

The Transition of Croatian Elites from the Habsburg Monarchy to the Yugoslav State

Research summary

The project, funded by the Croatian Science Foundation, ended on 31 December 2020 and we want to share our major research results with the wider scientific community.

The series of transitions after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the socialist Yugoslavia sparked the interest for other such processes as well, enticing researchers to rethink the transitions out of empires in 1917/1918. This was one of the motives to launch a project on the transition of Croatian elites from the Habsburg Monarchy to the Yugoslav state. The other was a tendency to shed light on the Habsburg legacy in general, since historiographies of its successor states have for long often stressed their own national narratives, sometimes even turning the Monarchy into the periphery of their national histories.

Croatian elites enjoyed different positions in the new Yugoslav state, depending on the specific group characteristics, but also on their personal political and national orientation. In general, the most vulnerable were those whose position and existence directly depended on the political/ideological and national frame, such as the nobility, regarded by the new regime as adversaries. Miha Preinfalk and Iskra Iveljić compared the fate of the nobility in Slovenia and Croatia, concluding that, despite some differences prior to 1918, they adopted similar strategies of survival in the new state. Aristocracy intended to preserve its landed estates and its way of life, whereas the new and the petty nobility was more prone to adjustment. The noblemen in Slovenia and Croatia did not found their associations, like their counterparts in Austria, and they were far less present in the public than before the war.

Administrative elite reflects the governing system of a country. The position of the old elite - the great prefects (*veliki župani*), researched by Božena Vranješ-Šoljan, is therefore significant for the assessment of the transition. They were as a rule members of the nobility, and appointed by the king himself, representing institutions that were fundamental for the state sovereignty. In this respect, a parallel can be drawn with Hungary, as well as other countries of Central and Eastern Europe, in which nobility played a role in important political institutions. Most of the old county prefects in Croatia and Slavonia did not belong to the administrative elite in the new state; they were pushed to the sidelines of political decision-making in the process of the strengthening the governing structures in the unitary Yugoslav state.

Contrary to the administrative elite, the economic one was used to adapting to various economic and political circumstances, and was of vital importance for the new regime. The Slovenian case, analysed by Žarko Lazarević, shows

that a small group of businessmen used the transition to improve their economic and social position. They presented themselves as a “true Slovene elite” and relied on political power. Since they were already established entrepreneurs integrated into international capital networks, there was no break or complete replacement of the old economic elites. Similar are the findings of Iskra Iveljić for a group of influential Croatian businessmen. The new regime needed a developed Croatian economic elite, as opposed to the old noble landowners. Ž. Lazarević’s and I. Iveljić’s comparison between Slovenian and Croatian economic elites shows that businessmen were mostly interested in political stability and redistribution of political power as the conditions for economic development and better representation in the central institutions. The regime for its part did not intend to destroy or replace the pre-war economic elites, but to control capital flows, which was achieved by the “nostrification” of the banking sector.

Among the intelligentsia historians were probably the most exposed to political influence since the post-1918 regime preferred historians who were pro-Yugoslav (Ferdo Šišić, Gavro Manojlović) as opposed to the Croatian-oriented ones (Ivo Pilar, Milan Šufflay). The situation worsened under the dictatorship of King Alexander introduced in 1929, which exercised a much stricter control over history than it was before 1918 and from 1918-1929, as shown by Branimir Janković. On the opposite pole were professionals such as physicians or lawyers whose education, expert knowledge and international connections were of vital importance. Therefore it is not surprising that many lawyers that were active before 1918, turned into prominent figures in the interwar period, as shown by Mark Cornwall’s research. Croatian lawyers had a sense of importance as ‘guardians of the law’ in their communities. It was perhaps the investigative magistrates and prosecutors who found it hardest to adapt to the new regime. Croatian physicians, studied by Željko Dugac, were mostly educated at the universities in Vienna and Graz. Upon returning to Croatia they founded the areas of specialist professions, occupied university positions after the foundation of the medical school in Zagreb (1917) and enticed the development of social medicine. However, even prominent physicians were sometimes exposed to political pressure; with the introduction of the dictatorship of King Alexander, Andrija Štampar went abroad and became a well-known expert of the Health Organization of the League of Nations.

In general, the post-1918 world encouraged the further development of the women’s movement especially when it comes to the issues of suffrage, education, or women’s organizations. The transition to the Yugoslav state provided opportunity for the movement in Croatia (studied by Ida Ograjšek Gorenjak), for cooperation and contacts across the Yugoslav territory, as well as a better chance for the international activity. The result were several cross-Yugoslav women’s alliances and the transformation of some of the existing

associations (e.g. the Lady's Club - an elite association of Hungarian-oriented women, became the Circle of Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian sisters). However, national and political orientation had an impact on women's associations as well, resulting in the change of names, or breaking up of cooperation.

Generation factor was of importance during the transition. Many of the new leaders belonged to the generation of the *fin-de-siècle*, marked by the modernist movement of 'the Young' (*mladi*), studied by Nikola Tomašević. This formative period of their life marked their views on politics, culture, as well as ideology. Nevertheless, their careers evolved in different directions, and their views changed ranging from integral Yugoslavism to exclusive Croatianhood, but as expected, with many turns. Some members of the *fin de siècle* Croatian modernist movement became major political figures in the interwar period (Stjepan Radić, Svetozar Pribičević), while others achieved illustrious careers in business and state administration (Dušan Plavšić, Franjo Poljak), journalism (Milivoj Dežman, Milan Marjanović), literature (Milutin Cihlar Nehajev) etc. In many of the cases, they used the symbolic capital they had acquired before the war to further their careers in the new Yugoslav state, but in some instances also to criticize the regime for having deviated from the pre-war Yugoslav ideological assumptions.

To conclude with, it seems that our overall findings brought to light many traits of continuity that have so far been marginalised or neglected in historiography, traditionally focused on national and political themes and grand narratives that stress discontinuities. We very much feel that we have opened more questions than we have provided answers, but this is the fate of all historians. We hope that our researches will be carried on by other colleagues, and widened to other segments of elites and to the local level. The next step could then include a synthesis and a comparison with other countries in transition.

Transition is an intermediary period, a hybrid phase characterised by both continuity and discontinuity, the elements of the old and new structures (laws, currencies, institutions, officials...). It therefore does not necessarily present a coherent system, especially not at the operational everyday and local level. When it comes to the transition from the Habsburg Monarchy to the Yugoslav state, it can be said that the immediate transitional period lasted until the 1930s, but it had a different rhythm and dynamics in individual spheres and territories. It was much easier to carry through or even impose political and administrative changes in the centre, than the ones on the local level and in the field of culture or everyday life.

It is possible to pose a question on the very character of the interwar Yugoslav state, namely has it reached a proper stability or was it still in the process of transition? Of course, this dilemma is a part of the interpretative

frame, which is open to discussion and varying viewpoints. However, it is worth pointing out that the interwar Yugoslavia collapsed in 1941 and was not in any form restored after the end of the Second World War. Its legacy was intentionally discarded or marginalised not just by the following regimes, but by many individuals and groups as well. For Croatian-oriented groups 'Yugoslav' equalled 'great Serbian' mostly because of the character of the interwar state. The Yugoslav legacy thus fared no better than the Habsburg one after 1918.

Finally, I would like to thank all the project members and our consultant Pieter M. Judson, who put a lot of effort into following our work and giving us valuable comments and suggestions.

Zagreb, 11 January 2021

Iskra Iveljić

Iskra Iveljić, Zagreb

Noblesse oblige. Nobility in Croatia and Slavonia from the End of the 19th Century until 1945

Nobility in Croatia and Slavonia was heterogeneous and multilayered in social, political, economic and ethnic aspect, just to mention the most important ones. It consisted of magnates and lesser nobility, of old and new nobility of Croatian, German, Hungarian, Serbian, French, even of Irish or Portuguese ethnic origin. The new nobility often rose through administrative or military career (especially in the Military Border with a large percentage of Serbs), later it was plutocracy including Jewish families (e.g. Weiss de Polna, Barons Gutmann de Gelse de Belišće...). There were even major differences between civil Croatia and Slavonia; in the latter landed estates were on average bigger, there were fewer noblemen but more magnates, often of non-Croatian origin.

Elite nobility i.e. magnates (Barons, Counts, Princes) cherished supranational ties (familiar, political, economic, cultural...) Europe-wide, enjoyed a guaranteed seat in the Croatian Diet (*Hrvatski sabor*) and had big landed estates. Petty nobility had small holdings or no holdings at all, so it often moved to towns, and lead a burgher's life, yet it desperately held on to its noble status. Modernisation and national integration forced the nobility to adapt, bringing about further differentiation. A part of nobility took part in the Croatian national movement from its start in the 1830s, more joined later on, yet the nobility remained split in this respect in pro-Croatian, pro-Austrian, pro-Hungarian. The former two options were often combined

especially during the dualistic era when Budapest was considered by many prominent groups in Croatia to be a more dangerous enemy than Vienna. National movements meant adhering to one, national, entity - quite contrary to traditional aristocratic habitus; therefore, modern middle-class intelligentsia had the upper hand in articulating the new concept of national culture and policy.

With the abolishment of feudalism in 1848/49 the nobility lost its traditional privileges and its position as *natio politica*, as well as a portion of its land farmed by peasants, as was the case in the whole Habsburg Monarchy. Thus, it had to undergo a major transition to modern society and capitalism. In late 19th century successful rise of the middle class especially in the economic sphere, lead to the restructuring of aristocracy, which included ennobled middle-class members or previously non-aristocratic noblemen (e.g. the bans Antun Mihalović, Nikola Tomašić). Despite all the challenges, nobility retained its elite status until 1918, old aristocracy constituted the so called first society ("die erste Gesellschaft") - the old elite which enjoyed the right of direct admission to the Viennese Court. It still occupied influential political-administrative posts, namely that of the ban (governor), county prefects (*veliki župani*), Croatian minister in the Hungarian government and and of appointed members of the Croatian Diet (virilists).

The beginning of the twentieth century was marked by a series of crises within and out of the Habsburg Monarchy, which made the South Slav question a contested subject urging some noblemen to be open to a range of political, social and economic options. On the eve of the First World War Croatian and Slavonian nobility was of course loyal to the sovereign and the Monarchy, yet it to some extent started practising strategies of survival cooperating with the middle-classes, with the Serbs, and eventually even with the new Yugoslav regime in Belgrade.

The complex transition into the new state in December of 1918, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, a kingdom without nobility of its own, confronted the former Habsburg nobility with enormous difficulties: violence, the problem of citizenship, the partition of its estates to several new states, the land reform and the agrarian character of the new state. After the fall of the Habsburg Monarchy the nobility was left without its sovereign, and moreover, in a new state it was treated as a potential enemy in almost every aspect (national, political, economic...). In these unstable and demanding circumstances noblemen developed different strategies of survival, depending on their social and economic status, political and national orientation, but often on personal choices. Petty noblemen had been pauperised much before 1918, while land-owning aristocrats were resolved to struggle for their property and their way of life. Even among aristocrats there were different approaches, as a rule the new and pro-Yugoslav nobility before 1918 was more eager to adapt. The Belgrade regime also had at least a

partially differentiated approach to noblemen, preferring the ones who were considered to be of pro-Yugoslav orientation. In spite of these differences, the landed nobility as a whole was very much endangered through land reform that had begun in 1919 but was of a provisional character until the beginning of 1930s, enhancing thus additionally the conflict between peasants, especially the colonists from the so called passive regions or Serbian war veterans, and landed nobility.

Despite above mentioned difficulties many noblemen retained their status as landowners, yet on a smaller scale than before 1918. The communist regime after the end of the Second World War put an end to this. Many noble families, deprived of their land, castles and manors, town palaces, their collections of art works, libraries and even family photographs, decided upon moving to the West. However, some families stayed, and a couple of them even managed to live in their manors.

After the collapse of socialist Yugoslavia and the founding of the independent Croatian state, many noble families either returned to Croatia or established firm relations to it. They were welcomed in the public as a proof of Croatian identity and its pertaining to the European civilization. They founded their association (*Hrvatski plemićki zbor*), some of them held positions in diplomacy and politics, or were active as entrepreneurs. They all were mostly interested in claiming their property back, which the law made possible. This turned to be a very complex process, that is still not over since many of the noble families finally decided upon filing a suit, because they did not get hold of all their expropriated property or were not satisfied with the offered financial compensation. Those who did manage to get their property back, often decided on selling it, but there are other examples as well. Unfortunately, little is known on nobility in post-communist era, the only sources of information are currently the noblemen themselves or articles written by journalists.

Miha Preinfalk, Ljubljana

The Last Three Decades of the Nobility in Slovenia (1918-1948)

Research conducted by Miha Preinfalk had two focuses. The first one was the nobility in Slovenia in the long 19th century until 1918. It consisted of noble families that were of feudal origin and were forced to adapt themselves to new social circumstances in the 19th century, and of new families, ennobled because of their careers in the bureaucracy or in the army. One of the main questions was the national identity of such noble families. The period until 1918 was in the Slovenian territory marked by serious national conflicts between Germans and Slovenes. Members of the new nobility were also very much involved in those conflicts, whereas members of the former feudal nobility tried to avoid them.

On the other hand, Preinfalk's research expanded into the period after the end of the First World War. The "Slovene" nobility of this period has so far been very poorly researched in the Slovene historiography, or to be more precise, only some aspects have been researched, such as e. g. the agrarian reform. The social and cultural aspects were completely ignored. It is important to emphasize the fact that until 1918 the Habsburg nobility underwent more or less equal development within the Habsburg monarchy. After 1918, however, the nobility in each of the newly formed states experienced a specific fate. The nobility, which found itself in the Yugoslav political framework, had the same starting points, although there were some significant differences between that in Slovenia and that in Croatia – particularly concerning the issue of nationality, economic power and political engagement – the nobility in Slovenia found it much more difficult to integrate into Slovene society, had less capital and did not engage in politics.

The biggest problem in the research of nobility in Slovenia in the 20th century is the lack of primary sources. The nobility that remained in Slovenia after 1918 withdrew into the private sphere, and was therefore almost never seen in the public, and the sources that reveal their private life are extremely rare and scarce. It is therefore necessary to make comparisons with other newly founded countries, which is not entirely appropriate, given – as mentioned before – that each of these countries had a specific political and social situation.

Miha Preinfalk's review and analysis of the, mostly non-Slovenian, literature was supplemented with documents from the archives and several interviews with members of the nobility who experienced the interwar situation either personally or had knowledge of it from the family tradition. The research was conducted in archives in Slovenia (Arhiv Republike Slovenije, Zgodovinski arhiv Ljubljana) and Austria (Österreichisches Staatsarchiv in Vienna and Steiermärkisches Landesarchiv in Graz).

Miha Preinfalk and Iskra Iveljić

From the Habsburgs to the Karađorđevićs. The fate of Croatian and Slovenian nobility in the Yugoslav State

Miha Preinfalk and Iskra Iveljić drew a comparison between nobility in Slovenia, and Croatia and Slavonia before and after the Great War. During the Habsburg era similarities included the elite position of aristocracy, its multiculturalism and polyglossy, the characteristic way of life, aristocratic habitus and loyalty to the sovereign. Major differences were: pertaining to different halves of Austria-Hungary, Croatian political autonomy within Hungary and the existence of domestic nobility. Consequently, the Croatian national movement appeared earlier, in the 1830s attracting a part of the

nobility right from the start. The collapse of the Habsburg Monarchy jeopardised the very foundations of nobility and faced Croatian and Slovenian nobility with the demanding transition into the Yugoslav state. In the transition period noblemen in Slovenia, Croatia and Slavonia developed similar strategies of survival. They did not found their associations, like their counterparts in Austria, and they were far less present in the public than before the War. Yet, they cherished personal ties to their extended family and other noble families. In general, noblemen were treated by the new regime as adversaries, especially the ones of foreign origin or enjoying the reputation of „enemies of the people“. The latter were from the late 1918 until the beginning of 1919 often faced with violent outbreaks on their estates. Furthermore, nobility lost its sovereign, its titles, and the Yugoslav land reform deprived the aristocracy of a big portion of its landed estates. As a rule, lesser nobility was forced to adapt, but the landed aristocracy tried to keep up appearances and to preserve its way of life. However, even among its ranks there were different strategies. A part of aristocrats opted for non-Yugoslav citizenship and settled outside of the Yugoslav state, and some chose to do so later, in the 1920s. Yet, a part of old and new aristocrats tried to adapt to the new circumstances, some of them even cherishing good relations with the new regime and thus enjoying a better treatment. Therefore, in spite of all difficulties, a substantial part of noblemen were able to retain their landed estates until the end of the Second World War when the communist regime confiscated their property, forcing many to emigrate to the West.

Žarko Lazarević, Ljubljana

Slovenian economic elite in transition from the Habsburg Monarchy to the Yugoslav state

In the first two years, work was carried out on analyzing the existing literature and collecting material on the transition of the Slovenian economic elites to the Yugoslav state. In third year, the focus was on synthetization of collected and sorted information in form of articles. The basic aim of research was to determine the moments of change and the ways in which the economic elites enter the Yugoslav state. In the conceptual part, the research was based on the thesis that members of economic elites have an exclusive position of controlling and directing investment decisions, financial flows, day to day operations, as well as the very existence of companies. Concentration of economic power or control of the flows of productive wealth gives members of the economic elite great social power. The aim was to analyze continuities or discontinuities in the structure of economic elites, their strategies and practices in the transition period to a new state space. For

that purpose, a representative sample was established in the accordance with the initial conceptual criteria. Especially in the relationship between the new political context and the ethnic origin of members of elites, which was very important in the Slovenian situation.

The work took place in national libraries (Ljubljana, Belgrade) and archives (Ljubljana, Maribor, Celje, Belgrade). The collection of material therefore took place at the local and national levels. At the local level, the process (Celje, Maribor, Ljubljana) of registration and structure of companies in the registers of commercial courts was at the forefront. At the national level, consulting the material of the Ministry of Trade and Industry and the Bureau of Prices and the archive collection of entrepreneur associations, the most important Centrala industrijskih korporacija. On the basis of sparsely preserved records of Centrala industrijskih korporacija (partial) insight into ways of representing the interests of individual members of economic elites or groups at the central government in Belgrade is provided.

To study the economic performance of elites, the printed annual balance sheets of companies in various sources and libraries (Ljubljana, Belgrade) were taken into account. The emphasis was on the monthly publications *Narodno blagostanje*, with appendix on balance sheet (Analize bilansa) and yearly publication Compass. On that basis a collection of balance sheets of companies (over 500) was created in digital form, which could be exported/used for different research questions. The collection is structured by economic branches and regions. This type of collection enables the members of the project team to analyze the efficiency of business and thus the economic performance of economic elites and the connection between their actual economic efficiency and declarative social self-presentation.

Analyses have shown that the study of economic elites in Slovene historiography is insufficiently developed. It was not until the 1980s that more space was opened for the study of entrepreneurship and, in this context, of economic elites. Previously, due to the nature of the political system, the topic was not desirable. Despite the relaxation, the research of economic elites is still in its infancy, both in methodological and substantive terms. The awakened interest in economic elites has resulted in a relatively large number of articles, many times written by non-historians. Individual entrepreneurial destinies were at the forefront, but without the necessary critical consideration as a result.

A detailed review of the literature and collected material showed that in the Slovenian case the ethnic moment was very important. The criteria for defining ethnicity (Slovenes, Germans) were relative, depending on individuals and local conditions, i.e., local social networks and relationships. Despite the uniformity of regulations (agrarian reform or “nostrification”, for example), practices were divergent. And this placed individuals of the same ethnic origin in different positions during the transition period.

The collected material shows that with the transition to the Yugoslav state, a relatively small circle of individuals managed to improve their economic and social situation. They were considered as a “true Slovene elite” and already established as entrepreneurs or businessmen. They relied heavily on mechanisms of political power in consolidating their position and eliminating competition. They were concentrated in important banking joint-stock companies, which were closely integrated into international capital networks through ownership connections. By controlling financial flows, they ranked among the members of the economic elite. There was no break or complete replacement of the elites. The “new Slovene” economic elites quickly found common interest with members of pre-World War I elites. Regardless of ethnic origin (German) of prewar elite, they were with business cooperation “politically incorporated” into the Slovene/Yugoslav economic elite and preserved already established social and economic positions. The Slovenian example shows that the restructuring of economic elites is a long-term process. The transition to the Yugoslav state brought only minor modifications. The prevailing continuity of economic elites was necessary for social and economic stability.

Iskra Iveljić

An attempt at prosopography of the business elite in Croatia from the end of the 19th century until the 1930s

I. Iveljić analysed a group of Croatian elite businessmen that were active before and after 1918. The group is representative since it encompasses individuals of various ethnic origin and confession, industrialists, entrepreneurs, bankers, merchants and as well as ennobled middle-class entrepreneurs that became landowners.

Croatian business elite was relatively successful in the immediate transition period to the mid-1920s. They were often members of economic dynasties established in the second half of the 19th century, who had already diversified their activities by becoming entrepreneurs and increasingly practicing work in the form of modern companies and joint stock companies. They successfully established business connections in the large Austro-Hungarian market and in Croatia they intertwined family-business, almost clientelistic networks. They were important members and officials of professional associations and at the beginning of the 20th century they were engaged in the creation of qualitatively new institutions and associations (National Union of Industrialists, Stock Exchange, the Zagreb Fair). The economic rise meant belonging to the social elite and a sophisticated everyday life that in some families turned into a lavish lifestyle, sometimes with elements of aristocratic culture.

Jews were still strongly represented in the economic elite and internationally connected, as a rule they were great benefactors and engaged in the Jewish community. The economic difficulties faced by businessmen after 1918 were mainly of macroeconomic character and have been more pronounced since the mid-1920s (agrarian crisis, economic depression, the role of central banks and the suppression of private banks ...) which is in line with the economic situation in the country. This does not mean that the Yugoslav regime had no influence on the economic elite, suffice it to recall the structure and operation of the National Bank and the taxation system that was unified only in 1928. In addition, the constant change of governments dominated by Serbian politicians, also affected the economic sphere. As J. Lampe concluded the main problem during the 1920s was the dominance of a political leadership shaped before 1918, and inclined to think in regional terms, and incompatible in their personalities.

Although they represented different political views, elite businessmen mostly tried to adapt to the regime, so former Habsburg barons became Yugoslav unitarians, like Vladimir Turković. Mostly the economic elite was dissatisfied with the political and economic situation, but its goals were not entirely identical to those of the Croatian-oriented parties. Businessmen wanted political stability and redistribution of political power as the primary conditions for unhindered economic development and better representation in central institutions. After all, members of the economic elite must be adaptable and ready to react promptly to economic and political changes. The regime needed a developed Croatian bourgeois economic elite, as opposed to the old noble landowners, whom it tried to suppress and even liquidate with land reform. Therefore, the Croatian economic elite formed before 1918, retained its economic and social status in the Yugoslav state as well.

Žarko Lazarević and Iskra Iveljić

*Economic elites, transition and the interwar Yugoslav state: cases from
Slovenia and Croatia*

Žarko Lazarević and Iskra Iveljić compared the transition of the Slovenian and Croatian economic elites. Croatian businessmen were relatively successful in the immediate transition period to the mid-1920s. In general, the economic elite was dissatisfied with the political and economic situation, but its goals were not entirely identical to those of the Croatian-oriented parties. Businessmen wanted political stability and redistribution of political power as the primary conditions for unhindered economic development and better representation in central institutions. After all, members of the economic elite must be adaptable and ready to react promptly to economic and political changes. The Yugoslav regime needed a developed Croatian bourgeois economic elite, as opposed to the old

noble landowners, whom it tried to suppress and even liquidate with land reform. Therefore, the Croatian economic elite formed before 1918, retained its economic and social status in the Yugoslav state as well.

Slovenian elites were like their Croatian counterparts heterogeneous in terms of wealth, education or ethnic/national identification. Particularly problematic was the latter, which was important in the Slovenian socio-political context before and after 1918. The case of the Vošnjak /Woschnagg family shows that the process of nationalisation of elites was relative, controversial, situational and often ambiguous. This family is an example of successful entrepreneurs who opted for German identification or were identified as non-Slovenes (Germans) due to various criteria, not just political ones. Slovenian political elites, especially in local communities, equated economic performance and the affiliation to the German cultural circle. This in many ways explains the intervention into the ownership structure after 1918 in Slovenia. These measures were based on the concept of the "Slovenian national question" and/or "the Slovenian national (economic) interest". Immediately after 1918 party-political structures pursued a policy of "independence". The foundation of the Yugoslav state was only a precondition for the process of bringing "ethnic" structure of economic ownership in line with the political reality. The standpoint was simple: Slovenes in the Habsburg Monarchy were subordinate not only politically but also economically and prominent members of the pre-war economic elites mostly identified themselves with the German culture (Tönnies, Woschnagg). Therefore, Slovenian politicians were convinced that the political independence, that the Yugoslav state was supposed to bring, must result in the "ethnization/Slovenization" of the economy. This was followed by the control of ownership changes (sequestration) in the first phase and by the possibility of taking over "foreign" companies (nostrification) in the second.

Although the starting point was politically clear, the implementation practices were much more complex and contradictory depending largely on local conditions and capital groups, whose interest had to be in tune with the dominant political groups. Thus, the nostrification was also an opportunity to partially replace members of economic elites. Members of pre-war economic elites have been exposed to the risk of partial expropriation (land reform, nostrification), as the Tönnies family and many other companies show. This risk, which may have been the political, personal or partial interest of individual business groups, existed for only a few years after the establishment of new authorities. Subsequently, members of the prewar economic elites were incorporated into newly created or existing capital interest networks, that were formed around the most important banks. It should be emphasised, that the intention of political elites was never to completely replace the pre-war economic elites. They were satisfied with the control of capital flows, which was achieved by the "nostrification" of banking sector.

Presented entrepreneurial families and businessmen had been before the First World War connected to Croatian elites through capital, trade or industrial networks, even through marriages, as the Tönnies or Tykač examples show. Economic cooperation followed the political cooperation of Slovenian and Croatian political elites towards the end of the 19th century. The mere transition did not, therefore, mark a major turning point, as economic cooperation only intensified. At the time the Slovene side was entering the Yugoslav space through Croatia, and many times economic cooperation with Croatia was already recognised as a Yugoslav dimension.

Mark Cornwall, Southampton

The Rise and Fall of Croatian Lawyers in the Habsburg and Yugoslav State Frameworks

There is little historiography on the subject of Croatian lawyers in the early twentieth century (see bibliography I supplied), even though they played a key role at the local and national level in terms of their social and political influence. There are however some memoirs and biographies of key individuals (Hinković, Politeo, Potočnjak). There are also some general histories of ‘Yugoslav’ lawyers (e.g. *Istorija Jugoslovenske Advokature*, Belgrade 2000: with a very Serb focus), and a few studies on the mindsets of lawyers (e.g. by the Novi Sad lawyer Milorad Botić: *Advokatura. Ogledi i eseji*, 1991). Particularly useful so far have been the personal papers of two lawyers, discovered in the Zagreb archives: Radivoj Walter, who was very involved in the professional organization of Croatian lawyers from 1913 onwards; Dušan Popović, a Serb lawyer and politician, whose has left a fragmentary archive from his Zagreb legal office. In addition, in Belgrade, the *Arhiv Jugoslavije* produced much material about how Croatian lawyers were actively involved in creating the new Yugoslav penal code in the 1930s; about disputes over legal training after 1918; about the creation of a new lawyers’ code for Croatia (to replace that of 1852!).

The main research findings are that most Croatian lawyers (in Croatia-Slavonia, compared to Dalmatia) were not professionally organized until 1913, when after an initiative in Osijek, lawyers in Zagreb too started to act. This professional organization – which lasted through into Yugoslavia – gave Croatian lawyers a certain strength and confidence in facing the new government in Belgrade after 1918, and in affirming their own professional continuity through the transition of regimes. In the same way, the very nature of Croatian law – *sui generis* in Austria-Hungary – provided lawyers in Croatia with a sense of their own importance: not so much as national representatives, but as ‘guardians of the law’ in their communities. This, too, many were determined to defend when

they entered the Yugoslav state (i.e the law above all was their focus and mindset).

Some of the most public lawyers defended clients in very public trials both in the late Habsburg era and in the Kingdom of SHS. For them the experience of a failed *Rechtsstaat* (Austria) was crucial in shaping their mindset of fighting injustice. Some of them like Hinko Hinković fled abroad in WW1 but returned to continue their defence work in Yugoslavia (e.g. defending Stjepan Radić at his 1920 trial). Some lawyers who were active politically against the Habsburg state before 1914 went further and proceeded to fully embrace the Yugoslav state after 1918, rising to elite positions: e.g. Edo Lukinić as Minister of Justice 1924-25 (he had a legal office in Karlovac).

In the Croatian judicial system, it was perhaps the *investigative magistrates and prosecutors* who found it hardest to make the adjustment into Yugoslavia. This needs further research, and the supreme prosecutor Viktor Aleksander is an example of someone who did manage to survive and prosper under both regimes. However, he seems to be an exception. Milan Accurti (notorious prosecutor in the 1909 Zagreb treason trial) took early retirement in 1918 but was accused a few years later of being a fifth-columnist for Hungary. The very nature of these elite lawyers' occupation – as Habsburg state officials – made them vulnerable to dismissal after 1918 but we need more evidence on their fate. A prosopographical survey of Croatian lawyers will be very useful, and is partly possible since I have discovered lists of some lawyers from 1914 and 1930. The latter shows that in 1930, 27% of Croatian lawyers had been trained before 1914. This does not suggest a mass purge in 1918. Rather, much evidence suggests that 1918 was not a watershed for Croatian lawyers – many continued their legal practices (e.g. Walter, Popović) across the transition of regimes. They may have been disrupted to some degree by the Yugoslav emergency rule of 1918-1920, but this needs further research. The main caesura probably came in 1930 when the new Yugoslav penal code was introduced and required their attention.

The prosopographical survey can also highlight how generational issues influenced the fate of lawyers. Ivo Politeo for example was not really active until after the war, while Radivoj Walter maintained the same legal office in Zagreb from 1913 to 1961. Besides Zagreb, certain towns are worth investigating further as legal centres with influence: especially Osijek, Bjelovar, Karlovac, since influential lawyers were based there. The main sources here are newspapers but also legal journals which were continuously being published through these decades. In view of the special sense of status of lawyers from Croatia-Slavonia (spatially and in their training), it may be decided in this case study to omit Dalmatia which had a different trajectory after the 1860s. The material discovered for Croatia-Slavonia is also sufficient and compact enough to make reliable comparisons across the transition of regimes.

Boženja Vranješ-Šoljan, Zagreb

The transition of the Croatian administrative elite to the Yugoslav state

The research of the topic of the administrative elite was conducted through two time series. The first analyzes the position of the administrative elite within the liberal society of Croatia at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, until the end of 1918. The second focused on the analysis of the transition process that this elite went through after the First World War and the entry of Croatian lands into the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (Kingdom of Yugoslavia) until the mid-1920s.

At the center of the research were the great prefects who, according to their social structure, traditionally represented the top layer of the administrative elite. They managed to keep their elite status almost intact until the completion of the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The great prefects, who as a rule were members of the nobility, represented institutions that were considered an important pillar of state sovereignty. In this respect, a parallel can be drawn with Hungary, as well as other countries of Central and Eastern Europe, in which the nobility were members of parliament or other important political institutions.

A comparative approach examines the context of the transition of the administrative elite from Croatia in the 1920s (while it was part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy) to the newly formed Yugoslav state. After the adoption of the 1921 Constitution, the administrative elite was affected by changes at the institutional, regional-administrative, ideological, worldview, and cultural levels. They were, among other things, a consequence of the restrictions on parliamentarism that sought to create a new administrative elite in the Yugoslav state.

The research has established that the majority of members of the administrative elite from Croatia were pushed to the sidelines of political decision-making in the new state. This is because the goal of the changes was to strengthen the position of the governing structures in the unitary state. Therefore, only a small part of the members of the Croatian administrative elite were acceptable to the new authorities. Analysis of case studies in this work has found that the newly appointed great prefects became obedient administrative officials – fierce implementers of the centralization and unitarization of the new state. As such, they served the authorities to oversee the implementation of that policy. The new administrative elite in the first years of the 1920s no longer bore any resemblance to the administrative elite of the period when Croatia was part of the Habsburg Monarchy.

This research has created the initial foundations for further, in-depth and comprehensive research over a longer period of time of the Croatian administrative elite in the newly formed state.

Ida Ograjšek Gorenjak, Zagreb

Croatian women's associations in transition

Since the 19th century, women's societies and associations have gathered members of the social, economic, and/or intellectual elite and have promoted diverse range of humanitarian, national, religious, professional and gender goals. Democratization, globalization, geo-political changes followed by redefinition of social and economic elites, shift in the status of women and the evolution of the women's movement have influenced the transformation of goals, organization, structure of membership and number of women's societies both in the world and in Croatia.

It is necessary to identify continuities and discontinuities of women's organizations in Croatia during the first half of the 20th century and study the activities of *National Ladies' Association for the Education and Earnings of Women in Croatia and Slavonia*, the *Teachers' Association*, *Croatian Women*, Croatian associations and members within the *Yugoslav Women's Alliance*, the *Association of University Educated Women* and the *Alliance of Women's Movements*. The focus of the research was on the impact of the democratization, nationalization and women's movement on the growth and operation of women's associations.

The democratic upheaval caused the establishment or dissolution of various women's associations, or at least it changed the structure of their members, organization, and goals. For example, it induced the transformation of the Lady's Club from an elite association that brought together Hungarian-oriented women to the Circle of SHS sisters, a society with a more democratic admission procedure and a pro-Yugoslav political stand. The introduction of universal suffrage, also, raised the issue of women's suffrage, consequently presenting a common ground for building bridges between various women's associations in Yugoslavia. The change in political framework had a great impact on the development and operation of the women's movement. On the one hand, it provided a greater opportunity for cooperation, exchange of experiences and contacts between members of different parts of Yugoslavia, and the international activity of the Yugoslav women's movement opened new opportunities for women's organizations and their members. Several cross-Yugoslav women's alliances were established, such as Yugoslav Women's Alliance, the Association of University Educated Women or the Alliance of Women's Movements. All of

them participated in international women's alliances (International Council of Women, International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, International Federation of University Women etc.) but they also initiated the creation of a women's regional social network (Little Entente of Women, Slavic Women's Committee and various contacts between Balkan women at the beginning of 1930s.). On the other hand, women's associations were not immune to inter-ethnic conflicts within Yugoslavia. At some point, most associations had to take a stand on political events, which often led to a change of name, termination of cooperation, outflow of members or change of status of certain organizations. Finally, the work of women's associations was influenced by the development and growing popularity of the women's movement and the new possibilities for women. The new constitution removed old legal barriers to women's education and employment, and the universal concept of modern "new women" favored the idea of active, educated, informed women, engaged in all aspects of their society. As a result, professional associations flourished, and women intellectuals began to replace members of the social elite in leading positions in various women's organizations.

Željko Dugac, Zagreb

Transfer of knowledge and changes in status: Croatian physicians in transition

During the project Ž. Dugac conducted research in the following archives: Archive of Yugoslavia in Belgrade on the public health work of Dr. Andrija Štampar; University archive in Vienna and the Institute for the history of medicine - Josephinum University of Vienna in order to collect data on Dr. Andrija Štampar, Dr. Julius Tandler, Dr. Miroslav Čačković and Dr. Dragutin Mašek, and University archive in Graz on documents connected with Dr. Teodor Wickerhauser.

All researched physicians were Austrian students, mostly Viennese. After graduating from college, they gradually took important positions in Croatia and shaped the areas of certain specialist professions, as well as achieving university positions. As much as possible, they participated in the founding of the medical school in Zagreb in 1918 in which they took leading positions. Of course, there were certain differences between them and some, such as Andrija Štampar, were in a specific situation. Štampar, as the most publicly exposed Croatian physician, experienced turbulence in his professional life. For example, upon the introduction of the dictatorship of King Alexander, Štampar interrupted his professional work in the country and went abroad. In the end, this proved to be a decision that brought him exceptional career progress, since he achieved a

significant international reputation which, upon his return to Yugoslavia, represented an excellent symbolic capital.

Ž. Dugac methodologically relied on the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's theoretical observations whose concepts of scientific fields, autonomy, and symbolic capital best sustained the processes observed while researching these elite figures. The medical elites, with their education, administrative position and competencies established fields of activity and finally the institutions over which they extended their authority, managed to maintain the continuity through two wars and the transition between three socio-political systems.

The research confirmed that the example of prominent doctors and scientists who worked through three political systems in Croatia can be seen in all the determinants set by Pierre Bourdieu by observing the medical craft, autonomy and access rights, scientific capital and scientific positions within scientific fields.

At the same time, it is clear that the transformation of social systems has not produced significant turbulence for physicians and their scientific and administrative positions. The same can be said for the continuity in the development of professional and institutional frameworks.

Nikola Tomašegović, Zagreb

The modernist Movement of 'the Young' in Croatian politics and culture at the turn of the 20th century

The main topic of research I focused on as part of the research project is the modernist Movement of 'the Young' in Croatian politics and culture at the turn of the 20th century, which is also the topic of my PhD dissertation. Although chronologically located at the *fin de siècle*, this movement is often cited as playing a pivotal role for the development of Croatian culture and politics in the first decades of the 20th century. Because of this, I have focused on the intellectual formation of a generation that is going to have a profound influence on Croatian cultural and political development, including its transition to the Yugoslav state. Theoretically, I have framed my research on two axes. The first is diachronic in nature and deals with the question of continuities and discontinuities with established political and cultural notions and practices dominant in Croatian public and political life at the time. The second is synchronic and investigates the ways in which historical actors – adherents and activists of the Croatian modernist movement – transferred and appropriated

ideas and practices stemming from other European modernist movements of the time, especially in Vienna and Prague. This aspect of the research owes primarily to the theoretical and methodological impetuses put forward by transnational and entangled history, thus enriching and expanding the more nationally-oriented perspective inherent to the first, diachronic axis.

On October 16, during the Emperor's visit to Zagreb, a group of students from the University of Zagreb staged a demonstration on Ban Jelačić Square in which they hailed Franz Joseph as the Croatian king and burned the Hungarian flag in sign of protest against ban Khuen's regime and Croatia's subdualistic arrangement within the Monarchy. This event also represented a protest of the youth against the passivity and impotence of the Croatian opposition. In historiographical literature it is often cited as the beginning of the so-called Progressive Youth Movement. In reality, though, the students who carried out this demonstration made up a very heterogeneous group and had no intention of making it a public announcement of a new political project or party. Only what followed triggered the events that would lead to the emergence of the full-fledged Youth Movement. The students had to face the consequences of their actions. Some of them were jailed, but almost all of them were simply expelled from the University of Zagreb, which entailed a prohibition to enroll in any of the Transleithenian universities. As a consequence, the expelled Croatian students continued their studies at Cisleithenian universities, mostly in Vienna and Prague.

The universities in Prague and Vienna, as well as in Graz, had already been established as popular destinations for students from all over Croatia. The difference with the student emigration that started to arrive at these universities in 1896 is that they carried with themselves a symbolic capital in the eyes of the public and were already invested in politics. By reading their letters, we can see that they were consciously building a movement that should carry out the mission of changing Croatian culture, society and politics. This movement, comprised of student and youth groups in Prague, Vienna, Graz, Zagreb, Osijek and Karlovac came to be known as the Movement of 'the Young' (*mladi*) or the Progressive Youth Movement (*napredna omladina*). In historiographical literature we can find heuristic divisions of the Movement in the so-called Prague and Vienna groups, and sometimes the separate Zagreb group. The Prague and Zagreb groups were supposedly more invested in politics and social questions, the latter also focusing more on the question of nationhood and Serbo-Croat relations, while the Vienna group concentrated on literature and art, drawing heavy influences from *fin de siècle* Viennese cultural developments. This division can, however, somewhat obscure the reality of the united and interconnected functioning of these groups as part of the Youth Movement in general. Thus, we have to focus on the Movement in its entirety when examining its distinctive ideological and political positions and practice.

Even though the centers of the formation of the Youth Movement were abroad, they had to ideologically position themselves according to the current political and cultural situation in Croatia. The students in Prague were especially fascinated with what they had seen and heard. They were impressed with the successes of Czech national politics and were ardent admirers of Masaryk's thought, proclaiming themselves "political realists". Yet at the same time they were very well aware that Croatia was not as near as developed as the Czech lands and that they would have to adapt the ideas they appropriated to the current needs and situation of their homeland. When Yugoslavism was concerned, we could say that the Youth tried to change its character from a historicist and romanticist into a modernist one. The *mladi* saw themselves as the true successors of the Illyrian project and as rejuvenators of Croatian politics and Yugoslav ideology, acutely in the form of Serbo-Croat national unity. Yet this rejuvenation was not a simple imitation. The very problem they identified with Croatian culture and politics is that it was not up to date with current developments in modern Europe. Therefore, there can be no return to old forms. The forces of tradition had to be brought into conjunction with the present needs and practices. The 'Illyrians' knew that and their movement was an integral part of the all-European romanticist-national movements. Their current successors blindly perpetuated that tradition and had closed themselves off inside provincial boundaries, ignoring the great changes that were happening elsewhere. It is now up to the *mladi* to bring Croatia back up to date, to rejuvenate Croatian politics and Yugoslavism as its main ideological moving force.

We can trace the same notions in literature as in politics. The beginning of the Croatian modernist movement in literature can be attributed to the before mentioned Vienna group of the Modernist Movement which published their ideas and texts in three successive journals titled *Youth*, *The Croatian Salon* and *Life*. Emulating the Viennese Secession, they called for complete artistic freedom, criticized the political instrumentalization of art and proclaimed the need for the incorporation of Croatian literature into modern European artistic trends. Not all of the Movement agreed, though. Especially those members that were close to the Prague group emphasized that art should continue to play a national role and that the turn to Europe should not mean a blind imitation, but an inspiration to create high-quality literature rooted in national traditions.

The rejuvenation of Yugoslavism at the turn of the century is thus visible both in the political ideology and the literary criticism of the Croatian Modernist Movement. In both spheres, notions of youth and nature played significant roles. Both in culture and in politics, a new generation, uncompromised and full of energy, in sync with their own age and needs, should carry out the mission of leading the Croatian national movement back into its own tracks. The rejuvenated Yugoslavism was to be based on the life of the common people, on vitalistic concepts of Slavic life energy and natural right, as opposed to historic state right and elitist politics of the old elites. This ideology thus represented a

specific iteration of common European *fin de siècle* modernist trends. Although one should not overstate its immediate practical implications, it was undoubtedly of enormous importance in the long run. By recontextualizing and reinvigorating Yugoslavism both as ideology and as a *Realpolitik*, it helped maintain its role as the main driving force of Croatian politics in the century to come.

The other area of research I have conducted as part of the research project is the various usages of ideology by historical actors in the processes of transition. For this purpose, I chose a case study of two Croatian historians in transition from the Habsburg Monarchy to Yugoslavia – Ferdo Šišić and Gavro Manojlović. Both Šišić and Manojlović belonged to the Croatian intellectual elite embedded in the Yugoslav ideology. This elite had been dominant in Croatian cultural and scientific institutions of the second half of the 19th century (such as the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts, the *Matica hrvatska*, in large part the University of Zagreb etc.), but its grip on political power was not so strong and depended on broader circumstances. Because of this, the professionalization and the institutionalization of Croatian historiography was closely intertwined with Yugoslavism and the historians of this tradition formed the mainstream of Croatian historiography. The political role of this mainstream was to legitimize the claims for Croatian autonomy inside Austria-Hungary, as well as to construct historical narratives to support nation-building processes. The other major characteristic of this historiography is its theoretical and methodological affiliation with romanticist idealism and historicism (the ‘Rankean school’). In conjunction, these characteristics resulted in the important position of historiography and historians in nation-building and state-building processes, both before and after 1918. The aim of case study was to explore the usages of pre-war Yugoslavism in the new Yugoslav state, apart from the more common interest in the ideological relationship of pre-1918 and post-1918 Yugoslavism. The central question of the research was: how did historical actors use their pre-war Yugoslav loyalties in the new Yugoslav state?

The research showed that there is no direct correlation between pre-war Yugoslav loyalties and the opinions and positions of actors in the new state. The political positioning in the new state thus depended more on particular interest, whether personal or corporate, than on previously held ideological assumptions. Pre-war Yugoslav loyalties could be used to solidify one’s position with the new regime (Šišić), but they could also be employed as strategies of defying the pretensions of the government and of advocating different state policies, e.g., anti-centralism and anti-unitarism (Manojlović). It therefore constituted a symbolic capital that could be used in different ways in various political contexts. On the other hand, their formation within the Hegelian-Rankean idealist and historicist tradition was crucial for their fundamental assumptions about the role of historiography within the new state and their understanding of the nature of historical narratives. Therefore, the historians’ intellectual

formation represented a continuity in both the theory and practice of their history-writing in the new context.

Branimir Janković, Zagreb

Historians and university professors in transition

B. Janković primarily researched historians and university history professors as members of the social elite and their transition from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy into the new Yugoslav state. Although emphasis is put on the Croatian elite in the project, I tried to take into account not only Croatian, but also Serbian and Slovene historians and their interactions. In that way I tried to step out of the framework of Croatian historiography and to include a transnational perspective. Because of that he focused both on historians and university professors who themselves crossed national borders during the transition. I therefore followed the mobility of historians and university history professors who moved between Ljubljana, Zagreb, Sarajevo, Belgrade and Skopje in the new Yugoslav state. Some of these historians are Milko Kos, Ljudmil Hauptmann, Nikola Radojčić, Viktor Novak, Josip Matasović, Grga Novak and others.

Although Croatian, Serbian and Slovene historians had continuously attended universities of Central and Southeast Europe even in the 19th century, during the Habsburg Monarchy, their mobility was especially strong in the newly founded Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and it occurred mainly within the new state. The new employment policy at universities enabled this, which strongly preferred historians who were pro-Yugoslav – as opposed to oppositional historians who supported, for example, Croatian nationalism – and in that way it influenced the formation of the new university elite in Yugoslavia. One of the criteria for employment were the attitudes towards the unification of the South Slavic peoples which historians expressed during the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy or after the founding of the Yugoslav state. This employment policy was researched through official documents of the Ministry of Education of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, university archives and the correspondences between Croatian, Serbian and Slovene historians (Ferdo Šišić, Viktor Novak, Stanoje Stanojević, Milko Kos, etc.).

The research focused on the representatives of the pro-Yugoslav university elite and on those Croatian, Serbian and Slovene historians who published books and articles on Yugoslav history and the idea of Yugoslavism, such as Ferdo Šišić, Vladimir Čorović, Milko Kos, Nikola Radojčić and others. Despite the focus being on pro-Yugoslav historians, Janković also included oppositional historians who were close to Croatian nationalism or who were opposed to the Yugoslav monarchical regime such as Ivo Pilar, Milan Šufflay and Rudolf

Horvat. The former spoke of that which bound the Yugoslav peoples together, and the latter of their irreconcilable differences, especially between Croats and Serbs.

In Croatian historiography the main focus is put on historians who were opposed to the Yugoslav state (Ivo Pilar, Milan Šufflay, Rudolf Horvat) as opposed to historians who were pro-Yugoslav (Ferdo Šišić, Gavro Manojlović). Besides that, all the historiographies in post-Yugoslav countries are mainly interested in their own national historians and do not include other historians of that time, so Janković framed his research contrary to that. He tried to put the research into the context of wider international literature, such as the works of Pieter Troch *Nationalism and Yugoslavia: Education, Yugoslavism and the Balkans Before World War II* (2015) and Jan Surman *Universities in Imperial Austria 1848–1918: A Social History of a Multilingual Space* (2019).

In doing so Janković was interested in the question of the continuities and discontinuities which occurred during the transition from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy into Yugoslavia, which he followed through examples of different educational traditions and the unification of education laws, curricula and history textbooks, the employment policy at universities and the mobility of university professors. Continuities and discontinuities are visible both in university institutions and personally. The new Yugoslav state relied on the already existing universities and their staffs as the heritage of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, but it also founded new faculties and universities and it employed new professors. The mobility of the students and university professors also existed, of course, during the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, but now it became more intense precisely within the new Yugoslav state.

Serbian historians came to work at the University of Ljubljana, Slovene historians at the University of Belgrade and University of Zagreb, and Croatian historians at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Skopje. Thus, Serbian historian Nikola Radojčić came to Ljubljana, Slovene historian Milko Kos to Belgrade and Zagreb, Slovene historian Ljudmil Hauptmann to Zagreb and Croatian historians Josip Matasović, Grga Novak and Milan Prelog to Skopje. Janković believes that the professors who circulated between Ljubljana, Zagreb, Belgrade, Sarajevo and Skopje connected not only the heterogeneous academic space but also the nationally heterogeneous space of the new Yugoslav state. Of course, at the level of social elites.

The arrival of numerous Russian émigrés to interwar Yugoslavia represents a discontinuity in comparison to the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. They were employed at universities from Ljubljana to Zagreb, Belgrade and Skopje. Aleksije Jelačić can definitely be pointed out among historians. The spread of communist ideas in interwar Yugoslavia, which the police strictly monitored also represents a discontinuity, but there were generally no supporters of these ideas among historians. Janković especially focused on the period of the dictatorship of King Alexander in 1929 as an important discontinuity and a

special challenge for historians, university history professors and publishers of historical literature.

It can be concluded that the transition from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy to Yugoslavia was a comprehensive change which encompassed numerous areas of social life, among them also institutions, such as universities. The transition was mostly successful for pro-Yugoslav historians and was not successful for oppositional historians who were close to Croatian nationalism. The former continued their successful careers at universities (Ferdo Šišić), while others did not (Milan Šufflay was first imprisoned, and then killed during the dictatorship). Publishers of historical literature were included in the research of the final stage of the project. As members of the social elite historians, university professors and publisher were directly connected through their professions, and there are almost no works which deal with the transition of publishers from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy into Yugoslavia. Janković researched historians, university professors and publishers in the following archives: the Archives of Yugoslavia in Belgrade (*Arhiv Jugoslavije u Beogradu*), the University of Ljubljana Historical Archives and Museum (*Zgodovinski arhiv in muzej Univerze v Ljubljani*), the Sarajevo Historical Archives (*Historijski arhiv Sarajevo*), the State Archives in Osijek (*Državni arhiv u Osijeku*). He used the library of the Central European University in Budapest for the methodological framework and wider scope of literature for the research.

After the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, the publishers first had to adapt to the circumstances in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. During the transition from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy into the new Yugoslav state some publishers fought to keep their monopolistic position. The majority of other publishers had to face competition and the increase of the number of publishers in interwar Yugoslavia. The first years after the First World War were mostly successful for publishers who published and sold more books than before. But during the Great Depression of the 1920s and 1930s circumstances grew worse for publishers.

In the interwar period, the publishing business was often a family business which was passed down from fathers to sons (e.g. the publishing house Kugli in Zagreb, etc.). Because of that numerous publishers kept a continuity from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy into Yugoslavia. Some of them achieved their greatest success precisely in the new state (e.g. Geca Kon from Belgrade, etc.). Of course, many publishers just started their businesses during interwar Yugoslavia. The publishing business was mostly a family business, but after the First World War bigger companies and joint-stock companies began to emerge. The dictatorship of King Alexander brought about a strong control over history, education and publishing at the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s. Although political control and repression existed also in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and in the newly founded Yugoslav state, the dictatorships of the first half of the 20th century strove for an even stronger control. In that sense, the

dictatorship represents a large discontinuity in comparison to the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and a great challenge in terms of adapting to it for historians, university professors and publishers. The dictatorship of King Alexander was the first dictatorship in the Yugoslav area, and many professors, historians and publishers lived through several dictatorships in the middle of the 20th century.

The dictatorship of King Alexander had grave consequences for many of them, which is especially true for historian Milan Šufflay who was killed in 1931. The control over history during the dictatorship in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia encompassed the politics of history, the education system, history textbooks and the activities of historians and publishers of historical literature. Publishers, as well as historians and university professors, supported certain political agendas and participated in political conflicts of that time. It should be emphasized that the existing literature on publishers in interwar Yugoslavia does not analyse the fate of publishers and the publishing business during the dictatorship.

Conflicts in interwar Yugoslavia, in which historians, university history professors and publishers of historical literature were involved mostly revolved around the concept of the Yugoslav state (monarchism or republicanism, centralism or federalism). Inter-ethnic conflicts were also at stake (especially between Croats and Serbs) and conflicts around the adoption or rejection of the idea of the integral Yugoslav nation during the dictatorship of King Alexander. A continuous conflict revolved around whether supranational Yugoslav identity should be given precedence as opposed to particular national identities. Along with the national question, the social question was also present. This especially refers to the fight against the communist movement and the spread of communist ideas. Historians were much less present in that context, as opposed to publishers in interwar Yugoslavia.

In any case, the dictatorship of King Alexander was a great challenge for historians, university history professors, publishers of historical literature and for their adaptation to the ever-changing circumstances in interwar Yugoslavia. Having that in mind, we can speak of a long transition from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy into the new Yugoslav state.