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The Kingdom of Dalmatia became an integral part of the Austrian portion of the Habsburg Monarchy after the 1815 Congress of Vienna. It encompassed the area of 12,840 square kilometers and extended from the island of Rab in the north to Spilj (a settlement near the port of Bar) in the south. After the administrative reform of 1868, it was divided into twelve districts and, by the early twentieth century, the number grew to fourteen. The Austrian government headquarters in Dalmatia were situated in Zadar, namely: the Governor's office, the Provincial Finance Directorate, the Provincial School Board, the Gendarmerie Command and the Post.1 The headquarters of Dalmatian autonomous bodies—the Kingdom of Dalmatia Parliament and its executive organ, the National Committee of the Kingdom of Dalmatia (Zemaljski odbor)—were also in Zadar.2

Dalmatia was in a specific constitutional and legal position at the time. According to the factual situation, it was integrated in the Austrian part of the Monarchy but, at the same time, according to the Hungarian-Croatian Settlement (Art. 66) of 1868, it was a part of the Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia, which belonged to the Hungarian portion of the Monarchy. This position was not resolved until the fall of the Monarchy.3

According to the Austrian census of 1910, the Kingdom of Dalmatia had 645,666 inhabitants. Since Austrian censuses did not include the "nationality" component, ethnic composition of Dalmatia can be determined by combining linguistic and religious principles in order to obtain approximately accurate results. The number of Italians can be determined according to the lin-

3 V. Krestić, Hrvatsko-ugarska nagodba 1868. godine, [Croatian-Hungarian Settlement 1868], Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti [Serbian academy of science and arts], Beograd, 1969.
guistic principle, i.e., the people who declared Italian as their native language are considered Italians. According to the 1910 census, there were 18,028 Italians, which amounts to 2.79 per cent of the population. More than a half of the Italian population lived in the municipality of Zadar. For determining the number of Croats and Serbs, a combination of linguistic and religious principles is used. The total number of Croats and Serbs can be obtained by subtracting the number of Orthodox Christians from the total number of residents who declared “Croatian or Serbian” as their spoken language. According to the aforementioned census, there were 520,073 Croats, representing 80.56 per cent of the population, and 106,308 or 16.46 per cent of Serbs in Zadar. The Census data clearly reveals that the Croats constituted around four-fifths of the population in Dalmatia and dominated the autonomous authorities’ bodies in the early twentieth century. As for the Serbian population, it was predominantly settled in Northern Dalmatia (Knin district), and in the area around Boka kotorska (now part of Montenegro).

Table 1 – Ethnic composition of the Kingdom of Dalmatia according to censuses between 1880 and 1910

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croats</td>
<td>369,531</td>
<td>77.62</td>
<td>423,536</td>
<td>80.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>27,305</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>476,102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>524,426</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adoption of a linguistic decree, which entered into force on January 1, 1912, had an important role in strengthening the position of Croats in Dalmatia. According to the decree, Croatian became the official language of the Austrian administration, with minor exceptions regarding Italian language, which meant that Austrian authorities were obliged to communicate in Croatian not only when communicating with public, but also within the administrative apparatus.

---


The Kingdom of Dalmatia was an extremely underdeveloped country with a high proportion of rural population. Illiteracy rate was extremely high and decreased very slowly. The dominant group within the society was the urban patricianbourgeois class, which dominated both political and economic life in the province.6

Dalmatia joined national integration processes of the second half of the nineteenth century. Dalmatian elites were divided about the issue of Dalmatia entering a union with northern Croatia. The autonomists, opponents to the union with northern Croatia, won the first elections for Dalmatian Parliament in 1861. In the beginning (from the 1860s to the end of 1870s), Croatian and Serbian elites were united in the fight against superior autonomist (pro-Italian) elite. The first major victory was won in the elections for provincial parliament in 1870, and the process was completed with Croatization of Split, the most populated Dalmatian town, in 1882. By the time the Habsburg Monarchy collapsed in 1918, the Autonomist (Italian) party kept power only in the Zadar municipality. From the beginning of the twentieth century the irredentists, supporters of unification with Italy, began to take dominance within the Italian community.7

Joint activities of Croats and Serbs ceased by the end of the 1870s. In fact, Dalmatian Serbs would soon closely cooperate with Dalmatian Italians in the elections. Only a policy of the “New Course” (1903 to 1905) will lead to a convergence of attitudes within a part of Croatian and Serbian political parties in Dalmatia. However, these relations were often conflicted on the local level (e.g. Zadar).8

---

6 D. FORETIĆ, 'Drustvene prilike u Dalmaciji pred Prvi svjetski rat s osobitom osvrtom na radničku klasu', [Social situation in Dalmatia before the first world war, with particular emphasis on the working class], Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru, II. Razdjel Historije, arheologije, historije umjetnosti, (1), Zadar, 1963., FORETIĆ, D.: 'O ekonomskim prilikama u Dalmaciji u drugoj polovici XIX stoljeća do Prvog svjetskog rata', [The economic situation in Dalmatia in the second half of the nineteenth century until the first world war]. Hrvatski narodni preporod u Dalmaciji i Istri, zbornik, Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb, 1969.


On the eve of the Balkan Wars there were six active political parties in Dalmatia: Hrvatska stranka [Croatian Party], Stranka prava u Dalmaciji [Party of Rights in Dalmatia], Hrvatska pučka napredna stranka [Croatian People's Progressive Party], Srpska stranka na Primorju [Serbian Party in Primorje], Italian (Liberal) Party and Italian Democratic Party.

Hrvatska stranka [Croatian Party] was created in 1905 as a merger of the old Narodna hrvatska stranka [National Croatian Party] and liberal part of the Party of Rights. The party had a majority in Dalmatian Parliament and the National Committee, and conducted an opportunistically moderate policy towards the centre of the monarchy in Vienna. It also held power in most Dalmatian municipalities, especially on the coast and the islands. By its social structure, it consisted of the members of the wealthy Croatian elite. The party's organ was Narodni list from Zadar.9

Stranka prava u Dalmaciji [Party of Rights in Dalmatia] was established in the late nineteenth century. Its programme campaigned for unification of all Croatian lands into one state unit within the Habsburg Monarchy. Party was anti-Serbian, and saw the Great Serbia ideology as the greatest danger for the Croats. After the unification of the liberal part of the Party of Rights with the Narodna hrvatska stranka [National Croatian Party], Catholic priests and teachers took dominant roles in the party. The party enjoyed great popularity among the rural population in Dalmatian hinterland and the Zadar district. As for major towns, the party held power in Šibenik. Its official organ was Hrvatska kruna from Zadar.10

Hrvatska pučka napredna stranka [Croatian People's Progressive Party] was formed in 1905 in Split from a minor part of the Party of Rights. Although their wish was to influence the entire Dalmatia, their factual influence was limited to the area around Split. The party's programme was pronouncedly anticlerical and promoted the idea of integral Yugoslavism. They were decidedly anti-Austrian-minded. The party, according to the social structure, represented a mixture of lower social classes of Split and a minor part of the town's elite. Its official organ was Sloboda from Split.11


Srpska stranka na Primorju [Serbian Party on the Coast] was predominant within the Serbian community in Dalmatia. After sharp conflicts in the early twentieth century, a small group of Catholic Serbs, representatives of Dubrovnik’s elite, prevailed within the party. The party gathered all social classes within the Serbian community. It was also extremely anti-Austrian and participated in the regional autonomous bodies (Zemaljski odbor) together with the Hrvatska stranka. The party’s organ was Dubrovnik.12

Italian (Liberal) Party continued the policy of the "old" Autonomist Party and, from the beginning of the twentieth century, was dominated by irredentist elements. The party gathered higher social classes of the Italian community and implemented an opportunist policy towards the Austrian authorities, expecting support from Vienna to retain dominance in Zadar, the capital of Dalmatia. The organ of the party was Il Dalmata.

Italian Democratic Party represented a more radical portion of the Italian community in the town of Zadar, with its social base consisting of lower and middle urban classes and students. Its members were the organizers of pro-Italian demonstrations. They worked closely with the irredentist circles in Italy. They did not have representatives in the Dalmatian Parliament. The organ of the party was Risorgimento.13

The electoral system in the Austrian part of the monarchy, at least for municipal councils and provincial parliaments, was a curial electoral system that favoured wealthier social strata. In fact, the wealthiest members of community used to elect a third of representatives for municipal councils, while the lower classes, which formed the majority in electoral bodies, also elected a third of the representatives. The wealthy were also overly represented in the provincial Parliament (Zemaljski sabor). Dalmatian Parliament consisted of four “curies”: the commercial chambers curia (3 members), curia of higher-income taxpayers (individuals who paid over 100 kunas a year for taxes) (10 members), the curia of cities (8 members), and the curia of external (rural) municipalities (20 members). Along with 41 elected members, the Catholic archbishop of Zadar and the Orthodox archbishop were also MPs by virtue of their positions. The curial structure shows that the largest number of voters, who belonged to the curia of rural municipalities and accounted for nearly 90

---


per cent of the population, had less than 50 per cent of MPs. Such social inequality had its national implications. Namely, Dalmatian Italians who made less than 3 per cent of the population had 15 per cent of MPs, to the detriment of the Croatian representatives. The number of Serbian representatives corresponded to their statistical representation in the province.

Table 2—Composition of the last Dalmatian Parliament in 1908 (curial system)\textsuperscript{14}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>High-income taxpayers</th>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Commercial chambers</th>
<th>External municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hrvatska stranka</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranka prava</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talijanska stranka</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srpska stranka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrvatska naprećna stranka</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the Stranka prava [Party of Rights] had great influence in the rural part of the province and it is, therefore, understandable that its members were the strongest advocates of universal suffrage during the attempts to reform the electoral system for the provincial parliament in 1914, while all the other parties were, more or less, satisfied with the existing (curial) system.

Table 3—The number of residents and voters in the Zadar District in 1912\textsuperscript{15}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of voters</th>
<th>Taxes paid in 1912</th>
<th>Taxes per voter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biograd</td>
<td>8,629</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>19,591</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nin</td>
<td>8,668</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>18,384</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novigrad</td>
<td>6,709</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>14,114</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pag</td>
<td>7,462</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>17,665</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rab</td>
<td>5,099</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>11,716</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šolta</td>
<td>6,875</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>7,747</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibina</td>
<td>4,076</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>7,040</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zadar—the town</td>
<td>13,191</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>406,447</td>
<td>361.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zadar—rural areas</td>
<td>22,536</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>50,247</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83,248</td>
<td>9,656</td>
<td>552,951</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{14} Pериč, I., Dalmačinski sabor... [Dalmatian parliament...].

\textsuperscript{15} Državni arhiv u Zadru [State Archives in Zadar]. STAMPE fundus, Nr. 205/57, 21 Jan 1914
As already stated, the Italians kept power in the capital city of Dalmatia as a result of the curial electoral system. Specifically, the Italians in Zadar accounted for only about 30 per cent of the population of the municipality, while Croats accounted for sixty per cent. However, since the Italians represented a wealthier group in the municipality's population they could easily control two of three curiae of the municipal council. Table below shows that voters from the town of Zadar (mostly Italians) were paying almost twenty times more taxes than the voters in the District's rural areas (mostly Croats).

The Dalmatian press and the First Balkan War

The first Balkan war began on October 8, 1912, when Montenegro attacked the Ottoman Empire. On October 16 Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece joined the attack. Of course, the Balkan states would not dare to attack the Ottoman Empire had the recent history not encouraged them to do so. The beginning of the twentieth century only accelerated turbulence and decay that revealed obvious weaknesses of the Empire. The Young Turk Revolution of 1908 through which the young Ottoman army officers wanted to thoroughly reform the Empire, was an introduction to the Balkan Wars. Important goals of the reforms included restoration of the constitutional era suspended by Sultan Abdul Hamid (1876-1909) and centralization of the country by use of Turkish national ideology combined with Turkization of non-Turkish nations. Such politics provoked strong resistance of non-Turkish nations, especially Greeks, Bulgarians, Macedonians, and Albanians. Bloody assaults on Turkish authorities most often occurred in Macedonia, plundered by infiltrated troops of Bulgarians, Serbs, Greeks, and pugnacious Albanian mountain tribes. Italy was the first to take advantage of the Young Turks regime's obvious incompetence and took Turkish African provinces of Tripoli and Ciremaku in the war 1911-1912, which ended on the very eve of the first Balkan war with a peace treaty signed in Lausanne on October 15, 1912.

Negotiations between the Balkan League regarding war plans, mutual relationships, and, most importantly, regarding the distribution of conquered areas, were led throughout 1912. The negotiations were held under the Russian Empire patronage. The members mostly disagreed about the division of Macedonian territories, i.e. the Vardar River valley that naturally ends with


17 MATUZ, J., Osmansko carstvo [The Ottoman Empire], Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1992; VON HAMMER, J. Historija Turskog (Osmanskog) carstva [History of the Turkish (Ottoman) Empire], Vol. III, Ognjen Prča, Zagreb, 1979.
the port of Thessaloniki. According to the original plan, Serbia gained the out
to sea via northern Albania, Greece gets southern Albania, and Bulgaria most
of the remaining Macedonia. The countries were unable to agree on the heart
of the problem—the Vardar River valley and Thessaloniki. Therefore the area
was marked as disputable and put to further negotiations between Serbia and
Bulgaria. Greece refused to accept or sign such agreement.

Another controversial issue was the possible conduct of Austria in the
forthcoming conflict, since it also aspired to the aforementioned area and
wished to dominate the Southeast Europe through its plans for strategic rail-
roads across Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sandžak, Kosovo, and Macedonia to
Thessaloniki. Therefore Serbia insisted on Bulgarian military assistance in
case of possible Austrian interference, which Bulgaria reluctantly agreed to
provide. However, effectiveness of the Austrian-Hungarian foreign policy
was substantially reduced by Hungarian attitude towards the events on the
Balkans. Firstly, Hungarian domestic politics was distinctly hostile towards
the Slaves and, therefore, enemies of any policy that would encourage growth
of Slavic population in the Monarchy. Secondly, since Hungary protected its
agriculture, especially livestock breeding, the Hungarians were the biggest
opponents of agricultural trade liberalization with the Balkan countries, and
thus kept them apart from the Monarchy.

The Balkan allies' attack on Turkish positions caused euphoria in Croa-
tian press in Zadar. The front cover of the first October issue of the Narodni
list announced, with obvious pleasure and dramatic tension, the "Dawn in the
Balkans".18 "[Last night we received a telegram from our distinguished coun-
tryman from Sofia:19 'Armies of our united brothers are departing for the bor-
der side by side, with great enthusiasm, followed by the sounds of the Yugo-
slav anthem. Their enthusiasm is indescribable. Dawn has finally broken on
the Balkans.']". For the Narodni list, which supported the idea of Croatian-
Serbian harmony, the war was of essential national interest for Croatian peo-
ple. Therefore the paper quoted a part of the text of Serbian king Peter's war
proclamation in which he emphasized his passion for "the brothers of the
same blood". Moreover, quoting Russian publicist T. D. Florinski who wrote
about the power of Slavdom, the paper cited without any comment the name
"Serbo-Croats" (meaning that Croats and Serbs were the same nation).20

After great allies' victories, euphoria also took over the Party of Rights
and its organ Hrvatska kruna. The paper transmitted fantastic forecasts in its
texts, one of them speculating that the Balkan rulers would enter Constantino-

18 Zora sa Balkana [Dawn from the Balkans], Narodni list (further NL.), no 78, 2 Oct 1912.
19 This probably refers to B. Jurinić, a professor at the University of Sofia.
20 Priestolna besjeda kralja Petra', [Throne speech of King Peter] NL., no. 80, 9 Oct 1912. The
reference to the name "Serbo-Croat" can be found in the article 'The Power of Slavdom' by Rus-
rian publicist Florinski, published by Petersburg Slavic Benevolent Society. It is worth empha-
sizing that, according to him, Macedonia is inhabited by "Serbo-Croats" and Bulgarians.
ple together, led by the Bulgarian king Ferdinand I, the future ruler of the Balkan Empire. While doing so, a legend in which Ferdinand was to enter Constantinople only through the Golden Gates had to be respected. Unity of the Balkan League was a done deal for *Hrvatska kruna* and, in support of that, the paper revealed information from a confidential source about preparations for printing a common currency. In such atmosphere, the paper’s disbelief upon receiving news that the Bulgarians had suffered defeat at Ciataldze near Constantinople is understandable.21

Split’s *Sloboda* and Dubrovnik’s *Dubrovnik* joined the euphoria. They also believed that the new circumstances in the Balkans would bring freedom to the people. In the light of Pan-Slavic cooperation, the pro-Serbian *Dubrovnik* writes quite affirmatively about joint activities of Serbia and Bulgaria and the success of mobilization in Bulgaria. In fact, the Bulgarians are portrayed as compassionate warriors who take “into care” abandoned Turkish children from the battlefields.22 The *Sloboda* called joint warfare of the Balkan League “the Yugoslav war”: [“Although Greece also participates in this cultural uprising and rebellion against Turkish tyrants and bullies, this army should be called the Yugoslav army (italics by the *Sloboda*) because Serbia, Montenegro, and Bulgaria are its main participants.”].23 Soon the *Sloboda* published Croatian translation of the Bulgarian anthem “Šumi Marica.”24

The *Dan*25 from Split reported about the Balkan wars with much less euphoria and general attention. Yet, at the beginning of the war, the paper expressed a positive attitude about the Balkan states’ actions, Bulgarian in particular: [“In this war, Bulgaria could especially successfully oppose to Turkey. The Bulgarian king would probably be chosen to be the chief military commander of the coalition (...) Bulgaria is the centre of the campaign, while the other countries would have auxiliary roles.”]. The *Dan*’s attitude towards the war is clearly apparent in the commentary from the end of October 1912: [“(...) we too, being Catholics and Croats, are following the successes of our neighbouring brothers in their struggle against centennial oppressors and enemies of Christianity and liberty with vivid sympathies.”].26 This sentence

---


24 ‘Šumi Marica’, *Sloboda*, No. 86, 16.10.1912.

25 *Dan* is clerically-oriented newspaper from Split, with a distinct note of anti-Serbism.

26 ‘Mobilizacije’ [Mobilizations], *Dan*, no. 41, 10. Oct 1912; i ‘Zora rudi’ [The Dawn is Breaking], *Dan*, No. 44, 31 Oct 1912.
clearly shows the principles the paper followed in its assessments of war events. The newspaper views the battle between the Balkan Slavs and the Turks primarily as a fight between Christianity and Islam, not a Yugoslav struggle against its enemies. Since the newspaper was consistently against cooperation and, in particular, against national union with Serbia, one could not expect its excitement with Serbian national struggle. The paper created its attitudes towards a particular Balkan nation according to their treatment of the Catholic Church. Accordingly, the Bulgarians had the best image, for only they and the Montenegrins had allowed the Catholic Church to act independently. The Dan harshly condemned Serbian politics for the difficult situation of Catholics in Serbia.27

At the beginning of the war, the Smotra Dalmatinska, a semi-official organ of the Austrian authorities in Dalmatia, advocated maintenance of the status quo—a position best illustrated by the Austrian Foreign Minister Berchtold who, when Montenegro declared war against Turkey, said that the upcoming war actions would be nothing but mountain skirmishes and that the great powers would prevent the spread of the conflict in the Balkans.28 However, it was clear who had Austrian sympathies, since only the Bulgarian Army combat readiness had been praised.29 It was only after the Balkan League’s great victories that the Smotra Dalmatinska changed its tone, and began to accept the reality of collapse of the Ottoman Empire in the Southeast Europe. The Smotra then began to print articles about the Austro-Hungarian Empire’s peaceful policy in the Balkans, saying that Empire had nothing against the Balkan League.30

While the official Austrian policy took a different tone, at least for the public, only after great victories of the Balkan League, the Dalmatian public euphorically welcomed the allies’ successes. The largest event took place on November 10, 1912 when municipal governments in Šibenik and Split organized demonstration in support of the League. At the gatherings the crowd cheered to the Serbian King Peter and Montenegrin King Nikola. Simultaneously, they shouted “Down with Austria!” The fact that the Austrian authori-

27 'Katolička crkva za slobode kršćana' [Catholic Church for Christian freedoms] Dan. No. 45, 7 Nov 1912, Bilješke i osvrti [Notes and Reviews], Dan. No. 46, 14 Nov. 1912. The tone of the article about the Holy Sophia supports the Christian brothers: “(...) let the day of liberation of Constantinople and Exaltation the Holy Cross on the dome of St. Sophia be solemnly celebrated in all churches by singing songs of thanks and tolling all the bells, since such important events for freedom, enlightenment and Christianity happen only every couple of centuries!” Dan. No. 46, 14 Nov. 1912.
28 Smotra dalmatinska (further SD), No. 79, 2 Oct 1912.
29 'Rat na Balkanu', [War in the Balkans], SD. No. 85, 23. Oct 1912.
30 'Poslije pada Solun', [After the Fall of Thessaloniki ] SD. No. 91, 13 Nov 1912; 'Austro-Ugarska i rat na Balkanu', 'Austro-Ugarska i Srbija', 'Poljska ambulanca austrijskog Crvenog kršća u Crnoj Gori', [Austro-Hungary and the Balkan War], [Austria-Hungary and Serbia], [Field Ambulance of the Austrian Red Cross in Montenegro], SD, No. 92, 16 Nov 1912.
ties, at the same time, wanted to establish cooperation with the Party of Rights that ruled in Šibenik was even more damaging for their reputation. The awareness of loosing the Party of Rights, the regime’s last possible ally in the southeast, was deeply unsettling for the leading men of the Monarchy. After the demonstrations, the provincial Regency was forced to react and dissolved the municipal councils in Split and Šibenik. This measure antagonized Dalmatian public even further, which was reflected through the actions of its MPs and newspapers. In response to the dissolution of municipal councils in Split and Šibenik, all Croatian and Serbian representatives in Dalmatian Parliament met in Zadar on November 24, 1912 and sent a protest note to the Austrian authorities. After the dissolution of the municipal councils, all parties agreed to appoint the very same councillors and municipal councils than before the dissolution.

It is easy to understand from the aforementioned why the humanitarian action to help the Balkan League’s Red Cross was a success. A committee that was supposed to coordinate the activities was formed. Presidency of the Committee, with headquarters in Split, was consisted of the most distinguished political figures from all political parties and ethnic groups in Dalmatia. The president of the Committee was Vicko Katalinić, mayor of Split and member of the Hrvatska stranka. Other members were: Ercolano Salvi, a member of the Italian party, Dr. Josip Smolža, a lawyer and a member of the Hrvatska pučka napredna stranka [Croatian People’s Progressive Party], and others. Not even the authorities could dispute such an action so that the Dalmatian governor, Count Mario Attems, was one of the first contributors with a donation of 100 crowns. The press played a major role in collecting the contributions, publishing the names of donors and covering fundraising campaign in different parts of Dalmatia. The idea of collecting aid was to help all the Slavs in the Balkans, i.e. Serbs, Montenegrins, and Bulgarians, and this was the reason why the editorial board of the Narodni list denounced the municipality of Knin for giving 5000 crowns each only to Serbia and Montenegro. But, even Bliakini, the editor of the Narodni list, did not stick to this principle. Namely, he was the head of the fundraising committee in Zadar, which gathered 39,300 crowns by the end of 1912, of which Belgrade and Cetinje got 15,000 crowns each while Sofia got only 9,000 crowns.

32 'Interpelacija zastupnika Laginje glede Zadarske rezolucije', [Interpellation of MP Laginja about Zadar resolution], HK, No. 108, 30 Nov 1912; Razpust občina Split i Šibenik. Zar vilajet?, [The dissolution of municipalities of Split and Šibenik], NL, No. 92, 20 Nov 1912.
33 'Doprinosi za crveni krst balkanskih naroda', [Contributions to the Red Cross of the Balkan nations], NL, No. 84, 23 Oct 1912.
34 'Knin za bračar', [Knin for brothers], NL, No. 98, 26 Oct. 1912.
35 'Zadarski odbor', [Zadar Committee], NL, No. 2, 4 Jan 1913.
The extent to which Dalmatian newspapers had been following the Balkan Wars can be seen in the table below:

Table 4 – Percentage of articles dedicated to the situation in the Balkans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1913</th>
<th>1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hrvatska krova</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narodni list</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>9.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smotra dalmatinska</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>31.89</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il Dalmata</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risorgimento</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *Narodni list* was the most important Croatian newspaper in Dalmatia, and its Italian counterpart was *Il Dalmata*. Comparing different percentages of specific columns' coverage, a difference in their approach to the topic can be determined. In this research, we view an example from 1913 because of the actuality of the Balkan wars at the time. The table shows that Croatian and Serbian newspapers had been covering the Balkan wars much more than the Italian newspapers.

Table 5 – Data comparison of the *Narodni list* and *Il Dalmata* (percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric</th>
<th>Narodni list</th>
<th>Il Dalmata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dalmatian situation</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>77.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkans situation</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian situation</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation in Austro-Hungary</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Palić Case

Father Alojzije Palić was a Croatian Catholic priest, a Franciscan born in Janjevo. He was murdered by Montenegrin soldiers because he, allegedly, resisted against their army entering Đakovica (Kosovo). Other sources had

---

36 Catholics from the Dubrovnik Republic moved in the thirteenth century to what is today's Kosovo and formed settlements of Janjevo, Letnica and Vrniko. They kept their Catholic faith all through the medieval Serbian rule, the Ottoman Empire, the Kingdom of Serbia, and Yugoslavia. During the 1990s was in the former Yugoslavia most of them moved to Croatia. The biggest community of Janjevo Croats today is situated in Kistanje in the Diocese of Zadar (Croatia). Source: ŠTJKOVIĆ, Z., GLAMUŽINA, M.: *Janjevo and Janjevci – from Kosovo to Zagreb*, Geodadria, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 89-109, Department of Geography, University of Zadar, Zadar, 2004.
reported that he was murdered because he resisted involuntary conversions of Catholic and Muslims to Orthodox religion.\textsuperscript{37}

The \textit{Smotra dalmatinaska} was the first to report about the case.\textsuperscript{38} It reported the ultimate request of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy for its authorities and the bishop of Prizren to conduct an investigation, to which the Monarchy as the protector of Catholics in Turkey was entitled. Montenegro declined the investigation by claiming its sovereign rights over the conquered area. The Palić Case was an excellent excuse for pressuring Montenegro since the Skadar crisis had been escalating at the time. It should be mentioned that the \textit{Smotra} did not blow the issue out of proportions and refrained from commenting.

The \textit{Narodni list} was of a different opinion. Firstly, the \textit{Narodni list} did not believe at all that the murder was committed in the aforementioned manner and quoted the French press that had claimed that Father Palić had been alarming the Albanians and had been murdered while escaping. Secondly, forceful religious conversions, according to the paper, did not exist at all but were rather a normal course of events.\textsuperscript{39} It is quite surprising how the editor’s (Biankini’s) ideological affinity towards the Balkan League could so easily annul religious and peer solidarity with the murdered priest.

On the other hand, the murder of Father Palić was very disturbing for Father Prodan, the editor of the \textit{Hrvatska kruna}. His writing reveals his disbelief and a great concern. The editor wrote that he had not published news about possible Serbian crimes up to that point because he had believed them to be nothing but Austrian exaggerations\textsuperscript{40} but that in this case he was con-

\textsuperscript{37} Fr Alojzije Palić was born in Janjevo on April 9, 1878. His birth name was Matej. He joined the Franciscan Order by taking his eternal vows on December 8, 1901. He was ordained in Parma on April 20, 1902. He studied philosophy in Skadar and graduated in theology in Bologna and Parma. He returned to Kosovo where he served as a pastor in Bežë and Đakovica in 1907 and in Peć and Glogane from 1911 to 1913. While serving as pastor in Glogane, he opposed forceful conversions of Muslims to Orthodoxy in a few of neighboring villages and was arrested and spent a couple of days in Đakovica prison. On March 9, 1913, on a road near the village of Janoš, Montenegrin soldiers captured him and took off his Franciscan habit, forcing him to renounce his priesthood and the Franciscan Order to become Orthodox. When they realized his faith was firm and that he would suffer anything in the name of Christ and the Church they shot him with five shots from a rifle. His body was found intact a few weeks later and transported to a church in Zvumba. At the time of his death Fr Alojzije Palić was 35 years old and had been a monk for 17 and a priest for 10 years. \textbf{Source:} http://www.ika.hr/index.php?prikaz=vijest\&ID0127273 (downloaded on Sept. 18, 2013).

\textsuperscript{38} ‘Austrougarski korak na Cetinju’ [Austro-Hungarian Move in Cetinje], \textit{SD}, No. 23, Mar. 22, 1913 and No. 24, Mar. 26, 1913.


\textsuperscript{40} ["is it possible"]: after the title there is a text that points to disbelief. [Many of us have asked ourselves the same question when we heard that Serbian soldiers, who have been burning villages and murdering Albanians, have begun to murder the Catholic Serbs and burn their villages, too (at the beginning of the twentieth century the inhabitants of Janjevo, Vrnakoło and Ljetica were considered Serbian, the author’s note), in old Serbia and Albania. We thought this was exaggerat-
fused. He was shaken even more when the Montenegrin authorities partially admitted forceful conversions on their part. The death of Fr Palić was used by semi-official Austrian and German press (Neue Freie Presse and Reichpost) to put the deed on a level of a hideous crime (they reported he was tortured and his bones had been smashed). The Hrvatska kruna was revealed to receive a report from the official investigation that had an Austrian physician as a member. The report said that there had been no torture prior to death, which the Hrvatska kruna commented as follows: [“With everything taken into consideration, perhaps certain assumptions regarding the conversions are not completely accurate, since, when the Slavs are concerned, Jewish and German presses often tend to exaggerate and twist the truth. By all means the investigators are expected to shed light on the case! Then let there be a trial! If the Serbs are responsible, they should be tried, but, if they are not guilty, those who have recklessly played with the public will be tarnished.”]. It can still be noticed that, after the crime, the number of pathetic and non-critical articles about the Balkan War in both Croatian newspapers has decreased.

The Risorgimento offers a different approach to the matter. As already mentioned, the Risorgimento was against the Church and so, in its article called “Il Martire” the paper mocks fanaticism of both the priest and his murderer(s). For this newspaper, this death is an example of fanaticism and ignorance in “the century of reason”.

The Palić Case was finalized at the beginning of May, 1913, when it was definitely determined that Fr Palić had been tortured and killed “without a valid reason”, which was also accepted by Montenegro. For redress, Montenegro had to build a Catholic church, send its representatives to its consecration and to Fr Palić’s funeral. Furthermore, it should allow a free practice of Catholicism and conversion back to Catholicism to those who were forcibly converted to Orthodoxy. It should be noted that only the Smotra reported

ed and did not want to report the news brought by the German papers in our chronicles since we thought they have been making mountains out of molehills, like in the job of the consul Prohaska. But not only had the pro-Austrian German paper reported about the matter this time. Slavic press also noted a number of atrocities done by the Serbian troops to the Albanian and, also, Slavic population in Albania., HK, No. 25, Mar. 26, 1913.

41 An article from the politics rubric Političke viesti: ‘Crnogorska vlada’ [Montenegrin Government], HK, No. 27, Apr. 4, 1913.

42 ‘Bliamaža ili blamažom’ [One Embarassement after Another], HK, No.31, Apr. 4, 1913.

43 To better understand the writer’s cynicism, a part of the text is quoted: “Palić, di Giacowa, uomo forse incolto, forse rozzo e sporco, ha risollevaro e stretto in pugno il labaro del martirio. Bravo Palić! Nello scorciro dei secoli degeneranti, quando per esperienza si e giunti a perdere la fiducia nell’ umanità coscienza e nella forza primitiva dei suoi errori di concetto, come giova urtarli in un esempio evidente, che per lo meno nelle foresti balcaniche e rimasto qualche erede della vecchia ostinazione!... E così Palić, morendo per un assurdo nel secolo del ragionamento, riscatta l’ umanità dalla ignavia ragionante.,” RIS, No. 210, Mar.27, 1913.

44 ‘Zadovoljšćina Crne Gore Austro-Ugarskoj’ [Montenegrin Compensation to Austro-Hungary], SD, No. 36, May 7, 1913.
about the aforementioned conclusions and requests. The *Hrvatska kruna* did report about the compensation. However, it commented askance on the news that the Montenegrins had been forcefully converting Albanian Catholics: "["has Vienna press been fooled again, or are these violent events only a figment of their imagination as was the case with the Palić murder. We shall see!"]\(^{45}\)

*The Albanian Question and Dalmatian Public*

Incredibly swift victories of the Balkan League encouraged lively diplomatic activities. Serbian conquest of Albanian ports of Medua and Duress and persistent Montenegrin sieges of Skadar, along with the simultaneous penetration of Greek troops to the south of Albania, prompted Austro-Hungary and Italy to take a brisk action to prevent Serbia and Greece to gain exit to the Adriatic Sea.\(^{46}\) Breaking the Balkan League was Austro-Hungarian foreign policy’s priority. A good opportunity to do so was acknowledging the Albanians’ right to their own country. Creation of an Albanian state would annul the agreement between Serbia and Bulgaria because Serbia would lose its out to the sea and would try even harder to reach Thessaloniki and the Aegean Sea. This raised suspicion in Bulgarians and weakened the League. Austrian advocating of the Albanian state could be sensed right away in the *Smostra*’s reports. As early as mid November 1912, the article "Austro-Ugarska i Srbija"\(^{47}\) [Austro-Hungary and Serbia] claimed that the Division of Albania would not happen since it was not the wish of the entire Europe and that Serbia could gain a seaport on the Aegean. The same issue described Albanian ports of Medua and Duress, stating that the majority of their trade was done with Austria.

The affair concerning the Austro-Hungarian consul in Prizren, Prohauska\(^{48}\), did not upset the Dalmatian press as much as the press in other parts of

\(^{45}\) 'Opet nasilna poobraćenja' [More Forceful Conversions], *HK*, No. 33, Apr. 23, 1913. More than a hundred years after his death the Albanian Franciscan Province that also includes Kosovo had initiated process of beatification of 40 Franciscans and laymen from Kosovo and Albania murdered between 1913 and 1947, which includes Fr Alejošje Palić. The Janjeveci community in Croatia (the village of Kistanje) commemorates his death every year on March 7. Source: http://www.ika.hr/index.php?prikaz=vijesti&ID=127273 (Downloaded on Sept 1, 2013, at 16:45).

\(^{46}\) For further reading on the Albanian question in the Balkan Wars see: BOBEV, B.: 'Vraposat za granicite na Albanija ot objavjavaneto na nezavisnismata do okoćatelnim utvarčavanje', *Evropa: narodi i granici, Versaiskijat mir i negovoto nasledstvo [*The Albanian Borders Question from Declaration of Independence until their Final Confirmation*]. Europe: Peoples and Borders. The Versaile Peace and its Heritage*, Sofia 2010, pp. 56-76.

\(^{47}\) *SD*, No. 92, Nov. 16, 1912.

\(^{48}\) The affair that brought relations between Austro-Hungary and Serbia to a boiling point. According to the Serbian version, shots were fired at Serbian troops from the Austro-Hungarian Consulate. According to the Austrians, the Serbs had violated the integrity of the Consulate and even threw away their flag. The affair ended in Serbian remission and compensation to the consul Prohauska.
the Monarchy. The Smoira did not go after the scandals in the affair, although certain newspapers in the Monarchy claimed that the consul had been tortured and even castrated. The objective was to intensify the pressure on Serbia regarding the Albanian question. Creation of the Albanian state remained one of the most pursued issues in Zadar newspapers. The Smoira continued to write about the right of the Albanians to their own country in its issues.49

The Narodni list treated the Albanian question differently. Their opinion was that Serbia had the right to gain access to the se via Albania. They tried to negate the right of the Albanians to their own country. In the eyes of the Narodni list, the Albanians had become uneducated savages incapable to form a state. The paper emphasizes Albanian atrocities50; they had “the look of a beast”51. In addition, the Albanians were incoherent, divided among three religions and, moreover, formed the majority of population only in the mountain areas.52 As opposed to that, the paper emphasizes the civility of Serbian army and the peace the army brought when it entered the Albanian territory.53 The news that the Catholic tribe of Mirditi had invited the Serbian army to occupy the north of Albania was particularly important for Dalmatian Catholics.54 In this case the Albanians would keep only their right to education religion, guaranteed by Serbia and Greece on their respective territories.55 Certain distinguished Dalmatian politicians supported the idea. For instance, the Narodni list reported Ante Tresić-Pavićić’s statement in the House of Representatives of the Imperial Council that granting the Albanians the right to


51 ‘Dolazak zarobljenika’ [The Arrival of Prisoners], signed by N. This article is an example of ugly propaganda about a nation and therefore we will quote a part of it: [...] While the other soldiers were walking peacefully, those beasts (the Albanians, A/N) glanced restlessly to the left and the right expecting the audience to charge at them. Poor men, they cannot grasp that a Serbian does not wreak his anger on bared-hand slaves! They judge according to themselves because, not so long ago, they used to rip the wombs of women and take out little Christians. All the Turkish prisoners were taken to the baths on the same day...], NL. No. 100, 14 Dec 1912.

52 ‘Na čemu smo’ [Where We Stand], NL. No. 100, 12 Dec, 1912.

53 ‘U osvojenim krajevima. Držanje Armatu’ [In the Conquered Areas. The Albanian's Conduct] gives an idyllic portrait of peace and labour, NL. No. 96, 4 Dec. 1912.

54 ‘Mirditi za Srbiju’ [Mirditi for Serbia], NL. No. 93, 23 Nov 1912.

55 The article “Zahtjevi Srbihe” [Serbian Requests] quotes the interview with the Serbian Prime Minister Pašić from the Parisian „Temps“, NL. No. 90, 13 Nov 1912.
their own state would mean to return to “medieval barbarism”, and that the Croats would not against Serbia for the sake of the Albanians.\textsuperscript{56} The goal of all the Slavs in the Monarchy was to avoid the war between the Austro-Hungary and Serbia. Czech leader Tomáš Masaryk came to Belgrade to help calm the tensions and warned the Serbs about the negative publicity their crimes against the Albanians had brought them. Serbian politicians’ answer was: [“Of course the Serbs shot the Albanians they had found with arms in their hands, according to the military law. It is also understandable that Serbian soldiers, bitter and angry at the Albanians’ cruelties, retaliated here and there.”]\textsuperscript{57} It is worth mentioning that the \textit{Narodni list} never reported about “retaliation here and there” of the Albanians.\textsuperscript{58}

Similarities between the views of the \textit{Hrvatska kruna} and the \textit{Narodni list} are evident in the matter of the Albanian state creation. The \textit{Hrvatska kruna} was against the idea and claimed that such a state could cause major disputes and conflicts in the southeast of Europe.\textsuperscript{59} However, there is one significant difference between the \textit{Narodni list} and the \textit{Hrvatska kruna} regarding the issue. Namely, the \textit{Hrvatska kruna} would have never written or quote a text in which the Albanians were belittled. Such an attitude is understandable if taken into consideration that Arbanasi (an Albanian community in Zadar suburbia at the time) were the most significant stronghold of the Party of Rights in Zadar and that its inhabitants formed a movement that supported the formation of an Albanian state.\textsuperscript{60} Since the Party of Rights condemned the creation of the Albanian state and, at the same time, its most powerful stronghold were the Arbanasi – croatized descendants of Albanian settlers from the Skadar district in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century – the situation was very suitable for manipulations by the Italian and “old Croatian” parties. The \textit{Nasje jedinstvo} newspaper from Split reported from issue to issue about the incredible news that the Arbanasi from Zadar had sent a letter to Count Berchtold in which they had suggested that they should join the Albanian state as “corpus separatium vetusti regni Albaeniae”. This was, of course, followed by a sharp reply and taunt by the \textit{Hrvatska kruna}.\textsuperscript{61}

The opinion of the Catholic Church regarding Skadar’s affiliation to Albania provoked sharp attacks from a part of Croatian press. The attacks to the very foundations of the Church, i.e. the Pope, were coming from Croatian

\textsuperscript{56} 'Za mir' [For Peace]. \textit{NL}, No. 98, 11 Dec 1912.
\textsuperscript{57} 'Misija prof. Masaryka', \textit{NL}, No. 100, 18 Dec 1912.
\textsuperscript{58} Serbian Socialist intellectual D. Tucović wrote in detail about Serbian troops’ retaliation against the Albanians in his \textit{Srbija i Arbanija, jedan prilog zavojevačke politike srpske barijerci, Kultura}, Zagreb, 1945.
\textsuperscript{59} 'Ozbiljan polecaj' [A Serious Position]. \textit{HK}, No. 103, 13 Nov 1912.
\textsuperscript{60} PDKLIĆ, M.: \textit{Pravštvo u zodarskim Arbanasima, Zadar 1992 and Hrvatska članica u Arbanasima, Matica hrvatska, Zadar, 1994.}
\textsuperscript{61} 'Kako ljudi jako nasiedaju' \textit{HK}, No. 10, 1 Feb 1913.
liberal circles, for instance, the Novi list from Rijeka. The paper claimed that better connoisseurs of the Curia knew why the Pope prefers the Muslims to the Orthodox "schismatic" (quotations by the Novi list, the author's note) and why the Church rather supported the Turks in their efforts to conquer Constantinople than the Orthodox Byzantium. This was met with a sharp response from the Hrvatska kruna: ["It is impossible to write a bigger historical lie!"]

However, the Hrvatska kruna justified the Curia's policy regarding Albania by writing: ["The Pope loves the Muslims! It seems as though the Pope supports the idea of Skadar remaining under the Turks! Not wanting it to become Montenegrin does not mean he wants it to stay Turkish, there are other options: among which a suggestion already known to the public, to separate the Albanian Catholics and the town of Skadar from both Turkey and Albania and create a separate small Catholic country."]

Zadar newspapers written in Italian supported the formation of the Albanian state but only under Italian protectorate. The Risorgimento paid much attention to the movement of the Zadar Arbanasi who stood in solidarity with the creation of the state. Furthermore, they wrote about historic relationships between Venetian Republic and the Albanians with Italians as natural heirs of Venice. The paper also condemned ["long and horrible reproach (requisitoria) of the representative Tresić-Pavičić said in the House of Representatives of the Imperial Council"]. This support of the Albanians is slightly different than the Smotra's. Both papers disapprove of Serbia gaining access to the sea, but the Risorgimento thinks that Italy and not Austro-Hungary should hold the most power in the Adriatic. Namely, Austria had organized an All-Albanian Congress in Trieste, on its own territory, which sent a significant message that the Albanian question pertained to Austrian sphere of interests. Nevertheless, the Risorgimento commented the official thank-you letter the Congress' board had sent to the Italian authorities as a collapse of exclusively Austrian policy towards the Albanians.

Il Dalmata was of a similar opinion, although it was not so openly pro-Italian (referred to the Kingdom of Italy) as the Risorgimento. Their opinion is best illustrated in their report of the representative Bugatti's speech in the House of Representatives of the Imperial Council, which the paper quoted. He condemned the anti-Balkan attitudes of certain representatives (aimed at Tresić-Pavičić) and claimed the Albanians were hardworking people with

62 'Vatikan i naši narodni interesi', HK, No. 7, 22 Jan 1913.
63 The Risorgimento also mocks the Croatian national awareness of the Zadar Arbanasi. The articles in their rubric Cronica di Zara: 'Gli albanesi di Borgo Erizzo pre l’Albania', RIS, No. 198, 5 Dec 1912; 'Al concesso degli Albanesi', Ibid., No. 207, 27 Feb 1913.
64 'Venezia e Albania', RIS, No. 200, 19 Dec 1912.
65 The article in Cronaca di Zara 'Guerra Slavo-Albanesse', RIS, No. 200, 19 Dec 1912.
66 The article in Cronaca di Zara 'Il congresso albanesse', RIS, No. 208, 6 Mar 1913.
more developed culture than in some European parts of Turkey. The "Albani-
ans from Arbanasi" congratulated Bugatti on this speech.67

Only the Narodni list had an openly negative attitude towards the
Congress in Trieste. They wrote that the Albanians from "Duress, Tirana,
Valona and Kruje... beg for their territories to remain under Serbian auth-

ority that brings freedom and culture, while autonomy would be fatal for them."68
A more serious attempt to discredit the Congress appeared in the next, twenti-
eth issue, of the Narodni list, in the article called "Arbanaški sastanak" [The
Albanian Meeting], in which they claim the Chief of Police in Trieste is the
actual organizer of the Congress and that he had spent 50,000 krunas for the
purpose.69

The general conclusion is that pro-Yugoslavian and pro-Serbian politi-
cal parties were against the creation of the Albanian state and used what is
nowadays referred to as "politically incorrect" speech for their arguments,
which particularly refers to the Narodni list, an organ which reflected the
views and opinions of the Hrvatska stranka [Croatian Party], the most influ-
ential political party in Dalmatia.

The Second Balkan War

On the eve of the second Balkan war, pro-Serbian views of the Dubrovnik
and Split's progressive paper Sloboda were almost equal regarding the
search for a potential culprit for the beginning of the war. Both papers
blamed Bulgaria. In early June of 1913 The Dubrovnik writes: ["... why have
the Bulgarians become so obstinate to take ancient Serbian lands, redeemed
with the blood of Serbian soldiers, away from the Serbs? Is someone hiding
behind their back, (an allusion to the Austria-Hungary and Germany, A/N)
because we are convinced that they have realized that Serbia and its army are
no longer weak and that another Slivnica can not happen again."] The paper
noted that in the event of war Bulgaria will lose sympathies of the South
Slavs.70 The Sloboda is even tougher in its condemnations of Bulgaria. Ac-
cording to the paper, the culprit for the escalation of the Balkans situation is
the Bulgarian king Ferdinand of the Coburg-Gotha dynasty. He is ["German
in his body, in his soul, in his heart, nothing but a German."] The article ends

67 The article in La cronaca 'L' on. Bugatto e gli Albanesi', DAL, No. 92, 16 Nov 1912.
68 The article in Političke bilježke 'Arbanaški kongres u Trstu', NL, No. 19, 5 Mar 1913.
69 The article ends in the following prediction: ["To form an Albanian state now that the Balkan
issue could be resolved once and for all (by dividing Albania, A/N) would mean to leave the seed
of future interferences and conflicts. Recently Charles Loiseau wrote well that this remnant—this
Balkan issue—could cause the war for supremacy on the Adriatic between Austro-Hungary and
Italy. The Trieste meeting is nothing but a comic prelude to a game that could turn into a bloody
tragedy."] NL, No. 20, 8 March 1913.
70 Dubrovnik, 4. junja', [Dubrovnik, 4th of June], DUB, No. 23, 5 Jun 1913.
with a threat directed to Ferdinand: "the crown of a Bulgarian King is given and taken by the Russian Tsar"], alluding to Russia's strong role in the Balkan alliance formation. On the eve of the war, the Sloboda's attitude became crystal clear. The newspaper emphasized its opinion in italics: "We suffer, at the thought that there might come to a fratricidal criminal war but, should that be Bulgaria's fault, our sympathies will be on the side of justice, on the side of those who have in sight not only their own interests but the whole Slavic race and Yugoslavism. Our sympathies will be on the side of our closest brothers, on the side of the Serbs.".72

The beginning of the second Balkan war on June 30, 1913 was condemned by the Dalmatian public. Although the Narodni list declared the war fratricidal, it very clearly demonstrated which side it favoured more. Specifically, the article entitled "A War without Declaration" aimed to portray the Bulgarian attacks as perfidious and fraudulent: "A Bulgarian battalion, under the cover of darkness, came close to a Serbian battery. Serbian infantry that had been positioned nearby opened fire. The Bulgarians shouted: 'We are yours. Do not shoot!' There was confusion. Fire was ceased. Bulgarians attacked and seized four Serbian guns. Their hoax was uncovered late, which enraged the Serbian troops. It began to dawn. Two Serbian battalions attacked as one and, in one bayonet attack, took a kidnapped battery back from the Bulgarians. Most Bulgarians were killed, and the remaining escaped."73 In its editorial in issue number 55 of July 9, 1913, the Narodni list took an even firmer stand when, after introductory remarks on the tragedy of war, it moved to discuss its causes. According to the paper, Bulgaria and its territorial ambitions were to be blamed for the war. Bulgarian king Ferdinand Coburg, who was accused of trying to renew Simeon's Empire and proclaiming himself the supreme ruler of the Balkans, was portrayed particularly negatively. As opposed to "perfidy of the Bulgarians", the Serbs were described as victims who sacrificed themselves for the common Slavic and Balkan cause. The conclusion is unequivocal: "Since it came to this tragic development we, of course, want victory for Serbian arms, for both national and ethical reasons."

The Narodni list, after taking a clear position, openly joined Serbian propaganda machinery. The paper published news from only Serbian sources. News of Serbian military successes was published along with the repeated reports of Bulgarian frauds and malice in the field during retreat. The Narodni list did not even hesitate to publish the most obvious propagandist creations. For instance, it published a note about a union of the Egzarchist Church in Macedo-

73 'Rat bez navještenja'. [A War without Declaration], NL, No. 53, 2 Jul 1913.
74 'Prekinuti diplomatski odnosaji'. [Diplomatic Relations Broken Off], NL, No. 55, 9 Jul 1913.
nia and Serbian Orthodox Church. The Egzarchist Church was a pro-
Bulgarian Orthodox Church organization on the Ottoman Empire territory.
The article portrayed the event as solemn to the satisfaction of both sides.
This news was far from reality since the Smotra later brought news that Serbi-
an army took control over Ohrid, the seat of the Egzarchist Church in Mac-
donia, with severe retaliation.75

The Hrvatska kruna did not pay much attention to the beginning of the
second Balkan war since, at the same, there was a split in the Party of Rights
partly caused by the Balkan wars. The escalation of the war prompted the
Hrvatska kruna to define its attitude towards the war. In their commentary on
the Serbian King Peter's war proclamation the newspaper wrote:

Serbian king Peter issued a proclamation of war. Serbia therefore formally
proclaimed war against Bulgaria. The scope of this decision will be judged by
the future while the presence can only register it with sadness in heart. We will
inform our readers from both sources, objectively, without bias towards one or
the other belligerent parties. The current war is a shame for the Slavs and espe-
cially for us Croats because now there is an imminent danger that we, too, after
this butchering between brothers, could find an uninvited guest ante portas,
who would harness us to a wagon of its policy and interest. This war is a
shame and neither side is clean, so why would we advocate or defend them be-
fore the public? No, when they want shame, let them have it.76

If we compare their views regarding the first Balkan war with this, we
can see that the Kruna retreated from pro-Serbian writing. Namely, enormous
successes of the Balkan League had drawn considerable number of the Party
of Rights’ members to become inclined to Yugoslavism and Serbophilia.
Such affection, among other reasons, led to a split within the Party. The Par-
y's minority, the Frankovites,77 accused the leadership of the Party for aban-
donning the fundamental postulates of the Party’s policy in favour of Yu-go-

75 'Izmirene crkve', [Churches Reconciled], NL, No. 56, 12 Jul 1913. The article in the Smotra in
its entirety: ['The newspapers bring reports from the town of Ohrid about alleged cruelties of
Serbian troops. After the insurgents left, the town was rounded, most of the chiefstains executed,
Bulgarian churches were burned, and all Bulgarian clergy men and teachers were imprisoned, and
some of them murdered'], SD, No. 88, 5 Nov 1913.
76 'Bratoubilački rat naviješten', [Fraticidal War Proclaimed], HK, No. 56-57, 12 Jul 1913.
77 The Frankovites were supporters of the policy of Josip Frank, one of the Party of Rights’
leaders in Northern Croatia. Josip Frank argued that Croatian position in the Monarchy should be
resolved in cooperation with the Greater-Austrian circle by creating a third, Croatian, state unit.
The plan was called Triasism. Frank was a strong opponent of pro-Yugoslav and pro-Serbian
policies. For further reading: MATKOVIĆ, S.: Čista siračka prava: 1895-1903., [Pure Party of
hrvatske politike, [Records: Behind the Scenes of Croatian politics], Mladost, Zagreb, 1986.
slavism.\textsuperscript{78} Such disputes affected the Dalmatian Party of Rights as well. While the President of Dalmatian Party of Rights, Prodan, tried to maintain the Party’s unity, two confronting factions were formed. On one side there were the Frankovites fraction gathered around the Dan with its consistent anti-Serbian tone and, on the other side, there was a fraction positioned around Mate Drinković and portion of party members from Šibenik who favoured Yugoslavism. Prodan and the Hrvatska kruna condemned, albeit mildly, both sides and tried to reconcile their views. However, it should be noted that, despite its pro-Serbian attitude during the first Balkan war, the Kruna was becoming increasingly disappointed by the growth of Yugoslavism and pro-Serbian attitudes in Dalmatia and thus looked to restore its policy of protecting Croatian interests and keep distance from the Serbs.\textsuperscript{79}

Greek victories in Macedonia in the war against Bulgaria prompted the Narodni list to define its attitude towards the events. In the article "Beware of the Greeks!" the paper pointed out that the Greeks had no business in Macedonia because it was a Slavic area and it did not matter whether these Slavs are Serbs or Bulgarians. The author of the article, Lupis, recounted the Greek war crimes, noting that the Greeks had always been unfaithful, i.e. Byzantines. A confirmation of this attitude can be found in a published letter by M. Brkan from Thessaloniki. The letter describes the events that occurred after the Greeks had moved to force out the Bulgarians from Thessaloniki. Brkan portrayed Greeks as vile and extremely cruel, while Bulgarian resistance in Thessaloniki was shown as heroic. The writer denounced the alleged Bulgarian atrocities, claiming that they had been conducted by Macedonia-born Komitas (members of rebel bands), whose motto was "Macedonia either to the Bulgarians, or to fire and ashes."\textsuperscript{80}

Successes of non-Slavic Bulgarian adversaries prompted the Hrvatska kruna to radically condemn Bulgaria’s Southern Slavic enemies. In the article "In the Name of Slavism?" the Hrvatska kruna unequivocally condemned Serbia for betraying the Slavic cause and, at the same time, criticized domestic Serbophiles for their lack of principles:

Kings of Serbia, Montenegro and Bulgaria declared war on Turkey. We have all read them (war proclamation) and enjoyed them. In the name of Chris-

\textsuperscript{78} About the split between members of the Party of Rights in Šibenik see: GROSS, M.: ‘Uloga sibenskog pravaštva u dalmatinskoj i općehravtskoj pravaskoj politici uoči prvog svjetskog rata’, [The role of the Party of Rights in Šibenik in Dalmatian politics and the Party’s all-Croatian policy on the eve of the first world war], Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest 1, Zagreb, 1971, pp. 259-285.

\textsuperscript{79} See article ‘Nečastna prisposoba’, [A Dishonourable Parable] HK, N. 56-57, 12 Jul 1913. It expressly condemns [‘excessive enthusiasm for Serbians, Yugoslavs. We have forgotten that we are Croats; because of excessive enthusiasm for others we have neglected our domestic needs and troubles.’].

\textsuperscript{80} ‘Pisma iz Soluna’, [Letters from Thessaloniki], NL, No. 63, 6 Aug 1913.
tianity, for the freedom of oppressed Slavic peoples — was the unanimous motto of the united kings. Today? Serbia, the South Slavs' 'Piedmont', and Montenegro—with three non-Slavic nations: Greece, Romania and Turkey—are throwing a lot for a Bulgarian territory, a Slavic nation, on behalf of the Slavs. All this in the name of Slavdom! Unfortunately, this 'spirit of Slavism' prevails around here also. Among the Ten Commandments of each South Slav we read this: One should always know that Croats, Serbs, Slovenes and Bulgarians are one nation. Today? As a proof of an allegiance to this Commandment in Supilo's bag (referring to the Novi list of Rijeka, edited by Frano Supilo, A/N) we read a parable in which a German, a Hungarian, an Italian, and a Bulgarian are equal enemies of the South Slavs. And the Sloboda? — It baptizes the Bulgarians worse than the Albanians!... Recently the Bulgarians were Slavs and now, after a few months, they are not! And why is that so? Because the Serbian interests, supposedly for the faults of the Bulgarian diplomacy, would not let them. If the Bulgarian diplomacy and government made mistakes, the Bulgarian people did not. Serbia is silent and approves when Romania unreasonably seeks compensation for its inaction. But, would Serbia be quiet, should some other country also unfairly and unreasonably seek compensation for inaction in the Balkans for the sake of its supposed interests, also at the expense of Serbia? It seems to us that Slavism is a roommate who wants to conceal his imperialist conquest and aspirations!\(^{81}\)

A similar view was expressed in Split's *Dan*, which condemned Dalmatian "liberals" and "progressives" lack of principles:

The same democratic pamphlet, (referring to the Sloboda of Split, A/N), which in the midst of the Balkan-Turkish War had celebrated Bulgaria's heroes as brothers, which had praised the Bulgarians for their noble hearts and unimaginable heroism, recently solemnly declared that the Bulgarians are worse than the Albanians. Instead of trying to—if possible—reconcile arguing brothers, instead of treating Bulgarians as our Slavic brothers, this democratic pamphlet puts its body and soul on the Serbian side. It is very conspicuous, non-fraternal and unfair! We are confident, even if the Bulgarians would be proven right for a thousand times, that our democrats and their bulletin would be on the Serbian side (...) and this is a proof of how much our liberals care about universal Slavic brotherhood and the famous Yugoslav alliance.\(^{82}\)

---

81 ‘U ime Slavenske?’, [On Behalf of the Slavs?] *HK*, No. 59, 23 Jul 1913. The Sloboda strongly condemned the Bulgarian politics in the article 'The Bulgarians — worse than the Arnauts'. Here it should be noted that the term "Arnauts" (Albanians) is used in the pejorative sense, which further emphasized the condemnation of the Bulgarians. *Sloboda*, No. 152, 3 Jul 1913.

82 ‘Sloboda i Bugari’, ['Sloboda' and Bulgarians], *Dan*, No. 28, Jul 1913.
The primary focus of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in the Balkans after the successes of the Allies in World War I was to break the Balkan alliance, which in itself contained a distinct anti-Austrian note. Austro-Hungary was supporting Romania’s territorial demands at Bulgaria’s expense but, on the other hand, its diplomacy wanted to keep the Romanians out of the war and thus facilitate the position of its new ally Bulgaria. Bulgarian and Austro-Hungarian Military Staff’s miscalculation regarding the Bulgaria’s Army power, as would be seen, had fatal consequences for the Bulgarians. The writing of the Smotra Dalmatinska becomes more understandable if viewed within such Austro-Hungarian foreign policy. At the beginning of the war, in spite of the evident Serb and Greek victories, the Smotra still held the position that the situation in the Balkans was still uncertain and confusing. Only after Romania and Turkey entered the war and when it became clear that Bulgaria is losing, the Smotra accepted the situation and tried to justify Bulgarian entrance into the war.

The Italian press in Zadar followed the second Balkan war very reluctantly. Il Dalmata put a conflict between Serbia and Bulgaria in the context of a wider conflict between Pan-German and Pan-Slavic ideas. In the case of Bulgarian domination over the Balkans, the united Germans will become a leading force in this part of Europe and, in the case of Serbia, this would be Russia. Il Dalmata considered Pan-Germanism a greater risk and encouraged the struggle against this menace.

The second Balkan war ended with the signing of the Treaty of Bucharest on August 9, 1913. Consequences of the Treaty were great for Bulgaria since it lost most of the territories gained in the first Balkan war. Croatian newspapers are interpreting this fact in different manners. The Narodni list accepted the results of the war without much opposition, apart from the case of the Turkish occupation of Adrianople. The Hrvatska kruna used the Treaty to attack the hypocrisy of Serbian politics. The Hrvatska kruna sarcastically commented the results of the Bucharest Treaty: "(...) This Treaty or, better said, this fratricidal war will make Bulgaria step down and forget about the huge complex of land it had taken from the Turks, at the cost of innumerable lives of its sons, and give it to the Greeks and Serbs, who have not shed a drop of blood to get it. True, Bulgaria is the one to blame but, as 'popolo romano' would put it, there was a good deal of envy on behalf of the Serbs and the Greeks. Bulgaria, under pressure from all sides, has to agree with anything." Even more ironical was the Kruna’s comment on the division of the conquered territories: "It is a truly fraternal partition, as was the behaviour of brothers in the second Balkan war. Slavic History will write the Treaty

84 O Valerio, 'La crisi balcanica', [The Balkan Crisis], DAL, No. 52, 2. Jul 1913.
85 'Mir', [The Peace], HK, No. 64, 9 Aug 1913.
of Bucharest with black letters in its books, and its consequences will confirm that.”

Both Italian newspapers, the *Risorgimento* and *Il Dalmata* resented the Turks had occupied Edirne and Europe’s inactivity on the issue. The *Risorgimento*, in its old fashion, concluded its dealing with the Balkan nations by rephrasing the opinion of “old Europe” that they were all the same kind of barbarians, which is confirmed by their mutual accusations of committing the most horrible crimes.

**Conclusion**

Unresolved position of Croatia in the Habsburg Monarchy, difficult economic and social situation that resulted in massive overseas emigration, especially from Dalmatia, were undermining the hopes that Croatian problems could be successfully addressed within the Habsburg Monarchy. The last relevant political force on Croatian territory, the Croatian Party of Rights, attempted to unite into a single party in 1911. Thus united party was supposed to, at least in theory, enter into closer relations with the Greater Austrian circle led by Archduke Francis Ferdinand and participate in the reorganization of the Monarchy when he came to the throne. However, the introduction of marshal law in Northern Croatia in 1912 and the outbreak of the Balkan Wars disabled their plans. The Balkan Wars were met with incredible euphoria in Dalmatian political circles. It turned out that the "small" Balkan nations can defeat the "great" Ottoman Empire. The successes of Serbia were seen particularly favourably and, in the eyes of a large part of Dalmatian political elite, Serbia became the new Piedmont—the country that would unite and free the South Slavs. At the same time, the pro-Serbian circles in Dalmatia denied Croatian ethnic independence and claimed that the Croats and the Serbs were one nation. The euphoria crushed the unity of the Party of Rights, the last major political group that opposed the union with Serbia. In 1913 the Party was split again into several smaller factions. Even before the outbreak of the first world war the Austrian military circles had estimated that Austrians had limited support in Dalmatia. After the Balkan Wars, most of the Croatian political elite from Dalmatia saw Serbia as the force that would resolve Croatian position. At the time, the leader of the Dalmatian Party of Rights, don Ivo Prodan, had not yet accepted the Yugoslav idea, which he would do by the

---

86 Propala slavenska prevlast na Balkanu, [Failed Slavic Dominance in the Balkans], *HK*, No. 65, 13 Aug 1913.
88 Gross, M., *Hrvatska politika velikoaustrijskog kruga oko prijestolnolisadnika Ferdina* _da_, [Croatian Politics in the Greater Austrian Circle around the Archduke Ferdinand], p. 72.
end of 1918. However, the rural population that constituted most of the Dalmatian population was not actively involved in the political life of the province. The ideological matrix of Yugoslavism had never been accepted by wider layers of the population, which was proved by the first elections, with universal suffrage, in the Kingdom of SHS (Yugoslavia), when the greatest number of rural population voted for the Hrvatska republikanska seljačka stranka [Croatian Republican Peasant Party], radical opponents of Yugoslav ideology.

*Translated from Croatian: Ana Pavlinović Dorkin*