar wanted and ordered the murder of Stjepan Radić, wouldn’t he have found another way to do it, other than a spectacular shooting in Parliament before the eyes, so to say, of the whole world? Couldn’t the king hire killers to put him away?” (p. 6). After all, even the reputable

historians from Belgrade and Zagreb, such as Jovan Marjanović and Ferd Culinović, whose scientific authority was indisputable even under the communist regime, openly claimed that there had been no evidence of King Aleksandar’s implication in the assassination, which had actually been executed by Radical Parliament member, Puniša Račić.

While the post-war regime spokesmen pointed out that both the Serbs and the Croats had joined the partisans, having followed the ideological and life ideals of the Radić brothers, Kostić states that Radić’s son “in Zagreb during the war, claimed that Stipica had been a predecessor of the Ustahas equal to them. The Serbs had joined the partisans to liberate themselves from Radić’s followers who sought their lives, not by following Radić’s ideology” (p. 8). In the preface, Kostić especially emphasizes the fact that no Belgrade street had been named after Nikola Pašić during the communist regime, while one of the downtown city ones had been named after Stjepan Radić, “although Pašić had been the Mayor of Belgrade and the President of the Serbian Government in the most turbulent and most glorious days of our recent past. He was President of the Government of the Kingdom of Serbia during almost the whole of WWI, while Stjepan Radić intrigued and wrote the most horrible pamphlets against Serbia. Yet, there was no street in the capital of Serbia of that time named after Nikola P. Pašić (in Zurich, where I live now and where I write this, there is a board on a building where he stayed as a student of the Polytechnic College). Still, the street named after the one who scolded and accused the Serbian Government and the Serbian nation throughout the war ‘embellishes’ Belgrade even today. This would be a sufficient reason to highlight his attitude and his conduct during WWI and towards Serbia generally. All documented, as I always do. I wonder what would happen if a board appeared in Zagreb or in any other city in Croatia naming a street after Nikola Pašić? It would be smeared or taken off every day. Only a Serb is so tolerant and puts up with everything” (p. 11-12).

Stjepan Radić appeared on the Croatian political scene as a true follower of Ante Starčević, who was named the “father of the homeland” by the Ustahas. Radić left the Croatian Party of Rights and found himself in the Croatian Peasant Party, exclusively because he estimated that it would be easier to realize his personal political ambitions in that way, but he never made any real distance from the policy of the former party. After all, the fact that Radić’s policy is based on Starčević’s and stayed within its ideological limits was witnessed by Bogdan Krizman and Josip Horvat – and, in his papers *Home* of 22 September 1914, having joined in the overall anti-Serbian hysteria and glorifying Starčević’s opinion of the Serbs, Radić himself says: “He did not recognize the Serbs. Not just in Croatia, he did not recognize them in Serbia either. He wrote that the Serbs in Croatia were Gypsies, Vlachs and God knew what, who had fled there to avoid death on a Turkish stake. The Serbs are therefore the Vlach brood, ripe for an axe. They are drifters and also an itch on the body of the Croatian people” (p. 15).

From 1895 to 1905, Radić acted from Yugoslav positions, but then he started to propagate the Danube Region Federation in order to curry

favour with the Habsburg court and, in the line of Austrian and Hungarian snipes at each other, to strongly advocate the side of Vienna. As a Czech publicist, František Hlaváček wrote that

Stjepan Radić “stepped to the Vienna line, bowed to the Habsburgs, and remained their admirer and fan until the end of the war, served their interests against Serbia and against the interests of other Slavic people in such a manner that he might be called servile” (p. 20) and he was the most fervent in conducting anti-Serbian politics.

In the territories that the Croats had pretensions to, Stjepan Radić did not recognize the existence of the Serbian people at all. He imagined the Danube Federation as a monarchy with five federal units, of which Croatia would be one, extending over all the south Slavic provinces that had already been under the Habsburg crown at the time. “There would be as many Serbs there as Croats, if not more, but Radić does not envisage any national rights for them. They would be just a hanger-on to the Croats. It is understandable that their position would be immeasurably worse than that of Croats in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenians and in Yugoslavia. The Serbs would generally lose their name – to the benefit of the Croats of course. This seems completely natural to him” (p. 24). Along with Croatia, the integral parts of the federally structured monarchy would be the Czech Republic, Galitia, Hungary and the Alpine Germany. At the session of the Croatian Parliament on 12 March 1914, Radić said, among other things, that “there are a number of documents proving that Montenegro used to be an integral part of Croatia... Now we wanted to pass to Serbia. I have proved that Mačva, in the northern part of Serbia, used to be an autonomous Banate of Croatia – that, by the Karlovac peace treaty, one part of Serbia came under the monarchy. I also said that Bulgaria once had a part of Srem” (p. 25). Referring to Josip Horvat and his book *Croatia and Panopticum*, Kostić adds the information that Stjepan Radić used to be a paid agent of Vienna for several decades.

On writing about Vinko Kršković, Horvat says that, as a vice-governor, Kršković found himself in a rather unpleasant situation when he became convinced that Radić had been an Austrian hireling. In Horvat’s book, published in Zagreb in 1965, there is unambiguous testimony of Radić’s immorality and inconsistency: “After the May Declaration, the leader of the Croatian Popular Peasant Party, Stjepan Radić, having been a loud Austrian patriot so far, suddenly became radicalized, finally shouting in the Parliament ‘Down with Austria!’ Several days later, the presidency of the Austrian Government asked the Governor by telephone to call Radić to account; Vienna could not understand Radić – for years he had been receiving support in money from a secret fund on condition he advocated the policy of the dynasty. Ban Mihalović did not personally care for Radić and he assigned the task to Krišković. Radić apologized, saying that he had been carried away by temperament and that he would mend things at the following session. In sessions to follow, however, Radić repeated his scandalous anti-Austrian and anti-dynasty behaviour. Austria was dying at the time. No one in Zagreb knew that Radić had been receiving grants from Vienna since the

year of the Rijeka Resolution; not even to the “worldly government”, since it was a unique act against the system of dualism, intolerable mingling and scheming. That is why the grants were being paid through Ljubljana (via dra Šusterčik, a leader of the clerical party who favoured Austria). Krišković did not hide his antipathies towards Radić, even at a later stage. Radić’s act was not in accordance with his ethical criterion” (p. 28).

A man of no principles and moral scruples suddenly grew into a generally-known and untouchable Croatian political leader after WWI. As Horvat pointed out, “history will find it hard to reconstruct the phenomenon of Radić from archive material, his writing, short hand reports of his speeches or reports from numerous sessions. In such a way, a Herbarium says little or nothing of the live colour and odour of a herb. That man of plain and comic appearance, with the hypomaniac visionary quality of Don Quixote, erudite as an encyclopaedia but without a grain of rationality, used to have a hypnotic influence on his listeners in both a close circle and in mass sessions. Perhaps he operated in the most complex way when he described unexpected potentials in detail, showing everlasting complexes of the desires and dreams of a collective in a dizzy rhythm. In the fireworks of words, in metaphors of popular language, he would regularly mystify his basic idea of the unity of the southern Slavs as a precondition of establishing a class peasant state, the way he had conceived it. During sessions, the masses could not follow his speech because he spoke in a comparatively low voice – he could only be heard by closest audience, and the masses reacted upon their approval. His ideas were communicated more orally than by the printed word” (p. 30-31).

Rapping the palms of the *Chicago Serbian Struggle* – which “does not acknowledge that anything came out to the benefit of the Serbs from emigration other than what had not originated in the pen of the Drašković brothers” – Kostić cites parts of the book *Stjepan Radić during the Annexation and Wars*, written by a famous Serbian politician and publicist of Roman Catholic denomination, Stijepa Kobasica, and published in Belgrade in 1924. This includes some of the most important speeches of Stjepan Radić, from which it can be seen how enthusiastic he had been during the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. On 28 October 1908, Radić wrote as follows: “The whole of Serbia is in fever and the leading Serbian statesmen have lost reason... Serbia, together with the Government and its sad Peter, is not able to take any heroic and fair measures since it is completely untended and ashamed. Our monarchy should suppress any such venture most energetically and once and for all seal the mouth of that Byzantine race whose propaganda has infected and poisoned everyone... The Serbs dream about some compensation! Doesn’t this word “compensation” sound like some bloody irony? What has Serbia lost? Literally nothing. Bosnia is not a Serbian land. Bosnia and Herzegovina belong to the Croatian king who is entitled to these lands” (p. 34).

The following lines are even more convincing testimony of the hatred with which Radić wrote about the Serbs and the humiliating

obsequiousness with which he used to court the Habsburg regime: "Great misfortune. Two Croatian provinces adjoined to the monarchy. Belgrade is furious and sad because they have lost these two beautiful Croatian provinces for good. If these two territories were adjoined to Serbia... the Serbs would be delighted for Serbia, to whom they have left their sinful soul at the expense of Croatia. But the enthusiasm that has overcome the Croatian towns in Bosnia and Herzegovina is the best proof that we are entitled to rejoice at the annexation, even if all the Serbs ate their hearts out because these provinces were not adjoined to Serbia... Wretched Serbia. Their children cried for war, although they were not even been armed with rifles. While the children were crying 'war, war, war!', the Serbian war minister was having stomach aches at the very thought of the state of the Serbian military forces... Miserable Serbia" (p. 34).

Radić's anti-Serbian hatred was boundless and soon grew into a real obsession, as the following words of his witness: "The Serbs are not just a political, but also an anti-Catholic program. They want to destroy Catholicism and Mohammedanism... We must fight against Serbia. The Dynasty of the Habsburgs is our best and strongest ally, which we had brought to the Croatian throne by a great opportunity... Serbia has no entitlements of state in Croatian territories, thus there must be no political Serbian nation. All the population is Croatian, being the only state-building factor. By becoming Croats, politically they lose nothing but gain religiously, since they become members of one strong nation, which will become a factor within the Habsburg monarchy equal to the Germans and Hungarians. We have been continuously told of harmony with the Serbs. People do not even think about the reach of Serbian aspirations and do not mind the fact that the science that proclaims Orthodox populace in Croatian territories to be Serbs are false. One must not forget that, in Croatia, there are hardly 20,000 Slavic Serbs who were made up by propaganda" (p. 35).

Stjepan Radić published the book *The Live Right of Croatia to Bosnia and Herzegovina* in Zagreb in 1908 in which he proved, by nebulous constructions, that he had not been familiar with the legal science at all. But it is interesting that, on 22 March 1910, Radić himself spoke in a melancholic tone of his attitude towards Bosnia and Herzegovina, quoted Franjo Rački, whose words he had literally cited: "Let gentlemen ask anything from me, but they should not ask me to destroy my historical authority in my old age, or to break my historical convictions... According to history, the whole that is today Bosnia, as far as I know - and I don't know anyone who knows more than me - has never been ours! How on earth can we demand that whole territories be adjoined to Croatia - territories larger than Banska Croatia itself?" (p. 39).

What a shock Radić caused in March 1909 in Rijeka when, during a lecture before a chosen intellectual audience, he pleaded that Russia should recognize Croatia's alleged historical rights over Bosnia and Herzegovina and prevent a potential war between Serbia and Austria because of that issue. He claimed that Serbia and Montenegro had no rights to these territories since they had come into the possession of the Austrian Emperor

who is simultaneously the Croatian king, in a completely legal way. He accused the Serbs of lying about the poor status of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. He praised the moral qualities and philanthropy of the Croatian Catholic priests and the Austrian clerks in that territory and denied the existence of any Serbian national consciousness of the Orthodox and Muslim population there. He claimed that the works of Jovan Cvijić had no scientific value at all and imputed him with chauvinism. The point was that all the Slavs in the Balkans should become a part of the Austrian state and create a strong Slavic community within it.

Regarding the assassination in Sarajevo, Stjepan Radić published the following text in his papers entitled *Home* on 1 July 1914: "No longer shall we be the Croatian lambs eaten by the Serbian wolves. The shameful Serbian crime destroyed the greatest Croatian hope, but, with God's help, this crime will destroy such mean, anti-Croatian, anti-Slavic, godless and inhuman Serbian politics for good in the Croatian land. Let Ferdinand and his Sophia live the eternal glory" (p. 46-47).

Radić's behaviour at the time was also described by Adam Pribičević in his study *Starčevićinian Paranoia. A Report on the Century-Long Hatred of the Serbs*, published on 20 May 1971 in *Voice of the Canadian Serbs*: "After the assassination in Sarajevo in 1914, Stjepan Radić joined a furious Starčevićinian prosecution of the Serbs. The Serbs were denounced and thousands of them were thrown into prisons and POW camps. One Serbian church was demolished in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbian shops were destroyed or robbed in Sarajevo, Mostar and elsewhere, and somewhere the Serbs were burnt alive, as Croatian Parliament member Tresić-Pavičić pointed out in the Parliament of Vienna. The Hungarian Government had saved the Serbs then from what happened to them in 1941-45 but, when the Austrian-Hungarian army broke into Serbia in Mačva in 1914, Croatian soldiers infatuated by Starčević and followers of Radić committed outrageous crimes over the urban Serbian population, which were not inferior to any of Pavelić's between 1941-45. Although Belgrade was not a capital city at the time, there was no Yugoslavia either, so the Serbs could not provoke the Croats by anything" (p. 47-48).

The abovementioned issue of Radić's *Home* boasted that the Croats in Sarajevo destroyed about two hundred Serbian shops, that marshal law had been proclaimed and that a fervent anti-Serbian demonstration had been held in Zagreb for days. Radić's papers published the messages of the Croatian Peasant Party and the Croatian Party of Rights - messages of protest against the attitudes of the President of the Hungarian Government; count Istvan Tisza, who had made strong pleas to avoid the war against Serbia. Radić himself wrote of Ferdinand on 9 July 1914: "He was killed by the Serbs, the Serbian nation. In short, the Serbs wanted to adjoin other countries to their state, not just the territories that had been under the Turks, but Bosnia and Herzegovina in particular. But there they had encountered an obstacle which they removed by bombs and revolvers: they killed Franz Ferdinand when he arrived to prevent the adjoining of these territories to Serbia" (p. 49).

As Bogdan Krizman states in his study *Stjepan Radić and the Croatian Peasant Party in WWI* (published in Zagreb in 1970 in the 2nd issue of the magazine for modern history), in his excessive lamentations in the *Home* papers, Radić's brother Ante points out: "Whenever he heard of the troubles and suffering of the Croatian people, Archduke Franz Ferdinand would say: The first thing I will do as a ruler will be to have the Croats get everything to which they are entitled by God and law. He would also add: I, as a member of the Habsburg Dynasty, consider myself a debtor of the Croats for the year of 1848 and I will pay my debt in a fair way. As soon as I come to the throne, I will unite all the Croatian territories and give a fair Croatian government to everyone" (p. 50). Naturally, this would mean annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina to Banate of Croatia and Dalmatia, so Ante Radić concludes: "That is why the Serbian politicians in Belgrade, in their excessive greed for Bosnia and their even greater hatred of everything that is Croatian, Catholic or Austrian, schemed and ordered a mean and perfidious crime, which they unfortunately succeeded in doing since the politicians were great masters at such crimes" (p. 50).

When the Austrian military campaign against Serbia started, "no one was as enthusiastic and enthusiastic as Radić. It was as if his everlasting dream had come true. He shouts joyously, greets the army and the king who will finally settle accounts with a mean enemy, he screams in expectation of the fall of Serbia. This mood does not leave him throughout the war. He sees the war as the effectuation of his own and his Croatian nation's desires" (p. 51). In accordance with that, Radić's papers report on 22 September 1941: "Victories in Serbia fill us with happiness. The heroic deeds of the 16th and 53rd Croatian regiments in Mačva imbue us with pride. Our army victoriously broke into Serbia at four points, to Loznica from Bosnia and to Obrenovac from lower Croatia. In this way, the Serbian Posavina and Serbian Podrinje are in our hands now, being the most fertile, the most civilized and the most valuable part of Serbia. This is a former Banate of Mačva. Our army often had to fight very hard on its way. The Croatian 16th and 53rd regiments made themselves particularly prominent in all these battles but, of course, the other Croatian regiments were brave and enthusiastic in their battles" (p. 52).

Since the Austro-Hungarian army had experienced a right fiasco during the first year of the war, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Vienna came up with the idea that Stjepan Radić should go to Bulgaria to agitate from an anti-Serbian and anti-Russian position and contribute to the creation of adequate public opinion in favour of Bulgaria entering the war against Serbia. The journey was prevented by some Hungarian politicians, always suspicious of Croatian impostors. Ban Škerlec pointed out on that occasion, as Krizman also witnesses, that Radić was "a very unreliable individual who has left anyone to whom he was politically allied in the lurch. This inconsistency of his – according to Škerlec – should not be attributed to his mean character, but much more to his quality of being a very rhapsodic and – it could be said – abnormal man who is inconsistent at least three times in one speech" (p. 57). Even

During WWI, Stjepan Radić had simply filled everyone around him with anti-Serbian hatred, but his love for Serbia and Russia returned in the middle of 1917 when the defeat of the Central Powers was already certain. He had never cooperated with the Yugoslav Committee, but he started to prepare a fall-back position for himself, hoping that the anti-Serbian hysteria on his part would be forgotten. And he was not wrong. The Serbs have often been too forgetful throughout history and too easily forgive their sworn enemies.

Radić's intentions were again obvious this time. He tried to make the Serbs from the Austro-Hungarian monarchy consent to the Croatian issue. He fought with all his heart against the union of the south Slavs. "Upon the end of WWI, the Croatian feelings for the Serbs suddenly changed. The name of Serbia was shouted joyously; people demanded union with Serbia and the "several centuries' long friendship" and love were emphasized. As if there was no fight between the Serbs and Croats at all! This was a trick, naturally: the Croats wanted to use the wonderful position of Serbia and to be equal with the winners through it, to avoid the payment of war reparations and to receive it on behalf of Serbia. Even the most fervent enemies of the Serbs were silent; they did not dare take any action against them. Only Radić was an exception. He continued his activity against the Serbs even further, even more fervently" (p. 64). He submitted to the Paris Peace Conference a memorandum supported by two hundred thousand signatures, in which he demanded independence for the Croatian republic.

Since all his attempts to prevent unification were unsuccessful, Radić exerted himself to impede the consolidation of the newly-established state. After he had won terms of office for fifty Parliament members at the elections for the constituent assembly in 1920, Radić did not allow his Parliament members to go to Belgrade to attend the session of the constituent assembly. Instead, he called them to Zagreb so he could illegally establish a special representative body to counter-act the highest state authority bodies. In 1923, he started an almost one-year long tour of Europe, during which he tirelessly agitated against the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians. Some historical sources witness that Radić had managed to obtain significant financial support from both the Comintern and the Italian government.

Ustasha emigrant, Vlaho Raić published the book *Croatia and Serbia* in Buenos Aires in 1953, in which he recalls his memories during the visit of the Dalmatian Croats to Stjepan Radić, who "complained to them about the Serbian attitude, which made Radić so furious that he said: "Kemal Pasha expelled the Greeks who had lived in Asia Minor for over 4000 years and we will soon get rid of the Serbs who arrived in our territories just 300 years ago" (p. 78). It is obvious that there was no essential difference between Radić and Pavelić. As Kostić notices, the comparison with Atatürk and Asia Minor that Radić made is interesting since it is not in favour of the Croats. In Asia Minor, the Greeks were indigenous there and the Turks were the settlers and 'intruders'. The first

had lived there for three or four millennia and the latter only six or seven centuries. According to the Croatian theory, the Greeks were entitled to throw out the Turks, not vice versa” (p. 78-79).

In 1927, the Italian publicist Italo Zingarelli wrote on Radić’s inconsistency “which, depending on the case, has allowed him [Radić] to prove without doubt that he was a friend to the Habsburgs and the enemy of the Karađorđević dynasty, the enemy of the Austrian crown and a true servant of the Serbian Royal House, a Republican and a Monarchist, a friend and an enemy to Italy, a communist and an imperialist” (p. 91). That is how Radić came back to the National Assembly in 1925 and recognized the Constitution of Vidovdan, in order to start to pull it down quickly. Yet, the most appropriate testimony on the personality and work of Stjepan Radić was given by his son Vladimir in 1942 in the article *Day and Homeland*, published in Zagreb’s newspaper *New Croatia*: “With respect to major issues and in essential principles, the Ustasha teachings are nothing more than the teachings of Stjepana Radić. The teachings of the Radić brothers are being executed under the wise leadership of the head of the state” (p. 96).

5. The Ustasha Demagogy of Ivan Meštrović

The second book of the series *Brave Croatian Husbands* was also published in Melbourne in 1976 under the title *Ivan Meštrović and his Memoirs*. In both cases it refers to the second, supplemented edition. The first edition of Kostić’s writings on Radić and Meštrović was published using duplication technique. In the preface, Lazo Kostić says that after biological genocide against the Serbs in WWII, the Croats tried to expose the Serbian people to an extended moral and spiritual genocide. “They compete at who will humiliate the Serbs the most, just as they competed at who would kill more Serbs during the war. There are even persons among them who were physical killers during the war and moral ones after the war. And there are those who did not kill during the war but wished the Serbs would disappear or be brought down to the level of Pigmy people. All the qualities of a nation worthy of self-management, bringing its fellow-countrymen together and living its life in terms of politics and national law” (p. 5).

One of these Croats, who consistently, systematically and unscrupulously attacked the Serbian reputation, honour and historical greatness, was sculptor Ivan Meštrović. Meštrović pours out the concentrate of his personal hatred, insults and anti-Serbian slanders in his memoirs *Reminiscences of Politicians and Political Events*, published in Argentina in 1961. The most prominent intellectuals among Serbian emigration reacted fervently to the book and exposed Meštrović’s dirty lies one by one through argumentation. These reactions were collected, systematized and published by Dr Branko Miljuš in the book *Ivan Meštrović and Anti-Serbian Slandering Propaganda*. However, it appeared that Miljuš was not able to find a large number of serious reactions to publish in his collection, thus Kostić took up the work of extending Miljuš’s efforts from the results of his

IT-03-67-T
own research.

To objections that Meštrović is dead and that one should not speak and write about him, Kostić replies that “he will not be dead as long as his detestability lives in his book. It extends his life; he still lives through that book. One should not forget that Meštrović is the most famous and most recognized person among the Croats, worldwide” (p. 7). In the book, Kostić makes a note that he had not included some valuable texts by significant authors from his home-country so that he would not harm them. “Whenever an emigrant uses them, he is called an ally and collaborator of the Četniks (Chetniks). The Croats may reprint the whole of Meštrović’s book in their country, while no one can cite us” (p. 8).

In 1951, Adam Pribičević said that Meštrović was a follower of Starčević – thus the follower of a particular paranoia of great men that leads only to violence and bloodshed. This is the reason why Ivan Meštrović “defends the criminal Starčević teaching with vulgar Starčević register and argumentation. It is truly sad that a man with such a reputation makes such cheap ironies on Byzantinism, the cult of Saint Sava, the artistic value of some destroyed Serbian churches and the theft of Croatian national poems, allegedly by Vuk.” (p. 14) This is Pribičević’s first reaction in the *Voice of Canadian Serbs* of 16 August 1951.

That same year in October and in that same paper, he says: “The Serbs know very well that a federation based on three states and national consciousness is just a seeming delay of the break-up. Therefore, under no condition will they accept that the Serbs leave a state within a Croatian unit. Or, they could not accept the establishment of such a Croatian unit that would include these Serbs. They must not accept that, even if there was no longer any Starčević teaching. No nation, even a large one, would voluntarily give up a large number of its sons to another state. Even less if such a state may become a slaughterhouse for those sons, as is the case of Croatia, as long as Starčević’s killing ideology rules the spirits of such a large number of Croats” (p. 18).

All this was described by Pribičević before the appearance of Meštrović’s memoirs as a reaction to his newspapers articles. *Voice of the Canadian Serbs* published several articles by anonymous authors with a similar theme. With respect to Meštrović’s hysterical anti-Serbian attacks, these authors comment that “it is very often the case that a great scientist or artist has a weak character and a narrow mind. It happens when one lets one’s basic instincts rule. During the war, particularly in totalitarian regimes, legions of scientists and artists have trodden upon the human conscience and became a blind weapon of the bloodthirsty power-holders” (p. 21-22).

With respect to the memorandum of the reputed Serbian intellectuals submitted to the United Nations in relation to Ustasha crimes, Meštrović replied, as is paraphrased here, “that this memorandum “pamphlet” is against the Croats and Catholicism; that the undersigned in the pamphlet are no better than Ustashas they accuse; that it serves to spread lies and eternalized hatred, that it is shameful for Adam Pribičević, a Christian,

'a fan of Tolstoy' 'who believed that evil should not be fought with evil'; that Ante Starčević has no other sin than his desire for a free Croatia and that the Serbs do not understand him, since he spoke openly and that they are 'the Byzantines' – who 'bow in a Turkish way, and pray in a Vlach way'; that Starčević is as worthy as Saint Sava and Vuk; that Starčević's formulation that the Serbs 'are a brood ripe for the axe' is just an evangelical formula for the destruction of children who are a 'weed', notwithstanding the camp they are in, and that Jovan Skerlić understood that; that the Ustashas are 'fervent nationalists' and nothing more, that they are better than the Serbs, since they fight for 'free Croatia', while the Serbs fight for 'Great Serbia', that the Serbs would glorify Ustashas as national heroes if they were Serbs; that Ustasha's crimes show that the Serbs and the Croats are equal; that there is no difference between Ustashas and Chetniks; that the physical resemblance of the Ustashas and the Serbs was noticed in 1902 by public opinion in Zagreb – which points to the same Serbian-Vlach racial origin of the Serbs and the Ustasha criminals (he also noticed the similarity of Bucharest citizens and the Serbs); that the Ustashas 'had cause' for the heinous slaughters of Serbian people; that the monster Mile Budak became such after he had been beaten by 'the royal police', that the hundreds of Serbian places of worship destroyed and defiled by Ustashas 'had had no great historical and artistic value', while the Chetniks of priest Đuić damaged one Catholic church in Dalmatian Kosovo of incomparably greater value, since he, Meštrović, had designed it; that the Chetniks burnt his uncle; that Bosnia and Herzegovina have never been Serbian territories, that the Croats are the majority there today, because all the Muslims are Croats; ... that the Ustashas are just national revolutionaries and that there is a great difference between revolutionaries and criminals; that the Chetniks slaughtered children;" etc. (p. 22-23.).

The essence of Meštrović's attitude was described by an anonymous author saying that Ivan Meštrović "multiplies by thousands or just makes up the sins of the opposite side, then subtracts by thousands or simply denies the sins of his Ustasha side, and then shouts joyously and proudly: – You see, eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth, we have made a balance in crimes and responsibilities, we are even, the scales doesn't tilt to any side! ... He acts like that ungodly sort of people of whom Jesus spoke in the Sermon on the Mount, who see a particle in another man's eye, but do not see the beam in their own eyes. He puts both executioners and victims on the same scales and measures them equally, both the Ustasha Ante and Saint Sava, both the organizers of the Jasenovac death camp and the signatories of the memorandum to the United Nations, originators of the slaughter of thousands of Serbian men, women and children killed by the Ustashas – and the head of my uncle weighs more! We owe you nothing! These were Vlach heads and the head of my uncle, what meaning it has! ... Hundreds of Serbian churches devastated and defiled may not be compared in historical and artistic value with one church of mine in Dalmatia, which was damaged by the priest Đuić! – Again, we do not owe you any justification. The

a) A Croatian Chameleon

Another author who studies Meštrović, summarizes: "What numerous roles has this Croatian Hamlet played? A fanatic Yugoslav, Trumbić's separatist, Aleksandar's integral Yugoslav, a follower of Maček, organizer of Ustasha exhibitions, again a follower of Maček, an ideologist of the synthesis of Starčević and Radić's teachings, Tito's member of the national liberation struggle – and we don't know what he is now, but he was a [person of] character neither now, nor will ever be" (p. 29). In 1954 in the *Canadian Serb Defender*, Lazo Kostić reacted to Meštrović's claim that he had never received money from the Serbian regime: "There is no greater impertinence than this one. Everyone knows that, before WWI, Meštrović lived mostly in Serbia and on Serbian funds. During that very war, he was a Yugoslav emigrant getting regular funds from the Serbian government. He travelled the world at the Serbian expense, etc. After the war he made a series of sculptures, the value of which exceeded millions, among which is *The Winner* in Kalemegdan, etc." (p. 31). Kostić also cites one article published in *Politika* in 1920, from which it could be seen that the royal government had allocated Ivan Meštrović, as "our great artist", a regular annual reimbursement in the amount of 85,000 French francs, which was to be effected for the following thirty years.

In 1962, making extensive reference to Meštrović's memoirs, Dragiša Cvetković writes in the *Messenger of the Serbian Historical-Cultural Society "Njegoš"* in America, reporting from Paris: "It would not be an exaggeration to say that the hatred of this Meštrović against the Serbian people was to some extent even stronger than the hatred of the criminal and marauding 'head of state' Pavelić, accountable for the death of several hundreds of thousands of Serbs at the time of the 'Independent State of Croatia'. The difference is only in that Pavelić's hatred was short and public while Meštrović's hatred was long and hidden, therefore no one could even suspect it while he was alive. Thus, driven by a strong bestial instinct and using the most brutal methods, Pavelić openly destroyed Serbian people, while Meštrović, receiving all the benefits and inclination of the former Kingdom of Serbia and of the Serbs in general – in all events he depicts – stirred up hatred, supporting that separatist psychosis that made impossible the existence of the community of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenians" (p. 42).

Along with the writings of Dragiša Cvetković, Kostić also publishes the texts of Dr Radoje Vukčević from the *Canadian Serb Defender*, the texts of Milan Fotić from *Spark*, the texts of M.M. Vlahović from *Spark*, the texts of Spas Šaraba from the *American Serb Defender* and a series of his own texts. Item by item, the Serbian authors simply exposed the numerous lies and slanders with which Meštrović barraged his Serbian contemporaries, prominent statesmen and intellectuals. Kostić starts his comments on Meštrović's memoirs by analyzing their integral lie that, before the end of WWI, Stojan Protić had stated: "When our army has

crossed the Drina, it will give 24 hours to the Turks – or perhaps 48 hours – to return to their ancestors' faith, and those who wouldn't do so should be killed as the Turks had done in Serbia in their times" (p. 82).

Historical facts speak to the contrary. The Serbian army, under the command of Duke Stepa Stepanović brought order and law throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina, because of which the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina of all denominations unanimously praised it. The most prominent Muslim historians bear witness to this. Not only that, as president of a royal government, he had acted in a correct manner and in full compliance with the principles of the rule of law, "but he went even further, which cannot be forgiven either from a moral or legal point of view. He did not allow revenge on the Muslim criminals from WWI, particularly upon the so-called Šuckori, which was realized by Ademaga Mešić from Tešanj. They had been the terror of the Serbian population and had committed numerous crimes. Justice demanded that they should be punished. Stojan Protić prevented that. It is a well-known fact that state prosecutors are independent when bringing charges, but not in political delicts. The government's consent is needed for that. It was deprived precisely by Stojan Protić" (p. 83).

Meštrović makes up what the Serbs had allegedly planned, so that he could make some balance with the real Croatian crimes from both world wars. After all, even on the liberation of the Old Serbia and Macedonia, the Serbs did not force anyone to return to the Orthodox faith although they had come across a large number of Shqiptars who spoke Serbian and who had recently turned Muslims, then became Arbanasi (Albanians). Meštrović is a liar with a short memory. His lies catch up with each other. When he makes up new lies, he forgets the old ones, so the logical contradictions are very frequent and striking, not to mention the wrong dates and fantastic locations of the events in his imagination. What can we say about the pretension to interpret discussions half a century old literally? Actually, Meštrović "described the events and discussions in the way he liked, and in the way he likes now, not at the time they occurred. Perhaps someone else interfered: his son who hates the Serbs even more than his father, or the director of the *Review* etc. Meštar himself was not literate enough, he had not gone to any high school. The indisputable Cypriot talent cannot replace the school for writing. There must have been more correctors, more censors and language editors. One cannot doubt that all of them were Serb-haters. From the last war to the present, Meštar had no friends among the Serbs" (p. 98).

It is interesting that, in the Zagreb's edition, Tito's alleged address to Meštrović reading "Believe me, I am no less a Croat than you" was amended to read: "Croatian interests are in my heart, just as is the case with you. Believe me, if I were not on top of the state, it would not bode well for Croatia" (p. 99-100). Kostić makes a particular note here: "While no books by a Serb emigrant may not be cited in the country, Croatian books and Croatian articles are reprinted and officially distributed. Especially if they include attacks on Serbs. This makes them free of any censorship. They are even propagated. The case with the reminiscences

of Ivan Meštrović, where the hatred of the Serbs pops up in every paragraph, proves this best... Each Serbian mentioned has been attributed the dirtiest features, both King Aleksandar and Draža Mihajlović in particular. Nothing bad about any Croat; not even the arch-criminal Ante Pavelić. He was referred to as the head of the state of Independent Croatia. That's all" (p. 98-99).

It might be interesting to point out that Meštrović related all his most significant works to Serbian history and mythology, which the prominent Croatian intellectuals of his time disliked – such as Miroslav Krleža, Antun Gustav Matoš and Antun Branko Šimić. Matoš openly reproaches Meštrović that he is a Serb in his art, while Šimić concludes that Meštrović's art cannot be the expression of the Croatian national spirit. During his emigrant days, even Vlatko Maček avoided him, although Meštrović had always besieged him with ideas on political engagement and organization.

Referring to the book *A Journey to Meštrović* by the Croatian author Vlatko Tomičić, published in Buenos Aires in 1965, Kostić states that Meštrović's ancestors had changed their religion at least four times and this sometimes meant a change of nationality and national consciousness. The home village of Meštrović is Otavice near Drniš and his family's surname used to be Gavrilović-Meštrović. As Tomičić says, "Meštrović came from Bosnia with that dual surname". Even Ivan Meštrović used the first part of the surname for some time, before rejecting it. "In the village, they told me that they had been incorrectly kept under that name in the land register, thus it lived for some time. However, there must be another, older reason for that when the Meštrovićs, who had been bogomils, then Muslims, then Christened muslims and finally Catholics, moved from Bosnia to Dalmatia" (p. 136).

Jovan Dučić wrote about the Serbian origin of Ivan Meštrović. "He claimed that the surname of Meštrović's family was Gavrilović and that it was a Serbian family" (p. 136). As Kostić comments, "Meštrović's ancestors had come to Dalmatia under a different name and with another religion. One thing is for certain – they changed their religion like shirts and nothing in these people (the Serbian people of north Dalmatia within whose midst was the Meštrović family's home village) had been so terrifying and shameful as changing religion. Perhaps the change of religion and the ideals that come with it had influenced the character of Ivan Meštrović: his inconsistency, awkwardness and chameleonism. If his ancestors weren't faithful to anyone or anything, why should this be expected from him now?" (p. 136-137).

Although he had often presented himself earlier as a Serb, since it was popular and attractive, and although many foreigners considered him a true Serb – although he had been paid by the Royal Serbian Home for decades and, as an artist, had received preferential treatment to the degree of bad taste – Meštrović has never said anything nice about any Serb in his memoirs. "Is this possible? No, not in any case. Meštrović crafted his memoirs several decades after the events he described. He

already hated the Serbs at the time and turned against them, since they were no longer popular. As with all opportunists and profiteers, which he has proved himself to be through his actions – which Miroslav Krleža himself detests. As an offspring of a Serbian family, he acted like all apostates. He had to prove that he had renounced them and he would do so most drastically and most perfidiously at the same time” (p. 151).

6. The Croatian People are Guilty for the Ustasha's Crimes

In Switzerland in 1972, Lazo Kostić self-published a legal-political treatise entitled *Who Is Guilty of the Crimes against the Serbs in the Independent State of Croatia?* in which, primarily from a legal standpoint, he studies the fact that, in the Croatian Ustasha's state, the Serbs were cast outside the law and each true Croat was entitled, even obliged to kill them. Not only to kill them but to torture them – “to have them tortured in such a manner that human imagination can hardly invent, to have them tortured in a way modern history does not know of” (p. 5). Even though the object of the crime is known as these were all Serbs under Croatian rule, those who were the perpetrators of these crimes, as Kostić remarks, “cannot be named by anyone in an indisputable way. That is a taboo in the state so that the principle of ‘brotherhood and unity’ would not be shaken, so that the Croats in emigration would not be insulted and that the existence of Yugoslavia would not be made more difficult” (p. 5). And yet, none of the forgeries may deny the fact that a great majority of Croats accepted and fully supported the Ustasha state, so the issue of the collective accountability of the whole Croatian nation for the genocide against the Serbs here arises.

The principle of the collective accountability for committed crimes is generally accepted in criminal law, even in cases when there are lots of perpetrators, since the real extent of one's personal involvement and the corresponding sanction are determined for each of them. Almost all the Serbs that have dealt with the issue of the Ustasha's crimes scientifically, legally and politically, categorically insisted that such accountability could be strictly individual, both for those issuing orders and for their immediate executors. This issue is also insisted upon in the declaration of the Chetniks' Congress in the village of Ba, at the beginning of 1944. Even the Serbian emigration had persistently avoided assigning accountability for the crimes to the whole Croatian nation, while, on the other hand, the Croatian emigrants systematically claimed, based on made up data, that there were no mass killings. Serbian authors overseas went furthest when they accused the Ustasha government of the crimes, but even then they would exculpate the Croatian nation itself, claiming that it had not appointed the government but a foreign conqueror and occupying force.

Kostić comments on such ignorant and favour-currying behaviour in the following manner: “A human mind stops when it reads this: it means that only the government in Zagreb and several individual persons were accountable for all murders and torture of the Serbs. But in this case,

maybe not even them, since they were not appointed by the peoples' will but by foreign occupying forces. It is an impertinent lie: that government had been appointed by an ally and friend of the Croatian people and the Croatian nation itself enthusiastically and “by a plebiscite” approved of the state, its government and its acts, as no less than Archbishop Štepinac said” (p. 11).

The attitude of the Croats themselves is most vividly shown by the article from issue 4 of the Argentinean *Croatian Review* for the year 1962, in which the author praised the pro-Ustasha intoned memoirs of Ivan Meštrović, concluding: “His memoirs are a true testimony that the Croats and the Serbs are two different worlds, that no “Yugoslavia” can exist without force and dictatorship, thus the only solution for the peace in that part of Europe is a break up of Croatia and Serbia. At the same time, the memoirs are irrefutable evidence that the head of the state, Dr Ante Pavelić, was a statesman of the first order, that he knew what he wanted and that he wanted the same thing as 99 percent of the Croatian people wanted and, finally, that the Ustasha regime did not make many mistakes when it used bloody methods against the enemy of Croatia, who showed they understood and respected only such methods. Those who wanted to destroy the state of Croatia with knives and swords had to be killed and should be killed by the Croatian knife and sword. The Ustasha do not have to feel sorry for anything and, if they could not do their duty to the fullest since they were prevented by time and occasion, they are always ready when the homeland calls them - ‘Ready for the homeland’” (p. 11).

Showing that the Croats primarily stuck to the principle of collective accountability and thus accused all the Serbs of the alleged guilt of certain Serbian political leaders and used mass killing to respond, punish and retaliate, Kostić theoretically elaborates the term itself. After all, one of the pillars of collective accountability has been included in the Jewish and Christian learning where it is said that God punished all people collectively since their father had tasted forbidden fruit. Billions of people are, by inheritance, accountable for one man's act. All people are expected to admit that first sin and repent in accordance with that, trying to become better, or actually to amend it by prayers and sacrifices. Catholic theologians themselves are the ones who most insist on that collective accountability of the human race. The Roman-Catholic church assigned the guilt for death of Jesus Christ to the whole Jewish nation; which was a motive for the systematic persecutions of the Jews for two thousand years. Only before the end of the 20th century was this prejudice partially attenuated by the highest Vatican hierarchy. Other Biblical illustrations of the persecution of the offspring for the sins of their ancestors are numerous.

The principle of collective accountability was retained in modern times. One of the examples is when a winning party in a war imposes the payment of war damages on the defeated one, assigning to it the guilt for the breakout of the war. The word of the winner is still decisive, while the burden of the payment of war damages always falls on the back of all the people of the defeated country. Millions of Germans were

expelled from the Czech Republic, Rumania, Hungary and Yugoslavia since they had been assigned the collective guilt for all the Nazi crimes. Those who had not complied with or who had obviously opposed Hitler's policy also suffered. The division of Germany is also one type of collective punishment for Hitler's guilt from the WWII. International public law still includes to a great extent the accepted principle that the whole country is accountable for crimes committed or organized on its territory. This was also applied as a rule in the war in the Middle East when Israel retaliated on Arabian civilians for each armed threat to its territory by military formations over which the neighbouring countries often had no effective control.

The Croats collectively blamed the Serbs for all the historical troubles they had and for all bad things that had actually or seemingly happened to them in Yugoslavia, although the Yugoslav internal and external politics were determined by different political circles, often foreign ones, even international conspirational organizations. The Croats openly and specifically blamed "the Serbs as a nation, all the Serbs without exception, and just the Serbs. The Serbs were guilty of everything that was wrong in Yugoslavia, all the Serbs, without exception. They had true friends among the Serbs, all independent Serbian parties chose their leader to be the holder of the electoral list on the elections in 1938, yet the Serbs were guilty of all misfortunes. The Croats put the burden of all the troubles of the former Yugoslavia, all the deeds of the Yugoslav authorities and the private deeds of individuals on the Serbs' back. And, at the same time, they did not allow that they should be burdened with anything that had been done by the Croats themselves, exclusively by the Croats in the state that was theirs in its name and its essence" (p. 25).

Dual criteria are applied, even in respect of political assassinations. When King Aleksandar Karađorđević was killed in Marseilles in 1934, it was forbidden to say that the assassin was a Croat. "After one high-strung Parliamentarian had killed the leaders of the Croatian Peasant Party in the middle of the Belgrade Parliament, that crazy and insane act of an individual was cast on the whole Serbian nation. Not only that, but the truth was that the killer was a Serbian, a thoroughbred Serbian from the family of Vasojevići, but the Croats did not consider the Montenegrins to be Serbs and they even managed to include that idea in the state constitution in 1945. Yet, Radić, Basariček, etc. were killed by Serbs. According to the Croatian standpoint, all the Serbs were guilty of that murder, although the whole Serbian nation had condemned that act honestly and spontaneously" (p. 25-26).

a) Collective Accountability – (Hang) Serbs from the Willow Trees!

A similar phenomenon was noted at the time of the assassination in Sarajevo and, by that example, Kostić shows how under the Austrian rule the Croats constructed the "collective accountability of the Serbs for the personal acts of individuals". He writes: "On Vidovdan in 1914, a

Serb from Bosnia killed the Austrian heir to the throne, openly and bravely, as befits the Serbs. It was the killing of a tyrant, which would have been lauded to the stars by the old Greeks. The Croats condemned not only him, but the whole Serbian nation, both in Serbia and outside it. The slogan "Hang Serbs from the willow trees!" was shouted in Zagreb, Serbian shops were robbed; the Serbs were pestered in the streets and in their homes, etc. Of course, for the purpose of protecting the Croatian rule of order, since the Croats lacked the courage to disturb the peace [...] But with respect to the organized mass crimes of the Croatian state authority, with the explicit or tacit collaboration of the whole Croatian nation, then, by God, the Croatian name must not be uttered in relation to that. Where is the consistency there, where is the logic?" (p. 26).

Although they insist upon the Serbian collective accountability for such strictly individual acts or the acts of a limited group of people, the Croats reject in every possible way the very idea that they might be accountable in any manner for the Ustasas' crimes. "They simply assign them to several insignificant and anonymous Ustasas, with whom, allegedly, the Croatian nation does not have anything in common. Other Croats "see no evil". And there has never been the case in history where the whole nation was overcome with the psychosis of killing and torturing as was the case with the Croats with respect to Serbs in the years mentioned. Of course, with strong beliefs that they (the Croats) would never be held accountable for that. But, as soon as the possibility that they might be accountable arose, they denied everything, for the purpose of morality. That is the character of the Croatian nation, which cannot be changed. There has never been any chivalry in it. They have always killed from ambush, in disguise, avoiding the fight, later assigning their crimes to the police, the Austrian army, the Ustasas, etc. While the Serbs do all this openly, truly, bravely. And when they should be assigned accountability, they receive it chivalrously. This very difference in the character of the nations makes cohabitation impossible. Since they lack chivalry and strength, they compensate for it by deliveries, cheating and spying - they call it propaganda. That is why they managed to denigrate the Serbs worldwide, so that the world could be horrified by one arrest of Croatian criminals, rather than by murdering millions of Serbs" (p. 26-27).

Another specific Croatian deceit was laying the crimes of Croatian communists at the Serbian door using the phrase "the Belgrade regime" for justification, as Kostić describes it: "The peak of impertinence and forgery is shown in the Croats' naming today's communist regime in Yugoslavia the "Serbian-communist", or just as "the Belgrade" one. This is today's regime of Dictator Josip Broz, the Croat from Klanjac, the most fanatic of all the Croats. The Serbs are made accountable for all the acts of that regime - not particular Serbs, but the Serbs as a whole. During the war, the Croats officially announced to the Germans that the whole Serbian nation were communists, starting from their patriarch [...] They wanted us all killed by the Germans. When a thoroughbred Croat who killed Serbs and defended Croats became the leader of the communist movement, it was again a Serbian regime. And we must not

call the regime of Pavelić a Croatian one” (p. 27).

Foreign literature is full of examples of nations accepting the collective accountability for the acts of individuals and groups. With respect to the assassination in Sarajevo, Austro-Hungary applied this principle in practice by starting a punitive expedition against Serbia. The expedition was wholeheartedly insisted on by the German, Austrian and Croatian press, many prominent politicians, particularly the Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the German Reich Councillor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg, the Austro-Hungarian Chief of General Staff, Count Francis Conrad von Hötzendorf, etc. However, many more reputable intellectuals gave their opinion regarding the WWII and the crimes committed during it, insisting on the issue of the collective accountability of the German people for all that Hitler’s regime had caused.

Kostić quotes several striking statements in his book, starting from the London lecture by a French intellectual, Louis Marin, who said at the end of 1944 that “the German people must pay debts for all that Hitler has done, because William had lived before Hitler, Bismarck before William and Fridrich the Great before Bismarck. Marin explained that, in France, German citizens had behaved worse than German soldiers and that children evacuated from Germany had acted even worse than the occupation troops. Therefore, the whole German nation must be kept under discipline for a long time” (p. 38-39). At the end of the fifties, the Englishman John Simpson treated this issue in the following way: “Although that crime was designed and organized by Hitler’s crazy mind, the German nation as a whole cannot escape accountability. The present government of West Germany realized this now and accepted to amend what can be amended, having allocated a larger amount of money to be paid to the Government of Israel. But a stream of gold cannot wash the hatred away” (p. 39).

Kostić demands that this principle should be applied to the Croats as well since, in case of the Croats, “even the idea was not derived from one person (perhaps the original one was, from Ante Starčević, “father of the homeland”), but from the majority of the Croatian nation and it was also well received by the whole Croatian nation without hesitation. The names of those who used to condemn that should be announced: they were numerous in Germany, although punishments were not less severe than in the Independent State of Croatia. In any case, if one accepts the collective accountability of the Germans, one should also accept the idea of collective accountability in general. It is possible, it exists, it is recognized by the world’s authorities” (p. 39).

None of the authors who had condemned the Germans and exculpated the Croats for war crimes had credible arguments. As Kostić points out, “the whole German nation is by no means as collectively guilty of murdering the Jews in Germany and in the occupied countries as was the case with the Croats for murdering the Serbs in their criminal state. The Germans could have assigned that to the Nazis and the Wehrmacht even more easily, but they were people of quality and they recognized their general guilt. It is interesting that even the non-

IT-03-67-T.

united Germany - in other words, one big fragment of it, one state led by the victims of the Nazi regime themselves - recognized this as well. They do not consider themselves victims, but culprits” (p. 41).

Upon the suggestion of Federal Chancellor Konrad Adenauer on 27 September 1951, the German Bundestag received the government’s declaration which, among other things, says: “The Federal Government together with the majority of the German nation are aware of the immense suffering of the Jews in Germany and occupied territories during the time of national-socialism. The majority of the German nation loathed the committed crimes and did not take part in them. During the time of national-socialism, there were many people who, by risking their lives, were ready to help their fellow-townsmen both for religious reasons, acting in good conscience or for shame. But unutterable crimes were committed on behalf of the German nation, obliging moral and material reparations” (p. 42). With respect to that, the Embassy of Israel in London issued the statement saying that “the federal German government recognizes without any limitation the unutterable crimes committed on behalf of the German nation and, by that, the obligation for moral and material restitution on an individual and collective basis” (p. 42).

b) The Penitence of the German Politicians

In October 1968, Adenauer published his memoirs, in which he writes as follows: “One of the darkest capitals is the persecution of Jews by national-socialists in the time behind us. They used to persecute and kill the Germans of Jewish origin in Germany first, although they had had no evidence against them and although our Jewish fellow-townsmen used to play an important role in our spiritual life; they used to persecute and kill men, women, children and old people, both the rich and the poor. After the beginning of the WWII, the national-socialists continued with the horrible act of the destruction of the Jews in other countries occupied by German troops. The Jews fled if they could but most of them failed to escape. Nothing had disgraced the German name and drawn such contempt of other nations upon them like this annihilation of the Jews. Not all the Germans were guilty of these crimes, many found about them much later, but the leaders of the national-socialists acted, as they used to state, on behalf of the German nation. When Germany collapsed, the Germans were surrounded by a sea of hatred, fear and contempt. The German nation completely recognized its duty to redress injustice” (p. 43).

A particularly interesting part of the memoirs is where Adenauer describes his meeting with the president of the World Jewish Congress, Nahum Goldman, who told him that “the Jewish people will never be able to forget what was done to it by the Germans during the time of national-socialism. Germany may compensate for the damage in a form of a kind-hearted gesture, which may be assessed less in its material value than in its symbolic significance. “I have”, as Adenauer further writes, “expressly recognized the moral accountability of the German nation for redressing injustice and stated that I considered it the

236/57440

honourable duty of the German nation to do everything possible so that the injustice committed to the Jews could be redressed” (p. 44).

During the trial of Adolf Eichmann in February 1961, the leaders of the Evangelistic Church passed the declaration from which Kostić cites the following parts: “We must not close our eyes and our ears with respect to the crime for which we are accountable as a nation. All the still living Germans who lived at the time of the horrible destruction of the Jews as persons aware of what used to happen (not as minors – L.M.K.), even those who used to help their Jewish fellow-townsmen in their suffering, must admit before God that they have become accomplices due to lack of vigilant love ready to sacrifice [...] That is why we want to subject ourselves to God’s trial and to admit our indifference, or fear, or even complicity in the crimes as our part of the guilt. We want to encourage each other to confess our complicity and with all our hearts believe that, in God’s forgiveness, we will find our freedom and life. And if we also realize that the guilt cries for earthly punishment, many people will be ready to be trialled” (p. 45).

Numerous German newspapers wrote about the historical and moral guilt of the German nation at the time and thus Kostić, as an example, cites the article from the Catholic newspaper *Rheinischer Merkur* from Köln, which writes in the issue of 10 April 1961: “Through their unimaginable deeds, Adolf Eichmann and his bad associates, from the Minister to the guards of the concentration camps, took care that whenever the Jewish people was mentioned, one should always think of the German nation, on whose behalf the shameful acts had been performed. It put on all of us, even on the innocent ones under the age of 30 who today make up one half of our population, the invisible “medal of blood” that we must wear, notwithstanding personal participation in the act, in the same manner that one respectable family suffers from the shame of a crime originating in its surroundings” (p. 45). Even Willy Brandt, as the Mayor of Berlin at the time, gave his comment on Eichmann’s trial saying: “If the trial is often to be considered unpleasant, the Germans must not fear the world’s condemnation. Each German, who is aware of the accountability, must be ashamed of what happened in Hitler’s time, in the disgraced name of Germany” (p. 45).

The Germans verbally stated their attitude on different occasions, but they also compensated material damage to Israel in billions of German marks and financed the reconstruction of destroyed synagogues and other religious Jewish cultural monuments. At the press-conference held on 3 December 1963, the next Federal Chancellor, Ludwig Erhard, stated that the German relation towards Israel would be “determined by attempting the highest possible realizations in order to compensate for the German guilt towards the Jewish people” (p. 47).

With regard to celebrating the 20th anniversary of the liberation of the prisoners in the concentration camps, on 25 April 1965, the President of the Republic, Heinrich Lübke criticized in his speech all those who would not speak of the Nazis’ crimes or those who demanded that, after such a long time, the horrors of the war should be left to historical oblivion, and he drew a lesson that “hiding the truth did not bring us the

confidence of other people in our honesty and fairness, as well as our keeping silent and suppressing memories. Only by proving through our politics that our intentions were serious based on our power and within our capacities to redress the injustice committed on behalf of the German people could we gain the confidence of the world. There is no worse reversal of truth than the claim that we Germans make our nest dirty by doing so. The reputation of Germany would be damaged if the readiness for self-purification would not be proven by acts” (p. 47). Also his successor to the presidential function, Gustav Heinemann, at a similar ceremony in April in 1970, stated: “Germany is accountable for everything that happened in the concentration camps Bergen, Belsen, Dachau, Auschwitz, Terezin, Mauthausen and **Simrek**, which have lost nothing of their horror 25 years after the war ended [...] The brutality of the crimes and murders committed in these camps will bear a sign of uniqueness in history for a long time. Nothing can attenuate them, and by no means must they be cast into oblivion” (p. 48).

In August 1966 at the World Jewish Congress in Brussels, the President of the German Bundestag, Eugen Gerstenmaier said that “today there is no Germany that could overcome its past, but there is Germany which is ashamed and which swore that nothing of the kind will happen to it again” (p. 48). He further says that the craziness of the anti-Semite mood was deeply rooted and that it had to be pulled out then. Thomas Mann’s son, the historian Golo Mann wrote that upon his post-war return to Germany, as an emigrant, in his heart he felt “only the shame: because of the unutterable crimes his own nation had committed, the shame because of the revenge that came upon us” (p. 49). He thought that the German nation could have opposed Hitler and prevented catastrophe, but it was not the case, thus the lack of more serious resistance “did not make the German nation less accountable and the leaders of the nation, industry, army, universities, bureaucracy, and justice administration less condemned [...] Even when all Jewish neighbours were gone, the people felt little compassion and shame, little contempt and much indifference” (p.49).

Kostić lists several further testimonies on the recognition of the collective accountability of the German nation by the highest legal and religious circles and, in March 1968, in the town of Bensberg near Köln, at a meeting of prominent Catholic laymen, the memorandum of German-Polish reconciliation was issued and it expressly described “the accountability of the whole German nation for all that had been done on its behalf during the time of the Nazis. It also stated that the Germans, apart from compensation for damage and individual compensation, must also recognize political losses, while the loss of territories was not excluded” (p. 51).

As Dušan Ivančević observes in the Belgrade magazine *Orthodoxy* on 16 July 1970, “The Germans do not even try to justify the Nazi crimes through some imagined guilt of their victims, and they even less try to mention what evil some other nations had done to them during wars in the past, or even in the Middle Ages, so that they could say that they gave ’tit for tat’! Even in that respect they say: we are guilty and

Comment [K.B.28]: Translator’s note. Unknown concentration camp, possibly a mistake

responsible for we have not done, but for what our men had done - our army and our state authorities. Although the main war criminals were punished immediately upon the war's end and although the German courts still punish war criminals that are revealed, yet, apart from all these punishments the President of the Republic says: "the inhumanities, crimes and murders in the concentration camps cannot and must not be forgotten." The President of the Republic does not ask that the nations that suffered should not mention their victims - on the contrary, on behalf of the whole nation he decisively states that the great crimes committed against innocent victims cannot and must not be forgotten" (p. 54).

During the first inter-German state officials meeting on the 19 March 1970, the Chancellor of West Germany at the time, Willy Brandt, during the welcoming speech said: "In several weeks' time, it will be 25 years since the rule of the national-socialists' violence ended with the collapse of the German Reich. That event connects all of us who sit at this table, no matter what has separated us. Again it is filled with the horror of the atrocities committed on behalf of the Germans, with the destructions that were made. All of us are responsible for these acts, wherever destiny has scattered us. This accountability that the world has imposed on us on good grounds (and with full entitlement), it is one of the causes of today's situation in Germany (he is probably referring to the divided Germany, L.M.K.)" (p. 55-56). Brandt's famous joyous shouting before the monument of Jewish victims from the Warsaw ghetto followed at the end of that year, as well as the recognition of a newly established order at the Oder and Neisse River by which Germany was territorially punished.

In 1966, a leading and indisputable authority of all Jews, Nahum Goldman, wrote in the article *German-Jewish Co-existence* about a shocking crime "committed by Germany against the Jewish nation" (p.58). Many Jews thought that the German people should not be given any chance to repent and redeem themselves, as well as that Israel should reject any material help from the German state. However, more rational attitudes prevailed and the Germans were enabled to, at least partially, attenuate the misery of the surviving offspring from a systematic genocide. Yet, the most important thing here is the public recognition of the guilt of the leading German politicians and statesmen, which most impressively stigmatized the crime itself and discouraged all those who would, in their ideological blindness, potentially plan to repeat it on a new historical occasion.

c) Broz's Impudence and Cynicism

In contrast to that, as Kostić points out, "The Croats hold a record far ahead of the Germans in the execution of genocide crimes. No one can equal them; no one can come close. Of course, the Croatian-communist top structures do not allow one to speak of that: it accepted the principle 'much ado about nothing' (p. 58). Tito did not mind this at all and, at the meeting held on 27 July 1955 in Karlovac, he personally

joined those who assigned the accountability for Nazi crimes to all Germans. On that occasion, Tito said: "The former Germany, the fascist one of course, made war here by rifle and knife. The whole German nation is accountable for that, because someone must be responsible for what was destroyed in our country. It must be done by the German side and they should not think we will give up our minimal requirements" (p.61).

As Laza Kostić comments on the Broz's impudence and ultimate cynicism, "not only that the communist regime of Yugoslavia, over its morality, charged all the Germans with the crimes of German Wehrmacht, and now tries to charge them with the crimes obviously committed by Croats (the concentration camp in Jasenovac), but it declared that local Germans were accountable for the crimes committed by occupiers and expelled them all from the country. And they were far less guilty than the Hungarians, not to mention the Croats themselves. However, the most important thing here is that the collective guilt has been declared and applied without court proceedings and without giving any opportunity for justification" (p.61).

The French publicist Jean Hussard defines the collective crime of the Croatian nation over the Serbs in the following way: "If one tried to understand this collective crime, there would be no other explanation than this: a premeditation to fully exterminate a population that was determined to preserve its uniqueness for good, which in future could offer its hand to brothers in Serbia, with loyalty relying on the pact that cannot be betrayed, this being the pact of blood [...] One normal being will never accept these crimes. That is a typical example of the desired perverseness, premeditated so that a certain result could be achieved with the help of terror: the destruction of one whole population" (p. 61-62).

Even the Catholic papers, like *The Catholic World* for example, in order to disclaim the responsibility of the Pope and the Roman-Catholic clergy, openly accused the Croats and, as Kostić conveys, said that these war crimes and massacre of hundreds of Serbs "were the crimes of Croatian nation, led by Ante Pavelić, and that Stepinac did everything he could to stop them" (p. 62). Following the reaction of one Croatian emigrant who opposed the accusation of the whole Croatian nation, the editor of *The Catholic World* replied: "Nuremberg did not solve the problem of the 'collective guilt' of the German nation; neither do I claim that all Croats are individually guilty for the crimes committed by the Pavelić's regime. Yet, we may say that one nation as a collective personality is responsible for accepting one government and the crimes committed on its behalf" (p. 63). The Croats turn a blind eye in relation to this since they are the only nation in the world that is not ashamed of its crimes, neither they consider inhumanities to be crimes - they are proud of them instead.

To tell the truth, there were a few individual examples of Croatian intellectuals who understood the collective guilt of the nation and accepted it, Želimir Mažuranić even demonstratively committed suicide, but it was well covered up in the Croatian public and escaped unnoticed.

Josip Horvat wrote about it in his book *Croatian Panopticum*, published in Zagreb in 1965: "Apocalyptic darkness covered everything and the explosion of bestiality flashed in the middle of it. The massacre of Serbs and Jews began, particular knives were construed for cutting people's throats, and the line of butchers rushed over Kordun, Pokuplje and Lika, followed by individuals in sacerdotal clothing who used to encourage those who hesitated by saying: 'Cut his throat, I will absolve you from sin [...]' Then Želimir Mažuranić, the son of Vladimir, the grandson to Ivan [...] committed harakiri having informed a close circle of friends by letter that he was to depart to death, 'since he cannot endure the shame cast on the Croatian name'" (p. 67). Želimir Mažuranić, PhD, was the President of the Senate of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia; the similar act was committed by another prominent public officer Dinko Krišković, of whom Horvat wrote how he had reacted to the news of the horrible Ustasha's massacres of Serbian people: "Krišković was shocked by such news, the only expression he had on his face was that of loathing and pain, the only thing he could say was to repeat: 'I am ashamed, we have been ashamed for good!'" (p.66).

The words of penitence were uttered by the Bishop of Banja Luka, Alfred Pihler in a Christmas epistle in 1963, but with a characteristic equalization of disproportionate guilt and a call for general pardon. Pihler stated: "During the last war, numerous brothers of ours of Orthodox faith died in this country because they were Orthodox. Those who killed them were christened in Catholic churches. They were called Catholics. Those Christians used to kill other people, also Christians, because they were not Croats and Catholics. We painfully recognize this horrible delusion of those strayed men and beg our orthodox brothers to forgive us as Christ on the cross forgave everybody. At the same time we forgive all who perhaps hated us and did us wrong. Today, before the cradle of Jesus, let all debts be erased and let love rule" (p. 68).

Kostić is not surprised that the Croats systematically covered up their own inhumanities and denied responsibility for those which could not be covered up. But he wonders and gets angry when the Serbs help them in doing so, refraining from calling the things by their real name and getting carried away by the illusions that a common state is still possible. I hereby illustrate one of better examples through review of the book written by Dragoslav Dragutinović, which was written by Colonel Branislav Pantić and published in *The Canadian Serbian Defender* of 26 July 1962. Pantić writes that Dragutinović "could not be indifferent to the people around him dying from hunger, Croats killing hundreds and thousands of innocent fellow-countrymen [...]" Yet he writes calmly about the horrors and most horrifying memories of Croatian-Nazi persecutions [...]. In opposition to our numerous lost sons, he specifically states that the executor of that horrible genocide was – the Croatian nation. He is one of numerous Serbs who do not turn a blind eye to reality, but clearly notice and convey the real and pure truth. While a certain number of Serbs, writers with a "Yugoslav orientation", keep silent in relation to these horrible crimes and artistically fail to cover these issues, or they assign them to some "Ustasha's" who, obviously had

fallen from the sky, Dragutinović feels and sees a murderer in each Croat, in each Croatian family! To tell the truth, he mentions some "Ustasha's" here and there, but the meaning of the whole text is clear that Dragutinović accuses the whole Croatian nation. And that is the real and only truth! [...] And in this case, to tell the truth, this means to reveal and recognize that there is a bloody history of Serbs and their reality, marked by the piles of Serbian dead bodies and the rivers of Serbian blood. And the Serbs of "Yugoslav orientation" keep this truth as a dark secret!" (p.73-74).

Even those prominent emigrant writers, who at first used to spare the Croats and protect them from the justified equalization with the Ustasha's, gave in before the torrent of relentless counter-arguments. Thus even Adam Pribičević admitted, in the *American Serbian Defender* of 2 March 1956, that "almost all today's Croatian intelligence and semi-intelligence have slaughtering tendencies" (p. 74). All that was done against the Serbs was done for the purpose of realizing the Croatian national idea and Croatian state establishment programme. "The executors of crimes and atrocities were engaged by the state's leadership and that was the only recognized national leadership. It is true that individuals committed those crimes but, as the mandataries of the Croatian state and Croatian nation, they performed a public, state duty, they carried out the fundamental state mission on the grounds of which the state was established, they fulfilled its main assignment. Murdering Serbs was not an isolated action of individuals, but the premeditated politics of the state - the "Croatian plebiscite", as Stepinac explained. Ultimately, everything was done by delegation and in the interest of the Croatian nation as a whole. This nation as a whole is responsible for that. Since this nation as a whole and only this nation would have benefited from the destruction of the Serbian nation, if it had succeeded. Neither would the Croatian nation call the remaining Serbs who had fled to Serbia or become imprisoned by the Germans to come back, neither would they return to the Serbs the property they had confiscated, let alone compensate for it" (p. 78).

According to the testimony of Božidar Purić, President of the Yugoslav emigrant government, none of the Croatian ministers in that government accepted the appeal through the London radio that the Croatian crimes against the Serbs be stopped. Not individuals, not groups, but the whole nation. To tell the truth, one part of them participated in these crimes actively, the other part passively - one part of them commissively, the other part ommissively - one part of them committed massacres, the other part encouraged them, approved of them and used them. But no one defended the Serbs. There was no one to warn the executors of the possible consequences of such crimes. Both the Croats in the country and the Croats abroad were accomplices in these massacres" (p.79). All the facts indicate that the Croats were in a great collective "elevation that the Serbs would disappear completely and that they would occupy their property, that they would overtake their role in the Balkans. They were so deep in blood that they could not come back. All the Serbs must disappear and then there would be no

revenge and no competition. When they realized they would not make it, they all became communists” (p. 81).

d) A Crime – Spiritual Nourishment of the Croatian National Being

Kostić especially insists on the specification and public distinction of the form of the responsibility. “It is clear that not all Croats individually participated actively in the slaughter of Serbs and they are consequently relieved from any penal responsibility. This is more the case of moral responsibility, which applies to the entire Croatian nation. We believe that just a small number of Croats directly and physically participated in the slaughter of Serbs. But the whole constellation of crimes and the psychology of the moment not only does not relieve other Croats from moral responsibility but, on the contrary, emphasizes it. The Romans spoke of the genius of place and genius of time in the case of collective phenomena [...] In the case of the Croats, we may speak of a demon of time and demon of place that had been summoned by the whole Croatian nation” (p. 81).

The crime is contained in the being of the Croatian national itself, and it serves as its main spiritual nourishment. “Starting from Starčević, or even earlier, Croatia was ruled by one psychosis - that it was necessary to destroy the Serbs so that the Croats could be saved. That psychosis sometimes smouldered sometimes flared, but it has always existed, either latent or active. “The Ustasha movement is its emanation - or one of its variants - it originates in Croatinism as such, its scope is Croatian and its aim is Croatian. Now it is called the Ustasha movement, it had a different name in the past, it will have a different name in the future again, but it will always be Croatian. That is why it should be marked as such if we want to stay within the field of truth” (p. 84).

When insisting on the collective accountability of the Croats, Kostić understands that it cannot be penal, so he refers to a significant German philosopher Karl Jaspers who says: “A criminal guilt always affects only individuals. Moral guilt is not subject to secular administration of justice. It requires individual penitence [...] Political accountability, however, refers to all those who have not timely realized a political crime, who have not taken action against it at later stage and who did not want to risk their lives for resistance” (p. 86). Even if the penal responsibility of the whole nation could be determined for encouragement, passivity, non-resistance, it would be impossible to pronounce any legal sanction. That is why civic and moral responsibility cease to exist and the Serbs must insist on it in the first place because, by stigmatizing the crimes and culprits they will prevent the repeating of a historical tragedy caused by the will of the Croatian nation, particularly under conditions when the communist regime rarely trialled the direct executors of crimes and pronounced too mild sentences.

As *The Voice of Canadian Serbs* wrote on 8 February 1962, the Ustasha genocide was “a crime directed at the whole Serbian nation by the whole Croatian nation. None of the Ustashes aimed at destroying

IT-03-67-T

only one life or one family, but the whole Serbian nation in the territory of the monstrous state of Croatia, so that they could expand at the expense of Serbs. It was the state program of the whole Croatian nation. Pavelić himself was not the only initiator and commander, as some precious Serbs would like to show, thus he was not the only one guilty of these crimes. The whole Croatian nation that gave birth to Pavelić, followed him indifferently and willingly made his wishes come true is guilty. Since those were the wishes of the entire Croatian nation. If this had not been the case, the Croats would have condemned these crimes for they had the opportunity to do so over the last 20 years, or at least they would have shown a sign of penitence. But they had not even tried to do so. On the contrary, even today they still threaten new massacres - to finish what they could not do between 1941 and 1945” (p. 95).

The references to the principle of civic responsibility mean insisting on the restitution to the original status, if possible. If this is not possible, then there is the option of compensation for damage. In the communist Yugoslavia, not only did the Croats did not compensate the damage they had done to Serbs, but also the reparations that were received from the occupation forces on behalf of Serbian victims were redirected to Croatian hands for the development of areas in which the Serbs hardly lived. As Kostić notes: “Yugoslavia continuously asks Germany to compensate some damages incurred to the Serbs (in the country, in concentration camps, etc), which are far less than damages that were incurred to Serbs by the Croats. This issue is now opened again (1971). Then it entered another phase: the government of the German federation is inclined to pay something, but the opposing powers are also strong. Therefore, some time in the spring of 1971, a reputable magazine *Frankfurter Rundschau* wrote that “Yugoslavia must not charge the German account for damages arising from the crimes that Pavelić committed over the Serbs in Croatia” (p. 101).

The moral responsibility is the most distinctive in the case of the Croatian crime. “The moral responsibility covers a long period of time, which cannot easily be limited. It has its root before the very act, as it can be manifested and established again after the act. Not only does it precede the act, but it conditions it to some extent. It appears as its presumption, not to say as its cause. Before the actual execution of Croatian crimes, their spiritual foundation had been made, which was expressed in the dissemination of hatred towards the Serbs and the whole Serbian nation, in defiling everything that was Serbian: the history of the Serbian nation, its moral characteristics, human qualities in general and its members. The idea of Ante Starčević that the Serbs were just ‘the race ready for an axe’ was well adopted and spread wide to cover the whole Croatian nation” (p. 109).

The war period was only significant because it provided new conditions for the Croats to carry out what they had planned for a long time. The psychosis of genocide was gradually born, developed and enhanced in parallel with the constitution of the Croatian state-building ideal and the rebirth of the national consciousness. “Within that psychosis, the execution of crimes at the appropriate time seemed just a

232/57440

logical consequence of the spiritual structure of the whole Croatian nation. Penal and civic responsibility came from the moral responsibility, but the moral responsibility did not disappear. On the contrary, by the very execution of acts - by the fulfilment of the hellish consequences that followed - it became almost visible in its substance, it gained an actual base, it proved to be indisputable, and it was weighted in its harmfulness and hellishness. By then it could not even be conceived, neither had anyone assigned such efficiency to it. That psychosis was so wide-spread in the Croatian nation that it was embraced by it totally. If one could ever speak of the collective accountability of a crowd, of one whole nation, one may speak about the collective, general, total moral responsibility of the whole Croatian nation for the crimes committed on behalf of that nation against the Serbian nation during the WWII" (p.109).

Criminal law includes commissive and omissive delicts. Commissive delicts are those that are performed actively by immediate execution, while the omissive ones are executed by non-doing, passivity, not taking any possible action to prevent a crime, by observing someone in trouble with one's arms folded, for example by not giving first aid. The omissive penal responsibility of the Croatian nation is indisputable, but the problem here is the non-existence of appropriate sanctions. Its moral responsibility is even greater and more distinctive. Only adult men who could prevent crime could be subject to prosecution. All those who approved of the crimes, who were happy because of them, who took Serbian property or bought it at a cheap price, or settled in Serbian property and made celebrations while the Serbs were choked in blood were morally responsible. Even those who already oversaw the great ethnographic changes in the parts unnaturally adjoined to the "Independent State of Croatia" and who were happy that these parts would be purified from "the Serbian race" that Croatia would become homogenous, etc. In one word: that the Croats would do better from the disappearance of the Serbs. And almost all the Croats were such, with minimal exceptions" (p. 109-110).

Neither does moral responsibility ever get superannuated, as is the case with penal responsibility for war crimes. As Kostić points out, "after the crimes were committed, even through to today, not only does this responsibility not disappear morally, does not get reduced, but it is brought forth again and again. It is disclosed when covering up the crimes, in keeping silent about them, in the failure to condemn them, etc. This is normal not only in the country but in the free world. It is so universal that exceptions almost never occur. If one could ever speak of the overall responsibility of one nation in the world, the general moral responsibility of the Croatian nation for the crimes committed against the Serbs, against the Serbian nation as such can be probably designed now; it precedes and it follows, it is continuous and unchanged, it cannot be denied" (p. 110).

Kostić also cites the radical emigrant leader Stevan Tomić, who issued the magazine *Radical*. In the issue of December 1956, he published his own essay on the moral responsibility of Croatian politics in which he

says: "During cohabitation in our common state, the Croatian political leaders used to systematically accuse the Serbs of all evils, both general and particular Croatian ones. They did not consider certain regimes or particular politicians or perhaps the political system itself responsible for them. They ruthlessly ignored the fact that the Croats, Slovenians and Muslims always constituted governments with the Serbs and that non-Serbian elements often decided on the manner of conducting the policy and the management. They only recognized the responsibility of the Serbs and Belgrade as the symbol of Serbiandom. For more than 20 years the Croatian nation was poisoned with the unconscientious and unfair propaganda that all evil came from the Serbs and that any Serb was an enemy, both in Belgrade and there on the same native soil. The harvest of pathological, blind and unjustified hatred started to reap these crimes first in so-called Banate of Croatia. In several places and on several occasions, the hatred towards the Serbs played an overture to the subsequent bloody Ustasha's Independent State of Croatia" (p. 113).

Argumentatively, Trifunac further shows that Maček had already prepared a complete infrastructure for Ustasha rule and politics. "In 1941, the Ustashes found everything prepared: in the Croatian civil and peasant protection, the first troops armed with the care of an unconscious tutor regime. The administrative staff in the bureaucracy of the Banate of Croatia was already prepared. Passive beholders of the biological extermination and genocide of the Serbs were among the Croatian nation. When the Ustasha axe began to cut Serbian throats at a faster rate, the Croatian nation passively beheld that crime, which would remain a stain on its conscience for thousand years. But the responsible Croatian political leaders also kept quiet. There were no words of protest, no condemnation" (p. 113-114).

Maček's followers in particular, as the most numerous Croatian political option, acted in emigration after the war in the same manner as they acted during the war. "The leaders of the Croatian Peasant Party kept quiet then, although they had recommended that the Croatian nation recognize and obey the new Ustashes' reign, they should keep quiet today, while others actively cooperate with the Ustashes and rescue Ustasha criminals from the court. While the first secretary of the Croatian Peasant Party kisses the criminal Artuković and offers him all his services for his defence, while that same secretary even today publicly writes that the Serbs are the evil in Croatia, sharpening the Croatian knife for new slaughters, the leader of the Croatian Peasant Party, from time to time, tries to imitate Pythia's prophecies in statements, for example, "that the ruthless Chetniks were opposed by the ruthless Ustashes", or that the people in the parts of former Independent State of Croatia were forced to join the partisans by "Italian, Ustasha and Chetnik crimes." Reading these lines, which are everything but honest, one may have the impression that we Serbs first started to cut throats of the poor Ustashes and that they, and not we, were the victims who had to defend themselves" (p. 114).

With respect to the political accountability of the Croats, it was so distinctive that even the American President Roosevelt strove to ensure

that the term of international guardianship should be applied to them as a nation unworthy of having their own state. As Laza Kostić says, “the statement of President Roosevelt is and will always be a stamp of shame on the Croatian nation. It was described in a way that no other European nation had been described; it was said by the most competent person in the international forum at the time in the free world. By communicating this, we do not dispute that Croatia should have its freedom and independence within her ethnic borders of course (where the Croats make up more than 50% of the population). But the consequences should be drawn from this that the Croats must not ever rule the minorities, particularly the minorities they used to exterminate. That is their “political responsibility”, which concerns us Serbs very much. What will happen to the Croats is the least concern for us, but we are directly concerned with what will happen to the Serbs in their environment. That is why we highlight the issue of the political responsibility of the Croats, to whose “guardianship” and sovereignty we must never entrust our country-fellowmen again” (p 120).

e) Many Serbs Covered Up Croatian Crimes

Many Serbs participated in covering up Croatian crimes, some unconsciously, some consciously - most of them unconsciously, accepting the empty phrases about the civil war, fratricidal war, the national settling of accounts between the Serbs and the Croats, etc. Kostić is particularly antagonized by the situation where, “when they speak about the crimes committed against Serbian nation during the last war, almost all Serbs mention the Germans first, then the Italians, Hungarians, the Albanians, Bulgarians etc., and in the end, almost through clenched teeth, they dare to whisper ‘and the Ustashas’. But they utter it with trepidation, fearing that they might offend them. Sometimes the list even ends without the Ustashas, sometimes one says simply ‘and so on’. In that respect, the Serbs hardly differ among each other, whoever’s name is heard and whose statements are read. Both those in the country and those in emigration speak about it in the same way. There is no difference between, for example, the words of Moša Pijade and our most prominent fellow-countrymen in emigration. When Serbian enemies during the last war are quoted, they are quoted using the same words and in the same order, both from the communists and from anti-communists. There is no difference either among ‘the Yugoslavs’ or the ‘Great Serbians’, among the latter, there is no difference between ‘Ravna Gora movement members’ and ‘the members of the assembly’, either among some newspapers, no matter what attitude they have in our relations with the Croats” (p. 136-137).

And the Croats are objectively the criminals without equal. “They are at the top of the list of killers of the Serbs, while all other nations follow far behind. It may be said without exaggeration that at least four-fifths of the total number of Serbian victims in the WWII, or 80%, were killed by the Croats. They are at the top of the list - ranked first, while there is no one ranked second, third, fourth or fifth, etc. No one can even

IT-03-67-T
come close to them. Probably the Germans or Hungarians are ranked tenth, then perhaps the Albanians or the English (these are generally not included among the Serbian enemies, although they are hardly less evil than the Germans). The Ustashas are ranked after the Bulgarians, although, to tell the truth, the Bulgarians hardly killed more than one hundred Serbs during this war that cost several hundred thousand Serbs” (p. 137-138).

The main wish of the Croats is that one should keep quiet about their collective crime, that it should not be written about anywhere. If this cannot be avoided, then the actual facts are underestimated, thrown into doubt and relativized - an artificial symmetry is sought or justification for the Serbian acts that allegedly provoked retaliation. Often the fundamental guilt is assigned to the Germans or the Serbs are claimed to have started the settling of accounts by destroying the Croats; often the war events are compared to the legend on prosecution of converts to Islam in Montenegro. It is certain that, even during the January 6th Dictatorship, no crimes were committed against the Croats. The dictatorship was established over all citizens and the manifestations of elements of the Serbian national consciousness were particularly attacked.

After all, in *The Croatian Nation* in 1941 the Croatian Ustasha government published statistical data stating that 230 Croats had been killed during the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Branko Miljuš, Phd and a reputable Serbian emigrant intellectual, commented in his book *Ivan Meštrović and Anti-Serbian Slandering Propaganda* that this statistical data “did not show how many Croats were killed in political demonstrations against the January 6th regime, how many were killed during the attempted uprising in Lika, how many while conducting terrorist attacks or during the drunken fights, how many during the riots because of branding the horses for the army in Slavonia and, finally, how many Croats were executed under court sentences, based on criminal law. In opposition to this, one should question how many Serbs were killed in political demonstrations, how many of them were killed by the iron hay-forks of the Croats in the notorious Kerestinac and how many Serb clerks were killed in the streets of Zagreb after the establishment of the Banate of Croatia in 1939” (p. 175).

Instead of seeking justice after the war - instead of précisising the individual guilt and penally sanctioning it - instead of determining moral and the political accountability of the nation and, in accordance with that, determining a just satisfaction to the victims, the communists struck the Serbian nation again, liquidated and persecuted its most prominent patriots and kept the Croatian guilt in the background. “After the war, the Croats got their federal unit – “the National Republic of Croatia” – again with a large part of Serbs in it. What did they do then? They kept a great part of the Ustasha apparatus in function, both the justice administration and the administrative apparatus. Those who managed the Serbs during Pavelić’s “reign of terror”, continued to do so after the war. Those who trialled the Serbs, that is, those who relieved the Croatian killers from sentence, continued to do the same. The clergy

was the most obvious example. It was kept in function with its episcopate. Not even the worst criminal was defrocked, or received *agitimia*. Isn't this an expression of full support of the post-war Croatian church hierarchy to the wartime Ustasha one? Isn't this solidarity with the crime of converting to another religion, of killing, torturing people for having a different religion?" (p. 245).

Kostić warns that we must neither forget, nor forgive the Croatian crimes, since in that case they would certainly happen to us again. "Owing to the Croats, we have had to forget numerous Serbian victims from the past. If we continue doing so, then we destroy the Serbian patriotism. Anyone who would want to sacrifice for the Serbian cause after that would be considered crazy" (p. 264).

Chapter IX

SERBIAN NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

Laza Kostić published a large number of books – collections, or rather compilations of thoughts and excerpts from the works of different authors, using and interpreting them to create a scientific base for his basic theoretical and political presumptions. He put a lot of effort and energy into this work, which sometimes whole institutes lack. Through a series of such books, he showed the basic fundamentals of Serbian national consciousness and traditions, primarily from the viewpoint of foreign authors, which provide the objectivity and credibility of the statements. We will not refer to those books by the order of their publication since that order has never depended on the author's will, but on the volume of the book and the possibility of finding sponsors that would finance the publication.

1. The Birth and Development of the Serbian Nation

The basic book of the cycle, *The Establishment and Survival of the Serbian Nation According to Foreign Writers*, was only issued in 1978 in Switzerland and the author dedicated it to his father, Archpriest Marko L. Kostić, who "not only did give him his life, but also brought the Serbian soul into it" (p. 3). He lists many interesting details from his biography in the preface, illustrating all the troubles of emigrant life and the hard and devoted work with which he gave meaning to it to the benefit of the mother-country and the Serbian nation. Here Kostić discusses Serbian national uniqueness, starting with the following statement: "It is funny to even think that any nation in Europe today is pure in race, i.e. completely without foreign admixtures. Even the Serbian nation is not completely pure, no matter how much we wanted that. But comparatively it remains among the purest nations in Europe in terms of the race itself. It mixed the least with foreigners and has kept its

731

somatic features to the greatest extent, as well as its blood composition, apart from its spiritual particularities” (p. 13). By the time of the Nemanjić dynasty, the Serbs had resisted Byzantine influences and, for a long time, preserved the basic characteristics of their primal social community, parochial organization and patriarchal traditions.

The German Byzantologist Franz Doegler and historians Konstantin von Höfler, Joseph Matl and Constantine Jiricek wrote about this. Höfler, for example, observes: “Since the exclusiveness of the Serbs was greater, if possible, than that of the Bulgarians, the external influence in the Serbian hills, gorges and valleys was even more severely rejected. That is why their political life ran more slowly and monotonously, their institutions did not reach outside the closest circle of the national element, they influenced other nations only through wars and attacks” (p. 14).

Matl points out the basic characteristics of the political and social system of the Serbian nation, and states: “The oldest form of the state and social life of the south Slavic peoples was the tribal organization that was formed after the takeover of the land. The foundation of this system - the core of the formation of social life - was parish that was divided into several brotherhoods and these used to have their cell cores in families and cooperatives. Blood and family lines were relevant in brotherhoods, families and cooperatives” (p. 15). Here he treats the Serbs in a special way in comparison to the Bulgarians or Croats, and he especially points out that “in those centuries of glory and power, there appeared that typical juxtaposition of the state, national and church interests, the juxtaposition of the state and church, of faith and people, that is typical even today. There lie the roots of the immense stubbornness this nation shows even today in its political and national life” (p. 15).

In 1950, the Munich historian Georg Stadtmüller wrote of the strength of the Serbian pre-Christian faith: “The very fact that Christened names are not widespread shows that the Christianization remained only on the surface. The Serbian Orthodox Church managed to incorporate national beliefs from the pre-Christian time and the folklore into the spirit of Christianity to a small extent. The tribal-patriarchal social structure of the Serbian mountains preserved, as some kind of protective judgement, the real national standpoint. The centre of Serbian folklore is the cult of ancestors, which is annually celebrated in the family circle (family patron saint’s day and Christian name) and survived the Christianity itself. It took over the Christian form externally and a mystical progenitor was transformed into a Christian patron saint. The Serbs celebrate their former tribal celebration in that form even today” (p. 15). In the book *Memories of My Life* published in Belgrade in 1930, the famous Croatian scientist Vatroslav Jagić is fascinated with the characteristics of the Serbian race, and says that “he would be sorry if the Serbian type disappeared for good, since it is purer and more Slavic than our Croatian type” (p. 16).

How could this be reconciled with the statements of most of the Croatian intellectuals that today’s Serbs are the product of “the Turkish-

Phanariot retort”? The Serbs were most isolated under the Turks in the first place and they jealously preserved their ethnical uniqueness. The ones who turned apostate and lost their national identity had no influence on the core of their nation. The more arrogant was foreign tyranny, the more the subjugated nation was isolated and unsusceptible to foreign influences. Only the renegades gradually lost their national identity. The basic differentiation was among the rural and town population and, in time, the town population completely disappeared.

In *Serbian Revolution*, the famous German historian Leopold von Ranke concludes that “both parts of the population became isolated and separated. When a foreigner visited Serbia at the end of the century, nothing was so striking to him as the difference between the country and the town. The Turks used to live in the towns, larger and smaller, in fortresses and market towns, while the Serbs lived in the country” (p. 17). The process that took place in England and France in which the newly-settled conquerors merged completely with the subjugated inhabitants was not possible in Serbia. As Johann Langer wrote in 1881, “the provisions of the Koran made any assimilation with the Christians impossible, and the Christians were not at all inclined to abandon their faith, nationality and language for the Prophet and his followers. Thus, the contrasts remained in their full sharpness” (p. 18).

The French, Italian, Romanian and Hungarian authors August Dijon, Edmond Plosy, Ernest Denis, Emile Haumant, **Eduard Shire**, Carlo Sforza, Giacomo Giudina, Nicolae Iorga, Benjamin von Kallay, Lajos Thallóczy and others all had a similar line of thought. Thus, for example, Dijon draws the conclusion that Turkish domination, “in comparison with other foreign dominations, was actually an advantage since it had been conducted wisely as a superstructure and sought no assimilation at all, as the Germans do today, for example, using a method that is unwisely oppressive towards the subjugated nations, making them accept their language and systematically implementing the ideas represented by that language among them [...] In no way did the Turkish state interfere with the upbringing of the common folks [...] who were [...] excluded from public services, like the military service was left isolated and protected from Muslim absorption by language and faith, to whom it remained faithful without hesitation” (p. 21).

Even the Croatian historian of literature envied the Serbs because they did not have to sell their souls to a devil under Turkish occupation, in contrast to his fellow-countrymen who had been systematically denationalized under German or Hungarian domination. “In general, the Turkish invasion had a similar effect on the Serbs as the Mongolian one on the Russians. It kept and conserved the national particularities” (p. 27). In his book published in Zagreb in 1911 in German, from which the above quotation was taken, Prohaska referred to the conclusion of the Czech scientist Josef Holecck in the book *Bosnia and Herzegovina during the Occupation* published in Belgrade in 1903, which says that “the national life and system remained the same with both the Serbs and the Russians; as well as the faith, language and everything that makes one nation unique. The constructive power of one nation became

Comment [K.B.29]: Translator’s note. The author has not been found in the available sources, possibly wrong spelling in the original

particularly distinctive during this period in the home communities and its creative strength found its expression in beautiful epic and lyric poetry” (p. 27-28).

The isolation under Turkish occupation enabled the Serbs to create their own legal order based on standards that were significantly different to the official Turkish regulations and legal customs. That specific autonomous legal system entirely consisted of unwritten standards of common law, but their essential legal foundation was based on the framework of Dušan's Code. In 1882, the Prague University Professor Konstantin von Höfler estimated the historical significance of that legal act in the following manner: “In his capacity as autocrat (despot), Dušan had the laws and customs of the Serbs collected and published, by which he erected himself a great monument, even greater since the internal system was made known by it. The Code was published six years before the collection of *Maiestas Carolina* and proved that the Code could not prevent Serbia from declining, but it contributed powerfully to the survival of the nation after that time” (p. 31).

In his book *South Slavs, Turkey and the Rivalry of European Governments in the Balkan Peninsula*, published in Sankt Petersburg in 1879, the Russian historian L. Dobrov recapitulates the position of Serbia in the Turkish Empire: “Until the end of 16th–17th centuries, its position with respect to the other countries of the Balkan peninsula was among better ones. Notwithstanding Turkish rule, Serbia kept its municipal autonomy, which consisted of the head of the pachalic – pasha – being in a direct relationship only with the municipality representatives, senior princes (who certainly ruled several villages, LMK), and those who collected taxes through them and published the enacted laws i.e. personal will of the padishah (sultan) while, on the other hand, the people expressed their needs and desires of the government through them [...] Along with the senior princes, who used to manage the counties, each village had its own headman who represented its local interests and he could dispose of the executive power in the village, on behalf of the prince. The princes and headmen elected by the villagers combined the police and the administration of justice in their capacity; they collected taxes on the basis of the assessment made by the senior prince to whom they submitted the collected amounts; the senior prince submitted the tax amounts to pasha; they also determined the allowance-in-kind. The Serbian municipality represented the closed circle of national life that kept the basic features of the nationality for further generations, notwithstanding all unpleasant political events. That municipality, where the weak breath of national-political freedom was preserved, became the precious heritage of the past for all Serbs since there, in that municipality, he could find some protection from Turkish autocracy” (p. 35-36).

Another factor of the preservation of the Serbian national individuality was the Orthodox Church. The Turkish society existed based on the complete interfusion of the religious and state organization, while there was no difference between the religion and the law. That is why the Turkish government found it normal that, among their Christian

IT-03-67-T

subjects, such a role must be played by the church. Kostić explains this in the following manner: “The conqueror did not want to remove these religious differences by hook or by crook; it preserved the religion of its subjugated nations, it even promised that it would protect it. However, it destroyed their political existence, it destroyed their state institutions, and thus it was impossible to provide them with the full reimbursement for that in the newly-established Muslim state. But the church was left to them together with the faith, not as an institution of God but as a church provided with the new far-reaching administrative powers which became the regent of the tax-paying nationalities, at the same time responsible for their obedience through solidarity. In that way, it became the medium between the Christians and the Moslems: for the faith, nationality and customs of the former as some protective wall and for the latter (the Moslems) a suitable instrument by which the state could keep obedient the politically deprived masses and through which it could collect taxes” (p. 42)”

Georg Stadtmüller also wrote in *The History of South Europe*, published in München in 1950, that: “The national consciousness of the peoples of the Balkans that had been smouldering for centuries continued to live below the surface of the Ottoman rule. The national church, outlaws and local autonomies were its holders. The double religious layer of the state meant that the Moslem upper class in general took no care of the religious and church relations of the folks. The church had its cultural autonomy and, since the church in the East was not the super-national ecumenical church but the national church, such circumstance had a great deal of significance for the spiritual self-preservation of the peoples of the Balkans. Only under the protection of the cultural autonomy could the peoples of the Balkans preserve their special spiritual life, at least in its modest form” (p. 44).

Foreign authors emphasize the great significance of the Serbian family for the preservation of the Serbian national consciousness. Nikola Tomazeo writes: “Like the family, like the nation. In so great a misery, a great comfort lies in the fact that a Serbian family preserved the pure and dear holy local connections in those areas that are not yet spoiled with a foreign spirit and customs. A major part of Serbian poetry should be assigned to the local life and atmosphere; they are the particularity and mirror of the greatness of civil society” (p. 48.). There were no deviations from that in the standpoints of the Hungarian ethnographer Alexander Szana, the German ethnographer Joseph Matl, the Italian historian Angelo Pernice, etc. The travel writers of the 19th century admire the Serbs for their distinctive state-building feeling and the sense of their rule of law, particularly for the fact that they had no nobility and neither did anyone make any serious effort to renew it after liberation from the Turkish rule. A Serbian peasant could hardly tolerate anyone above himself save for a prince he had elected himself, and he was proud of the fact that he could freely take guns and defend the state within the national army, to which all fit for fighting in war belonged.

Amy Boué emphasized that the Serbian government was rather national and elected by the people in order to justly serve the people

under the appointed prince. Robert Cyprien states: “one Muslim writer said that the Serbs were the European Arabs; and really this nation, which has an exalted love for independence in its character, the nation that Slavic publicists call the most democratic nation of the East, has actually formed a real republic [...] The equality that the Serbs avidly advocate does not mean that all of them should behave like vulgars, but they should all become gentlemen. I asked these peasants if there were some of the noble blood among them. “Yes, they replied, all of us are of noble blood” [...] A master could not be better than those whose interests he represented and, if he ruled badly, they would elect his son or some cousin and replace him. The same right that they (the people) exercised towards the special masters (princes or heads of families), had been exercised by them towards the supreme master, recognizing the dynasty’s hereditary quality. The opponents of any yoke, without newspapers, without the capital that could serve as a forum, they dictate the law to their masters” (p. 51)”

A deep respect for the Serbian democratic spirit and freedom-loving pride is shown by Otto von Pirsch, Alphonse de Lamartine, Ritter, Hipolite Dupré, De Clerval, Ubcini and Guillaume Lejean, Wilson Denton and von Reisswitz, but the observations of the Prussian publicist Gustav Guasch in his book *The Lighthouse of the East, Serbia and the Serbs*, published in Prague in 1872, say that: “A Serb who calls his ministers and the regent by their names, to whose blood the second element of the democratic trinity entered most deeply, who says for himself only this – Every Serb is of noble blood – is completely unfamiliar with the sentiment felt in Germany by the ‘inferior towards the superior’, even by night and, by day, which makes him take off his hat and bring his body into the upright position [...] A Serb speaks with the minister, head of department, senator and state councillor in the same manner as with his neighbour cultivating the land and breeding a great herd of pigs, as he does himself. Bureaucratic arrogance and deep servility are unknown in the land of ‘pig breeders’. A Serb lacks consciousness of all that” (p. 57).

The Italian statesman Carlo Sforza wrote the book *Nikola Pašić and the Unification of the Slavs*, which was published in Serbian translation in Belgrade in 1937. In this book, Sforza says, among other things, that the generation to which Pašić’s father belonged gave Serbia “the atmosphere of freedom and equality to which Nikola Pašić remained devoted for life; there were no great differences in property, mild prosperity was felt everywhere, the freedom of speech was established that would sharply criticize the prince’s work if some abuse was anticipated [...] All this in the tone of classy and serious elegance of the peasants of one country that has gained freedom again; an elegant and serious openness that was typical of the Serbs at the time, while the free peasants from Hungary showed a certain fearfulness inbred by the cruel subjugation of their landowners and feudal masters [...] Pašić managed to create a party doctrine that corresponded to the positive ideals of the Serbs: democracy, self-management and the development of national goals among the people [...] Pašić’s parliamentarism was deeply rooted in the

purest Serbian traditions, in the traditions of the Serbian peasants who used to criticize the decisions of the old Serbian princes in Serbia, while they would supervise the election of their parliamentaries two generations later” (p. 63).

Since the Turkish occupation had caused the social homogenization of the Serbian people and the legal equality of individuals, the conditions for developing a unique national consciousness no longer endangered by class differentiation were met. The ruling class belonged to some other nation, to foreigners, occupiers, thus the national resistance was economically social at the same time. As the Göttingen Professor Maximilian Braun wrote in 1939, “The Turks always took care not to allow the elevation of one social class that might produce some political leadership at a certain moment. The old feudal class was unscrupulously exterminated; the clergy were the only ones to be spared - and even privileged - but its political influence and cultural potentials were significantly reduced” (p. 74).

Such a developed national consciousness brought liberation uprisings and wars, the direct consequence of which was the creation of the modern Serbian state. The war traditions gave the military service a great reputation, but the military officers had never been a particular class, instead they continuously represented the most vital expression of the national peasant spirit they originated from. As the German ethnographer Gerhard Wolfrum observed in the book *Nations and Nationalities*, published in Köln and Graz in 1954, “a deeply rooted reputation that the military forces has among the Serbian people comes from the fact that it used to be the bearer of the liberation wars and the unification of all Serbs. Recruited from the gangs of outlaws at first and organizationally structured similarly to the Austrian *freikorps*, it preserved the ability to return to the partisan way of fighting. The decisive factor was that it attracted warlike active elements from the Serbian peasantry, from which the core of officers was also recruited and which resisted the entrance of non-peasant classes of civil intelligence for a long time” (p. 83).

Numerous foreign authors realized the role of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the development of the national consciousness and the preservation of state-building traditions, particularly Saint-René Taillandier, Edmond Plosy, René Millet, Ami Boué, Ivan Kastelan, Ranke, Höfler and others. In 1868, Taillandier wrote that the Serbs “wanted to have their national church. Either because the power of the Roman Pope disturbed them or because this power was too distant for them to use and they would rather accept the Eastern Church, refraining from being subjected to full religious influence [...] Thus we discarded the issue that certain publicists raised, we will not waste time any more studying whether Serbia would have done better if, during the early centuries, it had joined the Latin Church and, through that, the western community. Serbia followed its inclinations; the eastern nation, predetermined to play the role in the East, accepted the eastern form of Christianity as its own” (p. 86-87).

Ranke states that the Serbs “were introduced to Christianity by

Comment [K.B.30]: Translator’s note. The author has not been found in the available sources, possibly wrong spelling in the original

Greek teachers coming from Constantinople, at the same time when the differences between the Latin and Greek Church developed: all over again, they had to absorb the repulsion that the Anatolians had felt for the forms of the western church, the repulsion that, once there, could never be removed" (p. 89). The Prague Professor Gerhard Gesemann deeply appreciated the role of Saint Sava in all that. "The greatest credit of Saint Sava was in having made the newly-established church the Serbian Orthodox National Church" (p. 90).

But the essence of this issue was best described by Maximilian Braun who estimates that: "The Slavs in the Balkans, the Orthodox ones in the first place, have not established a completely close relationship with the faith yet. Compared to the Russian or the Pole, the Balkans' Slav is completely indifferent in terms of religion. His interceding for the church is almost always caused by other motives - in the first place by political and national judgements. After all, one cannot speak of some deep religiousness, even in terms of peasant ritual sensibility: "The church is for the priest", a Serbian peasant often says and, with a clear conscience, stays far from it" (p. 90).

Joseph Matl studies this process present at the time of the Serbian medieval state and draws the following conclusion: "In those centuries of glory and power, there appeared that typical juxtaposition of state, national and church interests - the juxtaposition of the state and church, of the faith and the people, typical even today. There lie the roots of the immense stubbornness this nation shows even today in its political and national life" (p. 103-104). This issue is also boldly studied by Gerhard Wolfrum, Mathias Bernat, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Šafarik, Jiricek, Thomas Masaryk, Golenishchev Kutuzov, George Ostrogorsky, Alexander Gilferding and many others.

In the book *Muslims and Christians* published in 1877, the French publicist Jean-Henri-Abdolonyme Ubicini recapitulates: "During five hundred years of slavery, the church was the one who prevented the national life of the Serbs from being extinguished. Neither the Ottoman barbarism nor the poverty of the Serbs could influence their faith (to change it). One holy spark lived at the bottom of their ignorance and superstition. The old church had canonized the old kings but it was ready to welcome new dynasties (the writer thinks of the renewed Serbia). Without these invincible traditions, without this faith and this hope, two shepherds, two pig breeders, Karađorđe and Miloš, might be heroic commanders of a company; they could not gather the chips of this nation and to raise the dead" (p. 104-105).

The Serbian Orthodox Church had a similar role in the preservation of the Serbian national consciousness in the Austro-Hungarian territories where the Serbian people lived. It violently opposed the Catholic proselytism and, with its clergy, it was a political leader of the Serbs. Joseph Redlich wrote of it that: "Only religious confessions, as this particular orthodox religion among the Serbs and Romanians again represented the strongest protective dam against Hungarization at that time and even later; yet this was only the case with the peasants who were under the authority of their national church at the time and

IT-03-67-T
afterwards" (p. 114-115). This issue was described differently by the Hungarian historian Schwicher, the German historian Lorenz, the Prussian historian Neugebauer, the Austrian historians Anton Springer and Joseph Redlich, even the German historian who hated the Serbs, Hans Ubersberger, as well as Hungarian historians Nikola Veseleny and Bela Pogany and the Frenchmen Charles Loiseau and Leroux Golieu.

Kostić particularly emphasizes the physical self-defence of the Serbs from tyrants and enemies and their means of resistance, including primary personal revenge, outlaws and uprisings. From early childhood, the Serbs were brought up to revenge every Turkish crime, individual crimes first, and then, in general, the greatest crime of all - Kosovo. The revenge for Kosovo as the vow of the predecessors was passed from one generation to another. All these were moral obligations of the highest priority and, by departing from them, a violator would incur public contempt. The Serbian revengeful spirit used to strike terror into Turkish hearts and it was often a preventive measure against excessive violence. The proverb 'One that does not take revenge, does not get canonized' can only be applied to the Serbs."

With respect to outlaws, it was recorded that Ranke considered them faithful, devoted, fair and generous national fighters. In his study on outlaws published in 1867, the German ethnologist Siegfried Kaper writes: "For south Slavs, for the Serbs and Bulgarians, an outlaw is actually a preserver and protector of the right of public safety. He is a canonized person and his name is a reputable name. At first, the outlaws came from the Christian population of towns and villages, as brave individuals who generously gave up the peace and satisfactions of home and, either alone or in company of other people with similar viewpoints, they travelled the country as a type of voluntary police and helped their brothers in faith and fellow-countrymen oppose their violent masters, even to oppose the pashas themselves; or, if it was too late for help, to entrust them with peace and satisfaction. It was so to speak, a golden age of banditry. People from reputable families did not refrain from undergoing these troubles, from spending their lives on the move and in escape, fighting with the Turkish authorities in the entire province so that, in the end, their names would be praised in poems as a reward for their life full of deprivation and danger. The outlaws were later recruited among those people who had been affected by Turkish violence [...] They chose a permanent fight and thus the avenger of an individual crime grew into an avenger of crime in general" (p. 136).

Kaper specifically lists in detail the moral characteristics of the outlaws which made their greatness and immortality "the glory of martyrs and early fighters for the Orthodox Christianity [...]" The discipline required conscientious fairness and pure morality from the outlaws. None of the outlaws could do something on his own, neither could he benefit from his acts. The goods and properties of his brothers in faith and his fellow countrymen are sacred for him. A simple theft, even the one committed against the Turks, makes him dishonourable and results in his expulsion from the gang. A promise, under vow or otherwise, cannot be violated and he keeps it so strongly that even a

Comment [K.B.31]: Translator's note. The authors have not been found in the available sources, suggested spelling is given here

Turk does not refrain from relying on it. The honour and safety of women are the highest priority of an outlaw. In that respect, he is a real knight. If he violates those principles, he will be killed if he does not take his own life [...] There are outlaws who, after years spent in a gang, return to their normal lives for some time or for good [...] These are people that are admired by their fellow-countrymen, who are physically and spiritually agile, whose advice is sought and who are wise defenders and efficient helpers of the subjugated. They represent an important link in the chain of liberation wars that were being prepared; they are the liveliest bearers of political and national propaganda” (p. 136-137).

The outlaws maintained and developed a chivalrous spirit and, in uprisings it represented the base of the national army. Its specific form is *uskoci* and border-guards in Krajina. Their existence actually proved that the war against the Turks never stopped. The German scientists who wrote about Serbian outlaws with great sympathy were Gerhard Gesemann, Friedrich von Hellwald, Beck, Stadtmüller and Mathias Vernet, while the French ones were Alphonse de Lamartine, Xavier Marmier, Celeste Courier, Edmond Plosy, Jaques Ansel and the Italians were Attilio Brunialti, Giuseppe Brabanti, Carlo Sforza, Arturo Cronia and Angelo Pernice, insisting on their importance for the survival of the Serbian nation. The English archaeologist Arthur John Evans compares them to Robin Hood. The most beautiful texts on the Serbian outlaws were written by the Slovene scientists, the Russian Andrei Sirotinin, the Czech Mahal and our own Vladimir Dvorniković.

Greater national uprisings took place from time to time and the Serbs usually tried to adjust them to the actual effects of some Christian army nearby, in the first place the Russian, Austrian, Hungarian or Venetian. The greatest Serbian uprisings were seriously covered in all the significant world histories. Kostić again quotes Ranke, Dobrov, Canitz, von Rayovitz, Šafárik, Taillandier, Montague, Edmund Spenser, Gervinus, Redlich, Kober, Stadtmüller, etc, but the most important quotation for us is the one of Benjamin von Kallay: “The time of light was gone, the Serbian medieval state disappeared and the Serbian nation seemed to be swept away from the line of other nations. But at the beginning of the latest age, a certain phenomenon with no equal in world history draws our attention. After one hundred years of fighting wars, one nation gets awakened and rises to the national self-conscience: and the most interesting and undoubtedly the most illuminating fact is that even after so long in subjugation, under which the Serbian national being almost disappeared, the common folks rose by their strength and without foreign help, drawing enthusiasm from its old traditions [...] and, having no necessary structures for creating a powerful movement, instead of being deprived even of the most primitive accessories: the nation continues the struggle against the more superior Turkish power for years and the common folks became so capable of being the nation again and of establishing an independent state for themselves, in accordance with modern principles. The Serbs achieved this at the beginning of the 19th century in their revolution, in which they persisted and therefore they deserve our admiration” (p. 151).

The Russian Historian Dobrov graphically describes the initial fights, and says: “What a ghastly image of inequality the very beginning of the fight shows. On the one hand, we see a numerous army approaching from all directions - a regular army experienced in waging wars, with great armament and the powerful artillery that the Turkish army was always famous for; while on the other hand there is a crowd of peasants, craftsmen, tradesmen - detached from ploughs, artisan tools or the trading counter - people completely ignorant of the art of war, at first armed with maces, yataghans [...] And in all that inequality, in the bare hands of these peasants, craftsmen and tradesmen led by Karadjordje, lay the permanent foundations of Serbia’s independence” (p. 152).

In the following chapter of the book, Kostić takes the cultural particularities of the Serbs into consideration. Thus he refers to the Polish legal historian Maciejowski, who speaks of the high level of Serbian and Russian education in the Middle Ages, which is borne out by the visual arts in the first place. A very important fact is that education was in the local rather than in the foreign language as was the case with the western Slavic peoples. Šafárik and Jireček point out the highly developed Serbian Medieval literature with praise, while Louis Leger speaks of the high level of civilization at the time of Nemanjić dynasty. In his book *Cultural History* published in Augsburg in 1877, Fridrich von Helvald wrote that “Serbia is far above Turkey in all its institutions and makes great efforts to catch up with the other European nations” (p 160-161). Gerhard Gezemann claims that “there is no other nation in Europe today whose members - even the peasants - know more about its past than the Serbian nation” (p. 162).

With respect to legal monuments, the opinion of historian Maciejowski is interesting again: “Save for among the Serbs [...] I could not find a trace of law among other Visa-Carpathian Slavs” (p. 167). He pays special attention to Dušan’s Code and concludes: “If we consider the spirit and internal value of this law in general, we may freely say that it is in the mean among the Slavic laws we have known so far and assessed. To tell the truth, it hasn’t the mildness of Polish and Russian law and hasn’t such a good possibility of choice as Czech law, but it may be presented more fully and in more detail; it is written more in the Slavic folk spirit than the other two. This results from the fact that it was less influenced by foreign law than the other two, particularly the Czech one” (p. 162). His opinion that Serbian law is the most national one in comparison to all other Slavic laws derives from this.

A great number of foreign authors pointed out the significance of national poetry in the survival of the Serbian nation. Thus, for example, Otto von Pirch states: “The Serbian nation should thank its spiritual strength for its moral survival – it was not the result of some external factor. The great heroic period of the nation continued to live in its memory, passed by word of mouth from one man to another in the national poems that used to be the nation’s fortune for a long time, almost hidden and only becoming known to the rest of Europe in modern times. Thus the memories of the past removed the pain and shame of reality, as well as awareness of the time when the nation had been great and that it

could be great” (p. 174). The magnificent works of medieval architecture and painting, which showed that the Serbs did not lag behind the most civilized nations of that time, played a special role as well. This cannot just be the case of copying Byzantine or Latin models.

The Serbs are obviously one of the European nations that first developed a national self-confidence. Yet, the most significant fact here is that the national consciousness includes the unity of the whole nation in all its territories, which is the case with no other European nation. Only those parts that had shown historical and moral weakness through having accepted the standpoints and ideology of occupiers by converting to Islam or Catholicism separated from the Serbian nation. But, by separating from it, they didn’t just make the main Serbian national current stronger and harder, but they reduced it in terms of quantity.

In his book *The Balkans* published in 1924 in Jena, the famous German publicist August Kober recapitulated the results of research into the modern European science of the Serbian national self-being in the following way, claiming that the Serbs already had the distinctive elements of a national consciousness in the 10th century: “The natural organization of the Serbs resulted from a strong national feeling and association – from that patriarchal family authority, which was spread through the community of clans and tribes to the kingdom, which was in principle democratic, if we want to use the European expression for this specific form of state where people of equal rights, national feelings and the same ideals united freely into one community, pursuing those ideals. This sober and practical community of aims with a strong linking national conscience or the feeling for the race, without mincing about any state ideal, this organically created power kept the Serbs free, comparatively so even under Turkish rule, while the Croats succumbed to European civilization and the other Balkan states to stronger enemies. This strength united many Serbian tribes as early as in the 10th century in their joint struggle against the Bulgarians” (p. 198). He thinks that the Serbian nation, “owing to its elasticity between form and strength, not only did it contaminate Turkish rule, but even came out stronger from this school of suffering” (p. 199).

It is interesting how the Frenchman George Perrot in 1869 depicts some of the striking features of the Serbian national character that significantly contributed to the survival of the national consciousness under conditions of the most difficult experience. He says: “All those who know this country agree that one of its main strengths is its cohesion. The Serbs appear to be a colder nation than the Hellenes; they don’t have a passion for propaganda or their restless and loud enthusiasm. But, in order to be more restrained, their national feeling is not weaker. They can organize better and they would rather sacrifice their personal rivalries. The Serbs do not have the egotistical vanity that rejects any possibility of cooperation, that personal ambition that, in heroic time and ancient times, always prevented the Greeks from combining their efforts and, due to which, they would have disappeared at the beginning of this century if the West had not interfered. Since it began to have trust in its leaders, the Serbian nation has gathered around

them and served obediently upon the spur. It is one trait of the national character that is evidenced by the entire modern history of Serbia” (p. 217).

Hermann Wendell, the German politician and publicist, wrote in 1925 that Vuk Karadžić had contributed the most to completely defining Serbian nationalism by investing its historical heritage with the specific touch of the French Bourgeois Revolution and the idea of German romanticism. On the basis of that, he concludes: “The new Serbian nationalism was not familiar with the limitations of historical classes, or with the difference between the clan and the nation, between *populus* and *natio*, between the nation as the ethnic and the political unit as was the case with the Croats at the beginning - instead it was christened with the water of democracy and encompassed all Serbs under the condition that they were pure Serbs” (p. 219). Therefore, it was no coincidence that the Austro-Hungarian diplomat Baron Muslin, who was the chief editor of the ultimatum to Serbia after the assassination in Sarajevo, emphasized in his memoirs published in Munich in 1924 that “the Serbian national idea was developed more than any other national idea” (p. 224).

2. Foreign Authors on the Characteristics of the Serbian Nation

Kostić published the collection *The Serbs in the Eyes of Foreigners* in two volumes in Switzerland. The first was published in 1968 and the second in 1972. In the first book, the author demonstrates what foreign authors wrote, above all, about the physical appearance, courage and the nobleness of the Serbs towards a defeated enemy. In the preface, he explains that he was especially motivated to collect the authoritative opinions of foreign authors on the Serbs, “at the moments of our greatest national digression, when it seemed that dusk had come over the Serbian nation, when everybody betrayed us, everybody attacked and scolded us, when even those who had to represent Serbdom refuted it, when entire provinces denounced Serbdom with objections that were often unjustified (particularly those made by the Montenegrins), when our non-brothers and the greatest murderers of our people, after the physical extermination of hundreds and thousands of Serbs, started to discredit us morally and stigmatize with all unpermitted means” (p. 3).

Kostić is proud that he did not find a trace in the entire world literature of anyone who negatively described the physical appearance of the Serbs, especially of not finding a trace of anyone considering the Serbs a degenerate or ugly nation. On the basis of several recorded testimonies, Konstantin Jireček concluded in a concise and clear way that “The Serbian men and women in the Middle Ages were beautiful people with regular features [...] as opposite to the close-shaven Italians, the Greeks, Serbs, Bulgarians and other nations of the Eastern Europe used to wear long beard and long hair [...] The poetic ideal was a woman with fair golden hair, as in the works of the classical past [...] The old frescoes and descriptions show the Serbian men and women as beautiful

Comment [K.B.32]: Translator’s note. The authors have not been found in the available sources, suggested spelling is given here

Comment [K.B.33]: Translator’s note. The authors have not been found in the available sources, suggested spelling is given here

and tall people with regular features [...] A Bosnian Serb is taller than Serbs from other areas even today [...] There is very little data from the Middle Ages regarding the colour of eyes and skin. Along with the brown and dark hair that prevails, there are still fair-haired people, even on the Adriatic Coast, in Albania and Macedonia. According to the Greek writers, the Slavic settlers in the 6th and 7th century were prevailing of a fair complexion while, even today after twelve centuries, the Serbs are prevailing of dark complexion" (p. 26). It is obvious that the Serbs assimilated the indigenous Balkan inhabitants and thus took over some of their racial features, which was rather useful to the Serbs both in a biological and the cultural sense, helping them to become, as some authors later wrote, a nation of healthy and strong people, endowed with reason, honour and endurance.

The German travel writer Kohl and the ethnologist Leist describe the Serbian folk costume in a beautiful way, while the French painter Theodore Valerio and the poet Théophile Gautier were simply enchanted by it. *The Great Meyer's Conversation Lexicon*, published in Leipzig and Vienna in 1909 in twenty volumes seemed to synthesize previously published data of the ethnographer Lorenz Diefenbach, Attilio Brunialti, Alexander Heksch and others. The lexicon describes: "Typical Serbs, who are most numerous in Herzegovina, are tall, broad-shouldered, with proportional head, a well-built body, usually with an aquiline nose, fair-haired, with fair to light brown eyes. Dark mixed types can often be found, but they are also of tall stature" (p. 31).

Regarding Serbian women, the most distinctive description was made by Friedrich Wallisch in 1928, who wrote: "In Serbia and Montenegro, one may find an unusually large number of beautiful women. With wonder, one may find women of classical beauty in a mountain cottage among dirt and poverty. In abundance and without picking, nature gives the most unique gifts there. A free, wide look of dark eyes between long eyelashes and below sharp and distinctive eyebrows cannot be compared to anything. Regular glittering teeth shine between lightly curved lips. The face is wrapped by dark waves of curly hair [...] Among the women I have seen, as often before in the Serbian hills, some women whose beauty overwhelms me like some great event" (p. 31). Many authors also wrote about the specific features of Serbs from different Serbian territories and Kostić pays special attention to presenting the results of anthropological and anthropometric research, showing that the Serbs belong among the tallest European nations, as well as having the largest brain since the average capacity of their skull is 1,542 cm, which is 136 cm more than the Slavs with 1,406 cm, the Czechs 1,415, the Polish 1,440, the Hungarians 1,437, the Germans 1,489, the Romanians 1,478, the Dutch 1,382 cm etc.

Serbian courage and heroic deeds cannot be disputed, as the contemporaries of various historical events, scientific analyses and travel writers' narratives testify. Kostić starts presenting these opinions with Safárik's statement that courage was and is one of the most important positive characteristics of the Serbian nation. They have never lacked this feature. The courage and belligerence of the Serbs impressed not

only Konstantin Jireček, but the Austrian general Josef Arnim Knapp. However, they primarily rely on the testimonies of Gregory Tsamblak and John Cantacuzene, as well as those of Du Cange, Schlitz, Priest Dukljanin, and Raphaeli etc. Felix Kanitz concludes from that: "As today, according to Byzantine sources (which always assessed the Slavs strictly), courage was a distinctive virtue of the Serbs. History speaks of many Serbs whose strength, courage and devotedness made them worthy of standing next to the heroes of all nations" (p. 53).

Joseph Holeček is even more convincing and specific: "The Serbs fought bravely in the Turkish and German (Austrian) armies, fought like gladiators and did not forgive [...] A hero worthy of miracles, the Serbian nation bore all the marks of all heroic deeds itself, similar to suicide" (p. 57). The official remarks of the Austrian military officers from 1747 on the characteristics of Serbian soldiers, to which Radoslav Grujić refers, are interesting. "These are beautiful people, tall, uneducated but clever, brave heroes as if made for fighting; they must just be brought to discipline. By no means should their superiors be young. They should be older and more experienced officers who would treat them politely. They must not be whipped without great necessity; though if this must be done, those among them with great respect should be informed first, so they can be convinced of the necessity of the punishment and agree to it" (p. 57).

Friedrich von Taube had the similar opinion when speaking of the Serbs from Slavonia: "Since they have a strong and healthy body enduring all unpleasantness, heat and cold, hunger and thirst, sleepless nights and long marches, this courageous and stout-hearted nation appears to be made for war. The whole life of this nation is cruel and differs from the lives of softened nations like night and day. They love arms more than anything and practice hard to use it from early childhood" (p. 57-58). Kostić further lists numerous individual testimonies, assessments and reports on actual historical events and the distinctiveness of the Serbian participation in them.

Here, it is perhaps particularly significant, for example, to explain the viewpoint of the French publicist René Pinon regarding the Serbian military accomplishments in the First Balkan War: "It is natural that all Serbian hearts vibrate when they listen to the great deeds of their brothers who renewed the accomplishments of the legendary heroes, praised in national poems that the old bards sing in a sad voice along with the *gusle*, and which illuminated, after so many centuries, the heroes that died in the battle of Kosovo with King Lazar. But this time the epic narratives conveyed by word of mouth were not embellished with poems; this was authentic news on heroism and Serbian victories, confirmed by three hundred Turkish cannons in a line across the old fortress in Belgrade. One should know the importance of a bloody memory of Kosovo battlefield to the upbringing and culture of the Serbs, so that the zeal of the Serbian troops and the elevated enthusiasm of the whole nation over one victory could be understood, which deletes the humiliation of the defeat in 1389 for good. That nightmare had oppressed the race; it finally disappeared: a great example for nations that expect

Comment [K.B.341: Translator's note. The authors have not been found in the available sources, suggested spelling is given here]

necessary reparations from history” (p. 75).

Neither did the enemies spare the words of praise of the Serbian army. Ali Riza Pasha, the commander-in-chief of the Ottoman army in Macedonia during the First Balkan War, used to say that a Serbian soldier was the best in the world while Galib Pasha complained that he could not possibly seize at least a foot of Serbian land from the Serbian army. The telegram that Javed Pasha sent to Constantinople from Bitola in 1912 states the following: “A Serbian soldier is invincible; we cannot do anything against the Serbs. A Serbian peasant has no vices, he is gentle and generous. A Serbian soldier always wins because he is more refined and more intelligent, disciplined and high-moralled” (P. 92). And during the WWI, the Austrian field-marshal von Borojević lamented on the gloomy destiny of the defeated army of his emperor and says: “The Serbs fight endlessly, they are strange fighters; they are more aggressive, wilder and more energetic than the Russians; they take more initiative and are more independent. They catch their enemies with their nails and teeth” (p. 98). It is no coincidence that, in September 1915, the German General Field Marshal August von Mackensen warned his soldiers: “You don’t set off to the Italian, Russian or French front. You set off to fight with a new enemy, dangerous, tough and harsh. You set off to the Serbian front and Serbia and the Serbs are the nation that loves freedom and that fights and sacrifices to the last. Be careful that this small enemy does not obscure your glory and compromise your accomplishments to date” (p. 98).

In the emigrant edition of his collected works, which were published posthumously in Chicago in 1951, Jovan Dučić quotes the words that the Austrian prince and Hungarian marshal Grand Duke Josef of Habsburg told him in front of numerous witnesses: “The Serbian army is the first and most courageous army in Europe. I know this from personal experience, because I set off to fight against it at the river Danube. Gentlemen, said the Prince, what did you do to me that day: after the fight which lasted only half an hour, you destroyed my division. As of that, moment I became redundant [...] My battalions were completely blown away by your devastating fire. Believe me, I do not exaggerate when I say that the Serbian army is the first in the world” (p. 98-99).

On 6 December 1917, the German newspapers *Tagliche Rundstadt* wrote: “At the beginning of the war, the army of the small Kingdom of Serbia represented the best that one small and culturally backward country could make in the military field. Excellently organized, with great and up-to-date arms, trained seriously and in detail, with considerable and recent war experience, simple and enthusiastic about the national idea of Great Serbia; brave to the point of devotedness and full of confidence to win, that was the Serbian power that entered the war. It fought with incomparable devotedness and great stubbornness and, even when it was defeated, it made its flags glorious. A Serbian soldier was a worthy opponent and the Serbian army in favourable opportunities showed to be more powerful. Fairness, even towards the enemy, requires that this be admitted publicly and be determined” (p. 108). The daily command of the German Kaiser Wilhelm before sending

IT-03-67-T
his armada to the Serbian front included: “Heroes! I am sending you to a new war against one small but very brave nation. Those are the Serbs who, during the three recent and very hard battles with Turkey, Bulgaria and Austro-Hungary, showed the world the most distinctive virtues and great military skills and who, for four years, wrote on their flags marked with blood only incomparable and glorious victories” (p. 116).

The allies showed much more admiration of the Serbian soldiers. A considerable quantity of praise was published in books and newspapers but, in our opinion, it would be sufficient if we quoted here what Lady Paget wrote in a report of 1916 as the wife of the British Ambassador in Belgrade, which was submitted to the English Committee for providing aid to Serbia “Maybe it is too early to assess what position Serbia will have in the future. The end and completion is too far away now. Serbia has the right to recover everything it has lost. Its suffering exceeds all the greatness with which it had fought in the wars, as well as the heroism that had made it distinctive. I lived among the Serbs for six years, but I may say that I am only just getting to know them now (1916, May). I observed their self-sacrifice and resistance through all the temptations that had come upon them, but I did not have a clue of the secret power at the heart of a Serbian peasant soldier; torture to his body will always remind me of the soul that triumphantly rejoices. Neither death nor torture, neither disappointment in allies that did not arrive in time through Thessalonica, could break this invincible heroism in the soul of a Serbian soldier. During retreat, one hundred and fifty thousand Serb martyrs stayed in Albania. The line of broken heroes walked from defeat to defeat, yet its soldier would not accept defeat, rose above the pain, did not complain and endured it all. As a fighter with no match, he believed and sang, that is why I respect and admire a Serbian soldier. Many countries may have good soldiers, but I doubt they can be proud of having a soldier who waged war, pleased to have one loaf of bread a week! The allies realize themselves that the destiny of such a nation is to play a greater role in the Balkans than it used to play in the past” (p. 129).

Kostić here states an excellent quotation by the anonymous English diplomat that took over from priest Dušan Popović, providing an excellent assessment of the character of the Serbian nation: “The Serbian nation is psychologically strong. It has so many great characteristics, that it enchants everybody so incredibly fast and with incredible speed. It has excellent assimilation powers. It is a democrat in its widest sense. It is free-minded in a uniquely clever way. It is not cruel in winning, but a correct master; more a friend than a commander, managing to invoke respect even from uncivilized mountain persons such as the Arnauts. Dreadful in revenge, a Serb is calm and kind as a friend. He gives his hand first, quickly gets acquainted and he is honest and kind in the intimate way” (p. 130).

In his book, Kostić continues to providing several testimonies on the heroic deeds of Draža Mihajović and his fighters during the WWII, insisting that he had not dealt with that issue in more detail, since Radoje Knežević and Kosta Pavlović dedicated themselves to collecting foreign opinion on the role of the Serbian Chetniks during the WWII. He states as

a particular oddity the positive opinion of the prominent German communist Franz Borkenau on the Chetniks in *World Communism* published in Bern in 1952.

Borkenau is very objective in his analysis and commentaries of the facts and thus, at one point, he says that several days after the occupation of Yugoslavia in 1941, the Serbia uprising began - on the 10 May more precisely - when "Mihajlović raised the flag of resistance on Ravna Gora. In doing so, he implemented the ideas of the Serbian revolution of the 27 March and Serbian peasants soon started to gather under his flag [...] The incredibly fast development of the Serbian uprising relied on its detailed preparation in the time of peace. Mihajlović was not the founder of the Chetnik movement which proclaimed him duke" (p. 146). He says that Mihajlović is a famous first European guerrilla leader recognized worldwide, that he lacked political capabilities but was an extreme patriot and endowed with great military skills.

Salvatore Loi, the Italian historian and military officer participating in the WWII, wrote about the Serbian Chetnik uprising in the book *Yugoslavia in 1941* published in Turin in 1953. At one point he says that the Chetnik movement "became more intense (more and more people joined it)". This invisible conspiracy that made the Serbs (subject of Croatian hatred) get together, those carefully woven connections between various centres of this conspiracy, resulted in one organized and capable army presenting itself on the battlefield like magic, even before the hour of uprising came. In above all, one armed nation fought in war for its survival with a decisive stubbornness. With respect to organization, the Serbs really had several centuries of experience. Often in their history, particularly during the epoch of the wild Turkish reign, they were forced to leave their modest homes in order to form armed companies" (p. 147). Like Loi, the Italian military officer Mauricio Bassi describes the Chetniks from Herzegovina and says that "some mysterious spiritual power kept these people together, more than command or the power emitted by the master, and one more idea: the idea of Serbian homeland, of Serbian blood, of the Serbian nation" (p. 149).

Kostić finishes the first book by proving, based on foreign sources, that the Serbs were far ahead with respect to their noble relationship towards the enemy they defeated in war, as well as in relation to war prisoners. In their ancient homeland, the Serbs did not recognize slavery and the Byzantine historian Mavrikios testifies that the Serbs let their prisoners decide themselves whether they would go back to their homes for a certain ransom or join the Serbs as free men with equal rights. Therefore, they did not behave like barbarians and Šafárik also states that they acted in accordance with some war rules of theirs regarding prisoners, civilians, the weak and helpless, churches, etc. The medieval Serbian outlaws also acted in accordance with the code of honour. Leopold von Ranke wrote that the Serbian outlaws "must boast of their faithfulness, honour and generosity" (p. 168). Ranke also writes about the discipline of the Serbs participating in the uprising under Karađorđe: "Karađorđe applied the prohibition of robbery so strictly that, after Belgrade had been taken, he killed two people who had violated the

prohibition and had their bodies hung on city gates. He received with hospitality those people from the fortress who wanted to come under his protection" (p. 170).

In his *Notes from a Journey*, published in Paris in 1835, the prominent French writer and scientist Alphonse de Lamartine admired the military honour of Karađorđe and Miloš and gave actual examples: "A Ruthless defender of justice and order, Karađorđe had his own brother hung when the latter tried to rape a girl [...] Ali Pasha was imprisoned and returned numerous gifts to the Grand Vizier. In their generosity, the Serbs showed that they were worthy of the civilization for which they fought and Miloš, in advance, used to treat his enemies as future friends. He felt that his homeland was yet to gain its full independence, and he stuck to the agreement, instead of disgracing his homeland with slaughter" (p. 170).

3. The Serbian National Character

In the second book, Kostić provides foreign descriptions of Serbian spiritual qualities and comparisons with the Croats, Bulgarians and neighbouring nations. Along with a series of striking testimonies, one has to include that by Konstantin Jireček providing a great number of actual examples of generosity and humanity, as well as evidence that medieval rulers, feudal nobility and all other state officials and church dignitaries devotedly pursued the example of the secular and spiritual establisher of the Nemanjić dynasty, thus pointing out that "biographers praise Nemanja for protecting the poor, the blind, the paralytic, the mute, the orphaned; he ransomed the debtors and freed the slaves. In his preaching, Sava taught his followers to feed those who were hungry, to receive the homeless into their homes, to give clothes to the poor, to protect widows and orphans, to ransom slaves and free them" (p. 15).

With regard to Kosovo and Lazar's dilemma between idealism and utilitarianism, Joseph Holecček wrote of the essence of the fateful Serbian choice: "The Serbian nation, rejecting the earthly empire, faithful to the empire of heaven demonstrates itself so full of powers of idealism, that we, who hope that in future we shall purify the nation of the shame and injustice of the earthly empire, must see in it (the Serbian nation) and respect the pre-matter of the nation, which will in the future play an honourable role allocated by fate; in order to ensure such a role, it must be ready for further pain and suffering, further self-denial and sacrifices" (p. 19).

After the WWII, the English scientist Elisabeth Hill wrote the following: "The same spirit of Kosovo urged the Serbs to make a choice in 1914, the choice that ultimately created Yugoslavia. The same spirit urged the Yugoslavs to make their choice on the 27 March 1941. There were many Kosovo battles as of 27 March. The spirit of Kosovo, which lives even today, carries one message for all of us – not just for all the Serbs but for all the Yugoslavs and all the nations in the Balkans – it encourages us to neither make compromises or create something temporary, deceptive, opportunistic, but to keep the faith for which the

Serbian Tsar Lazar died for good and at any cost. We are all responsible for each other. We have a mutual responsibility. We chose to be allies in the war that just ended, but our mutual future is to gain peace by reviving the Kosovo spirit. And the more we take part in the revival of that spirit, the more we will contribute to the spiritual reconstruction of Europe” (p. 19-20).

The words of Professor Émile Haumant from Sorbonne on 28th June 1915 seemed to be inspired by contemporary events. They indicate with amazing authenticity that history repeats for us Serbs. Haumant starts his lecture with the following statements: “I will talk to you about Serbia. I might talk about the military Serbia, about the victories that impressed Europe. The Austrian provocations, the introduction to the present war - the provocations in which diplomats and university professors competed by producing false documents would also be a very interesting topic for discussion. But, even if I disappoint you, I will go further back in the past and seek there the answer to the question that each Serbian victory raises. How was it possible that, in the present time of great countries, such a small state was born, lived and rose itself to play an important role in the drama shaking a good third of mankind? Which fairy endowed this state – as soon as it appeared in the map – with so much energy that it could – like a Hercules from the cradle – reject the attacks of a monster, the two-headed Habsburg eagle” (p. 38). Every Serbian child knows the answer that Haumant gives. The power that leads us and gives us that enormous energy is Serbian faith.

Kostić here published hundreds of opinions on the Serbs written or spoken by famous intellectuals, but they are all more or less similar and so we find it appropriate to quote one of the rare ones that also points to the weaknesses of the Serbian national character - said, of course, in good faith by French historian Ernest Denis in his book *Great Serbia*. Denis, among other things, writes that “the Serbs have their own weaknesses, which are the result of their temperament and their upbringing. Their will is not a lasting one; they quickly lose trust and it usually happens that they make decisions without thinking, only to regret them soon. They do not have a continuous feeling of duty towards a state and very often they sacrifice the general interests to their humours, which are temporary but fervent. They can get easily carried away by powerful words and false accusations, at the same time forgetting the credits they made; they are more capable of heroism than of thinking, since they are full of fervour and they believe, like the French, that their mistakes will be corrected easily” (p. 86).

Denis searches for the causes that created these characteristics and says: “The long rule of the Turks, during which they had never been sure that they would collect the fruits of their labour, did not give them a taste for additional effort. These are the southerners who easily start a conversation and enjoy sweetening their dreams with the smoke of their cigarettes. Their internal fighting and their inconsistency served as a weapon for their neighbours to use against them - to the Germans and the Hungarians, who took care to magnify the weaknesses of the Serbs.

Their enemies do not see or they don't want to see the higher

qualities of this race: its flexibility caused by long suffering, fineness and sharpness of its intelligence. In the first place, the consistence of its idealism and the solidity of its faith, which survive in spite of the alleged oscillations. The winds disturb the surface of the river, but do not change its course” (p. 86-87). However, the point of Denis's considerations lies in the very true and, we are sure, original statement that “the Serbs have one strange virtue (worthy of admiration), which is usual with the Slavs after all: they believe in the power of cause and right; according to the apostles' words, they hope even when no hope exists” (p. 87). The Serbs hope even when all others think that there is no chance for hope.

In the book *Serbian Homeland*, published in Paris in 1917, Madeleine de Benoit Sigoyer describes the war tragedy of the Serbian nation and the Albanian golgotha and Kostić quotes the following words of hers: “In spite of so much misfortune, the Serbian nation is not dead. It goes through the greatest suffering but it lost nothing of its life power. Young blood boils in its veins. Soon, a gorgeous flower of freedom will blossom. The tyrants could not subject it for centuries; it always broke its chains. The great powers are jealous of its youth, old powerless forces may try to imprison it; it will break down the walls of its cell. The dream of Great Serbia is more outlined during temptations. Days of temptations will join the river of eternity. A strong and greater Serbia will resurrect in its entirety. The opposing nations will try in vain to make it forget its dream; it has its power of youth, the power that will reject the limits of the impossible” (p. 88).

Another famous Frenchwoman of the time, the writer Janine Clapier, wrote in her book *Legendary Serbia* published in Paris in 1918: “Even the Serbian soul is a mystical one. It escapes the world's methodological study and rebelliously rejects it, not giving in to anatomic dissection. It has sudden confusing ups and only a deep knowledge of Serbian history may explain it. The Serbian soul is so strong that nothing can break it. It has such a great feeling of honour, which lives in it petrified” (p. 89). What else is there that distinguishes them from other nations, particularly the neighbouring ones? “The Serbs are a proud nation. Even in the greatest pain, they would not cry. Oh, when will a human heart open more easily than in pain and sorrow? Yet, no matter how strange it looks, you will hardly see a Serb crying” (p. 89).

With respect to the situation in which the Serbian nation found itself in the WWII, the American journalist Ruth Mitchell published a brochure *The Chetniks Speak. Facts about the Serbian Fighters – Mihajlović and Yugoslavia*, noting something that is a Serbian problem even today – the lack of talent for efficient state propaganda. She testifies: “The Serbs, reliable and loyal as a race, belong among the greatest fighters and democrats in Europe. But they are also among its worst nations with respect to propaganda. They do not know how to use words for their own account, believing that their deeds would speak more than words and loud enough about them and about us, their allies. The Croats, on the other hand, trained for a long time by the intrigues of Austro-Hungarian politics, are skilled in propaganda. Therefore, it is very important that the Americans finally hear the whole documented

truth about Yugoslavia, the Serbs and Croats, as well as of General Mihajlović himself and the Partisans” (p. 102-103).

With regard to comparing the character features of the Serbs and the Croats, Kostić quotes the descriptions of the Austrian historian Anton Springer from 1863, speaking of “the great features of the Serbian nation, manly courage, a natural sense of poetics and a primeval thinking and understanding, which the Croats had to a small extent” (p. 120). After careful and overall consideration and study, Franz Mauer came to the conclusion that “a Serb who is devoted to his Orthodox faith by his consistency and self-sacrifice, is more tolerant than a Croat”. He thinks that this “may result from his faith in the same way the Catholic faith and clerical influence can be blamed for the fanaticism and inclination to intolerance that is more expressed in the Croats” (p. 120). The German travel writer Kohl points out the other aspects that distinguish the Serbs from the Croats and thinks that “the Serbs and the Croats in Dalmatia differ in some characteristics, both in their physical and moral (being). In general, the Serbian nation is considered more beautiful and noble. The Serbs are not only higher and of stronger physical build than the Croats, but their heroism and passion for freedom are also greater” (p. 121).

In the book *The South Slavs and their Lands*, published in Leipzig in 1851, the German lawyer and theologist Johann Ferdinand Neugebauer brings his personal testimony: “The writer asked one learned Franciscan priest from the Poljica Republic for his opinion on the difference between the Serbs i.e. Illyrians (a direct quote - L.M.K.) and the Croats. He replied: I would rather be a Turk than a Croat” (p. 121). On the other hand, in the book *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina on Foot During the Rebellion in August and September 1875. Historical Overview of the Bosnia and a Glimpse of the Croats, Slavs and the Old Literature of Dubrovnik*, published in London in 1876, the English historian Arthur Evans describes the physical appearance of the Croats: “The Croats from Karlovac physically resemble the Croats from Zagreb to the extent that I am forced to describe the main characteristics. The nose is cut low and flat towards the forehead, with the deep furrow between the nose and forehead that I remember in many Romanians [...] Croat’s deep and restless eyes, of which he is so proud, are often repulsive at first sight since they suggest doubt and roughness [...] Taken as a whole, the face lacks the expression of Teutonic strength and massiveness. The Croats, as opposite to the Serbs, are not so tall and so nicely or proportionally built. They are not so open in their behaviour and rarely beautiful. The Croats complain a lot about the laziness of their peasants [...] The Croats are incurable drunkards” (p.123-124). The Austrian author Herman Biere claims that the Croats simply have a strong urge to be servants.

4. The Serbian Religious Life

Kostić published the collection of essays *From the Serbian Religious Life* in Munich in 1961 in which he discussed the issue of the significance of the independent Serbian church, the Patriarchate of Peć,

church endowments, the role of monasteries in the preservation of the Serbian national consciousness and the tolerance of the Serbian Orthodox faith, as well as some actual religious customs and church practice. The establishment of the autocephalous Serbian church is a historical event of invaluable significance since church independence was a primary foundation of state independence. The Patriarch of Constantinople proclaimed that independence in 1219, after some very successful church-state activity on the part of the Serbian Prince Rastko Nemanjić. According to the concept of Saint Sava, as Vladimir Ćorović resumes, “Serbia should be a unique orthodox state in which the faith, in the lack of a developed national idea, should be the cohesive element of all the tribes and provinces. Therefore, Sava decided to organize the independent Serbian Orthodox church into the state and to entrust that organization with carrying out the national consolidation. For that reason, he went to Nicaea and presented his reasons for the necessity of establishing Serbian church independence, emphasizing the danger of the Latin influence in Serbia. The emperor and the patriarch accepted these reasons, hoping they would gain allies in the Serbs in their fight against the odious western knights, who still kept Constantinople under their rule” (p. 12).

Kostić particularly emphasizes Ćorović’s conclusions that, as the Archbishop, Saint Sava “organized the Serbian church energetically and very well”, giving to it a pure national character. Also, “the Serbian state idea of the Nemanjić dynasty was physically made by Nemanja and intellectually by Sava. He worked systematically on making the orthodox faith a synthetic part of the Serbian state culture” (p. 12). The church of Saint Sava served God and the people, and thus developed the idea of a homeland of the Serbs and laid the foundations of modern Serbian nationalism and patriotism. As Taillandier points out, “it is without doubt that the connection of the kingdom and the church was in good faith, without tension and inter-concessions, that this connection was natural and naïve, as could be seen in the Serbs of that time, and that this phenomenon was unique in history. The Serbian kings used to listen to the *genius* (protective spirit) of their race when they favoured that connection [...] The rulers that were politicians and the rulers that were mild dreamers, all of them pursued the same route” (p. 15).

Amy Boué correctly assessed the significance of another aspect of the Serbian eastern orientation with respect to the Christian faith. “In contrast to the Latin Church, the Eastern Church used to have a sound understanding at all times that the church books should be written in the language of its own nation that accepted that ritual. This concession certainly influenced the progress made by the Eastern Church, since nothing opposed a common sense more than a ritual in a language that one did not understand. After all, having taken the national antipathies into consideration, the Slavs would have rejected the faith practiced in Greek or Latin simply because of the language in which the liturgy had been delivered” (p. 16-17).

In principle, Boué also takes into consideration some general differences in the eastern and western variant of the church organization

within the unique Christian faith, saying: “An enormous difference between the Western and Eastern Church is that the first one requires complete unity in the church hierarchy and the recognition of only one headman in the person of the Pope who, in that capacity, is considered of even higher rank than all crowned heads. The Greek church does not set such excessive requirements and is more easily adapted to the events and ideas of the century; it is the faith of progress, while the Roman faith is a stationary cult, as is that of the Dalai Lama from Tibet, which cannot and did not attempt to include any possibility of modification and adjustment to the spirit of the time. A well understood policy requires that the clergy of all nations should be national and that it does not depend on any authority and foreign state. And the Orthodox Church allows that the synod of archpriests recognizes an archbishop as a headman and that he should become a metropolitan or patriarch. Thus, we saw that the Slavs got a patriarch who was independent of Constantinople (he is thinking of Dušan’s patriarch-L.M.K.)” (p. 17). As Ubcini noted, “in a country like Serbia, where a citizen and a priest were always combined (considered to be the same), church that distinguished its issues from the issues of a nation and that desired to be heard abroad would look like something abnormal and monstrous.

In his doctoral dissertation in 1934, the German historian Gerhard Hiller saw the fundamental power in the Serbian tradition of St. Sava and the ideological traditions and state-building idea of Dušan’s empire, which ultimately destroyed the great and powerful Austro-Hungarian Empire. Hiller’s thoughts are as follows: “Why did the dual monarchy fail because of the Yugoslav other than the Romanian irredentism? Because Serbian nationalism was more than simple irredentism, since it represented a unique historical phenomenon. The Serbian irredentism was not conditioned by scattered Yugoslav elements in Austro-Hungary; it cannot even be explained by the Hungarian national policy. It used to have positive spiritual bases: a living memory of Dušan’s Empire and the tradition of the Orthodox Church. These traditions were modernized by the assimilation of democratic ideas and the spiritual connections of all the Serbs with the Russian radicalism of the 19th century, with Bakunin and Kropotkin. Serbian nationalism, which we cannot claim wasn’t taught by modern foreign influences, represented a completely independent phenomenon” (p. 27).

That is why it was possible that preserving the continuity of the Patriarchate of Peć would cause the preservation of the continuity of the Serbian state-building idea based on the Nemanjić ruling traditions. Its restoration under Patriarch Makarije Sokolović and the recognition of four great patriarchs - of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antiochia and Jerusalem - enabled the full blossoming of spiritual life in all the territories where the Serbs lived. In one encyclopaedia determinant, Radoslav Grujić writes: “The restored Patriarchate of Peć not only included all Serbian territories that had been its integral part during the time of Dušan and Uroš, but also all other territories in which the Serbs lived under various masters, or which the Serbs had populated in migrations during the Turkish invasion. Thus, the restored Patriarchate

of Peć, along with its old territory in South Serbia, North Serbia and Montenegro, included two more eparchies in today’s Bulgaria (Kyustendil and Samokov). It also encompassed the entire territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina with Dalmatia, Srem and Slavonia with Croatia, as well as Banat and Bačka with Baranja all the way to Buda, Timisoara and Arad, where many Orthodox Serbs had settled fleeing from the Turks. The Archbishopric of Ohrid only included the territories to the south of Tetovo, Skopje, Veles and Štip in the southern part of the kingdom. Thus, for the first time, all the Serbs became united in one national/church community, which won extraordinary merits not only due to the separation and spreading of the Orthodox faith, but also for the preservation and development of the Serbian national consciousness and, along with that the subsequent realization state unification” (p. 33). The historian Dušan Popović adds his opinion to that conclusion, saying that “the nation was more completely united through church organization than it was during Dušan’s reign, not only nationally, in the church and culturally, but also politically, led by its Patriarch” (p. 34).

Since the Turkish Empire was an extremely theocratic creation, it insisted on the strict separation of believers and non-believers to the end; that was the source of the autonomous rights and the social organization of the Christian population and, according to the theocratic ideological structure, it was quite natural that the Christian church appeared as a representative and transmitter of politics. Thus the church leaders had numerous important secular functions and competences. Radoslav Grujić describes this status in the following manner: “As secular national leaders, patriarchs and bishops were entitled to administer justice in secular issues, not only in the issues of marriage and inheritance, but also in many other civil disputes. In such cases, they would usually insist that the parties be reconciled and that a settlement be made: if that was not possible, the church representatives, along with mandatory fines and imprisonment, also used other types of sentences – even the curse. In adjudicating matters, they usually practiced common law and later relied on the Nomocanon and Dušan’s Code. They had their own police, called the kavass, who were in charge of executing sentences. As national headmen, the patriarchs and their bishops were at the same time the main mediators and the representatives of the Serbs before the Turkish authorities and, as appropriate, their protectors from unconscientious clerks and landowners. Only the emperor’s court in Constantinople could administer justice to patriarchs in secular issues and, in accordance with the law, no one could imprison a Serbian priest without their knowledge and approval [...] The patriarchs were the legal successors not only of all the episcopos, but of all the Serbs in the Patriarchate of Peć who died without a will or without a successor” (p. 42).

A Patriarch used to have numerous competencies in the area of executive power and was elected by “the congregation of Serbian metropolitans, episcopos, priests and other church and people’s representatives. The election of the Patriarch was confirmed by the sultan’s berat [...] The Patriarch used to convene the council of

episcopos and prominent men as appropriate. With them, he would assess the tax for the people, out of which the patriarch's tax to the sultan should be paid; he would discuss and decide on important church and secular issues and educational and cultural needs. The subsequent church/secular councils in the Karlovac Metropolitanate under the Austro-Hungarian reign developed from this practice" (p. 42). Through the church organization, the Serbian Patriarchate obviously conducted the entire local and much of the state administration, except in the military sphere, while the tax administration was managed by a superior authority. It acted like a state within a state - of a vassal and theocratic character, to tell the truth - but it was extremely valuable to the Serbian nation under Turkish rule.

In his lecture *On the Centenary of the Illyrian Movement*, delivered in Zagreb in 1936, Ferdo Šišić said: "If we compare illyrism with the resurrection of the Serbian state at the beginning of the 19th century - for Karadorde and Miloš - we can immediately see that the Croatian renaissance was undoubtedly more difficult as a problem than as a struggle, since the long-term physical and bloody Serbian struggle was undoubtedly more complex and the resolution of the Serbian national problem - in the antithesis between the an Orthodox and a Muslim - was always very simple. The illyrism had to both make the Croatian nation and to defend it from the enemy at the same time while, in the Serbian renaissance, that first task - the creation of the Serbian nation - was completely renounced. For a long time, all the Orthodox people within the boundaries of the Patriarchate of Peć, and within the Karlovac Metropolitanate considered themselves Serbs. Thus, during one hundred years of Turkish rule and although the Serbian political state had not existed as an independent one, the unified spiritual Serbia had existed within the boundaries of the Orthodox Church" (p. 50).

In the book *The Yugoslav Issue and Yugoslav Crisis in 1924*, published in Stuttgart in 1931, the German historian Ernest Aurich presents the thesis that "the Serbs have a historical right to Bosnia and Herzegovina, since, for several centuries, it used to be within the composition of the Patriarchate of Peć." As Kostić points out, "We Serbs have never cared about historical rights and this theory is, in general, outdated. Yet, the opinions of this German historian should be given full attention: they are at least scientifically unique" (p. 51). The relevant quotation of Ernest Aurich is as follows: "Yet, the old state (the Serbian one) has never achieved that objective (conquering the whole of Bosnia, L.M.K.). However, the modern Serbian movement is legally entitled to Bosnia: it was a part of the territory of the old Patriarchate of Peć, which took over the Dušan's ideal heritage in terms of culture and the church at the time of deepest humiliation to Serbia. Through a good attitude towards the ruling Turkey, that Patriarchate, in spite of political impotence, brought under its competence, all Serbian lands where the south Slavs used to live, in an expansion worthy of every admiration. It even adjoined Bosnia, which it had not managed to do before, establishing a cultural imperialism" (p. 52). All the subsequent Serbian imperial privileges in Austria and Hungary were mostly based on what the

Impressed by the Serbian church endowments and the construction of Orthodox temples throughout North America - for which the Serbian emigrants spared no effort and sometimes their last dollar - Kostić wrote a study on the Serbian church endowments, which he published within this book. That tradition has been carefully cherished since the time of the Nemanjić dynasty. The monumentality of the Serbian medieval monasteries did not leave indifferent both Serbian friends or foes, and many foreign authors have left striking marks of their admiration and respect for Serbian architecture and the devoted spirituality permeating the Serbian national being. Jireček, considering that the buildings are the most significant and material monument of the past periods in culture, says that "there is a great number of big and beautiful churches in Serbian countries from the last century of the Middle Ages, speaking clearly of the wealth of the country in the past, of the sense and love for art that the Serbian rulers and people had" (p. 69). Many authors are amazed by their artistic perfection and they study the expert documentation and interpret the construction procedure, ornaments, style and harmony of architectural solutions.

In his study on Serbian monasteries published in 1930, the French art historian Charles Diehl says: "studying these valuable monuments preserved in Serbia, opened it up as a new field in the history of the art of the East. And this is because it invokes interest and incomparable charm when visiting these old monasteries full of memories from the history of art, which keep master-pieces of a great past in beautiful places and in a moral atmosphere" (p. 75). In the book *Serbian Heritage*, published in London in 1959, the English historian Cecil Stewart says that it is a miraculous, unexplained and unexplainable thing how the Serbian Byzantine style exceeded the Byzantine art that was its ideal.

Kostić particularly insists on the fact that Serbian medieval towns and fortresses were built by a national labour force and that they were often cursed because of the trouble and misfortune that came upon people because of the unpaid hard, sometimes bloody work. However, the rulers and feudal nobility paid for church and monastery building and they were often very generous about it, thus people had nice memories of the construction process itself. The splendour of the rulers' power and their generosity in constructing temples should not be diminished by the tears of the poor. The monasteries represented the feudal power, the expression of deep religiousness, but they were also schools for educating people and spreading the spiritual and ideological influence. Everyone had access to monasteries and church liturgies, so that, in order to make a monastery self-supporting, the benefactor would assign it feudal status and allocate a certain number of serfs to it.

Under Turkish occupation, when the feudal nobility was destroyed and the people were equalled in terms of status, the serf's duties to the monastery became customary and their amount was not burdening the believers. People voluntarily worked on their preservation and repair and

showed themselves to be a subsequent collective trustee. At the time of the Turkish attacks, numerous monasteries were burnt and destroyed and the biggest and most beautiful were turned into mosques, while the priests who fled built small monasteries in the mountains and thick woods. The Turks did not allow the construction of new Christian places of worship, and they only allowed the repair of the old ones using previously used material and with an enormous bribe. The first century of slavery passed in infernal troubles and thus the immeasurable historical importance of the restoration of the Patriarchate of Peć and the influence of the Serbian Pasha Mehmed Sokolović may be viewed based on that contrast.

After analysis of the subsequent historical events, the restoration and construction of places of worship in the liberated Serbian territories, the destructive Croatian campaigns in the WWII, the communist prohibitions of building new churches or repairing old ones, Kostić returns again to the issue of the overseas church endowments and wonders what will happen to the beautiful Serbian temples throughout America. "The answer I give myself is not as pessimistic as it is in respect to the preservation of nationality. While the Serbian emigrants in America are doomed to lose their national identity no later than the second generation (or the third generation at the latest), isolation from the faith is very rare. There are cases where an Orthodox groom converts to his religion a bride of other faith and when an orthodox bride converts to her faith a groom of a different religion, even if both of them don't speak Serbian anymore (there are, naturally, opposite cases, but possibly fewer than the examples mentioned)" (p. 104-105).

Kostić explains this religious consistency as because tradition, but also because there is no dominant, privileged or state religion or religious discrimination in America. "In contrast to the language, which must be one and the same for all (English), and contrary to the nationality (which must be American if one wants to prosper in that country), the initial variety of religion has been preserved and even increased, thus no one is ashamed of or proud of belonging to this or that religion. Anyone can live and basically lives a separate religious life, which, in general, is very lively in America (as opposed to Europe). That is why there is no chance that Serbian emigrants in the USA or Canada will become detached from their faith or converted to another faith. They might not be able to understand the language of the liturgy, but then the church will adapt and provide more and more passages in English. Emigrants will undoubtedly stay devoted to the religion of their ancestors and in which they were christened" (p. 105).

The Serbian monasteries maintained and preserved Serbiandom. Also the voice of a man playing a *gusle* was most vivid and most impressive within monastery walls. Serbian literacy was preserved in within these walls and the literary works were copied there. Historical events were remembered and recorded and they are now of great significance for modern historiography. Monastery frescoes, as a particular illustrated Bible, offered religious teaching to a religious audience and, on the other hand, represented illustrated historical

reading that provided fundamental knowledge of the old Serbian state. Through their church endowments, "the Serbian medieval rulers served Serbiandom even after their death, for many centuries, no less or more usefully, if not even better, than during their lives. There is no other example like this in the world. History has no record of a longer, more honourable and holier service of rulers to their nation" (p. 115).

New foreign authors emphasized the unusual religious tolerance of the Orthodox people, particularly the Orthodox Serbs. There has never been any proselytism in the Orthodox faith. Kostić wrote a short essay on that issue and he finishes his book with extensive disputes on Orthodox temples in the Serbian coastal areas, particularly in Boka Kotorska. He also writes about the traditional, legal and spiritual meaning of carrying the cross during a certain religious holidays, about the issue of the seat of Serbian Orthodox episcopos, particularly in Hungary, and he gives comparisons of some actual standards of Orthodox and Catholic Church law.

5. The Serbian Heroic Epic

Lazo Kostić published the collection *Foreigners on Serbian National Poetry* in 1964 in Melbourne. It is the result of his detailed study and systematization of the most important viewpoints on Serbian national literature by the German writers Jacob Grimm, Therese von Jacob, Johann Wolfgang Goethe, Wimar Grand Duke Karl August, Asnus Serensen and numerous travel writers, geographers, historians, literary theoreticians, philosophers and linguists; the French writers Alphonse Lamartine, Amy Boué, Saint-René Taillandier, Emile Montague, Edouard Daladier, Charles Yriarte, Celeste Courier, August Dejon, Louis Leger, Ernest Denis, Eduard Shire and others; Italian writers Nicolo Tomasi and Giuseppe Maccini; the Russian, Polish, Czech, Ukrainian, Slovenian, Croatian, Romanian, Hungarian, Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon writers. It is not necessary to point out that these statements were full of admiration and praise, or that Serbian epic poetry was mostly compared to Homer's work. There are numerous statements that the Serbian national poetry is the highest achievement in this field in the world.

Here, we will state only a handful of these opinions - not the honey mouthed, but those that are the most sincere and the shrewd. In 1933, Maxim Brown wrote on the Serbian national poems: "Heroic poems are more than just fun, more than simple boasting or a fantastic imagination. The thing they tend to achieve in their particular connection and the reality of their fantasy is more some kind of ethical elevation of life, a way of giving sense to their own existence. The aim of exaggerating the reality is, if we may say so, of an educational character: the nation uses it to set an ideal image with the aim of achieving it" (p. 55).

In 1951, Ernest Dickenmann, as the University Professor of Slavistics in Bern and Zurich, wrote: "These poems show a deep rooted national feeling and passionate patriotism: the participation in the battle against the infidel Turks as a Serbian hero when defending the home-

land and the Christian faith and give one's life for it is considered a special honour. These poems revive the memory of the glorious past again and again, keep the latent forces in the nation awake and boost the spirit for fighting for the highest ideals such as freedom, independence, honour and justice. They also offer comfort in great misfortune, invoke strength and the will to endure hardships. Although the poems often exaggerate in the idealization of the strength and heroic deeds of the heroes, they do not lack a sense of reality; they describe weaknesses with strong realism, such as the inclination to drink, the love of honour, quarrelsomeness, perfidity and infidelity. The humanitarian aspect of these poems is emphasized by the heroic features of women, either as a mother who bravely bears her pain or as a sister ready for sacrifice, as a faithful and devoted wife who goes to death together with her husband, as a proud fiancé who brings water to fighters before they die. There is really a kind of "noble simplicity and calm magnificence" in this type of women. The poems give deep insight into family life, showing that the medieval Serbian woman was highly respected" (p. 63).

In the book *The Coast of Adriatic and Montenegro*, published in Paris in 1878, French historian of art Charles Yriarte says of the Serbian national poems that they are "propaganda that escaped all sovereigns' police, government orders, brutal imprisonments and sultans' decrees: it is a holy coffin of the nation, in which it finds reflections of its greatness in the past, comfort for present evil and hope for future freedom" (p. 73).

In his Paris University lectures on Slavic literature in the mid 19th century, the greatest Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz pointed out the essence of the Serbian Kosovo cycle of national poems: "As with the Greek, the Slavic heroes are also ordinary men, passionate in their anger and love towards war. They consider courage as the greatest value, respect faith (religion) and love abundance and wealth; they are often violent but never cruel. The war is not a manhunt for them, as is the case with the savage Americans. On the contrary, they respect international law, keep oaths as something sacred and the word of honour - they fight with the honourable sword. Their character raises Christianity to a higher level - in Serbian poetry, we cannot see the dreadful revenge of the Greeks or the savagery of the Trojans. This is the case of a greater humanness: individuals spare war prisoners and do not rejoice over the bodies of dead enemies [...] The opposite gender is depicted in its mild mood [...] a man respects a woman as his friend, as his mother and the mother of his children. There is no contempt for the female in Serbian poetry, which we can see in the poetry of more educated but more corrupted societies" (p. 96-97).

6. The Territorial Scope of the Serbian Lands

In 1965 in Munich, Lazo Kostić published the book *The Spatial Distribution of the Serbs in the Past and in the Present Time*, in which he tackles that issue through all fifteen centuries of Serbian history. As of the beginning of the 6th century, there are written trails, while all the trails before that have been lost in the darkness of pre-history. The

Czech palaeontologist and archaeologist Lubor Niederle competently dealt with the earliest Slavic history and concluded that the differentiation between certain Slavic nations already started in their ancient homeland. He points out that the Serbs settled in the Balkan Peninsula near the rivers Bosnia, Drina and Morava, as well as on the Adriatic coast from the Cetina to the Drim River.

Safárik claims that the Serbs and the Croats settled in the Balkans at the same time, but separately from each other. In his *Slowianskich Starozitnosci*, he is utterly determined and precise: "All the Serbian tribes that settled between the Croats and the Bulgarian Slavs in the basins of the rivers Bosnia, Drina, Kolubara, Western or Serbian Morava, Ibar, Neretva and Morača, belonged to one and the same nation on the basis of their common language. That is why we may speak here only of different lines of the same powerful tribe, and not about different nations in the real sense of the word" (p. 11). Safárik considered the Croats as just one part of the Serbian nation. His grandson Konstantin Jireček specifically located the Croats in the territory from the river Cetina, Imotsko, Livno and the Pliva River through to the mountains in Istria.

Alexander Guilferding, as a Russian historian and diplomat, stated in his *Letters on the History of the Serbs and Bulgarians*, published in 1854, that: "Serbia was divided into several smaller or more independent provinces: the real Serbia with Bosnia to the east of the Croats and to the south of the Croats; Neretva or the Pagan country between the rivers Cetina and Neretva through to the town of Dubrovnik, Travunija with Konavle between Dubrovnik and Montenegro and Duklja, today's Montenegro" (p. 13). Apollon Alexandrovich Maikof locates the Serbs in the same way in his *History of the Serbian Nation* published in 1876, also in Serbian. He specifically proved that Bosnia had never been Croatian but exclusively Serbian.

The Russian historian Derzhavin also located the border between the Serbs and the Croats at the river Cetina and town Livno and he stated that the Croatian people lived in Styria and Carynthia. Derzhavin also points out the Serbian lands and the regional marking of the Serbs as Neretljani, Zahumci, Travunjani, Konavljani and Dukljani, and Raška as the central Serbian territory. He says that "Vlastimir (836-843) should be attributed the first historically confirmed attempt to gather together the Serbian lands by conquest, which provided a necessary base for upgrading the economy. Apart from Raška, Old Serbia and Bosnia, the lands in Vlastimir's possession included territory that stretched in the north-west to the right banks of tributaries of the rivers Sava, Bosnia and Vrbas and it encompassed the areas of eastern Bosnia as well. It was therefore the beginning of the Serbian state" (p. 15).

Derzhavin writes about this in his book *The Slavs in the Ancient Times. A Cultural-Historical Study*, published in Moscow in 1946 in the edition of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. He further states that the Serbian territories were also united under Vojislav (who died in 1051) who "used the unrests in Byzantium and united all the old Serbian lands under his power, among which were Bosnia and Raška" (p. 15). After

the ruler Bodin, a new division of Serbian lands took place. “Thus, in the second half of the 12th century, two political and cultural centres of the Serbian people were created instead of Serbia: Bosnia and Raška. As of then, Bosnia fell under the sphere of western cultural influence and Catholicism, while Raška had been under the sphere of influence of the Byzantine Empire and the Orthodox religion” (p. 15).

In 1673, Johanes Lucius also wrote that the Croats occupied the territory from Istria to the river Cetina, while the Serbs occupied the territory from the Cetina to Drač, saying: “The Serbs who were mostly subjects of the Eastern Empire, were assigned different names according to the lands where they lived and the most famous were the Neretljani and the Bosnians, who were named after the rivers Neretva and Bosna, running through their country” (p. 15). The Franciscan monk Matija Petar Katančić wrote that the Croatian border line stretched from the river Drava, through Moslavina, to the spring of the river Cetina in Dalmatia. Franjo Raški gives similar determinants, insisting on the river Cetina and Livno as the southern-most Croatian borders, stating that the Serbs lived beyond them. He is also explicit that Zahumlje, Travunija, Konavle, Duklja or Zeta, as well as Bosnia were populated by the Serbs.

Prominent later Croatian historians such as Tadija Smičiklas, Vjekoslav Klaić and Ferdo Šišić fully accepted the positioning of the Croatian nation made by Johanes Lucius and Franjo Raški. Tomo Maretić also accepts this completely, while insisting that the river Vrbas had definitely been the Serbian-Croatian border in the continental part. Other Croatian historians wrote of the river Cetina as the border between the Croats and the Serbs, including Šime Ljubić and Ivan Kukuljević, while Kukuljević also insisted on the river Vrbas as their eastern border.

Kostić shows through unambiguous quotations that the Serbian-Croatian border line and the territories where the Serbian nation had lived were determined by the most acknowledged German historians of the 18th and 19th century, such as August Ludwig Schletzer, Johann Gotthilf von Stritter and Johann Wilhelm Zinkeisen, while the latter pointed out that all the territories where the Serbs settled had been previously devastated by the Avars. Such determinants are also given by the greatest German linguist Caspar Zeiss, the Slavist Ernest Ludwig Diemler, the ethnographer Johann Georg Kohl, Karl von Czoernig and geographers Herzberg and Otto Maul.

Diemler wrote that the Neretva Serbs had populated the Dalmatian islands of Korčula, Ljet, Brač, Hvar and Lastovo. The viewpoints of the Russian and German geographers are parallel to those of the French geographer Gijome Lejan, the Italian slavist Domenico Ciampoli and the historian Angelo Pernive, as well as the Hungarian historian Benjamin von Kallay and the ethnographer Paul Hunfallen. Gijome Lejan especially points out that, between the 5th and the 8th centuries, the Croats “spread from Istria to the river Cetina, including in their territories the remnants of the Avar tribes that existed separately for three more centuries” (p. 25). The Croats finally assimilated them and took over many of their racial features. The genetics is a miracle!

In the Serbian medieval states, there used to be lots of internal

IT-03-67-T
movements of the population but the settling of foreigners was very rare. The historical sources only mention the arrival of Saxon miners from Hungary, Bulgarian fugitives from the Tatar invasion and Greek emigrants from the Byzantine Empire, all in very limited number. When the Serbs started to settle in Macedonia, all the way to the suburbs of Thessalonica, they came across the Greeks or the Vlachs converted to the Greek faith. Jovan Cvijić says that Skopje was also a Greek town when the Serbs took it over in 1282. Serbian rule stretched to the whole of North Albania and many Serbs populated that area and lived together with the Arbanasi people, unified in religion and without any prejudices. Kostić cites Jireček as well, who concluded that, in the Middle Ages, “the Serbian language was the language of the Arbanasi culture. Their princes, in close family relations with Serbian feudal landlords and nobility, wrote their charters in Serbian” (p. 31).

The famous German albanologist Johann Georg von Hahn, Hans Helmolt, Gijome Lejan, Šime Ljubić and Milan Suflaj wrote on the Serbian ethnical and political domination in North Albania. In his work *The Deployment of the Balkans Nations* from 1913, Jovan Cvijić concludes: “The Serbs in the Northern Albania had to be numerous; otherwise it would not be possible that one small Serbian state, such as Zeta, chose its capital (Skadar) in the foreign ethnographic element [...] The Zabojana and Zadrima plains were predominantly Serbian. Only in that way can it be explained that numerous citizens of Skadar moved from North Albania during the last two centuries and settled in Old Serbia and today’s western Serbia” (p. 32-33).

Lubor Niederle wrote that, during the 19th century, around one hundred thousand Serbs lived in North Albania with Skadar, while Bianconi wrote that seventy-thousand Serbs lived in the province of Skadar. In the study *Ethnographic Division of the Balkans’ Nations*, published in 1913 in German, Cvijić argued that the population of North Albania was predominantly Serbian. His ethnical map, which was highly respected in European scientific circles, “marked Northern Albania as an Arbanas area and the Arbanasi people as a mixture of real Arbanasi and albanized Serbs” (p. 33).

Spiridon Gopčević also proved that the members of the Gege tribe were mostly Albanized Serbs, as well as that, at the time his book on that issue was published in German, in mid Albania in 1914, there lived “around twenty-thousand crypto-Serbs who publicly practiced the faith of the Mohamedan Shqiptars but secretly spoke Serbian and considered themselves Serbs” (p. 33). Gopčević claims that the Malisori are definitively of Serbian origin because they still celebrate the family patron saint’s day. In 1862, German historian Karl Hopf found in Naples the notes by Despot of Epirus Giovanni Musachi dated 1510, from which it could be concluded that Skanderbeg had been born as a Serb. In his *History of the World*, published in 1905, Hellmol writes that Skanderbeg’s grandfather, the Serb Branilo, was “captain in the service of the Serbian Prince Aleksandar Ćorić from Valona in Kaniniva”, that his mother “was Vojislava, daughter of the Serbian landlord Pollog”. Kostić further states that Skanderbeg’s sister “was married to Stefan

Comment [S35]: Translator’s note. The authors have not been found in the available sources, suggested spelling is given here

Comment [S36]: Translator’s note. The authors have not been found in the available sources, suggested spelling is given here

Crnojević and that his son John was married to Irene of Serbia” (p. 35). In *The Ethnography of the Balkan Peninsula*, published in 1878, Herzberg is unequivocal: “As of 1443, the real hero of the Shqiptars was Skanderbeg or Gjergj Kastrioti, who originated in the Serbian tribe, which settled in the land of Shqiptars since the time of Dušan and which used to marry the Arbanasi women” (p. 35.)

In Turkish times, the Serbian migrations were incomparably more intensive, although some were the consequence of the occasional excesses of the Dinara population in non-fertile mountain lands. However, the migrations were mostly due to political reasons and the fear of savagery and uncertainty. Kostić recapitulates this process in the following way: “While the migration of the Serbian people had been far more peaceful and smaller in their scope (although they never ceased), the real eruption of migrations took place with the invasion of the Turks and the occupation of the Serbian land by their army. Everyone set off, everyone moved, everyone moved forward and then went back again, to the north and then to the south, to the hills and into foreign lands. As all eruptions, it could not settle down for a long time. People had reasons to fear, but they feared more than was necessary. And, like frightened animals, they sought shelter. They did not find it or they did not believe they had found it and so they continued farther, from refugee camp to refugee camp. This lasted for decades, always somehow in relation to the movement of the Turkish borders. The first migrations, which, as we said, were the greatest and the most far-reaching changes of settlement, were caused by the invasion of the Turks, afterwards by the Turkish retreat from central Europe and finally by the weakening of the Turkish power and the uprising of the Serbs against the Turks. In one way or another, the Turks were the main cause of the geographic movement of the Serbian people” (p. 36).

During those ethnic migrations, the major part of the Croatian population had moved from Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia, while the devastated lands were populated by the Serbs, as well as the territory of Srem and South Hungary. Numerous authors state that a large number of the Serbs used to live in the territory of today’s Vojvodina, even before the Turkish invasion, but it is certain that the Serbs populated these lands after the fall of the despotate, mostly the numerous and vast properties that the Serbian despots had been given as a gift or had bought as friends and allies to the Hungarian rulers. But when the Turks conquered South Hungary, they encouraged the Serbs to settle there because they needed people that would populate the territory, cultivate the land and frequently protect their borders. The massive Serbian migrations to South Hungary were described in detail by Jovan Cvijić and Alekša Ivić, as well as Georg Stadtmüller, Konstantin Jireček, Karl von Czoernig, Johann Christian Engel, Adolf Ficker, Gustav von Kleden, Johann Georg Kohl, Theodor von Sosnowsky and many others.

With respect to Slavonia, Kostić thinks that “the Serbs had not lived there until the 15th century and nor had the Croats did. The old Slavonians used to live there, nationally still undefined, as well as various foreigners. As of the 15th century, Slavonia was populated with

more and more Serbs, creating the Serbian ethnic character. To tell the truth, there are serious authors who claim that the Serbs had lived in Slavonia for more than thousand years, even before the invasion of the Hungarians. There are also Hungarian authors who claim the same” (p. 54). In *The Ethnography of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy*, von Czoernig speaks about the nations that the Hungarians came across in the territories that they settled and says: “The Serbs are not mentioned in South Hungary, Croatia, Dalmatia and Transylvania. In the so-called Lower Panonia with Srem, later called Slavonia, the Hungarians came across many nations, primarily the Slavs (the Serbs, Croats, Slovenians and Bulgarians), then the Franks, the Langobards, the Gepides, the Vlachs and the Greeks” (p. 54). Many Serbs settled in the Panonia valley during the Turkish invasion and even more after the Turks had conquered it and divided it into two regions, Požega and Pakrac. After the Turks had been expelled, the Austrians encouraged the Serbs to populate Slavonia again.

In his book *Along With Hungarian-Croatian Issue*, published in Pest and Leipzig in 1863, the Hungarian historian László Szalay explicitly claims: “These three regions (the region of Požega, the region of Virovitica and the region of Srem) were mostly populated by the Serbs before the invasion of the Turks, and even more during Turkish rule, since the Slavonians and the Hungarians left their settlements in masses. Many geographic maps that appeared in the middle of the 17th century included the name “the Rascians” or “the Raci”, particularly for the part between Srem and Vukovar. After the new conquest (he means the liberation from the Turks, L.M.K.), this territory was scarcely populated. However, the remains of the old Serbian population were strengthened by new Serbian colonies. At the same time the work of Szent-Ivány appeared and we should not be surprised that he called these three districts the Raška districts” (p. 57). For several centuries, the Serbs constituted the major part of Slavonia citizens, the Orthodox Serbs above all, while the Catholics appeared after some of these Serbs converted to Catholicism. The Catholics were never called Croats, just the Sokci. Later, the number of Catholics increased as the Germans and Hungarians settled there. The extent to which the unbelievable Croatian historical irony was demonstrated in the Slavonia issue is emphasized by Lazo Kostić through the following conclusion: “The Croats managed to appropriate that conglomerate of nations, among which there were no Croats at all for the last 200 years, and to Croatianize the land. First they proclaimed the Slavonians and Sokci as Croats, then they gradually assimilated all Catholics irrespective of language and nationality and finally they killed all the Serbs they could find. Thus Slavonia remained Croatian!!!” (p. 65).

Regarding Croatia, its three northern districts were populated by the Slovenians. In 1859, Czoernig wrote: “The Slovenian tribe maintained a less resistive force than the other Slavic tribes and lost its lands in the north in favour of the Germans and, in the east, in favour of the Croats. The entire present provincial part of Croatia belonged to the former Vindiska (Slovenian) province and was populated by the Slovenians, who

Comment [S37]: Translator’s note. The authors have not been found in the available sources, suggested spelling is given here

were gradually Croatinized (became Croats) and developed a mixed nation of Slovenian-Croats. At least ethnographically speaking, it is closer to the Slovenians than to the Croats" (p. 68).

Vladimir Dvorniković writes on the same issue: "The Croatian name was transferred to the Croatian-Kajkavian region from the old Chakavian-Croatian centres. Until then, the Croats had called its language 'the Slavic language' [...] The Kajkavian-Croatian historian Juraj Ratkaj from the 18th referred to its Zagorje-Kajkavian language as 'Slavic', and the whole nation as 'Slavic people'" (p. 68). Before Bosnia fell under Turkish reign, as Adam Pribicević says, there had been no Serbs living in the region between the river Vrbas, Velebit mountain and the region of Kranjska. Kostić notes that a certain number of Serbs came to Croatia after the Serbian ruler Časlav Klonimirović had been imprisoned by the Bulgarians and the Bulgarian Emperor Simeon had conquered the Serbian lands at the beginning of the 9th century. However, there is no significant historical trace of these Serbs.

The Croats used to flee from the Turks in incomparably greater number than the Serbs, and the Serbs used to populate completely emptied territories. The most recognized Croatian historian wrote in the *Croatian History*, published in three volumes in Zagreb from 1906 to 1913 about the people populating the empty Croatian lands: "In the first place, it was the Serbs who populated the greater part of the Military Frontier, Slavonia and Srem. In the parts where the Turks had never ruled and where there had been no Military Frontier (as in Zagorje and to the south of Zagreb towards Kupa), there had been no Serbs as well." After the Turks had been expelled at the end of the 17th century, the Serbs remained and the land on which they had lived "was Croatian by the old name, mostly devastated and mostly populated by foreign elements, by the Serbs primarily" (p.75). The outlaws whose only duty had been to fight the Turks were particularly glorious. Kostić recapitulates the Serbian settlement in parts of Croatia - the so-called the Military Frontier - in the following way: "The Serbs settled in 'Croatia' - in the hilly, mountain 'inhospitable' areas, mostly non-fertile. For centuries they had led a hard life in these areas to which they remained faithful. Not only because they devotedly defended it from the pagans, but because they did not want to leave it. There were individual migrations in other direction as a sign of spite and protest, but there were no more substantial migrations. Until this century, so to speak, the population of Lika, Kordun and Banija remained in their first-occupied lands. There were no internal and external migrations. It was just at the beginning of this century that 'temporary' migrations overseas took place (mostly to the USA and Canada), to Vojvodina, Slavonia and Kosovo after the WWI and everywhere after the WWII. The experience with the marauding Croatian nation ensured that that neither could trust living with the other, or even being close by" (p. 74).

The process of the radical change to the ethnic structure of the population in the former Croatia is most striking and can be seen in the example of Lika. The Croatian historian Stjepan Pavičić wrote in the anti-Serbian collection of texts *Parapet of Lika* published in Zagreb in

IT-03-67-T

1940: "As of 1514, the Turks had only attacked the area of Lika to a lesser extent but, as of 1522, they started to damage it more and more. From 1522 until 1526, the Lika population migrated silently and, in 1527, the Turks completely destroyed the empty land with small groups of soldiers. In ten years, they established their management in the occupied part of Lika and started to populate it more intensely after 1550. During these thirty years, the areas of Lika to the south of Otočac and to the east of the peak of the Velebit Mountain became completely empty and traces of the old settlements completely disappeared. The Turks restored the population, having brought either their Muslim settlements from Western Bosnia or the orthodox people from their south-east regions, but these people did not naturally make good connections with the older settlements that had disappeared and gave their own names to their villages in most cases [...] Thus, the difficult and unpleasant fact may be established that, with the arrival of the Turks in this part of Lika, memories of the old settlements completely vanished under the new ones" (p. 87-88).

Nada Klaić wrote about the change in the ethnic structure of the Lika population in the encyclopaedic determinant. There was no trace of the Croats who used to live in Lika in the past. As of the mid 16th century, Lika became Serbian and exclusively Serbian land after the Turks had been expelled. This data is impressively confirmed by Serbian historians Radoslav Grujić and Aleksa Ivić.

In 1689, when Lika was liberated from the Turks with the whole-hearted engagement of the Serbs, unscrupulous proselytism action was launched against both the Orthodox and the Muslims. A certain number of Muslim families of Serbian origin were quickly converted to Catholicism, though the Orthodox resisted longer. Unlike Lika, which was completely populated by the Serbs during one hundred years of Turkish occupation, the first Serbian settlements in North Dalmatia were established during the rule of Tsar Dušan, since the Serbian tsar sent a great number of Serbian soldiers with their families to his brother-in-law Mladen Šubić, who had married the tsar's sister, to be his court guards. The Croats in these areas simply ran away before the Turks and then the Serbs settled down there in great numbers.

Kostić here summarizes some viewpoints that he explained in details in his book *Disputable Lands of the Serbs and Croats*, thus drawing a conclusion: "When almost all of European science unanimously proclaimed the Morlachs to be the Serbs and the Morlachs had given the demographic and ethnical character to continental Dalmatia (while the larger agglomerates in the coastal Dalmatia were Italian), it is no wonder that science proclaimed Dalmatia to be Serbian land. All the more so since, starting from Dobrowski and Šafárik through to the last ones in the 19th century, the Slavists uncompromisingly defended the idea of Serbian Dalmatia. Among the population itself, by the mid 19th century, the Catholics speaking our language did not know what they were, while the Orthodox were fully aware of their Serbian identity, just like today" (p. 105).

Along with the long line of German, Italian, French and Slavic

authors who unequivocally claimed that the Dalmatians were ethnically pure Serbs, the English scientists Artur John Evans and Neville Forbes shared the same opinion. In 1914, Forbes published the book *The South Slavs* in Oxford, from which Kostić quotes the following opinion on Dalmatia: “The coasts were ruled by foreign enemies whose interest was to cut off Serbia from the sea and the world [...] The Serbian provinces that were attractive to foreigners were the areas with purebred Serbs, like the Serbs near Belgrade, were under Turkish rule [...] For example, Dalmatia: knowing that Dalmatia is an Austrian province, the reality that the population of Dalmatia are pure-bred Serbs is ignored” (p. 107).

At the beginning of the 19th century, Božidar Petranović, the political leader of the Dalmatian Serbs wrote in 1839 that: “The Serbian language, national costume and customs were preserved nowhere else on the entire territory of great Ilyria to such a degree as in Dalmatia” (p. 108). Later, in various forgeries, the Croats tried to present Petranović as a Croat.

In this book, Kostić does not explain the issue of the Serbian coastline and Serbian Bosnia in detail, since he wrote several books on that issue. He continues his work with an analysis of the population of central Serbia and Moesia Superior, as it was called in the pre-Serbian history. At the dawn of the Serbian arrival to the Balkans, historical sources mention the Serbs in the Braničevo and Timok regions. Prior to the arrival of the Turks in Serbia, Serbia had been populated almost exclusively by Serbs, though during the Turkish rule the Serbian ethnical element was exclusive for village settlements, while the Muslims of various origins (mostly Serbian) lived in towns, as well as a certain number of Greeks, Aromanians, Jews and Gypsies. During the rule of the Nemanjić dynasty, Serbia was thickly populated, but the Turks caused real devastation on several occasions.

As the Serbian population moved to the north, the emptied lands were populated by Serbs from all the Serbian territories. As Cvijić says “Šumadija is a condensed power of all the Serbian lands, both the Dinara and Kosovo-Vardar ones [...] The Šumadija variety covers almost the whole of Serbia around the river Morava [...] It consists of the old ethnical groups, older than the great migrations and the various ethnic groups that settled down: the population of the Dinara mountain that came down from the mountainous lands to the south. The people from Kosovo and around the river Vardar and various other people [...] The settlers had to adapt to the new geographical and social environment. All of them permeated and became equal. The general manner of thinking and working and the national and social ideals became common for all of them [...] The population made joint efforts to liberate themselves from Turkish rule and establish an independent state” (p. 120-121). At some other point, Cvijić says that: “It is a known fact that nine-tenths of the population of Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Novi Pazar district originate from the old Serbia and Macedonia” (p. 121).

Regarding regional distribution, Cvijić states that “the settlers from the mountainous area of the Dinara mountain (Dalmatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Lika), then from Kosovo and Metohija,

are the prevailing population in Western Serbia. Eastern Serbia is populated by the old population and the settlers from Kosovo, Sandžak and the Shopi [...] There are many settlers from Kosovo in South Serbia, particularly between Nis and Vranje; yet the Macedonian or Vardar migration current prevails here, which stretches from the south along the valley of the river Morava all the way to Smederevo” (p. 121). When Serbia was liberated from the Turkish rule, the Serbs from the not yet liberated Serbian territories were attracted to it with a new magnetism.

Kostić takes into consideration the structure of the population and migration to Montenegro, Raška and Kosovo and the Metohija region, as well as the issue of the Serbian Diaspora, stating that purely Serbian settlements existed in both Slovenia and Bulgaria and even in Italy in the village of Peroy and the great Serbian community in Trieste. There are still some Serbian villages in Albania and a great Serbian national minority lives in the Romanian Banat and Arad. The Serbian Diaspora was the largest in Hungary, but it almost completely vanished, though leaving significant material traces. Pécs was a prevailingly Serbian town at some point in the past. A great number of Serbs moved to Russia and blended in with the Russians most easily since there were no ethnic or religious barriers at all. The Turks used to populate the inner parts of their empire with a great number of Serbs. Many of them were settled as Christians, while the majority was settled as Moslems. Lazo Kostić finishes the book with consideration of the positive and negative balances of the Serbian migrations over the centuries.

7. The History of the Serbian Cyrillic Alphabet

In 1960, Lazo Kostić published the second and, in 1963, the first volume of the cultural-historical and/or cultural-political study *The Cyrillic Alphabet and the Serbs* in the edition of the American Institute for Balkan Issues. The first volume includes the subtitle *Connections between the Cyrillic Alphabet and the Serbs*, and was motivated by the fact that our Cyrillic alphabet had always been considered the Serbian alphabet and a constitutive part of the Serbian national identity. Cyril and Methodius were the creators of the first Slavic alphabet, based on the Greek alphabet and called the Glagolitic alphabet at first. Today's Cyrillic alphabet was created by adapting the Glagolitic alphabet to the Greek uncial alphabet. Owing to the Cyrillic alphabet, the Old Slavonic language was made a standard literary language of all Orthodox Slavs. It was also the language of the church at first but, as of the 11th century, it started to differentiate into the Serbian, Russian and Bulgarian Church Slavonic languages. Jernej Kopitar thought that, owing to the fact that each voice was marked with a separate sign in the Cyrillic alphabet, “all today's languages could be written better in a rich Cyrillic alphabet than with the usual combination of Latin signs” (p. 11).

In the book *History of the Slavic Language and Literature*, the French philologist Eihoff states that: “The Slavs did not have the alphabet before Cyril, there is no trace of such an alphabet that we know

of. In the 9th century, this pious missionary, skilfully combining the Greek letters in their various degrees of pronunciation with several specific signs taken from Asian alphabets, managed to offer all the intonations of the Slavic language spoken at the time among the Moravians and the Serbs with a great deal of precision. This alphabet, so extensive and precise, was sufficient for all dialects and started to spread with the newly translated Bible, until the great eastern schism split the Slavs in two opposite sects depending on whether their metropolitans and episcopos were followers of Constantinople or Rome, which contributed to the split in their speech and their manner of writing. Along with the Cyrillic alphabet, which had been received by the Serbs and later by the Russians, there appeared an alphabet in Carynthia, in the scope of the Glagolitic alphabet, a bizarre and old amperation of the same letters, which was falsely assigned to Saint Jerome. A part of the Dalmatians and Croats practicing the Roman-Catholic faith accepted the Latin letters, which they combined in different ways" (p. 12-13).

In the *History of the Modern Literature of the Slavs*, Courier emphasizes certain differences in the shape of letters and interprets them in the following manner: "The Slavs prefer Cyril's alphabet for their church liturgies. Another alphabet, that of the 18th century, was adopted for civilian needs, the so-called civic alphabet introduced by Peter the Great, the letters of which are similar to the Latin majuscule and Modern Greek alphabets. The Serbs received it with Vuk Karadžić, who introduced some modifications. The Russniaks and Bulgarians, who have preserved the Cyrillic alphabet until today, have started to use the civic one" (p. 14).

Petar Budmani of Dubrovnik thinks that after Vuk Karadžić's reformation, the Serbian alphabet became the most perfect among the modern alphabets, while Caplović thinks that all the Slavic nations should use the Cyrillic alphabet. Vuk eliminated all the unnecessary letters from the civic Cyrillic alphabet, while he invented the appropriate signs himself for some sounds. The Catholic Church persistently and for a long time opposed the expansion of the Cyrillic alphabet and, at the Council in Split in 1059, the Slavic liturgy and the Cyrillic letters were rejected as heresy and even considered as Satan's invention.

Serbian from ancient times, the Cyrillic alphabet is our only alphabet and has been used since the 10th century. As Kostić emphasizes, "The Russians received it from us, not vice versa. The Cyrillic alphabet had been created before the division into the Eastern and the Western Church. That happened long before Saint Sava and before our autocephalous Serbian Church. The Cyrillic alphabet was created at a time when there were hardly any literate people among the Serbs. The Cyrillic alphabet was created before any Serbian cultural monument. All our literacy and our entire culture has been expressed in it. In all our cultural history, we have nothing that happened before it was created and we have nothing that it does not refer to. Our visible culture starts with it, it is reflected in the Cyrillic alphabet" (p. 21).

Everything that has been written in the Serbian language, both the church books and the rulers' charters, as well as gravestones, chronicles

and records, whether on paper or sheepskin, stone, plaster, metal or wood, everything has been written in the Cyrillic alphabet. "While the Serbs were inconsistent in their faith, and oscillated for some time between the East and the West, there was no hesitation with respect to the alphabet, there was no doubt, no resistance at all. The alphabet was received unreservedly; all the more so because there was no rooted tradition of a previous alphabet, since such an alphabet had not existed. The Serbs were "made literate" [...] at the same time that the Cyrillic alphabet was created or began to spread. It was created for the Slavs in the Balkans and they received it as something normal and natural" (p. 22). The Serbian alphabet was especially cherished by the Church and only under its patronage did the national literacy exist in the Middle Ages. The most important Cyrillic monuments of Serbian literacy are Miroslav's Gospels and the Charter of Ban Kulin. The Serbs also remained faithful to the Cyrillic alphabet while moving to the west.

In the Austrian Military Frontier, the laws had to be printed in the Cyrillic alphabet; otherwise the Serbs would not read them. Even when addressing the Habsburg Court, the Serbian national leaders wrote in Serbian and in the Cyrillic alphabet. "The Bosnian Bogomils, Bosnian rulers and their subjects also used the Cyrillic alphabet. They would use it even after they were converted to the Catholic faith" (p. 30).

The Muslims from Bosnia and Herzegovina wrote in the Cyrillic alphabet, having modified it to a small extent based on the review introduced in Hum and Duklja, on the basis of which it was called *bosančica*. The Latin alphabet was brought with the Austrian occupation and was artificially insisted upon. Even the Catholic monks throughout Bosnia used to write in the Cyrillic alphabet, firstly the Franciscans who were the most numerous. Lazo Kostić lists a whole series of evidence that the Cyrillic was considered an explicitly Serbian alphabet in our territories during the Middle Ages. Having researched extensive archived materials and literature, he concludes that "the Serbs were born culturally with the appearance of the Cyrillic alphabet and, with its rejection, they would certainly disappear, cease to exist as an independent nation, an independent cultural identity" (p. 58).

The lessons that could be drawn from the historical facts say that the Cyrillic alphabet stands as a holy alphabet for the Serbian nation and the instrument of the Orthodox faith, as well as an integral part of the Serbian national being. It is a specific expression of a particular, Serbian variant of the Orthodox faith that is known as the tradition of Saint Sava and, at the same time, the historical alphabet of the Serbian sovereignty. The Cyrillic alphabet was the expression of national defiance, as well as consistent faith in the freedom of the Serbian nation and the restoration of the Serbian state. It connects us to other Slavic Orthodox nations. As Kostić warns, "the west increasingly turns its back to us. That does not mean that we shall depart from it. But we must have space to manoeuvre. We must not depart from the national Russia, since we would have such a hard time without it. We must not break the ties that connect us with the Russians. While the other nations wish to group themselves based on the Catholic faith and see it as the main weapon

against us, we must not reject something that may tie us with the other great nations that are inclined towards us” (p. 64).

Kostić finishes the first volume by pointing to the communist tendencies to suppress the Cyrillic alphabet in the homeland, but here we are interested in his reminder of the resistance to Vuk’s reformation of the Serbian alphabet. “Today we read with irony how the Serbian archpriests in the first half of the 19th century opposed Vuk’s reformation. They might have been wrong, but their intentions were honourable and national. They feared uniatism, since there were attempts throughout the century to introduce it in the most perfidious and diverse ways. They knew of the principle [...] resist from the beginning and they simply feared that it was some new introduction to the uniatism. That idea was all-pervading and they saw the ghost of uniatism in every act. They saw it especially in the letter yotta, which none of the Orthodox nations had” (p. 63).

8. The Catholics and the Communists Threatening the Cyrillic Alphabet

In the second volume, Kostić deals with the issue of threatening the defense of the Cyrillic alphabet. The process of its suppression, elimination, rejection and humiliation was already initiated in the homeland under the communist regime. All this was underlined with the incredible contempt towards it manifested primarily by the Serbian communists. Tito’s followers continued the systematic action that the Serbian enemies had begun in the Middle Ages. The Turks did not touch the Cyrillic alphabet, we must admit that. It was mostly threatened by Catholic and Croatian circles since its elimination was considered one of the ways to eliminate the Serbian national identity, achieve conversion to Catholicism and the loss of national consciousness. The Venetians did not jeopardize the Cyrillic alphabet; the Austrians did but not persistently, and the Hungarians were rather tolerant. “There was no trace of that tolerance in the Croats. They have never seen the Cyrillic alphabet with friendly eyes ever since the Serbs appeared in their vicinity (just as they could not come to terms with the Serbs themselves). But the real persecution of the Cyrillic alphabet by the Croats took place when they created their “own” alphabet - i.e. when they accepted the standard Serbian literary language as their own and polished their Latin alphabet in accordance with the Czech model. Then they proclaimed that two nations with the same language could not live in one country i.e. ‘state’, that the Croatian people had been the natives and the land owners and that it should absorb the Serbian nation. And how could this be carried out the easiest? By taking from the Serbs all that is typical of them, which distinguishes them from the Croats, which makes them a nation” (p. 15-16).

Ban Jelačić hated and felt contempt for the Serbs and tried to treat them badly any time he could, but when he needed the Serbs he would flatter them and address them in texts written in the Cyrillic alphabet. Ljudevit Gaj used to take money from the Austrians, allegedly for the

IT-03-67-T
purchase of the Latin printing machine so that the Croats and the Slavonians would not fall under the Serbian influence, and would take enormous amounts again from the Serbian and Russian government for the alleged purchase of Cyrillic letters and opening a printing office for printing materials in the Serbian language. “As soon as the Croats accepted and affirmed ‘their’ alphabet, they began to prove that it was sufficient, the only right alphabet and the only cultural one. Any insisting of the Serbs on the Cyrillic alphabet was just an act of separation, of inclination towards the east, ‘Byzantinism’ or ‘barbarism’. But it did not help much. The Serbs were devoted to their alphabet and became even more faithful to it. Then Vuk’s reformation was successful and Serbian national poetry expanded the glory of the Serbs throughout the world, thus there was no Serb who would give up anything that was typically Serbian at the time” (p. 19).

The Cyrillic alphabet was officially prohibited by Ban Ivan Mažuranić. As Ivo Pilar writes under the pseudonym von Sidland, in the book *The South Slavic Issue* published in Zagreb in 1943, “he broke the lawful name of Greek Eastern religion to the Orthodox and passed the school law, in accordance with which Serbian denomination schools were not allowed and the existing ones were closed; [...] Mažuranić prohibited the use of the Serbian flag” (p. 21).

On the 17 October 1869, the newspaper *Flag* from Novi Sad reacted respectfully to the Croatian prohibition of the Cyrillic alphabet: “The news from the Croatian Parliament that, by a majority vote, the Cyrillic alphabet should be expelled from use in our glorious Srem, moved every hard-living Serb in this region. Poor them – couldn’t they mess with something other than a sacred thing of their brothers, of those brothers without whom they couldn’t live. Can’t they see that, by doing so, they arrange their own destruction. Poor them – can’t they see that no might lasts forever? The Serbian nation will not be destroyed by this cowardice; the Serbs have always cherished the Cyrillic alphabet and will be devoted to it forever as to a natural alphabet, no matter the Habsburgs rose that tried to destroy it; neither had we hoped that the Croats would act differently. – Let their cowardice serve them well; neither a Slavonian nor someone from Srem would be as a Croat. They have become worse than the Turks, this is the whole truth. They should look up to Safet-pasha in Sarajevo, who said when he came there: the Serbian people and the Serbian language should use the Cyrillic alphabet; because he knew and heard that the majority of people in Bosnia had been of the eastern denomination. Anyone who does not believe should look into the Vilayet official paper *Bosnia* and convince oneself since, along with the Turkish language, everything issued in public is issued in the Serbian language and in the Cyrillic alphabet. The Cyrillic alphabet is Serbian and will remain Serbian, that is the real truth, but what will happen now in Croatia – we shall see. And these people had dreams about Bosnia –Bosnian brothers hear the voice of the Croats – look at today’s dark Zagreb, telling shameful and ridiculous things, – and you will see plenty about the alleged bearers of the Yugoslav culture” (p. 23-24).

During the WWI, not only was the Cyrillic alphabet prohibited in the whole of the Austro-Hungarian territory, but the same thing happened in the occupied Serbian territories of Serbia and Montenegro as well. Raimund Friedrich Kaindl explained this decision in one of his brochures published in Graz in 1917: "As recent events have shown, the Cyrillic alphabet became the weapon of Russian politics in the Balkans. With the destruction of those politics, the Cyrillic alphabet must become again what it used to be before and it must again take the place it once had. It must be returned to whom it belongs, and that is the Greek Eastern Church" (p. 33).

Kostić argues that the Croatian politicians and state officials played a decisive role in deciding on the prohibition of the Cyrillic alphabet in the occupied Serbian territories. The Croats hoped that the abolishment of the Cyrillic alphabet would lead to the assimilation of the Serbs into the national Croatian corpus. In principle, neither the Germans nor the Hungarians had any interest in persecuting the Cyrillic alphabet. As Kostić concludes, "Only the Croats would benefit from it. Since, without any power of regeneration and assimilation of their own, they still managed, through pressure and forgery and with the active assistance of the Catholic Church, to grow from a small nation of hardly one million souls to a nation of almost four million people within just one century. They managed to become four times more numerous, while the Serbs, with far greater regenerative power, did not even double their number" (p. 40-41).

As Viktor Novak states, immediately after the beginning of the WWII and as soon as the Croatian Ustasha state was established, "the Ministry of Internal Affairs prohibited the use of the Cyrillic alphabet in the territory of the Independent State of Croatia in both public and private life. All public notifications written in Cyrillic had to be removed, even those on gravestones" (p. 42). On the 25 April, a law was passed prohibiting the use of the Cyrillic alphabet. But the Serbian Cyrillic survived this as well.

The period most dangerous to its survival was the communist regime. As Kostić explains, in communist Yugoslavia, "its suppression is conducted by means of decrees and formal orders from the authorities. However, one has the impression that it is tolerated, that it is equal, that sometimes it is even welcomed. But it is still eliminated, rejected, neglected, replaced by the Croatian Latin alphabet using the most sophisticated methods – methods that only the Jesuits could use. This was all done gradually, almost imperceptibly: first in peripheral areas where the nation would pay no attention; then in ostensibly foreign subjects and relations, in the territories where the Cyrillic alphabet is not used and loved; then in the official sector where opposition cannot be tolerated; followed by advertising, etc." (p. 53-54).

Kostić arrived at the essence of that process and its perfidious methodology. "One gets the impression that it is some horrible plan, already conceived and implemented to the full. One gets the impression that in neither case would this plan be stopped halfway and that the Serbian Cyrillic alphabet has little time left to live if this power

continues for several more decades [...] Instead of prohibiting the Cyrillic alphabet in a decree as the Croatian authorities did in their state whenever they were not under the control of foreigners with resistance to that, now it is done *via facti*: by gradually introducing the Latin alphabet and by its exclusive use. One should have the impression that the Cyrillic alphabet is allowed, equal and official, but that no one wants to use it. As the Latin alphabet is also official and "equal" and the people ostensibly want it, it will therefore replace the Cyrillic alphabet more and more until it has been eliminated for good and made redundant. The Cyrillic alphabet would disappear imperceptibly, without protest, without noise, even without a funeral" (p. 54-55).

The silent elimination of the Cyrillic alphabet was a direct product of Tito's personal politics. Under the conditions of the totalitarian dictatorship, the Serbian communists simply competed to read his thoughts more precisely and serve more loyally to the detriment of the nation. It was enough that he personally wrote and used the Latin alphabet exclusively and thousands of Serbian communists would follow him blindly. "Broz set the tone with the Croatian Latin alphabet in the first days of his rule and all his associates considered it a sacred thing - the only correct guideline. They needed no other order, no other formal regulation. For it is understandable that the army was the first in the line to comply with its "beloved marshal" and its commander-in-chief. Gradually but safely, it eliminated the Serbian Cyrillic alphabet, even the Macedonian one from use. It used the Croatian Latin alphabet, both where it was and where it was not necessary and in both the Croatian and in Serbian territories" (p. 67).

In the text to follow, Kostić gives a large number of examples of the systematic suppression of the Cyrillic alphabet in Serbia and in other Serbian territories. He then points out that a similar phenomenon also took place in emigration, particularly with those who were still ecstatic about the idea of Yugoslavianism. This phenomenon was also noticed in relation to the Serbian Orthodox priests, both in their official and private written communication. Kostić lists numerous actual cases and stigmatizes faint-heartedness and taking the line of least resistance. He warns his fellow-countrymen: "With each use of the national alphabet, one makes a national confession, proves the national consciousness, shows loyalty and devotedness to one's ancestors and the national past in general, strengthens one's ethnic spirit and the spirit of the environment. On the contrary, each foreign sign, even the least, that is used instead of the sign of one's own alphabet - each foreign and unfriendly alphabet - at least expresses national indifference or non-resistance (especially in the case of those in the country) or, more often, national non-solidarity or even national betrayal. The nation is demoralized in a dully and almost-perceptible way by this. The nation certainly becomes disoriented, it cannot distinguish its property from the property of others, it becomes hesitant, unresisting, ethnically uninterested, making a path towards cosmopolitanism and internationalism. The nation gradually disappears, until one day it disappears for good" (p. 168-169).

Kostić finishes his study by taking into consideration actual examples of the persistent and energetic Serbian defence of the Cyrillic alphabet within the territory of the Karlovac Metropolitanate and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as a proposal to adopt one common Serbian-Croatian alphabet i.e. the initiative of Jovan Skerlić to reach a compromise between the Serbs and the Croats by speaking the Ekavian dialect and write in the Latin alphabet. However, the initiative had no real chance of realization, as impressively described by Vladimir Corović, a devoted and passionate follower of the idea of integral Yugoslavianism and the Unitarian option. He says: "There is one particular thing that makes the Cyrillic alphabet particularly important for us. If there were choice, reason and time, there would be no doubt that a good part of the Serbian intelligence would easily accept the Latin alphabet and thus become closer to the ideal unification of the literary art. However, as has always happened before, the strongest and the least effective way of solving the issue was chosen, by force and prohibition. The Cyrillic alphabet thus became our fellow sufferer and a graphic symbol of our struggle to survive, our consciousness and persistence. For this reason, as long as our national survival is jeopardized, it will remain one of the emblems that must not be departed from and one flag under which we must endure." (p. 242)

Chapter X

SERBIAN EMIGRATION

1. Emigrant Polemics

Lazo Kostić published a collection of newspaper articles entitled *The National Attitude of the Serbian Emigration* in Melbourne in 1959 in mimeograph edition. In the first article of the collection, he defines the four basic categories of Serbian emigrants. The first category includes the Yugoslavs in the political sense of the word. "These are the Serbs who want a common state of Yugoslavia. This is the great majority of Serbs in emigration and many famous men belong to this category. Their patriotism and Serbian national feeling cannot be disputed *a priori*. They just think that the Serbs are the safest in the state building of Yugoslavia. In the field of politics, the future will show who was right. Nor is this category completely undivided, since it includes the Serbs who advocate the Yugoslav option at any cost, always and all the time; it also includes those who advocate the Yugoslav option only if it meets important conditions concerning the life of the Serbs; it also includes those who only advocate the Yugoslav option if all the other constituents want it" (p. 7).

The second category includes those who take Yugoslavianism to mean Yugoslav citizenship. "In this respect, a Yugoslav is equally an Arnaut from Kosovo, a Hungarian from Bačka, a Slovakian from Srem, a Czech from Slavonia, an Italian from Istria, etc.; like a Serb from Šumadija, Bosnia, Vojvodina, etc. Foreigners often think of this type of Yugoslavianism when they denote someone as a Yugoslav. Foreign countries avoid any other differentiation, particularly for official purposes [...] This category is the simplest, yet even this is not undivided. There are former Yugoslavs who became foreign citizens, there are numerous "persons without a citizenship" who were Yugoslavs and who are denoted as such by the countries in which they live although they have not felt themselves to be Yugoslavs for a long time. No country would

recognize the status of a stateless person without great necessity (since its duties towards these persons are greater then)” (p. 7-8).

The third category includes followers of the synthetic-ethnical Yugoslavianism. “The Yugoslavs are all Serbs, Croats and Slovenians. It is their common, higher expression: the Slavs and, more extensively, the Indo-Europeans, then the Aryans, etc. The Yugoslavs in this sense mean simply the Slavs in the south or the Slavs of the south. We are Yugoslavs just as the Russians and Ukrainians are Eastern Slavs, the Czechs and the Polish are Western Slavs, etc. We cannot deny this as such. Yet it is rare that we use the more correct term “the South Slavs”. There is less confusion when we say that” (p. 8). In that respect, this category would include the Bulgarians as well.

The fourth category includes the integral Yugoslavs who, as such, pretend to ethnic exclusivity. “This category includes those whose original nationality is Yugoslav – meaning the only one, as no one can have two ethnic nationalities. While the first three categories do not exclude the Serbian element, this excludes it quite radically. It does not recognize it and rejects it with contempt” (p. 9). This understanding of Yugoslavianism was officially insisted upon in the common state and it represented one of the reasons for its falling apart, since neither the Croats nor the Slovenians accepted it, while the communists proved the existence of the great Serbian hegemony on the basis of it. Since, according to Kostić, it is unnatural that people reject their nationality and the national identity of their ancestors, the integral Yugoslavs consist of “the renegades, betrayers and national deserters” (p. 9). Every nation feels contempt for such people. “But our Yugoslavs, exclusive Yugoslavs, have become impertinent recently and, if I may say so, impudent. They emphasize with pride that they are not “chauvinists”, since this expression is reserved only for those who remained Serbs, who remained devoted to the tradition of Saint Sava and their ancestors” (p. 9).

With the unbelievable impertinence, the integral Yugoslavs boast in public “about having changed the nationality and having become the renegades, and stigmatize those who are faithful to their ancestors and history with shameful names” (p. 10). They even praise Đilas and ask “that we look up to him [...] that we change our nationality every three or four years, to leave the old-fashioned Serbian name and do them a favour [...] They speak of the Yugoslav nation, while in all other categories the term of the Yugoslav nations is correctly used. Who constitutes this “Yugoslav nation”? All those packed in there by the renegades. And all the Serbs (“chauvinists”), and all the Croats, and all the Slovenians, etc. They determine the nationality of other people. It is a shame that one cannot put up with any more. Many do this in ignorance, of course. Those are mostly illiterate people who cannot understand the above differentiations, particularly if they are not warned to do so. But some want to order the nationality consciously by decree, like Đilas and his associates” (p. 10).

And the height of the irony was that these integral Yugoslavs persistently advocated the federal organization of Yugoslavia, since one

should take care of the ethnic and historical individualities that they deny with their previous attitude. The integral Yugoslavs wished for unity with the Croats and the Slovenians more than anything else, while the Croats and the Slovenians ran from this option as fast as their legs could carry them. And even if their conception of integral Yugoslavianism was realized successfully, what would be the sense of this federal state? “Whenever there is only one nationality in a state, the federation is not sustainable there. The example of Germany illustrates this best. The legal experts had doubts whether Bismarck’s Germany was a confederation or a federation – whether the state of Weimar was a federal or Unitarian state – until Hitler came and proclaimed the principle: one nation, one Reich, one leader! It is a logical consequence of all European federations that proclaim a unity and rely on it. If we are one, the power will be one. The development of events leads to this imminently. The Yugoslav nationality, no matter how paradoxically this appeared, was the greatest obstacle and the greatest negation of the Yugoslav state[...] That nationality was the greatest obstacle to freedom and democracy in the state” (p. 11).

If such a nationality was introduced by decree or by force, a specific despotism and tyranny over the spirit could not be avoided. “Every freedom in that country is already disputable when people cannot make a national choice, say what they feel and for whom they feel compassion” (p. 12). The worst consequence was the fact that the Serbs were divided among themselves in the first place and became strong opponents. All who advocate the Yugoslav sovereignty think that it could end the national disputes and national divergences, or at least channel and attenuate them. But instead, by making a new nationality, these disputes would become intensified and brought to a fever pitch. There are no greater contrasts and greater hostilities than the national ones, as was the case with religious ones in the past. Everyone will complain about everyone else, people will insult each other, everything will fall apart. Science and literature and art and political life after all. Everything will be ‘ongoing’ – struggling” (p. 13).

Kostić notes with pleasure that the crucial viewpoints in this respect are parallel with the views of one of the leading Serbian emigrant organizations, the Serbian National Defence, so he continues to elaborate the basic idea with the same enthusiasm in the following essay, in which he says: “One may not but be an enemy to the enemy. And the Yugoslav nationality is an enemy to the Serbs. It negates the existence of the Serbian nationality in general (as is the case with some other nationalities for which we do not care much). It denies the fact that the Serbian nationality exists, it thinks that the Serbs should be assimilated into Yugoslavism and should disappear there, if it has existed so far. While the creation of the artificial nationalities (such as Montenegrin and Macedonian) deprives the Serbian nation of its constituents, the establishment of the Yugoslav nation would eliminate it as a whole. It would completely disappear” (p. 14).

Kostić’s texts in the Chicago *Freedom* had a great influence on all Serbian emigrant circles and lead to an increased soberness and an

immediate departure from the ideology of integral Yugoslavianism, which was not even accepted by the communist regime in the homeland. Those who were least expected to do so - the followers of Ljotić and their Munich papers *A Spark* - became more careful with respect to this issue and more delicate in expressing their attitudes. However, there were still lots of followers of the idea of the Yugoslav state among the Serbian emigrants. The more the emigrant Croats decisively opposed it, the more the fanatical Serbs propagated it. "We Yugoslavs play a game of defeatism. They compete to see who will offer more Serbian victims and in currying favour with the blood enemy of the Serbian nation. In that respect, the capital of France offers weird and painful evidence, the place where the Serbs were praised several decades ago; praised and glorified almost as the first nation in the world. There are different groups of defeatists gathered there, as well as individuals with a Yugoslav orientation. They copy some brochures and bulletins, rising above one another in their defeatism and betrayal of the Serbian national interests. They even accuse and slander anyone who opposes them and, to the greatest extent, those who try to unmask them" (p. 19-20).

These defeatists include the former first Regent, Prince Pavle Karadorđević and the last president of his government, Dragiša Cvetković. "They issue *Documents* in their defence. It is good and, if these documents are authentic, they may contribute to a truer knowledge of the events that preceded the war. But they and their whole group, which is not very large, are claimed not only to have insisted on the 'agreement', but to have been ready for far-reaching concessions to the Croats. This is not claimed by just anybody, but by persons who should be fully trusted and who are capable of making such events. In this way, it is confirmed that the president of the government of 'the agreement' had promised Dr. Maček Bačka not to make any attempts at concessions. And further concessions in Bosnia. There is considerable evidence that this group worked diligently to increase the capacity of the Croats so that it could play a certain role in Yugoslavia again through them (since they could not play any role outside Yugoslavia). After all, their personal connections with the Croatian leaders, who were informed of everything that happened to the Serbs in that way, were more than obvious" (p. 20).

Some other emigrants, often the comrades-in-arms of Draža Mihajlović, were ready to equal the role of the Chetniks and the Ustashas, while the London *Our Word*, which was originally printed in Paris and which could be recognized in Kostić's allusions, "usually destroys all Serbian values and attacks everything that is Serbian, particularly in emigration. There is hardly a prominent Serbian person that the papers have not castigated. It spares the Croats, but if it must speak negatively about some of its fellow-countrymen, it immediately establishes that the Serbs make the same mistakes, that the Serbs do not fall behind the Croats in impudence in any sector" (p. 22).

A certain Paris magazine "acts in the same way, but with one major difference. If it wants to point to some negative Croat, it always finds some negative Serb as well. It does not point out anything positive about anyone, only negative (so that only the members of the Group could be

seen as the great and pure). It whips the Serbs and the Serbian prominent intellectuals ruthlessly and without parallel. And if it must burn some Croat, then it finds a Serbian counterpart for him. But what kind of a counterpart? For example, that the late General Nedić was the same as Pavelić, that every fighter for Serbia and the Serbian national feeling in the last war was equal to the Ustashas criminals, etc. And, at the same time, it has understanding and even the words of praise for Ante Starčević, who proclaimed that the entire Serbian nation was 'a brood ready for the axe [...]' Since this group is considered to have a favourable position with the Croats in its own way, many envied it and thus established other organizations and started to issue additional 'magazines' and/or bulletins in the Croatian alphabet. At first naïve and 'neutral', the magazine shows its betrayal more and more clearly. It wants to rise above the other editions of the defeatist Paris. It conducts some surveys about Yugoslavia, passing the floor to the worst Serbian enemies and approves of the most destructive texts of one completely unprincipled renegade who writes about the Serbs in the Munich Croatian papers in a manner worse than Radić himself or some Ustasha" (p. 22).

The Paris emigrant environment had one Serbian Orthodox theologist who saw Serbian chauvinism and the Great Serbia ideology as the main reasons for all the war events, openly justifying the Croatian crimes. Another thought that Serbia was small without Bulgaria, so he used to say that a million new Serbian victims would not be too high a price for reaching the Black Sea. But a specific scandal was caused by the arrival of Branko Mihajlović in Paris in the fifties, evidently under communist orders. He was sent to top things off in "the city of Serbian defeatists who compete to please the Croats most. All of them neglect Serbian interests on behalf of some imaginary Yugoslavia that they realize themselves will bring death and destruction to the Serbs. Yet, the most important thing for them is to be considered the best and to occupy the ruling positions on behalf of the disappearing Serbdom" (p. 24).

Thus Kostić does not think the numerous statements that "the son of the late General Draža Mihajlović" gave were strange. He says he dropped by a restaurant where "all the Yugoslavs" used to gather. That means the Ustashas as well as the Croats. And he repeats this twice. He gave statements to the German press through one Swiss illustrated magazine. He says that the Yugoslav army fought bravely in the last war. And that Pavelić stabbed it in the back. And Pavelić was in Italy while all military-bound Croats surrendered and disarmed the Serbs. (Also the Germans, Hungarians, Arnauts, Macedonians, etc.). He says that the Yugoslavs were imprisoned, and he says twice, though we know that only the Serbs and the Slovenians were taken. He says that his father had told him that all the Yugoslavs would rise up in arms. Tito gathered all the Yugoslavs in Serbia and brought them to the Srem battlefield; the Russian army deported the Yugoslavs from the concentration camps, etc. These were unbelievable and incredible lies. Not once did this young man mention the Serbs and Serbian national feeling. He assigns all the credit for the struggle of General Draža

Mihajlović and his heroes, even in Bosnia, Dalmatia, etc., to the Yugoslavs” (p. 24).

How funny the pro-Yugoslav magazine *Fighter of Ravna Gora* seemed when it wrote that “three young Yugoslav emigrants demolished the Yugoslav Information Bureau. And, in the official statements of the government of the communist Yugoslavia, these were “three Chetniks”. The papers could just as well have written that three Europeans had done that or three white men. And the editorial office would say so just to avoid using the Serbian name” (p. 26). Kostić continues to discuss many Yugoslav oriented authors in the Canadian, American or Australian papers of the Serbian emigration, stigmatizing their stupidities, ignorance, dilettantism or immorality. In the lack of more valid counter-arguments, the opponents replied by simply calling him a chauvinist. He laughs at them spitefully: “Would our glorious history exist if without the exalted national inspiration that is today christened chauvinism? Would Kumanovo, Bitolj, Albania and Kajmakčalan have existed then? Would all Njegoš’s works, in which he describes the enthusiasm of the Montenegrins as *spiritus movens* of all their history, the enthusiasm for the Serbs and the desire for the Serbian Empire, would this history and these heroic achievements have existed if this Serbian ‘chauvinism’ had not existed? Can indifference and intolerance make something great? All great heroic achievements of the national history are just the fruits of such chauvinism” (p. 41).

Both the communists and the pro-Yugoslav Serbian emigrants only find the chauvinists within the Serbian nation, among the Serbian nationalists and patriots. On the other hand, they encourage artificial nationalism such as the Yugoslav, Montenegrin or Macedonian kinds and they are full of understanding for the Croatian and the Slovenian. The worst of all the Serbian emigrant papers ever issued, *Our Word*, glorified Ante Starčević in several texts, particularly in the article by Radovanović. As Kostić writes in *The Freedom* on 13 November 1957, the fundamental idea of the ardent Yugoslavs gathered around *Our Word* and Radovanović was that Starčević “was not a bad person” and that he was not against the Serbs, as Jovan Skerlić had already established. He was just against the Serbian name. Otherwise, he considered the Serbs to be Croats and everyone had to accept this. For example: the Serbs brought to Croatia had to be converted into Catholicism, to become Croats. Then there would be neither Starčević’s reaction, nor some of the Croatian attacks on the Serbs. Our ancestors just had to do this little thing and Radovanović and his group find this logical and understandable. Since our ancestors did not want to become Catholics or Croats, no one could be blamed but them for what happened later. In this article, Radovanović also suggests that he would defend the Ustashas - that neither the Croats nor the Ustashas, but Hitler and Mussolini should be assigned responsibility for all the crimes against the Serbs in the last war” (p. 48-49).

2. An Analysis of the Serbian Emigration Circumstances

Kostić’s second collection of texts on Serbian emigration, entitled *Us and Them: Differences in Our Emigration*, was published ten years later in Baden, Switzerland. This collection was not prepared as a compilation of newspaper articles, but as a rather comprehensive study on this subject. The author’s goal was to present the Serbian emigration in its entirety, with all its layers and complexity, as well as the effect the life in western countries had on their consciousness. Kostić began his treatise by dividing the emigration into the economic one – formed before WWII – and the political one that arrived after the war, including the *gastarbeiters* who were not permanent emigrants. Political emigrants left the country seeking refuge from actual or imminent persecution; they were either given asylum in certain western countries or treated as refugees with a lower level of legal protection than such a status implied. Some of them would only get sojourn permits, while some would obtain residence permits; it was generally easier to get citizenship in overseas countries. In practice, all of this was accompanied by various forms of humiliation of the refugees and displaced persons by the state authorities of the countries in which these people were seeking refuge.

Following WWII, the number of Serbs who left the country was far smaller than that of the Croats. The number of Serbs was somewhat increased by war prisoners and internees who refused to return to their homeland after the communists had come to power. “As regards the Croats, those who moved abroad were the social and political scum, villains and murderers. Most of them were Ustashas who presented themselves to the English, French and Americans as their allies. They once again confirmed Dučić’s claim that they were indeed shameless. They were led by their *poglavnici*, *doglavnici*, *bezglavnici* (Translator’s note: leaders, informers and the mindless), friars, priests and the most diverse dregs of society. Their motto was ‘For home-ready!’ and they would use it to greet each other, though they left their ‘home’ as soon as they were abandoned by their real allies – the Germans and Italians” (p. 10-11).

At the end of the sixties, Western Europe swarmed with temporary workers from Yugoslavia, whose departure was encouraged by the communist regime as it represented the easiest way to acquire foreign currency and reduce the social pressure caused by a high unemployment rate in the country. “They may or may not be communists (though they pretended to be communists); they do not want to hear anything against communists and it is a bit awkward to lead them to say something to that end since they will return to their country and might get into trouble. The authorities would certainly ask them about the conversations they had with us and we might have problems too. Expressing approval of the praise for their country is even less advisable – and the majority of them now praise their country saying that it is a land of plenty! Our people then ask them: “What on earth are you looking for in this rotten West?” They are also afraid of the UDBA officers (Translator’s note: State Security Service), who have infiltrated among the workers. They are everywhere, as previously discussed elsewhere herein (even in the refugee camps) but, as a rule, they are present among the workers. They

watch workers' every step and 'make sure they do not go astray'. They sometimes give them fatherly lessons in patriotism. Their infiltration among workers has become significantly easier since the labour force is provided by the state (i.e. party) organizations from their homeland. As the decision on who will be let abroad practically depends on the communist authorities, they can infiltrate their trusted men without any obstacles" (p. 14).

What Kostić found most surprising regarding the *gastarbeiters* was the fact "that the Serbs show the least national interest and consciousness. They are, Yugoslavs, for the most part while the Croats are just Croats, just like the Slovenes are Slovenes. There are some exceptions, though they are rare. The Serbs even say that they speak 'the Yugoslav language' – all of them, with no exception. They find it difficult to approach and adapt to the old emigration, while the Croats and Slovenes often look for connections with it" (p. 15).

Real emigrants are scattered across all the continents, individually or in larger or smaller groups. In Kostić's opinion, emigration had both positive and negative effects. As far as the political aspect is concerned, "without the old emigration, the regime in the country would have no opposition or critics. It could have continued its job even more resolutely. It could have damaged Serbian interests even more as the Serbian communists listened to the voice of emigration to at least some extent, though unwillingly and without paying particular attention. Some rumours still reached them and at least stirred them or sometimes shook them. It is not the same if the emigration existed or not, or whether it was active or passive. The regime tried many times to make it disappear (by luring emigrants into returning to the country, protesting to the countries of their residence about their activities, criticizing them in magazines and sending spies and saboteurs into their ranks)" (p. 22).

Kostić was of the opinion that sending workers to temporarily work in Western European countries would have positive political effects in the long run. "Our political and labouring emigrants will see what freedom and democracy mean. They will feel it with their senses rather than understand it rationally. They will see that there exists the right to strike, freedom of speech and freedom of the press. They will see many things that they have never dreamed of in the communist Yugoslavia, which they did not have sufficiently even in the pre-war Yugoslavia. They will realize how fake this communist propaganda has been [...] They may and will feel the spirit of freedom and that is already something. Never again will they opt for slavery. The communists who stay here for only a short period of time will shake their heads. Even those who return to their homeland for good will never again be enchanted by the communism and its army" (p. 22).

Kostić believed that any overestimation of the emigration's political influence was unrealistic and harmful, though he also opposed its underestimation since it was preserving the suppressed and slumbering national consciousness in the country. "It is said that no emigration has achieved anything. That is a lie. The communist emigration was rather small, but it still managed to occupy the entire country (understandably,

with the arrival of new supporters and fighters). There were as few as several hundred Ustashas in emigration, but they still succeeded in killing so many hundreds of thousands of Serbs and taking over power in the country" (p. 23).

Nevertheless, Kostić was well aware of all the negative consequences of emigration driven by political motives. "The number of nationally conscious fighters in the country is continually decreasing. When genuine patriots are arriving, they are strengthening the forces of emigration, but the numbers of external fighters and revolutionaries are getting smaller – and the main battle is fought in the country itself. If the truly best were to leave the country, they would strengthen the position of the emigration as much as they would weaken the position of those left in the country. Indeed, they would possibly weaken the position of those left in the country even more than they would strengthen the position of the emigrants. As for the scum, that will cause no harm to the regime, but is of no use to us either. In such a case, it would not be advisable to remove all the best from the country as the mass of people would be left without guidance like a flock without its shepherd" (p. 23).

The economic effects of the emigration are good both for the emigrants and the country they come from. In the culturological sense, it broadens the people's horizons and view of the world. It wipes out prejudice, deceptions and ideological lies. In terms of morale, there are great risks of social inflexibility and not fitting in. However, from the national aspect, each case of emigration represents an irreparable loss unless the emigrant eventually returns to his homeland. "If the Serbian emigration were territorially concentrated or if it were at least in the same country, its preservation would be easier and it would have more influence on our people in the country and abroad" (p. 27). However, in its current circumstances, it is doomed to disappear. In the second, third or some subsequent generation, the emigrants' descendants will be completely denationalised.

Kostić discussed the matter of communist agents infiltrating the emigrants as a separate issue, pointing to specific examples of their sneaking into the management of certain Serbian emigrant organizations and seizing editorial positions in their magazines. Nevertheless, it was not unusual that the countries that received emigrants recruited some of the more eminent emigrants and put them on their payroll in order to keep a close eye on the emigration circles and manipulate their activities as needed. "The legal position of the Serbian emigration was rather insecure. The authorities in Yugoslavia were only looking for the Serbian emigration and hardly ever for the Croatian or Slovenian one; they would request extradition of every Serb that was ill-disposed towards them, especially the fighters of General Mihailović's detachments. The allies did not respond to all their requests, but they did respond to many of them" (p. 47). In its orchestrated press, the communist regime openly demonstrated that it was most upset by the activities of the Serbian emigration. This best proves that its activities were not to be underestimated. "It publishes newspapers, organizes various events – clamorous or clandestine, in order to descry the regime.

God knows how many rallies with protestants bearing posters were organized in America – USA and Canada, which enraged Broz himself and forced him to leave the country before he had planned to, and how many individuals have met with foreigners and described the situation in our country as it is and not in the way the regime instruments presented it” (p. 50).

The Yugoslav secret police also liquidated two renowned Serbian emigrants – Andrija Lončarević in Paris and Ratko Obradović in Munich. It subsequently killed Dušan Sedlar and Dragiša Kašiković. A little girl, Kašiković’s wife’s daughter, was massacred along with him. The orchestrated Yugoslav press then wrote that they were victims of a bloody feud in the emigration underground. On the other hand, when the Croats engaged in terrorist actions in Belgrade or against Yugoslav diplomatic offices abroad, the communist leaders avoided speaking publicly of these incidents or calling them by the right names.

Of course, Kostić did not insist that the entire Serbian emigration had to think in the same way. Democratic orientation implied a variety of political opinion and ideological beliefs. What he saw as unfortunate was the fact that the Serbs were divided in opting for Serbia or Yugoslavia. “It is especially deplorable that the Chetniks, who were always united and fought for the same thing throughout the war, divided themselves into several organizations – five, six or even more. The most contemptible of these organizations is the one that bears the name *Draža Mihailović* (preceded by several abbreviations containing a half of the Croatian alphabet, as their magazine was mostly printed using the Ustasha letters). The true Serbian Chetniks acted in unison until two chiefs and dukes separated, namely Đujić and Jevđević. After Jevđević’s death, his organization split into several parts and the process of disintegration continued. Even though the Chetnik movement no longer has a significant influence on our public life, their unity still represented a moral and physical force that gave hope to everyone. However, regarding the basic issues in all the Serbian Chetnik organizations except the previously mentioned alphabetical association (‘Yugoslav army outside the country - *Draža Mihailović*’) are based on a consolidated and strictly Serbian platform” (p. 57).

As regards the church schism, Kostić said that “our great misfortune is that we divided ourselves in terms of church organization; we split into two groups, each one regarding the other as being schismatic. This has never happened before in Serbian history. There were protestations against the church hierarchy, there were rare examples of individual disobedience, but such a schism (formal separation) has never happened before. Since the Serbian Church was the main representative and equivalent of the Serbian nation, this schism has a significance that must not be underestimated – a significance that can even lead to catastrophe” (p. 57-58). This was indeed the major problem with the emigration. “The church schism brought about more difficult and almost irreconcilable differences among the Serbian emigration – a problem that is far more reaching than any other. They came to quarrel among themselves, hate each other; they do not want to meet each other, pray to God together in

IT-03-67-T
the same church. This can have serious consequences for the entire Serbian population and should be addressed as soon and as radically as possible” (p. 58).

In spite of this incredible divergence of the emigrant organizations, the majority of Serbian emigrants never joined any of them and were fairly passive concerning political issues. Most of those who got rich no longer cared about Serbdom, while the poor cherished the patriotic ideals. However, there were emigrants who completely committed themselves to national work. “Some of them write poems, some of them write articles, publish bulletins, hold conferences, verbally persuade people to support their cause; truth to be told, it is a small, but not ineffective circle. Some of them advocate our cause among their fellow citizens – foreigners. They show interest in our nation and its fate. They do not want to abandon their care for their fatherland. Some of them support our churches in the countries they live in – though it is a usual religious activity that cannot be separated from the national one. These people are (sometimes) more useful in this way to the general Serbian cause than direct national action (p. 61).

3. The Fate of Emigrant Literature

In 1975, Lazo Kostić published his cultural and political study entitled *Some Recent Developments in the Serbian Literary Field*, printed as a mimeograph edition by the Serbian People’s University of Milwaukee. In this book, Kostić analysed literature from the specific viewpoint of the defence of Serbdom. He elaborated on the subject of the communist artificial reduction of the scope of Serbian literature, on emigrant literary works and focused particularly on the post-war and posthumous fate of Jovan Dučić as the greatest emigrant writer. In the preface to this book, Kostić stated that his initial intention had been to write a more comprehensive work on Serbian emigrant publishing activities, but objective circumstances had prevented him from doing so.

Unlike the literatures of other nations, whose scope simply increases with every new written and published work, Serbian literature is systematically deprived of that which belonged to it for centuries. Serbian writers are perfidiously divested of their national identity by simply being pushed into the preposterous category of Yugoslav literature, while the administrative measures concurrently construe separate literatures that have never existed before, as is the case with Montenegrin literature. The officially imposed name of the Serbo-Croatian language aimed to create the conditions for presenting many of the Serbian classic works as spiritual products of nations other than the Serbs. The official policy of abandoning the Cyrillic alphabet as the traditional Serbian script was simultaneously enforced. Kostić confronted some Serbian linguists who claimed that both the Cyrillic and Latin scripts were Serbian (though the former was of earlier date), asserting that works published in the Latin alphabet were not published in the Serbian language. “Unfortunately, the role of the Serbian emigration in renouncing the Cyrillic alphabet is not insignificant.

Initially, the emigration almost exclusively used the Latin script, as they largely do even today. This is rather tragic and miserable as it involves a voluntary renunciation of the national values, abandoning the national sanctities, distancing oneself from one's own forefathers and a negation of the national individuality and even the nationality itself" (p. 12).

Kostić understood that, in addition to the perfidiousness of the communist leadership, a major role in the suppression of the Cyrillic alphabet in his native country was played by the opportunist public servants, intellectuals and publishing agencies; he criticized the emigration for not being ready to counteract this trend through individual examples, no matter how limited their effects might be. Instead, it was the emigration that led the way in the process of abandoning the Cyrillic script. "It is most disturbing that these actions of the emigration have a destructive and discouraging effect upon the people within the country. When they see the emigration publishing its works in the Latin alphabet without any pressure applied against them (and they write letters to their relatives using a mixture of Latin letters), then they lose all determination to resist the imposition of Latin script and more and more of them are accepting it. Our emigration is not always aware of the national impact they have on the people in the country. It sets an effective example: Words move people, examples draw them. In other words, words can incite someone to do something, but it is the examples that compel him to do the same. It is not sufficient to say: 'Do this,' but: 'Do as I do.' In our case it would be: 'Write in Cyrillic and do not mind what I do.' Yet, it is not efficient and cannot lead to a desired end" (p. 13-14).

The communist authorities prescribed education programmes that had stolen the old Dubrovnik literature from the Serbs and integrated it into the Croatian literature. A similar fate befell the Serbian writers from Montenegro. Only a few, the living ones, did not allow themselves to be forcibly included in the newly-composed Montenegrin literature. Moreover, authors of Muslim faith were also forcibly removed from the Serbian literature; sometimes full-scale campaigns would be launched against the two most prominent of these writers, Meša Selimović and Skender Kulenović, because they openly declared themselves Serbs. The communist autocrats of Montenegro even started negating the Serbian character of *Miroslav's Gospel* and presenting it as a Montenegrin cultural monument. However, this trend had its obvious counterbalance and the once-fervent propagators of Montenegrin individuality publicly announced their return to Serbdom and Serbian literature. Those included Milovan Đilas and Radovan Zogović himself. A separate Bosnian-Herzegovinian literature was artificially created through the direct involvement of the leading communist ideologists, who mercilessly falsified both the past and the present. As Kostić noted, "The writers from Bosnia-Herzegovina could not be counted as Serbian anymore, even those who openly and publically declared themselves Serbs. Before the war, these two provinces gave us our two best poets: Dučić and Santić. No one in the country is allowed to say that the latter was a Serbian poet. Even the postal stamp with his picture is printed in

IT-03-67-T

the Latin script. After the war, the best three prose authors of our country, Ivo Andrić, Meša Selimović and Branko Ćopić, emerged as Serbs and Serbian novelists. It is less and less emphasized and it is deemed politically incorrect by the current regime to emphasize such a thing. Meša Selimović and the exquisite poet Skender Kulenović moved to Serbia in order to be able to declare themselves Serbian writers" (p. 26).

Kostić listed the names of minor Serbian writers who left no significant traces in the Serbian literature but were willing to carry out every communist order in the cultural sphere and even worked on the project of establishing the homeland literature of Vojvodina. Among them was Professor Boško Novaković of the University of Novi Sad who, as Krleža's associate, propagated the thesis that the nationality of writers must be categorized by the area of their birth, regardless of whether they were Serbs or Croats. As it says in the article entitled *After*

Many Misunderstandings and Dilemmas, the History of Yugoslav Literature is Being Written, published in the *Politika* daily on the 5 March 1969, "the principle of territoriality has been adopted for the entire history. Practically, this means that the Serbs who live or lived and worked in Croatia are Croatian writers; accordingly, the Croatian writers who live and work in Serbia belong to Serbian literature. This principle will not only be applied where a writer declares himself differently" (p. 31).

Carefully following the cultural developments in his fatherland, Kostić extensively quoted the texts of certain of the most prominent participants in the public debate on the issue of the territorial demarcation of Yugoslav literature and showed that, behind all this, was a secret plan of the communists and their leader Tito. The production of the Yugoslav bibliography was devised in this way in order to enable the Croats to appropriate a large part of the Serbian literary works by force and posthumously proclaim the Serbian writers as their own. As far as the living writers were concerned, their associations were also territorially divided among the republics and provinces. No better fate befell the Serbian painters, sculptors, actors etc. "They could not express any solidarity, let alone lead a uniform cultural policy. The Serbian culture as a whole does not exist anymore; the same is true of the general Serbian literature" (p. 45).

On the other hand, Serbian emigration literature has been completely ignored in the country. "No matter how good the works written by Serbian emigrants were, they would not be mentioned anywhere outside the emigration circles. Their compatriots in the country completely ignore them; they do not register or mention these works, let alone quote or include them in the history of literature" (p. 45). The intentional disregard, brushing aside or banning of the emigrant literary works that was dictated by the communists could sometimes be stopped or even turned into praises and advertising campaigns if the authorities deemed it beneficial, as was the case with Miloš Crnjanski upon his return to the country. Kostić stated that he understood "that the emigrant political works could be ignored and banned, although it is against the principles

of democracy. However, this is also done with non-political emigration literature and literary criticism” (p. 45-46). Kostić was, nonetheless, certain that Serbian emigration literature could not simply disappear. “It will undergo selections and clarifications and many of these books will remain proven works of lasting value and become an integral part of the Serbian literary corpus, the good, selected ones [...] its full significance will be recognized once” (p. 46).

Jovan Dučić, Rastko Petrović and Miloš Crnjanski are, without doubt, the greatest literary names of Serbian emigration. Dučić and Petrović both died in emigration, while Crnjanski returned to the country. Regarding the repatriation of the emigrants, unlike many other publicists, Kostić found that Crnjanski had made a good move and stated that every concrete case should be evaluated individually. Despite the fact that Crnjanski returned to a country governed by a communist dictatorship, he “did not join the regime. His return caused consternation among the Serbian intellectual circles of the emigration; however, I do not believe that he had made a mistake, let alone committed treason. One cannot judge every individual case in the same manner. For instance, the return of Patriarch Gavrilović was welcomed by everybody (as it was believed that he, more than anyone else, would be able to save what could be salvaged of the Serbian Church). On the other hand, Generals Simović and Ilić were condemned by everyone. What were they to do in the country? Maybe see how much damage was done there? One could understand (and approve of) the return of the chiefs of democratic parties, Mišo Trifunović and Milan Grol, who hoped to save some democracy in the country” (p. 67).

Though the Titoist regime had hoped that the return of Crnjanski, whom the official critics used to call a fascist, would destroy the leadership of the Serbian emigration literature and that the communists would be able to win Crnjanski over, the regime failed in both of its plans. Until the end of his life, Crnjanski remained an honourable Serbian patriot and the emigration literature continued its way and successfully developed its publishing activities. Kostić appreciated the criticism Crnjanski expressed about the general conditions of Serbian emigration life in London: “Why must we enjoy all the negative, though true sides that we read about concerning the English?” (p. 67)

Kostić emphasized that the Serbian writers in emigration lived scattered across all the continents, that their communication was difficult and infrequent and that they were faced with significant problems in publishing their works. There was no institution, centre or library that would streamline their publishing efforts or at least prepare a comprehensive bibliography of their work. The literature of the emigration hardly ever produced a good novel, while the narrative prose of emigration writers was usually of mediocre or poor quality. At the same time, “we have a huge, even unnecessarily massive production of poetry among the Serbian emigrants. There are at least fifty collections of poetry and the periodicals are full of individual poems [...] The lyrical works alone number in their thousands. Many poets have published more than a hundred songs. More importantly, there are good, very

good and even excellent songs among them. There are songs of permanent value that could be included in any anthology, no matter how high the criteria that are applied [...] Among them are songs we can be proud of when we return to the country (or when their authors return)” (p. 74). In Kostić’s opinion, one of these poets, Milan Petrović, is one of the greatest poets in Serbian literature. Beside Petrović, Kostić noted the quality of the poetic works of Marko Vukčević, Vuk Đurišić, Dušan Petković, Milutin Bukara, Mateja Matejić, Dragoslav Dragutinović, Rodoljub Ilić, etc.

Regarding prose work, Kostić later somewhat corrected his earlier criticism and stated that “The novellas, which are a predominant form today and treat the subjects of war and emigration, will have the most lasting value. When we say war, we mean the prisoner camps. Regardless of their aesthetic value (which can be found in some of them), these novellas will remain as descriptions of a reality different to the one depicted in other such works of our writers [...] It is understandable that descriptions of the facets of the emigrant life, no matter how individual and peculiar, will remain as an almost exclusive source of our knowledge about the life of Serbian emigration after WWII. And this should not be underestimated” (p. 78).

The situation in the field of publicist writing was much better, as some of the most prominent Serbian journalists wrote in emigration, such as Milan Gavrilović, Adam Pribičević, Jovan Đonović, Dragi Stojadinović, Dobrosav Jevđević, Ratko Parežanin, Vlastimir Petković, etc. However, their influence on the Serbian public life was minimal and not commensurate with the real value of their texts, because the emigration did not have a major or representative newspaper but the host of small circulation papers and the foreign language publications paid little or no attention to the Serbian emigrants. “As the newspaper articles have little effect on enticing and developing the political aims of the emigration, the interest of the publicists in producing quality works is diminishing. Newspapers are of rather limited circulation and hardly read, even by those who subscribe to them. They are largely despised in the country and ignored abroad. Who would then strive to produce first class texts? That is why the Serbian emigration failed to create new publicist stars and dimmed the light of the old ones. The press is contributed to by individuals with insufficient skills and lucidity, by novices and often by charlatans. We have a myriad of newspapers and bulletins, but only two or three of them are worth reading. The essays of general importance are ignored; everything that does not praise the publishers and the organizations behind them is either ignored or published with delay, on the most insignificant page and in the smallest print. The men of letters can do nothing else but give up their writing! That is why the quality of newspapers is not improving but deteriorating [...] It should be sufficient to note the difference between what the following two newspapers once were and what they are now: *The Freedom of Chicago* was established and excellently managed by Jovan Đonović, while Božidar Purić lifted it to an even higher level. *The Voice of the Canadian Serbs* had an enviable reputation while it was managed

by Adam Pribičević, only to be reduced to the level of yellow journalism by a Belgrade charlatan” (p. 80-81).

The writers were generally disheartened. “Men of letters and reputation shy from writing for the emigrant newspapers. They see no reason for it and have no one to write for. The newspapers within the country are not only read by hundreds of thousands, but the authors receive salaries for their work. They are paid quite well, no less than their colleagues in any other field of intellectual work. In the emigration, even the editors are paid miserably, while their associates receive no or symbolic payment. Nowadays, a good newspaper article should be written thoroughly and include references to world press and political works in addition to presenting individual observations. It requires money and the emigrant writers do not have it. Moreover, the emigrant journalists do not have the prominence enjoyed by the domestic writers, they do not have access to the sources of current issues and they are ignored by all important figures. It is just as if they do not write at all!” (p. 81). Therefore, Kostić did not believe it was possible to improve the quality of Serbian emigrant journalism and expected that its intellectual level would continue to drop.

In that multitude of mostly second-rate newspapers, there was a distinct lack of magazines. “There were, and still are, very few magazines and all of them are of very low quality. None have had any lasting value in the fields of literature and science; Croatian emigration has more magazines and some of them are rather good; the Poles have excellent magazines which are quoted by the press and taken very seriously, but the Serbs hardly have one magazine that is worth mentioning and which does not contain works by belletrists. Our literary artists (novelists and poets) do not have a medium to publish their work. This is even truer of our scientific workers. It is harmful for our emigration culture in general, harmful for our apologist culture and discursive literacy, for our struggle against the enemies of our nation, for establishing our rights and disproving the lies of our enemy. They have nowhere to publish their work. Newspapers are ephemeral – literally ephemeral as they last for a day – and it is very difficult to publish books” (p. 82).

Serbian Scientific workers in emigration were primarily engaged in the field of social sciences. They were mostly ignored by the scientific critique of the countries they live and work in. Scientists in their native country could not even mention the emigrant scientific authorities in their works unless they were the subject of ideological disparaging and insults. However, the emigration works were often plagiarized under the assumption that they could not be traced back to the author. “Working conditions in emigration are much more difficult than within the country. Writing is not a full time job for the émigré. They have to find some time before or after their physical labour to sit and write. They have no libraries and other resources (different machines, typists, etc.) and receive no help from the foreigners who see them as insignificant writers cut off from their homeland. There is but a couple of print-shops, which blackmail the writers and set prices that are three times higher

than average. Demand is virtually nonexistent - hardly 200 copies are sold of books of first-rate significance for Serbdom! [...] The writer cannot cover his external expenses and the reader gets the books for a rather high price. This is a vicious cycle. Truth to be told, once in a while there emerges a Maecenas who pays for a part of the publishing expenses (a quarter or a third). It is a great relief because one can at least pay the first instalment to the print-shop and have it wait for the rest of the money. However, these Maecenas are usually very poor people that give their last penny for a patriotic cause. The rich do not give a single dime! They do not even buy any of those books” (p. 86). There was no scientific critique, but intrigues and malice were quite frequent.

Kostić vividly described all the problems a Serbian emigrant author faces in finding a suitable print-shop to publish his books, and retorted to the remarks of the critics that many of his books were printed in the Munich print-shop of the Ljotić magazine *Spark* as follows: “Recently, I have for the most part published with the *Spark* magazine, which has been held against me and that has prompted me to write this. First of all, I have done it because the other two print-shops have not had a Serbian type-setter for years and foreign type-setters make more typographical errors and ask many more questions [...] Moreover, the *Spark* does it most expeditiously; also, one can argue with its type-setters and management, which is a great advantage and satisfaction for a Serb [...] Finally, *Spark* agrees to secure a courier service and ship the books to the addresses I designate [...] Both the printing expenses and shipping are less expensive [...] That is why *Spark* has been the best choice. I would not consider any political reasons; if the price were lower I would even let a Yugoslav communist print-shop publish my books, provided they are printed in the Cyrillic alphabet and unaltered, if the price was lower there. Anyone who finds fault with this must be willing to pay the difference in price. It must be very convenient to criticize a writer and demand that he pay all the expenses” (p. 93-94).

As far as the Ljotićevci (Translator’s note: followers of Dimitrije Ljotić and his national movement named *Zbor*) are concerned, Kostić noted that “I print many of my works in their print-shop and not a single Ljotićevac has ever bought any of my books (I published 60 works, 500 copies of each, which amounts to 30,000 copies). Not a single member of *Zbor* has ever bought any of my books” (p. 97).

Kostić especially criticized the anthology of Serbian refugee poemss published in Melbourne in 1969 by Mateja Matejić and Borivoje Karapandžić as these two individuals took the financial participation of each author as the only criterion for publishing. “That is why we might have a situation where some excellent poets have been omitted and poor quality works included in their stead. The book might have a predominantly *Zbor* character (mostly containing the works of *Ljotićevci*) because both of the editors are ardent supporters of the *Zbor* movement” (p. 101). Yet, his most crucial remark was as follows: “The editors acted in a rather refined manner. They first printed the poems by Jovan Dučić and Bishop Nikolaj who, understandably, did not share the expenses. This was done to legitimize the anthology and point to its

objectivity and high level of art. It was done to deceive the readers. Moreover, only those of Dučić's poems that had been published in his *Lyric* collection on the day of his death were included in the anthology. It was indeed a very rare book, but it was re-printed in the *Collected Works of Jovan Dučić* that was published in the country. On the other hand, the editors included none of Dučić's poems of a stirring patriotic nature that had been published in newspapers. Perhaps because the Serbian poems were also anti-Croatian and did not appeal to the Yugoslav *Zbor* members" (p. 101).

In Chapter Three of his mimeograph manuscript, Kostić elaborated on the problems that ensued after the death of Jovan Dučić, the greatest Serbian lyric poet of all times. The communist regime disparaged and banned his work and removed his poems from school textbooks, only to subsequently rehabilitate him; afterwards, the anti-Serbian pro-regime ideologists bore down on him even more vehemently. In a number of newspaper articles, Kostić criticized the omission of many of Dučić's poetic and prose works from the *Collected Works of Jovan Dučić*, prepared by Meša Selimović and Živorad Stojković and published in 1969. In the preface to this collection, Stojković justified this censorship with the need to "disregard all that was reactionary, wrong, impermissibly naïve and immature in Dučić's work published in America [...] Dučić, the American publicist, is so distant and irrelevant to us that we must say it here and now in order to do justice to our strayed poet [...] As with many other poets, Dučić was a poor publicist and a particularly incompetent politician. Yet, his misconceptions were not completely wrong and his political blindness even showed clairvoyance [...] Envenomed by his nationalism, Dučić fell to a trivial political level, not only unbecoming for a poet but for any intellectual. Dučić's articles published in *The Serb Defender* resembled the journalism of our small-community political magazines, parochial libraries and choral associations" (p. 114-115). Kostić further openly criticised the conduct of the editors, though he took into consideration the difficult conditions under which they managed to publish Dučić's work.

Even such maimed collections of literary works would be subjected to a barrage of criticism, led by the communist executor and police informer Eli Finci. He stormed that: "Many of the texts in such collections, be it in their whole texts or individual sentences, be it openly or allusively, yet always passionately and relentlessly propagate chauvinist and reactionary ideas that are repeated like some form of pervasive leitmotiv: Bosnia-Herzegovina, Primorje and Dubrovnik are Serbian lands; the majority of Muslims are Serbs; a large number of Croats are actually the Catholicized Orthodox population; Serbian governments spread their enlightenment from the Drina to Thessaloniki, novelists, artists and publicists such as Gundulić, Kačić-Miošić, Divković, Friar Jukić, Meštrović, etc. are Serbian authors" (p. 199).

Kostić was convinced that slanderers like Eli Finci or Oskar Davičo could not harm the immense repute of Dučić. "Not only was Jovan Dučić a great Serbian writer, he was a great Serbian patriot, both as an

artist and as a man. When he wrote, spoke or just kept silent he always thought of and cared about Serbdom. This was most intense during the time spent in America, as it was then that Serbdom was in its greatest danger. He dedicated himself completely to its salvation and the Serbs are eternally indebted to him" (p. 135).

4. The Text on Milan Nedić

Kostić's brochure entitled *Army General Milan Nedić: His Role and Conduct in the Last War, Primarily According to Foreign Sources* was published in Melbourne in 1976. The author noted in the preface that he had not originally intended to deal with this issue as many Serbian writers in emigration had already elaborated on it. However, at the insistence of his Australian friends and owing to the fact that he had already collected a considerable amount of material on the topic, Kostić took on this task. He was primarily driven by the fact that even the enemy credited this man for his honour and patriotism. "We have not seen a single German document of that or later times that would describe Nedić as a simple tool of the Germans or the 'servant of the occupier', as the communist despots of Yugoslavia perfidiously refer to him. During and after the war, the Germans always considered him the most ardent Serbian patriot. And they essentially appreciated it (although they would rather he protected their interests instead of the Serbian ones)" (p. 3).

In the following few sentences, Kostić elaborated on the above statement and his ideological standpoint of evaluating the role of Nedić as a man who sacrificed his life, honour and integrity in order save as many Serbs as possible in the times when they were destroyed by virtually everybody. "The truth is coming to light and the farther we go; the more honour will be credited to Nedić. Very few people wanted to protect him while he was still alive. It is only now that we can see what he actually was and how greatly he contributed to Serbdom, performing the most thankless role imaginable, a role that had to end in disaster. His position was hopeless in every way. Milan Nedić could not have expected that his physical and spiritual anguish and efforts invested in protecting Serbdom would be rewarded, at least not at the end of the war when the world was obsessed with war collaborationists. He would have suffered no matter how the war ended. This was a rare case in the world history. But it was true, as General Nedić was a smart and rational man. He knew what was in store for him at the end of the war and he still walked that path because there was no other way out for Serbdom. One can finally see this today" (p. 4).

Nedić acted under conditions that could bring him no individual hope and salvation. He knew that after the war "he would face nothing but condemnation and death. Whoever won the war would judge and sentence him driven by their selfish reasons, as was the case with the merciless prosecution of Marshal Pétain of France. Nevertheless, he willingly accepted his role during the occupation, knowing that he served his people when no other reputable Serb from any Serbian area

was capable of consolidating the situation in Serbia and influencing the occupier to be more lenient and mind the consequences of war. He knew that he had to sacrifice his life for the people and did it serenely and willingly [...] Fate was merciless towards General Nedić. The war took his only son and his dearest brother Milutin” (p. 4-5).

According to the testimony of his intimate friend of many years Adam Pribičević, who was one of the most confident people of Draža Mihajlović and who spent all of WWII in Belgrade on a special assignment, Nedić told him the following on one occasion: “It is easy to give your life for the fatherland, it hurts only for a second or two. What is not easy is to betray your honour, as it pains even in the grave. When this tragedy is finished, you will kill me before a firing squad or hang me. But I will fly towards heaven, not towards hell, and I will see at least a million Serbs who will deeply thank me for ‘my betrayal’ that saved their lives” (p. 5).

On the 29 August 1941, as an elite Yugoslav general, Nedić took it upon himself to establish the Serbian government under German occupation in order to enforce law and order under conditions of complete wartime chaos and save the Serbs from the unthinkable German repercussions. In that period, Serbia was torn by the uprising in which the national forces could not find their way owing to the poor judgement of their leadership and the communists provoked the Germans to such an extent by conducting their revolutionary struggle, that the Germans took merciless revenge on unarmed people. Nedić formed the troops predominantly from former gendarmes, organized and disciplined them well and quickly expelled almost all the communists from Serbia. Until the arrival of the Soviet troops, the communists had no success in Serbia whatsoever. Tito himself admitted in the *Proletarian* magazine that the partisans would not have withdrawn had there not been Milan Nedić. As Kostić emphasized, “It is important to note that Tito himself admitted that Nedić had come to power when the communists were advancing and constantly gaining more strength, not immediately after the fall of the country and the arrival of the German occupiers” (p. 9).

As a capable man and a competent organizer, Nedić was relatively successful in securing basic supplies for the population and he continually confronted the Germans with the aim of protecting the Serbs; he once offered his resignation in order to ensure a decrease in repression; he also provided shelter for the refugees and displaced persons from other Serbian lands. Unbeknownst to the Germans, he supplied the Chetnik detachments of Eastern Bosnia, Herzegovina and Old Serbia with weapons. “During 1943, with the help of some benevolent occupying bodies, General Nedić saved about 30,000 internees from the death camp of Sajmište in which hundreds and even thousands of people died every day. One day, the wretched internees who were on the verge of death were transferred to Belgrade, where they were well received and helped through the evils of the war. All of them were Serbs from the monstrous State of Croatia” (p. 14). Nedić also managed to obtain permission to send food packages to the Serbian

IT-03-67-T
prisoners of war in Germany.

Furthermore, Nedić salvaged the relics of Tsars Lazar and Uroš and Duke Stijanović, which had been kept in the monasteries of the mountain Fruška Gora, thus falling into the hands of the criminals. “One day in 1942, Nedić was informed by Hans Moser, Mayor of Zemun, that the Croats were throwing out the relics from the monasteries and that they had even damaged some of them. He offered assistance to save these Serbian sanctities. Nedić immediately accepted the offer and the relics were transported on a German truck and under armed guard to the Cathedral Church in Belgrade where they are still kept” (p. 14). Kostić concluded that Nedić “did some immense favours to the Serbs in the last war – a war for which he was not at all responsible. Had it not been for Nedić, the number of Serbian victims would have doubled, even tripled. That is a ‘given’, an irrefutable historical fact. Very few people are in the position to know it with such certainty and we categorically state that Nedić saved everything that could be saved of Serbdom after so many unreasonable steps that others had taken before and during the war” (p. 14-15).

Nedić explained the motives behind his voluntary collaboration in the public address that was broadcast on Radio Belgrade on the 2 September 1941, stating that he had not been driven by any personal interests or need for power or glory: “I have come to the helm of the government to prevent the people from exterminating each other; to enforce the rule of law, work and brotherhood so that we may see the end of the war united under the Serbian flag. Only unity shall save the Serbs. What can we do now? Nothing but harm ourselves. We are but a grain of sand in the stormy sea of the world. The greatest powers of the world are settling their accounts today. We cannot do anything to help any of the sides [...] The Government, which is an expression of the will of the Serbian people to live and concentrate on its national forces, shall not allow any destructive elements, no matter what they are called, to prevail and lead the country into anarchy and disaster. We invite the Serbian people to help the Government in this cause, to remove all the hindering elements from their ranks and fully dedicate themselves to rebuilding our country” (p. 15). In the speech of the 8 November 1942, Nedić explained his motivation even more specifically: “Before my eyes I saw imminent disaster for the people who were left without leaders and abandoned by the officials who had caused this great tragedy and then left the people on the battlefield. Thus, I placed myself at the helm of the people in order to help them and be useful, and because my duty towards the fatherland demanded so” (p. 16).

Kostić referenced the most significant emigrant authors who previously dealt with the question of Milan Nedić’s role during the war, such as Stanislav Krakov, Petar Martinović Bajica and Boško Kostić, and referred to the testimony of Božidar Purić who stated that Slobodan Jovanović had told him that the opinion on General Nedić would have to change in spite of his dismissal by the Royal Government, because he personally heard a lot from individuals that had fled the country about Nedić’s actions in rescuing the Serbs and the respect he earned for that

among the Serbian people. Purić's positive attitude towards Nedić was especially significant because he had been the prime-minister of the Yugoslav Government in exile for a period of time and that he resigned because he could not accept Churchill's demand that General Mihailović be removed from the position of Minister of Defence. Moreover, Adam Pribićević also had a positive opinion of Nedić and his and Purić's public speeches caused a radical change in the attitude of the Serbian emigration which had initially condemned Nedić's conduct during the war.

The complexity of Nedić's role and the acceptance of the task to establish the Serbian government under German occupation was further corroborated by Kostić's personal testimony: "Having been a commissioner with the Ministry of Transport during the initial two months of the occupation, and having resigned long before the idea of entrusting the role (Translator's note: of prime-minister) to Milan Nedić emerged, I have had first-hand experience of the intentions of the occupying forces. The State Chancellor Dr Turner stated in my presence that Germany would not keep any more soldiers in Serbia than had been planned (afterwards it became clear that this was owing to their Russian campaign); 'If the Serbs would not form their government,' Dr Turner stated, 'then there is no other solution than to divide Serbia among the four occupying forces: Croatia, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria.' He spoke of no benefits for Serbia if it established a government, but threatened what would happen if Serbia did not do that. Generally, he behaved arrogantly, condescendingly and victoriously as only a German would. What patriot would allow even this small remainder of Serbia to be quartered, another million Serbs killed and the rest of the population tormented and persecuted? When Dr Turner asked me if I would accept the position of commissioner, I cursed the women that had given me life and did everything to shift the choice to someone else, but my patriotism prevented me from refusing it. It would have been much more convenient to think only of yourself and your family during the war" (p. 30-31).

Nedić was convinced that WWII would last for a long time and that the primary objective of the Serbian people should be their bare survival, as they could not affect the outcome of the war or expel the occupying forces on their own. On the other hand, Communist adventurism should be stopped because it was ruining Serbia, provoking the Serbs to kill each other and causing violent and cruel German revenge against innocent civilians. However, Kostić's book was centred on the opinions expressed by foreign authors about Nedić, primarily German ones, though he quoted some Swiss, Hungarian, English and Italian writers as well. Thus, in the book entitled *Yugoslavia and the Third Reich* published in Stuttgart in 1969, Johann Wuescht wrote that "General Nedić was a soldier, not a political economist. Nevertheless, under the most unfavourable conditions imaginable, he brilliantly managed to create the psychological preconditions among his people and the occupying authorities for a normalization of relations and circumstances in the country. From 1942 until late autumn of 1944, Serbia was in a

state of relative peace and quite active in all branches of the economy and public life. The General's resolute and rational policy consolidated the country. He gradually developed conditions for the proper functioning of the state authorities and created a basis for territorial expansion of the country that the occupying forces had to acknowledge *via facti* (Sandžak and Montenegro). There was portrait of King Peter on the wall in his office, his troops made an oath to the king and they fought against the Partisans under the Serbian flag. Although General Nedić was deemed a 'dishonourable man', it was he who managed to save the honour of his people from disgrace" (p. 45-46). The author also provided a series of examples of Nedić's openly anti-German stance both prior and during the war.

Kostić found Wuescht's review of the legal aspects of Nedić's collaboration to be of crucial importance: "Nedić's government, positioned by the Germans, was, within the legal framework of the Hague [Convention] regulations of war, that bound the population of an occupied country to obedience and unconditional peace during the conflict. Nedić continually warned the population of the dangers of subversion and sabotage, which was mostly focused on the main railroads and the Danube traffic [...] Nedić saw one of his major tasks to be the physical salvation of his people from sanguinary acts of retaliation by the Germans and its preservation from the Ustashas, which had announced the complete destruction of the Serbian people in the Independent State of Croatia as part of their programme. He could only achieve this goal through the loyal conduct of the Serbian population towards the occupying authorities and through armed protection of the Orthodox outside Serbia" (p. 49). Wuescht noted that Hitler had been rather upset by the news of Nedić's cooperation with Draža Mihailović, as well as by the constant suspicion that the highest German military and political officials, Ribbentrop in particular, expressed towards Nedić's government. Wilhelm Höttl wrote similarly on the German policy towards the Serbian people and Nedić's conduct in the book entitled *The Secret Front*, published under a pseudonym in Zurich in 1950. Höttl also noted that Nedić had financially supported the Chetniks through the National Bank of Serbia.

Josef Matl wrote more extensively on the cooperation between Nedić and Mihailović as a co-author of the bulletin on events in Yugoslavia during World War II. He claimed that "as early as 1941, Nedić helped the Chetnik movement and its national detachments in Bosnia led by Major Dangić, supplying them with money, food and clothing. In 1942, Nedić and Ljotić offered further assistance to Draža Mihailović in goods, ammunition and money. In return, they asked him not to form the government for a while, as the existing dual authorities, the German military administration and Nedić's government, already burdened the population of the country heavily. Nedić and Ljotić expressed their readiness to cooperate with Mihailović regarding the subsequent appointment of the commanders of armed units and district administrators. On the other hand, they found it more convenient if Mihailović alone would carry out the task of cleansing the territory

outside Serbia of the Communist Partisans in due course – the same task they had taken upon themselves to conduct within the country. At a given moment, Nedić and Ljotić would be ready to hand over the government and all its armed units to Draža Mihailović, i.e. to the person designated by the King” (p. 54).

Of particular significance was the testimony of Hitler’s personal envoy, Hermann Neubacher, who wrote of Milan Nedić as a great Serbian nationalist and described the impression Nedić left upon him during their meeting and in their extensive correspondence: “Nedić bravely expressed his complaints about the current German conduct towards Serbia and put forth a whole series of demands that would alleviate the situation of the people and improve his desperate position. Von Ribbentrop, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, did not look benevolently on these complaints and was rather harsh when Nedić requested a revision of the provisional borders of Serbia as purely Serbian districts had been unnaturally assigned to Croatia and the historical Kosovo polje was ceded to the newly-established Great Albania. Von Ribbentrop told Nedić that for the time being even France could not think of having its borders revised and that any such Serbian request was now out of question. Nedić was very discomposed and he refused to sign the text of a communiqué that had been proposed to him. It was no longer possible to continue the meeting and the failure of their encounter was complete in every respect” (p. 55).

Neubacher’s personal judgement of Nedić’s character was markedly positive. “Nedić was in a permanent state of disappointment and embitterment [...] The primary motive of his work was to alleviate the circumstances of the Serbs through cooperation with the occupying authorities. He endeavoured to defend the Karađorđević monarchy from Communism. In hundreds of letters, he complained to me of the persecution of the Serbs in Croatia, Albania and the areas occupied by the Bulgarians, as well as in the Hungarian and German occupied zones. He was a tireless plaintiff [...] I was his last hope [...] Milan Nedić was completely selfless and was left to his own devices. He lived in the household of his brother General Milutin Nedić who shared his political views. I personally know that his sister in law sold her jewellery so they could survive the difficulties of war” (p. 56).

In the book entitled *The Croatian Ustasha State*, published in Stuttgart in 1964, Laszlo Hory and Martin Broszat described the discomfort among the Croatian ruling circles of Zagreb when Nedić emerged as head of the Serbian government. Kostić quoted the following striking passages from this book: “The establishment of Nedić’s government alone caused a lot of disturbance there (in Zagreb, *L.M.K.*). Kasche (the German representative in Zagreb) reported that Kvaternik had marked Nedić as an enemy of the Germans and that the Croatian government was afraid that the Serbian resistance in Croatia would increase as long as the German authorities in Belgrade met the Serbian interests with approval [...] After everything that had happened, Nedić’s government was even more hostile towards the Ustasha administration. In the beginning of October 1941, Nedić was adamant in his refusal

when Benzler served him with Kasche’s proposal, made in agreement with Pavelić, to establish direct contact between Pavelić and Nedić” (p. 56-57).

In his book entitled *The End in the Balkans 1944/45*, published in Göttingen in 1970, German historian Karl Hnilicka wrote that “Milan Nedić was not a ‘collaborator’ in any derogatory sense of the term. The term ‘collaborator’ stems from propaganda whose only aim is to judge and condemn an individual. Much like Mihailović, General Nedić was a branch of the same oak that was deep rooted in the Serbian land. The insinuation that Nedić favoured the Germans is abominable. He was in every respect an honourable Serb, loyal to his king” (p. 57-58). Both Siegfried Kasche and von Ribbentrop were weary of Nedić’s prospective moves, as they saw him as a latent enemy of the Germans. Kostić quoted the Belgrade historian Blagoje Stokić who stated the following in the *Novosti* newspaper of the 26 May 1976, printed in the centre of Belgrade and under full control of the Titoist regime: “Among the most interesting German documents I discovered that were hitherto unknown to us are those on the relations between the Germans and our *quislings*. I was surprised by what those documents revealed: there was a continual mistrust between the German occupying administration in Serbia and the *quisling* authorities of Nedić, Ljotić and others. Simply put, according to these documents, the Germans could not establish at all who their true friends were” (p. 60).

Moreover, Hungarian historian Péter Gosztonyi stated in 1967 that Nedić’s principal goal was to save the Serbian people from complete destruction and anarchy, but also from the Communist revolution. Especially impressive is the testimony of English author Ruth Mitchell who expressed a rather positive opinion of Milan Nedić in 1947, emphasizing *inter alia* that “He was a German prisoner after the country had been occupied. He received reports of terrible Croatian massacres of Serbian victims and the expulsion of half a million Serbs, mostly women and children who flooded the roads towards Serbia desperately fleeing from the murderers. At that time he believed it was his duty to place his authority at the disposal of his people and try and resolve problems that had been unprecedented in history and save his people in any possible way. Those who knew General Nedić personally were fully aware of the fact that he was willing to sacrifice his life for the people. It is simply absurd to state that he was driven by individual ambition. He agreed to try and enforce law and order during the occupation provided that persecution of the Serbs would cease and that no Serbs would be compelled to serve in the German army. This second condition was met and no Serbs served in any of the Axis armies. Poland and Serbia were the only occupied countries with such a status [...] There is irrefutable evidence that Milan Nedić was never a collaborator in the sense related to Quisling, Laval and Pétain. Nedić’s name was never mentioned at the conferences that the Nazi leaders frequently held with their satellite political and military leaders” (p. 65).

5. Elections under the Communist Regimes

At the beginning of the sixties, Lazo Kostić published his own study on “voter turnout in the peoples’ democracies” in Volume Two of *The Study in Honour of Corrado Gini* published by the Statistics Institute of the Faculty of Statistical and Demographic Sciences of the University of Rome. Kostić began his study by addressing the issue of the enormous voter turnout in the countries under Communist regimes. Official statistics show that the turnout in these countries varies from 90 to 100 percent, which is simply unattainable in democratic states where the usual turnout varies from 50 to 60 percent and where anything above this percentage is regarded as an exception, even in states that legally bind their citizens to vote. Kostić substantiated these findings with specific data relating to more than one hundred years of elections in Switzerland. In the 19th century, the turnout in Switzerland was 57.5 percent on average and in the 20th century it was 57.2 percent, and they held a total of 179 elections.

The study continued with official indicators related to Romania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia, Russia, Yugoslavia, Albania, Hungary and the German Democratic Republic. Taking into account the circumstances under which the elections were held, the situation should have been quite different. There were no political struggles in these countries and the only candidates were those belonging to the Communist party, so their election was certain in advance. Hence, the voting was completely absurd. “Nonetheless, the voting in the peoples’ democracies is rather enthusiastic. The elderly, disabled, ill – all of them show good will and express their satisfaction with those who are trying to win the elections, without having any influence on their nomination! It is a rather unusual phenomenon but, according to the official reports, it seems to be true” (p. 51). The situation was no different even in the countries where people chose between two candidates since both of them were from the ruling party, while an organized and recognized opposition did not exist.

The data on the turnout offered by the regime propaganda instruments was even more amazing in light of the well-known fact that on average only 10 percent of the population were members of the Communist parties in these countries. “However, all other parties are banned in peoples’ democracies, though the ones who used to belong to a party or were members of certain social circles are bound by their old party principles and gladly hold to the instructions given by that party. These instructions discreetly and secretly call for a boycott of elections whenever possible and whenever it is not dangerous. It is not just one party, but all the parties that provide these instructions, though naturally, many voters do not hold to them. In spite of all this, the published results give no indication whatsoever of this boycott” (p. 6).

One of the realistic reasons behind such a huge turnout is the fact that almost all the citizens were organized into various regime associations in some way or other – transmitters of the ruling party’s views, which imposed the rules of social behaviour. Women also formally got the right to vote, which was usually denied to them before, which was an additional incentive for family voting. However, comparative analyses showed that women’s turnout in democracies is

usually smaller by ten percent than that of men. “As women rarely vote, the total quota of voters must be smaller in countries where women have the right to vote than in the countries where they do not have this right. The number of women and their lower turnout significantly reduce the total turnout quota. Curiously enough, the turnout percentage in peoples’ democracies increased considerably after women were granted the right to vote! This is contrary to all expectations and previous experience” (p. 7).

The fact that the turnout in Communist countries was almost one hundred percent was unbelievable to say the least, especially if one considered that these countries had a high percentage of illiterate people who usually avoided voting and the peasants who were not so interested in voting either. The data on women’s turnout was incredible. “All of them give their votes to the Communists who took everything away from them without giving them anything in return. They leave their infants, cattle, work, etc., at home, just to go and give a permanent and written indication that they are satisfied with the regime” (p. 7). Many voters lived in areas that were inaccessible and far from the polling stations. “Nevertheless, they rush over the hills and valleys to declare how satisfied they are with the Communist party. Without exception, they are the peasants whom the regime has treated harshly. Yet, these peasants sacrifice so many of their hours, even days to give recognition to the regime with their vote. And they do it ten times more than before the war, i.e. a period that was not favourable for them, but which did not harm them either” (p. 8).

They would not even mind the weather conditions. Besides, the voter registration lists were in a state of extreme disorder and mostly managed by unqualified clerks. As Kostić ironically observed, “in peoples’ democracies there is no obligation to vote. People willingly go to the polling stations to express their satisfaction with and gratitude to the regime. There is practically no voter that misses this opportunity. All of them hurry to the ballot boxes, even those who have just finished serving prison that they were sentenced to because of their anti-Communist activities” (p. 9). There was no one indifferent to, negligent of, or consciously boycotting elections. There was no political apathy and indolence. There were no exigencies that prevented people from coming to polling stations.

All this was impossible under normal social circumstances and it is therefore apparent that falsification was going on here. Moša Pijade partly acknowledged the falsifications, stating that the votes of those who were justifiably absent or were not able to vote were deducted from the total number of voters. The number of individuals who had the right to vote was thus misrepresented. At this point, Kostić’s irony simply had to turn into sarcasm: “In Communist countries, they have the so-called five-year plans that foresee everything and everything needs to happen according to their predictions. For instance, these plans foresee how many eggs a hen needs to lay, how many game animals should be hunted, how many exams students need to pass, what grades they should get, etc. It is quite possible that the five-year plans even prescribe the

Chapter XI

THE MISFORTUNE OF YUGOSLAVISM

1. The Ethnic and Territorial Aspects of the Yugoslav State Idea

Lazo Kostić published his political study entitled *Serbia or Yugoslavia* in four books over a period of thirteen years. The first book was printed in Hamilton in 1957, in which the author directly stated that he had always opposed the idea of Yugoslavism and a joint state with the Croats. Though the reckless Yugoslav experiment had caused an immense tragedy for the Serbian people, a large number of Serbs, both in the homeland and abroad, infatuatedly followed this idea even after the experience of WWII, blind and deaf to all counterarguments. Kostić noted that the greatest slaves of this obsession were the politicians who, in the nature of things, should have been the most conscious of its ultimately harmful consequences for the Serbian national being. “As though we are bewitched, enchanted or infatuated, we cannot get rid of the Yugoslav spectre. It squeezes us more and more, it wants to smother us, yet we pray that it does not leave us. We feel all its harmfulness, all the misfortune it has brought upon us, yet we cannot get rid of it. It is very much like in the story of the magician’s apprentice who summoned ghosts in the absence of his master, but did not know how to get rid of them afterwards – we cannot free ourselves from the Yugoslav spectre we recklessly summoned in 1918. This phantom is tormenting us, torturing us, destroying us, devastating us, yet we still keep it alive and believe in its spontaneity, as if it helped anyone” (p. 17).

a) Can This Delusion be Treated?

Never in their entire history have the Serbs made a more terrible mistake. They gave up their glorious name and voluntarily took over the burden of the Yugoslav mortgage, which spilled more of their blood than all the previous historical tragedies that they faced. Kostić embarked on the attempt to descry this serious national delusion with

great enthusiasm, believing that the consciousness of the broader mass of the Serbian people would mature sooner than the consciousness of the hot-headed and deluded intellectuals and political leaders. He was well aware that the Serbs themselves had to resolve their national problems, especially the issue of the substantial national strategy and state concept. Those were naïve authors who thought that the foreign political circles were interested in finding a fair and just solution to the Serbian problems and correcting historical injustice if we provided them with the relevant facts and our argumentation in an acceptable form. “Those who believe that our publicising activity should be focused on foreign countries in order to get their interest in our cause are wrong. First of all, our works are rarely read by anyone abroad, just as we do not read the publications of the Latvians, Estonians, etc. We should not fool ourselves and spend our money and energy in vain. Besides, the foreigners are guided by their own interest, not by ours. They will help us only to the extent that is convenient for them. If we do not know what we want, no one can help us” (p. 18).

The problem needed to be resolved in the Serbian heads as soon as possible. “Once we ourselves are clear about what we want, we can persuade our neighbourhood, our friends and, at the right moment, our foreign allies to support our cause. Everybody favours a well-defined position. If an idea spreads to the extent that it becomes general, it is highly unlikely that anyone will dare oppose it. If the moment comes for its implementation, everything will be in place, ready for its realization [...] No one knows how and at what rate things will develop [...] They can drag on for years, yet they can unexpectedly become of current interest [...] Finally, is there any disadvantage to a clear position? If it comes to a fight, everyone will fight better when he knows what he is fighting for. The Serbs will fight with much less enthusiasm if they are convinced that things will remain the same as before. Both the Serbs and the Croats will fight better for their own countries than for the fake Yugoslavia” (p. 19).

One must learn a valuable lesson from recent historic events. “For instance, the Communists knew exactly what they wanted. They prepared their programme in Jajce in 1943, implementing it afterwards. They looked neither left nor right. In this respect, General Mihailović lacked a constructive plan. His fighters did not have a clear picture of the future they were fighting for. It is possible that the forces that prevented the preparation of a single Serbian programme were the same forces that are preventing its preparation nowadays. If we ourselves fail to prepare this programme now, we run the risk of making the same mistake and facing the same failure” (p. 19).

b) The Emigrants’ Doubts

As regards the emigration press, things have long since become clear. Those who persistently advocated the idea of Yugoslavism in the absence of a more solid and logical ideological basis, resorted to empty declamations and simply offending their opponents. The extent of the

intolerance the Serbian emigrants of the pro-Yugoslav orientation showed towards the opponents of the Yugoslav concept was far greater than that of the most ardent Communists. The highest degree of this intolerance was expressed by the following two emigration groups: supporters of the coup of the 27 March and members of *Zbor*. Everything in their ideology separated them, save for Yugoslavism. It can be said without reservation that the *Zbor* members loved Yugoslavism with the same intensity that they hated civil democracy. In both of these cases, emotions prevailed over reason. Kostić noted that the *Zbor* members “use preposterous sermons in favour of Yugoslavia even more than they use platitudes. They simply “preach”. They speak of brotherhood, unity, etc. However, they understandably evade the Croatian carnage as if it had never happened. This must be done by all those who are in favour of Yugoslavia at any price. All of them simply write off the Serbian victims and are ready for almost total forgiveness” (p. 21).

Nevertheless, the Serbian Yugoslavs were only ready to forgive the Croats, our greatest malefactors. There was no force that could have persuaded them to forgive their ideological opponents among their own people. “Those gathered around the idea of the 27 March will in no way forgive those gathered around the idea of the 25 March and vice versa. On the other hand, the Croats magnanimously forgive each other. The *Zbor* members would by no means forgive the Communists; they find no words of understanding for them, though they are ready to forgive everything of the so-called ‘Ustashas’, as there is no Yugoslavia without such forgiveness. And the Croats committed at least a hundred times more crimes against the Serbs than the Communists did and they will commit them again. I certainly do not wish to defend the Yugoslav Communists, among whom the anti-Serb circle was the strongest, but I am infuriated, utterly infuriated when I read about the Serbs’ suffering in today’s Yugoslavia, which is worse than it ever was in history. The Serbs as a nation may suffer even more than they did under the Turks – that is what I think now. And the suffering under the pure Croats was at least a million times worse than that of today. Nonetheless, the advocates of Yugoslavia are not even allowed to mention these crimes! And when they do mention them, they are accorded little weight or not acknowledged at all” (p. 21-22).

Pleading for a sound, mature and open discussion about the Yugoslav issue, Kostić simply ridiculed the demagoguery inspired by Ljotić: “Telling us that we should all live as brothers and in harmony is the same as prescribing the condition that everybody must be healthy or that everybody must have sufficient means for life. It is like preaching that one should be as perfect as our heavenly father! This is pure demagoguery as even those who invented this motto do not believe in it, though they expect it to take root among those who are not allowed to think” (p. 22). Kostić further explicitly declared that his goal was to “return our revived ancient and glorious nation, our awakened national consciousness to Serbdom and Serbia and to re-establish the independence of our state” (p. 24). As far as Yugoslavia is concerned, its

fate should definitely be sealed. "Should God and fate give us another opportunity to organize a free national state, we must rid ourselves of this unnatural relation by all means even if our own life would become more difficult and unbearable – as this union will 'in the long run' lead to the imminent ruin of Serbdom. Fortunately, not only can we live without the Croats and Slovenes, but we can live without them even better" (p. 24).

In the fifties, the concept of a unitary Yugoslavia was largely abandoned as wrong even by the followers of Yugoslavism, primarily from the aspects of its starting point and its disingenuous ideological basis. The thesis that the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes were one people was pure fiction that brought about ultimately harmful consequences. "Indeed, we are not one. Never in history has there existed a consciousness of our national unity. We have had a different fate, different historical development, different interests, goals, feelings and consciousness. Nationality is a psychological relation of sorts, a spiritual feeling for the community that is deeply rooted and impossible to eradicate. It cannot be altered, let alone imposed by a decree" (p. 25). Scientists offered many different definitions of the notion of a people, i.e. a nation, and Kostić referred to one of these definitions given by the French sociologist Ernest Renan in his famous lecture delivered at the Paris Sorbonne on the 11 March 1882: "A nation is [therefore] a large-scale solidarity, constituted by the feeling of the sacrifices that one has made in the past and of those that one is prepared to make in the future. It presupposes a past; it is summarised, however, in the present by the tangible fact of consent, the clearly expressed desire to continue a common life. A nation's existence is [...] a daily plebiscite, just as an individual's existence is a perpetual affirmation of life [...] a nation does not have the king's right to say to a province: 'You belong to me, I am seizing you.' As far as I am concerned, a province is its inhabitants; if anyone has the right to be consulted in such an affair, it is the inhabitant. A nation never has any real interest in annexing or holding on to a country against its will. The wish of nations is, all in all, the sole legitimate criterion, the one to which one must always return [...] Man is a slave neither of his race, nor of his language, nor of his religion, nor of the course of rivers, nor of the direction taken by mountain chains. A large aggregate of men, healthy in mind and warm of heart, creates the kind of moral consciousness that we call a nation. So long as this moral consciousness gives proof of this strength by the sacrifices that demand the abdication of the individual to the advantage of the community, it is legitimate and has the right to exist" (p. 25-26).

c) The Issue of National Consciousness

Stojan Novaković was among the first to realize that throughout history no results had been achieved with regard to the national unity of the Serbs and Croats, adding that no significant attempts had been made to create their cultural unity and harmonize their moral interest. German-Hungarian ethnographer Alexander Sane wrote that the South Slavs

never considered the creation of a state union as their national ideal, while the Czech historian Perloff stated that they hated each other so much that they could not even live peacefully next to each other. American geographer Samuel von Valkenburg was of the opinion that Yugoslavia could not withstand its complex ethnic structure and that the same language as a common characteristic could not overcome their irreconcilable cultural differences.

Kostić claimed that the Serbian people "had a perfectly developed national consciousness [...] when very few other nations had it, let alone our neighbours ... We developed as Serbs and were educated in that spirit. We were one as a nation, though we were citizens and subjects of different local and foreign authorities. It was these circumstances that stimulated our nationalism and brought it to its heights. We all strived to unite under one rule – understandably a local one. This effort was both logical and natural" (p. 28). The Serbs had provoked WWI and entered it in order to unite their entire nation, while the subsequent re-orientation of the war objectives towards general Yugoslav unity was a result of the self-delusion of the Serbian politicians who believed that the Croatian leaders were honest in their torrents of phrases regarding brotherhood. The Yugoslav project was essentially against the principal Serbian national idea and the attempt to carry it out was premature at any rate. Kostić correctly noted that "Although the Serbs who were under a foreign rule did feel themselves to be Serbs, the expression and manifestation of their nationality was either prohibited or discouraged by the authorities. Their national characteristics were not supposed to be very visible. Wherever the Croats ruled independently, they prohibited the Serbian name and all the Serbian national attributes (especially the Cyrillic alphabet) and everyone who expressed the desire to use the Serbian language would be condemned as a 'high traitor'. Not only did it boost the Serbian aspirations for freedom, it also prompted the Serbs to express their national characteristics more intensely. For once, they wanted to be Serbs and fully show it; they wanted to be free to declare themselves Serbs and only Serbs (with no adjectives), to display their Serbian emblems and flags that they so far had to hide, to be proud to be Serbs and to defy their neighbours. They wanted to satisfy their national hunger, to live up to their Serbdom and simply be the Serbs. Despised and persecuted for their nationality, they wanted to show that the meek shall inherit the land, that their time has come" (p. 28-29).

The settling of national enthusiasm is a natural process that must not be omitted. Kostić believed that national euphoria involved an infantile complex of a sort that had been extensively studied by social psychology and mass psychology in particular. It cannot be artificially extracted, meaning that every nationalism has to realize itself through the materialization of its objectives. Once the age-long national ideals and dreams have been accomplished and the people accepted them as integral parts of their lives, they may turn to issues and problems of social, economic and other nature. "Our people who first came to power in the state union failed to take this psychological imperative into account. They did quite the contrary however; as soon as the Serbs had

their dream come true and their national aspirations accomplished, their leaders told them that they were not Serbs, but something else new and unheard of, something with new emblems, flags and paroles. Those who swore on the Serbian flag and never betrayed it had the flag suddenly betray them” (p. 29).

d) The Yugoslav Pseudo-Historical Experiment

Immediately after the end of WWI, the nation was subjected to a pseudo-historical experiment that cost us dearly. It artificially created the Yugoslavism that has, in practice, proved to be a great Serbian national disaster. “The authorities passed a decree creating a new nationality. The decision came from the highest level and was not concerned with what the subjects thought about it. The nationality was literally decreed through a government act and everyone was obliged to respect it. Serbdom had to be sacrificed; the Serbian people were required to commit national suicide in order to become another nation. The majority of people did not know that they belonged to this new nation and they had to be educated on the matter. Nationality is the most intimate and subtle connection between the people; they are aware of it even in sleep and willing to sacrifice their lives for it. The authorities now created a new nationality – a nationality with no roots and traditions, with no preconditions for prosperity. The more they realized that it was unnatural, the more they strived to impose it. To decree a nationality means to decree one’s feelings, which is equal to decreeing love” (p. 29).

Nevertheless, a true estimate of the validity of such an artificial concept can only be made through an analysis of its actual consequences. As Kostić noted: “The Serbs accepted the Yugoslav nationality as a necessity, while the other constituents of Yugoslavia did not even do that. This created confusion. Instead of having the three nations merge into one nationality, there emerged a new, purportedly collective nationality that was adopted by a minority of the peoples. From then on, the following four nationalities existed in Yugoslavia: the Yugoslavs, the Serbs, the Croats and the Slovenes. The Serbs were divided and the others remained united” (p. 29-30). Although the Serbs showed their dedication to Yugoslavism at the beginning of WWII, they were sobered up by the Germans and other occupying forces - and undoubtedly by the Croats most of all. None of them acknowledged the Serbian Yugoslavism and they reanimated the Serbian national consciousness when “the Germans took the Serbs into slavery and the Croats exterminated them like wild beasts. Yugoslavism did not help anybody because it was not sufficient to change one’s own nationality. It had to be recognized by the neighbours. New countries need to be recognised by the international community and such is the case with new nationalities. Yet the country, as a legal entity, is recognized through legal acts, while the nationality as an internal phenomenon is recognized by confirmation of the environment. The Croats that did not become Yugoslavs, did not want to believe that the Serbs did so. They ‘descried’

IT-03-67-T
the Serbs, returned them to ‘their previous state’ and murdered them because they were something different to the Croats. And the Serbs just wanted to be the same as them!” (p. 30).

Kostić was convinced that the very existence of the first Yugoslavia had paved the road towards Communism. The denationalization of the Serbs created the conditions for a foreign ideology to take root among our people that had no foundation in the Serbian national being. “As soon as one abandons the straight and unwinding national line and gives up nationality as an age-old principle of cohesion, he enters the pathless land of bewilderment and disorientation. He seeks new connections, new ideals and goals, but no one knows where it will lead him. It is because nationality represents a firm ground and a centuries-old historical achievement. Through nationality, one has obtained a balance that need not be disturbed” (p. 31). This violent split with national history and cultural traditions lead to the destruction of the national ideals and their replacement with the utilitarian aspirations of a utopian ideology. “In 1918, we were cut from our Serbian roots. The intention was to take two more branches and graft

them together onto a wild plant and create a powerful Yugoslav tree. It was an unnatural and unsuccessful endeavour, but still we were ripped out and distanced from the root that had fed our national consciousness for centuries. Now we cannot do anything else but reattach the trunk to its original root. Such an operation is not easily done. The later it is undertaken, the more difficult it is to perform and the more uncertain is its outcome. But there is still a chance that our Serbian national roots have not withered”(p. 31).

The starting point of synthesizing Yugoslavism was to integrate the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes through the process of their thorough denationalization. This process was only accepted in practice by the Serbs, who had renounced the legacy of their liberation wars. The principal issue at hand is why we did that in the first place. “We would not have acted differently if we had lost the war and embarrassed ourselves, if we had besmeared our name so much as to be afraid to show it to the world. The Croats needed all that to survive their defeats, to cover their shame and conceal their atrocities and bestiality. The Slovenes needed it because they were a small and politically immature nation. We needed it the least and yet we sacrificed Serbdom and Serbia when they were at the heights of their honour and glory. We resigned from the company when it had gained its highest reputation and credit rating” (p. 31-32).

According to Kostić, the historical fiction of Yugoslavism could not last long, but it had thus far cost us more than any historical reality. The victims of WWII caused only a partial awakening of the Serbian national consciousness and only in the sense of the abandonment of the Yugoslav national ideology by the majority of Serbs, while the Yugoslav state ideology was retained and still enforced. “In 1918, we sacrificed our nationality and were reduced to the level of a ‘tribe’. As of 1929 however, we could not even be seen as a ‘tribe’. The dictatorship strived towards the ‘abolishment of tribal differences’ and the complete

removal of national distinctions. Unlike the others, the Serbs complied again. The Slovenes managed to preserve their individuality owing to their language and geographic position; the Croats succeeded thanks to their hatred towards the Serbs; the Muslims remained coherent and different due to their religion and the minorities remained different due to their language and other significant dissimilarities. We had nothing to preserve us as a different group anymore and were evermore losing ourselves in the general Yugoslav mass” (p. 32). It was only the Serbs that truly believed in the life of the Yugoslav state, while all the others hoped for its death; when it appeared that its death ensued under the German occupation, they all fought amongst themselves to grab as much of what was left of the ‘bankruptcy mass’ and the Serbs were left with only a small part of their territory that had not been the subject of any territorial pretensions. Those Serbs who found themselves under the rule of their hitherto brothers were the victims of systematic genocide. “Yugoslavia was re-established in 1944 but its creditors mostly retained what they had taken. That will always happen to a group that starts to falter, mix and negate itself - to a group that does not carefully protect its individuality and its own ‘interests’” (p. 32).

Unitary Yugoslavia and its integral Yugoslavism were not realistic options, though they had their logical coherency as a concept. Federal Yugoslavia did not contain any logical substratum that would at least partially conceal the essential anti-Serbian utilitarianism of the project. Lazo Kostić opined that the arguments in favour of its survival were regularly teleological and opportunistic and he endeavoured to critically analyze each of them. There were no more assurances that the Serbs and the Croats were one nation, but there emerged a theory that proposed that we were cognate nations and insisted on their consanguinity, and that was the first premise of justification of the Yugoslav state to be criticized by Kostić. “One should start from the proposition that we were consanguineous nations, which is hard to refute. Yet, relatives do not live in the same household. It was different before, especially in the South Slavic areas where distant relatives lived together in large family cooperatives. Nowadays, most of those cooperatives have disintegrated and the phenomenon is undergoing extinction. Relatives live separately and have their individual property, their houses, farms and stables. Sometimes they may act jointly against the external danger, but they mostly quarrel and argue among themselves. Nowhere can one see more disputes than between relatives and neighbours. That is why one protects his interests from the neighbour/relative most carefully. The life of the Serbian nation is marked by increasing individualization” (p. 33-34).

e) National Consciousness and the Language Barriers

Comparing the state to a large family, Kostić insisted that the Serbian nation was interested in founding its state structure on the very principles that govern the structure of a family. A common language was a strong argument in favour of creating the state union as the language itself is the essential means of expression of the national spirit. However,

“The Croats are forcibly creating a language that is different from Serbian. They did it during the war and many of them continue to do so after the war. Then, for the first time in history, the Macedonian language was forcibly created. The Slovenes rightfully reacted to this by cherishing and developing their individuality. Yugoslavia does not have one, but as many as three or even four official languages and two alphabets. And there are even more vernaculars. The Croats have two distinct languages (Kaikavian and Chakavian) that differ from the literary language at least as much as ‘Macedonian’ differs from Serbian. Yet, they separated the Macedonian language from Serbian. Therefore, the reason of a common language fails” (p. 34).

The Serbs and Croats do not share national feelings; their views of the world are dissimilar, as are their political objectives and aspirations, which is why they cannot achieve a unity of thought and determination in realizing their goals. Their positions are diametrically opposite in all these regards. “Our common language serves us insofar as one side is able to understand the reproach of the other without the need of an interpreter. Is this a sufficient reason to have state union?” (p. 35). Kostić further emphasized that the claim that the Serbs and Croats were united through their fate was absurd. We have lived separate lives for centuries and the federal structure of the state could not suit us by any means. “Throughout history, we have never had a complicated state structure – a federation and the like. Our people simply could not find its way in such a multi-level state, with the conundrum of double citizenship, etc. Our people, the Serbs, are fond of clear and simple organizational forms and they proved that throughout their past. (Conversely, the Croats would sell their soul for the complicated state structures that they have had for some seven or eight hundred years, as only such an organization could provide them with the false sense of their peculiar ‘statehood’)” (p. 35).

If the state structure is clear and simple, the competence or lack of it of every state official is quite visible and it is possible to establish and individualise responsibility. It was the Communist federation, which was formed on a consistently anti-Serbian platform, that broke every illusion that a federal structure could be a relevant factor from the point of view of the Serbian state and national interests. Kostić was generally sceptical of the possibility of a true federation under the Communist regime while, in the Yugoslav case, the authority was not concentrated in the hands of the state organs at all but in the Central Committee of the Communist Party and Dictator Josip Broz himself.

Serbian intellectuals in emigration were often inclined to accept a federation containing three national components, while Kostić thought that it would not be rational and ironically compared such an ideological structure with an architecturally solid building erected on three pillars. A federation seems illogical if it is created through the federalization of a unitary state; it should be created by unification of the existing sovereign states, which in our case would imply that Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia should first be constituted as independent and sovereign countries and eventually enter into a state union. “Our people ask for the federation,

but they actually live in unitary concepts. They are terribly mistaken if they think that joint representation may resolve the underlying problem. The problem is not in 'self-governance' (which is a term that can hardly be taken away from the Serbians), but in the federation. It cannot be imposed from above. If that were possible, we Serbs would fare really great: we would be reduced to the borders established in 1941 or 1944" (p. 37).

If an agreement or bargain were to be made with the Croats, the question that would immediately pose itself is who would be authorized to negotiate. It could only be legitimate state authorities elected through a democratic process, but the issue is in what manner and in what area such a preliminary election would take place. A plebiscite would be out of the question in any event, as it would represent a legalization of the political and legal consequences of the genocide committed against the Serbs during WWII. "The existing federal units, though *pro forma* and false", additionally complicate the predefining of this process. Today's division into federal states has been carried out with the clear intention to fragmentize the Serbs. Nevertheless, according to the principle of self preservation, the established federal units would attempt to remain unchanged by invoking their acquired rights and referring to their earlier 'success' and the measures that were already undertaken. All the non-Serbs would support this because they have the same fundamental objective: the weakening of Serbdom" (p. 38).

Kostić was aware of all the accompanying problems that would complicate the resolution of final issue. "It would start with bargaining and blackmailing the Serbs and every action would probably be hindered in order to bide time or to show the world that the Serbs are obstructing the process and have unrealistic ambitions. Our counterparts could count on the kind of press that circulates across the world and that would readily support their cause and requests. That is the Catholic press. We do not have a similar means to oppose them" (p. 38). The establishing of an independent Serbia would certainly not pass without problems, but they would be far smaller than in the case of restructuring the state under the principles of federalism. "It is beyond doubt that the creation of independent Serbia would entail territorial problems. For instance, they could take our ethnic territories (e.g. Kordun, Lika, etc.). However, we would not have to recognize it; that would create an unresolved dispute to be dealt with by the international community or suspended until a more convenient time. In a federal state, the Serbian people as a whole have to agree to being territorially divided and to give up parts of its ethnic territories to a foreigner. That foreigner thus gains an irrefutable *titulus acquirendi* over such territories for all time and for all purposes. We cannot subsequently state: we have given this up only for the purpose of the federation. The territories we surrender to the Croats, Macedonians etc. as part of their federal units will be lost forever. If, on the other hand, they would forcibly take some territories from us, or if the great powers would demand that we cede them, our moral obligations would be much less binding because we did not relinquish these territories" (p. 38).

The absurdity of the Serbian insistence on Yugoslavia is even more striking in light of Croatia's absolute rejection of any kind of Yugoslav state, although it would suit them immeasurably more than the Serbs by all the objective criteria. Moreover, every sort of Serbian pro-Yugoslav activism greatly harms the Serbian nation, while it brings many benefits for the Croats, which Kostić summarized in the following three points: "1) The Croats use it as the most compelling evidence that we cannot live without them and that they could live without us. They also use it to show that we exploit them and still want to do so and that they have to fight against that with all means available. 2) The Croats use it to prove that they did not commit any crimes against the Serbs, because no sane person would want to live in a state union with the ones who purportedly committed the crimes that the 'propagators of Great Serbia' and 'Serbo-Communists' try to impute to them. Quite the contrary, it is proof that the Serbs murdered and exterminated the Croats during the war and that they are trying to do so again. The Croats want to distance themselves from this; they want their home without union with the Serbs. Therefore, this process could not be prejudicial. The Serbs want injustice and domination; they want to 'continue' their crimes against the Croats by living in imposed union with them. 3) If the representatives of our people ever started negotiations with the Croats, their position would be much more advantageous, because we are the ones who plead with the Croats to live with us and they are the ones who oppose it. We would have to beg them, humiliate ourselves and make concessions in important matters, because we want state union and the Croats do not" (p. 41).

Serbian politicians have humiliated themselves by begging the anti-Serbian criminals and tormentors to remain in the state union. "The more arrogant and brazen the Croats, the more pathetic and servile we are. Eventually, we will be despised by both them and the rest of the world. If we had at least some pride, we would stop currying favour with the Croats. If our split with them would mean total disaster for us, from the moral point of view, we should rather accept that disaster than continue to live with them" (p. 42). The pro-Yugoslav Serbs have placed themselves into a situation where they have to keep silent about the Croatian crimes or impute them to the indeterminate category of 'Ustashas' – that is, persistently differentiating them from the Croatian people, although the Ustashas were the highest expression of the Croatian national being and statehood. "The propagators of Yugoslavia from the Serbian ranks are not allowed to present any data that would embarrass the Croats, while the Croats put forward the worst possible theories about the Serbs. The Serbs must not tell the truth about the Croats, while they spread lies about us not only in Croatian but in English as well. The Serbs cannot even defend themselves from the Croatian lies as they are not supposed to provoke them" (p. 42).

In doing so, the Yugoslav Serbs lose their pride, honour, integrity and dignity for the love of a failed illusion. As Kostić stated, "representatives of a community – usually the state representatives – must be far more dignified than other individuals. It has been the case

since the very beginnings of diplomacy. They go out of their way to prevent the humiliation of a state representative. On the other hand, the 'representatives' of the Serbian people – the people that has deserved honourable treatment through its victims and its overall conduct in the war – continually humiliate themselves before the people that committed the countless crimes of this war and of whom Roosevelt stated that they should put under international custodianship. The thought of it leaves me speechless and more humiliated than I have ever been in my entire life" (p. 43).

It is beyond doubt that those who crawl and beg should not be allowed to represent the interests of the Serbian people, at least not officially. Yet, it seems that the Croats have become used to choosing who will negotiate with them from the Serbian side.

f) The Possibility of National Balance

Kostić based his analysis of the population and ethnic balance in Yugoslavia on Šafárik's estimation that, in the mid-nineteenth century, there were five million Serbs and only eight hundred thousand Croats. Serbdom was at its peak then in all the Serbian lands and the national consciousness was likewise distinct among the Catholic Serbs and the Muslim Serbs. However, a major crisis ensued upon the establishment of Yugoslavia. Many Catholic Serbs turned Croats, the Muslims began to have doubts and different winds began to blow among the Macedonians. The coup of 1929 and Aleksandar's experiment with integral Yugoslavism was a heavy blow to the Serbian national consciousness, while the Croatian war genocide brought the Serbs to the edge of their biological survival west of the Drina River. After the war, the Communists continued killing their political and ideological opponents and some segments of the Serbian people were even proclaimed separate nations. "They thus created the 'Macedonian' and 'Montenegrin' nationalities and, understandably, granted both Montenegro and Macedonia borders that were convenient for them. There was not to be any Serbs within these borders. And now we have this situation: before the war and before the unification, every Montenegrin was a Serb. The *Bokelji* in particular were Serbs – even the majority of the Catholics of Boka. The inhabitants of the southern part of Sandžak were not and could not be anything different from those of the northern part of Sandžak, i.e. Serbs. Officially, there is not a single Serb in that area today. Even the family of the author of this book is no longer Serbian as that has been prohibited by Communist decree. As regards this decree, the Montenegrin Communists played a most repugnant and treacherous role. The Serbs lived in Macedonia throughout history. There were more non-Serbs I presume, but there were Serbs as well. And it was not easy to declare oneself a Serb. Such individuals were threatened with death from all sides, yet they dared to express their Serbian character. Nowadays, no one is allowed to call himself a Serb there. What was allowed under the Turks is not allowed in Yugoslavia. All this shows how detrimental Yugoslavia is to Serbdom!" (p. 49-50).

Broz personally stated that in order to maintain the national balance in Yugoslavia, no nation could have an absolute majority of population, which was the reason behind the creation of artificial nations. On the eve of WWII, the Serbs had that majority – in spite of the Croatian genocide. The Communists felt threatened by the fact that such a majority could soon be re-established, so they resorted to the forcible disintegration of the Serbian nation. This disintegration was achieved by partitioning, administrative separations and decrees. The Communists were the principal creators of this policy, yet "all of this was brought about with the establishment of Yugoslavia, only Yugoslavia. It is Yugoslavia that enables it and its existence makes it imminent. The Serbian dominance in terms of numbers creates a Serbian supremacy and no one, no other nation, wants that supremacy. We should part with Yugoslavia in order to preserve the remaining Serbdom, or else we should be prepared for further destruction of the Serbs. This is the key to the problem" (p. 50).

All this implies the conclusion that "Yugoslavia cost our national balance dearly. The number of our victims is enormous – unheard of. It is difficult to establish their exact number, not just in this period, but in general: there is no exact and precise data about the war victims, nor is there any possibility to establish it" (p. 50). At this point, Kostić resorted to the statistical method in order to estimate Serbian losses in WWII as precisely as possible, given that the census of the Yugoslav population was not conducted either immediately before or after the war. The essence of Kostić's estimation consisted of the following: "After the Serbs' terrible sacrifice in WWI (Serbia alone had more than half a million victims), the first census conducted at the beginning of 1921 established that there were as many as five and a half million Serbs. The next census, conducted at the beginning of 1931, established that the number of Serbs considerably exceeded six and a half million. No more censuses were subsequently conducted in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. However, based on purely scientific estimations, it was established that, at the beginning of 1941, there must have been almost eight million Serbs as the birth-rate is calculated with compounded interest and the Serbian natality was higher than average. And we are talking here only of Serbs of the Orthodox faith. If the birth rate kept the same intensity, we could have counted on nine million Serbs as early as 1948. And this is the year in which the census was conducted in Communist Yugoslavia, which established that the number of Serbs slightly exceeded six and a half million – two and a half million less than expected and than should be expected according to the laws of nature" (p. 51).

However, this requires an intervention in the form of two corrective factors "since, in 1948, the so-called 'separate nations' of the Montenegrins and Macedonians were forcibly and fraudulently separated from their Serbian tree. The census established that there were more than 400,000 Montenegrins and twice as many Macedonians. This means that another 1,200,000 should be added to the number of 6,500,000 of Serbs since two statistical measures can only be compared if they are based on the same characteristics (the same traits, the same

territory, etc.). Therefore, the number of Serbs in 1948 reached seven and three quarters of a million (almost exactly). However, these are also the precise reasons why this number needs to be reduced. Namely, the number of Serbs in 1948 included 160,000 Muslims who declared themselves as Serbs. Nevertheless, they were not designated as Serbs in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Their number thus needs to be deducted from the present number if we want to use the same balance calculation basis. It is likely that there are some Catholic Serbs as well, and certainly 'Montenegrians' and 'Macedonians' who were not previously counted as Serbs (the Muslims and the Catholics of Boka who wanted to declare themselves as Montenegrians). That is why another quarter of a million needs to be deducted for the sake of comparison. This means that there were only 7,500,000 Serbs in 1948, while it was rightfully expected that their number should be no less than 9,000,000" (p. 51-52).

For the sake of clarity, it should be emphasized that the pre-war censuses registered religion, not nationality, while it was *vice versa* in the post-war ones. The balance of the Serbian population during the forty years of the existence of the Yugoslav state was a little short of 1,500,000 people. Kostić believed that about half of them were murdered or killed, while the other half had not been born due to the war circumstances. "When we speak of one million Serbian victims in the last war, that figure is quite close to the truth. This number could be somewhat smaller, but it could also be larger" (p. 52). In Kostić's opinion, the Communist data that the total number of Yugoslav war victims was 1,700,000 was relatively precise. "However, the fact that is being concealed by the official Yugoslav circles is that, out of a total of 1,700,000 victims, 1,500,000 of them were Serbs alone, while the remaining 200,000 were of all other the Yugoslav nations" (p. 52).

Kostić was well aware that "this concealment is not accidental and without purpose. It is even unethical since, on its basis, certain territories are sought from Italy in favour of Croatia. Given that the Croats killed more than half a million Serbs during the war, should they be rewarded with new territories containing the same number of people? Never in the entire history of humankind has there been such an example: to have the victors reward their enemies because they killed hundreds of thousands of their allies" (p. 52). Kostić further insisted on several other striking facts. "The following detail will show the ethnic balance Yugoslavia has left us. The census of 1948 established that there were 544,000 Serbs in 'the People's Republic of' Croatia. According to the laws of nature, the number of Serbs that should have been expected in that same territory was almost 800,000. On the other hand, the number of Croats in 'the People's Republic of' Serbia in 1948 was about 170,000. However, according to the laws of nature, it would be expected that their number should not exceed 30,000 or 40,000, half of which was in Belgrade and the other half in Srem. Almost 100,000 *Bunjevci* and *Šokci* were included in this number and they have never been Croats, nor would they ever have been Croats if they had not fallen within Yugoslavia. The remaining number of over 30,000 were Croatized foreigners. Had it not been for Yugoslavia, they would have remained Germans, Hungarians,

Slovaks, etc. Now they want them to be Yugoslavs at any price. Since their faith prevents them from becoming Serbs, most of them turn Croatian out of pride" (p. 52-53).

This process was not only induced in Serbia. "In Bosnia and Herzegovina it was even worse. The offspring of all possible *kuferasi* turn Croatian and embittered Serb-eaters, be they of German, Czech, Polish, Hungarian or any other descent. We have had losses everywhere save for Vojvodina, where the national balance shows a rather favourable picture (owing to the expulsion of the Germans from the country). We have reached a rather strong relative and lately even absolute majority there for which we could have waited a lot longer according to the natural principles" (p. 53). The Serbian prospects would be rather bad if Yugoslavia survived. "We are still the largest nation in Yugoslavia and our force is approaching the absolute majority. As soon as we strengthen ourselves a little more, secession, amputation, the tearing apart of a living body will ensue" (p. 53). It is quite certain that the Croats would seize the first favourable opportunity to attack the Serbs even if they had to wait for decades. Kostić also emphasized the psychological reasons behind the hatred of the Serbs. "All pygmies and degenerates will attack the one who stands out in the community, the one who is greater and better, braver and more generous, noble and virtuous, as soon as they see an opportunity, i.e. when he is without help" (p. 53).

g) Serbian Negative Balances

What would have happen if the Yugoslav state had not been established? "The Serbs in Serbia would have protected Serbian interests alone and prepared themselves for the right moment; they would not have been carried away and deluded by the phantom of Yugoslavism. United, materially and spiritually prepared and aware of the moment and our historical mission, we would have been capable of facing the enemy and showing him that it was not easy or advisable to be against us and to attempt to destroy us. In Yugoslavia, however, we have had to treat our most horrible executioners as 'brothers' and we have done nothing to prepare ourselves and resist their attempts to exterminate us. And they have had no other purpose and objective than to destroy us" (p. 54). That is why Kostić's following conclusion is as convincing as it is alarming: "Yugoslavia is fatal for our national survival and all its advocates have to realize that [...] Everything that we gained in Serbia, we lost in Yugoslavia" (p. 54).

Our ethnic substratum could not achieve any economic or social, let alone political progress within the state of Yugoslavia. "Yugoslavia cannot be an attractive force for anyone, much less an ethnic magnet drawing some scattered national components together. It is because Yugoslavia is nobody's national focal point. Being the hearth of many nations, it became nobody's home. Yugoslavia does not represent a specific national form or a certain national reality [...] Only Serbia can be the fatherland of the Serbs" (p. 54). After two naïve and unfortunate

Yugoslav experiments, any third attempt would be absolute madness. All the remaining advocates of the Yugoslav option must ask themselves "Is there a numerical margin of victims that must not be crossed, or will our Yugoslavs remain Yugoslavs no matter how many Serbs perish? One should not ignore the fact that national organisms, much like individual ones, cannot withstand excessive and frequent blows. Medical science has established the percentage of blood an organism can lose before the loss is fatal. The situation is similar with national organisms. A few more such experiments and we will no longer exist" (p. 55).

By joining Yugoslavia, the Serbian nation actually lost their state, which had been the haven of its national individuality and the expression of its collective consciousness. In the new state, the Croats and the Slovenes quickly gained what they had never had before, while the Serbs systematically lost their feelings of individuality, their self-confidence and their spiritual strength. This new situation was in such great contrast with the historical fact that the Serbs "never settled for some palliatives or dubious 'statehoods' without true sovereignty and full freedom. They never made 'bargains' whereby they would share or give up their independence, nor have they ever in history replaced their Serbian name with another one. They were not Illyrians or Yugoslavs, not until the fatal year of 1918" (p. 56). This is confirmed by the Serbian and Montenegrin statehood experience. "Montenegro, a small oasis of Serbdom, never recognized a foreign master. It was attacked and ransacked and sometimes subjected to the sultans, but the Montenegrins never saw it as a lasting situation and never succumbed to their rule. A century and a half ago, Serbia rose from the ashes like phoenix and it immediately strived towards being independent and sovereign (as previously quoted from one of the first decisions of the renewed Serbia). It took so much suffering and blood until Serbia succeeded in this endeavour. And both of these Serbian states constantly had to defend their independence by shedding their blood. They did not accept any compromise" (p. 56).

The Serbian national idea has always been centred on the unification of the Serbian state and Kostić claimed that 99 percent of the Serbs had not even known of the existence of any Yugoslav idea or such a state project before the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was created. The Serbs were primarily focused on the unification of Serbia and Montenegro and the issue of which dynasty would assume the main role in that process and complete the unification of all the other Serbian lands. As Kostić stated, "both of these states believed that they were destined to be the central point of unification of all Serbdom, until this role of Piedmont was completely assumed by Serbia, which was much larger and more powerful. And no one wanted anything more or thought of going any further than that. Unification of Serbdom under a single state roof was the ultimate goal of all the Serbian patriots in all the areas, both in the liberated kingdoms and in the Serbian lands that were still under Turkish and Austrian rule. They wanted nothing less and nothing more. Certain manifestos, panegyrics and political studies expanded the field of liberation to include all the 'Yugoslavs', all the Balkan people,

all the Slavs or all Christians. It was the case when the situation dictated so and when the political constellation opened up the possibilities for more extensive actions. However, no Serbs intimately wanted anything more than the unification of all the Serbs. It could not have been the case that the Serbs of Kosovo and Skopje saw Yugoslavia as their salvation; the same goes for the Bosnians, Herzegovinians, people of Vojvodina, Boka, etc. All of them only waited for the Serbian army and looked towards Belgrade and Cetinje. All of them expected the unification of Serbdom. They thought of nothing else and wanted nothing more" (p. 57).

The Serbs suffered a real nightmare when they established a state union with the Croats and Slovenes. "All of a sudden, they became Yugoslavs and were no longer Serbs. Overnight, they changed the nationality they had been aware of and dedicated to as few other nations of the world are. They became disoriented and, even more than that: they grew indifferent to their nationality. If nationality can be changed by a decree, if one can abandon spiritual connections that were cherished for centuries and cemented with the blood of many generations, then the connections in general become loose and profanated and they are seen as a matter of moment, regulations and transactions. One could even say that it is a matter of opportunity. The nation as such was done away with. A new one was not created and the old one vanished. A nationality is not a pair of clothes to be replaced when the old pair is torn. It is the most sacred and irreplaceable connection among the people. Nothing is holy for a person capable of changing his nation. He is a volatile and faithless individual. Dostoevsky rightfully stated that nationality shows the way towards God. It is much more than the faith" (p. 58).

The unfounded presumption that the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes are one nation was degraded to an objective yet to be attained after their unification, sometimes even attained through the implementation of violent methods. "Since one created a state with insufficient internal justification, it was necessary to subsequently enforce such a justification. But one cannot rectify a previous mistake by making another one" (p. 59). Therefore, Kostić was convinced that such a state was condemned to ruin because it was not capable of reconciling the internal differences and specificities, nor was it able to build the essential consciousness of national belonging. "It is far from true that one gets accustomed to and starts to love a country by living in it, and that no other country is then desired or thought of. We lived in Turkey for four, even five centuries and knew of no other country but Turkey. Yet we rose against it. My forefathers lived under Venetian rule for centuries and one hundred years under Austria, but they and their neighbours always wanted another country – their own country. And Austria was a rather large and heterogeneous country. Everyone could live in it and even have a good life there. Yet, the Serbs wanted their own, Serbian country. And the longer they lived in Austria, the less they were inclined towards living in it" (p. 62).

By entering the joint state, the Serbs sacrificed their already established and internationally recognized kingdom that had expanded to

include Montenegro and Vojvodina and for which the rivers of blood had been shed in the liberation wars. "The other partners had nothing to lose. Until then, they had almost exclusively lived under foreign rule and were now partially governed by their own people. In Yugoslavia, the Serbs had to share power not only in the new Serbian areas that they had obtained honourably (through war and combat) and where the Serbian people longed for their own administration, but also in the territories of their two hitherto independent states" (p. 63). And they could have created a purely Serbian state that would include literally all the Serbian national territories. "For the first time in history we united the Croats into one state, some of them in 1918 and the rest in 1944, and even gave them the opportunity to expand on our account. We eventually managed to have a Croat rule as a dictator over all the Serbian lands and, instead of two kings and two governments, we now have but a few obedient associates of a Croatian dictator, a few adjutants and valets of the Croatian tyrant" (p. 63).

The consequences of establishing the Yugoslav state union were indeed disastrous for the Serbian people. "We Serbs have died as an international subject. No one pays attention to us anymore; no foreign visitors and guests speak of us; there is no mention of us in the state press, political publications, lexicons and encyclopaedias. The words of praise started and ended with the liberated Serbian states. We are no longer a part of history, as Hegel said, nor do we represent anything historically. We have no home of our own and no state of our own. We are as homeless as vagabonds. We are provisional tenants in a foreign, mixed and 'collective' house in which our harmony with the other tenants is equal to that of the tenants who share Communist apartments" (p. 64). Immense energy was thus spent in mutual disagreements that hindered social prosperity and put the Serbs, as the largest nation, in a position to make constant concessions while there was no possibility of consolidating the state structure.

To all those who were in favour of Yugoslavia because they wanted a larger state that would guarantee sovereignty and prosperity, Kostić replied that the size was not quality in and of itself, because "the Serbs have no worse enemy than the Croats; all the other nations taken together are not as hostile as the Croats alone. In Austria, the Croats were restrained and balanced by other nations and their criminal spirit was less visible than in Yugoslavia. They are much more dangerous here; if they are not dangerous now, they will be when they seize an opportunity. 'We are nourishing a snake in our bosom'" (p. 65). In the contemporary world, it is absurd to insist on territorial grandeur at any price, because the ethnic coherence of the population is an immeasurably more important quality. "We want Serbia to be as big as our forefathers created it through their constant struggle and as they imbued it with their national spirit. Only that big. No bigger, but no smaller either. In cases where the other side puts forward brazen demands for our lands, we must respond with equal measure. Intransigence should be shown only towards nations that destroy foreign religions. To leave our population to them would be equal to leaving them to the mercy of wild beasts. No

IT-03-67-T
state can be rewarded for murdering its citizens" (p. 71).

Considered from the global point of view, the territories of Yugoslavia and Serbia fall under the same category and all the political geography text books define us as small countries. That is why any megalomania would be meaningless in our case and would only create existential problems. "We could have eventually retained and consolidated half of the territory we got from Austro-Hungary in 1919. And in this way we face the possibility of losing more than a half of our original territory. Likewise, had we taken a smaller part of Macedonia, it would have been much more difficult to attempt its Macedonization, as both Greece and Bulgaria were spared from that process" (p. 75). The fundamental principle observed by rational people in creating their state ideology is the existence of a spiritual connection among the citizens, the existence of a homogenous national consciousness. Under such circumstances, the citizens feel their connection with the state interests and are ready to serve them and even sacrifice their lives for them. Serbia had this kind of national homogeneity on the eve of WWI, which provided the basis for its unmatched war heroism. As Kostić noted, "After the experiment we underwent in the recent past, after the unimaginable suffering we lived through, is there anyone who does not see that it is not only impossible to have an ethnic union with the Croats, but that there is an unbridgeable gap between us? There is extreme heterogeneity in all the areas where we live together. There is no homogeneity whatsoever. And heterogeneity creates unrests, conflicts, intrigues, it leads to bloodshed and leaves nothing but disaster and shame" (p. 92-92).

Therefore, the Serbs cannot expect any prospects in Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia cost them many of their territories; it also cost them the Macedonians, the Montenegrins, the Muslims, the Catholic Serbs, the *Bunjevci* and *Sokci*, etc. "If we managed to rid ourselves of the Croatian burden and establish our own country, our Serbia, then our national relations would change fundamentally and create the conditions for even more radical changes. Truth to be told, we would still have national minorities, even a significant number of them. But the core of the state would be comprised of one nation, whose internal cohesion and spiritual connections are incontestable; it would be comprised of one people that have always been willing to sacrifice themselves for the fatherland. It is the Serbian people" (p. 99).

h) Prospects for the Serbian State

Kostić especially insisted that it was necessary for Serbia to have a strong Serbian ethnic majority of the population that would ensure the protection of its national interests. The protection of national interests of a majority of population in democratic systems by no means implies deprivation of the rights of any national minority, but it preserves the integrity of the state and the consistency of its legal order. Lazo Kostić did not exclude the possibility of recognising the Macedonian language and individuality. Kostić only envisaged a civilized exchange of

population based on the principles of reciprocity only in the case of Croats. As regards the Muslims who spoke Serbian, Kostić stated that, “Nowadays, almost all the Muslims of Sandžak have declared themselves Serbs without any pressure exerted on them. The same is the case with a significant number of Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Naturally, the number of such cases will increase in the independent Serbia without any steps taken by the authorities and even without any influence on the part of the Serbian population. We will not proclaim them the ‘blossom of our nation’; we will not spoil them and promise something we could not fulfil; we will not make them kill their neighbours as the Croats did. We will treat them correctly and with dignity. In no way will they be neglected because they are not Orthodox Serbs. There is no doubt that they would Serbianize themselves of their own volition” (p. 100-101). Unfortunately, history has taken a different course.

Many people thought that 1918 brought solutions to all the Serbian national problems and that all of their centuries-old national goals were achieved. However, as Kostić noted, “no greater misfortune can befall an ideal than its complete realization. Such an ideal is then gone. It is fulfilled, consumed, devoured. An ideal represents longing, striving, the endeavour to achieve something. When it is realized, it extinguishes the yearning and it is often followed by disappointment (disillusion) because the fulfilment did not bring all the expected results. Once a mission is accomplished, it is followed by indolence, inconstancy and spiritual emptiness. Preservation of the achieved goal cannot induce the same fervour of spirit as the process of attaining it” (p. 103). Renan concluded that institutions failed the very moment they succeeded and, on the occasion of the unification of Germany, Bismarck stated that a part of the job needed be left to posterity. “A complete unification of the nation, as was the case with our, Serbian, unification of 1918, erases a great national ideal, it extinguishes every vigilant interest in the national cause, let alone assertiveness; it creates indolence, indifference and national apathy. If, however, a people still has some ideological and idealistic forces (which the Serbian people have always had and always will have), they are reoriented towards other goals that are extra-national and often supranational or anational. This is why our academic youth became largely international, while all other student youths (Croatian, Hungarian, Bulgarian, etc.) were hyper-national. Those young generations had a single national objective, while the Serbs were satiated in that sense. Hence the extreme differences in the reactions of the University of Belgrade in 1914 and after 1918” (p. 103).

Kostić was of the opinion that, unlike Yugoslavia, which systematically subdued Serbian national interests in its futile attempts to curry favour with the Croats through ever-increasing concessions, independent Serbia would fully commit to the needs and aspirations of its people. There would not have been any more of the difficulties the Croats created by boycotting the previous joint state and hindering its consolidation by concurrently supporting the Macedonian separatists, the Albanian *Kachaci* (Translator’s note: terrorist saboteurs) and the

Montenegrin federalists. Anti-Serbian policy was incorporated into the official state programme of the Communist Yugoslavia. “As long as there is Yugoslavia and Yugoslavism, we will be in danger of becoming the victims of similar situations. Our situation may improve, but any unfavourable moment could result in explosion. Our national substance is the least protected in Yugoslavia” (p. 107).

Kostić further elaborated on the basic postulates of the prospective ethno-political programme of the renewal and unification of Serbia: “The concentration of Serbdom requires regrouping the Serbs scattered across the world, the return of the emigration, the integration of the remote Serbs who are facing denationalization if we are unable to reclaim their territories. [...] National purification of the country, as far as it is possible to achieve it through morally acceptable means and without doing anything unto others that we would not like them to do unto us [...] Prohibition of every anti-Serbian proselytism, be it religious or national [...] Favouring the Serbs in all equal opportunity cases [...] Uncompromising protection of Serbian interests, both in the country and abroad, which would not stop short of war in case the vital interests of Serbdom are endangered. If another Serbian neighbour tries to do as much as a millionth of the crimes that the Croats committed, we have to undertake the necessary countermeasures towards their nationals in our country, and if all other means are exhausted, we should eventually resort to armed conflict [...] The entire state idea needs to be given Serbian national thought and the Serbian national interests should be set as the basic principle of the regulation of public law and order” (p. 107).

The Serbs were deeply humiliated when the reverse Croatian tricolour was imposed as their new state flag. The crest consisted of three parts, as was the case with the new anthem that was musically impossible to perform. The Cyrillic alphabet has been systematically suppressed since the time of Alexander Karadžević and the King himself generally consented to it being completely replaced by the Latin script, which was strongly opposed by Patriarch Varnava. “His intervention bore fruit because he claimed that, more than anything else, this act would make the Macedonians turn to the Bulgarians. It was this factor that decided against it, not the Serbian national interests and the Serbian tradition” (p. 109). Moreover, the use of the Serbian national name was suppressed. All of that had been systematically enforced even before the Communists came to power, so that Josip Broz had a good foundation for all his subsequent anti-Serbian intrigues. To make the tragedy even greater, all that was bad in the royal and Communist Yugoslavias was ascribed to the Serbs through orchestrated western public opinion, while the good sides were accorded to the amorphous mass of Yugoslavs or directly to the Croats. “The Serbs have had nothing non-Serb to be proud of since Yugoslavia was created. On the other hand, everything valuable that had belonged to the Serbs was misappropriated by our enemies who took all our glory and benefits. Our butchers stole our credits and shifted their shame onto us. They made us suffer morally as much as we suffered biologically” (p. 121).

The balance of the state union with the Croats was disastrous and

Kostić bitterly concluded the following: “How unfortunate and difficult it is! The world spoke of the Serbs with so much respect and delight in the first half of the 19th century, when the uprising led by Karadorde and the songs collected by Vuk Karadžić presented Serbdom to Europe in its best light. One cannot read the statements of the European elite of that time on the glorious feats and high qualities of Serbian poetry without being deeply moved and proud. Such words of praise were repeated at the beginning of this century and they never stopped with regard to Montenegro. Yet we sacrificed all that in order to unite with the most villainous nation of Europe at the time when our moral and political position was perhaps the best in all our history. We offered the best assets a nation could invest into a state union and got only liabilities from the other side” (p. 121-122).

Kostić was convinced that the Serbian and Croatian states would separate sooner or later and he was aware of all the problems of such territorial separation. However, it was inevitable and would have to be definitive. “During WWI, almost all the territories inhabited by the Serbs were acknowledged as parts of Serbia, including all of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Vojvodina, a part of Dalmatia as far as Split, etc. Had we insisted, we could have received even more favourable borders at the peace conference. Those would have been the internationally recognized borders of Serbia and nobody would dare touch them without violating the international order. For instance, had Hitler and Mussolini attacked us and the Croats occupied some of those areas during the war, they would have had to abandon them after the war as soon as the international community again recognized them as Serbian territories” (p. 129). Nowadays, all these Serbian lands are disputed and occupied and we are also left without Macedonia.

Kostić was particularly concerned with the Serbian weakness towards the Slovenes, who had dissuaded many of the Serbian leaders from abandoning the Yugoslav idea and state concept and turning towards the independence of Serbia. Although he openly expressed a pro-Slovene sentiment, Kostić generally emphasized that everyone should primarily mind their own business and protect their own interests.

He concluded the first book of this cycle by refuting the proponents of Yugoslavism who referred to the example of Switzerland as the best proof for their thesis that a joint state of the Serbs and the Croats was still possible. Kostić first stated that the premise that various Swiss nations had lived in harmony for centuries was incorrect. That was only true of the last hundred years or so. Prior to that, they waged continual wars against each other, be it among the cantons, between religions or between different nationalities. Furthermore, Switzerland is not home to any nation as a whole but only its parts, while the majorities thereof live in the large neighbouring countries. Most importantly, these nations are not ethnically close to each other to be burdened by the curse of minor differences. They do not even mix with each other, at least not to any large degree. Their religions do not coincide with their languages and national consciousness.

Therefore, there are many differences between us and the Swiss.

Besides, pursuant to the Vidovdan Constitution, the initial division of the state into regions was carried out after the model of Swiss cantons, but the Croats were irreconcilably opposed to that. On the other hand, the great powers guaranteed neutrality to Switzerland, the regular presence of a huge number of foreigners has imbued it with a spirit of tolerance and, thanks to the neutral status and skill in the banking business, it accumulated considerable economic wealth in the early stages of its existence. What is more, the claims that Yugoslavia was of itself the protector of Serbdom because it opposed the escalation of nationalism were absurd. As Kostić stated, “Yugoslavia pushed certain nationalisms to their extreme and into paroxysms, i.e. all nationalisms except the Serbian one. While the Serbian nationalism was completely stupefied and purportedly suppressed by the Serbian leaders, the nationalism of other ethnic groups were instigated solely on the basis of hatred towards the Serbs and the intention of breaking the unity of the state they belonged to” (p. 143).

Had it not been for Yugoslavia, the genocide of Jasenovac would most probably have been avoided. The Croats murdered the Serbs even more vehemently and in greater numbers in order to eradicate their every will for Yugoslavism and life together. As this did not seem enough to many of the Serbs, they continued to delude themselves and renounce their own nation. Yet, this did not save them from new murders and torture. “Not only do the Serbs who abandon Serbdom and accept Yugoslavism remain unprotected from the other ‘Yugoslav’ branches, but they become the favourite target of their attacks. The fact that they ceased being Serbs and melted into Yugoslavs is of no help at all, because the other branches still see them as Serbs. Their enemies pick them out from the Yugoslav mass and murder them as Serbs. They only stopped being Serbs to themselves and remained Serbs in the eyes of their enemies. They were not punished by the Serbs (who understood them to say the least). They were murdered by those for whom they were willing to sacrifice their nationality. The fate of the Christianized and Germanized Jews in Germany was similar” (p. 148).

2. The Issue of the Yugoslav State Structure

The second book of Kostić’s study was published in 1959 and contained the author’s observations on the legal aspects of the Yugoslav state establishment. He began by refuting the deep-rooted prejudice that the Serbs had some legal or moral obligation to preserve Yugoslavia. If there was any legal obligation to consider, such as the Niš Declaration or the Ba Resolusion, whose provisions were impossible to implement, such an obligation was virtually nonexistent because the Croats simply did not accept any form of Yugoslav state union. By way of the Niš Declaration, the Government of Serbia proclaimed the struggle for liberation and unification of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes as its principle objective in addition to the defence of the existing state and its freedom. Kostić held that the Serbian leaders were of the opinion “that such a gesture would be beneficial as it would discourage the Austrian

soldiers of South Slavic origin from supporting the Austrian cause, because the Croats had fought for it with utter devotion, which was to some extent the case with the Slovenes too. This statement was issued at the time when the Serbs showed the world, including the 'Yugoslavs' of Austria, that they eventually may win the war" (p. 14). Besides, the historical and publicist testimonies of Croatian atrocities committed against civilians on the Serbian front were numerous.

a) The Birth of Serbian Delusion of Brotherhood with the Croats

Kostić quoted a series of statements and conclusions by the Croatian officials and impartial historians on the Croatian dedication to and zeal for the anti-Serbian war efforts of Austro-Hungary. He subsequently elaborated on the conduct of King Aleksandar Karađorđević, who personally decorated Archbishop Dr Antun Bauer of Zagreb with the Order of Karađorđ's Star of the First Degree. This same Bauer wholeheartedly justified the Austro-Hungarian aggression against Serbia and prayed for the victory of the Catholic monarchy's weapons on the Drina River. After the religious ceremony, the Archbishop delivered a real political propaganda speech, wherein he stated the following: "And on what shall we base the trust that our prayers will be heard? First of all, on the knowledge that this war we have been forced to wage is indeed a just and holy war. Our gray-haired ruler [...] has unsheathed his sword to obtain justice for the innocent blood of his heir Ferdinand and his virtuous wife Sophie, which had been spilt by criminal hands. It seems that it was necessary that this noble blood be spilt so that we could clearly see the dangers that threaten our kingdom's survival, that may cause our people's name and nationality to disappear and that led the Catholic faith into greatest temptation. A war that defends such great national, state, temporal and eternal values is just and holy! Therefore, we can pray to our Lord of heaven and earth to support our righteous struggle [...] If we place our ardent prayers into the hands of the Holy Mother of God with such fervour, we can rest assured that she will hear our cry and beg our Lord to grant victory for the weapons of our brave army – the victory that will bring true happiness and welfare to the Kingdom of Croatia by the grace of our noble king" (p. 18).

The struggle of the Serbs in the fatherland was only wholeheartedly supported by Serbs who lived outside its borders and who suffered terribly because of that support. As Kostić described, "Indeed, the Serbs in all the Austro-Hungarian provinces saw the struggle of the Serbs from Serbia and Montenegro as their own battle, knowing that their national survival depended on its outcome. This struggle was theirs as much as all the free Serbs, a struggle for life and death in the truest sense of the term. It was not necessary that it be emphasised from the Serbian side, as every Serb in the whole world felt it most intimately and knew it with the utmost certainty. During WWI, the Serbian struggle against Austro-Hungary was carried out on three fronts: the front of Serbia, the front of Montenegro and the Serbian front inside Austria. In Austria, we

IT-03-67-T

sabotaged their cause in every possible manner and whenever we could. We had casualties, victims of the bloodshed, much like on the other two fronts. Those were Serbian victims only! If the Croats participated in any of those actions, they did it as executors or masterminds of the persecutions and as headsmen. They fought for Austro-Hungary, not for Serbia or the Entente" (p. 19).

As expressed in the statement of Regent Aleksandar, Serbia entered WWI proclaiming its fight for freedom and the independence of the entire Serbian nation. His Order of 4 August 1914 reads as follows: "Heroes, in addition to our brotherly Montenegro and the rest of the Serbs who will fight against Austria wherever they are and with all means available, we will have our northern brothers, the Russians, on our side. As soon as the noble Tsar Nicholas II received the news of Austrian attack on Serbia, he resolutely stood up with all his knightly army of Russia to defend Serbdom and Slavdom" (p. 20). Therefore, Serbia and its state authorities did not have any allies in the Austrian territories, save for the Serbs who lived there. Not until the end of 1914 would the Serbian position change through the Niš Declaration, to include "the liberation and unification of all our unliberated brothers, the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes" (p. 20). As Kostić stated, "It is beyond doubt that the Serbs wanted it, all of them and wherever they were. The Croats did not want it in the least and the Slovenes were also completely against it at first" (p. 20).

However, the Serbian officials paid little attention to the Croats and Slovenes, even after the Niš Declaration had been adopted, which is reflected in the Easter address Regent Aleksandar delivered on 4 April 1915: "Christ has risen, soldiers! Today, on the eve of the resurrection of Great Serbia, I greet you with the words: 'Christ has risen', and with my wish that we may successfully and gloriously accomplish this grand task of achieving the Serbian ideals" (p. 20). Throughout their ordeals of the war, the heroic Serbian soldiers had no Yugoslav idea on their mind. They simply fought for their people and the liberation of their enslaved fatherland. Though Nikola Pašić gave certain diplomatic statements regarding the unification of the South Slavs towards the end of the war, all the available documents, as well as his contemporaries and historians, testify to the fact that he primarily focused on Great Serbia.

In 1956, Stevan Trivunac, the most significant leader of the radical political movement of the emigration, wrote in the *Radical* magazine that "it was the unaware and unconscientious Serbs that largely hindered Pašić in his endeavour to resolve the issue of the unification of the Serbs and the demarcation of the borders of the Serbian people. We entered the joint state instead" (p. 22). Pašić fervently strived to dispute the objectives of the Corfu Declaration through political practice, but the unaware and unconscientious Serbs Aleksandar Karađorđević and Stojan Protić above all had prevailed. Hence, Trivunac concluded that "Pašić was right. Thanks to the immature and the spiteful that had snatched the rudder of our fate from Pašić's hands, we Serbs found our age-old struggle and our victory on the wrong track. We irretrievably lost the unique opportunity to unite the Serbian people into a Serbian

state before any further integration. It cost us dearly, it still costs us and it depends on us and our Serbian consciousness whether it will cost us in the future” (p. 22). Lazo Kostić commented on the position of Pašić in the following words: “I believe that no one could find fault with Pašić for having thought and acted the way he did. He was the prime-minister of the Serbian government, the representative and hope of all the Serbs. He had to think and act in a way that was dictated by the vital interests of his people. He was a great statesman who had not been deluded by fantasies; he was a genius who foresaw the misfortunes of Yugoslavia” (p. 22).

As regards the situation that the Croats found themselves in, “they either had to endure the fate of the defeated side and face the disintegration of their ‘historical territories’ in favour of the Serbs or draw closer to the Serbs and mix with them. They did the latter, as they had done in 1848. On both occasions, they managed to steal large parts of the Serbian people and enjoy the fruits of Serbian victories. Thus, from a small nation that had been historically known mostly for their crimes, they transformed into partakers in the Serbian glory and grandeur, only to subsequently repay that through the most atrocious crimes against those same Serbs” (p. 22-23). Kostić also referred to Walter Hagen, one of the chiefs of the German Intelligence Service who published the book entitled *The Secret Front* in Zurich in 1950, in which he stated that the Croatian nation had never shown significant support for secession from Austro-Hungary and unification with Serbia, while some of the Croatian politicians were in favour of this unity “mostly owing to the fact that such a political connection with the Serbs allowed the Croats to leave the ranks of the defeated and join the side of the victors [...] A large number of the Croatian people were against the decision, which had been adopted in a completely undemocratic manner; the Croatian representatives abstained from participation in the parliament of Belgrade in order to show that they considered the creation of the state an illegal act” (p. 23).

During WWI, the Croatian Assembly was openly in favour of the victory of the Austrian side, while the May Declaration adopted by the Dalmatian and Slovenian representatives at the Imperial Council of Vienna reflected their commitment to the unity of the Slovenes, Croats and Serbs as Habsburg subjects within the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Therefore, the Niš Declaration could not legally obligate either the Croats and Slovenes, or the Serbs who were interested in nothing more than Great Serbia. According to Kostić, the Ba Resolution of 27 January 1944 could also not produce any legal consequences as it was drafted by party representatives with an insignificant number of Croats and Slovenes. The Declaration envisaged the restoration of the Yugoslav state in the form of a federal, constitutional and parliamentary monarchy, and its most important clause stipulated that “the Congress is of the opinion that the solidity of the future Yugoslavia depends on the creation of a single Serbian unit within the state union, which would, on the principles of democracy, gather the entire Serbian nation into its territory” (p. 25).

830

Kostić fully understood the conditions under which the Congress at the village of Ba was held, as well as the political needs of the Ravna Gora movement, but he opposed the emigrants’ blind adherence to the provisions of the Ba Resolution. “There is something movingly glorious and markedly Serbian in the conduct of the officers and soldiers of the late General Mihailović, who do not want to deviate from one single word of this Resolution. There is something knightly and officer-like in it. Yet, such conduct can hardly be wise politically” (p. 26). Lazo Kostić primarily rejected any apologetic approach to and dogmatic treatment of the provisions of this historical document because it had been adopted in an undemocratic manner. “One who is in favour of the Ba Resolution can be a good patriot, a good Serb and especially a good Yugoslav. He can be loyal to the king, etc. But he is against democracy, for democracy refuses to be tied to anything, let alone a military movement. Democracy requires that every generation of citizens freely decide on their fate. Today’s generation and the one that will replace it cannot be bound by the generation of 1944, even if the election of delegates had been flawless. A vast majority of the Serbs were not in the position to vote either in favour or against that election” (p. 27).

It is of particular interest to mention Kostić’s following digression: “I read something sensational after this work had long been finished. In the *Sindikalist* issue published in 1957 (the trans-border bulletin of Dr Živko Topalović, who presided over the Congress of Ba), a memorandum of the hitherto unknown *Veritas* was published, saying that the late General Mihailović stated the following before a renowned education worker: ‘Every single politician should be killed [...] both in towns and villages, and then we, the soldiers, will take the fate of our people into our hands.’ If these were the words of the late General, they reveal his essentially anti-democratic attitude, which has been unknown in the history of Serbia. On the other hand, if he had not said this, it sheds an unfavourable light on Dr Topalović, who was presiding at the Congress of Ba and who drafted the fabled Resolution. He would have been familiar with the position of the late General even before that Congress. How did he then participate in and perform the major role at the Congress? The Ba Resolution could not have suffered a more fatal blow than that contained in this memorandum. It destroyed the Resolution completely and buried it - even those segments that were not contested by anybody on the Serbian side” (p. 27).

For many years, the Serbian emigration was exhausting itself in pointless debates on the Ba Resolution. It wasted its energy in internal conflicts and often surrendered to dogmatic rapture and political intolerance. Hence, Kostić significantly contributed to the emigration by breaking certain taboos and initiating a serious debate on the future of the Serbian people. He never contested General Draža Mihailović’s positive role during the war, but he did not allow a war commander to become his political idol and guide. Kostić was convinced that Mihailović himself, had he survived, would have rejected many of the

831

points contained in the Ba Resolution: “At the Congress held in the village of Ba, the late General Mihailović delivered a speech full of Yugoslavism - not only state Yugoslavism but also the popular form. At the beginning, he spoke of the ‘right to life of our trinominal nation’, he greeted the delegates as ‘representatives of the democratic nation of Yugoslavia’ and, at the end of his speech, he exclaimed, ‘Long live the Yugoslav democratic nation!’ (Quotation from *The Book of Draža*, Vol. I, p. 8, Windsor, Ont., 1957). Perhaps it was becoming of a statesman and patriot at the time. However, nobody in the world recognizes the ‘Yugoslav nation’ anymore and the term itself would be sufficient to remove all the Slovenes from Yugoslavia and the insignificant number of Croats who were in favour of the state. The wheel of history cannot be turned backwards. Moreover, these words of Mihailović could be interpreted as a programme or guideline of Yugoslav, not Serbian unification - of Yugoslav, not Serbian politics. Mihailović did not make any mention of the Serbs in his entire speech, so the Serbs should not reference Draža Mihailović when they proceed as Serbs, though they are generally rather loyal to him” (p. 28-29).

Officers of the emigration again referred to their oath made to the king and Yugoslavia, which obliged them to uphold a certain state form that was a historical failure. Why did they deal with politics in the first place, if they were not able to comprehend that the project they had pledged their allegiance to was completely ruined? They should have yielded it to those capable of thinking and acting freely. To make the tragedy even worse, “it was the Serbs that the supreme commander invited to join the Partisan units. He did it against his will and on the ultimatum issued by British Prime Minister Churchill, but it was no less binding to the ones who believed they owed him loyalty and obedience” (p. 31). Kostić was unambiguous and straightforward on this issue. “The oaths given to Yugoslavia, even if made solely to Yugoslavia, would have lost any legal and moral significance. No one should feel bound by them. One should not accord much weight to such oaths, even if they were in place. They are imposed not only on those who are willing and eager, but also on those who take them perfunctorily and privately vow to do quite the opposite of what they committed themselves to. Perhaps they secretly make a solemn promise to God concurrently with taking the formal oath. Preservation of the nation is holier than any oath” (p. 32).

Lazo Kostić did not contest the right of the Croats to secede from Yugoslavia and form an independent state. However, “what must be held against the Croats, what makes them the most abominable and barbarous of all the present day nations is the horrible murder and torture of their own citizens - citizens that they got after their treason and with foreign help. One cannot take offence when they justify their conduct during the war by saying that they did not want to live in the ‘Yugoslav prison’ anymore. But they ignore two other terrible facts: their crimes and the fact that they imposed the war on western allies. The latter should not necessarily be a sin if the Croats did not demand that these same allies award them for their war conduct. No victorious

nation of the world has insisted on their democratic aspirations and their dedication to the West as much as the Croats, who imposed the war on the West and who would certainly have used their affinity with the Fascists if they had won the war (they would have used it primarily against the Serbs). And the Croatian crimes are a stigma that the Croats will never be able to remove. We are not offended by their establishment of their own state, not even by the wide borders that they got, but we take offence at the fact that they proved to be worse than the savages of the Middle Ages, thereby abusing the right to have their own state” (p. 33).

As regards the oaths, “a much more important issue with respect to the breach of oath emerged on 6 January 1929, when King Alexander rescinded the Constitution and arbitrarily imposed a new form of state. We accepted it without protest, which might have been a mistake. All of us breached the oath at that time, at least all of the state officials. And no one posed such a question then, but they do it now and without justification. The most flagrant breach of oath was committed by the king himself and its significance was thus nullified” (p. 33-34). How many naïve Serbs stuck to the alleged last words of Aleksandar: “Take care of Yugoslavia.” However, even General Petar Živković admitted as an émigré that the last words were fabricated. Kostić commented on them as follows: “I would not debate how much one should respect this testament of the king, simply because there were no such last words. The king did not utter those words before he died, nor was he able to say them. No serious people ever believed that; the doctors I spoke with unequivocally claimed that it had been impossible. It was a cleverly construed, though tendentious maxim. Here is how it was interpreted in Belgrade: the king’s entourage, which did not act bravely, wanted to preserve their positions by inventing this adage. It was a children’s maxim and the masses tend to be infantile, so it took root especially and perhaps even exclusively among the Serbs. Its veracity was not contested as no one saw any danger in it” (p. 34).

Kostić also referred to the testimony of Svetozar Pribićević, according to whom King Aleksandar intended to sever Croatia after the murders that took place at the parliament. “Svetozar Pribićević, who stated this, went on to reveal something that he, as a gentleman, should never have disclosed. He published his private conversation with King Aleksandar, in which the king complained about the Croats and stated that even his father used to say to him that the Croats were the enemies of the Serbs. According to Pribićević, Aleksandar said the following: ‘You do not want to admit that it will be best if we separate from the Croats. At least we will have a solid state of what remains ours. My late father would often say that we cannot reach an understanding with the Croats, that they are the age-old enemies of the Serbs and that we cannot have common politics’” (p. 35).

c) The Emigrant’s Doubts

Many politicians deal with the projects of structuring and

restructuring the Yugoslav federation with extreme incompetency. All of their concepts are based on the following two prejudices: that Yugoslavia must exist and that its preservation requires the sacrifice of certain Serbian interests. The less they know about the principles of federalism and contemporary legal and constitutional theories, the more they are fervent in their groundless defence of their naïve postulates. They conceptualize political and legal mechanisms without thinking how they would function in practice. Providing such examples of incompetency, Kostić focused on Desimir Tošić and his book entitled *Serbian National Problems*, published in Paris in 1952. He especially mocked Tošić's unintelligent acceptance of the Croatian phrase 'Triune Kingdom', because it was only a phantasm that lived in the imagination of Croatian megalomaniacs and fanatics. It never existed in reality. It was just a chimera, a figment of wishful thinking. It was used to designate the national or historical solidarity of the three 'kingdoms' and never to designate a reality. Why Tošić used the phrase, I do not know. Yet, he went on to say: '*The Triune Kingdom* (without Dalmatia)'. Would it not then be a dual kingdom instead?" (p. 40).

Deriding the political and publicist platitudes suggesting that the most difficult problems of the state structure and legal and constitutional relations would be resolved by the people alone, Kostić noted that historical experience showed little concern with popular opinion in moments of crucial importance for society. "If the nation were asked for its opinion prior to a decision, it practically amounted to designating its delegates. It is the same as electing members of parliament and means that the representatives of the people make the actual decisions, not the people itself. The role of the people is thus reduced to electing its representatives" (p. 43). The federal state structure provided a permanent basis for the re-emergence of the issue of redefining the status of its elements and the problems of territorial demarcation between the federal units. "Before such a state structure, I would always place a homogenous Serbian state, in which all these problems would be unnecessary, which could immediately start to work for the benefit of the people and whose entire state mechanism would not be paralyzed by perpetual organizational issues that poison internal relations. On the other hand, all this can only be avoided in the federation by sacrificing the principles of democracy" (p. 45).

Any project of the Yugoslav federation comprising more than three federal units is not sustainable, for material reasons if nothing else, because the units would have to be maintained artificially, through a continual system of endowment. That kind of allowance system is only seen in autocratic regimes. From the national point of view, every federal state would be anti-Serbian, because the majority in the houses of parliament, especially in the upper house that consists of an equal number of representatives from all the federal units, as well as the majority in the executive bodies and judicial institutions, would consist of political elements that oppose the Serbian interests for one reason or another. The communists took many territories from the Serbs and caused a situation where only half of the Serbian people lived in the

Serbian federal unit. The Macedonian and Montenegrin nations were invented. Kostić held that the proclamation of the Montenegrin nation was the greatest ethnic falsification of all times. Throughout history, the Slovenes never had their own state. Yet, in Yugoslavia, they got an ethnically compact territory for themselves. Macedonia included many territories that are markedly Serbian. Croatia was expanded to include Slavonia and Military Frontier, which had been outside its borders for centuries - and it was even given Dalmatia, with which Croatia had no state and legal connection for eight hundred years, save for those administered by the Court of Vienna. Moreover, Dubrovnik, Istria and Baranja had never been Croatian.

The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was administratively divided in a rather artificial manner and numbered 33 areas; following the coup d'état, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia proclaimed nine banates as administrative regions with almost exclusively police competences. The Croats systematically sabotaged the functioning of both those administrative concepts and the state authorities in general. Serbian political parties and their leaders continually endeavored to reach a political agreement with the Croatian politicians. "Understandably, they saw the only solution in the democratization of the entire country, in the return for civil liberties to all its citizens and major ethnic groups: the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. They also envisaged a democratic conduct for the negotiations and a truly democratic solution based on these negotiations. Otherwise, the Serbian democratic parties would never have attempted any action that would bring freedom to Croatia and slavery to the Serbian parts of the country. And that was exactly what happened" (p. 69).

The principal problem and trouble of the Serbian people was embodied in the person of the despotic and inept Regent Pavle Karađorđević. As Kostić stated, "the leaders of HSS (Translator's note: the Croatian Peasant Party) found a suitable moment to start negotiating with the Court and its exponents behind the back of the Serbian pro-democratic political representatives. The Court was represented by Prince Pavle, one of the three regents that had usurped all the power (contrary to the Constitution and the late king's will). He chose people with the lowest national integrity as his associates. They were his puppets, through which he established contact with the HSS [...] The international circles exerted a lot of pressure to see the Croats treated as leniently as possible, and Prince Pavle cared a lot for the opinion of those circles. Besides, he never took any care of the vital Serbian interests and the needs of the Serbian nation, which was intellectually foreign to him" (p. 69).

The Croats nominated three prominent lawyers for the negotiation process. "All of them had a thorough knowledge of history and the current circumstances of the Serbo-Croatian relations. The Serbian side designated three professors of the Belgrade Faculty of Law, leftists who were completely unable to perform the entrusted task (they had no mastery of the effective public law of the country, nor were they familiar with the ethnic and statistical ratios and did not sympathize with the

political circumstances of the trans-border Serbs)” (p. 69). The negotiation process was conspiratorial and it was conducted separately at Lake Bled and the Plitvice Lakes. As a result, the Banate of Croatia was created from the previous Banates of Sava and Primorje and the districts of Dubrovnik, Šid, Brčko, Gradačac, Derventa, Travnik and Fojnica were added to it. The remaining Serbian lands were left without their unique national identity. There were 850,000 Serbs left in the Banate of Croatia and systematic oppression and brutal propaganda terror against them ensued immediately. The Croats were given full democracy in their banate and they instantaneously showed their true face, while the rest of the country remained under the private dictatorial regime of the Prince.

The monstrous creation of Croatia was granted many state attributes and it represented a real federal unit within the state, which had preserved its unitary and centralized character in all the other areas. Croatian ministers continued to rule Serbian lands, while the Serbian ones had no authority over Croatian areas. However, the Croats were not satisfied with that and they still demanded Bačka and all the territories inhabited by the Catholic population. As Kostić noted, “I do not have any doubts that this is the standpoint of the entire Croatian nation. Not only do they request the area from Zemun to Kotor and the Drina, but they also demand Bačka, in which there were far less than 1,000 Croats in 1918. They demand it because it is Catholic and two-centuries of experience has taught us that all the Catholics become Croats under Croatian rule; they are supported in this cause by the Vatican, which would urge the Hungarians to accept that solution as a lesser evil than being under ‘schismatic rule’” (p. 72).

Kostić provided a general review of the state projects of Stojan Protić, Svetozar Pribićević and Franjo Supilo, as well as of the Serbian and Croatian representatives at the Paris Peace Conference, in order to present a broader analysis of the emigrant ideas of restructuring the Third Yugoslavia, all of which exclusively dealt with the territorial division of the state, be it into three, four, five or six units. Kostić stated that the arguments advanced by Dr Vladislav Stanić “were utterly incompetent and resembled the preaching of the *Zbor* members” (p. 84). Furthermore, he analysed the anti-Serbian ideas that were launched from the circles close to the *Our Word* magazine, whose authors’ primary preoccupation was the territorial division and political break of the Serbian people. Their texts were open to the premise “that, if it opted for Yugoslavia, Serbdom would have to continue to suffer and make continual concessions to everybody in order to preserve a union that was destroying it” (p. 85). Serbian traitors in emigration were ideologically close to the Croatian publicists, who insisted that the Serbian federal unit should not be larger than the Croatian one.

d) The Project of Creating the Montenegrin Nation

The communist project of inventing the Montenegrin nation found supporters among the Serbian emigration circles as well. “The Montenegrin ‘nationality’ is founded on lies, forgery and violence of the

IT-03-67-T
worst kind” (p. 93). This quasi-nation embraced the *Brđani* (Translator’s note: the Highlanders), Herzegovinians, *Bokelji*, *Primorci* (Translator’s note: inhabitants of Primorje), the Vasojević tribe, etc., and its creators were the most ardent promoters of the anti-Serbian policy and platitudes about the oppression of the Montenegrins by the advocates of Great Serbia. Kostić emphasized that the Montenegrin Serbs “had nothing to complain about in respect of the Yugoslav policy between the wars. Nevertheless, assuming that they did suffer injustice, was it really necessary to change their nationality? If anyone was neglected between the wars, it was the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Serbs and the areas inhabited by them. Yet it has never occurred to a Bosnian or a Herzegovinian to change his nationality” (p. 93). There emerged something that no one normal could have expected: the Montenegrin Ustashas as proponents of the hatred towards the Serbs.

Kostić analyzed this problem in detail, concluding that “This entire anti-Serbian action of the Montenegrins was initially a communist endeavour. It could in no way be generalized to put the blame on all the Montenegrins. The knights that fought under Arch-Knight Duke Pavle Đurišić, were no less Serbs and no less zealous than their forefathers who fought against the non-Christians in the name of Serbdom for more than five centuries. Had they won, there would not have been this embarrassment and disgrace. The Montenegrins would have remained what they had always been: the true Serbs, the elite and aristocracy of Serbdom. However, judging by the emigrants and even those among them that are close to the homeland, one can note that this heresy has taken root in the homeland and that it will not be easy to suppress it. It is partly due to threats, partly to cunning campaigns and schools and partly through promises and positions that quite a few Montenegrins in the homeland have embraced the idea of Montenegrin ethnic individuality” (p. 93-94).

Fully aware of the immensely negative consequences, Lazo Kostić concluded bitterly that “Serbdom has been broken apart terribly and unnecessarily compromised, and the question is when and whether these scars and wounds will ever heal. The farther we go, the more healing seems unlikely. Serbdom has suffered a terrible blow and one should not be fooled – nowadays, it seems certain that this was not the idea of an individual or a few men: many Montenegrins are supporting this idea with unsurpassable zeal” (p. 94). In this regard, Kostić referred to the words of Jovan Cvijić from 1907: “In Montenegro, the Serbian national consciousness has always been an unselfish force. I noticed that even every shepherd knows of the great Serbian unity and it is practically the only thing that creates the higher national feeling that comes after care for everyday existence” (p. 96).

At the beginning of the 20th century, the Englishwoman Edith Durham wrote the following in her book entitled *The Slavic Danger*: “Montenegro lives for the establishment of a great Serbian empire [...] We can see that the selfish ambition of the Petrović dynasty to establish and govern Great Serbia had taken a solid form long before Serbia gained its independence and anyone knew anything of the Karađorđević

family” (p. 96). She also spoke of the pretensions of King Nikola I Petrović: “At first, he had only one ambition: to establish a great Serbian empire with the Petrović family as the ruling dynasty ... He was already resolved to take the throne of Stefan Dušan [...] Ferdinand promised Nikola armed support to overthrow the Obrenović dynasty with a view to uniting Montenegro, Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina into one state with Nikola as its ruler [...] Both those who opposed the Petrović dynasty and those who were in favour of it took it for granted that Montenegro would head Great Serbia” (p. 96-97).

At this point, Kostić quoted the following observation on the main traits of the Montenegrin character by the renowned Slavist Gerhard Gesemann, presented in his book entitled *The Montenegrin Man*: “The fierce jealousy of certain tribes is alleviated by a more noble competition: who is the better Serb? As the Montenegrin must excel in everything, he must be the best in the national aspect too [...] According to his mythological beliefs, the Montenegrin is not only the best warrior in the world, but the best Serb as well – he is greater than all the Serbs. One cannot argue that he is not right in this respect as the Montenegrin is, to say the least, the heroic quintessence of the Serbian and Dinaric soul” (p. 98).

Therefore, it was not a coincidence that the following was emphasized in the first decision of the Great National Assembly of the Serb People in Montenegro, held in Podgorica on 26 November 1918: “The Serbian people in Montenegro is of the same blood, same language and same hopes, the same faith and customs as the people who live in Serbia and other Serbian areas; they share the same glorious past they admire, the same ideals, the same national heroes, the same suffering, i.e. everything that makes a nation” (p. 106).

e) The Bosnian Issue

The communist regime endeavoured to additionally disintegrate the Serbian people by establishing the federal unit of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Immediately after WWII, the Serbs had a relative majority and three quarters of the Muslims who declared themselves nationally were counted as Serbs. In the following decade, the communists systematically promoted Muslim individuality and concurrently suppressed the Serbian national consciousness and cultural and political tradition. Muslim religious distinction served as a basis for developing their Bosnian-Herzegovinian individuality, which the Serbs never wanted or accepted intimately. The Serbian national consciousness in Bosnia and Herzegovina was best described by Jovan Dučić, Petar Kočić and Aleksa Santić. Kostić was clear that Muslimism “cannot be considered an ethnic category. It represents a residue of the extinct Turkish rule and a product of a religious determination that is increasingly fading away nowadays. Their social individuality and distinction have completely disappeared. The Turkish culture that served as a model is rather distant and secularized. The Muslimism of Bosnia and Herzegovina completely lost the basis for its individuality and it will

IT-03-67-T
abandon this individuality itself” (p. 114).

The essence of all Kostić’s considerations of the issue of Bosnia and Herzegovina was that “the Serbian people in Bosnia and Herzegovina want to unite with Serbia at any price as they see it as the only chance for their future national existence” (p. 115). Analysing the different standpoints of the emigrant authors who preached about the need to create a buffering federal unit between Serbia and Croatia, Kostić wrote as follows: “I am not at all convinced by the arguments put forth in favour of separate units. Some of them are quite arbitrary, e.g. the one mentioned earlier arguing that such a unit should prevent a national conflict between Serbia and Croatia. Quite the opposite, if there were a free and democratic regime, such a unit would only perpetuate and inflame conflict. One should not be fooled and resort to platitudes as the Serbs and the Croats of Bosnia and Herzegovina have never in history got along well, nor does it seem possible. There were times when the Serbs and the Croats in Croatia and Slavonia had a common political platform and when they even ruled together, as was often the case in Dalmatia. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, such a case has never existed. The Croatian nationality was created there after 1878 and it immediately came into conflict with the Serbian one” (p. 118). Kostić’s historical prognosis was equally convincing: “If they really want to give the people a chance at self-determination, Bosnia and Herzegovina would disappear in a day – on the day of the plebiscite” (p. 120). The following consideration was even more striking: “Talking about a decision by the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a whole is a fanciful conception. There is no united nation there, but three ethnic groups, each advocating its own national interest, for which it will opt once the time comes. If the federal unit of Bosnia and Herzegovina is decreed despite this truth, it will represent a bone of contention for the entire state union and, moreover, it will be unsustainable. I am not saying this because I want it to be so, but simply because it is true” (p. 120).

f) The Macedonian Issue

Kostić believed that the issue of Macedonia as a separate federal unit would be quite a specific case if the Yugoslav federation survived. “Macedonia represents a territorially independent area, demographically different from other regions in terms of its language and ethnic specificities. This ethnic individuality is a fairly recent creation: it was not prearranged, it emerged quite unexpectedly, even to the experts themselves (ethnographers and Slavists), it was not fought for in the least, but was rather given as a present. It was not a direct result of the activities of Macedonian protagonists (they were divided into those inclined towards Bulgaria and those in favour of Serbia), but a result of the activities of Svetozar Vukmanović Tempo and his clique. However, they now blow the horn of that ethnic individuality that has entered encyclopaedias and lexicons (though scientists accept it with reservations or do not accept it at all), while the inhabitants of Macedonia become increasingly loyal to it. It can never be defeated,

wiped out, considered nonexistent. There is no doubt that it will moderate itself over time and take on more reasonable proportions, but it will never disappear. The present authorities of both Macedonia and Yugoslavia, which are of equally anti-Serbian disposition, mainly took care that this would not happen" (p. 121).

Even a four-unit federation would not be favourable for the Serbs as there would be more Serbs in such a state than Croats, Slovenes and Macedonians put together, while each nation would have its quarter of influence in the power. Besides, they would be exposed to coalition obstructions in the state institutions. "Such a collaboration of all the units against Serbia is more than certain, in my opinion at least. I can already see it with my spiritual sight. Dwarves always act in unison against a giant if they want to achieve some result" (p. 122). Kostić also analysed the fact that northern Macedonia was inhabited by Serbs who, territorially, would rather join Serbia, while the Albanians of the western parts would be inclined to integrate with the rest of their fellowmen. "It is not impossible that ethnic tendencies that do not fit into the given moulds could appear in the interior parts of Macedonia as well, since the present Macedonia and its nationality was not created through a natural process, as indicated earlier. It was imposed upon the people. A part of the population may have accepted it eagerly, yet there are many who simply yielded to the force but still remained what they had essentially been before. Doubtlessly, there are Serbs in the interior parts of Macedonia, in its south and west too, who cannot be seen right now. However, they could re-emerge in freedom and shake Macedonia and its individuality" (p. 122).

Kostić noted that the Macedonian language "was an interim form between Serbian and Bulgarian. I find it quite similar to Bulgarian (since I do not speak Bulgarian), while the Bulgarians find it similar to Serbian. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that it is similar to both of these languages" (p. 123). The Macedonians never had their literary language, nor did they have their literature or literacy until WWII. "It is also known to all the historians and linguists that there are no Macedonian written monuments, only Serbian and, to a lesser extent, Bulgarian ones [...] There are several dialects in the Serbian part of Macedonia itself and two of them can be distinguished as practically separate languages; the differences between them are equal to the differences between either of them and the Serbian language, or even less so" (p. 124).

Kostić corroborated this assumption by quoting Dr Kajica Milanov, a university professor who published his book entitled *Titoism in Yugoslavia* in 1952 in Perth: "The leading circles of the present Macedonia show an increasing tendency to form a new and separate national consciousness, apparently seeing it as the only national political solution [...] The fact that the Macedonians, who are neither Serbs nor Bulgarians, do not speak the same language seems to be the most serious obstacle to accomplishing their goal, but it is not completely impassable. Those Macedonians mostly speak two different Slavic dialects, which, in the unanimous opinion of all philologists, are as different to each other as much as each of them is different from Serbian or Bulgarian, if not

even more so. Consequently, from a purely linguistic point of view, they should be divided into at least two more nations. In order to avoid this, they are nowadays artificially creating their new Macedonian literary language, which is in fact a combination of the two previously mentioned dialects. Today, this language is not used as a mother tongue by any part of the Macedonian population [...] This language is now promoted in all the schools of the Yugoslav part of Macedonia and textbooks, books, newspapers and all the communist propaganda literature are printed in this language" (p. 124).

As early as the 19th century, Stojan Novaković competently and objectively wrote of the Macedonian linguistic dialects in the areas that belonged to Serbia after the Balkan Wars: "Taking its national dialects into account, northern Macedonia can be divided into two parts. The part east of the Vardar - between Bregalnica, Razlog and the Serbian border area [...] is dominated by a dialect that could probably be best designated as the dialect of Ovče polje and Kratovo [...] The area south-west of the Vardar, with Veles and Prilep as its centre, is dominated by another dialect, significantly different from that of Ovče polje and Kratovo, which I will designate the dialect of Veles and Prilep. - Further on, in the basin of Lake Ohrid and the Drim River they speak the dialect of Debar, which is certainly close to that of Veles and Prilep, but shows slight deviations" (p. 124-125).

In 1915, historian Ernest Denis wrote the following in his book entitled *Great Serbia*: "The Vardar dialects vary from district to district and one language gradually transforms into another, from pure Serbian in the west to pure Bulgarian in the east" (p. 125). Jovan Cvijić also wrote of the Macedonian dialects: "I cannot embark upon linguistic research. However, it seems almost certain that the language spoken by the inhabitants of the areas around Skopje, Kumanovo and Kratovo, as well as those of Tetovo and Gostivar, is undoubtedly closer to Serbian than Bulgarian [...] Aleksandar Belić was of the opinion that the entire area of the southern Serbian border (written in 1907) was always, as I had already noted, a part of Old Serbia with purely Serbian dialects. They represent archaic (old) Serbian languages and, as such, make a whole together with the languages of southern and eastern Serbia and western Bulgaria" (p. 125).

Having analysed the scientific results obtained by competent linguistic researchers, Kostić summarized the Macedonian linguistic issue in the following words: "The official 'Macedonian language', created in the year of our Lord 1945, is actually a combination of various dialects spoken in Macedonia. None of these dialects was proclaimed as the literary language, but bits were taken from all of them. Nevertheless, the dialects spoken in the west part of central Macedonia - primarily those spoken in the triangle of Prilep-Bitola-Kičevo-Veles, and the dialect of Prilep in particular - were taken as the basis of the Macedonian literary language. As can be seen, the dialect that is the most distinct from the Serbian language was taken as the basis. Taking all this into account, today's Macedonian language was an artificial creation, something invented and imposed and not something that was

developed naturally (like the Serbian language) – a language without a living basis and roots. After they had created the new literary language, they had to create a new alphabet for that language. And they did that with lightening speed” (p. 125).

The consequences of these actions were not by any means favourable for the Macedonians themselves. Kostić noted that “the Macedonians related to ‘their’ language in the same way as before: they had to learn it in schools as they could not learn it from their mothers. The same thing happened with Serbian and, during the occupation, with Bulgarian as well. What kind of progress is it when the Macedonians now have to learn a third language of ‘their own’? And how are they going to learn it? The Serbian language is one of the most developed languages in the world, with a quite prolific literature. Serbian has its past, its developed structure and a beauty admired by the most authoritative foreign scholars. It has a number of monuments in Macedonia itself. What is more, the Serbian literary language was established and affirmed itself for the first time in Macedonia and, as such, it is historically theirs as well. There was no need for the Macedonians to throw away Serbian and create a new, artificial language. All Macedonians were able to learn Serbian in one way or the other. On the other hand, today’s ‘Macedonian’ language needed to be learned by its creators first, who had to practice it and test it. Everybody had to learn it in the beginning. One would expect that they initially introduced it in primary schools, from the beginners’ classes upwards. But the communists did not even apply this proven rule. They concurrently established not only a number of schools, but also a university in Skopje. However, for a number of years there were no pupils enrolled in any secondary school after they had completed the Macedonian primary school and for eight years there were no students that enrolled in the university after they had completed Macedonian secondary school. In all these schools, both the pupils and teachers, including the university professors, had to leaf through the pages of ABC books for quite some time. They could not learn that language in schools or at home” (p. 126).

Kostić compared the creation of the Macedonian literary language to the Croats taking over the Serbian language as their own. “Any variant of the Macedonian language is no more different from Serbian than the two Croatian languages were (and are even now) different from Serbian when it was accepted as their literary language. The respective languages were the Chakavian and Kaikavian language of the islands of Dalmatia and Istria and a part of the coast, and the language of Zagorje, including Zagreb itself. The differences between these two Croatian languages, the only Croatian languages, were, I repeat, huge. The difference between Kaikavian and Slovene was slight, whereas the difference between Kaikavian-Ekavian and Chakavian-Ikavian was the comparable to the difference between Slovene and Chakavian. This difference was bigger than the difference between Serbian and Bulgarian. I am positive that, in the middle of the last century, an inhabitant of Zagorje could not understand half of the words used by an

inhabitant of Bodul and vice versa [...] And what did the then Croatian leaders (though almost all of them were of foreign descent) do? They simply proclaimed the Serbian language as their literary language, initially naming it Illyrian and afterwards Croatian. They thus succeeded in Croatizing all the Catholic Serbs (the Shtokavians and Iekavians), all the Kaikavian-Ekavians and Chakavian-Ikavians. The latter ones, the people of both Zagorje and Bodul, had to learn Serbian in order to become undisputed Croats. At home, however, they continued to use their old languages – or rather languages that were somewhat modified through the influence of school over a period of one hundred years” (p. 126).

All the aforementioned facts raise a number of crucial questions. “Why didn’t the Macedonians accept the Serbian literary language when they did not have their own (as the Slovenes had, who should otherwise have applied the same principle)? Why did they mind partaking in an internationally recognized classical language, with its folk poems admired by the whole world and most of them singing about ‘the honourable Macedonia’ and the events of its past? Why did they mind considering Njegoš as their own poet? Learning the language in their childhood, which they had to learn in the army anyway, which was the dominant or almost exclusive language used in the economy of Yugoslavia, thus having a chance to move freely and look for a job in the entire territory of Yugoslavia? Why did they need an artificial language spoken by no one outside that area and without any history? How come the people of Vranje, Niš and Leskovac took over the Serbian literary language in 1878? The answer is simple: Serbdom had to be disintegrated, stripped of its great province and all its acquisitions from the liberation wars. Serbdom had to be shrunk as much as possible, even if the price of it was the creation of a new and artificial ‘language’ (I put the word in inverted commas because the word language denotes a spoken category, something for which the physical tongue is used, while the Macedonian ‘language’ is still not spoken anywhere)” (p. 126-127). Lazo Kostić corroborated his claims with examples of the historical and cultural experience of other nations. “The differences between the Italian literary language (Tuscan) and the southern Italian dialects (Calabrian, Neapolitan, etc.) are many times larger than those between any Macedonian and Serbian dialects. Likewise, the differences between certain or almost all German dialects and the German literary language (Luther’s Language) are considerably greater than the differences between Serbian and Macedonian (the Serbian literary language is the same as the spoken language). Nevertheless, the best example can be seen in the differences between the Swiss German language and the German literary language. The Swiss have their distinctive dialect, the so-called *Schwiizertüütsch*, with all its variations between the cantons. They use this language exclusively to communicate among themselves. Never would two Swiss persons speak the German literary language, either privately or officially. But in schools, administration and literature they use [...] the ‘written language’ or the ‘language of letters’. There have been some attempts to introduce the Swiss dialect as the only

official language of the Confederation, but none of them has ever been even partially implemented. There are several reasons for that, the first being that the Swiss dialect forms no unity (which is another similarity with the Macedonian dialect). Additionally, no foreigners would be keen to learn the dialect, the job market would be reserved only for speakers of this dialect, foreigners would not be served in an international language and, last but not least, the Swiss did not want to lose their share of Goethe, Beethoven, Mozart, Schiller, etc. They are theirs as much as they are of the entire 'German speaking world'. As God created them to be so practical, the Swiss did not want to invent new language forms and grammar rules, a new army command, etc., when the others had created all of that with so little difference from their way of communication. And the Swiss have a sovereign state of their own, not a 'federal unit'" (p. 127).

Kostić believed that the Macedonians could have retained their spoken language and that it would have been better if they accepted Serbian as their official and literary language. "Perhaps the Macedonian spoken language should have been acknowledged and given some form of official recognition. In other words, it should have been declared the official spoken language of the territory in which it was used, which would not only mean that the people would speak it among themselves, but the authorities would also have been obliged to use it in verbal communication. Those without a good command of it would not have been allowed to be public servants in that area. Thus, all the dialects would have been recognized in their areas and the Macedonians would not have had to learn their own language. Understandably, the literary and 'written' language would have been Serbian. Their 'business language' would have been Macedonian and their 'written' language would have been Serbian" (p. 128).

In that regard, Kostić pointed out the historical analogy with ancient Macedonia: "Besides, this solution would have corresponded to the situation of the Macedonia of antiquity, of Philip of Macedon and Alexander the Great. The Macedonia of those times also had an internal spoken language that was very close to Greek, but it used the language of Homer and Hesiod as the written language. Macedonia did not lose anything but only benefited through such an arrangement. It would hardly have been so famous if it had not tied itself to Greekdom and the Greek language. If Aristotle had not educated Alexander in the Greek spirit, he would have remained a provincial and barbarian satrap with no prospect of conquering the world" (p. 128).

Kostić did not contest the fact that the number of Serbian literary expressions would gradually increase in the Macedonian spoken language, as that was a natural process that had been violently terminated by the communist regime. Until that time, the Macedonians had no national consciousness, which was confirmed by Hermann Wendell in his book entitled *Macedonia and Peace*, published in 1919. He stated that the "national indetermination of the Macedonians resulted in the fact that a large number of them are still in the slumberous state of a nation without history" (p. 130). Kostić added that "not only was the

nationality of Macedonian Slavs unclear to themselves, it was not even clarified scientifically. The ethnography of the European nations was brimming with controversial opinions: some scholars thought they were Bulgarians, others, though fewer in number, saw them as Serbs, while others considered them a separate nationality (those could be counted on your fingers and were only located in St Petersburg)" (p. 130).

Jovan Cvijić called the Macedonians a *flotant mass* that was predisposed to merge with the Serbs or Bulgarians, depending on which state they found themselves in. Wendell was of the same opinion. Jozef Berge saw Macedonia as a large melting pot of nations and cultures. Besides the prehistoric and ancient populations and Slavs, it was inhabited by the Pechenegs and Cumans, by the Adyghe, Tatars, Turks and Albanians, as well as by a large number of the Muslim *muhajirs* who settled there concurrently with the liberation of the Serbian lands from Turkish slavery. Finally, after WWI, a large number of Serbian colonists were settled there. As Jovan Cvijić wrote, the Macedonian areas "could, according to their linguistic and ethnographic traits and the historical traditions that lie buried in their national soul (but which could be easily awakened), be designated as predominantly Serbian and predominantly Bulgarian. The predominantly Serbian areas are located around Skopje, Kratovo, Tetovo and further in the south-west towards Old Serbia, to which the name of Macedonia was incorrectly applied. This territory, together with Kosovo and Metohija, comprises the core of the old Serbian state; the most glorious Serbian traditions found their continuation there and all the Slavic architectural and cultural monuments of those areas are exclusively Serbian" (p. 133).

Kostić emphasized that Cvijić had insisted particularly that the "term Old Serbia was not created for some national aspirations and the southern borders of Old Serbia need to be expanded beyond the Šar Mountain, primarily to include the area of today's *Vilayet* of Kosovo" (p. 134). German geographer Karl Oestreich wrote in the *Geographic Magazine* in 1904 that "the main mass of the population of Skopje is comprised of the Serbs, some of whom recognize the Exarchate and call themselves 'Bulgarians'; there are also Albanians and Mohammedanized Serbs" (p. 134).

Kostić further noted that Oestreich spoke about "purely Serbian Tetovo", as well as about "Mohammedan Serbs at Ovče polje who call themselves *Šcriptari* (Translator's note: Shqiptars)" (p. 134). Russian historian Timofey Dmitrievich Florinsky, Czech Slavist Niederle, French Balkanologist René Pinon, German Slavist Trautmann, Slovenian Slavist Mateja Murko and even the papal apostolic visitor from the 17th century Petar Masarek – they all claimed that Skopje, Tetovo, Kumanovo and Kratovo were Serbian areas. In his *New Universal Geography*, published in 1922, Ernest Granger stated that

"People are different in Serbian Macedonia. Though the people around Skopje and Veles are real Serbs, the Slavs of Prilep, Bitola, Strumica and the lower basin of the Vardar River did not have that feeling of belonging to a specific nation, not until our time" (p. 135). This is also corroborated by the 18th century official reports of

Archbishops Zmajević and Matija Masarek, which are kept in the Vatican archives. Austrian diplomat Hann wrote similarly in mid 19th century and the scientists Diemler and Miklošič emphasized that the language of those areas was markedly Serbian.” Even King Ferdinand I of Bulgaria considered Skopje, Kratovo and Tetovo to be Serbian towns.

The fact that the Macedonians objectively existed only in those areas of Macedonia that had been liberated by the Serbian army was of particular significance for Kostić. Pirin Macedonia was completely Bulgarized, while Aegean Macedonia was Grecianized and additionally colonized by the Greeks who had been evicted from Asia Minor; its ethnic structure was further altered by the mass escape of the Macedonians after the unsuccessful civil war that had been instigated by Tito’s communist patronage. There was no need for the forcible assimilation of the Aegean Macedonians, “because they were Orthodox, which always mattered most, and because many of them simply declared themselves Greeks as they spoke Greek and the environment predominantly used that language. Had the Serbs or Bulgarians taken those areas, the situation would have been different: thousands of Orthodox Macedonians that had been undecided between Greekdom and Slavdom would have embraced Slavdom” (p. 139). Besides, through analyzing all the available statistical data, Kostić showed that there were never more than 119,000 Macedonians in Aegean Macedonia, which comprised about 10 percent of the total number of Macedonians at the beginning of the 20th century. The number of Macedonians rapidly decreased over the following decades.

As regards the situation in the border area, “Greece did what any other state would have done: it formed a cordon of loyal population at its border. Thus, in order to integrate certain districts with a relative Slavic majority that were located far beyond the border one would have to annex the areas with a vast Greek majority situated along the border” (p. 141). Besides, in 1924, after the Greco-Turkish war, approximately a million and a half Greeks moved from Asia Minor to Greece. Based on this, Lazo Kostić concluded that there was no possibility whatsoever of integrating either Pirin Macedonia or Aegean Macedonia with the Yugoslav ‘People’s Republic’ of Macedonia. Thus, there is no possibility of ever accomplishing such a thing. Yugoslav Macedonia is an incomplete torso and it will remain a torso, if it survives at all. Torso is a word from the anorganic world (it is applied to denote status), and in biology the words preterm or abortive are used. Such creatures can survive, but they rarely have a good life and never show strength and vitality. While the possibility of establishing an integrated Macedonia is becoming increasingly unrealistic, the possibility and even inevitability of an international conflict over the ethnic individuality of Macedonia is becoming ever more likely. The Macedonian nation will never renounce its aspirations towards the two neighbouring and ‘consanguineous’ areas. No state politics of the country that is home to the majority of Macedonians will be able to ignore those aspirations. That country will have to arm itself and confront its neighbours, even the good ones such as the Greeks with whom we had no conflicts at all in modern times” (p.

Since the inclusion of external territories and ethnic expansion were impossible options, such a policy was then conducted internally. The propagators of the Titoist politics “hence imposed Macedonism more powerfully and recklessly, both on those who want it and those who oppose it. They strive to remedy their external losses by acting inside Yugoslavia [...] Thus, the number of ‘Macedonians’ is constantly increasing [...] As the term ‘Macedonia’ has so far just been a geographic term, all its inhabitants will accept it without much opposition, even the non-Slavic inhabitants. It is because they do not lie when they say they are Macedonians. By saying so, they do not intend to state their nationality, but the Macedonian authorities accept that statement and interpret it as they see fit. Thus, they managed to include tens of thousands of non-Slavic inhabitants into the ranks of ‘Macedonians’. Along with the real Macedonians who want that nationality, they also count the Serbs and Bulgarians as ‘Macedonians’. The same is true of many minorities, especially the Kutsovlachs and the Muslims” (p. 142).

Many Serbs were forced to change their last names that ended in “ić” into a form suffixed by “ski”, and the participation of the citizens of Serbian nationality in the overall population was artificially decreased in the official statistics. As Kostić noted, “if such a situation lasted, the Macedonian nationality has a chance to consolidate, because terrible means are applied in order to preserve it and make it stronger” (p. 143). The Serbs were mistreated the most in every respect. “They are simply forced to renounce their Serbdom and melt into the Macedonians. They are by no means allowed to declare themselves Serbs. One could say that he is a Vlach, a Gypsy or anything other than a Serb. Even if he has always been a Serb, if his ancestors were Serbs and he himself is a descendant of Serbian priests and Serbian Komitas, he must not declare himself a Serb” (p. 145). Kostić was aware of the fact that the earlier Serbian official policy was to Serbianize the Macedonian Christians, whose national consciousness was not developed, and that “the nationally undetermined Macedonians were” even forced “to declare themselves Serbs”, which means that “persons without nationality were offered the chance to accept the Serbian nationality instead of another, smaller, nationality. And now, the ‘Macedonians’, a nation unknown in ethnography, force the nationally conscious and determined Serbs to renounce their Serbdom and become something new and hitherto unknown. They are forced to stop being members of a great nation and become members of another nation that has no history whatsoever. To stop being members of a culturally developed nation that has produced Njegoš, Tesla, etc., and forcibly become members of a nation that has just started learning its newly-invented alphabet” (p. 146).

Kostić further dealt with the problem of the name of South Serbia and acknowledged certain cases of administrative arbitrariness and bureaucratic misconduct. However, he rightfully and indignantly rejected the communist platitudes regarding the hegemony of Great Serbia. “Strictly speaking, the overall Serbian ‘oppression’ of the

Macedonians could indeed be reduced to the imposition of the Serbian literary language. However, it must be emphasized again that the Macedonians had no other, closer language that had been prohibited and that the Serbian literary language was as close to the Macedonian spoken language as it was close to the dialects of Niš and Vranje. On the other hand, the Macedonians could use their spoken language without any limitations, both privately and in dealing with the authorities, especially in courts. If the clerks were Serbs from the North, they could understand the Macedonians as much as they understood the Serbs from that area” (p. 151).

Kostić did not stop there in his logical refuting of the hysterical anti-Serbian propaganda theories of the communist regime. “It is alleged that Macedonia and Yugoslavia in general were governed by the chauvinist spirit of Great Serbia. Let us accept that for the sake of argument (though it was not quite so). What did that spirit of Great Serbia demand from the Macedonians? It demanded that the Macedonians be proclaimed and considered a part of this Serbian ‘ruling clique’, that they should be fully equal with the other Serbs. If there had been national imposition, there certainly was no national oppression. If a nation is superior or comprises a leading circle in a state or a society, there can hardly be any room for national ‘exploitation’ when entire language groups with an undeveloped national consciousness are accepted into the ruling circles as equal members. All the exploiting and ruling strata of Serbian history were closed and unreachable. The Serbs provided the Macedonians with all the conditions for their complete equalization with the Serbs and their melding with the Serbs as accomplices and co-exploiters in the ‘hegemony of Greater Serbia’” (p. 151).

What sort of national oppression could be in place there if the Serbs “equalized the newly-liberated Macedonians with themselves, made them members of a large nation (relatively large), allowed them to participate in their culture and raised them to a higher cultural level. Serbia found a nationally amorphous mass in Macedonia and invited it to become equal with the victors and join their ranks. Serbia ensured that the Macedonians would be given an appropriate culture. The compulsory Serbianization of the Macedonians was partly a forgery, but on the other hand it provided them with a better chance, a chance for national elevation” (p. 151-152). Some other significant historical facts need to be noted here. “It might be the case that Macedonia is not predominantly Serbian and it seems to be true, but the Serbian people and its army believed that Macedonia was mostly Serbian. Therefore, much earlier than 1912, they demanded enormous sums of money from modest Serbian entrepreneurs in order to preserve and expand Serbian thought in Macedonia; they helped Macedonia by sending the Komitas there and the Serbs were dying everywhere for Macedonia; the Serbian government had always supported the people there, etc. Most importantly, Serbia waged four wars in order to save and preserve Macedonia and had almost a million of victims because of it. Bulgaria would not have attacked Serbia in 1915 and 1941 had it not been for

Macedonia; the tragedy of Surdulica, typhoid and other disasters would not have occurred had it not been for Macedonia” (p. 152).

The following unusually long quotation is provided as it contains a series of Kostić’s emotionally charged arguments in favour of the Serbian national soul that deeply loved Macedonia and took it in its brotherly embrace. “The Serbs could have been deluded that Macedonia was Serbian, that the expansion of Serbia was both ethnically and geographically natural. But they could not have been completely deluded, because they had known a few indisputable facts about Macedonia. Here is the evidence: the Serbs knew, for instance, that they had their metropolitan in Skopje, whom the Turks and the Greeks had accepted with so much difficulty. The Serbs knew that the metropolitan had his priests and parishes that were inhabited by a Serbian flock. They also knew that there was another metropolitan in Debar who also had his priests and flock. They knew that there was a Serbian gymnasium in Skopje that was full of Serbian students and teachers, while there were only two Serbian gymnasiums in Vojvodina. It was not easy to teach and learn in that Serbian gymnasium, because of the Turks, the Greeks and the Bulgarians. However, there were many students and teachers there. There was even a junior gymnasium in Thessaloniki. There were Serbian primary schools across Macedonia [...] The Serbs of Serbia also knew that, in the districts of Skopje and even in Bitola, the Serbs were elected representatives for the parliament of Istanbul at the first free election held in Turkey in 1908. They knew that there were Serbs in many other parts of Macedonia. Some of them came to Serbia to work and some of them fled from the Turkish and Bulgarian persecution; the people from the border area (e.g. Ristovac) would cross the border and find that people the same as themselves lived there, that they spoke the same language and had the same customs. All of the Serbs had heard of the battles of the Komita companies of Dovezenski, Skopljanče, Babunski, Sokolović, etc. It is not necessary to mention that they also knew much of the Serbian history of those areas, of Dušan’s town of Skopje, Marko’s Prilep, etc. It is beyond doubt that they were not completely deluded. There have always been Serbs in Macedonia. There were entire regions whose inhabitants felt themselves to be Serbs even under Turkish rule and they only felt more Serbian under Serbian rule” (p. 152-153).

It is this Serbian love for Macedonia that led to the liberation of the Macedonians from Turkish slavery. The Serbs believed that they were liberating their brothers of the same blood and faith. “Had there not been that conviction in the Serbian people and their willingness to sacrifice their lives, Macedonia would not have become a part of Serbia, nor would the Serbs have fought for it. However, neither would the current regime of Belgrade have had power over Macedonia, nor could it have granted the Macedonians their individuality and a separate federal unit. The anti-Serbian circles who nowadays create new nationalities at the expense of Serbdom owe their power to that Serbian conviction and selflessness and nothing else. By negating the Serbian character of Macedonia in such a radical way that they do not recognize the historical

existence of the Serbs in that federal unit, the authorities of today's Yugoslavia essentially destroyed the very foundation on which their power is structured both in Belgrade and in Skopje. They derive their power over Macedonia from the Serbian victories and from the international legal documents signed by Serbia. There is nothing new in that respect: not a single square metre of territory has been added to Serbian Macedonia, nor has its legal status been changed by a new international document" (p. 153).

Additionally, one cannot ignore the international legal and foreign policy aspects of this issue. "As Serbia fought for Macedonia believing that it was fighting for its own people and land, and that it would 'come home' as King Nikola stated, all the international factors had recognized that premise as a fact whereby they granted Macedonia to Serbia. Had they not been convinced that the Serbs and Macedonians were nationally identical, the great powers would never have allowed Macedonia to be integrated with Serbia. That would especially have been the case if the international bodies had been satisfied that there were no Serbs in Macedonia. It is not even necessary to mention that, in that case, the public opinion of Europe would have reacted harshly and prevented any decision in favour of Serbia. It must not be forgotten that Macedonia had been recognized as a part of Serbia, not Yugoslavia, and that it entered the Yugoslav union as an integral and unalienable part of Serbia" (p. 153).

The Yugoslav communist regime completely ignored the fact that Yugoslavia was the legal successor of the Kingdom of Serbia. If the Kingdom of Serbia had acquired something in an illegal way, it could not have been legally brought into the Yugoslav state. Any such illegal act could certainly have been contested on the basic principles of international public law. "Had the great powers believed that Yugoslavia and its Macedonian component could ever be disputed, they would quite probably have opposed its creation and denied the right of Serbia to integrate Macedonia. It would have been done by Russia in the first place, then by Italy and most ardently by Austria. Russia would never have given Macedonia to a religiously mixed county; they would rather have ceded it to Bulgaria; Italy would not have endorsed the enlargement of its rival, Yugoslavia; and Austria would rightfully have seen its doom in Yugoslavia. Austria even wanted to divert Serbdom from the Adriatic Sea by focusing it towards the Aegean Sea through Macedonia. France also only knew of Serbia, and so on. If it had not been for Serbia, there would not have been the People's Republic of Macedonia, or at least not as large as it is. This must be clear to everybody. Macedonia was granted to Serbia on the ethnic principle [...] If nothing else, it was granted *bona fide* to Serbia, which fought for its compatriots and received them under its roof. All of a sudden, the current regime of Yugoslavia started claiming that they were not Serbs, that Serbia had been cheating and misleading the world and that it had wanted to misappropriate and rule over something that did not belong to it" (p. 153-154).

During the twenty years of Serbian administration in Macedonia

(Yugoslav granted, but not communist), the once underdeveloped and remote province of Turkey saw significant economic progress. It was given railways, roads and industry. Its towns were Europeanized, the social relations became more civilized and the renegades and criminals were done away with. "Notwithstanding the wars, the population of Macedonia continually increased by at least one percent a year. Yet, the Slavic population saw most of the progress. They took many of the estates previously held by the Turks and other *muhajirs* who had left the country when it fell under Christian rule. The Serbs sacrificed their lives for Macedonia and others benefited from that, because the Serbs considered them as their Serbian brothers" (p. 155-156). There were only a handful of literate people in Macedonia after the Balkan Wars, while there were thousands of intellectuals there on the eve of WWII because they had access to all educational institutions. They increasingly found employment with state administration and public services, where they confirmed their diligence, mental capacities and professional aptitude. Large numbers of them moved to other Serbian lands, where they gained considerable fortune through their diligence, effort and savings. They predominantly engaged in commerce, crafts and hospitality. The Serbs "represented no hindrance whatsoever" to the Macedonians, "it is clear to everyone. They were magnanimous, too magnanimous. They presented no obstacle to anyone, be it the Jews, Germans, Hungarians, etc., let alone the Macedonians whom they considered Serbs. Had it not been for the war and post-war disruptions, the economic relations in Belgrade would have increasingly developed in favour of the Macedonians. They could have virtually become the most powerful economic factor in the city. Even during the war, when all the Serbs were evicted from Macedonia and their property was confiscated, no Macedonian in Belgrade and Serbia was harmed in any manner. They were truly and intimately considered Serbs. No Macedonian was dismissed from service if he wanted to work in Serbia, while in South Serbia and elsewhere the Serbs were punished for their sins. And everything that came to happen afterwards helped them to rehabilitate as Serbs. This misfortune will also have some good sides. The Serbs will come to terms with their mistakes, and the Macedonians will learn that they have nobody better and closer than the Serbs. What we did not do ourselves was done by the Bulgarians and communists. Our position is stronger than ever" (p. 155-157).

Based on those developments, Kostić concluded that "we Serbs can no longer negate the ethnic individuality and language of the Macedonians if they insist on them. We must not repeat our mistakes of the past, as they can come to haunt us again" (p. 157). The Macedonians as a whole have the right to identify as they wish. "The Serbs must acknowledge the ethnic individuality of the Macedonians in the form that suits them, but at the same time we must and will let every inhabitant of Macedonia declare himself nationally according to his most intimate feelings. This is the difference between the current and future situation, the difference that should bring us moral and political respect. One must remember that today's Macedonism is not only

freedom, it is also tyranny. We will retain the freedom and eradicate the tyranny. It means that everyone will also be allowed to state that he is not a 'Macedonian' by nationality. That will be real freedom" (p. 157).

In that sense, Kostić presumed that the Slavic population of Macedonia would declare themselves Macedonians, Serbs and Bulgarians, but he did not want to deal with estimates of the number of each nationality. "It was a great mistake that the Bulgarians had not previously been recognized in Macedonia (there was no notion of the Macedonian nation at that time and one could not have presumed that the Serbs would create it, so no mistake was made in that respect). However, if the Bulgarians had been recognized, I believe that no more than a third of the population of Macedonia would have accepted their nationality and it would have dwindled over time. On the other hand, the population that freely declared themselves Serbian would have remained Serbian in the future" (p. 158).

The fundamental principle that Lazo Kostić was in favour of is most clearly expressed in the following words: "We must no longer prevent anybody from declaring himself nationally as he sees fit and as his heart and mind require. Yet, by all means we have to protect those individuals who declare themselves Serbs and feel themselves Serbs. The Macedonians will face the uncompromising position of Serbs in that regard. If the Serbs are only a minority in Macedonia, we will have to be satisfied with their position as a minority. The Macedonians will have to recognize their right to education, to the Serbian language, their right to free national determination, etc. Every negation and ignoring of Serbdom, let alone the oppression of Serbian nationality, could have unfavourable consequences. The Macedonians are a rational nation and they will realize that promptly" (p. 158).

These rights were brutally denied to the Serbs under the Communist regime. "It is because of the victims and injustice that was imposed on us, because of the imputation of crimes that our nation did not commit, and finally because of its natural mission of defending Serbdom wherever it is in danger that the Serbian nation will never accept the currently valid solution. Our nation may recognize the Macedonian nationality and all the consequences of their individuality (separate schools, different language, etc.), but it will never accept the prohibition of the Serbian name and Serbian feelings in Macedonia. No nation could allow that to happen and neither will the Serbs [...] The Serbs will never renounce their share of Macedonia and their right to Macedonia. That must be clear to everybody. In the situation of having three nationalities in Macedonia, it would not be impossible to conduct ethnic assimilation over the course of their long historical development and have one nationality prevail. However, until that time, each side will grow to favour their other compatriots" (p. 158-159).

Such a position would require a special legal and state structure for Macedonia. In the case of the survival of Yugoslavia, there would have to be a Macedonian federal unit. If Yugoslavia dissolved, Macedonia would have a special autonomous status within Serbia, which would entail broad authorities and considerable independence from the central

IT-03-67-T
government. That would guarantee all its cultural and national individualities and ensure their free existence and development. Moreover, it is very important to note that the Serbs and Macedonians have the same Christian Orthodox faith. Since the liberation from Turkish slavery, the territory of Macedonia has been under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Serbian Orthodox Church and, historically speaking, "Macedonia, along with the Monastery of Hilandar, has been the cradle of Serbian Orthodoxy. It was created there and developed there in the imperial town of Skopje, where it crowned its triumph by establishing the patriarchate. The Serbian Orthodox Church had the historical right to re-emerge and reintegrate the Orthodox flock in Macedonia more than anywhere else (much more than in Bosnia, Vojvodina, Dalmatia, etc.). It had the continuity of hierarchy in the eparchies of Skopje and Debar. The situation was indeed accepted without protest. Nobody in Macedonia opposed it, as it entailed no change to the age-old religious doctrine, to the ritual of the population and to the church language" (p. 160).

Immediately after World War II, the communist regime endeavoured to divide the Serbian Orthodox Church and extract their Montenegrin and Macedonian components. Thanks to Patriarch Gavrilo Dožić, this endeavour quickly died out in Montenegro, while the Serbian bishops were evicted from Macedonia and the Macedonian Orthodox Church was created as a separate section of the Central Committee of the Communist League of Macedonia. It has never been recognized in the Christian Orthodox world. Kostić stated that the most treacherous role in this dirty job was played by the President of the Federal Commission for Religious Affairs, Dobrivoje Radosavljević, and Protopope Milan Smiljanić.

g) Legal Order and Political System

Lazo Kostić noted that the issue of adopting a new constitution as the fundamental legal document and basis for all other laws and provisions would be an immense problem if the Yugoslav state had survived. The federal state system complicated the problem by having two sets of constitutional norms – the federal constitution and the constitutions of federal units – which had to be harmonized. Which constitution would have to be passed first? If a true federation system were in place, the Federal Constitution would first have to determine the number of federal units and establish a uniform principle for their formation. Who would organize the election of the constitutional assembly and according to what principles? Kostić believed that it would be most important to avoid further bloodshed after the collapse of communism and, bearing in mind that his book was published in 1959, he opined that a significant role in resolving the situation could be played by the then still living last sovereign of Yugoslavia, King Petar II Karađorđević, adding that the King's father Aleksandar was in favour of separation from the Croats rather than having a federation.

As regards the form of political system, Kostić noted that a

monarchy was traditional among the Serbian people, while the republican tendencies were weak and short-lived. This inclination towards the monarchy was strengthened by the fact that our rulers had always been of Serbian blood and spoke the Serbian language. Since many Serbs at that time were still monarchists, Kostić resorted to the monarchy argument in order to orient them against Yugoslavism and elaborated on his position in the following manner: "Every free election within the borders of today's Yugoslavia would certainly be against the Karađorđević dynasty. Bearing in mind that the Serbs would never accept any other dynasty, every insistence on Yugoslavia would entail establishing a republic and the Serbian traditional form of rule would thus be abandoned. Nonetheless, this would not necessarily cause an irredeemable disaster, but the Serbs could hardly expect to have a Serb at the helm of the state that is home to all the Serbs. One should not be deluded about that. The non-Serbian majority would always impose a non-Serb or even an anti-Serb as the president of the republic. The experience of the second Yugoslavia certainly corroborates this claim. All the elements of the state would unite against the Serbs in order to prevent their candidate from being elected. And that would damage the Serbs alone. The other side of the problem would be that every subsequent presidential election would reignite national tensions and struggle. Those would only be partly visible during parliamentary elections, but more so at the presidential ones. According to our hitherto experience, there would be some Serbs voting for a non-Serb, but never would a non-Serb vote for a Serb. It is due to the hitherto proven fact that only a Serb can be a Yugoslav before being a Serb" (p. 168).

That is why all the Serbian emigration requests for a monarchy combined with Yugoslavism are so tragicomic. If the monarchy was re-established in the independent Serbia, it would contribute to the elevation of the Serbian national spirit; if the republican system were established, the Serbs would "elect the wisest, the most patriotic and best person as their president. We would also know that he would serve Serbdom in the most efficient manner. The issue of the chief of state requires us to reject any idea of Yugoslavia" (p. 170). Kostić was fairly rational regarding this issue and did not allow himself to be blinded by the romanticist and monarchical dreams that were deluding a vast majority of the Serbian political emigrants for decades. "It is beyond doubt that we have also had a number of bad experiences with the monarchy, such as violation of the Constitution, the restriction of human rights and personal regimes and dictatorships. Granted, our rulers were not bloodsuckers like the Croatian *poglavnici*, but they often thought that the country was in danger and that only a full transfer of power into their hands could save it" (p. 170).

Almost all the Serbian political emigrants were in favour of a democratic form of government, while the Croatian ones were predominantly inclined towards an autocratic regime because it better suited their totalitarian ideology. The Serbian people as a whole have a propensity towards democracy and have always firmly resisted all autocratic rulers. On the other hand, the Croats have never had any

democratic achievements and they always showed an inclination towards despotism and tyranny. Kostić was convinced that it was not possible for Yugoslavia to be a democratic country because "the proper functioning of democracy requires the existence of political parties that would act on its entire territory. Without such parties, democracy is deprived of its principal instruments. The democracy of the state as a whole cannot function properly if the common parliament is composed only of political factions of individual federal units or ethnic groups [...] Parliamentary crisis entails state crisis. The state apparatus works well in countries with political parties acting in their entire territory without any particularism and it works even better in countries that have two-party systems. And in Yugoslavia one should expect a myriad of deeply conflicting parties" (p. 175).

Many of those political parties were openly separatist. "They could gather all the members of one nation, or have a vast majority in one federal unit [...] Any suppression of the separatist movements that naturally stem from such tendencies of a nation would be antidemocratic and would mark the beginning of the destruction of the democratic system. Both the victims and the murderers are requested to live in Yugoslavia. What is more, the victims are not allowed to say anything about those murderers and criminals, let alone claim damages and demand reconstruction for their destroyed churches, etc. They may not do that because there would be no peace in the country if they did and eventually there would be no country. But there can be no democracy if the people are ordered to behave in a specific manner and told how to act and what they may or may not express" (p. 176). Democracy leads to the destruction of nationally heterogeneous and culturally and religiously divided countries. "In homogeneous states, the authorities are less afraid of the rights of the people, especially if the rulers are members of that people. It is easier to achieve legal equality in nationally homogenous states, as there already exists an equality of national spirit and national feelings. The equality of rights, i.e. the equality of citizens before the law, is a precondition of democracy. The federation itself, with its different legal systems, somewhat blurs that equality" (p. 177).

Irrespective of all the deficiencies of a democracy, Kostić was exclusively in favour of democratic political systems and preferred to live in a foreign democracy than in the non-democratic regime of his own country. As he said, he could not be irresolute and compromising and fight for democracy as much as he fought for Serbia. If the Yugoslav state would survive and transform into a federation, its state organs and public services would be deprived of the benefit of free competition in the election process, in appointments and the employment of personnel, because it would involve the application of the national quota system, whereby "no vacancy would be filled by the best candidate chosen from the whole country, but at best by the most qualified candidate from the group whose turn has come to fill that vacancy in accordance with the national quota" (p. 179). The Kingdom of Yugoslavia was troubled by the lack of competent administrative

personnel and the lack of preparation for immense territorial enlargement had unleashed corruption. “The public did not react as sharply as it had before, as nobody felt the country to be intimately theirs – neither those engaged in public service, nor those who appointed them – and not even those who would otherwise have been obliged to control it all. There was an increasing distance between the state and the people and corruption was only one of its manifestations” (p. 182).

It was the Serbians who were initially appointed to the key state positions of the Yugoslav state, which did not pose a problem to the Serbs outside the borders of Serbia, who accepted them wholeheartedly, but it met with disapproval from the Croats and Slovenes. “One will say that we could not allow those who are not honestly loyal to the state, or those who are not loyal to it at all or are openly against it, to command large military units and represent us abroad. It is true. But the ultimate solution to this problem would be to abandon such a state and establish our own country, in which we would be the ‘head of the household’, whose every state representative would be loyal to it and consider it his fatherland. Thus, nobody could complain because the majority of the generals are from eastern Serbia or vice versa” (p. 182).

The Serbs were completely neglected in the personnel policy of communist Yugoslavia. Besides, “the head of the state is a Croatian dictator. Moreover, he is an anti-Serb - one of the greatest enemies of Serbdom in all history. He attacks and disparages everything that is sacred to the Serbs, the battle of Kajmakčalan above all. The Serbs even have to applaud that. This man has never written a word in Cyrillic, nor has he allowed any of his speeches to be published in the *Ekavian* dialect. His hatred matches that of Stepinac” (p. 183). The Serbs had no influence on state affairs under the regime of Broz. Even those who were in Tito’s entourage were only servants and outcasts. The Serbs were “always only given the police sector in order to compromise them both inside the country and abroad. And the police do what Broz and his cabinet orders them” (p. 185). The army, economy, finance, media and diplomacy, all of that was continually in Croatian and Slovenian hands.

Kostić believed that even a new, post-communist Yugoslav state would be dysfunctional. For instance, the Croats would ceaselessly appear before the constitutional court, they would obstruct the work of parliament, engage in passive resistance, boycott state institutions, sabotage state interests, blackmail the state and conspire with its enemies. The unitary state structure could somehow handle such crisis situations, but “It is much more difficult to find a palliative to temporarily alleviate such a crisis in a federation. If one of the most significant components of a state with a central geographic position therein decided to obstruct it, the entire state apparatus would be paralysed. It could not function properly, everything would come to a halt and the state would eventually disintegrate. There are only two ways to prevent this: either suspend political rights, which means the imposition of a dictatorship (of which it is rightfully said that one knows where it starts but does not know where it ends), or continue to make concessions to the Croats and meet all their needs by sacrificing Serbian

Federal units have ample means of obstructing the exclusive competences of the federation in their territories. As regards the state capital, “the Croats do not want the capital city of Yugoslavia in their territory, as that would strengthen the ties with the union and they would not be able to continually threaten separation or shift their blame unto others. They also want to use the fact that the capital is situated in Serbia for blackmailing the Serbs” (p. 196). Concerning the issue of the communist retention of Belgrade as the Yugoslav capital, Kostić stated that “one of the reasons was the intention of the new rulers to officially seat themselves among the Serbs and to enslave them from there, as well as to occupy the palaces of the much-hated Karađorđević dynasty and the much-desired villas of the nouveau riche of Dedinje. Finally, they possibly wanted to conduct what they do so thoroughly today: the Croatization of Belgrade. The Cyrillic alphabet is evicted from all the state organs with no exceptions, just to humiliate the Serbs even more. And if the Serbs wrote in Cyrillic on just one document affixed by the seal of Zagreb, all of the European press would go wild! One must not express and promote Serbdom in Belgrade. More than half of the books that are published there are printed in the Latin alphabet and their number is increasing to the detriment of the Cyrillic script. The old inhabitants of Belgrade were evicted from their apartments and every imaginable anti-Serb moved into the Serbian nests” (p. 195).

Lazo Kostić was generally in favour of the removal of numerous central institutions and public services from Belgrade. “Such decentralization would not only decrease the burdens of Belgrade and make life there more bearable and pleasant, but it would enable us to have important regional centres that do not exist in the Serbian areas. In many respects, they would become attractive agglomerations that would subsequently become competitive in their development. There can be no happiness and success in a country where everything is attracted to and absorbed by only one place. Everyone who does not live there feels neglected and left out. The grandeur of Germany and Switzerland lay exactly in the competition between different towns, each of them being the leading centre in at least one field. By establishing a number of regional centres, we would open new and powerful nuclei of Serbian culture that would have positive effects on their immediate and broader environment. Serbdom as a whole would benefit from that. However, that is only possible in our own state. Otherwise we would have to conduct decentralization in favour of non-Serbian towns” (p. 198).

3. The External Political Circumstances and Military Aspects of the Yugoslav or Serbian State

The third book of Kostić’s study, entitled *Serbia or Yugoslavia*, was published in Hamilton in 1962 and deals with the external politics and military aspects in establishing which state form would be more convenient for the Serbian people, bearing in mind that “there are few who dare attack a country whose inhabitants are strongly interwoven and

blended with unanimity, solidarity and homogeneity” (p. 10). The state and people strive to preserve their external freedom, which is reflected in their independence and sovereignty, and Kostić insisted that the Serbs should promptly prepare themselves for all the possible dénouements of the Yugoslav scenario. He was convinced that Yugoslavia would eventually dissolve, though its communist regime was incomparably more powerful than the royal rule it had replaced. To those who believed that communism could be toppled without the destruction of the Yugoslav state Kostić replied that “it is not impossible, but it is less

likely. If it came to be overturned, no one knows where it would stop. Yugoslavia has great enemies, both internal and external, and the overturn would set them in motion. And when our part of the world is destroying something, it does it thoroughly and completely” (p. 13). Those who would like to topple communism alone could not control and streamline the process, nor would they be consulted as infallible authorities on how it should be done. “If it came to an overturn, all the enemies of Yugoslavia would be on the same side of the frontline and every group would proceed destroying it for its own account and with its hidden agenda. Those who wish to preserve Yugoslavia at any price believe that the only solution would be not to touch it at all. May it serve them right!” (p. 13).

It is beyond doubt that “the first Yugoslavia would not have been attacked by any Serb; any agitation to that effect would bear no fruit. The Serbs considered that country as their own. Yet, in 1941, many of them sobered up and the number of individuals who are against Yugoslavia is increasing every day” (p. 13). Nevertheless, after the fall of communism, the Croats would certainly be against the restoration of internal relations to their previous state. Therefore, the Serbs must not put themselves in the position of defending Yugoslavia from the Croats; they should only defend the Serbian nation and lands against the Croatian megalomaniac aspirations and their criminal inclinations. The ones who created communist Yugoslavia in the town of Jajce made sure that all the legal requirements were in place in time for the secession of the Slovenes, Croats, Macedonians and even the Montenegrins, in accordance with the communist principle of the right to national self-determination. However, this same right was denied to the Serbs, as their federal unit had been additionally fragmentized and obstructed by the creation of autonomous provinces that put us in a position of having only a half of the Serbian nation living in such a reduced and maimed Serbia. All other nations were thus provided with the possibility of eventually becoming independent and only the Serbs were kept in fear of what would happen to their trans-border lands in that event.

Kostić explained his much-criticized insistence on the worst scenarios of future events by the assertion that “the future brings many expected events and, along with them, or even without them, come a number of events that no one is able to predict. There are no prophets anymore but there have always been harbingers of bad times. One can even argue that they are necessary” (p. 21). The very fact that the Serbs lived with a nation who hated them more than any other nation in the

world and that our joint state could not promote internal freedom and democracy were both dangers that demanded constant caution. As regards the international circumstances, Kostić believed that neither of the two possible outcomes of the then pervasive crisis would necessarily be detrimental to the Serbs, i.e. regardless of whether the Russians or anti-communist powers prevailed. Yet, he was deluded that the alliances of WWII were a significant factor in determining the Balkan policy of the western powers. He believed that only the neighbouring countries could have pretensions towards Serbian territories. However, Kostić was aware of the fact that “we cannot know what the precise constellation of powers would be at the critical moment. In 1914, Russia entered the war because of Serbia, and it – the national Russia – disappeared in 1917. We cannot know what may change until the time of the ‘division of the empire’. There are many unknowns, on both our side and that of the enemy. One cannot know who will be there at the crucial moment, whose side they will be on, who will have critical influence and how it will be used” (p. 22).

a) Relations with the Neighbouring Nations

As regards the Serbian neighbours, Kostić noted that there were permanent and temporary friendships, as well as hostilities. He considered the Greeks and Romanians as friends, with whom we did not have any problems and who would not disturb us. Regarding the Italians, he believed that they would not aspire towards the Serbian coastal area. “Although they annexed Boka Kotorska during the last war (fortunately for us, as we would not have had the Serbian coastal area if it had been given to the Croats), they subsequently ceded all of Dalmatia as far as Split to the Serbs pursuant to the Treaty of London” (p. 23). The Italians would directly benefit from a Serbian presence at the Adriatic, “because their territorial pretensions towards the Adriatic territory held by the Croats can never be ignored. Thus, they would see us as their allies. Besides, Italy would certainly be more comfortable with two unavoidably rival states on the east coast of the Adriatic than with only one. It is a geopolitical axiom” (p. 23).

According to Kostić, we have long-standing unsettled issues with the Hungarians, Bulgarians, Albanians and Croats. Hungary would want to get hold of Banat, Bačka and Baranja by invoking its historical rights, which is a rather weak argument because the Serbs comprise more than an absolute majority in those areas. In that sense, the Hungarians are in a rather unenviable position, “as they do not only have pretensions towards our territories, but they aspire even more towards the Romanian and Slovenian areas and, to some extent, towards the Austrian and Russian territories (Burgenland and Carpathian Ruthenia). Only if they reclaimed all of those lands would they be able to speak about restoring the Crown of St Stephen. Their pretensions partly include the Croats (Baranja, Međimurje and Rijeka) and the Slovenes (Prekmurje). Hungary is especially eager to gain access to the sea and that could only be done through Croatia” (p. 24).

The Bulgarians have continual aspirations towards Macedonia, but the majority of the population of Macedonia declare themselves Macedonians. In the event of the dissolution of Yugoslavia, Macedonia may stay with Serbia, become independent or integrate with Bulgaria. "It would be nonsense to create an independent Macedonia because such a state would be the focal point of all sorts of disorder; it would have aspirations towards many territories and vice versa – Bulgaria, Serbia, Albania and Greece would have pretensions towards its areas. If Macedonia were independent, the Serbs would rightfully demand its northern part and would have a strong chance of gaining it. Its west would be claimed by the Albanians, its north possibly by the Greeks and the Bulgarians would want all of it. The neighbours would constantly fight over it, they would always send their guerrillas, *komitas* and Chetniks, sabotage would be everywhere and there would be no prospect of peace. Moreover, the Macedonian nation does not have what all other nations have: substantially long and indisputably individual cultural development. It does not have its own historical and spiritual values to rely on in times of trouble. Independent Macedonia would never have a sufficient army to defend itself in case of war. It would be the smallest of all the neighbouring countries (and size is a crucial criterion of survival); it would be a perpetual bone of contention among them; much like it was until 1912, it would be the keg of powder that anyone could set on fire at any given moment. One does not need much convincing that Macedonia could not be economically prosperous. Granted, it has a diverse culture and its inhabitants are extremely diligent (there is hardly a more sedulous nation in Europe), but that is not sufficient to ensure the steady and certain economic development of such a small country. The Macedonians would have to think more than twice before they agreed to or requested their independence" (p. 26-27).

During WWII, the Bulgarian occupiers ruled over the Macedonians with such cruelty that they killed off all pro-Bulgarian sentiment among them. Conversely, the Serbs recognized their individuality, while the integration processes between the Serbs and Bulgarians had been going on for decades and in all fields. Their economies were particularly complementary. Although all the pro-Serbian elements in Macedonia had long been deprived of power, "nowadays, there are no Macedonian tendencies towards Bulgaria, at least as far as we can see from here. There are no fugitives going to Bulgaria, otherwise we would hear of them. The number of Montenegrins (the conformists) who ran over to Albania (not to mention the other countries) is much larger than that of Macedonians who fled to Bulgaria" (p. 27). Neither would the western powers or the national minorities who live in the territory of Macedonia accept its integration with Bulgaria.

Kostić drew the following conclusion from his pragmatic analysis of the interests, wishes and inclinations of the Macedonians: "The way

things are today, the Macedonians would doubtlessly prefer to stay in Yugoslavia as one of its components, having equal rights with the others, i.e. to be on equal footing with the Serbs, not under the Serbs. They do not want to distance themselves from the Serbs, but they do not

want to be subordinated to them either. From their point of view, it is a natural demand. If other circumstances did not dictate that the Serbs should renounce Yugoslavia, and if all other components wanted to accept such a country, this Macedonian position would be crucial for our determination to support survival of Yugoslavia. However, it should be stated openly that, if we lived in a free country, be it Yugoslavia or Serbia, we would never tolerate the discrimination against the Serbs in Macedonia that is being conducted nowadays. On the other hand, we could recognize the autonomy of Macedonia within Serbia itself, which would mean more than its current status of a 'republic' and we could also recognize its linguistic and cultural individualities if the Macedonians insisted on them. Their highest demands would thereby be met to a great extent" (p. 28).

According to Kostić, the situation was most difficult in Old Serbia, as the position of the Serbs in that area was worse under the Yugoslav communist regime than it had been under Turkish occupation. At the time that Kostić wrote this study, the attractive power of Enver Hoxha's Albania over the Shqiptars of Kosovo and Metohija was minimal, which was confirmed by many West European reporters and publicists. However, he was sceptical about future developments and stated the following: "I would not like to delude the readers with any optimistic statements that I myself am not convinced of. The situation is difficult and perhaps only a surgical procedure could resolve it (by surgical procedure I mean abandoning certain territory and the transfer of the population)" (p. 29).

As far as the boundary delimitation with Croatia was concerned, it must be noted that Kostić relied excessively on the presumption that the politics of the western powers would be influenced by the data on the atrocious war crimes committed by the Croats and that the Americans would uphold the position of Roosevelt, who opined that the Serbs should establish their own state and that the Croats should be put under international trusteeship. He urged the Serbian intellectuals of the emigration to streamline their political and propaganda efforts towards informing western public opinion on those issues. Lazo Kostić was well aware of the fact that, "even if all the Serbs engaged in this cause, it would not at all be impossible that the political positions of the Croats turn out to be better than the Serbian ones at the crucial moment. It is beyond doubt that they will find strong intellectual supporters, the Catholic Church above all, and all the governments that are in favour of them. They will find what the Serbs cannot find until Orthodox Russia is re-established and strengthened" (p. 31).

Kostić naïvely counted on the morality of the American and British governments and their gratitude for the Serbian war efforts, and he found it impossible that the two western powers would firmly support the Croatian side. On the other hand, he indicate the fatal danger of Serbian Yugoslavism, "the danger that comes right after the Croatian one, as we will sooner or later be in a situation to nationally declare ourselves as Serbs and the bacillus of Yugoslavism that we were inoculated with will come to haunt us. The Croats will be nationally

conscious and they will know what they want, and we may or may not know what we want as we are constantly floating on air between Serbdom and Yugoslavism” (p. 33).

Had the fatal mistake of establishing the Yugoslav state after WWI not been made and, as Kostić lamented, “had independent Serbia remained, it would certainly have been given Bosnia with Herzegovina, Vojvodina and a significant part of the Adriatic coast. It would certainly have joined its allies in 1941. It is possible that it would have been so pro-ally that Hitler would not have made it any pact offers. Croatia would doubtlessly have sided with Hitler. It is very likely that he would have granted it all the areas he had indeed given it in 1941. However, they could not have committed all those crimes. First of all, the Serbs would have been ready and they would have had clearly defined frontlines. Moreover, the international community would have been very interested in the problem. Finally, our government in exile and international public opinion would have been protective of Serbia, as it would have been attacked by an abettor of the Axis Powers. Speaking from the moral point of view, Serbia would have been in a much more favourable position. One could not say that it was a ‘civil and fratricidal war’, an internal matter of the citizens of Yugoslavia. Even the supreme occupying forces, the Germans and Italians themselves, would not have allowed it to happen. It is beyond doubt that we would have had fewer victims. And after the war, we would have additionally improved our territorial positions regarding the Croats. They would certainly have resorted to killing the Serbs who had remained in Croatia and our statesmen, who would have been Serbs instead of Yugoslavs, would have brought the issue before the international community and had the Serbs delivered from Croatian rule. The Croats would then have been obliged to pay war damages to the Serbs. In this way, they got a lot of territory at the expense of the Serbian victims and took power over all of Yugoslavia (they got Rijeka, the Kvarner Islands, Istria, Zadar, Lastovo, Baranja, etc.). The Serbs would have lost no territories, let alone Macedonia. The above would almost certainly have been the case” (p. 33-34).

The territorial pretensions of certain Balkan states towards Serbian areas represent a constant international political reality that should always be counted on, regardless of the official positions of their

governments. “For the sake of clarity, these political realities include the national intolerance and animosity that one nation has expressed towards the other for centuries. Such enmity cannot be cured and no cultural or political education will be able to eradicate it” (p. 38). However, an independent Serbian state would have a far better political standing than Yugoslavia; the Austrians, who are incontestably a part of the German nation, want to gain access to the Adriatic Sea and they could only do it through Slovenian and Croatian territories. There is no reason why the Serbs should be against it. We have no interest in being involved in territorial issues between a foreign country and the Germans and Italians.

Of particular curiosity is the manner in which Lazo Kostić, forty years ago, analyzed the potential conduct of the great powers with regard to the Serbian national interests. He thought, or perhaps only wished, that they would be in favour of Serbia at the moment of the dissolution of Yugoslavia. “France is a traditional friend of Serbia and no country in Eastern Europe could usurp this initial inclination of France. National Russia (and one could hardly imagine a national Serbia without the national Russia, which had actually disappeared because of Serbia) does not have a more reliable friend than us. Experimenting with Bulgaria will always produce the same results. Germany despises its former allies that stabbed it in the back while it was lying on the ground mortally wounded. Towards the end of the war, it realized that only the Serbs were overt but honourable enemies and it is ever more remorseful about what it had done to us and considers us the only knightly warriors of the Balkans. Besides, we would not have any further territorial disputes and tensions with Germany. The same is true of Italy. We have no unsettled accounts with Italy, nor would any be likely to emerge if Serbia were an independent country” (p. 41).

As regards the Anglo-Saxon powers, Kostić was convinced that “the United States of America, whose president once stated that the Croats should be put under a trusteeship, would certainly not prefer a disloyal nation that always fought against progress and freedom to a nation which, largely owing to the insistence of the Americans themselves, entered the war in 1941 and eventually lost everything it had. That leaves us only John Bull, Great Britain, which is traditionally disinclined towards the Serbs. Only God knows why that is so. Perhaps it was influenced by its experts, such as Watson, Speed, etc. Great Britain always acted as an instigator; it led us into evil and left us in the lurch at critical moments. Yet, its enmity is not a ‘constant’, nor is its hatred towards us conditioned by any purported fondness for an enemy of ours. No, it is not the case (nor could one generally speak of the fondness of the English for anybody but themselves). That is why we should not take the English dislike of us so seriously or consider it an unalterable quality. Perhaps England will one day learn that only the Serbs have always been on its side in this part of the world. There is no love there, but its interests will dictate that it rely on a dependable ally who has thus far proven its loyalty and strength” (p. 41).

However, historical events assumed a different course. At the time of the fall of communism in Europe, while the national Russia was still on its knees and suffering heavy blows, all the western powers took a markedly anti-Serbian position. Truth be told, there was one dominant factor among them, one that led the way and about which Kostić had no doubts at all. He knew that it was “an unquestionable and powerful enemy, a perfidious foe with no military units or sovereign territory, but with unusually strong weapons of other calibre. It was the Catholic Church, embodied in the Vatican. It has never been a friend of ours and it is obvious that it endeavoured to destroy us during the last war.

Nevertheless, this enemy is not invincible either. Over the centuries, it did the Serbdom only one hundredth of the harm it had intended and attempted. That is because our forefathers were ready for this enemy. It will always work against us until we come under the 'wings of the only saving [Church]' and that will never happen. Notably, it will work against us with equal force from the inside if Yugoslavia survives, and from the outside if we establish our independent Serbia. We will fend off its actions from the outside much easier than from the inside. Internally, we would have to suffer and accept many things under the pretext of religious tolerance. Consequently, we would again be divided and disunited almost undetectably. The Catholic Church knows no limits in their methods of undermining their enemies, i.e. the members of other religions and particularly other Christian ones" (p. 41-42).

Most importantly, an independent Serbia would not be weaker than any neighbouring country. With regard to potential alliances in the Balkans, Kostić noted that "the initiatives for making such leagues should be left to others; Serbia need not seek allies, but it will be sought after" (p. 44). The Croats, on the other hand, would back all the enemies of the Serbs and openly support their aspirations that jeopardize Serbian national interests. The Albanians were their best friends whenever they endangered the Serbian nation and it was the Croats who assisted the Bulgarian extremists in the assassination of King Aleksandar Karađorđević. The Serbs should learn a lesson from their historical experience and form strong alliances with the enemies of Croatia. Also, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia supported all the enemies of Serbdom and national separatist movements between the two world wars. Therefore, by the time of the fall of communism, the Serbian political leaders should have a clear concept of cooperation with all our natural allies who are objectively more powerful than the supporters of Croatia.

Moreover, Kostić dismissed the arguments of the proponents of the Yugoslav option that such a state was desired by the great powers. He argued that the vast majority of the countries of the world were indifferent to the fate of Yugoslavia, while its neighbouring countries wanted our country to be as weak as possible, which was a natural and logical position. The western powers were guided solely by their own interests and there is always rivalry among the interests of great countries and those individual interests are not necessarily long-lasting. Only the Russian interest in the stability of the Serbian state has had a permanent character. "Thus, for example, until 1917, Imperial Russia paid great attention to Serbia and Montenegro as Orthodox states. In his *World Revolution*, Masaryk himself stated that, as far as the east of Europe was concerned, the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs was only concerned with the Orthodox and nobody else. He and the other important factors of the Russian policy of WWI averted the Serbian statesmen from making alliances with the Catholics. They explained that their experience with the Poles dictated them to do so" (p. 59).

As regards the western insistence on Yugoslavia, it had a markedly anti-Serbian undertone. That is why the western countries supported the

communist Yugoslavia under Tito's dictatorial regime, "i.e. because of their hatred towards the East, towards Russia, towards Orthodoxy, etc.. They are right to assume this and we would be suicidal if we did not rely on the East and use it to our best advantage" (p. 62). It is the critical shelter for the Serbs and the only defence from the ominous and dark plans of the West.

One should not have any illusions regarding the opinion the western powers have about the Serbs. "We have seen what Great Britain wishes for us and how it treated us. After all that betrayal, it bombarded the Serbian cities worse than the Germans did during the last war, while it completely spared the Croatian cities. Why did it do that? The answer is simple: Churchill had already agreed with Stalin to divide Yugoslavia, i.e. split it into spheres of interest with equal shares. It is alleged that Stalin immediately acquiesced to the proposal. And what would that fifty-fifty arrangement have been like? It is not hard to imagine that Great Britain would have had the western part of the country under its influence and Russia the eastern part. That is why Great Britain did not protest against the killing of Serbs in the NDH (Translator's note: Independent State of Croatia) and reacted to the Serbian acts of retaliation, as it wanted to spare its presumptive sphere of interest; that is why it imposed Šubašić as Prime Minister; that is why it favoured every anti-Serbian movement inside the country and abroad. It will continue to do so, because 'the principles of British foreign politics do not change, no matter which government rules the country', as reflected in a foreign policy maxim" (p. 62).

Accordingly, the British betrayed Draža Mihailović and showed willingness to support Ante Pavelić if he were to join Maček's followers and assume an anti-German course at a suitable moment. "The British will always see us as their potential enemies, as ones who prefer the Russians and who will permanently opt for the East instead of the West. These are the constants, the perpetual principles designating the course of British politics. That must be clear to everybody. Unfortunately, Great Britain still has a lot of influence over the USA, sometimes even a decisive influence. (That was the case during the last war, when Serbia was bombed by American airplanes and the supreme command over the Allied Air Forces in our part of the world was exercised by the English. They were the ones who committed all the killings of the Serbs since the beginning of 1944 and, indirectly, even the earlier ones). It was the 'Allies' who created communist Yugoslavia; it is their beloved child, their creation. If it does not suit them now, it means that we are supposed to destroy it and suit it to their objectives. And what are these objectives of theirs? They all boil down to the struggle against Russia and the East, against every Russia, not just the communist one. They need Yugoslavia because they are rightfully afraid that the Serbs will tie their interests to Orthodox and national Russia and they need it to counterbalance the Serbs with the Croats and other Catholics. That is why the 'Allies' support Yugoslavia, a Yugoslavia in which the Serbs must play a supporting role, in which the government conducts an anti-Serbian policy and is headed by anti-Serbs" (p. 63).

Lazo Kostić used that opportunity to reemphasize the significance of the Russian factor. “I need not preach to the Serbs what it would mean if we lost Russia or distanced ourselves from her, if we made Serbia embrace our enemies (as we did in the time of King Milan). We know it from history and we feel it instinctively. There is no more natural and more steadfast support than Russia – the Slavic, Orthodox and Cyrillic Russia. She helped us selflessly through many centuries and under different circumstances” (p. 63). Kostić further referred to a concrete historical example, quoting a passage from the book by the former royal emissary Jovan M. Jovanović entitled *The Creation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes*, in which he described the manner in which the negotiations between the allied powers were conducted in 1915 with regard to the east Adriatic coast: “The British government agreed to give Dalmatia to Italy, along with the area from Zadar to Split and the rest of the coast, if it entered the war [...] Russia is opposed to that, as such an arrangement would fail to provide for Serbia. Sir Edward Grey altered the proposal to grant Italy the coast from Zadar to Split, including the islands, and give Serbia the part from Split onwards. Russia disagreed again because Serbia would again be damaged [...] When he (Grey) realized that St Petersburg was becoming

increasingly aggravated, he agreed to grant Serbia all the areas proposed by the Russian government, even including Split, under the condition that the islands around Split be granted to Italy and have a neutral status if necessary ... The Russians are still dissatisfied. Sazonov goes on to propose that ‘Serbia should be granted the islands from Krk to Ulcinj, whereas the Croats should be given the areas north of Krk to Valoska along with the islands’” (p. 63-64).

At that time, Russia took more care of the Serbian interests than Serbia itself. The Serbian politicians had just been infected with the Yugoslav disease and they even appointed Franjo Supilo as their royal ambassador to St Petersburg. “By keeping the Serbs within Yugoslavia and imposing anti-Serbian politics on the state, Great Britain ensured that the Serbs would not side with their traditional friend, Russia. As much as it is in favour of Yugoslavia, Great Britain is in favour of oppressing the Serbs within that state. That is beyond any doubt. Thus, all the recent events suddenly get a logical explanation, no matter how absurd they seem. The Serbs should then know what they may expect from Yugoslavia” (p. 64).

Insisting on having the Serbs sacrificed for Yugoslavia, the purported western allies generally did not promise them anything substantial and betrayed them when they did make such promises. They even lied to us with regard to 28 March *coup d'état*. They kept persuading Draža Mihailović to attack the Germans, but they failed to intervene when the Germans resorted to savage retaliation by murdering Serbian civilians. When the communists captured Mihailović and sentenced him to death, the British officials claimed that his fate was not their concern. They cold-bloodedly surrendered the Chetnik combatants to the partisans for liquidation. “The British behave egoistically towards the whole world, but they treat the Serbs with animosity. The one who

relies on them is terribly wrong to say the least” (p. 66-67). Therefore, Kostić concluded that the western powers could not be trusted and humoured. They want to have submissive governments in every part of the world, but they respect and value the insubordinate ones. Kostić predicted the dissolution of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia at the time of the collapse of communism with striking clarity, noting that he was not convinced “that some country other than Russia could be established on the ruins of communism in the east of Europe, nor would the countless Russians across the world fight for some other country. They would not sacrifice their name, their alphabet, their literature, their faith, their history and the individuality they are rightfully so proud of for any other country” (p. 73).

Throughout the world, the western powers insisted on fragmenting nations and states, while they demanded that the Serbs unite with their age-old enemies. In their opinion, there was no alternative to Tito, although they vehemently opposed communism in all the other cases

and even waged bloody wars against it. Every attempt to artificially build an emigrant alternative to the system was doomed to failure, which was yet another reason why the Serbs should abandon the Yugoslav option once and for all. It was impossible for Yugoslavia to be a democratic country in which the Serbs as a nation would not be oppressed. “During the war, the British requested that the Yugoslav government dismiss General Mihailović, purportedly because he fought for Great Serbia” (p. 77). They preferred communism to a Serbian state and that is why it was impossible to turn them against Broz. All the other western powers acted in the same manner. “They imposed the current authorities by arming them and providing economic assistance. They see them as their undisputable and true friends. They treat them like their own kind. Even if that were not the case, the western powers would not allow a change of authorities for the following two reasons: they are afraid that the takeover of power might bring communists loyal to Moscow; and they would not want to see the destruction of a country they designated as one of the most significant ramparts in their struggle against Moscow” (p. 78).

The western powers were exclusively in favour of the communist Yugoslavia because it was their precious lever in the struggle against world communism and the Russian factor as a whole, regardless of the ideology. “It should be clear to everybody that no national Yugoslavia could be stronger than a communist Yugoslavia. No free Yugoslavia could be more powerful than a tyrannical Yugoslavia” (p. 78). In a free and democratic system, all the national processes of divergence and ideological friction would emerge. Yugoslav communism was governed by single-mindedness imposed by Broz to suit western interests. If the Titoist regime collapsed, major bloodshed would have been possible, but that never bothered the British in any manner. “First of all, it should be noted that not only would massacres be committed on the grounds of nationality, but much more of that would occur on the grounds of who is in favour of communism and who is against it. Since these circumstances are much more recent, our people would first retaliate

against the communist leaders, as was the case in Hungary. Nothing in the west, not a single newspaper or an influential politician condemned those killings, hangings and torture of the communist agents in Hungary. I personally find it disagreeable” (p. 79-80). As regards the national conflicts, Kostić was aware of the fact that they were a latent threat and noted that he “would never approve of us forgiving the Croats for the crimes they committed against us, but I would even less approve of us committing such crimes” (p. 80).

In terms of the international relations of the Serbs, we should only be guided by realistic interests. As long as the Serbs insisted on Yugoslavia, many elements would not be such significant factors as internal homogeneity, stability of the legal and state structure, clearly defined national interest, political stability and the proper functioning of the state institutions, etc. The voice of Serbia would be heard everywhere and its interests properly advocated, which is quite opposite from what is obtained through Yugoslavia. “In 1914, we stirred up all of Europe and managed to get it involved in our cause. Nowadays, there are few who know that the Serbian nation exists, let alone how much it suffers. Our nation does not know what it wants and needs. It is wrapped in a deceitful cloak of Yugoslavism, unable to shed it and show itself to the world” (p. 96).

c) The Military Issue

Regarding the potential wars that could befall us, Kostić stated that it was more likely that they would occur if we were within Yugoslavia and that our chances of military success were greater if we had an independent Serbia. Our borders would be smaller and more natural and we would not have land borders with the great powers such as Germany and Italy. Besides, “the military spirit, which is a reflection of the national spirit, is a category much more powerful, more constant and more efficient than any physical implement” (p. 101). It would be rather difficult to enter any war with the hostile Croats, the generally indifferent Slovenes and, to say the least, the disinterested national minorities on our side. It is best proven by the experiences of WWII. “If so many nations betrayed them, the Serbs would not be able to fight. Who would they fight first? If they turned against the traitors and deserters, it would clear the path for the external enemy. If they wanted to continue fighting against the external enemy, the local outcast would prevent that by discouraging, disorganizing and even killing the Serbs where they were not a majority. Was that not clearly proven in the recent history?” (p. 101). A country’s strength in times of war depends on how much it is loved by its citizens.

The creation of the Yugoslav Army after WWI recoiled adversely on

the Serbs in many ways. Not only were they left without any significant protection, but the enemies of the Serbs gained valuable military knowledge and training in that army. “All the commanders of the criminal state of Croatia were former Yugoslav officers or non-commissioned officers. That monstrous state would not have been able to establish its army without the officer cadre inherited from Yugoslavia” (p. 104). Nationally complex states usually have an officer cadre proportional to their national breakdown. The Croats played a

decisive role in communist Yugoslavia. “Granted, there were many Serbian generals, all of them partisan commanders from the war and all of them in subordinate positions. They were subordinated to the Croats both directly (through the chain of chief commanders) and indirectly to Josip Broz. They keep them as long as they are loyal to them and neglect the Serbian cause” (p. 107).

The participation of officers in political life always has extremely bad consequences. In the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, generals were even appointed prime ministers; they were members of the court clique, they resorted to nepotism and were involved in corruption affairs, etc. “Otherwise, there would hardly have been 27 March that pushed the country into a terrible disaster, brought down on it the rage of an utterly mad maniac and caused a million Serbian victims and the rise of communism. Granted, the country was ruled by a usurper, an anti-national and incompetent prince who was up to the task. He violated the constitution and took all the power into his own hands, thus breaching the late King’s last will and testament; he despised the people (especially the Serbs). Everybody was disgusted by it, so that 27 March was met with enthusiasm and accompanied by the incidents that exasperated the maniacs in Berlin” (p. 109).

Kostić’s following observation is also rather curious and concerns generals who dealt with politics: “During the last war, the power in Serbia was taken by two prominent military commanders: the power of the underground was assumed by Colonel Draža Mihailović as the leader of the rebels, while the visible power under the terror of the occupying forces was taken by Army General Milan Nedić. Both of them were remarkable Serbian patriots, unwavering fighters willing to sacrifice their lives (which indeed happened in the end). There were many others along with them, all of them good men, excellent and loyal Serbs who paid for their patriotism with their lives. Those two commanders in Serbia are emphasized here because they were said to have intended to establish a military regime after the war. It is difficult to discern how true these claims were, but one cannot dismiss them *a priori* either. There are many indicators that corroborate such presumptions” (p. 109-110). Kostić further quoted a reliable emigrant source corroborating the above claim.

Although Kostić’s analysis was corroborated by persuasive arguments, he often had to deal with the odium of the emotionally charged Serbian emigrants. As regards Milan Nedić, he did not have any political adherents, while Kostić noted that Draža Mihailović “won ideologically, based on the outcome of the war. His thought won as

much as his patriotism. He has followers across the world – true and loyal adherents that are as faithful to him now as they were while he was alive. They will not deviate from a single word of his programme, which was not always uniform and clear in its details. One should be clear that

his conduct during the war was not ambiguous, as was the case with his position towards the occupier. But he was not resolute about what should be done after the war; he would accept the opinion of one circle, only to subsequently replace it with other opinions” (p. 110).

Kostić noted that the royal army of Yugoslavia was gradually building the spirit of officership and a military class; its privileges grew over time and public judgement was increasingly excluded from its internal affairs. The basic elements of such a military spirit were subsequently taken over by the communist regime. “The public was not supposed to know anything about the disloyalty of certain officers, about corruption and regular crimes that no social class is immune to. The public was to be under the impression that the entire pool of officers were faultless and unable to commit any crimes” (p. 111).

With regard to 27 March *coup d'état*, Kostić emphasized that the situation within the army was rather bad and the country was in chaos. “Thanks to Yugoslavia, we had neither a democratic system nor was the government working for the people. We did not have a parliament that represented the people, nor was the executive power responsible to them. Thanks to Yugoslavia, half of the people were against the state and the other half were politically numb, disoriented, uninformed and apathetic. A few individuals who knew what they wanted succeeded in their endeavour, but they killed the Serbian state and harmed the Serbian people immensely” (p. 116).

Serbian ordeals of the war continued in peacetime, though with somewhat decreased intensity. The Croats would have benefited from the war either way, “if the Axis powers had won, there would have remained an independent Croatia spreading as far as the Drina and Zemun and a small Serbia east of it. Nevertheless, as the allies of Croatia failed in the last war, it was given an even larger territory and was granted power over the entire Serbian nation. Instead of paying war damages, Croatia was receiving it. All the war reparation funds were given to it (mostly for the shipyard of Rijeka). This is an unprecedented case in the entire history of the world, a case that no sane mind is able to comprehend. Yet it is true and it happened because of Yugoslavia” (p. 126). Croatian politicians were continually working against Yugoslavia and got the most from Yugoslavia in return. The Communist International wanted the destruction of the Yugoslav state and directed the Yugoslav communists towards cooperation with Maček’s supporters and with the Ustashas who built the communist Yugoslavia after the war to suit the needs of the Croats.

d) The Anti-Serbian Politics of the Vatican

Lazo Kostić especially emphasized the issue of the Vatican anti-Serbian politics. “Ever since Yugoslavia (i.e. the Kingdom of the Serbs,

Croats and Slovenes) was established, the relations with the Catholic Church have never been sincere. They were occasionally fair and officially peaceful, but in essence, the Catholic Church administration always snarled at the state we lived in. Why? Because it was largely a Catholic state, but it did not want to be absolutely a Catholic state. The areas that belonged to the former Austro-Hungary were part of the most Catholic state of the time and the Catholic Church does not easily give up its positions anywhere [...] And what happened afterwards? The undermining and destruction of the state itself – perfidious and covert, but no less resolute - were carried out continually and systematically. The Catholic Church is quite powerful and has a ramified structure. It does not use only legitimate diplomacy to achieve its goals, but other secret and unknown channels, both legitimate and illegitimate means. The saying that ‘the end justifies the means’ was created in its lap. It is brazen enough to do anything to achieve its objectives, which are sometimes fiendish, blasphemous and disgusting. We have experienced it personally. The victims that the Serbs suffered in the last war were for the most part caused by the Catholic clergy and the Catholic Church” (p. 147).

One should have no illusions in respect of the Catholic anti-Serbian politics. “The Vatican changes its tactics, adjusting it to the relations and circumstances of the time. However, its basic course of action against heretics and schismatics remains unchanged. Though these actions are kept secret, they occasionally come to light” (p. 147). In 1227, the Catholic Synod of Narbonne concluded that the life and property of heretics belonged to the one who first seized them, while their much-praised saint Thomas Aquinas proclaimed the right to kill heretics. One should not be surprised in the least that these supreme Catholic principles were strictly applied in the Croatian Ustasha state. The Vatican has a powerful structure that spreads across the whole world and represents one of the key factors in the global political power and influence. When the Serbs protested against the Concordat of 1937, the then Pope Pius XI openly threatened as follows: “The day will come [...] when many a soul will regret that they did not wholeheartedly and fervently accept this goodness offered by the Vicar of Christ to their country” (p. 149). Although the Vatican policy towards independent Serbia would have been identical, “the Catholics would have represented a minority that would have to struggle for ‘equality’; there would be no army of bishops and other monsignors, parish priests and other ‘votaries’ undermining the state, who not only send material against the state to the Vatican, but generally instigate the Vatican against their own state” (p. 150). After all the events of WWII, Kostić believed that it would be unnatural and unethical to establish diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

e) The Masonry Factor

As regards the elements with a decisive influence on the stability and survival of the state, Kostić especially indicated the existence of

certain invisible forces that “stand in the background, in the shadow, in the dark, exercising their pernicious influence on state bodies and leading state individuals - and sometimes on many other intermediaries as well. This influence is quite distinctive in both its intensity and form. It is especially characterized by the means used to achieve a goal: promises, threats to individuals and the nation as a whole, as well as to the state, bribing the press and influential office holders, sabotage, etc. ... Fortunately these ‘forces’ have different and conflicting interests and goals and use different methods; they are intolerant of and even spy on each other, thus desecrating one another. They scheme, conspire and defame one another in the eyes of both the authorities and the public. Each of them wants a monopoly over the secret influence, to take over the power over the country as solidly and as widely as possible - to be the single mysterious and invisible power of the country. Yes, everything about them is clothed in mystery. Secrecy is their main codeword and they try to destroy anyone who unveils it. The persons representing these forces are not known, nor are their headquarters from which they direct their actions, nor the channels through which they carry out their dark intentions, nor the bodies serving them (e.g. newspapers), nor the persons they have already won over and who work under their influence. Financial matters are in their hands; banks are for the most part under their control or in their once again invisible ownership [...] They buy or even establish newspapers if there is freedom of press. These large-scale secret movements are skilful at infiltrating their elements among the newspaper editors” (p. 153-154).

This refers to various international organizations, two of which – the Vatican and the communist – Kostić has already analysed in detail. He next turned to masonry, saying that its “influence is indeed fatal and it has brought a lot of evil to our country” (p. 155). According to the data provided by Mirko Kosić, the masons’ influence was quite distinct as early as 1925, while this organization became all-powerful in 1929. Dr Nikola Stjepanović, a tenured professor at the Faculty of Law in Belgrade and later a communist lawyer (whom I subsequently found to be a plagiarist, i.e. he stole and appropriated whole sections of Kostić’s book entitled *Administrative Law*) tried to impute that Kostić was a mason. Kostić himself responded to this as follows: “I have always only fooled around with the masons, among whom were many of my very good friends, but I would rather become a Catholic, God forgive me, than a mason: that is how disgusted I am with all these secret and obscure actions” (p. 156).

As regards European masonry, Kostić noted that it was “fatal for many states. In Serbia, masonry even had a national character and its Grand Master was Đoka Weifert. Its intrigues were of a personal or, in the worst case, of a party nature (favouring one party, scheming against another, etc.). However, in a nationally and religiously heterogeneous state, it is highly likely that the masonry or any other international organization will use and abuse the religious and ethnic conflicts for their own purposes” (p. 156). The masons’ activities are obscure, characterized by blackmail and often fatal for the people and the state. If

a state is homogenous, “these forces do not have so many conflicting goals or so many corners to hide behind. They are more easily recognized and desecrated. As soon as their actions are revealed, they become disoriented and powerless. They cannot find their way as they are created for darkness. It is a plant that grows only in the dark and dies out on the first rays of sun. These forces then suspend their activities until they regain strength, until they are forgotten, again waiting for the darkness and mist in order to start their new activity under a different name and in a different form. And none of that is for the benefit of the state or inspired by its benefit” (p. 157).

Moreover, the diplomatic service of a nationally homogenous state is better organized, more professional and more successful, primarily because there is no need to apply the national quota principle in the selection of diplomats and instead the selection is based exclusively on their expertise, ability and patriotism. The diplomacy of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was mostly outside democratic control and it succumbed to nepotism, favouritism, speculations of the court camarilla, etc., thus contributing to the deterioration of the state. In the communist regime, the role of the diplomats was taken over by primitive and bloodthirsty partisans who knew nothing of the diplomatic protocol. “They primarily or almost exclusively represent their own party and leadership - or, as they say, their managers. They care little about the state and do not care at all about the people they belong to. Perhaps they even work against the people instead of protecting and defending it. Should anyone criticize ‘comrade Tito’, they immediately protest; if anyone criticizes the Communist Party, they immediately leave the meetings; if there is anything in the press against the regime, they deny it. However, if, for example, the Serbs are libelled in the press and among the members of the quasi-nation, they do nothing to stop it as if it pleases them, as if they wanted it - especially if the former regimes of Serbia and Yugoslavia are criticized” (p. 160).

These diplomats were imposed on us after a series of superb diplomats such as Jovan Dučić, Branislav Nušić, Mihailo Gavrilović, Stojan Novaković and many others. The Serbian name was forbidden in the communist diplomacy. The international reputation of Yugoslavia was indeed overrated, just because of its geopolitical position and not because the country had anything to be proud of. “It stands on the border

between the West and the East and it gravitates towards both sides. That is why many want to win it over and care seriously about whether it will join one or the other side. That is why all the sides show constant interest in Yugoslavia. However, that still does not mean that this state is sincerely respected, especially in the moral sense” (p. 164). Kostić’s following observation on the international reputation of Yugoslavia is particularly interesting: “It is the greatest beggar that has ever existed among the states” (p. 170).

4. The Serbian Traitor Desimir Tošić and the Stanstead Declaration

In 1965 in Hamilton, Lazo Kostić published a collection of newspaper articles and essays entitled *What the Third Yugoslavia Would Look Like*, with the subtitle *The Plans of the Self-Proclaimed Statesmen*, printed in the private edition of Milutin Bajčetić and Lazar Stojić. All the texts were previously published in the *Canadian Serb Defender* as the author's reaction to the so-called Stanstead Points – *Draft Proposal of the Democratic Alternative* of March 1963, in which a group of self-proclaimed political representatives of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes presented a purely formal framework and principles on which the future Yugoslav state should be based. The purported advocates of democracy prepared this project in utmost secrecy from all other Serbian patriotic emigrant organizations. Such a 'democratic alternative' had a clearly anti-Serbian disposition, "but it is important as a symptom. It reveals the forces that, under the cover of Serbdom, wish to harm and deteriorate it further. It discloses the dark lairs that have been lying peacefully for years doing their business as the Serbs have been quarrelling among themselves" (p. 8). The Serbian traitors persistently concealed their participation and the content of the text, but the Ustasha press descried them when it published everything in several newspapers.

From the aspect of its style and the terms used, the text is full of Croatisms, it is printed in the Latin alphabet and it contains general concessions made only by the Serbs. It is not a coincidence that serious frictions appeared in the Serbian Orthodox Church among the emigration exactly at the time of the launch of the 'democratic alternative' project, frictions that were caused by the cunning intrigues and plots of the communists. The Serbian traitors who wholeheartedly participated in this anti-Serbian action were Desimir Tošić and Božidar Vlajić, along with the editors of the London *Our Word* and the *Liberation* cooperative." Kostić also emphasized the fact that this conspiratorial meeting was held in the vicinity of London. "That the Serbs cannot expect anything good to come from England is, I believe, clear to every Serb. Nothing good has ever come from there, nor will it come now" (p. 14). The funding was also surrounded by quite suspicious circumstances and the curious role of shipbuilder Vane Ivanović. Even if all of his doubts about the background of this project and the allusions to the dirty role of the British authorities are unfounded, Kostić still pointed out that it was quite normal that when a man "finds himself in an [unknown] territory, he is unconsciously influenced by the atmosphere and everything that rules in that territory. The very issuance of visas to men involved in politics implies a certain interest of the host state in certain things and events" (p. 15).

Kostić underlined the fact that the majority of the participants at this meeting did not even have Yugoslav citizenship and that those of Serbian nationality, though they had no legitimacy or authority, demonstrated their readiness to betray their own people and their interests, out of no necessity of their own or any real need save for their desire to serve foreign interests. Being zealous Yugoslavs, they still left the possibility that some of the Yugoslav peoples, such as the Serbs, Croats, Slovenes or Macedonians, who did not want Yugoslavia, could

vote on that, which, as Kostić ironically observed, meant that a separate voter registration list should be established for each nation. "Theoretically," as Lazo Kostić emphasized, "it is all nice; practically, however, it is impossible. Will everyone, in Croatia for instance, be allowed to declare themselves as a Serb? What are the guarantees that there will be no consequences arising from such a decision? Is anyone in Macedonia allowed to say that he is a Serb? Is anyone allowed to say that he is a Bulgarian? We are quite certain that both of these two nations live in Macedonia (their numbers might not be large, but they live there). And what about the Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina? They will have to declare themselves in terms of nation. And what if someone does not want to declare as either a Croat or a Serb? He must be denied the right to vote. This applies even more to the minorities. Do they have the right to vote in this decision process or not?" (p. 24).

The text continued with a series of other practical issues that made such a voting process ultimately irrational. Kostić thus concluded that the Stanstead Declaration was equal in its practical effect to the declaration of the communist Yugoslav constitutions, according to which any member of the state union could leave it at any time. However, any campaign in that direction, any attempt at such an action, would be punished most severely. The less binding these phrases were, the more easily they were inserted into legal decrees" (p. 25).

The role of the alleged Serbian representatives in the preparation of this Declaration was to illegitimately accept capitulation on behalf of the Serbs, as they completely ignored the state of facts and the consequences of the recent genocide committed against the Serbian people. "Whenever the issue of distinguishing between the Serbs and the Croats was addressed, the Serbian writers would request that the dead Serbs, those killed by the Croats, be recognized certain rights, that they be added to the Serbian votes. Many renowned Serbian writers in the emigration advocated and pleaded for such a position, which is indeed fully justified. Otherwise, the ignoring of this fact could have been interpreted as the Serbs' acquiescence to these murders and even more than that: in a way it could have sanctioned the Croatian goal to exterminate the Serbs as they wanted to cleanse 'the Croatian areas from the Vlachs.' It seems that the 'Serbs' of the [Democratic] Alternative are lending them a helping hand in that: they do not even look back on the Serbian victims. Those who capitulate cannot dictate any terms" (p. 25).

The self-proclaimed agreement makers believed that Yugoslavia was necessary for all the Yugoslav peoples, as well as that it was impossible to separate the Serbs and the Croats with both sides being satisfied with the outcome. Kostić insisted that Yugoslavia "proved itself not as an integrating but as a disintegrating factor of the Serbian people. Suffice it to say that two new 'nationalities' were created in it at the expense of the Serbs (the Macedonian and the Montenegrin), that the Croats killed hundreds of thousands of Serbs, that the authorities threaten the Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina if they want to declare themselves Serbs and that the Serbian name can hardly be mentioned because of it. Yugoslavia leads to the imminent disintegration and destruction of Serbdom" (p. 26-

On the other hand, the Slovenes and the Croats have only benefited from Yugoslavia. The Slovenes would “have undoubtedly been extracted from the Austro-Hungarian community to which they belonged for more than one millennium. However, their territory, especially the area towards Italy, would have been significantly smaller had it not been for the Serbian army, Serbian diplomacy, Serbian victims and Serbian victories in that war. That is why the Slovenes have largely attached themselves to the Serbs. During the war, their leader PhD Sušterčič publicly preached that Serbia must not be established and that the Serbs did deserve to have their own state [...] When the political circumstances changed, they firmly moored their boat to the victorious Serbian ship ... The main thing that needs to be established, or at least assumed, is that the borders of Slovenia would have shrunk without the prestige of Serbia; or at least they would not have been wider. Slovenia would neither be able to sustain itself on its own, nor would it have the same territory. It had to rely on someone and its reliance on Serbia within Yugoslavia was its salvation” (p. 27).

There is another factor that was extremely important for the Slovenes. “It should be noted that the cohesion among certain parts of Slovenia was not that strong in the least (if it existed at all) as was the case later in Yugoslavia. Historically, and not only historically, there was a clear distinction between the *Kranjci* (Translator’s note: inhabitants of Carniola), *Korušci* (Translator’s note: inhabitants of Carinthia), *Primorci* (Translator’s note: inhabitants of the coastal area) and *Štajerci* (Translator’s note: inhabitants of Styria). They were different and divided at least as much as the Slovenes and Croats were, or the Croats and Dalmatians. The Slovenes were first united into an administrative whole in Yugoslavia (and not only in a state and legal sense), which created the conditions for their national integration. Yugoslavia did not create the Slovenes but it secured their national survival” (p. 27).

The Croatian national consciousness developed some time earlier, but it was Yugoslavia that created the conditions for a large number of Catholic Serbs to meld into the Croatian national corps. “Had it not been for Serbia and its glory in WWI, the Croats would have been extracted from their hitherto legal and state structure (in accordance with President Wilson’s Fourteen Points that they so persistently invoke), but their borders would have been reduced so much that it would have covered less than a half of the territory to which they could aspire more or less rightfully. First of all, pursuant to the Treaty of London, they would have lost two thirds of Dalmatia, the Serbs would have been granted all of Srem, not to mention Bosnia-Herzegovina. Croatia would have been a headless torso without any possibility of independent life. It would have been a mockery of a state, which would either have to seek certain connections or would have provoked its neighbours to engulf it. The Croats and Croatia were saved by Yugoslavia in 1918; it was even more so in 1945, when Croatia was doomed to disappear as the most disgraceful state in the world, as proposed by US President Roosevelt

himself [...] Nevertheless, it happened that Croatia remained within Yugoslavia as its federal unit, as a ‘republic’ that would soon be granted all of Istria as far as the Italian border; it was given Baranja and the western part of Srem at the expense of Serbia. Thanks to the Serbian combatants (as almost all of the Croats had supported their Independent State of Croatia!), it was even given the ethnically Italian areas of Istria. It became larger than it had ever been. What is more, the members of their ethnic group ruled over all of Yugoslavia and made decisions on behalf of Serbdom” (p. 27-28).

The Slovenes and Croats largely benefited from Yugoslavia in the spheres of economy and culture, while the Serbs were victims of systematic exploitation. The proponents of the Declaration defined their version of Yugoslavia as the union of five completely equal and sovereign states that voluntarily deferred a part of their sovereignty to the federal state. Thereby, Serbia was even supposed to cede the west of Bačka to the Croats. Their aim of having the Serbian position weakened as much as possible was thus expressed most overtly. Desimir Tošić and his Alternativists fully accepted and furthered Tito’s concept of resolving the national issue and “his fundamental principle regarding territorial delineation: every member of the state union must include virtually all of its ethnic population and only Serbia should be disintegrated” (p. 31). The traitors to Serbdom would have ceded Subotica and the surrounding areas to the Croats, regardless of the fact that they never lived in those lands.

From the aspect of legal theory, the drafters of the Stanstead Declaration were lost in irreconcilable inconsistencies, as they concurrently spoke of four sovereign nations and five sovereign states. With regard to the sovereignty of nations, Kostić noted that it was “a term used in political demagoguery that has long been abandoned in legal science. It is states that can be sovereign, not nations” (p. 39). The insistence on the sovereignty of states reflected their inclination towards a confederation. The Federal Parliament consisted of the House of Peoples and National Minorities and the House of States, which could not function successfully in practice; at the same time, the citizens were neglected as a political subject. Although it was initially postulated in a different form, the *statehood* nations were gradually and officially identified with the federal units whose names they bore or in which they comprised an absolute or relative majority of the population. The sovereignty of the people, in the sense of *populus* or *demos*, was transformed into the sovereignty of nations in order to avoid the issue of democracy and civil rights. Such preposterous logic was fully adopted by the Stanstead drafters, who led the way even in the project of transforming the Yugoslav Federation into a confederation. The sovereignty of the federal units was corroborated by the basic principle, according to which “the federal ministries conduct only those affairs that are expressly conferred on them under the Constitution or federal law. All other affairs are conducted by the governments of the individual states” (p. 40). As regards the provision “stipulating that the competences of the union may be expanded by federal laws”, Kostić

emphasized that “over time, such laws could narrow the competences of the union and leave it with very little authority. Besides, the very wording of this ‘fundament’ undermines the principle of sovereignty and the primary competences of the member states” (p. 40). Such confusion in the legal theory and terminology was not at all incidental, as Josip Broz would show his real intentions ten years later by completely dismantling the federal state.

The Serbian positions with regard to Croatia were first weakened by territorial reduction and then by legal machinations. Ten years before Tito and Kardelj, the drafters of the Stanstead Declaration projected the federal parliament, to which every federal unit would delegate an equal number of representatives, regardless of the size of their population. Granted, they did not manage to designate a new capital city for the restructured Yugoslav state, which was one of the intentions of Desimir Tošić’s clique, along with the provision stipulating that no more than two federal ministers may be of the same nationality at any given time. This national quota principle was to be applied in the process of designating all the other federal office holders, diplomatic representatives and public servants. If the federal state indeed had five federal units, it would imply that the number of Serbs in the federal state apparatus could not exceed twenty percent of the total number. Small nations would always strive to oppress and abuse the largest one. As Kostić noted, “these principles are virtually impossible to implement without violating some other, perhaps even more significant principles (such as competence, skills, adherence to the state ideals, etc.). A parliamentary state (which was probably what the Third Yugoslavia was supposed to be) would have to rely on political parties to appoint its administrators and civil servants. What would happen to a ‘state’ whose ruling political party has no supporters or an insufficient number of supporters? It would have to admit members of the national minorities into its service and entrust them with establishing the state apparatus. This principle essentially disables the work of political parties and the parliamentary system as a whole” (p. 43).

The drafters of the Stanstead Declaration were the first to resort to the principle of rotating the chief of state in the capacity of the president of the federal parliament who would be elected for the period of one year, which would mean that the Serbian representative would be in power once every five years. Such a formal rotation was subsequently introduced by the communist autocrats in order to “establish an order, a rule by which the Serbs would be even more excluded from the leading positions in the state. This fully suited the national and political system of the current Yugoslav regime, which was emulated and even surpassed by the constitution makers from Stanstead” (p. 56). They went as far as to envisage separate armies for each federal unit, which Tito subsequently implemented through the system of territorial defence, thereby creating the preconditions for the separatist wars that ensued. They even envisaged the Federal Court comprised of three members from each federal unit. Kostić commented on these overtly anti-Serbian projects in the following way: “It is easy to establish such principles; the

IT-03-67-T
more incompetent the drafters and the less developed their sense of responsibility, the easier it is to impose them. It is like children playing at making a state” (p. 57).

Besides the Stanstead Alternativists, the adherents of Ljotić were also in favour of restructuring Yugoslavia on the basis of equality between the nations and religions. As Kostić stated, “the Yugoslav Serbs go even further and demand the equality of federal units along with their increased number. They do not think that what the Croats and Slovenes got is enough and they demand an equal position for the Bosnians, Macedonians and Montenegrins. They want the remaining Serbs, i.e. the Serbs who bear the historical name of their forefathers, to comprise not a third but a sixth of the state. If one tries to sober up these ‘statesmen’, they personally attack you because they have no other arguments. And the rest of the world is enjoying the show” (p. 60).

Bearing in mind that they were not at all concerned with cultural equality or the equality of the Cyrillic and Latin alphabets, with freedom of expression and use of state symbols, etc., the “Alternativists of Stanstead essentially limited themselves to structural and organizational issues - to the issues of state structure. They demanded equality in the areas where it is unnatural and unjust” (p. 63). Kostić warned that the issue of religion was too serious a matter to be ignored, because “it may even happen that certain religious organizations could be recognized as institutions under public law while others were excluded. The reason for that may not lie in the intention to legalize equality, but in the requests of some religious communities. Granting a public legal character to a religious organization would bind it to a state that may or may not favour it, thus limiting its freedoms. It would be against the principles of freedom to subordinate a religious community to the state authorities without its consent” (p. 65).

Kostić especially insisted on the significance of the differences between the equality of individuals and the equality of organizations. Individual equality, as equality before the law, is one of the most important values of the modern world. “The equality of organizations is nonsense; it is an unnatural and unsustainable concept. But it has many theoretical substitutes and the Serbian negotiating parties could easily have proposed one of them without fearing that it may seem reactionary. Such as the principle of proportionality. This is more natural and adequate for organizations” (p. 68). That is why it would be necessary to separate the Serbs from the Croats in accordance with the principle of equal percentage with the other nation as the national minority within the federal unit with a Serbian majority and vice versa. “Justice requires such proportionality of minorities in both states. And not only is it dictated by justice, but also by practical reasons of the survival of a nation. Only if there were as many Croats in Serbia as there were Serbs in Croatia would there be a guarantee (though not an unconditional guarantee as there is no certainty when dealing with criminals) that the Serbian minority would not be exterminated there. In such a situation, the Serbs could resort to retribution. If, however, there was no Croatian minority in Serbia, as envisaged at the meeting in Stanstead and as was

the case in occupied Serbia in 1941, the events of that year could easily be repeated. The matter of our survival demands that we bear that in mind” (p. 68).

The important reason behind Kostić position has not lost anything of its significance. “It would mean a potential transfer of the population. Perhaps the Serbs would not want to stay in Croatia and vice versa. We all agree that there must not be any forcible transfer of a population from their place of origin. However, the members of one nation may want to move to live among their majority, either immediately or afterwards. In

that case we should again have virtually equal numbers of inhabitants moving from one country to the other in order to have an eventual exchange of population. However, such an exchange would not have to occur; there might be no need for such an exodus and secession. A proportional number of minorities in both countries could create a natural balance that would lead to stability and retention. It would enable acknowledgement and respect for the existing minorities. Such is the case with e.g. the Serbs and Romanians in Banat. On either side of the border, there are almost equal numbers of the respective neighbouring minority. Perhaps this was one of the reasons (among many others) why there have been no serious problems with regard to the issue of minorities in that area. And neither minority has requested to be resettled (neither the Serbs in Romania, nor the Romanians in Serbia, i.e. Vojvodina). In that case, no country could expel national minorities of a nations in whose countries it has members of its own nation. Conversely, no country would settle for having its ethnic members mistreated abroad while keeping the national minorities [of the respective countries]” (p. 68-69).

Analyzing a number of texts from the Croatian emigration press, Lazo Kostić gathered unequivocal proof that the Croats were the principal initiators of the meeting at Stanstead and that they were supported by the Bosnian officials. After stating the obvious - “that the initiative for the meeting at Stanstead came from the Croatian side, that the idea was theirs and that they undertook the measures to implement it” - Kostić recalled that “It is a known and generally accepted principle that initiative comes from the side that benefits from it” (p. 73). As Vlatko Maček and Miha Krek previously approved the Stanstead Project, “the Croats and Slovenes were in agreement and they formed a united front before the meeting was held. The Serbs would hardly have been able to gain anything more from the meeting, even if they had been represented more competently. The meeting was certainly guided by the principle of the ‘equality’ of the representatives of each national group, and the Croats and Slovenes comprised a majority. They would have had an even more convincing majority if the meeting had been attended by Muslim and Macedonian representatives. The meeting reflected what the role of the Serbs would be in their project of establishing the state. The Serbs had the role of acquiescing to a project that had been devised in advance, from cover to cover” (p. 73).

The Serbs were always expected to make concessions and they always acted accordingly. It was not possible to openly discuss national

IT-03-67-T
and state issues in our fatherland under the communist dictatorship, and the emigration was swarming with traitors to Serbia. Aware of the tragic fate of the Serbs and our uncertain political future, Lazo Kostić summarized his analysis in the following words: “Bearing in mind that the Croats engage the entire public opinion of the world in backing up

their theories, that they twist the facts to unbelievable proportions and that they have the entire Catholic Church apparatus behind them, the Serbs have nothing left but to show the world who the Croats really are and what the Serbs can expect from them. This is done by a small number of Serbs, fewer than can be counted on the fingers of one hand. And those who do this are labelled lunatics by the traitors[...] According to them, ‘the real Serbs’ should do as they do, they should praise the Croats and treat them like brothers, make concessions to them and strengthen them morally, territorially and even legally! These traitors say it is not just Yugoslav patriotism, but also Serbian patriotism. They say that it is only wise to do so and those who act otherwise are lunatics! This is where the foreign agents have brought us” (p. 76).

5. The Enemies and Adherents of the Yugoslav Option

Volume four of Kostić’s political study entitled *Serbia or Yugoslavia* was printed in Hamilton as recently as 1969, under the title of *The Enemies and Proponents of Yugoslavia*. The author dealt here with the issue of subjective determination, which he believed could only be partially analyzed because it was impossible to include all the relevant facts and due to the volatile nature of individual disposition; what is more, “theory must not be influenced by the masses, nor should it be affected by subjective elements” (p. 11). Nonetheless, the decision on the fate of Yugoslavia would be made in a concrete political situation and in accordance with political arguments that *inter alia* depended on the disposition of people; thus, the matter of individual feelings and preference could be fairly important. Kostić particularly emphasized the following: “The disposition of the people is a mutable category and is influenced by minor or major, gradual or abrupt changes. Practically speaking, it is not important what the people think at any given moment, but what they think in the pivotal, crucial moment when the fate of the country is being decided and when the people become ‘the second judge’. Such a moment may cause people who constantly stuck to one opinion to change it all of a sudden. Perhaps it would not be a radical change, but it may be sufficiently different. Their opinion is influenced by the overall situation and world trends. For instance, communism would never have taken roots in Yugoslavia if the Soviet Russia had not taken part in the previous war and if it had not been a communist state. Opinions are influenced by the current situation [...] A competent orator can incite the masses; a good book can change their attitude and lead them in an opposite direction. There are many unpredictable factors that influence the disposition of the masses” (p. 12).

a) The Conduct of the Croatian Emigration

Kostić concurrently emphasized that “there are, however, some constant and unwavering factors among the masses, more of an emotional and traditional nature, which determine their position when deciding on the fate of the community and people. If these factors are ignored at the decisive moment, they will re-emerge later - and the more they are ignored, the more vehement they will be. They will tend to recklessly destroy anything that was created against their will” (p. 12). Kostić corroborated his theory using the Croatian example. “Whenever the current situation made them come closer to the Serbs, and whenever the Croats had to recognize some political, state or legal reality in relation to the Serbs, they would soon regret it and would resort to any means to ‘vacate’ it. The most striking (though not the only) example is the creation of Yugoslavia. They acquiesced to this under pressure from external political circumstances, but they immediately started sabotaging the state and destroying the creation that they had never wanted or accepted intimately” (p. 12).

That is why Lazo Kostić advised that the Croats “would never embrace” the Yugoslav state “with their hearts. This means that they will again work against it, they will undermine it from the inside and destroy it from the outside, and they will always endeavour to annihilate it. This is beyond doubt. Whoever is familiar with the Croatian mentality, whoever studied their history and aspirations, will have to admit it” (p. 13). Those Serbs who were in favour of the Yugoslav state had no valid arguments on their side and resorted to mere platitudes, which took on the shape of political demagoguery. If one of the three nations would not honestly accept Yugoslavia in any possible form, it would be senseless to impose such a state on anybody. That is why the Serbs should stick to their own proverb: that one can never make a new friend from an old enemy.

Kostić demonstrated the unanimous Croatian commitment to an independent Croatian state through a number of quotations from the emigrant press. Besides, their requests were regularly maximalist and megalomaniac, and the Ustasha press was extremely free in reproducing the public opinion of the entire Croatian nation. Corroborating this position, Kostić quoted the following statement by Croatian Professor Ivan Oršanić in 1957: “Yugoslavia must be liquidated regardless of the form it may take, because it has no historical substratum for its existence: neither a political, nor cultural, nor religious or ethical substratum. Yugoslavia either exists as a dictatorship or it cannot exist at all” (p. 18). Similar statements were made on several occasions by Dr Juraj Krnjević, the former Royal Minister and Secretary General of the Croatian Peasant Party, as well as by the most prominent emigrants such as Bogdan Radica, Ivan Pernar, etc. Radica said the following about his compatriots in Yugoslavia: “Every Croat who lives there is of the opinion that the Croatian people is a sovereign nation and, as such, has the right to its sovereign state. It is without doubt the position of every member of our people, especially the younger ones who fled from the

IT-03-67-T
county. The Croats want their own state” (p. 21). The acclaimed sculptor Jozo Klijaković stated that the Serbian and Croatian souls were as distinct “as if one was from Mars and the other from Jupiter” (p. 29).

On 30 September 1958, the emigrant newspaper *Hrvatska* wrote that “the Croatian people have three lethal enemies: the first is royal Belgrade; the second is red Belgrade; the third is any other Belgrade. It is Belgrade, and only Belgrade!” (p. 29). It was further emphasized that the Croats “are in favour of alliance with all those who want to join us in our attacks against Belgrade” (p. 29). In his extensive analysis of the Croatian positions on their future state, Kostić also unravelled the Serbian illusions that the Dalmatians were truly in favour of Yugoslavia. “It is hard to imagine that the people would think something like that. It was the case until 1918, perhaps even until 1928. But now it is completely different. The principal propagators of independent Croatia and the main enemies of the Serbs among the Croatian émigrés are the Dalmatians (beside Dr Krnjević and a few other Croats of the Sava basin)” (p. 42). The most prominent of them all was always Ivan Meštrović, who was subsequently replaced by his son Mate. Radica, Vlaho Raić, Ante Ciliga and others were not very far behind.

b) The Positions of the Prominent Serbian Émigrants

Unlike the Croats, who always acted in unison, the Serbian emigration was perpetually divided and rather disoriented. The wisest Serbs were largely against Yugoslavia and in favour of independent Serbia, as they had been sobered up by the experiences of WWII. Jovan Dučić led the way, and his book will be analyzed in detail in the section on Serbian Emigration owing to the fact that Lazo Kostić was not in the possession of its first part and only dealt with the second and the third volumes (it should be noted that the first edition of the book was printed in three separate volumes).

In 1951, Dr Marko Kosić, the greatest Serbian sociologist and pre-war university professor, published his treatise on Serbo-Croatian relations in the edition of the *American Serb Defender*. Kostić extensively quoted the following conclusion that was presented therein: “In the atrocious massacre (not a civil war, as some British advocates of the Croats would like to present it), almost a million defenceless Serbs (including women, children and the elderly) fell victim to the Croats (not only the ‘Ustashas’) who were voluntary allies of the Germans, which once and for all buried the delusion of any national unity between the Serbs and Croats. One would expect that the Serbian politicians would abandon the idea of establishing a permanent state union with the Croats once this fictitious ground of ‘national unity’ was removed. But no, they found out so little about the Croatian atrocities, so little that the monstrous death of a million of their compatriots did not concern them much and they still ramble on that those who do not want to breathe the same air as the Croats only do favours for ‘our common enemies’, meaning the Italians and Hungarians. But do the Serbs have any more terrible enemies than the Croats? In four centuries, the Turks did not kill

nearly as many unarmed Serbs as the Croats murdered in about four years. Are there still people among us who are so gullible that they would speak about ‘the common danger from the Italians and Germans’, as if the Croats had not fought on the German side in both world wars [...] Additionally, the state union of the Serbs and Croats is not sustainable because there is no state or legal genius on Earth that could structure the national (not provincial) federalism of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in a manner that would prevent the Croats from pursuing their inherent inclination towards sabotaging and hindering the proper functioning of state union. It is not possible to have any meaningful economic and social relations in a state union where one nation believes itself to be subordinated, exploited and even oppressed, unless the interests of the other ‘units’ are constantly sacrificed to suit its demands” (p. 51).

The prominent Serbian writer Branko Mašić expressed similar views in the *Canadian Serb Defender* in 1958: “Thus, over the course of two and a half decades, the Croats did to the Serbs what the Turks, Hungarians, Venetians, Austro-Hungarians, Germans, Bulgarians and Albanians had not managed to do for centuries. Yet, even more dangerous is the fact that the Croats do not even think about stopping at what they did to the Serbs. It is now, more than ever before, that the Croats intend to do away with the Serbs with all their might and all their available means. And now, it is with this ‘faithful’ horde of a ‘nation’ that we are supposed to create the third Yugoslavia, one that will certainly be fatal for all the Serbs? This is what is being devised in the miserable minds and the poorly hidden agenda of the notorious Yugoslavs of Serbian origin!” (p. 53).

In that same year, Mašić wrote his article entitled *Ploughing the Old Serbian Furrow* published in the *American Serb Defender*, in which, *inter alia*, he stated as follows: “Today, in our pathlessness and doom, we have no words to express the price we paid for one of our last, most terrible and fatal Serbian delusions. That is why pure, positive and constructive Serbdom should once and for all abandon the obscure, negative and destructive Yugoslavism. Forty years after the horrid lesson and all that bitter experience, it all seems like entering a bright and peaceful meadow after a dreadful and exhausting climb and not staying there to rest and build a house, but moving further into the dangerous thicket of a dark and marshy jungle and not wanting to come back from that nightmarish disaster. Was it not our educated generation that willingly and enthusiastically pushed the nation along with themselves into this delusion with unavoidably disastrous consequences? It will certainly not be easy to get out of this misadventure [...] Was this the reason why the Serbian people, which had cultivated and guided itself so brilliantly under Turkish rule, entrusted its leadership to the educated Serbian gentry that eventually led all of Serbdom to the abyss of disaster? They ignored the principal national interests: the survival, development and progress of the Serbs. Throughout the existence of Yugoslavia, they have simply enjoyed their power, negligence and easy living. They condemned all those who did not accept Yugoslavism the

Even Adam Pribičević, once a major promoter of Yugoslavia and the president of the Independent Democratic Party, completely changed his viewpoint at the end of his life. In his last text, published posthumously in 1958 in the *Voice of the Canadian Serbs*, Pribičević stated the following regarding the Croatian rejection of the Yugoslav state, even in its federal form: “then there is nothing left but separation, even at the price of having to resettle the Serbian and Croatian population” (p. 58). The former President of the Yugoslav government in exile, Dr Božidar Purić, wrote as follows in 1959: “We are fighting for Serbdom alone because we know that any liberation requires sacrifices and human lives. We are aware that the Serbian people would die for the freedom of Serbia, but we do not know of any Serb who gave his life for Yugoslavia, unless in confusion” (p. 60). Prior to this, Purić stated in 1957 that he was in favour of fighting for the Serbian state and “(NB. In his speech at the Congress of the Saint Sava Serbian Cultural Club, V. Š.) he described to his audience the establishment of Yugoslavia as an unfortunate event, an accident in the history of the Serbian people” (p. 61). Similarly, Milan Stojadonović, PhD, Jovan Đonović, *Vladika* Nikolaj Velimirović and others were openly in favour of a separate Serbian state.

In numerous emigration newspapers, many other less prominent or unknown Serbian intellectuals and officers also voiced their opinions against Yugoslavia and in favour of re-establishing the independent Serbian state. This issue caused schisms and splits in many emigrant organizations. Kostić noted that Mihailo Dučić, Milutin Bajčetić, Dr Slobodan Drašković and the Chetnik Dukes Momčilo Đujić and Dobrosav Jevđević, as well as the organizations they headed, all advocated the independence of the Serbian state. Only one of numerous citations provided by Kostić will be quoted here. It is the passage from the *American Serb Defender* of October 1951, in which the following was emphasized regarding the relations between the Serbs and Croats: “Any agreement is out of question (although there are some fools among the Serbs who are willing to ignore the more than a million Serbs who were murdered by the Croats), because the Croats clearly state that there will be no agreement with the Serbs and they have proven to everybody that they only want to destroy Serbdom. Finally, one can make an agreement with a sane enemy, but it cannot be done with a wild animal, let alone a rabid one. Such an animal is destroyed. The Croats are insane maniacs who need to be restrained in the interest of humankind; if it cannot be done physically, one should at least do it politically, as suggested by the late Mr Roosevelt. It would be easier to do insofar as there are not many of those degenerate descendants of the Illyrian Croats who degrade the neighbouring cultured nations by misrepresenting them as themselves” (p. 59).

The pro-Great Serbia option had a convincing majority in the overseas countries against the pro-Yugoslav one, while it was the other way round in Europe. Duke Jevđević commented on that situation in as

follows: "Besides our organization, there is no other large-scale organization in Europe that defends Serbian politics, whereas there are more than twenty different organizations whose treacherous Serbs lead anti-Serbian politics purportedly on behalf of the Serbs. These groups forgo all of their ideological differences when they need to unite into an anti-Serbian front, so the Yugoslav sector acts jointly against us – the clerical fascist and the remnants of Ljotić's followers along with the philo-Marxist members of the National Front gathered around the *Our Word* magazine and the falsifiers of the Chetnik struggle within the Yugoslav Army Veteran Association, as well as with other groups that discredit the honourable name of Ravna Gora. Several factions of the Radical Party, Ljotić's adherents of all colours, the Socialist Party, the *Liberation* cooperative, the Yugoslav Board, the Democratic Party, some strange semi-military associations in Germany, some humanitarian and literary Serbo-Yugoslav associations, all of those groups have nobody behind them, but the ones who pay them do not know it, nor do those who listen to them abroad" (p. 76).

As regards the proponents of Yugoslavia, Kostić stated that "their arguments are always miserable, which is usually the case with those who are wrong. They use mere platitudes and always the same ones. Their entire defence of Yugoslavia is stereotypical and clichéd; they cannot say anything new or different from what they have stated so far. All their 'arguments' are bloodless because they obviously have no compelling facts to corroborate them" (p. 82). Nevertheless, the advocates of Yugoslavia "were initially aggressive, unbridled and reckless (and to some extent are even today). They spoke condescendingly about Yugoslavia and offended everyone who was against it" (p. 83). Such was the case with Radoje Knežević, Kosta Pavlović and others. "The most prominent among the organizations who are absolutely in favour of Yugoslavia is *Zbor*, which is comprised of the so-called *Ljotićevci*. Through every issue of their *Spark* magazine, they endeavour to make the Croats like the Serbs and vice versa. They have managed to do so among their Serbian members, but they have not converted a single Croat. Quite the contrary, even those few Croats who were within their ranks have left them [...] They would sacrifice everything that is Serbian just to establish Yugoslavia. Fortunately, they are small in number" (p. 85). The most fervent proponents of the Yugoslav option in France were the former adherents of Pribićević, who had previously been headed by the 'Orthodox Croats' Sava Kosanović and Stojan Pribićević. "Hatred for the Serbs is the basis for all their actions. These Yugoslavs exclusively use the Latin alphabet and despise the Cyrillic letters as much as those in the country ... They are firmly united with some Croats and Slovenes who take advantage of them in terms of ideology" (p. 85).

Concerning Great Britain, the *Our Word* was widely circulated there and its representatives "want Yugoslavia at any price and unite with the Croats and Slovenes with that aim in mind. They often refer to the Croatian and Slovene representatives and allow them to present their essentially anti-Serbian criticism in the magazine" (p. 85). The Ustashas

found those followers of Desimir Tošić to be their favourite Serbs, as they were very close to Živko Topalović, the prominent pre-war socialist leader. Among the other ardent Yugoslavs, the most obtrusive were Professor Boža Marković, Mihailo Petrović, the son of the deposed King Nikola of Montenegro, Radmilo Grdić and King Peter II Karađorđević, while the most prominent Serbs of Muslim faith in emigration - Omer Kajmaković and Alija Konjhodžić - were unambiguously in favour of the independent Serbian state.

c) The Disposition of the Slovene Emigration

Kostić separately analysed the disposition of the Slovenes towards the future state, quoting the famous German geographer and ethnographer Paul Dehn, who wrote the following at the beginning of the 20th century: "The truth is that some pathetic anti-German chauvinism has taken root among the Slovenes. However, their number is too small for them to ever think about state independence and, in the best case, they must be satisfied with their unification with the Serbo-Croatian state in the future. Considering the passion with which they cherish their individuality, it can be assumed that, as members of a Serbo-Croatian state, they would show the same poorly founded disinclination they already express towards us Germans" (p. 95).

Kostić used this lucid and prophetic quote as a counterargument against the Serbian advocates of Yugoslavism, who argued that if the Slovenes wanted Yugoslavia, "we must want it too. The Slovenes have no choice, whereas we do. We had two free and independent Serbian states throughout the 19th century and for two decades of this century, when it was far more difficult for smaller states to survive. We have the most diverse options for bonding and support, while the Slovenes have but one such possibility. We can survive economically as an independent state, whereas the Slovenes never could [...] We Serbs find it difficult that we must separate from the Slovenes, but we will have to do it eventually" (p. 96).

Although the Slovenes were aware that they could not survive without Yugoslavia, they were not its ardent supporters and they mostly showed mild indifference and hesitation towards Yugoslavia and that the Serbs constantly had to plead with them to stay and fulfilled all their wishes to that end. As Vlatko Maček wrote in 1951 in the *American Croatian Herald*, many of them were in favour of an independent Slovenia from the very beginning: "Miho Krek, PhD, and the majority of Slovenes strive for the freedom of the Slovene state, just as we Croats fight for an independent Croatian state" (p. 97). Krek never denied Maček's claim, though he had an ideal opportunity to as one of the editors of the Serbian office of the *Free Europe*. Kostić emphasized that he was "very grateful to Maček for finally stating publicly that both he and Krek were in favour of their independent and free states. We wish them good luck with their struggle! The Serbs certainly have nothing against it. They will not even be bothered if the Croats and the Slovenes create a joint state. As far as I remember, I already told this to PhD Krek

during a conversation we had in Cairo. Both the Slovenes and the Croats are small nations and it would be no surprise if they united their state borders as they already have religious ties. They are Catholics and they should understand each other better than they understand the Serbs. The Serbs wish no harm to anyone, including the virtuous men Krek and Maček! We wish to thank both of them for delivering us from this delusion. At least I hope they did [...] Once again: Serbs, do not be fooled by and do not mind what others do, but mind your own business! As Maček says, the Croats and the Slovenes want to be independent!” (p. 98).

In 1966, the *Free Slovenia* bulletin, printed in Argentina, published an exhaustive survey conducted among the most distinguished Slovene emigrants on the goals of the Slovene national policy. The survey showed how fervently they advocated their state independence. Kostić first quoted Naca Eretnik, a Slovene Catholic priest from Paris, who lamented the loss of two thirds of the former Slovene territory, saying as follows: “As far as the future is concerned (and the present, of course), I believe that we are all aware that the Slovenes, both in the country and abroad, unanimously agree that the Slovene people [...] has the right to an independent state in which we ourselves would decide on our fate, in which the Slovene language would indeed be the official language, where the Slovene youth would serve in the army on Slovene ground and under the command of Slovene officers (and not just Slovene corporals and sergeants!), where the Slovene economy would be based on Slovene criteria and needs, and where we would be able to finally express our own opinion in respect of the foreign policy” (p. 99).

Rudolf Smers, former a member of parliament representing the Slovene People’s Party from Ljubljana, claimed that “the goal of a politically mature nation is to be free and independent, to be sole master in its home territory [...] Today, the Slovene people is politically mature and it is thus fully entitled to request freedom and independence for all its lands, meaning that it has the right to request its own state. The question of whether the sovereign Slovene state should of its own volition join any other state into a union of states (confederation) or a state union (federation), or any other form of union, is a completely separate issue. That is why we believe that the following is the only right position: first establish the Slovene state, which should then later decide on its own future [...] Only the Slovene state can be the subject of various state and legal combinations [...] The main Slovene political goal is so clear, so natural, so self-begotten that it is not bound by the people’s acceptance and there should be no voting on it. The Slovene state is an axiom. The proposals regarding the joining of the Slovene state to any other union of states can be subject to voting and acceptance. The free Slovene people will decide in a secret ballot whether the Slovene state should link itself with any other state” (p. 100).

The Vice President of the Slovene People’s Party and close friend of Desimir Tošić, Ljubo Sirc, PhD, who was also an Assistant Professor at the University of Glasgow, was of the similar opinion: “There is no

doubt that the developments of WWII and afterwards went in such a direction that the only acceptable option for the Slovenes is a separate legal and state unit. This actually became clear as soon as PhD Maček succeeded in establishing a separate Croatian unit” (p. 100). There were some Slovene emigrants, such as Dušan Plenčar, who were in favour of the Yugoslav confederation, in which the legal entity of Slovenia would be internationally recognized. “Plenčar stated that, in order to accomplish such an affirmation, the Slovenes must tell everyone everywhere what they wanted: their own state in which they themselves would decide on their own matters” (p. 101). Besides, Plenčar was the editor of the *Slovene Justice*. The entire Slovene People’s Party expressed its unambiguous opinion on this issue in its programme document of 1954, which emphasized the following: The Slovene people has an undisputable and natural right to its own state, a right to independently regulate its own life, to enter wider state unions and take part in the company of free nations. The Slovene People’s Party strives for this right and its goal is to have the Slovene people exercise this right and unite in the Slovene state” (p. 101).

It is interesting to mention what Miha Krek, PhD, stated in 1959, in a lecture given at the Serbian National University in Chicago, which was reported by the *Canadian Serb Defender*: “Although he delivered his lecture at the Serbian National University, PhD Krek was mainly paying compliments to the Croats. The Slovenes border is with the brotherly Croatian people in the east and naturally, their eyes and hopes are constantly turned in that direction. Their relations were ‘most cordial and beneficial to both nations.’ That is what he said at the beginning. PhD Krek continued his lecture by saying that, in the middle of the last century, the Croats prepared ‘a political programme for the unification of all the Croatian lands within the monarchy and focused all their energy towards that goal. But the idea of solidarity was always present among us in every situation. I have already mentioned that we Slovenes have continually followed all the progress in Croatia with love and sympathy and our public workers and writers have not only kept us informed about it, but imbued us with the spirit of friendship and brotherhood with the Croats.’ They were their brothers even when Ante Tresić Pavičić wrote that one should not pay attention to the Slovenes and that they should be divided between the Germans and Italians. As regards the Serbs, Krek admitted that ‘we hardly know each other’ (p. 103).

In 1959, in the *Slovene State*, the Slovenian publicist M. Geratič provided the following comment on the speech delivered in Paris by King Peter II, in which he referred to the Croats and Slovenes as tribes, as was the custom between the two world wars: “If the Serbs want to be a tribe, may God help them in their endeavour. We Slovenes are a nation. We want to remain a nation and we do not wish to be vassals of Belgrade; we know how to govern ourselves. Yugoslavia did not defend us and nor will it do so in the future either. The Croats are completely right to refuse the tailings from Serbian hands, while Belgrade is fattening incessantly” (p. 107). In 1962, the reputable leader of the

radicals Stevan Trivunac wrote the following comment in the Chicago *Sloboda* magazine on those frequent Slovenian outbursts, showing that “Save for a few Serbs, nobody in the merry state union, including the emigration, wishes to be Yugoslav; nobody accepts this expression of a unified nation into which the existing nationalities should merge; they want to remain what they are. Indeed, this integral ‘Yugoslavism’ that those few Serbs so awkwardly insist on in the country and abroad, is immediately labelled by the others as a continuation of the so-called ‘Greater Serbia’ concept, incriminating us in the imperialism or Stalinism of Greater Serbia. And as we Serbs waste our time and energy doing someone else’s business, all the others, both in the country and in emigration, act in unison for their individual areas, for their tribes (if one should not use the term ‘nation’) and concurrently against the Serbs” (p. 108).

The champions of the Slovene national cause accumulated a vast amount of venom and hatred for the Serbs. Their perfidious intentions to identify the Titoist communist regime, the decisive role of which was played by their very own Edvard Kardelj, with the Serbian people is reflected in the 1962 New Year’s address of the Action Committee for Independent Slovenia. The text, as published in the *Voice of Croatia*, read as follows: “Slovenes! – Here begins another year of slavery for our people in Yugoslavia, but also a new year of evermore active and conscious struggle for our national liberation, for the independence of Slovenia and for the true democracy of the Slovenes. The broader national strata of the Slovenes are becoming increasingly aware of the miserable situation in which our nation has found itself in the present Yugoslavia and of the violence used to keep it within the country. The ruling clique has endeavoured to eradicate the national consciousness among the Slovene youth by imposing a dictatorship, by banning the Slovene flag and by ripping the works of Cankar from the study books. In the second, post-war Yugoslavia, they completely enslaved the Slovene nation. They have stripped it of all political rights and strive to melt it into the unified socialist band of Yugoslavs. As proven in practice, this band would have a Serbian stamp and that is why the Serbian hegemonists are equally in favour of it along with the Tito’s ruling clique [...] You should fight for the Slovene place among the free nations and our vote in the United Nations. Believe in the future! Do not cooperate with the Titoist regime! Destroy the Titoist-Serbian rule! Open the eyes of the honest communists and let them feel their duty towards the Slovene fatherland. Long live independent Slovenia! Long live our freedom!” (p. 109).

In 1963, this same Slovene emigrant organization printed a leaflet that, *inter alia*, read: “Slovenia is also a victim of Serbian colonization. Nowadays, there are approximately 100,000 people from the south living in Slovenia. The number of Balkan emigrants in Slovenia is so large that they are afraid to publish it. After the last census of 1960, they published the number of inhabitants of Slovenia” but there was no data on how many inhabitants “are Slovenes and how many of them are Serbs and other Balkan peoples. It is the best evidence of the

IT-03-67-T
Serbianisation of Slovenia [...] Slovenia must not become a colony for settling Serbs under the guise of ‘brotherhood and unity’ [...] Fewer Germans settled here in 1300 years than the Balkan peoples did in 18 years” (p. 110). This text was also translated and published in the Croatian press. As Lazo Kostić commented on this Slovenian brazenness, “The Slovenes, whose participation in the power in Yugoslavia between the wars was proportionally much higher than that of the Serbs, and is nowadays even ten times higher, have the habit of blaming the Serbs for all their problems” (p. 111). On the other hand, “one should not say that there are no Slovenes in favour of Yugoslavia. There are many of them, including some excellent intellectuals and respectable individuals. Some of them are leading figures, but their arguments are not always sound. Sometimes they are dishonourable, and sometimes even offensive to the Serbs” (p. 112).

Earlier, the Slovenes used to think and write differently. For instance, in the *Slovene People* magazine of 1928, Alojzije Kokolj, Phd, described the immeasurable contribution of the Serbian army in the liberation of Slovenia of 1918. He stated as follows: “Heaven had mercy on the blinded Slovene people and sent them angelic saviours. Those saviours were the Serbian officers and heroes, the very Serbian soldiers whom fate delivered from the long years of slavery. On their way from imprisonment, those brave fellows stopped at Ljubljana; although they had been separated from their beloved fatherland for years, they did not hurry back to their devastated homes. They stayed in our land and voluntarily assumed the task that we should have performed ourselves. The leader of those heroes was Lieutenant-Colonel Švabić, whose name will remain written in gold letters on the pages of our history” (p. 120). Similar homage to the Serbian soldiers was paid by a Professor of the Ljubljana Faculty of Law named Max Snuderl, Phd, in 1968, though the communist regime frowned upon it. He described how the Serbian soldiers – returnees from imprisonment, stopped at the coast and fought to win Maribor for the Slovenes, acting as if they were liberating their own country.

d) The Positions of the Macedonian Emigrants

Here Kostić returned again to the question of Macedonia and the Macedonians. He began this chapter by quoting Gerhard Gessemann who, in his book *The National Characterology of the Serbo-Croatians*, wrote of the Macedonians: “One should bear in mind that this type did not have any literature or literary language, that it was turned Islamic, Bulgarian, Serbian, Greek and Albanian through terrorist propaganda and that, in the most disputable areas (those that were exposed to the propaganda the most), it could not attain a general self-identity at all. One should also remember that the harmonizing Balkan-Byzantine culture to which it belonged was not capable of creating individuality in a nation. In this way, this human type, with its old customs and archaic, sterile petty-bourgeois and provincial culture, politically bound and morally suppressed, with primitively preserved depths of its soul became

what Cvijić called an ‘amorphous Slavic mass’ in wide areas of its territory” (p. 125).

On his part, Kostić sent a far-reaching warning at this point to the Macedonians, which proved its relevance now, in our time: “Highly privileged and cared for in present-day Yugoslavia, the Macedonians (an otherwise healthy and cautious ethnic group) lost their sense of reality. Intoxicated with the unexpected privileges and put in line with the Serbs, or even opposed to them, they began dreaming of what could never be, to ramble nationally, to fantasize. They will hit the wall and come to their senses, but we don’t know when” (p. 125). The Macedonians were threatened for centuries and exposed to systematic brutalities by various conquerors “and Cvijić said that the Macedonians would definitely accept the nationality of the state that liberated them. The greatest part of the Slavic population in Macedonia became a part of Serbia and it tried to make them equal members of the Serbian nation. It had not succeeded yet, but it was on the right track. Yugoslavia was to blame for its failure because it brought new confusion among the Macedonians. The Communist regime recognised their particular nationality and this doubtlessly pleased them. I do not believe that they would gladly abandon it now. As with every young nation, especially nations whose identity was not quite determined and certain, they showed tremendous and abnormal, even fantastic megalomaniac requests. They wanted their own state as far as Thessaloniki, including Thessaloniki, with the entire area of Greek and Bulgarian Macedonia. Therefore, their free citizens, especially in Canada where there were the most of them, worked openly for a separate, independent Macedonia. They published some magazines in Sweden. First they called it *The Macedonian Lineage* and then *Free Macedonia*. It should not be questioned whether this Macedonia was an ideal for them” (p. 126). However, there were many Serbs and Bulgarians among the Macedonian emigrants.

Concerning the firm and committed Serbian Macedonians, “there were also guerrilla dukes among them (e.g. Duke Mine Stanković), there were prominent politicians (Karamatijević, Seizović etc.). There were higher and lower officers who spent the war in concentration camps because they would not renounce Serbdom and they would not return to the country even after the war (e.g. Colonel Branko Naumović and others). From the refugee camps in Greece, they turned to many Serbian overseas organisations to help them cross to the US or other overseas countries and they did all this although the emigrant Macedonians kept their new and imposed names ending in *ski*. It was nice of Serbs not to ask them to change their names. But these Macedonians could rarely be seen together with Serbs later. Of course, there were such people as well. There were still some Slavs from Vardar Macedonia who felt themselves to be Serbs, Bulgarians, Macedonians etc. and, accordingly, wanted this or that state” (p. 127). It was obvious that the future concerning the Macedonian issue was completely uncertain. Kostić assumed that the Yugoslav option would certainly be more acceptable for the Macedonians than the Serbian one, but warned that the Serbs would insist on complete civic equality in the possible new Yugoslavia and this could not be enforced without strictly

following the principle of one man one vote. Besides, the most extreme Macedonians in emigration strictly preserved an anti-Serbian course and conspired with the Croats. If they published something in Serbian, they did so in the Latin script and Iekavian dialect etc.

Lazo Kostić finished the final volume of his political study *Serbia or Yugoslavia* by pointing out the refined forms of propaganda activity of the Communist regime that showered the emigrant papers with letters and false statements that everyone in the homeland was for the Yugoslav option and that the nationalist requests should, therefore, be silenced to concentrate on the requests for political reforms. These letters were most often published in Ljotić’s *Spark* and some other emigrant papers directed toward Yugoslavism. Exposing these frauds, Kostić quoted Radical leader Stevan Trivunac, who wrote in 1964 in the Australian *Accord*: “The Serbian nation at home today primarily wants, wishes for and imagines its own home. In an enormous majority, it wants its own Serbia in which the entire Serbdom would gather. The Serbian nation has had enough of pre-

882
war and post-war ‘brotherhood and unity’. It is tired of the constant humiliation that this brotherhood and unity exposed it to. It wants to be its own master first, in its own territory and to decide what and how much, if any, it would give for the common home and not to be the subject of constant theft, requisitions and robberies. These tendencies and aspirations came from a new Serbian nationalism that caught not only the masses, but also a great part of the intellectual and elite Serbian youth and even certain circles of Serbian Communists. This new Serbian nationalism was not exclusive or chauvinistic or imperialistic. It rested on the painful and costly experience with which the Serbian nation paid for its former Yugoslav adventures. And its first concern was to secure its future from similar disasters, by respecting other people’s rights and directions, but primarily by preserving its own rights and fighting for its national direction. This is the truth of the present mood of the majority of the Serbian nation in the country. Everything else is propaganda, bluff and who knows whose order” (p. 134-135).

IT-03-67-T
the state primarily served” (p. 5). This was Kostić’s specific contribution to the public dispute that the Communists in Yugoslavia organised concerning the thorough constitutional changes whose creators were Tito and Kardelj. In Belgrade, a large number of prominent intellectuals, University professors, were subjected to persecution, arrest and even imprisonment because they dared to criticise some of the quasi-constitutional texts and formulations of individual norms. Only those who uncritically supported and enthusiastically applauded every nonsense and fraud concocted for the more thorough annihilation of the Serbian people were accepted in public debate. “While the Yugo-Communists claimed that their neglect of Serbdom was entirely according to the recipe of Marx, Engels and even Lenin, the Croatian intelligence all called the regime in Yugoslavia ‘Serbo-Communist’. They assured themselves, us and the foreigners that ‘Serbo-Communism’ was in power in Yugoslavia because they saw Croatianism in the state formation as was their precious ‘NDH’ (Translator’s note: Independent State of Croatia) where all the Serbs were to be destroyed. While a single Serb was alive, it was Serbianism for them and, since the free world was anti-Communist, they linked the Serbian name with Communism: who wanted to destroy the Communism should first destroy the Serbs. In this way, they would kill two birds with one stone. This was the official doctrine of the Croats in the free world, which they tried to impose on the entire world through the Catholic Church as the only true one!” (p. 6).

147/57440

Part XII

THE EVILS OF COMMUNISM

1. The Communist Treatment of the Yugoslav Nations

Lazo Kostić processed the Communist evil and its repercussions on the fate of the Serbian people in two comprehensive books. The first one, an ethno-political study *The Communist Taxation of the Yugoslav Nations*, was published in 1969 in Toronto, in the edition of Canadian branch of the Serbian “St Sava” Cultural Club. In it, the author began his study of the nature of the Yugoslav Communist regime and its basic ideological postulates with the statement that the life of the Serbs in the homeland under Tito’s dictatorship was increasingly difficult because of the well-synchronised and systematic action of killing the Serbian -national identity, the embarrassment of patriotic feelings and tradition, decreasing the national territories and denationalising significant parts of Serbdom. Kostić believed that “many Communists had a Serbian flame; it should only be stirred up. It was not impossible that all this opened the eyes of some Serbian Communists who, blinded by the Party, might have not have realised where the policy of their leaders led. And maybe even more to make those leaders realise this, to see that they were unmasked, exposed, deformed; that their intentions and goals were discovered” (p. 5).

Kostić implied that fateful days for the Serbian people would soon come and that the dangers were so extreme that they could cause a national disaster. “They worked on new ‘reforms’ that always meant a step further in narrowing and denying the Serbian position, so the entire impetus of the coming cataclysm should be stated. It was not likely, but also not impossible that they would snap out of it and start treating the Serbs at least like they treated the Albanians and Hungarians, because no one in their right mind would expect that this regime would ever treat them as it did the Slovenians, Montenegrins and Macedonians, let alone the Croats who were the most privileged and leading nations, which

a) The Anti-Serbian Policy of the Communist Clique

By taxing, Kostić meant the determination of values and actions based on the criterion of values that came from the conceptual determination. The former was a theoretical evaluation and the latter a practical distinction and treatment. In the introduction, Kostić emphasized that he reliably ascertained that “the anti-Serbian practice in present-day Yugoslavia did not result from the attitude of the first Communists but that it was a product of the hatred of Serbdom that the anti-Serbian clique that ruled over Yugoslavia bore” (p. 9). When it was in the interest of their anti-Serbian policy, they were prepared to forge even the works of their ideological forefathers. The Communist regime was ideocratic by nature, which meant that it had a lot of similarities with the theocratic regime. It persistently insisted on ideological rightfulness, even when it revised its regional provisions. It would rather make forgeries than enter open and public critical questioning.

The Yugoslav Communist summit persistently insisted on the claim that it applied original Marxism to its socialistic practice and that it was the most literal interpreter and implementer of the essential ideas of the Marxist classics. This is why Kostić invited them to follow the positions of Marx, Engels and Lenin concerning the Yugoslav nationalities. They had a very favourable attitude toward the Serbs and a highly unfavourable one to the Serbian enemies, so that the phrase on the Serbian hegemony could not be based on their works. Đilas called these

fragments from the writing of Marx and Engels exaggeration and the regime meticulously censored the unwanted extracts from the Yugoslav editions of their works.

Kostić began his extensive quotes with the text *What Would Happen to European Turkey* that Marx published in the New York Herald Tribune in 1853: “European Turkey was a natural heir to the Yugoslav race. Out of the 12 million people, 7 million belonged to it. It had this land for 1200 years. If we put aside the scarce population that accepted the Greek language (although it was of Slavic origin), then the Turkish and Albanian Barbarians, who proved to be against any progress long ago, were the only ones left as rivals to the South Slavs... In the inland area of the country, the Yugoslavians were the exclusive bearers of civilisation. However, they still had not formed a nation, but they had a strong and relatively formed core of a nation in Serbia. The Serbs had their own history and literature. They could thank their 11-year long brave fight against an enemy far more powerful and stronger in number for their present inner independence. In the last 20 years, they made significant cultural progress and the Christians in Thrace, Bulgaria, Macedonia and Bosnia saw them as the centre around which they would gather in the future fights for independence. It could be ascertained that the direct Russian influence on the Turkish Slavs was more suppressed as Serbia and the Serbian nationality was more strengthened. Because, in order to preserve its prominent position as a Christian state, Serbia took its political institutions, schools, scientific knowledge and industrial machines from Western Europe. This explained the anomaly that Serbia, even with Russian protection (Russian protectorate), had been a constitutional monarchy since its liberation” (p. 25-26).

Later research claimed that the previous quotation was actually from Engels’ article, but this expert dispute was not especially significant because it was practically impossible to separate Marx’s and Engels’ theoretical and publicist works and their complete works were usually printed together. By the way, this work was often quoted by significant authors, like Boris Meisner, Hermann Wendell, Fallmerayer, Nikolai Ryazanov, Juraj Demetrović etc. However, in the Russian-Turkish war of 1876-1878, Marx and Engels publicly declared themselves in favour of the Turkish and against the Russian and Serbian interests. In the letter from 25 July 1876, Engels said to Marx: “The collapse of the Serbs is much-vaunted. The entire campaign was intended to inciting the fire in Turkey and the material for the fire was wet everywhere. Montenegro betrayed it (this campaign? L. M. K.) for personal reasons, Bosnia did not want to organise any uprising now that had Serbia decided to liberate it and the fine (this was said as a joke, L. M. K.) Bulgarians would not lift a finger. The Serbian liberation army had to live off its own expense and, after the boastful offence; it had to retreat to its bandits’ hideouts, although it was never seriously defeated” (p. 28-29). In another letter, from 25 August 1876, Engels lamented that England did not condemn the tendencies of the Russians and their Balkan allies more determinedly, stating: “Naturally, there was no mention of the unscrupulousness of the Montenegrins and Herzegovinians. Luckily, the

IT-03-67-T
Serbs took most of the stick” (p. 29).

Marx’s and Engels’ basic anti-Serbian position came from the pathological hatred they showed for the Russians. Hermann Wendell stated that Engels condemned the Serbian efforts claiming that the Serbs “had complete autonomy during Turkish rule, that they got rich and paid low taxes” (p. 29). In a letter to Wilhelm Liebknecht, Marx reproached England for actually saving the Serbs with its passivity after they were already defeated by the Turks. This was contrary to all their previous markedly anti-Turkish positions but, as German chauvinists, an anti-Russian hatred was always primary for Marx and Engels, of course, always wrapped up in a demagogical fear that Russian imperialism might suppress the expected European proletarian revolution.

Friedrich Engels openly rejoiced in the Serbian defeat in the 1885 Serbian-Bulgarian war, which is testified in his letter to Edward Bernstein from 9 October 1886: “The Bulgarians are doing fine. They have the fact that they remained under Turkish rule for so long and, therefore, could preserve the remnants of their tribal organisation, to thank for this. On the other hand, the Serbs, who have been free from the Turks for 80 years, ruined their gentry (tribal) institutions through Austrian-schooled bureaucracy legislation and therefore, they were unavoidably beaten by the Bulgarians. Give the Bulgarians 60 years of civic development [...] and bureaucratic rule and they would end up as backward as the Serbs. For the Bulgarians, and also for us, it would be immensely better if they remained Turkish until the European revolution: the gentry (tribal) institutions would be the famous link for the further development into Communism, the same as the Russian ‘mir’ that now also falls apart right before our eyes. My opinion is: The South Slavs should be assisted if and while they were against Russia because then they would go (in parallel) with the revolutionary European movement. If they were against Turkey and wanted to annex the few remaining Serbs and Bulgarians (at any cost), then they are consciously or unconsciously a weapon of Russia and we cannot be with them” (p. 31).

b) The Montenegrin Homeric “Barbarianism”

Marx and Engels showed substantial contempt for the Montenegrins, also speaking of the shameful war acts of the Montenegrins and Herzegovinians. They said: “We did not have a fertile valley with proportionally large cities in Montenegro, but a futile hill area that was difficult to approach. A gang of bandits settled here and robbed the plains and stacked the loot in their hillside fortresses. These romantic but rather unpleasant gentlemen started boring Europe long ago” (p. 32). In the letter to Marx from 11 February 1853, Engels added to this: “Since their only point of contact, apart from the Austrian tyranny, were the Montenegrin shit, where, in the end, the Turkish ‘order’ left the Montenegrin Homeric barbarianism to defeat” (p. 32). According to Ryazanov’s words, even Wilhelm Liebknecht showed a great repulsion for the Montenegrins, which obviously originated in the hatred of the Russians and all their allies in general.

As opposed to them, the great scientist and Socialist member of German Parliament Hermann Wendell had lots of sympathy for the Serbs, but he ridiculed the possibility of the survival of independent Montenegro since, in his opinion, “‘independent’ Montenegro on its own, a playbox of a state, with the population of a middle-sized German town, inhabited by the purest Serbs, was a simple joke” (p. 34). He said of King Nikola as a ruler and poet: “But the dedication of a poet contributed to the fact that the naïve, harmless people admit the glory of super-humanity to the Prince, who clearly used his spiritual supremacy over poor Montenegrin ignorants intentionally to unscrupulously strengthen his power” (p. 35). After many examples of the moral and material exploitation of the subject, thanks to their naiveté and patriarchal loyalty, and also of the shooting, poisoning, slaughter and torture of the disobedient, Wendell believed “that those who wanted to paint Nikola’s age in Montenegro had to use the darkest colours of the Middle Ages. The greatest part of these misdeeds was done because of wealth or for the purpose of gaining wealth because the ‘state’ confiscated the property of the executed, arrested and persecuted” (p. 35).

Concerning the sincerity of Nikola’s efforts for the pan-Serbian unity, Wendell wrote that Prince Nikola “agreed with Prince Mihailo to give up the throne for Serbian unity and, in his poems, celebrated the day when he would place his crown at the feet of the Serbian ruler and guard the tent of the Serbian king. But, since then, there was barely a year when he did not stab the cause of Serbdom and Yugoslavism in the back. In 1875, he recommended that Franz Joseph take over Herzegovina and, two years later, he helped disarm the Herzegovinian rebels for a down-payment of two million forints and, for a yearly assistance of 30,000 kronas, he gave up any pretence to the purely Serbian neighbouring country and first encouraged the compatriots in the South-Dalmatian Krivošije to organise an uprising and then, for a Judas’ prize of a million forints, he performed outlaw-harboursing services during its quelling” (p. 35).

c) The Croats, the Worst Military Rabble

Furhter on, Kostić showed that, out of all other nations of the world, Marx and Engels had the most negative opinion of the Croats, whom they called an army of barbarians, imperial bandits and Jelašić’s Red hoods in 1848, while “they considered the Croatian order and freedom the incarnation of evil and crime. Shocked by Jelašić’s crimes and ‘terrifying details of the shameful acts of the Croats and other knights of ‘the legal order and freedom based on the constitution’, Marx and Engels, even in verse, expressed their hope that the Hungarians and Austrians would

Chase this scum into the Danube with a club,
Flogging, push away these insolent infidels,
Hungry beggars, tired of life,
A pack of fugitives, rogues, rascals, tramps,

The Croatian excrement of the human race, low peasant servants,
Whom its gorged country had vomited,

So they would become angry adventurers and fail for sure!” (p. 37).

Pointing out Jelašić’s devastation of Hungary and Italy, Marx and Engels, said of the fate of Vienna: “Croatian freedom and order won and celebrated their victory with arson and murders, robbery and violation, with shameful acts that could not be named”, and, concerning their Austrian string-pullers, “the gentlemen who had the cultural history of Germany on their hearts practically left the application of culture to Jelašić and his Croats!” (p. 38). Also giving an individual example of how the Croats shot the child of a Swiss woman in her arms in Vienna, they were even more precise in the following text: “Didn’t the red-coats (this was Jelašić’s personal guard, L. M. K.) and imperial-royal troops preach the gospel of peace and constitutional liberties with robbery, arson, murder and rape – therefore, in a way that everyone could understand? [...] This was shown by the death rattle of the murdered, the groaning, the desperation of the dishonoured – this was shown by the thousands in prison” (p. 38). This and a whole range of other examples led Engels to define Croatian barbarism as almost nomadic and Marx to call the Croats the worst military rabble of Europe. In addition, they wrote of the Czech and the Croats that they did not have either a national culture or a written language.

How much national tolerance was in the political attitudes and understandings of Friedrich Engels could be seen in his articles from *The New Rhine Newspaper* from 1849. Among other things, he said that “there was not a country in Europe that did not contain remnants of some people in some of its provinces, remnants of previous inhabitants, suppressed and conquered by the people that became the bearer of the historical development. These remnants of previous nations that were relentlessly overrun by history, as Hegel said – until its final destruction or denationalisation, this ethnic scum became and remained the most fanatical bearer of counter-revolution since its bare existence was nothing more than a protest against the great historical revolution... In Austria, this were the pan-Slavist South Slavs, who were nothing more than the waste of a highly chaotic development that went on for a thousand years already... The Germans and Hungarians would have their bloody vengeance on the Slavic Barbarians. The overall war that would happen then would break the Slavic alliance and these small, tiny stubborn nations would be destroyed so that nothing but their name would remain. The following world war would lead to the disappearance of not only reactionary classes and dynasties, but also of all the reactionary nations from the face of the earth. And this would mean progress” (p. 43).

In a new article in the same newspaper in the same year, Engels questioned: “whether the Austrian South Slavs could unite with the Serbs, Bosnians and Morlachs? They certainly could if it were not for . . . the old hatred of the Austrian border peoples against the Turkish Slavs on the other side of the Sava and Una rivers. These peoples, considered each other thieves and bandits for centuries and, in spite of the ethnic

similarity, hated each other immensely more than they hated the Germans and Hungarians [...] The greatest 'crime' of the Germans and Hungarians was certainly that they prevented these 12 million Slavs from becoming Turks" (p. 43-44). Engels had a similar view in 1882 and, in a letter to Karl Kautsky, he said: "You could ask me if I had any sympathies for these small Slavic peoples and remains of peoples... In reality, I have little sympathy for them [...] Only with the victory of (Russian) imperialism would the nationalist ambitions of these toy nations be liberated of their connections with the pan-Slavic aspirations for world domination and only then could we put their fate into their own hands. And I am sure that six months of independence would be enough for most Austro-Hungarian Slavs to make them beg to be a part of Austria-Hungary again" (p. 44).

In the Croatian emigrant press, there were also many texts in which the Ustasha ideologists lamented that Karl Marx hated them and ridiculed that "they wanted to build a strong, independent nation, capable of surviving, from these torn rags" (p. 44). Marx reproached the Hungarians most of all for "being over-indulgent and too soft toward the haughty Croats, especially after the revolution. It was known that Kossuth gave them everything possible, he only refused to allow their representatives to speak Croatian in Parliament. Compliance with a naturally counter-revolutionary nation was the only thing that could be considered a Hungarian sin" (p. 45).

d) Marx and Engels – Bitter Opponents of the Pan-Slavic Idea

The establishers of the Communist theory and ideology never said a word about the Macedonians and very few on the Slovenians, given that their political role was irrelevant and that they were considered a nation without history and incapable of having a future. Marx claimed that the Bosnian Muslims "would be destroyed, without any doubt" (p. 49). Their role was to be a caste of idlers and oppressors who were in the way of the change of order and the state affiliation of Bosnia, as Milan Gavrilović interpreted it. According to Marx's and Engels' similar opinions, the Bosnian Muslim were not a national but a religious and social class, while Marx considered Hadji Loza's rebels against the Austrian government to be a group of bandits. Wendell said that Engels called the Bulgarians the "pig people" for whom it would be the best if they remained under Turkish rule until the overall European revolution. Both of them were bitter opponents of any pan-Slavic idea. On several occasions, Engels claimed that "the revolution could be secured only with the help of determined terrorism against these Slavic nations. We now know where the enemies of the revolution are positioned: in Russia and in the Austrian Slavic countries and no phrases, no direction to a vague democratic future of these countries could keep us from treating our enemies as enemies".

In principle, Marx and Engels were not against the formation of a new state that would be made up of the Slavs and other Christians that

liberated from Turkish slavery. They treated Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina as Serbian areas, but they wanted to prolong the rule of Turkey there. This is why Engels criticised Austria for being "an accomplice in the division of Turkey by occupying Bosnia and a necessary opponent of every Serbian aspiration for independence and unification" (p. 53). They were both against the national principle in the constitution of states and especially against federalism. They believed that the great nations had the right to keep small ones within their boundaries if they were capable of raising them to a higher cultural level. Engels presented this attitude very clearly in the text *The Po and Rhine Rivers*, published in 1959: "No one could claim that the map of Europe was permanently set. But, in order to be permanent, every change must start from the fact that the great European nations that were capable of survival had their actual natural borders expanded, determined by language and affiliation, while, at the same time, the national refuse scattered here and there, who were no longer capable of national existence, were to remain included in the greater nations and would either completely blend with them or be preserved as ethnographic monuments without any political significance" (p. 54).

This basic position was further concretized by Karl Kautsky who said: "In 1849, Marx and Engels were sure that the destiny of, for example, the Basques and the Bretons also awaited the Austrian Slavs, because these Slavs did not have a literature that would be worth mentioning. Even among the Czechs, the use of the written language in masses was at the scarce beginning" (p. 55). Debating with Bakunin, Engels stated the conviction that "apart from the Polish, Russian and, in the best case, the Slavs from the Ottoman Empire, no other Slavic groups had any future [...] simply because all the other Slavs lacked the historical, geographical, political and industrial conditions for independence and survival" (p. 56). After all, the primary thing for him and Marx was that "a Slovenian and a Croatian state would block the Hungarian road to the Adriatic sea and this would be contrary to the determined vital interests of both nations" (p. 56).

Marx's consistent follower and distinguished theoretician Heinrich Kunov believed that the Croats were not a nation but that they belonged to the Serbs, only being different from most of them in their Roman-Catholic religion, but he admitted that this difference was such that it could hardly be overcome. Wendell also pointed out Engels' opinion that, "in spite of the pan-Slavic efforts of the enthusiast from Zagreb, a Serb, Bulgarian or Bosnian Turkish subject and Slavic peasant from Macedonia or Thrace had more national sympathies, more contact, more means of spiritual communication with the Russians than with the Roman-Catholic South Slavs with whom they shared a language" (p. 59). Lenin believed that, in the great imperialist war of WWI, only the Serbs fought a just national fight. He said: "The national element in the current war was only presented in the fight of Serbia against Austria, which was, among other things, said in the resolution of the Bern council of our party. Only in Serbia and among the Serbs, we had a years-long national-liberation movement that included millions of

‘national masses’; by prolonging this, the fight of Serbia against Austria occurred. If this war were isolated or unrelated to the overall-European military, selfish and grasping goals of England, Russia and others, then all the Socialists would be obliged to wish for the success of the Serbian bourgeoisie, [...] this was the only correct and absolutely necessary exit from the national characteristic of the present fight” (p. 62). Everything that the allies promised to Italy in the London agreement meant suffering for the Serbian territory or the sale of the interests of Serbian freedom. In 1967, Vladimir Bakarić pointed out that Lenin’s evaluation of the military role of the Serbian people should not be given too much significance and Rodoljub Čolaković tried to redirect it to the entire South-Slavism. As an Austrian non-commissioned officer (NCO), Josip Broz ignored Lenin’s attitude, calling the royal Yugoslavia a creation of Versailles. Kostić called Tito not only anti-Serbian but also ignorant. “The peace of Versailles was made with Germany, the peace of Saint-Germaine with Austria and the peace of Trianon with Hungary. Yugoslavia was created there (and in the peace of Neuilly with Bulgaria). But nothing more could be expected from an Austrian NCO” (p. 65).

The greatest Russian Communist writer, Maxim Gorky, wrote in the 1930s to his friend Babochkin, from Vrnjačka Banja, where he underwent spa treatment: “This is our country. It is so similar to Russia that it seems to me as if I crossed from the north, from Russia into Ukraine. The south keeps me warm here! In the end, all the people here are – PEOPLE! The history of this country only went for glory! This country has suffered, lived, survived and remained here, never to be moved! It appears to me that the Serbs are as much Russian as we are. Everything in us is so similar and the same that I cannot find a difference. They are as wide as we are and as great as we are. Do you remember that Lenin once said that this was the only people that knew how to fight and that wanted to fight for its freedom? A truly excellent nation!” (p. 66).

Leon Trotsky was in Switzerland as a political emigrant when WWI broke out and he reacted to that with the text *The Balkan Issue*, in which the following excerpt was particularly important: “The current events began with the Austria-Hungarian ultimatum to Serbia. The international democracy had no reason to protect the intrigues of the Serbian and other Balkan small dynasties that camouflaged their adventures with national goals. But we had even less reason to morally fight against the fact that a young fanaticised Serb responded to the villainous cowardly-vicious national policy of the Viennese and Budapest tyrants with a bloody assassination. Certainly, there was no doubt on our side that the true historical right, or the right to the development of the historical fighting between the Danube Monarchy and the Serbs was on the side of the latter (the Serbs), just as it was on the side of the Italians in 1859. Behind the duel of the imperialistic-royal police tatters with the Belgrade terrorists, a much deeper reason was concealed, deeper than the naiveté of the Karađorđević family or the criminal felonies of imperialistic diplomacy: on one hand, the unjustified imperialistic requests of a nationalistic state

incapable of survival and, on the other hand, the tendencies of the nationally shattered Serbdom to unite into a state capable of survival” (p. 68). While saying so, Trotsky did not spare the Serbian bourgeoisie at all and he believed that Serbian unity could only be achieved through war or European revolution. He was markedly for an independent and united Serbia.

The Serbian fight for national liberation was also justified by the Austro-Marxists who belonged to the Second International. In this way, Karl Kautsky wrote in the book *Serbia and Belgium* that the deep driving force behind the war of Serbia against Austria-Hungary and Germany was “the aspiration of the Serbian people for national unity, an aspiration that forms at a certain cultural level with the same necessity as modern democracy” (p. 75). He showed this attitude even more precisely when he pointed out: “The unification of all the Serbs into one state entity and their penetration to the sea were the two goals that were in accordance with the needs of the entire population and even with the principles of democracy and internationality” (p. 76). Otto Bauer wrote that the Serbs won their state in a revolutionary war. Edward Bernstein pointed out that Austria-Hungary “planned more than purely restraining great-Serbian agitations with the war. It wanted to take away the Serbian hope for the realisation of their idea of an independent Serbia ‘as long as the Serbian language was heard’ for good. But, first, history showed that if a people ever entered history as a nation or returned to it, then the idea of national unity could never be removed from their brains” (p. 77).

The Serbian Socialists supported the liberating tendencies of their people, but they did not ask for unity with the Croats and Slovenians. Svetozar Marković was in favour of a Serbian-Bulgarian federation. He considered at least a part of Macedonia to be Serbian and entire area of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and old Serbia. Jovan Skerlić wrote that Svetozar Marković “reminded the Serbian government many times that its duty was to work on the liberation and unification of the Serbian people” (p. 83). Dimitrije Tucović also never mentioned the Croats and Slovenians, he believed that the Serbs and Bulgarians lived in Macedonia and he was for the unity of the Serbs, Bulgarians, Greeks and Romanians. Dušan Popović wrote in a similar manner.

Vaso Pelagić attacked the Croatian pretensions to Bosnia and Herzegovina in an epistle to the Hungarian parliament, pointing out “that we do not accept your Croatian name nor want to politically unite with you under these circumstances. Until you became loyal to our people in your house, we could not be friends, let alone brethren. If we had to unite with someone, we would only want to do so with Serbian princedom because there we find the same language, rituals and a greater guarantee for a real and advancing life than with you Croats. Considering all these facts and reasons, we believe that all you ‘great-Croats’ would leave us alone to choose our company according to our wishes and free will and to call ourselves by the name that we preferred so far and that we want; so you Croats would also have more time to study yourselves and your home and find the means to primarily make yourselves cultured, happy and organised according to the spirit of

advanced times” (p. 86).

In order to parry the Slovenian anti-Serbian ruthlessness, at least to some extent, Kostić reminded them of what Karl Kautsky wrote about them: “The Slovenians are just at the beginning of the development of their literary language and, therefore, have great difficulties due to the minuteness and backwardness of their country. Their language is similar to Serbian and it could easily adapt to it in the case of a longer state community. The inclusion of the Slovenians into a Serbian national state should not be prevented for linguistic reasons” (p. 91). Otto Bauer also wrote on the Slovenians in the work *The Austrian Revolution*, published in Vienna in 1923: “As early as the 9th century, the Slovenians – a north-western tribe of South Slavic people – fell under foreign rule. The Slovenian peasants toiled and paid capitation to the German lords of the land over the entire Slovenia [...] After the German lords of the land (feudal lords) came the German citizens. They founded cities in the country of the Wends (this is how many Austrians call the Slovenians, L. M. K.); the cities were German, the villages remained Wendish [...] In this way, the Slovenian language remained a peasant dialect and the Slovenian people a nation without a history for a full thousand years... Slovenian literature could not develop; who would write books in a language spoken only by ignorants and analphabetic peasants? [...] And, just as it did not have any part in the higher cultural life, the Slovenian peasant ‘folk’ did not have any part in the social life for a thousand years. Only the class of feudal lords was the keeper of their state life in this millennium, not the peasantry... The peasants did not have a state, nor cities, nor architecture” (p. 91-92).

It was only after Napoleon formed the Illyrian provinces in the 19th century after defeating the Austrians that “the Slovenians formed their own literary language out of the royal peasant dialect. This certainly meant the formation of a scarce (pathetic) literature that this poor (miserable) little nation could not create and its political history was also scarce at first [...] The Wends of Carnythia, separated from Carniola by the Karawanken massive and without a civic centre, played a very small part in the national movement of the Slovenians. The Carnythian homeland feeling was stronger for the little peasant nation than the Slavic national feeling” (p. 92).

Karl Renner showed a special kind of disrespect for the Slovenians, writing in 1906 that: “A tiny little nation like the Slovenians wanted to build universities” (p. 93). Even in the mid 19th century, the Slovenians did not have a developed national identity. Heinrich Thume wrote that “even in 1860, the Slovenians as a mass were still not aware of their nationality. The name ‘Slovenia’ appeared for the first time in 1844 by poet Vesel-Konski, who greeted the visit of Emperor Ferdinand to Carniola with a hymn containing this name” (p. 93). In 1909, even Ivan Cankar himself said that “a Yugoslav question in a cultural or even linguistic aspect did not exist for me. We are blood brothers, linguistically at least relatives, but in culture, which is the product of a centuries-long separate development, we are far more foreign to each other than a Carniolan peasant is to a peasant from Tyrol or an inhabitant

IT-03-67-T

of Gorica to a Furlandian grape-farmer” (p. 94).

The Austro-Marxists supported the Serbian and Bulgarian liberation of Macedonia. For example, Otto Bauer stated his position in the following words: “The conquest of Macedonia by the Christian Balkan states meant a great historical step forward: the liberation of the Macedonian peasants from exploitation by the Turkish feudal lords; the expansion of the too-narrow boundaries of the Christian Balkan states – boundaries that prevented progress” (p. 95). The same author wrote on the question of the language that the Macedonian population spoke. “The dialects of the Slavic peasants in Macedonia were in between both languages. In the east, they were more similar to Bulgarian and, in the west, to the Serbian language. In the centre of the country, these dialects were equally similar to these languages” (p. 95-96). The most important thing for him was that the Serbian and Bulgarian government in this territory performed an agrarian reform as soon as possible but, just like every other serious scientist, Bauer never made any mention of a special Macedonian nation. “A Slavic peasant of Macedonia still did not have any national feeling; the narrow range of their village bounded their entire spiritual life and the peasant dialects unnoticeably and gradually blend into one another. This way, it could not be objectively determined whether the peasants of a Macedonian village could still be considered Bulgarian or already Serbian” (p. 98).

During WWI, while Serbia was entirely occupied, even Karl Kautsky was for the division of Macedonia in the way that the Serbs and Bulgarians agreed, as long as they respected the agreement after the First Balkan War. He considered Albania to be a premature child in state and political terms and he asked that it be annexed to Serbia. Edward Bernstein also claimed that Macedonia was equally Serbian and Bulgarian. Dušan Popović, a prominent Serbian Socialist, was well informed of all debates of the Austro-Marxists on the Balkan national problems and opposed the Bulgarian aspirations and exaggerated pretensions with arguments, pointing out that 13 different ethnic groups lived in Macedonia. He led a special discussion with Kunov, who was leaning more towards supporting the Bulgarians, saying: “The Serbian nation is almost twice the size of the Bulgarian and a part of it had more freedom and, therefore, more options for cultural development than Bulgaria, because it was never completely under Turkish rule as Bulgaria was. The Serbian Republic of Dubrovnik was not only an important merchant centre in the Middle Ages, but it also produced poets, scientists and thinkers who sometimes gained a worldwide reputation [...] If we wanted to remain objective, we must admit that Serbia was the Balkan state most connected with Macedonia” (p. 104).

Concerning the Albanians, all the Socialist thinkers were against their independent state. In that, they saw only the provisory of great forces that would help them realise their strategic interests. Otto Bauer said: “The Albanians were also a nation without a history until now. They had no literature, no written language, even no alphabet to write their own language with. The Mohammedan Albanians, who served the sultan as clerks and officers, used the Turkish language. The Greek-

142/57440

Comment [K.B.38]: Translator's note: The author was not found in the available sources. Therefore the name was left in the Serbian original

Orthodox Albanians in the south used the Greek language in school and church and they were considered 'Albanophone Greeks'. The Catholic Albanians were under the influence of Italy ever since Venetian times; they used the Italian language in speech and writing if they were highly educated... And just as the Albanians did not have a language and script, they also did not have an independent political life: the Mohammedans were under Turkish influence, the Orthodox under Greek and the Catholic under Austrian or Italian. A unique and independent Albanian state did not exist" (p. 112).

As Lazo Kostić stated, Karl Kautsky also "advocated the opinion that Albania as a separate state was not 'capable of survival' – that securing 'the language and freedom was also possible inside Serbian state, not only in the name of democracy but also due to simple Serbian interests' because the Albanians were not capable of forming a 'modern national state in the cultural level they were at'" (p. 113). Herman Wendell wrote that North Albania was one "of the poorest areas of Europe, where robbery and plunder inevitably developed as a normal, rightful form of attainment. The scarcity of areas with the bare necessities also forced the Albanians to move to the fertile areas of Old Serbia, at the foot of their hills long ago, where the Serbian population was either suppressed or inevitably sucked in. Old Turkey kept the Albanians in their stone caves, never getting in their way because it needed their unrestrained savagery against the Slavic subjects" (p. 113). Otto Bauer thought that it would have been most useful for Austria if Serbia and Greece divided Albania.

In the entire territory, some Socialist traditions were only present in the Serbian nation. Left-wing political parties, workers' and union movements were developed there for decades. At the beginning, this was only, undecided and vague, in clerical bounds, among the Slovenians and Croats. Renner, who studied this question in an expert and studious manner, gave the most impressive testimony to this. From the aspect of ideology and the aspirations of European Social-Democracy, even the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina was incomparably better, which Renner interpreted in the following way: "An important fact was that most of the population belonged to the Serbian branch of the South-Slavic people – that it did not belong to the Catholic but Greek-Eastern religion and that clericalism was very weak and disorganised there. After the Serbian revolution at the beginning of the 19th century that did not spread to all Serbian countries but it had a strong influence on the entire Serbian nation and the national position of the Serbs was not hopeless. The Serbian revolution and later uprisings preserved the always alive fighting spirit and the existence of two Serbian national states was a guarantee that the hope of national unification was not utopian. Although the people and circumstances in B&H were more backward than in Croatia and Slovenia, the people in these countries, a third of whom were almost apathetic Mohammedans, were much more fresh, intelligent and determined [...] The excellent Socialist influence from Serbia, where the workers' movement was determinedly Marxist, and the emigrant workers who were educated in the great workers

movement (Austria thought), made the Bosnian workers' movement strictly Socialist and preserved this character even in the World War, although the Marxist teaching was not as deeply rooted as it was in, for example, Serbia because of economic underdevelopment" (p. 120-121).

The Serbian Social-Democratic Party was founded on 27 July 1903 in Serbia and, in the first elections of this year, it won one mandate in Parliament. However, Kostić said that "an unorganised Socialist movement existed in Serbia long before, only under a different name. The beginnings of the Radical Party were purely Socialist [...] When the Radical Party was organised under this name, there were many individuals who considered themselves Socialist (Dragiša Stanojević, Mita Cenić, Boža Vučković, Vasa Pelagić)" (p. 122). Even Jaša Prodanović wrote in the encyclopaedic article *The Political Parties in Serbia*: "The National Radical Party developed from the Radical-Socialist group of Svetozar Marković" (p. 122). In the magazine *Kampf*, published by the Social-Democratic Party of Austria in 1910, an article was printed in which the general political and economic circumstances in Serbia, the belatedness of industrialisation and the agrarian character of the economy were depicted and the basic data on the beginnings of the Socialist movement were given: "The word Socialism sounded for the first time in Serbia 40 years ago from the mouth of student Zivojin Žujović, who had studied in Russia and encountered the Russian currents of the movement in the 1860s and 1870s. The movement boiled among the students. Žujović died young. His successor was Svetozar Marković, unusually talented theoreticians and, at the same time, an energetic practitioner, who went to work immediately after he returned from Russia and Switzerland [...] In the period from 1870 to 1872, he published the paper *Worker*, although there were no wage labourers in Serbia at that time. The former priest Vasa Pelagić joined him. This movement blended into the general Radicalism" (p. 123).

The Radicals soon came to their senses and withdrew from their left-wing wanderings and the Socialists strictly stuck to the anti-Nationalist course and gained the sympathies and applause of the European Social-Democracy. There was no support for Yugoslav unity from the Socialist lines but, after World War I, there was a race to see who would swear in unity the most convincingly. On 25 November 1919, the Serbian Social-Democratic Party issued a declaration that said: "The Serbs, Croats and Slovenians were one people because they had one language and other equal ethnic characteristics. They felt as one people and wanted to unite. Therefore, their unification into a single national state was a great political, economic and cultural need, beyond any discussion. With this national unification, the proletariat got a wider field for agitation and organisation and a reliable standpoint for the development of a class struggle and, finally, for settling scores with their national bourgeoisie" (p. 127-128). The Slovenian and Croatian Socialists also supported state unification and, on the 21st April 1919, all the Social-Democratic parties united into the Socialist Labour Party of Yugoslavia with a markedly Communist orientation at the congress in Belgrade. Those who did not accept the Comintern ideology or the Communist world view formed the

Socialist Party of Yugoslavia on 18 December 1921. At first, both parties insisted on national unity and centralist state organisation, while there was no mention of a possibly unsolved national question.

At the Vukovar congress on 21 June 1920, the Marxists changed the name of the party into the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and proclaimed in their program: "When the dictatorship of the proletariat is achieved, Yugoslavia will become organised as a Soviet republic. It should enter a brotherly union with the neighbouring nations and create a Soviet federation of Balkan-Transdanubian countries as a part of the international federation of Soviet republics" (p. 130). Not long after that, the Communist Party was prohibited in a legal act called *The Proclamation*, but continued working illegally. From 1923, the Communists increasingly insisted on the existence of deep national antagonisms, but exclusively among the three existing nations, accusing the Serbian bourgeoisie of national hegemony. They changed the name of their party again into the Independent Labour Party of Yugoslavia and, at its Third Earthly Congress, said: "The immediate result of this hegemony of the Serbian bourgeoisie were the defensive grouping of the Croatian and Slovenian nations and national minorities and the movements for the autonomy of Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Vojvodina and for the independence of Macedonia" (p. 132).

The Communists further concretized the Macedonian issue in the following way: "As none of the nationalities that inhabited Macedonia were not in majority, the reign of any Balkan state over Macedonia meant the national enslavement of the majority of the Macedonian population. Conquest, terror, mass persecution and violent denationalisation were the ruling methods of every Balkan state over Macedonia" (p. 132). Then, the first requests for the federal constitution of the state were sounded from the Communist lines. In 1924, the Fifth Congress of the Communist International set the request for the separation of Yugoslavia because of the national enslavement and denationalisation that the Serbian hegemonic bourgeoisie had performed. The separation of Croatia, Slovenia and Macedonia as independent republics was pleaded. Following the policy of the Comintern, the Communists led "orchestrated attacks on the Serbian hegemony and everything Serbian. The Communists inside and outside the country, domestic and foreign, international and national. The outcry against Serbdom began, against its egocentric and selfish leading of the state for the benefit of Serbdom and at the expense of all the other nations and nationalities. The number and denomination of these nationalities varied from case to case according to the need and tendency of the attackers" (p. 134).

There was no doubt that Serbdom, as a national force and national identity, was the principal enemy in the eyes of the Communists, so they allied with all its adversaries. In this way, in the penitentiary in Šremska Mitrovica, Moša Pijade signed an agreement of the Communists and Ustasas on cooperation with the aim of the destruction of the Yugoslav state.

The communist leader Sima Marković was liquidated in Stalinist

IT-03-67-T

executions so that he could not oppose the markedly anti-Serbian policy and Josip Broz was placed in his position in a decree. New nations were proclaimed – the Montenegrin and Macedonian ones. The Macedonian Dušan Petković wrote on this several decades later: "The Macedonian people, who lost their freedom in the 1st century before Christ and who were finished off and erased from the face of the earth twenty two centuries ago by the new groupings and migrations of peoples, passed centuries and the law of assimilation, were revamped at the Fifth Congress of the Comintern that took place in June and July 1924 in Moscow" (p. 137-138).

e) The Grotesqueness of the Communist Ideology

According to the Communist prejudice, the Serbs were always oppressors of other nationalities, while, on the other hand, the royal Yugoslav rule suppressed the Serbian national identity. How grotesque the Communist ideology and propaganda was could be seen in the following statement from the resolution of the Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia that took place in Dresden in 1928. "In Montenegro, which was deprived of its state independence and annexed to the state of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs after the war with the help of French and English imperialism, the great-Serbian bourgeoisie enforced a savage occupying regime and robbed the poor peasantry of the 'brotherly' Montenegro. Therefore, the Montenegrin peasantry, pressured by the monstrous persecution and hunger and robbed of all their possessions, aspired to the independence of Montenegro" (p. 149). The Serbian bourgeoisie was also condemned for the denationalising policy that was allegedly enforced toward the Macedonians, Albanians and Hungarians. It was even spoken of in connection with the Hungarian territory in North Vojvodina, which was annexed to Yugoslavia.

The Communist Party of Croatia was founded in 1937 and the Communist Party of Slovenia some time later. In the resolution of the Fifth Earthly Conference from 1940 that was held in Zagreb, the Communists supported "the fight against the colonising methods of the Serbian bourgeoisie in these areas and the banishing of all colonising elements, with the help of which the Serbian bourgeoisie oppressed the Macedonian, Arnaut and other peoples" and also "the fight for the freedom and equality of the Hungarian, Romanian, German and other national minorities in Vojvodina" (p. 152) in Kosovo and Metohija and Sandžak. In the book *The National Question in Yugoslavia in the Light of the National-Liberating Fight*, published in Zagreb in 1945, in which many articles and speeches by Josip Broz were collected, Tito said: "Born on Corfu, in London and Paris, the Versailles Yugoslavia became the most typical country of national oppression in Europe. The Croats, Slovenians and Montenegrins were subjected nations, unequal citizens of Yugoslavia. The Macedonians, Arnauts and others were enslaved and subjected to annihilation. The Muslim, German and Hungarian minorities served as currency for settling or as an instrument in the fight against the Croats and other nations of Yugoslavia. The

persistent and stupid ramble of the hegemonistic clique that the Serbs, Croats and Slovenians were just tribes of one and the same people was aimed at the Serbianisation of the Croats and Slovenians. Yugoslavia was only a mask for this Serbianisation [...] The Croats, with the stronger national individuality among the other nations of Yugoslavia, showed the strongest resistance to this great-Serbian national policy" (p. 153). As Kostić noted, it never occurred to Broz to mention the Ustasha genocide in Jasenovac in this book.

On the other hand, "another nation", now fictive and imaginary, only benefited from Yugoslavia, showed significant progress and the Communists presented it as a persecuted, suffering and oppressed "nation". These were the Montenegrins, who probably composed these laments in the Communist Party on their own. They always had excessive members and representatives in this party and they always found something wrong, so now they realised that the Serbs persecuted them, economically exploited them and denationalised them. A bigger lie had never before been uttered, even from the Communist side" (p. 157). Kostić here stated very convincing arguments on how rapidly the social standard of the Montenegrins improved after the unification. "Anyone who knew Montenegro during its independence and later in Yugoslavia had to notice the enormous differences. Primarily in the number of schools. Almost every place with a slightly concentrated population had a high school. There were a little fewer of these than there were elementary schools in the Kingdom of Montenegro. All of a sudden, almost every third Montenegrin had a certificate and diploma, everything grew somewhat too fast and their people overflowed the entire country as clerks. They had, proportionally at least, two to three times more clerical positions than the Serbs. And they mostly did not have any special interests or education for these positions. They were mostly supervisors" (p. 157). The situation in the army was similar. In addition, salaries were subsequently paid to all pre-war Montenegrin clerks for the entire period at war, war reparations were paid to citizens and a large number of pensions. "The most insipid statement was that the Montenegrins were subjected to denationalisation in the former Yugoslavia. Did anyone try to take away their language and script? Did anyone force them to choose this or that nationality? They boasted on their own that they were Serbs, pure Serbs, the purest Serbs, that no one could match them in this regard, that all other Serbs were only mixed etc.. All of a sudden, we heard from the Communists that the Montenegrins were not Serbs and that they were forced to choose this nationality. This was outrageous. Even if someone wanted to say that the Communists exaggerated and twisted the truth, it was enough to mention the case of the Montenegrins to keep them silent. From this it could be concluded that everybody lied" (p. 158).

The situation with the Macedonians was similar and the Communists claimed that they were deprived of their rights, persecuted, denationalised and economically neglected. If there were any individual examples, they were basically unscrupulous lies because the Macedonians "were not formed as a nation when they fell under Serbian

rule; they did not have any independent national identity, they did not even begin the process of national individuality, they had not even 'started' nationally. The Serbs liberated and accepted them, believing that they were also Serbs. And they treated them as such without any discrimination. If the Serbs were the master nation, the Slavs of Macedonia were participants in this nation. They were the "oppressors" and not the "oppressed". They never expressed their national individuality. When Macedonia was occupied, it did not exist. After the occupation, Bulgarian movements appeared there, but not "Macedonian" ones. No one could expect the Serbs to say: "You are not Serbs, you are Macedonians, so organise yourselves as a nation". The Macedonian national opposition did not exist in the country, only a Bulgarian one, and it goes without saying that the state authorities had to suppress it. The Macedonian Communists that are in power today are doing the same thing" (p. 159).

Concerning the economic situation, Kostić said that Macedonia showed great prosperity, more so in proportion to any other area of Yugoslavia. The times were hard on everyone, especially amidst the economic crisis of the 1930s. But still, the peasants were free, certain monopoly cultures (poppy, rice, medical plants etc.) were very popular, tobacco was cultivated and favoured so that it overshadowed every other area of Yugoslavia. More railways were built there than in any other part of the country. The most modern railroad station was in Skopje. King Aleksandar had a painful love and weakness for Macedonia and Old Serbia and, within his powers, he favoured all measures for their progress. All of Macedonia was filled with schools and, in 1921, the Faculty of Philosophy was opened as the nucleus of the later University of Skopje" (p. 159).

The Croats willingly abstained from the political processes, boycotted the state institutions and tried to block their function. They were never discriminated against in the state service. "Otherwise, nothing could be said of the denationalisation of the Croats. On the contrary, their nationality never surged as strongly. In every part of Yugoslavia, they spread a nationalist, chauvinist propaganda and no one stood in their way. Even in Bačka, where the Croats had never been present before, even in Kosovo (in Janjevo)! No one was ever held responsible for saying that they were Croatian. Yugoslavism was forced upon the Serbs and they did not resist it. The Croats did resist and they always and everywhere propagated pure Croatianhood. This is why the number and size of their nation grew disproportionately. More so in Yugoslavia than in their entire history after 1102. They had schools wherever they wanted and as many as they wanted, their university had more faculties and more professors than the Belgrade University. They also developed scientific and literary activity without any obstacles. And when they were in power, this was quite different" (p. 160).

In economic matters, the Croats were protected. "The economy in Croatia developed a great momentum and achieved unimagined results. In pre-war Yugoslavia, the principle of a liberal economy and private initiative was entirely valid. And the great range of the state with

rudimentary industry eased the raising of industrial companies. The Croatians, who avoided public service, used this for building various economic companies and placing their products, mostly in Serbian countries. In this way, they were far compensated for the disproportion in the number of representatives in high management. The industry in Croatia, and even in Slovenia, was far more developed than in Serbia, when viewed absolutely (even more so relatively)” (p. 161).

Although the Communists claimed the contrary, the Bosnia-Herzegovinian Muslims were not oppressed in any way either. “These Muslims used their language and the Latin script, which they accepted since Kemal Atatürk introduced it in Turkey. They were present in almost every government and very often had two ministers, while the Bosnia-Herzegovinian Serbs had one or none. These ministers of theirs also provided small clerical positions and various other services for them. They were not at all neglected. Truth be told, the feudal estates of their beys, through which they sucked their (mostly Serbian) subjects dry, were taken away. But they were compensated for this, so the tax payers of the entire country, including – certainly – the Serbs, had to pay reparation to the Bosnia-Herzegovinian beys and aghas for their unjustly gained and even more unjustly kept estates. The Muslims had proportionally smaller intelligence and they were known as spongers and idlers. Only between the wars did they start to come to their senses and catch up with the members of other nations in their cultural aspirations. This process now gained momentum and proved a full success. However, during the first Yugoslavia, they were really unfit for many functions and unwilling to be accepted. It was not in the interest of the state or the other parts of their province to force them into this. No, it could not be claimed that the Muslims of B&H were at all neglected in the first Yugoslavia. They only lacked their own dominant position as in the past, from which they, formally and physically, oppressed the members of other religions, which meant other ethnic groups. For the first time, after 500 years, there was an equality of religions and nationalities in B&H, which was not convenient for the Bosnia-Herzegovinian Muslims and which they could barely understand. Attacking the Serbs and reproaching them for narrow-mindedness and suffocation was an avoidance of every truth. If the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Muslims accepted this parole and used it to fight against the Serbs, they were the ones to show their subjectivity, their tendency to discriminate others, their eternal overbearing behaviour and maybe even atrocities, not the Serbs” (p. 161-162).

The Albanians in Serbia did not live worse than under Turkish rule either. Although their cultural level was medieval and their way of life highly uncivilised and often openly bandit-like, no one threatened or oppressed them. They had their members of Parliament. The Germans were the privileged national minority, so they publicly expressed their satisfaction with their status in the state. The Hungarians had all civic and minority rights, but the official distrust toward them was expressed to such an extent that they openly treated the state inimically. However, the government strictly respected all its obligations from the Treaty of

Trianon. Neither did the members of other national minorities have any serious reason for dissatisfaction, nor did they express any complaints or protests. In this regard, Kostić pointed out that “the Vlachs never had their schools recognised nor did they use their own language before the authorities. But no one prevented them from calling themselves the Vlachs and from maintaining and manifesting their individuality (ethnic, ethnological etc.). Only the Communist regime recognised their other rights. And what was the result of this: the Vlachs suddenly stated that they were Serbs, speaking a different language, true, but still national Serbs. This was unexpected for us national Serbs, unforeseen and very disagreeable for the Communist ‘managers’ who recognised every ‘nation’s’ right to reparation at the expense of the Serbs. They lived among the Serbs for 150 years, if not longer, surrounded only by the Serbs (without contact with their compatriots in Romania) and “shared the good and the bad with them”. They finally decided themselves and without being forced by anyone (on the contrary, they did so in spite of the tendencies and advice of the Communist government) to blend in with the Serbs” (p. 166).

In the Serbian state, the Hungarians had every civic right, although the Serbs in Hungary did not and, as Kostić stated, even Otto Bauer testified to this: “Only the Hungarians and Croatians had national rights in Hungary. All other nations were oppressed. Their languages did not have any rights in jurisdictions and courts [...] Not only faculties and high schools were prohibited for them [...] Every national and political movement of nations was considered ‘high treason’” (p. 169).

Concerning the Germans, they did not oppress other nations in Banat until World War II but, after the occupation of Yugoslav territory and the establishment of Hitler rule “their regime was very strict and bloody. But they did not interfere with the national rights. They restored the German names of the settlements where they were the majority - even some Hungarian ones, but they did not meddle with Serbian settlements. They even kept the names Vojvoda Stepa, Karadordevo etc. The Serbs could freely call themselves Serbs and use their own script and language. In Srem, they saved the Serbs from the actions of the Croatian criminals and, in Bačka, they were the minority, like the Serbs (in relation to the ruling class of Hungarians in WWII). However, before World War I and especially during this war, the Serbs suffered a lot of harassment by the Germans (in Bosnia, Dalmatia etc.) and, when the war was over, the Serbs did not ask for retribution” (p. 171).

Concerning the Macedonians, Kostić openly admitted that “the Serbs turned all the Macedonian surnames Serbian, forming them to end with *ić*. This was a mistake, even violence if you like. But now, the ‘Macedonians’ did the same, in an even rougher form. They forbade every, absolutely every inhabitant of Macedonia to use their Serbian name” (p. 173-174). On the other hand, they left the Bulgarian surnames alone. They mostly ended in *ov* and were, therefore, different to the Macedonian ones that traditionally ended in *ski*. “They banished all the colonised Serbs after 1912, although the resolutions of Communist conferences admitted there was very little of this colonisation.

Migrations were a constant phenomenon in these areas from ancient times. And now they 'restored to the previous state' everything that happened during the Serbian time. As if history had to pause then, to stop its flow?! And they considered their recent emigration from Greece to be legal, although they never conquered or legally gained power over Macedonia" (p. 174).

Lazo Kostić briefly mentioned the Bulgarians, who "twice, in both world wars, occupied Macedonia and the southern areas of old, pre-Kumanovo Serbia, where the national Serbian identity was developed as in Sumadija or the Boka Kotorska Bay. And the Bulgarians still proclaimed all these territories to be exclusively Bulgarian, forcibly introduced the Bulgarian language, turned all the names Bulgarian etc.. They simply tried to erase any trace of Serbdom in these areas. And the Yugo-Communists did not mention this but they protested against the Serbianisation of the two former Bulgarian counties that were legally given to Serbia! During World War I, the Bulgarians committed slightly milder crimes in Serbia than the Croats did in WWII. In Surdulica, they killed the flower of the Serbian intelligence from the part of Serbia that was occupied by them, in Skopje, they burned the Metropolitan of Skopje alive etc.. And still, no one reproached them for anything - only Serbia and the Serbs. True, the Bulgarians were briefly in our areas, for three or four years in both wars. But, during this time, they showed all their savagery and denationalising tendency. Did they ask any inhabitant of Vranje, Leskovac, Pirot etc. what their nationality was? They imposed the Bulgarian names on them, introduced Bulgarian schools and threatened those who declared themselves Serbian with death" (p. 175).

The Communists constantly trumpeted the alleged Serbian crimes against the Albanians, but they persistently kept silent about the Arnaut savagery and systematic persecutions of the Serbian population. The Bosnian Muslims never managed to get over the loss of their feudal privileges. They hated every idea of social justice and the necessity of agrarian reform, which left them without enormous estates cultivated by Serbian surfs, was foreign to them. "An animosity toward the Serbs formed and it was evident in both world wars, when the Serbs were not protected by the law. In the first war, they formed the so-called *šuckori* (protective corps) who terrorised and sometimes murdered Serbs. If the Austria-Hungarian government had not occasionally prevented this, the excesses would have been even greater. This showed in WWII, where there was no prevention and so the Muslim scum competed with the Catholic Croats over who would exterminate the most Serbs. Dozens of thousands of innocent Serbs were killed and beaten by the same Muslims. However, this could not be mentioned in Yugoslavia: neither could the 500-year long sweating of the Serbs so that the Muslims could be idle, nor the persecution of the Serbs during this time and the limitation of all their religious, national and human rights; neither the savage crimes against the Serbs in the last two wars, crimes that partly happened in front of the Partisans themselves. Nor anything else. Nothing could be reproached to the Muslims or Croats and other Yugoslav 'nations and nationalities' so that the principle 'brotherhood-

IT-03-67-T
unity' would not be harmed, but everything could be reproached to the Serbs, what they did and what they did not do, even what they did several decades ago, because nothing is reproached to them after that. From 1945, they were slaves the same as under Turkey and even worse. Slaves who could not even say they were slaves now or that they used to be before" (p. 176-177).

f) The Monstrous Murder of the "Obnoxious" Serbs

Under the Communist regime, the Serbs were collectively punished for what they had not done, while any possible Croatian collective responsibility could not even be mentioned. Croatian crimes were attributed to the occupiers or their servants and, when even talking about the Ustashas, they tried to present them as if they had nothing to do with the Croatian nation. On the other hand, As Kostić noticed, the Communist regime took away the past, the present and the future from the Serbs. In enforcing the anti-Serbian policy, the Serbian Communists were the ones who took the lead. Right after the Red Army liberated Serbia and brought Tito's Partisans to power, the mass killing of Serbs began under the accusation that they were pre-war anti-Communists, that they belonged to the great-Serbian bourgeoisie or cooperated with the occupying forces. The rich were murdered so that the leaders of the regime could seize their properties. All those who did not agree with Tito's views were automatically declared Fascist. All distinguished Serbs were under attack and prey for the Communist persecutors. "This was mostly done in Belgrade, where they thought that the head of Serbdom should be executed. There, they would simply abduct the reported person and atrociously murder them wherever possible, no matter who reported them. They were especially resentful of the former social elite, whom they slaughtered ruthlessly" (p. 186).

In spite of their war crimes, the Croats, like all other nationalities, received much milder treatment. "Far more Chetniks were convicted for 'collaborating' with the enemy (against whom they took to the forests) than Croatian Ustashas were who had only two goals: the victory of 'Axis Forces' and the liquidation of the Serbs. There were fewer Ustashas, I categorically claim, that were convicted for collaboration than Chetniks! Because the Chetniks were Serbs and they needed to be dishonoured (for being 'the servants of the occupying forces', the Croats were far less so!) and to decline in number. Especially the leading men. The Serbs that remained in the country (who did not 'take to the forests') prolonged their administration and, partially, the judicial system under the occupation, exactly according to the international order and public law. They did what the law order proclaimed and remained faithful to the oath to their ruler. They neither stepped on this oath nor took another one to someone else. They were still punished for collaborating far more than the Croatian 'functionaries' who were all traitors and, the greater part, villains" (p. 190).

Professor Franz Borkenau of the University of Zurich, who once belonged to the Communist movement, published the book *European*

Communism in Bern in 1952, stating in it that the Yugoslav Communists were in favour of the Fascist forces because their activities supported the anti-Serbian policy. He said: "We spoke of the passionate friendly attitude of the Montenegrin Communists (in relation to the Axis Forces) and the almost Ustasha-friendly attitude of the Croatian party organisations" (p. 191). At Tito's request, the English bombed Belgrade, Leskovac, Podgorica and other Serbian cities, but never a Croatian one. On the other hand, the Partisans, "whenever they took over our settlement or city during the war, would first pounce upon the Chetniks in this area, and this basically meant the Serbs, and kill them mercilessly. They only killed Ustashes if they were marked anti-Communists or if they committed a crime against the Partisans. Otherwise, they spared them. If a Serb partisan showed a greater dedication to the persecution of Ustashes, he would be executed in most cases (although they often only wanted vengeance on the murderers of their families)" (p. 193-194).

Kostić pointed out that Stanislav Krakov quoted some Partisan documents that testified to the Partisan collaboration with the Germans and Ustashes on an anti-Serbian basis in his book *General Milan Nedić*. In this way, on 3 March 1942, the Supreme Headquarters of the NLM sent an order to the Partisan troops in Bosnia: "You should primarily destroy the Chetnik gangs. You should be very energetic in doing so. You should persecute the gangs you manage to break until their destruction [...] Accept fight with the enemy when forced to do so". The letter that Tito sent to the Communists of Zagreb on 6 March 1942 read: "Our duty is to explain to the Croats the danger that threatens the Croatian people in Bosnia and other areas from Serbian Chetnik gangs, the Serbian hegemonic clique. We must win over the Croatian soldiers and even officers for this" (p. 194).

The Serbs were most often put in the category of national enemies. The Communists "rarely and exclusively included the others in this concept. What is more, many open occupation collaborationists had significant positions in Tito's hierarchy, all but the Serbs, who were relentlessly sent to the next world mostly blamed for fictional and staged crimes" (p. 195). They also shot the Metropolitan of Cetinje of the Serbian Orthodox Church, but not a single Roman-Catholic bishop, although they were all dedicated followers of Pavelić. This policy was continued in the following decades of Communist rule, only its methods of realisation differed. The goal was clear and comprehensive, the complete disintegration of the Serbian nation until complete national destruction was achieved. The Communists never changed their minds regarding the consistent anti-Serbian policy. "It sometimes appeared as if they came to their senses, as if they needed a break and the Serbs lulled themselves in the hope that the devil was perhaps not as black as they described him, only to soon see that everything was an illusion, that there was no yielding, no concessions, that the hellish goal was to be achieved in every anticipated detail. The steps were not equal, the tempo was different: they always waited for a suitable moment to make a step further, but it was a firm, assured, obligatory step. There was never a 'reform', never a new measure in the shaping of Communist Yugoslavia

that did not only harm the Serbs. It was enforced and it should not be questioned; the moment was opportunistically chosen to begin the realisation of something, to make a step further towards the set act, when Serbdom would be deprived of another asset, when the process of disintegration would progress a bit further. The Yugo-Communists foresaw a slightly longer, but not substantially long deadline and they systematically walked toward their goal" (p. 203).

g) The Fragmentation of Serbia

This showed that the power over the Serbs was not the only goal of the Communist management – instead it was primarily the rule against the Serbs. To achieve this more easily, they frantically separated, broke and mutually divided the Serbian nation. "The goal of Broz, Kardelj and formerly Đilas and the company mostly agreed with the goal of Hitler, Mussolini, Pavelić and Sekula Drljević: to return Serbia to its borders before the First Balkan War. Everything else should be separated from it; it should be torn apart, fragmented, dismembered. Then, it would die on its own: after you cut a leg, then an arm, another leg, ear etc. off a body, the organism can vegetate for a while longer until it completely dies. The anatomists who ruled over the present-day Yugoslavia knew this and they decided not to stop half way" (p. 204-205).

Every political demonstrator, the system of legal norms, the official ideology and the blinding propaganda were full of evidence of a persistent and concentrated anti-Serbian tendency. The demagogical wrapping of brotherhood, unity, equality and community in which they put this was increasingly transparent: "Some would say that Serbia was small even before 1914 and that neither it nor Serbdom failed. Yes, this is true. But, all Serbdom was also spiritually connected with it and solidary in every possible way. It made a national whole with it, maybe even more concentrated than today. Apart from this, there could be no talk of fragmentation or dismembering then because nothing was taken away from Serbia and Serbdom. If the analogy with organisms was allowed, it would look like this: the Serbia of that time was a developing embryo, but with every organ of a living human being. It could grow or remain undeveloped, but it was not amputated. In the meantime, it grew and got its definitive natural appearance and shape. Now, it is being torn apart and it cannot survive for long. Even while it does, it is only a torso, a mutilated being, a cripple. And during its life, it can provoke only sympathy and death awaits it at every step. This is what the leaders of the present-day Yugoslavia wanted and aspired for: the death of Serbdom, as a beggar that falls apart on its own. They did not reveal their plan, but also did not give the Serbs any hope or chance of a better life. On the contrary, they nipped in the bud every attempt of the Serbs to protest or rebel: they immediately invoked the great-Serbian chauvinism, the tendency to oppress other nations, their intolerance and lack of understanding of others (while they could not even make an allusion to the tolerance shown them)" (p. 205).

The separation of Macedonia, Montenegro and Bosnia and

Herzegovina, or their separation into independent federal units, and the annexation of the Military Frontier to Croatia did not quite satisfy Tito's ambitions, so the so-called autonomous provinces were increasingly given independence in the rest of Serbia, gaining more expressed state attributes, like constitutions, government, parliament, a state governor, judicial system etc. At the same time, the Serbian name and historical memory were systematically eradicated, events from the past were forged, freedom-loving traditions and national identity of the Serbian nation were denied. Even those Serbian historical endeavours that could not be ignored were presented as pan-Yugoslavian and common. Even the Serbian military cemetery from World War I in Zejtinlik near Thessaloniki was referred to as Yugoslavian in press. The entire Yugoslav encyclopaedic archive in Zagreb, under the management of Miroslav Krleža, was formed so that historical facts could be thoroughly forged and adapted to Croatian and Communist aspirations and, at the same time, harm the Serbian nation as much as possible. In his personal "encyclopaedia", in which the regime invested a large sum of money, Krleža subjected everything to the overall apology of Croatianhood and his cooperative board wholeheartedly emphasized "the Croatianhood, both where they should and where they should not and ignored and denied Serbdom. They boasted that they had discovered approximately 500 distinguished Croats who were previously unknown in Croatian works. They took various Romans, Latins, Italians and God knows what else and proclaimed them Croatian (most often changing their name into Croatian, sometimes even their surname). They stole all the Dubrovnik literature and similar and, at the same time, decreased the number of distinguished Serbs by more than a half and even those who were presented rarely had any mark of Serbdom" (p. 228).

This action was even enforced in a wider international territory. "The Yugo-Communists, led by the Croatian, Macedonian and Montenegrin Serbivores, even managed to include their anti-Serbian denunciations in all the world encyclopaedias and lexicons: on the Montenegrin nationality, on the Croatian literature of old Dubrovnik etc.. All things that were formerly presented in quite the opposite way in the same lexicons. But the Yugo-Communists refused any cooperation with these editions and prohibited their import or sale in the country if they did not write from their perspective. Even the German Slavists mainly accepted these Communist forgeries because, otherwise, they could not get a visa to enter the state or invitations for various symposiums" (p. 228).

Serbian writers were widely appropriated, Montenegrin and Bosnia-Herzegovian literature was proclaimed in decrees and Vladan Desnica was forcibly included in Croatian literature. Those who could not be seized were called "ours" so that their Serbian individuality would at least be obliterated in the subconscious of those who were not sufficiently informed. Concerning the "Montenegrin" frenzy and the attempt at stealing the original Serbian cultural values, Kostić said: "If the Montenegrins want literary and cultural individuality, if they do not want to mix with the Serbs, let them be. I truly would not fight this. But,

do they have the right to deprive the dead writers from Montenegro, who always considered themselves Serbian, of their Serbdom? I think not. But they have the power, the regime, the Party on their side; and what they could not prove with logic, they ordered through decrees and the authority of the owner and oppressor. In this way, they expanded their territory and their population in an expansionistic, imperialistic and megalomaniac manner. Wherever they seized and stole other people's land, they also appropriated the people, denationalised them and proclaimed them 'Montenegrin'. Especially writers and artists. Also, the Latin painters in Boka a few centuries back, who were not even Slavic. This did not bother the Montenegrin megalomania. These were all people who never dreamed they were, let alone said they were, Montenegrin" (p. 250).

h) The Schism in the Serbian Orthodox Church

Even in this book, Kostić dealt with the Macedonian schism in the Serbian Orthodox Church, presenting the then actual moves of various ecclesiastical and political factors in the country and abroad and summarising this in the following manner: "The entire period after the war, the Communist regime of Yugoslavia was on the Macedonian side and the foundation of their separate church was first autonomous and then autocephalous. There were no means that the regime did not try to use to break the resistance of the Serbian Orthodox Church and the Serbs in general. Every Serbian newspaper, of course, had to defend the position of the Macedonians and the Yugo-regime. No one ever happened to at least partially understand the position of the Serbian Church and Orthodox Serbs. It could be attacked as great-Serbian and as chauvinist. As on other occasions, if there was a conflict between a Serbian national interest and the interest of another in Yugoslavia, without exception Serbian would be sacrificed and – attacked! Everyone could attack it (while the Serbs could not even defend themselves), even the Serbian press had to" (p. 261).

Concerning the Macedonian church issue, the Communists openly broke their own principle of the strict separation of church and state. This principle did not prevent "the Macedonian Communist leaders attending the first so-called Council of Ohrid and publicly, ostentatiously, participating in all actions of the foundation and affirmation of this church. Until the Council of Ohrid, the Communists avoided the church 'like the Devil avoided the cross'; then they appeared in the church for the first time and attended liturgies. They gave a political character to this. They wanted to give their support to this schismatic church even on the outside, visible to anyone. The Serbs had to remain quiet: not only the politicians and public workmen, but also the experts in ecclesiastical law could not speak. This was against the 'brotherhood-unity' principle, while every attack on the Serbs was in accordance with this principle" (p. 261).

Even Miloš Minić, a famous Communist villain and ultimate traitor to the Serbian nation, with the almost unquestionable authority of a

regime official and blindly loyal follower of Broz, interfered with this question and, according to the testimony of NIN magazine from the 25th February 1968, said in Skopje: "I would mention the autocephaly of the Macedonian Orthodox Church. You know the opinions of the managing entities and people in Serbia on this matter. The autocephaly of the Macedonian church is a reality for us and no longer a matter of discussion. Our comrades and organs indeed made many steps so that we would convince the members of the Archpriest Council of the Serbian Orthodox Church that it was necessary that the Council find a positive attitude toward the autocephalous Macedonian Church... As we have seen, we did not succeed in this. We were not pleased with the tendencies of the clergy related to this either" (p. 262-263).

Concerning the related decision of the Holy Archpriest Council of the Serbian Orthodox Church from 1967, Kostić concluded, with unconcealed pleasure, that this was "the first organised opposition to the wishes of the Yugoslav regime - the tendencies of the authorities and the markedly expressed will of those in power in the form of imperatives. This was the first time that an establishment, as it is called today in the most modern language, resisted those in power, not only not obeying their order but also going ten steps further, condemning their formation and judging those whom the regime depicted, with 'comrade Tito' at the head. This was a revolt worthy of the Serbian hierarchy in its most glorified endeavours and manifestations. This was a heroic gesture to which I give full acclaim. Of course, as long as that the hierarchy persisted, it did not change its attitude, it did not get scared" (p. 265). In Kostić's words, it was especially important as this was "the first time that 'the Macedonians' did not succeed in their requests, in their chipping away at Serbdom, in their tendencies not only to weaken Serbdom but also to humiliate it. The regime claimed that they would succeed if it were not for this, for them unexpected, resistance. They got as far as the Government: this far and not a step further. They wanted to disgrace Serbdom and they disgraced themselves... Not only disgraced, but also weakened, lessened. Before, the 'Macedonian Orthodox Church' actually existed and when it was silently accepted as an independent formation inside the Serbian Orthodox Church, something separate from it... They were individual and now they were not anything, formally something in the orbit of the ecclesiastical law [...] Before, this 'church' was neither recognised nor unrecognised, so that it could create the illusion it was recognised... Now the deists made the legal non-existence of this 'church' public, made everyone realise that it was a wild church, schismatic, former and good for nothing! They could actually reproach themselves: If you kept quiet... They might have had a moment favourable for themselves and unfavourable to the Serbian Church and made this happen. But the deists, full of self-confidence and realising that everything they did against the Serbs had worked for them before, rushed a bit and – splash, fell into the water. An unstable church organisation became unworthy, got entirely lost, drowned, legally disappeared and vanished - even to Orthodoxy. This 'church' was not recognised by anyone, by any other independent Orthodox Church" (p. 910).

The Communist Yugoslav regime disturbed and constrained the economic development of the Serbian areas, although they were the richest in mineral resources and agricultural land. Bor and Trepča were relentlessly exploited, but all the investments went to Slovenia and Croatia, or the capital was wasted on the artificial maintenance of imaginary federal units. The industrialisation of Serbia and the building of hydroelectric power-plant in its narrow territory did not suit the Communists at all since they kept the country in the status of the strictly controlled source of raw materials. "In every other area of Yugoslavia, hydroelectric power-plants were insisted on and they even produced more power than these republics needed and it was exported to other 'republics' and even abroad (Austria, Italy, even Switzerland). Serbia had to satisfy its needs with primitive thermoelectric power-plants, mostly based on lignite. This was why disturbances and power cuts were daily occurrences and many Serbian areas, including Belgrade itself, were often in darkness. From time to time, power saving was ordered, while other republics exported it. And they justified the weak development of industry in Serbia by the lack of power!" (p. 269).

The Croatians were also given an energy advantage by building an oil pipeline. In Serbia and Montenegro, they purposely organised cumbersome and failed industrial projects, such as the ironworks. Any more lucrative work on the construction and development of the state infrastructure were given to the Slovenian and Croatian companies.

There was a similar situation for the expansion and modernisation of road and railroad communications. Sea traffic was insisted on and the Danube river traffic was neglected. Bosnia was increasingly linked to Croatia and the construction of the Belgrade-Bar railroad was sabotaged for years. While the Slovenians and Croatians rapidly electrified their railways, many railroads in Serbian areas, both regional and local, were cancelled, even those with strategic importance for hundred years.

i) The Systematic Destruction of Serbdom

Regarding the position of the Serbs outside their mother federal unit, this was increasingly difficult and unbearable: "In Northern Macedonia, they allowed several of the northernmost municipalities with a markedly Serbian population to declare themselves Serbian and they had their own Serbian schools. Gradually, this right was reduced; those who declared Serbian were threatened, neglected and deprived of their basic rights" (p. 276). All the Serbs in Montenegro had to declare themselves Montenegrin. In public publications, it could not be written that the Montenegrins were Serbs, but it was allowed to say they were actually Croatians, or 'Red Croatians', as Catholic friar Dominik Mandić wrote. Mandić's incredible forgeries on the Croatian ethnic nature of Bosnia and Herzegovina were also freely printed. No minority rights were given to the Serbs in the Croatian federal unit. On this question, Kostić quoted an 1968 open letter from a group of young Serbian intellectuals from Croatia, which read: "Although the Serbian people in SR Croatia formed

approximately 22 percent of the population, they did not have political or cultural representation because their position was based on the fiction that this part of the Serbian people was not a national minority in SR Croatia. Because of this fiction, the Serbs in these areas were deprived of all the rights that the national minorities had (for example, schools with special programs, cultural and social organisations) and even of those rights that this people had under Franz Joseph, Maria Thereza and Leopold. In the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, the Serbian people in the territory of the present-day SR Croatia had their political parties, dozens of cultural associations and published a number of papers and magazines. They had their printing-houses, support organisations and schools - and they also had their national representatives in the Croatian Parliament, although it was not very influential. Today, the Serbian people who inhabited eastern Lika, Kordun and Banija, a part of the Gorski Kotar, northern Dalmatia, central and eastern Slavonia in a compact mass, did not have any Serbian schools (except for the Seminary in the Krka monastery), printing-houses, papers or magazines, let alone cultural organisations. After the four-year period in which it fought against biological destruction with rifles in hands, it was exposed to the systematic destruction of the last traces of its culture – and deprived of any rights over 22 years. It finally reached such a position that, in the psychosis of fear and neglect, even the mere recognition or expression of the Serbian national individuality was called ‘chauvinism’, ‘Chetnik behaviour’ etc.” (p. 283-284).

In the signature of this letter, it said that its author was the Main Board of the Serbs in Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia. Kostić first quoted it partially, based on fragments from the emigrant press, then presented it in its entirety, as soon as he received the integral version. The entire history of Serbo-Croatian relations was presented in it in basic lines, which were processed with more detail in Kostić’s earlier books. The mention of the Declaration on the Croatian literary language by the most prominent Croatian intellectuals was interesting. The authors said: “No one denied the Croatian right to speak any language they wanted, write in any script they pleased and have their cultural autonomy. But what was ominous in this Declaration was their request to make this language, script and cultural autonomy obligatory for all the citizens of the Republic – even for the 700,000 Orthodox Serbs who made up 26 percent of the population before slaughter and who form 22 percent even today, and who belonged to the national and cultural unity of the Serbian people. The Declaration refused to give the Serbs the same rights that the Croats asked from Yugoslavia and imposed on them something that was not allowed to be imposed on the Croats by the common state” (p. 295).

When the leading Serbian intellectuals responded to the Declaration with their Proposition, asking only that the Serbs and Croats be completely equal in all questions in accordance with the officially proclaimed constitutional principles, the regime ignored them as great-Serbian chauvinists. Referring to this, the members of the signatory Main Board said that “therefore, the Serbs in the Republic of Croatia

asked that they receive the status of a Serbian autonomous province in the subsequent reforms. After all, how could the regime that incessantly declaimed the equality of nations deny this request? How could the regime that formed the autonomous province of Kosmet with 650,000 Albanians and autonomous Vojvodina with 450,000 Hungarians deny the request for an autonomous province of 700,000 Serbs of Republic Croatia, if they did not want to reveal their animosity toward the Serbian nation before of the entire world?” (p. 297). In the proclamation, the announced confederalisation of Yugoslavia, which was entirely unacceptable for the Serbs, was insisted on especially, so the inclusion of the Serbian areas of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia to Bosnia and Herzegovina was requested.

When the Serbian Communists led a propaganda campaign against their own nation, they primarily quoted Lenin and his thesis on the necessity of positive discrimination against small nations so that what could not be achieved in life objectively could be overcome, because of the great disproportion in the number of members of certain nationalities that lived in one state. Kostić reduced the essence of their traitorous anti-Serbian tendencies to the following: “The Serbs could be hegemonists because of their strength and the others could not [...] So, since the Serbs could be hegemonists and others could not, the entire problem was how to cut off the Serbian wings so that they could not fly, make them crippled, break them, foul them, embarrass them, prevent any national action and manifestation” (p. 306). The Serbian Communists were always forced to fight against the nationalism inside the Serbian nation, while the Communists of other nationalities incited nationalism inside their own actual or artificially patched nation.

j) The Regime Suppression of the Cyrillic Script

However, Kostić pointed out that there was both separation and oscillation, the restoration of Serbian national identity and conscience even among the Serbian Communists. The former fanatical Yugoslavs and fighters against Serbian nationalism started openly acting from nationalist positions in the mid 1960s – such as Dobrica Ćosić and Jovan Marjanović. These two were the first to speak publicly of the systematic persecution of the Serbian nation in Kosovo and Metohija. Soon, wider intellectual debates on the regime suppression of the Cyrillic script began and there was a specific reaffirmation of this script in social life. Mentioning these occurrences in the homeland, Kostić pointed out in detail how the Soviet Communists, after Lenin who was a fervent supporter of the Latin script, insisted on Cyrillic, even among almost every non-Russian nation that abandoned the Latin script and Arabic orthography. In this way, with the exception of Armenia, Georgia and the Baltic republics, almost the entire Soviet Union used the Cyrillic script, adapted to the various Slavic and non-Slavic languages. Today, around sixty nations use the Cyrillic script to write their languages.

Under the Communist regime, all state forms were printed in the

Latin script in Serbian countries, including passports and personal IDs. All state documents, court orders and official directions as well. Typing machines with Cyrillic letters were a true rarity in state organs and institutions. The army exclusively used the Latin script. Even if a list of names was printed in Cyrillic, the order was usually in the Latin alphabet. Traffic signs, license plates and road signs were a part of social life where Cyrillic did not exist at all. The same was in the field of the post office, telegraph and telephone traffic. "This was simply a further systematic Croatianisation of Yugoslavia. This was further de-Serbianisation, this was further cultural genocide. Every Serbian surface character had to vanish from the country that was called SFRY" (p. 350). In this regard, the situation was disastrous even in the field of culture. "It was as if the Serbs never had their own script. Little by little, the Serbs should be marked as a nation without a cultural history, as a nation without history at all. The hellish plan was made up, helped by the Serbian Communists, who found the position in the Communist hierarchy more dear and important than the entire Serbian nation – and the nation, beaten and harassed, kept silent" (p. 359-360). The constitutional guarantee of the equality of scripts was just a standard Communist phrase that no one took seriously.

Characteristic of the process of the systematic elimination of Cyrillic was that the Yugoslav Communist regime did not realise it through a public campaign. "The Communists never justified their actions concerning the elimination of Cyrillic. They did not speak publicly about this at all. Here lay their Jesuitism, which outdid the Ustashas. They would not speak of this publicly because this would mean their recognition that they had expelled the Cyrillic. They wanted to expel it and to avoid any mention of this, to avoid leaving any written trace of this. Broz and Kardelj were closer descendants of Loyola than Lenin in this regard" (p. 384-385). Apart from physical genocide, a skilfully planned cultural genocide was performed on the Serbs.

Although the Yugoslav regime was Communist, the nature of Tito's rule was primarily a personal dictatorship, because the entire Communist Party, state organs, army and police were subjected to his unlimited will. "It was said of King Aleksandar that he was a dictator from 1929. I do not deny this, but he did not have a fraction of the power of dictator Josip Broz, with his underground name of 'Tito'. He had more power than any other ruler, any monarch, any dictator in the world. No one was as omnipotent and unconstrained in their decisions as Josip Broz. He was not limited by any regulations, any people, any moral consideration. He could do whatever he wanted and did whatever he wanted" (p. 400). Tito's personal power and luxurious life were unprecedented in recent history. His function was for life and his authority was unlimited and immeasurable.

Tito's dictatorship overcame every monarchy. "In monarchies, rulers are for life. But every monarchist constitution foresaw what would happen in the case of a ruler's weakness, illness, incapability to rule... There was no analogous clause for Josip Broz. He could be entirely senile and still rule as a dictator and his word would still be more valid

IT-03-67-T
than any other, it would be irreplaceable and unsurpassable" (p. 401). Every political concept on which the regime relied was his personal one, the same as every program goal and practical political tendency. "And Josip Broz was not Serbian, he was not even a friend of the Serbs: Josip Broz hated the Serbs almost as much as Pavelić. Regardless of his formal function, in reality he remained a dictator. Formerly as the 'Prime Minister', the president of the council of ministers, later as the 'President of the Republic', always as the leader of the Party. He already had unlimited power in war and he did not reduce it even when he became the 'civil' President of the state. He performed acts of government and acts of violence with the same ease and lack of restraint, just as before. He did what he pleased and when he pleased" (p. 401).

Josip Broz murdered or imprisoned political adversaries as he saw fit in the given situation. All courts were entirely subjected to him. The Serbs suffered the most and the Croatians were mostly spared, except in exceptional cases. In 1944, during the first meeting with Ivan Šubašić PhD on the island of Vis, he openly declared that he was primarily Croatian and then Communist. As Kostić understood, "even then, on the island of Vis, he implied that he was Croatian and that he would lead a Croatian policy in the country. He, the representative of internationalism and the supreme supervisor of entire Yugoslav armed forces, implied that he would primarily preserve the Croatian interests while ruling! And who did he say this to: to the representative of the Yugoslav king from the Karadordević family. When it appeared, when it had to appear by all logical and moral laws, that the Croatians would pay for their misdeeds, their bestial and anti-ally actions in the war, two representatives of Yugoslavia (the new and the old) determined that the Croatian interests would be protected further" (p. 408).

No matter how grotesque and ridiculous Broz's personality was, the Serbs massively subjected to him and pledged loyalty to him, even when he oppressed them the most and harmed them obviously. "Tito was a taboo; nothing could be said to him and nothing reproached. If today he said this and tomorrow that, he was right both times. Both times the world would indulge him equally. In monarchies, the principle of the 'absoluteness' of the ruler was enforced; they were untouchable: nothing could be blamed on them. But their governments could be blamed, they were responsible even for the personal actions of the rulers. In the Yugoslav dictatorship, everyone could cover themselves with 'Tito' and say that it was his order and his will. Then the taboo formed. Not only was he unquestionable, but also everyone who stood behind him and covered by him" (p. 412).

From these detailed deliberations, Lazo Kostić drew the only possible conclusion that "the regime under which the Serbs squealed today was not only non-Serbian but it was also anti-Serbian to its utter limits. Its greatest representatives were Serbophobes, Serbivores. Their main national goal was the destruction of the Serbs, the main tendency was to make Serbdom disappear. This Yugo-Communist, or rather Croatian-Communist, regime was only different from the Ustasha

regime in that the Ustasas aimed at the physical extermination of the Serbs. These present-day Jesuit cadets (what is, for example, a Kardelj other than an incorporated Jesuit?) used indirect ways and concealed methods and did not aim for the physical but spiritual disappearance of the Serbs; for the deprivation of all their national marks and to stop them existing as a nation. The present 'leaders' of Yugoslavia worked by design and under Croatian directions, systematically, incessantly and untiringly on the theft of the Serbian territories, on the reduction of the Serbian national volume, on the removal of all Serbian marks, on their neglect, on the desecration of all their sacred things, on the denial of their historical endeavours and even their entire historical importance. They forced the Serbian representatives to approve this, to agree with this and even to request this themselves and prove that this was in the interest of the Serbs" (p. 241).

2. The Communist Propaganda Delusions

The book *These were All Lies and Delusions*, with the subtitle *The Phrases and Paroles of Communist Yugoslavia*, was one of the last works of Professor Lazo Kostić PhD to be published in his lifetime. It was printed in Munich in 1977 author's private edition. The author started with the analysis of the Communist devices or mottos, specific maxims that depicted the nature of the regime and represented the actually improvised and often senseless revolutionary slogans. The first of these slogans was "Death to the Fascism – Freedom to the people!", used long after the end of the war. It was used especially in the army to avoid the traditional salutation "God helped you, heroes – God helped you!". The history does not remember any military salutation beginning with the word "death". And the Fascism was not the only enemy of freedom, so its actual death was no guarantee that the people would gain freedom. After all, freedom was not possible under the Communist regime either, since the Communism was incomparably closer in nature to Fascism than democracy.

The parole on "brotherhood-unity" was coined during war, while the Croatian genocide against the Serbian nation was in progress, so that the Serbs would be discouraged and refrain from vengeance. After the war, the parole insistence on unity and the concurrent campaign against Unitarianism were incredibly contradictory. Unique meant unitary and not federal or even confederal, and the development of Communist constitutionalism went in this direction. A similar case was the Communist cry of "Workers of all countries unite!" Firstly, the proletarians never actually ruled in the country, nor did the Yugoslav Communists lead a policy of actual internationalism, instead scattering the unity of the international labour and Communist movements urged by the Americans. "When they asked the worldwide proletariat to unite, the Yugoslav Communists also asked the fanatical capitalists, primarily in the USA, to arm them against these proletarian states so they could kill the 'proletarians'. And here they are asked to unite with them!" (p. 8-9). In the internal political relations, the proletarians should unite

against the authorities that falsely represented themselves as the dictatorship of the proletariat and was actually the dictatorship of the Communist Party. "This was the fighting cry of the poor, barren and deprived against the rulers of the countries and these masses also asked for their rights and equality with other classes in other countries. Now the exploiters asked for this and not even they knew from whom. The wolves dressed in lamb skins and presented themselves as lambs. And they should be seen all dressed up in the same photographs. No bourgeois circles could match them. Every slightly known Communist, every 'delegate' and leader, was dressed better than an English lord. Each had a car, a tailored suit, a golden watch. Many were obese from plenty; at least every other had a weekend-house (indeed, they created this word), and every third had a large house. Still, they liked calling themselves proletarian, which meant naked and barefoot, hungry and deprived homeless people" (p. 9).

Under the Communist rule, Yugoslavia did not have its own anthem but it took the old Polish melody and adapted lyrics by a Slovakian author. Basically, the anthem *Hey Slavs* was pan-Slavic, but the Communists made it repulsive to the Serbian nation. Concerning the state coat of arms, the royal one was, like the anthem, a combination of three elements, Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian. The Communist variant first had five torches that symbolised five nations, then six torches that symbolised six federal units, with the date of the Second Session of the AVNOJ (the Anti-Fascist Council of the National Liberation of Yugoslavia) in Jajce. The wheat ears were introduced following the model of the Soviet Union, as was the red five-pointed star as an ideological symbol. The flag remained the same as the royal one, only a large red five-pointed star was added. After WWI, the Slovenians invented their own flag as a reversed Serbian one, not knowing that it was actually the imperial Russian flag. Flags were arbitrarily designated for the new federal units of Macedonian and Bosnia-Herzegovian – red with a five-pointed star or the Yugoslav tricolour flag in the upper left corner. The coats of arms of all the federal units were also completely invented and without any traditional heraldry while, in the case of Serbia and Croatia, they were modified after the Communist pattern.

The Yugoslav Communists were proud of the multi-nationality of their state, as if this was an advantage, a positive trait. In political theory, the national homogeneity of the state population and the compactness of the citizens and territory were considered values. The wisely-led state tried to achieve the highest degree of integration possible and it never occurred to them to insist on ethnic or religious differentiations. The Communist naming of national minorities as ethnicities and their doctrinary distinction from nations was against the generally accepted scientific terminology and against common sense. The ethnicity always meant the ethnic membership to a nation and, in conceptual terms, it meant the same as a nationality. The Communists used the term nations for members of the fictive national formations of the Macedonians, Montenegrins and Muslims, and the term ethnicity for the members of traditional and historical nations, like the Germans,

Hungarians and Turks, only because their mother nations lived outside Yugoslav borders. The terminological confusion had no special significance except that it appeared to the Communists that the expression “national minorities” was degrading and that it denied the principle of national equality.

According to Mr. Kostić, the truism on the equality of nations and nationalities is absurd. One can say that there is no national discrimination and that all individuals are equal in the eyes of law but, collectively, they can never be equal, as can be seen from the state names and symbols. If they are equal in the use of languages and the alphabet, it does not mean that nations and nationalities are totally equal. It is impossible to talk about the total equality of entities that are non-proportional in terms of their numbers, especially if they are not represented in the governmental bodies according to the principle of parity, but according to the proportional principle with artificial corrections.

The communist truism on the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the framework of the overall Marxist political theory, is especially ludicrous. In Yugoslav practice, communists deemed this dictatorship to be a first-rate democracy, specifying it in their own ideology as the self-management socialist democracy: “The dictatorship of the proletariat is the quasi-transitional form of government leading to a classless society, that is, as its own inventors and propagators argue, one provisional state [...] They themselves argue (Marx and Co.) that that provisional state is to survive until the classless society emerges”. That classless society is a utopia: it has never existed and it will never exist. In Yugoslavia, the classless society is impossible. In Yugoslavia, all ruling and wealthy classes were declassified and deprived of power and assets, but that did not lead to the appearance of a classless society, because the former proletarians became a “new class”, as explained by their greatest and most recognized ideologist, Milovan Đilas. Some proletarians became well-to-do, some became affluent. At the same time, the former rich became proletarians. Now, according to the principles of “Marxism-Leninism” the former rich should have been allowed to lead the dictatorship of the proletariat, because they were the “real proletarians”. Of course, that idea has crossed the mind of the new ruling class. That class proclaimed itself as proletarian, and remained proletarian even when they became millionaires. The ultimate leaders are already multimillionaires and billionaires and are still insatiable (p. 40). In addition, according to the international press, Tito’s personal wealth is invaluable.

All the communist regimes are one-party systems because the communists cannot stand competition. As Kostić observed, “before they took over, they were complaining everywhere that ‘bourgeois’ parties repressed and prosecuted them... And after they took over, they simply prohibited and destroyed such parties. This act, a hundred times worse and more cruel than the acts of the bourgeoisie towards them, is deemed justified and legitimate by the communists. They conduct such acts because they have the power and dispute that same right to those who

were in power before them in order to legitimately repress and prosecute them. They are allowed to kill, but they do not allow others to even cause injury” (p. 45). From the point of view of political theory, “a party is a part and the expression ‘one-party’ is nonsense... Furthermore, a one-party system is nonsense politically” (p. 45). Like a horse race where only one horse is racing, as Attlee ironically observed.

One-party regimes promote the party state – the state subordinate to the party and to the power of its leaders. Tito made a kind of a personal union that usurped the key functions in both the party and the state. In other communist states, things were not like that at first, the function of the secretary general of the parties was dominant. Afterwards, other communist leaders mostly followed Tito’s example and formally usurped key state functions. The leading role of the League of Communists was prescribed by the constitutions, thus spreading through the system of all the state institutions. The secret police was directly subordinated to the party, as was the army. Inside the party, the dictator wages a constant battle against possible or traduced opponents in order to preserve the monolithic, centralized structure and suppresses any attempt at organizing fractions on ideological or interest-related grounds.

For decades, the right to the secession of federal units seemed like a hollow proclamation without any realistic possibility of being realized, but at the moment of the collapse of European communism, the tragic consequences thereof affected both the Russians and the Serbs. This ideological postulate was initially conceived against these two nations. Lazo Kostić holds the communist concept of the withering away of the state to be the most absurd and that concept is entwined with the theory of abolishing classes and achieving a classless society. Communists started the nationalization and expropriations by abolishing private property and transforming such property into state, collective or public property. However, this was soon shown to be an economic failure, especially in the unsuccessful Yugoslav attempt to establish agricultural cooperatives. Subsequently, that communist dogma weakened and the private sector was gradually reinstated. “Before, nobody was allowed to have more than one flat but now the communist leaders have several houses and second homes each... The place of the former rich people has been taken by the new rich - communist leaders. The upheaval in the society and the state, celebrated and praised by the communist adherents was then described in a proverb ‘*Sjaši Kurta, da uzjaše Murta* (one exploiter is gone, but another is coming to power)’. The difference between the two is that the first class never misled anyone into believing they had nothing and that they should not have anything. The other, new class only uses slogans and deceives its adherents and opponents” (p. 59).

a) Broz’s Caesar-Mania

Concerning the non-aligned foreign policy, Kostić holds that this is Tito’s Caesar-mania, his wishes to achieve international affirmation at all cost. This is the movement of “countries that have no permanent

connection, they are only connected on paper” (p. 64). According to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs, communist Yugoslavia does not respect the same principle when other countries’ internal affairs are concerned p. 64). Tito supported the left opposition in some Western countries and screamed like a he-goat when somebody tried to help the withering Yugoslav opposition which he did not allow to become organized in a legal manner. He acted in support of the allegedly violated human rights of the Slovenian minority in Austria and Italy and the Macedonian in Greece and Bulgaria, but he never had any interest in the systematic oppression of Serbs in Romania and Albania, for example. Even the Serbs from Serbia are not able to take an interest in the plight of the Serbs who live in the Croatian federal unit without the political leaders accusing them of malicious patronizing or spreading nationalistic prejudices and chauvinistic hatred. Not to mention that it was impossible for the Serbs to get involved and prevent the persecution of Serbs in Kosovo and Metohija, which was formally an autonomous province within Serbia.

In Yugoslavia, it was exclusively the Serbian nationalism that was thoroughly suppressed, all other forms of nationalism were officially supported until the communist leaders decided that they had been taken too far and started to jeopardize the essence of the communist dictatorship. In the beginning, the regime's atheist course had been very pronounced but, after Tito's conflict with Stalin, it was slightly mitigated. Serbian Orthodox priests were maltreated the most and all religious activities outside churches were prohibited. “The Serbian Orthodox Churches that the Croats demolished during WWII were not restored for ten years or more because it was not allowed. It was even prohibited to adapt them for religious services. Later, when monetary aid started arriving on a mass scale into the country from abroad and Yugoslavia did not have any foreign currency inflow from tourism and “guest workers” as it does today, a gradual relaxation of the attitude toward the reparation of the demolished churches took place. If brand new buildings were concerned (because the old ones were totally demolished, for example), the authorities did not issue permits for them to be built in the same locations if these were salient (even in Banja Luka). At first, the restored churches in Croatia were even destroyed at night using dynamite. Brand new churches were prohibited because they “were not in line with city planning” or “the working people” objected. That happened more than once even in the vicinity of Belgrade. The pretext was that the land should have been better used, for schools and workers’ institutions, and not for some idle religious services. At the same time, communist leadership allowed the building of a monumental Roman-Catholic church in Podgorica, which was large enough for all the Catholics of old Montenegro to gather at the same time. “Nobody was allowed to protest against that” (p. 81).

Communist ideologists look down on capitalist countries, referring to them as the rotten and decadent West, but that did not stop Tito from accepting billions of dollars of non-refundable aid from the Americans and huge quantities of arms, as well as sending more than a million

IT-03-67-T
 redundant workers to work in the Western European countries. Even members of the League of Communists and hardened self-management adherents had to go abroad to work and they were even officially requested to cherish Tito's cult of personality in foreign countries and to interpret to the unenlightened Westerners the advantages of socialist self-management in comparison with their system of capitalist exploitation. Even after Stalin's cult of personality was toppled in the Soviet Union, Tito's cult was only promoted even more. “He seized supreme power for himself and the property of former rulers. On the other hand, in accordance with his wishes, the people of Yugoslavia had to worship and adore him time and time again. On a particular level, that was the case with the Roman Caesars. The cult of personality has been kindled from the top all the time, thus becoming the largest cult of personality after WWII. It was unprecedented in Europe and the rest of the world [...] Four cities in Yugoslavia carry his name, all of them former Serbian cities (Titova Korenica, Titovo Užice, Titov Veles and Titograd). Montenegro broke the record: it rejected the original name of the glorious town where Stefan Nemanja was born – the town Prince Nikola had returned to Serbs, helped by the heroism of Marko Miljanov and Jolo Piletić. In 1944, Tito ordered Podgorica to be bombed and, probably, this was why in honour of the bombing Podgorica is now called Titograd. In each Yugoslav town, at least one street is named after Tito – always the most prestigious and the longest. His paintings are not only kept in the state institutions but also in all cafés, restaurants, etc. His bust is situated on the largest squares in all cities. His pictures are published on the newspaper covers of every newspaper in Yugoslavia, sometimes more than once. If someone uses an insinuation to criticize him, he gets several years of penal servitude. Now in his 83rd year, he is elected as life-long president of the Republic, although in Yugoslavia common people get retired in their sixties” (p. 90-91).

All important positions in Tito's Yugoslavia could only be held by communists. Ideological and political suitability have always had an advantage over merit. This has been particularly ensured where universities and education in general are concerned, as well as cultural institutions. Political life is seemingly quite intensive, but rigorously controlled. Yugoslavia has incessant elections, but candidates are always from the ranks of a single party. Communists found rivals unnecessary and they regularly state that over 90 percent of registered voters vote in the elections. They introduced the pentacameral parliament and, subsequently, the indirect form of elections through the so-called delegate system. “All their Constitutions are based on experiments; all of them are trials and experiments. I cannot say with absolute certainty who redacted those Constitutions, but one thing is obvious: either those people were not lawyers or they were not eminent lawyers” (p. 103).

b) Constituent Experiments

Lazo Kostić summarizes accurately and concisely what the

communist constituent experiments looked like regarding the structure of the supreme legislative body: “The structure of the supreme representative and legislative body of Yugoslavia has changed more than once. In 1945, the Temporary People’s Assembly was a unicameral parliament. The People’s Assembly of FPRY in 1943 was a bicameral Parliament consisting of the Federal Council and the People’s Council. In 1953, the Federal People’s Assembly was a bicameral Parliament – the Federal Council and the Council of Producers, with the possibility of establishing a third house – the People’s Council – by separating it from the Federal Council. In 1963, the Federal Assembly was a pentacameral Parliament – the Federal Council, the Commercial Council, the Educational/Cultural Council, Social/Health Council and the Organizational/Political Council. In 1968, the Assembly was also pentacameral but, instead of the Federal Council and the Organizational/Political Council, Yugoslavia now has the People’s Council and the Social/Political Council. Pursuant to the new Constitution of SFRJ, the Assembly was bicameral, consisting of the Federal Council and the Council of the Republics and Provinces, which would be elected via the delegate system” (p. 104). A similar maze existed at other levels of legislative authorities.

The fundamental constitutive act was often changed by the communists, while in the civilized world there is the principle of constancy and stability of the constitutional and legal norms. “In countries with unstable constitutions, there is no respect for the legal system. Everyone thinks: these are the provisional norms that are surely going to be changed soon. And there are always forces that want to change the constitutional system. It is subject to changes and does not inspire respect as a permanent institution. Of course, this stands for the constitutions of all countries because the constitution prescribes the fundamental norm from which all norms are derived, it underpins all other norms. Communist Yugoslavia had five such constitutions and none was considered final. When constitutions change like that, what happens to laws? So many laws have been amassed that the best lawyers had considerable difficulties finding their way” (p. 107–108). Furthermore, each federal unit and even each of the autonomous provinces have their own constitution and network of laws. “It has been proven long ago that a country with a multitude of laws is unstable and rotten... In other words, the more corrupted a state is, the more laws it has” (p. 108).

Despite the old legal standard that a law should be concise and clear, Yugoslav communists praise the fact that their constitution is the largest and the longest in the world with a total of 378 articles. The idiotic principle of arranged federalism was introduced in practice, and the principle of parity was inaugurated on the federal level for the socialist republics and autonomous provinces, as well as periodical personnel rotations for the major political functions. Such rotations were prescribed for a very short period of time – a year, for example. This leads to the new politician disease – office-holder dizziness. For positions where rotation is compulsory in the democratic world, as in the function of the President of the Republic for example, the Yugoslav

system does not practice rotations but, where legal countries avoid rotations if there is no great need, the Yugoslav system does practice rotations.

The Yugoslav communists base their ideological and doctrinal beliefs on their self-management concept, which has nothing in common with the practice of local self-governments, first introduced in the Anglo-Saxon world. The essence of a local self-government is to allow the people to solve important issues of local importance without the influence of the federal authorities in the basic territorial units, i.e. the municipalities. The federal government was not allowed to interfere. Continental democracies introduced that principle at a later stage as an integral part of the democratic system which cannot function or even be conceived off without that principle. That principle was introduced in the democratic Serbia, when it existed as such – i.e. when the Radical Party was in power. They even called their main body, the official newspapers ‘*Self-governance*’, which was also published in Yugoslavia while the Radical Party existed (p. 115).

Communist self-management was primarily introduced in commercial companies and, later, in public institutions. “Drones are in charge there or, more precisely, idlers – i.e. workers’ leaders. Maybe the neo-communist workers have the right to vote, but only the communists are allowed to speak, make proposals and formulate decisions” (p. 116). Fifteen percent of employees had only one activity – political agitation and self-management – as their only profession, which is a luxury that a developed capitalist economy could not afford to have. Instead of the declarative democratization, an unprecedented bureaucratization was implemented.

c) Communist Courts – Revolutionary Tribunals

In all criminal cases where there existed an interest of the regime in the outcome, communist courts worked in accordance with the orders of the party committees and openly acted as revolutionary tribunals. In the first years after WWII, “the mob was allowed to affect lawsuits and judges were unable to disentangle themselves from such influences. The mob demanded conviction and the court almost always abided by that. Such a practice is unknown to and prohibited by contemporary judicature” (p. 119). In political processes, penalties are determined in advance. “The whole lawsuit becomes a farce. All evidence or counter evidence is worthless as the judgement is passed before the trial. The court only formulates and presents in legal form the verdict of the communist party” (p. 120). Although, formally, all judgements are passed in the name of the people, “the people in Yugoslavia had no connection with the judgements of the courts in the country. The people neither appoint the judges nor have influence on the system of justice. The people cannot revise or abolish judgements. All that is made possible and performed by the communist party of Yugoslavia (SKJ). It influences the appointment of judges, determines the penalty in advance if it deems it necessary and orders the court to revise the penalties, annul

judgments or replace a judgment with another” (p. 128).

The prison sentences were served in extremely inhuman conditions. The convicts were starved, they were freezing, they were forced to spy on each other, they were beaten for the smallest of things. In the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, political prisoners had had a privileged status, while in the communist Yugoslavia they were harassed more than anyone. Even the penalties imposed by the party caused serious status and social consequences. The cruellest treatment was used when the communists dealt with their former co-fighters. Survivors from Goli otok (Bare Island) testify of their experience there. Suspicious co-fighters were sent there by the party committees or authorities. In all of the above, the most humiliating was the institution of self-criticism. “When someone is accused and convicted, most often to the cruellest penalty – ousting from the party – he has to accuse and convict himself in addition. These cases border on the grotesque. If he refuses to undergo the process of self-criticism, the party shall have no mercy. Therefore, even completely innocent people who did nothing wrong have to exercise self-criticism” (p. 133). According to Kostić, self-criticism is “exclusively a communist institution, nobody else has ever used it, not even the Nazis or the Fascists. Self-criticism is something communists should not be proud of because it degrades the human being to the lowest kind of slave” (p. 134).

The foreign policy of the communist Yugoslavia was totally inconsistent. It was subject solely to Tito's wishes and whims. The foreign policy was not serving to consolidate the political status of the country abroad. No superpower would have been able to sustain so many diplomatic missions around the world. When he finds it useful, Broz recalls old alliances from the World Wars – although these are Serbian allies only. Croatia was allied with the defeated countries in both WWI and WWII. “In WWI, the dictator Broz himself fought in the Hungarian-Croatian army units and was decorated for courage exhibited in fighting the Serbs. He was promoted to the rank of corporal (though not a Marshal yet!)” (p. 141).

Where the army was concerned, “the army in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was one of the most reliable and the most disciplined – the best organization in the country. That army was built on the Army of the Kingdom of Serbia and it was renowned across the world because such an army was highly respected abroad. However, it was not successful in WWII. The war came unexpectedly, the enemy was superior in number and the powerful centrifugal currents in the army revealed themselves. All this led to a debacle and the ruin of what had been laboriously built at great cost over two decades. It was not just the fact that the enemy captured all supplies and all weapons, but – what was most painful – half of that army (i.e. the whole army except for the national Serbs and Slovenes) fought against the Serbs. Trained by the Serbs and mostly financed by the Serbs, the army turned against the Serbs. Serbs trained the army to kill Serbs. First and foremost, this refers to the Croats, whose officers were taken over from the Yugoslav army, as well as the Croat corporals and enlisted soldiers. The same applies to other Serbian

IT-03-67-T

enemies. The Germans established two squadrons of former Yugoslav soldiers and officers. Furthermore, the Arbanasi (Albanians) also used their military knowledge obtained in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Equally, if not more so, “partisans” or communists obtained their knowledge in the Yugoslav army. There was a mass of reserve officers, non-commissioned officers and soldiers in the “partisans”. There were also active duty officers, mostly Montenegrin, including the army chief of staff, Arso Jovanović” (p. 144).

Kostić is confident that the communist army was no better than the royal army and, in case of war, history would repeat itself. “The commanding element was certainly not as educated as it was in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. So far, and even now for the most part, the generals in the communist Yugoslavia have been non-commissioned officers or reserve officers, artisans or workers – rarely intellectuals. Ranks were skipped, privates became generals” (p.146).

Serbia achieved its economic development through receiving presents from the USA, exporting the labour force and opening up to tourism. That created a false image of a functional economy and self-management in companies. Ship-building was organized as joint venture of federal units, but shipping was collapsing. Hotels on the Adriatic coast were built by everyone, but were left mostly to the Croats. Serbian mineral resources were overly exploited – Bor and Majdanpek especially – but for the benefit of other parts of Yugoslavia, not Serbia. Under the communist regime, food had to be imported intensively, although the pre-war Yugoslavia was a great exporter of food. Normally, Broz constantly struggled with the foreign trade deficit, considering that the import exceeded the export by 75%.

In addition, industrialization was proclaimed when there was no place for it in Yugoslavia, there were no pre-conditions or preparatory activities and research. As collectivization was proclaimed first and people were trying to avoid it, they started moving to the cities. Farms in the villages were no longer their own. They would not have anything in the city either, but at least they would have a better quality of life. Subsequently, when the communists abolished compulsory collectivization, they left minimal plots of land to the land-owners. Again, they were unable to live there, especially families with several children. They were simply urged to go to the city, where they again would not have anything except a better quality of life. Furthermore, others would not have anything, so they would feel better. After all, young people who did not have any kind of entertainment at the time, yearned for the cities” (p. 162).

Cities were soon populated with displaced and disoriented village people, which also multiplied social issues. “Flats were scarce and the labour force was not always sufficient. Cities received tremendous ballast – a mortgage they could not free themselves from. That made the establishment of new economically unviable industrial companies necessary and that only generated and increased unemployment. If the town was larger, more people moved there, until finally a mass of a several hundred thousand unemployed would emerge there” (p. 162). If

the situation had not been alleviated by exporting “gastarbeiter” (guest workers), the socially tense situation in the country would have soon become explosive. Big cities were expanded enormously and in such a rapid manner that infrastructure would lag behind for years. With the prohibition of private property and the introduction of socially-owned property, the criminal possibilities doubled, which opened the doors to a new category of economic crime, which became the major form of behaviour. Work ethics were degraded. Communists were never able to achieve a stable Dinar. In communists’ hands, the coin mint was a great temptation for them, so they constantly went from devaluation to devaluation. “Comparison with the pre-war Yugoslavia is inevitable. In the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, after the first few years, the exchange rate was stable, mostly thanks to Dr Milan Stojadinović. And, for 20 years, if not longer, the Dinar was stable... the Dinar was convertible and appreciated everywhere” (p. 174).

An unstable exchange rate is the best indicator of the chronically bad state of the communist economy was in and of the deficit in the state treasury. Confidence in the bank was lost, creditors were handicapped and debtors protected, while healthy domestic sources of investments were totally eliminated. While the Kingdom of Yugoslavia avoided taking foreign loans, communist borrowing was taken to the extreme. The expenditures of public enterprises increased enormously but improved quality was not achieved. Everything therefore came down to administrative and ideological improvisation. Nevertheless, despite a decline in the quality of teaching and knowledge, the network of primary schools was significantly expanded. Primary schools are mostly turned into eight-year schools. Kostić holds that progress was achieved when the diversity of secondary schools was introduced, which lead to an increase in the competence of workers. The number of secondary school graduates soon exceeded the objective demand and possibilities but, for the technical secondary school graduates, the possibility of employment abroad was the salvation. “They were needed in the country and it was easy for them to find work. But, they are the ones foreign countries attracted, so the efforts and costs the society and the country invested to educate these young people were all in vain”. They are gone. If they are needed in the country, they are that much more useful abroad. Foreign countries pay them better and they leave the country” (p. 180). At the same time, there was a virtual flood of new universities and faculties, but with a significant decrease in the scientific and educational level. This led to a real inflation of higher-education diplomas, Master’s and PhD degrees. The quality of textbooks declined constantly, as well as the academic dignity of the university professors, lecturers and assistants.

In the sphere of spiritual and cultural creative work, Lazo Kostić primarily criticizes the artificial establishment of Academies of Arts and Sciences by the communists in each federal unit as an ignorant travesty of science and a further repression of Serbian national awareness. The Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences managed to preserve its name, but not its autonomy. Furthermore, the Academy had to limit the selection of its members to the Serbian federal unit and, very soon,

provincial “academies”, Vojvodina’s and Kosovo’s were established. In addition, the associations of writers were turned, with more or less success, into certain party transmissions. However, a considerable number of Serbian intellectuals resisted the regime’s pressures and created significant works, primarily dealing with older political history, theory and the history of literature, etc. Journalism and publicist writing was under strict control of the regime and had a rigidly formulated ideological and propaganda-related function. “In Yugoslavia, there is no censorship of the press, because it is completely unnecessary - the editorial offices employ the most zealous communists and they write whatever the political leaders command” (p. 214).

Kostić holds that the development of Serbian poetry in Yugoslavia was arrested, but that the fiction has achieved its greatest success, mentioning the great names of Serbian literature like Ivo Andrić, Meša Selimović, Branko Ćopić, Dobrica Ćosić and others. “Each of them wrote excellent novels and very interesting, accomplished short stories. Some of their works are timeless masterpieces of Serbian literature” (p. 218). Ivo Andrić, Veljko Petrović, Isidora Sekulić and Desanka Maksimović wrote some of their best works before or during the WWII and Miloš Crnjanski as an emigrant. Theatre turned to the classical works, thus releasing the artist from the communist ideological clinch, though the TV programme remained extremely biased and tendentious, serving exclusively for political indoctrination. A similar situation can be observed where the development of cinema is concerned, where social realism and revolutionary enthusiasm have dominated for decades. Directors striving for the free-minded approach were rare and some were persecuted.

The Yugoslav communist regime systematically denied them their basic civil rights and their freedom. All anti-regime activities were strictly forbidden and rigorously sanctioned. Legal proceedings in political cases were completely staged, and the right to defence was formalized to the extreme. Kostić analyses these issues from the point of view of internal legal principles and international law, and then quotes the text by Svetomir Paunović from “*Amerikanski srbobran*” (*American Serb Defender*) from 1977, which is very precise in its presentation of the communist: “The official opinion is the communist opinion, as dictated by Tito’s party. Neo-communists are not allowed to have a collective, group or individual opinion. Each opinion not in line with the ‘official’ opinion of the League of Communists, i.e. - Tito’s and the Central Committee’s opinion is considered ‘antinational’ and ‘anarchic’, ‘distorting the communist reality’, is classified as ‘enemy propaganda’, as ‘slandering the social system’, as a ‘malicious and untrue presentation of the Yugoslav reality’. In addition, it ‘insults the reputation of the country’ and its ‘organs and representatives’. To summarize – an opinion different from the communist opinion is equal to high treason and is punishable accordingly!” (p. 259).

Communists physically liquidated their war enemies, formally equalizing Chetniks and Ustashas, but they had a far more tolerant attitude toward Ustashas. They referred to their political enemies as

reactionaries. However, soon the major political conflicts started appearing within the communist ranks because of ideological divergences, interest clashes, clans and altercations. "They say that the adherents of Informbiro were treated far worse than the reactionaries. Unbelievable stories are told about the island of Goli Otok. I do not know whether they are true or not and I cannot believe that such horrors are possible" (p. 262). For people who were not there, it seemed unbelievable that Tito's camps exceeded Stalin's when it comes to cruelty and torture methods. "When that problem calmed, other conflicts started, protests and secessions came. But the communist leadership is always right: only what they believe is good, which is in conformity with the doctrines of Marx and Lenin, and that is real communism. All other beliefs are deviations, a departure from the true road, which is, maybe, only the leader's road – Tito's dictatorship. He is unerring and anyone departing from his line, however slightly, is a transgressor, an enemy of the principle, a traitor. Those traitors are not on the same line and they are not guided by the same ideas. They are different from each other: they have different aspirations; one wants reforms leading in one direction, the other also wants reforms, but in another direction. For all of these ideological movements, an expression should be found that would compromise them, that expression should be short, clear and convincing. Only the expression should be convincing, not the arguments. Who would dare ask about the arguments? That expression is intended to blemish the reputation of a person permanently and intimidate others. Even when the divergences are not a matter of principles but are personal in their nature, opponents should also be compromised with one expression, stigmatized and neutralized" (p. 262-263).

When Tito was forced to eliminate the Croatian communist leaders in order to stay in power, he had to make a balance on the Serbian side and to get rid of the services of communist officials who competed among themselves in who would spite the Serbian people more. They were labelled Anarcho-Liberals, while their predecessors had been removed as Unitarians. A few years later, there was a campaign against technocracy and techno-managers in order for the communists to liquidate successful businessmen who did not fit into the standard official dogmas. Certain categories of Tito's real or imaginary enemies were referred to as Đilas's men or Ranković's men, etc. Their counterparts in other communist countries were revisionists, Trotskyites, Stalinists, etc.

Since political parties are the fundamental instruments of democracy – the precondition for the existence of democracy – the freedom of political organizing and party activities is of the utmost importance. In Yugoslavia, under the communist regime, such freedom was abolished at the very beginning and the overall social life was orchestrated from just one centre. In that situation, the single party loses its original sense, because a party should signify a part of the social entity. Here, the single party is the absolute entity, outside of which everything is disempowered. The quasi-parliamentary bodies act without opposition. "A Parliament without opposition is the invention of the communists

and the Nazis and it only befits them. That is nonsense, a mockery of parliament; parliament requires different opinions to be heard and requires all the aspirations in the country to be articulated" (p. 294–295). A communist parliament only agrees to decisions passed in advance by the Communist Party. Therefore, there are no free elections of people's representatives. The freedom of university studies and the freedom of the press are also abolished. "Writing against the regime is not only forbidden, but one has to write what one is told. One cannot be a critic but, at the same time, one cannot be neutral, everyone is supposed to praise what the regime finds favourable and especially what the regime is doing. However, this is all referred to as if the press is not only free, but that this freedom is guaranteed" (p. 301).

Giving a whole list of concrete cases of the persecution of free-thinking intellectuals under Tito's regime, Kostić says that in a "liberal country, there is no such thing as a press offence if someone criticizes the government. On the contrary, the protection of an individual's honour is statutorily defined and their laws envisage enormous fines. When an individual criticizes the government, he is merely performing his duty as a citizen and the government has hundreds of ways of rebutting such criticisms. Under communism, an individual has no other way to express his discontent other than to physically attack the libeller, which is impossible in large countries, where people live separated by vast distances" (p. 303). Communists can use the press to publish whatever they like, to attack or slander anyone they want, and an individual has no right to reply and there is no such thing as an official denial.

Kostić gives special attention to the persecution of a group of Belgrade university professors/philosophers – the "praxisists" – and says that it was the topic that "the whole world was writing about, but nobody investigated it. Nobody wondered why it was only the Belgrade professors who were prosecuted. Furthermore, why had they been working there for ten years, using the Croat alphabet and Croatian culture? Were they unaware of their Serbian nationality? We would not say so: it was due to the fact that they were hoping to save themselves because Zagreb and Croatia were tolerated in the country of Croatian dictator [Tito]. Their writing could be safely published and they would not be persecuted. But they were wrong! But all of us outsiders have to wonder why the Croatian editors of that magazine were neither punished, nor removed from the university. They had either never written anything inconvenient for the regime, or the regime had been protecting them since they were Croats. We have never heard that any of them had any problems" (p. 313).

Radio and television under the communist regime were even more controlled than the books, newspapers and magazines. The inviolability of correspondence was violated since the police opened all correspondence with foreign countries. Telephone conversations were intensively intercepted. Private conversations were also recorded using a special magnetoscopic technique. The authorities had the discretionary right to deny the issuance of a passport to any citizen or to refuse to

extend the validity of a passport without explanation. The Yugoslav secret police organized the kidnapping or liquidation of prominent emigrants. The organization of a Labour Union was formalized and the Union was without any real power or influence, while used up party and state leaders were appointed leaders of trade unions. The courts were completely instrumentalized – even attorneys were persecuted if they tried to do their job professionally in a political proceeding. In his book, Lazo Kostić described the process against the attorney Srđa Popović, who was convicted because he had tried to prove that his client, Dragoljub Ignjatović, had been telling the truth and the public prosecutor characterized his defence as a criminal act of enemy propaganda or spreading false information.

Communists have been promoting a new terminology. Old terms received a new meaning, but they also introduced artificial new terms that were unknown before. Thus, they used the term republic to refer to an entity that had no attributes of republican statehood. Serbs were accused of centralistic (unitarian) tendencies and endeavours, while they supported Croatian and Shqiptarian (Albanian) centralism at the same time. They made up the term rukovodilac (steersman or handler), which had never existed in the Serbian language before. This must be someone who guides with his hand or handles something. Kostić especially mocks Tito's third proclamation as a national hero. The Communists even had city-heroes, but they also proclaimed heroes of socialist labour. Belgrade and Zagreb were proclaimed hero cities. "Belgrade was bombed by the maniac Hitler and his military formations without mercy in the early hours of the war... People who went to churches, women who went to green markets, babies in their cradles were all killed in Belgrade. The Germans were welcomed in Zagreb though, people were throwing flowers at German soldiers, crying in happiness, and young women kissed the German officers publicly because they brought them freedom. If any blood was spilt, it was again the blood of the Serbs killed by the Croats "liberated from the Serbian yoke" (p. 368).

The communists were bothered by the conventional urban address of "Mister", so they introduced the term "comrade" instead, as a compulsory way to address people in public communication. "True, socialists address each other as comrade, but that was their internal way of address, a party address. Now, it is compulsory to address a judge in Yugoslavia as 'comrade'. Attorneys have to do that, clients too – even defendants charged as criminals. A criminal is a comrade (friend) to the judge, which means they are equals. This is how logic can explain this way of address. Everybody is everybody's comrade! And camaraderie (friendship) is a sacred thing that should be limited as much as possible. It is interesting that the arch enemies of communism in the Serbian society are the so-called "zborashi" or "ljotičevci" who also address each other as comrades. However, in the communist society this form of address is considerably more rigorous, general, obligatory and in practice for a longer time" (p. 376).

Chapter XIII

SERBIAN BOSNIA

Professor Lazo Kostić first addressed the Bosnian question in the publication *Who is Entitled to Bosnia? The Opinions of Foreign Scientists and Politicians on the Ethnicity of Bosnia and Herzegovina* which was published in Toronto in 1955 in the magazine *Bratstvo (Brotherhood)*, the editor-in-chief of which was the Serbian intellectual Alija Konjhođić. In subsequent years, Kostić was pursuing other national issues and problems but, concurrently, he was collecting materials for the second, extended edition. The material he found was so comprehensive that the second edition had to be published in six voluminous books in the period from 1965 to 1975. The books were published as a series under the combined name *National Problems of Bosnia and Herzegovina*.

1. A Study on Inter-Religious Relations

The first book in the serial is a demographic study, *Inter-Religious Relations in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, which Kostić self-published in Munich in 1965. The author is treating the fundamental issue of religion from the time the Serbs settled in Bosnia in the sixth century and brought their old faith with them. The systematic Christianization of Serbs lasted for three centuries and the Serbian Neretljani tribe resisted more than any Serbian tribe in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Almost a hundred years after the definitive Christian schism, the Hungarians started to introduce Catholicism to Bosnia. German historian Heinrich Renner, a devout catholic, wrote in 1896 that the Hungarian kings "were designated to become the executors of the papal will" (p. 9). Munich professor Georg Stadtmiller wrote in the early 20th century: "The penetration of the catholic church into late-medieval Bosnia was performed from the north, involving Hungarian state authorities. Due to that fact, the catholic hierarchy in Bosnia belonged to the church province of the Archbishop of Kalacha (Hungary)" (p. 9), Kostić also finds an indirect confirmation of the information on the expectations of Bosnian Catholics from the Austro-Hungarian occupation in the study of the Hungarian state official Janos Asbott, published in the late 19th century in Vienna: "Those leaders of Bosnian Catholics who expected to make their dreams come

true from the occupation, who expected that the old policy of the Hungarian kings would restore Catholic faith in Bosnia – i.e. those who expected nothing less than that the whole of Bosnia would turn Catholic – were in for a rude awakening” (p. 9-10).

Even in the encyclopaedia reference, university professor Jaroslav Šidak wrote in 1956 that, in the 18th century, the Roman Curia had tried “to break the country's resistance with the crusades and the stakes, thus giving support to the aspiration of the court in Buda to subjugate Bosnia to Hungary and its episcopate [...]” (p. 10). Coerced conversions to the Catholic faith by fire and sword were persistently performed in all the territories held by the Hungarians, while Orthodox Christianity was better preserved in the southern parts of Bosnia. In the early 12th century, the Bogomils came to Bosnia, banished from the Nemanjić Serbia. The Bogomils were a heretical Christian sect, members of which were also called the Patarenes, *Babuni*, Manichaeists or Cathars. They established the Bosnian church, which was active until the Turkish invasion. “And that trinity of religions followed B&H in the future. The Muslims would come instead of the Bogomils, but they would always be three significant religions that would most likely never permeate, but hate and oppose each other. Sometimes one of the three would proclaim itself as the state religion, only to cede its position to another one that was stronger at the time. Even the ‘rulers’ - princes, bans or kings - converted to one of the three faiths opportunistically in accordance with the current situation. It is sometimes even impossible to determine which religion they converted to” (p. 10–11)...

It is obvious from the letter sent by the King of Duklja, Vukašin Nemanjić, to Pope Innocent III in 1199 that Ban Kulin was a Bogomil. Kulin converted to the Catholic faith when the Pope threatened him with a crusade, but his Catholicism lasted only as long as the threat of war, when the Bosnian nobility relapsed into Bogomil faith. Subsequently, Ban Matija Ninoslav was also forced to renounce the heresy and subject himself to the authority of the Catholic Church, while King Stefan I Kotromanić was publicly accused of relying on Bogomils. The Bogomils killed Mladen I Šubić in 1305. Only after Stefan II Kotromanić married a Polish princess in the first half of 14th century, did the Catholicism started to seriously penetrate Bosnia. At that time, Franciscan friars also appeared in Bosnia, beginning their perfidious and infamous missionary activities. Prince Hrvoje converted to Catholicism on his deathbed and King Tvrtko II Tvrtković converted after King Sigismund's open threats in 1435 in Belgrade, where he was hunting with the Hungarian and Austrian aristocrats. Tvrtko's successor, Stefan Tomaš was also a Bogomil and, even after he was converted into the Catholic faith in 1444 (according to historical sources, his conversion was just skin-deep), he continued to support and protect the Bosnian Church. With reference to the study of Franjo Rački *Bogomils and Patarenes*, published in Belgrade in 1931, Kostić says that “King Tomaš neither wanted to spread the Catholicism in Bosnia at any cost, nor take vigorous measures against the “infidels”. The Franciscans demanded that he apply iron and fire against them. King Tomaš personally

addressed the Pope, explaining his position, caused by the great number of non-Catholics and their influence in the country. All these rulers converted to the Catholicism under the tremendous pressure from Rome and the Catholic rulers surrounding them, but they had never been truly faithful to it” (p. 12).

A vast majority of Bosnian noblemen never converted to Catholicism and the Catholic faith had never had many followers among the common people. The Herzog of Saint Sava, Stefan Vukčić Kosača, remained Orthodox until death. In the encyclopaedia reference on Bogomils, Alexander Soloviev wrote in 1995: “The papal delegate, Tomasini, Bishop of Hvar, had the task of converting Duke Stefan Kosača and his subjects into Catholicism, but Kosača deceived the Pope and, in the following year, he proclaimed himself Herzog of Saint Sava in order to gain sympathies of the Orthodox people who were numerous in Hum. Then, as a Turkish vassal, he attacked Dubrovnik, which sharply accused him of being a ‘perfidious Patarene’ (p. 13). In 1881, Ilarion Ruvarac wrote of the great Bosnian Duke Hrvoje: “Hrvoje the Herzog was a Patarene and the protector of Patarenes. His brother Vuk was most likely also a member of that sect, while their nephews, the offspring of their two brothers and, especially, Zorislav's grandson, were faithful Catholics who built many monasteries for Bosnian fraters on their lands” (p.13). In 1447, the Pope praised Petar Zorislavić for being the first Bosnian prince who managed to remain a faithful Catholic in a heretical society. Kostić points out that “Vuk's sons - Hrvoje, Vuk, Dragiša and Vojislav - and his daughter Vukica all have pure folk names; and that the sons and grandsons of Dragiša and Vojislav have Christian names: Ivaniš, Đurađ, Pavao, Marko, Jurje and Petar. This is the result of the activities of “the honourable vicar and the brethren of the holy Catholic Church of the Roman order of St. Francis, who managed, at least in some parts of Bosnia, to take over and perform religious services previously performed by the honourable *djed* (Translator's note: grandfather) and his *strojnici* (Translator's note: the keepers) and the Christians of the Bosnian Church” (p.13). The proof that the Catholicism in Bosnia was not firmly rooted is the letter of the last Bosnian King, Stefan Tomašević to the Pope in 1461, in which he asks the Pope for the royal crown and new bishops and promised the following: “Crowned by thee, I shall bring thy faith to my subjects, fear to the enemies” (p.14).

It is obvious that the reasons for some Bosnian rulers to convert to Catholicism were primarily political and that even those who formally converted to Catholicism did not do that sincerely or for long. The common people always considered this faith alien and rarely accepted it. They were either faithful Orthodox or faithful Bogomils. In his famous *History of Bosnia*, Vladimir Ćorović wrote: “Bosnian politicians accepted Catholic Church either because of fear of Hungarian persecution or due to their opportunism, in order to obtain or strengthen certain benefits from their conversion. If they noticed that the Catholic forces had weakened or if there had been confusion in the Catholic ranks, they would abandon their Catholic orientation, sometimes

overnight, searching for the new ways” (p. 13–14). At that time, there were many conversions and much fighting over believers, but the continuous Catholic proselytism and methods of inquisition had never been able to gain a foothold and become rooted in the hearts of the ordinary Bosnian Serbs.

The Vatican medieval archives are full of alarming reports of Bosnian heretics, as well as of failed crusades and inquisitors' actions against them. Their battle against the Bogomil heresy buffered and delayed their attacks on the Orthodox Christians, but the Serbian feudal nobility also had a negative attitude toward Bosnian Bogomils and the historical sources recorded that the first Franciscan friars came to Bosnia in 1291, invited by King Dragutin Nemanjić. Some records prove that the Bogomil heretics had extremely good relations with the Orthodox schismatics, thus leaving no place for Catholicism where the common people were concerned. Alexander Soloviev draws attention to interesting historical information with respect to the latter: “In 1340, the Franciscan General Gerard came to Bosnia as arbiter. The Ban gave him a warm welcome and persuaded him that he only tolerated the heretics because they would call upon their schismatic allies to fight against him” (p. 18). The Hungarian King Sigismund boasted that he “captivated a great number of the infidel and schismatics inhabitants of Bosnia and Raška” in his campaign against King Tvrtko (p.18). During the reign of Tvrtko I and his successor, Stefan Dabiša, the Catholics in Bosnia were nearly eradicated. In the early 15th century, the situation was almost the same and Kostić writes: “King Tvrtko II Tvrtković appealed to the Pope in 1428 to allow him to marry Dorothea from Pécs, which would be his third marriage. He assured the Roman Curia that he was a faithful Catholic despite the fact that he was the king of a country with a population of infidels and schismatics” (p. 18-19). The data was taken from the Ludwig von Thallóczy's *Study on the history of the Bosnians and the Serbs*. In addition, Duke Stjepan Vučić asked the Pope in 1439 to send someone capable of converting him and his subjects to Catholicism. The Pope sent Toma, Bishop of Hvar to Hum, Bosnia and Croatia.

In the 15th century, the Vatican Curia showed its impatience and intolerance. “The less successful the Franciscan friars were in Bosnia, the more the Vatican persisted in its attempt to convert Bosnia to Catholicism, especially after the collapse of the Serbian state in the second quarter of 15th century. At that time, the Pope sent renowned friar James of the Marches who spent some time in Konavli near Dubrovnik, where he fought the Orthodox faith in particular. He started his first mission as an inquisitor against the Hussites in Bohemia. He stayed in Konavli in 1435, right after Konavli was made part of the Republic of Dubrovnik, and there he was caught up in a dispute “with a local priest named Nikša”, and the latter had to be protected by the Republic of Dubrovnik, (Grand Council, the Rector and the Small Council). His activities in Bosnia were recorded in 1432, 1435, 1451 and 1452 - “he was always brave and energetic in his defence of the Catholicism and fanatical in his fight to suppress the Bogomils [...] He was so ruthless in

conducting his proselytistic mission as inquisitor that he provoked numberless complaints and his superiors had to remind him to be more considerate. There is a letter of the Franciscan Minister General, Guillermo da Casale that describes how he had to warn Friar James not to exaggerate in his zeal as he was even causing scandals. However, that did not stop the Catholic Church from proclaiming him a Saint, because that was the way of spreading the Catholicism” (p. 19).

When King Stefan Tomaš began coerced conversions into Catholicism, a great number of his subjects fled to the territory of Herzog Stefan and, on 31 May 1459, the Dominican friar Nicolo Barbuzzi wrote in Jajce that “the position of King Tomaš was extremely difficult and he could not fight the Turks because his subjects were mostly Manichaeists who preferred the Turks over the Catholic forces and he could not rely on them in fight” (p. 20). Here, Kostić cites the university professor from Sarajevo and historian of the Croats, Anto Babić, who wrote in 1956: “From the first appearance of the Bogomils until the ruin of the Bosnian state, Roman Popes had treated Bosnia as a heretical country, and used the Bogomilism as a pretext to start crusades that threatened the independence of the country and arrested its normal development” (p. 20). Amy Boué writes about this in his book *European Turkey*: “The only Slav country that was supposed to be inclined to the Pope was Bosnia, because it had been under the influence of the Hungarian kings and had always recognized the sovereignty of Hungary, willingly or less willingly. Unfortunately, the Paulicianism or the Patarene and the Bogomil heresy caused so much trouble for Rome; despite the Vatican efforts and the good will of certain domestic princes, as well as Hungary itself, there had been only a handful of Roman Catholics left” (p. 21).

Kostić cites Spenser's travelogue from 1852, where the author wrote, among other things: “The inhabitants of Bosnia used to be a part of the Serbian state but they overthrew the Serbian tsar in the 12th century and accepted the protection of the Hungarian Kings. History teaches us that the Hungarians who were faithful Catholics at that time, and who had received the holy banner with various symbols of the salvation of their souls from the Pope, took it upon themselves to bring their new subjects into the bosom of Serbian church. Since the Hungarians did not come up with any means other than fire and sword, and the unfortunate people who remained faithful to the faith of their ancestors were unable to defend themselves, they secretly sought help from the Ottoman Turks who encroached into Europe for the first time, setting foot in the Thracian lowlands” (p. 21). The German ethnographer Richard Kiperig wrote in 1876 that the persecuted heretics from various countries had found shelter in Bosnia “because those who managed to escape the bloody persecutions inflicted on them by the Pope, found refuge in Bosnia and there they strengthened the anti-Catholic party significantly. At first, the Roman Curia tried to fight these dangerous enemies with spiritual weapons, sending the members of the newly established Franciscan order (1208). When such methods proved unsuccessful, the Curia incited the Hungarian Kings to realize their alleged rights to this

Comment [K.B.39]: Translator's note: Author has not been found, suggested spelling

land by sword - and thus it (Roman Curia) led a series of bloody crusades, starting in 1238 and lasting for a century [...] However, the persecuted found new strength by disintegration of the Hungarian power and establishment of national rule in Bosnia, which even introduced the title of king in 1376. Although these rulers were formally Catholics, it seems that at first they approved of the heretics who were able to send four episcopos to the Council of Basel in 1433 and establish connections with the Hussites in 1437. The mighty vassals of the new kings were even more tolerant [...] in Zahumlje or Herzegovina [...] The Bogomils or Patarenes, persecuted in Bosnia, found their last refuge there. It is understandable that after so much suffering, the Bogomils saw their salvation in a change of regime [...] even under the power of the arch-enemies of Christianity [...] they were hoping that they would find some relief for their position” (p. 22).

Kostić finds similar information in the works of the Swiss publicist Max Kohn, who wrote in 1953 that “In 1325, when Bosnia became a maritime state under Stefan Kotromanić, the Pope warned the Hungarian king that he was allowing heretics to thrive unpunished, especially knowing that they grew significantly stronger, supported by the religious refugees from other countries. But faced with the indomitable will of the Bosnian people and the ill-will of their rulers, not even the soldiers, the Inquisition or the preaching ardour of the selfless Dominicans and Franciscans were able to change the situation for 150 years. Around 1375, Pope Gregory XI complained that almost all the inhabitants were either heretics or – in the northern part that became Bosnian after 1300 – schismatics (the Greek Orthodox)” (p. 22). Medieval Bosnia continuously changed the size of its territory and the distribution of the Bogomils and the Orthodox depended on it, but there are no records that they had any serious conflicts. Kostić points out that: “At the times of the greatest Catholic proselytism, during the Hungarian suzerainty and the conversion of the domestic rulers to the Catholicism, the Orthodoxy still smouldered in Bosnia and flourished in Herzegovina. It had somehow mysteriously entered Bosnia and waited for the right time to rise. This time had come with the termination of the Inquisition’s actions in accordance with the principle of the ‘militant church’[...] Which was, at the same time, the beginning of non-Christian, Islamic rule and could serve as evidence that even the *agarjani* (Translator’s note: old Serbian word for the Turks and Moslems) were less intolerant and did not persecute the Orthodox faith as much as the Catholics and that the Despot of Smederevo was right when he saw a greater danger for the Serbs in Catholicism than in Islam” (p. 23).

The Franciscan preacher Ivan Kapištran complained in 1455 to the Pope about the influence of the Metropolitan of Raška in Bosnia and his interference with Franciscan proselytic actions. Janosz Asbót refers to Farlatti who discovered the charter of the Bosnian king issued in 1444 in Kreševo, which was written by “our faithful and beloved father in Christ, Vladimir Vladimirović, Greek Orthodox Episcopo of Kreševo and Neretva, the secret scribe on our court and doctor of Greek literature and law, in the presence of the Catholic Bishop of Hvar, Pope’s legate,

and Teofan, the Bishop of Duklja and Peć, the Greek patriarch of our Kingdom of Raška (the emissary); the Serbian Metropolitan Maksim and several Dukes of Serbia and Raška” (p. 24). Asbót then added: “The Orthodox element only began to play an important role in the history of Bosnia after Tvrtko I annexed a part of Raška to Bosnia [...] But the Orthodox population quickly grew through refugees after the Turks had conquered Serbia and Raška” (p. 25).

In his text on Mostar, Austrian Robert Michel wrote in 1909 about the situation in medieval Bosnia: “Under the influence of the Serbian princes, who ruled the country many times in history, Orthodox Christianity became stronger. The Catholics managed to maintain their position only because they were close to Dalmatia. Within the Orthodox confession, there was a schism when the Bogomil sect separated itself” (p. 25). Alexander Gilferding, the Russian Consul in Sarajevo and a distinguished historian, carefully studied the fact that a much larger percentage of the Muslims lived in Bosnia than in other Serbian lands, and came to the following conclusion in his book *Traveling through Herzegovina, Bosnia and Old Serbia*, published in Saint Petersburg in 1859: “Why didn’t Bosnia defend her faith better? Why are there almost 200,000 Muslim men in Bosnia, when, at the same time, in other counties inhabited by the same Serbs, people preferred slavery and death of faith to conversion? History gives us an answer. Bosnia [...] had been constantly separated from the other Serbian states. The Bosnian rulers were opponents of the Orthodox Church because of their enmity to the rulers of Serbia, who were its ardent supporters. Many were protectors of the Bogomil heresy, others became Roman adherents. The Orthodoxy survived among the common people until the decline of Bosnia. In the middle of Bosnia, the Bogomils had their strongholds surrounding the capitals of the Bosnian bans and kings, around Sutjeska, Travnik and Jajce – and that was where they were subsequently converted to Catholicism, partly because of Franciscan preaching and partly because of Islam. Soon afterwards, the Turks invaded Bosnia and the new Catholic converts rushed to convert again in order to please their new masters” (p. 26-27).

The Turkish conquests deeply changed religious relations. The occupier stationed its army and distributed its administration. In the German magazine *Ausland* an article was published in 1852 that dealt with Bosnian history and described mass conversions to Islam in Bosnia: “Mehmed II placed the Turkish garrisons in castles, converted the Serbs to Islam and took the best of the Bosnian youth - around 30 thousand boys - to become Janissaries” (p. 28). The feudal nobility was the first to convert to Islam, followed by a large percentage of the Bogomil. Vladimir Ćorović states that, “torn by internal struggles, rotten within, Bosnia scandalously lost its statehood. According to the Bosnian king, half of the inhabitants of Bosnia who were resentful of Catholic ruthlessness loved the Turks better than him. They even allied themselves with the Turks and invited them to repeat in Bosnia what they had done to Serbia [...] A vast majority of the Bosnian nobility had connections with the Turks much earlier. A portion of the Bosnian

nobility was even fighting on the Turkish side against the Catholics and the Hungarians. Therefore they easily converted to Islam (Hranušević, Hercegović, Borovinić, Branković, Vranešević etc.). Some converted in order to retain their privileges; some did it for their own personal reasons [...] As the Bosnian noblemen, and even its rulers, had earlier converted to Catholicism to avoid Hungarian attacks or to get Hungarian help in their hour of need, its noblemen converted to Islam in 15th century with the same motives. The lack of religious principles led over time to speculations and cynicism” (p. 29). Considering that the Orthodox and the Catholics had firm religious organization, unlike the Bogomils), the Bogomils more easily decided to convert.

In his book *Short Instructions in the History of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, published in Sarajevo in 1910, Sahvet-beg Bašagić-Redžepašić wrote that: “All of this did not bring anything useful to Bosnia (i.e. from the attempts of the Hungarians and the Bosnian rulers who were dependent on them, to convert Bosnia to Catholicism), but only served to accelerate its own downfall. Religious hatred accumulated in the Bogomils over the centuries and made them go to extremes. In that critical hour, the Bogomil decided to sacrifice their own independence and faith in order to have their vengeance against the Pope” (p. 29). Dragutin Prohaska wrote something similar on the eve of WWI: “For four hundred years, lasted the tormented history of a nation that was supposed to be taught culture and Catholicism by the Hungarian ‘crusaders’. The consequence of this was horrible vengeance wreaked by the Bosnians on the Hungarians and Catholicism – their conversion to Islam and their pillaging campaigns into Croatia, Hungary and the whole Catholic world that lasted for one hundred years [...] All of that is the work of the Bogomils and the medieval Bosnian freedom movements. The nobility converted to Islam and swore to fight against Rome” (p. 29-30). Alexander Soloviev, a professor of the Law School of the University of Sarajevo, wrote: “In 1459, King Stefan Tomaš complained to the Dominican friar Barbuzzi that he could not fight against the Turks because the Manichaeist majority of his subjects have more sympathy for the Turks than the Catholic [...] The new king, Stefan Tomašević informed Pope Pius that he had been baptized as a child and that he would completely destroy the Manichaeists. He lived to regret those words in 1463 when the Bosnians refused to fight for a Catholic King: Radak, a former Manichaeist and subsequently a false Catholic, betrayed Bobovac to the sultan. The majority of common people and the nobility converted to Islam (if they were not killed or if they did not flee)” (p. 30).

The distinguished Orientologist Hazim Šabanović wrote in the encyclopaedia reference about Bosnia and Herzegovina: “Although we cannot find direct confirmation in the historical records that the majority of Bogomils converted to Islam instantaneously, this assumption is probable because of their known connections with the Turks at the time of the great religious persecutions” (p. 30). Janosz Asbót shares this opinion and points out that: “The majority of Bosnian people and almost all the nobility accepted the Turks and Moslem religion, not because

they were scared and feeble, but due to persecutions and struggles and their hatred of the pressure of the Latin Church and the Hungarian weapons. The mass conversions of the Bosnian Bogomils to Islam were false at first, without any doubt; they adapted to the Turkish yoke, which was not especially hard for the converts, in order to free themselves from the old yoke and take revenge on those who persecuted them. Secretly, hoping for a better future, they adhered to the Bogomil traditions [...] The majority of magnates who had abandoned the Bogomil faith under threats and pressures, now abandoned the Catholic faith and converted to Islam of their own free will; that change was much easier to them because, in Islam, they found some common religious practices and beliefs - namely, they both rejected the cross, baptism, the church pomp, the ceremonies, the hierarchy, the sacrament of marriage [...] We can claim with certainty that the Bogomils converted to Islam, the Catholics mostly moved to the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and the Orthodox, who were opposed to the Catholic faith and Islam equally and, accordingly, did not want to convert or to go to a Catholic country, remained in Bosnia and gradually their numbers increased, both through permanent colonisation and natural population growth” (p. 30-31).

The Hungarian historian, Lajos Thallóczy wrote in 1900 of the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina: “the Orthodox population - mostly shepherds - was very numerous in Herzegovina and eastern Bosnia and lived in accordance with their old traditions [...] Their traditional dedication to their religion is not based on their faithfulness to religion itself but to their stubborn adherence to their old customs [...] Catholicism, with its Latin language, was hated by the Orthodox as much as Islam with its Arabic Qur’an, and they remained unobserved in their passive resistance, they were despised but nobody paid attention to them so their numbers multiplied [...] strengthened by elements that came from the South [...] Masses of farmers, both Orthodox and Catholic, remained faithful to their respective religions despite the fact that their nobility had converted to Islam” (p. 31). Kostić adds that “not all peasants remained faithful to their religion - only the great majority, though where the Bogomils were concerned, the situation was quite the opposite: the majority of them converted to Islam, although some remained faithful to old religion and some of turned Orthodox (We do not have any evidence that the Bogomils turned Catholic)” (p. 31). Kostić also cites the study on the people of Yugoslavia by the Viennese author, Alexander Sane published in Heidelberg: “the Turkish rule (in Bosnia and Herzegovina) caused great changes in the structure of the population. The Bogomils converted to Islam and the Catholics who had been leading until then (had the majority) left the country. The Orthodox population remained in the country, preserving their old faith and taking over the position held by the Catholics before the conquest in the 16th and 18th centuries” (p. 32).

The Orthodox converted to Islam, but not in masses as the Bogomils did. The son of Herzog Stjepan converted to Islam and became a Grand Vizier under the name of Ahmet Hercegović. In the Tvrdoš monastery

near Trebinje, a record from 1509 is preserved, where the authentic chronicler testifies: "Due to our sins, we are punished by the Islamic iron rod, which defeats the Orthodox institutions without mercy; they destroyed the holy churches and altered the tradition of the pious endowers, because the laws and the books became unruly. Many rejected the Orthodox faith without torture and accepted Islam, as prophesied by the apostle; when they saw the Turkish multitudes and their might" (p. 32). Kostić adds that a large number of the Bogomils "turned Orthodox (those who did not want to renounce Christianity), so the total number of Orthodox did not decrease after the Turkish conquest. Two reasons were decisive for the conversion of the Bogomils to the Orthodox faith: their common hatred of Catholic proselytism and the social-religious affinity" (p. 32). Kostić finds corroboration of his opinion in the works of Vladimir Ćorović: "As the Catholics were equally aggressive towards the Bogomils and the Orthodox Christians, as time passed they became closer to each other in defence [...] The Bogomils were a conservative sect who preserved many elements from the initial culture they received in Macedonia and Serbia; therefore they were close to Orthodoxy and, in time, they immersed in its masses and were lost in it" (p. 32).

Kostić has little doubt that "mass conversions of non-Orthodox Christians to Islam took place [...] Another characteristic is that they converted willingly. A third is that the conversions took place immediately after the Turkish invasion, while subsequent conversions were a rare exception and not a mass phenomenon" (p. 33). The French author Saint Eymard wrote in 1883 that: "Conversions to Islam were not as universal and as commonplace as one would think and, even today, after three centuries of fanatical Turkish rule, the Muslims are a minority in Bosnia (around 40% of population)" (p. 33). When it comes to conversion, Bosnia was an exception among the countries under Turkish occupation. The Turks either completely converted the population of the conquered countries to Islam or set up just a thin layer of Muslim governors to rule the Christian population of feudal serfs. In Bosnia – one privileged person came to one unprivileged. Since the conversion to Islam was mostly voluntary and encouraged only by privileges, and because the Turkish state was typically theocratic, Hazim Šabanović wrote that, "the Turkish conquest significantly changed the structure and ratio of the Bosnian population. Mass conversions of the peasants and partly of the small gentry took place, the main attraction being the significant social, economic and legal advantages the Muslim population had in the Turkish state, which were reflected in tax exemption and decreased amounts of other duties and better legal security. Islam spread gradually and in stages. Even if there were no coerced conversions to Islam, there is no doubt that the Turks were striving to spread Islam using different means, because Islam tightly connected the population with the state and was an obvious sign of loyalty to the sultan" (p. 34). The real Turks treated the Bosnian converts with disdain, but they were their best soldiers and Janissaries.

Although there were no mass conversions after the first century of

Turkish rule, religious fluctuations in the population were constant. The demographic migrations were sometimes voluntary and sometimes due to violence and, apart from religious factors, were caused by military and economic factors. "It was the Christians especially, mostly the Orthodox, who migrated. They fled to the north and to the west; while masses of Serbs flooded Bosnia from the south, from Raška and Herzegovina, thinking that there they would be less exposed to the *agarjan* persecutions (p. 35). Đorđe Pejanović wrote about that in his book *The Population of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, published in Belgrade in 1955 in the edition of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts: "All those numerous migrations and continuous emigrations mixed the population of the country and the adherents of different religions so that afterwards there was no part or area in Bosnia that was inhabited by members of only one religion" (35). The Austro-Hungarian General Molinari, in the occupying army, claimed in his memoirs published in Zurich in 1905: "From the beginning of the Christian persecutions until the occupation by the Austrian troops late in 1878, 200 thousand Christians left their country, seeking protection on the other side of the border. Almost half of that number found refuge in the Austro-Hungarian Empire" (p. 35-36). Others fled to Serbia and Montenegro.

On the other hand, when the Turks were banished from Lika, Kordun, Slavonia and Dalmatia, as well as Serbia after the Serbian uprisings, almost all Muslims from those parts migrated to Bosnia and Herzegovina. After the Austro-Hungarian occupation, "mass migrations of the *muhadžir* (Muslims) took place to Turkey, while the Catholics penetrated Bosnia and Herzegovina concurrently with mathematically-precise action, in order to convert Bosnia to Catholicism, as they did in the Middle Ages. All other migrations were more or less spontaneous, but the Catholic migration was well-planned and tendentious. During the first Yugoslavia, many Bosnians and many more inhabitants of Herzegovina migrated to other Serbian lands. During WWII, they were murdered and driven from their hearths by the Croatian monsters, when hundreds of thousands went to Serbia, mostly never to return. After the war, many settled in Vojvodina, etc. There had never been demographic peace and such constellations had never been recorded in the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina: during the last war, only Orthodox Christians migrated from B&H. Others mostly remained where they were" (p. 36). However, there had never been any plausible statistical data until the present time.

In his *Travels through Bosnia, Serbia, Bulgaria and Rumania*, from 1530, Benedict Kuripešić testifies that the Upper Bosnia was home to the Catholics, Orthodox and Muslims and, the Lower Bosnia, only to the Orthodox and Muslims. He does not say anything about the Catholics with respect to their ethnicity; however, he says of the Orthodox that they were Serbs and of the Muslims that they were Turks, which was how they identified themselves anyway. "The Serbs have their own Christian priests and churches [...] We saw in Upper Bosnia many churches and many Serbian priests, and monasteries with Greek monks; we saw crosses on the graves and other Christian symbols. All the time

we were guessing - and later our guesses were confirmed - that, at their time, they and their kings and lords had fought bravely for Christendom in many battles and we saw many battlegrounds where they had fought so valiantly that the Turks had only conquered them because they had left them their faith [...] The same Serbs we found there in their Christian faith showed us their heartfelt hospitality” (p. 37-38).

The Orthodox faith was the most important factor in preserving the Serbian national consciousness and unity. The Church organization, as described by Gabriel Sarm in the 17th century, was not as strong as the Catholic, but the faith itself, in the spiritual sense, was more persistent. The Orthodox Serbs had always cooperated readily with any Christian army that was at war with the Turks in Bosnia, but they had often migrated further northwards. According to the data of Aleksa Ivić, the Turks were enraged in 1624 by the Serbian insubordination and the Serbian monasteries in Bosnia were considerably damaged, the worst fate befalling those in the northwest. “All the Serbian monasteries, from the Austrian border to Sarajevo were seized. The Serbian monks persecuted by the Turks fled and 17 of them crossed the Austrian border and asked for permission to settle there [...] Then the aforementioned monks from the monastery of Rmanj and Moštanica also fled and requested, through their Prior Cirilo, permission to build a Serbian monastery on the Austrian border. Upon the intervention from Count Frankopan, who was unable to hide his hatred toward anything Serbian even on this occasion, in January 1643, the emperor’s resolution was passed not to accept Serbian monks and priests from Turkey and not to allow them to settle in Croatia and Slavonia” (p. 39-40). After his travels through Bosnia, Atanasije Georgijević wrote to Emperor Ferdinand in 1626: “The schimatics considerably outnumber the Catholics in this kingdom and they are, where spiritual things are concerned, mostly governed by their own priests and monks, who had been great friends with Catholics before the reform of the calendar [...] The Catholics and the schematics outnumber the Turks significantly” (p. 40). Georgijević was a distinguished papal legate.

There were cases where even some Catholics from Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia would settle in Bosnia, because the governance of the Turkish Beys was far more tolerable than the oppression of the Catholic Counts. However, Orthodox Christianity had always been a dominant religion in Bosnia. There was no mass settlement of the real Turks in Bosnia - or any other foreign Muslims. Only the Serbian-speaking Muslims would gladly settle there after the Turks started losing power in other Serbian lands. There were sporadic cases where state administrators stayed permanently in Bosnia, being assimilated by the local Muslims. But when Prince Eugene of Savoy burnt Sarajevo in the late 18th century, he took lots of Muslims into slavery. Some were converted to Catholicism, the others were killed.

The largest percentage of Serbs lived in Bosnia early in the 19th century but it has been decreasing since then, both absolutely and relatively. Absolutely because the largest portion of the Serbian population migrated to Serbia. That process began during the First

Serbian Uprising and continued throughout 19th century, albeit not with the same intensity. On the other hand, the Muslims banished from Serbia in the first, second and the seventh decades of 19th century mostly settled in Bosnia. In 1876 and 1878, a significant part of the territory of Herzegovina became a part of Montenegro and that was the part with a dominant Serbian majority. Of course, that also weakened the relative majority of the Orthodox Serbs in both provinces. Sandžak is sometimes referred to as a part of Bosnia, i.e. Herzegovina and sometimes not. But, in the beginning of the 19th century, the Serbian Orthodoxy is still very powerful and preponderant in B&H. Their relative majority cannot be taken away by anybody; it would only diminish as time went by” (p. 43).

Leopold von Ranke described the domination of the Orthodox Christians in Bosnia in 1879, and preservation of some Serbian ethnic customs both among the Catholics and the Muslims: “the *raja* (Translator’s note: the people) is partly of a Greek or Catholic creed. The affiliation of the two creeds can be observed. The Catholics weave closer ties with the Greeks more than anywhere else: they respect the same fasts as their countrymen, in accordance with the Serbian national customs; almost all (catholic) families have one patron saint of their home and family [...] Even the Muslims remember well the patron saint their forefathers used to honour. It seems as if they cannot forget their old faith easily. Sometimes a Bosnian Bey would even secretly take a Christian priest to the grave of his ancestors to pray for their souls” (p. 43).

More serious data and estimates on the religious structure of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian population dates back to the first half of 19th century. Romanian historian Nicolae Iorga claimed that, in the early 19th century, 600,000 Orthodox Christians and a total of 40,000 Catholics lived in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Some historians argue that, in 1802, there were 91,047 Catholics. A French diplomat, Amadeus Somet de Fosse wrote about the population of 1,300,000, out of which 120,000 were Catholics, more than half a million were Orthodox, less than 600,000 were Muslims, 30,000 were Gypsies and 1,200 were Jews. Kostić points out that these estimates are burdened by the fact that de Fosse lived in the vizier’s capital, Travnik, where the number of Orthodox Christians was the lowest in comparison with the other Bosnian places. Much more viable are the estimates of the Viennese semi-official publication from 1821 *A Historical-Typographic Description of Bosnia and Serbia, Especially with Respect to the Contemporary Period*, where it said: “The main creed of Bosnia is Greek, but there are also a lot of Muslims. There are at least 50,000 Roman-Catholics – the Franciscans have three monasteries in Bosnia [...] the Roman-Catholics have around 32 parishes and the Greek have 374 parishes and 20 monasteries” (p. 46).

Ivan Mažuranić’s brother Matija published the book *An Insight into Bosnia or a Short Trip into this Province in 1829-1840. According to the native* in 1842, where he writes about his personal observations: “In Bosnia, Christian faith of eastern denomination prevails, second in

Comment [K.B.40]: Translator’s note. Author not found in the available sources

numbers are the Muslims, and finally the Christians of western denomination. The Jews are a minority, but they are numerous, too” (p. 46). In the review of the works of Pavle Karano-Tvrtković from the archive of Dubrovnik, the German magazine *Ausland* from 1845 states that Bosnia and Herzegovina have 1,430,000 inhabitants. “Out of that number, one million are Greek Orthodox, 150,000 are Roman Catholics and 280,000 are Muslim” (p. 46). In the *Serbian-Dalmatian Magazine* in 1841, the Franciscan monk Ivo Franjo Jukić wrote that, in the Travnik and Mostar area under the rule of viziers, lives a total of one million and one hundred thousand people - half a million Orthodox Christians, 200,000 Catholics, 384,000 Muslims, 6,000 Gypsies, 2,500 Jews” (p. 47). He publishes similar data in 1851 in his text *Omer-Pasha and the Bosnian Turks*, as well as in his subsequent treatises and memoranda. Jukić gives separate data for Herzegovina in 1843: “The population consists of a) Catholic Christians - 41,860, b) the Orthodox Christians, around 180,000, c) the Turks, who live in cities and rarely in villages - around 68,000, all converts and former Patarenes. The entire population is 290,000 souls” (p. 48).

In 1844, the Russian scientist Starchevsky published his text *The Historical and Geographical Observations about Bosnia* in the Journal of the Ministry of National Education issued in Saint Petersburg, where he pointed out: “Bosnia is inhabited by Serbs of three different religions: the Orthodox (Eastern), the Roman-Catholic (Western) and the Muslims. The total population cannot be estimated but, according to the parishes and the number of homes in the parishes, it can be approximated that, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, lives over a million Orthodox Christians, up to 150,000 Roman Catholics and up to 280,000 Bosnians converted to Islam” (p. 49).

Omer Pasha Latas attempted to conduct a census in 1850, but failed because many Muslims and Christians thought they would be enlisted as *nizam* (Translator’s note: converts) and therefore hid and, due to that fact that the data was recorded arbitrarily and sloppily, the number of houses was decreased in order to decrease the overall tax levy. It was mostly the Muslims who refused to be recorded and their number was decreased the most. Collecting data on the number of women was especially difficult and the collectors mostly only took men over 10 years of age into consideration, because the status of a tax payer in Turkey started at the age of 10. That failed attempt at performing a census was the only one under Turkish rule and afterwards the statisticians would deal in more or less reliable estimates. Omer Pasha’s census discovered that 175,000 Muslims lived in Bosnia, as well as 265,000 Christians, but only the data about men were collected. Blau-Kipert and Pejanović agree in estimation that, at that time, Bosnia had slightly over one million inhabitants. Subsequently, the Turkish administration artificially increased the number of Muslims and decreased the number of Christians in its official reports after the Congress of Berlin, because it was feeling insecure. Thus, they presented the percentage of Muslims as 37.30%, as determined by the census in 1851. In 1865, they presented the number of Muslims as 33.70%, in

IT-03-67-T
1871 as 49.70% and in 1876 as 48.90%. They manipulated the number of the Orthodox Christians in that same year, presenting their percentage as 37.60% instead of 44.90%, and the number of the Catholics as 16.50% instead of 12.66%. Where the Catholics were concerned, they had to be more convincing when decreasing their numbers, because they knew that the Catholic priests had accurate data and that meant that only Orthodox Christians were the victims of statistical forgeries, as they did not have any counter-data. Further to those figures presented by the Turks, the great European forces launched false data campaign that was in accordance with their respective interests and those designs had significant consequences on the outcome of the Congress of Berlin, where Austro-Hungarian diplomacy was the most successful.

After the Austro-Hungarian occupation, “the Muslims (the so called Muhajir, who fled to Turkey) left the country in masses and, at the same time, the Serbs migrated to the two free Serbian states, though to a smaller extent. On the other hand, since the first days of the Austro-Hungarian invasion, masses of Catholics migrated to Bosnia from the territory of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy; the so-called *kuferasi* (Translator’s note: the carpathbaggers) - because they only brought their suitcases with them when they came via Bosanski Brod in masses to get rich. Like an army of hungry ants, they flooded the country and, obviously, changed the religious situation” (p. 61). Kostić provides plenty of data from different sources that predate the occupation, comparing them to the subsequent official Austro-Hungarian statistics. According to the official decree of the missionary province of Silver Bosnia, in 1852 Bosnia was home to 122,519 Catholics, 560,000 Orthodox and 400,000 Muslims. Similar data can be found in the books of the Franciscan friar Toma Kovačević, the French consul Rousseau, the Austrian clerk Gustav Temel, the Austrian general Baron Anton Molinari, Major Jovan Raškojević, the travel writer Franz Maurer, etc. Certain departures in the numbers are due to the authors’ estimates, not real indicators. However, the fundamental inter-religious relations are almost analogous with all these researchers.

The first official Austro-Hungarian census in Bosnia and Herzegovina was carried out in 1879, but it was mostly improvised although its results were relatively viable. According to that census, 42.9% of the Bosnian population were Orthodox Christians, 38.8% were Muslims and 18.1% were Catholics. According to the census from 1885, 42.8% of the total population in Bosnia were Orthodox Christians, 36.9% were Muslims and 19.9% were Catholics. The census from 1895 established that 42.9% of the Bosnian population were Orthodox, 35% were Muslims and 21.3% were Catholics. The percentage of Orthodox Christians increased to 43.5%, the percentage of Muslims decreased to 32.3% and the percentage of Catholics increased to 22.9%. After WWI, the first Yugoslav census established that 43.9% of the Bosnian population were Orthodox, 31% were Muslims and 23.5% were Catholics. In 1931, 44.3% of the Bosnian population were Orthodox Christians, 30.9% were Muslims and 23.6% were Catholics. Kostić compares these figures with the results of the census after WWII but,

under the communist regime, people could not state their religious leaning, they could only declare their nationality and therefore the comparisons cannot be accurate because a certain number of Muslims declared that they were of Serbian nationality. In 1948, 41.6% of the Bosnian population were Serbs, 34.71% were Muslims and 22.61% were Croats. According to the census from 1953, 41.84% of the Bosnian population were Serbs, 35.24% were Muslims and 22.28% were Croats. The enormous decrease in the percentage of the Serbian population in Bosnia was caused by the Croatian genocide in WWII.

Where the decrease in the percentage of Muslim population in Bosnia during the Austro-Hungarian occupation is concerned, Kostić points out that some other factors were the cause, apart from the Muhajir. "It is a well-known fact that the Muslim population in B&H had an above-average mortality rate, especially the infant mortality rate. Furthermore, syphilis was present in many of the Muslim inhabited areas and the upper classes, accustomed to a carefree and easy-going life through the centuries, were unable to embrace labour and peaceful family life. Leisure, revelry, folk love songs, horseback riding, excursions, etc. were deemed the only honorable way of life for Islam believers. The lower classes of Muslims tried to imitate the upper classes in every way, including the way of life. In Yugoslavia, the social climate suddenly improved and all the retarding factors in the progress of the Muslim population in B&H were forsaken. "The Serbian" government in B&H acted in time to improve the numbers of the Muslim population. In the communist Yugoslavia, where they were privileged in every way, they advance faster than any other religious or ethnical group. Consequently, that refutes false and offensive claim that the Muslims were mass murdered by Serbs in the last war. There were individual vendettas, sometimes collective retaliations, but I think that no more than 10,000 Muslims were killed because of that. And that was ten times fewer than the number of Serbian victims killed by the Muslims (again individuals)" (p. 84).

Where the increase of the percentage of the Catholic population is concerned, that was due to migration, not the population growth. "At the beginning of the occupation, the Catholics were a little over one sixth of the total population, subsequently reaching 25% of the total population. Since they did not perish in the last war at all (they killed, but nobody killed them), their privileged numbers remained the same and even increased" (p. 86). In the first Austro-Hungarian census, 10% of the recorded Catholics were neither Bosnians nor Herzegovinians. "Bringing a large number of Catholics into the occupied territories was organized most meticulously and was planned in advance in order to change the ratio to their benefit, (because there were too few indigenous Catholic). They were simply imported, systematically. They were employed in public services that were denied to the locals and they were given all economic privileges. The farmers received the land of the Muslims who fled the country and they were not serfs as the locals were" (p. 97).

Dorđe Pejanović estimated that, during the Austro-Hungarian

occupation, around 140,000 Muslims and between 30,000 and 40,000 Orthodox Christians moved from Bosnia and Herzegovina. Also, some indicators show that up to 200,000 Catholics moved into the country. Thousands of young Serbian men went over to Serbia and joined the Serbian army and a huge number went to America as emigrants after the Austro-Hungarian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in order to avoid serving in the Austro-Hungarian army. Kostić says that, for him, "the greatest mystery of our public life is the devotion of the Serbian peasant in Bosnia to his land. He used to be a serf or a slave, but still his devotion to his land has never been surpassed by any other Serb. At the beginning of this century, masses of Serbs migrated from their lands, except from Serbia and Bosnia. The Serbs from Bosnia migrated too, but never in masses. At that time, the Serbs in Serbia had the lifestyle envied by all other Serbs. The Bosnian Serbs were the poorest and their lives were the most miserable among Serbs. However, they practically did not migrate, but stayed on their land. This phenomenon is virtually unexplainable sociologically! They had been suffering - dying, but they preserved their lands for the Serbiandom" (p. 103). Based on the available statistical indicators, Kostić concludes that the Orthodox Serbs lost 5% of the Serbian population in B&H under the Austro-Hungarian occupation, the Muslims lost about 20%, whereas the percentage of Catholics in Bosnia increased by 60 to 70%.

The comments of various authors with respect to the Austro-Hungarian official reports on the census of Bosnian and Herzegovinian population are very interesting as well. Mostly, they are surprised by the large percentage of Orthodox Serbs, and the small number of Catholics in Bosnia and Herzegovina, although at the Congress of Vienna and the Congress of Berlin these issues had been presented to the European public quite differently. Kostić draws our attention to the opinions of Dr. Maurice Hernes, Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, Emile de Laveleye, Gabriel Sarm, Eduard Richter, Lubor Niederle, etc. Of special interest are the writings of the Croatian author Ivo Pilar in his book *The Yugoslav Question*, published in Vienna in 1918, translated and reprinted in Zagreb in 1943. He laments because "the fact remains that the Serbs are today the strongest national and religious element in Bosnia and that they represent approximately 43% of the total population and have the strongest national awareness. The Catholic Croats, who comprise 20% of the population, mostly lack national awareness. And the Muslims, who account for 33% of the total population, are especially late in building their national awareness [...] The theory of Serbian nationality can be further corroborated by the fact that the Serbs were the majority in Bosnia and Herzegovina after the occupation and the most active element politically, while the Muslims and Croats almost entirely lacked national awareness" (p. 108).

The adherents of all religions lived in mixed communities throughout the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. According to the census of 1931, out of a total of 368 municipalities, only eight were exclusively inhabited by the Orthodox, while two were purely Catholic. There were none with an exclusively Muslim population. In 61

municipalities, there were no Muslims and in 48 there were no Catholics. However, smaller settlements were mostly homogenous. Many villages were officially - even in their names - partitioned into Serbian parts and Muslim parts. Later, the communists changed the initial toponymy through special administrative measures. Under the Austrian occupation, out of a total of 51 districts, 27 were predominantly Orthodox, the Muslims were the majority in 12 and in 12 the Catholics. In 23 districts, the Orthodox were an absolute majority, in eight the Muslims and in six the Catholics. "The Orthodox districts were no more populated than the others, but they were significantly more spatial. Especially in Herzegovina. That is why the cartograms show that the Orthodox Christians are more numerous than they really are" (p. 113).

Not long after the Turkish conquest and the suspension of Catholic proselytism activities - which had been supported, albeit reluctantly, by the Bosnian rulers, due to political reasons - the Serbian Orthodox Church flourished in Bosnia and Herzegovina. That fact is confirmed by Ustasha ideologist and Catholic Priest Krunoslav Draganović, who wrote in Rome, 1937: "In the early 16th century, Bosnia was already flooded with Orthodox monasteries [...] Subsequent to the fall of Bosnia - in around 1500 and later - Serbian monasteries started springing up like mushrooms after the rain on Bosnian soil and many of Orthodox Christians emerged everywhere" (p. 117-118). Another Ustasha ideologist, Ivo Pilar, lamented publicly that the Catholic faith in Bosnia had been almost extinguished after the Turkish conquest. In 1758, there were only three Catholic monasteries, all Franciscan: Sutjeska, Fojnica and Kreševo. In the 1877 article *The Province of Bosnia. The Historical, Geographical and Political Outline*, the magazine *Ausland* emphasizes that: "the Orthodox monasteries were small and poor (though some churches are rather impressive, like the ones in Sarajevo and Mostar). All the monasteries are pious endowments from the Serbian kings from the 11th to 14th centuries, and therefore they were especially revered by the Serbs. Those monasteries have perpetuated the (Serbian) national and religious traditions and rekindled the Serbian national feelings within the people" (p. 118).

Kostić points to a large number of documented testimonies from medieval travel writers about the Serbian monasteries in Bosnia and Herzegovina. "A significant number of God's temples have remained to show that the Orthodox Christians praise the Lord in those countries. For two, three, four, five centuries. The monasteries are modest because these are not the pious endowments or Lavras of tsars. However, they deserve even more respect and admiration because of that. They were built by people deprived of everything - hungry and powerless. They had to work for themselves, for the bey and for the Turkish Empire. And, despite the fact that they lived their lives in extreme poverty, they found the means to build God's temples and leave traces of their lives and faith" (p. 121). Three Serbian eparchies have always existed on that territory - the Eparchy of Herzegovina, the Eparchy of Bosnia and the Eparchy of Zvornik. They were continuously under the Patriarchy of Peć - or under the Ohrid Episcopacy - until the restoration of the Patriarchy in 1557.

The Catholics had not had a priest before the Austro-Hungarian occupation, only friars. In the early 19th century, the Catholic vicar in Herzegovina bribed the Turks to allow him to build his residence in Mostar and commence with conversions there. Heinrich Renner writes about his previous position: "Until the fifties of our (the 19th) century, the Catholic vicar of Herzegovina could only enter the capital at night in disguise to provide spiritual support to few Catholics there" (p. 122). The Turks only allowed the Orthodox episcopate to perform his activities, because he was the only one they found when they came to Mostar. The Catholic Bishopric did not exist at that time. When the Austrians came to Bosnia, the Franciscans, Jesuits and Trappists (Cistercians) flooded the country. The authorities urged the building of Catholic churches and monasteries even in areas where they had never existed before. They found only 35 Catholic churches when they came but, in the first 24 years of the Austro-Hungarian occupation, another 146 were built. The geographer Getz pays special attention to the data from the book of Andre Barre called *Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Austrian Administration from 1878-1903*, which was published in Paris in 1906. There, he found the information that 235 Orthodox churches had been found in Bosnia at the time of occupation, and that 200 more were built. Writing about the same issues in 1908, Jovan Cvijić emphasized in his book *The Annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Serbian*: "Until the occupation, the Catholics had only several churches in Bosnia. Today, they have 200 churches, 12 monasteries, 11 convents, 7 different catholic institutes, 11 minor seminaries and 800 Jesuits, Franciscans and Trappists" (p. 125).

The Muslim population was mostly centred in the urban areas, as described by Jefto Dedijer, Lajos Thallóczy, Gustav Temmel and other authors. In the seven largest cities, the Muslims were an absolute majority. "Out of the 66 cities, the Muslims had an absolute majority in 46, the Catholics in 5, the Orthodox in only one and in 14 cities there was no absolute majority because the population was pretty mixed. The governing elements lived in the cities, as well as the main creed (which the Jews always joined). During Turkish rule, the cities were Muslim in their character, while during the Austrian rule the Bosnian and Herzegovinian cities were impetuously catholicized" (p. 130). Where the Catholics are concerned, under Austrian rule the Croats, the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians and others were settled in Bosnia and Herzegovina. All the generations that followed had been "increasingly 'Croatised', so that in the cities today there are no Catholics or former Catholics that are not Croats! And there they plotted to exterminate the Serbs, partially executing such plans" (p. 130-131). During the Kingdom of Yugoslavia - 'during the Serbian rule', as some like to call it - there was no significant migration of the Serbs into the cities, although the army was included in the censuses and that army was predominantly Orthodox. However, there was no revolution in that respect. Although the city offered a better quality of life, the possibility of getting rich quickly, better education for children, etc. - the Serbs did not flood into cities, because they had always appeared alien to them. The Catholics

stayed in the cities, and although they were mostly of foreign origin, they were assimilated by the Croats and became more and more arrogant" (p. 131).

Evaluating the attitude of the Austro-Hungarian authorities regarding religion, Jovan Cvijić wrote: "Catholicism is being favoured by all available means. The Catholics, who had been on the lowest levels of society concerning education and property before the occupation, have now been elevated to the highest social level by the efforts of the government. The government uses resources belonging to the whole population of Bosnia and Herzegovina to achieve that. The adherents of other religions, especially the Orthodox, are treated by the government as second class citizens [...] Numerous complaints from the Muslims and the Orthodox Christians addressed to the emperor and the common Minister of Finance testify that the teaching in all schools is fabricated to fit the designs of the political authorities, that teachers are predominantly Catholics, that the Catholic students are privileged [...] The government gives preferential treatment to the Catholics at the expense of other religious groups when it comes to income, state procurements and employment in the state administration. The life for the Muslims and the Orthodox in the cities has been made so difficult that they have to move to the villages [...] All Catholics who migrate to Bosnia declare themselves as Croats as soon as they arrive at their destination, because then they are sure that the government will give them preferential status in any aspect" (p. 144).

Vjekoslav Klaić, the most significant Croatian historian, testifies that the Catholics in Bosnia and Herzegovina did not have any Croatian national consciousness. He says of Bosnia and Herzegovina that "the Catholics call themselves Latins and the Orthodox Christians call them the *Šokci* in some regions and, in other places in Turkish Croatia, the *Madžari* (Translator's note: the Hungarians) [...] Before the Turkish conquest, the Catholics were numerous; they had 30 monasteries and 151 churches, while Turkish rule saw their decline in numbers. In 1776 there were only 50,000 Catholics and their number had increased five times by 1878. The growth in their number was the work of the Franciscan friars. They had been using their cunning to get privileges and concessions for their coreligionists, and later they were infiltrated by the Austrian government (the writer refers to the Turkish era, before the occupation, L.M.K.). However, the order (the Franciscans) was criticized for being unable to maintain discipline among the Catholics, for suppressing their national awareness and for eradicating many of their old customs, such as the celebration of *slava*" (p. 148).

The French publicist Cuverville describes the religious persecutions systematically performed by the Austro-Hungarian authorities: "The Muslims and Serbs were persecuted by all the officials, they were hunted and imprisoned as if they were criminals. They were ruined for being faithful to their ancestral religions and nationality, and both Moslem and Orthodox Serbs suffered brutal treatment by the Austro-Hungarians, who persecuted them until death because they did not want to renounce their old faith or to forget their historical traditions. Kallay,

who had the power unknown even to the crowned heads, arrogantly abused his position and thought about nothing else except to subordinate religion to the brutal police force; to desecrate the tombs by toppling over the historical monuments on them in order to crush all memories of the Serbian past and the national awareness of the young generation. The autocephalous Orthodox Church has never been questioned under the Turkish rule, not even during the uprising, which led to intervention, and today that church is in danger" (p. 153-154).

Kostić gives us detailed information on the religious structure of certain Bosnian and Herzegovian regions and cities at the end of his book to corroborate the already acquired knowledge and the defined attitude. He also presents numerous irrefutable historiographical facts here and cites a great number of other authors. We find the citation of Mark Zimmerman's words from the publication *The Illustrated History of Oriental Wars 1876-1878*, which was published in Vienna in 1878. The citation refers to Herzegovina, and the author says: "The population of Herzegovina amounts to 300,000 people and they are all Serbs. Many distinguished Serbian families were afraid that they might lose their privileges after the Turkish conquests and were forced to convert to Islam; hence the ranks of beys, aghas, spahis, mullahs, effendis, etc., mostly comprise Serbian families such as the Ljubović, Filipović, Babić, etc." (p. 161-162).

2. An Analysis of Ethnical Relations

The historical and ethnopolitical study *Ethnical Relations in Bosnia and Herzegovina* represents the second book of Kostić's Bosnian cycle, which Kostić published himself in Munich in 1967. He dedicated the book to the memory of one of the greatest sons of Serbian Bosnia, Petar Kočić, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of his death. Kostić begins the study with the observation that there is no historical data on the pre-Slavic inhabitants of Bosnia, while the relevant historiographical sources agree that the Bosnian Slavs are Serbs and that their country is a Serbian country, that they speak the Serbian language and use the Serbian alphabet. Nobody has ever marked Bosnia as a Croatian country until the most recent times. Until the writings of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the territory of Bosnia had been considered a part of Dalmatia. German writer Einhard reports that Ljudevit Posavski (translator's note: Trans-Savian) managed to escape from the Franks and find refuge with the Serbs in Dalmatia, but that literally meant that Ljudevit had only fled across the river Sava. Therefore Franjo Rački wrote that Ljudevit simply fled to the Serbs in Bosnia" (p. 15). Both Sima Ćirković and Ante Babić agreed with the above explanations. Einhard's testimony is reliable because he was a contemporary of Ljudevit Posavski and Charlemagne's biographer. He lived approximately from 770 to 840. Caspar Zeiss, the German linguist who lived in the first half of the 19th century, described the ethnic character of Bosnia in his book *The Germans and their Neighbours*, which was published in Munich in 1837, saying "that the Serbs had been inhabitants

of Bosnia and that the Franks heard [...]” (p. 16). Pope John VIII wrote about the Serbs in 874, meaning that he had used that geographical term before Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

In the *History of Serbian Literature*, Šafarik wrote that “Bosnia was described by Constantine Porphyrogenitus as a separate region in the country of Serbia, which recognized the sovereignty of the Serbian Grand Zhupan” In his work *On Slav Antiquities*, he gives even more concrete details: “All the Serbian tribes that settled between the territories of the Croats and the Bulgarian Slavs, in the areas around the watersheds of the Bosnia, the Drina, the Kolubara, the West/Serbian Morava, the Ibar, the Neretva and the Morača belonged to the same nation, according to the characteristics of their common language. Therefore we can only talk here about the different branches of a powerful and numerous tribe, not about different nations in the real sense of that word” (p. 18). In his comments about the first mention of Bosnia, Ilarion Ruvarac concludes: “We can and must draw the following conclusions from the writings of Constantine Porphyrogenitus: first, that Bosnia belonged to Serbia in the first half of 10th century and, second, that at that time only the area and the region around the river Bosnia was referred to as Bosnia” (p. 18).

Jiricek was also interested in these matters and he observed that: “Bosnia was mentioned for the first time in the writings of Emperor Constantine, who referred to the ‘small country of Bosnia’ as a region of Serbia, in accordance with the common beliefs of his time” [...] the region was “comprised of the area of the upper Bosnia – the Roman Bosanta; the area of Usora around the lower Bosnia river and, presumably, the valley of the upper Vrbas (the Roman Urbanus) [...] The area around Tuzla and the whole of the Drina valley belonged to Serbia at the time of Emperor Constantine (Porphyrogenitus). There is no doubt that Constantine was referring to the modern Soli or Tuzla (Slav *sol*, Turkish *tuz* = salt), because there has never been a place with the same name on the territory between the Adriatic and the Black Sea and there has never been any halite beds or rock salt deposits there” (p. 18-19). Vladimir Corović shared his opinion, as did Dragutin Anastasijević, who wrote: “Since Prince Časlav’s Serbia, according to Constantine Porphyrogenitus, encompassed Bosnia - which was the name used to refer to the area around the river Bosnia, Porphyrogenitus clearly included Bosnia, together with the Časlav’s Serbia, in the regions initially settled by the Serbs. It can be concluded from the fact that he initially bordered the Croatian settlements by the river Vrbas” (p. 19).

Stojan Novaković did not agree that the river Vrbas was the western border of Bosnia and wrote in 1880 that: “We can see what Constantine Porphyrogenitus considered to be the territory of Serbia when we draw our attention to Chapter 30 of *De Administrando Imperio* (in which he described the southern parts of Serbia). Where the borders of Croatia are concerned, he explains that Hlevno and Cetina are Croatia’s border areas between Croatia and Serbia (presumably he meant that the words Hlevno and Cetina were the names of the regions). According to that, the western riverbeds of the Vrbas and the Sana would have been the

borders of Serbia, because the tributary of Sana, the river Una that meets the Sana near Vrbas, is directly and closely connected to the Adriatic mountain system and, therefore, the Una has always been considered the border between the two. Accordingly, the mountain ranges that divide the rivers Primorija and Una from the Vrbas and the Sana Rivers, the mountain ranges that stretch through Hlevno and Glamoč – were the westernmost Serbian border at that time” (p. 19-20). The Croatian writers Rački and Miretić agree with Novaković’s opinion. That explanation caused the lamentations of Ivo Pilar because Porphyrogenitus “limited the area settled by the Croats by the river Vrbas in the east and the river Cetina in the south, while he gave the Serbs vast areas, larger than England, Wales and Scotland together; he gave the Serbs Bosnia and Herzegovina and South Dalmatia [...] Porphyrogenitus has remained the competent expert where South Slavic issues are concerned” (p. 20). Kostić produces evidence that the Roman Curia had deemed Bosnia a Serbian country for centuries. For example, Pope Urban III formulated in his papal bull issued on 28 March 1187: “state of Serbia, that is Bosnia” (p. 20). Ferdo Šišić mentions the papal bull of Pope Benedict VIII, issued in 1022, which gave the Archbishop of Dubrovnik and Epidauros jurisdiction over *Sorbulia* – i.e. Serbia, and comments: “In this spot in the papal bull, Serbia means as much as Bosnia” (p. 21). The Croatian author Milan Šufraj points out that the location mentioned in the decrees of the Roman Curia “was identified as Bosnia in the country of the real Serbs in 13th century” (p. 21). All of this happens before the Turkish invasion and Friar Ivan from Dubrovnik writes about activities “in the province of Bosnia or Serbia” (p. 21). Ferdo Šišić wrote in his edition of the *Chronicles of the Priest Dukljanin* about the dispute between the Archbishop of Dubrovnik and the Archbishop of Duklja and Bar concerning the jurisdiction over the territories west of Dubrovnik and about the letter of the Archbishop of Dubrovnik, Ivan, who wrote of the ancient rights over the three kingdoms he referred to as Zahumlje, Serbia or Bosnia and Trebinje. “Out of these lands, Zahumlje, as far as the borders with the Archiepiscopate of Split, is under dispute, – says the Archiepiscopo of Dubrovnik – as well Serbia or Bosnia, which borders the Archiepiscopate of Kaleb (i.e. as far as the borders with the Episcopates of Zagreb, Pécs and Srem), and Trebinje, to the borders the Archiepiscopate of Drač (i.e. the Episcopate of Raška)” (p. 22).

The writings of the Varaždin Priest Ruder also indicate that Bosnia was referred to as Serbia. He wrote that the Tatar king “destroyed the Raška state of Bosnia” (p. 22). The term ‘Rasi’ is a synonym for the Serbs. Furthermore, in 1346, Pope Innocent VI addressed Stjepan as the “Ban of Raška” (p. 22). The Archdeacon of Gorica, Ivan, wrote in the 14th century that the Croatian king “plundered the Serbian hills as far as the Drina” in the 11th century (p. 22). In the *Chronicles of the Priest Dukljanin*, who was a Serb and a Catholic priest living in the 12th century, it is written: “Serbia, which is also called Zagorje, has two provinces: one that occupies the territory from the river Drina toward the mountain of Borovo in the west and is also called Bosnia, and the other

that occupies the territory from the Drina toward the Lab and the Labian marshes in the east, which is called Raška” (p. 23). Ferdo Šišić comments on that: “Serbia (*Surbin*) was only a geographical term for the

Priest Dukljanin, it was not a political entity or a state. Priest Dukljanin wrote that Serbia was comprised of Raška and Bosnia, which was in conformity with the Emperor Constantine’s conclusions” (p. 23-24). Šišić repeats in his other writings that Bosnia was a part of Serbia according to Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

In his study *The Croats and Croatia*, published in Zagreb in 1890, Vjekoslav Klaić did not dispute the writings of the Priest Dukljanin and Ferdo Šišić. He said: “Constantine’s descriptions of Serbia match the descriptions of the Priest Dukljanin. He is also aware of the region of Bosnia (Horion Bosona), which was an integral part of Serbia and what he refers to as Serbia is the same as the Surbin or Zagorje of the Priest Dukljanin [...] According to the Priest Dukljanin, the whole territory of the ‘Slav Kingdom’ (*Regnum Sklavorum*) was divided into Primorje and Serbia (*Meritima et Surbia*). The area of the Adriatic Sea drainage basin was called Primorje and the area where the rivers flow into the Danube was called Serbia. Serbia (or Zagorje, *Surbia que est Transmontana*) is divided into Bosnia, which spread from the river Drina towards the west to the mountain of Borovo (*ad mentem Pini*) and Ras (land of Raška), which spread toward the Lab and Lipljan (in Kosovo polje) in the east” (p. 24).

In addition, the Croatian geographer Ivan Hoić wrote in his book *The Geographical Images*: “Since ancient times, the Serbian land was divided into several regions, and Raška and Bosnia were the most prominent” (p. 24). Francesco Maria Appendini, an Italian historian who lived in Dubrovnik and Zadar, wrote in 1802 that: “*Sorbulia* or Serbia was the second state of the Slav Kingdom and it encompassed the Mediterranean parts of the Upper Dalmatia – i.e. Mesia (today’s Bosnia) and Raška.” (p. 24). Lajos Thallóczy also writes about the two provinces of Serbia at the time of the Priest Dukljanin: “One spread from the great Drina toward the mountain of Borovo and was called Bosnia” (p. 25). The province across the Drina was known as Raška, according to Thallóczy. Stojan Novaković summarizes this issue as follows: “Both sources from which I have been drawing the basic facts for my research indicate that Bosnia and Serbia are inseparable; they treat them as one geographical entity. They both present ‘Serbia’ as the major name for the areas through which the tributaries of the Sava and the Danube flow, and Bosnia as the region recognizing the sovereignty of Serbia. The Priest Dukljanin, who is better acquainted with the particulars than Porphyrogenitus, puts Bosnia as one part of the Serbia in the same line as Raška, as the other part of Serbia. Both writers distinguish this Serbia from Dalmatia (both upper and lower) or from the coastal regions by certain well known clues, drawing the border that goes in the same direction as the mountain range that direct the rivers to flow into the Adriatic Sea or into the Sava. And they both use such words that can be clearly understood” (p. 25).

In the second volume of his *Letters from the Adriatic Sea and*
954

Montenegro, published in Paris in 1853, the French publicist Xavier Marmier explains: “The first confirmed notes we have on the migration of the Serbs into Europe dates back to the mid 7th century. During that period, they reached the Danube banks and started spreading quickly through the principedom that has preserved its name to this day (Serbia, L.M.K.). They were also spreading through Bosnia until they reached the Bay of Kotor. There they abandoned their enthusiasm for further migration” (p. 25). The Serbian character of Bosnia from ancient times is undisputed in scientific circles. There is not a single argument that can oppose that. It is only possible to add more relevant opinions, such as the text of the Byzantine historian John Kinnamos, written in the late 12th century: “The River called Drina that [...] divides (cuts, separates, partitions) Bosnia from the other Serbian lands” (p. 26). Kinnamos then says that this division led to the establishment of two Serbian states. The German historian Maximilian Schimek, who refers to Kinnamos in his book *The Political History of the Kingdom of Bosnia and Rama*, published in Vienna in 1727 points out: “John Kinnamos agrees with that and says, in his descriptions of the raids of the Emperor Manuel Comnenos, that the river Drina flows through the centre of Serbia and that its western part is called Bosnia. Bosnia is ruled by its domestic rulers” (p. 26). The Dodge of Venice, Andrea Dandolo, referred to Bosnia as the Serbian land in his *Chronicles*, which were published in the early 14th century.

Johannes Lucius, the Italian historian from Dalmatia, wrote in his book *The Kingdom of Dalmatia and Croatia*, published in Amsterdam in 1666: “However, Bosnia, which was located to the east of modern-day Croatia, was obviously a part of Serbia at the time of Porphyrogenitus” (p. 27). In his second book, *The Historical Monuments of Trogir*, which was published in Venice in 1673, Lucius becomes even more convinced: “The Serbs, who were mostly the adherents of the Eastern Church, derived the names of their groups from the places they lived in. The Neretljani and the Bosnians were the most renowned, being named after the Neretva and the Bosnia rivers which flowed through their lands” (p. 27-28). The Croatian historian and Catholic priest Franjo Rački completely accepted Lucius’ standpoint. Furthermore, in his book *The Old and the New Illyricum*, published in 1746, the French Byzantologist Charles Dufren claims that: “Budimir, the King of Dalmatia and Serbia, divided Serbia and established the states of Bosnia and Raška” (p. 28). The Italian historian and Jesuit, Daniele Farlati says in his *Saint Iliria*, published in eight volumes and written in the 18th century, that Bosnia was a Serbian province that had been a part of the Roman Empire before the Serbian migration to the Balkan Peninsula: “In the 7th century, the emperor gave this province to the Serbs, together with the Upper Mesia and other parts of the Mediterranean Dalmatia (the eastern parts). Then these provinces changed their names and were referred to by the common name of Serbia, although they had their old names. This is how the Serbian state was established” (p. 29).

Where the Serbian character of Herzegovina was concerned, there is data older than Porphyrogenitus’ descriptions. Long before the

definitive schism in the Christian Church, in around 925, according to an original Vatican document that was studied by Franjo Rački, the papal legates negotiated with the Croatian and Serbian aristocrats on the Council of Split. Rački says in his comment “we should keep two things in mind: the fact that it was not just the Croatian King Tomislav who participated in the Council of Split, but it was also Prince Mihailo of Zahumlje and the Serbian aristocrats who took part in those negotiations” (p. 30). Porphyrogenitus undoubtedly stated that the people of Zahumlje - the Neretljani - and the population of Trebinje and Konavli were Serbs: “And since Serbia and Paganía and the lands of Zahumlje and Travunia are now under the rule of the Byzantine emperor, and since the Avars ravaged and plundered those lands – due to the fact that they forced the Romans to leave for Dalmatia and Drač, which they inhabit now – the emperor settled the Serbs in those very lands” (p. 31). He repeats this information in several places: “the Zahumljani who now live in Zahumlje are Serbs [...] The land of the Travunci and the people in Konavle are the same. The inhabitants of that land are descendants of the pagan Serbs [...] The rulers of Travunia have always been under the rule of the rulers of Serbia [...] Pagans are also descendants of the Serbs who did not receive Christianity [...] They are called ‘pagans’ because they were not Christians, as other Serbs were” (p. 31).

Johann Gotthilf von Stritter, a German historian, wrote about the situation in the Balkans at the end of the first millennium, emphasising the following: “A little afterwards, the Serbs wanted to return to their land, and the emperor released them. But when they crossed the Danube, they resented their decision and asked the emperor through his prefect, who at that time ruled Belgrade, to give them some land to settle there. Since the lands that are now called Serbia and Paganía - which is also referred to as Zahumlje and Travunia (Trebinje) and the Konavle area, which had all been under the Roman rule before, were all deserted after the Avar raids and the Roman population had settled in Dalmatia and Drač, the emperor allowed the Serbs to settle there, so they remained under his sovereignty [...] Those inhabitants of Zahumlje, who now live in Dalmatia, are Serbs who fled to the Roman Emperor Heraclius– the inhabitants of Trebinje and Konavle are the descendants of the Pagan Serbs, who had lived there since the time of that prince, who escaped from the pagan Serbia to the Emperor Heraclius, until the reign of the Serbian Prince Vlastimir. – *De facto*, the Princes of Trebinje had always been vassals of the Serbian prince – the pagans are the descendants of the Serbian pagans – i.e. they were the descendants of the prince who fled to the Emperor Heraclius. That is why they are called *Pagani* (Pagans) – because they were not Christians at the time when all the Serbs were already Christians” (p. 32).

Stanislav Siestrenčević de Bohuz, a Catholic Bishop of Mogilev, wrote in his book *The Studies on the Origins of the Sarmatians, the Slavons and the Slavs*, published in Saint Petersburg around 1800: “The Principedom of Zahumlje was a branch of the Principedom of Dubrovnik. Its fields spread to the banks of the Neretva; its coast went as far as the land of Pagans (Neretljani); in the hilly northern parts, Zahumlje

bordered Croatia along the river Cetina. On the other side, Zahumlje bordered Serbia. The first inhabitants of Zahumlje were the Roman colonists who settled there during the reign of Diocletian, but they were either enslaved or drawn away during the Avar migration. Subsequently, the Serbs came to their settlements [...] The White Serbs in Bosnia were christened in 867” (p. 32-33). It is interesting that Zeis also observed that “Constantine Porphyrogenitus only gives the names of the smaller groups of the Serbs who lived close to the sea, but not the names of the tribes in the main Serbian population mass in the east” (p. 33). Furthermore, the Byzantine military writer Kekaumenos wrote about the Serb of Trebinje who managed to capture the great Greek army in Duklja.

All the medieval Bosnian Rulers and writers clearly identified themselves as Serbs. Many documents that corroborate that were kept in the archives of Dubrovnik. Milan Rešetar from Konavle wrote that “Bosnian Ban Ninoslav refers to his subjects only as the Serbs in his decrees from 1234–1249” (p. 36). These decrees were published by Franc Miklošić. They dealt with Bosnia-Dubrovnik relations. Maikov, a Russian historian confirms that these decrees are viable proof that the Bosnians referred to themselves as Serbs. In addition, Đuro Daničić concludes in his *Dictionary of the Ancient Serbian Literature* that: “The name of the people was stronger than the name of the land, and therefore the Bosnian kings called their subjects Serbs” (p. 37). Furthermore, in 1418, Prince Grgur Vukosalić referred to the inhabitants of Ston as Serbs. Also, Duke Juraj of Lower Bosnia allocated the estates to the certain feudal lords on the territories where the Serbs and the Vlachs lived. Juraj was the son of Prince Vojislav, who was brother of Herzog Hrvoje. He was a faithful Catholic, wrote in the Ikavian dialect but was undoubtedly a Serb. In the decrees of Herzog Stefan and his son Vladislav, their subjects were exclusively referred to as Serbs and Vlachs. The Vlachs were obviously inhabitants of Dubrovnik as other Gomers.

In his letter from 1438, Pirko Boljesaljić referred to the inhabitants of Srebrenica as Serbs. Konstantin Jiricek found this letter in the archives of Dubrovnik and published it in his book *The Serbian Monuments* in 1892. Furthermore, from the collection of decrees of the rulers, published by Miklošić, it is obvious that the Bosnian rules treat their subject exclusively as Serbs in the ethnical sense. Ban Stjepan II Kotromanić signed two decrees on the 15th of March 1333. Both were written in Serbian and in the Serbian alphabet, with two copies in Latin. In those decrees, Ban Stjepan ceded Rat with Ston to Dubrovnik. What was omitted by Miklošić was found Medo Pucić and Konstantin Jiricek, including the letters of Pribislav Pohvalić from 1406 and subsequent years. The fact that there is no trace of the Croats in Bosnia is corroborated by the distinguished Croatian scientist Vatroslav Jagić, who said: “According to our knowledge, during the reign of Ban Ninoslav, the term *Srbljin* (the Serb) was used for the Orthodox Christians (and maybe the Patarenes), at least in the religious sense, while the Catholics of Dubrovnik were known as the Vlachs” (p. 42). Milan Rešetar, a Catholic from Dubrovnik, said of this issue: “Bosnian

Ban Ninoslav refers to his subjects as Serbs and only Serbs, in the three decrees issued between 1234 and 1249” (p. 43). Furthermore, Vatroslav Jagić stated that the Decree of Ban Kulin from 1189 was written in Serbian and in the Cyrillic alphabet and that it would be impossible that this document could be the first document of its kind.

Although fluctuations of population were a common thing in Bosnia and Herzegovina, they were lesser in extent than the fluctuations in other Serbian lands. And there have never been major changes in the ethnic structure of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Mass migrations from Serbia to Bosnia occurred in the 12th century, when Stefan Nemanja banished the Bogomils. Vladimir Ćorović said of that that: “The sect migrated from Serbia to Bosnia [...] The adherents of the new religion were called the Patarenos in Bosnia” (p. 46). The political leader of the Serbs in Dalmatia, Božidar Petranović, wrote in his book *The Bogomils. The Church of Bosnia and the Krstijani* (the Christians), published in Zadar in 1867: “From Bulgaria and the Serbian princedoms, some religious teachers of the new religion migrated to Bosnia possibly at the beginning of the heresy. Their numbers multiplied when two members of the Nemanjić dynasty - Simeon and his son, Stefan Prvovenčani, banished the heretics from Serbia in the late 12th century and early 13th. The renowned Ban Kulin ruled Bosnia at that time and he received the Bogomil refugees gladly” (p. 46). Croatian scientist Dragutin Franić wrote about that in 1897: “the Bogomils that were banished from Serbia, fled to Stefan’s brother’s domain of Zahumlje, where Prince Miroslav readily accepted them to spite his brother. The Bogomil preachers then went to proud Bosnia, where their heresy spread under the patronage of the ban, the nobility and the clergy” (p. 46-47).

In historical analyses, it is not disputed that this exodus was a mass one, but it is very difficult to give any accurate numbers. Lazo Kostić summarizes that question: “what was the ethnicity of the banished Bogomils? They were surely the Serbs, that fact is undoubtedly true. The Serbs found refuge with other Serbs. In any case, the number of Serbs in Bosnia increased and the ethnic mixture did not occur because of that [...] Science does not doubt that the Bogomils of Bosnia were Serbs. This fact is so obvious that it does not need proving” (p. 47). The Bogomils celebrated *slava* according to indisputable indicators. They changed their creed but did not renounce *slava*. Lajos Thallóczy, studying the request of Tvrtko II in which he is applying to the Pope to give him permission to marry a Hungarian Catholic, writes: “The mention that there are infidels and schismatics in Bosnia in the text of his request is very important. The Bogomils (the Patarenos) are referred to as infidels and the term ‘schismatics’ can only apply to the Orthodox Christians. The evidence we have about the history and organization of the Bosnian Orthodox church is so scarce and incomplete that we must especially emphasise the mention of the Orthodox Christians in this supplication. In our opinion, the majority of the cattle breeders were members of the Orthodox church, although the believers of the Orthodox church were not organised at that time” (p. 48).

It is without doubt that a certain number of Vlachs lived in the Serbian

lands, including Bosnia, but they were quickly assimilated into the Serbian population. However, their name remained in use because the Turks called all Christians Vlachs. Franjo Racki, Tadija Smičiklas and Ferdo Šišić hold that the term ‘Vlachs’ lost its original meaning and became the common name for cattle breeders. On the other hand, the Catholics migrated to Bosnia sporadically, primarily as Saxon miners and several merchants from Dubrovnik who settled there only temporarily. After the Turkish conquest, a certain number of real Turks and Muslims from other countries settled in Bosnia, but their numbers were too small to have a serious impact on the ethnic structure. They were assimilated by the local Muslims and accepted the Serbian language, preserving a significant number of Turkish and Arabic words and phrases. In his book *The Contributions to the National Issues*, published in Sarajevo in 1963, Enver Redžić wrote: “The Ottoman Turks were numerous at the beginning of their conquest. Those were primarily soldiers, administrators and merchants. They forgot their language under the influence of the environment and of marriage and were assimilated and merged with the ‘Muslim Serbs’” (p. 54).

The Austrian author Karl Sax and the Russian author Rayevski both agree with the matters discussed in the preceding paragraph and Vladimir Ćorović gives more details: “The Muslim ranks in our lands were also filled with real Turks, who were sent when necessary from Constantinople by the authorities. Some of them stayed there for good. The surnames of some of the slavified Bosnian Muslim families indicate their Turkish origin: Kajtazi, Kamure, Firdusi, Behrami, Korkuti, Bekmeni, Filusije, etc., including the bey family Čengić” (p. 54). Vladimir Dvorniković and Louis Olivier also wrote about that. The Austrian Joseph Bernreiter wrote in 1918 that the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina “were differentiated from the Christians by their awareness that they were the ruling class and that awareness has lasted for centuries. Their differentiation was accentuated by the infusion they received from their harems full of Turkish and Anatolian women” (p. 56). Gerhard Gesemann claims that the “real Ottoman Turks, who settled in Bosnia as clerks, soldiers and merchants were assimilated by the Serbs quickly” (p. 56). Inter-marriages between the Muslim feudal classes and the Muslim farmers were rare. The Muslim farmers were called *balije* – heathens – the beys did not distinguish them much from the Christian common people and kept a typical class distance from them.

Ćorović indicates how Bosnia was colonised by the masses of Muslims from other countries after the collapse of the Turkish expansion. “When the Muslims had to flee from Dalmatia, Slavonia, Boka and Lika due to the gradual progress of the Christians in the second half of 17th century, they flooded Bosnia [...] The most zealous Herzegovian Muslims were the Korjenčići, who for the most part originate from the settlements near Herceg-Novi, as well as the population of the ‘damned Lijevno’, made up of the Dalmatian Muslim refugees [...] In the early 19th century, a great portion of the Muslim refugees from Western Serbia migrated to Bosnia and settled there. For example, the Kučukalići of Brčko are descendants of the infamous dahia from the First Serbian

Comment [S41]: Translator’s note. Author not found in the available sources

Uprising” (p. 57). In his monograph *The Old Užice*, published in 1922, Ljubomir Stojanović indicated that the Turks in Užice “were not Ottoman Turks but converts, as in Bosnia, and they did not speak Turkish though they knew some words – such as the Turkish salutations and some Turkish loan words that entered into the Serbian language of that time” (p. 57). Even Pilar acknowledged that he “often came across names in Bosnia such as Biogradlija, Šabčanin, Užičanin” etc (p. 57). Risto Jeremić described the process of the Muslim emigration as the *Muhajir* from various neighbouring lands in his study *On the Origins of the Inhabitants of the Region of Tuzla*, which was published in 1922: “The bey families claim that they originate from Anatolia and that they cannot write in the ‘bey alphabet’ like the beys in Herzegovina, Polimlje and Upper Podrinje. They consider this a clear sign that the beys of the Tuzla region are not descendants of our domestic medieval aristocrats. It is only said that the Tuzlić family originates from Cvetko Altomanović and that the Uzeirbegovići from Maglaj are related to the family Kondić in Serbian Brusnica in the Maglaj canton” (p. 58). Furthermore, Đorđe Pejanović and Beaux, the Prussian consul in Sarajevo, write in detail about these matters. Beaux claimed that, in around 1867, thirty thousand Muslims were banished from Serbia to Bosnia.

In his book *The Organisation of the Dinaric Tribes*, published in 1957 in Belgrade, Sreten Vukosavljević indicated that, on the occasion of the territorial expansions of Montenegro and the extermination of the Muslim converts, the banished Muslims settled near the new borders. “These refugees established the frontier, which was fierce and dangerous although it was not formally organized as a frontier. They surrendered Montenegro” (p. 59). Due to the emigrations of the Muslim refugees, a process similar to that before the Turkish invasion took place; at that time, the Serbs from the conquered Serbian lands found refuge in Bosnia. As Đorđe Pejanović remarked, “from the regions around Skopje, from Kosovo and Metohija, Sandžak, Serbia, Montenegro and from Herzegovina, the local population ran to the north and west, and a considerable number migrated to Bosnia and Central and Western Herzegovina” (p. 62). From time to time, coerced resettlements took place and, as Kostić explained, “the forced settlement of the population was performed by the Turks when a certain area was deserted due to emigration and the flight of the local population. The population was then settled mostly in the northern, north-western and western parts of Bosnia. The first two regions of Bosnia gained their Serbian character because of this, even though their character may not have been Serbian before” (p. 63). Jefto Dedijer wrote that, in the beginning of 18th century, the Serbs from highlands of Herzegovina had settled the areas around Sarajevo and Tuzla and, even before that, the areas around Travnik, Bihać and Banja Luka. That was corroborated by Vladimir Skorić and Jovan Dučić. Sreten Vukosavljević wrote that “the fact that the Serbs migrated from Sandžak and the mountain areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina to Bosanska Posavina or Semberija is still alive in the collective memories of the Serbian people” (p. 63).

In the 1949 study *The disappearance of the Bogomils and the*

Islamisation of Bosnia, Alexander Soloviev wrote about the situation in Bosnia in the late 17th century: “The number of Orthodox Christians in the villages increased; the continuous emigrations from Sandžak, Herzegovina and Montenegro brought the toughened Serbian population into the deserted Muslim and Catholic villages (e.g. - to Sarajevsko polje)” (p. 64). Gerhard Wolfram said that, after the Turkish occupation, the process of Islamisation occurred and, in that process, Catholicism “suffered a heavy blow at first, while the Orthodox faith was able to spread significantly when the Serbian population settled there” (p. 64). However, Kostić points out that the Serbs also migrated from Bosnia in masses and that “almost the whole of the Orthodox Slavonia, the largest part of Orthodox Dalmatia, Lika, Kordun and Banija, the significant parts of Srem and Montenegro, etc., were settled by Serbs from Bosnia and Herzegovina. Tens of thousands of Orthodox Christians migrated from Bosnia and Herzegovina at that time. That undoubtedly weakened the Serbs in Bosnia. But the sole proof that the Serbian population is in the majority in Bosnia, despite the tribulations and mass murders, is that all those provinces were Serbian in their essence” (p. 64). The consequences of that process were very distinct. “The Serbs from Bosnia and Herzegovina settled in all of the neighbouring regions, giving those areas a Serbian character if they were not Serbian, or consolidating the Serbian character elsewhere if it was endangered. But, at the same time, their migrations did not weaken the ethnic position of the regions they migrated from. The verse of the Serbian poet Šantić about Bosnia and Herzegovina as the ‘the nursery of Serbdom’ was not an exaggeration. What does that really mean? It means that Bosnia and Herzegovina were so full of Serbs that the migration of tens of thousands of Serbs could not disturb or destroy their ethnic structure. The migrations, wars and persecutions suffered by the Serbian population of Bosnia and Herzegovina for centuries were unable to challenge the Serbian character of the two provinces. Not even the monstrous and systematic extermination of the Serbs in the criminal ‘Independent State of Croatia’ could eradicate the Serbian character of Bosnia and Herzegovina. While Serbia was left almost empty after the uprisings of Karađorđe and Miloš Obrenović, Bosnia and Herzegovina were full of Serbs and have remained that way to this day. The Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina suffered migrations, persecutions and exterminations, but enough of them would always manage to survive so that nobody could deny their ethnic character – both today or in the ancient past when the Serbs migrated to the Balkans” (p. 67-68).

Emil de Laveley, Karl Zeden, Ernest Denis, Anatol Leroy-Beaulieu, Ivo Andrić, Heinrich Renner, Đorđe Pejanović and many other writers wrote about the migrations of the Catholic ethnic groups into Bosnia and Herzegovina after the Austro-Hungarian occupation. Kostić extensively quotes from their works and places special importance on the data revealing that the colonists were settled in the areas where the former population was ethnically compact, they were awarded the most fertile land and they were also given the best positions in the state administrations, the most profitable work, etc. According to the census

from 1910, 71,061 citizens of German, Polish, Ukrainian, Gypsy, Czech, Hungarian, Slovenian, Italian, Romanian, Slovakian, Albanian, Turkish and Greek nationality, as well as other non-Serbian speaking nationalities, were recorded. 40,000 Croats should be added to that number. Since the Austro-Hungarian rule did not last for more than half a century, their ethnic restructuring policy did not have enough time to fully succeed, but it was continued by the Croatian atrocities during WWII, when 600,000 Orthodox Serbs were murdered on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The people of Bosnia and Herzegovina, once homogenous, were divided by religion alone, but the religion is the fundamental factor in modern times when it comes to national self-identification. As written by Jovan Dučić, "in Bosnia, people of all creeds had multiplied and they were artificially trying to become members of other nationalities, even those unknown to their fathers before the Austrian regime" (p. 82). The Bosnian Catholics had never identified themselves as Croats until the Austrian occupation. For centuries, they identified themselves as the Latins or the 'Šokci', as supported by all the available historical documents. Ivan Franjo Jukić travelled extensively through Bosnia but did not find any Croats there. His numerous travel essays were published in various magazines. Somewhere around that time, the Croatian historian Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski seems to lament: "In the old days, the Pliva River was the border of the Croatian kingdom and the Pliva district was a county of Croatia. The Croatian name has vanished from that area long since." (p. 85). Vasilije Đerić commented on this as follows: "It is a mistake that the word 'vanished' was used here, because we do not have feasible evidence that the Croatian character ever existed there" (p. 86). In addition, Ante Radić, brother of Stjepan Radić, concluded in 1899: "I was able to sufficiently and even accidentally assure myself that in many parts of Bosnia Herzegovina the Croat name was totally obscure to the villagers in B&H" (p. 86).

The writings of Vjekoslav Klaić are the most ridiculous. In his book *Bosnia. Information on Geography and History*, which was published in Zagreb in 1878, he wrote that: "the inhabitants of B&H, apart from some other tribes, are the Croats. However, this name cannot be heard often because the national consciousness of the Croats has withered away, and therefore the provincial names are mentioned more often, such as the Bosnian or the Herzegovinian, or the religion-related names (the Turk, the Serb, the Latin)" (p. 86). According to Klaić, it seems that all of them were Croats, but somehow none of them were aware of that fact. And the Serbs, who had known their nationality for centuries, were not Serbs but Orthodox Croats; only they did not know that either. Klaić was ridiculed by Richard Kiperig in 1879, in the influential German magazine for geography and ethnography *The Globe*, which was published in Braunschweig: "Klaić here uses the term 'Croats' as a *marote* (a kind of hoax or tomfoolery, L.M.K) for the majority of Croatian writers, who wanted to advertise that all the Yugoslav people were Croats, in order to increase the potentials of their own fatherland and feed their separatism even more" (p. 86).

Many authors pointed out that the Catholics of Bosnia and Herzegovina had not had any national awareness for centuries. In his book *The European Turkey*, published in 1840 in four volumes, Ami Boué points out: "Austria should always remember that their only supporters in Bosnia, the Catholics or the Šokci, are hated by their Muslim countrymen and the Greek (Orthodox) Christians in Bosnia and Herzegovina, because they lack the feeling of nationality and patriotism that is developed in other Bosnians" (p. 87). Vjekoslav Klaić, being aware of the essential issues, and desiring to help the Croatian national aspirations and despite the fact that the Bosnian Catholics simply did not have any Croatian national awareness, considered that the Bosnian and Herzegovinian parsons and Franciscans "could not instil Croatian national awareness and pride into the Bosnian Catholics, because even they did not know who they were [...]. Therefore, it is no wonder that some of the travellers, including Guilferding, observed that the Catholics were far behind the Orthodox when it came to their beliefs and spiritual properties. The reasons for that were a belief in the authority of other people and the lack of a sense of nationality" (p. 87).

The Croatian politician Šime Macura wrote in 1891 that: "if we do not want to delude ourselves, we should admit today that, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the national awareness has not been inspired to such a degree that we could clearly say that the population of these countries totally and decidedly inclines toward the Croatian nationality" (p. 87). Furthermore, the Ustasha writer Ivo Pilar admitted that the Bosnian Catholics had not possessed any Croatian national awareness under Turkish rule and the Croatian national awareness was introduced together with the Austro-Hungarian occupation and spread artificially. He said: "Before 1848 in Slavonia, before 1861 in Dalmatia and before 1895 among the Bosnian Catholics, there was no national awareness! Where the latter are concerned, that national awareness did not prevail as it did in Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia. When the Bosnian Muslims were concerned that national awareness met with considerable difficulties" (p. 88). Milan Marjanović concluded in his book *Contemporary Croatia*, which was published in 1913: "Throughout the 19th century, the Croatian politics had a legal and statehood character. The national awakening commenced in a limited relation to the state-establishing struggle. Thus, the movement of national awakening spread in Croatia with Gaj's activities, as well as in Dalmatia with respect to the actuality of the legal and statehood issues. The same happened in Bosnia and Herzegovina" (p. 88). The bishop of Đakovica, Josip Juraj Štrosmajer, invested special efforts into indoctrinating the future Bosnian Catholic priests and persuading them that they were Croats. *The Gazette of the Bosnia and Srem Bishopric* from 1881 openly admits that "the Bosnian clergy found out for the first time that they were the sons of the Croatian nation in Đakovica" (p. 88).

In his study *The Annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Relation of the Slavism towards It*, published in 1909 in Sankt Petersburg in the magazine for history, politics and literature *The Herald of Europe*, The Russian scientist Peter Lavrovich Lavrov commented on Klaić's

question: "Where the Croatian name is concerned, even professor Klaić, the distinguished geography and history writer, had to admit that the people of Bosnia, even the Catholics, do not call themselves Croats. Only Klaić refers to the Bosnians and the Herzegovians as Croats" (p. 89). Apollon Nikolaevich Maikov wrote in 1876 that the Bosnian Catholics had lost their nationality a long time ago and that Austria successfully manipulates them. The Catholic priest Tomo Kovačević wrote in 1862 about the situation in Bosnia: "In this district there are 100,000 Catholics, but there are no Croats there. We should keep this fact in mind and start informing the people that they belong to Bosnia. At the same time, we should know that the Croats' aspirations to claim all of Bosnia will increase. The Catholics of Bosnia and Herzegovina are under the rule of friars, and there are good patriots among them" (p. 89).

Vasa Pelagić expressed his resentment toward the Croats in his *History of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Rebellion*, because they tried to publicly proclaim the Bosnian and Herzegovinian rebels as Croats, even though they had almost two hundred thousand Bosnian and Herzegovinian refugees on Croatian territory who identified themselves as Serbs in masses. "Not even the Catholics from those provinces called themselves Croats, but identified as the Šokci, the Christians and the Latins" (p. 89). Jovan Dučić was very accurate in his approach to these matters: "The Croatian name has always been alien to Bosnia, just as the Portuguese or Finnish. Bosnia has only been referred to as a Serbian land" (p. 89). Jovan Cvijić wrote in 1913: "Moreover, the Catholics of Bosnia and Herzegovina had been without national awareness until the occupation in 1878, the same as the Slavs of Macedonia. Now they mainly became Croats and this tendency is increasing" (p. 90). Then Cvijić adds: "All foreign Catholics who migrate to Bosnia declare themselves as Croats as soon as they arrive at their destination, because then they are sure that the government will give them preferential status" (p. 90).

The Muslims also had no national awareness for centuries, but identified themselves with the Turkish occupators and shared the same creed. According to Kostić, "when they were told that they were not Turks, the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina no longer knew what they were. They were disoriented and confused. Their intellectuals started to make decisions with respect to their nationality after the occupation. Some of them proclaimed themselves Serbs, other as Croats. It is not certain which were more numerous, because there were no statistical records at that time and it was impossible to record such data. It seems that the Serbs were more numerous but both were few, they amounted to barely 2% of the total Muslim population. The Muslim masses did not want to follow the intellectuals, who were mostly young. They remained indifferent, almost indolent with respect to their national awareness. Religion remained the main feature of national differentiation as well as grouping. This situation lasted until recently, until after WWII. Independently, the scientists treated the question of the Muslim nationality and almost unanimously came to the conclusion that the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina were Serbs. They were guided

by objective criteria: language, race, history, etc. However, the masses of Muslims never found out about the opinions of the foreign experts and never cared about what experts, however competent, think about them and their nationality. Such Muslim masses went their own separate ways, guided by their effendis, aghas and beys, whose ancestors had been guiding and determining their attitudes toward God and the whole world, even toward their countrymen, for centuries. Even now, they have remained faithful to their effendis and allowed them to decide on their nationality. The aghas and beys remained faithful to their old beliefs and all the novelties confused them and made them suspicious" (p. 91).

In his study *Races, Religions and Nationalities of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, which was published in 1900, the French historian Anatol Leroy-Beaulieu points out that "the Qu'ran suppresses and suffocates the idea of nationality in its believers. This is one of the reasons why, in Bosnia and in the whole of the east, the Christians and Muslims defer more and more. While everywhere in the Orient, the national ideas are awakening today in the Christian population, who try to subjugate religious ideas to the national idea, the faith continues to absorb the Muslims. It fills their souls and their whole lives in such a way that there is no room left for any other sentiments. The Muslims from Sarajevo and Mostar are Slavs according to both their language and origin and have nothing in common with the Turks except their common religion, but generations should grow, maybe for centuries, before they start to feel like Slavs and Europeans again and before they learn to consider themselves a part of the same nation as their Christian countrymen [...] Islam moulds human beings and the nation all over again. The Qu'an turned people of European origin, like the Bosnians, almost into Asians and they have difficulties in embracing the spirit of Europe again [...] A large portion of Muslims seem to have remained faithful to the sultan and the Ottoman Empire, the destiny of which is made equal in their minds with the destiny of Islam [...] They are still obstinate in their belief that they are the Turks" (p. 91-92).

This is also confirmed by Enver Redžić, who pointed out: "The large masses of Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina developed and preserved the awareness that their destiny is inseparable from the destiny of the Turks. Their Turkish national awareness manifested in their loyalty to Islam and the Turks" (p. 92). In his text *The Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, published in 1920, Hofrat Pach observed: "The Muslims in B&H are not only referred to as Turks by the heterodox in communications and literature, but they also call themselves the Turks. However, the Altaic blood does not flow through their veins; only here and there you can see a person with an Asiatic infusion [...] But more than 400 hundred years of their connection with the East, the influence of the faith that alters the spirit and the soul and their social position as the ruling class severed the ties that connected them to their Serbian and Croatian compatriots who had become *raja* during the Turkish occupation. If one could not hear what they say, but could just watch their settlements and their way of life, their national costumes, their behaviour and the way they were doing business, one would conclude

that they were a totally different world. The cities, villages and the farms that they inhabit look like their eastern models in all respects and we could find the likes of them in the Bosphorus or in Anatolia [...] The people you meet until the dark falls in the streets – the businessmen, the artisans, the café-owners and cooks, carriers who leave the streets after dark – are all Oriental. All except *pasvandžije* (Translator's note: the night patrols) and guards leave the city centre at dusk [...] The Bosnian Muslims are incredibly faithful to their religion. The dogmas of Islam and the dominant character in the country formed the character of the Bosnian Muslims" (p. 92-93).

The German author Karl Petz had no doubt that the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims were initially Serbs. Vaso Pelagić adds to that: "The religion of the Muslims somewhat changed their character, customs and abilities. The Serbs who converted to Islam, as well as the Greeks and Bulgarians, are even more faithful to Islam than the Arabs and the Asian Turks" (p. 93). Kostić came upon the statement of the Austrian army general Baron Emil Vojnović, who was extremely anti-Serbian, written in 1917, concerning "550,000 Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which are really Serbs but do not consider themselves Serbs" (p. 93). Based on his personal knowledge and experience, Jovan Cvijić testified in his text *On the Migrations of the Bosnian Muslims*, how the Bosnian Muslims, although objectively in the ethnic sense Serbs, fled as the Turks: "The fact that we speak the same language does not help. There is no trace of a feeling that they are of the same ethnicity as us. If you even mention that fact, you can clearly see that that notion is far from their minds; as far away as the notion that they are clearly the same as the Turks because of their religion is close" (p. 93).

The Ustasha ideologist Ivo Pilar elaborates on the same issue in an extremely tendentious way: "Contrary to the Seton-Watson writings, I consider the Bosnian Muslims to be Croats, but would like to emphasise that the considerable number of Muslims still have no national awareness [...] The lack of national awareness of the Muslims does not disturb my point of view because, in the Slav countries in the Balkans, national awareness has withered away almost completely under Turkish rule and lived on only as the legal and state-related and national-political feeling of affinity. Where the Bosnian Muslims are concerned, the restoration of their nationality encountered serious problems [...] The national awareness of the Bosnian Croats (!) who converted to Islam has withered away completely. It seems that their national awareness had already been weakened considerably by the religious schism [...] According to Miler, Islam takes over the entire personality; Islam makes an individual forget his past, his family and all relations in order to commit himself to the only religion that can save his soul. That happened to the Bosnian Bogomils. Their connection with their national and political 'history' was severed completely" (p. 94).

Indicating that he had already published the book *The New Yugoslav Nationalities* and that he is preparing a special brochure on the nationality of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims, Lazo Kostić cites here the English travel writer Artur Evans, who published the book *Through*

Bosnia and Herzegovina on Foot During the Rebellion of August and September 1875, with a Historical Overview of Bosnia, where he concluded, among other things, that: "The Janissaries, the rulers of Sarajevo, were more than just a mob of murderers. They were mostly Slavs, descendants of the ruling families of the old Bosnian kingdom. They speak in the folk language and they are full of the provincial patriotism" (p. 94).

Contrary to Catholicism and Islam, Orthodox Christianity has always been absolutely identified with Serbdom in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Although their religion was referred to in Austria as Greek Eastern and even in Serbia and Montenegro as Orthodox and Eastern Orthodox and in Turkey as Orthodox and Greek, the Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina succeeded in their plea for their faith to be recognized under the Austro-Hungarian occupation as Serbian-Orthodox. In the decree issued on 13 August 1905, the Statute with 264 paragraphs was adopted by the Austro-Hungarian government in Bosnia, which defined the church and school autonomy of the Serbian-Orthodox episcopates, as well as the use of the Serbian language with Cyrillic letters as the official language of the Serbian-Orthodox episcopates, the red-blue-white church flag and the activities of the Serbian-Orthodox church and school municipalities, parishes, the clergy, the monasteries, the episcopates, their boards and the supreme management and school boards were regulated.

Although Kostić does not enter into the theoretical details concerning the terms 'people' and 'nation', he says that the term 'nation' was "a new term in world history that originated some time after Napoleon's conquests. The establishment of nations had lasted through the centuries and the consolidation of nations for decades. And it has never been more immaculate, clearer and impeccable as in the establishment of the Serbian nation, especially where the Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina are concerned. The process of creating the Serbian awareness and the gathering of Serbs was completed a few centuries before Napoleon and, when the Serbian nation was proclaimed there were no difficulties, questions, doubts and hesitations. While, on the contrary, that process has been in progress until today and has encountered considerable difficulties, struggle, disorientation and, inconsequence. Sometimes the same person would declare himself as a German, sometimes as a Croat, sometimes as a Muslim, then again as a Croat, then a Muslim, etc. People could only be recorded as Serbs if their grandfathers, great-grandfathers and great-great-grandfathers declared themselves as Serbs. Only Muslims whose descendents were mainly Serbs can be recorded as Serbs, but they have not always been conscious of that fact. There are no homogenous nations, we must repeat that. But if there is a relatively homogenous nation that has been constant and aware of its nationality at the same time – that is the Serbian nation, especially the part of the Serbian nation from Bosnia and Herzegovina. That is the undeniable fact" (p. 95-96).

Guilferding pointed out the significance of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the centuries' long preservation of the Serbian national

awareness. "The great self-knowledge of the Orthodox Church in the Serbian lands rendered it capable of identifying with the nation at a time when Catholicism and Islam both destroyed nationalities. The Serb means – that is, the Orthodox Christian and the Orthodox Christian for the common people means – the Serb. For an Orthodox Serb, faith and nationality are inseparable: to renounce the faith means to renounce the whole national being" (p. 96-97). The French historian, Charles Yriarte wrote something similar about the Bosnian Orthodox Serbs in 1876: "Those people identify the idea of religion and race to such extent that the word 'Serb' became a synonym of the word 'Orthodox'. The Catholics are different in that respect: the idea of religion precedes the idea of nationality with the Bosnian (Catholic) priests" (p. 97). It is interesting that the French publicist Gabriel Sharm makes the distinction between the Serbs and the neighbouring Orthodox nations, taking the Bosnian Serbs as an example in 1885: "They are identified, as a religious group, as Serbs and not Greeks, although everywhere in the Orient the adherents of the Orthodox religion are called Greeks regardless of their nationality [...] Starting from 1880, the Serbs changed the official name of their Orthodox faith: since the adherents of this faith had manifested their aversion toward the name the Greek or the Greek Orthodox and since they wanted to call themselves the Serbs or the Orthodox, it was decided that they would change their name to the Eastern Orthodox or simply the Orthodox" (p. 97). Furthermore, their faith had been referred to as the Serbian-Orthodox in official Austro-Hungarian documents until WWI. Anatol Leroy-Beaulieu wrote about the same matter: "The Orthodox, who call themselves the Serbs, are the most numerous. The Orthodox or the Serbs – for them, these two names are synonyms – without a doubt form the most significant element of Bosnia and Herzegovina according to their number" (p. 97-98).

Because of the failure of his proselytistic mission and the impossibility of converting the Orthodox Serbs in Bosnia to Catholicism, the Archbishop of Sarajevo lamented that: "Their faith intimately coincided with their race. You could talk to them about the superiority of Catholicism and they would answer: I am a Serb – They are Serbs indeed, both in their language and their blood. To suggest that they abandon their faith would be the same as to suggest that they abandon their nationality" (p. 98). In addition, Arthur Evans also testified about the strong national awareness of the Bosnian Serbs, as well as the French historian Coquelle in 1895 in his book *The History of Montenegro and Bosnia according to the Original Source*. This fact was also especially emphasised in the works of Jovan Dučić, who observed: "Although the Bosnian peasant does not know where his Bosnia begins and ends on a map, he knows where the history of his blood begins and ends and where his battlefields against the foreigners are situated in that land" (p. 99-100).

Evans wrote of the Bosnian Serbs' patriotism: "The Serbs, who were all members of the Greek Church, are truly the most patriotic people in Bosnia. But their ultimate goal is the restoration of the Serbian empire or the establishment of a democratic government of the same kind, with or

without a ruler" (p. 100). After that, he said: "In Bosnia, Dušan and Lazar are worshiped instead of the kings of the provinces" (p. 100). From his travels in 1829, the Prussian guard officer Otto von Pirch testified that: "Even today, after almost five hundred years, each Serbian peasant and each Serbian child in Serbia and Bosnia knows and sings about the Tsar Dušan and Prince Lazar, about the heroes of that time and the destruction of the old Serbia" (p. 100). Many Austrian journalists, as well as the consular representative Karl Sax, the Prussian agent Kopper and Gerhardt Wolfrum wrote of the unfaltering Serbian national awareness of the Bosnian Orthodox Christians, while the distinguished politician Jozef Bernreiter wrote of the Serbs in his diary in 1913: "Their national awareness and their pride have been elevated by their latest military successes. They are tough and unscrupulous, hyperactive and sparing; they have the talent to acquire material possessions, which the Muslims and the Turks are deprived of" (p. 102).

Discussing the Austro-Hungarian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Jovan Cvijić emphasises how the Bosnian Serbian environment "managed to preserve their old faith and nationality with dignity [...] On the major part of that geographical territory, Serbian national feeling and opinion exists and becomes ever stronger among the Serbian population, a trend that has never been as strong in the other peoples of the Balkans. According to their common historical traditions, we can sense that the nation and the spiritual life of those people are comprised not only of the living people, but also of the dead people and past events [...] Even in this sense, the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina represent one of the most ethnographically self-conscious and strongest parts of the Serbian people, and that they are inseparable from the people of Western Serbia, the Sanjak of Novi Pazar and of Montenegro [...] Since the end of 15th century, the Serbian national awareness in B&H has become significantly stronger" (p. 102). In his lectures in the Association of the Pan-Slavic Unity in St. Petersburg in 1909, the Serbian-Bosnian politician Dr Dušan Vasiljević said the following: "The national awareness – as recognised even in the official report of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian government – is developed the most in the Orthodox Serbs. I dare say that the Serbian national ideal has been completely crystallised in all the segments of Serbian population. This is based on tradition – on the epic poetry and the tales of the Serbian princes and knights from the time of the Battle of Kosovo – a tradition sodden with recent memories of suffering and the common struggles for freedom with their brothers from Serbia and Montenegro" (p. 102).

Lazo Kostić cites the writings of several authors who wrote on the ethnic structure of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian population, where he gave special significance to the writings of Guilferding, who wrote: "The inhabitants of Bosnia belong to three nations, according to my understanding and the official acknowledgements of the three nations, although they belong to only one and the same Serbian tribe and speak the same language. Those three nations are: the Turks i.e. the Muslims, the Latins (who are Christians and derogatorily the Šokci), - i.e. the

Catholics and the Serbs (who are Christians, and derogatorily the Vlachs) – i.e. the Orthodox [...] If you ask the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina which nation they belong to, the great majority will say that they are Serbs, others call themselves Latins and Turks in accordance with their religion, although they are both Slavs and speak the same language: nobody identifies themselves as a Croat [...] The Orthodox faith blended together with their Slav nationality to such a degree that the name of the Serb became a synonym for the Orthodox Slav[...] On the other hand, there has never been a connection like that between the Catholic faith and the Slav nationality of the Croats [...] and that name only survived in the area where it was supported by a permanent political tradition – i.e. in their own constitutional Croatia; in Bosnia and Herzegovina they have been surrounded by the Serbian majority and have lost their sense of nationality [...] they started calling themselves exclusively according to their faith – i.e. the Latins” (p. 103).

Franz Maurer confirmed that only the Bosnian Orthodox Christians had any national awareness, while the Catholics identified themselves only as Latins. Arthur Evans and Friedrich von Hellwald wrote in a similar manner. Arthur Evans wrote in his book: “The Orthodox Bosnians use the alphabet of Cyril and are known as the Serbs, the Orthodox Christians or the Orthodox. Those other inhabitants (who call Christ Krist and themselves Christians - Kršćani) see the Cyrillic alphabet as the devil’s trap and are far from seeking friendship with the people of free Serbia and even call themselves Latins [...] The politics of the Muslim invaders were more inclined toward the Catholic Church in the province as a counter balance to the Orthodox Serbs, who were more numerous than the Muslims and who were inspired by national ideals, while the Latins lack them” (p. 104-105). In 1879, the French *Universal Geographical Dictionary* was printed and Kostić cites the following lines from the first volume: “The Slavs of Turkey are divided into three nationalities according to their religious symbols: the Serbs or the Greek Orthodox, the Latins or the Roman Catholics and the Turks or the Muslims. The latter are dispersed over the whole territory of the country, though mostly concentrated in towns. The Serbs are generally concentrated in the north; the Latins live in small groups among the two other nations” (p. 105).

Therefore it is no wonder that on 24 March 1878, right before the Austro-Hungarian occupation, the Serbian political leaders from Bosnia sent a letter of protest to the Croatian delegates in the Hungarian Assembly where they stated, among other things, the following: “Today there are no Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina and none of the indigenous inhabitants identify themselves as Croats. Only Bosnians and Herzegovians live in B&H and they are divided into three confessions: the Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic and the Islam. The Eastern Orthodox are called Serbs and Christians. There is around 700,000 of them. The Roman Catholics are called Catholics, Šokci, Latins or Christians. According to the report of the Catholic schematic of Mostar and the Austrian consul Todorović, there are around 180,000 Catholics in B&H. The Islam adherents are known as the Turks or Muslims. There are

around 400,000 Muslims. All of these inhabitants of Bosnia speak Serbian – i.e. the same language as the Montenegrins and the Serbs in Serbia. They all find it hard to understand a real Croat and that *Kranjc* from history” (p. 106).

At the moment of occupation, Gabriel Sharm said that: “the separation between religions was performed in such an obvious manner that the clashes between them were often fiercer than the clashes between two nationalities. – The population of both provinces is homogenous as a race [...] but, from the standpoint of religion, they are divided into the Muslims, the Serb (*Rum millet* - translator’s note - the Roman nation, the name used to describe the Orthodox Christians under Turkish rule, the Christians) and the Latins (the Christians) – i.e. the Catholics” (p. 106). Not till 1902, as Leroy-Beaulieu observed, did the Bosnian Catholics start to have certain sympathies toward Croatia. He concludes the following: “If Bosnia and Herzegovina is a homogenous country for an ethnologist, we cannot say that it is a homogenous country from the point of view of politics and nationality. In Bosnia, as almost everywhere in the Orient, the thing that unites people in terms of conscious and solidarity is not the obscure racial communities, the same language or centuries-long habit of living together under the same rule, but the similarity of creed and rites – the religious community. And this is not a consequence of ignorance or fatalism, as we would be inclined to believe, but historical legacy, the history of three or four centuries under Turkish rule, where nationality was replaced by faith, or at least equalised with it. Religion was the only fatherland for the oppressed *raja* [...] If you ask a Muslim what his nationality is he will answer that he is a Turk, although he is most likely of pure Slav blood. If you ask the Orthodox peasant the same question, he will answer that he is a Serb (I had the opportunity to hear this more than once). Where Catholics are concerned, although they mostly do not identify themselves as “Croats”, the sympathies of the Catholics in Bosnia and Dalmatia are turned towards Croatia” (p. 107). It took 24 years of occupation for the tens of thousands of Croats and other Catholics to migrate into Bosnia and Herzegovina and arouse certain sympathies toward Croatia in the local autochthonous Catholic population, which had not grown into the real national identification or the sense of any ethnical sameness.

The Bosnian Catholics had not felt any direct connections with the Croats. That connection was indirect, through the Roman Pope, which is corroborated by the Austrian scientist and official expert for Bosnian and Herzegovinian matters Dr Morris Hermes in an official state publication that was published in Vienna in 1889. He said: “According to whether a Bosnian Christian belongs to the Greek Orthodox or the Roman Catholic creed, he identifies himself as a Serb – i.e. either as a member of the church that is dominant in the neighbouring principedom or as a Latin – i.e. if he believes that the Roman Pope is the supreme head of the entire Christian community” (p. 108).

Because of this, the Ustasha ideologist Ivo Pilar lamented bitterly and openly, as can be seen from the following excerpt taken from his book: “Bosnia is historically and ethnically Croatian (!), “because all

Muslims are Croats, and the Serbs migrated to Bosnia in the last 400 years (!). But they represent 43.48% of the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which is even more important, as the Serbs are religiously united, while the Croats are divided into two religious groups and the national awareness of the Serbs is considerably more developed than the national awareness of the Croats and the Muslims [...] However, the fact remains that the Serbs are the strongest national and religious element in Bosnia today and that they represent approximately 43% of the total population and they have the strongest national awareness. The Catholic Croats, who comprise 20% of the population, mostly lack national awareness. And the Muslims, who account for 33% of the total population, are especially late in building their national awareness [...] The theory of Serbian nationality can be further corroborated by the fact that the Serbs were the most numerous and the most politically active element, while the Moslems and the Catholics almost had no national awareness [...] The Serbs were not only the majority in Bosnia and Herzegovina (now around 800,000 Orthodox Christians, 600,000 Muslims and 400,000 Catholics) after the occupation, but politically the most active element” (p. 108).

In his book *The Croats*, which was published in Graz and Köln in 1956, Rudolf Kiesling said, starting from the fact that the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Serbs had the most developed national awareness: “Distinguished historians such as Engels, Ranke, Kallay and Hellwald consider the inhabitants of Bosnia to be of Serbian origin [...] The national awareness of the Bosnian Croats and Muslims was developed to a much lesser extent than the Serbian. First and foremost, the Croats in Bosnia identified themselves as Catholic, but their adherence to the Roman Catholic Church made them stay behind the Serbs who were nationally consolidated through the Serbian Orthodox Church” (p.108–109). Both Petar Rađenović, the author of the book *Bjelajsko Polje and Bravsko*, and Abduselil Balagija, the author of the book *The Muslims of Yugoslavia*, published in Algiers in 1940, corroborated that the Orthodox Christians of Bosnia and Herzegovina have always been the Serbs. Besides, the overall toponomastics of Bosnia and Herzegovina confirms their conclusions because the adjective “Serbian” pops up innumerable times, the adjective “Turkish” is fairly common, while there were no Croatian attributes ever. Settlements, rivers, mountains and regions are in question. Both Konstantin Jireček and L.V. Berzin drew special attention to this phenomenon.

The independence of the Bosnian medieval state lasted far longer than the Croatian one did. It was made possible probably because the Nemanjić dynasty was more preoccupied with expansion toward the south of the Balkans and Constantinople and it was not interested in incorporating Bosnia into their empire. However, it existed in Bosnia on a limited territory. There was no specific national awareness at that time and the project of Benjamin Kallay to inaugurate the Bosnian nationality by a decree was doomed in advance. The appellation Bosniak has always been the term used to denominate the territorial origin, and the different religions put special emphasis on that name in various

historical periods. The real Turks used the term Bosniak as a derogatory name for the Bosnian converts. The Orthodox Serbs have never held Bosnian individuality to be important and to be a Bosnian only meant to be from Bosnia for them. The feudal Bosnian state was always deemed by the Bosnian Serbs an accidental occurrence in the main Serbian history. Therefore, Bosnia has never had any special value as an independent state to the Serbian people, primarily because the Bosnian rulers were ready to change their religion for political reasons. On the other hand, the Christian priests systematically removed all traces of the Bogomil heresy, which had once been dominant and influential in Bosnia, from the national conscience. That is probably why Bosnia remained only a geographical concept. As pointed out by Vladimir Corović, “its past was forgotten even by its own population and on its own territory, as something too complex, alien and distant and unattached to the people’s soul. Our rich national poetry is totally unaware of it, as well as the local legends and traditions, which can be so obstinate in other countries. In 1463, Bosnia disappeared as a state. That country emerged and lived as a geographical unit only, and only once in all its history found itself in a unique position to accomplish a historical mission” (p. 113). The people of Bosnia did not keep the Bosnian rulers in their collective memories, except Ban Kulin and Herzog Stefan. Corović concluded that “Tvrtko’s deeds are not mentioned in any part of Bosnia, although he worked for Bosnia his entire life and secured an enviable status for it; and they only know about Herzog Stefan because the adventures in his family” (p. 113).

In his study *Conversations in Bosnia*, published in the *Voice of Canadian Serbs* in 1959, Radmilo Grdić wrote: “The ideal of the Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina is the Nemanjić ideal, not the Bosnian one. In their tradition or their historical memory there is nothing left of the old Bosnian state. They do not have a sense of the Bosnian ‘historical borders’. Their only ideal was the freedom and the unification of all the Serbian people” (p. 113). Therefore, aspirations towards some form of Bosnian individuality can only flourish among the Muslims of Bosnia. Corović pointed out that Kallay’s experiment had been aimed at the artificial creation “of a separate Bosnian patriotism in order to suppress the connections of the population of B&H with the free Serbian states” (p. 114). The German author Ernest Aurich was even more direct in his appraisal of the situation: “Baron Kallay tried to transfer the outside stigmatization of Bosnia to the inside as well and strived to constitute a Bosnian national awareness in spite of the ethnic fact that the population of Bosnia was comprised of three different nationalities (the Serbs, the Croats and the Muslims) [...] His ideal as a statesman was to merge the Croats, the Muslims and the Serbs into a single nation and than to entrust the leading role to the Croats and the Muslims if his designs succeeded” (p. 114–115). In accordance with Kallay’s ideas, Franz Ferdinand created the parole that Austria should put them all into a melting pot and encourage the emergence of the Croats. The Russian scientist Lavrov commented on that act in 1909 as follows: “Being afraid of even the Serbian name and the adjective ‘Serbian’, the occupying government

introduced the term Bosnian as the official name of the language spoken in Bosnia (sometimes they used the name 'the language of the land')" (p. 115). Kostić contributed to that: "The reaction of the entire Serbian people was fierce. Kallay's 'Bosniaks' and the 'Bosnian language' were mocked by the Serbian press: the entire nation rose as one man to defend Serbdom. The Croats also criticised his designs, while the Muslims mostly kept quiet and seemed satisfied with this combination. When Kallay was ousted from power, his detested and ridiculed idea was dropped. However, it seems that Kallay's experiment is being repeated now under the personal initiative of the dictator of Yugoslavia Josip Broz" (p. 115).

Lazo Kostić dedicates a whole section in his book to the statistical conundrum regarding the official censuses of the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina. During the Austro-Hungarian occupation, the main issue was to make a distinction between the Croats and the other Catholics. In the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, only the religions were recorded in censuses. The first communist census was performed under the circumstances of the official atheistic ideology and the Muslims were treated in different ways at first. Some of them identified themselves as Serbs or Croats, but almost 90% of the Muslim population was indeterminate. However, the statistics from 1948 did not take into consideration the Muslim atheists who identified themselves as Serbs – almost 80%. "The process of the nationalization of Muslims that was systematically initiated after WWII with great enthusiasm was arrested and discontinued. Obviously, the tendency of its development was Serbian in character, which was totally unexpected for the anti-Serbian clique that rules Yugoslavia; they were astonished and even worried. When the results of the first census were published, it was the signal for the ruling clique to arrest and discontinue the process of nationalisation. Maybe today the Serbs would be in the absolute majority if it had not happened. And this had to be stopped at any cost" (p. 124).

It is an objective fact that a large majority of the Muslims remained nationally indifferent. "One of the main reasons for that is the conservatism and traditionalism of our Muslims. Undoubtedly, they are the most conservative part of our world and they are loyal to their religion more than others. Many welcomed the fact that they cannot continue to identify themselves according to their religion because, when religion is cast aside, the other parts of a nation cannot emphasise it as well. The Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina have always represented a unique group in comparison with their Christian cohabitants, both Catholic and Orthodox. They have always had the intimate feeling that they were special and different. However, that feature did not take the form of nationality yet and they have never developed into a group with the attributes of a nation. There were attempts at that though, because the other two religions were increasingly replacing the religious differentiations with the national – to such national differentiation, one similar differentiation had to be contrasted or the differences between them erased. The attempts were made in all directions (p. 125).

The young and educated Muslims increasingly declared themselves

IT-03-67-T
 erbs or Croats in the late 19th and early 20th century, which led to new divisions among the Muslims, despite the traditional spiritual compactness. If the Yugoslav state had not been established, most of them would have become Serbs. But in the discrepancies between the Serbs and the Croats, many Muslims started searching for a third option that would keep them together and protect their collective interests. "The leaders of that part of the Bosnian population observed that they would assimilate into Serbs or Croats and lose their powers of representation and their high positions. For example, the Serbs would not allow them to represent the Serbs and they could not represent the Muslims if they were of different ethnicity. Assimilated into the Serbs and Croats, the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina would not be able to express their needs and opinions. These were all their preoccupations. The regime was very happy because of that, because the trend of the increasing the numbers of the declarations of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims as Serbs became very suspicious and unpleasant" (p. 125). The statistics established that the absolute number and the percentage of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims had been growing rapidly, probably because they did not have many war casualties, because of their high rates of population growth and the organized emigrations of Muslims from other parts of the country.

The process of the coerced Croatisation of Bosnia and Herzegovina "had three components: the national awareness of the Catholics who had lived on the territory of B&H had to be established, which was made easier considering that they were completely ignorant of their nationality, lacking national awareness and that their coreligionists who lived in the neighbouring Austro-Hungarian countries were Croats. – Furthermore the next step was to colonise Bosnia with as many Croats from the neighbouring countries as possible. – At the end, the offspring of the foreigners who settled in Bosnia and who lost their foreign customs and identity were to be Croatinised. All these activities were performed concurrently and very quickly" (p. 126-127). Kostić exhibits here the details about the more numerous Catholic minorities, such as the Poles and the Germans, and their further destiny. Then he gives his attention to the issues regarding the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Jews and Gypsies. More than half of the local Jews were killed by the Croats in WWII and the others moved out after the war so that very few remained. The Gypsies who settled in Bosnia permanently mostly declared themselves as Muslims and, as a consequence, it is very difficult to obtain relevant statistical information about them.

The historical documents, official reports and travel accounts describing the Turkish occupation only mention the Serbs and the Turks, never the Croats. The oldest travel account was written by Benedict Kuripešić in 1532. He wrote about the Serbian inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina, about the Serbian monks and monasteries, about the Serbian language and the Cyrillic inscriptions carved on the tombstones. In 1538, Emperor Ferdinand mentioned the relocation of the Bosnian Serbs to Zumberak. In 1549, the secretary of the French ambassador described his frequent trips to Dubrovnik via Trebinje to Foča, through

the Serbian country. The Venetian ambassador Katarin Cen mentioned the Serbs of Sarajevo he met on his way to Constantinople in 1550.

Ayazbashi, the Turkish governor of Herzegovina mentioned the Serbs of Herzegovina in 1481. According to the Secretary of the Venetian Senate Benedetto Ramberti, Trebinje was the first town in Serbia he came to in 1534 on his way from Dubrovnik. In 1585, Marco Antonio Pigafetta wrote that the term 'Serbia' mostly used to refer to Herzegovina. In 1611, the secretary of the French envoy Sansi, named Le Fevre, described Bileća as the town in Serbia. The Duke of Hungarian Walachia Jon Matei Basarab endowed the Serbian monastery in Trebinje in the Serbian land with generous gifts in 1646. Angelo Rocca wrote in his book the *Vatican Apostolic Library*, which was published in Rome in 1591, that: "Among the Serbian language speakers, the Serbian language spoken in Bosnia is the purest and the most elegant" (p. 155). The abbot Pajsije of the Grabovac monastery in the Episcopate of Budim, described in 1593 how "the Turks conquered many countries then, including our Serbian lands – Serbia, Bosnia, Slavonia and Dalmatia - and that many Serbs had to migrate to this Hungarian land" (p. 156). The Russian scientist Jastrebov imparted that the Bosnian catholic priests had complained in 1615 to Sultan Ahmed about a *ferman* (translator's note: Decree) that ordered the Catholics to pay tribute to the Orthodox Church. They said in their complaint: "We are of the Latin faith and a sect that is completely different from the faith of the Serbs, Vlachs [...] and we do not have any connection with them" (p. 156). In 1641, the Archdeacon of Trogir informed the Roman congregation that the Serbs do live in Serbia but also in Herzegovina and Bosnia.

Even a Bosnian Muslim, Mohamed Hevaj, wrote a poem at the end of the 17th century *Ilahije in Serbian*. *Ilahija* is an invitation to religious service. The Frenchmen Quiclet travelled in a caravan made up of 14 carriages in from Zvornik to Bijeljina in 1658 and testified that all the coach drivers in the caravan were either Serbs or Morlacs. Around 1600, Evlija Čelebija wrote that the Bosnian race was comprised of Serbs, Bulgarians and Vlachs and that, in Bosnia, both Serbian and Catholic churches could be found. The German Emperor Leopold mentioned the Christians in Bosnia – the Bosnian Serbs in 1685. In a letter of 1681, the Orthodox Christians of Sarajevo addressed the Patriarch of Serbia as "the Patriarch of this Serbian land." After his visit to Bosnia in 1692, the Serbian Patriarch Kalinik wrote to the Metropolitan of Belgrade that "sadness has filled the hearts of the Christians in Serbia and we went to visit those people in the name of the Christ" (p. 158). Vasilije Đerić collected and published a great number of the monastery records of Bosnia as a Serbian land, dating back to the 14th and 15th centuries, in the second edition of his book *Of the Serbian Name in the Western Regions of our Nation*, which was published in Belgrade in 1914. Kostić pays special attention to the records of the Papraće monastery in north-eastern Bosnia, where the letters of the Russian tsars were kept – the letters of Tsar Fyodor from 1588 and 1591, Basil from 1607 and Emperor Alexei from 1645. The list of the Serbian metropolitans from the 18th century is

preserved and among them was the Bosnian metropolitan in the Serbian land. Furthermore, there are numerous letters from church dignitaries who speak about Serbian Bosnia, but the text of the Catholic Bishop Matija Karaman is maybe the most interesting – he wrote in 1744 that "at the time of the Vienna war there were no Serbian *vladikas* in the Zadar area, but nevertheless, the upper parts of the area were all inhabited by Serbs, who came from Bosnia around that time" (p. 160). The letter was published in Zadar in 1889 by the Serbian Episcopo Nikodim Milaš in his book *Documents Concerning the History of the Orthodox Church in the Dalmatian-historical Episcopate Between the 14th and 19th Centuries*. The book is rich in other information on the Bosnian Serbs and their migrations. In his book *The Life and Adventures of Dimitrije Obradović*, published in 1783, Dositej Obradović presented similar data, as did Sheikh Sejfidin Kemur, whose writings were published in Sarajevo in 1911. His writings deal with various questions and problems, but they have a common motif – he uses the Serbian attribute whenever he mentions the Bosnian Christian *raja*.

In the period between 1807 and 1814, the French consul in Travnik, Pierre David gave a striking testimony of the Turkish brutality against the local Serbs, who were killed because they expressed sympathies toward the Karadorde's uprising in Serbia. But in around 1850, the whole of cultured Europe was aware of the internal affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina and their Serbian ethnic character. That same year, the German magazine *Ausland* published *A Short Outline of Herzegovina*, which explained that "the common people use the Serbian language; only the Serbs who converted to Islam and live in the towns mix the Serbian language with Turkish phrases and words. The Serbian Muslims can be tolerated [...] In the areas where only Serbian is spoken, especially in the Orthodox population, the grammar and syntax is preserved intact. Even the children can tell the difference between the classes of nouns and the cases or conjugation" (p. 162). Spencer, Guilferding, Mackenzie and Irby all give a variety of information on the anthropological, ethnological, linguistic, moral, customary and ethnopsychological uniformity of the Bosnian Serbs and the Serbs from Serbia. Franz Mouer and Kinkel had similar opinions.

The Prussian politician Gustav Rasch wrote about the social situation in Bosnia in his book *Travels through the East. Serbia and the Serbs*, published in Prague in 1872, saying that: "Between the untilled areas, uncultivated and full of weeds and bushes, you can see the Serbian-looking men and women here and there, labouring in the wheat and corn fields, wearing village folk costumes. The unfortunate people had once been the owners of the land, but now they can only earn their daily wages on someone else's land [...] The miserable Serbian serf who tills the land for the bey, the very land that once belonged to him, has to give a third of the harvest to his master. One tenth of his wages is taken by the pasha for the sultan [...] A Serb in Bosnia has to pay two forints and twenty dimes not to become a Turkish soldier [...] A Serbian farmer became a Turkish serf" (p. 163). German ethnographers, Hellwald and Beck studied the characteristics of the European Turkey in 1878 and

drew the following conclusions: “We have learned of the tribal characteristics of the South Slavs by studying the Serbs and the Montenegrins and feel that we do not have to study the Bosnians, Herzegovians and Rascians again from the ethnological standpoint. What we said about the Serbs and the Montenegrins can be applied to them” (p. 164).

The works of Carl Sceden and Heinrich Renner abound with information on the Serbian ethnic and cultural characteristics and the works of the French authors are similar. It was not a coincidence that the French Consul in Skadar, De Grande, came to the following conclusion: “The Herzegovians, Bosnians, Serbs and Montenegrins all speak in the same language; they can unite and form a common state, without a doubt” (p. 166). Meier’s *Great Conversational Lexicon*, published in twenty volumes in Leipzig and Vienna in 1909, emphasises the fact that typical Serbs can be found in Herzegovina. In addition, the British publicists, Henry Steed and Maud Mallbach only speak of the Serbs as the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina, regardless of their religious differences. Furthermore, Mallbach emphasises the fact that, “in the Serbian monastery near the village named Zavala in Popovo polje, the library preserved interesting old manuscripts and rare books in Turkish and Serbian and the monastery seals date back to 1271” (p. 167). And it was not a coincidence that the Croats rushed to burn all the monastery books and kill the monks in 1941. Kostić cites the words of the Austrian travel writer Hans Witholm from the book *Travels through the Balkans. Border areas of the Balkans*, as a curiosity. According to Kostić, Witholm said that “in the Popovo polje, when it turns into a lake, two sorts of fish appear – one is as beautiful as the trout from the Neretva river and is hard to catch – it is called the Serb. The other is as abominable as the carp and is easy to catch – it is called the Croat” (p. 168). A beautiful and humorous characterisation of the ‘newly-composed’ Croats.

There have not been any doubts of the Serbian ethnic character of Bosnia and Herzegovina in modern historiography. Even in Helmholt’s *The History of the World*, published in nine volumes in Leipzig and Vienna in 1905, there is an observation that: “If we wanted to criticise Tsar Dušan for his political mistakes, we could only say that he should have invested all his energy into winning Bosnia, inhabited by purely Serbian population” (p. 172). Furthermore, he says that Dubrovnik was “surrounded by the two Serbian tribes – the Zahumljani and the Neretljani - and exposed to Slavification” (p. 173.) Sava Bjelanović likes to refer to the Kallay’s history of the Serbs in his book *Don Miho as the Bulwark*, published in Zadar in 1883, saying: “Kallay came to the conclusion that Bosnia was the third state/political centre of the Serbian people, after his extensive research – their two other centres were in Serbia proper and in Montenegro. Therefore, according to him, Bosnia is Serbian” (p. 173). In the introduction to his book *The History of the Serbian People*, Benjamin Kallay points out the original multitude of the Serbian princedoms, which were more or less independent and even confrontational at times. “But the population of these Serbian

princedoms were the same nation according to their origin and language. And these characteristics undoubtedly became the most remarkable explanation as to why the whole Serbian element on the Balkan Peninsula was able to make a simple state based on the unification of all the Serbian territories in the best circumstances and in a short time. The disharmony occurred again. Even today, we find the three points that politically attract one another in the Serbs who live across the Sava (although not as an outburst of conscious political aspiration) – Serbia proper, Bosnia and Montenegro with Herzegovina. We find this aspiration of the three points to gather together in a unified state in the same form at the time of the migration of the Serbs to the Balkans and throughout Serbian history” (p. 173-174).

Another Hungarian historian, Gyula Pauler, illustrated the alleged Hungarian historical rights to Bosnia in 1894 as follows – indicating that in the 12th century, “the Serbian tribes inhabited the valley of the Bosnia and the surrounding valleys, but without any permanent connection – similar to the Romanians of the Zenvin area (?), but with a difference - they (the Serbs) were not new-comers but had lived there for centuries as inhabitants of their districts. The traces of these individual districts (tribes) can be found even in the 13th century and explain the fact that Bosnia was so easily divided into regions – i.e. the Banates of Ozor and Usora (Tuzla) [...] At the end of the 11th century, Bosnia was a part of Bodin’s state – Bodin was a Serbian King of Primorje (the word primorje remains in Serbian). After his death, his state collapsed. At the same time, the Hungarian appetite for the Adriatic Sea coastline began [...] Accordingly, it is most probable that the Serbian tribes that lived in Bosnia without a strong centralised state to bind them together, subjugated themselves to the Hungarian king in the third decade of the 12th century” (p. 174).

Beside Guilferding, who wrote that “the inhabitants of Bosnia – according to their own comprehension and the official version – are members of the three different nations, although they all belong to the same Serbian tribe and speak the same language” (p. 175), stating that the three nations are the Turks, the Latins and the Serbs, another Russian historian, Nil Popov, wrote in his book *Serbia and Russia between the Koča’s Krajina and the Saint Andrew’s Day Assembly*, translated and published in Belgrade in 1870, saying that: “It is a known fact that the Serbian people do not only live in the lands that are now referred to as Serbia. The inhabitants of Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro and their neighbouring parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the so called Old Serbia are all Serbian and members of the Serbian tribe” (p. 175). In his *History of the Serbian People*, published in 1857, Maikov says: “Let us remember Bosnia in her beginning – Bosnia was a district or a Serbian region that was a part of Serbia, it was populated by the same people that lived in Serbia and it was established at the same time as Serbia – when the Serbs settled the lands across the Danube; the people of Serbia and Bosnia had the same folklore and tradition. Let us remember that Bosnia was a part of Serbia to begin with - the connections between Bosnia and Serbia are much stronger than the

Comment [S43]: Translator’s note. Author not found in the available sources

Comment [S44]: ibid

connections between Bosnia and Hum, Travunia, Neretva and Duklja, and therefore, when Constantine Porphyrogenitus listed the Serbian lands and failed to mention Bosnia – it was because he was aware of today's Serbia and Bosnia under the common name of Serbia, like Mačva and Semberija” (p. 175-176).

Maikov is also remembered today because of his letters addressed to the Croatian academic youth in 1876, in which he protested their requests that Bosnia and Herzegovina should be annexed to Croatia. Kostić cites the significant parts of those letters: “The Croatian academic youth state that only one nation lives in B&H – the Croats. No, gentlemen, you do not have a clue. Furthermore, you do not even know on behalf of which nation you make such claims. Your provincial country - Croatia with her capital Zagreb - was settled by emigrants from Styria, Kranjska and Carinthia because it had been devastated by the Turks in the old days – i.e. the Slovenes settled the territory of Croatia, not the Croats [...] Give your attention to the western parts of the districts of Zagreb and Varaždin and you will see that it is purebred Slovenes who live there. Listen and hear the language spoken near the former Croatian military borders and you will realise that the inhabitants of these parts are purely Serbian and mostly Orthodox [...] If you use the word ‘Croat’, you should know that the term was formulated by the Austrian government and if you use the alphabet introduced by Ljudevit Gaj, you should give up your attempts to present the Bosnians and Herzegovinians as Croats because they are, according to the ethnographical standpoint, purely Serbian, because they all use the Serbian language, not Croatian. Moreover, the Turkish Croatia, spreading between the Vrbas and the Una is inhabited by the Serbs [...] Have you ever thought of the fact that you have insulted the whole Serbian nation by trying to steal their name and their moral unity – the very things they hold dearest? [...] This is the fickle and terrible base that bridge is being built on, by your own hand. That bridge is built with the aim of grabbing a Serbian province. And the Serbs long for their freedom, not for a new yoke” (p. 176-177).

Russian historian Dobrov wrote of the Serbian lands – Bosnia, Zahumlje, Srem, Mačva and western Serbia consisting of Duklja, Zahumlje, Travunia and Neretva - in his book *South Slavs. Turkey and the Rivalry of the European Countries on the Balkan Peninsula*, printed in St Petersburg in 1879. The Soviet Academy of Sciences and Fine Arts published the book of N.S. Dierzhavin entitled *Slavs in Ancient Times. A Cultural and Historical Study* in 1946, reprinted by the Germans in 1848 in Weimar. Dierzhavin says that “the Serbian people occupied a vast territory in the old times that spread easternmost from the Dalmatian Croatia and southernmost from Croatia, which was occupying the territory at the Sava River [...] Consequently the following neighbouring tribes belonged to the Serbian people: 1. the Neretljani, who lived on the territory spreading between the north-western corner of the Peninsula and the Neretva; they were divided into three districts – subsequently they penetrated the Adriatic coast and occupied the islands – they were famous as seafarers and pirates. 2. the Zahumci; in the 10th century the name *dux culmorum* emerged according to the sources; their country was

IT-03-67-T

referred to as Zahumlja, Hlem or Humska. Their territory spread toward the east, along the river Neretva to Dubrovnik and toward the continental part. The part that spread toward the continental part is identified as today's Herzegovina. 3. The Travunians (Greek - *Trebunia Dioklea*, Latin - *Travunia, Tribunia*); their territory spread between Dubrovnik and Kotor. 4. the Konavljani occupied the narrow coastline between Dubrovnik and the Bay of Kotor” (p. 178). Dierzhavin pays special attention to the main Serbian states – Raška and Duklja - and emphasises that the rulers Vlastimir, Vojislav and Bodin managed to unite the Serbian lands, while he says that Croatia spread only as far as the Una. He corroborated all his statements with precise geographical maps. His conclusion that, with the unification of the Serbian lands, “two political and cultural centres of the Serbian people emerged in the second half of 12th century, is extremely important. From then on, Bosnia fell under the sphere of interest and cultural influence of the west and the Catholicism, while Raška fell under the sphere of interest and influence of Byzantium and Orthodoxy” (p. 177-178).

Nicolae Iorga, the distinguished Romanian historian, wrote about Serbian Bosnia and the Serbs of Bosnia in his studies. The British writer Evans wrote that the Serbs came from Galicia and “occupied all of the land – or almost all of the land - that encompasses the freed Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro, Old Serbia and the northern part of Albania, spreading further along the coast of the Adriatic Sea, between Split, where the river Cetina flows into the sea and to Drač – which was named Dirahium at the time. Therefore, including the barren corner known under the name of Krajina or Turkish Croatia- all known today as Bosnia which is of special interest to us – all of that belongs to the Serbian Slavic branch” (p. 179). The professor at the Sorbonne University and the art historian, Charles Diehl, categorically deems that Bosnia is a Serbian land and says of its ancient history that “the Croats occupied the north-western parts of Bosnia [...] between the Cetina and the Vrbas Rivers; the Serbs took the rest of the territory – toward the Danube, the valleys of the rivers Drina and Bosnia, which gently slope downhill towards the river; the hilly terrain toward the Adriatic Sea that spread through today's Herzegovina and Montenegro; and between the Danube Serbia and the Adriatic Serbia – the tall mountain range of Raška (The Sanjak of Novi Pazar today) [...] the physical center of the country that will, a few centuries later, become the political centre of the Greek-Slavic world for a short time” (p. 180). The serious scientists have always characterized Bosnia as a Serbian country in the ethnic sense - something that has always been Serbian, since the day the Serbs were first mentioned in the chronicles of the Frankish writer Einhard in 822.

In addition, aside from the historians, all the European ethnographers, geographers, anthropo-geographers, ethnologists and anthropologists are in no doubts of the Serbian ethnical character of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian population – they always confirm and emphasise that fact. The ethnographer Johan Georg Kohl wrote of the Serbs in 1872: “It was the inhabitants of Serbia who first stemmed from

the Slavs of this nation – and it was the inhabitants of Serbia who won their independence in recent times, fighting in a series of bloody wars - then the brave Bosnians, who used to give the best recruits to the Janissaries core, the indomitable Montenegrins [...] Different circumstances prove that they all belong to the great group of the Slavs, who are all unique and different from the other branches of the Slavic peoples. Montenegrins are a Slavic tribe, belonging to the great Serbian Slavic family – the same as the Morlachs and Dubrovians. Their language and their customs differ in small ways from the language and the customs of the Serbian Bosnians, Herzegovinians and other Serbs” (p. 182).

Many experts wrote about the Serbs in the magazine *Ausland* in 1861. One of them said: “the Serbs, the Bosnians, the Herzegovinians and the Montenegrins – if Montenegro can be counted as part of the Ottoman Empire - all belong to the Slavic family of peoples in European Turkey. All of them belong to just one nation, despite their different religions and political attitudes” (p. 182-183). The other emphasised that “the Serbs are a significant fraction of the population of the former Ottoman Empire and the most prominent Yugoslav nation, living in the modern Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Serbs are largely Serbian Orthodox, but a smaller percentage of the Serbs are Roman-Catholics and they are often in conflict due to the different interests of the two Churches” (p. 183). The articles were published anonymously, but the editor of the magazine and a distinguished ethnographer Friedrich von Hellwald expressed a similar opinion in 1876: “The Slavs of Turkey belong to two large groups: the Serbs in the northwest and the Bulgarians in the east and southeast. The first are efficient and ambitious and the latter are hard-working but dispirited. The Montenegrins, the Herzegovinians and the Bosnians belong among the Serbian branch, as explained many times to the readers of *Ausland*” (p. 183). Hellwald is also the author of the geographical handbook entitled *The Country and Nations*, published in 1878, where he concluded in the ethnographical section that the Serbs were the inhabitants of Bosnia, as well as of Montenegro and Herzegovina, Hellwald said that the Bosnian Catholics were undoubtedly Serbian as well.

Kleden presents the same facts in his *Geographical Handbook* published in 1875–77, as did Herzberg, Lorenz Diefenbach, Richard von Mann, Kiepert etc. Bosnia and Herzegovina are exclusively Serbian lands. That is their unanimous position and Kostić cites them patiently and neatly. Then he quotes Otto Maul, August Heinrich Kober, Hugo Bernatzik and other authors. Bernatzik even states that “not only the Orthodox Serbs, but the Catholic Serbs of Dalmatia, Bosnia and Slavonia celebrate a certain saint as the patron saint of their family, although that custom has gradually disappeared” (p. 187). Ami Boué and Emile de Laveley both wrote that the Serbian nation encompasses the populations of Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Old Serbia. In addition, Emile de Laveley wrote that the Serbs had destroyed the Avars in 640 and that they “had populated Serbia, south Bosnia,

IT-03-67-T

Montenegro and Dalmatia” (p. 189). Kostić is determined in his further quotes from the works of Vivianne d’Sent-Martin, Jacques Ancel, Eugene Pittard, etc.

Where Russian scientists are concerned, they also have no doubts in this matter. In his book *Croatia, Slavonia and the Military Border*, published in Saint Peterburg in 1879, the Russian ethnologist Berezin described how Stevan Nemanja was “determined to place Bosnia under his rule. Bosnia was no different from other *krajine* (border regions) of the Serbian lands in terms of the language, customs and traditions of the local population. We can even say that Bosnia was connected more with Serbia than the other Serbian lands – Travunia, Zahumlje and Duklja” (p. 101). Jakob Golowietzky published *The Geographical Dictionary of the Western-Slav and Yugoslav Lands* in Vilnius in 1884, in which he stated precisely: “Bosnian, an inhabitant of Bosnia. They are members of the Slavic, Serbian tribe. The overwhelming majority of Bosnians are Orthodox Christians, with a small percentage of Catholics and Muslims” (p. 191). Even Lipowsky, who supported the idea that the Serbs in Bosnia should be politically included in the Croatian nation in 1900, thinking that Croatia could then become independent more easily from Austro-Hungarian Empire, explicitly and unmistakably considered that Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia were all Serbian countries. Even the *Great Soviet Encyclopaedia* stated specifically that: “the unification of the Serbian tribes into a nation took place between the 9th and 14th centuries as a consequence of the formation of the medieval Serbian State, while the Serbian tribes from Montenegro and Bosnia developed especially, particularly after the Turkish conquest (at the end of the 14th century)” (p. 192).

It is quite understandable that the Czech ethnologist, Lubor Niederle was very precise and concrete in his *The Slavic World* when he determined the Serbian countries: “The Serbs have their main nucleus on the Balkan Peninsula. They inhabit their independent Kingdom, Bosnia and Herzegovina (annexed by Austria), a part of Dalmatia, in the independent principality of Montenegro, in the northern parts of the Turkish districts of Skadar and Skopje and in the north of Slavonia, as well as comprising significant islands in South Hungary” (p. 192). The result of all these statements is that the greatest Serbian ethnologist of all times, Jovan Cvijić, was not isolated in world science and nobody contradicted his definition of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a country with a central position in the ethnographic region of the Serbian people. Cvijić considers that, “as the indisputable minimum of the principle of nationality, it has to be valid that the central region and the core of a nation should not be given to an alien – a foreign country - because Bosnia and Herzegovina is the central region and the core of the Serbian people. They are not the same for Serbia and the Serbian people as Alsace and Lotharingia are to the French people or Trento and Trieste are for the Italians, or the alpine Austrian regions for Germany – they are what the region of Moscow is for Russia and what the most important parts of Germany and France represent to those two peoples – those parts that are the best representatives of the German and the

98/57440

Comment [K.B.45]: Translator's note. Author not found in the available sources

French race” (p. 192).

Arpad Terek, the leading Hungarian geopolitical expert, also has no doubts of the Serbian ethnical nature of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian people, or of the Serbian nature of Dubrovnik, Baranja and the whole of Vojvodina. Johan Georg Kohl, ethnographer Adolf Behr, Aleksander Heksch, military expert Ristov, historians Wilhelm Miller and Wilhelm Augrenstein, French slavist Cypriane Robert, Emile de Laveley, geographer Elizej Rekli, journalist Edmond Plosy, statistician Henry Gedau and others, describe the Serbian character of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the same way, including statistical data in their writings. In 1864, Jean Ubicini expressed in a simple appeal what later became the attitude of all the scientists, journalists and travel writers: “Serbia does not end at the borders of the small country, the capital of which is Belgrade. On the other side of these borders are lands that are purely Serbian according to their race and history: in the south – Old Serbia; in the west - Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro; in the north, separated from the Princedom by the Sava and the Danube Rivers – the old Serbian dukedom comprised of Srem, a part of Slavonia and Banat. Half of these areas belong to Turkey, the other half to Austria. The population thereof is divided into two equal parts: 2,300,000 inhabitants for Turkey and 2,700,000 for Austria. The only language spoken by them and written by them is the Serbian language. To the west and the east of the Serbian land, two compact groups are situated: one is Slavonic – the Croats – including one million people, all Catholics; - and the other, completely Slavicised – is the Bulgarians – three to four million people, all Orthodox Christians” (. 200).

In 1886, the Imperial and the Royal Geographical Society published the official comment on the second census of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian population in Vienna, the author of which was Franz de Monier, where the absolute Serbian character of the population was emphasised. It was stated in that report that “almost all of inhabitants of B&H belong to the Serbian national branch. While the religion is not a an indicator of differences in the ethnographical sense in these countries, as is generally the case in the East, the significance of confession as a characteristic of the heterogeneity of different populations is of great significance. The religion bears great significance, not only historically, but politically and socially. The Muslims had been the sole proprietors of the land until recently and even today are the proprietors for the most part, while the Christians are in a subordinate position – as serfs” (p. 201). The Croats were not even mentioned because they were not among the autochthonic population.

Furthermore, the Slavistic studies have never had any doubt in respect of this. The founder of Slavistic studies, the Jesuit priest Josef Dobrovský, wrote in his letter to Jernej Kopitar at the beginning of the 19th century: “I do not have any issues with the geographical names. For goodness sake, the Dubrovians, the Macedonians and the Bosnians are Serbs” (p. 202). Kopitar agreed with him completely. Another great Slavist, Jozef Šafárik, deemed as Serbs not only the Serbs of Serbia, the Bosnians, the Montenegrins and the Slavonians, but also the Bulgarians.

984

IT-03-67-T

Vatroslav Jagić criticised him for including the Bulgarians, but never disputed that the Slavonians, Dalmatians and the Bosnians were the Serbs. Šafárik said that “it is a historical and linguistic fact that the Serbs in Serbia, Bosnia, Slavonia, Herzegovina and Dalmatia compose only one branch of the great Slavic family, whether they belong to the Eastern or the Western Churches, their language is made only of one dialect (no more than one, L.M.K.), although there are various insignificant variants” (p. 203-204).

In his book *The Slavs of Turkey*, published in 1844, the most famous French slavist praised the Bosnian Serbs: “The Bosnians, who are Serbs according to their language and customs, were different from their compatriots from the Danube because of their sharper character. Aside from that, they aspire to surpass the other Serbs in their noble character and pure origin” (p. 207). In 1815, Jacob Grimm set the territorial boundaries of the Serbian lands in the following manner: “What we refer to as Illyrians should correctly be called the Serbs. The Serbs belong to the Slav family and there are around five million Serbs, living on territory spreading from the Kranjska border in the south of the Kupa and the Sava Rivers to the old Acroceraunius and Hemus (the Balkan, L.M.K.) and from the Adriatic Sea to the Bulgarian Timok. They also live in colonies in Slavonia and South Hungary, spreading to Saint Andrea near Buda” (p. 207). Jacob Grimm gets even more precise when writing the preface to *the Grammar of the Serbian Language* by Vuk Karadžić from 1824, where he addressed the Serbs of all Serbian countries: “A population of around five million is easily calculated: there are three million non-united Greeks (i.e. - Orthodox, L.M.K.) (one million in Serbia, one million in Hungary, one million in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Dalmatia); out of the remaining two million, one third lives in Bosnia – and they are called Turks because of their religion, even though not even one in a thousand is able to speak the Turkish language; one third are the Catholic Serbs who live in Bosnia, Dalmatia, Slavonia and Croatia” (p. 208).

In the same way, the leading German philologist Johan Severin Vater, classifies the Serbs according to their territorial distribution in his work *Literary Grammar*, published in 1847 in Berlin: “We include among the Slavs-Serbs: 1) the Serbs from Serbia, who lived in the former Kingdom of Serbia, today’s Turkish province called the Vilayet of Serf, encompassing both sides of the Morava river, between the Timok, the Drina, the Balkan, the Sava and the Danube. A large portion of the Serbs from Serbia moved to Austrian Slavonia and South Hungary: almost all of them are Orthodox Christians. 2) the Bosnians, who live between the Drina, the Vrbas, the Sava, Dalmatia and the Balkans. A large number of them converted to Islam but they preserved their language and tradition for the most part. However, the largest portion of the Bosnians is Greek Orthodox and a handful of them are Roman Catholics. 3) the Montenegrins, in Turkish Albania, between the Montenegrin hills, from Bosnia towards the sea coast to Bar, all Greek Orthodox. 4) the Slavonians, in the Austrian kingdom of Slavonia and the Dukedom of Srem, who are partly Greek Orthodox and partly

Comment [K.B.46]: Translator's note. Author not found in the available sources

97/57440

985

Roman Catholics. 5) the Dalmatians, who live on the Adriatic Sea coast, in the districts of Zadar, Dubrovnik and Kotor, as well as in the nearby islands, almost all of whom are Roman Catholics. All these people speak the Serbian languages, with minor variations in the dialect [...] The true Serbian language is divided into three sub-dialects: the Herzegovinian, and the sub-dialects of Resava and Srem. The dialect of Bosnia is almost the same as the Serbian. The Slavonian dialect is just a variation of the Serbian language. Dalmatian dialect has been considerably modified due to the influence of the neighbouring Italy, especially in the speech of the common people” (p. 208-209).

After presenting and extensively citing the opinions of the most authoritative scientists, Lazo Kostić presents the opinions and attitudes of renowned publicists and politicians, who were informed in the results of multidisciplinary scientific research and, at the same time, took part in the formation of the public opinion of their countries through their writings. Starting from the French consular clerk in Travnik, from the time of Napoleon, through Massieu de Clerval, who said of the population of Herzegovina that “the total population belongs to the Serbian race and are mostly Greek Orthodox” (p. 211), through to D’Avrillé, anonymous French authors – cited in Miroslav Spalajković’s doctoral thesis – or Jean Ućić, who wrote in 1882 that: “In the ethnographical sense, Bosnia is the most homogenous because of the European Turkey. Apart from a few hundred Ottoman Turks, three to four thousands Jews who came in the 17th and 18th centuries from either the Turkish provinces or from Dubrovnik and Venice and 18 to 20 thousand Arbanasi scattered around the Sanjak of Novi Pazar, all the inhabitants are Serbs” (p. 212). Furthermore, René Henry pointed out in 1905 that “the Serbs comprise the most important part of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian population” (p. 212).

August Dejon, a distinguished French diplomat and publicist, wrote the preface to the anthology of Serbian poems, which was published in Paris in French in 1888, saying *inter alia*: “Separated by religion into three parts, divided by political necessity under various rulers, the Serbian race is unfortunate to have spread to various regions, the names of which hide her unity - Serbia, Old Serbia (today’s Turkish districts of Kosovo and Skadar), Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro, Dalmatia with Dubrovnik, the southern parts of Hungary (Bačka, Srem, Banat), Slavonia and Croatia (the whole of Croatia and with the different dialects). All these parts, some of which managed to form kingdoms, are all, partially or completely, the dwelling places of the Serbian people though nothing is indicative of that fact to foreign countries, if you take the name of the new kingdom with Belgrade as its capital. The ethnical and moral unity, divided by religion and politics, is proved by the language and, if that is not enough, by the national folk poetry” (p. 213).

In addition, the French art historian Charles Diehl stated that the total population of Bosnia and Herzegovina was Serbian, regardless of the striking religious differences. René Pinon said the same thing, looking back at the days of the rule of von Kállay: “Serbian history, Serbian tradition and the Serbian folk poems and songs were all

prohibited; never, even during the Turkish regime, had the country endured such oppression. Everything even similar to any connection with the Serbs was so severely persecuted that Governor von Kállay, when he became governor of both provinces, even prohibited his own work, in which he had once written: “In Bosnia and Herzegovina there are three religions but only one nation – Serbian” (p. 215). Even the first volume of the French *Quillet Encyclopaedic Dictionary*, published in Paris in 1953, says of Bosnia and Herzegovina: “The population of Bosnia is Serbian, but it is divided with respect to religion into the Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholics and Muslims” (p. 216).

The German publicists wrote in the similar way - the Austrian consular clerk Carl Sax, writer Karl Braun-Wiesbaden, historian Morris Zimmerman, Baron von Schweiger-Lerchenfeld, Vigand, Carl Getz, Eduarda Richter, Neubacher, Arthur Achleitner, Albrecht Wirth, Catherine Sturzenacker, Zurlinden, Heinrich Kanner and many others. Kostić quotes here a large number of the most prominent encyclopaedias and dictionaries. Each of them treats Bosnia and Herzegovina as predominantly Serbian land. For example, the distinguished *Meier’s Lexicon* for 1889 stated under “Bosnia” that: “The inhabitants are Slavs and belong to the Serbian nation. They speak the Serbian language, which has been preserved in its pure and complete and beautiful form, especially in the villages. The Turkish language could not have taken root anywhere, despite the long Ottoman rule” (p. 224). Metzger’s *Geographic-Statistical Dictionary*, as well as the Giter’s and the Benze’s ones etc. had similar attitudes.

In his book *Russia and the Slavs*, published in 1910, the Russian author Andrei Sirotin said that Bosnia and Herzegovina were to the Serbs “the same as Moscow is to us. This is the Serbian heartland. They are situated on the Serbian road to the sea [...] Only the Croats were thrilled by the annexation, because they were hoping, and still hope, that they would unite all the Serbian lands under the sceptre of the Hapsburgs, in a separate Croatian state. Although we do not speak about the fact that they never succeeded in doing that, the Croats are still a minority in Bosnia. The autochthonous inhabitants of Bosnia are the Serbs. The Bosnian aristocracy, beys and aghas go against Austria with the Serbs. For god’s sake, they too are Serbs. During the long Turkish rule, they converted to Islam but preserved the clarity of their mother tongue – the Serbian language [...] Let us now see what has happened to Serbia proper and the neighbouring Herzeg-Bosnia, where the Serbs have always lived in close-knit groups without mixing with other nationalities” (p. 226-227).

Furthermore, the historian Rajewski wrote in 1850 that the history of Herzegovina was “a history of continuous oppressions toward the Serbian people under the arbitrary rule of viziers and pashas. Many of the noble Serbian families converted to Islam, while others, instigated by the machinations of the Jesuit and the Roman Catholic propaganda, rejected the faith of their ancestors and converted to Catholicism. But the majority of the Herzegovinians, we have to say to their honour, have remained faithful to their Orthodox religion despite Turkish persecutions

- especially the persecution of the converts and Latin luring - for over 400 years" (p. 227). Even the Croats - namely the politician Franjo Supilo, writer Franc Kurelec and the poet Mato Topalović - referred to Bosnia and Herzegovina as Serbian lands. And the Catholic friar Tomo Kovačević is even more precise. Fra Grgo Škorić, Fra Grgur Jakšić, Fra Ivan Franjo Jukić and others continued with that. Kostić also cites the words of Nikola Tomazeo, Angelo Pernici, Lafanne, Neville Forbes, Johnson, Geogre Allen, Janos Asbot, Felix Kanitz and Dora d'Istria, who all had identical opinions in this, at the end of his book.

3. The Nationality of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims

Lazo Kostić published his third book in his Bosnia cycle under the title *Science Determines the Nationality of the B&H Muslims* in 1967, in the edition *The Serbian Issues* of the series of the writings of the Saint Sava Serbian Cultural Club in Canada. As far as was possible, the author investigated the attitudes of the large number of competent scientists that all stated expressly that the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims were considered Serbs or those who were only implicit with respect to that issue. In the epilogue, he discussed the attitudes of Radoje Knežević, one of the protagonists of the coup of 27 March, who considered Kostić's efforts unnecessary and who supported the futile and sterile discussions of the modalities of the preservation of the Yugoslav state. In addition, Lazo Kostić publishes an article from the Chicago *Liberty* from 1955, where he entered into a discussion with the editorial office of *Our Word*, which had criticised him for alleged Great Serbian claims that the Muslims were Serbs and insisted on their alleged different nationality. *Our Word* was supported and followed by other pro-Yugoslav emigrant newspapers, showing the typical self-confidence of ignoramuses who did not respect scientifically founded arguments and methodological evidence, preferring instead the ideological conceptions of wishful thinking and political desires. Until the end of the 19th century, national issues were treated with objective criteria but then subjective criteria emerged. Kostić thinks that none of them should be ignored, especially where expert opinions are concerned. The most distinguished world scientists "have classified the Bosnian Muslims as Serbs without exception. However, they have been doing that without really asking the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims for their own opinion. And what would have happened if they actually asked them? They would have said that they were the Turks. There is no doubt about that. But could the ethnographers classify those people as the Turks? What would their ethnography look like? They would have to say that there are not just Turanian Turks and similar, but that there are Slav Turks as well. Than we would have an additional Slav nationality – Turkish! The example of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims is the best to refute the advocates of the uncompromising subjective criteria" (p. 104-105).

With these humorous and ironical questions, Kostić mocks the

IT-03-67-T
dilettante and cheap political attempts of the self-confident quasi-democrats and the advocates of the Yugoslav nationality. He confused them with the dilemma: "Are we to expect the 19th century ethnographers to write: there is an additional Slav nationality that we cannot classify and, therefore, we have to wait until the second half of the 20th century or even later to confirm its existence, even though the Byzantine Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus himself presented us with information on the Serbs and Croats in the 10th century and was unable to find anybody else on that territory. All the 19th century Slavists were writing about the Serbian and Croatian ethnic territory and had never even tried to see the Croats in Bosnia. We have determined that only the Serbs live in Bosnia and the world of science accepted that fact without "propaganda". Even today, the situation has not changed significantly. The truth is that a large percentage of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims are not determined in their nationality, that they are hesitating, that they cannot reject their Turkish feelings lightly and accept the new, infidel ones. Ethno-politics may have to take that into account. However, ethnography may do it to a smaller extent or not at all. As in the past, ethnography has not seriously taken into account the Turkish national feelings of the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina, but ethnography cannot wait now for the Muslims to decide on their nationality and gain national awareness" (p. 105).

It is extremely important to emphasise that there has never been a serious author who stated that the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina are national Croats. However, there are Muslim families that are undoubtedly of Croatian origin in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but their number is small in comparison to the families of Serbian origin. In addition, even Leopold von Ranke wrote about Turkish grand viziers of Serbian nationality, such as Ahmed, the son of Herzog Stevan in the time of Bayezid II and Mehmed Sokolović in the time of Suleiman I the Magnificent, with a comment that could be understood as a lamentation: "If, in accordance with the aforementioned, we cannot dispute that the Serbian nation had the greatest influence on the development of the Empire, the Serbian nation was most influenced by the religion (Islam). The conversions of the Bosnians to Islam did not take place suddenly but was a process lasting for a century or more [...] Instead of establishing their own state, the Serbian people were destined to help the Turkish (state) to rise [...] However, not even the Serbs who converted to Islam were able to resist their love for (folk) poetry. Frequently, both parts of the nation have the same poem, but in each part the member of the relevant religion prevails. The nobles (surely the Muslims? L.M.K.) will not engage in poetry, but gladly listen to folk poems – once the judge of Sarajevo let a Christian prisoner go without a trial because he liked his poems. The poetry transcends the gap between the two different religions: it connects the whole nation and lives in the whole nation. The valleys where shepherds bring their sheep to graze, the valleys where wheat is reaped, the forests where people travel – all are full of poems and songs. The songs and poems are the companions to all kinds of labour" (p. 9-10).

In addition to this quote from the *Serbian Revolution*, published in Hamburg in 1829, Kostić mentions other works of Ranke, including Ranke's description of the folk poem *Dragon of Bosnia*, where the Muslim feudal lords and their warriors prepare to fight against the central Turkish rule on Kosovo polje, where their forefathers fought for their Orthodox Christian faith and lost. They consider their feudal autonomy in Bosnia as the beginning of the old Serbian statehood and oppose the centralistic crushing of the feudal factions. Ranke explains that as follows: "Something magnificent and exalting underpins this feeling. They think that they will fight for their faith, for their whole national being. They chose the place for their battle where these matters were decided, although the outcome of the battle was unfortunate. They would either both prevail and keep their faith – Islam – at the very place they lost their old faith – Christianity – or succumb. And then, at the very least, they would join the great memories of old glory and its doom" (p. 10). In addition, Jacob Grimm was categorical in his statements that all the inhabitants of Bosnia were Serbs, and pointed out that: "The Muslim Serbs seem to sing the same (folk) songs and just replace the winners and the losers" (p. 10).

Kostić cited the works of Kohl several times so far now and he wrote of the Bosnian Muslims that: "The Turks succeeded in converting only one Serbian tribe, the Bosnians, to Islam [...] And the Bosnians therefore represent the only Slav tribe in the middle of Illyria who, especially in the upper classes, were almost all at least converted to Islam if not Turkicised, to the regret of all Serbian patriots. The Bosnian converts, like all renegades, have become fanatical Muslims" (p. 11-12). Kohl added here that, among the Croats, "there are neither Muslims nor the Orthodox, or their numbers are almost negligible" (p. 12). Carl Braun, the author of the preface to a German edition of the Serbian folk poems, said: "The Serbian race developed in different ways in different regions. In Bosnia, the Serbian nobility converted to Islam a short-while after the Turkish conquest and pulled a portion of the population with them. In Herzegovina, a portion of the Serbian dukes remained faithful to their old faith, but had to receive privileges by the decrees of padishah" (p. 12).

Furthermore, in his article in the renowned magazine *The Globe* in 1865, the German author Layet was clear when he said: "In Bosnia, where the Christians are enslaved and their former coreligionists are now the Serbian Muslims and, as such, the nobility, spahis and soldiers, it is not uncommon for them to reject Christianity and convert even today" (p. 12). In a later 1867 article in the same magazine, he repeated that the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina were Serbs and spoke in the Serbian language. He repeated the same in the magazine *Ausland*, in 1868 "because all Slavs who live in Turkey and their countries, excluding the Bulgarians, are subject to tribute – Serbia and Montenegro – according to their origin, they are the same (Serbian) nation" (p. 13). He was talking about the Orthodox, Muslim and Catholic Serbs in all Serbian countries. In the same magazine, *the Globe*, Otto Reisberg shared Layet's standpoint regarding the Serbs who converted to Islam, as well

as the Roman Catholic Serbs, but he drew a far-reaching conclusion, saying that the South Slavs "account for no more than eight million people, out of which more than four million live under Austrian rule and the rest under Turkish government. Their language divides them into the Slovenes, Croats, Serbs and Bulgarians, although the variation between their languages, which emerge in gradual phases, is so small that the impartial eyewitness can only discern the dialects of the Serbian languages in all of them" (p. 13). Where the Serbs are concerned, "despite the fact that the tribes are given different names and despite the religious hatred that divides the Serbs into three hostile camps – into the adherents of the Eastern Church, the Roman Catholics and the Muslims, their customs and moral traits are the same and even their body structure, clothes and mode of life only differ slightly" (p. 14).

In 1876, in his consideration of the ethnical conditions in the Turkish part of the Balkans, Von Stein said that: "the ethnographical relations are not the only factor in evaluating the number and power of the Muslim element, because many Serbs, Bulgarians and the Arbanasi are fanatical adherents of Islam. Especially in Bosnia, because almost all the noblemen converted to Islam in order to retain their feudal privileges. These same noblemen, who have preserved their language and ethnicity so persistently, are fanatical opponents of all reforms that the Porte undertakes to alleviate the position of its Christian subjects" (p. 14-15). In his book *The War in Turkey - 1875-76*, published in Zurich in 1876. The military theoretician Ristov said: "With some small exceptions, the Muslims in Bosnia [...] are of Serbian origin" (p. 15). Kinkel, a professor at the University of Zurich, states in that same year that, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, "a portion of the Muslims even carry their old family names of Serbian origin" (p. 15). In 1877, the magazine *Deutscherundschau* published an extensive elaboration on the circumstances in the Balkans, stating that Bosnia "was once a part of the Great Serbian Empire and that it resisted the Ottoman invasion longer than Serbia [...]. While in Serbia the nobility was destroyed during the conquest, the Bosnian nobility for the most part converted to Islam in order to preserve their property and status [...] Bosnia then became the only province of the Porte with a considerable number of non-Muslim inhabitants and a hereditary nobility that belonged to the same race as the majority of the population, spoke the same Serbian dialect but were still alienated in their religious and social aspects" (p. 15-16). Herzberg expressed the same view in 1878, in Petermann's *Geographical Magazine*.

In the *Illustrated History of the Oriental Wars - 1876-1878*, published in Vienna in 1878, Maurice Zimmermann said of the Herzegovinian population: "The population of Herzegovina amounts to around 300,000 people and they are all Serbs. Many noble families were afraid that they would lose their privileges after the Turkish conquest and converted to Islam; therefore, among the ranks of the beys, aghas, spahis, mullahs and efendies, etc., there are Serbian families such as the Ljubović, the Filipović, the Babić, etc [...] Of the 300,000 inhabitants of Herzegovina, 60 thousand are Muslims, 50 thousand are Roman

Catholics and 190 thousand are Greek Orthodox” (p. 16).

In 1889, Maurice Hernes wrote in an interesting way about the Serbs of the Islamic faith, examining the continuous unrest in the Turkish part of the Balkans: “Even this miserable situation, which has transformed the Bosnian cities and the cities of the neighbouring Christian countries into permanent war camps, has not been completely without a positive effect. The epic folk poetry of those Serbs who converted to Islam but continued to celebrate their old customs and heroic deeds, have been intoxicated by the splendour and greatness of the Ottoman Empire, as the Christian epic had previously been intoxicated by the splendour and glory of the Byzantine court [...] The relation of the Bosnian Muslims to the real Ottoman Turks and their general position in the Islamic world requires particular analysis. They are pure-blooded Slavs; they speak the Serbian language and, despite their adherence to Islam, consider themselves better than the Turks and even better than the other Muslims. But, in their hearts and their customs, they have preserved their traditions, making them very different from other Muslims who turn to Mecca to worship Allah. The Bosnian Muslims celebrated St. George’s Day in the same way their Christian compatriots did” (p. 18.)

In 1891, Carl Getz confirmed that the ethnic origin of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims was Serbian, while the ethnologists Friedrich Samuel Kraus and Johan Beckman wrote in 1887 that: “Powerful war campaigns against Austria gave the Serbian-speaking Muslims of the Serbian race a far richer and more favourable basis for their epic poetry than they had in their older traditions” (p. 19). This epic folk poetry is completely unaware of the terms ‘Croat’ and ‘Croatia’, as the authors pointed out, emphasising that: “The Bosnians and Herzegovinians took part in the conquest of Hungary under the Turkish banner [...] 300 year ago, somebody would have thought that half of Western Europe as far as Vienna would have been subject to Serbianization” (p. 19). At the time of the annexation crisis in 1908, Theobald Fischer pointed out the fateful significance of the fact that the Serbs were divided by state borders, as well as religion – they were the Orthodox, the Roman Catholic or the Islam adherents. Paul Den, a German geographer wrote about the Muslim Serbs in 1909, as well as Bian in 1910, while the Viennese Professor August Furnir stated in 1909 that the crisis in the Ottoman authority over Bosnia was provoked by opposition to modernisation and reforms, where the disobedience of “the Muslim land owners, those Serbian renegades that had once bought their privileges by converting to Islam, now fought desperately against losing them” (p. 21). Richard von Mach, a distinguished military analyst, also wrote of the Serbian origin of the Bosnian Muslims in Berlin in 1913.

On the eve of WWI, in his book *The Balkan*, published in Berlin and Leipzig in 1914, the German journalist Albrecht Wirth pointed out that “there are Muslims of Serbian origin in Bosnia and Herzegovina who are extremely hostile to their Christian compatriots” (p. 21). Furthermore, he observed that the Bulgarian Muslims – the Pomaks – “differ from the Serbian Muslims because religious hatred is alien to them” (p. 22). The Swiss author Robert Vitz wrote of the Bosnian Muslims as Serbian

converts in his book *The Question of the Balkans*, published in Zurich in 1915. Amazingly, the Austrian general, Baron Emil Vojnović - a fanatical Serb-hater who was probably frustrated by his own Serbian origin - wrote in 1917 that “550,000 Muslims live in Bosnia and Herzegovina, who are really Serbs, but they are not considered Serbs... In BiH, where the national Serbs are a great majority, their social importance is paralysed by a great number of Muslims (who make up more than one third of the total population)” (p. 23). There is numerous evidence that the Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs referred to the Bosnian Muslims exclusively as members of the Serbian nationality in their official communications.

After WWI, German scientists did not dispute the ethnic essence of the B&H Muslims – including the geographer Otto Maul, the geopolitical expert Rupert von Schumacher, the Slavist Gerhard Gesemann and many others. In his *National Characteristics of the Serbo-Croats*, published in Berlin in 1928, Gezeman wrote: “A great majority of the Muslim converts originate from the ancient Serbian feudal nobility, who were banished by the central state authorities in the early middle ages because of their Bogomil sect and political obstruction and who were accepted by the Bosnian nobility who had similar religious beliefs... Only the most powerful, such as Grand Vizier Mehmed Sokolović, dared to show their Serbian national feeling and conduct in the old times. Mehmed Sokolović performed the greatest national service to the Serbs when he re-established the Patriarchy of Peć in 1557, appointing his brother as the Serbian Patriarch” (p. 25). In his book *The Culture of the South Slavs*, published after 1935, Gerhard Gezeman argued how efficient the process of denationalisation of the Bosnian Muslims was – and how it succeeded to “uproot the Serbian ethnical and national awareness so thoroughly from men traditionally very proud of their national and racial feelings - that even today, in their own country, they are unable to connect to their compatriots” (p. 25).

In his study *Kosovo in the Folk Songs of the Muslims*, published in Munich in 1938, the Slavist Alois Schmauss states that: “comparative analysis of the Serbian Muslim and Arnaut songs only convinces us further that the Arnaut Kosovo traditions are borrowed from the Serbs to a great extent. We even think that the Arnaut songs were borrowed as such from the Serbian Muslims” (p. 25). Fritz von Rummel stated in 1940 that: “In Yugoslavia, there are a million and a half Muslims, but they mostly consist of the Bosnians – i.e. Serbs who were converted to Islam” (p. 26). Hermann Neubacher, Reinhold Trautmann, Alexander Shana and many others share that opinion. In the entire German scientific circle, the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina are treated as members of the Serbian nation. There is no author that considers them to be Croats or a separate nation.

The situation in the French science and journalism circles is the same. The ethnographer Ami Boué states many times in his book *The European Turkey* from 1840 that: “The Serbian Muslims of Bosnia, as well as the Turks, refer to the Serbian language as the Bosnian language... Actually, although a Serb and a Bosnian spring from the same branch,

the latter has tougher skin [...] In Bosnia, the Muslims of Serbian origin are the only [...] The Serbian Muslims of Bosnia have preserved the most Slavic customs regarding marriage and the Serbian Muslims from Herzegovina celebrate their weddings for three to four weeks” (p. 27). Furthermore, Cyprien Robert mentioned the Serbian Muslims, while *Saint* René Taillandier said in 1868 that, “of the Bosnians - today’s Serbian Muslims - who became Muslims after the (Turkish) conquest to avoid the cruelty of the invaders [...] Husein-kapetan’s fanatical soldiers - persistent Islamic warriors - were the sons of Dušan and Lazar” (p. 28).

The doctor of Prince Miloš, **Bartelemi Silvestre Kunibert**, published his study of the Serbian revolution and independence in Leipzig in 1855, putting great emphasis on the hatred between the Orthodox Serbs of Serbia and the Bosnian Muslims, “although both peoples share the same language and origin and had been a single nation for a long time [...] At the end of the Serbian rule, many Bosnians rejected Christianity in order to convert to Islam [...] The Bosnians consider the Serbs as eternal reminders of the apostasy of their ancestors; they become red when the Ottomans remind them that they and the Serbs have a common ancestry” (p. 28). Explaining why the Bosnian Serbs refer to the Orthodox Serbs as the Vlachs, the author summarised that: “the Christians of Serbia and Bosnia have never been identified as anything other than the Vlachs by their Muslim compatriots. To call them Serbs would mean that they would remind themselves of their common ancestry and the apostasy of their forefathers” (p. 28). Kunibert also mentions the Dragon of Bosnia, Husein-kapetan Gradašćević, who “gathered an army of 25 thousand selected soldiers and descended on the glorious field of Kosovo, hoping to vanquish the Sultan’s army and to get revenge for the disgrace of the defeat his forefathers had endured in 1389” (p. 28). The French Slavist Louis Leger wrote in 1873 that “five hundred thousand Serbian Muslims live in Bosnia. They were once converted to Islam by the sword and they accepted Islam but never forgot their national idiom. Many cultivate it with great passion, considering themselves as Serbs of a different faith” (p. 28-29).

The Belgian geographer Kraus established in 1876 that, of the all Slavic peoples, only the Serbs and the Bulgarians have the Islamic faith. The French travel writer Charles Yriarte testifies about the Serbian Muslims as follows: “We should acknowledge the fact that these descendants of the Serbs, the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina were converted to Islam during the Turkish conquest of their country [...] They practice Islam with greater zeal than the Muslims from Turkey [...] In their conversion to Islam, the Bosnian Serbs [...] did not see anything more than the aim to preserve their privileges as much as they could [...] Property had already been taken from the converts [...] These generations (of the Orthodox Serbs) must never forget that the Muslims who ruled them were not the Turks who came as conquerors [...] but their brothers, the Serbs who had been conquered and who had once been Christians [...] This rejection of the ancestral faith was carried out by the Serbs who became Muslims” (p. 29). The journalist Henry Gedau and the Slavist Celeste Courier, etc. wrote about the Serbian Muslims.

Courier points out that the Serbian Muslims guard the border on the Bosnian side the same way as the Austrian Serbs guard the border on their side. The Serbs guard the same border, often pitted against each other. In addition, he concludes: “The Catholic Serbs are mostly inclined toward Austria and expect salvation from it. On the contrary, the Orthodox Serbs turn to Russia for her help in their struggle for liberation” (p. 30).

Art historian, Charles Diehl, wrote in his book *The Mediterranean, an Introduction to History and Art*, printed in Paris in 1901, that the inhabitants of Bosnia – the Serbs – are divided into three religions. In his book *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, published in Paris in 1903, The publicist Andre Barre explains that: “The majority of the population belongs to the Serbian race, which settled in these provinces in the 7th century; Serbian is spoken in the whole country, save for the Croats – the dialect of which differs slightly. Croats prevail in Krajina. German is not spoken, as Turkish before, save for by clerks or soldiers stationed in the country. The Serbian ethnicity of the domestic inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina is undisputed. Even Kallay himself, writing his own *History of the Serbs*, said that there were three religions in BiH but only one nation – the Serbs [...] The Orthodox faith is the oldest. Orthodox Christianity originates from the time the Serbs rejected paganism and accepted the dogma of the Eastern Church. The Muslims are the descendants of the old Serbian nobility who converted to Islam after the Turkish conquest in order to retain their privileges. The Catholics are recruited among the sons of certain Serbs who subjugated themselves to the Roman Church at the time of the papal influence in BiH and among the Austrian clerks today” (p. 31). In addition, *René* Pinon wrote several times that all the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina are Serbs, adding that the Muslims are descendants of the old Serbian lords. He best expressed this position in the study *Austro-Serbian Conflict*, which was published in 1907: “The Muslims are Serbs, not just because of their origin, but by their own confession. These are mostly the former lords of the country, who converted to Islam after the conquest... Without beating around the bush, we should determine that the public opinion in Bosnia is not very friendly toward Austrian domination. That the Serbian majority of the population – both Orthodox and Muslims – absolutely refuses the establishment of Austrian dominance cannot be disputed, to say the least” (p. 31).

Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, a historian, pointed out that the Bogomils only existed among the Serbs and the Bulgarians and noted in his study *Races, Religions and the Ethnicity of Bosnia and Herzegovina* from 1900, that the: “Serbian noblemen of old formed a kind of aristocratic oligarchy after they became Muslim beys – even the sultans and the caliphs of the far away Istanbul had to take them into account” (p. 32). Victor Berar, Ernest Deni and George Deva wrote the same thing. In his book *The New Serbia*, published in 1918, Deva mentions: “It is interesting to note here one distinctive character trait of a Bosnian convert. Although a Muslim, he has preserved his Serbian national awareness for centuries” (p. 33). Kostić then cites Gaston Gravier who

Comment [K.B.48]: Translator’s note. This person not found in the available sources, possibly wrong spelling in the original

published a study in 1911 that described the Muslim migrations under Austro-Hungarian occupation and after the annexation: “Three hundred and fifty years ago, during the Turkish conquest, Bosnia and Herzegovina were populated by the completely Christian Serbian population, who lived under the feudal regime. Unlike the situation in other countries, a considerable portion of these Slavs converted to Islam. That was especially the case with the landed gentry, who saw the conversion as a means to preserve their property and status. Since then, they have been the privileged class of the Muslim converts of Serbian origin, who managed to maintain their position during the Turkish occupation [...] The Serbs who remained Orthodox Christians and the Catholics became serfs [...] It is true that the Muhajir are faithful Muslims but, despite that, they belong to the Serbian race, come from a Serbian country and can speak no language other than Serbian” (p. 33). Kostić found an almost identical view in the writings of Pierre Marge and Emile Haumant.

The Russian Slavist Pyotr Ivanovich Preiss wrote in 1845 of the Bosnian Serbs as adherents of the Orthodox, Catholic and the Muslim faith, as did Starchevski, Gaievski and especially Gilferding, the world-renowned authority on the 19th century Bosnian question. He pays special attention to the fact that the Bosnian beys “confess to being descendants of the ancient Bosnian aristocrats. When they speak Serbian, it sounds unusually clear and elegant; they use the old forms, almost extinct in the speech of the Christians. It is said that they even passed on the grammar of the Bosnian and Serbian kings of old to their posterity” (p. 36). Furthermore, Maykov pointed out in his earlier writings that “even the Serbs who converted to Islam consider themselves to be Serbs, speak the Serbian language and respect the Orthodox faith [...] The Bosnian, Herzegovinian and the Old Serbian Muslims remember their Serbian origins, their former Orthodoxy and their mother tongue (which they speak better than the Turkish). They consider the Catholics to be ‘unclean’, hate them and call them the *Sokci* and the ‘frog-eaters’ with disdain. If a Catholic wanted to convert to Islam, he had to first convert to Orthodox Christianity” (p. 37). The fact that the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims are Serbs is clear to Jakob Golowietsky, Timofei Dimitrijevič Florinski, Andrei Sirotinin, Golicin - Kutusov and other distinguished Russian Slavists.

The English travel writer Edmond Spencer wrote while he was travelling through Kosovo that: “some years ago, this glorious field was a battleground where a fierce battle was fought. The Muslim of Serbian origin from Bosnia gathered 25,000 well armed warriors and completely vanquished the regular Turkish troupes. These warriors were under the command of a person they referred to as the Dragon of Bosnia. This man is a descendant of the Branković family, the former princes of Serbia, infamous in the history of Serbia because one Branković rejected Christianity and betrayed his country to the Turks” (p. 39). Spencer then lists the ethnological and characterological traits of the Bosnian Muslims and their compatriots, the Orthodox Serbs, which are identical, especially in customs, morals, language, hospitality, social relations, folk costumes, village and town settlements and their dislike of agriculture.

In addition, even Chamberlain wrote that the Bosnian Muslims are of Serbian origin, as did Edith Durham, who openly hated the Serbs. In the book *The Slavic Menace*, Durham points out that “Montenegro fought in wars against the Muslims of Serbian origin from Bosnia and Herzegovina. As a matter of fact, the ‘Turks’ that the Christian of the Balkans waged war on was more often than not his own national brother who had converted to Islam [...] With the exception of the wars Montenegro waged against the troupes of the Pasha of Skadar and his Arbanasi, the real enemies of Montenegro were the Muslims of Serbian origin in Bosnia and Herzegovina – therefore people who were identical to the Montenegrins in their origin, language and customs [...] A Muslim of Serbian origin persecuted a Serbian Christian more unscrupulously than a Turk” (p. 40-41).

Kostić points out the similar opinions of Maud Holbach and Seton-Watson, and the conclusion of the latter that: “While in Bosnia the nobility converted to Islam, the Serbian nobility was eradicated by the Turks” (p. 41). In his book *The History of Serbia*, published in 1917, Harold Temperley also wrote about the Serbs who converted to Islam. Cambridge University professors Grant and Temperley published the book *Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries* in 1934 – in which they made the following remark: “In 1878, the Austro-Hungarian Empire was authorised to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina, the inhabitants of which were identical to the Serbs in their race and language. Even the Muslims of this land speak Serbian and are of Serbian blood” (p. 42). The American geographer, Samuel Falkenburg published the book *The Elements of Political Geography* in New York in 1942 and wrote about the Serbs in there: “The Serbs are highlanders and, in the last century, they have spent their time and all their energy in their incessant fight for freedom... War was their specialty and, in the World War (obviously WWI, L.M.K.), they showed the world their hereditary heroic traits. As the majority of the Christians on the Balkans are adherents to the Orthodox Church [...] The Serbs who lived outside the pre-war borders of Serbia, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, were the same as the Serbs in the Fatherland, although many of them were Muslims. The Austro-Hungarian rule lasted for only a short time and there was no time to alter their customs” (p. 42). In his book *The European Horizons – Yesterday and Today* of 1945, Bernard Anushen described that the Serbs, especially the Bogomils, “preferred the tolerant Islam to the aggressive Catholicism, which tried to exterminate those who did not want to convert. A great number of Bosnians were considered to be Turks after their conversion to Islam [...] More than half of the Serbs retained their faith” (p. 43). All other Anglo-Saxon writers determined the ethnicity of the Bosnian Muslims in the same way.

Safárik and Niederle wrote of the Serbs and Muslims in Bosnia, while Tomaš Masarik wrote in his memorandum to the British Prime Minister Edward Grey in 1915 that: “even the Czech politicians hope and wish that Turkey would be erased from the map. England is the more powerful Muslim force than Turkey, Russia is almost as powerful as Turkey [...] The Slavs are interested in this question because a

considerable number of Serbs or Bulgarians are Muslim” (p. 45). The Polish Slavist, Adam Mickiewicz wrote in 1840 that our folk poetry expresses “the struggles between the Christian Serbs and the Muslim Serbs” (p. 46). Italian writer Nikola Tomazeo considered all Serbian-speaking Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sandžak, the Skadar area, Kosovo and Metohija to be Serbs. Luigi Vilari and Gondi, concluded in their writings, published in 1956 and 1962 respectively, that without a doubt the Muslims of Bosnia and Macedonia are Serbs who converted to Islam, although both writers were anti-Serbian.

In his *Description of Bosnia and Herzegovina* from 1865, the Catholic friar Toma Kovačević said that: “All the inhabitants of Bosnia, excluding a small number of the Ottomans, Jews and Gypsies, belong purely to the South Slavs of the Serbian branch regardless of their different religions, because even those Serbs who converted to Islam remain Serbs in their race and their language... Because of that, the Serbs in Bosnia belong to three different confessions: the Orthodox faith, the Catholic faith and Islam (or the Turkish faith)” (p. 47). Ivan Franjo Jukić wrote on the Serbs who converted to Islam and fra Grgo Škarić wrote to the Serbian government in 1869, saying the following: “The people of Herzegovina are your people and they are the Serbs – there is no doubt about that and it is something they themselves show in their customs and their language and their ancient traditions (passed from father to son) from time immemorial” (p. 48). According to Kostić, these testimonies are more important than the opinions of the Serbian scientists, who may be accused of presumed partiality.

However, Kostić presents a detailed mosaic of Jovan Cvijić’s attitudes cited from many of his works regarding the Bosnian Muslims. Kostić considers that Jovan Cvijić is one of the best ethnographers and geographers. Where the Bosnian Muslims of Serbian origin are concerned, Cvijić says that “the Muslims of Serbian origin and Dinaric character spread from the Sava river, through Bosnia and Herzegovina and the former Sanjak of Novi Pazar, to Mitrovica in Kosovo. The Dinaric Muslims are descendants of the Bosnian and Herzegoviniannobility and the Bogomils and Patarenes who converted to Islam after the Turkish conquest. The majority of Bogomils were converted to Islam at the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century [...] (In Sandžak, the conversions took place a bit later). The Ottoman Turks, who settled in Bosnia as clerks, soldiers and merchants were numerous, as were the Turks who were expelled from Hungary. But, due to the influence of the environment and mixed marriages, they were assimilated by the Muslims of Serbian origin and forgot their language [...] The Dinaric Muslims belong to the earliest Serbian population in these areas. Before the Austrian occupation of Bosnia, they had not been migrating from Bosnia [...] They speak in an especially beautiful and picturesque Serbian language – full of old figures of speech and characteristic old words; furthermore, they use many Serbianized Turkish words. The Muslims of Serbian origin speak in the Iekavian dialect from Kosovska Mitrovica through to the Neretva River, while from the Neretva River to the north-west people speak in

the Serbian Ikavian dialect [...] Consequently, these Muslims are the Dinaric Serbs, whose traits have been altered by the influence of the Koran and Islam [...] Islam weakened the ties based on the Serbian blood and the Serbian language in these proud Dinaroid people. But it did not destroy their main Dinaric traits. They completely preserved the Serbian language and the nobility kept the memories of their Slavic origin. Their surnames end in *ić*, like the majority of Serbian surnames. The Dinaric nobility, which was converted to Islam has preserved the memories of their ancestors to a greater degree than other Dinaroids. They honour, respect and never forget their Christian ancestors [...] The sultan had to leave the Serbian nobility, those who converted to Islam, to rule Bosnia and Herzegovina [...] The Muslims of Serbian origin had great influence on the *Đivan* (Translator’s note: The Oriental council of state)” (p. 50). This is a quote from Cvijić’s book *The Balkan Peninsula*.

In the study *On the Migrations of the Bosnian Muslims*, Cvijić continues to elaborate this essential question and says: “It was a misfortune that a considerable number of the Bosnian Serbs changed their faith and lost all their national feelings. Now, because of that, a considerable number of the Bosnian Muslims must disappear: their Serbian language shall disappear too, as will their Serbian physical constitution, as they will be assimilated into an Asiatic nation. That was once called the ‘atonement for sin’, but now is called the ‘social law’. However, according to the same law, the Bosnian Muslims who stay in Bosnia will return to their original ethnicity [...] It is known that the Bosnian Muslims are Serbs and the majority of them are the descendants of the Serbian nobility, who converted to Islam (especially the Bogomils and the Orthodox), losing their national awareness” (p. 51).

Vuk Stefanović Karadžić also deemed the Bosnian Muslims, as well as the other inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina, to be Serbs. In *The Serbian Dictionary*, under the entry the “spahi” and “surname”, he says: “Some of them still have their old Serbian family names, e.g [...] the Ljubovići, Vidaći, Brankovići, Vilipovići, Todorovići, etc [...], but they still do not like to be reminded that they originate from the Serbs, although only one in a hundred speaks Turkish – the language they actually use is Serbian like other Serbs [...] Even the Bosnian Muslims, especially the aristocrats, keep their old surnames – even those that indicate that their ancestors were Christian – and they are only called Turks because of their faith, while being the real Serbs according to tradition and language. In accordance with contemporary opinion, they should be ashamed of their origins as, for example the Filipovići, Đurđevići, Todorovići, etc. The reason for this could be the fact that their surnames are on the old charters with which they were granted their estates and their other properties and rights” (p. 52-53). Njegoš, Nikola I Petrović and Mićo Ljubibratić were devoted to spreading friendship and brotherly love toward the Muslims of Serbian origin, indicating that they belonged to the same nation and that it was a sin to spill their brothers’ blood in mutual conflict.

Stojan Novaković, Stanoje Stanojević, Jovan Skerlić, Miroslav Spaljković, Sava Tekelija, Jefto Dedijer and others wrote of the Bosnian

and Herzegovinian Muslims of Serbian origin with obvious sympathy. Skerlić introduced the book of Šukrija Kurtović on the nationalisation of the Bosnian Muslims in 1914 with the following words: “Mr. Šukrija Kurtović was born in one of the most important Serbian regions – our cradle Herzegovina – and since his childhood he has considered himself a Serb and has remained a Serb until this day [...] Mr. Kurtović, who understands the importance of the Muslim question, analyses the situation as a Muslim who understands the true and lasting interests of his coreligionists. He addresses the Muslims, appealing to their feelings and their common sense, proving that their direct and real interest is not to alienate themselves from their compatriots but to join them. He points out the dangers awaiting the Muslim element if they do not radically abandon their prejudices and take a new course that will bring them back under the wings of the Serbian nation they were separated from by centuries and religion”[...] From the ranks of our Muslims, we have never heard a more reasonable voice and never has the Muslim question been described with so much knowledge, common sense and political understanding” (p. 55.)

Kostić dedicates a whole chapter of his book to the writers who implicitly deemed the Bosnian Muslims to be Serbs. There are German writers – such as the philologist Ernst von Ebert, historian Johann Wilhelm Zinkeisen, statistician Otto Hausner, geographers Adrian Zalbas and Friedrich von Hellwald, the consular clerk Carl Sax, the officer Von Jaks-Dembitsky – who paid special attention to the language or origin but, in all generalisation, they understand that it was the Serbs, divided into three religions, that they were writing about. Where French authors are concerned, Kostić pays special attention to Shomet de Fose, Lejan consul Engelhard, historian Emile Picaud, geographer Elizej Rekli, journalist Abdolonyme Ubicini, anthropologist Eugen Pittard, etc. Where the Anglo-Saxon authors are concerned, Kostić emphasises the works of the officer James Baker and the historian Frank Simmonds. Where Italians are concerned it is the Slavists Domenico Ciampoli and Carlo Sforza. Where the Romanians are concerned, he emphasises the works of Nicolae Iorga. The Northern-Slavic authors are Šafārik, Dobrovski. The Russians are Pipin, Spasovich and Budilovich, etc. Furthermore, the distinguished Slovenian Slavists, Jernej Kopitar and Franc Miklošić understand that all Shtokavians are Serbs, including the Bosnian Muslims. In his review of the book *The Folk Songs of the Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina* by Kosta Herman, the most significant Croatian scientist says that “the book contains the epic songs and poems of the Serbs practicing Islam” (p. 72). After criticising the author for failing to print his book (which was published in Sarajevo in 1888) in the Cyrillic alphabet, Jagić continues: “I will not comment on the content of these 39 songs, it is enough to say that they deal with the same motifs as other Serbian folk songs [...] Finally, we should say a couple of words about the language and versification: if we disregard the fact that there are more Turkish words in those songs than in the folk songs of the Christian Serbs, we can draw the conclusion that the diction of these songs reflects the magnificent

Serbian language – and that language contains many high-sounding words and sometimes even a form of language worthy of our attention” (p. 72-73).

The Dubrovian, Ivan August Kaznačić, who was the editor of the magazine *L'avvenire* (*The Future*), which was released in 1848 in Italian, referred to the Slav languages as the Illyrian language and classified their dialects as Bulgarian, Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian. Kostić points out that “All the Orthodox Christians (2,880,000), almost a million and half Catholics (1,490,000) and 550,000 Muslims were considered to speak the Serbian dialect. (the Croatian dialect was spoken by only 801 thousand of people, all living in Austria – therefore, there was no Croatian speaking population in Bosnia) – In the *Turkey* column it was said that almost a million and a half people in Turkey spoke in the Serbian dialect (1,490,000) and nobody spoke in the Croatian dialect” (p. 73). We would like to emphasise here that Kaznačić was a Croatian-oriented Dubrovian.

Another Dubrovian, Matija Ban, who was more distinguished than Kaznačić and who was a Catholic priest for a time, wrote in the almanac *Dubrovnik* for 1851: “Until now, in all our regions and almost everywhere, the name ‘Serb’ was used to denominate a part of our tribe that practices Eastern Orthodox Christianity. That fatal thought has become especially evident in the recent events and we realized that we are the Serbs who speak in a Serbian dialect, regardless of the church we belong to – Eastern, Western or Turkish faith (Translator’s note: Islam). The nations are differentiated on the basis of language and the tribes are differentiated on the bases of nationality” (p. 73-74). Milan Rašetar, a renowned Slavist, Catholic and a professor at the University of Vienna, also explicitly treated the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims and his Dubrovians as Serbs. In his study on the Chakavian dialect. It was called Chakavian because of the interrogative pronoun *čā*, meaning “what”, and is considered a name for the Croatian dialect, while the Shtokavian is considered the Serbian dialect) in 1891, he wrote: “According to Miklošić, all Shtokavians are Serbs or Croats of Serbian origin, while the Chakavians are Croats and Kaikavians are Slovenes [...] Therefore, it is completely justified to agree with Miklošić and to take the Croatian language to be the same as Chakavian and vice versa. On the other hand, since it has been proven by all of the older manuscripts that, in all the regions that were parts of the Serbian state, for a longer or shorter time only the Shtokavian dialect was spoken (Old Serbia, Serbia proper, Montenegro, Zeta, Herzegovina, South Dalmatia, East and West Bosnia and Srem) and that the Serbian name was used in these areas for both the people and the language, even in times where there was no affiliation with Serbia. Knowing that, we must confess to Miklošić and everyone who agrees with him that the terms Shtokavian and Serbian coincide” (p. 74).

Bearing in mind that the material from various almanacs and encyclopaedias is compressed and concise, that it expresses the scientific attitudes and scientifically-based opinions of its time and that it is accessible to a wide audience and affects the creation of public opinion,

Comment [K.B.49]: Translator’s note. This person not found in the available sources

Comment [K.B.50]: Translator’s note. This person not found in the available sources, possibly wrong spelling in the original

Comment [K.B.51]: ibid

Lazo Kostić points to the entries in the *Meier's Lexicon* and *Brockhouse German Dictionary*, the *Great Universal Dictionary of the 20th Century* and the *Quillet French Encyclopaedic Dictionary*, the *British Encyclopaedia* in English and the *Great Soviet Encyclopaedia* and *Great Encyclopaedic Dictionary* from the Tsarist Russia (in Russian). In all of them it is explicitly stated, without hesitation, that the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina are Serbs, along with the total population of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We have a similar situation in the special, mostly geographical and statistical almanacs and handbooks, as well as in ethnographic maps. The most important cartographic projections are Šafarik's cartographic projection in the *Slavic Ethnology*, Guillaume Lejean's *Ethnographical Map of European Turkey*, published in 1861, Petermann's ethnographic map from 1869, *The Ethnographical Map of the European Orient* by Heinrich Kipert, etc. In all of them, the Bosnian Muslims are marked as Islamic Serbs.

Although there has never been a serious European scientist who ever referred to the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims as Croats, a considerable number of Croatian propagandists insisted on that. In his book *The Capitulation of Montenegro*, published in Belgrade in 1938, making a mockery of the attempts to impose the Croatian name on the Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Andrija Luburić described, how a Herzegovinian Muslim, after the surrender of the rebels to the Austrian army in 1878 and after an attempt to officially designate the Muslims as Croats, stated: "Really, it is a wonder that they call us Croats – I don't know why they are calling us that. That can't be, it is known even to a blind man that we are ethnic Serbs called Turks because of our religion, and I don't know where they found this word *Rvat* (Translator's note: Croat). Maybe it's because we fought and *hrvali se* (Translator's note: wrestled, similar pronunciation as the word Croat) for our homeland that these foreigners gave us the name Croats to mock us, but I hope this won't last" (p. 95). It was clear to the Austrian authorities that the conversion of the Muslims would have been very difficult, so they were trying to force an artificial awareness of the Croatian nationality on them. They were conducting an aggressive campaign to persuade them, but at the same time they made a public proclamation that the Muslims agreed with that initiative. The revolt of the Muslim population was rising and there were open incidents when the Croatian propagandists went too far in their ardour. In 1894, the Muslims from Travnik reacted sharply when a Catholic Jesuit called them Croats and put up a poster all over Travnik with the following message, among other things: "Until recently, we were unaware of the existence of the Croats but, at some point, the ill-taught children started calling themselves Croats. If that was the only issue, we would not worry, but they want to call us adult citizens by that, to us completely unfamiliar name. Because of that, we request them to leave us alone, stop their lies and slanders and stop testing our patience. And now we would like to finish our statement saying that we cannot consider ourselves to be the Croats and that we cannot be a part of the Jesuit community – and we deem every Muslim who joins them to be a traitor of his clan, faith and tribe" (p. 96). This statement

1002

4. Croatian Pretensions to Bosnia and Herzegovina

Lazo Kostić published the fourth book of the Bosnian cycle in 1968 in Baden, Switzerland. The fourth book was a historical and political study entitled *The Historical and Similar 'Rights' of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, with the sub-title of *The Eruption of Croatian Megalomania*. He dedicated his book to the memory of one of the greatest Serbian poets and patriots, Aleksa Santić, who was also one of the most famous sons of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as a tribute on the hundredth anniversary of Santic's birth. Here, Kostić deals with the question of the Croatian territorial pretensions with reference to some fictional Croatian historical rights once again. Kostić considers that this megalomania is a sign that a nation is in a state of sickness, collective daydreaming, imagination, visions, fantasies and foolishness. The term megalomania itself is a synonym for grandomania. Great nations are not usually inclined to megalomania, only the unimportant, inferior nations burdened with the complex of their own irrelevance and unworthiness. The Croats are unrivalled in the modern world when it comes to megalomania. Their megalomania is not only pathological, but also criminal, drenched in the blood of the victims of their dreadful atrocities and of publicist forgeries.

The Croatian historian Vjekoslav Klaić was trying to prove that Croatian history was richer than the history of France, England or Germany, proving his own academic frivolity. A serious and conscientious scientist like Vatroslav Jagić found himself having to react in a bitter way to the epigones of Starčević. Franco Matteri, an Italian journalist, explained the Croatian claims to the Hungarian national hero Miklós Zrínyi in his book *Hungary and the Hungarians*, published in Turin in 1913. Apparently, he had some Croatian blood, but not a Croatian national awareness, saying that: "Croatian greed does not stop at claiming the national heroes of other nations as their own, that would be too idealistic a food for their lust; that greed has a practical intention, bearing in mind two things; after claiming the heroes, they then want to claim their lands and that greed dreams of a great and powerful Croatia, that would spread along the eastern coast of the Adriatic Sea and border on the near impossible, with a vague desire to get across the sea and take that coast, too" (p. 19).

By insisting on their alleged historical rights, they seek a base for contemporary revindication, usurpation or demands for all that was once theirs in history – the same as if the Serbs demanded Greece to return them Epirus and Thessaly just because Tsar Dušan once had them in his possession. They are not interested in the temporal dimension, the ethnic elements or the method of acquiring or losing them. In the modern world, there is no serious scientist who would approach the question of historical rights like that, and Kostić points out that "with their construction of the 'Croat-Hungarian' kings, the Croats could put the claim over Hungary to the Habsburgs especially and claim that it was

1003

them who conquered Hungary and not the other way around” (p. 22). In his book *The Political Letters from Dalmatia*, which was published in Zadar in 1920, the Dalmatian Luka Poduje, who wrote in Italian, warned that: “Due to a single Croatian campaign in our province, which took place in ancient time, the Croats managed to create an alleged historical right to Dalmatia, using perfidious and cunning mystification” (p. 23).

The Italian Nikola Tomazeo from Šibenik testifies to the absurd Croatian forgeries in his book *The Dalmatian Question*, printed in Zadar in 1861. Kostić cites extensively from this book: “The historical weapons almost always have two blades and are hard to handle. And it is an evil skill – to take from history what is favourable to one’s own cause, because that way you force your opponents to take weapons from the same arsenal. An MP from Moravia in the Viennese Parliament said that we should be able to read more than just one page when it comes to history. Now, what does the history of the Croats actually say about them? That they have not been able to agree on important issues – that they surrendered their sovereignty to Hungary; that they neglected (and harassed) Dalmatia and lost her due to their trust of Hungary or, in their ignorance, they allow their rights to be infringed; they tarnished (lost) the crown of Zvonimir, they coloured the other (crown) of St. Stephen with blood; then they promise us unity, freedom, peace and glory! [...]. In defence of the ancient titles, nations could easily have the pleasure of confronting the impossibility of creating new titles for rights and responsibilities and forgetting to see whether it is possible to hold on to the old ones [...] But what kind of history does Croatia present to us? It presents us with a cession (a cession of the whole country) to King Koloman – pursuant to which, he allowed Hungary to sell us [...] It presents us with thieving župans. It presents us with a pact with King Ferdinand where Dalmatia was not included [...] A tripartite kingdom is a method of stating that historical rights cannot be created in any other way than as a mockery, but the travesty was made worse by the tragedy of the tripartite. And who would want to repeat the Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slovenia each time they need to be mentioned? This should be simplified, not just in practice but in the decree printed in Latin, like the fact that the Hungarian crown had encompassed the Croatian crown – thus they agreed the new Kingdom Croatia (because Slovenia cannot take that honour and Dalmatia refuses it) –. The name would become the symbol of the cause.” And that’s what happened. Although Slovenia was historically Hungarian and ethnically Serbian and Dalmatia was historically Roman but ethnically Serbian, by this pseudo-historical and political construction and simplification the country was reduced to a Croatian ‘tripartite Kingdom’.

The positive right entails the objective possibility of realisation or it becomes absurd and wishful thinking, recognising no other legal subject or real right. In case of the collision of rights, historical documents are consulted, but the current condition takes precedence and prevails in this case, first. The rights and desires cannot be equal. If the historical rights really exist, than it entails the existence of the subject thereof, the title holder through centuries. If a country ceased to exist a thousand years

ago, then a newly proclaimed country with the same name cannot automatically become a successor. The historical rights do not have the legal standing and are more of an anachronism than a basis for serious political pretenses. Asking why “the Croats are such ardent defendants of absurd historical rights”, Aleksa Stojanović came to a conclusion in his book *The Serbs and the Croats*, published in Novi Sad in 1902, and that conclusion, interpreted by Kostić, is as follows, “he came to the conclusion that the reason for this that the Serbs spread their territory at the expense of the Croats and they can only manage to preserve that territory in such a way” (p. 26). Invoking historical rights is indicative of contradictory internal political pretensions and means insisting on endless litigations and conflict, which were common in the feudal age though the French revolution definitively ended up on the scrap-heap of history. The Croats have continuously tried to terrorise the Serbs under the pretext of their historical rights, but they would not have succeeded in that without help from the foreign countries.

The coined word on the Croatian state rights was slapped together, according to the Hungarian model, on which Kostić comments humorously, citing a folk proverb: “a frog saw that a horse was shod and lifted its lag to imitate him. One of the leading legal theoreticians, Georg Jellinek, wrote in his *General Theory of the State*, that “Croatia is lacking state character in comparison with Hungary – just as Finland is lacking in comparison with Russia - because the king of Croatia is legally identical with the king of Hungary, as the Grand Duke of Finland is with the Russian Tsar. Therefore, these relations do not represent real unions, but a single state” (p. 32). Something that does not match the objective criteria, is not a state and cannot invoke certain rights that could be reserved by the real states. The coined word on the Croatian state rights is a political parole in the full sense of the word, which is totally unclear but is designed to arouse certain emotions and fit in with the political programs - through which it can receive different meanings depending on the needs of the propagandists and depending on the actual situation. Although Bishop Štrosmajer and Ante Starčević were political enemies, when it came to the apology for the obscure historical right of Croatia their policies were in the same line. Eugen Kvaternik assigned a mystical meaning to all of that.

The burden of the dogma on the state rights probably led to the failure of the Croats to establish a liberal political party. However, it is very difficult to explain under the terms the historical right of Croatia and different Croatian interpreters have different definitions. Nikola Tomašić sees the *Pacta conventa* from 1102 as the foundation of that idea, as well as the Agreement from 1867. On the other hand, Marko Konstrešić thinks that the *Pacta conventa* was not a contract on personal union, but a feudal convention between the Hungarian king as the senior and 12 Croatian noblemen who agreed to become his vassals. Miško Radojević, the prominent lay in Zagreb, makes fun of the illusions of the Croatian state in his study *Frano Supilo*, which was published in Zagreb in 1930: “The Croatian *Pravaši* (Translator’s note: the members of the political party from Croatia) in Zagreb, as well as their brothers the Hungarians

are characterised by their aristocratic way of thinking – in the manner of the feudal advocates of the legitimacy, and they discuss their political matters like their Hungarian brothers across the Drava River as if they were lawyers. Croatian state. The fact that Croatia practically did not exist as a state in the political sense since it did not have any of the attributes of an independent state: the army, the finances or anything else that makes up a state – did not trouble the legitimists of the *pravaški* (Translator's note: the adjective derived from the name for the adherents of the Croatian Party of Rights) and the Hungarian calibre, they behaved like feudal jurists. Their standpoint was purely juristic – they considered that the contract was not legally terminated and, when a contract is not terminated the way it was created, then the contract still exists, according to their logic [...] They found a historical documents more valuable than real life. They raised their children on fantastical and romantic theories of Croatian state law. Their program was just castles in the air and their tactics were formalistic, dogmatic and, sometimes, even lackey” (p. 35).

What the term Croatian state law really means is unclear to the Croats themselves and, furthermore, they are unable to explain that term to people of other nations. That concept is so flexible that it can encompass everything the Croatian politicians wish from time to time, if necessary. In addition, they even developed the theory of their virtual historical rights to territories that are not parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire – but if they are included, they would have to be attached to the territory of Croatia because they were part of Croatia in history and Croatia has never lost her rights to them. Actually, the Croats reserve their rights for some possible future situations. They have concentrated their aspiration into the fanciful projection of a situation where the major European forces would destroy the Turkish state and all Serbian territories would be annexed to Croatia – as the Yugoslav lands. The Croats declare some real or imaginary situation from the past as legal and then present it as their legitimate right, taking as a model the principles of conservative legitimacy invoked by the European monarchists. The French revolutionaries gave precedence to the principle of nationality over the principle of feudal-autocratic legitimacy. The latter is represented by the thesis that the population of the land belongs to the owner of the land and – the first – that the land belongs to its population. The new age denied the approach that treated the population of a country as a derivative of the state ruled in the name of God's mercy and saw the state as the expression of the ethnic individuality of the certain territory that obtained its legal expression that way. Unlike the Serbs, whose aspirations are mostly national in character and aimed at unifying and liberating all the territories where the Serbian people live, the Croatian aspirations are purely territorial and to abstract the current ethnic character of the territories they aspire to.

Furthermore, the Croats insisted on making the distinction between the people who were the first to settle a territory and the new-comers, but only when they benefited from that, claiming that they have the rights to territories they used to inhabit in the past, even when Croats did

not live there anymore or only remained there in small numbers. They used this as a way to deny the Serbs their rights because they were intruders on traditionally Croatian territory, which subsequently turned into a real ideology of extermination, though in the milder version, they would verbally express their readiness to accept the Serbs as Orthodox Croats. History would have to freeze at the moment the Croats occupied a certain territory in the past and that moment should be immortalized. According to their hideous logic – as Kostić ironically observed: “everything else is occupation, intrusion or theft. If somebody settled the territory peacefully or legally or if somebody conquered a certain territory in a regular manner - it was still all wrong and worthless. The territories where the Croats had set their foot automatically became their own according to their inalienable rights, and that circumstance itself was recorded on an incontestable deed of land. The Croats do not have to defend their territory because it is inalienable. Acquisitions and conquests are worthless here, as well as the migrations of peoples. What is Croatian is Croatian and nobody else can have it” (p. 48).

The Croats are evasive when it comes to the general principles applicable to all the nations in the world. Their principles are only applicable to themselves in order to compensate for the territories lost due to their mass exodus before the Turks. After their exodus, the land was empty and the Serbs settled their, forming a protective military frontier. When the Turkish threat was over, the Serbs became redundant and the Croats have been constantly planning how to eliminate them ever since: by converting them to Catholicism, by denying them their rights and by extermination. But the greatest Croatian problem lies in their history and identity. What they refer to as historical grandeur, was in fact pathetic and miniature, not worthy of mention. In his book *The Characterology of the Yugoslavs* from 1939, the great scientist Vladimir Dvorniković pointed out that “the Croatian name was brought to the Croatian-Kaikavian territory after the Turkish wars from their old Chakavian-Croatian centres. Until then, the Croats had identified their language as “Slavic” [...] The 17th century Kaikavian-Croatian historian Juraj Ratkaj calls his Kaikavian language from Zagorje the “Slavic language” and the people are “our Slovenes”. (p. 52).

The Croats took over the Hungarian theory of the political nation – according to which, the nation in the political sense is represented by all the inhabitants thereof, regardless of their ethnicity. According to this theory, the real ethnic and language differences would be annulled. The pretensions to the territories finally present themselves as aspirations to subjugate the population and transform them into an imaginary Croatian political nation. This was also the basis for the Croatian megalomaniac aspirations to Bosnia and Herzegovina, because a small portion of the Bosnian territory was once under Croatian domination and, in the Middle Ages, a considerable number of Catholics lived in Bosnia. The Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina would be declared Croats by the political proclamation, which would be the basis of their claims to the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina – and than the Croatian ideologists wonder why the Bosnian Muslims were not honoured by their concern

and attention.

The Croats readily admit their rights to conquer certain territories, but regularly on the basis of some other nation's victories where they appear as the ones who enjoy the spoils. From here stems their habit of joining the bigger force – the conquering or occupying armies. Their instinctive urge is to always find themselves on the side of the conquerors, whoever that conqueror might be. The most impressive proof for this estimation of the Croats is the unbelievable welcoming party for the Nazi soldiers in Zagreb, in the beginning of April 1941. The German journalist Schulte-Straphaus wrote about that: “The events develop at the speed of lightning. At noon we crossed the Yugoslav border on the river Drava and this evening we are in the Croatian capital Zagreb. Our vehicles are covered with flowers. The enthusiasm of the Croatian people for the entry of the German troops, who came to liberate them from the Serbian yoke, is amazing. In the streets of Zagreb, people hug and cheer and the cheers are passed on. We came to the city as the first German troops. Our vehicles drove through the masses on the streets with great difficulty. We had to shake friendly hands and answer ecstatic salutations all the time. The inhabitants of Zagreb would like to invite us into their homes and entertain us. But our road led us to the temporary seat of the Croatian government, which has been under the leadership of general Slavko Kvaternik for the past two hours and is located in the building of the Banate” (p. 75-76).

On that occasion, General Slavko Kvaternik concentrated in his statement all the emotions that flooded the hearts and souls of the Croatian people at that moment, which was all meticulously recorded and broadcast by the German media. Therefore, his statement remains forever as a testimony to the 'glorious' Croatian history. Kvaternik stated, among other things, that: “The warm welcome the Croats prepared for the German troops [...] in Zagreb and the whole of Croatia, was a real triumph in which the old people and children participated with tears in their eyes. A German soldier is considered the saviour of the Croats' freedom and all Croats have only one wish: to respond to loyalty with loyalty. We worship the Führer of the German people as a demi-god. The Croats know that they can only receive their state on the popular-historical territory from the Führer of the German people and in his friendship. The entry of the German troupes to Zagreb is a triumphant parade and a documentation of our enormous love and devotion to the German military force” (p. 76).

Kostić gives here a citation from the text of another German journalist, Karl von Lesch, which was published (in German) in the book-collection *Croatia Marches* in Zagreb in 1942, in order to credibly describe the primordial Croatian love toward Hitler and Nazism. As soon as the German soldiers appeared, “scenes of indescribable rapture took place. Under the sea of the red-white-blue flags, the celebration of an exalted nation of national victory and of gratitude to their liberators who protected the independent Croatia with the might of their arms [...] One hundred thousand people shouted over and over again: 'Heil Hitler! Sieg-Heil/Sieg-Heil!' In addition, shouts of 'Long live' in Croatian

could be heard. These are all moving eruptions of the joy of an elated nation [...] Women tried to pull the men with the steel helmets (i.e. the German soldiers) from their vehicles to hug them and shake their hands. Each German officer, regardless of his rank, was assailed by hundreds of Croatians with the following questions: 'How can I help you? Do you need petrol? Would you like a cigarette?' [...] I am embarrassed because my words are not strong enough to describe what is happening in Zagreb at the moment. I need say only one thing in the end: we who wear the grey military uniforms are immensely proud to stand here, tonight of all nights, as the soldiers of our leader and that we can show the Croats (as we would say in Croatian: *zorno prikazati* – Translator's note: Proudly present) what the will of a nation is able to do and we too thank our Führer and supreme commander for making these unforgettable hours in Zagreb possible” (p. 76-77).

As the Hitler's loyal ally, Croatia entered into war with the Soviet Union on 2 July 1941 and sent her troops to the Eastern front. On 14 December 1941, they declared war on the United States of America and Britain. In his text *The Croatian Soldier in the Contemporary War*, which was published in Pavelić's official gazette *The New Croatia* in 1942, Ante Oršanić described the extent of Croatian contribution to Hitler's destruction of the Yugoslav state – “in this war, all Croats refused to execute their duties, refused to carry out commands, disrupted the connections, spread panic, aimed imprecisely, sabotaged tanks and cannons and other weapons for war and disarmed the Serbian disbanded masses who went wild. In other words, in all these wars, the Croats were the only ones who unanimously destroyed and broke the Balkan front from the inside as rapidly as as the Germans destroyed it and broke it from the outside. For example, even before the war, the response of the Croats, when summoned to the army, mainly the infantry (because others were summoned before them)), fell to just 30% to 40%. The rest stayed at home or ran to the woods, went to other towns – e.g. visited their relatives or rode to and fro on the trains as 'passengers without tickets' looking for their 'command posts'” (p. 78).

The author brags about the Croatian “heroism” on the Russian front in the same article and Kostić cites the most striking fragments: “The Croats had a handful of soldiers on the Eastern front, much fewer than the other Axis powers, both great and small. The Croats on that battlefield can be compared with the oldest and best, the greatest and the best equipped the most enlightened and best trained armies and even with the most numerous ones. The Croatian troops fought on the Eastern front in the air, on the ground and on the sea, in the siege of Leningrad, on the Black Sea and even more in the siege of Stalingrad. In the same manner as the Croatian soldiers in the former state, that is, standing for all that is the worthiest, healthiest, most glorious and best in one nation, spontaneous and unique everywhere, had been breaking from within and finally destroyed the Balkan front together with the soldiers of the Axis powers – mostly German, the Croats acted on the Eastern front [...] There are only a few of us – we could say the least – but, nonetheless we are heroes there. Our soldiers are heroes on the sea, heroes on the land

Comment [K.B.52]: Translator's note. This person not found in the available sources, possibly wrong spelling in the original

and even more so in the air. They are famous for their low flights on the Eastern front and, according to some views; those low flights were introduced by the Croats themselves – the Croatian pilots, whose sorties on the Black Sea are only inherent to millennium old naval people such as the Croats. Even more so, with their melee combats and their ventures, the Soviets themselves say that they are Black people and that they come from the so called *Corti* - i.e. the devils legions. According to this, although their divisions and their numbers were the smallest on the Eastern front, the Croats were still the scariest to the Soviets – among other, greater armies” (p. 78-79).

The Croats were not able to create their own independent state on their own. Twice was their statehood given to them, first by Hitler and the second time by the will of Helmut Kohl, assisted by Vatican and the Americans. In both cases, Croatia was only a vassal state and nothing more. And a country like that will last only as long as their outside creators are present. When they leave, the artificial creation falls apart completely. From that standpoint, Kostić concludes that “one formation that considers itself to be a state while having no attributes of a state, one nation that was unable to make and preserve the state institution, has no ‘rights’, has no authorisations and no moral grounds to ask for other areas, even if it had some more justified pretensions. How can a large area be put under the rule and protection of another, not much bigger area, when that area cannot defend itself and cannot create a state of its own?” (p. 85). According to Kostić, that is one more argument against the Croatian pretensions to Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in favour of the Serbian aspirations. “Serbia is larger by far than Bosnia, it managed to liberate herself first and then the others, including Bosnia, and she never lets an inch of her territory go without a fight. She protects herself and all that is entrusted to her, all that seek support or ask protection from her. With Serbia, everyone feels stronger, safer and protected” (p. 85).

The Croatian state was proclaimed an operetta theatre for a band of Italian mercenaries, transported from emigration by the occupiers and put to power by force. Bombastic proclamations and propaganda noise, as well as atrocities committed on the Serbian civilians in masses, were the recipe used in both historical cases. The Croatian ideologists speak of the category of natural rights of their people to certain territories. The natural rights of one nation in that sense are nonsense and cannot receive serious treatment in the theory of law, but they were officially proclaimed by the statute of the Croatian Party of Rights dated 3rd November 1893, the beginning of which Kostić translated from German: “The Party of Rights strives for the reincarnation of the Croatian state right and the natural rights of the Croatian people in accordance with the following articles: – Article 1: the establishment of the complete Croatian kingdom by the incorporation of Slavonia, Dalmatia, the city of Rijeka and the lateral parts, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Istria, Carniola, Carinthia and Styria within the Habsburg Monarchy” (p. 91-92). The fact that they included all three of Slovenia’s regions is far-fetched but somehow logical. But to claim the Serbian ethnic territories and regions where only the Shtokavian dialect is used seems even more grotesque.

1010

And what is the natural right in all this? In 1867 Franjo Rački made a reference to the arguments of the alleged natural rights, requiring that the parliament should discuss the incorporation of Rijeka into Croatia. According to the logics, the natural right should be the right of the stronger one, but when could the Croats be the stronger one.

Kostić points out the serious nature of the Serbian borders with Croatia and the methods that would be used to implement them. A plebiscite is always problematical, because it abstracts the territorial grouping of the population and is affected by the political atmosphere of the historical moment, neglecting the change of the ethnic structure by the war politics of genocide. The statistical data is often questionable, especially that proclaimed by the communist regime. Arbitration always leaves the question of the objectivity of the selected or accepted arbitrators, while settlements are always problematic because of the argumentative and quarrelsome Croatian national spirit, which was defined precisely by the greatest Croatian writer Miroslav Krleža in the following words: “The Croatiandom seeks someone to subjugate, to sign a political contract with and then to complain against that political contract for the next 400 years [...] the Croatian fools have been experts for centuries in concluding contracts and making stupid political treaties” (p. 103).

Kostić expresses particular regret in his analysis of the Serbian/Croatian relations between wars and the Croatian insistence of introducing a special dualism in the Yugoslav state, taking the Austrian and Hungarian experience as a model and including territorial division in accordance with the principle: half to the Serbs, half to the Croats, because the possibility to amputate Croatia and Slovenia was not used on time, when the scissors had been in the Serbian confident and strong hands. Some of the Serbian politicians were categorically against the amputation, such as Svetozar Pribićević and Živko Topalović, and Stojan Protić, the creator of the term, was not serious about its implementation, using it instead as a threat in situations where the Croats exaggerated in their demands. In a text from 1925, Topalović wrote about what amputation would mean in practice: “The Serbian monarchy, the army, the bureaucracy and all old political parties – the state cast in one cast during several wars – could not be won over to allow federalism. It was either a Unitarian state or amputation, which means that the separation of the purely Croatian and Slovenian regions from the state borders would be the solution to this problem [...] If Croatian or Slovenian resistance to the Unitarian state increased, it would undoubtedly lead to that crazy amputation. Instead of a state with constant unrest, a combination would emerge where all regions populated by the Serbs would be proclaimed state territories and the purely Croatian and Slovenian regions, spreading around Zagreb and Ljubljana, populated by barely three million inhabitants, would be proclaimed outside of borders of the state and left to their own destiny. The Serbian state would have sufficient inner strength to survive this but, for the Croats and the Slovenes, this amputation, which would halve their tribes, would be their ruin. The people thrown out would have only

1011

two choices left: to join the Hungarians or the Italians and to surrender to a hopeless future” (p. 115).

The Croatian impudence with respect to their pretensions to Bosnia and Herzegovina is clear from the attitude of Stjepan Radić that “the Croatian element is the most developed in B&H” (p. 117). Radić stated this in his book *The Active Rights of Croatia to Bosnia and Herzegovina*, published in 1908. This happened during the blossoming of the Croatian political support for tripartite remodelling of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, where the Croats would have been the representatives and assimilators of the other South Slavs. This statement of Radić was made, although there were numerous constant historical indicators of the cultural superiority of the Orthodox Serbs and the hopeless cultural backwardness of the Catholics, who even lacked the Croatian national consciousness. Kostić emphasises that the Croatian megalomania does not “increase in proportion to the Croatian people’s power, or in proportion to their merits gained. It mostly seizes conjunctures and uses the weakness of the Croatian opponents, uses surprise attacks and treason, puts Croatia under the wings of an alien country and then starts making impossible demands” (p. 119).

The creator of the Croatian megalomania, Pavao Riter Vitezović (who was not even of Croatian origin), proclaimed all Serbian lands to be Croatia. He considered that Croatia was the whole territory the Romans referred to as Illyria. He included Serbia, Macedonia, Bulgaria and Thrace into Red Croatia, and projected that all Yugoslav lands should be encompassed in the restored Croatian kingdom under the reign of the Habsburg dynasty. He published numerous works dealing with that subject at the end of the 17th and beginning of the 18th centuries. The Croatian literary critic Branko Vodnik said of him that Pavao Riter Vitezović was “the first to develop the greater Croatia idea in the political sense. His Croatia encompassed all Yugoslav lands. Vitezović’s ideology remained politically sterile but had a strong influence on the cultural life, because it brought the idea of a single national name, a uniform literary language [...] His thoughts were incarnated by Ljudevit Gaj under the name ‘Illyrian’. Ljudevit Gaj considered Vitezović to be his precursor and Ante Starčević inherited Vitezović’s greater Croatia idea and developed it further” (p. 126-127).

In his first Croatian political brochure, published in the Shtokavian dialect in 1832, Count Janko Drašković formulated the first concrete Croatian national program and makes claims to Bosnia. Afterwards, Vjekoslav Babukić, an eminent Illyrian, expressed the same idea in verse in his only poem he ever wrote. The historian Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski continued the same ideology in 1842, talking about the Bosnian regions that had been grabbed from the Croatian nobility at some point in history. Although the Illyrian movement avoided using the Croatian name, it has never been all-Yugoslav, only designed cunningly and shrewdly, considering the really bad condition of the Croatian national consciousness at that time, which is explained by Milan Banić in the following way: “If Zagreb was just striving to gather the Croats, it would only have gathered a few because, at the time, the term Croat was

IT-03-67-T

used in a very narrow sense on a purely provincial level [...] and exactly because it was trying to appeal to the whole Slavic south, Zagreb took on the Illyrian name” (131). In his study *Of The Centennial of the Illyrian Movement*, published in Zagreb in 1937, the prominent historian Ferdo Šišić concluded that: “The practical policy of the Illyrian movement was purely Croatian in its essence (highlighted by the author) – not Yugoslav. It was founded on exclusively Croatian historical statehood rights, primarily because they were trying to rally all the Croatian lands in the Habsburg Monarchy around Zagreb, as well as those areas that were included in the Ottoman Empire – i.e. the so-called Turkish Croatia (or the historical Banate of Jajce) and Turkish Dalmatia (or the regions northwards of the Lower Neretva River), creating an area capable of successfully resisting the Hungarian attacks by its power and great territory” (p. 131).

The Illyrian movement was supported by Vienna, when they found it useful to confront Hungarian aspirations, but when the Austrians and the Hungarians reached an agreement, the Croats were left in the lurch. However, the Croats did not renounce their aspirations, even if it meant that they would be forced to cooperate with the Serbian political leaders. Even then they did not want to give up their greater Croatian national concept in relation to the Serbs and the Slovenes. As Kostić observed: “when they saw that the assimilation of the Slovenes met with difficulties, the Croats doubled their aspiration to the Serbian lands. In order to achieve this in an easier manner, they made up the so called Illyrian movement and accepted the Serbian language as their own. They did this to erase all obstacles and to proclaim that everyone who speaks the Serbian language was a Croat! This event is also unprecedented in world history. Despite the fact that the difference between the Serbian and Croatian literary language was erased, many other differences remained. For example: the alphabet, religion, etc. Subsequently, they tried trickery at first and then used violence as well. Gaj wanted to introduce the Cyrillic alphabet, but the Viennese court thwarted that plan. If he had managed to introduce the Cyrillic alphabet, the national proselytism would have been more successful. When they failed to accomplish that, they simply prohibited the Cyrillic alphabet whenever they could [...] Where religion was concerned, they first tried to convert them into the Greek-Roman faith. They used force as well, not just deceit. When all of that failed, WWII started. Then forced conversions to Catholicism took place and the converts managed to escape from the axe of the Croatian war criminals. This is the way they expand their “historical and ethnic territories” (p. 132-133).

The expression of Croatian megalomaniac aspirations reached its peak in the ideology of Ante Starčević, who wanted to either Croatise all Serbs or exterminate them. In his book *The Croatian Politician Ante Pavelić and the Serbs*, published in Leipzig in 1938, Ernest Bauer cited Starčević’s reply to remarks that the denial of the existence of the Serbs and Slovenes was unrealistic: “There is no one who does not recognize the factual existence of these two peoples but everyone who is not evil shall do his best to exterminated their harmful existence as far as

possible, and to replace the facts that collide with the laws with the facts that don't" (p. 134). Starčević's message to the Serbs was clear: "Be a Croat or disappear!" Even the famous Ustasha ideologist Ivo Pilar could not resist opposing Starčević's madness, saying: "He used the fact that the Romans of the Balkans played a major part in the genesis of Serbdom and the fact that Serbdom was initially very small and ruled by the Croats, to build a theory that the Serbs have never existed, but he forgot that there has never been a state without a strong national element" (p. 135).

Pilar only criticised the exaggerations that were counterproductive to the goals of Croatian national megalomania. But in their essence, these views were characteristic for the entire public opinion. Joseph Redlich indicates that in the following words: "The new Croatian Party of Rights, established by Starčević, had been the deepest force in the whole country and the real power that had mostly been tracing the destiny of Croatia until the fall of the (Austrian) Empire" (p. 135). One of the best experts when it comes to the ethnical character of the Croats, Vladimir Dvorniković, estimated the influence of Starčević's ideology on the Croatian national conscience: "Never before has the tribal and atavistic urge in the south entered with such a force of irrationality into the world of the political formulas and programs as in this Starčević's Pan-Croatism. At the time there were two Serbian states, the idea of Croatising the South Slavs and the standpoint of 'negating' the existence of the Serbs and the Slovenes was a complete nonsense" (135-136).

In his speech on the grave of Ante Starčević, Stjepan Radić used well-chosen words to express the all-Croatian dominant attitude to the political ideals and directives of the man the Croats considered the father of their fatherland. Radić said: "Today we are on this holy place, which is a real shrine. This great grave, around which we have gathered as men and as Croats, is a sacrificial altar to that immortal and magnificent idea that gives true content and true value to our Croatian nation. This is a true idea, stronger than any force - the idea of national self-determinations against tyranny" (p. 136). Croatian historian Josip Horvat was even more direct in his appraisal of Starčević's ideological postulates in 1942: "Starčević saw a life-giving force in the Croatian state right - this is why his group was named 'The Party of Rights'. The Croatian Party of Rights wanted the unification and of all Croatian lands within the Austro-Hungarian Empire or outside the Monarchy. And that thought followed Starčević, despite the realities of daily politics, remained alive during the epoch of Settlement and has always inspired the young generation with a new energy and gets ever stronger because it is in conformity with the soul and the being of the Croatian people" (p. 136).

The Croatian pretensions to Bosnia and Herzegovina in the 18th century encompassed the Vrbas and the Neretva rivers but, subsequently, at the time of the Illyrian movement, their aspirations encompassed everything in the Starčević-Pavelić version. When the Austrians conquered Turkish territory, the Croats would immediately present it as a gift to the Austrian emperor. In accordance with that model, they were even striving to materialize the results of the Serbian

uprisings in Bosnia and Herzegovina. At times, even the Austrian emperor had to intervene directly and warn the Assembly of Croatia and Slavonia not to exceed their authorities. However, the Roman Catholic Church cordially supported the Croatian megalomaniacal wishes and the request for the tripartite rearrangement of the Monarchy. In November 1917, the Archbishop of Sarajevo Josip Štadler organised the signing of a petition, where only his signature was displayed and others were kept quiet. The main point of the petition was as follows: "We demand the unification of all the lands to which the Croatian state right extends - i.e. Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Croatian Istria into a single political and autonomous body within the Habsburg Monarchy as a indestructible entirety" (p. 145).

Furthermore, the Croatian pretensions to Slovenia were completely open, although Slovenia has never been a part of a Croatian state. Nevertheless, they had a realistic base in the following facts: considering that all the eminent Slavists considered all the speakers of the Kaikavian dialect to be Slovenes, the Croatian ideologists proclaimed the Slovenes to be Croats based on that very fact. Both are right. How grotesque that was in practice is indicated by the words of the Roman Catholic priest Ivan Jagić, Vatroslav's brother, at the Croatian Assembly session in 1894: "Why convert a Serb into a Croat or a Croat into a Serb, if they do not want that? You have tried to convert all the Slovenes and the inhabitants of Carniola into 'mountain Croats'. You should go to Ljubljana and Carniola and see how many followers you have. I was there again during the holidays and talked with their leaders and noblemen, and they *perhoresciraju* any relation with the people who negate their characteristic before they even have them" (the word *perhorescirati*, which is obsolete, meant: to refuse something with disgust or loathing, to be horrified, to detest)" (p. 148-149).

Since they do not find any valid historical facts or statistical data, the Croatian megalomaniac propagandists simply conjecture about what belongs to them, what they wish for, about their dreams and daydreams, but also about their bloodthirsty plans. They even made up a Native American tribe, *the Kroatana*, in order to prove that they were in America even before Columbus. Some Croatian pseudo-historians even claim the first Bulgarian dynasty as their own and assert that Old Church Slavic was originally called Croatian. Dominik Mandić simply turns all Slavic designations into the 'Croatian'.

Before the Turkish occupation, Bosnia did not have permanent borders. Bosnia sometimes encompassed wider territory and sometimes less, depending on the capabilities, military prowess and the fortunes of war of her feudal lords, which was completely in line with the spirit of that time. Mavro Orbin wrote about the Serbian lands in his book *The Kingdom of Slavs*, published in Pesaro in 1601, concluding that: "This state, Bosnia, and the other - Raška, the area around Hum and Zeta - were sometimes under one ruler and sometimes they had their own respective rulers" (p. 193). When the Croatian national ideologists invoke their alleged historical rights, they do not really know how to formulate them in terms of territories. Considering that Ivo Pilar, Ferdo

Šišić and Vjenčeslav Vlajić} all agree on the geographically unstable territory of Bosnia, the contemporary concept of which developed after the stabilisation of the Turkish government. In addition, Vlajić showed that, initially, in a small Bosnia, territorial expansions brought a series of new titles to her rulers, not the expansion of the geographical regions that the concept should have encompassed. As an example, he states Tvrtko's titles: 'Lord, Ban Tvrtko [...] By the grace of God, the ruler of many countries: Bosnia, Soli and Usora and the Lower Parts, Podrinje and Hum. Subsequently, his titles expanded to Raška (Serbia) and the coastal region'. For a time, even Croatia and Dalmatia were among King Tvrtko's titles" (p. 194).

The French Balkanologist, Ubicini confirms that, and the German geographer Otto Schmiter wrote in 1905 that: "The name 'Bosnia' was limited to the region of the Upper Bosnia - i.e. the Sarajevsko polje and the surrounding areas. That was the only lasting and real property of the Bosnian bans and kings throughout all the changes that took place [...] From the real Bosnia, the so called Upper Bosnia, the rule of the Bosnian lords spread ever farther [...] But Bosnia had not existed in today's scope until the Turkish rule" (p. 194-195). By cartographic projections, Vladimir Corović and Sima Ćirković clearly demonstrated the spread of the original Bosnia, but that matter had been tackled by Stojan Novaković long before them. The Bosnian Turkish pashalic at one time encompassed the whole of continental Dalmatia, Lika and Slavonia, while Herzegovina was established by merging of three ancient Serbian regions – the areas of Neretva, Trebinje and Zahumlje. In the Turkish time, it used to have a more independent administrative status and sometimes it was made a part of Bosnia.

The Croats proclaim their alleged historical rights over Bosnia and Herzegovina, but they have virtually no evidence of this whatsoever. Because of that, they have to be very resourceful. In his book *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, published in Vienna in 1888, the famous Hungarian historian Janos Asbot convincingly mocked the phantasmagoria of Vjekoslav Klaić. With respect to that resourcefulness and lack of evidence, Asbot wrote: "Klaić, a Croatian historian of Bosnia, was the first to use the most recent research in his considerable work, but that work is often spoiled by his national-Croatian tendencies. He thinks that the Bosnian župans took over the title of ban from the Croats and therefore he concludes that Bosnia belongs to Croatia, because, according to him the Croats are the only South Slavs who use the title of ban. But what is this for? The word ban has nothing to do with the word pan, even the Slavonian philologists do not believe that this word is of Slavic origin, but Avarian – and that it had been domesticated in the south, especially the south of Hungary [...] (gives examples) [...] It is probable that the word was introduced to the Croats through the Hungarian administration and then in Bosnia. Subsequent volumes of the Priest Dukljanin do not have great significance. Ban Boris was called the exarch by the contemporary Greeks and it is very doubtful that any of the bans of Vrhbosnia actually used the title of ban, although all the historians of Bosnia, even the new ones, list a whole series of bans and their history.

1016

Such histories of ban Želimir, Krešimir, Legat and Vukmir are only based on the fables of the Priest Dukljanin, which were expanded by the Dubrovian Orbini and others in their own fantasies. All these works have no historical value and no historical proof can be found that those bans from the fables really existed" (p. 207).

Gyula Pauler, another Hungarian historian, wrote in 1894 that: "there was an idea that from the fact that only Priest Dukljanin, and no one else, gave a list of the Bosnian bans, we can conclude that Bosnia once belonged to Croatia, because the name and the title of ban was allegedly known only to the Croats. It is not impossible and is even probable that, at certain times, the power of the Croatian rulers extended to some of the most important parts of Bosnia [...] However, from that we cannot find any sustainable cause to consider that the Banate of Bosnia (certain state institution of the whole of Bosnia) was a Croatian institution for this reason alone. Dukljanin only used the word ban as a denomination for herzog – commander – and this is why he wrote about a certain Ban Base. At that time, the Hungarians adapted this name and applied it to regions that had never had any connection with Croatia - Mačva, Braničevo and Severin. Anyway, whatever the relation between Croatia and Bosnia had once been, at the end of the 11th century Bosnia belonged to the Bodin's state – here Dukljanin is much more reliable – and Bodin was a Serbian king of the coastal area. Subsequent to his death, his state collapsed" (p. 107-208). Kostić then presents a series of information about the Serbian use of the word ban, referencing the works of Šafárik, Jorga, Šišić and the Serbian folk poems.

In addition, Lazo Kostić refutes another Croatian thesis they use to put forward their claims on Bosnia – the fact that Livno is now in Bosnia and Herzegovina, while in ancient times, it used to be an old Croatian capital. "The essence of the new Croatian thesis is as follows: If a certain region contains an old capital of a 'nation', it automatically means that the whole region belongs to that nation, regardless of how and why it was marked as such. Consequently, since Pressburg (today's Bratislava) is in Slovakia and Pressburg was the capital of Hungary for two centuries, the whole of Hungary should therefore become a part of Slovakia. Similarly, since Skadar was the capital of Zeta – i.e. Montenegro – that means that the whole of Montenegro should become a part of Albania, because Skadar is today situated in Albania" (p. 210). We would like to make a small inversion here, which was missed by Kostić. Logically, the parallels here should be made differently in order to make this argumentation complementary to the case of Livno. In the first version, Slovakia would become a part of Hungary and, in the second, Albania should become a part of Montenegro. Furthermore, Kostić draws a conclusion that "such things could be said about all of Europe. The capitals and the borders have changed everywhere. And never before, since the beginning of history, has had anyone thought of making such 'argumentation'. Prominent and dignified scientists would most certainly feel disgusted. But the Croats think that nothing is off limits for them. However, I do not know whether Livno was a Croatian capital at all, because it is Croatian 'history' and that history has been

1017

manipulated. But, even if we imagine that it was, that situation lasted just for a short time and Livno was not the only capital of Croatia. Finally, it could only have been capital of the regions to the west of the city itself, because the Serbian ethnic territory begins to the east of Livno [...] It is understandable that the Turkish administration did not care about the ethnic borders and the Croatian part of Bosnia was so small that it could not have been made a vilayet and was thus connected with Bosnia – with Serbian Bosnia” (p. 210-211).

The Croats published hundreds of fake publications in order to persuade the whole world that their pretensions were justified, but Stojan Novaković refuted all their claims with a humorous ruse, saying that if the theory of the historical rights would be relevant, then the most impressive rights to Bosnia and Herzegovina would then belong to the Turks, because their rule over Bosnia was the longest. The historian Ljubomir Jovanović refuted the Croatian concept of the state rights in 1899 in the following words: “When some Croatian and the Habsburg rights to Bosnia (and also Herzegovina) are mentioned today, what can that mean essentially? Does the fact that they claim that they ruled Bosnia once (even if that really happened, and we are certain that they never did) have any practical value today, or any consequences? Is Bosnia a thing that someone can have rights to? That ‘right’ means: that someone can proclaim Bosnia and Herzegovina to be their property and have some territorial claims over her, and that the people of Zagreb, Križevac and Varaždin have some rights to rule over the people of Mostar, Sarajevo or Tuzla, even though they have never had anything to do with them! What are these Bosnians and Herzegovinians and how can anyone have the right to rule them? Aren’t they human beings, or can a man have the right to govern another man?” (p. 217-218).

The Croats are not interested in the fact that all historical documents and the cultural artefacts of Bosnia and Herzegovina are undoubtedly Serbian, or the fact that the Serbs live there as a convincing majority. With their torrent of lies and prejudices, they even try to artificially transform and overcome the present situation in accordance with their political aspirations. Jovanović observed that: “it is certain fact that a great portion of the Croatian literature and a certain part of their science (namely national history), is based on a fake foundation and their starting point is full of false assumptions. The creation of false projections of the permanent magnificence and power of Croatia, humiliating ‘someone else’s’ past and presenting a projection of a large number of lands with spacious territories (especially Serbian) as purely Croatian – that is the main goal of Croatian literature” (p. 220). In the competition for achievements in the field of fantasy, attractive colouring and intriguing plots, Tadija Smičiklas, Vjekoslav Klaić, Ivo Pilar, Dominik Mandić and others try to surpass each other. The less proof they have, the bigger their pretension and romantic fervour.

When Ferdo Šišić presented his thesis of the Croatian historical rights to Bosnia and Herzegovina in his lecture in Ljubljana in 1909, the Belgrade university professor, Stanoje Stanojević reacted in a letter that Kostić partially cites here, taken from a German translation, which was

the only available copy. Stanojević addressed Šišić as follows: “When I read your book in which you request that B&H should be a part of Croatia, based on Croatian historical rights, I remembered a very significant and edifying episode from ancient history. Once when the Gauls attacked Rome, the Romans were unable to understand how the Gauls dared attack Rome when they did not have any legal base for it – and the Romans were really skilled in law. The delegate sent by the Roman people and the Senate asked the Gaulish commander with pathos: ‘What gives you the right to attack Rome?’ And the Gaulish commander replied: ‘That right is on the tips of our swords.’ The same answer will be given to the Croats by the Serbs on the day the great struggle for Bosnia and Herzegovina starts. Our right is our national strength. The right of our national force and our bayonets shall be more powerful and more important than your right, which can be measured on a scale. You, the Croats, will barely understand that struggle – the right of a whole nation to fight for its existence because one hundred years have passed since you forgot how it is to die in defence of your country, and have been defending your rights with just words and speeches. A nation that, as you say yourself, ‘chose the Hungarian King to be their king of its own free will’, cannot understand the great national struggle for existence. The struggle of the Serbian people in B&H is a great national battle. You and your masters should not deceive yourselves. When the Serbian people and the Serbian army enter that holy war, we shall not enter that slaughter to conquer lands and defend some rights. No, we go to battle to defend our lives. Because, without Bosnia and Herzegovina, there is no life for Serbia and Montenegro. Bosnia and Herzegovina are to the Serbian people – and you and your masters should remember this – the same as Serbia or Montenegro” (p. 224-225).

After he brilliantly exposed all the Croatian pseudo-historical forgeries and reduced their historical facts to their real measure, based on the valid evidence, the Russian historian Maikov emphasised that “to rule a small portion of a whole country for some time still does not create historical rights and cannot be the motive for eternal aspirations, despite all other necessary conditions – among which the ethnicity and the inclinations of the local population hold first place. Because, on the contrary, pretension based on bare titles would lead to the situation that the throne of the apostle of the Habsburg Monarchy, which carries the title of the Kingdom of Jerusalem among other titles, could offer the Habsburgs an opportunity to claim its pretensions to Jerusalem [...] For Bosnia, it is positively certain that, only after the election of Coloman, the Serbian King Uroš Beli ceded Bosnia to his grandson Ladislaus in 1120 and, since that time, the Hungarian kings have adorned their royal titles with the names of Rome and Bosnia. And, accordingly, when the Croats gave Zvonimir's crown to Coloman, Bosnia was under Serbian rule and it was ceded to the Hungarian kings and remained under their sovereignty for a short time. However, according to the testimony of John Kinnamos, it had enjoyed certain autonomy. During the reign of the Nemanjić dynasty, Zahumlje and Bosnia had been under the rule of the

Serbian kings or the Hungarian kings alternately, until the reign of Dušan the Mighty, who annexed Bosnia to his empire; however, Bosnia and Herzegovina had always been under the rule of their own princes, bans and their vassal positions, which sometimes passed into total independence, so the Hungarian kings did not add them as their official titles. In the 13th century, Zahumlje or Hum was found in both the Serbian and the Hungarian titles at the same time. After the collapse of the Serbian empire, Bosnia and Zahumlje – i.e. a larger portion of today's Herzegovina – became an independent kingdom and a lot of the charters and the acts of the Bosnian kings prove that there was no trace of Hungarian supremacy at that time. Furthermore, in the 15th century, the word Croatia was a part of the titles of the Bosnian kings and the pope crowned the Bosnian King Stevan Tomašević with that title, without asking the Hungarian King, Matthias Corvinus of Hungary for permission. Consequently, if we should stick to the theories of the modern Croatian scientists, the situation would be the same as if we were trying to attach the Croatian Kingdom to today's Bosnia" (p. 232-233).

With respect to the disputes regarding the alleged Croatian state rights and territorial pretensions based on this, In his study *The Origin of Croatia*, published in *The Hungarian Review* in Leipzig in 1882, Imre Pesti concluded that: "These aspirations of Croatia must seem weird, even comical. The Croats ceased to be a nomadic tribe a long time ago, their number does not urge them to seek expansion, conquests are something that their nation has never achieved; Croatia is not spiritually and materially superior to their neighbouring nations [...] We do not get carried away with the law of the club and the conqueror's rights – but, undoubtedly, these are the rights that shall always play the decisive role in world history and this should also be taken into consideration when a unique phenomenon is observed – where the creation of the Great Croatia is concerned. The means to this end are simple: always and everywhere – always demand a lot, and demand arrogantly and forcefully – your success shall be guaranteed because of the naivety of the enemy who will always yield to your demands. The people of Croatia today dispose of the land they cannot put up any historical claims for – we think of the whole zone between the Sava and the Drava rivers" (p. 242).

Pesti was completely convincing. If the theory of historical rights is valid and relevant, it is easy to prove that Croatia does not have the rights to Croatia and Slavonia, let alone the neighbouring countries. Where the Croatian national megalomania is concerned, he said: "It is indeed a strange phenomenon when a small nation that lacks almost all the prerequisites for statehood dares to be so extravagant [...] and asks for parts of the region according to their own will, in order to make an imaginary future empire" (p. 242). In his study *Aspirations of the Croats*, published in 1886, the same author emphasised: "If the Croats have a tendency to claim that the Croatian state spreads from the Adriatic Sea to Zemun, as they do these days, it would be nice if they would explain the following: how Croatia, which lost its independence

as a consequence of the *Pacta Conventa*, was able to become divided into two kingdoms subsequently – namely, Croatia and Slavonia, and what historical event lead to that" (p. 242-243). In accordance with logical analysis of the historical facts, Pesti concluded: "The history of the modern era proves that the Croats cannot achieve their goals using their own resources and power alone. And what Muškatović said in the Croatian Parliament on 4 May 1882 was right: Croatia rose from nothing, only thanks to the victory of the Hungarian historical right over absolutism" (p. 243).

However, it was not only the Croats who placed their hopes in the principles of historical rights, it was also the Hungarians. Sometimes even more so than the Croats. Where the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina was concerned, they also expressed their pretensions to that territory, either directly or indirectly through the alleged Croatian state rights. In 1923, Stefan Burijan wrote that: "Croatia made her request to annex B&H. Hungary considered these two countries to belong to the territory of the Crown of Saint Stephen and vindicated for their incorporation the same legal entitlement for joining with Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia. For Hungary, the only issue was whether personal union with the Kingdom of Hungary should be direct or through Croatia. In the Hungarian governmental circles, direct union was favoured, with recognition of autonomy" (p. 254).

It is important to emphasise the statements of the French political theoretician August Gauvin, who published a large number of his writings of the previous years in his book *The Annexation Crisis in Bosnia 1908-1909*, printed in Paris in 1917 where he particularly emphasised the dangers of uncritical approach to the principles of the historical rights. It is especially interesting that Gauvin pointed out that, if such theory was found acceptable, the Serbs would have an undisputable advantage, because their historical argumentation is by far more documented and more solid than the Croatian and Hungarian. "That would be a dangerous theory. If each country wanted to take back the lands that had belonged to her some time in history, what would happen to peace in the world? But, even in that respect, the Serbs have a nice role. They ruled Bosnia historically. But they have the other argument that the Bosnians are Serbs according to their language and traditions and that they have never expressed their wish to return to the rule of the heirs of Saint Stephen" (p. 259).

There is no data from the ancient history of Bosnia, when the Serbs first settled there. The first data the researchers found treat Bosnia as an integral part of Serbia from the time of Časlav and Bodin. Furthermore, Maikov said: "Bosnia was once a Serbian župa, under the complete controls of Serbia proper. Bosnia spread between the Sava, the Drina, the Neretva and the Vrbas" (p. 260). Derzhavin wrote of the time before Časlav: "Vlastimir (836-843) made the first attempt to unite the Serbian lands through conquest, as history recorded, and this conquest gave him the base necessary to consolidate his economic powers. Except for Raska, Old Serbia and Bosnia, Vlastimir's domains encompassed the territory that spread to the northwest, to the right banks of the tributaries

of the Sava – the Bosnia and the Vrbas - and, apart from Old Serbia, encompassed the territory of eastern Bosnia. Consequently, this was the beginning of the Serbian statehood” (p. 260-261).

In his doctoral theses, defended at the University of Berlin in the mid-19th-century, the subsequently prominent historian Herman Leopold Kraus wrote about the events of around 837: “The Serbs held only the southern part of Dalmatia and, from there, they spread to Bosnia, to the Danube and the Sava, defeating the Bulgarians in the second half of the 9th century [...] Serbia was distant from the Frankish borders but, when she occupied Bosnia, she came close to those borders” (261). Working on the historical period before Časlav and Bodin, the Hungarian historian Ferenc Komlósi mentioned Svetomir and his son Budimir as the first princes of Serbia and Dalmatia. “He deemed that he was not able to rule his spacious state on his own, so he divided the western part into two provinces. The part furthest west from the river Drina, which spread to the hill of Pan (Pine Woods) he called Bosnia. He called the south-eastern part of the state Raška. Many bans and župans were appointed to rule the provinces as governors” (p. 261).

On the eve of WWII, the Croatian historian Milan Prelog published the book *The History of Bosnia from the Ancient Times to the Collapse of the Fall of the Kingdom* in Sarajevo, in which he wrote: “Of the history of this area, starting from the settlement of the Slavs until the 10th century, we know nothing for certain [...] While the tribal Croatian and Serbian states were established in the neighbourhood, this region lived in the Slavic patriarchal way. Since at that time Raša(Serbia) under the rule of Prince Časlav, started rising and recovering from the heavy blows delivered by Simeon, the Emperor of Bulgaria, Časlav joined this territory to his state [...] During the second half of 10th century, Bosnia cast off Serbian rule after the collapse of Časlav’s state, but fell under the Byzantine rule soon afterwards [...] At the end of the 11th century, during the rule of Mihailo’s son Bodin, Bosnia became a part of the Kingdom of Duklja and stayed in his hand until Bodin’s death. Before that, the rulers of Duklja had taken over the rule of Zahumlje and Travunia. From these regions, Herzegovina subsequently developed” (p. 261-262). Tadija Smičiklas also agrees that, during Časlav’s time, Bosnia was Serbian. Furthermore, according to von Thallóczy, Časlav liberated Serbia from Bulgarian rule and lead her to the suzerainty of Byzantium. He is considered the undisputed ruler of Bosnia.

Vladimir Ćorović points out that Časlav “managed to unite the whole of today’s Bosnia as far as the Pliva river, Lijevno and Cetinje under his rule; the eastern borders of his state were as far as Ras, the northern as far as Rudnik and the Sava and the southern as far as the Adriatic Sea” (p. 262). Mihailo Đinić makes a competent scientific judgment of Časlav: “Undoubtedly, Časlav was the most significant ruler of the first Serbian dynasty. Aside for Serbia, he ruled the area around Tuzla (Constantine Porphyrogenetus’s Salines) and the whole of Bosnia and Travunia of that time were under his rule as well” (p. 262-263). The next unification of the Serbian lands, including Bosnia, took place under

Bodin – Derzhavin wrote about that, as did Franjo Rački, Ivan Božić, etc [...] Rački undoubtedly designated Bosnia as an old Serbian župa. From Bodin’s death until Stefan Nemanja, the Serbian lands were in territorial chaos. Nemanja reintegrated the state again and the Bosnian Ban Kulin recognized the Stefan Nemanja’s overlordship. During the subsequent rulers from the Nemanjić dynasty, Bosnia became more and more independent but within a territory much smaller in size: However, Bosnia has never renounced her Serbian ethnic character and the best testimony to that is the coronation of Tvrtko as the King of Serbia on the grave of Saint Sava. The foreign medieval history sources testify about the Serbian King Tvrtko. Furthermore, Tvrtko’s heirs, Kings Stefan Dabiša and Ostoja, were crowned in Mileševa as the kings of the Serbs, Bosnia and the coastal region. In the first place, the most important crown dependency is Serbia. Tvrtko II, Stefan Tomaš and Stefan Tomašević, the last King of Bosnia, kept these titles. The royal title of Stefan Tomašević was: “King of the Serbs, Bosnia, the coastal region, Hum, Dalmatia, the Croats, the Lower Parts, the Western Parts, Usorje, Soča and Podrinje” (p. 270).

When, the Serbian Tsar Uroš Nemanjić died, many of the nobles were pretenders to the empty imperial throne but, as Sima Ćirković pointed out, contrary to all the other pretenders, the Ban of Bosnia had more prerequisites necessary to re-establish the Serbian monarchy. First of all, he was undoubtedly, though indirectly, related to the Nemanjić “holy dynasty”, which acquired its holy aureole thanks to its relation with the church. His Nemanjić ancestry – his great-great grandfather through the female line was King Dragutin Nemanjić – was recorded in one of the genealogies of the Nemanjić dynasty [...] He observed that the Serbian state was left without ‘its shepherd’ and, wanting to consolidate the throne of his ancestors, Ban Tvrtko felt invited to come to the Serbian land to be crowned there. The coronation was performed in the autumn, most probably on Saint Dimitrios’ Day (26th October) 1377 in the ‘Serbian land’, most likely in the Mileševa Monastery, where the cult of Saint Sava, the founder of the Serbian independent church, was the strongest [...] In addition to taking the royal crown, Tvrtko also took the name of Stefan, which was a state symbol in Serbia. That name was adopted by all the subsequent Bosnian kings in their official acts [...] On some occasions, Tvrtko pushed his real name into the background, using only the name Stefan. – Tvrtko did not simply change his rank and start using the royal name instead of the name of ban, he acted as the ruler of Serbia [...] The neighbouring countries all recognized Tvrtko’s royal title. Venice referred to Tvrtko as *Rex Rascie* (Translator’s note: King of Raška), as well as Dubrovnik [...] We can see from the Dubrovian correspondence of that time [...] that Hungarian King Ludwig agreed to Tvrtko’s coronation as the Serbian king [...] Tvrtko strove to appear as the successor to his ancestors’ rights in Dubrovnik, his ancestor being the ‘Serbian lords’. Not long after his coronation, he issued a charter in Dubrovnik, by which he confirmed all the previous contracts of the Serbian and Bosnian rules and transferred the ‘Serbia’ or the ‘St. Dimitry’s Day’ revenue to himself. That revenue, amounting to two

thousand perpers, had been paid to the Serbian rulers from the 13th century” (p. 271).

Croatian scientists of different ideological orientations wrote about Tvrtko as a Serbian king - Milan Proleg, Ivo Pilar, Grgo Novak, the half-Croat Vladimir Dvorniković, etc, as well as Konstantin von Höfler, who deemed that the whole of Bosnia and her population were unreservedly Serbian. Other German scientists, like Vladimir Milkovitz and Aleksandar Sane are in total agreement on this matter. Sane wrote in 1921 that: “Tvrtko was aware of the real danger in the progress of the Turkish hordes. In order to be able to face them with a matching force, he wanted to establish the Great Serbian Empire for the second time” (p. 274). Maikov added here that the Tvrtko’s alleged family relations with the Nemanjić family was just a convenient excuse for emphasising the Serbian ethnic character of his state. Where Herzegovina is concerned, according to considerable historical information, she was more deeply and more completely integrated into the parent state. The name of Herzegovina dates back to 1448, when Stefan Vukčić Kosača proclaimed himself as the Herzog of Saint Sava. Ioannes Lucius determined that Rasto Nemanjić ruled Zahumlje on behalf of his father before he became a monk, and that fact motivated Kosača determine the title of herzog.

5. The Serbian Treatment of Bosnia

The political-historical study *How did the Serbs feel about Bosnia* is the fifth book of Kostić’s cycle *The National Problems of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, which Kostić published himself in Toronto in 1965 – and in an edited and supplemented version in Munich in 1975. In this study, Kostić presented the attitudes and dispositions of the Serbs as a whole, and that of distinguished individuals, paying special attention to their sentimental significance and their role in shaping the complete Serbian national consciousness. In the preface to the first edition, he defined his main motivation as follows: “If we want to be nationally faithful to our ancestors, we need to think and feel the same or at least approximately the same as they did. Otherwise, the connections between our nationality and their nationality would disappear. Not to mention the ideals that give wings and inspiration to nationalism, without which it would become apathetic and stagnate” (p. 4).

Kostić starts his presentation of the attitudes of the Serbian historians toward Bosnia and Herzegovina with a detailed review of the statements of Stojan Novaković. The most striking of these, in our opinion, was his statement from 1911, when Novaković said: “It is a well known fact that Serbian politics has always had the unification with Bosnia as its ultimate goal, ever since the beginning of the independent existence of Serbia. This goal coincides with the national feelings. The politics of Ilija Garašanin, under Prince Aleksandar Karadordević, had always been directed at unification with Bosnia and Herzegovina and Old Serbia. The same statesman led the foreign affairs of Serbia under Prince Mihailo Obrenović in the same direction. His experience and his considerable authority with respect to these matters put him above the

IT-03-67-T
dynastic disputes. Already at the time of the Serbian-Turkish War of 1876, he asked the Porte to entrust the administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which were Turkish vassal territories, to Serbia in order to avoid the imminent war. This was one of the most significant reasons for the interruption of diplomatic relations between Serbia and Turkey. It was clear that the union of Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina under Serbian rule would represent a decisive step toward realising the unity of the Serbian people. Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, united in one state, would truly be a nucleus that would secure the political future of Serbdom” (p. 16). According to the testimony of Slobodan Jovanović, which was published in his *Personal Memories*, Stojan Novaković used the following words to express his sadness and resignation at the Austrian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina: “All is lost, at least for me and the people of my age, from the time of Prince Mihailo. The Serbia we had dreamt of – Serbia united with Bosnia and Herzegovina, her own master in the Balkans – that Serbia is not impossible now. Probably you, the younger people, will manage to find a new direction and a new ideal. We are too old to cherish new hopes and we must go to our grave with an aching hole in our hearts” (p. 17).

The academician, Ljubomir Jovanović, who was also the Speaker for the National Assembly, made a speech in the Assembly where he emphasised the following: “The national rights of the Serbian people are endangered now. Brothers, we know who resides in Bosnia and what national rights such people have. There is no other nation that has ever lived in Bosnia apart from the Serbs. The people who had lived there before the Serbs in almost prehistoric times have disappeared from the face of the Earth. The Serbs lived there before the Hungarians even came to their present fatherland. The Serbs had been there before Charlemagne’s state appeared and, therefore, long before the states originating from Charlemagne’s state emerged” (p. 18).

Miodrag Purković pointed out in 1955 in the emigrant magazine *Brotherhood*, published in Canada: “We should never forget that, through the entire 19th century, the wish of Serbia was to liberate Bosnia and Herzegovina and unite them with Serbia. All of us need to know and say that the same nation lives on both sides of the Drina River [...] If we know all this, our duty is to inform others of that fact. It is our sacred duty to say, loudly and clearly, that these areas where the Serbs live are undisputable and that their place is in the Serbian territorial unit, because they have their historical and ethnical deeds. The Serbs have to stand together and defend their endangered rights and to realize that a blow on their brother’s head is the same as a blow on their own one. The Serbs can have their differences regarding the economic and social structure of their country, but they must have in common the supreme interests that would transcend party and program differences. The Serbs who live outside the endangered territories should feel that parts of their own bodies are being torn apart and should unite in defence of what the enemy seeks to grab” (p. 22-23).

In the anthology *Political and Legal Dissertations*, Slobodan Jovanović said that “we should bear in mind without a doubt that the

part of the Serbian land spreading between the Vrbas and the Kolubara, represents the core of the Serbian people and that, approximately, the foundations of the first larger political organisation of the Serbian people were laid there under Časlav Klonimirović” (p. 23). Historian and politician Živan Živanović printed the book *The Mission of Serbia and our Political Delusions and Duties* in Belgrade in 1894, where he stated: “The unification of the Serbian tribe is the golden dream of each Serb – the ultimate goal of contemporary Serbia. All other goals are less important [...] In her contemporary borders, Serbia is just a bud waiting to blossom into a complete Serbian state [...] Serbia is a beginner, she is in the era of progress and development; Serbia has yet to become what she should be – great, united [...] We are looking for the means that can unite the physically divided nation. The feelings of togetherness, blood relation and brotherly love and devotion are the means that can keep a nation united and maintain their spiritual unity, despite all obstacles, and the political union will not lack. The effect of these attractive powers is irresistible” (p. 25).

In the *Serbian Literary Gazette* of Herzegovina, Jovan Skerlić wrote in 1908: “The proud province where the nucleus of the complete Serbian nation is situated, the land of robust people with strong feelings, where our best national songs and poems were born, that province was the nursery of the Serbian race, from which we were all transplanted to our northern and eastern regions” (p. 30). In 1914, Skerlić wrote of the famous Serbian poet Osman Cikić that: “He was addressing the Muslims, convincing them that their real and direct interest was not in separation from their Orthodox brothers but in drawing closer to them [...] Cikić was a real Serb. He was born in Herzegovina, the cradle of the Serbian nation. Since childhood, he had considered himself to be a Serb and he lived all his life as one [...] Unfortunately, he died before he reached old age, but his ideas have remained. His ideas are the only thing that could motivate the Muslims and lead them toward a better future and progress” (p. 31).

In his lecture, organised by the Association of the Slavic Cooperation in Saint Petersburg in 1909, Dušan Vasiljević reported that Bosnia and Herzegovina were “the two purest Serbian lands with respect to race and language. The people of these lands, despite the fact that it is divided into three religions, have preserved the purity of the language and the feeling of a community in which the Orthodox Serbs constitute an absolute majority of the population. The national awareness – as admitted even in the report of the government of Bosnia and Herzegovina – is the most developed of the Orthodox Serbs. I dare say that the Serbian national idea is completely crystallised in all strata of society. That idea is based on tradition – on the poems and songs and the tales of the Serbian kings, tsars and dukes, especially from the time of the Battle of Kosovo – sodden with recent memories of suffering and battles fought together with their brothers from Serbia and Montenegro” (p. 34). Wholeheartedly supporting the unification of Bosnia and Herzegovina with Serbia, Nikola Stojanović published the book *Bosnia and Herzegovina* in 1917 in Geneva, where he reminded, among other

things, of the Serbs who were the adherents of Islam “who were the first to proclaim their independence (1831), under Husein-bey Gradašević, throwing out the Turks and joining the other insurgents in Kosovo, where they defeated the Turkish forces in a historic battle” (p. 35).

The great Serbian national warrior Stevan Moljević pointed out that “the inclination of the Serbs from Bosnia and Herzegovina toward Serbia is not the result of the acts of the Serbian government or of official Serbia, but of a natural aspiration of the Serbian people who were conscious and eager to live together and die together with the Serbs from Serbia, and that the people felt that, after the battles of Kumanovo, Bitolj and Bregalnica, the time was right to realise these aspirations [...] The entire nation, all people were filled with the same feeling and the same hope” (p. 36). From the beginning of the Serbian revolution, the Serbian political leaders have considered the Bosnian question to be the key question in the war for liberation of the Serbian people and building the modern Serbian state. Karadorde wrote to the Montenegrin Metropolitan Petar I in 1807 that he “will support our brothers in Bosnia and Herzegovina, because they have risen in arms against the Turks and, naturally, expect help and support from Serbia. I have already sent several detachments to Bosnia” (p. 39). The French diplomat, Boa le Conte reported in 1834 that the main goal of Miloš Obrenović was the restoration of the Serbian Empire, “or, in other words, to unite all three provinces: Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, into a single state. The inhabitants of these three provinces are of the same origin; they speak the same language and have been sharing the same destiny for a long time. In this, as well as in other matters, Prince Milos does not follow his personal feelings alone; he identifies himself intimately with his people, he shares all their ideas, prejudices and aspirations, which make him well liked in his country” (p. 41). Prince Petar Karadordeć personally participated in the Bosnian Uprising, under a false name.

In his foreign policy programme document, known as the *Načertanije* (Translator’s note: Draft), Ilija Garašanin points out that “the cornerstone of the Serbian politics is that it does not confine itself to the present Serbian borders, but strives to embrace all the Serbian people that surround it [...] We should inform ourselves about Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and North Albania, in particular.” That document was written in 1844. Hamdija Kapidžić, a professor of the University of Sarajevo, wrote in 1953 that: “The policies of the Serbian government toward Bosnia were not always the same and were related to its general attitude towards Turkey and the other Balkan states. Since Ilija Garašanin, who carried out the special policy toward Bosnia, reflected in his famous work *Draft*, Serbia had been working on the liberation of B&H. During the reign of Prince Mihailo, that policy become even more intensive and was a part of the Balkan policy of the Serbian principedom. However, this policy did not lead to the war of national liberation, but satisfied itself with a diplomatic solution – receiving the towns in 1867. The Serbian youth was discontented with this policy, because they longed for the liberation of B&H through revolution. In order to restrain the Russian influence, the Austro-

Hungarian Monarchy went out of its way to keep Serbia friendly and, for some time, it drafted a plan for the joint occupation of B&H. The Austro-Hungarian Empire was to take the regions spreading to the Vrbas and Neretva, and the other parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina – Serbia. The Serbian bourgeoisie in Vojvodina were dissatisfied with such policy of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and Serbia toward Bosnia and it carried a different policy through the People's Party, which was lead by Dr. Svetozar Miletić, with another direct objective: to force Austro-Hungary to abandon their aspirations toward B&H and persuade the Serbian government of the need for a different, revolutionary policy toward B&H [...] Delaying the war with Turkey from one Đurdevdan (Translator's note: St. George's Day) to another did not satisfy the Serbian people in B&H or the Serbs in Vojvodina" (p. 45-46).

The Prussian lieutenant colonel Krenski reported to Berlin on the Serbian aspiration to annex Bosnia and the Prussian Consul Gosen testified that Regent Blaznavac told him that "the arrondation of Serbia with Bosnia is a vital condition for Serbia and Serbia would unite with anybody who would fulfil that vital condition" (p. 47). In his writings on Mihailo's Bosnian and Herzegovinian liberation priorities, Émile Haumant pointed out that: "There are but a few Serbian families that do not have ancestors from Bosnia and Herzegovina; in Karadorde's proclamations 'the cold Drina' was the holy river of Serbia [...] There is hope that Prince Mihailo would turn to that side before any other, but it all depends on the disposition of the European countries and the methods they impose on him" (p. 47).

Although Prince Mihailo hesitated for a long time, Serbia and Montenegro entered into war with Turkey in 1876, trying to help the Serbian insurgents in Bosnian and Herzegovina. Subsequently, the National Assembly addressed a formal petition to Prince Milan, where they stated, among other things: "Serbia wages this war to liberate Bosnia. Bosnia and Herzegovina are the two Serbian provinces where the Serbian national awareness is the most developed; they raised the standard of liberty many times and declared that they strive for the unification of Bosnia with Serbia and Herzegovina with Montenegro" (p. 49). Even after the annexation, and as an answer to Milan's condescension and constant Austro-Hungarian pressure, Jovan Ristić, the Prime Minister of Serbia, submitted his resignation because he was not ready to give up Bosnia. The new progressive government with Čeda Mijatović at its head – absolutely obedient to Milan – made a Secret Convention giving the Austrians a guarantee that Serbia would not interfere in the question of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Sanjak of Novi Pazar. The Radicals severely criticised this degrading policy in their gazette *Self-Governance*. King Milan has been and remains the only Serb ready to give up Bosnia.

In 1908, in the heat of the annexation crisis, the leading magazine in Vienna, *The Austrian Review*, reported that the Serbian heir to the throne, Đorđe, "has stated many times that he will not rest until the Serbian lands, Bosnia and Herzegovina become the crown territories of Serbia, to which they legally belong" (p. 56). One of the greatest Radical Party

leaders, Milovan Milovanović, published his study *The Serbs and the Croats* in the Radical Party magazine *Action* in 1895, in which he ridiculed the Croatian aspirations, nonsense and abjectness, saying: "Openly and without inhibition we can declare that it has never occurred to us, the Serbs, that we would need to prove even the fact that B&H are Serbian lands. For us, the Serbs, this is one of those truths that are self-evident and accepted as true without proof, because they are so clear that they glare. To prove that B&H are Serbian! Why don't we ask for evidence that we, the Serbs of Šumadija are Serbs, or that the Bavarians or the inhabitants of Baden-Württemberg are Germans or that the Parisians or the inhabitants of Orleans are French. Wasn't it that in B&H, more so than in any other Serbian land, that the vivid memories of the Serbian past, as the past of the whole of B&H, were preserved in folk traditions and folk literature. In B&H the people honour Saint Sava, praise Nemanja, the mighty Tsar Stefan (Dušan) and his weak son Uroš, admire Marko Kraljević and the heroes of the Battle of Kosovo – curses the killer Vukašin and the traitor Vuk Branković, sings with the *gusle* about the magnificent epic myth of Kosovo – just as is done in today's Kingdom of Serbia. And that history, preserved in the folk traditions is worth more than the history obtained from charters and chronicles, even those that are absolutely authentic, when it comes to the determination of the ethnic communities. Furthermore, the historical monuments clearly testify, independently from the folk traditions, that B&H have always been Serbian lands save for a small north-western part of Bosnia [...] The Croatian pretensions to these two Serbian provinces [...] are related to an alien government, they base their hopes on alien forces. Also, the two provinces would have to renounce their Serbian ethnicity and the Bosnian and Herzegovinian people would be deprived of their freedom and the right of self-determination" (p. 59-60).

Božidar Purić published his study *The National Policy of Nikola Pašić* in the Chicago *Liberty* in several instalments in 1955 and 1956, and Kostić pays special attention to the fragment relating to the decisive events of the winter of 1917-1918, when peace between the great powers was possible after Russia had been broken by the Bolshevik revolution: "Facing the cold reality, and being aware of our painful and bloody experience with the great powers, Pašić had to try to save at least something. He sent strictly confidential directions to the embassies in Washington, London and Paris to take steps and find out whether Serbia could at least get Bosnia and Herzegovina. It was because of them that the war had started in the first place. "If the allies worry about the violation of Belgian neutrality and the injustice inflicted on France in 1871, then they have even more reason to decide on the violation of the Treaty of Berlin by the proclamation of the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and settle that injustice by allowing the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina to declare whether they want to stay under Austrian rule or unite with Serbia." Furthermore, he added: "From different sides and with such conversations, try to persuade the government of the USA to ask at least for the reparation of the violation of the Treaty of Berlin, where they found fitting to restrain the Habsburg Monarchy, which has

always been the source of the European wars and the vanguard of the recent German encroachment into the east.” And, knowing the alarm the Yugoslav Committee, already at war with Pašić, would raise: “Proceed secretly, because our brothers may become angry when they find out that Bosnia and Herzegovina can be liberated and that they have to stay under Austrian rule. They insist on that request: they want all or nothing. They do not act like a good father who, knowing that he cannot liberate all his children, liberates as many as he can and, where others are concerned, waits for a suitable time to liberate them as well. “If they suffer, they want others to suffer and share the burden of slavery.” In this difficult moment of war, Pašić was, first and foremost, the Prime Minister – the President of the Government of the Kingdom of Serbia – and, after that, somewhere in his shadow, a national revolutionary against Austria. He brought this duality to balance in accordance with the international opportunities. He did not change his politics or his goals, but stretched the bow of his actions according to them. This time, his stretch was at its minimum [...] Ljuba Mihailović, the first Serbian ambassador in Washington, considered that it was his duty as a Yugoslav to refuse to execute Pašić’s orders [...] He revealed Pašić’s confidential instructions, directly or indirectly, to the Yugoslav Committee and, through them, to the allies’ intelligence services. The Yugoslav Committee later used this as a pretext to accuse Pašić before the foreign countries of being a traitor to Yugoslav thought and a Great Serbia adherent whose only intention was to create the Great Serbia by taking Bosnia and Herzegovina” (p. 66-67).

Vladan Đorđević and Stojan Protić also wholeheartedly defended the Serbian national rights with respect to the question of the Austrian occupation and the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the book *The Serbian Question*, published in 1909, Đorđević asserted: “Bosnia and Herzegovina are Serbian lands, not only because of the national consciousness of her population, but according to God’s law and human rights” (p. 68). Protić concluded that, subsequent to the usurpation of other Serbian lands, above all Boka and Dalmatia, “Austria tries to definitely adjoin Bosnia and Herzegovina to its empire. We shouldn’t just shout, we should scream with rage” (p. 69). According to the statement of Joseph Redlich from his *Political Diary*, which was published in Graz and Köln in 1953, Laza Paču once told him: “My intention is not to talk about Bosnia now, I would only like to say now that the annexation was performed brutally and that the Serbs were deeply hurt. The people of Bosnia were thinking that Bosnia was as Serbian as Serbia herself and that it would belong to them. Furthermore: nobody consulted Serbia and the annexation (of Bosnia) was simply conducted without that” (p. 70).

Therefore, the war with Austro-Hungary was simply inevitable for the Serbs and, in the first days of war, Aleksandar, the Regent of Serbia publicly emphasised the importance of the liberation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and all the other European countries under Austrian slavery. At the beginning of WWI, the allies firmly promised Bosnia, Herzegovina and a significant part of the Adriatic Sea coastline in

Dalmatia to Serbia. The Russian minister Sezonov hinted that Serbia would be a few times bigger than before, when the war ends. In his book *Fragments for the History of Unification on the Occasion of the 40th Anniversary of the Establishment of the Yugoslav Committee*, which was printed in Zagreb in 1956, the Croatian historian Ante Mandić stated that Sezonov announced to the special envoys of the Serbian government and the prominent Russophiles Ljubomir Stojanović and Aleksandar Belić on their arrival at Saint Petersburg in April 1915: “The Serbs, who showed such heroism that the whole world admires them, have no reasons to be pessimistic. Matters are not unfavourable for them. Serbian merits will be awarded a hundredfold. After the war, Serbia’s territory shall be many times larger than it is today. Well, has anyone ever doubted that Bosnia and Herzegovina are Serbian lands and that they form a whole with her? Montenegro has always been one with Serbia; therefore Montenegro will unite with Serbia when the war ends. ‘Serbia has asked for access to the sea; well, she shall have it in the wide stretch of the Adriatic Sea coastline in Dalmatia with the old town of Split! Serbia shall be able to develop with happiness and satisfaction’ (p. 72). The western allies confirmed all of this many times and, in addition, even guaranteed Slavonia to the Serbs.

In his memoirs *Diplomacy and the World War*, published in Berlin and Vienna in 1920, Guyla Andrassy, the former Foreign Affairs Minister, recollected: “We occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina in order to defend our access to the sea and the right to the old possession – Dalmatia – from the idea of the Great Serbia. The idea of Great Serbia was not the means of occupation, but occupation was a means against the idea of Great Serbia” (p. 85). In this part of the book, Kostić gives a multitude of various fragments and citations from the works of different authors who informed the European public of the Serbian preoccupation with the question of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the aspirations of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Serbs regarding rapid unification with their parent country. Božidar Purić gave the exact essence of the matter in the *Serbian Newspapers* in 1917: “The citizens and peasants (of B&H) were great nationalists and patriots in their own respective ways, and they believed in Serbia fanatically and with veneration. Especially the peasants. For them, Serbia was an embodiment of something safe and invincible, like Russia” (p. 126-127).

A German pre-war ambassador in London, Prince Karl Max Lichnowsky, wrote in 1929 of Young Bosnia and the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria: “The concept of Great Serbia, which gave direct momentum to the assassination and which was supposed to suffer a ‘deadly blow’, has its root in the national community of the inhabitants of Serbia, Montenegro and Bosnia [...] If the culture of a nation is progressive and if the education is developed, the national consciousness becomes more vivid and all of that strengthens the necessity of a common state with the same organisations and common development. Such a movement cannot suffer a ‘deadly blow’ and such development has to be taken into account” (p. 127). On the basis of a conversation with the Austrian General Šnjarić, Friedrich

von Viesner wrote of the strength of the idea of Great Serbia in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the movement of the Young Bosnians, the illusions of Yugoslavia were present – as the Chetnik Duke Dobroslav Jevđević wrote in his study *The Conspirators of Sarajevo, Vidovdan 1914*: “We shouldn’t be surprised at the idealistic dream of the Bosnian revolutionaries of brotherhood and living together with the Croatian and Slovenian people [...] Sobering up lasted for a long time and it is still in progress in some places, but the assassins of Sarajevo were cured of that right after the Croatian scoundrels started killing the Serbs, setting fire to their property and establishing the units of the Ustasha forerunners – the *Suckori* – throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina. Gavriilo Princip talked about the revision of his views on the unification with Croats during his trial” (p. 129).

In 1917 in Switzerland, the Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs printed the propaganda pamphlet in French entitled *The Serbian Conspiracy Against the Monarchy*, where they argued that “all the assassinations that had been carried out for several years in the lands to the south of the Monarchy had their roots in Serbia. They were the fruits of the Great Serbian propaganda, whose principle was that all means had to be used to reach their goal and triumph” (*Unification of Serbdom*) (p. 130). The idea of Great Serbia overturned two empires – Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman.

Kostić then presents the Montenegrin attitudes toward Bosnia and Herzegovina in detail, which are all identical with the Serbian, but their emotional charge is greater. Surely, apart from the declarations and act of Petar II, Prince Danilo and Marko Miljanov, the proclamation of Prince Nikola on the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina was the most striking: “Montenegrins! Today your sad sisters, Bosnia and Herzegovina, which had a glimpse of freedom thirty years ago, were totally completely wrenched from the Serbian embrace. The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy transferred the occupation of these two provinces into a final annexation. Against their will and without their assent, they dragged them into the alien flock. Between you and them, between Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina, obstacles have been raised with respect to the national and political separation. Montenegrins! Your most precious blood had been shed for the freedom of these provinces. In Herzegovina, thousand of graves remained, where the bones of your noble Montenegrin brothers had turned to dust. The alien boot will step on their graves and an alien hand will shake the hands of our Herzegovinian brothers, the very hands they used to offer to us with hope. Faced with such an evil destiny for a Serbian tribe, be brave, Montenegrin heroes, and know that my heart mourns the heart of Serbdom – Bosnia and Herzegovina. The red and black symbols all over the Serbian lands will not be a border that will separate you from your brothers in your thoughts and feelings. On the contrary, that symbol will always be a sign of injustice and it shall strengthen the ties and the pledge of faith that justice shall prevail. Montenegrins! Do not despair! Do not let your hope falter and be as strong as our rocks. Today’s undefined state of the free parts of the Serbian people will not last

forever. After these hard days, we shall have better times. The Serbian sun will shine even brighter to bring warmth and light to all our Serbian brothers” (p. 171). The German journalist Arthur Achleitner wrote in 1913 that: “It is self-evident that the aspirations of Montenegro relating to Great Serbia have brought her into collision with Austro-Hungary over the Serbian lands of Bosnia and Herzegovina” (p. 173).

Furthermore, all the Serbs who lived in various Austro-Hungarian territories were unambiguously and decisively in favour of the unification of Bosnia and Herzegovina with Serbia and Montenegro, although the annexation significantly improved their own position, thanks to a growth in the percentage of the Serbian ethnic mass. As Lazo Kostić observed, “The Serbs who lived on these territories did not care for their own personal or general interests, but had the common Serbian interests in mind and these interests required the unification of the liberated Serbian lands. This was the only way that they could expect the subsequent unification of the Serbian regions in the Austro-Hungary with the free Serbian lands. And that was the ultimate goal of each Serb” (p. 173). To corroborate this, Kostić gives examples from the texts of Sava Tekelića, Dositej Obradović, Jakša Ignjatović, Mihailo Polit-Desančić, Svetozar Miletić and the whole united Serbian youth.

Kostić then presents the reactions of the Serbs from Slavonia, Croatia and Dalmatia, Dubrovnik and Boka regarding the Bosnian question, of which the most impressive was *The First Epistle to the Dalmatian Youth* by the Dubrovian Catholic Serb Ljudevit Vuličević, who had been a Catholic friar when he was young and had got rid of the mantle when a bit older. Vuličević declaimed strongly, from his Serbian bosom, as reported in *The Flag* from Novi Sad in 1879: “Then came the Herzegovinian uprising and the war of the Serbian principedoms with the Turks and the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. These renowned events opened the eyes of the Dalmatians. We were able to see clearly who the Serbs were and who were the Croats; we realised where the spirit and power reside. In these events, Serbdom demonstrated its magnificence to us [...] The Dalmatians became closer to Bosnia and Herzegovina because their future was there and the Dalmatians had more contact with Bosnia and Herzegovina than with Croatia. Dalmatian Slavic families came to the coast of the Adriatic Sea from Bosnia and Herzegovina. There are no provinces that are so naturally united as Bosnia, Herzegovina and Dalmatia; these three provinces are like three sisters who cannot be separated without enormous effort. The nature, history, customs, language, inclinations and the very hope in our hearts fortify this without a doubt; the people of Dalmatia cannot resist that for long. The nature takes its toll; believe me, it will have its revenge on the people who hinder its natural course. Youth of Dalmatia, behold and see the nation dwelling in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Serbs live there. There the most important deeds of their history started, developed and were reaped and finished. Herzegovina is the Tuscany of our Serbian language; there lie the sources of the beauty, sweetness and grace of our Serbian language, which is more beautiful than many other languages. Who are we? And what should we be? If Dalmatia is the flowery coast

of the Serbian Bosnia and Herzegovina, we are Serbs, and even if we aren't, this is who we must be. In Bosnia, Herzegovina and even further, live our brothers, the valiant descendants of Obilić's spirit, which grew tired on Kosovo but did not die. I am aware of the fact that the old Croatian territory spread to the northern parts of today's Dalmatia and Primorje, between the Neretva and the Kupa, but in the arena of contemporary politics, this means almost nothing; a tiny part of the former Croatia naturally belongs to Bosnia and Herzegovina, the land where the Serbs, the Serbian force and the future of Serbian Dalmatia, live. Some put historical rights against our Serbian character, but political outcomes clearly prove that the weak protect themselves with historical rights – those that plead for life in death. Dalmatia deserves better luck and has to direct her movement toward a better future. So far, the Dalmatians have not been living in their true spirit because they were separated from the Serbian brothers and served alien lords [...] Our future lies in Serbdom. Let us awake, for we have lived under the foreign rule in our own country! Let us surrender to our true nature! If we work on our Serbian character, we shall work to our benefit and we shall eat of the fruit of our hands, not of alien leftovers. The Dalmatians cannot only be Slavs – they have to be Serbs, because Dalmatia is an important part of the Serbian Bosnia and Herzegovina; they find their life force, power and future in Serbdom. We were moved by Serbian suffering, we understood what the Serbian spirit stands for, our heart predicts our Serbian future. Youth of Dalmatia, stand tall, call out and proclaim yourselves to be the Serbian youth" (p. 192-193).

Kostić pays special attention to the fact that the fathers of the Serbian socialist movement, Svetozar Marković and Vasa Pelagić, were great supporters of the liberation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and its unification with Serbia. According to the specific information of Jovan Skerlić, Marković participated in conspiratorial activities that were supposed to lead to that end. Among other things, Vasa Pelagić addressed a manifesto to the Serbs in Turkey from Cetinje in 1871, which he ended with the following invitation: "Brothers, countrymen [...] unite as brothers with the Muslim Serbs and the Catholic Serbs, whoever has honest thoughts and breaths in the spirit of this century [...] Whoever has Serbian blood in his bosom and remembers the bitter wounds from Kosovo, whoever wishes luck and progress for himself and his generation, as well as glory and a better future, he should gather and encourage the people to be ready to stand selflessly under the holy banner when the sincere friends of the people and fatherland, freedom and progress call upon them with the cry: If you are a man, a Serb, take up your arms" (p. 199). Furthermore, Kostić mentions the engagement of Dimitrije Tucović, Triša Kaclerović, Jovan Skerlić, Dragisa Lapčević. Lazo Kostić finishes his book with a review of the poems of the Serbian poets, who wrote poems about Bosnia and Herzegovina, as real patriots. Among them, he mentions Stevan Kačanski, the "Serbian bard", who was born in Srbobran in Bačka - he established and published the newspaper *Great Serbia* in Belgrade and Kostić found some of the issues of the newspaper from 1888 in the Vatican library in Rome and cited

them.

Kostić adds a special paragraph where he demonstrates that even some Croats deemed and communicated to the public their standpoint that Bosnia and Herzegovina should belong to Serbia. First of all, that was Štrosmajer, Rački, Vatroslav Jagić, Lovro Monti, Franjo Supilo, etc. The data Lazo Kostić cites from the book of the Belgrade University Professor Grgur Jakšić entitled *From the Contemporary Serbian History* is incredibly interesting. The book speaks of friar Grga Škarić, head of the monastery of Široki Brijeg, which was established by the Association of the Roman Catholic Youth in Herzegovina, who wrote "a plan", in accordance with which they should have worked to "awaken the people from slavery to an alien and prepare for the universal unification of all Serbs and joining their brothers of the glorious Principedom of Serbia" (p. 233). Škarić's plan dates from 1869 and consists of twelve points. "In point three, he argued that it was necessary to awaken the spirit of the Serbian ethnicity and convince the Catholics "that freedom and independence can only be achieved by rooting out the mentioned hatred and by the unification of all the divided Serbian branches". In point five, he said that the people should be taught that all our ancestors had been Orthodox until the 14th century and that "until then we had been happy and had our own masters and rulers, and then the Franciscans came and divided the people into two fractions". In point seven, friar Grgo recommended that the people should be taught that the word Serb did not denominate a faith, but only one nation with the same language, ethnicity and customs – of the same fatherland, of the same freedom and independence and of the same rights. In point eight, he defended Serbia and said that the claims of the Catholic priests that Serbia wanted to convert the people to Orthodoxy were totally unfounded and that Serbia allowed everyone the freedom of consciousness and confession and that it only strove for our liberation from slavery, from violence against us and for the unification of the Serbian people – without that unification we could not escape from slavery. In point nine of the plan, he expressed his aspirations to awaken the sympathies with and the popularity of Serbia in the Catholics and, if possible, the Muslims [...]. In point ten, he proposed that people should swear allegiance to Serbia in case of the universal movement and that the Catholics from Herzegovina should be ready at any time to join their Serbian brothers in their struggle for the liberation of their people and fatherland" (p. 233-234).

6. The Serbian Character of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Cultural Heritage

His last book of the Bosnian cycle, the cultural and historical political study *Cultural Conditions in Bosnia and Herzegovina (The Serbian Share in the Cultural Heritage of B&H)* was published in 1971 in Switzerland and Lazo Kostić dedicated it to Jovan Dučić on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his birth. In Chapter one, Kostić discusses the alphabet as the fundamental means and basis of culture.

“Culture does not start with alphabet but only after the alphabet is used can it be known what culture consisted of. What was before the alphabet has mostly been lost and such items are beyond reconstruction or determination” (p. 17). The population of Bosnia had exclusively used the Cyrillic alphabet and it has always been designated as the Serbian alphabet. Other alphabets in Bosnia were ephemeral, sporadic and without permanent influence. Under the influence of the Dalmatian literacy in the western parts of Bosnia, the Glagolitic alphabet sometimes emerged. However, the first Serbian written artefacts were written in the Cyrillic alphabet and originated from these territories. Vladimir Corović wrote about this phenomenon: “It is interesting that the first artefacts of our literature come from the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Our two oldest inscriptions, both written in the Cyrillic alphabet, come from these territories. The first inscription is the one on the tombstone of Grdo, the Zhupan of Trebinje, now in the church in Poljice near Trebinje, written sometime around 1180, during the rule of Mihailo, the Grand Prince of Zeta, who was ousted by Nemanja. The second is the inscription of Ban Kulin, written at around 1185, found near Visoko and kept today in the Museum of Sarajevo” (p. 23).

The Communist authorities had been engaged in a crusade of suppressing the Serbian history of Bosnia and forging the inscriptions on historical artefacts. That campaign was led by the anti-Serbian ideologists Mak Dizdar and Pavao Anđelić. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, around fifty thousand medieval standing tombstones were found with epitaphs written in Cyrillic letters. Dizdar and Anđelić kept quiet about the Cyrillic inscriptions and Ciro Truhelka referred to the inscriptions as being written in *bosančica* (Translator’s note: Bosnian alphabet), although Benedikt Kurpesic referred to the the standing tombstones as Serbian monuments as early as 1930. Truhelka introduced the name *bosančica* in order to launch the falsehood that the inscription was made in Croatian more easily, although the great Croatian scientist Vatroslav Jagić wrote that the famous charter of Kulin Ban was written in the Cyrillic alphabet and the Serbian language. The developed calligraphy and orthography testify that the Cyrillic alphabet was improved long before Kulin’s time. Both Konstantin Jireček and Franc Miklošić confirm that the Charter of Kulin Ban is the first integral Serbian charter that has survived to this day. Miklošić printed about ten Bosnian ban charters in his *Serbian Artefacts* and they were all written in the Cyrillic alphabet. In addition, all the Orthodox and the Bogomil religious books were written exclusively in Cyrillic. The most beautiful manuscript of Serbian literature of all time, the *Miroslav’s Gospel*, originates from Zahumlje at the end of the 12th century.

The Cyrillic alphabet was dominant even during the Turkish occupation, although the Roman Catholic Church was striving to introduce the Latin alphabet among the Catholics, while the Turkish administration was trying to stimulate the use of the Arabic alphabet among the Muslims. That was a really difficult endeavour, because the Franciscan monks originally used Cyrillic. Even the Vatican did not have a problem with the Cyrillic alphabet, especially when it was able to

use it to proselytize. Kostić gives considerable proof that Catholic authors considered the Cyrillic alphabet to be the Serbian alphabet, as well as the language they used to write in. The Bosnian Franciscans abandoned the Cyrillic script as late as the second part of the 19th century. There was a similar situation with the Muslims of Bosnia, who had spoken in Serbian and written in the Cyrillic script for centuries and started using the Latin script, imitating Kemal Atatürk’s reforms in Turkey. Some evidence was preserved that some of the Turkish sultans, like Mohamed II and Bayezid, issued numerous charters written in Serbian. Vladimir Corović wrote that, at the time of Bayezid, “even the Turkish central and provincial authorities wrote in Serbian to their subjects in Bosnia, Herzegovina and Boka Kotorska, because the provincial authorities only spoke Serbian and used the Cyrillic alphabet. In 16th century, this tradition was still alive. In 1540, Husrev-bey, the founder of the city of Sarajevo, wrote to Croatian Ban P. Keklević in Serbian” (p. 56).

In the book *The Muslims Speaking the Serbo-Croatian Language*, published in Sarajevo in 1968, Salim Džerić pointed out the official introduction of the Arabic alphabet: “Where religious texts were concerned, the use of the Arabian language was compulsory and a modified Arabic alphabet adapted for the domestic language was also in use. The literature in the domestic language was written with the corresponding Arabian or Turkish letters. Since the authors of such literary works were religiously educated people, their works were mostly pervaded with religious topics” (p. 62-63). In an encyclopaedia article written around 1920, Osman Hadžić stated: “It is widely known that the Muslims from B&H started writing in the Arabic alphabet 150 years ago. The first books written in the Arabic alphabet were *Muminluci* by Omer effendi Hume of Stolac and *Mevlud*, a poem on the Muhammad’s birth by Salih effendi Gašević from Nikšić. Subsequently, *Mevlud* was printed in Arabic letters in Skopje, in the Turkish state printing shop for the Vilayet of Kosovo. Čaušević remodelled the Arabic alphabet and adapted it to our language and the Muslim joint stock printing shop then cast those letters, because, until then, only lithography had been used” (p. 63). Only forty books were printed in Bosnia and Herzegovina with Arabic lettering and this so called the *alhemjado* literature failed to produce literature with any serious literary value, and, in essence, it represents a literary-historical phenomenon.

Since they were unable to deny the existence of the Cyrillic alphabet, the Croats strove to usurp the artefacts written in those letters, referring to it as *bosančica* or as the Croatian alphabet. The contemporary Croatian forgers, such as Dominik Mandić, were compelled to invest considerable effort and strain to eliminate the multitudes of Serbian attributes present there since ancient times. In the text *Bosančica, the Bosnian-Croatian Cyrillic alphabet and the Dubrovians*, published in the magazine *The Bosnian Fairy* in 1904, the Dubrovian Catholic Petar Kolendić wrote: “It is a fact that the Muslims of Herzeg-Bosnia and the adherents of the Catholic Church used the cursive Cyrillic script, but were unaware of any name for the Cyril’s

alphabet other than the 'Serbian letters'. Only recently have some scribes started calling that alphabet *bosančica*, which is not a convenient name. It is inconvenient because that alphabet has always been used in the regions where the Serbs live and, accordingly, there is no reason to call the alphabet by a provincial name. The name Bosnian-Croatian Cyrillic alphabet is even more inconvenient. Ivan Kukuljević-Sakcinski was particularly attached to this name and, if we are to believe his *Archive*, he was the first to give it without a serious base [...]" (p. 68).

The Croatian literary historian Dragutin Prohaska wrote that the name *bosančica* has no real foundation. Furthermore, he pointed out the series of evidence that *bosančica* was, in fact, the authentic Serbian Cyrillic alphabet. Milan Rešetar, a Serbian Catholic, had the same opinion. After WWII, the Slovenian historian Gregor Čremožnik proved convincingly that the Bosnian and Dubrovian Cyrillic scripts had been taken directly from the Serbian royal office of King Milutin. However, the best proof of the Serbian character of the Bosnian Cyrillic alphabet is the fact that the Austrian occupying forces tried to prohibit it and replace it with the Latin alphabet. Hamdija Kapidžić, Enver Redžić and Vladan Đorđević wrote of these matters in the great Russian *Encyclopaedic Dictionary*, published in Saint Petersburg in 1891. Vojislav Bogičević wrote how certain leaders from Kotar prohibited Serbian books from Serbia and Vojvodina. However, the major attacks on the Cyrillic alphabet came from the Croatian Ustasha authorities in WWII and the anti-Serbian communist authorities after the war.

Kostić dedicates the second chapter of his book to examination of the oral folk culture of Bosnia and Herzegovina – above all, to the folk poems, because the best Serbian epic folk poems were composed there. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Serbian popular language was Serbian, which was also the official literary language. As emphasised by Vladimir Corović, "the Bosnian charters and numerous inscriptions were prevalently written in the folk language, which was sometimes very authentic and not very different to modern Serbian [...]; in contrast to the scribes of Raška, who predominantly used Serbian Church Slavonic, Bosnian scribes did not have literary ambitions and wrote in a more natural manner. Therefore, their texts are valuable contributions to the history of our language, almost the best we have" (p. 116). According to Lazo Kostić, "The population of B&H mostly preserved its language in its original clear form; they may have rendered it even more melodious and pleasant when we entered the 19th century and when our language became world-famous due to the efforts of Vuk and his poems, when the beauty and purity of the Serbian language of B&H came to the world stage. The language of the Bosnian Serbs is perhaps the closest to the language of the ancient Serbs spoken before the Great Migration. In any case, their language is as pure as it is beautiful. Undoubtedly, the language spoken in B&H had been the most beautiful and the purest in the whole Serbian nation; it was the most resonant, the least corrupted and the most melodious. And no other language has ever been like it. Especially the language spoken and sung by the Orthodox Serbs" (p. 117-119).

1038

When he wrote of and praised the short-stories of Petar Kočić, Jovan Skerlić emphasised that his language – the language of the Serbian Bosnia – was "select, pure, fluent and melodious folk Serbian – the language used by Njegoš and Ljubiša. Even if we live our separate lives in Serbia and have certain distinctive features, we still remain the migrants from Sjenica and Herzegovina who settled the deserted Sumadija and the language of this book reverberates like something intimate, familiar and precious – when we hear it, we begin to tremble, as if we hear an old childhood lullaby. Without history and expert books, we can feel that this is our language and the language of our forefathers. This language shall refresh and enrich the wilted and dry language we use today" (p. 124-125). Isidora Sekulić, Veljko Petrović and Ivo Andrić also wrote of Kočić's language with great enthusiasm.

Lazo Kostić dedicates a separate chapter to examining the individual Bosnian and Herzegovinian cultural workers - the people who were the subjects of cultural life. He starts with the famous poets who composed epic poems in decasyllabic metre, the most distinguished being Filip Višnjić, Tešan Podrugović and Sima Milutinović Sarajlija. He says of Filip Višnjić: "He was uneducated, illiterate and blind – and all he had done was the work of his genius. He is completely original and, as a folk poet, he does not use any conventions or mannerisms. He said everything in his own way, he borrowed from no one and nobody could borrow from him. He sang about events directly and truthfully, as if he had seen him with his own eyes (he was always near the battlefields). Only for him can we tell that all his poems are exclusively his, without someone else's ingredients – which makes him different to all the other Serbian *gusle* players. He did not reproduce, he produced. And all his poems are of such artistic value that they are read even today as they used to be read in the past. They are classic and integral" (p. 153). Where Tešan Podrugović is concerned, Kostić believes that he was the 'reproducer'. He did not create his poems, but he adapted, revised and transposed the already famous ones and told them to Vuk. It is not known what was his work in those poems, but it is assumed that a great portion of these poems are the fruit of his poetic genius. If Vuk Karadžić had not found and listened to him, who knows whether we would have any of these poems that are considered the greatest treasure of Serbian folk poetry" (p. 155-156). The third outstanding Serbian poet Kostić singles out "is not only a folk poet, and far from anonymous, but the famous and prominent writer and poet Sima Milutinović-Sarajlija. He was the darling of the Serbian Parnassus, considered to be the greatest Serbian poet in all Serbian lands in the beginning of 19th century (until Njegoš appeared. His poems found their way to the Serbian reading public gradually and slowly. Njegoš became famous only decades after his death, while Sima had been famous and glorified as the greatest living Serbian poet ever while he was alive)" (p. 157).

The beginning of the 20th century gave Serbdom two genius poets from Herzegovina – Aleksa Šantić and Jovan Dučić. Jovan Skerlić wrote of Šantić that: "He is a Serb, in a way much more sensible, realistic and modern than any in the historical fiction and poetic mist [...]" He loves

1039

his people in the present and real moment – in their labour, in their poverty and in their faith in better days [...] The poems of Aleksa Šantić is, to a great extent, the poet of our race, our time and our soul and who's poems have a healing effect on us. We bathe our withered, stony and numb soul in them; his poems melt the ice of doubt, dryness and sneering; and it is as if we drank this miraculous water from the well of eternal youth, where that which fell asleep is awakened and what had died, resurrects. We return to ourselves faithfully and become ever better, brighter and stronger" (p. 161-162). Jovan Dučić is, without a doubt, the greatest lyrical poet the Serbs have ever had. As Kostić points out, "a multitude of reviews of his works have been published, multitudes of discussions regarding his poems were published, even doctoral theses were written about him (Nikola Mirković). All comments about his works were hyperbolic. Everyone praised the great Serbian poet, save for some of the jealous and defeatist communist writers gathered together under Miroslav Krleža's banner (Milan Bogdanovi, Velibor Gligorić, Marko Ristić, Eli Finči, etc.). Those pigmies were jealous of the Dučić star and they could not even perceive his greatness. But in the Serbian middle class (bourgeois) reviews, Dučić was received extremely well. All the praise was written enthusiastically. No one has ever put him in second place – he has always been the first among all the Serbian lyric poets" (p. 165).

Kostić introduces a few Serbian Muslims poets as well. He puts Osman Đikić in first place, of whom Jovan Dučić said: "At the time of the Mostar dawn, Osman Đikić had emerged as an unexpected apprentice of Šantić in poetry – more of an illuminated prophetic figure than a literary figure. The nationalisation of the Muslim received its original and logical character and the epicentre in this way, the waves of which have not ceased to spread even today, regardless of artificial and accidental obstacles. Certainly, we are proud that it was Mostar that created the movement of Osman Đikić, who was the most prominent figure to our Muslims after Mehmed Paša Sokolović" (p. 174). Avdo Karabegović, Omerbeg Sulejmanpašić and Čazim Catić (famous for his poem *The Serbian Pride*) were also all imbued with Serbdom and aspirations for brotherly accord between the Orthodox and the Muslims.

Where other Serbian poets are concerned, Kostić singles out the poets Isaija Mitrović, Miloš Vidaković and Vladimir Gačinović who wrote before WWI, and the post-war poets Mihailo Miren, Ljubica Grković and Gazija Hanyić. After WWII, Skender Kulenović, Rajko Petrov Nogo, Izet Sarajlić, etc, shone brightly.

The father of all the great Bosnian-Serb story writers was Petar Kočić. In his encyclopaedia article, Veljko Petrović concluded: "Kočić's belletrist work is incomparably more significant than his political actions, although his short stories were closely related to his national activities [...] Although almost all of Kočić's short stories were bitter, passionate and nationalistic social protests against the alien political and economic exploiter of the Serbian peasant population of Bosnia, they are so saturated with pure poetry that they will preserve their original fervour [...] In his view of the poetic nature of village life, Kočić surpassed all

our story writers, not only with the force of his zest and scope, but with his original subtlety [...] Along with Bora Stanković, Kočić is the father of lyricism in the Serbian story writing and the founder of the special, original and subjective short story" (p. 184). Besides Kočić, Svetozar Corović and Radovan Tunguz Perović, as well as a pleiad of young writers gathered around the nationalist 'Young Bosnia' organisation, also played a significant part in the literature of Bosnia and Herzegovina". In the period between WWI and WWII, the most distinguished story writers in Bosnia and Herzegovina were Isak Samokovlija, Hamza Humo, Borivoje Jevtić, Marko Marković and Emil Petrović.

Bosnia and Herzegovina gave three grandiose novel and story writers to Serbdom – Ivo Andrić, Branko Ćopić and Meša Selimović, who represent the greatest names of Serbian literature. Some first-class literary critics also came from B&H, such as Dimitrije Mitrović and Milovan Vidaković, but also Jovan Kršić, Todor Kruševac, Predrag Palavestra, Risto Trifković, Vuk Krnjević and Midhat Begić. Near the end of his book, Kostić gives a short review of the literary production of the Catholics and the Muslims, then a more comprehensive review of the publicist works of the inciters of the awakening of national consciousness, political activists and enlighteners. He pays special attention to the activities of Vasa Pelagić, the "Young Bosnia" organisation and the writers in emigration of Bosnian and Herzegovinian descent. Then he gives a review of scientific work and activities on other cultural fields, as well as a shorter analysis of magazines, the development of education and cultural societies, theatre and architecture. Lazo Kostić effectively closes his book with a citation of a famous Belgrade psychiatrist named Dr Veselin Savić from the *Literary Newspaper* in 1969, who said in reply to a question asking what he thought of various nationalisms: "I am under the shroud of one concept and one nation called the Serbian, i.e. I am an ethnic Serb and I personally feel as a Serb. Why? Each nation is worth as much as it contributes to the universal ethical and cultural freedom of the development of humanity with its culture. And I am proud of the prevalent concept of my people and my culture: My son, do not speak falsely, do not judge according to your family relations – do not lose your soul. –It is better for you to die than to commit a sin – This is what my nation, my ethnic group, contributes to the more humane, wider, better and genuine culture and to the progress of the free man. I am proud of the fact that the history of my nation has nothing in common with those horrible human specimens like, for example, in the Crusades, when somebody travels for weeks on horseback, in full armour with the notion that if he succeeded in recapturing the Christ's tomb, than everything in the world would be all right. But when he came to Jerusalem, that same man killed children" (p. 297).

Chapter XIV

THE LIBERAL AND THE DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES OF THE MODERN LEGAL SYSTEM

Lazo Kostić dedicated the first twenty years of his scientific and university career to studying public law and theoretical statistics, becoming one of the most important founders of these scientific disciplines in the Serbian intellectual milieu. Regarding the fact that the social sciences are not familiar with the institution of the judgements of neutral absolute validity, Kostić's works, by the virtue of things, express ideological determination from the very beginning. Lazo Kostić is a Serbian patriot and nationalist, whose love and concern for Serbdom were never held back. Regardless of the theoretical or specialist problems he discusses as a diverse and prolific author, his political ideals are distinctly liberal and democratic, and regarding the struggle for the elementary democratic principles, he has never been ready to compromise. His nationalist and democratic determination brought him to the ranks of the Radical Party, which has been developing the democratic and liberal variant of Serbian nationalism and, with great existential ruptures and interruptions, fighting for the unity of all the Serbian lands and the Great Serbian nation-building ideal, rejecting the primitive and autocratic restraints of monarchism and clericalism.

Kostić was the founder of the Serbian theoretical statistics and was on his way to developing a complete, consistent and coherent system of public law – but was prevented by WWII. However, his book in three volumes *The Administrative Law*, and a considerable number of works in the field of the constitutional law, represents the unavoidable scientific foundation of the Serbian legal science even today. Deep theoretical legal breakthroughs and detailed specialist elaborations enabled this first-class intellectual to process almost all the significant questions with respect to the Serbian national idea and the nation-building ideology even in his emigration phase. As a distinguished and prominent Radical, he did not deal with party activities or participate actively in political life. He concentrated his overall energy into his

scientific work and, because of that, reached a culmination of intellectual creativity. He considered that a modern state has to be founded on a developed legal system and the rule of the law principle and he invested enormous energy into developing its general framework to bring them into harmony with the highest democratic achievements in the world, while never hesitating to severely and uncompromisingly criticise all the weaknesses and amateur behaviour of the political magnates.

And that is why we are trying to locate Kostić's opus between WWI and WWII and find its place in the overall development of the Serbian legal system and its various constitutional forms in the history of the Serbian state, starting from the Nemajić nation-building ideology, through the glorious Serbian revolution to the disastrous 20th century – to the plague of Yugoslav-ideology and the communists, which crushed the Serbian national pride and dignity. Tormented by the century-long break-up of the Serbian national being and political unity, faced with devastating economic crises and social poverty and sharing the destiny of deeply wounded Russia and her weakness and apathy, we found ourselves on the battlefield of the dreadful blow of the new world order of globalism. Its creators want to annihilate us, to destroy our national consciousness and transform us into the indifferent slaves of globalisation. And we have no other choice. We have been through many worse historical trials and, because of that, we have multitudes of lessons to learn from our rich national and political history. The nation-building project of Great Serbia and the political ideology of the Radical Party suffered some heavy blows and losses, but they have never been defeated. They shall endure all trials and bring about the resurrection of the free Serbia – Great Serbia.

In the three sections of this final part of the monograph on the scientific and publicist works of Lazo Kostić, his works in the field of the constitutional and administrative rights and theoretical statistics are presented. From these works, we can perceive Kostić's primary theoretical frameworks and ideological landmarks and, in the last chapter, we can see a review of the ideological foundation of the state and law and the constitutional development of the Serbian state – the nation-building project of Great Serbia, underpinned by the vision Vladimir Corović provoked in him, as well as the historical development of Serbian radicalism from Pašić's Serbian People's Radical Party in 1881 to the modern Serbian Radical Party, which was proud to raise the banner of Great Serbian nationalism, freedom and democracy again.

I. Constitutional Law

1. Commentaries on the *Oktroisani* (Imposed) Constitution from 1931

This was one of Kostić's key works in the field of constitutional law, which was prepared in the form of an improvised textbook, where the positive constitutional law is completely processed, but in an

exegetic rather than systematic form. The Imposed Constitution was decreed by King Aleksandar on 3 September 1931 after he, King Aleksandar I Karađorđević, performed a coup d'état on 6 January 1929. "He simply abolished the Vidovdan Constitution and transferred the executive power to himself and the government, in accordance with the principle of absolute monarchy [...] Laws were replaced rapidly and there was none of the stability inherent in a legal regime, political rights were non-existent [...] The administrative power was completely without control" (Lazo Kostić: *Complete Works, Volume I, Constitutional Law*, ZIPS, the Serbian Radical Party, Belgrade 2000, p. 19).

The new Constitution approved the new name of the country and the constitutional monarchy was proclaimed as a form of rule. The unity of the people was formulated by terminology, as well as the unitarian governmental structure, and the restoration of parliamentarism was implicitly announced. In Article 2, the state symbols were determined – the coat of arms and the flag. Previously, hoisting any flag other than the Yugoslav flag was prohibited by law, and the old Serbian flag could only be hoisted on the Serbian Orthodox churches on religious holidays, and then only together with the official state flag. The state anthem was not legally regulated but, in practice, the anthem was a combination of stanzas from the Serbian, Croatian and the Slovenian national anthems. The king's birthday and the day of unification were inaugurated as the only national holidays. Serbian-Croatian-Slovenian was proclaimed by the constitutional decree as the official language. Common citizenship was introduced, as well as the equality of all citizens before the law and the equal protection of the authority. Also, at the same time, it was declared that no nobility titles would be recognised or any other form of preferences with respect to birth rights, which is contradictory to the previously defined monarchist form of rule and the ascension to the throne.

The guarantees of citizen rights and liberties are listed as follows - the punishability of illegal arrests, the citizens can only be tried before a competent court of law, no one may be sentenced without having been previously interrogated by the competent authority or without being legally invited to defend himself, no punishment may be laid down except by law, no citizen may be banished from the state, extradited or imprisoned, his abode is inviolable, freedom of religion and conscience is guaranteed. The religions are recognised by law and only those explicitly recognised become equal before the law. However, article 11 prescribed that no one could be released from the citizen and military duty on the religious grounds. In addition, the obligation to following any religion or participate in religious rituals is non-existent. Furthermore, it is regulated that the recognised religions can organise their connections with their supreme religious leadership, which are located outside the country. The religious leaders are not allowed to misuse their spiritual authority, religious services or religious texts for political purposes. Following a certain religion cannot be grounds for achieving political privileges or greater political rights. Unrecognised

religions could exist as citizens' associations. "The religions recognised by the Vidovdan Constitution ("adopted") were as follows: the Orthodox, the Catholic (of both Roman and Greek rites), the Evangelical, both the Augsburg and Helvetica confession (the "Lutherans" and the "Calvinists"), Islam, the Old Catholic and Jewish of both Ashkenazi and Sephardic rites ("Spanish" and "German" Jews). Subsequently, the following two religions were recognised: Evangelical Reformed Church and the Adventist Church" (p. 47). The Muslims had the privilege that their domestic relations and inheritance issues were tried by state Sharia judges, which originated from the provisions of the Treaty of Saint-Germaine. The state is independent from the religious groups and the church officials are entrusted with some public authority, such as marriages and registries. Although the state religion was not proclaimed, the principle of the separation of the church and the state was not put into effect. The religious groups enjoy internal autonomy, but their charts are certified by the king and organised according to the principle of public law for personal corporations.

Where political rights and freedoms are concerned, this constitution is explicit when it comes to freedom of speech, scientific and artistic work, political organisation, meetings and negotiations, the submission of appellations to the authorities, compulsory and free of charge elementary education, the inviolability of the privacy of mail, telephone and telegraph communications. However, the subsequent censure of the press existed through the possibility of the state persecutors' or police prohibition of distribution. "Although the law prescribes when a newspaper or other printed media can be prohibited, no one can control whether the arbitrating authority has applied the law correctly. Actually, it all comes down to the fact that the authorities can prohibit the distribution and sale of any printed thing it deems to be against their interests. Since the newspaper companies would suffer considerable damages, in practice, they submit their articles in advance, for review by the bodies authorised for the prohibition of newspapers. Consequently, it is the newspapers that introduced preliminary censorship" (p. 51).

In accordance with Article 13 of the Constitution, political-party associations were forbidden if their forms of establishment were on a religious, tribal or regional basis or for the purposes of physical education, while the citizens were not allowed to participate in the meetings if they brought weapons with them. It was obligatory to notify the appropriate authorities about public meetings and the authorities had the discretionary rights to prohibit the organisation of these meetings if they estimated that they were against the law or dangerous to public order, human health or important state interests. In addition, meetings organised in the open had to have formal permission. The political parties were established in accordance with the two-round system of licenses issued by the Ministry of Interior, which reserved the right to disband a political party without any court control, at any time. With respect to this question, Kostić looks back to the previous situation in a broader context and says: "The political parties in Serbia were not legally regulated. The legislature had not taken them into consideration;

they did not even have the status in accordance with the private law. If a party had any kind of name, it was nevertheless recorded in a court as the property of a certain person (most often, the name of the party official determined by the party's main board); in the elections, the list would have been named after its first candidate, not after the party that nominated it. The same conditions were in our country from the 6th January 1929, when the political parties were 'forbidden and dispersed', pursuant to the Public and State Order Protection Law. Although the political parties were not publicly recognised, they existed factually and exerted considerable influence on public life and even law formation. They had their organisation, their party installations and their statute. The Public and State Order Protection Law intended to ruin their existence and activities; it proceeded from the factual, not the legal circumstances. It did not deprive them of the legal recognition, because that had been given to them; prohibiting and dispersing political parties, the law did not envisage the legal organisations, but social factors and forces" (p. 53).

Where scientific and artistic creative work were concerned, there was no customary formulation that the scientists and artists are independent within the limits of the law, provided that the state organs assess whether something was a scientific or artistic work according to uncertain criteria in the disputed cases. However, all the activities of academies, universities and institutes were qualified as scientific pursuant to special laws. All schools were obliged to implement moral upbringing and develop citizenship awareness, which was to be based on the spirit of the peoples' unity and religious tolerance. "The education shall be based on the patriotic foundations and in the spirit of integral Yugoslav unity" (p. 58).

The following constitutional norms inaugurate the right of each citizen to file charges against the state or self-governance organs if they commit any criminal acts that cause damage to him, and they are held accountable for damage caused by their illegal or irregular conduct. All citizens are entitled to all positions in the state services under equal conditions. A citizen is entitled to protection while staying abroad and is free to cancel citizenship if all his obligations towards the state are settled. However, a citizen cannot be extradited under any circumstances. These provisions primarily protect the citizens from possible abuse of power.

Within the constitutional section where the social and economic provisions are concentrated, the concept of the Vidovdan Constitution is continued. The Vidovdan Constitution made a change in direction in constitutional development, from egoistical individualism toward the social solidarity, implying that all individual human rights can be limited in the interest of the group, collective, society or state. The state started to protect the economically underprivileged and impoverished social layers from economic submission and exploitation, considering that these layers are incomparably more numerous and that their discontent could imperil the existence of the state. The social solidarity in the aim for social peace leads to the transformation of the liberal state of the

individualistic type into a social state. Furthermore, going by the constitutional norms, the state protection of marriage, family and children is proclaimed, the inviolability of property and the lawful possibility of its expropriation in the common interests with fair compensation is guaranteed, as well labour freedom and economic bargaining, with the state reserving the rights to intervene and remove social discrepancies and a special governmental consulting economic body being established.

Section four closely defines the state authority and generally proclaims its permanent division into the legislative, executive and judicial authorities, as well as the principle of constitutionality in exercising such powers. Article 26 states precisely that the legislative authority is executed by the king and the people's representation, comprised of the Senate and the National Assembly. The king also has executive authority through the competent ministries, while the judicial power is executed by the courts and their verdicts and decisions are pronounced in the name of the king, in accordance with the legal basis. Since each authority is strictly subject to the constitution, that is the fundamental legal act and all other acts have to be in conformity with its provisions or, on the contrary, they will be deemed non-existent. The constitutional provision that all previous laws remain in effect, regardless of whether they are in conformity with the constitutional norms is also contradictory to the constitutional norms and, since there are no constitutional courts in the country, there are no competent state officials who would appraise the constitutionality of laws in the case of a dispute. Kostić holds that "without such an institution, there are no guarantees that the constitutions would be respected and it is questionable whether their issuance and proclamation make any sense" (p. 74).

The king is the supreme constitutional and state factor and the framer of the constitution purported that he integrated and manifested the unity of all three aspects of government and that, in this case, he was the one who imposed the constitution on his people. Kostić points out that, in section five of the text of the constitution, "provisions relating to privileges and the provisions that prescribe the authority and the competence of the king were disarranged. Generally, in these, as in the previous constitutions, the logical order with respect to the composition of certain regulations was not observed" (p. 78). The constitution proclaims for the king that "he is the champion of popular unity and the state entirety" and, furthermore, "the guardian of their interests". He ratifies and proclaims laws, appoints the civil servants, promotes military officers and awards decorations and is the supreme commander of the armed forces. He grants amnesties and pardons, represents the state in foreign relations, declares war and proclaims peace but, if the country is not attacked, the agreement of the National Assembly is needed for him to declare war. The king convenes the Senate and the National Assembly in regular and extraordinary sessions, opens and adjourns Parliament sessions with a speech from the throne or by a letter or decree. In the case of the speech from the throne, both cameras of the Parliament sit together in a common session, while both the speech and

the letter are countersigned by all ministers, as is as the king's decree on adjourning the National Assembly and scheduling new elections. The king cannot be the ruler of another country at the same time unless the National Assembly decides otherwise.

Each king's act is countersigned by a competent minister, who is also held responsible for it and, in Article 34, it is especially emphasised that the Minister of the Army and the Navy is responsible for the king's acts as the supreme commander of the armed forces. A king and the heir apparent attain majority at the age of 18. The king cannot be held responsible for anything whatsoever, nor can he be sued. This does not apply to the king's private property. The king is succeeded by his male descendants in the order of primogeniture. If the king has no male descendants, he shall designate his heir from a collateral line. If, prior to his death, the king has not designated his heir, the Parliament shall elect a king from the same dynasty in a joint session. Article 38 lists the relatives representing the king's family and, for the regulation of their status and mutual relations, it is envisaged that the king shall pass a special statute. The following article prescribes the text of the oath the king takes before the National Assembly. In principle, the king resides in the country. If it is necessary for him to leave the country for a short time, the heir to the throne acts for him by right. If the heir to the throne is a minor or if he is prevented, the Council of Ministers act on behalf of --the king. This replacement is effected in accordance with the terms of the instructions issued by the king. This applies also in the event of an illness of the king that does not entail permanent incapacity.

The total of nine articles of this imposed constitution treats the regency issues in the form of acting temporarily and for a short-time on behalf of and in the name of the king, due to his temporary inability to perform his duties. The authority of the regent is equal to the king's when it comes to the rights and competencies and the regency is performed while the king is a minor or unfit to rule due to mental or bodily disease, and the National Assembly decides on the initiation or termination of the regency in a common session of both the cameras, upon the proposal of the Council of Ministers and with the expert opinion of at least three medical experts from the state medical schools. In the first case, as soon as the king comes of age, he proclaims that he takes-over without any special act. The constitution envisages that the regent's role primarily belongs to the adult heir apparent and, if this is not possible, the king appoints three regents (and three deputies) in a special act or in his will, which shall all be equal with respect to the regency. If the regency remains without one of the regents and his deputy, the National Assembly appoints the new regent by choosing between the remaining deputies in a secret ballot. The regents must be Yugoslav citizens and, before they assume royal authority, they swear loyalty to the king and take an oath to observe the constitution and the laws before the National Assembly. Each regency act must be signed by all three regents and, if one of the regents is absent or prevented, in accordance to article 43, the remaining two can issue and sign decrees without him.

The regents take care of the minor king's education, while his property is taken care of by the guardians appointed in the king's will or nominated by the regents. Until the regents take up their duties, the Council of Ministers has royal authority. If the king dies or abdicates, the heir apparent who is of age informs his subjects in a proclamation that he has taken-over and takes an oath before the National Assembly. The temporary regents are appointed if the king failed to appoint regents in his will or the queen was pregnant at the time of his death and if a tripartite medical commission reports on that. If the throne is left without a heir, the Council of Ministers takes-over temporarily and convenes the session of the National Assembly to pass a decision on the new monarch. The king's support comes from the Civil List and cannot be increased without the Parliament's consent or decreased without the king's permission. Compensation for the regents is established by the National Assembly, upon the proposal of the Council of Ministries. Kostić's opinion that "the king's abdication does not have the same consequences. The king can abdicate on his own behalf or on behalf of both himself and the heir to the throne for the first in line of succession, but not on behalf of the others, etc. However, in his act on abdication, the king must only consider his heirs that had already been born. His offspring born after the abdication are without significance from the standpoint of constitutional law" (p. 111).

There were two categories of senators elected and appointed by the king. The Constitution leaves it to the law to determine the method of the appointment of senators, and empowers the king to appoint an equal number of senators himself. In order to become a senator, a candidate has to be forty years of age and cannot be a Member of Parliament at the same time. The senators' mandates last for six years, but the terms are staggered so that one-half of the Senate seats are up for election every three years, while the appointed senators do not have limitations placed on their terms. However, a senate member can be relieved from duty on the proposal of the Ministry Council due to physical unfitness or if sentenced by the courts for an infraction of the Criminal Code. Civil servants on active service who are appointed senators may not retain their positions as civil servants. The Senate meets and adjourns at the same time as the National Assembly and verifies the appointment of the senators independently. According to the law, senators were appointed by the Members of Parliament, councillors of the banates and the mayors of the municipalities of the voting districts. Kostić criticises this solution severely: "The Law envisaged that the senators should have been appointed by the representatives of the people; Members of Parliament, Councillors of the banates and the mayors, who were all given a mandate by the people. But they received their mandate to perform their regular functions, not to appoint senators; they reserved the active election right to elect the senators even when they were not elected but appointed by a decree. When the voting right is used personally by those that this voting right belongs to, it is not an indirect, but a direct election. The law envisaged the fiction that the entire population participates in the election of the senators, but indirectly,

through the representatives of the people. Even if this was the true, elections were still not indirect; senators would enjoy the confidence of the people, but they did not receive this confidence from the people but from their appointers. Whether the electorate was expediently composed or not is a political question that will not be discussed here. From the standpoint of the legal logic, we must only observe that the participation of the people's representatives in the appointment of the senators is inappropriate: members of one camera should not be given any effective influence on the formation and organisation of another camera of the Parliament" (p. 118).

In contrast to the appointment of the senators, the members of the Chamber of Deputies were freely elected by the people on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage. Regulations regarding the number and election of deputies were laid down by law, as well as the expiration of their mandates. The Chamber of Deputies is elected for 4 years. Every national by birth or naturalisation has the right to vote if he has attained 21 years of age. Officers on the active list, non-commissioned officers and soldiers with the colours were neither able to exercise the right to vote nor to be elected. The question of woman suffrage was decided by law in accordance with Article 55 of the Constitution. As an advocate of proportional representation, Kostić observes: "Complete equality of suffrage is unattainable, but it is attained to the greatest degree in the so-called proportional representation. The Constitution did not render the proportional representation obligatory; the electoral law did not introduce it" (p. 123). The electoral law was based on majority of votes and it was very complicated, combining some elements of proportional representation. The right to vote is temporarily lost by persons condemned to imprisonment, those condemned to loss of civil rights, individuals declared bankrupt, those under the care of guardians and those deprived of the right to vote on account of infractions of electoral law. Apart from citizenship and age, according to Article 57, the following conditions were required from the senators and deputies - "to speak and write the national language" and, very importantly, "senators and deputies may not be suppliers or contractors to the State at the same time" (p. 129).

Civil servants on the active list were not able to submit their names as candidates for the mandate of senator or deputy, and that prohibition was absolute. Police, revenue and forest officials, as well as those dealing with agrarian reform, were not able to submit their names as candidates unless they had resigned their duties 1 year before the date of the decree fixing the elections. Only the highest ranking officials, Ministers on the active list and those *en disponibilité* could have been candidates. "Those were mostly officials with the imperium, the officials who executed power and had the right to command. The people were in awe of them. They could have been useful for them or could cause damage to them; the popular masses could have voted for them out of fear rather than confidence. The time period of one year was prescribed in order for the people to get accustomed to perceiving the former magnates as ordinary citizens. The masses are in awe of the magnates

IT-03-67-T

even when they are ousted from power and deprived of their authorisations" (p. 133).

Regardless of the electoral system and electorates, Article 59 of the Constitution emphasises that "each senator and deputy represents the entire nation. It was prescribed that all members of Parliament had to take an oath of fidelity to the king, engage in preserving the unity of the people, the independence of the state and the integrity of the national territory, safeguard the Constitution and the welfare of the public. The Parliament was convoked by royal decree in Belgrade, the capital, in ordinary session, on 20 October of each year and, in the event of war, in some other place. The ordinary session could not be closed until the State budget had been voted. Apart from the verification of the election of its members, the Chamber of Deputies elected its secretariat for each session from among its members. The right to introduce bills was vested in every Member of Parliament whose motion had support in writing from at least one-fifth of the members of the Senate or the Chamber of Deputies. In a bicameral Parliamentary system, an initiative could have been submitted to each of the Houses of the Parliament. When one of the Houses passed the bill, it forwarded it to the other House. If any modifications or amendments were made by the Senate or, as the case may have been, by the Chamber of Deputies, the bill was returned to the Chamber of Deputies or the Senate for further consideration. If the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies could not agree on a bill, the bill was considered rejected and removed from the agenda of the session. If this occurs again in the course of the following session, the king shall decide regarding the bill in question. "The king's decision", as observed by Kostić, "may be: 1) the bill is overruled, 2) the bill is adopted upon the motion of the Parliament, 3) the motion of the Senate is adopted. The king could not pass a project that had not been adopted by the Senate or the Chamber of Deputies, nor could he combine the project of the Senate or the Chamber of Deputies and pass a mixture as a bill (a mixture of some provisions from one and some provisions from the other project). It has been observed correctly (by Slobodan Jovanovic) that the king did not become the only legislator in this case, but that the place of a bicameral Parliamentary system was taken by a unicameral one. The king can adopt either the bill passed by the Senate or by the Chamber of Deputies, but only as a whole (in the king's decree promulgating a law, this had to be particularly emphasised)" (p. 141).

The king concluded treaties with foreign States, but the previous approval of the Parliament was required for the ratification of these treaties. The approval of the Parliament was not required for the ratification of purely political conventions. The Constitution especially emphasises that such ratification was necessary for a convention authorising a foreign army to occupy or traverse the territory of the Kingdom. In an emergency, the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies could authorise the Council of Ministers in advance to decree measures for the immediate application of the proposed convention, but the state territory could not have been alienated or exchanged without the consent of the Parliament. The king promulgated laws by decree countersigned

by all the Ministers and published in the *Official Gazette*. The law acquired binding force 15 days after its publication in the *Official Gazette*, unless the law itself provided otherwise.

Article 67 prescribes that the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, which constitute the National Assembly, had the right of enquiry and investigation. Each member of the Senate and of the Chamber of Deputies had the right to address questions and interpellations to the Ministers. Ministers had to reply thereto during the same session. Of all state officials and civil servants, only the Senate and Chamber of Deputies communicated directly with the Ministers. The right to speech in the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies appertained only to the senators and deputies, to members of the Government and to commissioners of the Government designated for this purpose by Royal decree. It is interesting that, pursuant to Article 71 of the Constitution, the deliberations of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies were only valid if at least one-third of all the senators or deputies were present. A majority vote from the senators or deputies present was necessary for valid decisions. If the votes were equally divided, the motion voted on was considered accepted. The voting on details is optional, although Kostić holds that this is the first voting, and the voting in general is the second, considering that the constitutional provision prescribed two readings. The deliberations of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies in joint session only took place in cases expressly specified. Joint sessions were presided over by the presidents of the Senate and of the Chamber of Deputies alternatively.

The provision that follows prescribes that a senator or deputy could not be held responsible by anyone for opinion provided during voting as a Member of Parliament and that they could only have been held responsible to the Chamber of Deputies or the Senate for their statements and acts during their mandates, under the provisions of the Rules of Procedure. As prescribed in Article 74, "For such statements and acts that constitute an infraction of the Criminal Code a senator or deputy shall be responsible to the ordinary courts, if the Senate or Chamber of Deputies consent thereto. For insults, libel or crimes, a senator or deputy shall be responsible to the ordinary courts even without the previous consent of the Senate or of the Chamber of Deputies" (p. 153-154). Kostić thoroughly criticises this provision and holds it to be unjustified, even unintelligible. "It is difficult to imagine the function of a Member of Parliament without criticising and pointing out facts; all this could be a pretext for somebody to hold him responsible for insult or libel and hinder his work. The representative of the people is not free to present his opinion if he always has to worry about not insulting somebody; he will prefer to stay quiet and let things happen. Therefore his role will be reduced to a passive role, he cannot fulfil his goals. If this constitutional provision cannot be altered, it could be mitigated as follows: a new form of criminal act could be envisaged and a form of punishment could be established for those who accuse a Member of Parliament or a senator for insult or libel, if they are exonerated as innocent. Therefore, the principle that the Members of

Parliament could not insult and libel anyone would remain, but they would be protected from frequent and tendentious charges at the same time" (p. 155).

Deputies and senators are better protected from responsibility and arrest for offences committed outside the exercise of their mandates, or from being deprived of their freedom during the validity of their mandate, except when caught in *flagrante delicto*. Nevertheless, in the latter case, the Senate or Chamber of Deputies, if in session, is immediately informed and consents or refuses to allow the proceedings to continue during the session. This consent is also necessary for the continuation of a procedure commenced before Election Day and obtaining immunity. And, when the Senate or Chamber of Deputies consents, a senator or a deputy can only be held responsible in respect of the act for which his immunity is forfeited. The Senate and the Chamber of Deputies have the exclusive right to maintain order among their members through their presidents. Article 76 prescribes that "No armed force may be stationed in the buildings or in the court without the consent of the president. Furthermore, no Government organ may effect any act of public authority in the Senate or the Chamber of Deputies without the consent of the president. No armed person may enter the building of the Senate or the Chamber of Deputies, with the exception of those in the service of the Senate or Chamber of Deputies who are authorised to carry arms by the regulations" (p. 157).

The king appoints and dismisses the President of the Council of Ministers and the Ministers. The President of the Council of Ministers and the Ministers from the Council of Ministers, they take an oath of fidelity and that they will act in conformity with the constitution and the laws. Ministers appoint subordinate civil servants in accordance with the provisions of the law, however, some of them may also be Ministers without portfolios. When the king is present at a session of the Council of Ministers he presides over the session and it is therefore called the Crown Council. In addition to the king's confidence, the Prime Minister and the Ministers need to enjoy the confidence of the Parliament. The king and the Chamber of Deputies may indict Ministers for violation of the constitution and the laws of the country in the exercise of their functions. The state is responsible to the nationals for damages caused by Ministers through the illegal exercise of their functions, while the Ministers are responsible to the State. Ministers may be indicted both while in office and for 5 years following their surrender of office, and when an accusation is brought by the Chamber of Deputies against a Minister, the decision to bring him before the court requires a majority of two-thirds of the members, while in accordance with the Vidovdan Constitution, two-thirds of the present members were supposed to vote in favour. As Lazo Kostić emphasises, "this is the strongest majority required for a Parliament decision, larger than the majority necessary for a decision on constitutional amendments. Generally, our regulations regarding the responsibilities of Ministers have always protected the ministers from the tendentious or improper accusations, more than they have ever protected the state or individuals from abuse of power by the

ministers. One member of the Parliament referred to a past law on the responsibility of ministers (1922) as the “law on the non-responsibility of ministers” (p. 163).

More detailed rules regarding the responsibility of Ministers are contained in a special law. Article 81 prescribes that the Executive Power may issue regulations necessary for the application of the laws and Article 82 prescribes that the administration in the Kingdom is effected through banates, districts and municipalities. Then the Constitution lists 9 banates and determines their territories in further detail. The banates are both administrative and autonomous units and the special law prescribes their territorial divisions into districts and municipalities, while the organisation of the municipal administrations and the delimitation of their jurisdiction forms the object of a special law based on the principle of autonomy, as well as the possibility of organising the urban municipalities on another basis.

The city of Belgrade, together with Zemun and Pančevo, forms a separate administrative territory, but they do not have self-governance, which is only reserved for municipalities that are parts of the administrative units. The city administrator of Belgrade has the same authorisations and competencies as a Ban. A Ban is at the head of each banate. The ban represents the supreme authority in the banate. Bans are appointed by the king at the proposal of the President of the Council of Ministers. Kostić emphasises that the ban “is really the head the banate as the state authority and the self-governance institution. The self-governance of the banates is just proclaimed, but has never been really introduced or, to be precise, it is established and suspended immediately. While it is suspended, the Ban acts as its commissar. He has a double role in the banate: he is both the head of the state administration and a commissar of the self-governance of the banate” (p. 172-173). The Ban appoints, removes, pensions and dismisses administrative officials within the limits defined by the law regarding the administration of banates.

As an autonomous administrative body, each banate has a Banate Council and a Banate Committee, as prescribed by the constitutional provisions, but these institutions are not implemented in practice. In addition, the law prescribes the introduction of the Banate Councils as advisory organs. The members of the Banate Council are appointed at the proposal of the Ban by the Minister of Internal Affairs. The constitutional norms envisage that the Banate Council is to be elected for a period of 4 years by universal, equal and direct vote, according to the provisions of the law. Then the Council elects the Banate Committee from among its members, which is its executive body of the banate. The Ban appoints and dismisses banate officials at the proposal of the Banate Committee. The Banate Committees may pass decrees within the scope of their competence that have the force of the law in their relevant Banates, provided that they are not in collision with the constitutional provisions and the laws of the country. Banate decrees are proclaimed and published by the Ban at proposal of the Banate Committee, and the Ban must request the concurrence of a Council of State beforehand as

regards the legality of the decrees. The Council of State must give or refuse its consent within a certain period; if the Council fails to pronounce on the matter within that period, its concurrence shall be considered as having been given. Therefore, the banates were conceived as autonomous regions.

Article 92 envisages that the central State authorities shall see that the administrative autonomous authorities perform their functions within the limits prescribed and in a manner not prejudicial to any general interest of the State. The following Article envisages the right to abrogate all the decisions of the Banate Council and the Banate Committee, or of the municipal convocations or councils that may be contrary to the constitution, the laws or the decrees in force. In the case of an appeal against the decision, that appeal must be submitted to the Minister of Internal Affairs within the period prescribed by law. A Banate Council may be dissolved by a Royal decree before the expiration of the 4 year term at the proposal of the Minister of Internal Affairs, and fresh elections for the respective banate may be ordered. The Banate Council is authorised to make the decision regarding the budget of the banate, at the proposal of the Banate Committee. Banate budgets are approved by the Minister of Finance and the State Audit Department verifies their execution by inspecting the financial statements. Considering that the banates are legal entities pursuant to both public and the private law, their property, income and expenses are independent from the state property, income and expenses.

Municipalities, unlike banates, are autonomous bodies. They may be charged with executive functions under the supervision of the higher administrative bodies, by special laws. Provisions regarding the organisation and competence of the autonomous banate and the municipal authorities are prescribed by law. The administrative Courts are established by the Constitution for disputes of an administrative nature. Their seats, jurisdiction and organisation are laid down by law. The supreme administrative court is called the Council of State. The manner in which the members of the Council of State are appointed, as well as its composition, competence and procedure, are prescribed by a special law. The administrative courts are not a part of the judicial authorities – they are within the structure of the executive authorities. Kostić pays special attention to the matters regarding the Council of State as a Second Instance Court, which “has other functions in addition to the administrative court function: (1) it serves as an auxiliary body of the state administration by reviewing and pre-approving certain acts; (2) sometimes the Council of State appears as a supervisory organ over self-governance bodies; (3) it has certain advisory functions regarding advisory services to the Government and the executive authorities; (4) the Council of State settles conflicts of jurisdiction between the administrative bodies (including self-governance bodies); (5) the Council of State is the disciplinary court for state officials, (6) it is the special criminal court with respect to customs, monopoly and excises” (p. 185).

The Imposed Constitution pays the least attention to the judicial authorities. Only two Articles deal with those matters, which is half that

of the provisions of the Vidovdan Constitution and drastically less than the Constitution of Serbia from 1903, where 14 articles treated judicial matters. Regarding these matters, Kostić expresses his opposition directly and says: "It is the truth that the courts are subject to the law and that it is sufficient if the laws regulate their organisation and their procedures in detail and with attention, but it is considered that the Constitution should contain certain principles that the legislators would not be able to alter. Such principles represent guarantees of judicial objectivity and impartiality: they are not proclaimed for the benefit of the courts and judges, but for the citizens who stand trials. Man's greatest possessions (honour, property and life itself) often depend on the court judgement: the state legal policies should be arranged in such a way that, in each case, justice would prevail and that the judgement should be the reflection of the true justice. Therefore, the creator of the Constitution should not be disinterested in matters of judicial organisation" (p. 186-187).

According to Article 100, the courts are independent. In administering justice, they are subject to no authority, but judge in accordance with the law. Courts and judicial jurisdiction may only be established by law. The law prescribes the mode of selection and appointment of the presidents of courts and judges. A separate Article determines that State Sheriat judges shall have jurisdiction in the family and inheritance matters of Muslims. The following Article determines that Judges of all courts are permanent. A judge may not be relieved of his functions or removed from office against his will for any reason whatsoever except under a decree or verdict from a regular court or a disciplinary decree of the Court of Cassation. No complaint may be brought against a judge for the way in which he exercises his magisterial functions, without the consent and approval of the competent court. A judge may not even be temporarily called upon to fill any other salaried or honorary public function without his consent and the approval of the Court of Cassation. A judge may only be transferred to another judicial position with his own consent. Judges may remain in service until the end of their 70th year and they may only be retired before this period elapses upon their written application or in the case of physical or mental incapacity rendering them unfit to perform their duties. In the latter case, decisions regarding their retirement are made by the Court of Cassation. With respect to these matters, Kostić emphasises that "the first requirement for the courts expected to administer true justice is their independence. The courts cannot be subject to any exterior influences; they cannot be influenced by the executive authorities, especially the government or the politicians, economic potentates and any other factor in general. They are only subject to the law: the law regulates their position and they find the sources for their judgements and decision in the law. They must not turn left or right; except for the legislative authorities, they cannot be ordered by any other authority when it comes to trials, even in the latter case - only in the form of legislation (not Parliamentary resolutions)" (p. 187).

Regarding the fact that the judges judge in accordance with the law in

IT-03-67-T
the way they interpret the law, their juristic expertise and personal integrity are of the utmost importance, but there is also the possibility of correction by the second instance court. Four instances of regular courts are established by the law – the municipal court, the district court, the appellate court and the court of cassation.

Section 10 of the Constitution regulates matters of the state domain, prescribing that each year the Parliament shall approve the State budget in sections, while the manner in which the budget is to be drawn up and passed is prescribed by law. It is especially emphasised that the proposal for the budget has to be submitted to the Chamber of Deputies 1 month at the latest after the date of its meeting in ordinary session; the financial statements for the last expired fiscal year have to be submitted to the Chamber simultaneously. The Chamber of Deputies may not increase the proposed section, but has the right to reduce and reject certain of them. The financial assets or savings under one budget section or in one fiscal year may not be expended to defray the needs of another section or another year without the prior consent of the Parliament. Until the submitted budget is passed, the Parliament may grant budgetary twelfths for certain months. If the Chamber of Deputies is dissolved before the passing of the budget, the budget for the preceding year shall be extended by a decree for a period not exceeding 4 months. If the budget is not passed during this period, the previous budget may be extended by Royal decree up to the end of the new fiscal year.

The state contributions and general taxes shall only be laid down by law. The Government shall submit a report to the Chamber of Deputies and certified by the State Audit Department regarding the execution of the agreements concluded for state loans and regarding their expenditure, in accordance with the law. Article 105 determines the general nature of the tax obligations and the equality of all the state contributions from the overall state territory. The King and the Heir to the Throne pay state taxes on their private property. No permanent or temporary subsidies and no gifts or remuneration whatsoever are paid out of the State Treasury unless based on law. The state property is administered by the Minister for Finance unless otherwise provided for by law. A special law governs the alienation of state property. The right of monopoly only appertains to the state and the mines, waters, mineral springs and natural resources are the property of the state. Special laws govern the granting of mining, industrial or other concessions of any kind.

The State Audit Department shall act as the supreme court of accountancy for verifying of State accounts and supervising the execution of the budgets of the State and administrative and autonomous bodies. The president and the members of the State Audit Department are elected by the Chamber of Deputies from a list of candidates prepared by the Council of State, including twice as many candidates as there are vacancies. The composition, competence and procedure of the State Audit Department and the possibility of appealing to the Court of Cassation are determined in a special law. It gives the initial opinion with notes to the financial statements before they are submitted to the

Chamber of Deputies. As defined in Article 107, “the State Audit Department examines, corrects and passes the accounts of the general administration and of all persons accountable for public funds. It makes sure that expenditure is restricted to the budgetary provisions and that no transfer is made from one heading of the budget to another. It closes the accounts of all the State administrations and is responsible for the collection of all the necessary evidence and information” (p. 206).

In Section 11, in six articles, the role of the army in the legal system is determined, from the general military service prescribed by law, the organisation and the size of the army and the navy, unit formation and financing from the budget, through the determination of the independence and autonomy of the military courts, the protection of the judges in the military courts by the military court of appeal, offences committed jointly by civilians and soldiers are to be tried in civil courts, but in time of war they shall be tried by military courts. No one who has reached 20 years of age may obtain employment in the civil service or retain such unless he has performed military service or has been exempted in conformity with the provisions of military law. According to Article 112, “The army can only be used for maintaining internal order at the request of the competent civil authorities” (p. 212). A foreign army cannot be taken into the service of the state, nor can the army of our state be put at the disposal of any foreign state without the previous approval of Parliament, considering the highest degree of the delicacy of these issues.

Amendments to the constitution shall be determined by the king, together with the Parliament. With respect to Article 114, which contains this principal provision, Kostić writes that, in our practice, “legal amendment of the constitutions are rare. In both Serbia and Yugoslavia, all constitutions contained provisions on the method of amending the constitution: constitutions were often altered, but never in accordance with such provisions. Rather they were changed radically (or the current constitutions would be declared as null and void or replaced with the completely new constitutions). The circumstances that these amendments caused and the new situations could not have been satisfied with palliatives - partial or legal amendments to the existing constitutions. Then, the legal order was altered” (p. 214).

Proposed amendments or supplements to the constitution may only be introduced by the king or the Parliament. These proposals must specifically state all the articles of the constitution that are to be amended or supplemented. If the proposal is made by the king, it shall be communicated to the Senate and the Chamber, whereupon the Chamber of Deputies must be immediately dissolved and a new Chamber convened within 4 months at the latest. If the proposal emanates from the Senate or the Chamber of Deputies, a decision must be arrived at by a majority of three-fifths of the total number of the deputies in the Chamber of Deputies or senators in the Senate. Upon the adoption of the proposal in this manner, the Chamber of Deputies shall be dissolved and a new Chamber of Deputies convened within 4 months of the date of the adoption of the proposal at the latest. In both cases, the

Senate or the Chamber of Deputies may only decide upon amendments to the constitution that are contained in the proposal, as stipulated in Article 115, “In both cases, the Senate or the Chamber of Deputies may only decide upon such changes or additions to the constitution as are contained in the proposal for the examination of which the Assemblies are convened” (p. 215). The amendments are definitively adopted by the newly convened Chamber of Deputies and the Senate by an absolute majority of the total number of their members. If the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies fail to agree on the adoption of the proposed amendments or supplements to the constitution, either in whole or in part, the subsequent procedure shall be the same as in the case of other bills.

Pursuant to the following constitutional provision, in the case of war, mobilisation, disorder or disturbances endangering public order and the security of the state, or in general if public interests are endangered, the king may decree all absolutely necessary extraordinary measures to be taken throughout the entire kingdom or in any part thereof, irrespective of constitutional and legal prescriptions, but all these exceptional measures shall be subsequently submitted to the Parliament for approval. In the transitory provisions, it is determined that the king shall promulgate and publish laws by decree until the date of the meeting of the Parliament in accordance with the provisions set forth herein and these decrees shall be countersigned by the President of the Council of Ministers, the competent Minister and the Minister for Justice. All laws in force, with the exception of the law regarding royal power and the supreme direction of the state, shall remain in operation until modified or cancelled in the ordinary way. Where the provision regarding the permanency of the position of judges is concerned, it will not be applied during a period of 5 years; from the date of the entry into force of the constitution or the moment of its publication in the *Official Gazette*. Kostić commented on each of the 120 Articles of the Imposed Constitution meticulously. He compared them with the text of prior constitutions and derived all possible repercussions to positive legislation and the legal practice. In addition, for purely educational purposes, he meticulously presented the basic constitutional institutes, criticising all the weaknesses of the elaborated text of the constitution and its legal illogicalities in detail and offering some better solutions.

2. Constitutional Studies and Discussions

The review *State and Constitutional Law*, based on the Kostić's textbook-comments, was printed in Belgrade in 1937 in a concise version. In sixteen paragraphs, the review elaborates the general legal matters of the Imposed Constitution, such as the general rights and responsibilities of the citizens, treatment of international agreements, sanctions, promulgations and publishing laws, matters concerning suffrage, problems concerning the responsibility of the administrative authorities, budget norms, territorial divisions in the state, definitions of the territorial and functional autonomies, the bicameral system of

Parliament and individual provisions regarding the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, the method of amending the constitutions, the power-sharing model of the legislative authority, the method of constitution and operation of the king's regents (passing the legal and administrative decrees), settling conflicts between the houses of the Parliament, the competencies of the king and the method of succession to the throne, as well as the especially pronounced problem of court supervision over the regularity of the legislative procedure, act of promulgation and the constitutionality of the legal content.

In a great number of scientific texts, published in all the significant periodicals of his time, Kostić treated all significant constitutional matters regarding not only the constitutional act, but the extensive field of basic state laws, which are purely political in their nature and proceed directly from the constitution – therefore, they are also called the organic laws. At the same time, he pointed out the tendency of parliamentary practice that a whole range of activities of the legislative bodies is transferred to their committees, while they remain the political body for controlling the activities of the government and the legislative mechanism. Furthermore, Kostić elaborates on the issues of federation, autonomy, self-governance and especially the rule of law, its principles of constitutionality and its legality, referring to the example from the Serbian history and practice - Dušan's Code, which expressly prohibits the self-will and tyranny of the ruler; the folk tradition of the struggle for justice and regularity, the revolt against the dahijas, "the 19th century resurgent Serbia striving for a fair legal system. She resents the self-will of the authorities, ousts unfair princes, kills tyrants, seeks the rule of law and the regime of legality" (p. 278).

At the same time, Kostić criticised the most important jurist of the Third Reich, Karl Schmitt and the Italian professor Carmelo Carristi, who were persistent in negating the idea and the concept of the rule of law. He ends his criticism, published in the dangerous times of December 1940 in the magazine *The Contemporary Municipality*, with the following words: "The above mentioned German and Italian writers negate each rule of law in general, even if it is social and legal in its nature. The Italian expert says that the Italian state of today can be called corporative, beneficial (eudemonic), a monarchic-presidential, party state, etc., but never the rule of law. In addition, the Germans do not want to hear about this word. People have been proud of establishing the rule of law and living in such a country and here they are today, ashamed of that name. Everything is better than the rule of law!"

Although, it is true that a large majority of the people insists on the idea of the rule of law, the world is no longer unanimous about the notion of the rule of law. Now, there are many who openly impugn and suppress it. Does the twilight of the rule of law mean its disappearance? It is difficult to answer this question. In their standpoint regarding the rule of law, people are not as unanimous as they were in the past, but there are still many – millions and hundreds of millions of people – who see the rule of law as a system worthy of a human being. I consider myself as one of them" (p. 279).

1060

Kostić's study on the legal possibilities of altering the form of the state is very interesting. It is published in *Annals of Matica Srpska* back in 1925. In this study, he begins with the statement that every new state law represents a new legal system in essence, because all the laws that had been previously passed and are contradictory to it are no longer of any importance. However, no matter how long it lasts, no constitution can be permanent, and almost every constitution regulates the manner of its change by its own norms because, according to Kostić, "there is no constitution that can stop the flow of history and nor can it prevent the inevitable shift of the social forces" (p. 280). When it comes to the Vidovdan constitution, Kostić states the problem of the possibility of consistent change the constitutional way, given that the king is also defined as one of the constitutional factors. In this way, he states his own opinion: "The king has the right to a constitutional initiative and a constitutional sanction. Without his consent there can be no change in any article of the constitution. Bearing in mind that no article of the constitution can be changed without the king's consent, which is given in a form of a sanction, it is really difficult to imagine that the king will accept changes to those articles that are the guarantees for his throne and power. However, what is hard to understand psychologically can be very easily constructed by the use of legal reasoning. In this case, it is not legally important whether the king will give his consent gladly or against his will; the only thing that is important is whether he can give his consent and thus make the change in state form legally possible. We think he can. If the constitution does not forbid him to do so, he can solve the problem of the change of the state form the same way he could deal with any other constitutional change (by means of constitutional initiative or sanction)" (p. 281).

Comparing his view to the views of other respectable legal theoreticians, Kostić calls our attention to the following: "if the form of monarchy could be transformed into the form of the republic by the use of a constitutional change, that would lead to the loss of the throne of a certain ruler, a loss which he had accepted in advance, and there could be complications in that the successors would probably deny the ruler's right to dispose their right to claim to the throne once it is empty. Such remarks... construct the hereditary right by the use of the private-legal principles, which are valid for the fee tail. The hereditary right is regulated by the constitution and modern science about state is not familiar with some of the constitutional and super-constitutional right of the dynasty. Like all authorities, the king's authority has its base in the constitution; at least from the time when the constitution has been passed. Otherwise [...] there would be no difference between a modern constitutional state and the former patrimonial one. Therefore, the transformation of the monarchical reign into a republic is not only legally possible, but cannot give a pretext to any opposite legal consequences. It is only possible, up to a point, in those states where line of

1061

inheritance is stated in court statutes and not by use of a constitution, which are statutes passed before the constitution. Here, it is not the case.” (p. 281-282).

However, no matter how clear it is in theory, Kostić is aware of the fact that, in reality, there has been no evidence of the legal transformation of a monarchy into a republic. It goes without saying that abdication does not represent suspension of monarchy, but the self-abdication of a monarch or a dynasty to which he belonged. “Theoretically possible, the legal transformation of monarchy into a republic is not feasible. In reality, it is always done mostly with the use of revolution. Law comes later to sanction states out of it, even against it” (p. 283). According to the procedure stated in the Vidovdan Constitution, “The constitution cannot be changed without the king’s consent. But in the constitution, the word king does not always denote a king personally. Instead, this it is very often understood as an executor i.e. a holder of the king’s reign (here we are covering the understandable meaning of the word king in constitutional countries; wherever a king is mentioned in the constitution regarding his functions not his personal prerogatives, it is assumed that he will be performing those functions in agreement with the responsible government. The word king encompasses both a factual king and the government. Formally, however, it is him)” (p. 284).

In Kostić’s opinion, it is important to consider whether the term king includes king’s regents and representatives. When, in a certain situation, the king’s authority is carried out by regents, it is easier to get their consent to the transformation of the constitution into the introduction of the republic. For this reason a lot of monarchies have forbidden constitutional changes by the use of constitutional decrees as long as regents have the authority or the regents’ authority has been considerably reduced in comparison to the king’s. The regents are holders of state functions, so a regent has no legal connection to an underage successor to the throne. By the use of subtle theoretical analysis, Kostić concludes that “from a legal point of view, a regency formed under the Vidovdan Constitution has the right to change the constitution in all its articles (it is understandable that the regency cannot change the constitution by itself, nor can it be done by the king; here it has only the constitutional attributes of the king: the right of initiative and rights of sanction and proclamation). Therefore, regency is not legally limited regarding changes in the constitution in its most important part, the part that standardises the form of authority. We shall not examine whether this right is usable morally and if it is in accordance with it. After all, when it comes to morality, especially public morality, it all depends on the given situation and the “state interest” (p. 288).

The fact that, even back in 1925, Lazo Kostić was seriously and thoroughly examining the possibilities for transforming the monarchical form of authority into a republican one is a testimony to his intellectual preoccupations, although the final conclusion was not encouraging from a legal point of view and he made it possible in 3 points: 1. All constitutional articles are subject to constitutional revision and,

consequently, the articles that regulate the question of state form are as well. But, since the king’s consent is needed for every constitutional revision, it is really impossible to change the monarchical form of authority into the republican legally. Impossible at least as long as the king’s reign is performed by the king himself. 2. When the royal authority is performed by chosen regency, it also has the right to change the constitution in all its parts. The factual possibility of changing parts of the constitution concerning the state form is not excluded in this case. 3. When the government exercises royal authority as a representative of an absent or currently prevented king, it does not have the authority to revise the Constitution and must not start constitutional change. If those changes are required by the Parliament, the government has to schedule

elections and convoke the parliament, which will solve the changes. The government is legitimised in this case to confirm or not confirm the decision of the constitutional parliament. However, on his return to a country, the king can take over authority from the government can at any time and decide for himself on the necessity of the decision of the parliament” (p. 294). The Vidovdan Constitution had made the possibility of the change of the state form difficult, but king Aleksandar abolished this by a *coup d’etat* on 6 January 1929 and passed the Imposed Constitution after two years, thus making the legal force of the constitutional structure relative; in a one-sided and arbitrary act, he annulled one and inaugurated the other legal order, which devalued the legal position of the throne and the authority of the dynasty. Scorning the value of a constitutional act adopted democratically, which is an irrefutable fact in the case of the Vidovdan Constitution, decreased the authority of the constitutional normative in general.

b) The Unconstitutionality of the Cvetković-Maček Agreement

Kostić’s criticism of the governmental Decree on changes to the existing regulations and passing new ones from the 16th September 1939 is especially important. The Government claimed that it was based on Article 116 of the constitution but Kostić found it to be unconstitutional. In case of war, mobilisation, disorder or disturbances endangering public order and the security of the state, or if public interests were endangered in general, the constitution gave the king the power decree all absolutely necessary extraordinary measures to be taken, independently of the constitutional or legitimate normatives, but it did not empower the government and nor did the representatives of the royal authority delegate that authority to the government in a special regents’ act, something they were not able to do in accordance with the law. In this case, the Government usurped the royal authority - this was the so called Cvetković-Maček agreement on forming the Banate of Croatia. “The claims that, for example, the Decree on the organisation of the authority of the ban and the Decree on the activities and the organisation regarding the elections of the Parliament of the Banate of Croatia have “the character of a Decree pursuant to Article 116 of the constitution”

are not true. This article cannot be applied pursuant to the proposal and the countersignature of any ban, only by the supreme state authorities" (p. 297).

The basic confusion in public law was caused by the different interpretation of the concept of the endangered public interests, i.e. whether the real social prerequisites for the application of article 116 existed at all, given that Kostić had already established that it had been applied by an unauthorized organ. The constitutional decree claims that it can be applied "in case of war, mobilisation, disorder or disturbances endangering public order and the security of the state", while and there is no endangering of public interests added as fifth case in which the relative constitutional norm can be applied. Kostić emphasises that the endangered public interests can only be public order and state safety. There was no war or mobilisation, as well as riots or mutiny, especially big enough to endanger public interests, public order and state safety. A case in which article 116 is applied has to be exceptional and clearly stated, not a matter of political agreement or inter-party harmonization.

After establishing the incompetence of organs and the non-existence of anticipated conditions, Kostić says that it is evident that "there was not enough of a basis for bringing a decree on the Banate of Croatia. One constitutional state alone can never be a reason for the application of article 116 of the Constitution, because it cannot insult constitutional order. In Smit's words, "one constitutional institution cannot endanger public law and order as such." Regional units that existed could not have been a reason for the application of article 116. But there were reasons, according to this article, for passing the Decree on broadening the normatives of the Decree on the Banate of Croatia to other regional units. Under this decree, new regional units could be made no matter if there was any "endangerment of public interests", moreover, even if their mere formation was against public interests. This decree is, in fact, an amendment to article 116 of the Constitution with unlimited scope" (p. 299).

The related constitutional decree enables taking the extraordinary and necessary measures. The measure is initially applied to denote the degree, power or intensity, when it is said that the reasons for application are "the public interests endangered to such a measure", but the point is in the other meaning of the term "measure", as an action or means that fall under king's authority. "If the Constitution stated that the king could, in such situations, do what he wants, use all the means at his disposal etc., his power would be higher than in a case where he is only authorised to use the necessary measures. Measures undertaken under article 116 of the Constitution have to be limited based on their own term ("measures"). To be true, these are the actions or means – the actions measured towards a goal, the means proportional to the emerging danger or evil. This is why the term measure was used, not actions, deeds, etc. Measures are repressive when danger emerges and preventive if the there is a threat. The Constitution was not precise in its definition of the "measures", but added that these measures have to be "extraordinary and necessary". The term extraordinary measures means: measures that are

IT-03-67-T

not taken in regular situations, which are heavier, harsher, rapid and more efficient. If those would be regular measures, there would be no need for citing article 116 of the Constitution. Extraordinary measures comprise censorship, the use of the army for breaking riots [...] etc. But, those extraordinary measures also have to be a necessary as well, it means that the violation of the normal regulations, the restoration of the personal status etc. has to be done in the most necessary scope. Harsh measures cannot be used where evil and danger can be restrained by mild means: the army should not be called where strong police forces are able to stop the riots; if the army is called, firearms should not be used, the reaction should be milder to begin with, both in type and action and stronger and heavier weapons should only be used later. This is the meaning of the term "necessary measures" (p. 299-300).

The king is free to judge for himself which measures to take in a given situation because he has to make quick decisions - but he must be aware that their suitability and balance would be subsequently assessed by the Chamber of Deputies. The choice and the use of these extraordinary means is limited in principle and the violation of that limitation represents a violation of the constitution. In case of the abuse of these extraordinary measures, the legislative authority is competent to apply their justification from the aspect of the set legal objectives. The extraordinary measures represent legal and factual action. The legal action in this case can only be the king's decrees and nothing more. These measures cannot end up lasting legal principles, they are limited only to temporary suitability. That is why changing the constitution could not have been one of the measures in accordance with article 116, given that the constitution is the legal base of the state in principle. The regulations referring to the Chamber of Deputies cannot be changed nor can it be deprived of its regular competence, and the king is not empowered to independently pass those legal acts for which, in normal situations, he needs the consent of the Senate and the Parliament, as stated in the constitution. The organizational minimum of state authority cannot be changed, especially its basic legislative body. Even more so, the article 116 clearly states the normal existence and functioning of the Chamber of Deputies in case of a state of emergency. "That is why the dismissal of the Parliament was not in accordance with the Constitution and depriving senators of their mandates and the actual dismissal of the Senate even less so. If that would be possible, then it would also be possible to change constitutional decrees concerning the crown, which the Constitution certainly did not have in mind. Also, there could be no changes made as to decrees on the borders of regional units. Their number, centre and borders were precisely marked by the Constitution (article 83), which had not been done up until now. They can only be changed by the regular procedure of revising the Constitution. The Constitution was harsher regarding changing those borders than regarding the change of the state borders themselves. While former constitutions asked for the consent of constitutional authority for transfer or exchange of state territory, under the current constitution it is enough to have approval from the regular Chamber of Deputies, while it is

57/57440

necessary to change the Constitution to change the borders of regional units.” (p. 301.)

Given that article 116 prescribes that extraordinary necessary can be applied to all the kingdom or in one of its parts, the framer of the constitution obviously wanted them to be limited to territory where there was a real danger to public interests, while in other parts of a state legal regime had to be intact if the situation there was calm, the people loyal and there was no danger. The desire to achieve “participation of the Croats in state life” cannot be the reason for imposing a state of emergency on all state territory, excessive suspension of the Constitution and even its unconstitutional changes. The goal of article 116 is to protect existing constitutional order and to illegally transform it. The effects of a couple of its norms is temporarily stopped in order to keep the constitutional act as a whole. The Constitution is protected against danger that could happen and it does not make itself into a suicide loop.

Arbitrary and usurping governmental acts, from 26 August 1939, were intended as lasting, so they cannot even be based on article 116, which “empowers the king to take such measures temporarily”, in this aspect. This term is not defined clearly but, when connected with subsequent words (“necessary measures”), it appears that state of emergency can last only as long as the danger that provoked it. As soon as the ideal public properties, over which article 116 was activated, are not endangered anymore, everything has to get back to its previous form. Just as it would be an abuse of the article 116 if there were no circumstances for its action, it would also be abuse if it was used continuously when there is no need for it. It appears that state created by this article cannot be perpetuated, permanent and stable situations cannot be created based on it and nor can constitutional order be modified with lasting effect. On the basis of article 116, there can only be the suspension of certain (not all) decrees, they can be put out of force temporarily and can be stopped. But they cannot be mixed. It is wrong to draw the conclusion from article 116 that there is a parallel form of constitution; there are not two constitutional authorities in a country, only one and it is anticipated by articles 114 and 115 of the Constitution” (p. 302).

Given that the same constitutional decree regulates the obligation to submit the measures taken for the approval of the Chamber of Delegates, the eventual harmonisation of the consents from the highest organs of legislative authorities would have political connotations as a consequence, and the ministers who countersigned the king's act may even have criminal responsibility, given that the king himself cannot be held responsible. Kostić thinks that the consent of the Chamber of Delegates has to be sort as soon as article 116 of the Constitution is applied, regardless of whether the circumstances which have caused the application are still lasting or have stopped. “If the series of measures are taken successively and are based on it, they should be submitted for consent one by one. If a certain amount of time passed between the moment of introducing the measures until the time of requesting consent, detailed results of the measures taken should have been submitted to the Chamber of Deputies, presenting the consequences they

IT-03-67-T

caused and how efficient they had been” (p.303). Directly criticising Dragiša Cvetković and his insistence on making the counter constitutional agreement lasting, Kostić mentions that, in that way, “the Prime Minister and co-framer have made themselves decidedly clear about the agreement in front of the senators of Yugoslav Radical Community on 1 April 1940. He attacked those who regard the undertaken measures as temporary and said that they were wrong to think that way” (p. 303)

If the Parliament denied its consent, the state of emergency would be abolished immediately and it would be normal that the government that carried it out would fall, because they gambled without a definite parliamentary mark of necessity and suitability. If the parliament accepted the state of emergency and if such a state had to last, it also had to be legalised by a parliamentary decision if it concerned measures touching on the field of legality. If it was a question of a measure suspending the constitutional decrees, in order to make them, lasting constitutional changes have to be made, using the procedure set by the Constitution. The king cannot arbitrate here, in the case of a disagreement between the houses of Parliament. “If it has already set normatives, the Constitution intended that the normatives were real legal regulations: to empower and to make responsible, to limit and to bond, so that everybody knows what they can or must do. Whence there are series of limitations that are explicitly or implicitly present in article 116. It is not a regulation that destroys the Constitution, it completes and conforms to it. By instantly closing certain parts, its goal is to preserve the constitution as a whole, as well as the order made by the constitution. This order cannot be changed and modified on the basis of article 116, it can only be consolidated” (p. 306).

From the standpoint of the legislative techniques, in Kostić's opinion, the Decree on the Banate of Croatia “is full of technical failures, dark spots, imprecise views and contradictory regulations” (p. 548). It is obvious that the text was written by legally incompetent people, who did not understand that the sense of a legal norm often depends on the sentence order. In *The Guardian*, in 1940, Kostić cites a huge number of completely unclear sentences in this article, supplementing the previous article published in *The Law Review*, which is presented here in more detail.

Previously, he had published two articles in *The Law Review* discussing the theoretical question of the resulting normatives and, from this point of view, he attacked the Decree on the Banate of Croatia. Laws belong to the resulting normatives and all the legislative acts lower than law and their framer have a duty to state the legislative normative or resulting normative that they are based on in the preamble. Legal standardisation is in the jurisdiction of the legislative authority and, when the administrative authority performs such actions, it has to be legitimized by citing the legislative empowerment on the basis of which it has the right to perform the normative actions. Otherwise, its regulations would be considered acts of usurpation *a priori*. The empowerment of an administrative organ also has to be logical and

causatively based on clear legislative regulation. "Given that one regulation cannot be formed without any authorisation, as it would represent a usurpation of power, it must not be formed on the basis of the empowerment given for other purposes and other circumstances, because that represents a flagrant abuse of power. One cannot exceed the limitations of his authorisation, because then it constitutes the abuse of power. When passing regulations, the administrative authority has to have certain empowerment and has to strictly follow its frame. Otherwise it does not act legally and its acts cannot produce the proper legal effect" (p. 552-553).

Since the king's representatives cited article 116 of the Constitution in the title of the Decree on the Banate of Croatia, as if the Banate of Croatia could have been formed by its interpretation in the broadest sense, that would have lasted for a very short period of time. "It is also interesting that the title of the Decree gives the motivation of its setting. Motivation is not a necessary condition when it comes to passing acts, especially regulations; on the contrary, one could argue that it is totally unnecessary and it never appears in practice. Motivation is not needed because it can be found in the resulting normative. However, if it is already given, it has to be real and adequate. However, in the Decree on the Banate of Croatia, there is such a motivation: "to secure the participation of the Croats in the state keeping public interests safe." Such a motivation is not correct at all. Above all, article 116 of the Constitution has the elimination of a certain negative circumstance or danger in mind, not bringing about a positive circumstance. Furthermore, it is not a question of the participation of the Croats in state life, but their participation in the state authorities. It is unquestionable that they "had been participating in state life" before, just like each group and each citizen participates. They performed military service, paid taxes, went to courts, used the railway, postal services, school, etc. and they were active in all parliamentary elections. It cannot be said that they did not participate in even the state area itself, although from time to time and not always in accordance with the size of their population. The motive of the above mentioned decree is not true and not right" (553/554).

Even more legally problematic is the Decree on broadening the Decree on the Banate of Croatia to other regional units, which was established at the same time. By this Decree, a new bordering of almost all the regional units took place, as well as the broadening of their jurisdictions in comparison with what had been stated previously by the constitutional text. This Decree would then represent a legal base for further suspensions and changes of the constitution, given that it has set itself above it, legally. "The Decree empowers the changing of the Constitution - the organ that had once illegally changed the Constitution empowers itself to keep doing it" (p. 554). According to this logic, the third illegal act followed - the Decree on changes to the existing regulations and passing of new ones, dated 16 September 1939. In this way, the regulative role of the Council of Ministry became unlimited, meaning that there was no need for the Parliament. By this decree, even

IT-03-67-T

the king himself would have to act within certain limitations and the Council of Ministers could act without the king and any limitations at all" (p. 554). The authorities did not dare to go so far as to allow the Council of Ministry to freely and arbitrarily appreciate all public interests and thus shape constitutional norms and the complete legislature. Kostić mentions that "pursuant to article 15 of the Decree on the Banate of Croatia, the Council of Ministry was empowered to pass "the regulations necessary for the execution of the mentioned provision". But "those regulations for execution of this regulation by which current laws are changed and abolished, will be passed by the king's regulations". Twenty days after that, the Council of ministry was empowered to change the existing laws in general, regardless of whether this organisation of the Banate of Croatia requires that" (p. 554).

The Parliament and the Senate were dismissed by decrees that same day when the unconstitutional Decree on the Banate of Croatia was passed. The Parliament was dismissed in accordance with article 32 of the Constitution without new elections being scheduled. The Senate was dismissed by a proclamation ending the mandates of all senators, both those appointed by the king and those elected. Both acts on dismissal were based on article 116, but this was legally untenable because, under this article, there could be no changes of regulations on the organization and functioning of the houses of the Parliament since, in that case, there would be nobody to control the king. When it comes to the monarch and the Members of Parliament, "the Constitution envisages the coexistence and later cooperation of these factors; one cannot deprive the other of jurisdiction, let alone the entity itself. If it does that, the support and the basis cannot be found in article 116 of the Constitution. The whole Constitution or some of its parts can be changed by *coup d'état*. Article 116 itself can be proclaimed as null and void, but then there is no continual legal development, one regulation does not flow from the other, one act is not derived from the other, there is no need for "legally resulting normatives" (p. 555). To make the situation even more tragicomic, "in the series of other acts with inadequate reference to the resulting normatives, it suffices to mention the Decree on the Vice-Presidency of the Council of Ministry from the 1st September 1939. It was passed "on the basis of article 15 of the Decree on the Banate of Croatia." The mere thought that a central jurisdiction was being formed on the basis of the Decree on the regional units seems strange. And really, nowhere in article 15 of the Decree on the Banate of Croatia could we find such empowerment" (p. 555).

In his discussion with some authors who thought that the statement of motivation in the text of the Decree - in accordance to which the aim of the Decree was to allow the Croats to participate in the state life - was appropriate, Kostić replies convincingly and in detail with inexorable logic: "Is it convenient to motivate a decree on a regional unit by participation in overall state life. That regulation would have the goal of providing the Croats with special Croatian authority, one narrow community that they would organise on their own and with parallel institutions, which was probably achieved. Because they would have the

total power in the Banate of Croatia, the Croats would participate in the state life less, would be more independent and would have a special status. In this regard, the motivation of the aforementioned decree is neither appropriate nor correct” (p. 558).

c) Discussions and Polemics

In his other texts, Kostić discussed the question of the parliamentary nature of the Yugoslav state organization, the mandates of the presidency of the Parliament and the special sessions, the manner of electing the parliamentary councils, the rank of the first and the second Parliament Vice-Presidents, the treatment of governmental announcements to the Parliament, the problems of treating the representatives as state officials under the legal regulations regarding state officials, etc. We deem particularly interesting two articles, published by Lazo Kostić in 1940, regarding the Decree on the election of representatives. Firstly, he states that such regulation is directly opposite to the principle of power-sharing because it is untenable for the administrative authority to regulate the form and the act of organizing legislative authority. The Constitution states that the number and manner of electing the representatives is regulated by the law, so this kind of regulation is unconstitutional. Given that the Parliament had previously been dismissed, only the former election law could have been applied, but Kostić thinks that the Government should have definitely consulted the opposition parties to find an optimal legal solution. At the same time, he further criticizes the complicated election procedures, the goal of which had always been to provide the authorities with as clear an election advantage as possible in advance – “Besides, the Croatian votes were grouped and the Serbian broken. In this way the electoral division was arranged so that the Croatian votes would almost never fail and thousands of Serbian votes would have had to remain without result in many areas, even if all the Serbs voted for the same list. This statement can be substantiated using examples regarding many different areas” (p. 355). This decree was passed without completely legalising the activities of the political parties and, therefore, it refers to the imaginary category of political groups. Even the political group that participated in the government coalition did not represent legal political organisations formally or legally.

Then follows a detailed inspection of the legal problems from the actual parliamentary reality, like the question whether the representatives have the right to remunerations after the end of the parliamentary session, the question of the repercussions for the rejection of the resignation of the government by the Parliament, the problem of active and passive suffrage in the senatorial elections, the problem of certain individual controversial cases of the senatorial elections and discussion on the cooperation of the state officials, the rank of the ministers, the expenditure of their department, the responsibility in front of the Parliament and their representation in front of the Senate and the Parliament if they are prevented personally. Kostić also takes into

consideration the right of an election mandate, the question of volunteers in the state service, the social insurance of the city officials, the legal standardisation of the jurisdiction of the State Council, the legal regulation of the status and the jurisdiction of municipalities, the specific character of the urban municipalities, the concept of the population of a municipality, the statute of Belgrade and its disputed issues, the legal regulations regarding the district of Belgrade, places, merging the districts, the voting districts, the equality of suffrage, the proportional and individual election, the cities as voting units, the implementation of the voting results, the application of the voting regulations, disputes regarding the voting lists, the structure of the voting authority, polling places and all other aspects of election issues.

Kostić’s creativity in the area of constitutional law is almost universal regarding the time and the conditions in which he studied it. It is important that he most prominently emphasised the inseparable connection between the constitutional and the administrative law in Serbian science, i.e. the organic and the essential unity of public law in general. In the first volume of *The Collected Works*, Kostić’s articles were published and they treated constitutional and administrative problems, such as the question of the annulment of the administrative acts by the administrative courts, adopting the administrative acts by financial laws, the regulation of economic matters, the influence of the verdict in a criminal case on the status of officials, the classification of court acts from the point of view of criminal law, criminal law protection, the railway, the registration of the academic titles in the municipalities, the nostrification of university diplomas, the use of academic titles, the school ranking, the regulation of the issuance of the state medals, running the national politics, the constitutional treatment of marriage and marital relations, the emergence of the hyper production of intellectuals and the creation of an intellectual proletariat.

d) The Question of the National Politics

Kostić published two very interesting texts on Serbian national politics in the magazine *The New Life* in 1922 and 1924. In the first article, *Our National Politics*, Kostić commences with the fact that, with the post-war peace contracts, the Serbs, the Croats and the Slovenians obtained the largest part of their national territories within the Kingdom of the Serbs, the Croats and the Slovenes. However, an important part of their ethnical corpus remained outside the state borders. Unlike the Serbs and the Croats, who are territorially compact in the surrounding countries and grouped close by the home country borders, the Serbs are dispersed in all the neighbouring countries and live deep in the state territory, often in national oases. Since the liberation, the official authorities have not taken good care of their destiny, leaving behind the politics of the Pan-Serbian Piedmontism, upon which almost all Serbian governments had insisted, regardless of dynastic intrigues. Kostić insists on the national concentration of the Serbs and the exchange of populations with the adjacent countries which would lead toward that

goal, bearing in mind the one hundred thousand Serbs who stayed in Hungary after the demarcation, dispersed deeply in the Hungarian territory and cut off from their home country. The exchange of population is necessary with Romania too, given that a large number of Serbs live in the Timisoara Banat and a large number of the Romanians live in the Serbian Banat. A similar procedure should be performed in the case of the Serbs who stayed in Albania. Our state territory is wide enough and can be populated with all the Serbs from the adjacent countries, especially if we bear in mind that the idea that the Serbs would have territorial pretensions toward any country is nonsense after her successes in WWI. With respect to these matters, he openly criticises the state authorities for failing to act in conformity with the concept of the concentration of the Serbian people.

In his second text, entitled *Our State was not Made after the War*, Kostić points to the verdict of the Electoral Court in Geneva passed in 1922, pursuant to which the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was not declared a new state from the standpoint of the post-war peace treaties. This means that the governmental and the international continuity of Serbia was confirmed. However, charlatans with high-sounding academic titles appeared in the country itself, from the Croatian and Slovenian side, wanting to challenge and deny that on the basis of passing a new constitution as if in international law states appear and disappear in accordance with internal constitutional changes. It is possible to change the whole legal system in one state, as Kostić argues patiently and in detail with one of the Slovenian challengers,

but it does not make changes regarding its legal subjectivity. Such an argument seems even more persuasive if we remember that dynastic changes are mostly done in accordance to the factual, not the legal manner.

e) Appropriate Reviews and Surveys

In 28 reviews and surveys, Lazo Kostić commented on the scientific works of other authors and analysed them patiently and meticulously, often criticising considerably. When discussing Slobodan Jovanović, Kostić is very considerate, full of respect and appreciation, but he inexorably states his own arguments, based on sound logical views and proofs from legal practice. In foundation, Kostić keeps the same principle when reviewing the works of Đorđe Tasić, Mihailo Ilić, Ive Krbeč, Stevan Segadin, Franjo Gorčić, Mirko Kosić and others, but the most prominent is his indication of the quasi-scientific amateurism of Nikola Stjepanović in the magazine *The Modern Municipality* from October 1940. It is interesting here to remember that, after WWII, Nikola Stjepanović was a major communist theoretician of administrative law and, as I found out recently, an unscrupulous plagiarist of Lazo Kostić's works. Regarding Stjepanović's book *The General Theory of the Supreme Control of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia*, which represented the text of his doctoral dissertation, Lazo Kostić, among other things, wrote: "Above all, the title itself is impossible,

unintelligible and inadequate. It is hard to see what was meant by the words "general territory". If it is general territory of control authorities, then it should not have been limited only to the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Given that it did limit to that, what kind of general territory could it be? The systematics and organization of material is also irregular, one could even say inverse. The writer first gives organization and management of our Main Control Board, and then gives theoretical explanations on the legal position and legal character of replaced organs with us and with the other side. While chapters I and II of the book are mostly descriptive, the other two chapters are too theoretical. Here we can find issues that have no direct connection to the basic subject. Notions of state functions are being "cleansed" here etc. Instead of presenting the particularities and necessity of the control authority and the general principles of its organization in the introduction, he theorises all over, unable to limit himself to the subject or indicate what is important. In one place, he cites what he had written in "*Justice*" on appointing members of the Main Control Board and cites his opinion! How can all this be placed within a "general theory" on Main Control Board?" (p. 675.)

Continuing further in the same sarcastic tone, Kostić does not leave a stone unturned regarding Stjepanović's intellectual premature baby: "Showing positive rights about our control body, about Main Control Board, the writer avoids groupings and systemisation. For example, he gives the attributions of the Chief control without any order of notions, the way he would find them in Law (p. 16-18). And, most importantly, he does not state the legal regulations from which he derived that, and many other source materials, so it is difficult to check his views. Besides all these flaws of the book, the writer's attitude is too arrogant and pretentious. We cannot find anything modest; the writer does not see that it is like the initial work of a new solicitor. On the contrary, in each of his conclusions, we can see that he regards his work as state of the art science, something unsurpassable and unattainable, that everything that had been written in area of Public law should now fade and step back before his "general theory". Reading his book, one cannot help remembering Propertius's sarcastic verses: "Latin writers, step back, Greek too; we do not know why, but something greater than the *Illiad* is being born!" (p. 676).

Kostić gives Propertius' texts in its original Latin, but here we have given only their loose translation, which he cited in a footnote. Then there is merciless criticism of Stjepanović's dissertation: "In our legal science, there have never been such pretensions; in that regard, Stjepanović's book represents a date just like he himself represents a curiosity. After all, to an extreme degree, he demonstrated a phenomenon in his thesis that is almost general among new doctors of law at Belgrade University. They glorify their professors and their administrators, find and quote even their newspaper articles, always agree with them, but with utmost scorn they casually mention or even pass over all other views, especially if they see that they please those they have become attached to like this. As a thesis, Stjepanović's book is not the worst coming from the Belgrade Law faculty, just as it is far from

the best. Nevertheless, Mr. Stjepanović's thesis had produced an effect that could be thought of as a record: on the basis of it, Mr. Stjepanović received three academic degrees in less than two full years: the rank of doctor, a docent and a professor. It is really hard to find better proof of the lousy state of our university" (p. 676).

II. Administrative Law

Lazo Kostić published the first thoroughly prepared Serbian textbook on Administrative Law in three volumes, titled *The administrative right of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia*, published by Geca Kon. The first volume, *The Organization of Management*, was published in 1933; the second, *The Activity of Management*, in 1919; and the third, *Monitoring Management*, in 1919. I have included all three books in the second volume of Kostić's collected works and added Kostić's collected articles and polemics from administrative right, published in the periodicals.

1. The Organization of Management

Lazo Kostić defines management as permanent and planned state activity with the goal of achieving its social purpose and it is hard to differentiate it from legislature and judiciary in its material criteria, given that even the administrative organs sometimes bring general rules and apply laws like judiciary. Division is possible by differentiating the state organs into administrative, legal and legislative. Administrative organs are organs of executive power, practical work and administration. Management is very easy to define negatively by defining that administrative organs are all state organs that are neither legislative nor legal. Administrative right in an objective sense is a group of positive constitutional norms. That is the name of the scientific discipline that studies this problem and it is different to the science of administration and constitutional rights. According to Kostić, the science of administration deals with the examination of manners and means by which public administration executes its social function and it does not examine them only from the legal point of view, but from the political, economic, cultural, technical etc. ones as well. The science of administration is growing into administrative politics, which criticises all administrative phenomena based on their value, rationality, suitability and usage and, based on their critique, establishes new demands and goals with the aim of perfecting the overall managing method and administrative activity.

Administrative rights examine administration solely in its normative aspect, some legal institutions and norms that are guided by administrative organs. It represents a unique system of state rights, with administrative rights. Their borderlines, such as official rights, the budget law or power organization cannot be totally separated. Kostić thinks that the basic distinguishing criteria lies in the fact that administrative rights affect organization with the highest state power and

IT-03-67-T

activity as legislative, and administrative rights deals with the activity of administrative organs, which implies both the problem of their organization and work regarding administration control. In all this, there is a process of prominent division between material and process administrative rights, which was published in criminal and civil law a long time ago. There are three basic methods of displaying administrative rights. The descriptive method is used to display and explain normatives following the order of state division into spheres of interest. The synthetic method is interested in norms as such, regardless of the manner and goal of their origin and it examines legal notions, institutions and principles within a strict legal system. The legal-sociological method says that legal institutions cannot be understood without knowledge of their historical and social development, mainly the political and economic relations that conditioned them.

Regarding organization, activity and administrative control, Kostić classifies all countries into three basic types: class state, police state and legal state. A class state inherited the feudal split and economic right of regional units, where the central power arbitrates in the case of conflicts between the rights of the dukes and their subjects. A duke always had an advantage because of having the right to police, but he also had to share his power with members of the highest class. A police state is absolutistic and operates under the principle of state causes or the arbitrary self-will of a ruler using understandable suitability. State administration amounts to police with no limitations and there is no legal protection against its self-will. There is an administrative hierarchy but, at any time, supreme power can take over the prerogatives of all minor organs. Courts only deal with criminal and civil processes, but they can protect civilians from police self-will in part, when it comes to their property rights.

The legal state appears in civil society and by the substitution of absolutism with constitutionalism. State administration is subject to legal organization and its empowerment is regulated by law regarding its citizens. On the basis of these legal norms, citizens have certain rights under the name of subjective public rights and, based on them, change their status as subjects into the status as citizens. The legal state is only possible where there is a constitutional system that guarantees basic civil rights and duties and where there is also a principle of the strict division of legislative, administrative and juridical power. Administration is regulated by legal norms and each of its obligatory acts has to have legal base. Laws are equally obligatory for both citizens and administrative organs. All administrative empowerments have to be clearly and precisely taxed and the discretionary power of administrative organs is reduced to a minimum. The actions of administrative organs have to be regulated by law and receive a form of court norm. Between determining obligations and their execution, there has to be certain formal act, mostly a solution that is analogous to a verdict with court power. To really speak of a legal state, it is necessary to have legal control of administrative power activity, where the principle of the independent court is respected. Courts examine the legitimacy of administrative acts.

In some countries, court control is done by regular courts, while there are special administrative courts in others.

Kostić points out that Hitler's concept of a social state, by negating the priorities of public and private subjective rights, in fact brought back a police state. At the same time, Russia and Italy introduced a system of a party state where one political party, by becoming a state factor, received competencies of the highest power and turned its party programme into a national one. Both corporative and socialistic systems completely negate the legal state. Indirectly, he criticizes King Alexander's dictatorship as a concept of strong hand, full security or national unity for being a negation of the idea and concept of a legal state.

Thinking that Serbian middle age rights had no influence on the development of the Serbian administration in 19th century, Kostić urges that "there are writers trying to find that connection and influence, at least here and there [...] These attempts contain a lot of forced and unsubstantiated evidence. One has to admit that the first laws in the restored Serbia in the first years of Karađorđe's reign, were looking for support from old Serbian rights. In his own words, Priest Mateja's points were made by *Nomokanon*: the first project of the Serbian constitution was drafted by Božidar Grujović [...] undoubtedly inspired by the Dušan's Code. All these are either legal propositions or laws with ephemeral durability that, in their part, did not infect later legislature. The Serbian legislature developed in the later period of 19th century was mostly based on foreign models, without the support of previous examples. This is particularly true of the administrative legislature" (p. 25).

Citing Teodor Taranovski and his *History of State Law*, published in Belgrade, in 1931, Kostić says: "During the Nemanjić dynasty, the Serbian state was undoubtedly a class state. Although the organization of state and power drew support from Byzantium, the state developed its class form independently from these role models. The state was pervaded by patrimonial character or character of the Serbian tradition. The ruler's right was not absolute; it was moderate: councils and lords (apart from the Assembly) were counterbalanced. Except for the centralised administration concentrated in the ruler's court, there were other permanent authorities, both regional and local. Taranovski mostly groups these into two categories: intermediary authorities and subordinate ones. The first were represented by lords whose estates "formed special parts of the state alongside regions and states", and then towns and villages. The second were represented by various officials, subject to the ruler personally. The main characteristic of the Serbian state in the Middle Ages is the principle of legitimacy, which could be found in the whole state organization and the activities of the state authorities. That principle was definitively put into practice in Dušan's Code" (p. 25-26).

According to Taranovski, "the legal code does not only carry out tacit principle of legislature, it also proclaims it publicly and explicitly. That proclamation manifests itself in direct regulations so that

everything should be done by law, and also in appropriate prohibitions against do anything without the law" (p. 26.) Kostić adds that this principle is "primarily applicable to courts, which had separated themselves into an independent category of power. Significantly, it is stated in article 172 of the Legal code: "All judges have to judge *verbatim* by the code, not to judge out of fear of the king." But administrative action was also regulated here and there by objective, even written legal norms. At that time, the administration was limited to the police, security and finance. Within this domain, the Code clearly carries out the principle of legality and leaves room for self-will and arbitration. The organization of the Serbian state in the Middle Ages, especially in its final period (during Dušan's reign), was not so different to the organization of the western states of the time. Differences, if there were any, were shown only in advancement, not in falling behind. Who knows how the old Serbian law would have developed if it had not been stopped and destroyed by the invasion of foreigners and the conquest of the country" (p. 26).

After many centuries in slavery, "when domestic authorities were established again on the restoration of Serbia at the beginning of 19th century, ideas of a legal state had already been created in the west. They were the forerunners but also the followers of the gradual transformation of police states into legal ones. However, the restored Serbia was not organized at once as a legal state. Just as Serbia during Nemanjić time, which was a period of two centuries, went through all the phases of the political organization of the other European states very quickly in order to reach the form of a class state, the restored Serbia had to go through the phases of political and state organization of the time to reach the accepted notion of a legal state. In its purity, that idea was barely applicable for a short while. Until 1830, we cannot talk about any definite administrative system in Serbia. In this period, Serbia was just one rebellious area from legal point of view. Power was organized factually, with swaying and straying; both Karađorđe and Miloš, as revolution leaders, tried to grab as much power as they could. One could not argue about the despotic characteristic of their rule. The only thing from this period that should be mentioned is the trial separation and individual organization of legal authority, a trial that was not realized and nor was it put into practice. (p. 260.)

Then we have Kostić's elaboration on constitutional development up until the WWI. "The direction of reign had not been altered, even after Hatt-i Sharif in 1930 - not after the first Sretenje Constitution in 1835. It happened that legal law was put under law and legal independence was proclaimed. Like legislative power, the duke shared administrative power with the Council. The Constitution was only effective for a couple of months. After its closing, things returned to the way they had been before. Only in the Turkish constitution (since 1838), there was a three part power division; the legal and administrative power divided and separate. Legal power became a multilevel organization and was promoted. With this Constitution, "the legal period in state administration begins". It initiates the practice of passing written laws.

The ruler's power was pretty limited, especially during Aleksandar Karadorđević's time (the movement of the "constitutionalists"). Slowly, professional and capable officials were recruited. Things were going in the direction of a modern state organization and it could be said that there was a trial organization of a legal state. The second Mihailo's reign was totally distant from that; it was rightfully characterized as a reign of enlightened absolutism. In a period when democracy and constitutionalism in Europe were celebrating a definitive victory, reign in Serbia imitated role models that were older than half a century. The Constitution was formally alive, but it was totally transformed and drilled by common laws and, at the end of Mihailo's reign, there was barely one of its regulations remaining in effect. At that time, many laws were passed: there was no more fruitful legislative period until 1929. Many of these laws had the goal of organizing administration; some were in effect for 50 and 60 years [...] The Prince Mihailo grabbed all the power into his hands but, at the same time, he organized a strong administration that had been utterly neglected and unappreciated. The Constitution in 1869 introduced an era of constitutionalism, the Constitution in 1888 established a parliamentary reign. Subjective public rights began to be heard and their protection by the State Council was admitted up to a point. All later turmoil, especially during time of Aleksandar Obrenović (the cancellation and imposition of the constitution, *coup d'états*, states of emergency, etc.) did not allow the legal state to appear, even in its basic form. It was able to come alive in the period after 1903, but even then not entirely. Political rights were given very widely, but the administrative law did not achieve adequate development" (p. 27).

Lazo Kostić here comes across as fierce and irreconcilable critic of king Aleksandar I Karadorđević's dictatorship, which prevented the democratic growth of the first Yugoslav state and the establishment of a modern legal order. He says: "Only in an extended state, after the Vidovdan Constitution, does the protection of subjective public rights gains full importance. By using modern administrative laws, it appeared that, in a very short period of time, our state would succeed in achieving the level of western states in the acceptance and protection of public rights. But these hopes did not come true. The State Council, being the supreme administrative law, showed itself to be a very slow moving body, not very willing to create a constant and solid judiciary and to oppose political influences. The period from 1929-32 could be compared to Mihailo's reign. There was attention given to the new and solid organization of administration; not a day passed without some important administrative norm being passed. Many of these entered a new field and regulated new relations; administration was becoming more and more tied, not only in the material and legal manner, but also in the matter of form. And while, on the one hand, we have the realisation of the principles and postulates of a legal state, on the other these principles were weakened and partly destroyed by lack of political freedom and legal independence (meaning the independence of administrative laws, too). At the time when administration was the most tied formally,

subjective public rights were very poorly protected. From all of this, one could say that the idea of the legal state here was often mentioned as a political ideal and that there were attempts at its realization, but in practice it never had deep roots. The forces that opposed it were always stronger. For more than half a century we have been going around the idea of a legal state and opposing it, apparently not being able to support it and accept it consciously and entirely. Still, in the frame of a legal state, there are ideas of former types of authority, especially the one which directly preceded the rule of law. From time to time they become so powerful that they break the frame within which they moved and give almost the full content to a certain nature" (p. 27-28).

Law is the original source of administrative right, and all other are derived and subject to the law, which obtains the guarantee of validity and perseverance to it. Decrees are the second in the legal power according to their source and they obligate the administrative organs, courts, citizens, even the bodies that passed them. They had to be in conformity with the Constitution and the law, as well as the entire lower general acts. In case of the application of the autonomous statutes the managing organ is authorised to examine into the legality first. The application of the norms of the common law in the sphere of the administrative law has to be consistently avoided, but the regard for the moral norms and the protection of public order, peace, common good and society's interest. The general legal acts which are not published in line with the prescribed method are legally null and void.

The state administration is organised through the system of bodies, institutions and functionaries with diversified legal and public relations which connect them in their attempts to realise the common goals and common interests. Organisation is implemented by forming the state administrative bodies, by regulating their mutual relations, determination of their powers and competencies, organising the essence and method of realisation of the public authorisations, as well as their undisturbed and parallel functioning. Actually, this is the administrative organisation of the state which the supreme management bodies are authorised to organize. These bodies are directly established by the Constitution and the Constitution states their competencies. Kostić holds that all organisation normatives have the character of the administrative regulations in the creation of which the bodies of the other two branches of power do not interfere. However, he immediately opposes the principle of legality as the foundation of the rule of law, which implies that the legislative authority organises the administration. He holds that this has to be primarily related to the activities of the administration and its financing, while, where the legal status of each individual citizen is concerned, the actual organisational structure of the administrative bodies is not of high importance.

By the constituent regulations, the organisational norms are passed, by which certain administration bodies are established and their competencies are delimited, since this is not only a matter of purely legal technique but, in its essence, it is a constitutional issue by which the body is established, internally organised, and a representative to

represent it in the legal trade is appointed. The legislative power that can establish such bodies, logically, can also discontinue those bodies.

The practice is different when matters of appointing functionaries and giving ranks are concerned. Sometimes it is prescribed by law and sometimes by a by-law, depending on the degree of the consistent implementation of the principle of the division of power and the primary concept of the legal regulation of the status of clerks. In the Parliamentary system, the legislative authorities choose or appoint and/or dissolve the highest officials of executive authority and they have the authorisation to appoint all lower-ranking functionaries and clerks in the subordinate hierarchy. Certain parts of the administration are referred to as administrative bodies but, at the same time, they are concrete bearers of administrative titles that have certain administrative authorisations. Authorisations can be individual or collective, but they are entrusted with certain public activities. Administrative titles are always personalised and connected with the name of its bearer. Titles are generally permanent and its users are changeable, while a strong continuity with respect to performing activities from certain competence is established. As opposed to the bureaus and institutions, the competent bodies are primarily bodies of the authority administration. An individual person can be in a position of the state body if he has certain administrative competencies and this separates them from the mass of civil servants, to whose status he belongs in the wider sense of the word. Local and other autonomies are also state bodies from the standpoint of administrative law, due to the fact that the state delegates certain power and competencies to them in the constitution or the law. However, they are individual legal entities, while all the other state bodies and offices represent a united and inseparable state as legal entities.

Competencies regarding external factors represent an independent entity, so its internal division has no external significance, regardless of whether it is made of individual, collective or complex bodies. All administrative bodies perform only those duties that are prescribed as their legal competence in advance - real or territorial. The competence encompasses the field of the work, rights and obligations, responsibilities, etc., and is always determined in the public interest and cannot be mixed with the will of an individual or an agreement of political parties. This makes it absolute, but competence can also be relative where the right to delegate from one body to another is concerned. Competence can be divided between the special administrative bodies that determine the facts, make decisions and execute those decisions. The competences of the autonomies can also be classified as those which have to and those which can perform it. In any case, the competences of administration needed to be regulated in detail because, where the administration is authorised to act freely, the rule of law does not exist and it is impossible to curb misuse. Real and localised competence is determined by the official duty, regardless of whether an objection was filed with respect to it. Where there is an indisputable danger from postponing, the regulations envisage the possibility of the violation of the localised competence. When it is impossible to specify

IT-03-67-T

the real competences, the concept of the presumption of competences is introduced, by their transfer to a higher body in accordance with the principle of 'it can be more, it can be less'. Where a clear competence of the individual bodies of authority cannot be found, the competence of general authority is implied. The delegation of competences from the higher to the lower administrative bodies is always possible, if it is not expressly excluded by law. The delegation of competencies is similar to the letter rogatory to the authorities, when one body addresses the other with a request for help. The delegation of competence can be revoked at any moment.

The avocation of the authorities starts when the higher, superior authority takes over a portion of the subordinate body's competence. This happens most often where the conflict of competence or indolence is concerned, as well as the inefficiency and poor work of the lower body. The conformity of the administration does not imply its simplicity, but its increasing complication in parallel with development and improvement. In order to function successfully, it has to be broken down but, under the condition that it does not break its unity and entirety, the regularity of its system and internal structure or cohesion and homogeneity. State administration can be active, advisory and controlling. Only the active administration enters into a direct contract with the citizens because of its activities, preparing, making or executing decisions. Advisory and control advises and controls the active administration, the first preceding its activities and the latter monitoring it, i.e. forcing it to be in line with the law. Advice from the advisory bodies can be of a legal or technical nature, but cannot be political. The opinion of the advisory authority is not obligatory, but asking for their opinion before certain activities can be obligatory. An opinion cannot be the same as an approval or agreement.

In the territorial respect, the state administration is divided in to central, regional and local types. The central administration is the supreme and direct state administration and the lower administrative levels are its transmission. Sometimes, the state itself recognises the autonomy of certain public law bodies, which are constituted as having territorial or personal self-governance. They are independent legal entities and freely decide within the scope of their competence and select the activities, means and methods of management based on the general legal principles pursuant to the Constitution and Laws. Self-governances are completely autonomous in constructing their internal structures of power and the appointment of its bearers. Since the central administration comprises all of the state administration, its bodies are organised in a hierarchy and are generally divided into supreme, middle and lower segments. The supreme administrative bodies are the ministries, while the middle and the lower bodies comprise the regional administration and represent the first degree administration. The middle administrative bodies are sometimes first-degree and sometimes second-degree but, in certain cases, the ministries can be first-degree bodies of state administration. Where the offices and institutions are concerned, there is no two-degree principle and they function independently and are

regularly subordinate to one ministry in the administrative regard.

Supreme state administration is divided into field ministries representing special administrative branches. The number and jurisdiction of the ministries varies from country to country. In order to perform jurisdiction more easily, ministries are usually divided from within into departments or competencies, but this does not question their jurisdiction. Ministries also have an outer service made up of their original and secondary bodies, institutions and public institutions directly subordinate to them and special administrations, bureaus, offices etc. Within a country, the administration is organized on a material or territorial principle. Regional state administration can be either general or specialised. For practical reasons, administration is sometimes divided by competence, by grouping similar administrative activities together according to their basic characteristics, and this is the way the state examination is organised. State clerks are also specialized according to competence. Administration is further divided based on which ones give orders, i.e. authoritative, and which deal with citizens on an equal basis, which is not authoritative and is generally divided further into social, cultural and economic.

Administrative institutionalization is done through administrative institutions which can be independent and non-independent, depending on whether they have the characteristic of a legal entity. Independent institutions have independence in matters of state administration, which can control their work, but it cannot command or order certain activities or conduct. Here, we speak about institutionalized autonomies, which Kostić divides into bureaus and corporations. Although independent in performing their activities, they do not have the right of self-cancellation. Corporations are forced associations, like obligatory chambers, and membership can not end by resignation or expulsion, only by forbidding a certain activity. Public-legal corporations have certain prescribed public authorisation and duties coming from that. Bureaus are institutions in the narrow sense of the word, which have a certain property base, directed towards achieving certain public purposes, but they do not have members, only external users, mostly in the sphere of education, health care and culture, but also science, traffic, etc. Bureaus can be independent and non-independent, general and specific.

Besides this, Kostić divides public administration into state and fiscal, public institutions and public services, then general and special, permanent and temporary. The notion of a public administration is much wider, according to this understanding, than the notion of state administration, but there are authors from the sphere of administrative law and the science of administration who consider the term 'public' to be synonymous with the term 'state'. Public enterprises differ from institutions primarily in their privately-legal regime of business activities, at a commercial basis. Sometimes a country, due to existing disturbances or having some other interest, starts to transform certain primarily private businesses and activities into a public service, which is called etatisation. Public services usually have a monopolistic character and are based on the assumption that private initiative in this sphere

could not entirely and adequately satisfy public interest. Sometimes a country entrusts such an activity to private persons, permanently or temporarily, by system of concession. With indirect administration, a country transfers administrative authorisations to private institutions regarding the performance of certain public activities. It usually concerns institutions that are regarded as generally useful, mostly humanitarian or about memorials, funds etc.

Administration is organized on the principle of seniority and subordination – i.e. hierarchically – and its bodies tend to act in accordance, in harmony, given that all are mutually connected but of different rank. Bodies of the same rank coordinate their work – those of lower rank are called subordinated and those of higher rank are superiors. Usually, bodies with a wider authority spectrum represent higher, and those with a narrower spectrum represent lower, so the system of administrative power is pyramidal. Higher bodies give instructions to lower ones on how to interpret and apply laws, i.e. conduct previous activity. They can confirm, change or annul their acts, but also punish clerks for disobedience. Higher bodies name, appoint and promote – i.e. acquit the lower bodies – and they also solve jurisdiction disputes among any kind of subordinate bodies. As Kostić points out, the lower bodies' power of making decisions concerning higher ones does not exist, because they cannot engage in an administrative lawsuit if they think that a higher body overstepped its empowerment. The formal supreme head of administrative authority is the head of the country but he, as a rule, has no right to abolish administrative acts or perform disciplinary punishment. In modern times, his function consists of giving mandates for the government structure, made by ministers as leaders of the individual administrative departments, but he has to ensure that his mandatory has the trust of the highest body of legislative power.

The basic principle upon which state administration is organized is monocratic, which means that one administrative body is managed by a head who bears complete responsibility for its work, represents it and passes resolutions and orders. He is a personalized expression of that body. All other personnel serve as training or executive. Only active management is organized monocratically, while the advisory administration, self-governance and various forms of temporary administration, are mostly organized under the colleague principle, modelled by legislative or court authority. A colleague body consists of a lot of persons who have the right to make decisions, which are passed by voting. Members of a colleague-based administrative body can be defined by function – delegated or appointed – and sometimes a body itself can have the right to co-opt new members to vacant posts. Colleague bodies of local self-governance are divided between solving and executing responsibilities.

State administration can be centralized and decentralized and the basic criteria for their difference in practice is the question whether only central bodies can pass general legal acts, or it can this also be done by various grades of autonomies or self-governance. There has to be a

difference between the decentralisation and deconcentration of administration where, by heaping the hierarchy and discipline, a certain amount of work is transferred from higher to lower administrative bodies.

The unity and similarity of executive power and administration provides the Council of ministers or government. The government can, actually or formally, be subject to the head of the state, but it has to provide parliamentary trust. All ministers are members of the government and can be either departmental or without portfolio. The president of the government is basically the first minister among equals, but he can have certain special powers. Sometimes he also has a special portfolio and sometimes there is no portfolio at all, which means he has no administrative competence, only political and state-legal. What puts him above the other ministers is that he is entrusted with a mandate for the government structure and because the government as a whole collapses with his resignation. Kostić here gives the organizational structure of a royal court in detail, as well as the jurisdiction and organization of ministries of justice, education, foreign affairs, internal affairs, finances, the army and navy, construction, traffic, agriculture, economy and industry, forestry and mines, social politics and national health care and physical education, as well as bank management, Belgrade city administration, regional offices, town offices and municipalities, under regulations of the imposed Constitution from 1931, and then valid laws. Besides this, he pays special attention to analyzing the role of the municipality in the structure of organization of a state administration as well as the basic institutions of local self-governance.

Then there is a detailed analysis of the notion and classification of state clerks. State clerks consist of independent state bodies and members of boards, among which the head of the state, peoples representatives and senators are not subordinate to anybody, and their right to perform functions derive directly from the Constitution. Then there are titular clerks like soldiers, temporary clerks and contractual clerks and professionals, as well as, at the end and also the largest category, the permanent clerical staff. This is made up of clerks in the technical sense of the word and it is characteristic of them that they are pragmatic, professional, permanent and categorized by their competence. Kostić classifies them further into clerks of citizenship, military and church ranking, as well as independent clerks. State clerks of higher rank are called officials and they are further categorized into classes. The law prescribes conditions for employing them in government service, ways of founding state service, promotion, transfers, disposal, suspension, sick leave, absence, oath taking, the duty to perform work conscientiously, total commitment to the service, keeping official secrets, subordinates, decent behaviour, political boundaries, income, the end of clerical competence, pensions, taking care of a clerk's family, etc..

Kostić pays special attention to distinct categories of state clerks, such as ministers, bans and university professors, but also members of parliamentary services, traffic staff, officers and non-commissioned

IT-03-67-T

officers. He says about the ministers that they are not officers, but that they are in the state service, although in monarchies they have some purely administrative characteristics. The conditions for obtaining the status are different and the status benefits are much bigger than those of the officers. Their status is double, political and official. Professors of the state universities are state officers and their titles are sorted in this manner. They differ from other officer in that their appointment is carried out on the basis of the previous elections by the autonomous university bodies. Minister issues an act on appointment, related to the received proposal and he can accept or reject it, but he cannot appoint someone who is not proposed by the council of the faculty and the university assembly. In army, besides the general and mandatory service there is also a voluntary one, performed by officers and non-commissioned officers and their status as state officers is regulated by special provisions.

2. Administrative Activity

For the science of administrative law, what public administration does is not so important and how and within which legal forms it acts. The activity of the administrative authority can be divided into administrative acts and administrative activities. In the first case, we can talk about orders and commands that are obligatory, and in the second. the administrative organs take part in administrative circulation equally with other participants. Generally speaking, administrative activity can be normative and under agreement, and specifically, it is primarily based on passing individual legal acts. Within its normative activity, the administrative organs pass regulations and autonomous statutes as general acts. In Kostić's opinion, the right to pass regulations is not entirely in accordance with the applied principle of authority classification and it represents a remnant from the period of omnipotent administration, but it has been kept in all modern legal and administrative practice, given that the legislative authority and parliamentarism were not capable of depriving the administrative authority of that entirely.

Regulations are very similar to laws because, in their essence, they are based on normativity and regulativity of general character. They can be divided into legal and administrative. In the material sense, legal regulations are laws because they contain everything a law has, which means general orders, the regulation of social relations and encroachment into the individual's rights. They are obligatory in general and widen the legal order by modifying it. The administrative regulations issue the organization of state organs and institutions, their internal order and dealings, as well as official instructions to the higher administrative organs, which are at a lower level regarding the application of certain laws and dealing with other activities under their jurisdiction. Kostić points out that there are regulations that, in their characteristics, are somewhere between legal and administrative, and contain interpretative, i.e. indicative regulations, with the goal of facilitating the application of law to the lower organs and to clear up

what is not clearly said in the law. In the case of extraordinary circumstances or a state of war, regulations are passed as necessary, in order to protect law and order, the country's safety and general public interests. Under the protocol of extraordinary circumstances, they are submitted for verification to the supreme legislative body. Regarding formal and legal power, Kostić divides regulations into those that derive directly from constitutional permissions, legalized regulations that have been later accepted by the parliament under the legal procedure (as in the case of the ratification of international contracts), regulations with legal power that can change certain laws under clear legal authority, regulations that can be changed only by law, regulations that the administrative authority can pass only once and cannot change afterwards, regulations that the administrative authority can pass and change freely on the basis of legal permission, regulations passed by permission from some earlier regulation (which are often called orders or books of regulations), refining regulations that are used to refine the text of former regulations and also of the law, regulations in the form of legal propositions that have not been voted for in parliament but which the government starts to apply immediately, which is primarily applicable in the sphere of defining the amount and payment of taxes.

Autonomous statutes are a sort of regulation passed by administrative organs lower than the highest organ of state executive authority, before all institutions and public law corporations. They have to be in accordance with the law and the state regulations and they represent an act by which autonomous bodies regulate their internal relations on the basis of the approved right and power to draft the statutes, i.e. the area of jurisdiction. The competence for passing autonomous statutes is general, but going into effect is determined on the basis of the later approval of the administrative authority, which examines the legislation and, often, their suitability. If an autonomous corporation disregards its obligation to pass its statute within a certain deadline, its statute can be imposed by an authorised administrative organ.

The agreed activity of the administrative organs consists of passing the bilateral acts which can be private and legal contracts and public and legal agreements. The contracts are based on the regulations of common law and the contracting parties are completely equal; therefore the state organs and private, physical or juristic persons are equal. Generally, they can be divided into contracting and purchasing contracts. The special norms, passed by the state in these cases, are primarily focused on stamping out corruption. On the other hand, in the case of a court procedure, the state organs, public corporations and self-governance institutions are better protected regarding property rights than private persons. With public-law agreements, it is not possible to achieve full equality of the parties and freedom of their will - and they are classified into mutual agreements of public and legal bodies and acts on the first appointment of clerks, as well as all other acts based on the acceptance of clerks regarding the conditions of employment.

An administrative act is a legal action of the administrative authority

by which its one-sided authoritative will is being executed, which is done by the legal regulations and draws legal consequences, in order to regulate a concrete case. It can apply to a person or an action that is obligatory or prohibited. In the area of court authority, a match to an administrative act is a verdict and that fact shows that it is a question of law application - the general legal norms to individual cases. Basically, the administrative acts can be divided into negative - by which the existing status is maintained, and positive - by which the existing legal status is changed. The positive legal acts can further be divided into those that create rights and obligations, those that change already existing rights and obligations or those that annul and cancel them. Besides, there are declarative legal acts that only state the existence of a legal situation regarding the rights, obligations and legal relations, so they are essentially different from the above mentioned positive acts, which are also called constitutive, reconstitutive and deconstitutive. The constitutive administrative acts, which consist of orders, prohibitions, obligations and burdens are called onerous. There are also favourable, constitutive acts, which admit the rights and competencies, give permissions, create mutual legal relations and legal situations. In other administrative activities, we can include simple administrative actions such as documenting, notifying, statement acceptance and material actions, that represent the technical work of institutionalised administration. Documenting can further be divided into filing and certificating. Filing comprises book keeping, registry and record book evidence, etc. Certificates are issued on the basis of data from the registry and their special forms are identity cards.

Besides widely explaining his own classification of administrative acts, Kostić deals with other authors' classifications. He personally followed Karlo Korman's ideas, but he also mentioned the views by which administrative acts can be divided into decrees and decisions of administrative authority, governmental acts and acts of other administrative organs, given that governmental organs have a political component as well; free and coherent administrative acts, provisional and temporal, external and internal, simple and complex, formal and informal orders and decisions, as well as quadripartite division on regulative, subjective, conditional and jurisdictional administrative acts. Further divisions are independent and non-independent, suspensionally conditional and resolutely conditional, etc.

To establish a legal state and secure the legal safety of citizens, besides having serious legal regulations, it is very important to strictly regulate the administrative activity with a tendency to have the procedure of administrative authority in compliance with the judicial as much as possible. Modern states are trying to codify procedural administrative rights. The procedural norms can be divided into those used in a certain case as obligatory, exclusive or facultative. The necessary participants in the administrative procedure are the administrative organs and the persons referred by the procedure, and eventual witnesses, court experts, interpreters, interested parties, etc. The administrative organ manages the procedure by protecting the

public interests, but cannot ignore the individual interests protected by the law, but has to act justly and unbiased. The parties in an administrative procedure are those who demand the passing of an administrative act, the persons the act would refer to and the persons against whom the administrative authority has started a procedure individually, in the line of duty, as well as the persons whose interests can be indirectly concerned. The parties in the proceedings can have representatives, agents, assistants and trustees. Kostić divides the administrative procedure into five phases: initiation, fact-questioning, making decisions, the usage of legal medicines and execution. Besides that, he pays special attention to cases of the abnormal course of administrative procedure, such as shortened procedure, the abolition of procedure, renewal and the return to the previous state.

In the chapter on the relation between the authority and the other participants of administrative procedure, Kostić meticulously takes into consideration the dealings with clients, the delivery of papers and summons, deadlines in administrative procedure, keeping order and bearing the expenses of a procedure. He pays special attention to the basic principles of an administrative procedure. Such an official principle shows that an authority initially starts an administrative procedure in the line of duty whenever it finds the conditions to do so, but there is also the limited usage of the private principle in the initial phase, mostly in the appeal and executive procedure. The inquisitive principle says that an authoritative organ states evidence or gives orders to obtain it and it is applied in most cases, although one can also use a dispositional one, which lets the client present evidence that they regard as relevant. Being prevalent, although there are no identical forms, the inquisitional principle has affirmed the principle of the material truth and the authorities are directly referred to its full inspection. Besides, the authority operates under the principle of free evidence evaluation based on its free conviction, but it also has an obligation to respect the principle of client interrogation, which means the right of private persons to declare under the question of the subject of an administrative procedure. Given that interrogation has to be mutual if the subjects are two-partial, it also includes the principle of the equality of the parties. The oral principle and the written principle are combined mutually so that, in practice, sometimes one prevails and sometimes the other. To these we can attach the direct and indirect principles, given that certain processed activities can be entrusted to some other organs of administrative authority, of a lower rank or the appealed of the same rank. In contrast to the majority of juridical procedures, an administrative procedure is led by the principle of not being public, which excludes the presence of legally disinterested persons in the course of dealing with the processed activities. In a certain phase of a procedure, by the principle of concentration, parties are under obligation to state all facts that could affect its outcome if that does not endanger the principle of the material truth and the public interest, but primarily it orders the official administrative organ to solve the entire subject of a procedure using one decision on the whole. The principle of two degree courts complies with

the one which guides the judiciary organs, but the problem appears with autonomous bodies and corporations where there is no assumed but self-monitoring authority. In modern countries, the principle of formality is being replaced with the principle of rationality, which insists on the suitability, speed, simplicity and cheapness of an administrative procedure. In an administrative procedure, we can find the principle of the separation of a procedure into certain phases, the principle of processed correction, by which an administrative organ has a obligation to correct for minor procedural errors on the part of the parties, the principle of restitution if a party is not guilty for missing of a processed activity, the principle of making a decision executive, the principle of official limitation of execution, the principle of social protection for the executors, the principle of the gradual pronouncement of harsher measures etc. Special regulations refer to administrative-penalty procedure in cases of a police delict, which consists of the endangerment of public law and order, traffic safety etc.

The importance of an administrative act ends with the execution of an activity it ordered, by fulfilling the conditions or having them fulfilled in time, by the death of an addressee, by the disappearance of a subject it refers to, by the abolition of a new legal norm, by a recall, cancellation, proclaiming invalid, annulment, etc. Its formal legislature acts when the possibility of cancellation is exhausted by regular legal measures. The material effectiveness exists when one administrative act is used to definitively solve the relevant subject, excluding the possibility of any change. The interests of the legal safety of citizens and the stability of a legal system are protected by the principle of effectiveness.

Administrative acts can be divided into regular and irregular. Regular acts are those that conform to all the prescribed legal requirements, even if they are retrieved later on. The irregular administrative acts are the sloppy, refutable, worthless and invalid acts. The correction of an irregular legal act can be performed at any time by the organ that passed that act, in the line of duty or at the request of a party. The refutable administrative acts can be refuted only within a certain deadline using available legal means. But they can be rebuilt by the authority, which removes the existing flaws later on. The authority and citizens have to regard the absolutely irregular or invalid acts as non-existent and ignore them as such. Such acts are usually passed in cases of power usurpation or power exceeding. The administrative authority is authorised to annul acts already annulled by their nature, while courts can annul every irregular act. The acts are proclaimed invalid if passed by an incompetent organ, if their execution leads to a criminal act or if there is a clear legal regulation under which they are invalidated by their nature.

The supreme administrative authority can cancel effective acts, the existence which is dangerous to life and health, state security, legal order, public law and order, vital economic interests etc. On the other hand, in certain cases, the effective administrative acts can be cancelled and changed by the acceptance of users who acquired the right. It is

much easier to revoke the ineffective acts if, in the meantime, their flaws and irregularities become known. This is done when the organs that passed them simply revoke them and solves a negative act, puts it out of force or changes the administrative authority.

The subjects of administrative-legal relations are a state and its subjects, whether it is a question of physical or legal entities. Just as in civil law, those relations are of a personal nature. The objects have public rights and public duties. The subjective public rights are based on belonging or membership and are divided into negative, independent, and positive, and an individual's requests towards the authorities are based on them. The key positive public rights are organic, i.e. voting rights, active and passive. Where an individual has an obligation, the state is authorised and, where there are subjective rights of the individual, the state has an obligation. Here Kostić pays special attention to the question of the monarchy and right to succession, saying: "The constitutional right to the throne is a purely subjective public right. It has been accepted by a norm and only a norm of the same rank can annul or modify it. It does not exist outside of that norm, according to Mr. Jelinek, and certain acquired right to the throne could not alter a correctly carried out line of successors; no single subjective public right, including this one, cannot be above the legal order" (p. 543). The subjective public rights are usually formed by a creative act, above all by the constitution or a statute, and can be cancelled by death, annulment, the disappearance of legal assumptions that served as their base, by termination of the agreed relations, by a court verdict, by denial, abdication, etc. In principle, those rights are not transferable except in strictly defined cases.

Public duties are divided into general and special. The most important general duties are personal military service, material military duty, tax duty on personal work, the concession of land for public purposes, the duty of testifying, contributions to independent and other public corporations, police duties etc. The citizens who are in a specific state of submission, as clerks, soldiers, pupils, students, hospitalized sick people, prisoners, etc., have special duties. The state manages official means of force in order to provide the unconditional fulfilment of the citizens' general and special duties, as well as the possibility of punishing those who disregard their duties. Kostić states that there is a connection between the public rights and duties and special administrative-legal relations, which make the reception of certain private-legal principles possible, whose importance is subsidiary, and then he considers the essence of legal relations towards public institutions, their usage, and the rules under which they are performed, as well as the treatment of administrative property, the legal position of public goods and the conditions of their usage, management etc. He finishes his second book with a detailed analysis of legal relations in concession, the modalities of how to apply the institute itself, the manner of assigning and execution, the possibility of modification and the conditions of ending, as well as legal relations in area of expropriation, explaining the notion itself, legal base, assumptions, reach, subjects,

IT-03-67-T
objects, procedure, legal construction, legal effects and compensation for expropriated goods. In the end, Kostić shows special cases of private property limitations, rarely applied, such as agrarian reform, nationalisation, forced renting of flats, grouping, limitations regarding construction and economic activity near specific official objects, temporary expropriation, requisition, confiscation, the destruction of dangerous objects, etc.

3. Supervision of the State Administration

In the foreword to the third book, entitled *The Administrative Law of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia*, published in 1939 under the title *The Supervision of Administration*, Lazo Kostić proudly points out that he did not personally take part in the building of Yugoslav legislature in any way after the imposition of the dictatorship on 1 January, although he did process and expose the whole area of public law. He says: "There is no law I participated in, there is no legal regulation quoted in these books that I had known of before it was published. If it was sometimes hard to find the purpose, the motive and the goal of a certain norm, the circumstance itself made it possible for me to show things freely, unbiased and taking care only of the press regime)" (p. 631). His critical attitude was limited only by striving not to have the book banned. Stating that it is the administrative authority that makes the most mistakes, the work of all its organs has to be strictly controlled. The higher administrative organs control the lower, and legislative and judicial power controls the complete administration. Administrative supervision has primarily a preventive function, and judicial is posterior and repressive. The legislative authority manages political supervision, which has both a preventive and repressive function. Since by administrative supervision, one administrative power corrects the other, it can be divided into the internal control of state administration and the supervision of central administration over individuals. Kostić differentiates internal administrative control into imitational and general, bishopric control. Supervision over territorial and institutionalized individuals has to be strictly regulated legally and limited solely to the area of rights and basically it can be divided into legislative control and opportunistic control.

Regular courts perform the administrative and legal control in some countries, while, in others, it is the special administrative courts that do that, bearing in mind that, in both cases, principle of the two degree courts is respected. An administrative dispute in a court is based on a suit and it is pointed towards denying the legality of an administrative act. Only people who have actively processed the legislation can bring charges i.e. that go directly against the disputed act, endangers their right or personal interest, otherwise guaranteed by law. The defendant is always a second degree organ of administrative power, except in cases when the supreme organ of state administration, a ministry, decides in the first degree and there is no second degree organ. A suit can be filed only within the precisely defined deadline and it does not prevent the

execution of an effective administrative act. If the court accepts the suit, the administrative act is revoked due to the violation of organisational, material or processed norms. This includes cases of material, territorial or functional incompetence, as well as cases of power usurpation in discretionary decisions because of negligence of public interest, opposite motives and the disposition of an administrative act, distortion of facts, contradictions of the established administrative practice, evident irregularities of the act and violations of law due to incompetence, carelessness or an error on the part of an administrative organ.

Given that the Kingdom of Yugoslavia had a special system of administrative judiciary, in the form of banate administrative courts as the primary and the State council as the secondary court instance, Kostić considers the origin, development, sources, position, organization, jurisdiction, organs and the status of the administrative staff in detail, as well as the procedure for managing an administrative dispute. He pays special attention to the supervision of the administrative judiciary over municipalities, being the basic units of local independence, voting control, the revocation of municipal organs, etc. In the system of administrative-judicial control, the chief control had a specific role, being an organ of the central state authority, which had the characteristics of a parliamentary special body, special court instances and a high administrative organ with a very wide jurisdiction in the sphere of accounting-financial control of economy of all other state organs and institutions. Kostić analyses its concept, origin, legal sources, position, duties, organisational principles, organs, staff, range of personal and territorial jurisdiction, material competence, general administrative and special regulations, organisational and personal functions in detail, as well as preventive and subsequent control of the state institutions' accounts and the court and disciplinary functions of the chief control. Then he considers the parallel roles of the regular courts in the control of the legality of the highest administrative acts, the correctness of the voting lists, the pursuit of criminal acts in the area of administrative activities, the responsibility for loss compensation by doing an administrative service in form of supervision role of disciplinary courts. Kostić analyses the notion of discipline itself and the disciplinary power, regulations and the guilty parties, punishment and disciplinary principles.

Given that the legislative authority primarily deals with political control of an administrative control, direct supervision is performed via the supreme organs of administrative authority – the ministers. The regulative administrative acts are legally supervised – regulations and the management of state finances by means of budgeting and control of its execution, as well as the adoption of financial statements for each fiscal year. Every representative has an individual right to ask a representative questions and submit interpellations, while the Parliament or its houses can individually lead specific investigations, usually called surveys. The ministry responsibility can be political, criminal or citizen-legal. The consequence of a minister's political responsibility can be a parliamentary debate on distrust and change. That responsibility can be

IT-03-67-T
individual and collective when overthrowing the government. The criminal responsibility of ministers exists for the criminal acts s/he commits when performing official duty, as well as for criminal acts in everyday life, like other citizens. The illegality of activities is seen in violation of the constitution and the law. If a minister commits material damage to citizens by performing his duties illegally, the state is directly responsible and it makes compensation, but the amount will be regressed from that minister later. State ministers are materially liable if they do direct harm to the state by their illegal actions.

4. State Civil Servant Law

Lazo Kostić concentrated a large number of his articles dealing with the field of civil servant law into a brochure. The articles were previously published in various magazines and he partially supplemented and amended them. These are the texts published in 1928, but apart from this volume of the *Complete Works*, he transferred eleven articles, published subsequently. All belong to this field, placed between the constitutional and administrative rights, and refer to status questions, the conditions when applying for a job and the advancement of state civil servants. Despite that, he considers and values the existing legal solutions and compares them with different models from comparative law. Kostić inexorably states the examples of norm violations and their twisting in administrative practice.

Kostić comments on the questions of the extraordinary full time state employment transfer from the individual to the state service, terminologically analyses the meaning and the legal definition of a decree as an administrative act and the definition of civil service, elaborates and defines the category of civil servants rank and, especially, the status of the parliamentary clerks with competence. He especially examines the status of the ministers and the officers, the problem of the ministers being active generals, the methods and conditions of transferring civil servants under punishment, the question of the retirement of civil servants, etc. He is especially interested in the analysis of the legal position of the committee and other municipality organs, the voting and polling practice in them, the legal status of villages, the problem of city halls or the Mayor's organisation of the basic units of local self-government, the treatment of the discretionary administrative acts under the administrative courts, the principles of disciplinary procedures, etc..

III. Theoretical Statistics

When preparing professor Lazo Kostić's collected works for the press, I concentrated all his scientific works from the field of statistics, written before WWII into one volume entitled *Theoretical Statistics*. The volume consists of three parts and encompassed the university statistical textbook, the doctoral dissertation and a large number of studies and articles from that area, written in the period between 1923 and 1941.

1. The Textbook from Theoretical Statistics

Lazo Kostić published this textbook in 1937, on the basis of lectures he gave at the Law school in Subotica during the previous three school years. In our science, it is a pioneering and totally successful undertaking, made on the basis of the German literature, above all. He immediately solved the dilemma of whether statistics is a science or just a method using the definition that says it is a science that explores collective social situations using its own, specific method and describes, sorts out, compares and analyses the results. Kostić speaks of material statistics - i.e. applied statistics - and statistical methodology (which represents general statistics). The statistical methodology defines the general principles of equal methodology applicable when examining almost all social situations, but it is also used in various natural sciences. It searches for the truth by defining certain regularities, which are presented in numbers and in specific forms of their mutual comparison.

Statistics is very close to all the other social sciences, especially the economic and financial disciplines. The political economy from the philosophical sphere - i.e. from the general theory - becomes a real discipline basing its results on statistical examinations, while economic politics cannot exist without statistics. Statistics is irreplaceable in every discipline that measures real life situations and tries to find some regularity in them or defines the future trend. It connects the social sciences with mathematics and enables them to use mathematical operations when examining social phenomena. Given that it deals in collective situations, i.e. a large number of situations, the statistics make it possible to learn them, classify them and abstract them on the basis of general and quantifying regularities. Independent situations are connected in ideal communities in order to define their origin, sense and cause-effect connection. It searches for the general, collective characteristics of what seems to be different and not drawn into the statistical mass. In order to achieve that, it is only important that these situations are measurable, countable and dimensional. They are anyway, just individual, while their collectivity is imagined to be in an ideal form in order to create the notions and general categories.

The characteristic of social relations operated by statistics can be qualitative or quantitative, changeable or unchangeable, natural and social, dynamical and static, but their characteristic is that they are monitored and noted at one critical moment, which has to be precisely determined and respected, so that the comparison does not lose its sense. The statistical mass has to be precisely limited, both in space and time. The basic results are shown in numbers, while text and graphs are only used to supplement the explanation. In the statistical sense, the numbers are absolutely irreplaceable, but only those numbers that are achieved by a precise application of the rules of statistical methodology and planned observation. Kostić explains in detail how the modern statistical science has developed from the traditional German university statistics and English political arithmetic, created by the taxative numbering of state

IT-03-67-T
characteristics and landmarks, i.e. by the numeric quantification of the social remarks determining the current social state.

For a statistical science to be successful, individual trials and accumulated experience are not enough. Unlike other social sciences, here we can find inevitable work division, the separation of the act of collecting the data from processing and the explanation of the relevant material. It is not possible to have any major undertakings without direct state engagement, so the statistical activity has very early defined and institutionalised itself as a public service receiving the title of an administrative service. Concentration within a unique institution, which has enough power and authority, and a certain administrative jurisdiction, has created a position that makes it possible to have pretensions to the realisation of the principle of the suitability of data collecting and the centralisation of its processing. Kostić gives the basic elements of how this process is done in leading European countries and later elaborates it in the development of the Serbian and Yugoslav institutions of state statistics. He also shows how it was possible to have an international harmonization of statistical practice on the basis of the principle of data sameness.

State administration is the most important subject in modern statistics and it has a crucial role to play in collecting, processing and publicising statistical data. Besides that, it organizes statistical producers and controls statistical sources. All other subjects have a limited scope and a limited type of participation in statistical production, and Kostić classifies them into public and private. In principle, public is more reliable, but private often enters those spheres of life that state statisticians cannot reach. Besides, there are international subjects in the form of institutes or statistical associations. Among the private subjects, Kostić includes newspapers and magazines, statistical societies and all physical and juristic persons dealing with certain aspects of statistical examinations. As for the state statistical service, in order to make it successful, it has to be separated from the rest of the administration – centralized, autonomous and rationally organized from within. Authority cannot meddle in methodology and statistical techniques, and nor in the scope of examination, i.e. the method of processing, exposure and the publication of the final results. Political influence is always incompetent, amateuristic, tendentious, calculated to cover up the truth or twist facts. That is why statistical institutions have to be independent when selecting professional personnel and in all other personal questions.

The social need for serious statistical surveys is growing intensive. According to Kostić, without them, there can be no competent management of state affairs or successful management of large territorial communities. Their results motivate the state authority to act in a certain way, but also demonstrate its competence. All three branches of authority, legislative, administrative and judicial, are forced to lean on the statistical results to see the complete picture of the diversification of social phenomenon they have to manage, control and direct. Without that, there can be no prosperity for large economic institutions, no successful investments, no trade ventures or bank transactions. The

business operations of all insurance companies are absolutely dependent on a clear understanding of the statistical indicators. But statistical institutions adapt a survey they undertake to the needs and wishes of real or assumed users. In order to have a successful statistical service, the state has to ensure the systematic exploration of statistical science and the education of competent personnel, but also of the general education of population so they can understand the statistical index.

Dividing material statistics into six disciplines (population statistics or demography, moral, political, cultural, economic and socially-hygienical statistics), Kostić explains the statistical methodology, which occupies the majority of his textbook. Defining its essence, Kostić says that the statistical method is very different to inductive and deductive research. It is based on monitoring, not experimenting, given that it is very difficult to subject social phenomena, especially groups of people, to a survey. Unlike natural phenomena, social phenomena are not typical, so statistics have to comprise all mass, not just one instance on the basis of which we could place all others. This is why the statistical method is used to define and state the facts and avoid too general conclusions, analogies and generalisations. A statistician has to act rationally, without haste and pressure, when in the data collection phase, its quantified processing and the usage of the data. Some authors call the first two phases the statistical technique and third statistical logic, studied by statistical theory. Kostić here adds here division between primary statistics, comprising activities performed purely for statistical reasons and for which there is an earlier statistical interest, and secondary statistics, which processes data later on, which has not been collected for earlier statistical goals, but eventually for certain lists, evidence or registries.

Lazo Kostić divides the statistical methodology into six phases: preparation for a statistical activity, the statistical survey and data collecting, processing the statistical material, publishing the statistical data, scientific usage of the statistical results and a critique of statistical material. Preparation of a statistical operation must be very serious and thorough, given that just one error or unforeseen situation can bring it into question. Here the educational level and competence of statisticians is very important, as is their morality and intelligence. The basic material, organizational, staff, legal, technical and psychological assumptions are also very important. When there is a census, we talk about the relation between legally sanctioned safety and wide awareness of necessity and suitability. Those who are ignorant have to eliminate their fear of statistical activities and their distrust of official statistical goals. In this regard, there is full data confidentiality and a guarantee that the collected data will not be used for any purpose other than statistical. In order to separate statistical activity into a logical order, it has to be based on a serious and clever plan and programme, carefully developed down to the tiniest details. This includes prior surveying and test monitoring activities in order to eliminate eventual flaws and solve problems.

A statistical survey has to be universal in its subject; it has to see its

relevant characteristics and elements. The result of a survey is collecting and meticulous data recording. Permanent statistical operations deal with the principle of automatic data collection and delivery to the central administration, and periodically deal with principle of reflexive collecting upon a concrete request. Automatic data collection can further be divided into successive and time grouped collection. In the territorial regard, a statistical survey has to be performed within already existing administrative borders or in purely statistically defined areas. Besides, a statistical organ can perform a direct survey or can trust data collected by some other organ. The goal of a survey is data collection concerning statistical units, which is usually done by individuals, but these can be certain collectives, items or animals. Statistical units can be precisely defined, and monitoring complete and detailed. When defining a domain and a scope of monitoring, serious science holds onto the principle that it is better to have a small quantity of accurate data than a large quantity of questionable material. When there is a census – i.e. survey – questions have to be modest, clear, simple and specific, as well as mutually connected, in order to avoid undecided or unclear answers. Obstacles that have to be overcome mostly include ignorance, negligence, malice, vanity and distrust of the examinees, but also the individual flaws of examiners themselves. It is very important to have a statistical questionnaire done competently – i.e. to have all the necessary instructions. The job has to be done conscientiously and the material fully collected and concentrated at the location of the final processing.

Processing statistical material produces the statistical data and they consist of sorting, classification and numbering. Before that, there is checking and the elimination of flaws and failures. A clear presentation of the data and results is done by the statistical tables which makes their usage and understanding easier. Statistical groups are formed on the basis of statistical units of equal characteristics and these can be qualitative and quantitative. Special attention is paid here to the territorial diffusion and time occurrence of certain phenomena. Sometimes grouping is done by natural differentiation and sometimes by purely artificial differentiation, for easier and clearer processing. In numbering, it is most important to determine measuring unit, whether we speak of individuals, weight, value, length, etc. A logical order has to exist among the statistical groups and then it is possible to combine them, in order to do a comparison using specific criteria. Combining only has logical sense if there is a certain interdependence or conditioning among these groups, because a statistical survey only has a purpose if it is done under the principle of causality.

To start with the addition of statistical data, it is necessary to determine the most suitable and rational model, to make the process easy, fast, simple and adequate. Only homogenous data can be added, so it is necessary that their previous differentiation is as accurate as possible, because integration of non-homogeneous data is senseless, like mixing the unmixable. Adding is done at various general levels, depending on various classification criteria. It has to be elastic regarding the constant grouping of available materials, but also based on precise

and clear marking. Partial data is processed from small to large.

Processing statistical material produces groups of numbers and the presentation of statistical data implies that these numbers are manifested in an appropriate form, equipped with striking symbols, geometrical pictures, explanations and illustrations. The most appropriate and common methods of the presentation are statistical graphs, representing the first basis of the scientific usage of statistical data and a platform for explaining phenomena and their trends, more or less original interpretation and theoretical generalisations. However, no matter how original, imaginative and striking they are, the methods of presenting the data cannot act as a substitute for absolute numbers that are the product of a statistical survey, only as their popular illustration.

Relative numbers are derived from absolute ones in the form of reduced numbers, proportional or mean value – i.e. the statistical coefficient. They convey statistical correlations, the intensity and frequency of phenomena and their mutual relations, statuses and values. At least two absolute numbers are necessary to create a relative one. One of them is the denominator, denoting a measurable mass used for measuring, and the other is the numerator, denoting the mass that is being measured. Relative numbers are mostly shown in percentages. Participating numbers show the relation of a part in regards to a whole; i.e. the relation of two parts of a whole to each other, relations of derivation, frequency, density, coexistence or fluctuation; index numbers show variations of statistical phenomena between two or more surveys, so they have a demonstrative or coordinative function. The numbers of probability show the relations of durability and repetition. The results of statistical surveys are simplified by stating mean values. A mean number denotes the ideally understood mean value of a surveyed phenomenon, by determining the arithmetical or geometrical mean. A special form of the mean value is the central value or medial, representing the mean number in a line. The most common value is represented by the number appearing most when measuring statistical units and represents the normal value of a changeable phenomenon – thus the dominant value. Kostić emphasises that most statistical errors happen when stating the mean values, primarily if the elements are not homogeneous, if there are few of them, if they do not all have the same accuracy, if they are not calculated on the basis of primary data, if their most appropriate form is not chosen or if the minimal and maximal value of individual elements is ignored, i.e. the natural deviation of elements from the mean value.

Graphs, diagrams, cartograms and reports are mostly used for the graphical presentation of the statistical data. The diagrams are mostly presented as dots, lines and surfaces. The cartograms are the most appropriate means of presenting the territorial width of the statistical masses. The public interest in having all the available and relevant statistical data published is understandable because, in modern times, one cannot imagine the democratic political life and competition among political subjects in a multiparty parliamentary system. The result of an activity of the official statistical institutions cannot be kept secret, as a rule, or not available to anyone who is interested. There is a legal

obligation to publish certain data. The experts regularly insist on having statistical publications to satisfy both the professional and popular criteria and so these consist of a table, graphic and textual part. In this way, the surveys have been carried out as subject to scientific critique, but they have also been placed at the disposal of the widest circle of potential users.

A serious statistician wants the results of his survey to be clear, usable and not misused. That is why s/he monitors their path after publication, offering additional explanations, replies to critiques and solutions to disputes. The scientific and objective usage has to be impersonal and based on unbiased interpretation. A search for a deeper sense of the facts leads to their theoretical elaboration and, conversely, it positively influences further empiric surveys. Besides, it is most important for science to determine the regularity and the cause and effects among phenomena. That is why the data has to be described precisely, in order to achieve a quality analysis. Data is grouped in the logically developed statistical series, where numbers are always the same, whether they are absolute, relative or mean numbers. The principle of a series has to be consistent as well, whether it is territorial, chronological, etc.. Statistical series can be simple or combined, mutable and variable, i.e. series of frequency and series of intensity. Regarding the position and the development of its members, a statistical series can be typical and untypical. The typical series are total or detailed, while the untypical can be irregular, symptomatic and evolutive (progressive and regressive).

Statistics is based on the large numbers law, which means it tries to grasp almost all the same cases in its surveys. If you have a more detailed statistical mass, the result will be more precise and more accurate. Having a large number of cases, regularity and causality among them, is sounder to establish. In this way, the general causes are in the first plan and the individual causes are not. The theory of probability is also based on the law of large numbers.

Analysis and interpretation of statistical results begins by comparing the collected data, on the basis of which positive or negative numerical differences are established. If there is a correctly determined difference, it is easy to see its causes. The comparison is performed by special, temporal criteria or the criteria of certain qualities of the statistical units. Only analogous and methodologically homogenous data can be compared – in other words, if they are uniform. Comparison is the soul of statistics in fact. Without comparison, statistics is impossible. A person who uses statistical data has to be competent at collecting and processing it, in order to value and apply the established statistical regulations. Those regulations are different in their ranking and strength. Where there are a lot of exceptions, we can talk of the simple regularities. The strong regularity speaks of the legality of the phenomena. A statistical law already represents the sound social norm of absolute regularity. Nevertheless, the character of the statistical regularities is relevant and only their historical meaning is undisputable, because it is not possible to have absolutely identical circumstances with totally

identical phenomena in a society. That is why the classification of statistical regularities is not especially reliable. But it clearly shows the existence of certain phenomena, i.e. their consistence and the trend of their development. It can draw attention to periodical growth and decline, the conditioning due to a concrete historical circumstance, the regularity of territorial diffusion and the regularities on the basis of accidental circumstances.

Kostić says that the ultimate goal of statistical analysis is to find causality. It is not about statistics on individual causes or statistics on motives, but a complex of conditions manifesting as general causes. Besides these, there are also causes of the differences among the surveyed phenomena, which can be divided into physical, anthropological and social. Causes always precede the consequences, but there are phenomena where it is not possible to determine what the cause and the effect are, and here it is only possible to determine the coincidence. In determining causal connections, a very important role is played by the serious formulations of previous assumptions, data isolation and complete comparison. An assumption is formulated on the basis of the former general knowledge and one's own and somebody else's experience and premonition. The statistical causality examination is performed on the basis of two basic models – the method of diversity and the method of parallel changes. The method of diversity can be either direct and indirect. In the second method, one statistical series is compared to another, cross-referencing all the possible criteria of value. Here, we speak of many correlations, more or less clearly stated, in part or as a total, parallel or inverse. It is very important to have the results of statistical surveys interpreted logically and correctly, which means that the whole work has to be without prejudices and bias and all collected relevant data has to be used. During this work, it is not permitted to use subjective reasoning to achieve something that the numbers themselves do not show. The conclusions have to be set modestly and soundly, without over-ambitious reflections on the unreal level of accuracy. Usually, the approximate conclusions are more serious and more valuable than the apodictic conclusions and views.

The credibility and accuracy of the statistical data is subject to doubt and questioning, which is called the statistical critique. Even in this science, it is not possible to avoid or completely eliminate errors, but they can be minimised. Errors can be made when choosing a methodology, collecting and processing statistical material, deriving final results and their interpretation. Statistical data can be incomplete, but also excessive if things that should not be dealt with at all are taken into consideration, as well as inaccuracies, etc. In total, statistical errors can be constant or changeable, open and hidden, preventable and incorrigible. A statistical survey is considered successful if it is clear that there has been no more than two percents of errors in it. Errors can be avoided by introducing connected questions in a questionnaire, by analyzing those that already exist, by data checking on the basis of documents and witnesses, by auditing in control sectors. A thorough statistical critique perfects the statistical methodology.

1100

There is a string of activities assigned to statistics or its methodology, but in essence they are not that and they represent certain statistical digressions, whether they add, simplify or compromise the statistical science. Those are statistical surrogates, quasi-statistical operations or pseudo statistical analyses. Kostić classifies all these digressions into additional statistical methods and metastatistical activities. With the lack of a regular way of choosing, monitoring and collecting data due to political, legal, financial, technical and other problems, using an additional statistical method provides an indirect way of collecting data or evidence, which can often provide pretty accurate data. Using statistical surrogates, it is possible to fill in the flaws of real science and its research gaps. Most serious statistical surrogates are appraisals, partial monitoring and a survey. Appraisals can be simple or calculated. The former is totally approximate and the latter is done by analogy, ratio or the symptoms of known numbers. By partial monitoring, we can have a relation and an average that is assumed to flow through the whole potential statistical mass. It is a representative method whose results can be very accurate, but they do not give absolute numbers. Here, it is possible to monitor typical or randomly found cases. Unlike statistics, which examines concrete facts, a survey also serves for collecting opinions and views. So, instead of objective facts, it operates with the subjective understanding of those facts. Besides, a statistical surrogate is an indirect derivation of the results from one completed statistical operation with the aim of making conclusions on what they would look like. This is not a statistical surrogate in monitoring, but in material processing. And, eventually, a surrogate in statistical data presentation represents the filling in of blanks in them, by compensating for the irrevocable flaw in certain data with appraisals, but also interpolations, i.e. insertions. On the other hand, equations are used to artificially round data, correcting minor mistakes and flaws.

Metastatistical activities derive from the statistical usage of statistical material, predicting from statistics and the misuse of it. Here, we speak primarily about giving certain non-statistical activities to statistical institutes to perform, because they can do it by nature of their business, such as activities of toponymy, the registry of populated places etc. Since statistical data is time-limited by their very nature, quasistatistical prediction arrives when, on the basis of past results, there is an attempt to conclude their future. The numbers used here are not statistical, but forecasted, expected, probable or possible. Extrapolation referring to the future, also denotes premonition, because it is not possible to predict future events that could have huge repercussions on the fact the examiner is interested in. Statistical denial is, above all, based on probability.

Statistical misuse occurs when users twist the numbers and their sense and this mostly cannot be prevented in practice. That is why attention should be focused on preventing the producers' misuse, and it has already been seen that private statistics have become more tendentious than official ones. A total statistical survey used to be motivated by desire to show a false reality. Misuses range in scope from

1101

ordinary forgery to formal truth, where reality is camouflaged by refined methods. Here, one should not disregard the fact that statistics as such does not lie – people do that. As in law, economy, history or politics. On finishing in his textbook, Lazo Kostić says, “only the truth can stamp out lies. And statistical methodology, as a science, serves the truth and reveals it.” (Prof. dr Lazo M. Kostić: Collective works, volume III, “Theoretical statistics, ZIPS, Serbian radical party, Beograd 2000, p. 221).

2. Parliamentary Elections and Statistics

In his doctoral dissertation, Lazo Kostić treated the basic relationship between politics and statistics, given that, in modern states, it is not possible to pass a new election law or enter an election process without previous statistical knowledge and data, on which the number of electing representatives, division into voting region, etc. often depends. In one day, people vote to make a decisive political decision who will be governing the state for the next few years. He rules by choosing representatives who will do the job instead of him. Only on that day is he the real political subject, after that mostly its object. Statistics cannot define political views, but voting can, and it is declared by using the voting right under a certain procedure.

Kostić thinks that the first phase of the election procedure is defining the voting regions. They represent groups of voters in a certain territory that elects a formerly defined number of people’s representatives. In some states, voting regions differ in whether major or proportional elections are performed there. With major ones, only one representative is elected in each voting unit, and with proportional ones, larger number is elected on the basis of voting lists. In practice, it is impossible for all voting units to have an identical population number, so this is the right job for statisticians to define the average number of registered voters and the possibilities of individual deviation from that number in concrete cases. Regarding the constant fluctuation of people, revision of voting units should be done after each registration. In some countries, there are huge disproportions regarding the number of people in certain voting units, which disturbs the principle of one man, one vote.

Kostić thinks that large voting regions emphasize the mutual fight among parties and disregard the appraisal of the candidates’ personal qualities. The geometry of voting regions does not depend only on the number of their people, but on the area’s national, religious, professional and similar structure. If voting regions are consistent with the already existing administrative units, statistics has an easy job of examining all the relevant facts effecting the voting will of the voters. There are also manipulative possibilities of tailoring electing legislature.

Every voting region has a larger number of voting units. In the countryside, due to distances, and in town due to the physical impossibility of voters to vote in one place in a day, there has to be a dispersion of voting places. Here, we have another danger, because where there are few registered voters, the secrecy of voting is

Some countries have a fixed number of peoples’ representatives and this is defined by constitutional regulations, while and in others it is changed from one election to the next, defining how many representatives will be elected in certain voting units on the basis of the fluctuation of people. Here, the possibility of manipulation can occur, because one who can tailor voting units primarily pays attention to his own interests and adapts them to the assumed will of the people from certain regions. This is why, in some countries, there was a situation of having the vote of a citizen in one place being more valuable than a vote in another. Often, the political influence of disloyal national minorities is secretly wiped out in this way.

In a case when a whole state territory is one voting unit, the choice of representatives depends solely on the citizens who vote. The more voting units there are, the larger the number of registered voters and the lower the direct influence of those who did vote because the same number of representatives is chosen in a certain voting unit whether the response is maximal or minimal. Some countries complicate voting legislature on purpose, to make it so incomprehensible for citizens that, in practice, it offers a chance for manipulation of the organs conducting elections.

Never, in any country, has the whole population had the right to vote. There have always been certain limitations. The general right to vote exists where no population layer or professional group is excluded from the voting process. But it is still possible here to have the exclusion of a large number of citizens out of personal reasons regardless of their social status. With a general right to vote, it is important to fulfil four basis conditions: citizenship, legal age, citizen rights ownership and private and legal capability. A limited right to vote exists where there is a property, taxative or educational census. However, in the period when Kostić was writing his doctoral dissertation, political science thought that denying women the right to vote did not represent a negation of the general right to vote, so where women had this right it was thought of as an expanded or additional general right to vote. In some countries, certain categories of citizens had the right to two or three votes. Here, Kostić gives a detailed analysis of the statistical indices of the German central elections and the elections in regions under the aspect of widening the voting right, and then he compares those results with the indices of other European countries. He also shows all the possibilities of statistical elaboration for improving citizens’ rights and electing technique, makes political analysis easier and controlling the veracity of the results.

The next phase of the voting process is choosing the candidates for whom the prescribed conditions have to be fulfilled. These are having the voting right, accepting to be a candidate and often a proof that s/he is supported by a certain number of voters. The possible number of candidates is not formally limited and they are usually grouped according to lists of political parties. For a statistical survey, the most important thing is that citizens come out to vote. From the response, it

can be told how much people are interested in the political processes and state management. Some countries have made voting obligatory. On the basis of the relevant statistical indices, Kostić shows how response to elections depends on nationalism, religion, sex, profession, social layer and whether people live in town or in a village, is educated or uneducated, etc..

When voting is finished, the first step is to separate the valid and invalid votes. all those voting slips that are not original or not the political will as the official candidatures cannot be defined in them are Invalid. The number of invalid voting slips can be an important indicator of the mood of voters. In a major electoral system, all votes given to non-elected candidates are failed. The ideal to reduce the number of lost votes to a minimum can only be realised with the proportional electoral system. A surplus of votes exists when a representative gets more votes than necessary for absolute or relative majority. If elections were expressed in percentage, that surplus would go into the favour of some of his other party colleagues.

In favour of proportional principle is the fact that a goal of an election is not to have a group of favourite individuals in the parliament, but to form a political majority that will run the country. Only that representative who belongs to the stronger political group can influence process of decision making. An ideal is that the party of a representative denotes the party determination of the voters. Parliamentary statistics examines the structure of the people's representatives and it is very interesting here to study how much the structure of parliament is consistent with the citizens' structure of the country in every respect. As Kostić points out, "the electoral procedure can be viewed statistically, especially the duration of the elections, breaks in collecting the votes because of people and similar, the punishment of certain voters and members of electoral committees due to illegal conduct such as violation of the secrecy of voting, corruption, forcing to vote, vote theft, the disturbance of voting, the irregular usage of the right to vote, etc). These statistics would make it possible to see the electoral morality of a nation and how an electoral system functions. Statistical work begins only when valid mandates are published, given that these questions are then taken into account and it is estimated how certain activities affect the final results. In other words, objections and accusations regarding elections have to be examined" (p. 274).

State bodies or private persons can be a subject of electoral statistics and it defines notion, spatial and time limit of the numerical whole which it examines, and which means the statistics of management and social statistics. "So, in its broadest sense, electoral statistics statistically processes: 1. the number and scope of the available legal regulations regarding elections and their practical repercussions (division into voting regions and voting polls, the number of elected representatives, the number and structure of the voting body if the voters are registered *ex officio*); 2. social occurrences, as well as the interest people showed in elections (the number of registered people with the right to vote when lists are made by registrations, objections and complaints regarding this

process, the frequency of people registering, the frequency of voting and the frequency of irregularity and illegal activities in conducting elections); 3. the electoral results and their repercussions (the number of votes counted, the number of valid votes, the number of votes belonging to one candidate, one political programme, one political view etc); and 4. the structure of the parliament (sorting the representatives according to their social and natural characteristics and especially according to the party they belong to). The subject of statistical interest in first category is the official procedure and voters are taken into account only in extraordinary cases and only partly; in the second category, the subject is the people and their activities; in the third, statistics deals with the votes given. When a voting slip goes into voting box, it loses its connection to a voter. Connection might exist only if there was a name and personal characteristics of the voter on a slip. But, since statistics is incompatible with electoral secrets, electoral statistics has to deal only with the distribution of votes. Therefore, electoral statistics monitors the following subject: official activities when conducting elections, the voters themselves, their will, votes and, finally, the candidates and elected representatives." (p. 276.)

The temporal and spatial frames of electoral statistics are very accurately determined but we can speak of secondary statistics with regard to frame. Data collecting is tabular and its purely statistical control is almost impossible. Processing has to be centralized and, apart from absolute numbers, it is used to calculate proportions and mean values, to perform graphical presentation and to give textual explanations. On the basis of the huge amount of statistical material he processed, Kostić defines 21 regulations imposed by electoral statistics. They refer to the percentage of people who have the right to vote, the fact that it is always done in towns, not villages, that there are more women than men, that at least 8 percent of the voters are prevented from voting for purely personal reasons and that others are deliberately abstinent. The participation of women in elections is less than the participation of men. For voters, direct elections are more appealing than indirect ones, as well as the additional ones in contrast to main elections, but there is a smaller number of voters on the additional elections. In towns, the response is larger than in villages. The more uneducated voters there are, the lower the response is. Participation in national and religiously homogenous regions is lower than in heterogeneous ones. Interest is lower in a candidate who applies many times. A lower percentage of people with voting rights leads to a higher percentage of them who vote. The minority population is more interested in elections than the majority one. The response depends on the political authority of a representative body. Mature people vote more often than old people, and the youngest are most scarce. Those who have just acquired the right to vote rarely vote. Industrial workers vote more often than farmers. Where voting is obligatory, abstinence is lower. Women are more prone to vote for rightist parties, especially conservative, and there is a trend of growing differentiation in their choice compared to their husbands, brothers and sons. In big cities and industrial centres,

left-wing parties have more success and in rural regions it is the right-wing parties. In a proportional electoral system, the number of political parties in regard to majority is decreasing. Kostić dedicates the last chapter of his dissertation to a detailed presentation of the organization and historical development of electoral statistics in Germany, which is of no interest to us.

3. Yugoslav Electoral Statistics between the Wars

In his position as the secretary to the Head Office of State Statistics, the parliament entrusted professor Lazo Kostić to perform a statistical review of the peoples' representatives in 1923, 1927 and 1935, and the results were published in special publications.

a) Parliamentary Elections of 18 March 1923

With respect to making these secondary statistics, Kostić comments in general on states problems he faces due to the fact that the electoral acts and records were not conceived with the aim to making statistical processing easy. By electoral law, the territory of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenians had been divided into 56 electoral districts, consistent with the existing division of administrative and judicial territorial competence. But these were of unequal size and, in pre-war Serbia, they are smaller than in the new regions. All the electoral units were divided into 351 electoral districts. For each voting centre could not have more than 800 voters who voted there, but there were violations in practice. It was taken into account that the people of one municipality belonged to one polling centre. Also, large municipalities were divided and smaller ones blended, and their total number was 6,562, and the number of polling centres was 5,624.

In accordance with Constitutional regulations and regulations from the Electoral law, the State Committee, on the basis of the official statistical data, used to determine the number of representatives using the principle of one representative for 40,000 people and the rest of 25,000 for each individual voting district. It turned out that the whole country was to elect 313 representatives. Out of the total number of voting units, there was one representative to be elected in one, two in six of them, three in nine of them, four in eight of them, five in six of them, six in seven of them, seven in nine of them, eight in two of them, ten in five of them, eleven in one of them, twelve in one of them and thirteen in one of them. 24.7% of the population had the right to vote, which was near upper limit of the European average of the time, given that women did not have the right to vote. 2,177,051 voters voted, according to the number of inserted balls, although there were 120 voters less in the voting lists. 73.7% of the registered voters voted, which was a notable increase in percentage in contrast with the elections for the Constituent Assembly when there was 64.95% of the voters.

In individual electoral circles, at most twelve voting lists were recorded and the least was three. In total, there were 281 voting lists. 33

IT-03-67-T
parties and political groups participated in elections, and this does not include voting polls that did not have any political mark. The people's radical party won 562,213 votes, or 25.8%, The Croatian republican farmers' party won 21.8% and the Yugoslav democratic party 18.4%. All the other parties won less than 10% and twelve parties even less than one percent of the votes. Kostić shows the fluctuation of votes won by the radicals in pre-war Serbia, where they had 38.3% in 1903, 37.5% in 1905, 43.3% in 1906, in 1908 they had 44.1%, in 1920 they had 34.6% and in 1923 they had 49.3%. Kostić says that "it looks as though the fluctuating voters only give their trust after disappointment in the management of other parties and vice versa. In 1905 and in 1920, the Radical party had significantly fewer votes than in the previous elections; and thus the tendency to increase the absolute number of votes, which could be stated in the first line, is considerably diluted." (p. 348.)

Since elections were performed under the proportional principle with multiple voting units, D'Ontov's formula was applied when calculating the number of representatives' mandates won. The Peoples' Radical Party won 108 places in Parliament, the Croatian Republican Farmers' party 70, Yugoslav Democratic 51, the Slovenian People's and the Bunjevačko-Sokačka Party 24, the Yugoslav Muslim Organization 18, Yemijeti 14, Farmers and Landowners 11, German 8, the Socialdemocratic 2, the Montenegrin Federalistic 1, Romanian 1, Serbian 1 and the Trumbić-Drinković list 1. A total of 312 as one representative was not elected. Of the total number of representatives, the Radicals had 34.61%, but when you deduct Slovenia, Croatia and Slavonia, this percentage is much higher. In Northern Serbia it was 68.49%, southern Serbia 36.5%, Montenegro 42.86%, Vojvodina 47.06%, Bosnia and Herzegovina 27.08%, Dalmatia 33.33% and Croatia and Slavonia 8.82% of the total number of the elected representatives. This was a very high increase for the Radicals because they had won 21.7% of the representative mandates in the elections in 1920. "The Radical lists won all the mandates in the districts of: Bregalnica, Metohija, Pirot, Toplica and Užice. (In Prizren, the radicals won all the representative mandates, but on two lists)" (p. 359). As Kostić says "one has to note here that, in Southern Serbia in 1920, there were joint muslim-radical lists. Elected representatives from these lists were included in the Yemiets column ('the National Turkish organisation') in the *Statistical Review of the Elections* in 1920. However, a couple of representatives joined the Radical Club, thus rendering the number of radical representatives higher and the number of Yemiets a bit lower. On the other hand, during the parliamentary period, there was secession from the Radical and the Democratic club into the Yemiet" (p. 358-359).

The radicals had the strongest representatives' club of 108 representatives in parliament and the only one representative of the Romanian Party joined them. Among them there were 103 Orthodox Christians, 2 Roman-Catholics and 3 Muslims. Regarding the mother tongue, 105 spoke Serbian, 2 spoke Albanian and 2 Romanian and Vlach. In the national review, 103 radical representatives declared

themselves Serbs, 1 as Croatian and 1 as *Bunjevac*. Out of the total number of representatives, 52.6% were Orthodox. Kostić emphasises a curiosity here: “One member of the Radical Club said that his mother tongue was Serbian, but his nationality as Albanian. On the other hand, however, a representative of the Radical Club said that his mother tongue was Albanian and his nationality Turkish and a member of Yemietis stated the opposite. The representative of the Vlach mother tongue (also a member of the Radical Club) gave his nationality as Serbian” (p. 305). Throughout the whole study, Kostić deals with all the possible statistical aspects and, on the bases of this, he points to various positive aspects and weaknesses in the electoral law applied.

b) Parliamentary Elections of 11 September 1927

As in the previous chapter, Lazo Kostić made a statistical study of the election of the people's representatives of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenians, performed on 11 September 1927, stating that the identical base, principles and line were necessary to facilitate comparisons. “That is already very difficult; given that the statistics of the elections on 8 February 1925 was not carried out completely on the same basis” (p. 367). In the meantime, the electoral law was not changed, but a range of certain electoral districts was applied because of the territorial bordering with surrounding countries. The number of polling places grew. The number of representatives increased to 315. The number of citizens with the right to vote increased by 400,000. Around one million did not vote. The response was 69%. 433 candidates' lists were posted. A total of 22 political parties came forward with their lists. “The strongest party had the largest number of lists, and that was the Peoples Radical Party. It posted 111 lists in the entire country, which accounted for almost two lists in every district respectively. Given that it did not post a list in two districts (Ljubljana-Novo Mesto and Ljubljana city), it turns out that there were more than two radical lists for every district. And indeed, in the majority of districts, the Radical Party had two or three lists (in Srem there was even four). In Serbia, Northern and Southern, the Radicals posted only one list in three districts: the District of Rudnik, Užie and the city of Belgrade. In fifteen districts, they posted two lists and in twelve districts the posted two. Since it is impossible to determine which lists were official and which were dissident, because there were a couple of official lists and it was thought that the official lists were only those supported by the government and those proclaimed by the Chief committee of the party, we did not make any difference between the lists in table IV. All these were denoted as radical lists. The proof that we did not make a mistake is that all the elected radicals, from all the lists (both official and unofficial), joined one Radical club. Only one representative, elected in the Morava District, later left the Club; but the fact that he joined the Club in the first place says that, for the elections, his list should not be separated from other lists of the Radical Party and neither should the votes for that list” (p. 399-400).

In these elections, the Peoples Radical Party again received the most

IT-03-67-T
votes, a total of 742,111, i.e. 31.9%, the Croatian (peoples) Farmers, the Montenegrin and Independent Farmers received 16.5%, the Democratic 16.4%, etc. In Northern Serbia, the Radicals won 50.9% and in Southern Serbia it was 52.8% – in Montenegro it was 34.7%, in Vojvodina 38.3%, in Bosnia and Herzegovina 27.5%, in Dalmatia 22.2%, in Croatia and Slavonia 13.1% and in Slovenia 2.8%. Comparing the results with the results of the previous electoral cycle, Kostić says that, in 1920, the Radical Party “went to elections as a compact and independent party, without any mutual or combined lists. The elections of 1920 do not represent any hardship, for the Radicals or any other party. However, in 1923, the so called Independent Radical Party came to the elections and this was created from its mother party (by the late Stojan M. Protić). In the whole country, it received only 13,742 votes – over 5,000 in Vojvodina and Srem and almost 5,000 in the district of Niš. All their supporters in those regions, even the list bearers, later joined the mother party. This means that, in a contrastive review, those votes can be regarded as votes for the Radical Party. In 1925, the independent radicals had less than 4,000 votes in the whole country and a greater majority in other districts than in 1923. In 1927 that party came forward independently in the elections. Its leaders, to be precise, posted the lists in some districts, but not under the special programme and totally independently from the official radical organizations. An elected representative of that group (in the Morava District) joined the club of representatives of the Radical Party at first. All this justifies our view that the votes for that group should not be presented separately but have to be added to the votes for the Radical Party. One could, it is true, argue that votes given for the lists of the Independent Radical Party were not just given for the lists of the official radicals, at least for the previous elections, but were mostly against them. If there was a joint state list, those specialists would not be close to it. This view would be correct. But, with all this, it is unquestionable that all the lists of the mother party, especially the unofficial ones, could not and would not want to join the state list. All of them, after all, are considered to be the radical lists” (p. 409-410).

“On the basis of the results of the parliamentary elections from 1927, the Peoples Radical Party won 112 representative mandates, the Croatian Farmers party 61, the Independent Farmers 1, the Montenegrin Federalists 1, the Democrats 58, the Yugoslav Muslim Organization 9, the Democratic Community 11, the Independent Democratic party 22, the Yugoslav National 21, the Farmers' union 9, the German Party 6, the Social democratic 1 and the Croatian Block 2. Out of a total of 112, the radicals won 41 mandates or 56.16% in Northern Serbia, 24 or 55.81% in Southern Serbia, 3 or 42.86% in Montenegro, 18 or 52.94% in Vojvodina, 14 or 29.17% in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 5 or 31.25% in Dalmatia and 7 or 10.29% in Croatia and Slavonia, while in Slovenia it did not win a representative place. In the whole country, out of the total number of 742,111 votes the Radicals won, the lists that reached a quotient of 566,342 votes or 76 % of all the votes, and on lists that did not achieve the quotient and did not get any representative the figure

was 175,769 votes or 24 %” (p. 434.) In this, Kostić finds a reason why the Radicals needed so many more votes for one representative place than in the previous elections - because a lot of votes were wasted on unsuccessful parallel lists of party dissidents.

Kostić compares the number of representatives of certain parties in all four electoral cycle in details, for the whole country and for all the historical regions individually. Here we find the most interesting data concerning the radicals. In the elections of 1920, out of a total of 419 mandates, the Radicals won 89 or 21.2%; in 1923, out of 312, they won 108 or 34.6%; in 1925, out of 315, they won 142 or 45.1%; in 1927, out of 315, they won 112 or 35.6%. “From this review, one could see that the majority of the representatives in the country in 1920 were democrats and in all the other elections they were radicals. Radical majorities alone were always stronger than the democrats used to be in 1920 (22.4% – comm. V. S.). The Democrats had a just over a fifth of all the mandates and the radical majority did not decrease below one third (in 1925, they reached 45% and grew to twice the relative share in 1920)” (p. 447.)

Regarding the religious structure of the parliament, there were 56.5% Orthodox people elected, 34.3% Roman-Catholics, 8.3% Muslims and one Evangelist, Old Catholic and Jew. Among the radicals, there were 100 Orthodox, 7 Roman-Catholics, 4 Muslims and 1 Jew. Regarding mother tongue, 105 radicals gave Serbo-Croatian, 2 Hungarian, 3 Albanian, 1 Turkish and 1 Spanish. Regarding nationality, 102 radicals declared themselves Serbs, 2 Croats, 2 Bunjevac, 2 Hungarians, 3 Albanians and 1 Turk. Out of the total number of radical representatives, 9 were farmers, 6 economists and engineers, 12 sales people, 2 industrialists, 1 construction worker, 6 private engineers, 1 engineer in civil service, 6 private doctors, 6 doctors in civil service, 1 pharmacist, 4 teachers and school janitors, 7 secondary school teachers and directors, 3 university professors of law, 1 other university professor and high school, 2 chiefs of ministry and a regional office, 2 chiefs of the cabinet, 2 official financial clerks, 2 agrarian official clerks, 3 official clerks of other professions, 3 judges and court presidents, 21 lawyer and law clerks, 1 clerk of independent bodies, 2 bank directors, 1 officer, 4 orthodox priests and 3 journalists and publicists.

c) The Parliamentary Elections of 5 May 1935

For every other electoral cycle, Lazo Kostić had a chance to manage statistical data processing and perform the final elaboration with the introductory study in the official parliamentary publication. The elections took place on 8 November 1931 were not statistically treated in this way. The elections in 1935 were performed under new electoral regulations in comparison with those from 1927, which made it harder and sometimes impossible to compare their results. The highest level of comparison is achieved with an identical methodological base. The whole state territory this time represented a unique electoral unit, within which regional units and electoral districts had a role when assigning

1110

IT-03-67-T

representative mandates. Nine regional units and administrative region of the city of Belgrade were divided into 35 electoral districts. Eleven towns were electing representatives. In total there were 6,974 polling places, while the state had 3,903 municipalities and 343 districts. There were 370 elected representatives, of which two were elected bearers of lists that won at least 50,000 votes in whole state territory, 343 representatives were elected through individual election and 25 on the basis of collective lists.

In the elections of 1931, there was, as Kostić says, “only one candidate that submitted and confirmed a list with Petar Živković as the bearer, the then president of the Ministry Council. In truth, the elections of 1931 were not elections at all; the electorate did not have anything to choose between and it did not elect, it just used their votes to approve the candidacies set. It was only in certain districts that voters had the opportunity to give an advantage to one or other candidate from the same land list (and that implies the same political ideology)” (p. 473). In the elections of 1935, the Court of Cassation confirmed four land candidacy lists with Bogoljub Jevtić, Vladimir Maček, Dimitrije Ljotić and Božidar Maksimović as bearers, but those lists had more candidates in certain districts. 73.6% of the registered voters accessed the elections. Jevtić’s lists won 1,748,024 votes, or 60.65% and 303 representative mandates. Maček’s list won 1,075,389 votes, or 37.32% and 67 representative mandates. The other two lists together won a total of 2% of the votes and no mandates. Such an electoral system is very complicated, major and majorising, but its basic flaw was that it had nothing to do with the classical multiparty elections. Maček’s list boycotted the parliamentary union, so only 16 of its representatives joined the mandates verification. After constituting the parliament, nine representative clubs were formed, of which the strongest club was the club of the Yugoslav radical community with a total of 176 members. This Parliament was adjourned on 10 October 1938.

d) Disputes and Articles from Theoretical Statistics

Although he did not do a detailed study on this matter from a statistical standpoint, in his short article in the magazine *New Life*, Kostić examined the basic characteristics of the parliamentary elections of 8 February 1925. It is surprising that the number of voters was higher in comparison with the previous elections and, since it is thought that a population growth of one percent per year is impossible, Kostić thinks that it is a matter of the gradual sorting out of the voting lists. Since there were a lot of electoral groupings and coalitions, it is hard to present the original party results, so Kostić conditionally grouped them into votes for the governmental National Block and votes for the oppositional People’s Agreement Block and the Peasant Democrats. The National Block won 43.7% of votes and the opposition, in a wider sense, 44.8%, but the group in office won the absolute majority of mandates, despite the smaller number of votes, thanks to electoral arithmetic.

Kostić dedicated a couple of texts in the magazine to analysis of the

1111

Belgrade and state censuses, including the lecture via Radio Belgrade. Then we have general evaluations of the results and a detailed historical retrospective of all the former censuses in Belgrade and Serbia, and also in Montenegro. The first census, performed on the 1st January 1921 in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, offered Kostić the possibility of a thorough demographic Analysis and the calculation of the territorial population density, categories of settlements, houses and homes, sex and age structure, literacy and nationality, confession and the population balance, educational structure and the number of students, etc. He published a special brochure on demographics and population politics, a significant theoretical study on the relations between law and statistics. Furthermore, he published a brochure on the autonomous states of the state statistical institution and the centralisation of the official statistics agency, the need of the local autonomy units for their own statistical agencies and several articles tackling the development of the statistical science and technique on an international level and their institutionalisation and operationalisation of the coordination of the statisticians from different countries.

Especially interesting is Kostić's polemical reaction to the statements of Stjepan Radic that, together with the Macedonians, the Serbs constituted only 40% of the population of the Kingdom, that the Croats constituted 30%, the Slovenes 10% and that the ethnic minorities were 20% of the population. Radic's rounded figures are the product of forgery of reality and decreasing the number of the Serbian population and increasing the numbers of the Croatian population. Kostić published his polemic text under the title *The Statistics of Mr. Radic*, in the newspaper *The Time* in October 1924. With precise figures, he showed that the Orthodox Serbs accounted for 45% of the total population (excluding the Catholic and Muslim Serbs). Since the census did not include a 'nationality' column, Kostić took the total number of the population of Croatia, Slovenia and Dalmatia who stated that their mother tongue was Serbo-Croatian, all the Orthodox Christians and all the Catholics of Bosnia and Herzegovina, regardless of their nationality and deduced that the Croats accounted for a maximum of 22.5% of the total population. The Slovenes accounted for 8.4% and all ethnic minorities for 17.1%. The Muslims accounted for 5.7%.

The extent of Radic's enormous decrease in the number of Serbs is corroborated by evidence from a different source, based on the election results. Kostić says with overt irony: "Mr. Radic and his representatives boast to the whole world that they are the only representatives of the Croats and that they received all the Croatian votes. They did indeed received over 90% of all the Croatian votes in the elections. The number of votes they received amounted to 462,569 and adding the votes of their dissidents in Herzegovina it comes to 473,733. However, in the whole state, the number of votes cast in the last elections amounted to 2,177,051. Accordingly, Radic received only 21.8% of all the votes. All the other Croatian parties received 1.8% of the total; all the Croatian parties had 23.6%. But we should bear in mind: 1) that the Croats are better represented in the electorate than in the whole

population, because the number of their men over 21 years of age was significantly higher than the number of Serbian men of the same age, because of Serbian losses in the wars; 2) that participation in the elections was significantly higher than in Serbia and in the regions where the Serbs live; 3) that, according to the opinion of experts, there had been great irregularities during the voting process in purely Croatian areas. In those areas, even the dead voted and there were areas where the percentage of votes cast exceeded 100%. However, the Serbian parties received over 55% of all the votes in the elections (57.7 %). We admit that there is a significant portion of votes cast by the ethnic minorities. Regardless of the method of calculation, the Croats account for much less than a fourth of the total population in our country and their number is twice as small as the number of the Serbs. In the whole country, they account for a much smaller percentage of the inhabitants than the Serbs in Croatia, who have never asked or been approved a Serbian assembly inside 'the internationally recognised borders' of Croatia and Slavonia" (p. 582).

Statistics was established as a scientific discipline, according to Kostić and his study *The Statistics and the Law*, inside the field of legal science, but it has never been possible to separate it from the historical, geographical, ethnographical and political sciences. By the very nature of things, it had to encompass the basic principles of the state organisation and, when it was first established as a university discipline and an educational subject, it also encompassed the state and administrative laws, as well as monarchical power and the court ceremonial, church, military and financial laws. Since the state at first successively collected data for concrete purposes, statistical activities did not have the characteristics of a special public service, but that situation gradually changed, especially because the scientific disciplines of all the natural and social sciences started referring to its results and impelled thematic research. Its specific status was consolidated to the extent in which it definitely opted for the same figures and relations between them, as well as the explanation of these relations, and it left the description and analysis of the concrete phenomena it studied with the help of the law of large figures to other sciences.

Statistics is characterised by its need for a legal base and a legal framework of existence and acting, as well as the state authority that would enable it to approach all the fields of social life and business. The statistical institutions are established by state legal decrees and they regulate their work and financing, which makes them a specific form of state management. The key statistical data, regardless of whether it is primary or secondary, most often cannot be obtained without the participation, intermediation or at least the favourable disposition of the state organs. In addition, the legal obligation for the cooperation of all the physical and legal entities with the official statistical organisations is established, as well as for preparing statements concerning the researched circumstances under the threat of criminal and infringement sanctions that are inconceivable for other sciences. The obligation of reporting certain events when they occur is constituted, if they are of interest for permanent statistical researches. The legal acts are important

for the strict limitation of the statistical organs with respect to their authorisations, the nature of their research, confidentiality and sanctioning of any abuse. Official statistical activity is still subject to the constitutional limitation of the guaranteed citizen rights and human rights and has to reduce that to the required measure. The arrangement, nomination and classification of data has to be in compliance with the positive law. The law does not expressly regulate this area, but it is implied. The statisticians must not feel administrative pressure concerning this matter; they have to be useable and applicable in concrete legal and social conditions in a categorical, conceptual and administrative sense. Legal regulation of the conditions and forms of publishing the statistical publications is possible. Statistics should not publish individual results, especially personal ones, only general ones and ones that relate to the conditions in the classes of people and social groups. Kostić emphasises that the objective of statistics is social reform, not individual intervention. Even other state organs, such as courts, tax authorities, military authorities, etc., are not allowed to use the individual data the statistical institutions collect for official purposes, however attractive or useful for them it is. The statistical institutions are legally bound to respect the normatives, contracts, clauses and usual practices of international organisations and statistical associations, the goal of which is to unify statistical research throughout the world for easier comparison. The normative activities in the field of statistics are so developed that Kostić holds that, due to this, the conditions are there for establishing a relatively autonomous scientific discipline and subject – statistical law, located between the administrative and international public law.

In addition, legal science and practice cannot be conceived without serious statistics to support it where the regulation of social relations, prohibitions and sanctions are concerned. Kostić argues that one of the most important goals of statistics is to suggest, “help and enable legal reforms (for that purpose, it has to present its results arranged in such a way that the places or groups that need reforming can be seen at first glance). Its direct goal is to point out the direction of the executive authorities’ action. However, in a state based on a constitution and law, the executive authority has limited competence, at least formally. For each greater and far-reaching action, the intervention of the legislative power will be necessary. It shall be initiated by the executive authority, but with statistical warnings and information. In the past, with almost unlimited competence, it made decisions on its own on the measures to be taken with the aim of social reforms. Consequently, all older writers, especially German and Austrian [...] hold statistics to be the most important auxiliary means for the executive authority’s actions. In today’s time of Parliamentarism, this statement is still sustainable, because the executive authority really rules and direct the parliamentary life today. Formally, statistics is today the unconditional requisite of each successful legislative action, necessary for both the legislative body and the executive authority. It is not only necessary to the legislative body to support the arguments of the initiators of a legal project, but also

IT-03-67-T
for the opposition to rebut false conclusions. Without statistics, modern public life is inconceivable and the Parliament is the concentration of the overall public life of a state” (p. 632).

In certain cases, a legal act prescribes prior consultation of the statistical data before making certain decisions, prescribing obligations and making distributions. Statistics enables the testing of the effects of legal acts in social practice, their expedience and their justifiability. The statistical critic regularly acts as a valuable corrective influence. It establishes the scope and the limits of a legal normative, as well as its adequacy for real life. Furthermore, certain social relations are located in accordance to class and field using statistics. Thanks to statistics in a society, the abstract sociological categories can be clearly identified and examined. Material statistics are necessary for legal politics as a science, especially for its narrower segments such as criminal politics, administrative and legal politics, etc. However, in order to avoid becoming the servant of daily politics and losing its fundamental sense, state statistics has to remain an autonomous and independent institution that is exclusively lead by the principle of truth. Its organs must not be turned into political entities or be ready to realise the possibility of corruption or demanding certain results that would create false statistical determinants or attributes.

Without depolitisation, the objectivity of the work is impossible and autonomy, above all, implies the freedom of choice regarding the method and research techniques. In the assessment of work and results, only the use of scientific methods is allowed. This puts special emphasis on the importance of conscientiousness and eliminates political obedience. Although initially a state institution with certain administrative authorisations, the statistical organ must act as a specifically scientific research institute. The statistical institution, which is not really autonomous cannot have specialist authority in the country and abroad and its existence would be pointless. The question of autonomy and objectivity is especially important in the sphere of administering the democratic and free parliamentary elections. Kostić advocates the concept of autonomous and centralised state statistics. He compared the advantages a centralised system has over decentralised statistics to the advantages a large company has over small companies with one owner. Centralised statistics are cheaper and economical and avoids parallelism in statistical research. Furthermore, it can achieve a higher degree of expertise in the professional statistics staff. Decentralisation of statistic leads to non-uniformity of technology, the confusion of concepts and makes it harder to achieve contemporary statistical techniques. Centralisation of the statistics institution should be performed in a vertical way and, where statistical data is concerned, all state organs should generally be treated as organs of the state statistics, subordinated to the central statistics institution.

Chapter XV

SERBIAN CONSTITUTIVE IDEOLOGY

I. The Continuity of the Serbian Political Idea

1. The Political Ideology of the Nemanjić Dynasty

From the 5th to the 11th century, the Serbian people in the Byzantine imperial aegis began their political and state-building development, achieving the level of an independent kingdom. Building the unitary territorial and political entity had been arduous, but an awareness of national unity had been brought to the Balkans and maintained steadfastly through all ordeals. And, on that very awareness, the original political concept was built, which would later be embodied in the Nemanjić era and which represents the basic milestone of the political and military activities of later Serbian generations. The definitive determination of the Serbian national centre and the political elite for the Eastern version of Christianity had a significant impact on the completion of the overall national determination and a homogenous state-building idea. This enabled the establishment of the state-building ideology on the original political theology, which supervened the old Serbian faith, adding modern and systematic Christian expression to it and placing the most significant ruling dynasty, whose roots could have been traced back to the leaders of the people who led them from their far-away homeland to the centre. This significant fact from the distant past has mostly been forgotten, but it left a strong impact on the people's souls and was expressed through the original national character of the whole Serbian nation. The creative reception of the Byzantine models would create the foundations of a philosophical and ideological substrate of thoughts resistant to all kinds of spiritual aggressions from the south or the west, regardless of the military force supporting them.

The inherited Byzantine and Eastern-Christian hierarchically systematised order of ideological values represents the base on which the Serbian medieval ruling class ideology of the sacrosanct Nemanjić dynasty explains the justifiability of their drive to establish and justify the existence of the sovereign Serbian state with her autocephalous national church. By that ideology, the common belief in the nation, the major ideas of the undisputed political leaders and the doctrine of the

creative thinkers in the traditional duality between the secular and church authorities, which are mutually solidarity and devoted to the same goal. This ideology has determined the course and the characteristics of Serbian history in the subsequent centuries to a great extent. The success in the struggle to establish and consolidate an independent Serbian state, lasting for 500 years, significantly contributed to the sacralisation of the founders of the dynasty that had achieved it, as well as their descendants who guarded the state and expanded her territorially, presenting her glory to the whole world. Therefore, a strong centralised government is one of its greatest values, because each decentralisation led to divisions and conflicts. The strong hierarchical structure of the state government, the personal charisma of the ruler, legitimacy based on God's providence in the spirit of the Christian tradition and the continuity of the dynasty, with the unity of the state and the church, embodied in the oneness of the father and son, Stefan Nemanja and Saint Sava as the founders of the state and the autocephalous church, secured the vitality, longevity and spiritual livelihood of that idea, even after material ruin. In folk legend, their holy and miracle-making power even worked posthumously and became ever more intensive. They cherished the people and the fatherland and their descendants find inspiration in the deeds of their ancestors, as well as the motivation for new heroic deeds and state-building endeavours.

In this way, almost all the Serbian historical memories have been sacralised and the Serbian national being, its consciousness, ideals and goals had been permeated by those memories. The cult of the rulers/saints has created the mass identification of the people with their statesmen, deeds and political intentions. In order to make this cult even more distinct, the pre-Nemanjić dynasties and rulers were consciously neglected - even the cult of the holy king Jovan Vladimir, partially because these matters took place at the time of the Serbian vacillation between the Eastern and the Western version of Christianity. Stefan Nemanja and Saint Sava resolved this dilemma definitively. A tolerant attitude toward Catholicism continued in the Serbian littoral area, but the Bogomil heresy had been shown no mercy because it posed a threat to the very foundations of the state, not just the church. Nemanja had just managed to stabilise the Serbian state and give it ideological cohesion, and he could not tolerate the heretical religion jeopardising his work, so he eliminated this danger at the cost of a civil war. The Serbian political theology and dynastic hagiography (translator's note: a story of a saint's life) took over the Biblical motifs and produced parallels that give the Serbian state-building a significant place and role in the Eastern Christian civilisation with respect to building of ruler's charisma and cult of sainthood. This created a strong moral potential and political inspiration for the preservation, glorification and restoration of the state-building inheritance as the materialisation of the primordial national ideology, which was able to concentrate and direct the spiritual strength of the nation - its collective endeavours and aspirations to be free. This is how the Serbs achieved the situation where their state-building idea emanated from itself and drew the reasons for its existence from itself,

which is the basic characteristic of historical nations and the base for their missionary visions. Since it was not the sacralisation of the king's function that took place, but the sacralisation of the personality of the ruler, Nemanja's descendants had to deserve their posthumous canonisation by concrete deeds, so they had to give special consideration to this during their lives. Some of them were not canonised, and some of them were, but not until a few centuries after their death. The symphony of the monarchy and the church implied a two-sided relationship, founded on strict rules that the kings and the church leaders tried to observe. However, since the whole dynasty was sacrosanct, i.e. holy, it caused the constitution of the monarchic religion in the Serbian reception of Orthodox Christianity, which represented a religious justification for the existence of the Serbian state and the justification of the necessity of the sacrifice of the people's representatives for her. Stefan Nemanja and Saint Sava represented the ultimate ideal, both spiritually and politically, and their work represents the source of the state-building ideology that was later shaped in literature and perfected. The pronounced theological component of this ideology was supplemented by the fact that the monasteries were almost the only places of complete spiritual creative work. And it was precisely this spiritual church authority that based its stronghold there when it tried to achieve a balance with the secular authority and secure the symphony of these two authorities.

To this dynastic charisma, based on principles of political theology and state-building ideology of the time, which grew from the national self-consciousness, Tsar Dušan added a structured legal dimension through the legal code that includes the basic elements of a constitution and represents the feudal precursor of the later Serbian constitutional laws. In that way, Saint Sava's previous creative reception of Roman law received an original Serbian national expression and, furthermore, the dominant ideology, aside from the theological and political, received a pronounced legal component. However, Dušan disturbed the national exclusivity of the Serbian state-building ideology, proclaiming himself the Tsar of the Serbs and the Greeks, giving his empire certain universal and cosmopolitan characteristics, as he was actually longing for the Byzantine throne in Constantinople. This deviation from the national being of the Serbian state-building ideology proved to be fatal not long after Dušan's death and, furthermore, his spiritual authority had been diminished during his life by opposition from the church circles in his dispute with the Ecumenical Patriarch (translator's note: In 1350 the Patriarch of Constantinople had proclaimed both the Serbian Emperor and the Patriarch anathema for elevating the Serbian Orthodox Church to a patriarchate. In 1375, however, due to the efforts of Prince Lazar and Isaija, the Serbian prior of the Russian Monastery of St. Panteleimon on Mount Athos, the schism was ended and Byzantium formally recognized the legality of the Serbian Patriarchate). The balance between the sacred and secular power was undermined and the harmony of their aspirations and ambitions was disturbed, which represented a severe blow to the state-building ideology. The weakening of the

political and social power of the church and the strengthening of the secular power at its expense had the negative consequence of enormously strengthening and emancipating the feudal lords. The fall of the empire ushered the political detachment of the Serbian nation, but the devastating results of the splitting of the state unity would consolidate the state-building ideology into the aspiration for the full unity and centralisation.

The heroic feat in Kosovo, despite its realistically tragic consequences, represents a new spiritual inspiration to Serbian nationalism and the state-building ideology and, the Serbian Despotate would exist on that basis for almost a century, as well as other Serbian states like Zeta, Bosnia and Herzegovina. Furthermore, the cult of Prince Lazar and other Martyrs of Kosovo permeated the cults of the Nemanjić rulers and fused into a single Serbian national Pantheon. The basic social role of the cult was in the national inspiration of the subsequent generations and the preservation of the fundamental state-building idea, which entailed national unity and solidarity, devotion to the faith and authentic cultural traditions. At the same time, the political ideology elaborated the new, extremely important element of sacrificing for the fatherland and the Orthodox faith. In this way, even when it was deprived of the state, the ideology represented the original source of the national spirit, collective consciousness, pride and defiance, actually a means of transcending all the historical ordeals that stood in their way.

Owing to the clear political ideology, the Serbs became a nation with a clear and defined national consciousness, which represents a great contrast with the nationally immature Europe, narrow-minded because of the Roman-Catholic faith, but also with Byzantium, burdened with universalistic enthusiasm. "The political ideology of the medieval Serbia developed together with the political and cultural history of the institution of state [...] It is the underlying principle of the social program and, at the same time, the reflection of the ethics and political attitudes. The political structure and the balance of the social authorities of the Nemanjić state were characterised by the relative balance of the duality of the sacred and secular power. The state had the support of the church in restraining the centrifugal powers of the feudal magnates. Those two powers have different natures, but their common background belongs to the field of the Divine Right. Starting from this axiom, common to the political theory of the Christian world, the Serbian state forged an ideology and practice of administering public activities in accordance with its functions and aspirations" (Boško I. Bojović: *The Kingdom and the Holiness, The Political Philosophy of Mediaeval Serbia*, the Official Gazette of FRY, Belgrade 1999, p. 356-357).

The Serbian state ideology was based on a clearly defined goal and the sincere belief in that goal along with the possibility and justifiability of its achievement. That goal was an all-encompassing national state - the modern organisation of the state in accordance with the basic practices of its time - and the practice showed that such state was possible as an independent, sovereign state with an autocephalous church. Such a state inclines toward unity in political and moral actions and therefore its

ideology strives to attain moral perfection and spiritual harmony. At the same time it educates and mobilises, teaches and assesses, warns in a timely manner and sanctions sins strictly. "The hagiographies of the Serbian rulers and archbishops reached the ultimate ideological range, building the historical-literary genre in accordance with the unique concept of the Serbian medieval state. Relatively widely-spread due to their cult-related role, these documents that communicated the ethical and political attitudes, enable the preservation of historical continuity, social cohesion and institutional balance. They helped in the preservation and transmission of historical memory, as testified by a series of rulers' hagiographies, which were the highest expression of political determination and lasting social goals. With the unity of ideas and the synthesis of the order of the values they advocated, with the preservation of the spirit and the method which had always been present, with the balance between ethical inspiration and the esthetical contribution, these documents carry a spiritual and cultural dimension of universal scope" (p. 359–360).

2. Contemporary Serbian Political Ideology

The fall of the medieval Serbian state and the Turkish occupation that lasted for several centuries led to the complete destruction of the Serbian feudal class and new classes with roles of political leadership emerged from the ranks of the military leaders, successful merchants or priests. The feudal social relations were developed by the Turkish authorities in a specific way and, therefore, they were directly connected to the alien yoke in the Serbian consciousness, while the military or tribal democracy of the patriarchal clan society will be renewed in each free part of the territory. The Serbs preserved the splendour and the glory of their medieval state, but forget the nature of the social relations of that period, which made it possible for them to facilitate the reception of the ideals of civil society and avoid restoring the feudal structure of the government and the hierarchical values at the time of the insurrections and uprisings. The Serbs' primordial aspiration was to have a mighty and great state that would encompass all the Serbian lands and have a powerful centralised government. The Serbian peasantry became the fundamental social class, and their patriarchal logic and the freedom-loving spirit persistently cherished the idea of the restoration of the state, yearning for revenge for the defeat of Kosovo. This revengeful spirit and the state-building idea were the backbone of the specific political ideology, originating among the people, cherished in the church circles and shaped by the literature written by the newly established intellectual circles who were aware of the European civilisation and cultural achievements. The idea of social equality and social justice, class solidarity and the democratic model of decision-making, strong government and conscientious citizens had a fertile land to blossom in. Therefore, the Serbian revolution from 1804 was both national and social.

The ideology of Serbian nationalism was cherished and developed

IT-03-67-T
by the epic folk poems. As a rule, they radiate the freedom-loving spirit, the revolutionary mood, the feeling of justice and the expression of defiance. The folk political idea is highly moral and its ethical postulates are worthy of the antic peaks and the whole constellation of ancient Greek philosophers. It encompasses the apology of the state, struggle, honour, integrity, courage and loyalty. The collective national consciousness entails the collective responsibility for historical destiny. The covenant to restore the state in her full splendour and magnificence was passed from father to son by instructive examples. In this way, nationalism was fed to the Serbs with their mother's milk and, therefore, it could never have been wrested from his social being and individual conscience. The nationalistic ideals and goals demand all-encompassing national concord and unity and emphasise them as the superior value and an irreplaceable means for achieving all historical accomplishments. They do not tolerate any kind of unbridled behaviour, lack of discipline, selfishness, extravagance, immorality or lack of principles. Determination and persistence, relentless struggle and readiness for sacrifice were necessary. Only those who fight and sacrifice deserves to be free.

The Serbian freedom-loving spirit was cherished and developed in the villages, which were considerably isolated from the dominant Turkish social processes and under the pronounced influence of the Serbian Orthodox priests, who had preserved and passed on the spiritual and political inheritance of the glorious past. Through centuries of slavery, the earlier feudal class had mostly died out and it was not a rare occurrence that the offspring of the nobles converted to Islam and became Turks in order to preserve their old privileges and obtain new ones. Therefore, the resurgent bourgeoisie did not encounter significant barriers. The Serbian peasants were mostly illiterate, but nevertheless, they were extremely nationally conscious and with mature political ideals. It was very difficult to infect them later with a more modern European expression. Their patriarchal nature had never been in collision with the freedom-loving spirit. The Serbian state-building idea was equally present in all classes of society, regardless of their social status or territorial distribution. Although the First Serbian Uprising of 1804 was limited in its spread, its fundamental guiding idea indicated that all the Serbian lands should be liberated as one unique political goal. The news of the Uprising was received among other Serbs with that notion, regardless of whether the Serbs lived in Turkish or Austrian slavery. From the first moments of freedom and the first liberated territories, the insurgent Serbia openly sets the liberation and unification of the whole Serbian nation as its main goal and addressed this issue to the whole world. Each new far-reaching political or military move was made in accordance with that goal, which was openly reported to Russia, as a traditional Serbian ally and patron. The struggle for national liberation was also a decisive confrontation with Islamic or Roman Catholic intolerance and state and legal exclusivity. Religious clashes had always followed the confrontation of the Serbian state idea with the Turkish or Austrian state idea, giving them one of the most distinct

legitimate components and manifestation forms.

The Serbian national state-building idea was so strongly rooted in the consciousness of the Serbian people that they were ready for mass sacrifice in uncompromising bloody battle, even at the cost of self-destruction in situations where they were outnumbered by the enemy. Even when the demoralised leadership of the First Serbian Uprising fled the country, the spirit of the people endured all ordeals and terrible Turkish atrocities and, two years after that, the Second Uprising broke out. The people showed that they were stronger, more mature, more capable and more courageous than their leaders. The previous tragic historical experiences gave a new quality to that national consciousness – the political realism and diplomatic tactics that shall facilitate the realisation of the state idea in the long-term. The political awareness of the people was democratic in its fundamental stream, which prevented any attempt at the restoration of feudalism and the nobility. However, the functioning of the state government preserved the strictly autocratic manners, which was helped by the deeply rooted patriarchal morality. A citizen could tell the prince what he thought to his face, or could even criticise his individual deeds, but he could not challenge his rule and the absolute power of his decision-making. The democratic consciousness thus remained only a principle, while the political processes consisted of bureaucratic practice, the self-will of the clerks and a middle class tradition. The most important Serbian leader of the time, Miloš Obrenović, was affirmed under these social circumstances as an exceptionally cunning and shrewd politician, a relentless defender of Serbian national interests and the achiever of state-building goals - but also as a cruel and unscrupulous persecutor of all alternative political options and their advocates.

A severe blow was dealt to Miloš's autocratic regime and the self-will of a cunning, intelligent and shrewd potentate by the adoption of the Sretenje Constitution in 1835. Although this extremely liberal constitution did not last long, it marked the beginning of the powerful manifestation of the Serbian democratic potential, which would systematically erode the Prince's power, influence and authority, which would lead to his eventual ousting from the throne. "This was the first time that the people in Serbia showed one trait that is visible to an attentive observer during major turning points; when the broad masses of the people are convinced that a change in the state politics is needed despite of the will of the ruler, then a common attitude and public opinion is gradually created that a ruler cannot resist. He has to comply or lose both his throne and his head" (Vasa Čubrilović: *The History of the Political Thought in 19th Century Serbia*, Narodna knjiga, Belgrade 1982, p. 112). However, after Miloš's fall, Serbia found herself placed to experience the government of the bureaucratic oligarchy and its concept of a police state, after a pronounced autocracy. In addition, the breakdown of Miloš's personal regime enabled the return of the powerful Turkish influence on Serbia, showing how an extreme deviation of the political balance in any direction could produce unforeseeable negative consequences. Anyhow, both the autocratic and

1122

the oligarchic option managed to continue the realisation of the national liberating and state-building aspirations of the Serbian nation. The sincere and deeply rooted aspirations of the common people were in significant contrast to the selfish and egotistical ambitions of the rulers. It was along that line that the differentiation of the pro-Russian, nationally oriented politicians and the pro-Western oriented flunkey politicians took place.

In 1844, a significant revolution took place when the *Draft* of Ilija Garašanin was created as the first written all-encompassing plan of the Serbian state politics founded on the general national liberation and state-building aspirations. This would be the principal directive for the next seventy years of the development and spreading of the Serbian state. A certain influence of the Polish emigrant, Adam Čartorijski and the Czech emigrant Franjo Zak to the writing of this confidential document would lead to the appearance of certain Yugoslav aspirations and the inauguration of their subsequent disastrous consequences. Garašanin is well aware of the permanent and unalterable enmity of Austria toward the Serbian national aspirations, so he primarily insists on the Serbian-Russian alliance as the most natural one, provided that Russia accepted the Serbian territorial expansion in its full ethnical scope. The legal foundations of the Serbian aspirations are bespoken by an explanation of the European geo-political need for the restoration of the Serbian empire on the ruins of the Ottoman Empire. "Setting out the principle of amplification, not unification as a condition for the unification of Bosnia and Serbia, putting the Serbian dynasty to rule the new state and expanding the Serbian order to new countries, Garašanin drafted the principles of the Great-Serbian policy of unification in 1844" (p. 139). Ilija Garašanin's great merit was the fact that he brought the traditional Serbian historical right in line with the principle of the self-determination of nations, which had been proclaimed by the French.

The revolutionary upheavals in Europe would affirm the principle of a national sovereignty as a key political principal, which had been developing into the Serbian national conscience for centuries, so that the overall Serbian history was recomposed and reinterpreted in accordance with that principle in a kind of idealistic and romantic ecstasy. The newly formed Serbian intellectual class took over the leading role in the further affirmation of the national consciousness, the modelling of the idealistic concepts, the articulation of political actions and creating the direct objectives and ideological values. The European educated intellectual class added the ardour for enlightenment of modern rationalistic thought to the Orthodox and rural democratic component of Serbian nationalism, which would cherish the old state-building traditions. The common values of European culture and civilisation imprinted a deep national mark on the domestic reception and they reshaped and adapted to the mature political aspirations of a nation that has never lacked an awareness of its own greatness, but has been almost unprecedented in history where the severity of its ordeals are concerned. There has been almost no European country where the idea of the people's sovereignty and parliamentarism found such fertile soil as it did

in the soul of the Serbian people who thought of parliamentarianism as the traditional national assembly tradition and the process of collective decision-making on essential issues and guidelines. Neither the self-willingness of the rulers, bureaucratic centralism or rigorous police repression were able to erase this guiding principle as the basic characteristic of the general social consciousness. The Serbian people accepted the forms of development of the European democracy as their own – as something that had belonged to them from the dawn of time, as something inherent to them and inseparable from them. As something fundamentally irrefutable and non-deductible. After all, the Serbs had, if not a developed constitution, then surely a clearly formulated basic principle of contemporary constitutionality and legality at the time of Tsar Dušan. The institution of government, actually the complete state structure, has always lagged behind the rapid development of this form of collective consciousness, but it had to adapt to that sooner or later and apply its principles.

As the basic ideological feature of Serbian political thought, democracy and liberalism had a major opponent in the monarchy and monarchism, which was its absolute antipode. Monarchism was strong and dangerous because it was, at least formally, shrouded in the veil of monarchism and, in addition, it manipulated the apologies from the epic folk poems. It found a key foothold in the conservatism of the rural social environment, which manifested a constant ambiguity between the libertarian tendencies and the cult of the ruler. The common people had an eye for court ceremonies, but their brains rationally resisted unchecked self-willingness and their hearts felt anger at the abuse of power and the enormous privileges of the newly formed ruling class, disinterested in the everyday problems of the common people and the suffering of the poor. The monarchy represented an additional stimulation for corruption, which had been taken over from the Oriental world as a normal way of doing things and a regular form of social behaviour that systematically undermined the spiritual health of the nation and disintegrated the political institutions of the state. The Serbs manifested their opposition to this absolutism by frequent dethroning or assassinations of absolutist rulers, understanding that they represented a serious threat to the realisation of the primary national ideals.

The development of a parliamentary democracy in Serbia led to the emergence of the first political parties, the Conservative Party and the Progressive Party – as well as the cabinet and bureaucratic parties and, soon afterwards, the emergence of the Radical Party as a political party in the full sense of the word, with a developed party structure. The Serbian Radical Party of Nikola Pašić took over the lead in the creation of Serbian national politics and the strategy of its realisation. As observed by Vasa Čubrilović, Nikola Pašić takes from Ilija Garašanin “the policy of relying on Russia and the Western powers, hatred toward Austria and strictly pro-Serbian foreign affairs goals: the defence of Serbian independence, cooperation with other peoples of the Balkans, the unification of Serbdom, including Bosnia and Herzegovina, Old Serbia, Macedonia and Montenegro and securing access to the sea for

IT-03-67-T
Serbia. We shall see that he observes the solutions for these goals from the standpoint of relations with the great powers and the military power of Serbia. In addition, he strives for the expansion of Serbia, not unification with the rest of the Serbian and Yugoslav lands, by implementing the principle of self-proclamation of nations” (p. 289). A certain number of distinguished intellectuals of the late 19th century abandoned themselves to fantasising about Yugoslavia, preparing the appropriate prerequisites for the greatest Serbian blunder of all times and the greatest national disaster.

Proclaiming at the beginning of WWI that the Serbian war objectives include the liberation and unification of all Yugoslav peoples, Serbia began her downfall, forfeiting all the results of the successful wars of liberation. In the especially unfavourable political climate of the elation with Yugoslavia, Pašić, as a leading Serbian statesman, decided not to go with the flow, but started to channel this euphoria toward the Serbian interest. Pašić “knew the significance of Serbia and her influence on other Serbs, but he raised Serbia above Serbdom as something that is a source, a stronghold of everything Serbian. Even beyond that, Nemanjić state tradition was reinforced in him with the state tradition of the 19th century Serbian aspirations. For him, Serbia was the symbol of all Serbian aspirations and he did not want to change her name. Yugoslavian and Yugoslavia as a common name for all the peoples in the Slavic South seemed alien and incomprehensible to Pašić; it seemed to him that the Austrians had their fingers in it” (p. 346). In the event of unification, Pašić advocated a unitarian and centralised state based on Serbian state-building traditions. “According to Pašić, if that could not be, the state should be organised on federalistic foundations, provided that Serbia annexed all the territories across the Drina and the Sava, which, in his opinion, belonged to Serbia either on the basis of historical rights or the Serbian majority. Above all, he referred to Bosnia and Herzegovina, Vojvodina with Srem and a part of Dalmatia. Then Montenegro and Serbia would unite. Vojvodina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and South Dalmatia would gather around Serbia from 1913 and Great Serbia would have been created in the Yugoslav federation. According to both size and population, Great Serbia would have been larger than Croatia and Slovenia. In such a federative Yugoslavia, Serbia would have been stronger than Prussia in the united German Reich after 1870” (p. 358–349). Because of that, any kind of Yugoslav federation based on historical provinces was unacceptable to Pašić. The thought that the Serbian people would not live in one united federal unit had never crossed his mind. On the other hand, the supremacy of Serbia in any kind of future Yugoslav state could not have been disputed.

II. The State-Building Project of Great Serbia

1) The Book by Ernest Denis on Great Serbia

So far, only Ernest Denis and Vladimir Ćorović have written

voluminous scientific studies tackling *Great Serbia*. In addition to the newspaper with the same title that Milan Jevtić published in New York in 1919, the book entitled *Great Serbia* and written in Serbian was a collection of newspaper articles published in the emigrant press over the preceding seven years. Also, in 1915, the editorial staff of the *Serbian South* published the annual entitled *The Great Serbia*, with a large number of essays, memoirs and poems with a strong patriotic charge. This is everything as far as independent publications are concerned. A large number of discussions, essays and polemics exist in scientific, specialist and publicist magazines that tackle the question of Great Serbia, but we must leave their analysis for some other time. We must confine ourselves to the most significant works in this study, which give us a more complete picture of the Serbian state-building ideology as a primary expression and aspiration of Serbian nationalism.

Ernest Denis's book *Great Serbia* was published in Paris in 1915, and has just recently been translated into Serbian. Its Serbian translation was published in the Radical Party's science magazine *Serbian Freedom Thought* number 1/2002. Denis wrote his book almost overnight, fascinated by the heroism and magnificent victories of the beginning of WWI and, at the same time, inspired by the flood of sympathy in France for the unexpected and almost inconceivable success of a small, distant and previously underestimated ally. After explaining the geographical position of the Serbian people and the influence of that position on national history, Ernest Denis emphasised: "In the struggle waged for centuries, on a daily basis, the population was purified and strengthened. To their heroic virtues and untameable perseverance, astute intelligence and great agility should be added. Watching the masses of enemies that outnumbered them greatly taught them to hate death and to elude the constant conspiracies of their adversaries. By its subtle appearance, it strengthened their nerves and taught them how to unite and endure great sufferings and the worst agonies – taught them stoical patience, without defeatism and without complaints – taught them rational bravery, which avoids all traps and waits for more favourable opportunities. Her heroes are brave and valiant and her warriors are diplomats as well" (p. 33). In his astute political analysis of the historical processes and political circumstances, he says that the contradictions between Serbia and Austria were so great that one of the rivals had to simply disappear.

Austria could only have tolerated Serbia as a state when she was able to instrumentalise her. A virtually independent Serbian state was simply unbearable in Vienna. "The principle of nationality, as we understand it in a simple way, i.e. like a community of people who speak the same language and want to share their destinies within a political group, unavoidably implicates the demise of Austria and the establishment of Great Serbia" (p. 86). Denis then analyses the nature of Serbian nationalism in detail and concludes that the national principle "ensues from the wish for happiness everyone carries inside and which mixes with the need for the complete development of our efficacious capabilities. Recent events have shown that the most consolidated political groups, the most deeply rooted habits and the strongest

convictions are carried like a straw on the wave of patriotism when national existence becomes seriously threatened... All in all, everywhere that it is felt that the independence of a country is in danger, all interests and lower passions disappear, because each intrusion, even the slightest, into the free development of common life, immediately decreases the material and intellectual power of a nation. Therefore, such intrusions decrease the creative potentials of an individual and his own sense of personal value and it destroys the sense of living. Work, freedom and happiness are synonyms. Patriotism is the highest form of moral, because it is the fundamental prerequisite for happiness and useful work, which are in fact human goals" (p. 86).

By detailed historical analysis of the political circumstances of the Balkans in the 19th and early 20th centuries, Denis affirms the strength of the Serbian national idea and its materialisation in the Balkan Wars, confirmed by the incredible victories in the beginning of WWI. The Serbs courageously and decisively liberated and unified parts of their nation and national territories by the strength of their own national spirit. "The Pan-Serbian program is not a figment of the imagination of a fistful of dreamers. History and ethnography imposed it on the politicians. It is derived from the consciousness of the people, who had been aspiring for centuries to mix their destinies by incessant and unanimous efforts" (p. 161). Denis holds that the Serbian aspirations to annex the Austrian area populated by the Serbs are natural and justified. After all, as he demonstrated, "to deny the Italian essence of Tuscany would be as strange as to deny the Serbian character of Split or Sibenik" (p. 162). Furthermore, Ernest Denis harboured some delusions with respect to the possibility and justifiability of the common state of the Serbs, the Croats and the Slovenes, i.e. including all the Croats and Slovenes in Great Serbia, as he insisted, but he also perceptively warned of the far-reaching negative consequences of the possible neglect of the Serbian national interests. "Free, intact and whole, Serbia represents a guarantee for peace; crippled, wrongfully deprived of her legitimate property, cheated with respect of the natural value of her heroic efforts, Serbia is condemned to a policy of vengeance" (p. 171).

Perhaps it would be interesting to convey Denis's attempt at a partial characterisation of the Serbian people through a lucid observation. He says: "The Serbs have faults derived from their temperament and education. They are volatile; their suspicion is quick to rise and they make hasty decisions without much thought, which they soon regret. They lack an awareness of their obligations to the state and, consequently, they easily sacrifice the state interests to their temporary, but strong angers; they are susceptible to propaganda slogans and fake accusations; they forget services; they are more inclined to heroism than thought and, since they are so enthusiastic, they naively believe that their negligence can be easily repaired, like the French. Long Turkish rule, when they were never sure whether they would be the ones to enjoy the fruits of their labour, did not develop an affinity for continuous labour in them. They are heroes who like speeches and amuse themselves in the circle of cigarette smoke, by following the lead of their dreams. Their internal

arguments and their inconsistency were weapon in the hands of the Germans and Hungarians, who found their interest in the Serbian mistakes. Their enemies failed to see, or did not want to see the higher qualities of the Serbian people, their elasticity acquired during hard times, the subtlety and astuteness of their intelligence and, especially, the persistence of their idealism and the strength of their will, which have survived despite the obvious oscillations. Winds make waves on the surface of a river, but they do not change its flow” (p. 77–67).

2. The Book of Vladimir Ćorović on the Realisation of the Concept of Great Serbia

At the time his book *Great Serbia* was published in 1924, one of the greatest Serbian historian of all time, Vladimir Ćorović, held that the Serbian state-building idea was completely and definitively realised in the results of WWI, which developed into a rational and consistent state system embodied in the national awareness since the time of Stefan Nemanja. It was the awareness of national unity that was the fundamental force in checking the regional particularism and the usual feudal fragmentation and mutual conflicts. Undoubtedly, Časlav’s state-building feats, and even more so, Bodin’s independence from Byzantium in the middle of the 9th century, as well as the successful unification of all the Serbian states had a great influence on the establishment of that awareness. In the following century, Raška would demonstrate a higher degree of state-building vitality due to the freedom-loving highland mentality and patriarchal ethics. It was also helped by the central geographic position in relation to other Serbian states, as well as a high degree of resistance to Catholic influences, to which the Serbian littoral has always been much more susceptible.

Although he was baptised in accordance with the Catholic rite, Stefan Nemanja realised at an early age that Orthodoxy was much more compatible with the Serbian national being and more in conformity with tradition and beliefs. He was born in Zeta, in the vicinity of Podgorica, and he made Raška his central political stronghold and spread his rule into almost all the other Serbian states. He made a fundamental mistake when, on the occasion of his retirement from the throne, he divided the country in such a way that he entrusted the throne of Raška to his son Stefan and the throne of Zeta to Vukan. Soon, the brothers were immersed in a fierce conflict, drawing the other countries and the Pope into their dispute. Saint Sava, the youngest son of Stefan Nemanja, had managed to settle the disputes between his brothers and prevent the conversion of Serbia to Catholicism when Stefan Prvovenčani was crowned by the Papal crown in 1217. After he had attained the independence of the Serbian Orthodox Church from the Patriarch of Nicaea and had become the first Archbishop thereof, he crowned his brother, but this time with an Orthodox crown. The subsequent rulers from the Nemanjić dynasty had increased the territory of the Serbian state, despite occasional crises and inter-dynastical conflicts, to reach her mediaeval zenith under the rule of Tsar Dušan.

1128

IT-03-67-T

However, as Ćorović points out, “Dušan expanded the state to encompass a much larger circle than could have been incorporated and assimilated in the new state. His conquests brought a great amount of territory, almost larger than the territory he had initially. And, most importantly, they brought a foreign element. The Serbian state, although not young, did not have sufficient skills and time to bring its breath to the new provinces; and, normally, that was not easy. The Greek element, with its stronger and long-lasting culture, could have been politically overpowered, but not spiritually so; and especially not when a new state incorporated a large number of people and many areas where some other element was more numerous than the Slavic. Furthermore, these countries were conquered, not joined; in those states the influence of the old affiliation and feelings remained strong and they were only submissive while they believed that each attempt at rebellion would be crushed in blood. And finally, when engaged in so many activities, the central authority had to weaken; firstly, because the emperor, as the bearer of that authority, was preoccupied with military campaigns and hardly had time to direct his attention to internal organisation; and secondly, because this expansion, at a time of poor infrastructure and difficult communication, rendered easy controls and direct supervision impossible. The consequences of these matters were the strengthening of the power of certain provincial lords, the development of centrifugal tendencies and, finally, the disintegration of the state into provincial units. All this was helped by Dušan’s death in the prime of his manhood and by the complete incompetence of his heirs” (V. Ćorović: *Great Serbia*, KIZ Kultura, Belgrade 1990, p. 7-8).

Such great speed did not bode well and the sudden rise did not last long. However, the glory and rapture remained to inspire posterity and give them confidence in the abilities of the Serbian people. It was sufficient to spark the centuries-long dream and collect sufficient strength for the realisation of that dream. After Dušan’s death, disintegrating Serbia was not able to resist the Turkish invasion for long but there was no force that could expelled the great state ambitions and imperial traditions. Learning from Dušan’s mistakes, when he came to the throne and was crowned in the monastery Mileševo in 1377, Tvrtko I Kotromanić tried to expand his state only in Serbian ethnic territories. But Tvrtko had not learned the most edifying lesson from the works of Saint Sava and his state was exhausted and broken by the strong religious dissensions of the three mutually intolerant religious.

At the time of Turkish slavery, the only carriers of the Great Serbian state idea, its guardians and glorifiers were the Serbian Orthodox Church and folk oral traditions. The Serbian Church identified itself with the state and the royal genealogy of the Nemanjić dynasty represented the central place at the altar of the Orthodox saints. State-building traditions and religious teachings were the fundamental and original sources of the national ideology that has preserved the Serbian national awareness, pride and dignity for centuries. Hopes for freedom erased all the sufferings of the typically feudal social organisation from the collective nation’s memories and created a naturally and nationally coloured

1129

25/57440

democratic concept, which prevented any tendency to restore feudalism, noble classes and surfs at a time when Europe was tormented by fierce attempts at the restoration of feudalism.

Serbian national identity was preserved primarily due to the autochthonous Orthodox creed and the national language. The spiritual authority of the Patriarchate of Peć spread through all the Serbian states, achieving what the secular rulers had never been able to manage. However, this had some negative consequences reflected in the deepening of the gap between the Orthodox Serbs and the Catholic and Muslims Serbs, whose national awareness had been fading progressively and to whom conversion to another faith meant a negation of their ethnicity, deprivation of the collective consciousness and memories and the loss of identity. The spirit of chivalry and readiness to sacrifice inspired generations, rendering Serbian nationalism one of the most developed, strongest and firmest nationalisms in the whole world. For centuries, personal ambitions and group wishes and aspirations had been entwined in it. Everyone yearned for the old glory and rushed in that direction, exhausting energy mercilessly on sporadic conflicts, vanity and envy at the same time. The main current of the wide Serbian river had to waste strength and energy in wild maelstroms and rapids, but it never gave up.

Where the preservation of national awareness was concerned, the Serbs who lived under the occupation of the Catholic states were more endangered than those who lived under the Turkish yoke. But where the Serbian concentration was stronger and more stable, in Austria and Hungary, the cultural bloom was stronger and more encompassing, influencing all the other Serbian lands. As Corović observed, analysing the Serbian political and cultural circumstances in the 18th century, “a great portion of our educated people lost the connection with their compatriots, was ashamed of their backwardness and, as upstarts, rushed into new cultures and societies where they were assimilated and lost. However, the other portion stayed among their compatriots, connected with them with their deepest roots and eternal love and strove to raise the level of general enlightenment in the Serbs using their education and knowledge” (p. 16).

Although it had many characteristics of spontaneity and naivety in its leadership, the First Serbian Uprising very quickly emerged like a revolution prepared for decades. “In such a way, look, in the first six months of the uprising, after the first attack and when people returned to their senses, the national program of the new Serbian state was created with increasing certainty. Even if the national leaders do not know how to formulate it yet - even those who have it in their souls and their blood, inherited from their forefathers, the environment and Serbs of different origins, who perceived the new cry for the national unification and the new spark of resurrection of the old Serbian statehood thought and creation” (p. 26). The success of the uprising was in many ways due to the fact that Russia took a serious step in the Balkans at that time and placed herself in the role of protector of her coreligionists and blood kin. The Russian protection inspired new confidence and caused an

incredible revolutionary rapture and battle enthusiasm, which had already transformed the ripe for national idea into a clear and intelligible state-building program.

The temporary collapse of the uprising from 1813, mostly caused by Napoleon's campaign against Russia, could not destroy the national enthusiasm that had been awakened in all Serbian territories. Both the Turkish authorities and the European powers were convinced that the Serbs could not recover from the defeat, especially as the insurgent Serbia had been left almost without a population after the Turkish atrocities and persecutions. “Obviously, they were unaware of the rare psychological trait of the Serbian people, characteristic through all the centuries of their history, that, especially in the darkest hours when they were almost on their knees, they would cast off the chains by fierce effort, inner energy and self-confidence and find the unsuspected strength needed to achieve success. That zest for life, their refusal to fall after even the fiercest blows, that stoical endurance of the numb organism makes one of the deepest strengths of our tribe, expressed so descriptively and uniquely in the ethic of our Kosovo epos. We can even say that we have always been stronger in calamities and that all the beautiful traits of our natural ethics have been developed through suffering and battles. Power and the feeling of might have always affected us as a corrupting force and given our raw passions wings with disastrous results” (p. 37).

In the Second Serbian Uprising, with profuse Russian political and diplomatic help, the foundations underpinning the contemporary Serbian statehood were laid. For a whole century, the Serbs continued their liberating efforts but, at the same time, they were building the legal structure of the state. They managed to avoid restoring the relicts of feudalism and to turn to the establishment of a modern European civil society on the basis of a strong and economically free peasantry, but they were constantly faced with dynastical struggles of the pro-Karadordević and pro-Obrenović parties, rulers' self-will, absolutist tendencies and, somewhat later, with the all-Serbian imperial pretensions of the Petrović dynasty. Alongside the expulsion of the Turks and the territorial expansion into the southern Serbian territories, Serbia had been facing the growing Austrian appetites and saw in that the sources of future threats to her independence. The Austrians and the Hungarians had been restricting the national rights of the Serbs under their rule and, at the same time, checked the Serbian efforts in the definite expulsion of the Turks from the Balkans.

Throughout the 19th century, the Serbs were immersed in the aspiration to liberate themselves nationally and to unite into a complete state that would encompass all the Serbian territories. No Serbian politician and no government was guided by narrow selfish interest and was ready to directly oppose such aspirations. However, at the time of Prince Mihailo Obrenović, Serbia openly put herself in the role of all-Serbian interest, which obviously meant the role of the Great Serbian Piedmont. Mihailo's untimely death, as a result of the dynastic conflicts and conspiracies, put an end to his great state, but could not restrain and

extinguish the burning ideas and the all-national freedom movement. The Bosnian and Herzegovinian Uprising in 1875 is the logical expression of these ideas, which drew Serbia, Montenegro and Russia into the war, despite Prince Milan's attempts at staying neutral. The king's dejection and his secret agreements with the Viennese government handicapped the Serbian state apparatus and considerably weakened their military efforts, though Russian intervention prevented a more serious Serbian defeat. However, not even Russian diplomacy was strong enough to prevent the Austrian pretension to Bosnia and Herzegovina and, at the same time, it was burdened with her own interest on the territory of Bulgaria. At one time, Russia even put Bulgarian interests above Serbian, because of Prince Milan's fickleness and diffidence.

At the Congress of Berlin in 1878, the independence of Serbia and Montenegro was recognised, as well as a certain territorial expansion, but it enabled the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Sandžak of Novi Pazar, which was a heavy blow to Serbian national romanticism. This would soon transfer the brunt of the Balkan conflicts to the north and cause a new accumulation of Serbian national energy, determination and combativeness. Prince Milan, unable to rise to the occasion, historical challenges and national aspirations, turned away from Russian support, entered into a secret convention with Vienna, persecuted his political adversaries and cruelly attacked liberal views and democratic tendencies, but also entered into a dangerous, senseless war with Bulgaria, which inflicted great damage on Serbia. The crisis of national awareness in Serbia was partially compensated for by the extensive national politics of the Montenegrin Prince Nikola Petrović, who brought new life into the Great Serbian idea and awoke the enthusiasm of all Serbdom.

Montenegro was too small and weak for serious national action, but it had always been there to admonish and abet. The absolutist tendencies of the Montenegrin rulers were even more pronounced there and, therefore, the struggle for democratic changes in Serbia and Montenegro always entailed the high existential risk for its advocates. However, the dynastic upheaval in Serbia in 1903 gave wings to a great nationalistic enthusiasm, the long-term installation of the Radical government and the statehood visions of Nikola Pašić and led to the glorious victories in the Balkan Wars and WWI. It was preceded by an extensive and well-organised action by the Chetniks in Old and Southern Serbia. Serbia could not have been stopped or unhinged by the Customs War or the Annexation Crisis, and her endurance went through an important trial for the future colossal national exploit. And then, when the Serbian people were at the zenith of their power and glory, when it had almost achieved Great Serbia, a terrible mistake occurred – the unbelievable imprudence and stupidity of the ruler and the delusion of the leading intellectuals – the establishment of a common state. A state that Vladimir Corović considered the realisation of the state-building project of Great Serbia destroyed the fruits of all the Serbian victories and condemned us to spend the 20th century in slavery and suffering, exposed to genocide and

IT-03-67-T

to end the period in ruins, misery and despair with the nation suffering from depleted morale.

Corović was unable to fathom that or even sense all this. It seems that Nikola Pašić had his reservations about this and Field Marshal Zivojin Mišić was overcome with anxiety. The hot-headed King Aleksandar Karadordević, in his blindness and deafness to everything around him, dreamed phantasmagorical and immature dreams that led him from one mistake to another. At the end of his book, Vladimir Corović left an instruction or recommendation to the Serbs: "All the great things we have today are the result of superhuman efforts and they remain a behest to the young generations, to develop them and complete them. Rising with us, they should, naturally, rise above us. We can say, without false modesty, that few generations have ever given posterity anything greater than the things we leave to them [...] If a man can make wishes for the future, then I only have one: I wish that the souls of the new generations always have enough understanding, and, if needs be a portion of the example of the imminent and eternal Great Serbia!" (p. 95).

3. The Great Serbian Concept of the Serbian Culture Club

The historical documents testify that the first person to use the term Great Serbia was Count Đorđe Branković in 1683, at the time of the Turkish siege of Vienna. Branković offered a written elaboration to the Austrian court, dealing with the liberation and unification of all Serbian lands into Great Serbia, which would have definitively stopped further Turkish penetration into Central Europe. While they were in danger, Vienna accepted the project but when the Turks were repulsed, they withdrew and gave primacy to their own plans of ruling the whole of the Balkans and annexing it. At that time, Branković was the Despot of Banat, Srem and Herzegovina, pursuant to the proclamation of Austrian Emperor Leopold. He incited the Serbs to rebel in the occupied territories and significantly weakened the Turkish pressure. When the Turks were repulsed with considerable help from the Serbs, the emperor saw Branković as the a danger for Austrian strategic interests and had him arrested and held in prison for 22 years, where Branković died in 1711 in Heb. Ever since that time, the mention of Great Serbia represents a real taboo for Austria, the greatest danger that ever threatened her and the whole Catholic world concerning their desired expansion to the east.

The Archimandrite of the Piva Monastery and distinguished Herzegovinian people's representative, Arsenije Gagović, presented a draft of the project on creating Great Serbia in Saint Petersburg in 1803 to the official representatives of the Russian government. In 1804, the Metropolitan of Karlovac, Stevan Stratimirović, sent a similar expressly Great Serbian plan to the Russian Emperor. These plans represented the major framework of Karadorde's national politics. It was further shaped and made precise by the Garašanin's *Draft*, which was not published but represented a landmark for all strategic statehood acts of the Serbian government for several decades. It was primarily oriented toward the

liberation and unification of the southern Serbian provinces, since that was more realistic in those circumstances, but it expressed a clear though indirect pretension to the northern provinces, considering that the Austrian state was much more powerful and stronger than the Turkish state.

The entire Austrian propaganda machinery was engaged against the danger that Great Serbia posed in 19th century. The secret reports of the leaders of the Viennese regimes confirm that the idea of Great Serbia overtook all the Serbs and made them hot-headed, especially since Svetozar Miletić appeared in the territory of Vojvodina, openly representing himself as an advocate of the state-building project of Great Serbia. This had also become the public political program of the Serbian Radicals in Vojvodina, Slavonia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The idea of Great Serbia was so strong that, for a moment, the Viennese court, helped by the military circles, considered proclaiming the territory of the abolished Serbian Dukedom as Great Serbia as an imperial protectorate and, in this way, use the Serbian national enthusiasm for the interests of the Habsburg dynastic ambitions and, in the long run, subjugate all Serbian states through the pretence of their unification. The idea was particularly insubstantial in the growing Serbian national euphoria and the international affirmation of the existing independent Serbian states – Serbia and Montenegro. Subsequent to the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Austrians and Hungarians would look upon Great Serbia, the guiding star and the fuel for Serbian state-building, as the major existential threat and Field Marshal Conrad von Hötzendorf deemed it the most pivotal reason for the preventive war against Serbia. This fear of the Habsburgs was especially indicative when they received the information that the establishment of Great Serbia was the most important political preoccupation of the secret society of officers known as The Black Hand, which was very influential in Serbia.

The impossibility of functioning and stabilising the first Yugoslavia due to systematic Croatian obstruction and subversion shortly after WWI, had gradually sobered the Serbs concerning the viability and the realistic perspective of a common state with the Croats and the Slovenes and the idea of Great Serbia started to recover gradually in public life. This was shown first in the establishment of the Serbian Party and the name of its official gazette, and then, in March 1928, the Radical Party member and MP Puniša Račić, demanded a reorganisation of the state and that the name be changed to Great Serbia at the session of the Parliament. The decisive point came with the coup, covertly performed by the formation of the Banate of Croatia. Since the Radical Party was completely destroyed at this time and Milan Stojadinović was physically ousted from political life, any organised party resistance to the self-will of Regent Pavle Karađorđević and the traitors in the court clique was impossible and a group of the most distinguished Serbian intellectuals established the Serbian Culture Club, which would reaffirm the state-building idea of Great Serbia. Unfortunately, it was too late, as the events that followed indicated, and the Serbian people were introduced to a new historical tragedy.

The founders of the Serbian Culture Club were Slobodan Jovanović and Dragiša Vasić. Formally or informally, this club is connected to Vladimir Corović, Dragoslav Stranjaković, Stevan Moljević, Lazo Kostić and Nikolaj Velimirović because of its Great Serbian idea. Finally, the great blunder made by the Act of 1 December 1918 was discovered and people lamented the missed opportunities to amputate Croatia. The first to go public with this idea was Stojan Protić in his polemic with Anto Trumbić, shortly after the unification, the then King Aleksandar in 1928 and Milan Stojadinović in 1937, who was striving to resolve the Croatian question once and for all but found himself caught in the crossfire of the court clique and the united opposition. The idea of Great Serbia was wholeheartedly propagated by Dobrosav Jevđević and Radmilo Grđić, as well as Mladen Žujović, Zoran Andrić, Nikola Stojanović and Vojislav Vujanac. The Serbian Culture Club developed extensive activities – organising lectures, publishing newspapers and developing the Serbian state-building idea on the reawakened Serbian national consciousness.

4. The Great Serbian Concept of Ravna Gora

Draža Mihailović's Chetnik movement of Ravna Gora was primarily guided by the ideology of the Serbian nationalist state-building concept. Great Serbia is the main preoccupation of almost all Chetniks, their commanders and ideologists, although it had not been fully developed as a concept. In the beginning, the basic text where the main ideas were presented was Moljević's discussion *Homogenous Serbia*, which served as a textbook for the ideological education of the members of the Ravna Gora movement and major propaganda material. Moljević did not oppose the survival of Yugoslavia directly, but insisted that, within the Yugoslav state, all the Serbian lands should be bordered and made ethnically homogenous. Dragiša Vasić and the emigrant minister of foreign affairs, Momčilo Ninčić had already made themselves clear that Yugoslavia should not be restored, but this attitude was not made public clearly, due to the foreign-affairs politics. But in the Chetnik press and the propaganda speeches of the distinguished activists of the Ravna Gora movement, Great Serbia was the main preoccupation. The Serbian nationalistic idea was prevalent in the Serbian people and it did not allow the communists to take the initiative until the change in the Allies' attitude.

In his next discussion, *The Opinion on Our Country and Her Borders*, Moljević pleads for a definite de-bordering with the Croats, consistent punishment of war criminals and moving their families to Croatia, as well as moving out the disloyal Muslims, compromised through the activities of the Ustasha movement, to Turkey. The Serbs did not want revenge on their enemies, but they thought that the Croats and the Roman-Catholic church had to pay full reparation to the Serbian people, both in money and territories. The Chetnik manifestos often called for unity, concord and equality for all the Serbs, from the various Serbian regions, which was something the pre-war authorities had not paid enough attention to, causing the dissatisfaction of the so called

Prečani (translator's note: the Serbs who live across the rivers Sava and Danube). The civil war, waged among the Serbs themselves, had a driving influence that the communists very skilfully manipulated, leading the Partisans from one region to harass the Serbs in another region.

The behaviour of the emigrant government in London and, in certain phases, even the king himself and the utter political incapability represented a huge burden for the Ravna Gora movement and the key disruptive factor in understanding its unique, coherent and solid ideology. The majority of the emigrant politicians were full of consideration towards the Croats, while the circumstances in the country indicated a definite Serbo-Croatian de-bordering as the only rational solution. Dragiša Vasić insisted that the Chetnik movement should critically move away from the wanderings of the royal government and especially its Croatian ministers who created considerable confusion even in the eyes of the Western Allies regarding the circumstances in the occupied Yugoslav countries. To Vasić, it was clear that the Croatian ministers were fiercely trying to annul the Ustasha crimes, to scorn the Serbian victims and to prevent the final reckoning for all the Croatian people for the genocide committed against the Serbs.

Although the Chetnik leaders clearly understood that only the Great Serbia project could satisfy the Serbian national interests, in some parts of the Ravna Gora movement, this dilemma - Great Serbia or Yugoslavia - would remain until the end of the war and waste a lot of precious political energy, making people confused and military commanders disoriented. In practice, the greatest danger to the Ravna Gora movement and the Serbian people were the Communists, but it seemed that the Serbs could not see that clearly. In 1942, the Great Serbian Concept of Ravna Gora pervaded all the followers of General Milan Nedić, so this was the period of the greatest enthusiasm in the military formations and in General Draža Mihailović's political groupings. The reckless military campaign that ended in defeat on the Neretva River, where Tito began successful cooperation with the Germans and the Ustashes on an anti-Serbian base, shook the movement and created certain centrifugal tendencies, weak discipline and disorientation during 1943. There is historical data that the British suggested that Mihailović avoid the battle on the Neretva, knowing about the cunning German idea that the Serbs should have been pulled into mutual fighting, after which ideological peace would be impossible. Mihailović obviously was not up to secret games and plots, making huge mistakes even in the period of the first agreements with Tito in 1941, when he was regularly manipulated by the Communist leader.

General Mihailović had every reason not to trust the English, knowing that they were the most prominent opponents of the idea of Great Serbia, but a precious discovery would cost him dearly in the end. In politics, all missed opportunities are irrevocable and mistakes are not forgiven. Even in demagoguery, Mihailović did not know how to compete with the Communists, his propaganda efforts were soft, anti-democratic and anti-party - wrong. Mihailović's animosity towards the national

minorities who betrayed the country was understandable, but it was stupid to write and publish the attitude that their members should be banished. Regarding this question, the Communists were silent but, after the war, they banished half a million Germans and three thousand Italians. The Italians posed no threat to the Serbs, quite the opposite. But there should have been a search for a solution to move out half a million Albanians, of course, without previously shouting from the housetops.

In 1943, during his program and political doubts, Draža Mihailović made a new mistake in reorienting his attitude to creating Great Yugoslavia, a state project with four federal units, Serbia, Slovenia, Croatia and Bulgaria, under the Karadordević dynasty. The people were tired of such projects and this could not fit into the interests of the Great Powers of the anti-Hitler coalition. The followers of the Ravna Gora movement were simply taken aback by the non-existence of a clearly defined political program, especially when some of the pretentious middle ranking officers started talking about a ten-year Chetnik dictatorship after the war, as a state and political unavoidability. In March 1943, Mihailović called most of the distinguished representatives of the Serbian Cultural Club – the representatives of the Radicals, the Democratic, the Socialist and the Republican parties, as well as the various professional organizations - in order to form the Central national committee and the national movement with a clearly defined political program, which would have been led by him. The program was outlined by Ljuba Davidović and Živko Topalović and, in the national respect, it largely deviated from Stevan Moljević and Dragiša Vasić's Great Serbian concepts, because even on the Serbian territories it anticipated yielding to the requests of certain regional particularises and the introduction of regional autonomies. The project did not satisfy even Mihailović himself. In addition, it returned to the political scene of Ravna Gora all the intrigues that the Democratic Party and the Socialist Party had been extremely prone to before the war.

On the other hand, Roosevelt insisted that Mihailović should leave the region west of the Drina and the Neretva to Tito's Partisans, in the operative regard, showing his wish for a new territorial division of Yugoslavia corresponding to the scheme of the Great Powers. In some of his performances, Mihailović started to claim that he was not at all a Serbian nationalist, but a supporter of Yugoslav ideas, which caused even greater confusion among the Serbian patriots. He did not even make his way in the possible cooperation with the Italians, which was something the British urged him to do, in order to deliver a strong blow to the Germans a couple of months before the capitulation of Italy, which would later give the Chetniks a chance to disarm the Italian units. After the capitulation of Italy, Draža Mihailović found himself in a very unpleasant situation – he had to justify himself to the British that he had not threatened the Croats with revenge, prove that he did not collaborate with the occupier, that he did not lead Serbian nationalistic politics, that he had no contact with Milan Nedić and that he had had no idea of Nedić's attempts to persuade Hitler via Neubacher to establish Greater Serbia by the annexation to Serbia of Bosnia and Herzegovina,

Montenegro, Kosovo and Metohija, as well as Srem. While Tito had already been secretly negotiating with the British delegations on his post-war anti-Russian politics, Mihailović started to call upon the Orthodox and Slavic Mother Russia.

By the end of 1943, instead of designing a realistic and efficient political concept, Mihailović started to express his animosity towards the pre-war politicians and parties. He returned to a formula of Great Serbia but, this time, as a part of Great Yugoslavia. He was faced with increasing fractions in the Chetnik movement, a decrease in discipline and morale, the instinctive feeling of the fighters that the Supreme Command was insecure in its decision-making and giving orders. The Teheran Conference, in which Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill participated, made the decision on the restoration of Yugoslavia and helping Tito's Partisans on the 28th November 1943, a day before the Second AVNOJ meeting. Mihailović was forsaken and the Western Allies betrayed the Serbs again. They got down to work at the definite destruction of Serbdom.

During the war, recklessly leaving the Communists with the initiative, Mihailović started to form regional, county, district, municipal and village Chetnik committees in order to establish political organisation, along with military organisations on the whole territory as late as 1944. But it proved that he was fatally late in this case as well. The territory of his Great Serbia was divided into eight regions, but he failed to take Lika, Kordun, Slavonija and Baranja into account, because he was probably ready to make a territorial concession regarding the possible federalisation of Yugoslavia. Before the congress in the village of Ba, the Ravna Gora movement split into two fractions, the consistent advocates of the Great Serbia project and the compromisers who were ready to renew the idea of Yugoslavia. At the Congress of Bač, Živko Topalović forced a kind of paternalistic attitude towards the Croats and a proclamation of federation and Lazo Kostić seriously criticized its resolution. All this produced even greater confusion among the Serbian patriots. Almost throughout 1944, various Chetnik newspapers dealt with the newest ideological confusion, polemised with each other, presenting above all the movement's confusion and disorientation. The hardest blow to Draža Mihailović's Chetniks was given by King Petar II Karadorđević. In July 1944, he ousted Božidar Purić from the position of Vice President of the Government and appointed the Croat Ivan Šubašić in his place. The British then forced an agreement between the two Croats - Tito and Šubašić - to the detriment of Serbia. All the Partisan units were concentrated to push Serbia into a fierce civil war, while the Croats received precious time out for their Ustasha leaders. Radio London was rabidly propagated the Partisan struggle while, under a direct order from Churchill, Draža Mihailović was ousted from the position of Army Minister.

Betrayal from the western allies and the forsaking of Yugoslavia to the Communist leader Tito ideologically disoriented the Ravna Gora movement, because all its political projections were based on the estimation that the Western Allies would start an invasion of the Balkans

and that they would start their struggle with the Soviet Union in an unthinkable anticommunism on the part of Roosevelt and Churchill. Nothing of this came true. There was a disturbance in the Chetnik military structure, a break-up of unity and a lack of discipline, while the regional commanders began to become independent, each starting to introduce their own politics. A lot of them openly stood up against Draža Mihailović and his politics, denying his further leadership and competence. Mihailović was left only to invoke the ritual of sacrifice and martyrdom in a situation where no political or military factor would help him. At the decisive moment, he failed to create and draft the national Serbian ideology, he did not know how to politically form and organise the movement he led, he did not fit into the position of a leader and into the designs of the Western Powers, nor was he personally up to dealing with their wickedness and perfidy - he continuously had the Roman Catholic Church against him, which was bathing in the Ustasha atrocities, feverishly searching for an optimal way to saving the Croatian people from the terrible crime they committed against the Serbs.

The long-term interests of the Americans and the British were focused on the persuasive weakening of the Serbian idea, breaking its state-building traditions, territorial break-up and political confusion. Throughout the war, the Chetnik leadership mostly did not lack military competence and courage, but it turned out that they were without political talent, sociological knowledge and a psychological approach in their propaganda efforts. The lack of political inspiration and the absence of a sense for legal subtleties could not have been compensated for with empty monarchism and national rhetoric. The clear anti-intellectual course and scorn for the politicians turned against the officers and the Serbian people were faced with terrible consequences. On the other hand, among the Communists, politicians and political commissars were always in charge and the military commanders obediently obeyed them and executed their will unconditionally. The Serbian political parties were hopelessly destroyed and headless even before the war and, after Milan Stojadinović's supplanting and exile, the Serbs had no significant political leader. The Serbian Cultural Club knew what they wanted, but they did not know how to realize that. The Radical Party had a grumbling president, who was over ninety years of age, and their most distinguished leaders were mostly passive in emigration.

And yet, the constant vacillation between the Yugoslav idea and the Serbian idea was the most fatal thing for the Serbian nationalists, while the traditional Russophile ideas led the young people largely to communism and caused a bloody civil war among the Serbs. In addition, serious people were flabbergasted at the sight of the unbelievable Croatian national abjectness and bloodthirstiness. The worst monsters in the history of mankind, both the Ustashas and the *Mačkovci*, and the clerics managed to conceal and suppress their atrocities and blind the world public with their propaganda on the danger of the Great Serbian hegemony, untarism and centralism. Vatican and the key free mason circles found themselves on the same line and with the same goals with respect to the Serbian question, supporting the pro-Western Croats

III. The Ideological and Political Roots of Modern Serbian Radicalism

The final departure of the Turks from the Belgrade Pashalic and the consolidation of the newly formed Serbian state, which was diligently and gradually gaining full independence, made room for the transfer from idealistic and romanticized nationalism towards a realistic view of the objective conditions of the life of the nation, gave special attention to the democratic politics, liberal economy and rationalized social component, which established a sound base for the Serbian national idea. Young educated people could not bear the tight chains of monarchist absolutism and the barren inter dynastic fight. In the conscience of the Serbs, nationalism and liberalism were going to increasingly represent two inseparable components of a new, modern outlook on life and the world. Both components were based on freethinking ideas and traditions. They could not make peace with political autocracy and royal self-will, lack of legality and lack of the freedom of the press.

1. Nikola Pašić's Radical Party

The educated people were increasingly making their way into the public, with ideas that the political line-up should not be done using inter dynastical relations. Under Obrenović's and Karađorđević's regime, only the methods of tyranny were changing. The Obrenovići were forcing personal authority and, under the Karađorđevići, an oligarchy personified in the court camarilla ruled. Among the leading intellectuals, there was no doubt that social relations needed a thorough change, but there were different views when it came to speed and how to make that change. The Socialists, led by Svetozar Marković, advocated violent and fierce changes and the Radicals, led by Nikola Pašić, advocated wise, thorough and clever methods. The Radicalism originated in the socialist ideological milieu but it had quickly overgrown it as an original idea of freedom and taken over nationalistic and liberalistic ideology from their then weary bearers, who merged with the autocratic regime for the sake of personal and group privileges.

The youth euphoria of the first Serbian Socialists gradually weakened, together with the emotional and intellectual growth of its bearers, transforming itself, in the serious people, into the struggle for political democracy, abandoning the original socialist doctrinarism and socialist ideology Marxist or anarchistic dogmatism was retreating and the primacy was given to basic democratic values, freedom of the press and associations, parliamentary supremacy over executive power, the responsibility of the government and ministers to the Parliament, local independent units, etc. Svetozar Marković's ideological fanaticism had to retreat before Nikola Pašić's political astuteness. The idea of the Radicals' democracy grew stronger, supported by the wisest people,

1140

while socialism was reduced to an ideological sect without any important influence and perspective.

The liberal ideas of the Radical movement were spreading quickly though the nation and, on 24 October 1874, the first of the Radical representatives were elected and found themselves in Parliament. The work of the Parliament was fraught with constant quarrels between the Conservatives and the Liberals, but there were no principal differences between them or any major political reforms when they succeeded one another in power. The Radicals discarded any kind of a dynastic orientation and turned towards the people's wishes and interests. They mercilessly criticised the bureaucracy of the police state, demystifying the authorities of the nation, undermining their authority based mostly on patriarchal traditions. They denuded the monarch's brutality, police violence and the clerks' illegalities and self-will. They were teaching people that the authority was not inviolable and God-given, because it can be replaced and had to be under the peoples' will.

The Radicals' criticism of the existing state was systematically turning into a complete program of state and social reforms, through which the spirit of the most modern European democratic achievements could have been felt. Furthermore, the Radicals had never neglected the national question and liberating aspirations and Nikola Pašić himself actively participated in assisting the Bosnian-Herzegovinian uprising and participated in it personally.

From the primarily left-wing orientated and communism-infatuated intellectuals, Pašić managed to create the nucleus of a predominantly democratic organisation, which was liberally oriented, and patiently and determinedly locate it in the position of a moderate right-wing party. When the Radicals won the municipal elections in Kragujevac in 1876, the Liberals tried to manipulate them with a new national rally, but the Radicals prevailed there and spontaneously started to protest in the streets of Kragujevac, with music and songs. A protestor raised a red flag with the inscription 'self-governance' made of paper letters. To Obrenović's regime, this served as a pretext to use the army and arrest the Radical activists as rebels and traitors. Soon enough, after the Serbian-Turkish war, King Milan arrested Lieutenant Colonel Jevrem Marković and had him shot under false accusations. He was a legendary war commander and a distinguished Radical representative. His brother Svetozar, who soon evolved from a youthful and indoctrinated Socialist into a thoughtful Radical, died of the consequences of imprisonment. The Radical press was systematically suppressed. The Parliament that convened in February 1877 was disbanded without having been able to open any dispute. The local self-governance was totally crushed.

In the elections held on 29 October 1878, Nikola Pašić was elected as representative for the first time. At the first session of the Parliament in Niš on 21 November, Pašić's election was annulled, which also happened to seven other Radicals. In the additional elections, they were all re-elected. In March 1880, Adam Bogosavljević was arrested and died two days later, probably of poisoning. When the Serbian People's Radical Party was formally founded on 4 January 1881, out of the total

of 128 representatives, 76 signed the Radical Program. The prince and the government reduced this number to 47 by persuasion, bribery and blackmail.

Before the elections of 1883, the Progressive Government started to arrest the Radicals at random, increasing their reputation among the people. The Radicals' municipalities were stolen and clerks and teachers were dismissed. In these elections, the Progressive Party was beaten to the ground and their government resigned, tried to explain the failure through the peoples' alleged objections to constitutional reforms. The newly elected parliament was opened and closed in just a couple of minutes, manipulating and mocking the basic postulates of parliamentarism. Incapable of stabilising his authority with only political resources, King Milan deliberately provoked an armed rebellion, ordering the confiscation of the armament of the people's army, immediately after closing down the parliament. This was the beginning of the Timok Rebellion, which started spontaneously, though the Radicals participated directly. Although the disenchantment of the people with the regime was huge, the rebellion was not well organized or led and the regular army soon fought the rebels and imposed a reign of unseen terror. Milan Obrenović's confrontation with the Radicals ended the opposition in Serbia. Milan showed his foolishness anew by starting a war against Bulgaria, in which Serbia was defeated and disgraced.

However, the state crisis reached its peak with the separation of King Milan and Queen Natalija. Milan Obrenović was so upset and disoriented that he accepted the enthroning of the Radicals and the Liberal coalition government. He still had all the power, causing personal clashes among the ministers and other political personalities. After twenty months or so, the coalition government fell and Milan did something astonishing. He gave the mandate to the Radicals in December 1887 to establish a new government and also published an act granting amnesty to all Radical emigrants, except for Nikola Pašić. Still, the Radicals' political flywheel was working in full capacity. In the parliamentary elections of 1888, the Radicals won almost all the representative mandates.

The convincing victory of the Radicals and their win of 500 mandates out of the total of 600 that Parliament had, opened the way towards the adoption of a distinctly democratic constitution in 1888. King Milan signed the Constitution, but he still did not allow Nikola Pašić to come back to Serbia. However, he was so weakened by the Radical upheaval that, on 22 February 1889, he abdicated and just four days later he 'asked' the regents to grant amnesty to his major political adversary, Nikola Pašić. The Serbian people were thrilled to hear this and the new Radical government of general Sava Grujić started an immense legislative project with the aim of bringing the state organisation and functioning in line with the provisions of the new constitution. After the new parliamentary elections, in which the Radicals triumphed again, Pašić was elected as the Parliamentary Speaker.

With its Russophile politics, the Radical government immediately contested the secret convention by which King Milan made Serbia dependent on Austro-Hungary. The former king returned to renew the clash with the Radicals because of their foreign affairs orientation, but this matter was overshadowed by the constant affairs, intrigues and scandals concerning the divorce of the royal couple, Milan and Natalija. The Radical Party decided to get involved more directly in the dynastical crisis and stamp out the manipulations of the court clique, which led to the reconstruction of the government and, for the first time, Nikola Pašić was elected Prime Minister on 11 February 1891. Pašić dealt with both King Milan and Queen Natalija relatively subtly. They were both banished from Serbia and this marked the beginning of the Radical Party's process of the definitive overthrow of the Obrenović dynasty. To illustrate the tragicomic position of the autocrat, we present the fact that, in return for rich compensation, King Milan officially recorded a statement on resigning his membership of the royal dynasty and Serbian citizenship.

But the royal regents, who reigned on behalf of the underage King Aleksandar, pursuant to the last decree of Milan Obrenović as a sovereign, followed Milan's example. On 9 August 1892, they overthrew Pašić's government, which had 118 members of Parliament out of a total of 134 mandates and installed the Liberal Party in power, although that party only had 15 representatives. In this way, above all, they tried to avoid Nikola Pašić's appointment to the vacant position of regent and also to test their own estimation that the Radicals' influence on the Serbian people had weakened.

The Liberals began brutal infringements of the Constitution. The appointment of the new royal regent was postponed for months, the regular session of Parliament was almost two months overdue, only to be dismissed right after that. The regime fiercely persecuted the Radicals, made thorough purges of civil servants and conducted systematic pressure and violence. The new elections were scheduled for the 25th February 1893 and, in the meantime, the voting lists were reduced by all sorts of manipulation, the presidents of the voting boards and box keepers were arrested, and the electoral procedure was given only to people who were loyal to the regime and ready for the worst misuses and forgeries. The army was randomly killing people who opposed this self-will. However, in spite of all the violations, the Radicals won the elections again, as well as winning the majority of mandates. However, during the Parliamentary reconstruction, irregularities continued. The Radicals left the session, and the Liberals continued to violate the will of the people, despite the fact that a quorum was unavailable for decision-making.

The situation in Serbia was so complicated that the underage King made a *coup d'état*, returned power to the Radicals on 1 April 1893, revoked the illegal oppressive measures that the Liberals conducted against their political opponents in order to distance himself from the royal regents and the Liberal government. The real force behind the plot and the instigator of the *coup d'état* was the King Milan again. He first

overthrew the Radicals, violated the Constitution and brought the Liberals to power, then he overthrew the Liberals and restored the Radicals in order to regain the peoples' trust and popularity. In the new elections, the Radicals won 90 percent of the votes.

Then there was a short period of cordial cooperation between King Aleksandar and the Radicals. The king travelled around Serbia, acting benevolently among the people and almost openly advertising Radical politics. He even promoted the reconciliation between the Obrenović and Karađorđević dynasties. In addition, he put a wreath on Karađorđe's tomb. This harmony lasted until Aleksandar's visit to Austria and a meeting with his father Milan. Upon his return he showed open hostility toward the Radicals and started to gather the almost completely dispersed Liberals and Progressives.

He started to allow Austro-Hungary, which had been traditionally hostile to the Radicals because of their unyielding nationalism, to meddle intensely in Serbia's affairs.

On 9 January 1894, King Milan returned to Belgrade in order to manage the persecution of the Radicals directly. Since it was an illegal act where even the army was deployed illegally to enforce it, the government immediately resigned demonstratively. The new government was established under direct royal control and it immediately started systematic persecutions of the Radicals. The Cabinets were changing and the system of personal absolutism was becoming evident. But the resistance of the Serbian public, accustomed to the Radicals' democratic heritage, to King Milan's self-will was stronger than this neurotic autocrat had ever expected. Aleksandar then abolished the Radical constitution from 1888 and restored the autocratic constitution from 1869.

At the height of his tyranny, relations between king Aleksandar and his father Milan became tense. In 1895, Aleksandar visited his mother in Biarritz to get her support in the dispute with Milan and there he met a fatal woman who would only add to the death and destruction of the dynasty, the lady of the court Draga Mašin. The Radicals boycotted the elections organised on 7 April 1895, but the regime was destabilized because of Aleksandar's dispute with his father over Milan's attempt to organise a financial malversation with respect to the newest state loan, for his personal benefit. People were convinced that Milan returned to Serbia and created chaos, only to grab the new amounts of money, which he would spend everywhere. Milan suddenly left Serbia in a rage and, not so long after that, queen Natalija returned to Belgrade. She immediately started intensive negotiations to reconcile Aleksandar with the Radicals. Tensions were a bit reduced, but the clashes continued.

In the summer of 1896, the Radicals held a huge rally in Belgrade and demonstrated their political power. They reorganised the party, strengthened the party discipline and thoroughly prepared for the imminent outcome of the political crisis. They skilfully got themselves entangled in the clashes between Aleksandar and Milan, gradually stamping out Milan's influence and slowly creating conditions to triumph in the elections held on 22 June 1897, winning all the mandates

IT-03-67-T

except for the three mandates that belonged to the liberals.

In spite of that, Simić's government, which had the support of the Radicals, submitted their resignation and the new cabinet was formed by Dr Vladan Đorđević, including the Liberals and the Progressives loyal to the Obrenović dynasty. The new elections were scheduled for the 23rd May 1898. Nikola Pašić was arrested because he offended the regent and was sentenced to nine months imprisonment. The police were looking through the candidates' lists for representatives and only those who were obedient could come to elections. A key had already been decided, according to which two thirds of the mandates were supposed to belong to the Liberals and one third to the Progressives. This was done under the absolutistic regime. The Parliament was constituted without any Radicals. The freedom of the press was suffocated and a terrifying dictatorship was in place. All the political parties were abolished by law.

Following the unsuccessful assassination attempt on King Milan on 24 June 1899, mass arrests of Radicals commenced and even court marshals were held. After undergoing systematic torture in the high treason investigation, any connection between the Radicals and the assassin was refuted. They were on trial due to the same political and press activities. Milan and Aleksandar's intention was to sentence Nikola Pašić and a few of his closest co-workers to death and

have them shot. However, Russia energetically defended the Radical leaders and blackmailed Austria into preventing their deaths by threatening to annul the important international agreement on stability in the Balkans. The Radical leaders received milder sentences than the Obrenović dynasty had planned, but Serbia lost a great deal of its international reputation.

Moral damage was done to the Radical Party because Nikola Pašić somewhat covered himself with ashes when on trial and showed servility towards the Royal House. There was a clash between the old guard, who showed understanding for Pašić's moments of weakness, and the young Radicals. The dictatorship prevailed and the parliamentarism was just a formality. For some time, the Obrenovićs did not have a serious political opponent but the break up between father and the son happened because of Aleksandar's love affair with Draga Mašin. Unable to hide his resentment, Milan left Belgrade on 8 July 1900, never to return to Serbia.

The whole Serbian public was disgusted by Aleksandar's intention to marry Queen Natalija's court lady. The government resigned and the new king was not able to establish a new one. Aleksandar had no choice but to turn to Russia and the Radicals. He granted amnesty to the Radical convicts, forbade Milan to return to Serbia and started to abandon Austrophile politics. However, besides the official support, the distrust remained between Russia and the Radicals on one side and King Aleksandar Obrenović on the other. The Radicals did not want to give up their request for the restoration of the parliament organization and this was a constant cause of distress. The Radicals were incapable of a more offensive attitude due to the party's inner weaknesses and the division into individuals and fusionists. A compromise between the ruler and the

17/57440

Radical party was realised with the imposed constitution from 1901.

The schism among the Radicals originated from the objections of the younger members of the party to Nikola Pašić, because of his remorseful attitude when on the trial and this reached its peak in their refusal to accept mutual cooperation between the Radicals and the Progressives, because they thought of it as excessive flexibility toward the politically weakened King Aleksandar. In all this, there were many elements of the generation gap. The schism was so deep that they came to elections on 1 October 1901 with two separate lists. Among the newly elected representatives, there were 84 Radicals, 14 independent Radicals, 26 Progressives and 6 Liberals. The Radicals gained a majority in the Senate.

With Dimitrije Cancer-Marković's government from 6 November 1902, King Aleksandar Obrenović relapsed into an open dictatorship. Bloody protests on 23 March 1903, when five people were killed, accelerated the outcome. After realising that the army no longer supported him, Aleksandar performed another *coup d'état* in 1903, abolished the Constitution and dismissed the Parliament and the Senate. On the 19th May, new elections took place organized by the police, in order to complete the final reckoning with the Radicals. But, on the 29th May, the officers' secret organization named the Black Hand assassinated King Aleksandar and Queen Draga and destroyed the Obrenović dynasty.

2. The 'Prečanski' Radicals of Jaša Tomić

Not long after the Radicals registered their party in Serbia in 1887 in Novi Sad, the Serbian National Radical Party was formed in Hungary, Croatia and Slavonia. In their first program act, the *Prečani* (translator's note: the Serbs who live across the Danube and the Sava Rivers) The Radicals kept themselves within the boundaries of the church-national autonomy, insisting on the right to independently elect the Patriarch and the representatives in their own autonomous synod, the use of the Serbian language etc. In these national-clerical elections in Sremski Karlovci in 1902, they won a convincing majority and took over the evading political role among the Serbs under Austro-Hungarian authority. Out of the total of 75 representatives, there were 37 the Radicals. Jovan Jovanović Zmaj was also a Radical representative. At the meeting of the Administrative Council of the Serbian National Radical Party in Novi Sad on 25 January 1904, the new political program and the statute were passed.

Being a party of farmers and middle class citizens, the Radicals had constantly born the brunt of the pro-feudal clericals, angry at losing their privileges, leisurely life and sclerotic way of thinking, in which there was no room for new ideas. The Radicals returned the blow with the Monastery Decree, which regulated the use of the income from monasteries and church estates for national purposes, which endangered corrupted clerical clans, stamped out frauds, nepotism and the very wide practice of bribery. The most active part in all this was taken by Jaša

Tomić and Đura Krasojević, making a huge number of enemies among all the individuals and groups whose private interests were endangered. All the opponents of the Radicals joined forces, largely supported by the Hungarian authorities and the Croatian politicians, whose Great Croatian illusions in the political struggle had been shattered to pieces by the Radicals. The Serbian Independent Party, led by Svetozar Pribičević, was ashamed of Serbdom and favoured the Yugoslav idea and rapprochement with the Croats, while the Liberal Party under Mihailo Polit-Desančić gathered the richest merchants, land owners, industrialists and bankers, who just wanted their wealth to increase and wanted further materialisation of their power and influence, hesitating to perform risky national activities.

There was a huge internal crisis in the Radical Party in 1910, pretty much caused from the outside, and this resulted in the break-up and separation of the renegades into the Serbian National Party. They lost all credibility in the eyes of the people, compromised themselves regarding the Serbian national question and, like all renegades, quickly vanished from the political scene. However, via their informers and mercenary agents, the Hungarian authorities caused trouble for their main opponents, provoking a crisis among the Radicals in 1912, making it easier to abolish the Serbian clerical-national autonomy and achieve the political destruction of the Serbs. The Radicals joining the Serbo-Croatian coalition was unsuccessful. They were the first to realise the Croatian dishonesty and corruption. When the First World War began, the Serbian National Party was prohibited, while its main leaders were hounded by imprisonment, house arrest or constant police surveillance. Unlike other parties during the war, there were no collaborators among the Radicals. In 1918, they openly rejected the May Declaration and the royal manifesto made by the new Emperor Charles, which proclaimed modification of Austro-Hungarian Empire on the principles of feudalism. At this time, they were preparing hard to give a welcome for the Serbian army, which freed Novi Sad on 19 November 1918. The Radical leader Jaša Tomić was the main organizer of large national meeting on 25 November, which announced the annexation of Banat, Bačka and Baranja to the Kingdom of Serbia. The Serbian National The Radical party, merged into the Radical mother-Party on 3 March 1919, passing the act on accepting the Statute and Program of the National The Radicals Party; and the Serbian The Radicals and the Radicals from Vojvodina merged thus into one party.

3. Serbian Radicals in Defence of the Fatherland

From 1903 until 1941, the Radicals constantly participated in the authority, but in different ways, power relations and personal solutions. The Radical nationalistic and democratic ideology dominated the people's consciousness, but the party was not always equal to it and it was mostly unable to seriously oppose the king's self-will and intrigues. After a dynastical shift, the political star of Nikola Pašić shined fully, uniting the deeply rooted Serbian traditionalism and patriarchy with

European democratic constitutionalism, democratic and liberal principles in a whole system of nationalistic values, aspirations to freedom and state enthusiasm. The Radicals successfully opposed the principle of national sovereignty of Obrenović's bureaucracy, which was seen in multiparty parliamentarism, free press and local independence. Even when the Radical movement was populist, it never showed totalitarian single-mindedness, instead keeping a critical awareness and access to all social problems.

The Radicals did not play a direct part in the officers' conspiracy and the liquidation of the last royal couple of the Obrenović dynasty, but all their previous activities and their wide agitation greatly contributed to the hopeless reduction of royal authority. The Obrenović's simply had to disappear because, for decades, they had been a major obstacle to formation of democratic political life, a liberal market economy, freedom of intellectual creativity and further liberation successes of the Serbian people. Since the foundation of the Radical Party, almost the whole Serbian people had simply identified with its programme, the Radicals' political regulations and goals.

The Radicals also had major internal problems due to the lack of sound party discipline and constant political fighting between two already organised fractions of the old Radicals and the independent ones. Although they never totally separated into two separate parties, in practice it often seemed that this had happened. It was, above all, a clash of generations, patience and eagerness to strive for gradual change or fast breaks. Since the new constitution of 1903 restored parliamentarism, the governmental responsibility to the Parliament was emphasised - not only to the king. Furthermore, the King's authorities were limited. Acting as the opposition to the new government for a couple of months after the upheaval, the Radicals principally disputed the legitimacy of the dynastic shift, personally wanting a republican form of government. These matters were publicly advocated and even Petar Karađorđević expressed his readiness to become the president of the republic, rather than the king. However, the necessary political and historical conditions for the establishment of a republic were not yet ripe. Many distinguished Radicals in Parliament wanted the plotters and the king's murderers arrested and brought to trial, to preserve the principle of legalism. But the Black Hand conspirators were so strong that they arrested their opponents in the army - Chief among them, Milan Novaković was killed in jail in 1907, and further discussions on the matter were prevented in public. The society for a legal solution to the conspiratorial question was forcibly dismissed. Military politically-conspiratorial oligarchies remained strong until the Thessalonica process.

At the parliamentary elections on 8 September 1903, the Radicals won 75% of the votes and 141 representatives' mandate out of a total 160. In terms of mutual crossing swords, the old Radicals and the members of the independent party were almost equal. The first won 75 and the second 66 representatives, the while liberals won 17 and the progressives and social democrats one each respectively. The major Radical success quickly quietened all the internal party disputes, stopped

fractions, ended the special fractional magazines that were constantly at war, such as *Constitutional Serbia* and *Echo*, while the old pan-Radical magazine *Self Government* was reformed. The Radicals also formed a unique representatives' club.

But the euphoria of unity and electoral triumph was short. The Radicals' political strength was not just big at this time, but huge. Lacking a more serious oppositional factor, they formed an opposition in their own lines. Solidarity was only renewed through confronting opponents of Radical ideology, but the process of differentiation in the two separate Radical parties was accelerated. The independent Radical, Sava Grujić, formed the government on 26 January 1904, in which the old Radicals Nikola Pašić and Lazar Paču found themselves. Pašić formed the new government, in which there were no independents, on 27 November 1904. Pre-term parliament elections were scheduled for 10 July 1905. The Independent Radicals won 81 mandates, the old Radicals 55 and all the other parties together won 24 representatives' places. Although they fought and divided among themselves, and, like every party in authority, made a lot of mistakes, the Radicals did not abuse the trust of the Serbian people.

After the constituency of Parliament, the government was formed by independent Radical Ljuba Stojanović, while the old Radicals became the opposition, fiercely criticising the government moves and insisting on the renewal of pan-Radical unity, given that the ideology remained totally identical and separation was purely of an organizational/personal character into two separate parties with special program acts and statutes. The Independents even refused the formal proposition of the old Radicals, for unity of the parties in February 1906, which was revenged at the next elections, because the people had never looked at the Radicals discord approvingly. At the new pre-term parliamentary elections on 11 June 1906, the old Radicals won 91 mandates and the independents 47, totalling 138, and all other parties won 22 mandates. The Radicalism returned to Pašić's old mother party, while the independents figured as the Radical dissidents. Pašić was in full political power, which enabled him to make good moves in the economy, effectively fighting Austrian-Hungarian ambitions in the imposed customs war and exporting Serbian products to new markets, establishing good relations with France, England and Italy and starting the complete modernization and armament of the Serbian army, with artillery having primacy. The Radicals managed to turn consequences of the five year customs war to the benefit of Serbia and Serbia started strong economic growth.

At the parliamentary elections on the 18th March 1908, the old Radicals won 84, the independent Radicals 48 and other parties 28 mandates. Given that, in the period of the Annexation crisis, a wide coalitional government of all parliamentary parties, except social democrats, was formed, led by the progressive Stojan Novaković, it existed until end of the crisis and, in October 1909, Nikola Pašić formed the government again, introducing independent Radicals as ministers. New fierce clashes between the old Radicals and the independents took

place in 1911 and the old Radicals were left alone in power. Nikola Pašić behaved very aggressively in a verbal sense in politics concerning the annexation crisis, but he knew, as the Russians advised, that Serbia had to be patient and wait for a favourable opportunity to achieve a solution in its own interest. He succeeded in getting rid of the egocentric prince Đorđe, who had caused major problems for the Radicals and all Serbia in public life, but he was not pleased when, in 1914, Petar transferred royal rights to the heir to the throne, Alexander. The Peoples Radical Party consolidated organizationally, passing the new statute at the Land Conference of the Radicals in 1911.

Nevertheless, in elections in 1912, the Radicals appeared with three electoral lists, and the old Radicals won 84, the independent Radicals 41, the special Radical dissidents 7 and other parties 34 mandates. On 30 August 1912, Nikola Pašić formed the Old Radical government and led the country through both Balkan Wars and introduced her into WWI. This lasted until 22 November 1914. Among the independent Radicals, ideological and programmatic disputes grew stronger, giving up on traditional radical nationalism and distinct patriotism, which prevailed above all the other program goals. They lacked political skills and shrewdness and they did not behave soundly and thoughtfully. They were losing authority and popularity among the people, had never been able to establish their political identity and pure spite, fanaticism and jealousy motivated them to join the Democratic Party in 1919.

Nicola Pašić found the independents to be a weak threat. A much bigger threat was the dissatisfied officers of the Black Hand, whom he was systematically repressing from political life. Pašić did not arrest them or put them on trial, but he retired almost all of them back in 1906. Their leader and the head of intelligence, Dragutin Dimitrijević Apis, was secretly plotting with the heir to the throne Aleksandar and, with his financial assistance, he published "Unity or death" and began endangering Pašić more and more through conspiratorial activities and intrigues of a police character. The Radicals and the Black Hand members did not fight over major Serbian national goals, but over inner political organization and the role of the army in it and its possible participation in authority. Apis's secret revolutionary organisation was simply an anti-constitutional factor and a form of illegal politisation of the army, not consistent with the modern principles of legal order and democracy. Its magazine openly agitated against the multiparty system and, above all, the Radicals, their leader and their politics.

Nikola Pašić led some highly successful external politics, whether directly as the president of the government, or indirectly as the head of the party that continuously participated in the Serbian government. Making the Balkans Union led to the banishment of Turks from the Balkans and freedom for the southern Serbian lands. He thoroughly prepared the country and the army for the Balkan war. In a magnificent victory in the battle of Kumanovo, on 11 October 1912, the defeat Kosovo was revenged. Serbian military triumph was so great that European forces hurried to improvise a new, Albanian state in order to deny the Serbia access to the Adriatic sea. In the Second Balkan war, Bulgaria was

defeated and the Serbs got a new territorial expansion. Those were the years of general Radical political triumph. Although the Radicals agreed that the Serbian political and legal order could not expand immediately to the area of Old Serbia and Macedonia, Pašić energetically opposed the Black Hand, with support of Alexander, who wanted to establish a purely military power in those areas, in order to practice their principle in whole of Serbia. Tension between Aleksandar Karadžević and Nikola Pašić was continuously increasing.

The assassination in Sarajevo, inspired and organized by Apis's Black Hand members and performed by the young Bosnians, caused the beginning of the First World War, which was too large a temptation for Serbia, exhausted and mutilated in the Balkan wars. Pašić's Radicals did not take part in it, given that they had always been the soundest and calmest Serbian political factor, used to being patient and thorough in their actions. Even before the assassination happened, Nikola Pašić ordered the military authorities to start an investigation against the section head of the Intelligence department of the Serbian supreme command, colonel Dragutin Dimitrijević Apis, and informed the Serbian government of this as soon as he found out that a group of Bosnian youth crossed the Drina river in mid June, 1914. After the assassination, Austro-Hungary made an ultimatum to Serbia, demanding the cancellation of the Serbian people's defence, the removal of all Serbian officers who took part in anti-Austro-Hungarian propaganda and that the Austrian state organs directly perform an investigation in Serbia. Pašić invested all his diplomatic skills to strike back at the ultimatum, accepting all the requests except the last one, which would negate Serbian state sovereignty and national independence.

Given that Austro-Hungary had been preparing for the war, it welcomed this assassination and it did not want Serbia to satisfy the ultimatum. But Nikola Pašić succeeded in achieving the total unity of all the Serbian political factors, except the social democrats, and thus he made Serbia politically capable of new war efforts. The Radical Party had found itself in the role of the ultimate political leader. The Serbian war goals were proclaimed through the Niš declaration of Parliament, when the war had already started, and, in them, apart from setting free and uniting all the Serbs, the liberation and unity of the enslaved brothers the Croats and Slovenians, in order to reduce their anti-Serbian war enthusiasm and lead to a certain political ferment. With this goal, the Yugoslav committee was initiated that would politically gather the most distinguished representatives of Austro-Hungarian Serbs, Croats and Slovenians, though, in the Croatian and Slovenian case, their legitimacy was disputable.

The Croats and Slovenians joined in the activities of the Yugoslav committee totally dishonestly, and Serbia passed up its biggest historical chance to round off its national territories, which Russia and western allies were openly offering. Making decisions at the Serbian political summit was somewhat blocked by the three strongest and mutually opposing factors: Aleksandar and the court camarilla, Pašić's government and the Radical Party, which acted synchronically, and the

Black Hand with its clear political ambitions. The regent had managed to deal with Apis, even during the war, while he postponed the clash with Pašić until the first post-war days. Nevertheless, even in 1916, he tried to cut into the Radicals by stirring up 14 of the Radical representatives at the only parliamentary session, to separate into independent representatives' club. Aleksandar Karadorđević used old and tested monarchistic means, artificial instigation of inner disputes and clashes among the Radicals.

Although all the distinguished Croatian political representatives were clearly and openly for staying under Austro-Hungary, and the proof for this was the well-known May Declaration in 1917, the Serbian government and the Yugoslav committee adopted the Corfu declaration on 20 June 1917 and proclaimed their will, after the war, to form the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians. In signing this declaration, Pašić was stepping back from the traditional Radical program, but he could not avoid this under the given circumstances and his insistence that the Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian national should have been delimited first, remained unheeded. While the Austro-Hungarian army was crushing down, representatives of the Viennese Imperial Council and the Croatian, Slovenian and Dalmatian congress gathered in Zagreb on 19 October 1918 and declared the formation of the Peoples' council of Slovenians, Croats and Serbs, taking over complete power in these parts of the Austro-Hungarian territory. From 6 to 9 November in Geneva, a conference was held of representatives of the Serbian government and the National council, at which they adopted a declaration on the aspiration to achieve state unity, which had a lot of dualistic elements, but also predicted the convocation of Constitutional parliament in order to define a definite state organization. At this conference, Pašić was alone as he was attacked by representatives of the People's council and the Yugoslav committee, as well as the Serbian oppositional politicians, Milorad Drašković in front of the independent Radicals, Marko Trifunović in front of the Radical dissidents and the representative of progressives named Marinković. Nikola Pašić did not even make it to Belgrade and regent Aleksandar proclaimed unity on the 1st December and ordered Stojan Protić to form a new government.

4. The Post-War Crisis of Serbian Radicalism

Aleksandar's big post-war strike against Nikola Pašić had negative consequences on the political strength of the Radical party. Forcing Stojan Protić and his disloyalty by court circles and the transfer of independent Radicals into the Democratic party led to primacy of democrats to the Radicals' disadvantage on elections for constitutional parliament, but on next elections that relation returned to its natural harmony. Renegades and traitors can make a big harm to their mother party, but in the long run, they are politically totally lost, irrelevant and despised. The Radicals posed a problem for Aleksandar Karadorđević because they strongly opposed the despotic ambitions, self-will and dictatorial pretensions that were so characteristic of the total mental and

IT-03-67-T
genetic structure of his personality. Since he knew that he could not destroy the whole party, the regent strived to destroy Pašić and, in the period up until the first elections, he changed the government six times, each time looking for a disloyal Radical to lead it. So it happened that Stojan Protić, Ljuba Davidović and Milenko Vesnić changed twice in succession. At the elections on 28 November 1920, the democrats won 92 representative mandates and the Radicals 91. This was the only time that democrats were stronger than the Radicals, but solely thanks to Radical renegades and fugitives, bribed by the court camarilla.

At that time, Nikola Pašić was successfully leading the Yugoslav delegation at the Peace conference in Versailles and he failed to achieve just one goal there – that of returning Serbian Skadar to the fatherland – and this was because of obstructive activity of a member of the delegation, Ante Trumbić. Upon his return to the country, he dedicated himself to organizing the Land Conference of Radicals. There was a necessity for two conferences. In 1920, resolutions on the Program of the Peoples Radical Party were adopted and, in 1921, a resolution by which the party declared most of its actual program goals. The party widened its organizational structure to cover the whole state territory, consolidated itself, renewed its staff and prepared for new political challenges.

The Croats were destroying state unity from the start and Stojan Protić was yielding to them, offering a constitutional project on the division of state territory into 9 independent areas, which he illusorily claimed would not being federal units, but assumed that each would have its parliament and government. The primary thing in all this was the demolition of the Serbian national territory. Protić especially, fiercely opposed the traditional Radical ideas on Great Serbia. On 31 January 1923, Stojan Protić formed the Independent Radicals party, made up of Radical renegades and sold souls. It is certain that no other Serbian politician, save for the regent, did more harm to the Serbian people than Protić caused. Nevertheless, in 1921, the Constitutional parliament voted for the Vidovdan constitution, according to the project supported by the regent Aleksandar, meaning that Protić's concept of patronizing the Croats failed ingloriously and integralistics won – the one for which the Radicals voted shamefully, not hiding their dissatisfaction with the fact that it had not been clearly bordered previously what parts of the new state were territorially Serbian.

Since six short-term governments proved to be failures in terms of personnel and competency, Nikola Pašić won the mandate again at the beginning of 1921 and, for almost the next two years, continuously led three governments in which the Radicals were the main speakers. His success restored the Radicals reputation and popularity, and, at the elections on 18 March 1923, the Peoples Radical Party simply triumphed, winning 108 out of a total of 312 representatives mandates. Stojan Protić experienced a total electoral disaster, because his renegade Independent Radical Party won only 0.63% of the votes. People would only vote for it by mistake, out of confusion. The Democrats were also cut half at the elections.

Beside the fact that the Radicals had their own party youth in the National Radical youth, Nikola Pašić helped the formation of the Serbian national youth, led by some distinguished Radicals and with a program openly declared for Big Serbia, for all that the Radicals leaders were afraid to publicly state as their own view directly. The SRNAO had close connections with the Serbian party, which was returning to the original Radical pan-Serbian program, publishing a magazine entitled *Great Serbia* and managing to enter into Parliament. It is evident that, in due course, Pašić formed a back-up political variant, so all the Chetnik organisations fused into the Serbian national youth and two new Chetnik associations were formed with a Great Serbian basis, with Puniša Račić as the key player.

Nikola Pašić had continuously formed four governments by 27 June 1924. Then, Ljuba Davidović formed the government in three months, and it contained only one Radical dissident. Then, on 6 November 1924, Pašić formed his eighth Yugoslav government. At the elections in February, the Radicals achieved an even greater success, winning 142 mandates, while Protić's Independent Radical Party won just 3,905 votes, or 0.2%, after which they simply ended. Pašić's ninth and tenth governments lasted from 29 April 1925 until 8 July 1926. Although he was now at an old age, Pašić's political skills were fabulous. Everybody was against him, the court, the Croats and the Serbian opposition, but he was practically irreplaceable for a long time, with the massive trust of the Serbian people. King Aleksandar was especially jealous of Nikola Pašić when he found out that there was going to be a big celebration of Pašić's 80th birthday in 1926. Under the king's pressure (who thought he should be the only guest of honour in the country), the celebration for the undisputed Radical leader was cancelled.

When Ljuba Jovanović's mutiny failed, the king prepared his main strike against Pašić with the help of Nikola Uzunović, a minister and one of the narrowest of the Radicals leaders, whom he trusted, appreciating his traitorous affections. With Aleksandar's help, Uzunović quietly and gradually formed a new fraction within the Peoples Radical party. The king entrusted Uzunović with forming a new government, although the whole Radical club stood by Pašić. On 9 December 1926, Nikola Pašić had an audience with King Aleksandar. The king was very rough and impudent, insulting Pašić so fiercely that this great Serbian statesman died the very next day, just before his 81st birthday.

With Nikola Uzunović's help, the king almost totally controlled the Peoples Radical Party over the next few years. Aca Stanojević, Marko Trifković and Velja Vukičević fought to be president within the party. To get a sound base for dealing with Pašić's followers, Vukičević restored Ljuba Jovanović and all the other Radical dissidents into the party, but he failed because, out of 20 members of the Main committee, there were 13 supporters of Pašić's, among whom were Milan Stojadinović and Aca Stanojević. However, the king entrusted Nikola Uzunović with the formation of four governments and Velja Vukičević two. Vukičević, contrary to party regulations, took control of the Radicals representatives' club in 1927, and there was a fierce clash

between the Main committee and the king's favourite, who supported the monarch's absolutist tendencies and was not even a member of the Main committee. The party was practically moved away from area of managing state politics, its alleged ministers belonged to it only in writing and Aca Stanojević and Lazar Marković were too indecisive and hesitant when dealing with Velja Vukičević, although Milan Stojadinović, with a group of distinguished radicals, demanded that the internal party problems should be cleared up as soon as possible in a special memorandum on 11 May 1928.

After the Radical Puniša Račić, provoked by an insult, shot at Stjepan and Pavle Radić, Đuro Basariček, Ivan Pernar and Granžu at the Parliament session in the heat of a public discussion on whether there was any point in continuing the life of the common country of the Serbs and the Croats. When Stjepan Radić succumbed to his wounds at the beginning of July 1928, the king entrusted Anton Korošec with the mandate to form a new government but, in that government, there was a large number of members of the Radical party. The government lasted until 6 January dictatorship of 1929. Parallel to those farfetched state political matters, there was a crisis in the Radical Party, which lasted all that time, due to the discord between the Representative's Club and the Head Committee. The king tried to control the whole party via the Committee and Velja Vukičević. The liberal wing, faithful to Pašić's tradition and at a distance from the king and the court, appointed Aca Stanojević as the head of the Head Committee, while Lazar Marković led the fraction seeking compromise at any cost.

When King Aleksandar abolished the Vidovdan Constitution and imposed an open dictatorship, Velja Vukičević and his cowardly radical wing supported him, while Aca Stanojević chose to keep a distance and begin passive resistance at the session of the Head Committee. There was no serious discipline in the party, so 10 Radicals, led by Nikola Uzunović, entered into the newly formed government of General Petar Živković. The government lasted until the imposed constitution was passed on 3 September 1931 and it legally regulated the disregard of the political parties in the political life that had lasted for the previous two years. The parties were not formally forbidden, unless they were subversive, communist or separatist, but they were not found important in any form. Also, to establish a party it was necessary to obtain permission from the executive authorities. On this occasion, Aca Stanojević publicly criticized the obstacles to the political work, limitations on the freedom of the press and the freedom of public rallies and political activities.

In order to destroy the People's Radical Party completely, King Aleksandar established the Yugoslav Radical-Peasant Democracy in December 1931, but his court party did not succeed in gaining serious popularity or the trust of the people. The king thought that his party would be sufficient for the complete political life of the country and that there could be no place for any political competition whatsoever there. Of the Radical Party, only Nikola Uzunović's group supported him and his ministers were members of the next two governments of Petar

Živković, from 3 September 1931 until 4 April 1932. Boža Maksimović led a group of radical representatives in the Yugoslav Radical-Peasant Democracy, which was the only formal participant in the elections under the stipulations of the imposed constitution, but they criticized Marinković's government though there were four Radicals in it, including Maksimović. The government lasted for only three months. The new government was formed on 2 July 1932 by a Radical named Milan Srškić and it lasted until 5 November. It included five more Radicals. The next government was also formed by Srškić, including another five Radicals and the representatives of other political groups and this lasted until 27 January 1934.

Since his project of the Yugoslav Radical-Peasant Democracy was a complete failure, King Aleksandar ordered that the Yugoslav People's Party should be established, whose formal member was the Radical party from the very beginning, although many distinguished Radicals opposed it fiercely. A Radical, Nikola Uzunović, was appointed President of the new court party. He became the President of the Cabinet on 27 January 1934 and, by 20 December, he had changed three cabinets. Then, Bogoljub Jevtić became the head of the new government and he remained on that position until 24 June 1935. In all these governments, there were a lot of Radicals, but only those who were obedient to the court, who disavowed the principles of the Radical Party because of career prospects and privileges and who blindly served the dictator, becoming an instrument of his self-will and autocracy. In order to strike another blow against the disobedient Radical masses, the king's court started the project of establishing the Radical Social Party using abundant amounts of money and registering it in July 1933. Its leader was the former minister Vojislav Janjić, a member of the Head Committee of the People's Radical Party, known for his corruption and unscrupulousness and also a notorious alcoholic. The court camarilla soon realised that this project was also a failure and stopped financing it, so this quasi-party soon disappeared.

Some of the Radicals joined the Yugoslav National Club of Svetislav Hođer, together with the representatives of other parties close to Petar Živković, but they did not achieve much. Subsequent to that, they established the Yugoslav People's Party, which managed to make a more significant breakthrough in political life with profuse help from the regime and it was increasingly taking over the Nazi insignia and blue shirts, declaring themselves as the extreme left-wingers and supporters of authoritative power. They were also called the *borbaši* after their party newspaper. There were attempts at merging with the *Zbor* of Dimitrije Ljotić, but leadership issues were a major problem. For the same reason, their attempt at making an agreement with Petar Živković's group failed because the issues of higher rank would immediately resurface.

5. Milan Stojadinović – the New Radical Leader

After King Aleksandar's assassination in Marseille on 9 October 1156

1934 and Yugoslavia's fall into a great economic crisis, Bogoljub Jevtić's neutral government fell and the new government was formed by Milan Stojadinović, one of the Radical ministers in Jevtić's cabinet, who distinguished himself especially as an expert in financial matters. His government lasted from 24 June 1935 until 21 December 1938 and he succeeded in reaching an agreement with Anton Korošec and Mehmed Spaho. With the approval of Aca Stanojević, Miloš Trifunović, Momčilo Ninčić and the whole Head Committee of the People's Radical Party, Milan Stojadinović initiated the establishment of the Yugoslav Radical Association.

The Yugoslav Radical Association was founded on 20 August 1935 by the merger of the People's Radical Party, the Slovenian People's Party and the Yugoslav Muslim Organization. It was formed under conditions of great international upheaval caused by the expansion of fascism and deep economic crisis that spread through the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, somewhat later than other countries, as well as by the political disputes systematically created by the Croatian separatists, this time seriously complicated by King Aleksandar's murder.

Before that, subsequent to the fall of Bogoljuba Jevtić's government, Jevtić's minister of finance, Milan Stojadinović, a member of the Head Committee of the People's Radical Party, formed a new party. The work on fusing these three parties had started earlier and it was, above all, motivated by their wish to comply with the regulations of the imposed constitution of 1931, which did not allow the registration of national (i.e. tribal, as it used to be referred to at the time) political organisations, which would endanger the domination of the regime ideology of the ideology of the integral Yugoslav idea. The establishment of Stojadinović's government created a favourable political base for establishing a common political party out of all the political factors underpinning the government.

The Head Committee of the People's Radical Party did not oppose the establishment of Stojadinović's government, but even his most distinguished members did not want to participate in it, assuming that Stojadinović did not have very good chances and that a new election would soon take place, at which the Yugoslav Radical Association would achieve good results and then the 'more important' people from the highest ranks of the Radical Party would join the game. The Radical leaders underestimated Stojadinović though, in regarding him as valuable for them as a temporary solution, since he enjoyed Prince Pavle's support and could have improved the normalisation of the political circumstances and the realisation of the political conditions for the new parliamentary elections. From this position, he could improve the normalization of political life and realize the political conditions for next parliamentary elections. Stojadinović's government was, in the ideological sense, a government of compromise between the obstinate unitarists and the left-wingers favouring the Croatian nationalists.

All the prominent leaders of the People's Radical Party entered into the managing organs of the Yugoslav Radical Association and then the action of registering new members all over the country. The greatest

problems arose among the Bosnian-Herzegovinian and the Slovenian Radicals, which saw the decision of the party leaders as favouring the Slovenian People's Party and the Yugoslav Muslim Organisation in those historical provinces. Stojadinović entered into his first open dispute with the old Radical leaders when he opposed their insistence on only giving the authorisation to form regional committees to the old members of the party. Stojadinović disliked these criteria and insisted on attracting the former activists of other parties in accordance with the principle of competence and readiness to join the Yugoslav Radical Association and dedicate themselves to the realisation of its political program. This led to the issuance of a resolution of double decisions on authorisation. Sometimes Milan Stojadinović and Miloš Trifunović, the closest associate of Aca Stanojević, would issue the same decision on authorisation to different people in the same region. The consequence was the establishment of double committees in many places.

As the Prime Minister, Stojadinović proved to be much more successful than the traditional Radical leaders would have expected and they suddenly became aware that they did not control the government. They wanted to take control over the newly formed party. They tried to keep away the activists of other parties who intended to join the Yugoslav Radical Association, in order to weaken Stojadinović in Parliament, where he had the support of a large number of dissidents from other parties, especially the Democrats.

In October, Aca Stanojević criticised Stojadinović because of the work of the government and the way the Yugoslav Radical association was organised, in an angry letter. And the tiring inner party discussions and mutual accusations began. Stojadinović tried to make the old Stanojević more pliable. However, it turned out that the old Radical leaders showed increasing intolerance towards Stojadinović, wanting to replace him with Miloš Trifunović. Stojadinović's opponents definitively won over Aca Stanojević, renewed the activities of the Head Committee of the People's Radical Party and, on 18 December, issued an announcement openly attacking Stojadinović and cancelling further cooperation. Only two ministers stood by Stanojević and they resigned their positions in the government. Antun Korošec and Mehmed Spaho agreed with Stojadinović and Stojadinović had all prerogatives of the authorities at his disposal, so it was not difficult for him to win the innerparty reckoning. Stanojević, Trifunović and their followers left the Yugoslav Radical Association and focused on getting closer to the associated opposition.

The internal division of the Radicals echoed painfully among the Serbian Radicals and their sympathisers, but the convincing majority stood by Stojadinović. However, the dispute weakened his political position and, therefore, the further actions of the Head Committee of the People's Radical Party, however politically marginalised, and its main leaders concentrated all their energy and fury into the struggle with Stojadinović. Stojadinović became their obsession and they did not hesitate to cooperate with Maček. However, they were able to stand up to their opponent. Milan Stojadinović managed to keep the parliament

majority together by skilful political combinations, initiating constant rearrangements of representatives' groups. Using his skilful political tactics, he simply drove the opposition crazy and their intolerance towards the politically skilful and economically successful Prime Minister grew higher. The opposition first started boycotting the parliamentary sessions and then, on 6 March 1936, the people's representative Damjan Arnautović tried to assassinate the Prime Minister Milan Stojadinović, shooting at him when seated at Parliament. General Petar Živković was probably involved in organisation the assassination, who could not make peace with the fact that, with Stojadinović's arrival, the power of his intrigues, which used to dominate the public political life, was over.

The unsuccessful assassination attempt only served to consolidate Stojadinović's position and enabled him to definitively deal with several inter-party political opponents from the ranks of the members of Parliament and, especially, to finally get rid of General Živković, the most significant symbol of 6 January dictatorship. Stojadinović's authority among the people and in the country suddenly increased and his government easily administrated the country until 13 July 1937, when the so called Concordat Crisis took place. The discussion of the ratification of the agreement between the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and the Vatican was put on the agenda of Parliament. In 1935, the Concordat was signed by the Jevtić's former government, so Stojadinović did not take part in the preparation of the content of this document. The Serbian Orthodox Church fiercely opposed this ratification, inciting huge riots in the streets of Belgrade and bloody conflicts with gendarmerie. Although the law on ratification was accepted by the majority of representatives in the Parliament, Stojadinović gave up on forwarding it to the Senate for definite adoption, in order to avoid further political inconveniences – emphasised by the Belgrade gossiping that Patriarch Varnava, who died suddenly, had been poisoned, as well as the decision of the Church authorities to impose sanctions on ministers and people's representatives, who belonged to the Serbian Orthodox Church, that voted for the concordat. Stojadinović was not at all interested personally in passing the concordat. He gradually came to the voting of the MPs under a slow Parliamentary procedure, but the opposition used this unexpected chance to provoke a new political crisis through demagogical disputes and firing the emotions of the ill-educated and ignorant.

Stojadinović gave a great deal of attention to building the party infrastructure and the propaganda activities of the party officials and soon there was no other political party on the Serbian ethnic territories with better discipline than the Yugoslav Radical Association. At the local elections in the Banovina of Morava, on 27 September 1936, where Stojadinović's Radicals triumphed, they demonstrated their quality and the party's strength and especially its popularity among the people. What was really striking was the defeat of the renegade Head Committee of the People's Radical Party, which the voters could not forgive for their exaggerated program goals and dissidence regarding the

Radical mother party. The Yugoslav Radical Association had similar results in the local elections that followed in the Banates of Drina, Zeta, Danube and Vardar. There was nothing else left to the opposition, including Svetislav Hodera's Yugoslav People's Party and Petar Živković's Yugoslav National Party on the one side and the United Opposition on the other, but to lament and complain about electoral irregularities. To be honest, there were irregularities, but not too many.

The success at the local elections enabled the further build-up of the organisational infrastructure and the consolidation of the Yugoslav Radical Association. The Yugoslav Radical Association was officially recognised as the only legal successor to the People's Radical Party and, on that basis, the property of the party, which had been seized from the Radicals in 1929 when the dictatorship was introduced, was returned to them. The party activists spread all over the country and organised intensive political rallies and public meetings. The political blow suffered by the Radicals because of the Concordat crisis was finally overcome and the public was much more occupied with the agreement of the united opposition from 8 October 1937 and its political repercussions.

Feeling strong enough, Stojadinović decided to organise parliamentary elections a few months before the regular period. So, on 10 October 1938, the Parliament was adjourned and the elections were scheduled for 11 September. In the meantime, the electoral law had not been changed, so the elections were performed under the complicated regulations that Stojadinović himself had criticised before, thinking they were not up to date enough – especially in the support it gave to the major party. Through propaganda efforts and innovations, Stojadinović brought the competition completely to their knees. Furthermore, he had considerable success in stabilising the economic circumstances of the country and in consolidating its international status. However, in its essence, the campaign came down to competition between the two state-building concepts, unitarist and federalistic. The Radical unitarists, led by Stojadinović, advocated national unity, while the parties in opposition plotted with the separatists and all kinds of dissatisfied people. Pre-electoral collision was fierce, though Stojadinović had a certain psychological advantage due to the fact that, during the campaign, the Yugoslav People's and the Radical-Social parties joined him, apart from the advantage of being in power and using its instruments openly. Stojadinović had an even greater moral satisfaction because of the fact that the list of the united opposition was led by Vlatko Maček. Stojadinović beat the opposition completely, winning 62% of the votes on the whole territory of Yugoslavia. In addition to the absolute majority of Serbian votes won, the members of the national minorities also gave him a greater percentage of their trust.

Faced with electoral defeat, the opposition protested, thinking that the electoral conditions and the procedure were to blame. In all this mess, it seemed as if the only sane objection to Stojadinović was that the national minorities voted for him in masses. But, he obligated them by improving their social status considerably, so nobody could justifiably

accuse him of Serbian chauvinism. Therefore, objections to the alleged non-democratic attitude lost their logical base. Besides this, the Yugoslav Radical Association gathered the members of literally all the social statuses and professions in its lines, which testified to it being based in all social structures. Stojadinović was especially successful in organising labour unions, taking the initiative from the Marxist-oriented groups, which were acting subversively against the state. Workers' rights were more protected and the provisions of the collective agreements were more convenient for the workers than in any other period of Yugoslavia in between the wars, thanks to the activities of the Yugoslav labour unions (JUGORAS) led by Stojadinović's Radicals. Significant results were also achieved in the field of youth organizations and in their various activities. There were various forms of cultural activities and the party press in particular. The activity of the Yugoslav Radical Association was so aggressive and appealing – especially its reputation gained by the successful functioning of the government and its results in foreign relations, economy and on the political plan – that there was a flood from the ranks of other parties transferring to its lines.

We can say that Milan Stojadinović's party received the only big blow in its whole period in power at the time of the Concordat Crisis. Nevertheless, the crisis was artificially provoked. In the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, all aspects of the legal position of the Serbian Orthodox Church and the Islamic religious association were regulated in accordance with the Constitution, laws and other legal acts. The only thing that was to be resolved was the issue regarding the Roman Catholic Church, as a practically international religious community whose supreme hierarchy was placed abroad, formally and legally organised and internationally accepted as an independent state. That is why the relations with it had to be based on a sort of international contract. Concluding the concord, as a special kind of an international and legal agreement, was initiated and accelerated by King Aleksandar. Until then, four concords had legal power on the territory of Yugoslavia. Their contents had to be explained and systematised and then they definitively regulated the legal position of the Roman Catholic Church and its clergy, so that it would not burden the already very complicated international relations and international and political position of the country.

When Stojadinović's government placed the finished text of the concordat, prepared and harmonised by Bogoljub Jevtic and King Aleksandar, into the parliamentary procedure, the Serbian Orthodox Church opposed it fiercely. The Church revolt was based on an irrational claim that, by this concord, the Catholics in the country would be in a privileged position, but it was actually based on the political reasons of the Church clique, who did not like Stojadinović and cooperated with his opponents, especially with Dimitrije Ljotić. The Holy Hierarchical Synod excommunicated a member of the Parliament from the Serbian Orthodox Church and threatened all the others with the same fate if they voted for ratifying the concord. The Church authorities invited people into the streets, organising a real political procession and the

government reacted nervously, leading to fierce fights between the people and the police, which could probably have been avoided if the reaction had been wiser. When the concordat was ratified on 1 August 1937, the Synod made the decision to excommunicate all the representatives and ministers who had voted for it. This decision of the church authorities was probably one of the most striking stains on the history of the Serbian Orthodox Church.

Milan Stojadinović's government fell at the peak of the Radical leader's power, thanks to a skilfully led conspiracy of the chief royal regent, Prince Pavle Karađorđević. First there was a clash with Korošac, which was relatively easily overcome by reconstruction and compromise, then there was a resignation of a group of ministers acting on Pavle's orders. Pavle himself acted in conspiracy with the British and the French government, so the main reasons for Stojadinović's downfall were to do with foreign-affairs. According to the claims of the direct protagonists and informed observers, the prince suspected that Milan Stojadinović had signed a secret treaty with the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Count Ciano, on the division of Albania and Italian support regarding the establishment of Great Serbia through the amputation of Croatia, which should have been given to Italy. The politically immature Karađorđević was afraid that the capable prime minister would jeopardize his personal position and spoke in public that Stojadinović was unfit for the agreement with Maček and the Croats, while the people in Belgrade were convinced that Stojadinović was removed because of his increasing orientation towards the foreign relations with Germany and Italy.

The new government was formed by Dragiša Cvetković on 5 February 1939, in accordance with the orders of Prince Pavle, causing huge dissatisfaction in the Yugoslav Radical Association, but Stojadinović decided to support the government formally, at least in the beginning, knowing how strong and how unanimous his opponents were. He decided that it was best to temporarily retire from politics, waiting for further development of the situation and knowing how incompetent Cvetković was. When the negotiations between Dragiša Cvetković and Vlatko Maček were over, Stojadinović tried to oppose them by interpolating a large number of representatives in June 1939. The government avoided putting the interpolation on the agenda of the Parliament, but the final reckoning in the Serbian part of the Yugoslav Radical Association took place, which divided into two fractions - Stojadinović's supporters and the supporters of Prince Pavle and Prime Minister Cvetković. The leaders of the representatives' club decided to exclude Stojadinović and his closest co-workers from their lines and, with the help of the state apparatus Cvetković systematically removed Stojadinović's most ardent adherents from the complete party infrastructure.

That is how the intervention of the crown in the sphere of executive authority turned into a coup within the Yugoslav Radical Association. On 9 July 1939, Cvetković convened a session of the Head Committee of the Yugoslav Radical Association, where they decided to expel

Stojadinović from the party. The police seized the magazine *The Time*. Stojadinović's ousting from the party basically meant the end of the Yugoslav Radical Association as a serious political party. All its activities simply withered away under strict police control. Stojadinović tried to register the Serbian Radical Party, but the police banned it. Stojadinović experienced a blockade in all the media, but the regime was still afraid of him and so, on 19 April 1940, he was arrested and incarcerated in Rudnik, then transferred to Ilidža and then, on 18 March 1941, he was extradited to the British who kept him prisoner in Mauritius until 1948. After gaining his freedom, he lived in Argentina and died in 1961.

Milan Stojadinović's huge successes in the economy and foreign relations, as well as the constant growth of his popularity because of that, drove Karađorđević's court and Regent Pavle crazy, while the gossips in Belgrade contributed significantly spreading rumours that Stojadinović was the secret lover of Pavle's wife, Princess Olga. Very soon, Stojadinović became a thorn in the side of British and French politics, because he understood that those two once major forces were waning and that they could not provide any safety guarantees to Yugoslavia and the Serbian people. Although they were powerless to offer any serious assistance, the British and the French did not accept any kind of more independent management of Yugoslav foreign politics. The Italian-Yugoslav political agreement dated 25 March 1937, practically made our foreign relations stronger and increased the international safety of the whole region, buying some precious time out from the troublesome years of confrontations between the two seemingly antagonistic interests.

During Stojadinović's visit to Germany in 1938, Adolph Hitler promised him that the Third Reich had no territorial pretensions in the Balkans and that they decidedly opposed every wish for the restoration of Austro-Hungary. For Hitler, the most important thing was the struggle against Bolshevism and the British and the French strategic interests. Good relations with Germany were of the utmost importance for Yugoslavia, especially when the Yugoslav-German border was established, subsequent to the annexation of Austria on the 11th March 1938. Stojadinović continued cordial relations with the British and the French government, but gave a great deal of attention to improving international relations with Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania and Turkey. When he was on his way to dealing with the foreign affairs concerning the Vatican, in order to secure his country from that side, he was faced with huge artificially created problems in the country. After all, the content of the concordat had been formulated by King Aleksandar before his assassination in Marseilles on 9 October 1934 and its text was entirely consistent with the agreement that the Kingdom of Serbia had signed with the Vatican in 1914. Because of the concordat, the communists, the Ljotić's followers, the clergy, the farmers, the democrats and the failed fractions of the Radicals joined forces against Stojadinović, but the common people mostly kept silent and there were no massive demonstrations.

Through his skilful economic politics, Stojadinović first liquidated the debts of the farmers, primarily helping the small landowners. He introduced the stimulative purchase of cotton, silk and olaceous plants, establishing the production of fruit and industrial facilities, providing precious raw materials for the development of domestic industry. He also organized the public works with respect to the construction of the railways, roads and irrigation canals.

All Stojadinović's financial constructions were covered from real sources. Foreign investors had a lot of trust in the seriousness of his business activities. Mining was improved and, most importantly, factories for processing the raw materials related to mining were established in our country, together with the most powerful international partners. He paid special attention to the development of military industry. But, gradually, he made very powerful enemies in British and the French business circles, who did not like the penetration of German capital into Yugoslavia. However, their envy would not have had an inhibiting effect on Stojadinović's government if the western intelligence agencies and the Masonic circles had not had a huge influence on the court camarilla. He carried the politics of the budget balance and state saving, discontinued the practice of government borrowings from the National Bank and consolidated the dinar as a currency. He also disliked taking loans from abroad, but tried to attract investors by guaranteeing them political and legal safety, but they had to take the economic risk of doing business themselves.

Milan Stojadinović materialised his huge economic and political success in the elections of 11 December 1938, when his list – the Yugoslav Radical Association – won more than the absolute majority of votes. His political grouping had 306 mandates, while the united opposition, led by Vlatko Maček, had only 67. Stojadinović formed his second government when he was at the peak of his political power, on 21 December 1938, but it lasted only until 5 February 1939. This time, also due to court plots and the recruitment of the closest associates, a direct blow was directed at the most capable leader of the Radicals. Just as Prince Aleksandar had removed Nikola Pašić from power using Stojan Protić in 1918, who was Pašić's closest associate – that was how Pavle recruited Dragiša Cvetković in 1939, a person with Stojadinović's outmost confidence in both cabinets, to topple him. To this end, he used the levity of the Slovenian and Muslim ministers. The main role in Stojadinović's case was played by the British, because his politics of Yugoslav independence was unsuitable for them. They needed the Serbian cannon fodder for the struggle with Germany. Of course, the envy and jealousy of Prince Pavle Karađorđević was very important as well, because this physical and moral degenerate saw in Stojadinović all those personal traits and values that he, as a man of royal blood and flawless pedigree, lacked hopelessly.

They appointed Dragiša Cvetković to Stojadinović's place – an immature and corruptible man who interpreted the position of the Prime Minister of the Royal Government as the role of the Prince's adjutant. The other so-called Radicals, who entered Cvetković's government,

were also insignificant and, in order to gain at least the minimal pretence of credibility in Radical circles, Cvetković suddenly started to emphasise his personal political fidelity to Aca Stanojević. His agreement with Maček, achieved under the orders of Prince Pavle, inflicted massive damage on the Serbian people and caused the wrath of the Serbian patriots. Furthermore, Lazo Kostić repudiated it from a legal point of view. Even Aca Stanojević had to distance himself from that ill-fortuned agreement and Lazar Marković, who personally participated in its formation, was removed from the People's Radical Party, although he had previously represented the chief mediator between Aca Stanojević and Dragiša Cvetković. That is how the merger of the two confrontational Radical wings – gathered around the Head Committee and the Yugoslav Radical Association – failed, so Cvetković represented his further radical activity as the ideological direction of the people, not a party organisation. Taking the pulse of the people and the massive protests of the Radicals, the Head Committee of the People's Radical Party began their politics of confrontation with the Cvetković-Maček Agreement and its protagonists from the actual and illegal authorities, especially insisting that a Serbian unit should be formed in Yugoslavia using political means and with great deal of resolve. However, they did not present such attitudes in the official party program that they submitted to the Ministry of Interior, with the request to approve the organisation and the activities of the People's Radical Party in accordance with the regulations prevailing at that time, since the previous party registration was indirect, via the Yugoslav Radical Association.

In this way, the Yugoslav Radical Association practically disappeared. After he had been expelled from the People's Radical Party, Lazar Marković concentrated all his political activities on the struggle with the Head Committee of the Party, dominated by Miloš Trifunović, Aca Stanojević's closest friend. The Radical dissidents Lazar Marković and Boža Maksimović prevailed over the Club of representatives and entered the Cvetković-Maček Government as the representatives of their fraction of the Radicals. The Cvetković-Maček Government lasted from 26 August 1939 to 27 March 1941.

Stojadinović was toppled because of his skilful and realistic foreign affairs politics, because of his consolidation of the international position of the Yugoslav state in accordance with the new balance of power of European countries, as well as for not allowing anti-Serbian concessions to the Croats. Stojadinović primarily represented the Serbian national interests and, in accordance with them, the Yugoslav interests. He was not guided by his emotions and traditional foreign affairs affinities, he analysed the international political situation objectively, realistically and reasonably and his enemies simply went crazy after he was accepted almost triumphantly in Italy. "There were suspicions that Stojadinović had a secret agreement with the Italians, especially with Count Ciano. Under that agreement, the well-known Treaty of London from 1919 was supposed to put in force. The Italian goals were to penetrate the Balkans and annex not only the south of Albania, but also parts of Dalmatia. The

Croats suspected that Stojadinović signed a secret agreement in Vienna that was detrimental to Croatian territories, with Count Ciano, subsequent to Ciano's visit to Belgrade. According to these theories, in the event of a world war, Italy would have the right to occupy a part of Gorski Kotar and the whole of the Adriatic coast from Sušak to Split. The rest of Yugoslavia would be acknowledged as Great Serbia” (Branko Nadoveza: *Dr Milan Stojadinović's Serbian Radical Party*, Srpska slobodarska misao, no. 4/2001, p. 116).

Lacking any valid arguments, the political opponents accused Milan Stojadinović of having inclinations toward fascism, based on the fact that he had achieved great diplomatic successes in negotiations with Mussolini's and Hitler's regime. Those successes were primarily to the advantage of our country, its stability and safety, but it was vain to give such facts to hot-headed people. The political rivals objected to his technocratic skills in the economy and his pronounced talent in political struggles; the western countries were bothered by their inability to instrumentalise Yugoslavia for the materialisation of their own selfish and unscrupulous interests as long as the Prime Minister was a stable person who knew what he wanted and, more importantly, knew how to achieve what he wanted. Furthermore, the Ljotić's followers were spreading rumours everywhere that he was a republican and secretly a great opponent of the monarchy – there was a lot of truth in those accusations, judging by the facts.

When he was toppled and when Prince Pavle stole his political party, the Yugoslav Radical Association, from him, Milan Stojadinović formed the Serbian Radical Party – forming his own political group in the National Assembly out of sixty Radical MPs and thirteen senators. In accordance with its program act, the Serbian Radical Party declared itself to be the political successor of the former Yugoslav Radical Association, which also meant that it was a successor to the People's Radical Party, which was an integral part thereof. The agreement from August 1939 was openly called a *coup d'etat* and any kind of federalisation of the country was attacked energetically. Article 22 of the Program read: “Regarding the territory itself, our party does not accept the border drawn by the Cvetković-Maček agreement for the Serbian people due to the following reasons: a) because this border prevents the unification of the Serbian people, for which they have been suffering tremendously, and leaves a million of Serbs in the Banovina of Croatia. We decidedly demand the unification of all Serbs; b) because the border takes away the whole coast from the Serbs, leaving them only its southwestern part, from Boka Kotorska to the river Bojana, which is hard to access and has no railway connections with the hinterland; c) because that border divides the Serbian Bosnia and Herzegovina. There can be no discussion on the division of Bosnia and Herzegovina, because of which Serbia and Montenegro entered the war in 1914 and Bosnia and Herzegovina themselves suffered so many victims for their unity with Serbia; and d) because the border hinders the free development of the Serbian people and weakens the nucleus of the Yugoslav idea, to which it will strive for consciously and honestly in the future, just as in the

On 23 February 1940, Milan Stojadinović's political group declared itself the Serbian Radical Party. The party already had a great number of supporters from the beginning, held distinguished public manifestations, gathered together prominent people, marginalised all the other Radical fractions politically, but the authorities denied its registration at first and then imprisoned Milan Stojadinović.

During WWII, the Radical Party did not act in an organised way, but the Radical leaders continued their political activities on personal level, depending on the circumstances they found themselves in. The Radical ministers Miloš Trifunović and Momčilo Ninčić fled with the royal government, while the old party president Aca Stanojević remained in the country, living a retired life in his hometown of Knjaževac. The majority of distinguished Radicals opted for Draža Mihailović's movement - especially Dr Lazo Kostić, Stevan Trivunac, Vasa Ristić, Aleksandar Aksentijević, etc. Some joined Milan Nedić and some joined the partisans, like the priest Smiljanić. Lazar Marković, Mirko Kosić and Kosta Kumanudi participated in the structures of Nedić's government under German occupation, as well as Stojadinović's followers Milan Aćimović, Momčilo Janković and Bogoljub Kojundžić, who, in parallel, liaised with and helped the Chetnik movement. A great number of Radicals signed Nedić's appeal to the Serbian people, which had clearly anticommunist content. By the way, in his first order after establishing the government, Nedić prohibited any kind of partisan political activities, insisting on national unity under occupation. The majority of delegates at the Congress of Bač were Radicals. Acting through the Central National Committee, they energetically opposed the anti-Serbian moves of Šubačić's emigration government, which Trifunović also did on his part as a member of that government.

After the liberation of the country and after the communists took over the power, the Radicals tried to reorganize their party and gather all their former activists, regardless of the fraction they had belonged to. At a time when it was very dangerous, “the Radicals issued a leaflet in which they condemned the war tactics on the Srem front in 1944, which were equal to ‘sending the Serbian youth to be slaughtered’. They demanded the demobilisation of a portion of the army and the police, the exemption of martial courts for civilians, revoking all the laws passed by the Temporary Parliament and the presence of the foreign commissions during the Constitutional Parliamentary elections. Nevertheless, the Radicals registered, regardless of the conditions. The Ministry of Interior gave them permission to work on 1 October 1945” (Nadoveza, the same book, p. 564). The new party program was adapted to the circumstances of the extremely repressive communist dictatorship, but the core Radical spirit was preserved. Although Aca Stanojević once met with Tito, the communist press meticulously reported that the Radical Party refused to enter the National Front, because the elections for the Constitutional Parliament, held on 11 November 1945, were completely false and forged. Soon afterwards, the Radical leaders Miloš

Trifunović and Lazar Marković ended up in prison and nobody paid attention to the 95-year-old Stanojević. The Radical Party in the fatherland withered and died.

Many Radicals stayed in emigration, tragically divided into followers of the Serbian and the Yugoslav option, but a great majority advocated the establishment of Great Serbia after the demise of communism. Those who were more politically active spread through a great number of emigrant organisations in western European and overseas countries. On 18 May 1952, Stevan Trivunac founded the Working Committee of the People's Radical Party in exile in Paris, which published the magazine *The Radicals* in a duplicated edition. He was supported by the former Radical minister Branko Miljuš and opposed by Dragiša Cvetković. In Argentina, Milan Stojadinović formed the Radical Committee for South America and published the Radical Party newspaper *The Serbian Standard*, as well as maintaining intensive correspondence with Trivunac. However, the activities of the Radicals ended with the death of their activists and, mostly, there was no rejuvenation, the same as in the other emigrant organisations.

CONTENTS:

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.....	5
PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.....	14
Chapter I	
THE HISTORICAL SUBSTRATE OF SERBIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY	
I. The Prehistoric Homeland of the Serbian People.....	15
1. Great Serbia between the Vistula and Elbe Rivers.....	15
2. The Balkans before the Serbian Migration.....	23
II. Serbian Political History.....	26
1. State-Forming History before the Nemanjić Family.....	26
2. Serbia at the Time of the Nemanjić Family.....	29
a. Gaining Full State Independence.....	30
b. The Rise and Fall of the Serbian Empire.....	35
c. The Serbian Despotate.....	38
3. The History of Serbian Bosnia.....	45
a. Gaining Actual State Independence.....	46
b. The Bosnian Serbian Kingdom.....	51
4. The History of Hum Territory, Travunia and Principdom of Neretva.....	57
a. The Period of Parishes and Autonomous Principdoms.....	58
b. The Hum Territory as an Independent State.....	66
5. Serbian Montenegro.....	71
a. Serbian Duklja.....	71
b. Serbian Zeta.....	76
c. Serbian Montenegro.....	83
d. The Constant Uprisings against the Turks.....	86
e. The Time of <i>Vladika</i> Danilo.....	89
f. <i>Vladika</i> Vasilije Petrović.....	91
g. The False Tsar Šćepan the Little.....	92
h. The Rule of Petar I and Petar II.....	93
i. The Rule of Prince Danilo.....	97
j. The Rule of King Nikola.....	102
6. The Serbian People Under the Turkish Rule.....	108
a. The General Situation in the Enslaved Serbian States.....	108
b. The Ever-Restless Belgrade Pashalic.....	113
c. The State of Affairs in the Bosnian Pashalic.....	119
7. Serbian Pannonia.....	124
8. Serbian Krajina.....	143
a. Serbian Dalmatia.....	153
b. Bosnia and Herzegovina under the Austro-Hungarian Occupation.....	155
9. Serbian Dubrovnik.....	157
a. Byzantine and Venetian Rule.....	158
b. Hungarian Central Sovereignty.....	160
c. Vassaldom to the Turkish Sultan.....	163
d. The Twilight and Collapse of Dubrovnik.....	167
e. Engel's Research into the History of Dubrovnik.....	169
f. The Dubrovian Historian Mavro Orbin.....	173

IT-03-67-T	
10. Serbian Macedonia.....	177
a. The Slavic Settlement in Macedonia.....	178
b. Macedonia at the Time of Samuilo.....	179
c. Macedonia under the Turkish Slavery.....	184
d. Decades of Insurgencies.....	186
e. The Serbian Liberation of Macedonia.....	190
11. Restoration of the Independent Serbian State.....	194
a. The First and the Second Serbian Uprising.....	194
b. The Establishment of the Serbian Constitutionality.....	198
c. Gaining State Independence.....	202
III. Serbian Religion.....	204
1. The Old Serbian Religion.....	204
2. The Serbian Orthodox Church.....	213
a. The Acceptance of Christianity.....	213
b. The Serbian Archbishopric.....	216
c. The Serbian Patriarchate.....	217
d. The Restoration of the Serbian Patriarchate.....	219
e. The Serbian Church in Austria and Hungary.....	223
f. The Serbian Church in Montenegro.....	229
g. The Serbian Church in the Liberated Part of Serbia.....	232
h. The Serbian Church in the Occupied Serbian Countries.....	235
i. The Unification of the Orthodox Church.....	238
j. The Serbian Church during the Communist Oppression.....	240
k. The Overseas Church Schism.....	244
3. Christian Schism as the Main Cause of the Serbian Tragedy.....	245
a. The Church in the First Millennium of Christianity.....	245
b. The Political Pretensions of the Roman Bishops.....	249
c. Christianity as the State Religion.....	254
d. The New Monotheistic Factor of Islam and Further Confusion in the Christian Church.....	258
e. The Age of Roman Church Pornocracy.....	260
f. The Great Christian Schism.....	263
g. The Great Crime of the Crusades Incited the Unionist Ambitions of the Roman Popes.....	265
h. The Long-Lasting Crime of Inquisition.....	267
i. The Protestant Reformation.....	271
j. Villainous Roman Catholic Proselytism on the Serbian Territories.....	274
IV. Serbian National Symbols.....	286
1. The Serbian Coat of Arms.....	286
2. The Serbian Anthem.....	290
V. The Creative Thought Components of the Serbian Nationalism.....	293
1. The Beginning of the Modern Serbian Literary Language.....	293
a. The Serbian Language in the Family of Slavic Languages.....	294
b. The Essence of Serbo-Croatian Linguistic Confrontations.....	299
2. The Development of Serbian Literature.....	307
a. Nationalism of Old Serbian Literature.....	307
b. Renaissance Serbian Literature.....	311
c. The Baroque Style in Serbian Literature.....	314
d. The Literary Expression of the Serbian National Romanticism.....	316
e. Realism and Modernism in Serbian Literature.....	317

3.	Serbian Art Through Centuries.....	323
a.	Visual Art.....	323
b.	Serbian Music.....	330
4.	The Affirmation of the Serbian National Spirit in Scientific Research.....	333
a.	The Institutionalisation of Serbian Science and Culture.....	333
b.	The Great Serbian Mathematician and Astronomer Ruder Bošković and His Unquestionable Serbian Origin.....	334
c.	The Widely Known Giants of World Science.....	338
d.	The Stolen Glory of Mileva Marić-Einstein.....	340
5.	Serbian Philosophical Thought.....	343

Chapter II

HOW THE CROATS SEIZED THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE

1.	The Emigrant Fate is Always Tragic.....	353
2.	Biographical Records.....	354
3.	The Recognition of Distinguished Serbian Emigrants.....	355
4.	World Linguistics on the Traits of the Serbian Language.....	356
5.	The Theft of the Serbian Language.....	358
a.	The Foreign Leaders of the Ilyrian Movement.....	362
b.	The Croats as an Artificial Nation.....	364
c.	The Political Goals of Ilyrism.....	364
d.	The Abuse of Language.....	368
6.	The Centuries-Long Separation of the Serbian and the Croatian Nations.....	369
7.	An Essay about the Serbian Flags.....	372
8.	The Origin of the Serbian National Name.....	375
9.	Discussion on Constitutional Issues.....	379
a.	The Constitutional Court.....	381
b.	Voting Rights.....	384
c.	The Sharing of Power.....	385
d.	The Establishment of Interpellation.....	387

Chapter III

THE SERBIAN CATHOLICS

1.	The Historical and Social Circumstances of the Activities of the Catholic Serbs.....	391
2.	The Serbdom of Dubrovnik.....	404
3.	The Serbian Sea.....	417

Chapter IV

NJEGOŠ AND SERBDM

1.	Introduction.....	429
2.	General Approach.....	430
3.	Basic Studies.....	431
4.	Legal Institutes.....	435
5.	The Religious Folcloric Attitude.....	438
6.	Characterology of Montenegrins.....	440
7.	Comparison with Antique Examples.....	446
8.	The Violent Wresting of Serbian Writers.....	447
9.	The Defence of Marko Kraljević.....	454

Chapter V

SERBIAN BOKA KOTORSKA (BAY OF KOTOR)

1.	General Remarks.....	458
2.	A Historical Retrospective of Kotor.....	460

IT-03-67-T

3.	Boka Kotorska in Serbian States.....	463
4.	Changes in the Ethnic Composition of the Population.....	466
5.	The Religious Issue.....	469
6.	Catholic Proselytism during the Venetian Rule.....	472
7.	The Unwavering Serbdom of Bokelji (The Inhabitants of Boka Kotorska).....	474
8.	The Serbian National Characteristics of Boka Kotorska.....	478
9.	The Continuity of the Serbian Legal Mind.....	480
10.	The Serbian Tribal and Clan Structure.....	481
11.	Serbian Customs and Cultural Tradition.....	483
12.	The Indisputability of the Serbian Character of Boka Kotorska.....	484
13.	The First Uprising of Krivošije as the Greatest Historical Exploit of Bokelji.....	485
14.	A Final Study of Boka and its Inhabitants.....	489

Chapter VI

NATIONAL MINORITIES AND ARTIFICIAL NATIONS IN SERBIAN COUNTRIES

1.	A General Approach to the Issue of National Minorities.....	493
2.	The Vlachs in Serbian Areas.....	495
3.	The Aromanians (<i>Cincari</i>).....	497
4.	The Rumanian National Minority.....	500
5.	The Serbian Assimilation of the Autochthonous Romance Population in the Balkans.....	502
6.	The Islamization and Albanization of the Serbs.....	503
7.	Serbian Vojvodina.....	506
8.	The <i>Bunjevci</i> and <i>Šokci</i>	508
9.	Other Slavic Ethnicities.....	513
10.	The Serbs and the Hungarians.....	514
11.	The Serbs and the Jews.....	520
12.	The Communist Creation of Artificial Nations.....	524
13.	The Invention of the Montenegrin Nationality.....	525
14.	The Artificial Creation of the Macedonian Nation.....	532
15.	The Communist Project of Creating a Muslim Nation.....	536
16.	The Communist Destruction of the Serbian Orthodox Church.....	537
17.	The National Aspects of the Censuses.....	545
18.	Kostić's Vidovdan Speeches.....	551
19.	The Serbian National Pledge of Patriotism.....	555

Chapter VII

A THOUSAND YEARS OF CROATIAN BARBARITY

1.	The Thirty Year's War.....	558
a.	The Tragedy of Magdeburg.....	559
b.	Europe is Apalled by the Croatian Blood Thirst.....	560
c.	Unbelievable Criminal Manifestations of the Croatian Mentality.....	562
d.	The Croatian Atrocities in Pomerania.....	564
e.	What Schiller Wrote about the Croats.....	564
f.	The Croats as a Measure of Atrocity.....	566
g.	The Croatian Crimes as Preserved in Literature.....	567
h.	The Croatian Savagery in Folk Songs.....	568
2.	The Silesian Wars.....	569
a.	The Croatian Pandours of Franjo Trenk.....	570
b.	The Croatian Massacres in Cham.....	571
c.	The Second Silesian War.....	573
d.	The Croatian Atrocities in the Seven Years' War.....	575

3.	The Savagery of the Croats in the 19 th Century.....	576
a.	The Croats as Pandours of the Reaction.....	577
b.	The Tragedy of Milan.....	578
c.	Italian Civilians are in Utmost Fear of the Croats.....	581
d.	Jelačić and his Croatian Outlaws.....	582
e.	Vienna Pillaged by the Croats.....	584
4.	The Croatian History is Replete with Savagery.....	586
a.	Pillage and Murder as the Primordial National Character Traits of the Croats.....	586
b.	The Abominaion of the Croatian Concept of Civilizational Values.....	587
c.	The Serbs are the Principal Object of Croatian Hatred and Fury.....	589
5.	The Travesty of the Purported Thousand-Year-Old Croatian Statehood.....	591
a.	The Croats under the Hungarian Domination.....	592
b.	A Provincial Status as a Basis for the Provincial Spirit.....	594
c.	The Foreign Yoke as God's Punishment.....	595
d.	The Croatian Laws Prosecute Witches and Kill Sparrows.....	596
6.	German and Italian Evidence of the Croatian Crimes in the World War II.....	598
a.	The Testimony of Hermann Neubacher.....	599
b.	Gleise von Horstenau and His Documents.....	601
c.	The Memoirs of Lothar Rendulic.....	602
d.	The Germans are Appalled by the Croatian Blood Thirst.....	603
e.	The Croatian Technology of Death.....	605
f.	The Bestial Instincts of the Croatian Ethnic Being.....	607
g.	The Croats as a Blind Tool of the Vatican.....	609
h.	The Catholic Priests as Leaders in the Croatian Crimes.....	610
i.	The Roman Pope Blesses the Croatian Crimes.....	612
j.	Better Have a Croat as an Ally than an Enemy.....	613
k.	The Italians are Appalled by Croatian Brutality.....	616
l.	The Italians cannot Stand the Bestial Mentality of the Croats.....	617
m.	To be a Croat is a Harsh God's Punishment.....	619
n.	It is the Greatest Shame to be a Croat.....	622
o.	The Communists Systematically Concealed the Croatian Crimes.....	623
p.	The Pope, too, is an Arch-Criminal.....	625
q.	The World is Appalled by the Catholic Terror.....	628
r.	Croatian Crimes cannot be Forgotten.....	630
Chapter VIII		
THE CROATS AS THE GREATEST EVILDOERS AGAINST THE SERBS		
1.	Territorial Disputes between the Serbs and the Croats.....	633
a.	The Geographic Position of Serbian and Croatian Territories.....	638
b.	The Religious Differences between the Serbs and the Croats.....	640
c.	The Appropriation of the Serbian Language and Literature.....	641
d.	The Numerical Ratio between the Two Peoples.....	643
e.	The 20 th Century – The Century of Fraud.....	646
f.	Statistical Abuse and Manipulations.....	648
g.	Legal Science vs “Historical Rights”.....	652
h.	Etnographic Relations in Dalmatia.....	655
i.	The Processes of Uniatism and Catholicity of the Serbs.....	658
j.	Use of the Serbian Language.....	661
k.	The Manifestations of Serbdom in Dalmatian Towns.....	663
l.	The Historical Mistake of the Serbs.....	666

m.	The Forms of Catholic Proselytization.....	668
n.	The Perfidiousness of the Croats.....	674
o.	Racism of the Ethnic Crossbreeds.....	676
2.	Croatian National Megalomania.....	681
a.	The Communist Divisions of the Serbian National Corps.....	684
b.	The Croats cannot be Trusted.....	686
c.	Ready for Crimes.....	688
d.	The <i>Poglavnik</i> Fled Disguised as a Friar.....	691
3.	Croatian Delusions and Forgeries.....	694
a.	The Serbian Origin of the Vojnović Brothers.....	696
4.	The Ustasha Ideology of Stjepan Radić.....	698
5.	The Ustasha Demagogy of Ivan Meštrović.....	706
a.	A Croatian Chameleon.....	709
6.	The Croatian People are Guilty for the Ustashes' Crimes.....	712
a.	Collective Accountability – (Hang) Serbs from the Willow Trees.....	714
b.	The Penitence of the German Politicians.....	717
c.	Broz's Impudence and Cynicism.....	720
d.	A Crime-Spiritual Nourishment of the Croatian National Being.....	724
e.	Many Serbs Covered Up Croatian Crimes.....	728

Chapter IX**SERBIAN NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS**

1.	The Birth and the Development of the Serbian Nation.....	731
2.	Foreign Authors on the Characteristics of the Serbian Nation.....	743
3.	The Serbian National Character.....	749
4.	The Serbian Religious Life.....	752
5.	The Serbian Heroic Epic.....	759
6.	The Territorial Scope of the Serbian Lands.....	760
7.	The History of the Serbian Cyrillic Alphabet.....	769
8.	The Catholics and Communists Threatening the Cyrillic Alphabet.....	772

Chapter X**SERBIAN EMIGRATION**

1.	Emigrant Polemics.....	777
2.	An Analysis of the Serbian Emigration Circumstances.....	782
3.	The Fate of Emigrant Literature.....	787
4.	The Text on Milan Nedić.....	795
5.	Elections under the Communist Regimes.....	801

Chapter XI**THE MISFORTUNE OF YUGOSLAVISM**

1.	The Ethnic and Territorial Aspect of the Yugoslav State Idea.....	805
a.	Can This Delusion be Treated?.....	805
b.	The Emigrant's Doubts.....	806
c.	The Issue of National Consciousness.....	808
d.	The Yugoslav Pseudo-Historical Experiment.....	810
e.	National Consciousness and the Language Barriers.....	812
f.	The Possibility of National Balance.....	816
g.	Serbian Negative Balances.....	819
h.	Prospects for the Serbian State.....	823
2.	The Issue of the Yugoslav State Structure.....	827
a.	The Birth of Serbian Delusion of Brotherhood with the Croats.....	828
b.	The Naivety of the Ba Resolution.....	831

c.	The Emigrant's Doubts.....	833
d.	The Project of Creating the Montenegrin Nation.....	836
e.	The Bosnian Issue.....	838
f.	The Macedonian Issue.....	839
g.	Legal Order and Political System.....	853
3.	The External Political Circumstances and Military Aspects of the Yugoslav or Serbian State.....	857
a.	Relations with the Neighbouring Nations.....	859
b.	The Aspirations of the Great Powers.....	863
c.	The Military Issue.....	868
d.	The Anti-Serbian Politics of the Vatican.....	870
e.	The Masonry Factor.....	871
4.	The Serbian Traitor Desimir Tošić and the Stanstead Declaration.....	873
5.	The Enemies and Adherents of the Yugoslav Opinion.....	881
a.	The Conduct of the Croatian Emigraiton.....	882
b.	The Positions of the Prominent Serbian Emigrants.....	883
c.	The Disposition of the Slovene Emigration.....	887
d.	The Positions of the Macedonian Emigrants.....	891

Chapter XII

THE EVILS OF COMMUNISM

1.	The Communist Treatment of the Yugoslav Nation.....	894
a.	The Anti-Serbian Policy of the Communist Clique.....	895
b.	The Montenegrin Homeric "Barbarism".....	897
c.	The Croats, the Worst Military Rabble.....	898
d.	Marx and Engels-Bitter Opponents of the Pan-Slavic Idea.....	899
e.	The Monstrous Murder of the "Obnoxious" Serbs.....	905
f.	The Fragmentation of Serbia.....	907
g.	The Schism in the Serbian Orthodox Church.....	909
h.	The Systematic Destruction of Serbdom.....	911
i.	The Regime Suppression of the Cyrillic Script.....	913
2.	The Communist Propaganda Delusions.....	916
a.	Broz's Caesar-Mania.....	919
b.	Constituent Experiments.....	921
c.	Communist Courts-Revolutionary Tribunals.....	923

Chapter XIII

SERBIAN BOSNIA

1.	A Study on Inter-Religious Relations.....	931
2.	An Analysis of Ethnical Relations.....	951
3.	The Nationality of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims.....	988
4.	Croatian Pretensions to Bosnia and Herzegovina.....	1003
5.	The Serbian Treatment of Bosnia.....	1024
6.	The Serbian Character of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Cultural Heritage.....	1035

Chapter XIV

THE LIBERAL AND THE DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES OF THE MODERN LEGAL SYSTEM

I.	Constitutional Law	
1.	Comments on the <i>Oktroisani</i> (Imposed) Constitution from 1931.....	1043
2.	Constitutional Studies and Discussions.....	1059
a.	The Possibility of the Constitutional Transformation of a Monarchy into Republic.....	1061

b.	The Unconstitutionality of the Cvetković-Maček Agreement.....	1063
c.	Discussions and Polemics.....	1070
d.	The Question of the National Politics.....	1071
e.	Appropriate Reviews and Surveys.....	1072
II.	Administrative Law	1074
1.	The Organisation of Management.....	1074
2.	Administrative Activity.....	1085
3.	Supervision of the State Administration.....	1091
4.	State Civil Servant Law.....	1093
III.	Theoretical Statistics	1093
1.	The Textbook of Theoretical Statistics.....	1094
2.	Parliamentary Elections and Statistics.....	1102
3.	Yugoslav Electoral Statistics Between the Wars.....	1106
a.	Parliamentary Election of 18 March 1923.....	1106
b.	Parliamentary Election of 11 September 1927.....	1108
c.	Parliamentary Election of 5 May 1935.....	1110
d.	Disputes and Articles from Theoretical Statistics.....	1111

Chapter XV

SERBIAN CONSTITUTIVE IDEOLOGY

I.	The Continuity of the Serbian Political Idea	1116
1.	The Political Ideology of the Nemanjić Dynasty.....	1116
2.	Contemporary Serbian Political Ideology.....	1120
II.	The State-Building Project of Great Serbia	1125
1.	The Book by Ernest Denis on Great Serbia.....	1125
2.	The Book of Vladimir Ćorović on the Realization of the Concept of Great Serbia.....	1128
3.	The Great Serbian Concept of the Serbian Culture Club.....	1133
4.	The Great Serbian Concept of Ravna Gora.....	1135
III.	The Ideological and Political Roots of Modern Serbian Radicalism	1140
1.	Nikola Pašić's Radical Party.....	1140
2.	The "Prečanski" Radicals of Jaša Tomić.....	1146
3.	Serbian Radicals in Defence of the Fatherland.....	1147
4.	The Post-War Crisis of Serbian Radicalism.....	1152
5.	Milan Stojadinović-The New Radical Leader.....	1156