

National ideology and Croatian-Serbian relations in the works of Josip Ljubić

Bačmaga, Ivan; Badurina, Marino

Source / Izvornik: **Radovi : Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 2019, 51, 215 - 216**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

<https://doi.org/10.17234/RadoviZHP.51.9>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:413403>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-27**



Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Filozofski fakultet
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences

Repository / Repozitorij:

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)



National ideology and Croatian-Serbian relations in the works of Josip Ljubić

This article presents an overview of the life and career of lawyer and writer Dr Josip Ljubić (1869-1931), with a special focus on an analysis of the development of his national-political views and the reception of his ideas by the public of his time. In the political pamphlets and contributions he had published in periodicals, Ljubić worked on “big” topics, striving to find a formula for resolving Croatian-Serbian discord and bringing various conceptions of Yugoslavism to life. Working within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and later the Yugoslav monarchy, he modified his ideological positions several times more or less radically, altering potential solutions to the Yugoslav Question ranging from a Balkan Federation, through a Croatocentric “Habsburg Yugoslavia” within a reformed “trialist” Austria-Hungary, to a Yugoslav community based on Greater-Serbian foundations. Ljubić’s ideological wanderings likely also had professional and economic motives, and his incessant search for “sustainable Yugoslavism” reached its zenith in his defence of Puniša Račić, who assassinated Croatian Peasant Party representatives at the National Assembly in Belgrade.

As one of the humanities, historiography has always primarily concerned itself with human beings and various aspects of their activity, and the traditional historiographic approach was usually focused primarily on exceptional personalities, “great men”, and then entire groups. The continued evolution of research tools and methodologies as well as the broadening palette of topics and phenomena covered by modern historical scholarship allows us to shed light on the fate of thousands of individuals whom we do not count among the “great men” but who have distinguished themselves enough to rise above the “nameless masses”, to avoid falling into oblivion, and merit more careful scrutiny. Filip Hameršak estimates that Croatian culture encompasses ten to thirty thousand such persons born in the 1848-1918 period, and labels them “marginals of the third kind” – they are described as “bio-bibliographically determinable persons encompassed by written culture and whose traces we can follow in various materials”, individuals whose careers can be characterised as both “ordinary” and “exceptional”.¹ A relatively large number of such “marginals” can be considered members of the Croatian elite,

¹ HAMERŠAK 2005: 101-102.

taking into consideration the socio-economic conditions in which they operated and using a rather flexible definition of the term *elite*. In any case, both from a quantitative and a qualitative standpoint, “marginals of the third kind” take up a relatively large and significant, but still insufficiently researched space in Croatian history. The life and work of one of them, primarily his national-political thought, are the subject of this work.

Education and early literary work

Josip Ljubić, the son of teacher Dinko and nephew of historian and archaeologist Šime Ljubić, was born in Veli Lošinj on 20 March 1869. After completing the classical gymnasium (secondary school) in Split in 1886,² he studied history and geography at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb from 1886 to 1887, and then studied in Graz from 1890 to 1891.³ Although the political texts he published are the most informative and important for the reconstruction, interpretation, and evaluation of his national ideology, it is important to note that he had literary accomplishments, or better said attempts, during his student days, which are also relevant sources for analysing his political thought and its development.

Ljubić's poetry collection *Juvenilia* (1888) is not particularly important for its artistic value, but is interesting due to its foreword, where he expressed a very negative view of Croatian literature at that time, stressing that there were actually neither any quality writers in Croatia nor a real audience because Croatian writers lived in the past and wrote unoriginally, and that no noteworthy work had appeared for some time.⁴ Calling for the creation of a new type of poetry, through this poetry collection – more so because of its foreword than its actual content – he joined the conflict between the literary generations on the side of the “youth” as a radical but relatively marginal figure.⁵ In *Juvenilia* he covered various topics, and we shall single out the poem *Jedna želja Domovini!* [One Wish for the Homeland!], indicative to the study of the national-political ideas of the young Ljubić, who placed this poem, likely not by accident, first in his poetry collection. *Jedna želja Domovini!* contrasts the glorious past, symbolised by the distinguished figures of Croatian and Serbian history and resistance to foreign invaders, with the gloomy present, which was such due to his homeland's

² *Program c. k. velike gimnazije u Spljetu za školsku godinu 1885-86*: 109.

³ Data on his studies was provided to the editors of *Hrvatski biografski leksikon* by Mr Ivan Kurjak (completed form, 2006), head of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Science archives in Zagreb, and Mr Alois Kembauer (e-mail, 11 October 2016), head of the University of Graz archives. We extend our gratitude to both of them.

⁴ LJUBIĆ 1888: IX, XI.

⁵ BARAC 1964: 238-239; PAVLETIĆ 1958: 63, 68.

subservient position to foreigners, who were certainly supposed to represent Vienna and Budapest. Although the present offered little reason for optimism, the author found a recipe for resolving the seemingly insurmountable problems in the establishment of brotherly concord between Croats and Serbs, while the verses “Poor home, where murder each other/ Croat, Serb, brothers” effectively evoked the tensions burdening Croatian-Serbian relations during the tenure of Károly Khuen-Héderváry as the *ban* (viceroy).

Much more successful than *Juvenilia* was Ljubić's *Pošljednji kralj*,⁶ a historical drama that, despite certain objections, was well received by contemporaneous critics.⁷ This is a work covering one of the most important events in Croatian medieval history, when the Croatian royal lineage was extinguished and a foreign dynasty ascended to the Croatian throne. The result is presented as a national catastrophe caused by the disunity and greed of the Croatian nobility, and the main character is the idealised Peter Svačić, a model defender of the homeland who sacrifices his life for its freedom. The drama ends with a sort of curse through which the king foretells that Croats will be slaves to foreigners for centuries, while the arrival of a “wild horde”, obviously a reference to the Hungarians, mirrored the then quite popular stereotype about their non-European, Asiatic, barbarian nature.

The Croatian-Serbian dispute and Balkanism as its solution

After his literary attempts, Ljubić turned to writing political pamphlets in the mid-1890s, in which he covered “big” topics: Croatian-Serbian relations and the related phenomena of national ideology and integration. He dedicated his first booklet of this type, entitled *Spor izmegju Srba i Hrvata* (1895) to the “very learned gentleman” Milovan Milovanović, a Serbian politician, lawyer, and diplomat, describing it as a “response from Dalmatia” to his essay *Srbi i Hrvati* (1895). In his text, Milovanović presented a history of Croatian-Serbian relations and concluded that the initiative for national unity with the Serbs had originated from the Croats, but also that it was the Croats who had halted this process through their “separatist” ambitions and ties to foreign interests, primarily Vienna. Even though he eventually expressed the hope that Serbs and Croats would find the strength to establish concord and national unity, Milovanović was a realistic politician and knew that the unity of Serbs and Croats was a distant goal. Therefore, he primarily advocated Serbian interests, and only then expanded them through Yugoslavism. However, his essay is important because it was written during a time when the so-called “western variant” of unification (i.e.,

⁶ LJUBIĆ 1892.

⁷ See “Književno pismo”, *Vienac* (Zagreb), no. 19, 7 May 1892, 300, 302-303; TURK 1892: 74-75.

with the Croats) was no longer as popular in the independent Kingdom of Serbia because Serbia had turned to the south, expressing pretensions to the remaining Ottoman territory there.

Therefore, Ljubić's interest in Milovanović's work is understandable and he would – despite the visible Croatian and Serbian conceptual differences regarding mutual rapprochement and possible unification in these two studies – heed this call, claiming that resolving the heated dispute between the Serbs and the Croats was “a categorical imperative for everyone who is willing to contribute their own small stone to the great edifice of national enlightenment”.⁸ Critically assessing the ambitions to impose the Serbian name on the Croats (i.e., Serbification), or *vice versa*, Ljubić claimed that disputes and negation of the existence of Serbs/Croats actually contributed to their rapprochement because they reveal that the two are very similar, that “apparent negation contains a great affirmation, that the Serbian is also Croatian, that there are no differences between Serbs and Croats”.⁹ Therefore, he generally agreed that Serbs and Croats are one people with two names – which Milovanović also advocated at that time – however, the expression “national unity” then still primarily meant the “spiritual, moral, cultural, but not political, because it would be pointless to talk about political unification at this time”.¹⁰

Related to this, he considered ambitions towards Serbification/Croatianisation fruitless, because he judged each side “numerically and educationally” lacking sufficient strength to Serbify/Croatise the other,¹¹ but at the same time warned that such attempts were not harmless because they weakened both Serbs and Croats while working in favour of “our enlighteners”, the Germans and the Hungarians, who were fuelling the fire so as to prevent cultural unification in the Balkans. For example, in order to prevent the unification of the Croatian lands with Bosnia and Herzegovina, the “enlighteners” were promoting the affirmation of a separate Bosnian identity (*bošnjaštvo*) and the Bosnian language among the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Muslims. However, Ljubić primarily blamed the conflict between Croats and Serbs for the appearance of this phenomenon, concluding that the Muslims had “simply imitated Croats and Serbs” when they declared a Bosnian nationality.¹²

Striving to contribute to the settlement of the Serbian-Croatian dispute, the author offered an interesting solution: he attempted to blunt the edge of the conflict through double negation: “There is neither a Serbian nation nor a Croatian one. Serbs and Croats are tribes of the same nation. This nation can be called neither

⁸ LJUBIĆ 1895: 3.

⁹ *Ibid.*: 6-7.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 6 (footnote), 9.

¹¹ *Ibid.*: 40.

¹² *Ibid.*: 16-17, 20-22, 24.

Serbian nor Croatian.”¹³ He wanted to reconcile and bring the opposing sides closer on a platform of Balkanism.¹⁴ In doing so, Ljubić attempted to remove the East–West dichotomy by claiming that both Serbs and Croats were positioned among Slavdom as a “third world”, a wedge between East and West.¹⁵ The Serbian-Croatian dispute was therefore in no way a manifestation of the civilizational conflict between East and West, and was to be overcome through a process of “national consolidation” (national integration), for which France, Italy, Spain, and Germany should serve as examples with regard to the internal relations in these countries, relations between their north and south, the overcoming of regionalisms, etc.¹⁶ Balkanism would have been extended to encompass Slovenians and Bulgarians, whom Ljubić marked as decisive factors, “moderating elements” in resolving the Serbian-Croatian dispute.¹⁷ The entire concept was based on the author’s assumption that the four South Slavic nations would “not survive as nations, but exclusively as *tribal individualities* of one nation”. He emphasised that the internal differences and specificities of each of the tribes would not disappear in the new community, and this entailed the survival of the individual names of each of the four tribes.¹⁸

Even though he refused to separate them on the basis of their belonging to different cultural-civilizational circles and joined them together in Slavdom, Ljubić nonetheless wrote about the Croats and Serbs as nations divided by religion and history, i.e., a tradition of separate statehood.¹⁹ However, he subordinated the national feeling that would arise from a specific historical and/or cultural development to a theory that nations are created by nature, using categories of blood and soil,²⁰ by which he distanced himself from the politically liberal, modern understanding of the concept of nation, and embraced the biological one.

Developing “Balkan thought”

Ljubić’s idea of Balkanism drew a certain amount of attention and interest from his contemporaries. The booklet was noticed by the Zagreb-based newspaper *Obzor*, whose editorial board knew the author only by his pseudonym, Jld Bogda-

¹³ *Ibid.*: 11-12. – Ivan Mužić believed that Ljubić had “gone completely astray” with this approach. MUŽIĆ 1969: 47 (footnote 46).

¹⁴ LJUBIĆ 1895: 25.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*: 30.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*: 31-32.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*: 41-42.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*: 42-43.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*: 21.

²⁰ *Ibid.*: 44 (see footnote), 46 (see footnote).

nov. Even though no one in *Obzor* knew who stood behind the pseudonym, they stated that he “writes in a nice, pure language, objectively and civilly”. They did, however, declare him too optimistic, particularly criticising his “answer” to the call put forth by Milovan Milovanović, whose theses they considered fundamentally inextricable from the idea of Greater Serbia. The author of the review published in *Obzor* believed that Serbian-Croatian concord is not possible when one centre, i.e., Belgrade, is dominant; instead, it should be built around two centres. The concept of Balkanism was deemed an extension of the Illyrianism and Yugoslavism of the past, and critiqued as follows: “We don’t know whether the writer is a Serb or a Croat, but we point out that he is not opposed to the unification of Bosnia and Herzegovina with Dalmatia, Croatia, and Slavonia, so even if he is a Serb, he is closer to our stance than to the Serbian stance in the Serbian-Croatian dispute.”²¹

An evaluation of Ljubić’s pamphlet was also printed in Zadar’s *Narodni list*, which maintained that political unity is a precondition for the “spiritual, moral, and cultural”, which is actually an inversion of Ljubić’s claims. However, the author of this review did not see a point where this political unity could be implemented, judging that it was perhaps too late for this sort of national crystallisation. Serbs and Croats were understood as two “separate historical individualities”, which begged the question of whether “each of them has the right to preserve its specific significance within its historical borders”.²²

The initiative for resolving the dispute between the Serbs and the Croats was also welcomed by journalist and writer Dinko Politeo in the Split newspaper *Jedinstvo*. Explaining that “national unity” is not incompatible with the statehood right, and invoking Franjo Rački, Politeo lauded the idea of a Serbian-Croatian agreement, but stressed that he cannot accept the idea of Balkanism.²³

Ljubić continued to develop the tenets of Balkanism in the booklet *Trenutak, prvo poglavlje balkanske misli* (1896), in which he tried to present his national-integration ideology as the optimal, middle-of-the-road answer, rejecting tribal particularisms, but also Panslavism, as too extreme.²⁴ Here, too, he presented his theory on the South Slavs as four different tribes of the same nation, which still had not been consolidated because national consciousness had not developed within it, but the author had no doubt that this would happen “as a *natural* outcome”.²⁵ In this sense, he critically commented on the problem of “tribal egoism”, which manifests in a desire to impose the name of one’s own tribe onto a whole

²¹ Dobri počeci. *Obzor* (Zagreb), 7 October 1895, 1.

²² Balkanizam. *Narodni list* (Zadar), 5 October 1895, 1.

²³ POLITEO 1895: 1.

²⁴ LJUBIĆ 1896: 55-56.

²⁵ *Ibid.*: 29, 31, 38-42, 49 (see footnote), 52-53, 83.

nation,²⁶ which he contrasted with national identity constructions derived from geographical terms – Balkan Slavs, the Balkan nation, people of the Balkans.²⁷ However, insisting that Serbs and Croats are “tribes, which in their megalomania declared themselves nations”, and drawing a parallel to the national integration processes in Italy and France,²⁸ Ljubić ignored the fact that the process of forming separate Serbian and Croatian national identities had already advanced too far to be reset or taken to a lower, tribal level of integration. Discussing the intertwining of the phenomena of religion,²⁹ nationality, and politics (the state, i.e., its borders), he claimed that these three categories must be separated³⁰ because, of course, they potentiate the historical individuality of each of these “tribes”. He rejected the phrase *political nation*, which he saw as synonymous to the term *state*, and antithetical to the term *nation*,³¹ therefore describing it as a pointless fabrication and reproaching the Croats for coining it so they could avoid admitting that they are not, in fact, a nation.³²

As a precondition for the revival of Balkanism, he highlighted, among other things, the elimination of conflicts and the necessity of harmony among the intelligentsia and the general populace,³³ and also warned about the danger of coming too close together and imitating the “more cultured” (West) European nations, believing that this inescapably leads to “*intellectual slavery*”, i.e., the enslavement of the Slavic nations and the dissolution of their cultural specificities. Therefore, he insisted that Slavic specificities (language, customs, songs, prayers, etc.), and thus also Slavic identity, must be preserved, while the acceptance of (West) European cultural capital had to be carefully dosed.³⁴

²⁶ *Ibid.*: 42.

²⁷ *Ibid.*: 50-51 (see footnote).

²⁸ *Ibid.*: 36, 39.

²⁹ In the field of (inter)religious relations within the frame of Balkanism, Ljubić propagated a trans-confessional concept based on the equality of the three most widespread religions – Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and Islam – while completely excluding the others because they allegedly did not exist among “our” people. He sought to justify such an approach thusly: “Only older, already consolidated nations, who strive towards expansion and conquest, can toy with liberalism; for us, however, a young nation that doesn’t care for conquest, but defence, liberalism can bring naught but slavery.” *Ibid.*: 22.

³⁰ *Ibid.*: 21-23, 27.

³¹ “Austria is a state, therefore a political nation; Hungary is a state, therefore a political nation; Montenegro is a state, therefore a political nation. But Austria isn’t a nation, but a group of nations; Hungary isn’t a nation, but the *negation* of a nation; Montenegro isn’t a nation, but part of a nation.” Using the same logic, Ljubić considered Croatianism, Serbianism, Slovenianism, and Bulgarianism political, rather than national terms. *Ibid.*: 35 (see footnote), 49 (see footnote).

³² *Ibid.*: 33-35, 37.

³³ *Ibid.*: 15-18.

³⁴ *Ibid.*: 44-45, 69-73.

During this time, the idea of Balkanism also attracted the attention of the young Rightist [*pravaš*] Frano Supilo, who published a critique of Ljubić's national-political concepts in the Dubrovnik-based periodical *Crvena Hrvatska* on 21 December 1895. Assessing that the Croats had always paid the highest price in "all experiments in South-Slavic confusion", Supilo rejected Balkanism because its implementation would have required the Croats to renounce their name, history, culture, and statehood. He also stressed that it is unacceptable to justify such projects with the thought that "we're too small a nation", and underscored that Croats and Serbs, although relatively close, were still two different tribes, and therefore two names, two histories, cultures and literatures, though only one language. Moreover, he held that the idea of four South Slavic tribes merging into one nation was unattainable and lacked prospects, partly because the Serbs and Bulgarians were uninterested in the Balkan project, and also because they had conflicting interests. He concluded that Balkanism, like "every other *anti-Croatian idea* [emphasis added by the authors] is perilous and harmful to us."³⁵

Like Supilo, the unsigned columnist in the newspaper *Srbobran* also rejected Balkanism, albeit after approaching the problem from the opposite position: he stressed that the booklet had been written by a non-Serb and, due to its claim that Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, and Bulgarians are one nation, he declared that Ljubić's work was a "political fairy tale".³⁶ However, the idea of Balkanism was approached more seriously in future issues of *Srbobran*, and was seen to echo Illyrianism, which was given negative connotations by this publication. The next part of the commentary rejected Ljubić's assertion that all South Slavs can simply be dubbed Balkaners, which was explained by pointing out that the Russians, Spaniards, French, or Italians had not had a single name before their unification. *Srbobran*'s columnist, signed as Siniša, thus offered an interpretation of the historical genesis of their national names and highlighted that they are permanently recorded in historical geographies, but this was not the case with Balkanism and Balkaners.³⁷ He firmly concluded that "At least we Serbs have no cause to change our names; the Illyrians of the past didn't manage to lure us into this suicide, and neither will the newly-created *Balkaners*."³⁸

³⁵ SUPILO 1970: 196-199.

³⁶ Ild Bogdanov: Prvo poglavlje "Balkanske Misli", *Srbobran* (Zagreb), 17 (29) February 1896, 4.

³⁷ Balkanske misli, *Srbobran* (Zagreb), 22 February (5 March) 1896, 1.

³⁸ Balkanske misli. *Srbobran* (Zagreb), 24 February (7 March) 1896, 1.

The turn to Austro-Yugoslavism, attempts to revitalise the National Party's ideology and achieve Croatian-Serbian unity in Dalmatia

Even though Ljubić announced further editions in his pamphlet on Balkanism, which were to further develop the idea, these works were never printed. He sent booklets on the Croatian-Serbian dispute and Balkanism to Baltazar Bogišić, then the Montenegrin minister of justice, via Luko Zore. Writing to Bogišić from Dubrovnik on 27 December 1896, Zore described Ljubić, then a court intern in Zadar, as “a real exception among today’s youth. His political thought is healthy and he is a great friend of the Serbs, even though he is a born Croat. He has, however, separated from the others due to his broad culture.” As Ljubić expressed a desire to become a diplomat in the service of Montenegro, Zore stressed that he would be “quite an acquisition for Montenegro. He is recommended for this.”³⁹ Ljubić did not achieve a diplomatic career, but he did have a career in the courts: from 1897 he was a clerk in the District Court in Skradin and then in the County Court in Split from 1899, while 1903 he was a judge in the District Court in Cavtat, and secretary of the Provincial Court in Zadar from 1905.⁴⁰

Parallel to his career, he continued to publish political works, but moved toward a more pragmatic, conventional *Realpolitik*, tuning down his oppositional fervour, perhaps due to the fact that he worked as a civil servant, but perhaps also because his ideas had not achieved the desired result. Thus, one of the foundations of his ideology until the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was a firm, consistent loyalty to the Habsburg dynasty, while his Balkanism was gradually replaced by Austro-Yugoslavism.

In order to understand and interpret Ljubić’s national ideology and its development, one must keep in mind the political situation in Dalmatia at that time: the national-integration and national-differentiation processes in this Habsburg province had already been well-developed by the 1890s, while Croatian-Serbian relations were becoming strained at the same time, and heated debates were being held over the question of Dalmatia’s unification with Civil Croatia. From the 1870s onward, the National Party, renamed the National Croatian Party in 1889, rapidly lost influence, unable to secure unity with the Serbian political body, which had gone down a separate national path. Also, the unsuccessful tactics employed by the ‘Nationals’ [*narodnjaci*] made the problem of unification with Civil Croatia

³⁹ PERIĆ 1980: 320.

⁴⁰ Ljubić’s judicial career was reconstructed according to: *Hof- und Staats-Handbuch der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie*, for 1898: 795, for 1899: 826, for 1900: 821, for 1901: 838, for 1902: 857, for 1903: 856, for 1904: 834, for 1905: 850, for 1906: 871, for 1907: 889, for 1908: 923; *Zvonimir: hrvatski ilustrovani koledar*, for 1899: 155, for 1900: 151, for 1901: 164, for 1902: 168, for 1903: 174, for 1904: 234, for 1905: 264, for 1906: 263, for 1907: 196, for 1908: 242, for 1909: 314.

a theoretical question, so the nationally more radical Rightists took the lead in Dalmatia.

On the eve of the elections for the Dalmatian provincial parliament in 1901, Ljubić attempted to influence the political scene with his the essay *Poziv Dalmacije. Preporogjaj hrvatske narodne stranke u Dalmaciji i njezina programa*, which he addressed to “Croatian Leaders and Mayors in Dalmatia”. Analysis of this essay shows that Ljubić clearly saw the increasing anaemia of the National Party’s policies, but this still had not led him closer to Rightism. We suppose that Rightist ideology seemed too radical to him for two reasons: its harsher attitude toward the Serbs and its simmering subversive stance in relation to Vienna and the ruling dynasty.

In *Poziv Dalmacije*, Ljubić openly declared himself a supporter of the National Party⁴¹ and criticised its by then already long-time ills, opining that, after being left leaderless, it had fallen into a crisis that manifested itself through “practical” politics, i.e., the opportunistic standpoints of its current leadership,⁴² which then resulted in the withdrawal or passiveness of the party’s base. This in turn repelled young people, who would then support the Rightists.⁴³ He expressed the opinion that the National Party, regardless of the depth of its crisis, should not fear for its existence, judging that its platform was broad enough and “impregnable and before which all Rightist platforms are merely *toys* that will be scattered by the wind”.⁴⁴ However, being aware of the current situation, he stressed the necessity of a “unification, let’s say *fusion*, of all Croatian leaders, of all Croatian parties in Dalmatia”.⁴⁵ Still, the Nationals were to retain their primacy even in the new framework because, according to Ljubić, only their programme, with revisions and adaptations to the current time, could serve as the basis of a new Croatian political platform in Dalmatia.⁴⁶ Claiming that “Dalmatia is *something that cannot be self-sufficient* in the geographic, ethnographic, and national sense”, the author rejected Autonomism as nonsense,⁴⁷ and positioned the province in a national and political sense. Thus, Dalmatia “in the national sense completely and in its entirety belongs to nobody but to Slavdom”, and “in the political sense certainly belongs

⁴¹ LJUBIĆ 1901: 10.

⁴² Of course, leading opportunistic/practical/realistic politics, the “politics of crumbs”, is not a phenomenon that became characteristic for the Dalmatian Nationals at the turn of the century; the party had been led much earlier in a similar manner by some of its prominent members, including Gajo Bulat and Miho Klaić.

⁴³ LJUBIĆ 1901: 6-8. – See GANZA-ARAS 1992: 96.

⁴⁴ LJUBIĆ 1901: 6-7, 10, 11, 13.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*: 8.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*: 12.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*: 13.

to Austria”.⁴⁸ In doing so, he did not betray the Austro-Slavic leanings to which Croatian politicians in Dalmatia, especially Nationals, had always been inclined, including Mihovil Pavlinović, who, through his writings from the 1860s onward, had remained a sort of bashful forerunner of the idea of trialism.

While Ljubić’s separation of the terms *Dalmatia* and *Croatia* could be taken as a sign of his separatist or autonomist tendencies, it is important to note that the latter term encompassed Civil Croatia, i.e., only that part of the Croatian lands that, as opposed to Dalmatia, belonged to the Hungarian half of the Dual Monarchy. Any possible doubts were eliminated by Ljubić when highlighting the fact that “the overwhelming majority [of the population] in Dalmatia is *Croatian*” and stressing that Croats from Dalmatia “are to, on every occasion and through all legal means, strive for closer cultural and political links and unification with the other parts of the Croatian tribe, *wherever it may be*, based on the natural [...] and statehood-right to which every tribe on Earth is entitled, to gather and bring together all its parts into one whole”.⁴⁹ Positioning the modernised/fused National Party as an option loyal to Vienna, Ljubić also dealt with its national ideology. Similarly to the two pamphlets considered earlier, here he also presented the concept of three equal tribes of the same nation due to “the indelible links of blood, language and territory which bind together Croats, Serbs, and Slovenes for all time”, highlighting that “every tribe has the right to assert its name within the national community because such an assertion reflects its equality”.⁵⁰ This represents a certain discontinuity in regard to the opinions he presented in previous discussions, when he maintained that tribal names should not suppress the common national name. In addition, the Bulgarians were dropped in this case because it became impossible to include them in a paradigm that functioned exclusively within the framework of the Dual Monarchy.

In sum, now proceeding from a stance of moderate opposition, in his essay *Poziv Dalmacije* Ljubić proposed the fusion of all Croatian political options in Dalmatia into a single party whose activity would be based on a revised and modernised version of the National Party’s platform. The party would be Croatian in character and loyal to the Habsburg dynasty and, desiring to gain additional political weight, it would attempt to establish cooperation with all South Slavic options in Austria-Hungary that would, just like the new party, advocate the idea of three equal tribes of one nation.⁵¹ At the end of his essay, Ljubić invited prominent Dalmatian politicians to respond to his suggestions, and the youth and intelligentsia to mobilise themselves for these ideas.⁵² However, his message did

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*: 14.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*: 17.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*: 18-20.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*: 19.

⁵² *Ibid.*: 21-23.

not achieve the desired impact, even though he also wrote to National Party leader Pero Čingrija, expressing the belief that accepting the proposed programme would attract Rightists and Pure Rightists, at least those from Šibenik.⁵³

Ljubić actually attempted to reconcile several then already quite differentiated national-political concepts. On the one hand, he aspired to the revitalisation of the weakened and divided National Party, which was supposed to become an umbrella organisation for the consolidated Croatian political scene, including the Rightists (a fusion of all Croatian parties in Dalmatia), and then reconcile Serbdom and Croatdom, although these processes had begun to crystallize and move away from one another in the 1860s and 1870s. By overcoming their mutual pretensions, the Croats and Serbs were to return to Slavdom, with Dalmatia playing the role of “spiritual Piedmont of the Balkans”. Finally, he strove to reconcile dynastic interests with such a South Slavic conception, with the Croats acting as guarantors of sorts that the interests of the Monarchy would be preserved.

Ljubić’s proposals were not well received among Croatian politicians, particularly the Rightists. Responding in a series of articles in the Rijeka newspaper *Novi list*, Dinko Politeo resented Ljubić’s separation of Dalmatia, i.e., his claim that it nationally belongs to Slavdom, and politically to Austria. Politeo stressed that Dalmatia can nationally belong only and exclusively to Croatdom.⁵⁴ He accepted that a party with a Croatian national platform must find its place in Dalmatia, but added that this need not be a party that calls itself the Croatian National Party.⁵⁵ Referring to Ljubić’s two pillars of the “revived National Party” – the theory of three tribes of one nation and unquestioning loyalty to the Habsburg dynasty – Politeo asked what, save for its name, would remain Croatian in such a party.⁵⁶ He believed that a “revival” could only happen after a return to the principle of the statehood right, i.e., insisting on the unification of Dalmatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Istria with Croatia and Slavonia.⁵⁷ However, even if the National Party returned to its original programme, one could not, as Politeo claimed, have expected it to fuse with the Dalmatian Rightists; such a move would have presented a step backwards for them and their leader Juraj Biankini, because they had already gone further in the Croatian direction.⁵⁸ Politeo underscored that he had voiced all of these objections as a former member of the National Party, expressing the

⁵³ GANZA-ARAS 1992: 98, 245. – Unlike other prominent National Party members, Čingrija showed more understanding for the goals of the Dalmatian Rightists. His party’s collaboration with the Rightists also resulted in their fusion into the Croatian Party in 1905, with Čingrija as its leader.

⁵⁴ POLITEO 1901 (15 November): 1.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* (18 November): 1.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* (19 November): 1.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* (22 November): 1.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* (23 November): 1-2.

belief that the weakened Nationals and the Rightists could find common ground, but not on the basis suggested by Ljubić.⁵⁹

His programme for the revitalisation of the fallen Dalmatian National Party was not well received by the Serbs, either – they criticised it from a Greater-Serbian standpoint. Thus, the Serbian newspaper *Dubrovnik* attacked him by stressing that the political majority in Dalmatia was Croatian exclusively thanks to the Austrian authorities, but that, historically, linguistically, and tribally, Dalmatia belonged to the Serbian nation. They added that Dalmatia was not a unique term, but that there existed Dalmatia proper as well as Dubrovnik and the Bay of Kotor. Unlike Dubrovnik and the Bay of Kotor, Dalmatia proper had always been on the side of “the Western invaders of the Balkans”, and the Serbs, unlike Croatian parties, did not want to be a bridge to the West. Finally, Ljubić was characterised as “an educated Croat who cannot completely identify with Croatian politics, but also cannot completely extricate himself from them”. According to this paper, the solution for Dalmatia was not a fusion of all Croatian parties, but the “tying” of Croats to Serbdom, because: “There can be no room for two national ideas in *one* territory.”⁶⁰

Although Ljubić’s *Poziv Dalmacije* did not achieve the desired reception – in fact, it exacerbated existing differences – it should be noted that the author nonetheless fairly accurately detected the problems burdening the National Party, and he was not alone in this opinion in Dalmatia at that time. Namely, negotiations about electoral cooperation between the Nationals and the Rightists were held in November 1901, but the Rightists broke them off because the other party did not want to run joint candidates in the elections.⁶¹

Ljubić, however, did not give up, and made various attempts to affirm his ideas, particularly the idea of Croatian-Serbian tribal unity as a precondition for the formation of a common nation. The Croatian and Serbian National Home Society of Cavtat and Konavle (*Cavtatsko-konavosko društvo “Hrvatski i srpski narodni dom”*) was established under his leadership in May 1904. Its purpose was “educational and national, and consisted of awakening the national consciousness of the Croatian and Serbian tribes” as well as the cultural and economic linking of Cavtat and Konavle to Dubrovnik, the Bay of Kotor, Dalmatia, and Herzegovina.⁶² Although formally uninterested in political activity,⁶³ the Society’s official mottos were “My brother is dear to me, whether Croat or Serb” and “The Balkans to the Balkan People”,⁶⁴ and displaying images of Christ and the emperor, a ‘Serbian-

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* (28 November): 1-2.

⁶⁰ *Poziv Dalmacije, Dubrovnik* (Dubrovnik), 10 November 1901, 2.

⁶¹ GANZA-ARAS 1992: 87, 96-98.

⁶² LJUBIĆ 1905: 3 (art. 2 of the Statute).

⁶³ *Ibid.*: 4 (art. 5).

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*: 5 (art. 8).

Croatian edition' of a map of the Monarchy, and a map of the Balkan Peninsula was obligatory in the Society's headquarters or subsidiary offices.⁶⁵ The Society's charter also left open the possibility of displaying pictures of major events and/or personalities from Croatian and Serbian history, albeit under the condition that such decisions are made by a two-thirds majority of the founding members.⁶⁶ The Society's flag was a tricolour with the Serbian national colours (red-blue-white) on the left side and the Croatian colours (red-white-blue) on the right,⁶⁷ and Ljubić wrote the Society's anthem,⁶⁸ which extolled Croatian-Serbian concord and unity as the foundations of a better future in the Balkans. The organisation gathered 188 members at its founding,⁶⁹ and this number grew to 263 in less than six months at its first assembly in Cavtat on 23 October 1904. According to this data, it appears that the newly-formed Society was relatively well-received by the local community. Writing affirmatively about the Society's goals, *Dubrovnik's* correspondent reported that 39 houses in Cavtat displayed the Society's flag on the eve of the aforementioned assembly, and he also highlighted the "notable feature" that "there are neither priests nor teachers in the Society".⁷⁰

During this time, Ljubić was a district judge in Cavtat, and he may have thought that the local, regional, and national political climate (Croatian-Serbian rapprochement in the atmosphere of the "New Course" and the appearance of Serbo-Catholic movement in the Dubrovnik area) was an ideal basis for the development of the activities of a society of this kind. Namely, from the 1870s onward, when the once-unified National Party, encompassing both Serbs and Croats, was undergoing divisions on a national and conceptual basis, Dubrovnik was a hub of activity for a group of Nationals, including the previously mentioned Luko Zore, a prominent supporter of the Serbo-Catholic movement, who promoted the idea that the National Party should return to a policy of Croatian-Serbian unity, in the tradition of the so-called "Dubrovnik Slavism". Did Ljubić wish to continue these attempts at a time when Croatian-Serbian national differentiation was already in an advanced stage, and when attempts to establish political cooperation between Croats and Serbs in Dalmatia were being revived? In any case, the activities of the Croatian and Serbian National Home Society were aimed at bringing to life and merging the basic ideas he had previously proposed in his publications. The

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* (art. 7, 9).

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* (art. 10).

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*: 6 (art. 13).

⁶⁸ The anthem was set to music by Ivo Čižek, and its refrain was inserted into *Antologija jugoslovenske misli i narodnog jedinstva* [Anthology of Yugoslav Thought and National Unity] by Viktor Novak. NOVAK 1930: 513.

⁶⁹ LJUBIĆ 1905: see "Imenik prvih članova".

⁷⁰ TOLJA 2011: 394-395.

fact that the pamphlet *Narodna zastava ujedinjenih Srba i Hrvata* had a print run of 5,000 and was sent to public servants and institutions confirms that the founder of the Society had (overly) ambitious plans; his goal was to raise funds to establishing a printing company in Cavtat that would publish the newspaper *Narodna zastava*.⁷¹

Unlike the local community, the Croatian public, judging by the articles in the contemporaneous press (*Narodni list*, *Novi list*, *Crvena Hrvatska*, *Hrvatska kruna*, *Jedinstvo*), did not greet the establishment of this society with sympathy,⁷² and it failed to survive. *Obzor* used the news of its establishment to mock Ljubić, presenting him as one of those people who “in their jittery ambition for originality, don’t shy away from even the most tragic and most comical; [...] throughout his entire life, one can trace a strong love for sensationalism”. Furthermore, the founding of the Croatian and Serbian National Home Society was interpreted as Ljubić’s attempt to secure a political function by playing the card of Serbian-Croatian concord, while his declaration of loyalty to the dynasty was described as a calculated act intended to preserve his position of imperial and royal judge. *Obzor* also wryly commented on a letter Ljubić had sent to political leaders in Dalmatia after the negative reception in the above-mentioned newspapers, in which he among other things stressed that “Not a single letter of all that was is printed in those papers is true”, and told them: “your leaders are cowards and slanderers. Your newspapers are low and unworthy. Your parties are rotten [...] This is no longer Dalmatia, this is Denmark.” *Obzor* added that Ljubić was suspended as imperial and royal judge after this.⁷³

Before the collapse of the Monarchy: “Habsburg and Yugoslavia!”

Attempting to gain support for his political projects, in 1906 Ljubić contacted three members of the ruling dynasty known as supporters of trialism – Archdukes Franz Ferdinand (heir to the throne), Franz Salvator, and Leopold Salvator. He sent them a memorandum entitled *Die Neue Jugoslawia. Grundlage für eine den Habsburgischen Interessen entsprechende politische Aktion im Süden der Monarchie*, in which he presented a proposal for the formation of “Habsburg Yugoslavia”⁷⁴ as a third unit in the Monarchy. This would become the basis of his ideology and political agitation until the collapse of Austria-Hungary.

⁷¹ LJUBIĆ 1905: 25.

⁷² GANZA-ARAS 1992: 245 (see footnote 124).

⁷³ Iz Dalmacije. Senzacionalna poslanica Ilda Bogdanova, *Obzor* (Zagreb), 14 January 1905, 1-2.

⁷⁴ MILUTINOVIĆ 1971: 281.

Having attained a doctorate after passing a rigorous examination in Graz in 1908,⁷⁵ he was put on the register of attorneys in Zadar in 1913.⁷⁶ He was engaged in the social, cultural, and sporting life of this city, the capital of the Kingdom of Dalmatia in the pre-war years. According to the data received by Vjekoslav Maštrović from Ivo Bendiš, Ljubić published an “epistle” entitled *Puku hrvatskom u izbornom kotaru zadarskom* in 1911.⁷⁷ Even though we have not been able to retrieve a copy of this text and thus are not acquainted with its contents, we assume it is a pamphlet similar in intent to the essay *Poziv Dalmacije*. Namely, elections for the Imperial Council were held in the summer of 1911, and it appears that Ljubić attempted to influence voters through this “epistle”; judging by the title, it was aimed at the Croatian population. These were the second elections for the Imperial Council in which all adult males were allowed to vote, and Ljubić’s agitation could thus have affected a much higher number of potential Croatian voters. It would not be illogical to assume that his appeal to Croatian voters drew the ire of the Italianists (Italian Party supporters) in Zadar.

Ljubić suffered an inconvenience at the hands of the Italianists in August 1911, as reported by the *Narodni list*. Namely, while travelling to the 2nd Croatian All-Sokol Meet (*slet*) in Zagreb, the Dalmatian Sokols stopped in Zadar, where they were met by members of the local Sokol society, and then they all continued to the festival by steamer. The welcome and send-off ceremonies for the steamer carrying to the Sokols from Zadar and the rest of Dalmatia turned into a national event. The Croatian populace enthusiastically greeted the Sokol procession, also cheering to “Croatian Zadar”. On the other hand, the event was accompanied by fervent Italianist demonstrations. Once the ship had set off from Zadar, the gathered Croats under Ljubić’s leadership, merry and singing, went to the local Sokol society’s gymnasium, after which they dispersed. Apart from numerous verbal outbursts that accompanied the entire event, several physical assaults were also recorded, resulting in 44 arrests (4 of them women); 8 people were turned over to the state prosecutor’s office on charges of “public violence”. One day later, at around 10 a.m., Ljubić himself became the victim of an attack while he was in Centrale, a coffee shop he frequented. He was approached by three prominent members of the Italian Party’s radical wing, Girolamo Boxich, Ludovico Milcovich, and Carlo de Hoerberth, who demanded that he leave the premises because he had “insulted Zadar”. There was an altercation, and someone struck Ljubić in the head from the behind “with a stick or a chair so hard that he immediately collapsed. Then

⁷⁵ Information received from Alois Kembauer, head of the University of Graz archives (e-mail, 11 October 2016). Unfortunately, we have been unable to determine Ljubić’s occupation in the period from 1908 to 1911.

⁷⁶ Eintragungen in die Advokatenliste, *Juristische Blätter* (Vienna), 9 February 1913, 67.

⁷⁷ V. MAŠTROVIĆ 1977: 287.

they hit him a few more times. [...After the incident] he was taken home and found to have suffered two serious injuries. His physicians ordered him to stay in bed.”⁷⁸ There is a very real possibility that besides Ljubić’s leading role in the sending-off for the Sokols, the Italianists had also been irritated by the content of his aforementioned “epistle”. Be that as it may, Ljubić was undeterred, and this incident did not influence the ardour of his public activity. On the contrary, the most important pages in the “Zadar” phase of his life had yet to be written. Let us first mention that, in 1912, he became the deputy of the local Croatian Sokol elder, a board member of the Croatian Amateur Theatre Association (*Hrvatsko diletantsko pozorišno društvo*), and the first chairman of the Forward Croatian Cyclist Association (*Hrvatsko koturaško društvo “Naprijed”*).⁷⁹

In addition to Zadar and Dalmatia, his activity was noticed in Civil Croatia. Remembering the conversation he had with Rightist sympathiser Antun Gustav Matoš in Zagreb in 1912, Zadar professor Ljubomir Maštrović noted that that the great man of Croatian literary, cultural, and “general” history had mentioned Josip Ljubić among the prominent people of Zadar at that time, describing him as a “confused fantasist”.⁸⁰ We have no doubt that Matoš, a proponent of Renan’s national model,⁸¹ gave Ljubić this unflattering label precisely because he rejected his national-political views. Thus, after Politeo and Supilo, one further prominent figure of Croatian public life assumed a negative stance on Ljubić’s ideology, and

⁷⁸ Prolaz sokolova, *Narodni list* (Zadar), 12 August 1911, 2.

⁷⁹ Sokolska statistika. *Hrvatski sokolski koledar za godinu 1913*, 188; V. MAŠTROVIĆ 1964a: 482; T. MAŠTROVIĆ 1990: 201, 349.

⁸⁰ LJ. MAŠTROVIĆ 1954: 80.

⁸¹ As an adherent of the ideas of French philosopher and historian Ernest Renan, Matoš saw the concept of nation and the accompanying phenomena of national integration and differentiation, and also the relationship between the terms *nation* and *tribe*, entirely differently from Ljubić, which is clearly shown in his writings: “to us, nationality is not merely a consequence of race, but the result of cultural and political development, just like Renan saw it [...] Nationality and nation are therefore primarily the consequence of common cultural and political development, and the unity of nationality is therefore not based on unity of blood, unity of race, but unity of cultural and political thought [...]”; “Croats and Serbs are two nations because they historically had two separate histories, two separate states and statehood ideas. One tribe, but two nations, like Danes and Norwegians, like the Yanks and English, like the French Belgians [authors’ note: Walloons] and French, like Austrian Germans and German Germans. The word nation isn’t so much a mark of the tribal and linguistic as it is of the common interests of a single group of people that are fulfilled in common political thought. According to this, we and the Serbs can become one nation, but these are still ‘pia desideria’, an ideal; it does not follow from this that we, otherwise one tribe and one language, are already one and the same nation.”; “A nation, therefore, is a state/legal and historical term, not merely ethnographic and linguistic. Unity of race and unity of language do not make a nation. A nation is the result of a specific, unique historical and cultural development. Accordingly, the Croatian nation is a part of the Slavic, Yugoslav tribe living in the area of specific Croatian historical, state, and cultural thought.” MATOŠ 1973a: 173; IDEM 1973b: 93; IDEM 1973c: 117.

Ljubić was soon to gain further “prominent” critics, though their criticism would come from different angles.

In 1914, after waiting over a year for a permit, Ljubić’s “Dr Ljubić and Associates First Yugoslav Printing Press” (*Prva jugoslavenska štamparija dr. Ljubić i drugovi*) finally opened in the capital of Dalmatia. The printing press, described by Pavao Galić as “the best in Dalmatia [...] based on expert opinion responsible for improving the printing industry in the province”, was allegedly situated in the Third Order Franciscan Abbey of St Michael. It published the “Croatian democratic paper” *Mlada Dalmacija*, whose first issue was published on 2 May, and the last one (no. 18) on 8 August 1914. The paper had 3,347 subscribers and was published twice weekly until no. 10, and once per week thereafter.⁸² As editor⁸³ and contributor, Ljubić continued to advocate his trialist Austro-Yugoslav concept, unwavering and unquestioning loyalty to the Crown, and political activity exclusively within the framework of the law, calling for resistance to the existing “rotten” political parties and the formation of a new and united Yugoslav party, rejecting both liberalism and clericalism, and attempting to position *Mlada Dalmacija* as “a purely Croatian paper” and a counterbalance to the Italianist *Il Dalmata*.⁸⁴ Some writers would stress that this was a paper “neither liberally nor clerically oriented, nor too serious”,⁸⁵ possibly because *Mlada Dalmacija* included the humorous supplement *Šaljiva Dalmacija*, previously an independent publication, also published by Ljubić.⁸⁶

Mlada Dalmacija advocated harmony between Serbs and Croats, but believed that Croats in Yugoslavia should primarily be Croats because “Yugoslavism has need of strong, tenacious, conscious Croats”, who as such need to be the bearers of Yugoslavism.⁸⁷ Although the programme of this paper is most succinctly illustrated by its motto “Dynasty and Nation, Habsburg and Yugoslavia!”, analysis of the published texts, mostly written by Ljubić himself, reveals the special role assigned to the Croats regarding the transmission of the Yugoslav idea. For example, in *Mlada Dalmacija*, one can read that “Croatdom should now be a *judge* among the Yugoslavs”, i.e., the Serbs and Bulgarians; Croats would therefore be “the teachers of Yugoslavism”⁸⁸. An even sharper call was issued to the Croatian

⁸² GALIĆ 1979: 71-72; V. MAŠTROVIĆ 1954: 98-99; IDEM 1964b: 752.

⁸³ Although Zvonimir Rakvin (later replaced by Toma Novak) was at first listed as the editor of *Mlada Dalmacija*, the paper was actually edited by its founder and owner, Josip Ljubić. V. MAŠTROVIĆ 1964b: 752.

⁸⁴ Temelji Mlade Dalmacije, *Mlada Dalmacija* (Zadar), 29 May 1914, 1-2.

⁸⁵ V. MAŠTROVIĆ 1964b: 752.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*: 756. – The first issue of *Šaljiva Dalmacija* was published on 9 May, the last one, the sixth, on 13 June 1914. The paper continued to exist as a column in *Mlada Dalmacija*, beginning on 20 June (no. 11). V. MAŠTROVIĆ 1954: 101.

⁸⁷ Temelji Mlade Dalmacije, *Mlada Dalmacija* (Zadar), 29 May 1914, 2.

⁸⁸ Pravo hrvatsko stanovište, *Mlada Dalmacija* (Zadar), 3 June 1914, 1.

nationalist youth, to affirm Croatism vis-à-vis Vienna, Budapest, and Belgrade, and to assume spiritual leadership of all Yugoslavs and leadership of *political* Yugoslavia *within the framework* of the Monarchy. On the other hand, the demands of the Serbian nationalist youth were also projected: the affirmation of Serbism vis-à-vis the Balkans and abroad as well as demands for spiritual leadership over all Yugoslavs and leadership of *political* Yugoslavia *outside* of the Monarchy. Ljubić, therefore, detected a struggle between two foci for primacy within the framework of the future Yugoslav nation, with the former opposition between Croatism and Serbism now taking the form of an opposition between the Serbian and Croatian versions of Yugoslavia.⁸⁹ One gets the impression that, in this phase, he considered himself a representative of a certain Croatocentric vision of Yugoslavia, and tried to reconcile this vision with the broader Yugoslav framework. For him, Croatism and Yugoslavism were not mutually exclusive; indeed, “only when I feel the most Croatian can I become a Yugoslav”. Croatdom is one of the organs within the (Yugoslav) nation, and one organ cannot be replaced with another.⁹⁰ Apart from the fact that Ljubić clearly considered Croats “the head of Yugoslavdom”, here one can see the typical collectivism characteristic of every form of nationalism, which is completely in line with Ljubić’s declared rejection of liberalism; nationalism as an ideology would remain his only constant, regardless of relatively numerous wanderings, contradictions, changes of course, and oscillations in that/those nationalism(s). Furthermore, he was obviously aware of the complexity of the problem faced by every Yugoslav project, i.e., the historically conditioned contrasts primarily between the Serbs and the Croats as the Yugoslav core. Thus, the Croats, as western Christians, would always be attracted to the East, and the Serbs, as Easterners, to the West. He saw the resolution of this dichotomy in the standpoint “that neither Yugoslavia in general, nor the Croats and [our] Serb brothers, as a core, are West or East, but something different, a world of its own, a still-undiscovered Yugoslav world, which needs to rid itself of the evil of the West and the evil of the East in order to manifest itself”. He held a similar position regarding religion, but not in the sense of conversion from Catholicism to Orthodox Christianity or vice versa, holding instead that the South Slavs should return to the first centuries of Christianity, when it had been undivided. He would exultantly ask himself regarding this murky discourse: “Where is the new Strossmayer? Croatia calls for him and needs him now more than ever.”⁹¹

The most common target of criticism in Ljubić’s paper was the leader of the former Croatian Democratic Party, later the Croatian People’s Progressive Party,

⁸⁹ Pravo hrvatsko stanovište, *Mlada Dalmacija* (Zadar), 6 June 1914, 1.

⁹⁰ Pravo hrvatsko stanovište, *Mlada Dalmacija* (Zadar), 10 June 1914, 1.

⁹¹ Kontrasti u jugoslavenskoj psihi. *Mlada Dalmacija* (Zadar), 20 June 1914, 1.

Josip Smodlaka, who responded to the attacks by labelling *Mlada Dalmacija* a pro-regime paper.⁹² From the Balkan Wars onward, Smodlaka believed that it would eventually be impossible to reconcile Serbian and Croatian interests with those of the Monarchy, and that trialism was “a fantasy”.⁹³ Other political opponents, most of all members of the anti-Austrian/anti-state oriented Yugoslav Nationalist Youth such as Vladimir Čerina, Oskar Tartaglia and Tin Ujević, sharply attacked Ljubić’s paper, for reasons similar to Smodlaka’s.⁹⁴ These echoes left no doubt that *Mlada Dalmacija* was a relatively well-known publication, which corroborates Kosta Milutinović’s assessment that Ljubić was “the leader of the Dalmatian trialists”.⁹⁵ Since his opponents criticised him for his supposed insincere patriotism, *Mlada Dalmacija* defended Ljubić’s Croatism, pointing out that the people of Split had given him a Croatian flag when his play about the death of Peter Svačić was shown to approximately 2,000 people in their city. “And everyone knows Dr Ljubić in Zadar, too. Who in Zadar is a better Croat than him? Whose residence in Zadar is more adorned with Croatian flags on every public occasion than his? Who else has three children in a Croatian gymnasium [secondary school] in Zadar like he has?”⁹⁶

It seems that political, and later also wartime, circumstances gave new life to Ljubić’s ideas, particularly because he now presented them in his own paper, which would retain the same ideological positions during its entire short lifespan. Although critical remarks about the politics of Serbia would appear after the assassination of Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo in the spirit of loyalty to the Monarchy,⁹⁷ the motto “Dynasty and Nation, Habsburg and Yugoslavia!” would remain unchanged. Consistency was also apparent in Ljubić’s reaction to a letter from a prominent

⁹² MILUTINOVIĆ 1971: 280-281; V. MAŠTROVIĆ 1954: 98.

⁹³ BOBAN 1976: 136 (letter, J. Smodlaka to R. W. Seton-Watson, 19 January 1913).

⁹⁴ Vladimir Čerina wrote about *Mlada Dalmacija* in the Zagreb bi-monthly *Vihor* (no. 6, 1914): “Disgraceful journalism and nationalism. A terrible shame to young Dalmatia and an incomprehensible insolence to give such a corpse of a paper such a significant and great name.” Writing in Split’s *Zastava* (24 June and 8 August 1914), the unofficial organ of the Yugoslav youth movement, Oskar Tartaglia cynically characterised the political orientation of Ljubić’s paper as “imperial and royal South Slavism”, and as “false Yugoslavism”, claiming that Vienna is financing Ljubić’s pro-regime activity. Ujević, writing in Smodlaka’s paper *Sloboda* (18 June 1914), summarized the views expressed in *Mlada Dalmacija* as Greater Yugoslavian unitarism in the service of Austrian imperialism. KARUC 1964: 626 (main text and footnote 38); MILUTINOVIĆ 1971: 281-282.

⁹⁵ MILUTINOVIĆ 1971: 283.

⁹⁶ Komentari, *Mlada Dalmacija* (Zadar), 24 June 1914, 3.

⁹⁷ Interestingly, while telegrams with expressions of condolences toward the ruling dynasty due to the death of the heir presumptive were published and the policy of Serbia was criticised in *Mlada Dalmacija*, at the same time Marko Perin, one of the participants in the Sarajevo assassination, claimed at his hearing that it was precisely from the pages of Ljubić’s paper that he had absorbed the Austro-Yugoslav idea of gathering the South Slavs within the Monarchy. KARUC 1964: 626; MILUTINOVIĆ 1971: 283.

priest, who suggested that he exchange the formulation “Habsburg Yugoslavia” for “Greater Croatia”, after which the entire Croatian nation would support that programme. Ljubić briefly explained that this would have been harmful because “Greater Croatia” would have immediately led to calls for “Greater Serbia” from the other side, and this would have led to a renewal of conflict and division.⁹⁸

When Ljubić travelled from Zadar to Vienna in August 1914, his printing press ceased functioning and his newspaper was no longer published; he moved to Zagreb in 1915, taking a smaller part of his printing inventory with him and selling the rest.⁹⁹ The letter he sent to Juraj Biankini on 13 June 1915, in which he, in a somewhat conspiratorial tone, apprised him of current events in Zagreb, where work on uniting the Croatian lands was under way (“An effort to annex Dalmatia is in progress.”) with the support of the *ban* (viceroy), Ivan Škrlec, who “made the deepest impression of a patriot and good Croat” on Ljubić, shows that Ljubić remained true to the ideas he presented in *Mlada Dalmacija* throughout the war. He also announced that all parties would issue a declaration that they would work on the unification of the Croatian lands and secure whatever was necessary for the formation of “a new dynastic party on the ruins of the previous ones”. The unification of Civil Croatia and Dalmatia would simultaneously answer “the demands of rabid and treacherous Italy”, which had joined the Entente to satisfy its territorial pretensions toward the eastern Adriatic coast. Ljubić’s imperial patriotism, i.e., his loyalty to the Habsburgs and the Monarchy, radiated from the motto at the end of his letter to Biankini: “Dynasty and Nation, Habsburg and Croats”.¹⁰⁰

Even before the outbreak of war, Ljubić intended to launch a political weekly called *Nova Jugoslavija* in his Zadar printing press – this was announced in *Mlada Dalmacija* on 10 June 1914. This paper’s intended audience was the intelligentsia and, in line with the publisher’s political views, it was to strive “toward the creation of a unified national Yugoslav party in Ljubljana, Zagreb, Trieste, Rijeka, Zadar, Split, Dubrovnik, Mostar, and Sarajevo, which would, following the motto Dynasty and Nation, carry out through legal means the *national and political* [highlighted by the authors] unification of the Slovenes, Croats, and Serbs in the Monarchy”.¹⁰¹ He did not abandon the idea of this project, and tried to bring the weekly *Nova Jugoslavija* to life in Zagreb, now defining it as “neo-Illyrian” and loyal to the Monarchy, with the already known motto “Habsburg and Yugoslavia”. In the request for permission to launch the publication, he clarified that it would advocate for “the theory of the Vienna-Budapest-Zagreb triangle, the theory of the sunflower and the eye, proving the importance of our monarchy to

⁹⁸ ‘Velika Hrvatska’ ili ‘Habsburška Jugoslavija’, *Mlada Dalmacija* (Zadar), 25 July 1914, 1.

⁹⁹ V. MAŠTROVIĆ 1964b: 740; GALIĆ 1979: 72, 73 (see footnote 10).

¹⁰⁰ MOROVIĆ 1979: 342.

¹⁰¹ V. MAŠTROVIĆ 1954: XVIII (see footnote 93).

Europe and humanity in general”, therefore retaining the trialist line. However, the police commission responsible for the city of Zagreb refused to support his publication. A document from August 1916, referring to Ljubić’s request, contains a handwritten note that “Dr Josip Ljubić should continue to be under strict surveillance and [...] the findings and opinion of the office physician regarding his mental condition should be obtained”.¹⁰² Evidently the authorities did not put much trust in his “neo-Illyrian” political ideas or him as a person, or even his mental health. Contemporaneous papers from Zagreb reported on some of Ljubić’s activities that were considered very peculiar. He allegedly painted the façade of his would-be newspaper office “in all the colours of the rainbow”, which prompted Zagreb newspapers to call the police and health service to intervene.¹⁰³ Still, it remains unclear why Ljubić was perceived and presented as a mentally unstable person. Were there, apart from his possible unconventionality and political views that were often considered unrealistic, other reasons – of a medical nature – that provoked such remarks about him?

Be that as it may, Ljubić did not succumb to disappointment. He confirmed his loyalty to the empire and the dynasty, i.e., the new ruling couple, Charles and Zita, in the poems *Tibi regina!* and *Karl I.*, published on 30 December 1916. The first, written in Italian, is a panegyric to the empress, while the second presented an optimistic view of wartime developments.¹⁰⁴ He tried his hand at theatrical reviews, publishing several in the Zagreb daily papers *Jutarnji list*, *Novosti*, and *Narodne novine* in 1915. It appears that he attempted to become active (again) as a writer, applying *Kamenje ili San rodnoga kraja*, a play about social relations in the lives of the common people, for a grant from Matica dalmatinska in August 1917. He sent in two recommendations, one of which was written by Vladimir Treščec, then director of the Croatian National Theatre in Zagreb. However, the would-be publisher fell into financial difficulties and this work remained unpublished.¹⁰⁵

We lack full knowledge about how Ljubić experienced the end of the war and the collapse of the Monarchy, but it appears that he quickly adapted to the new situation and accepted the altered political circumstances, in which he very likely saw an open path to the achievement of Yugoslav national and political unity that he had been advocating in various forms for over 20 years. We do not know what brought this attorney to Imotski and when he came to this town, where he delivered a speech during a ceremony in front of the municipal hall

¹⁰² Hrvatski državni arhiv (Croatian State Archives, hereinafter: HDA), HR-HDA-1361, Grupa XVIII, Cenzura i zabrana tiska, inv. br. 97, kut. 1, Molba za dozvolu izdavanja neoilirskog lista “Nova Jugoslavija”.

¹⁰³ Razgled, *Učiteljski tovariš* (Ljubljana), 25 August 1916, 5.

¹⁰⁴ LJUBIĆ 1916.

¹⁰⁵ T. MAŠTROVIĆ 1990: 200-201.

on 6 November 1918, hailing the establishment of the State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs.¹⁰⁶ In any case, his professional path during the next roughly ten years was linked to Imotski.

In the Yugoslav monarchy: a new modification of views

In the new unified state, the Yugoslav monarchy, Ljubić maintained a pro-regime orientation, which of course entailed certain modifications of his national-political ideology. He would adapt his Yugoslavism to the altered political circumstances, still attempting to find a way to retain its integral quality.

At first, he would be somewhat critical of the policies implemented by Serbian ruling circles, judging that even a “middling Serb” would put Serbian interests above Yugoslav ones, i.e., particularism above nationalism. He noted that the vast majority of the Croats also thought along the same lines, putting Croatian interests above Yugoslav ones, but still claimed that the “Serbian tribe”, as the leading Balkan tribe, should be *the most Yugoslav*. However, Ljubić wrote in 1922 that it was precisely the Serbs who had taken the lead in particularism, and thereby also reinforcing other particularisms; the creation of such a climate harmed not only Serbism, but Yugoslavism as a whole. And indeed, during constitutional debates, the centralists, most of all the (Serbian) Radicals, supported the retention of separate, “tribal” names, while those who even temporarily respected separate identities were more inclined toward the Yugoslav name.¹⁰⁷ Ljubić would highlight the historical contributions of non-Serbian South Slavic peoples in the defence of their common territory from foreigners, stressing that the idea of Yugoslavism would be politically and nationally unattainable without such contributions. He therefore claimed that the character of Serbdom cannot be imposed upon the Croats, Slovenes, or Bulgarians.¹⁰⁸ This implies that Ljubić, at least at this moment, felt a certain resistance to Belgrade’s centralism because it directly threatened the achievement of the Yugoslav idea. Therefore, he attempted to influence the Serbs, calling on them, like he did the Croats in Austria-Hungary, to become the “most Yugoslav” element, to become an example. In doing so, however, he believed that Serbs should look up to those who, like the Croats, already have some sort of *Yugoslavist* tradition.

He would also comment on the relations between prominent political personalities and their roles in the process of Yugoslav integration and the organisation of the common state, taking Josip Smodlaka and Svetozar Pribićević as paradigmatic examples of different approaches to the issue of unification. Both of them

¹⁰⁶ UJEVIĆ 1991: 281.

¹⁰⁷ ĐOKIĆ 2010: 73.

¹⁰⁸ LJUBIĆ 1922a: 2.

supported unity, but Smodlaka stressed the need to reach an agreement, while Pribićević believed there was no need for this because there is only one nation. Ljubić accepted Pribićević's view that agreement within the framework of one nation is normally unnecessary, but believed that it is necessary when the nation is still forming. Therefore, seeing that state unification had not immediately led to the creation of a single nation, he moved closer to Smodlaka's view. He took Stjepan Radić and Stojan Protić as a second pair for comparison. He was sympathetic to Protić as the father of the agreement theory, and was not repelled even by the fact that Protić was "the incarnation of Pan-Serbism, a masked integralist".¹⁰⁹ On the other hand, he was ambivalent about Radić, judging him "blind, but seeing", not doubting that his faith in unity was sincere, but still reproaching him as "a masked republican", contradictory, "the father of the national principle and the father of agreement".¹¹⁰ Ljubić favoured a compromise between the Radić and Protić concepts, stating which one was closer to his: "I, too, and a few million Yugoslavs with me, don't know what to do, should we follow the intellectuals, or Radić; no, I wouldn't go with Radić, but with Protić?"¹¹¹ Ultimately, the visions of Yugoslavia put forth by Protić and Radić remained separate, as these two men failed to find any manner of common ground.¹¹²

Two of Ljubić's articles from 1922 suggest that, at that moment, although undoubtedly a Yugoslav integralist, he rejected crude centralism. He therefore did not unquestioningly support Pribićević, then the fiercest supporter of the centralist concept of the Yugoslav monarchy's internal structure; it appears that Protić's "compromise" solution was the closest to his views. However, only five years later, Yugoslav integralist Ljubić would move on to Radical Greater-Serbian, even Pan-Serbian positions.

Namely, in 1927 he published a pamphlet entitled *Neprijatelj Jugoslovenstva. Protiv Dra Sitona-Vatsona*, which begins with his declaration that the "radical Serbian root" are the foundation of the common building in which Slovenes, Croats and Bulgarians are the "walls", while Yugoslavism is the "roof".¹¹³ He stressed

¹⁰⁹ An important figure in the Radical Party, the prime minister of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes 1918-1919 and again in 1920, Stojan Protić warned that it was a mistake to believe that the unification of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes also meant the fusion of all elements of their identities, regional and historical traditions, and specific traits, highlighting that such exaggeration in the early days of the common state was detrimental to the aim of national unity. Regarding the state order, Protić advocated a sort of compromise between centralism and federalism, a division into nine provinces whose borders would approximately match historical districts (*oblasts*), i.e., something similar to the British system. See ĐOKIĆ 2010: 71-74.

¹¹⁰ See RADIĆ 1971.

¹¹¹ LJUBIĆ 1922b: 2.

¹¹² See STANKOVIĆ 1971.

¹¹³ LJUBIĆ 1927: 3-4.

that the non-Serbian elements (“walls”) should first become Yugoslavs, and only then should the Serbs do so, since they are the foundation of the Yugoslav edifice. But this was not all: Slovenes, Croats and Bulgarians “should all become Serbs, not by name, but in spirit”, because “Serbdom is the stature, the measure for all Yugoslavs”.¹¹⁴ Therefore, five years after advocating that the Serbs should be the first to adopt Yugoslavism and thus show the way for the other “tribes”, Ljubić took the opposite position and held that Bulgarians, Croats and Slovenes must not wait for Serbdom to become Yugoslav; instead, they must become Serbs in spirit and head down the Yugoslav path before the Serbs, since the achievement of unification projects always flows from the periphery to the centre.¹¹⁵

He was prompted to write this pamphlet by Robert William Seton-Watson’s book *Sarajevo: A Study on the Origin of the Great War* (1926), which, according to Ljubić, propagated the interpretation that “The crime in Sarajevo is a stain [...] on the movement for Yugoslav unity”. He, on the other hand, claimed that Sarajevo was neither the start nor the cause, but the consequence of a specific state of affairs, and that responsibility for the assassination cannot be equated to responsibility for the war.¹¹⁶ He called Gavrilo Princip a hero, martyr, and freedom fighter against tyranny, and characterized his act a defensive gesture, akin to David against Goliath. According to Ljubić, the war had been caused by German imperialism, and those most responsible included the Austro-Hungarian emperor and King Francis Joseph and his heir presumptive, Franz Ferdinand – members of the dynasty towards which he had previously expressed such ardent loyalty. Apart from seeing Princip, Čubrilović, and the others as the only true and integral Yugoslavs – as opposed to Pribićević, Davidović, and the others who had moved on to the “Austrian” concept of Yugoslavism in the meantime – Ljubić saw in the assassins “the genius of the Serbian race”, “the Serbian ethical radical”; for him, Serbian politics had been “always ethical, holy, and to the Europeans incomprehensible, wrongly interpreted, a scarecrow, because they are of a different, higher spirit”¹¹⁷, and he therefore saw Seton-Watson’s interpretation as malicious.

Namely, that British journalist, historian, and diplomat had been a fervent advocate of Yugoslav unity until World War I, but exclusively within the framework of the Habsburg Monarchy, propagating a trialist version of resolving the South Slav Question – actually one quite close to what Ljubić had proposed. However, wartime developments led Seton-Watson to accept the possibility of the Monarchy’s dissolution and the option of forming a Yugoslav state community by uniting the South Slavs of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy with Serbia and

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*: 4-5.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*: 5.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*: 9-11.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*: 40-42.

Montenegro. Regarding the relations between the nations that found themselves in a common Yugoslav state in 1918, Seton-Watson had been suspicious of Greater Serbian aspirations even before the war, and he was particularly influenced by Frano Supilo and the Yugoslav Committee during the war. Even though he saw, immediately after the war, that Greater Serbianism was the main threat to the internal stability and survival of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, he never ceased his advocacy for a unified Yugoslav state. Therefore, he occasionally criticised Croatian separatism, albeit much less often and less intensely than he did Greater Serbianism.¹¹⁸ His views irritated the followers of the Greater Serbian line that, at the time he was writing this pamphlet, already included Ljubić.

As opposed to Seton-Watson, Ljubić believed that the greatest threat to a unified state and nation came from Zagreb, which he described as the centre of particularism, and therefore more openly criticised Radić. The growth of Croatian particularism would also prompt him to completely abandon the idea of tribal equality. It was no longer an acceptable option to him because Croatism was seriously threatening the Yugoslav state and nation: "Croatism has shown itself united in laying down the law of 'balance', which is the death of the Nation."¹¹⁹ However, by claiming that "a Dalmatian views everything broadly; someone from Civil Croatia has a narrow view",¹²⁰ Ljubić in a way divided the Croatian "tribe" into two groups, to a certain extent following his pre-war thinking about Dalmatia as "the spiritual Piedmont of the Balkans" and the region that nationally belongs more to Slavdom than Croatia.

And so, while his commitment to Yugoslavism meant that he could not accept Croatism, Ljubić, an ethnic Croat, approached Serbism with open sympathy, labelling Serbs as the strongest and most ancient "tribe" and therefore some sort of guarantors for the successful achievement of the Yugoslav state and national project. One gains the impression that the completion of this project in the way that Ljubić then envisioned it would actually have filled Yugoslavism with Greater Serbian content. Namely, Ljubić would claim that all others ("divergent tribes at the frontlines") had lost the "Serbian ethical radical", that Croats had no folk songs save Serbian ones, even that all Slavs "without exception were [...] Serbs in their ancestral homeland. This has been determined. Serbdom is therefore the archetype of all Slavs."¹²¹ It is difficult not to agree with Ivan Mužić who, referring to Ljubić's aforementioned hypothesis that all Slavs are descended from Serbs, stated that Ljubić, through the views and (pseudo)arguments he presented in his

¹¹⁸ For a more detailed overview of R. W. Seton-Watson's treatment of the Yugoslav Question, see SETON-WATSON 1970; MATKOVIĆ 2006.

¹¹⁹ LJUBIĆ 1927: 17.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ *Ibid.*: 48-49.

booklet *Neprijatelj Jugoslovenstva*, had fallen into “the greatest nonsense through his Yugoslav unitarist thought.”¹²²

Apart from politically deviating from his earlier views and despite expressing clear sympathy for Serbism, Ljubić still did not abandon his near-fanatical faith in a unified Yugoslav state and nation, which he now saw as a creation springing forth from the foundation of (Greater) Serbianism, not a community of equal “tribes”. In any case, Ljubić held that the constitution of the Yugoslav nation would conclude a chapter of European nation-building.¹²³ Related to this, let us recall that, during the Austro-Hungarian period, he had claimed that the creation of a Yugoslav nation would spontaneously follow after the unification of the South Slavs. Now, when the experience of life in the common state showed all of the contradictions between various socio-political paths, Ljubić offered a new formula whereby a nation is created primarily by consciousness and intellect, and therefore the goal of political and intellectual elites was to induce, even impose, the process of forming the (Yugoslav) nation.¹²⁴ We have already offered several examples of how Ljubić, for the sake of a “higher” national objective, adapted his national-political ideology to the moment, thoroughly modifying some of its key tenets.

We should also mention that, while trying to realise his ideas, he established a philosophical-sociological Yugoslav Symbolic School in Sarajevo in 1926, with the goal of promoting the spiritual fusion of the four South Slavic tribes into one Yugoslav nation.¹²⁵ Also linked to the “Sarajevo” segment of his life are his roughly fifteen articles published in the local periodical *Novi čovjek* from 1926 through 1928, which was published under the aegis of the Cultural-Ethical Movement led by Miljenko Vidović. Ljubić published a booklet about the leader of this movement under the title *Ko je Miljenko Vidović?* (Sarajevo 1930).

An (un)expected epilogue: slipping into Greater Serbian positions and the defence of Puniša Račić

After the assassination of Croatian Peasant Party leaders in the National Assembly in Belgrade on 20 June 1928, Ljubić’s political ideology would undergo its final major metamorphosis. While the assassination led to a temporary national consolidation within the ranks of the Croatian political and intellectual elite, it was precisely then, in the late 1920s, that Ljubić would assume openly Greater

¹²² MUŽIĆ 1969: 164-165.

¹²³ LJUBIĆ 1927: 50.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*: 51.

¹²⁵ MUŽIĆ 1969: 164.

Serbian positions.¹²⁶ He presented a new version of this ideological concept in the Belgrade pro-regime daily newspaper *Vreme*, which was close to the royal court and the Radical Party, in a text under the headline “Što je hrvatstvo?”. Here he examined the political concept of Croatism and in his own way promoted exclusive Serbism. He no longer declared Croats and Serbs to be one nation, but one tribe – the Serbocroats. As opposed to them, the Slovenes and Bulgarians were two related but different tribes, but they, too, would assimilate with time, adopt the “Serbian type” and spiritually become Serbs; indeed, “The whole Balkans, all would become one, all spiritual Serbs.”¹²⁷ Ljubić now abandoned the names “Yugoslavia” and “Yugoslav” because he believed the terms “jug” and “južni” (south and southern) indicated a relation to some greater whole, something that is outside of the Nation, whose name must express complete independence “from West and East, even from Slavdom”. He would interpret this turn through his view of Radić and especially Pribičević: “Until the unification he did not even want to hear about Yugoslavism. In my third brochure *Poziv Dalmacije* [...] I presented the motivation of what was then the narrowest Yugoslavism. Radić and Pribičević always remained chained to ‘Serbocroatism’ in the narrowest, Pannonian sense. Even so, I was on the right path back then, and they were not. Because then, under foreign rule, it was reasonable for the Slovenes, Croats and Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy to use the Yugoslav formula to affirm their national unity against the Germans and Hungarians.”¹²⁸ It is as if Ljubić had suddenly forgotten his so often promoted slogan “Habsburg and Yugoslavia”. He also stressed that Pribičević and Davidović erred when they, along with the Croats and Slovenes, wanted to use the Yugoslav name to “break the Radicals, the mind and soul of Serbism”. It is evident that Ljubić became closer to the Radicals, i.e., accepted their ideological positions. Namely, the Radicals had from the beginning been more inclined to leave the names Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in the common state’s name, instead of allowing them to be melded into one, Yugoslav name. Ljubić’s “original” contribution to this problem was the suggestion that the new state, at least until the much desired single Nation appeared, be called the state of “Serbocroats and Slovenes”. However, later in this text, again contradictorily, he would allow the possibility of “Yugoslavdom” as the final product.¹²⁹

Ljubić partially reached the view previously expressed by Nikola Pašić in the manuscript *Sloga Srbo-Hrvata*, in which he mentioned the “Serbo-Croatian

¹²⁶ We cannot say with complete certainty that Ljubić did not adopt Greater Serbian standpoints a few years earlier. Traces of this are visible in the pamphlet *Neprijatelj Jugoslovenstva* (1927), in which, however, Ljubić’s sympathies towards (Greater) Serbianism were cloaked with Yugoslavism.

¹²⁷ LJUBIĆ 1928 (22 November): 4.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

tribe”, albeit using both the term “tribe” and “nation”.¹³⁰ Pašić also asserted that Croats and Poles, as Catholics who replaced the Slavic liturgy with the Latin one, had actually betrayed Slavdom and sided with the West, using their Catholicism against the Serbs and the Russians, respectively.¹³¹ Pašić therefore believed that the Serbs, not the Croats, should lead the South Slavic unification project.¹³² Ljubić, on the other hand, would not go down the path of glorifying Orthodoxy and Slavophilia (the Nation must be independent even from Slavdom!), probably in part because he was not of Orthodox faith, but also because even Pašić in his public (real)political activity never, as in this unpublished manuscript, highlighted religious strife as a potential stumbling block within the South Slavic body. Unlike the “Serbo-Croats” mentioned by that Radical leader, Ljubić used the same term with an apparently minor, but actually rather vital modification: “Serbocroats”. By omitting the hyphen, he additionally highlighted their unity and, also, the dominance of the Serbian element.

And finally, an important component of Ljubić’s “original contribution” to troubled Serbian-Croatian relations in the post-assassination phase was his attack on the late Stjepan Radić. Furthermore, some of his thoughts can be understood as a direct justification, even glorification, of the crime in the Assembly: Ljubić characterized the assassination as an event that “we of course regret [...] but that still cleared the atmosphere with its elementary and explosive strength. It clarified everything and uncluttered the horizon.” He judged that the Croatian populace was committed to integral Yugoslavism but, since it had in reality been offered only “truncated Yugoslavism”, it had thrown itself into the arms of “Radić’s insane salvationist demagoguery”.¹³³ He continued to express thoughts similar those he had presented in *Neprijatelj Jugoslovenstva*: “All of the tradition residing within the Croatian peasant is exclusively Serbian [...] The Croat has no original culture of his own, but the Serb has.”¹³⁴

Thus, the finale of Ljubić’s ideological metamorphosis was embodied in political views marked by Yugoslav unitarism and integral Yugoslavism, combined with more or less open (Greater) Serbianism,¹³⁵ followed by the abandonment of tribal

¹³⁰ PAŠIĆ 1995: 55.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*: 65.

¹³² *Ibid.*: 110.

¹³³ LJUBIĆ 1928 (23 November): 4.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*

¹³⁵ The terms *unitarism* and *integral Yugoslavism* are here used in accordance with Behschnitt’s typology of Croatian and Serbian nationalism. According to this model, Ljubić’s configuration of Yugoslavism was somewhere between unitarism – earlier, in Austria-Hungary, with the primacy of Croatism, and now with the even more prominent primacy of (Greater) Serbianism, rather than Yugoslavism – and integralism, according to which Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, and even Bulgarians are one nation, which needs to be awakened and finalised through intellectual,

equality in favour of “harmony”. Prompted by the growth of “tribal” particularisms, he designated Serbdom as the source of all Slavdom, and the Serbs as the leading South Slavic tribe and the foundation of Yugoslav integralism. All this, together with explicit anti-Western elements, was in perfect alignment with the Radical political worldview, which Ljubić had evidently embraced a few years before his death.

It comes as no surprise that, while internalising these views, Dr Josip Ljubić, a “public prosecutor” from Imotski, would be appointed a “public attorney in the Court of First Instance for the City of Belgrade”¹³⁶, where he would act as one of Puniša Račić’s defence counsels in late spring of 1929, when that Radical was tried for his murder of Croatian Peasant Party representatives.

Providing a relatively detailed description of Ljubić’s appearance in court, Račić’s biographers Dragomir Kićović and Milisav Sekulić stated that “thanks to his brilliant defence in the courtroom, he elicited the applause of all those present”. Ljubić, who had volunteered to defend the assassin, began his defence with a lengthy introduction in which he, appealing to foreign sources and often reading citations in German, described the Montenegrin mind-set and temperament, mentioning the local motto that “slander should be answered with fists”. Namely, Račić, born near Andrijevića in Montenegro, had fired immediately after Croatian Peasant Party representative Ivan Pernar had exclaimed “You robbed the beys!” at him and other Radical representatives. Presenting the accused as a war hero, Ljubić further recalled that Račić had been an important associate of Nikola Pašić “in the difficult days of the national ordeal on Corfu and in Thessaloniki [therefore at the time when he (Ljubić) had faithfully supported the Habsburg dynasty and promoted the idea of establishing a “Habsburg Yugoslavia” under Croatian leadership], he was a *chetnik* leader, he was wounded several times and both his legs were disabled”, so he was extremely sensitive to insults such as Pernar’s. Ljubić characterised the assassination itself as “a shocking act” that had forced “both politicians and parliamentarians to think. Fate uses even minor events to perform such an act. Puniša Račić was only a tool in the hands of fate. His energy came from higher spheres.” So as to make this absurd performance even more spectacular, the assassin’s defence counsel would compare the “shocking act” from the National Assembly to nothing less than the shattering of the tablets bearing the Ten Commandments by Moses, after which the Israelite people, temporarily corrupted, returned to the right path. Reconstructing the event, he would continue to offer similar otherworldly and quasi-psychological

political, cultural, and economic goodwill. However, the common modifications and the wealth of controversy and contradictions of Ljubić’s calculations allow for his Yugoslavism to be termed *pseudo-Yugoslavism*, which can conceal Greater Croatian, and in this case without a doubt Pan-Serbian and Greater Serbian goals. See BEHSCHNITT 1992: 236-237.

¹³⁶ Beleške, *Branič* (Belgrade), no. 1-6, 1929, 94; Advokati sa teritorije Beogradskog Apelacionog Suda, *Branič* (Belgrade), no. 7-12, 1929, 171.

proofs and explanations: “Pernar did not flee because Satan had bound his legs. The others did not flee before the revolver, either (...). It was the hypnosis of all those present, as the psychiatrist will prove (...) He [Račić] was slandered, belittled, his reputation besmirched, and his wartime fame questioned. It was a battle of principled versus unprincipled, (...) they were belittling everyone. In doing so, they filled the Montenegrin keg with powder. They filled it, and it exploded. (...) [W]hen Račić demanded an apology, laughter broke out among the opposition. (...) Should Puniša have withdrawn? (...) [T]he Montenegrin was there. He did not retreat.” So as not to rest his entire defence on arguments about the explosive Montenegrin temperament – which knows no other way than to offer a “principled” answer to slander, insults, and provocations – or claims of intervention by higher powers and quasi-psychological assessments, Ljubić complained that legal procedures had not been properly observed, saying that the accused had been brought to trial on legal grounds that applied only to acts committed outside parliament. Even though he had determined in an earlier phase of the defence that “there is nothing sick, only typical, racial” in Račić’s act – i.e., that it was typical of the mind-set of the land of the murderer’s origin – that it “isn’t insane but completely conscious”, Ljubić eventually tried to defend the assassin by appealing to his state of mind, prompted by Pernar’s insult: “He began shaking. He was no longer Puniša Račić. At that moment, he could see apparitions and animals and impossible forms, but he could not flee. (...) Puniša Račić fired in a state of insanity and his act is of a defensive nature.”¹³⁷

As far as we know, this “brilliant” act in the Belgrade courtroom was also Ljubić’s final important public appearance. He died in Belgrade on 17 February 1931 and was buried in the New Cemetery there the day after; the Belgrade Bar Association covered the expenses. A death notice for “the well-known national worker” was published on the front page of the daily newspaper *Vreme*, taking the form of a relatively lengthy obituary in which the deceased, among other things, was described as an accomplished orator. His “psychological, almost biological defence” of Puniša Račić was highly praised, as was his work in the Yugoslav Symbolic School. “Belgrade has lost a dear figure.”¹³⁸

Conclusion

When analysing the career of Josip Ljubić, which spanned over four decades, one can conclude that attempts to create a Yugoslav synthesis were a permanent feature of his efforts. However, given all the specific adaptations and, most of

¹³⁷ KIČOVIĆ AND SEKULIĆ 2010: 262-263.

¹³⁸ † dr. Josif Ljubić, *Vreme* (Belgrade), 18 February 1931, 1.

all, differences and even contradictions the term *Yugoslavism* carried through various phases of Ljubić's activity, it is difficult to detect any firm constant in his national-political ideology, save for loyalty to the Austro-Hungarian, and later the Yugoslav crown and state.¹³⁹ Still, Ljubić's tragedy lies in his constant search for a Yugoslav "panacea" for Serbian-Croatian relations, and his late Radicalism and defence of Puniša Radić perhaps best illustrate his consequent fall into the depths of his own delusions.

Striving to contribute to a resolution to the Serbian-Croatian dispute and find a "magic" formula for achieving Yugoslav unity, firstly in a "cultural", "spiritual" community, in the mid-1890s Ljubić publicly presented himself as an opponent of "tribal" particularisms and a promoter of the thesis of four equal tribes of one nation. The fact that he considered the Bulgarians within this concept shows that he thought beyond the framework of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. However, his idea of Balkanism, which at its core represented the purest form of national integralism, failed to take root among either Croats or Serbs; indeed, it was rejected by both sides.

After finding employment in the Austrian judicial system in Dalmatia near the end of the 19th century, Ljubić became less subversive and moved to a standpoint of moderate opposition. Even though he retained his ideals of tribal equality and the need to realise national unity, he now formulated his thought exclusively within the Austro-Hungarian framework, so the Bulgarian element was dropped from his four-tribe equation. Furthermore, Ljubić clearly and unambiguously expressed loyalty to the Habsburg dynasty, and contacted three of its members in 1906 in order to gain their support for his political project, i.e., the formation of "Habsburg Yugoslavia" as a third unit within the Monarchy.

Acknowledging the crisis of the failing National Party in Dalmatia, he attempted to influence local political events, and in his 1901 essay advocated the fusion of Croatian parties in Dalmatia under the National Party's patronage, based on its revised and modernised platform. In collaboration with the Serbs, the new party was to attempt to achieve South Slavic unity under the Habsburg crown, which would be manifested in the trialist reorganisation of the Empire, i.e., the establishment of the aforementioned "Habsburg Yugoslavia" within its borders. This was the beginning of the Austro-Yugoslav phase of Ljubić's national-political ideology, which lasted until the end of World War I and the dissolution of the Dual Monarchy.

¹³⁹ We are under the impression that this loyalty was more pronounced after 1918. Namely, however often and fervently Ljubić proclaimed his loyalty to the Habsburgs and the Monarchy, in his publications he nonetheless proposed a thorough reorganisation of the Empire (trialism instead of dualism). On the other hand, Ljubić's reflections, his statements in the media and public appearances after 1918 do not seem to contain the seeds of something equivalent (e. g. federalism, even in some milder, "Protićian" form).

Ljubić also advocated tribalism in his texts published in 1914 in the Zadar newspaper *Mlada Dalmacija*, which he launched, published, edited, and for which he was the main contributor. At that time he still propagated the concept of the tribal unity of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs and the need for their national and political consolidation within the framework of the Monarchy, adding that the project should take place under the “spiritual leadership” of the Croats as the state-building tribe and the most loyal proponents of the Yugoslav idea. Of course, this standpoint, which we could characterise as Croatocentric Austro-Yugoslavism, was not without its predecessors and traditions, especially under the aegis of the National Party. However, Ljubić persisted in it at a time when such an outcome was no longer considered likely – for example, during the time the Croatian-Serbian Coalition was in power and during World War I.

One gets the impression that, after the end of the Great War and the collapse of Austria-Hungary, Ljubić rather quickly accepted the new reality, embraced the newly-established Yugoslav state and the ruling Karađorđević dynasty, seeing them as the basis for the creation of a unified Yugoslav nation. Therefore, in the interwar period, also motivated by the growth of “tribal” particularisms and separatisms – most of all Croatian – he promoted integral Yugoslavism, but now stressing that the process of building a common nation must revolve around the Serbs as the leading, strongest South Slavic tribe. As time went by, his Yugoslavism would assume an increasingly (Greater) Serbian character, the most blatant example of which is Ljubić’s claim that all Slavs are descended from the Serbs and therefore the non-Serbian elements in the project of merging into a single nation must adapt, actually submit, themselves to “the genius of the Serbian race”.

While he had declared himself a follower of the National Party’s ideology during the Austro-Hungarian era, near the end of his life Ljubić acted as a Radical supporter and a sharp critic of Stjepan Radić and the Croatian Peasant Party. After the assassination of Peasant Party leaders in the National Assembly in Belgrade, he justified, even supported that crime in the pro-regime newspaper *Vreme*, and served as defence attorney at Puniša Račić’s trial in 1929. The Radicals themselves were likely also glad to have a highly educated individual of Croatian descent on their side, which could serve as proof of their Yugoslav preferences and aspirations.

Through over 40 years of public activity, Josip Ljubić tried to actively influence national-integration and national-differentiation processes within and between the Croatian and Serbian national body, offering several different “Yugoslav” solutions for settling Serbian-Croatian disputes and building a unified nation. While his initiatives did not garner the results he had wished for, and he was no decision-maker, it appears to us that it would be unfair to label Ljubić a marginal figure. Even though his views were controversial, contradictory, confusing, strange and even misguided, there is no doubt that they drew the interest, attention, and responses

of the contemporaneous public. True, these reactions were by and large negative, but we nonetheless believe that Ljubić's place in Croatian intellectual history is not trivial because of the simple fact that his national-political ideas were, more or less extensively, commented upon in the media or informal conversations by the prominent figures in Croatian political and/or cultural life: Dinko Politeo, Frano Supilo, Josip Smodlaka, Antun Gustav Matoš, Tin Ujević, Vladimir Čerina, Oskar Tartaglia, etc., and also because his ideas and activities were described in periodicals such as *Obzor* and *Novi list*. Interestingly, in addition to the aforementioned figures, his son Đuro, a prominent member of the Croatian Catholic Movement, also rejected his ideology.¹⁴⁰ All in all, one gains the impression that the impact of Ljubić's views lessened over time, albeit a small part of the media landscape was always open to him.

So, did Josip Ljubić sincerely believe in the possibility of "tribes" fusing into a single nation? Could it be that he, among others, did not recognise that the processes of forming separate national identities, especially Serbian and Croatian, had already gone too far for his ideas to be achievable? Or did he, perhaps for existential reasons, opportunistically side with those he considered stronger at a given moment? Did he cease to believe in national integration as a result of "nature" or "wiser heads", i.e., the intellectual elite, and begin to trust in the power of the government? Or was it simply convenient for his personal gain? Was he, as his ideological opponents criticised him, a "careerist" or only a "confused fantasist"?

We believe that Ljubić always took the contemporaneous political paradigm into account and usually sided with the dominant political force. In doing so, he tried to reconcile his opportunism with his hazy vision of an "ideal" Yugoslavism, which eventually took an utterly perverted form, as evidenced in his defence of Račić. Therefore, Ljubić – even though his ideological opportunism also served to secure his livelihood, which should never be discounted as a motive for any intellectual and public servant – remains a tragic figure, one who burned out in

¹⁴⁰ A jurist and publicist like his father, Đuro Ljubić was born in Jelsa on 4 November 1903. After earning his doctorate at the Faculty of Law in Zagreb in 1926, he worked at the High Court, then the Public Prosecutor's Office, and near the end of his life at the Administrative Court. He was one of the ideologues of the Croatian Catholic Movement, a member of the editorial boards of the newspapers *Narodna politika* and *Hrvatska straža*, a legal advisor to Janko Šimrak in writing polemics, and to priests stranding trial during the 6 January Dictatorship. He is the author of an extensive study entitled *Lige i posobe u starom hrvatskom pravu i njihov odnos prema Poljičkom statutu* (1931), in which he outlined the importance of these institutions to Croatian legal history, also comparing them to similar phenomena in other European countries. He published articles in the periodicals *Narodno kolo*, *Mladost*, *Narodna politika*, *Hrvatska prosvjeta*, *Seljački kalendar*, *Hrvatska straža*, *Danica*, *Selo i grad* and *Naš mornar*, covering topics such as international law, jurisprudence, state law, and Croatian legal and medieval history as well as foreign policy commentaries and texts in which he sharply criticised Freemasonry and Marxism, judging them harmful to Croatian national interests, which he held complementary with Catholicism. He died in Zagreb on 12 June 1933. BAČMAGA 2017.

efforts whose final consequences he could never fully grasp. In any case, his life and work are one of the numerous expressions, sometimes extremely controversial and unconventional, of the political, intellectual, psychological, and other processes, changes, and delusions experienced by Croatian (and Serbian!) society in the latter half of the 19th and first three decades of the 20th century.

Bibliography

Sources

Ljubić's works

- LJUBIĆ, Josip. [1 April] 1888. *Juvenilia*. "Gospogijci Zori Budicki poklonjeno" [Juvenilia. Dedicated to Miss Zora Budicki]. Zagreb: printed by Scholz and Kralj. 81 pp.
- LJUBIĆ, Josip Dinkov. 1892. *Posljednji kralj*. "Omladini hrvatskoj posvećeno" [*The Last King. Dedicated to the Croatian Youth*]. Spljet [Split]: Knjigotiskara A. Zannoni (St. Bulat). 143 pp.
- LJUBIĆ, Josip [pseudonym Jld Bogdanov]. [18 September] 1895. *Spor izmegju Srba i Hrvata* [The Dispute between the Serbs and the Croats]. Zadar: Self-published, print run: 2,000 copies, printed by Štamparija S. Artale. 46 pp.
- LJUBIĆ, Josip [pseudonym Jld Bogdanov]. [1 February] 1896. *Trenutak, prvo poglavlje balkanske misli* [*The Moment, First Chapter of Balkan Thought*]. Zadar: Published by the Megjunarodna Knjižara E. pl. Schönfelda, print run: 2,000 copies. 83 pp.
- LJUBIĆ, Josip. [19 October] 1901. *Poziv Dalmacije. Preporogijaj hrvatske narodne stranke u Dalmaciji i njezina programa* [*A Call to Dalmatia. A Revival of the Croatian National Party in Dalmatia and its Platform*]. Spljet: published by Josip Ljubić, Štamparija "Narodne Tiskare", print run: 2,000 copies. 23 pp.
- LJUBIĆ, Josip¹⁴¹. 1905. *Narodna zastava ujedinjenih Srba i Hrvata* [*The National Flag of the United Serbs and Croats*]. Dubrovnik: Cavtatsko i konavosko bratstvo, Srpska dubrovačka štamparija A. Pasarića, print run: 5,000 copies. 35 pp.
- LJUBIĆ, Josip. [30 December] 1916. *Tibi regina! Karl I.* Zagabria [Published as a leaflet].
- LJUBIĆ, Josip. 1922a. "Srpstvu ne dostaje nacionalizma" [*Serbdom is Lacking Nationalism*], *Narod* (Split), 30 July 1922.
- LJUBIĆ, Josip. 1922b. "Jedan momenat u našoj integraciji" [*A Moment in Our Integration*], *Narod* (Split), 8 October 1922.
- LJUBIĆ, Josip. 1927. *Neprijatelj Jugoslovenstva. Protiv Dra Sitona-Vatsona* [*An Enemy of Yugoslavism. Against Dr Seton-Watson*]. Sarajevo: Štamparija Gaković i drugovi. 52 pp.
- LJUBIĆ, Josip. 1928. "Što je hrvatstvo?" [*What is Croatism?*], *Vreme* (Belgrade), 22-23 November 1928.

¹⁴¹ The pamphlet was printed without the author's name, but Ljubić mentioned it as his work in the booklet *Neprijatelj Jugoslovenstva*. LJUBIĆ 1927: 2.

Contributions to *Mlada Dalmacija* [Young Dalmatia] (Zadar)¹⁴²

“Temelji Mlade Dalmacije” [The Foundations of Young Dalmatia], 29 May 1914.

“Pravo hrvatsko stanovište” [The True Croatian Standpoint], 3, 6 and 10 June 1914.

“Kontrasti u jugoslavenskoj psihi” [Contrasts in the Yugoslav Psyche], 20 June 1914.

“Komentari” [Commentaries], 24 June 1914.

“‘Velika Hrvatska’ ili ‘Habsburška Jugoslavija’” [‘Greater Croatia’ or ‘Habsburg Yugoslavia’]. 25 July 1914.

Archival sources

Hrvatski državni arhiv

HR-HDA-1361, Grupa XVIII, Cenzura i zabrana tiska, inv. br. 97, kut. 1, Molba za dozvolu izdavanja neoilirskog lista “Nova Jugoslavija”.

Reviews of Ljubić’s literary and political publications and his public activity

Književno pismo, *Vienac* (Zagreb), no. 19, 7 May 1892.

Balkanizam, *Narodni list* (Zadar), 5 October 1895.

Dobri počeci, *Obzor* (Zagreb), 7 October 1895.

Ild Bogdanov: Prvo poglavlje ‘Balkanske Misli’, *Srbobran* (Zagreb), 17 (29) February 1896.

Balkanske misli, *Srbobran* (Zagreb), 22 February (5 March) and 24 February (7 March) 1896.

Poziv Dalmacije, *Dubrovnik* (Dubrovnik), 10 November 1901.

Iz Dalmacije. Senzacionalna poslanica Ilda Bogdanova, *Obzor* (Zagreb), 14 January 1905.

Prolaz sokolova, *Narodni list* (Zadar), 12 August 1911.

Razgled, *Učiteljski tovariš* (Ljubljana), 25 August 1916.

† dr. Josif Ljubić, *Vreme* (Belgrade), 18 February 1931.

POLITEO, Dinko. 1895. Spor između Srba i Hrvata, *Jedinstvo* (Split), 13 December 1895.

POLITEO, Dinko. 1901. Preporogjaj hrvatske narodne stranke u Dalmaciji i njezina programa. Otvorena pisma Gospodinu Josipu Ljubiću u Splitu, *Novi list* (Rijeka), 15, 18, 19, 22, 23 and 28 November 1901.

SUPILO, Frano. 1970. *Politički spisi*. Zagreb: Znanje.

TURK, Zvonimir [Z. T.]. 1892. Pošljednji kralj, *Iskra* (Zadar), no. 9-10, 25 May 1892.

Correspondence

BOBAN, Ljubo et al. (ed.). 1976. *R. W. Seton-Watson i Jugoslaveni: Korespondencija 1906-1941* 1. Zagreb – London: Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Institut za hrvatsku povijest, Britanska akademija.

¹⁴² As all these units were published anonymously, here we shall also note that the author of most of the texts in *Mlada Dalmacija* was in fact Ljubić, its founder, owner, and editor.

- MOROVIĆ, Hrvoje. 1979. Iz korespondencije Jurja Biankinija, urednika Narodnog lista (1882.-1915.). *Radovi Zavoda Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Zadru* 26: 287-344.
- PERIĆ, Ivo. 1980. Pisma Luka Zore Valtazaru Bogišiću, Franji Račkom i Vatroslavu Jagiću. *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Istraživačkog centra Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Dubrovniku* 18: 313-340.

Schematisms

- Hof- und Staats-Handbuch der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie*. 1898-1908. Wien: K. k. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei.
- [Schematisms of the judicial authorities of the Kingdom of Dalmatia]. *Zvonimir: hrvatski ilustrovani koledar*. 1899-1909. Zagreb: Knjižara L. Hartmanna (St. Kugli).

Miscellaneous

- Advokati sa teritorije Beogradskog Apelacionog Suda, *Branič* (Belgrade), no. 7-12, 1929. Beleške. *Branič* (Belgrade), no. 1-6, 1929.
- Eintragungen in die Advokatenliste, *Juristische Blätter* (Vienna), 9 February 1913. *Hrvatski sokolski koledar za godinu 1913* (Zagreb), 1912.
- Program c. k. velike gimnazije u Spljetu za školsku godinu 1885-86*. 1886. Spljet: Brzotiskom Ante Zannoni-a.
- MATOŠ, Antun Gustav. 1973a. Sastanak naših srednjoškolaca. In: *Sabrana djela Antuna Gustava Matoša 15: Feljtoni, impresije, članci I*, ed. Vida Flaker, 173-176. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Liber, Mladost.
- MATOŠ, Antun Gustav. 1973b. Obradović. In: *Sabrana djela Antuna Gustava Matoša 16: Feljtoni, impresije, članci II*, ed. Vida Flaker, 91-95. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Liber, Mladost.
- MATOŠ, Antun Gustav. 1973c. Hrvatski nacionalizam. In: *Sabrana djela Antuna Gustava Matoša 16: Feljtoni, impresije, članci II*, ed. Vida Flaker, 115-120. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Liber, Mladost.
- PAŠIĆ, Nikola. 1995. *Sloga Srbo-Hrvata*, ed. Đorđe Stanković. Belgrade: Vreme knjige.
- RADIĆ, Stjepan. 1971. Hoćemo u jugoslavenskom jedinstvu svoju hrvatsku državu. In: *Politički spisi, autobiografija, članci, govori, rasprave*, ed. Zvonimir Kulundžić, 319-322. Zagreb: Znanje.

Literature

- BAČMAGA, Ivan. 2017. Ljubić, Đuro [manuscript]. *Hrvatski biografski leksikon*, vol. 9. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža.
- BARAC, Antun. 1964. *Problemi književnosti*. Belgrade: Prosveta.
- BEHSCHNITT, Wolf Dietrich. 1992. O tipologiji nacionalizma u Srba i Hrvata, *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 24/3: 227-240.

- ĐOKIĆ, Dejan B. 2010. *Nedostižni kompromis: srpsko-hrvatsko pitanje u međuratnoj Jugoslaviji*. Belgrade: Fabrika knjiga.
- GALIĆ, Pavao. 1979. *Povijest zadarskih tiskara*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko bibliotekarsko društvo.
- GANZA-ARAS, Tereza. 1992. *Politika novog kursa dalmatinskih pravaša oko Supila i Trumbića*. Split: Matica hrvatska.
- HAMERŠAK, Filip. 2005. Josip Jedlowski – životopis (s bilješkama za transnacionalnu povijest jedne građanske obitelji), *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 37/1: 101-128.
- KARUC, Niko. 1964. Jugoslavenska omladina u Zadru (1910–1914). In: *Zadar: geografija–ekonomija–saobraćaj–povijest–kultura*, ed. Jakša Ravlić, 619-628. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- KIĆOVIĆ, Dragomir M., Milisav S. SEKULIĆ. 2010. *Puniša Račić i/li O zabludama i diobama*. Belgrade–Andrijevića: Udruženje ratnih dobrovoljaca 1912–1918, njihovih potomaka i poštovalaca, Izdavačka kuća Komovi.
- MAŠTROVIĆ, Ljubomir. 1954. Moja sjećanja na A. G. Matoša, *Zadarska revija* 2: 79-89.
- MAŠTROVIĆ, Tihomil. 1990. *Drama i kazalište hrvatske moderne u Zadru*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.
- MAŠTROVIĆ, Vjekoslav. 1954. *Jadertina Croatica. Bibliografija knjiga, časopisa i novina izdanih na hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku u Zadru* 2. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- MAŠTROVIĆ, Vjekoslav. 1964a. Hrvatska društva u Zadru (1848–1920). In: *Zadar: geografija–ekonomija–saobraćaj–povijest–kultura*, ed. Jakša Ravlić, 471-486. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- MAŠTROVIĆ, Vjekoslav. 1964b. Izdavačka djelatnost na hrvatskom jeziku u Zadru od 1800. do 1960. In: *Zadar: geografija–ekonomija–saobraćaj–povijest–kultura*, ed. Jakša Ravlić, 737-760. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- MAŠTROVIĆ, Vjekoslav. 1977. Dopuna 1. Jadertini Croatici, *Radovi Centra Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Zadru* 24: 227-317.
- MATKOVIĆ, Stjepan. 2006. Ivo Pilar i Robert W. Seton-Watson (Dva pogleda na južnoslavensko pitanje), *Pilar: časopis za društvene i humanističke studije* 1/1: 21-45.
- MILUTINOVIĆ, Kosta. 1971. Josip Smolaka i jugoslavensko pitanje u Habsburškoj Monarhiji, *Rad JAZU* 359: 163-287.
- MUŽIĆ, Ivan. 1969. *Hrvatska politika i jugoslavenska ideja*. Split: vlastita naklada.
- NOVAK, Viktor (ed.). 1930. *Antologija jugoslovenske misli i narodnog jedinstva*. Belgrade: izdanje autora.
- PAVLETIĆ, Vlatko (ed.). 1958. *Hrvatski književni kritičari* 2. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- SETON-WATSON, Hugh. 1970. Robert William Seton-Watson i jugoslavensko pitanje, *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 2/2: 75-97.
- STANKOVIĆ, Đorđe. 1971. Neuspeh Stojana Protića u okupljanju političkih snaga radi rešavanja hrvatskog pitanja 1921. Godine, *Istorijski glasnik* 1: 7-34.
- TOLJA, Nikola. 2011. *Dubrovački Srbi katolici. Istine i zablude*. Dubrovnik: vlastita naklada.
- UJEVIĆ, Ante. 1991. *Imotska krajina*. Imotski: Ogranak Matice hrvatske.

Nacionalna ideologija i hrvatsko-srpski odnosi u radovima Josipa Ljubića

Pravnik i publicist dr. Josip Ljubić (Veli Lošinj, 1869. – Beograd, 1931.) u hrvatskoj je povijesti najdublji trag ostavio kao pisac političkih brošura i osvrta u kojima je obrađivao problematiku hrvatsko-srpskih odnosa i tražio recept za integraciju južnoslavenskih naroda („plemena“) u jedinstvenu naciju, a komentirao je i aktualne političke prilike, nastojeći na njih aktivno utjecati. Djelujući publicistički više od četiri desetljeća, svoju je ideologiju u više navrata modificirao, prilagođavajući je tekućim zbivanjima. Za Austro-Ugarske se sredinom 1890-ih javio idejom balkanizma, propagirajući „plemensku“ ravnopravnost Slovenaca, Hrvata, Srba i Bugara kao podlogu za njihovo „kulturno“ stapanje u jednu, balkansku naciju. Ovu je koncepciju oko 1900., nakon što je zaposlen u pravosudnom aparatu u Dalmaciji, učinio manje subverzivnom, isključivši iz nje bugarski čimbenik i pomaknuvši se na trijalističku, austro-jugoslavensku poziciju, počevši zagovarati uspostavu „Habsburške Jugoslavije“ u okviru Monarhije i kontinuirano izražavati lojalnost vladajućoj dinastiji. Neposredno uoči i tijekom Prvoga svjetskoga rata i dalje se zauzimao za narodno i političko ujedinjenje Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba u okviru habsburškoga imperija, sada uz opasku da se taj proces treba odvijati pod „duhovnim“ vodstvom Hrvata kao državotvornoga plemena, ujedno najodanijega jugoslavenskoj ideji. Nova prilagodba Ljubićeve jugoslavenske koncepcije uslijedila je nakon sloma Austro-Ugarske, kada u svoju ideologiju postupno unosi sve više i više (veliko)srpstva. Prigrlivši jugoslavensku monarhiju, ponukan jačanjem „plemenskih“ partikularizama, a napose hrvatskoga separatizma, počeo je promovirati integralno jugoslavenstvo, no sada ističući da se proces izgradnje zajedničke nacije treba odvijati oko Srba kao stožernoga, najjačega južnoslavenskoga i ujedno najdrevnijega slavenskoga plemena (teza da su svi Slaveni potekli od Srba). Stoga nesrpski elementi u projektu stapanja u jedinstvenu naciju moraju „duhovno“ postati Srbi, tj. prilagoditi se, zapravo podrediti „geniju srpske rase“. S tim u vezi ne začuđuje da se Ljubić, koji se u Austro-Ugarskoj deklarirao simpatizerom moderniziranoga narodnjaštva, u posljednjih nekoliko godina života pozicionirao kao radikalski pristaša i kritičar Hrvatske seljačke stranke te je bio branitelj Puniše Račića u sudskom procesu zbog atentata u Narodnoj skupštini. Premda se Ljubićeva nacionalno-politička promišljanja s punim pravom može označiti nedosljednima, proturječnima, konfuznima, kaotičnima, na koncu i promašenima, dapače, čistim zabludama, ona su ipak izazivala zamjetnu pozornost hrvatske javnosti te su na njegove napise i istupe reagirali neki od dionika tadašnjega hrvatskoga društvenoga, političkoga i kulturnoga života koje danas nerijetko prepoznajemo kao velikane. Te su reakcije gotovo odreda bile negativne, a Ljubićevi pokušaji utjecanja na nacionalno-in-

tegracijske i nacionalno-diferencijacijske procese unutar i između hrvatskoga i srpskoga „plemenskoga“ bloka pokazali su se jalovima. Označiti Josipa Ljubića ključnom figurom hrvatske povijesti njegova vremena bilo bi nedvojbeno vrlo pretjerano. No, kolikogod (ne)važan bio, nesumnjivo je riječ o zanimljivu pojedincu u čijem se javnom djelovanju ogleda sva složenost, pa i sva jednostavnost međunacionalnih odnosa unutar austro-ugarske i jugoslavenske monarhije, a i ondašnjih političkih, društvenih, kulturnih i drugih prilika i mijena.

Ključne riječi: Josip Ljubić, nacionalna ideologija, hrvatsko-srpski odnosi, balkanizam, Narodna stranka, Dalmacija, austro-jugoslavenstvo, Habsburška Jugoslavija, integralno jugoslavenstvo, (veliko)srpstvo.

Key words: Josip Ljubić, national ideology, Croatian-Serbian relations, Balkanism, National Party, Dalmatia, Austro-Yugoslavisim, Habsburg Yugoslavia, Integral Yugoslavism, (Greater) Serbianism.

Ivan Bačmaga
Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža
Frankopanska 26
HR-1000 Zagreb
ibacmaga@lzmk.hr

Marino Badurina
Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu
Ivana Lučića 3
HR-10000 Zagreb
mbadurina90@gmail.com

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET SVEUČILIŠTA U ZAGREBU

ZAVOD ZA HRVATSKU POVIJEST
INSTITUTE OF CROATIAN HISTORY
INSTITUT FÜR KROATISCHE GESCHICHTE

RADOVI

51

BROJ 2

ZAVOD ZA HRVATSKU POVIJEST
FILOZOFSKOGA FAKULTETA SVEUČILIŠTA U ZAGREBU

The logo for FF press, featuring the letters 'FF' in a stylized font with a horizontal line through them, followed by the word 'press' in a lowercase, sans-serif font.

ZAGREB 2019.

RADOVI ZAVODA ZA HRVATSKU POVIJEST
FILOZOFSKOGA FAKULTETA SVEUČILIŠTA U ZAGREBU

Knjiga 51, broj 2

Izdavač / Publisher
Zavod za hrvatsku povijest
Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu
FF-press

Za izdavača / For Publisher
Vesna Vlahović Štetić

Glavni urednik / Editor-in-Chief
Inga Vilogorac Brčić

Izvršni urednik / Executive Editor
Kornelija Jurin Starčević

Uredništvo / Editorial Board
Jasmina Osterman (stara povijest/ancient history), Trpimir Vedriš (srednji vijek/medieval history), Hrvoje Petrić (rani novi vijek/early modern history), Željko Holjevac (moderna povijest/modern history), Tvrtko Jakovina (suvremena povijest/contemporary history), Silvija Pisk (mikrohistorija i zavičajna povijest/microhistory and local history),
Zrinka Blažević (teorija i metodologija povijesti/theory and methodology of history)

Međunarodno uredničko vijeće / International Editorial Council
Denis Alimov (Sankt Peterburg), Živko Andrijašević (Nikšić), Csaba Békés (Budapest), Rajko Bratož (Ljubljana), Svetlozar Eldarov (Sofija), Toni Filiposki (Skopje), Aleksandar Fotić (Beograd), Vladan Gavrilović (Novi Sad), Alojz Ivanišević (Wien), Egidio Ivetić (Padova), Husnija Kamberović (Sarajevo), Karl Kaser (Graz), Irina Ognyanova (Sofija), Géza Pálffy (Budapest), Ioan-Aurel Pop (Cluj), Nade Proeva (Skopje), Alexios Savvides (Kalamata), Vlada Stanković (Beograd), Ludwig Steindorff (Kiel), Peter Štih (Ljubljana)

*Izvršni urednik za tuzemnu i inozemnu razmjenu /
Executive Editor for Publications Exchange*
Martin Previšić

Tajnik uredništva / Editorial Board Assistant
Dejan Zadro

Adresa uredništva/Editorial Board address
Zavod za hrvatsku povijest, Filozofski fakultet Zagreb,
Ivana Lučića 3, HR-10 000, Zagreb
Tel. ++385 (0)1 6120191

Časopis izlazi jedanput godišnje / The Journal is published once a year

Časopis je u digitalnom obliku dostupan na / The Journal in digital form is accessible at
Portal znanstvenih časopisa Republike Hrvatske „Hrčak“
<http://hrcak.srce.hr/radovi-zhp>

Financijska potpora za tisak časopisa / The Journal is published with the support by
Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i športa Republike Hrvatske

Časopis je indeksiran u sljedećim bazama / The Journal is indexed in the following databases:
Directory of Open Access Journals, EBSCO, SCOPUS, ERIH PLUS, Emerging Sources Citation
Index - Web of Science

Naslovna stranica / Title page by

Marko Maraković

Grafičko oblikovanje i računalni slog / Graphic design and layout

Marko Maraković

Lektura / Language editors

Samanta Paronić (hrvatski / Croatian)

Edward Bosnar (engleski / English)

Tisak / Printed by

Tiskara Zelina, Sv. Ivan Zelina

Naklada / Issued

200 primjeraka / 200 copies

Ilustracija na naslovnici

Muza Klio (Alexander S. Murray, *Manual of Mythology*, London 1898)

*Časopis je u digitalnom obliku dostupan na Portalu znanstvenih časopisa
Republike Hrvatske „Hrčak“ <http://hrcak.srce.hr/radovi-zhp>*

*The Journal is accessible in digital form at the Hrcak - Portal of scientific
journals of Croatia <http://hrcak.srce.hr/radovi-zhp>*