

International conference

TRANSITIONS OUT OF EMPIRE IN CENTRAL AND SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE



University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Zagreb

23-24 September 2020

International conference

**TRANSITIONS OUT OF EMPIRE IN
CENTRAL AND SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE**

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Zagreb, 23-24 September 2020



Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Zagreb



Publisher:

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb
FF press



For the publisher:

Miljenko Šimpraga, acting dean

International conference

Transitions out of Empire in Central and Southeastern Europe

Organising committee

Mark Cornwall (Southampton), Iskra Iveljić (Zagreb),
Branimir Janković (Zagreb), Pieter Judson (Florence),
Žarko Lazarević (Ljubljana), Nikola Tomašegović (Zagreb)

Editor:

Iskra Iveljić

Graphic design:

Boris Bui

Computer layout:

Ivanka Cokol

Circulation:

100 copies

Printed by:

Kolor klinika d.o.o., Zagreb

ISBN 978-953-175-875-8

**TRANSITIONS OUT OF EMPIRE IN
CENTRAL AND SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE**

INTRODUCTION

The Fall of the Berlin Wall marked the beginning of complex transitions in the countries of the former Eastern Bloc and Yugoslavia, which led not just to the change of the regime, but also to the collapse of multiethnic countries and the founding of new national states. In this respect, the post-communist era in Eastern and Central Europe echoed the one after the First World War, encouraging many scholars to rethink the transitions out of empires after 1917/1918. In the case of the Habsburg Monarchy, recent studies offer reinterpretations of both the transition out of empire and also of specific Habsburg legacies and practices that remained influential in the region long after 1918.

In an attempt to shed more light on both of these aspects, we have organised an international conference in Zagreb. The aim is to present papers on all aspects of the transition out of empire, on continuities and breaks among social elites, state institutions, administrative practices, legal codes, forms of citizenship, gender regimes, and welfare practices covering the period until the late 1930s. The conference is a part of the Croatian Science Foundation Project: *The Transition of Croatian Elites from the Habsburg Monarchy to the Yugoslav State* (<https://croelite.ffzg.unizg.hr/>) and is co-financed by the History department and the doctoral programme of Modern and Contemporary Croatian History in European and World Context of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb.

Due to the epidemiological situation, some participants will take part via video conference.

Iskra Iveljić, on behalf of the Organising committee
Professor of Modern Croatian History
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Zagreb



Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Zagreb



TRANSITIONS OUT OF EMPIRE IN CENTRAL AND SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Zagreb, 23-24 September 2020
Conference programme

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Hall VII Wednesday, 23 September 2020

9.30 – 9.50 Conference opening

9.50 – 10.20 **Keynote lecture:** Pieter JUDSON (Florence), Did Empire End?
Central and Southeastern Europe after the First World War

10.20 – 10.30 Coffee break

Panel 1: Transitional Continuities and Discontinuities: Old Legacy and New Paths

Chair: Iskra Iveljić (Zagreb)

10.30 – 10.50 Lothar HÖBELT (Vienna), The Austrian District Governors:
Continuity or Change of Guard?

10.50 – 11.10 Jana OSTERKAMP (Munich), The Federal Legacy of the
Habsburg Empire after 1918

11.10 – 11.30 Pál HATOS (Budapest), Revolutionary Aftermath? Hungary
after the First World War

11.30 – 12.00 Discussion

12.00 – 12.20 Coffee break

Panel 2: Lawyers in the Political and Social Spheres

Chair: Gábor Egry (Budapest)

12.20 – 12.40 Franz ADLGASSER (Vienna), Lawyers and Politics – Jurists in the Old Austrian Parliament

12.40 – 13.00 Mark CORNWALL (Southampton), The Rise and Fall of Croatian Lawyers in the Habsburg and Yugoslav State Frameworks

13.00 – 13.20 Discussion

13.20 – 14.40 Lunch

Panel 3: Administrative Elite – the Backbone of the Regime?

Chair: Branimir Janković (Zagreb)

14.40 – 15.00 Gábor EGRY (Budapest), The Empire that Kept Greater Romania Alive? Imperial Continuities and Differentiated Rule in Romania, 1919-1940

15.00 – 15.20 Rok STERGAR (Ljubljana), “We Hesitated with the Purge of Non-Native Judges and Officials”: Post-1918 Slovene Public Administration between Nationalist Militancy and Pragmatic Solutions

15.20 – 15.40 Discussion

15.40 – 16.00 Coffee break

Panel 4: War Veterans and Postwar Violence

Chair: Ida Ogrišek Gorenjak (Zagreb)

16.00 – 16.20 Ljiljana DOBROVŠAK, Ivana ŽEBEC ŠILJ (Zagreb), The Croatian World War One Veterans between Two Monarchies

16.20 – 16.40 Ota KONRÁD (Prague), Post-War Violence in Czechoslovakia

16.40 – 17.00 Discussion

19.00 Conference dinner

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Hall VII
Thursday, 24 September 2020

Panel 5: The Fate of the Nobility

Chair: Ivo Goldstein (Zagreb)

9.30 – 9.50 Klaus BUCHENAU (Regensburg), The Nationalisation and Restitution of the Thurn und Taxis Forests in Croatia (1919-1941). A Case Study on the Interplay of National, Post-Imperial and Criminal Elite Networks

9.50 – 10.10 Miha PREINFALK (Ljubljana), The Last Three Decades of the Nobility in Slovenia (1918-1948)

10.10 – 10.30 Iskra IVELJIĆ (Zagreb), Noblesse Oblige. Nobility in Croatia and Slavonia from the End of the 19th Century until 1945

10.30 – 10.50 Discussion

10.50 – 11.10 Coffee break

Panel 6: Aspects of the Transition to the Yugoslav State 1

Chair: Klaus Buchenau (Regensburg)

11.10 – 11.30 Peter VODOPIVEC (Ljubljana), About the Continuity and Discontinuity of Slovene Political Elites and their Political Practices in the First Yugoslavia

11.30 – 11.50 Ivo GOLDSTEIN (Zagreb), 1918 in Croatia: Revolution or Evolution

11.50 – 12.10 Marijan BOBINAC (Zagreb), How the Croatian Elites Switched over from the Habsburg Empire to the South Slav Kingdom in a Drunken Night of November 1918: On an Autobiographical Essay of Miroslav Krleža

12.10 – 12.30 Ida OGRAJŠEK GORENJAK (Zagreb), Croatian Women's Associations in Transition

12.30 – 12.50 Discussion

12.50 – 14.10 Lunch

Panel 7: Aspects of the Transition to the Yugoslav and Czechoslovakian States

Chair: Vedran Duančić (Zagreb)

14.10 – 14.30 Žarko LAZAREVIĆ (Ljubljana), Economic Elites, Transition and Yugoslavia (Cases from Slovenia and Croatia)

14.30 – 14.50 Ivan JELIČIĆ (Rijeka/Budapest), Persistence, Reconfiguration, and Exclusion, the Political Elites in Fiume/Rijeka and Liburnia from Austria-Hungary to Italy

14.50 – 15.10 Jernej KOSI (Ljubljana), Local Elites in Prekmurje after 1919: Continuities and Ruptures

15.10 – 15.30 Róbert ARPÁŠ, Adriana KIČKOVÁ (Nitra), From a Multi-Ethnic Monarchy to National States? The Idea of a National State in Interwar Czechoslovakia

15.30 – 15.50 Discussion

15.50 – 16.10 Coffee break

Panel 8: Croatian Scholars between Profession and Politics

Chair: Iskra Iveljić (Zagreb)

16.10 – 16.30 Branimir JANKOVIĆ (Zagreb), University Professors on the Move in the Period of Transition

16.30 – 16.50 Željko DUGAC (Zagreb), Transfer of Knowledge and Changes in Status: The First Professors of the Zagreb School of Medicine

16.50 – 17.10 Nikola TOMAŠEGOVIĆ (Zagreb), Croatian Historians in Transition: the Case of Ferdo Šišić and Gavro Manojlović

17.10 – 17.30 Vedran DUANČIĆ (Zagreb), Were Imperial Geographies Useful in Post-Imperial East Central Europe? The Yugoslav Perspective

17.30 – 17.50 Discussion

17.50 – 18.10 Conference conclusions

SUMMARIES

Pieter M. Judson

DID EMPIRE END? CENTRAL AND SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE AFTER THE FIRST WORLD WAR

In 1918 both Woodrow Wilson and Thomas Garrigue Masaryk defined empire specifically as an illegitimate state form based on the oppressive use of power. Wilson declared that the Austro-Hungarian empire had used harsh military force to hold together people who had not wanted to live together. Masaryk too consigned empire to a dark past of force and oppression, a past that unlike the new day had not recognized the modern twin principles of nationality and democracy. Both politicians framed the peacemaking moment in 1919 as a radical break with the recent past. Of course, millions of people on the Indian subcontinent or the Korean peninsula or the Indonesian archipelago might have disputed the righteous assertions that the Paris treaties had done away with empire. Wilson himself presided over a racially segregated USA that fought a brutal colonial war to subjugate the Philippines. Masaryk headed a self-styled nation state that both in demographic and structural terms somewhat like the very Austria-Austro-Hungarian empire it had replaced. The new Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, the new Poland, Greater Romania, and Italy all housed far more diverse groups than the leading nations of the state, and each also struggled to create a unified national citizenship. Nevertheless, the “end of empire” narrative became the dominant paradigm for understanding the events of 1918-1919, and many historians have attached the labels “post-imperial” or even “post-colonial” to Central and Southeastern Europe after the first World War.

Several scientific projects in the past decade have sought to change the terms of this narrative and to enable historians to ask different questions of the period after the war. They have done so by closely investigating and analyzing the character of the social, economic, political, and cultural transformations that followed the collapse of the Habsburg Monarchy. In this

talk I explore how their work helps us better to conceptualize people's local experience of the interwar period in some new ways. How different could the regimes, cultures, societies, and politics be that replaced empire? How radical were the changes? Are the stakes of the argument about the mythic meanings of 1918 different if we recognize the continuities of some institutions, forms of administration, and personnel that connected the old and new regimes? How might the recognition of some continuities in structures and personnel offer us more effective models for understanding this historical moment? Changes in some areas, such as economics, were indeed devastating. Changes in others, were hardly noticeable, a fact that often drew bitter criticism from opponents of the new regimes. Finally, how might the work of historians who try to bring together different scales of analysis (the micro, regional, and state levels) help us to develop more persuasive accounts of events?

Lothar Höbelt

THE AUSTRIAN DISTRICT GOVERNORS: CONTINUITY OR CHANGE OF GUARD?

Let's start with the famous German rule: „Verfassung vergeht, Verwaltung besteht.“ (Constitutions come and go, administration stays). On the other hand, John Boyer has once written that after 1918 the two Austrian mass parties started to carve up the state between themselves. In terms of the two spheres formerly belonging to the prerogatives of the Emperor, the Armed Forces and the Foreign Office, it is easy to show that the collapse of the ancient regime was followed by an exodus of aristocrats from the ranks of officers and diplomats. But what about the “civil service” as such? For the general public, the most visible exponent of state authority traditionally was the district governor, the “Bezirkshauptmann”. A saying had it that in the Eastern marches of the Empire people feared God and the “Bezirkshauptmann”. Only, it was not quite clear who came first.

Was there a change of guards after 1918 or not? Prior to World War I, aristocrats and nobles did have their share of district governors but maybe not exactly where you would expect it. In Galicia and in Bohemia, especially

in the Czech parts of Bohemia, there were almost none, in the Bukovina there was literally none. Almost paradoxically, their proportion tended to be much higher in the Alpine lands where the aristocracy as such played a minor role. The highest concentration can be found in the alpine regions of Styria, a land of mining enterprises and monasteries, with very few big magnates. Of course, one might argue that the poor Styrian Counts needed to earn an extra income whereas Bohemian grandees were far above such mundane pursuits.

As in many other aspects, Lower Austria occupied a middling position between the Alpine and the Bohemian lands. However, Lower Austria was the one province where the calls for a reform of the district administration were most insistent after 1918. It will not come as a big surprise that the Social Democrats were sceptical about old-style arrangements. They pushed for a general reform with elected district councils and a break with the traditions of the “Obrigkeitsstaat”. In Lower Austria, however, that push was seconded by the big battalions of the rural supporters of the Christian Socials, the Farmers’ League. One of the reasons for that state of affairs may have been that the long-time “Statthalter” (Provincial Governor) of Lower Austria who had a hand in selecting most of the district governors, Count Kielmansegg, had been a Protestant who did not see eye to eye with Lueger.

After 1918, as far as flooding the administration with democracy was concerned, there was a marked divergence of opinion between urban and rural Christian Socials. The urban element, more often than not lawyers themselves, insisted on the primacy of legal qualifications for any sort of administrative agenda. Yet, the idea of putting the “Bezirkshauptmann” at the mercy of an elected body died slowly. Bills and proposals resurfaced every few years but were usually buried at the committee stage. In the end, party loyalty prevailed. The Lower Austrian farmers did not carry their resentment against arrogant academics too far. Party loyalty also prevailed in a different sense, however: District governors were still appointed from above but the Ministry of the Interior listened very attentively to the opinions of the provincial Governor – who was now an elected official and a Christian Social in seven out of eight cases. However, this process of “politicising” the “political administration” took a long time.

Ten years after the establishment of the Republic, nobles and aristocrats still held on to half of their pre-war share of district governors. Dilution there was, but no radical break with the Imperial past.

Jana Osterkamp

THE FEDERAL LEGACY OF THE HABSBURG EMPIRE AFTER 1918

After 1918, the Habsburg Monarchy left behind a diverse and tentative political legacy in the successor states. In the 19th century, not only did the conflict between imperial and nation-state orders begin to emerge, but at the same time the European 19th century was a federal century. Countries such as Germany and Switzerland were organized on a federal level, followed by the monarchical federal unions such as Sweden-Norway, Russia-Finland, Denmark-Iceland or England-Scotland-Ireland.

The Habsburg Monarchy stood out in a special way as an innovative laboratory of both federal ideas and federal practices of rule. After 1918, the majority of the post-Habsburg states adopted a centralized constitution, however, federal reform ideas for individual states and a larger “Danube Federation” remained alive. The lecture examines the question, controversial in historiography, of whether federalism in the post-Habsburg area showed a tendency toward nationalism.

Pál Hatos

REVOLUTIONARY AFTERMATH? HUNGARY AFTER THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Hungary's present day political memory is by and large centered around the so called Trianon-trauma, an allusion to the Treaty of Trianon signed on the 4th of June 1920 which ended the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy established in 1867 and dismantled its eastern part, the Hungarian Kingdom. The social-political and economic consequences of the Treaty are highly controversial, but its complex phenomena often recapitulated in a simple sentence

to arouse sympathy for the „Victim of History”: Hungary lost 2/3 of her territory, more than half of her population and approximately one-third of her Hungarian-speaking population.

In contrast one still pays relatively little attention to the fact, that the collapse of the Dual Monarchy in World War I brought revolutionary changes throughout the whole territory of the former multinational Empire. The revolutionary wave was particularly strong in Hungary and especially in its capital Budapest where hundreds of thousands of people celebrated the proclamation of the Hungarian People's Republic on November 16, 1919. Yet the so called Aster Revolution of Mihály Károlyi and its democratic aspirations soon fell because of internal hardship and international isolation. The Hungarian Soviet Republic which came into its place in March 21 1919 promised to make Hungary a Communist State in a fortnight and an armed messenger of Lenin's World Revolution towards the West. The bolshevik experience led by Béla Kun lasted only 133 days and ended in chaos and military defeat against the Romanian Army. When Miklós Horthy took power in the Autumn of 1919 the newly found „counterrevolutionary” regime established its power and legitimacy on antisemitism, antiliberalism and the idea of „Christian Hungary”. Nevertheless Communism and before it *pacifism* and *Wilsonianism* were also accompanied by enthusiastically assumed metaphysical hopes in the turbulent aftermath of World War I. May it be that the real „historical event” was the ephemeral revolution in its manifold manifestations? Why and how secular religion and revolutionary zeal made alliance in Central-and Eastern Europe and especially in Hungary in the critical years of 1918-1919? How violence, political radicalism and generational frustration influenced its multiple expressions? And finally why revolution faded away soon and gave way to a conservative regeneration from the early 1920s?

Franz Adlgasser

LAWYERS AND POLITICS – JURISTS IN THE OLD AUSTRIAN PARLIAMENT

Academically trained jurists were an important factor in the Austrian parliament from its early years in 1848/49 and 1861 until the end of the empire in 1918. This included jurists in the public sector (judges, civil servants), in agriculture and private industry (estate owners, managers), but especially attorneys and notaries public. They were key figures of the political elite in parliament, in the party system and in the civil society at large. The paper will focus on their presence in the House of Representatives by looking at changes over time as well as their influence in the house, the representation of the regions, political parties and interest groups. While the fact that lawyers significantly shaped the political system of the Habsburg Monarchy is generally accepted, the paper will provide a look at their actual role as parliamentary players from the perspective of a collective biography.

Mark Cornwall

THE RISE AND FALL OF CROATIAN LAWYERS IN THE HABSBURG AND YUGOSLAV STATE FRAMEWORKS

Lawyers and the legal profession constitute a key under-researched element among the elite of the late Habsburg Monarchy. On the one hand they were fundamentally responsible for upholding the Habsburg *Rechtsstaat*. On the other, by 1914, many lawyers in the Slav regions of the empire had been drawn into defending and sympathizing with those who challenged the political system. As a result, some lawyers themselves became political activists who sought radical reform or even worked for the Monarchy's destruction during the First World War. At a time when East-Central European historiography has been giving due attention to the transition period at the end of the Great War, this paper sets out a new perspective for understanding the 'watershed' of 1918 in the Yugoslav lands.

The paper analyses the career trajectories of a range of lawyers from different backgrounds and generations in Croatia-Slavonia. Croatian law-

yers often had a common legal training outside the region and some had built up impressive international legal contacts. Many were also bonded together by a strong professional networking which began in Croatia before 1914. During the war however the legal profession splintered. A few notable personalities – such as Hinko Hinković or Ante Trumbić – fled to the West and were self-confessed traitors to the empire; others such as the Serb Dušan Popović stayed at home and were deeply suspect to the authorities. Then there was a mass of the judiciary who were either Habsburg-loyal (e.g. Zagreb's 'state attorney' Viktor Aleksander), or engaged in charity work (Robert Siebenschein), or who avoided politics altogether in favour of pursuing their chosen legal profession. While some of these men chose the emergence of Yugoslavia as a time to retire, the evidence suggests that many did manage to make a smooth transition, transferring their allegiance with varying degrees of success. In Yugoslavia, Lav Mazzura became the new Zagreb state attorney, while Edo Lukinić was for a time the minister of justice. The paper shows how and why some lawyers made the transition to a new state allegiance, while others could not or they soon became strongly critical. It also suggests that legal continuity was fundamentally important in Croatia. Through Croatia's singular legal code, and through a strong tradition of professional networking, Croatian lawyers were able to play a significant role in stabilizing the early Yugoslav state while still critiquing its rule of law.

Gábor Egry

**THE EMPIRE THAT KEPT GREATER-ROMANIA ALIVE?
IMPERIAL CONTINUITIES AND DIFFERENTIATED RULE
IN ROMANIA 1919-1940**

This paper argues that the imperial legacies of local societies, annexed to the successor states of Austria-Hungary were essential for the bridging of difference within the new, composite and multi-ethnic and multiregional states. Using the example of Romania, I will demonstrate how certain features of imperial rule, first the co-optation of local elites in a set of differentiated centre-periphery relationships, second the persistence of institutions that

retained familiarity of administration for the people, third the common middle-class culture of all ethnicities enabled the centralizing state to accept local compromises without changing its normative statehood, being a unitary nation-state. As the management of diversity of the disparate regions that constituted Romania was the toughest challenge, in this sense the conscious use of this legacy for the aims of the new state was instrumental in its – albeit temporary – consolidation.

Rok Stergar

**“WE HESITATED WITH THE PURGE OF NON-NATIVE
JUDGES AND OFFICIALS”: POST-1918 SLOVENE PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION BETWEEN NATIONALIST MILITANCY
AND PRAGMATIC SOLUTIONS**

Already in August 1918, before the establishment of the State of Slovenes, Croats, and Serbs, the National Council for Slovenia and Istria had spoken of the need to appoint only native officials to all the posts, and as the preparations for independence proceeded in the following months, some Slovene nationalists advocated a radical purge of public administration. In fact, soon after the new state had been established and some semblance of stability returned, the National Government in Ljubljana passed a brief decree that fired all officials of “German nationality” on the territory it controlled.

As Yugoslavia defined itself as a nation-state, it wanted to create a public administration which would include only members of this nation. The purge of supposed foreigners was supported by a narrative of liberation: the imperial administration was presented as an oppressive tool, an essential element of the alleged German domination over the so-called Slovene lands.

While the new state’s public administration remained essentially Habsburg in its organization and its procedures, layoffs of all those who were categorized as Germans were an important break with the imperial past. The administration was no longer understood as a neutral instrument of state power. On the contrary, it was supposed to serve the interests of the ethnolinguistically defined nation and minorities were to be at best tolerated.

However, it soon became obvious that in some regions the normal functioning of the administration, the schools, and the judiciary simply would not be possible without at least some of the fired officials. All those who had been dismissed could apply for their posts again and the National Government in Ljubljana quickly approved several rehires. Pragmatism made the purge less radical than originally planned.

Ljiljana Dobrovšak, Ivana Žebec Šilj

THE CROATIAN WORLD WAR ONE VETERANS BETWEEN TWO MONARCHIES

The paper examines the relationship between the government of Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes/Yugoslavia and Croatian World War I Veterans - former Austro-Hungarian subjects and recent citizens of the Yugoslav Monarchy. The analysis of this complex relationship is primarily focused on the legislative framework, although the activities of Croatian and central Yugoslav veterans' societies are of great importance to understand this relationship studied in the paper. To deduce more on this relationship the descriptions of burial ceremonies of the former Austro-Hungarian soldiers and Salonica front volunteers are analyzed as well.

Ota Konrád

POST-WAR VIOLENCE IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

For many societies in Central and Eastern Europe, the armistice of 11 November 1918 did not stop fighting and violence. Brutal and ruthless violence continued during the bloody civil war on the territory of the former Romanov empire, in the course of the Soviet-Polish war, as well as in Hungary during the waves of the "red" and "white" terror. The German *Freikorps* got involved in the fighting in the Baltic countries, in contested territories like Upper Silesia, as well as on German soil itself. Central and Eastern Europe suffered, as a result of the dissolution of the empires, a power vacuum,

unclear and contested state borders, social breakdown, and confused collective identities. However, not only these “shatterzones” became a territory of war that “failed to end.” The postwar conflicts among – in various ways – “vanquished” has become a vivid research topic during the last year. It pointed out how these conflicts and their uncontrolled violence, which further blurred the line between combatants and civilians, as well as the problematic demobilization of postwar societies, undermined their stabilization.

The newly founded Czechoslovak Republic was no exception. Territorial conflicts, a wave of mainly spontaneous collective violence, anti-Jewish riots, as well as an immense increase in “ordinary” criminality, characterized the aftermath in the new state. However, despite the number of these and similar violent acts, the importance of violence for postwar Czechoslovakia was not comparable to its devastating impacts on other countries in the region. Paramilitary violence did not play a crucial role, and demobilization proceeded successfully in Czechoslovakia in comparison with other countries in central Europe.

The traditional interpretation has referred to Czechoslovakia as an exception in the region, like an island in an ocean of instability. This interpretation is not accurate. On the other hand, one cannot overlook the differences between postwar Czechoslovakia and many other new states created on the ruins of the dissolved empires. In this paper, I investigate the reasons for this development. It was precisely the specific postwar setting that shaped the different ways in which individual societies evolved as a result of the war. The paper is based on findings of the project about the collective violence in central Europe 1914-1922, mainly on the monograph *Out of the Apocalypse* (Prague 2018).

Klaus Buchenau

THE NATIONALISATION AND RESTITUTION OF THE THURN UND TAXIS FORESTS IN CROATIA (1919-1941). A CASE STUDY ON THE INTERPLAY OF NATIONAL, POST-IMPERIAL AND CRIMINAL ELITE NETWORKS

This paper will highlight, on the basis of archival evidence from archives in Germany, Serbia and Croatia, how a noble magnate family with close historical ties to the Habsburg Monarchy tried to reverse the nationalisation/sequestration of its vast possessions in interwar Croatia. While Croatian politicians, especially from the HSS (Croatian Peasant Party), were interested in nationalising large parts of the Thurn und Taxis properties to satisfy peasant demands, Prince Albert von Thurn und Taxis made ample use of lawyers with a strong post-imperial background, according connections and worldviews to bring forward the restitution of his sequestered or nationalized forests. A third force is to be seen in criminal networks trying to channel the princely properties into their own pockets. As in other large corruption scandals of interwar Yugoslavia, public opinion was divided. While a majority portrayed the conflict as one between the „good“ and socially oriented national state and „bad“ greedy post-imperial elite networks, another blamed the „new“ national elites (especially, but not only from Serbia) as breaking the law in the name of selfish private interests.

Miha Preinfalk

THE LAST THREE DECADES OF THE NOBILITY IN SLOVENIA (1918-1948)

After the disintegration of the Habsburg Monarchy at the end of 1918, the nobility in the new following states was abolished or even banned. In the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, noble titles were abolished by the Vidovdan Constitution in 1921. Due to national frictions, a large part of the lower and newer nobility emigrated to the German-speaking area. Those who stayed were mostly families who had lived there for centuries and considered this territory their homeland.

Members of the nobility in the Slovene part of the Yugoslav kingdom were much less noticeable in public than in neighbouring countries. They withdrew into privacy on their property, did not expose themselves, nor did they act in public. Their main activity was aimed at maintaining as many family estates as possible, despite the agrarian reform. Nevertheless, they came much closer to the Slovene environment by publicly using Slovene, attending Slovene schools and accepting Yugoslav citizenship.

During World War II, only a small part of the nobility joined the Nazi movement, as legitimists and monarchists predominated among them, rejecting Hitler's ideas, some even supporting the partisan movement. Nevertheless, almost all members of the former nobility were declared Germans or »Volksdeutscher.« Those who did not withdraw from Slovenia in time were imprisoned in concentration camps and later deported. All their property was confiscated and nationalized. The process of "degermanization" and "defeudalization" of the Slovene territory thus actually and also in a symbolic way achieved one of the ultimate goals.

Iskra Iveljić

NOBLESSE OBLIGE. NOBILITY IN CROATIA AND SLAVONIA FROM THE END OF THE 19TH CENTURY UNTIL 1945

Nobility in Croatia and Slavonia was rather heterogeneous, ethnically, regionally and socially. It consisted of various layers (from lesser nobility to magnates), of old and new nobility and of noblemen of various ethnic origin. There were differences even between Croatia and Slavonia, since in the latter aristocracy of mostly non-Croatian origin prevailed, and it held larger landed estates. Nobility was in the 19th century faced with modernisation and nationalisation. The first process deprived it of its traditional privileges and a part of their estates which became the property of former serfs. Moreover, nobility lost its position as *natio politica*. The onset of the national movement divided the ranks of nobility and jeopardised the very core of aristocratic multiculturalism and supranational networking. However, aristocracy retained its elite position until 1918 even though it was hardly keeping pace with the modern middle class, especially in the economic as-

pect. Since late 19th century the restructuring of aristocracy took place, encompassing some members of lesser nobility and elite middle class. The new meritocracy was much more adaptable than the old grandees. On the eve of the First World War, even some aristocrats changed their political views, turning towards Yugoslav options, yet they were at the same time still loyal Habsburg politicians. The founding of the Yugoslav state was a major turning point, since nobility lost its sovereign, its titles, and the land reform deprived the aristocracy of a big portion of its landed estates. Noblemen were treated by the new regime as adversaries, especially the ones of foreign origin or enjoying the reputation of „enemies of the people“. Even under these circumstance, not few noblemen managed to preserve a least a part of their landed estates and their way of life until 1945.

Peter Vodopivec

ABOUT THE CONTINUITY AND DISCONTINUITY OF SLOVENE POLITICAL ELITES AND THEIR POLITICAL PRACTICES IN THE FIRST YUGOSLAVIA

“The national liberation that we have just achieved means the most important turning point we have ever seen since we came under the Frankish-German rule a thousand years ago,” the geographer and liberal political essayist Anton Melik wrote in 1919 in the *Ljubljanski zvon* literary magazine. “The new age will radically change the course of our lives ... and all the general civilisational circumstances of our people will be altered.” In Melik’s opinion, in the future, Slovenes would no longer maintain any political or economic contacts with Germans. They would turn towards Yugoslavia and Western Europe, and in these efforts, the new “civilisational orientation” would, apart from “Croatian and Serbian literature”, also be made possible by “learning French” – the language that “almost plays the main role ... in international communication”.

In 1918, the ideas of the Slovene political and intellectual elites about Yugoslavia and the relations between the nations united within it were still very unclear. Already at the end of the 19th century, all three Slovene political parties (the Catholic People’s Party, the liberal Progressive Party, and the

Social Democratic Party) had started turning towards South Slavs under the influence of the tense national relations in the Habsburg Monarchy. In the years leading up to World War I, “Yugoslavism” became one of the central Slovene political topics. Both of the Slovene middle-class parties discussed trialism and federalism and supported (at least in a declarative way) the establishment of a distinct South Slav unit in the framework of the Habsburg Monarchy. This was also the goal of the so-called May Declaration of the South Slav deputies of the Vienna Reichsrat in 1917, which was, in the autumn of the same year, followed by a mass movement supporting the “Yugoslav state” under the Habsburg rule. Meanwhile, the concept of establishing an independent Yugoslav state outside of the Monarchy did not assert itself in Slovene politics until the final months of Austria-Hungary. However, the ideas of what this new state was supposed to look remained very dissimilar. While the Catholic Party and the social democrats favoured a federal “Yugoslavia” with national autonomies and even a republican system, the liberals argued for a single state “of a united Yugoslav nation”.

Both Slovene middle-class parties that had dominated the Slovenian political arena since the 1890s were, above all, ideological-political groups and they did not, unlike the Social Democratic Party, represent the more homogeneous social groups. Until as late as 1917, when they joined forces for a short time during the May movement, these two parties had been engaged in relentless ideological-political conflicts. Consequently, despite the occasional attempts at reconciliation, they were unable to reach a more long-term consensus even when it came to the fundamental national issues. Their attitudes to the introduction of democratic principles, expansion of voting rights, and democratisation of the public life were inconsistent and pragmatic. Slovene liberalism was weak, while the Slovene politics was dominated by conservative, Catholic, even clericalist aspirations focusing on the demands for national and especially linguistic emancipation. Also during World War I, political leaders (except for the social democrat Henrik Tuma) lacked any concrete ideas about the constitutional and political transformation of the Monarchy. They did not start thinking about the constitutional-political system of the desired Yugoslav state until as late as the last weeks of October 1918.

The political leadership of the Catholic Party had already started to be assumed by the representatives of the younger generation in the last years

before World War I; while in the Liberal Party, the generational change began in 1918 and continued in the beginning of the 1920s. Nevertheless, during the first years of the Yugoslav state, the Slovene political parties did not find common ground, not even regarding the Slovene national position in the new state. Not only did their opinions about the state's internal regime remain incompatible, but they also remained irreconcilably divided in terms of ideology and politics, while in the wider state framework, they were extremely pragmatic and ready for concessions and compromises. In their search for allies, both of the largest Slovenian parties turned to Belgrade rather than Zagreb: the liberals welcomed the Yugoslav democrats as allies; while the People's Party sought associates with the radicals and in the Royal Court, even though it persisted in opposition until 1927 (except for 1924). Naturally, this did not contribute to the democratisation of the public and political life in the Slovene part of Yugoslavia, but instead resulted in endless political disputes and in the formation of new political parties.

Ivo Goldstein

1918 IN CROATIA: REVOLUTION OR EVOLUTION?

In this paper the author is trying to assess how much Croatian society in general has changed due to the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the creation of Yugoslavia. The change was profound. In some aspects it can be even called a revolution, although these events did not imply classical revolutionary developments.

The new state stretched from the Alps almost to the Aegean Sea, an area that had never been under a single administration since the 4th century. Almost all the pre-war political parties in Croatia disappeared. Some parties kept their old names, but faced completely new issues that demanded new answers.

One of the basic problems was whether the new state should be a republic or a monarchy. Another dilemma was whether it would be centralised or federative state, that means whether special national features would be taken into account. Last but not least, the question was whether these problems will be or will not be resolved in a democratic manner. The lack of demo-

cratic traditions was obvious and the answer to this dilemma was in fact never in question.

Therefore the question – how to create new Yugoslav identity remained a problem for decades to come. Paradoxically or not, Croatia was in few years after 1918 clenching the same questions as in the Habsburg Monarchy. As the philosopher Vladimir Dvorniković wrote back in 1939: “Croatia is like a woman who, although she strives for full freedom, always remarries and always rebels and resists in the marriage”.

Marijan Bobinac

**HOW THE CROATIAN ELITES SWITCHED OVER FROM
THE HABSBURG EMPIRE TO THE SOUTH SLAV KINGDOM
IN A DRUNKEN NIGHT OF NOVEMBER 1918. ON AN
AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY OF MIROSLAV KRLEŽA**

In his autobiographical, slightly fictionalized essay *A Drunken November Night 1918* (written in 1942, first published in 1952), repeatedly noticed and quoted also by historians, Miroslav Krleža attempts to reconstruct a sensational scandal to whose creation he himself contributed to a large extent. In November 1918, in the interregnum from the collapse of the Habsburg monarchy at the end of October to the foundation of the South Slav kingdom at the beginning of December, the then young author felt himself compelled at a reception held in Zagreb in honor of the Serbian officers to protest loudly against the speech of the former high Austrian-Hungarian officer Slavko Kvaternik. The public scandal in the ‘post-imperial hour zero’ retrospectively reinforced Krleža’s conviction of the misery of the contemporary Croatian elite, a circumstance whose reasons, in his opinion, not only lay in political opportunism and moral corruption, but also in unreflected utopianism and the underlying political naivety. His hope that after the dissolution of the compromised rule of the Habsburgs the South Slav peoples could advance towards national, political and social emancipation is soon substituted by the sober insight that the imperial Danube monarchy has been replaced by a small-sized post-imperial structure based on pronounced relations of dominance.

Ida Ograjšek Gorenjak

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.

The paper will identify continuities and discontinuities of women's organizations in Croatia during the first half of the 20th century. It will 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 will be 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. The change in political framework had a great impact on the development and operation of the women's movement. On 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. 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. This refers in particular to some new educational opportunities

and the emergence of a women's intellectual elite. Academically-educated women were not only active in establishing their own professional women's organizations but they have, also, been taking over the leadership positions in various women's associations.

Žarko Lazarević

ECONOMIC ELITES, TRANSITION AND YUGOSLAVIA (CASES FROM SLOVENIA AND CROATIA)

The presentation will cover the transition of economic elites to the Yugoslav state. The transition will be placed in the political, economic and social context that determined the position of the elites in the environment of the new Yugoslav state. On the one hand, there was a turning point; the former state stopped to exist. At the same time, the Habsburg monarchy was still very much alive in the concepts of regulating everyday private, social and economic life. This means confronting discontinuity and continuity as a macro framework for elites entering in a new political and economic environment. The focus will be on the comparison of Slovenian and Croatian conditions and the presentation of transition strategies and practices in the case of individual entrepreneurs. The presentation is based on joint research work and an article we did with prof. dr. Iskra Iveljić.

Ivan Jeličić

PERSISTENCE, RECONFIGURATION, AND EXCLUSION, THE POLITICAL ELITES IN FIUME/RIJEKA AND LIBURNIA FROM AUSTRIA-HUNGARY TO ITALY

The paper will focus on political elites in northeastern Istria (Liburnia) and former *corpus separatum* (Fiume/Rijeka) during the postwar transition period from the Habsburg Empire to the Italian state. Though merged administratively in one Italian province in 1924, the two areas, part of two different state administrations during the Habsburg Empire, experienced two diverging transition processes. On one side, Fiume/Rijeka, already ruled by

an Italian-speaking political elite before the war, suffered from an intricate transition with multiple actors and variables, a process that lasted years after the end of World War One. On the other side, Liburnia, specifically Volosko-Opatija, a municipality under prewar Croatian national political leadership, sustained an Italian state military and civil administration driven and less protracted transition. Inside these two transition processes, the paper will provide an insight on persistence, continuity of political power, reconfiguration, changes of political elites, and exclusion, the complete removal of a political elite. Specific attention will be devoted to relations between political groups and the role of Italian state actors in channeling the transition in favor of an Italian national political group.

Jernej Kosi

LOCAL ELITES IN PREKMURJE AFTER 1919: CONTINUITIES AND RUPTURES

On March 1, 1930, a rather unusual business-meeting took place in Vienna. Josip Benko, a Yugoslav citizen, paid a visit to count László Szapáry, a Hungarian citizen. On the one side of the table sat the major of Murska Sobota, the administrative and commercial center of Prekmurje, and the most influential and successful industrialist in the region that had belonged to the Kingdom of Hungary until the Yugoslav occupation in August 1919. Opposite to him sat a heavily indebted member of prominent Hungarian aristocratic family – an owner of the castle in Murska Sobota and an individual, whose noble title “de Szapár, **Muraszombat** et Széchy-Sziget” implied a centuries-old connection with both the town Muraszombat/Murska Sobota and the region of Prekmurje where the family owned a considerable chunk of agricultural land until the land reform in Yugoslavia. On this occasion, Benko and Szapáry signed a contract that transferred the property of the Murska Sobota Castle and all of the movables in and around the castle from the count to the industrialist. The meeting in Vienna thus marked the moment that put an end to the long but steady farewell of Szapáry’s from Prekmurje. In the presentation, by building on a case study of Benko and Szapáry, I aim to illustrate the impact of World War I, the collapse of the

Habsburg empire and the subsequent period of post-imperial transition on the composition of the local elites in the rural border region at the fringes of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.

Róbert Arpáš – Adriana Kičková

FROM A MULTI-ETHNIC MONARCHY TO NATIONAL-STATES? THE IDEA OF A NATIONAL STATE IN INTERWAR CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Habsburg Empire was a multi-ethnic state with unequal status of its ethnic groups. National oppression has led the suppressed ethnic groups to believe that the future is only possible outside the monarchy. Ideally in their own national states. Due to the low population size, some ethnic groups were united. The Slovaks preferred a common approach with the Czechs. The Serbians and Croatians and Slovenians were doing the same. The “national unions” were born on the ruins of the monarchy. Their national composition didn’t match with their definition as national states.

Therefore, they needed to create a state idea justifying their existence. Like the idea of Yugoslavism in the future Yugoslavia, the ideology of Czechoslovakism was based on historical narrative. According to Czechoslovakism, Czechs and Slovaks formed a common state “Czechoslovak nation”. Within the framework of this ideological construction, compared to the previous state establishment, the position of the Slovak nation has significantly improved. In Hungary, the Slovaks were supposed to assimilate, in Czechoslovakia they became part of the ruling nation. Yet they were not recognized as a distinctive nation. The dissatisfaction of a large part of Slovakia with such a situation was transformed into so-called “Slovak question”. It caused tensions in Czech-Slovak relations and weakened the internal stability of interwar Czechoslovakia.

Branimir Janković

UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS ON THE MOVE IN THE PERIOD OF TRANSITION

A transition from the Habsburg Empire to the newly founded Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in 1918 (later Kingdom of Yugoslavia) has been an extensive transformation that shaped the numerous fields of social life. This includes significant state institutions such as schools and universities. Despite the obvious continuities of the Habsburg legacy – institutional and personal – a process of introducing the new universities, faculties, curricula, and newly appointed professors was clearly showing all-encompassing ambitions of the new Yugoslav state. Therefore, although Serbian, Croatian, and Slovenian university professors were constantly studying at large number of universities across the Habsburg Monarchy until 1918, their scholarly mobility has been now intensified within Yugoslavia, spreading from Ljubljana, Zagreb, Belgrade, Sarajevo to Skopje and back. Did intense mobility of university professors along with specific appointment policy contribute to more interconnection of not only the heterogeneous academic space but also the heterogeneous national space of the new multinational Yugoslav state? And does the Yugoslav case tackle main issues of the history of Habsburg and post-Habsburg universities raised in a recent Jan Surman's book *Universities in Imperial Austria 1848–1918: A Social History of a Multilingual Space* (2019)?

Željko Dugac

TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE AND CHANGES IN STATUS: THE FIRST PROFESSORS OF THE ZAGREB SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

The Medical Faculty in Zagreb was eventually founded in 1917, even though it was supposed to be a part of the modern University in Zagreb right from its beginning in 1874. The physicians in the Croatian Physicians Association, who were the first professors at the Medical Faculty and who get the most credit for establishing the Faculty, were mostly Viennese students,

their worldviews often differed from what the Viennese society imposed. Paradoxically, in the later “Yugoslav” years, the very same profession will call upon on what was previously considered regressive and outdated. In this text, I will try, on the basis of professional activities of four renowned physicians: Miroslav Čačković, Teodor Wickerhauser, Dragutin Mašek and Andrija Štampar, to reconstruct typical/atypical professional paths of physicians of that time in the environment of changing socio-political relations, but also new paradigms in medicine as both a profession and a science.

Nikola Tomašegović

CROATIAN HISTORIANS IN TRANSITION: THE CASE OF FERDO ŠIŠIĆ AND GAVRO MANOJLOVIĆ

The professionalization and institutionalization of Croatian historiography in the second half of the 19th century was closely tied with Croatian politics, most importantly the Yugoslav ideology and its cultural institutions. It fulfilled its political role by legitimizing the claims for Croatian autonomy inside Austria-Hungary, as well as by constructing historical narratives to support nation-building processes. With the dissolution of Austria-Hungary and the establishment of the new Yugoslav state, Croatian historians found themselves in a new situation, yet their long lasting subscription to Yugoslavism proved to be a valuable asset in adapting to new circumstances. Croatian historians could assume the same important roles in nation-building efforts in the new state just as well as in the old one. Ferdo Šišić and Gavro Manojlović are perfect examples in this regard. Both of them were educated and were intellectually formed in the former Croatian Habsburg context, yet they both achieved very important positions in the new Yugoslav state. By examining their life and work, I wish to look at the strategies they used to acquire these positions. The central question I wish to pose is in what degree was their new position facilitated with their involvement with pre-war Yugoslavism, and in what degree was it a result of the expected political role of academic historiography in the historicist tradition. In doing this I will focus on the analysis of large-scale national narratives in their works.

Vedran Duančić

**WERE IMPERIAL GEOGRAPHIES USEFUL IN POST-IMPERIAL
EAST CENTRAL EUROPE? THE YUGOSLAV PERSPECTIVE**

In the late days of the First World War and the immediate post-war period, when the map of Europe, and other parts of the world controlled by European colonial powers, was being redrawn at the Paris Peace Conference, an ironical situation occurred. Geographers, who had largely been trained in “imperial”—most prominently, German—geographies, came to play an unprecedented role in the global affairs. Many of them applied their expertise to “break” the very empires that the geographical “language” they used had been designed to help “build.” Geography, it turned out, was a far less exact science than its practitioners believed, and there were different ways to interpret one and the same map. In contrast to the situation in other East Central European countries, in the newly created Yugoslav state geography became the most prominent political-cum-scientific discourse *after* the country’s borders were (temporarily) settled, when the focus was shifted to internal concerns. The search for the “essence” of the new state and the conceptualization of relations between its regions and titular ethnic groups was largely conducted within the framework of the German “imperial” geographical tradition. The paper addresses the usefulness of the notion of cohort in intellectual history and points to the limitations of relying on the “old” geographical paradigms as well as the possibilities it opened for creative (though selective) and politically conflicting readings in the 1920s and 1930s.

SHORT BIOGRAPHIES

Franz Adlgasser, born in 1963, is a historian at the Institute for Habsburg and Balkan Studies of the Austrian Academy of Sciences in Vienna. His primary fields of research are Austrian parliamentarianism and civil service in the 19th and early 20th centuries; international humanitarian relief after World War I. He is also editor of the series *Studien zur Geschichte der Habsburgermonarchie* and co-editor of the minutes of the Austrian (Cisleithanian) ministerial council 1867-1918.

Róbert Arpáš, PhD, works as assistant professor at the Department of History, Faculty of Arts, University of Constantine the Philosopher in Nitra and a researcher at the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava. His research focuses on the Slovak history of the first half of the 20th century with an emphasis on the Slovak autonomist movement, Czech-Slovak relations and anti-regime activities during the existence of the Slovak state during World War II. He is the author and co-author of several monographies - *Autonomy: Victory or Loss? (2011) [Autonómia: víťazstvo alebo prehra?]; Slovakia in the 20th century. Slovak Republic 1939 - 1945 (2015) [Slovensko v 20. storočí. Slovenská republika 1939 - 1945]; The City and Region Against the Backdrop of Totalitarianism. Images from the Life in the Slovak Republic (1939 - 1945), Illustrated by the City of Nitra and Its Surroundings (2018); Czechoslovakism (2019) [Čechoslovakismus]*. He has also published a large number of studies in scientific and popular journals and composite books.

Marijan Bobinac (born in 1952), is Professor of Modern German Literature at the German Department of the Zagreb University. His research interests include German language literature from the 19th century up to present day, Croatian modern literature, popular theatre, Croatian-German/Austrian cultural transfer, Habsburg and postimperial studies, historical fiction. Recent book publications: *Uvod u romantizam* (Introduction into Romanticism), Zagreb: Leykam 2012; *Narrative im (post)imperialen Kontext. Literarische Identitätsbildung als Potential im regionalen Spannungs-*

feld zwischen Habsburg und Hoher Pforte in Zentral- und Südosteuropa (ed. with Matthias Schmidt et al.), Tübingen: Francke 2015; *Postimperiale Narrative im zentraleuropäischen Raum* (ed. with Wolfgang Müller-Funk et al.), Tübingen: Francke 2018; *Sjećanje i suvremenost. Ogledi o novom njemačkom povijesnom romanu* (Memory and Contemporaneity. Essays on the New German Historical Novel), Zagreb: Disput 2018.

Klaus Buchenau obtained a doctoral degree on Orthodoxy and Catholicism in socialist Yugoslavia at the Freie Universität Berlin in 2003. At the same university he habilitated in 2010 with a theme on transnational anti-Western networks (Russia/Serbia). From 2009 to 2013 he was a Research Associate at the International Research Training Group “Religious cultures in 19th and 20th-century Europe”. Since 2013 he is Acting Professor for Southeast and East European History at the Universität Regensburg. His main research areas are: History of religion in Southeast and East Europe, 19th-21st century (Anti-westernism, Fundamentalism in Orthodox cultures); History of Yugoslavia and its successor states; Southeast Europe in a global comparison (especially with Latin America); Relations between Russia/Soviet Union and Southeast Europe, 19th and 20th century; History of corruption in Southeast Europe; History of Russian emigration.

Mark Cornwall obtained a PhD in History at the University of Leeds in 1988. Since 2004 he is Professor of Modern European History at the University of Southampton. His current focus is on the lands of the Habsburg or ex-Habsburg Empire, especially the history of traitors in the era of Emperor Franz Joseph, 1848-1918. In this research he uses the legal and abstract concept of treason as a new touchstone for evaluating issues of security and stability in Austria-Hungary. His new book on this topic will thus be a novel case-study in the unresearched history of treason on the European continent. He has received many awards and fellowships, most recently a Leverhulme Major Research Fellowship and a Visiting Fellowship at All Souls College, Oxford (2017-2020). His major publications include: *The Undermining of Austria-Hungary. The Battle for Hearts and Minds* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000; 2nd edition 2018); *The Devil's Wall. The Nationalist Youth Mission of Heinz Rutha* (Cambridge

Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012), winner of the 2013 book prize of the Czechoslovak Studies Association, USA; *Sacrifice and Rebirth: The Legacy of the Habsburg Empire's Last War* [with John Paul Newman] (New York: Berghahn Press, 2016); *Sarajevo 1914: The Spark of the First World War* (London: Bloomsbury, 2020).

Ljiljana Dobrovšak, holds a PhD in history (2007) from the University of Zagreb. She is a scientific adviser at the Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar in Zagreb. Her primary areas of research are the history of the Jews in the 19th and 20th centuries and the cultural history of World War I. She is the author of five books, editor of five books and one exhibition catalogue as well as 66 variously categorized academic journals and publications. Currently she is project leader of research project of the Croatian Science Foundation: The First World War in the Culture of Memory. Forgotten Heritage.

Vedran Duančić is a postdoctoral researcher at the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts in Zagreb. He holds a PhD in History and Civilization from the European University Institute in Florence (2016), and MA in Central European History from the Central European University in Budapest (2011), and a diploma in history from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb (2010). He published several papers on the history of geography in interwar Yugoslavia, as well as papers on the history of science in general, the reception of Lysenkoism, and political aspects of establishing “Big Science” in socialist Yugoslavia. He recently published a monograph titled *Geography and Nationalist Visions of Interwar Yugoslavia* with Palgrave Macmillan.

Željko Dugac graduated in 1994 at the Medical Faculty of the University of Rijeka with a thesis in the field of the history of medicine. In 1999 he gained the academic title of Master of Science – Biology (biological anthropology), with a thesis on the history of folk medicine. In 2003 he attained the academic title of Doctor of Science in the field of biomedicine and health sciences. His doctoral thesis was about the history of public health. In 1998 he became a research assistant at the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Department of History and Philosophy of Science, Division of

the History of Medicine and in 2015 he became a tenured scientific adviser at the same institution. In 2010 he was elected to a teaching position as Associate Professor at the Centre for Croatian Studies, University of Zagreb. He was also elected a member of the scientific board of the University of Jan Amos Komenský in Prague in 2012.

Gábor Egry is historian, Doctor of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, director of the Institute of Political History, Budapest. His research focuses on ethnicity, nationalism, state-building and politics of memory/identity in modern East Central Europe. He held several fellowships in Hungary and abroad (Jena, Regensburg, Bucharest, Stanford, Ca.) Since 2018 he is the PI of the ERC Consolidator Project *NEPOSTRANS – Negotiating post-imperial transitions: from remobilization to nation-state consolidation. A comparative study of local and regional transitions in post-Habsburg East and Central Europe*.

Ivo Goldstein (Zagreb, 1958) graduated history in Zagreb, received in 1988 his PhD in history at the University of Belgrade, Serbia. Since 2001 he is full professor at the University of Zagreb. He deals with Byzantine and Croatian medieval history, as well as history of the Jews in Croatia and the Croatian history of 20th century. Among some twenty books which Goldstein wrote are *Bizant na Jadranu od 6. do 9. stoljeća* («Byzantium on Adriatic – 6th to 9th centuries, Zagreb 1992), *Hrvatski rani srednji vijek* («Croatian Early Middle Ages», Zagreb 1995), *Croatia. A History* (London – Montreal, 1999), *Holokaust u Zagrebu* («Holocaust in Zagreb», together with Slavko Goldstein, Zagreb 2001, Washington D. C. 2015), *Židovi u Zagrebu 1918-1941* (Jews in Zagreb 1918-1941, Zagreb 2004), *Hrvatska 1918-2008* (Zagreb 2008), *Tito* (together with Slavko Goldstein, Zagreb 2015) and *Jasenovac* (Zagreb 2018). Ivo Goldstein was Ambassador of Croatia to France and Monaco (2013-2017).

Pál Hatos, born in 1971, holds an MA in literature and in law and earned his PhD in history from the Eötvös Loránd University of Budapest (ELTE). He was a Research Fellow at the University of Geneva, the Institut Protestant de Montpellier, and at Sorbonne University in Paris. Twice a Vis-

iting Professor, he has been the holder of the chair of Hungarian studies at Indiana University Bloomington. He has widely published on the topic of European and Hungarian intellectual history of the 19th and 20th century. He is currently the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Theatre of Saint Stephen University. From February 2019 he was appointed to organise and direct the newly founded Institute for Central Europe Studies of the National University of Public Service Budapest. His publications include: József Kardinal Mindszenty (1892–1975) Divergierende Erinnerungen und die Perspektiven der vergleichenden Forschung pp. 9-28. In: Csaba, Szabó (ed.) *József Kardinal Mindszenty in Wien (1971–1975)*. Vienna: Institut für Ungarische Geschichtsforschung, Balassi Institut Collegium Hungaricum, Ungarische Archivdelegation beim Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (2012). With Attila Novák (eds.): *Between Minority and Majority. Hungarian and Jewish/Israeli Ethnical and Cultural Experiences in Recent Centuries*, Budapest 2013, Eastern Policy – Western Roots. The Cultural Context of the Vatican's Ostpolitik, in: András Fejérdy (ed.): *The Vatican 'Ostpolitik' 1958-1978. Responsibility and Witness during John XXIII and Paul VI*, Rome 2015, pp. 19-43; László Ravasz et les Conceptions du Protestantisme Hongrois au Tournant du XXe Siècle, in: *Hungarian Studies*, No. 1-2, Vol. 29, 2015, pp. 205-219; Hungarian Nation Branding – Past and Present In: Caroline, Y. Robertson-Von Trotha (szerk.) *Nationeurope: The Polarised Solidarity Community*, Baden-Baden, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, (2018) pp. 147 His latest book *Az elátkozott köztársaság* („The Damned Republic. The history of the collapse of 1918 and of the Aster Revolution.) deals with the chaotic aftermath of WWI in Hungary.

Lothar Höbelt (born in 1956) is Associate Professor of Modern History at the University of Vienna since 1997; Visiting Professor at University of Chicago (1992), University of Pardubice (2019); Lecturer at the Military Academy in Wiener Neustadt. He is also Vice-President and Secretary General (2011-15) of the International Commission for the History of Representative & Parliamentary Institutions. His publications include a dozen monographs and ca. 300 articles, amongst others: *Franz Joseph I. Der Kaiser und sein Reich. Eine politische Geschichte* (2009); „Stehen oder Fallen?“ *Österreichische Politik im Ersten Weltkrieg* (2015); *Die Erste Republik Österreich 1918-1938. Das Provisorium* (2018).

Iskra Iveljić is Professor of Croatian 19th century History at the History Department of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Her research is focused on various aspects of modernization, on the middle-class elite and on aristocracy in northwestern Croatia in the 19th and early 20th century. Both her studies of middle class and nobility encompass political, economic and cultural aspects, gender issues and the relationship towards children and teenagers. She was the head of the History Department (2008-2010) and its Chair of Croatian History (2014-2016) and is now heading the Doctoral programme of Modern and Contemporary Croatian History in European and World Context. Personal web page: <http://www.ffzg.unizg.hr/pov/pov2/biografija.php?id=13>

Branimir Janković is assistant professor at the Department of History, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University in Zagreb, where he obtained a PhD in 2014 with a dissertation about the theoretical and methodological transformations of Croatian historiography in late Yugoslav socialism. His research and teaching interests focus on the history of historiography, the history of revolutions, intellectual history, and public history. His recent articles in English include “François Furet in Socialist Yugoslavia” (in Drago Roksandić et al. (eds.) *Annales in Perspective: Designs and Accomplishments*. Zagreb: FF Press, 2019) and “History-writing: Croatian” (in Joep Leerssen (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Romantic Nationalism in Europe*. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 2018).

Ivan Jeličić obtained his PhD in History at the University of Trieste with a dissertation on the socialist movement in Fiume during the late Habsburg period. He is currently a post-doc fellow in the ERC project *Nepostrans* at the Institute of Political History in Budapest and a research assistant in the project *Rijeka in Flux: Borders and Urban Change after World War II* (University of British Columbia Okanagan), and collaborates with the Department of History of the University of Rijeka. He has published on political figures and associations of late Habsburg and post-Habsburg Fiume/Rijeka.

Pieter M. Judson (PhD Columbia University, 1987) currently holds the chair in 19th- and 20th century history at the European University

Institute in Florence. Judson served for ten years as editor of the *Austrian History Yearbook* and is currently president of the Central European History Society (USA). He is the author of several prize-winning works on empire, borderlands, nationalism, liberalism, and gender in 19th-century Habsburg Central Europe:

Exclusive Revolutionaries: Liberal Politics, Social Experience, and National Identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848-1914, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996 (Winner of the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize of the American Historical Association, 1997; Winner of the Austrian Cultural Forum Book Prize for 1998); *Wien brennt! Die Revolution von 1848 und ihr liberales Erbe*, Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1998; *Constructing Nationalities in East Central Europe* ed. with Marsha Rozenblit, New York: Berghahn Books, 2004; *Guardians of the Nation. Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2006; (Winner of the Karl von Vogelsang Staatspreis awarded by the Government of Austria, 2010; Winner of the Jelavich Prize of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, 2007; Winner of the Czechoslovak Studies Association Book Prize, 2006-2007);

His most recent book, *The Habsburg Empire. A New History* (Harvard 2016) is being translated into eleven languages. In preparation are the following titles: *The Cambridge History of the Habsburg Empire Volume 2: 1795-1918*, coedited with Mark Cornwall, Cambridge University Press; *The Great War and the Transformation of Habsburg Central Europe, 1908-1923*, with Tara Zahra, Oxford University Press.

Adriana Kičková, PhD, is associate professor in the field of Slovak history. She is a graduate of the Faculty of Arts of Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra. Her scientific research focuses on the political system of interwar Czechoslovakia Republic (1918 – 1938) in connection with their cultural policies, school system and educational strategies in Central European context. She is the co-author of a supplementary textbook for secondary schools - *Solving the Jewish Question in Slovakia 1939-1945* (2013), the author of the monograph *Women and the British Diplomatic Service 1782-1964* (2011), and *Movie in the Educational Process* (2019).

Ota Konrád is associate professor of modern history and director of the Modern history PhD program at the Charles University in Prague. He was the head of the Department of German and Austrian Studies at Charles University from 2012 until 2019 and a visiting professor (Vertretungsprofessor) at the University in Regensburg in 2018. His research topics include the history of the humanities, history of the foreign policy, history of the First World War in Central Europe, cultural history of violence, and contemporary Austrian history. He co-authored (together with Rudolf Kučera) *Out of the Apocalypse: Physical Violence in the Fall and Reconstruction of Central Europe, 1914–1922* (Prague, 2018), which deals with the cultural history of violence in Austria, the Czech lands, and South Tyrol in the Great War and its aftermath. The book was nominated for the “Magnesia Litera Award – Litera for Non-fiction” (2019). Recently, he has published a monograph about the history of humanities at the German University in Prague, 1918–1945 (*Geisteswissenschaften im Umbruch: Die Fächer Geschichte, Germanistik und Slawistik an der Deutschen Universität in Prag 1918–1945*. Berlin, 2020). His current research project deals with collective violence as a tool for reshaping national identities at the end of the Second World War in Europe, mainly in Czechoslovakia.

Jernej Kosi is Research Fellow and Assistant Professor at the University of Ljubljana, and Post-Doc researcher in the ERC funded project »Nepostrans – Negotiating post-imperial transitions« at the Institute of Political History in Budapest. He is the author of a book on cultural origins and the emergence of the Slovene national movement (*Kako je nastal slovenski narod*, 2013) and several articles on the history of Slovene nationalism and World War I refugees.

Žarko Lazarević is a Head of Department of Economic and Social History at the Institute of Contemporary History in Ljubljana and a professor of Economic and Social History at University of Primorska in Koper (Slovenia). The research field encompasses many aspects of the economic development of Slovenia, economic and social features of agriculture, the processes of industrialization, entrepreneur and corporate studies, co-operative movement, and development of financial institutions in 20th Century Slovenia.

Ida Ograjšek Gorenjak is assistant professor at History Department of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb, where she teaches courses on Modern and Gender History. Her research interests and publications focus on gender history, history of education and cultural history. She published book on correlation of gender stereotypes, political and modernization process and construction of national identities, she was chief editor of history magazine *Povijest u nastavi* (History teaching) and she actively participated in five national and international projects that dealt with cultural and political, national, regional and gender issues of the late 19th and first half of the 20th century.

Jana Osterkamp (born in 1977) is a historian and legal scholar. Her book on the federal history of the Habsburg Empire in the “long” 19th century will be out in winter 2020. Her home institution is the Collegium Carolinum, Research Institute for the History of the Czech Lands and Slovakia, in Munich; since 2007 she held teaching assignments at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University in Munich (LMU) and the University of Vienna. Together with Peter Becker (Vienna) she is Principal investigator of the research group “The emperors’s desk: a site of policy making in the Habsburg Empire? Francis Joseph I and his Cabinet Office”.

Miha Preinfalk is a senior research fellow at the Milko Kos Historical Institute of the Slovene Academy of Sciences (ZRC SAZU). He devotes most of his research to (primarily genealogical) studies of nobility in the territory of the present-day Slovenia and former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Lately he has been exploring changes in identity that occurred as a result of one’s transition into a different social stratum, particularly their elevation to nobility, and as an aftermath of major watershed events, e.g. the end of the First World War. He is also actively involved in addressing the problem concerning Slovenian castle heritage. He organised several symposiums and a number of round tables on the role and significance of Slovenian castles. In collaboration with the France Stele Institute of Art History, he has also conceived a new collection of books titled *Castellologica Slovenica*, which will provide an interdisciplinary presentation of individual castle buildings in Slovenia. Since 2005 he is also the editor of the scientific historical journal *Kronika*.

Rok Stergar is Associate Professor at the University of Ljubljana and a historian of the Habsburg Empire in the long nineteenth century, the First World War, and of nationalism. He is the author of two books and numerous articles on nationalisms in the Habsburg Empire, the Habsburg military, and Austro-Hungarian soldier experience in the First World War. His latest publication is the chapter “Continuity, Pragmatism, and Ethnolinguistic Nationalism: Public Administration in Slovenia during the Early Years of Yugoslavia,” in Peter Becker et al., eds., *Hofratsdämmerung? Verwaltung und ihr Personal in den Nachfolgestaaten der Habsburgermonarchie 1918 bis 1920*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 75 (Vienna, 2020).

Nikola Tomašegović works as a teaching assistant at the History Department of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb, where he obtained his MA degrees in History and Philosophy. He is currently writing his PhD thesis titled *The Modernist Movement of the „Youth“ in Croatian Culture and Politics at the Turn of the 20th Century* under the supervision of professor Iskra Ivelić. He is also a member of the research project *The Transition of Croatian Elites from the Habsburg Monarchy to the Yugoslav State* led by Iskra Iveljić. His areas of research include: 19th century intellectual and cultural history, nationalism studies, history of knowledge and history of science, modern Croatian history and theory and history of historiography.

Peter Vodopivec is scientific advisor of the Institute of Contemporary History in Ljubljana and elected associate member of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts. He received his doctorate in 1978 under the mentorship of Professor Fran Zwitter. He became a full professor of general history of the 18th and 19th centuries at the Faculty of Arts in Ljubljana, and from 1999 until his retirement in 2012 he was employed as a scientific advisor at the Institute of Contemporary History in Ljubljana. He is the author of many articles and books published in various languages. He gave his in-depth understanding of the past and extensive scientific research, pedagogical and professional work in the most comprehensive form in the monograph *From Pohlin's Grammar to an Independent State. Slovenian history from the end of the 18th century to the end of the 20th century* (Ljubljana:

Modrijan, 2006) and in the synthesis *Slowenische Geschichte: Gesellschaft - Politik - Kultur* (Graz: Leykam, 2008) together with Peter Štih and Vasko Simoniti. He received several awards for his research and professional work - in 1996 the French Order of the Knight of Academic Palms, in 2008 the Anton Gindely Austrian Prize for Culture and History of Central, Eastern and Southern Europe. In the same year he also received the Clio Award, and in 2009 the award of the Department of History of the Jagiellonian University and the Historical Society of Krakow. Two years later, he was awarded the Austrian Cross of Honor for Science and Art of the First Order.

Ivana Žebec Šilj, holds a PhD in history (2011) from the University of Zagreb. She is senior research associate at the Ivo Pilar Institute of Social Sciences in Zagreb, Croatia. Her research focuses on the industrial history in interwar and socialist period. Currently she is team member of research project HRZZ IP-2019-04-5897: The First World War in the Culture of Memory. Forgotten Heritage and project leader of small-scale research project "Femme industrielle – Female Industrial Workers in Socialist Croatia – Borovo, Vukovar Case Study funded by Ivo Pilar Institute.



Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Filozofski fakultet

