

Slovanstvo.

40 ZBIRKA
RAZPOZNAVANJA
RECOGNITIONES

Jurij Perovšek

SLOVENCİ IN SLOVANSKI SVET

Politične slike
od včeraj in danes



Založila in na svitlo dala

MATICA SLOVENSKA.

Tisk Blaznikov v Ljubljani.

40 ZBIRKA
RAZPOZNAVANJA
RECOGNITIONES

Jurij Perovšek

SLOVENC I IN SLOVANSKI SVET

**Politične slike od
včeraj in danes**

ZALOŽBA INŠTITUTA ZA NOVEJŠO ZGODOVINO

Odgovorna urednica: dr. Mojca Šorn
Založnik: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino
Zanj: dr. Damijan Guštin

ZBIRKA RAZPOZNAVANJA / RECOGNITIONES 40
ISSN 2350-5664

Jurij Perovšek
SLOVENCİ IN SLOVANSKI SVET
Politične slike od včeraj in danes

Recenzenta: dr. Bogdan Kolar
dr. Renato Podbersič

Jezikovni pregled: Polona Kekec

Prevod povzetka: Borut Praper

Oblikovanje: Barbara Bogataj Kokalj

Slikovno gradivo na ovitku: Prva stran: notranja naslovnica Majcigerjevega, Pleteršnikovega in Raičevega Slovanstva (1873–1874).
Zadnja stran: notranja naslovnica slovenskega prevoda Niederlejevega Slovanskega sveta (1911).

Tisk: Medium d.o.o.

Naklada: 300 izvodov

Izid knjige je finančno podprla: Javna agencija za raziskovalno dejavnost
Republike Slovenije

CIP - Kataložni zapis o publikaciji
Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Ljubljana

94(497.4)"19"
94(4=16)"19"

PEROVŠEK, Jurij

Slovinci in slovanski svet : politične slike od včeraj in danes / Jurij Perovšek ; [prevod povzetka Borut Praper]. - Ljubljana : Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 2019. - (Zbirka Razpoznavanja = Recognitiones, ISSN 2350-5664 ; 40)

ISBN 978-961-6386-98-2
COBISS.SI-ID 302269952

VSEBINA

- 7 PREDGOVOR
- 13 NARODNI BOJI IN COUP D'ÉTAT: češki in bolgarski primer**
- 14 »Češki separatizem«
- 43 Bolgarija in Aleksander Stambolijski
- 59 RUSIJA, RUSI IN OKTOBRSKI REVOLUCIONARNI PRELOM**
- 60 Rusija v očeh slovenske politike od sarajevskega atentata do začetka svetovne vojne leta 1914
- 75 »Psi s cveticami«: slovenski vojaki in bojevanje z Rusi in drugimi slovanskimi nasprotniki v pisanju časopisja med prvo svetovno vojno
- 94 Wranglovci
- 104 O Leninu
- 122 »Mefisto na carskem dvoru«: odmevi ob Rasputinovi smrti in kasnejši pogledi nanj na Slovenskem
- 138 Slovenska meščanska politika in oktobrska revolucija

**199 OD JUGOSLOVANSTVA DO SLOVENSKE
DRŽAVE**

200 Jugoslovanstvo in vprašanje narodov v južnoslovanski
problematiki od 19. do 21. stoletja

224 Iz razmisleka o Sloveniji

243 POVZETEK

253 SUMMARY

265 VIRI IN LITERATURA

291 IMENSKO KAZALO

303 BESEDA O AVTORJU

POVZETEK

**SLOVENC
I IN
SLOVANSKI SVET**

**Politične slike od
včeraj in danes**

S slovansko idejno, politično in družbeno problematiko, ki je ena od ključnih evropskih zgodovinskih tem, so se na Slovanskem vseskozi srečevali. Poglede na etnografske, jezikovne, kulturne, zgodovinske, politične, zemljepisne in gospodarske razmere v slovanskem okolju so v drugi polovici 19. stoletja začeli zgoščevati. Med drugim je postalo opazno spremljanje političnih vprašanj in z njimi povezanega dogajanja, ki je po intenzivnosti prešlo tudi v novo stoletje.

Raznovrstnost dogajanja v slovanskem svetu in med Slovani v 20. stoletju kaže na stopnjevanost dobe moderne, ki je po prvem vodila še v drugi svetovni spopad. V prvi, z začetkom nove svetovne vojne zamejeni polovici prejšnjega stoletja ponuja skozi posamezne idejne, družbene in političnovojaške dinamike zaokrožene slike tedanjega razvoja slovanstva. Osredinjenje na to obdobje omogoča spoznati poglede slovenske politike na slovansko problematiko v raziskovalno izzivnem času, ki je spočel obravnavo tedanjih pomembnih ideoloških in političnih načel, nasilnih notranjedržavnih sprememb, vrednotenja slovanstva in slovanskih držav v kriznih mednarodnih razmerah in v vojnem času, zgodovinskih slovanskih osebnosti in v slovanskem svetu izvedenega oktobrskega svetovnozgodovinskega revolucionarnega premika. Z vidika slovenskega in specifično slovanskega, to je jugoslovanskega razvoja svojski zgodovinopisni izziv pomenita tudi zgodovinska razsežnost jugoslovanskega idejnopolitičnega in državnega pojava ter vrednostni pogled na Slovence same s seboj – v Republiki Sloveniji, oblikovani z njihovo ločitvijo od jugoslovanskega sveta leta 1991.

Med vprašanji, ki so v avstrijski dobi in v času med svetovnima vojnama vzbudila kritično pozornost slovenske politike, sta iz idejno- in državopolitične problematike v Slovencem bližjih slovanskih okoljih to očitno pokazala t. i. češki separatizem v letih 1910–1912 in državni udar v Bolgariji leta 1923. »Češki separatizem« je zadeval eno od pomembnih ideoloških in političnih načel moderne, ob katerem sta se ustavili slovenska politika in v njenem okviru posebej socialnodemokratska

stranka. Odprl je kritično vrednotenje internacionalizma kot vodila delavskega gibanja. To izkušnjo je stopnjevano doživljala avstrijska socialna demokracija, potem ko se je centralistična avstrijska socialnodemokratska stranka na svojem VI. zboru leta 1897 na Dunaju pod vplivom nacionalnih gibanj in nasprotij v lastnih vrstah pretvorila v federacijo samostojnih nacionalnih strank. Zbor je uveljavil načelo, da nacionalno razčlenjeni skupni stranki ustreza le internacionalno združeno vodenje strokovnega boja avstrijskega delavstva. To je bilo sporno za češke socialne demokrate, organizirane v Češkoslovanski socialnodemokratski stranki (ČSSDS). Centralistični ustroj strokovnih organizacij je oviral njihov socialni boj, poleg tega pa je po njihovem poudarku vzpostavil hegemonijo nemškoavstrijske socialnodemokratske stranke. Pripadniki ČSSDS so na nacionalni podlagi oblikovali tudi strokovne organizacije, da bi se uprli nacionalnemu nerazumevanju nemških socialnih demokratov in kopičenju finančnih sredstev v dunajskih strokovnih centralah. Nemškoavstrijska socialnodemokratska stranka in ČSSDS sta prišli v spor, ki je pokazal, da je narodnostni vidik v resnici dejavno prisoten pri reševanju ključnih vprašanj v razvoju (avstrijskega) delavskega gibanja. To je problematiziralo ideološko in politično načelo internacionalizma, saj so ga posamezne strani v sporu razumele in udeleževale različno. Češki socialni demokrati so v vprašanju vodenja razrednega boja spoznali, da internacionalizem ne vzpostavlja medsebojne solidarnosti in enakopravnosti narodnih delavskih gibanj. Nemški socialni demokrati, ki so se sklicevali na njegovo ideološko neizpodbitnost, pa so internacionalizem uporabili kot sredstvo za izvajanje prevlade nad socialnimi demokrati drugih narodov v Avstriji in s tem objektivno podpirali nemško nadvlado v državi. Avtoritarnost idej moderne je v tedanjem zgodovinskem trenutku prestala preizkušnjo znotraj avstrijskega in mednarodnega delavskega gibanja, saj sta obe obsodili osamosvojitve čeških socialnih demokratov na strokovnem področju. K temu je pripomoglo tudi dejstvo, da razlike med nacionalizmom zatiranega in

zatirajočega naroda ni poznala teorija vse druge internacionale. Značilna predstavnica tedanjega socialnodemokratskega duhá je bila Jugoslovanska socialnodemokratska stranka. V češkem separatizmu je videla zgolj kršitev načel internacionalizma, ne pa prizadevanja njegovih nosilcev za samostojnost nacionalnega delavskega gibanja. To ji je na primeru iz slovanskega sveta onemogočilo vpogled v vprašanje celostnega udejanjenja modernega naroda. V vprašanju »češkega separatizma« so ga razumeli v slovenskem meščanskem taboru, saj so podpirali boj čeških socialnih demokratov proti nemškoavstrijskim.

Razhajanje slovenske politike se je v manjši meri pokazalo tudi v pogledih na vprašanje družbenega in državnega razvoja v Bolgariji po prvi svetovni vojni. Povezano je bilo s politiko Aleksandra Stambolijskega. Stambolijski je s svojo zaostreno, a nekomunistično družbeno reformno politiko, ki je dajala primat kmečkemu stanu, tako v meščanski kot v marksistični politiki obveljal za nesprijemljivo ali vsaj sporno osebnost. Tako ga ni videla le njegovi kmečki ideologiji sorodna Samostojna kmetijska stranka. Drugi so njegovo ravnanje, vsak s svojih programskih in političnih izhodišč, negativno ocenili. Stambolijskemu so bili na Slovenskem naklonjeni le glede njegove zunanje politike, to je spodbudnega razvijanja jugoslovansko-bolgarskih odnosov. Stambolijski je v slovenskem zanimanju za Bolgarijo v času med svetovnim vojnama zasedel eno od najbolj opaznih mest, k čemur je pripomogel tudi krvavi konec njegove vladavine; med državnim udarom je 14. junija 1923 izgubil življenje. Kljub njegovi svojski politiki, ki je opredelila njegovo delovanje in vzbudila nemalo pozornosti, poglobljanje vanjo na Slovenskem ni pomenilo izjeme, saj so se ob Bolgariji ustavljali ves čas prve jugoslovanske države.

Trajno pozornost slovenske politike so uživali tudi Rusija in Rusi. Sarajevski atentat 28. junija 1914 je pokazal, da sta tako katoliška kot liberalna politika v Rusiji videli nevarno in Avstro-Ogrski sovražno državo ter grožnjo za evropski mir. Vlogi in pomenu Ruskega carstva v tedanjih mednarodnih razmerah v

marksističnem taboru niso posvetili pozornosti. V negativnem odnosu do Rusije, utemeljenem v avstrijskem patriotizmu, je prednjačil katoliški tabor, ki je protirusko usmeritev podkrepil še z ideološkimi in verskimi razlogi. Ko je Avstro-Ogrska 6. avgusta 1914 Rusiji napovedala vojno, so bili na Slovenskem prepričani o avstrijski zmagi. Med vojno je v slovenskem pogledu na Rusijo prišlo do premika, ko so tako v katoliškem kot liberalnem taboru obenem z rastočim protiaavstrijskim razpoloženjem začeli bolj naklonjeno gledati na rusko državo.

Pri veliki večini Slovencev in slovenskih vojakov so bili med prvo svetovno vojno na podlagi njihovega nespornega avstrijskega patriotizma slovanski nasprotniki monarhije izključno le njeni sovražniki. Tako razpoloženje sta v letih 1914–1916 spodbujala vodilna slovenska politična dnevnika, katoliški *Slovenec* in liberalni *Slovenski narod*. V tem času marksistični tisk ni izhajal. V odnosu do slovanskih nasprotnikov Avstro-Ogrske nista dopuščala misli o vzajemnosti Slovencev z drugimi slovanskimi narodi. V vprašanju slovanstva so bile zanju odločilne frontne črte, postavljene med avstro-ogrsko in nemško ter z njima vojskujočimi se slovanskimi državami. Kljub posameznim prispevkom, v katerih o slovanskih nasprotnikih ni bilo težkih besed, je bila na straneh obeh listov pot k slovanskemu identitetnemu samorazmisleku tesno zaprta. Obstajala sta le avstrijska vrednostna bit in v njej zamejen odnos do slovanstva. *Slovenec* in *Slovenski narod* sta pomembno utrjevala stališče, da so Slovenci – kot tudi drugi habsburški Slovani – Avstrijci, tisti, ki to niso, pa so iz drugega sveta.

Slovenci so se s slovanskim vojaštvom soočili tudi po vojni. To so bili pripadniki poražene protirevolucionarne vojske generala barona Petra Nikolajeviča Wrangla, ki se je konec leta 1920 umaknila iz Rusije, del njenega sestava pa se je junija 1921 nastanil v Kraljevini Srbov, Hrvatov in Slovencev (Kraljevina SHS). T. i. wranglovci so opravljali službo v jugoslovanski obmejni straži. Na Slovenskem niso bili na dobrem glasu, saj so surovo in v več primerih tudi zločinsko ravnali z obmejnim prebivalstvom.

Nezadovoljstvo so vzbujala tudi gmotna sredstva, ki jih je država namenjala za wranglovce. Ljudi in politiko je prav tako motilo, da so nosili ruske uniforme, vojaška znamenja in caristična odlikovanja ter da so bili v javnosti oboroženi. V slovenskem prostoru so se stopnjevano pojavljali poudarki, da predstavljajo državo v državi, zato jih je treba odpustiti iz obmejne službe, razorožiti in izgnati iz države. Omenjena stališča so izrekli v vseh političnih taborih. Ko so v Narodni skupščini Kraljevine SHS konec aprila 1922 sprejeli sklep o odpoklicu wranglovcev iz jugoslovanskih obmejnih enot, so na Slovenskem, kjer je bila zaradi mejne lege ozemlja njihova prisotnost občutnejša, njihov odhod sprejeli z olajšanjem. Wranglovci so s svojim zastrašujočim vedenjem vznemirjali prebivalstvo in predstavljali motnjo v rasti mirnodobskega duhá, ki so ga po svetovni vojni obnovili v slovenski družbi.

Posebno mesto v pogledih slovenske politike na Rusijo in Ruse je nedvomno zasedel tvorec oktobrske revolucije Vladimir Iljič Uljanov Lenin. Ocenjevali so ga kot izjemno osebnost svetovne zgodovine. Taki poudarki so bili najbolj pogosti ob njegovi smrti, 21. januarja 1924, ko so se najceloviteje izrekli o voditelju ruske boljševistične revolucije. V njegovo revolucionarno delo so se poglobili v vseh slovenskih političnih taborih. Revolucionarni del marksističnega tabora ga je pozdravljal, za njegov nerevolucionarni del pa je bil Lenin mož razkola in sovraštva, velik v dejanju in silen v rušenju, postavljenem izven veljavnih moralnih zakonov. Podobno so menili liberalci, za katere je Lenin predstavljal svet, zrasel iz revolucije, ki usodno ogroža obstoječe razmerje družbene in politične moči. V katoliškem taboru so ga nekako občudovali. Seveda je bil zanje diktator, demonski genij z etičnim nagibom socialne pravičnosti, sloneči na zanikanju posameznika ter brezobzirni, ateistični, »džingiskansko« krvavi marksistični revoluciji. A imeli so ga tudi za moža dejanj ter energije, ki ga ne prekašata ne Peter Veliki in ne Napoleon. Šteli so ga med največje slovanske osebnosti. To je bilo v času, ko je slovenski politični katolicizem v komunizmu še

videl družbeni pojav, ki lahko tudi drugim socialnim gibanjem ponudi nekatere družbene in gospodarske rešitve. Kasneje se je na Slovenskem pogled na Lenina bistveno zaostрил. Vendar so še pred »časom nestrpnih« opredelili temeljne prvine Leninovega dela: izjemnost njegovega pojava, skrajni revolucionarni nastop, velikansko politično sposobnost, neusmiljeno nadgrajevanje doseženega cilja ter zgodovinsko razumevanje razvoja, ki je utemeljil dogodeno. Pri tem je potonil en del družbe, da bi se dvignil drugi. Le-to je za ene imelo negativni predznak, ki so ga videli v revolucionarnem nasilju, medtem ko je za druge predstavljalo najvišji vrednostni smisel.

Od izstopajočih ruskih osebnosti prve polovice 20. stoletja so se na Slovenskem ustavili tudi ob Grigoriju Jefimoviču Rasputinu. Rasputin se je v slovensko zavest vtisnil kot človek izjemnega vpliva na zadnji ruski carski par ter tedanje rusko politično in cerkveno življenje. Tako za časa njegovega življenja kot ob smrti in kasneje so opozarjali na magično moč njegove osebnosti, obenem pa poudarjali njegovo razuzdano življenje in nagnjenost do denarja ter družbene moči, a tudi naklonjenost do ruskega kmeta in malega človeka. Imeli so ga za nasprotnika (svetovne) vojne, zaradi njegovih dolgoletnih posegov v odločanje v Ruskem carstvu pa so ga tudi krivili za njegov propad. V Rasputinov fenomen se je najbolj poglobil pisatelj Vladimir Bartol. V njem je videl utelešenje kaotičnega stanja Rusije pred boljševiško revolucijo, v katerem se je Rasputin s sugestivno močjo svetopisemskega preroka, ogromno življenjsko silo in samozavestjo povzpел na skoraj najvišji položaj v državi. »Ta mož je moral nekaj vedeti o sebi in o svetu, kar večina drugih smrtnikov ne ve,« je zapisal Bartol. Njegovo opozorilo na presežni vidik Rasputinove osebnosti najbolj povedno izrisuje njegovo, sicer negativno podobo na Slovenskem.

Največ energije, časa in široke idejne, politične in družbene občutljivosti pa sta v slovenski politiki vzbudila boljševiška revolucija in v njej utemeljeni sovjetski družbeni, politični in državni razvoj. V meščanskem taboru, ki je imel dober vpogled

v revolucionarni oktober in njegovo državo, so na podlagi svojega razumevanja človeške družbe in posameznika v njej v oktobrskem družbenem prelomu ter v njem porojenem sovjetskem družbenem, političnem in gospodarskem razvoju videli temeljno civilizacijsko grožnjo svetu, v katerem so živeli in ga zavestno podpirali. Čeprav so zgodovinsko razumeli oktobrski pojav, njegovih posledic niso sprejemali. Obenem s protisemit-skim stališčem so opozarjali na totalitarno, vseobsegajočo razredno boljševisko oblast, kolektivistični in protiverski značaj sovjetske skupnosti, vanjo vraščeno osebno negotovost in – ob priznavanju nekaterih gospodarskih in prosvetnih uspehov – na njen neobetaven družbeni in gospodarski razvoj. Na liberalni strani je s svojim negativnim vrednotenjem oktobrske revolucije in sovjetske države izstopal dr. Ivan Tavčar, na katoliški strani pa sta izstopala dr. Ivan Ahčin in Fran Erjavec. Teoretsko ga je odklonil tudi tedanji vodilni katoliški filozof dr. Aleš Ušeničnik. Za meščanski tabor je bil boljševizem njegov ključni nasprotnik, izjavljanje boja proti njemu pa je bila stalnica meščanske politike v Kraljevini SHS/Jugoslaviji. Bila je sestavni del njene ideološke podlage, ki so mu na katoliški strani dali tudi prepoznavni svetovnonazorski naboj. V taki ideološki in politični drži je meščanski tabor dočakal konec jugoslovanske kraljevine in vstopil v čas druge svetovne vojne na Slovenskem.

Najbolj občutljivo narodnopolitično vlogo v slovanski misli na Slovenskem je imelo vprašanje jugoslovanstva. Jugoslovanstvo, ki je za Slovence v 20. stoletju predstavljalo tudi konkretno državno obliko, je v njegovem idejnem in političnem razvoju že od 19. stoletja opredeljevalo soočenje dvoje koncepcij: narodnounitaristične in narodnofederalistične. Unitaristična je poudarjala nujnost odstranjevanja narodnokulturnih in jezikovnih razlik med južnoslovanskimi narodi, federalistična pa je zagovarjala načelo narodne emancipacije in samostojnosti demokratično združenih južnoslovanskih narodov. Najprej je politično prevladala unitaristična koncepcija, saj je bila prva jugoslovanska državna skupnost iz let 1918–1941 utemeljena na

narodnounitaristični in centralistični državnopravni osnovi. To je za svoje nadvladovalne cilje izrabljaj velikosrbski narodnopolitični program. Po drugi svetovni vojni so leta 1945 oblikovali federativno jugoslovansko državo, v kateri je že v petdesetih letih prišlo do obuditve unitarističnih tendenc. Jugoslovansko vodstvo jih je politično ustavilo sredi šestdesetih let, enako kot je v začetku sedemdesetih let ustavilo prizadevanja Hrvatov in Slovencev, da bi na osnovi doslednega spoštovanja federativnega načela modernizirali in demokratizirali jugoslovansko državo in družbo. Oba koncepta, unitaristični in demokratično federalistični, sta se odločilno soočila v drugi polovici osemdesetih let. Ker je unitaristični program, ki ga je zagovarjala velikosrbska nadvladovalna politika, zanikal demokratično federativno narodno suverenost združenih jugoslovanskih narodov, so se v letih 1990–1992 nesrbski narodi odločili za lastno neodvisno državno življenje. Svojo polno narodno emancipacijo so uresničili v zgodovinskem porazu jugoslovanske združevalne ideje, ki sta jo vseskozi omejevala jugoslovanski unitaristični nacionalni program in velikosrbska nadvladovalna politika.

Odhod iz jugoslovanske skupnosti in utemeljitev lastne države leta 1991 sta pomenila zgodovinsko izpolnitev dotedanjih slovenskih narodnoemancipacijskih prizadevanj. Zgodil pa se je »raj z napako«. V novem slovenskem svetu je, ob tistih, ki so s polnimi pljuči zadihali narodno čustvo in pričakovali zgodovinski dvig slovenstva ter njegovo etično potrditev, nastopila *the open season*: lovska sezona olastninjevalnih, orožarskih, političnih in drugih predatorjev. Samostojni slovenski narodnodržavni položaj so označili pohlep, človeška brezbriznost in zanikanje duhá, ki govorijo o veliki vrednostni oseki. Izrojena tekmovalnost in neusmiljeno stremuštvo, zastavljena že z osnovnošolskim sistemom – tvorcem le v individualni zgodbi veljavnega bivanja –, so oglušili človečnost. Slovenec ni postal, kar je kot narodovo izpolnitev videl Edvard Kocbek, »notranji silak«. Zavladali sta nestrpnost in agresija, Slovenci civilizacijskega pospeška, utemeljenega v lastni nacionalni državi, moralno niso

vzdržali. V družbi se je uveljavil narcistični tip človeka, ki želi čim bolj poskrbeti zase in pri tem odrivati druge. »Šefovske etaže« neusmiljeno pobijajo socialni čut, zanikanje glasu zaposlenih in v njegovi senci prežeči mobing pa neslišane ali že žrtve potiskajo v socialno izolacijo. Družbo pretresajo hudi ideološki spori in preprečujejo nacionalno soglasje o etičnem temelju slovenske države in smotru njenega obstoja. Zgodovinopisje in psihiatrija sta o omenjeni problematiki v zadnjih letih opravila več kvalitetnih, tudi monografskih obravnav. Slovence – če si to želijo – za uresničitev civilizacijskega imperativa človečnosti in kulture čaka še veliko dela.

Politične slike o Slovencih in slovanskem svetu prikazujejo različne zgodovinopisne podobe. Kažejo, da je slovanstvo v prejšnjem stoletju vseskozi spremljalo slovensko politiko ter idejno in družbeno misel in s svojim širokim razvojnim obsegom vplivalo na različne vrednostne zgodovinske položaje in odločitve slovenske skupnosti. Le-ta v svoji samostojni državni obliki in njeni vsebini predstavlja enega od členov današnjega slovanskega in širšega sveta.



SUMMARY

**SLOVENIANS AND
THE SLAVIC WORLD**

**The Political Landscapes of
Yesterday and Today**

Slovenians kept encountering the Slavic ideological, political, and social issues, which comprise one of the key European historical topics. In the second half of the 19th century, the outlooks on the ethnographic, linguistic, cultural, historical, political, geographical, and economic circumstances in the Slavic environment started to consolidate. Among other things, political issues and the related developments started attracting notable attention, and their intensity continued in the new century as well.

The diversity of events that took place in the Slavic world and among Slavs in the 20th century points to the intensification of modernity, which eventually led to the first as well as the second global conflict. With regard to the first half of the previous century, which concluded with the onset of World War II, comprehensive imagery of the development of Slavism at the time can be discerned from the individual ideological, social, and political-military dynamics. Focusing on this period allows for the familiarisation with the outlooks of the Slovenian politics on the Slavic issues in the time that represents a considerable research challenge. With regard to this period, the following had to be considered: the important contemporaneous ideological and political principles; violent intrastate changes; the evaluation of Slavism and Slavic countries in the critical international circumstances and during wartime; Slavic historical personalities; and the October revolutionary shift of global historical importance, carried out in the Slavic world. From the viewpoint of the Slovenian and specifically Slavic, i.e. Yugoslav, development, the historical dimensions of the Yugoslav ideological-political and state phenomenon represent a distinctive historiographical challenge, as does the self-evaluation of Slovenians – in the Republic of Slovenia, formed after it had separated itself from the Yugoslav world in 1991.

Of the questions that garnered the critical attention of the Slovenian politics during the Austrian period and in the time between the two world wars, the so-called Czech separatism between 1910 and 1912 and the 1923 coup d'état in Bulgaria

were among the most prominent ideological and state-political issues. The “Czech separatism” was related to one of the important ideological and political principles of modernity, which became the focus of the Slovenian politics and, in its framework, the Social Democratic Party in particular. It paved the way for the critical evaluation of internationalism as a driving force of the workers’ movement. This was more and more prominently experienced by the Austrian social democracy as well, after the centralist Social Democratic Party of Austria had, under the influence of the national movements and conflicts in its own ranks, transformed into a federation of independent national parties at the Vienna Congress of 1897. At this Congress, the principle was introduced that only a joint international leadership of the Austrian workers’ struggle suited the nationally-divided common party. This was seen as disputable by the Czech social democrats, organised in the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party (CSSDP). The centralist structure of professional organisations hindered their social engagement as well as, in accordance with their emphases, implemented the hegemony of the German-Austrian Social Democratic Party. The members of the CSSDP also formed professional organisations on the national foundations in order to resist the lack of national understanding on the part of the German social democrats and the accumulation of financial resources in the professional centres in Vienna. A conflict arose between the German-Austrian Social Democratic Party and the CSSDP, indicating that the national aspect was actively influencing the resolution of the key issues pertaining to the development of the (Austrian) workers’ movement. Consequently, the ideological and political principle of internationalism became an issue of note, as the individual sides in the conflict understood and implemented it in various manners. With regard to the question of leading the class struggle, the Czech social democrats realised that internationalism did not contribute to the mutual solidarity and equality of the national workers’ movements. Meanwhile, the German social

democrats, who appealed to their ideological incontestability, used internationalism as a means to achieve domination over the social democrats of other nations in Austria and thus objectively supported the German domination in the state. At that historical moment, the authoritarian ideas of modernity stood the test within the Austrian and international workers' movement, as both condemned the emancipation of the Czech social democrats in the professional field. The fact that the differences between the nationalisms of the oppressed and the oppressing nations were not recognised by the theory of the whole Second International contributed to this as well. The Yugoslav Social Democratic Party was a characteristic representative of the social-democratic spirit of the time. It saw the Czech separatism merely as a breach of the principles of internationalism, not as a struggle of its protagonists to ensure the independence of their national workers' movement. This example from the Slavic world allowed the Yugoslav Social Democratic Party to gain insight into the question of the comprehensive establishment of a modern nation. The issue of the "Czech separatism" was understood by the Slovenian bourgeois camp, though, as it supported the struggle of the Czech social democrats against the Germans and Austrians.

To a lesser degree, the division of the Slovenian politics also became apparent from the outlooks on the question of the social and state development in Bulgaria in the aftermath of World War I, related to the politics of Aleksandar Stamboliyski. With his policy of intense but non-communist social reforms, which favoured the peasant class, Stamboliyski was seen as an unacceptable or at least controversial personality by the bourgeois as well as Marxist politics. The only party that did not share this opinion was the Independent Peasant Party, whose ideology was similar to Stamboliyski's. Others had an unfavourable opinion of his actions, each for their own programme and political reasons. In Slovenia, Stamboliyski was seen as a positive figure only with regard to his foreign policy, i.e. due to the encouraging development of Yugoslav-Bulgarian relations. In the interwar

period, Aleksandar Stamboliyski was one of the topics related to Bulgaria that Slovenians were most interested in, even more so due to the bloody end of his government: he lost his life during the coup d'état on 14 June 1923. Stamboliyski's specific policy defined his actions and gained much attention in the Slovenian public. Nevertheless, the Slovenian focus on this issue was not exceptional, as Bulgaria was often discussed throughout the entire existence of the first Yugoslav state.

Slovenian politics paid permanent attention to Russia and Russians as well. The assassination in Sarajevo on 28 June 1914 revealed that the Catholic as well as liberal politics saw Russia as a dangerous state, hostile to Austro-Hungary and threatening the European peace. The Marxist camp, on the other hand, did not pay much attention to the role and importance of the Russian Empire in the international circumstances at the time. The Catholic camp had the most negative attitude towards Russia, based on Austrian patriotism. It also supported its anti-Russian stance with ideological and religious reasons. When Austro-Hungary declared war against Russia on 6 August 1914, Slovenians were convinced that Austria would be victorious. However, in the course of the war, the Slovenian outlook on Russia changed: both the Catholic as well as the liberal camp started seeing Russia more positively as the anti-Austrian disposition grew.

Based on indisputable Austrian patriotism, the Slavic opponents of the Monarchy were seen exclusively as its enemies by the vast majority of Slovenians and Slovenian soldiers during World War I. Between 1914 and 1916 such disposition was encouraged by the leading Slovenian political daily newspapers, the Catholic *Slovenec* and the liberal *Slovenski narod*. No Marxist press existed at this time. These two newspapers did not allow for any considerations of Slovenian reciprocity with the other Slavic nations regarding the attitude to the Slavic opponents of Austro-Hungary. For them, the front lines established between Austro-Hungary, Germany, and the Slavic countries that fought against them were decisive with regard to

the question of Slavism. Despite individual contributions that did not condemn the Slavic opponents quite so resolutely, any consideration of the Slovenian own Slavic identity was impossible in either of these two newspapers. All that existed was the Austrian value essence and the restricted attitude towards Slavism in its context. The *Slovenec* and *Slovenski narod* newspapers importantly consolidated the standpoint that Slovenians – as well as other Habsburg Slavs – were Austrians; while those that were not Austrians belonged to some other world.

Slovenians had to face the Slavic military even after the war: the members of the defeated anti-revolutionary army of General Baron Pyotr Nikolayevich Wrangel, which retreated from Russia in 1920. Some of these troops settled in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (the Kingdom of SHS) in June 1921. The so-called Wrangel's troops served in the Yugoslav border guard. They did not enjoy a good reputation in Slovenia, as they treated the population at the border roughly and in many cases also criminally. The monetary resources that the state allocated for these troops were also a source of discontent. People and politicians also resented the fact that they wore Russian uniforms, military insignia and tsarist decorations, and that they carried weapons in public. Therefore, increasingly louder complaints started to be voiced in the Slovenian space that Wrangel's troops represented a state within a state and that they should, therefore, be recalled from border service, disarmed, and exiled. This standpoint was shared by all political camps. When the National Assembly of the Kingdom of SHS adopted a decision to recall Wrangel's troops from the Yugoslav border units at the end of April 1922, in Slovenia, where the presence of these units was more evident due to the frontier location of the Slovenian territory, their departure was welcomed with relief. With their intimidating behaviour, Wrangel's troops had been upsetting the population and represented a disturbance in the development of the peacetime spirit, restored in the Slovenian society after World War I.

A similar place in the Slovenian political outlook on Russia and Russians was certainly assigned to the originator of the October Revolution, Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov Lenin. He was deemed as an extraordinary personality of world history. Such emphases were most frequent on the occasion of his death, on 21 January 1924, when the most comprehensive statements about the leader of the Russian Bolshevik revolution were made. Lenin's revolutionary work was analysed by all of the Slovenian political camps: Catholic, liberal, and Marxist. The revolutionary part of the Marxist camp welcomed it; while for its non-revolutionary part, Lenin was a man who represented schism and hatred, a man of great deeds and terrifying destruction, standing outside of the applicable moral laws. The views of the liberals were similar: in their opinion, Lenin represented a world born from a revolution, fatally threatening the existing balance of social and political power. The Catholic camp admired Lenin in a way. Naturally, they saw him as a dictator, a demonic genius with an ethical inclination towards social justice, based on the denial of individualism and a ruthlessly atheist, "Genghis Khan-like", bloody Marxist revolution. However, they also saw him as a man of action and energy, unmatched by either Peter the Great or Napoleon. They counted him among the greatest Slavic personalities. All of this took place at the time when the Slovenian political Catholicism still saw communism as a social phenomenon that could provide certain social and economic solutions for other social movements as well. Later on, the Slovenian outlook on Lenin became significantly less tolerant. However, even before the "time of intolerance", the essential elements of Lenin's work had been defined: the extraordinary significance of his emergence, his extreme revolutionary action, enormous political capabilities, uncompromising upgrading of the already achieved goals, and his historical understanding of the development that represented the foundation for the events that had taken place. During this process, one part of the society had to sink in order for another one to rise. While this was – due to the

revolutionary violence – seen as negative by some, for others it represented the highest value and meaning.

Another Russian personality of the first half of the 20th century that Slovenians also focused on was Grigori Yefimovich Rasputin. In the Slovenian conscience, Rasputin represented a man who had an extraordinary influence on the last Russian imperial couple as well as on the Russian political and ecclesiastical life at the time. During his life, on the occasion of his death, as well as later on, his incredible charisma was being underlined, while his decadent life, fondness of money and social power, but also a favourable inclination towards the Russian peasants and ordinary people were also emphasised. He was seen as an opponent of the (world) war but also blamed for the demise of the Russian Empire due to the many years of his meddling in its affairs. The writer Vladimir Bartol was the one who dedicated himself to the Rasputin phenomenon the most. He saw Rasputin as the embodiment of the chaotic state of Russia that preceded the Bolshevik Revolution. In these conditions, Rasputin managed to hoist himself to almost the highest position in the state thanks to his suggestive power characteristic of Bible prophets, an enormous life force, and confidence. “This man had to know something about himself and the world that remains a mystery to the majority of other mortals,” Bartol wrote. Bartol’s warning regarding the excessive aspect of Rasputin’s personality outlines his image, otherwise negative in Slovenia, most expressively.

However, most of the energy, time, and profound ideological, political, and social sensitivity of the Slovenian politics was invested in the Bolshevik Revolution and the Soviet social, political, and state development that was based on it. On the basis of their understanding of the human society and the individual in it, the members of the Slovenian bourgeois camp – who possessed a thorough insight into the revolutionary October and the country it took place in – saw the October social overthrow and the consequent Soviet social, political, and economic development as a fundamental threat to the civilised world in which

they lived and which they consciously advocated. Even though they understood the October phenomenon historically, they did not accept its consequences. Along with the anti-Semitic viewpoint, they would underline the totalitarian, all-encompassing class-based Bolshevik power, the collectivist and anti-religious character of the Soviet community, its inherent personal insecurity, and its unpromising social and economic development – even though they did recognise some of Russia's economic and educational achievements. Dr Ivan Tavčar stood out with his negative opinion of the October Revolution on the liberal side, just as Dr Ivan Ahčin and Fran Erjavec did on the Catholic side. Dr Aleš Ušeničnik, the leading Catholic philosopher, rejected it theoretically as well. The bourgeois camp saw Bolshevism as its crucial opponent, and the declared struggle against it represented a permanent feature of the bourgeois politics in the Kingdom of SHS/Yugoslavia. This was an integral part of its ideological foundations, which the Catholic side provided with a distinct world-view moment as well. With such an ideological and political attitude, the bourgeois camp saw the end of the Yugoslav Kingdom and awaited World War II in Slovenia.

The question of Yugoslavism had the most sensitive national-political role in the Slavic thought in Slovenia. Ever since the 19th century, the ideological and political development of Yugoslavism, which also represented a concrete state entity for Slovenians in the 20th century, was defined by the clash of two concepts: national-unitarian and national-federalist. The unitarian side underlined the necessity to abolish the national-cultural and linguistic differences between the South Slavic nations, while the federal option argued in favour of the national emancipation principle and independence of the democratically united South Slavic nations. At first, the unitarian concept was politically dominant, as the first Yugoslav state community of the period between 1918 and 1941 was based on the national-unitarian and centralist state-legal foundations. This was abused by the Greater Serbian national political programme in order to

implement its aspirations for domination. However, in 1945, after World War II, the federal Yugoslav state was established, in which the unitarian tendencies were resurrected as early as in the 1950s. The Yugoslav leadership put a stop to these politically in the middle of the 1960s, just as it prevented, at the beginning of the 1970s, the efforts of Croats and Slovenians to modernise and democratise the Yugoslav state and society based on the consistent observation of the federal principle. Both concepts – the unitarian and democratic federalist – confronted each other decisively in the second half of the 1980s. As the unitarian programme, supported by the Greater Serbian politics of dominance, denied the democratic federal national sovereignty of the united Yugoslav nations, the non-Serbian nations decided in favour of their own independent states between 1990 and 1992. Their full national emancipation was achieved following the historic defeat of the Yugoslav unification idea, which had been constantly hindered by the Yugoslav unitarian national programme and the Greater Serbian supremacy politics.

The secession from the Yugoslav community and establishment of the independent state in 1991 represented the historical fulfilment of all the previous Slovenian national emancipation efforts. What followed, though, was “flawed heaven”. While some people revelled thoroughly in national emotions, expecting to witness the historical rise of Slovenianism and its ethical confirmation, others took advantage of “the open season”: the plundering committed by the predators involved in privatisation, arms trade, politics, and the like. The Slovenian independent national state position has been characterised by greed, indifference, and the denial of the spirit, all of which attests to a profound decline in values. The degenerate competitiveness and merciless careerism, established as early as in the primary school system that promotes individualism as the only valid existence, have deafened humanity. Slovenians have not become the “giants of the soul”, as Edvard Kocbek envisioned the nation’s self-realisation. Instead, intolerance and aggression prevailed,

as Slovenians have not morally withstood the civilisational momentum, stemming from their own national state. The society has become dominated by narcissists, striving to take care of themselves first and at the same time pushing others away. The “managerial circles” keep stifling any social responsibility, while the fact that the employees are being ignored and that mobbing has been lurking in the shadows of this disregard keeps pushing the unheard or those who have already become victims into social isolation. The society is being shaken by severe ideological disputes, preventing the national consensus on the ethical foundations of the Slovenian state and the purpose of its existence. In recent years, historiography and psychiatry have carried out several high-quality (and also monographic) studies. Slovenians have their work cut out for them if they wish to implement the civilisational imperative of humanity and culture.

The political landscape of Slovenians and the Slavic world reveals a variety of historiographical images. It shows that Slavism accompanied the Slovenian politics as well as ideological and social thought throughout the previous century, influencing the various historical positions regarding the values and decisions of the Slovenian community. In its form as an independent state and regarding its contents, this community represents one of the elements of the today’s Slavic and wider world.

SLOVANSKI SVET.

Zemljepisna in statistična slika
danešnjega slovanstva.

Napisal

prof. LUBOR NIEDERLE.

Monografija dr. Jurija Perovška je celovita in poglobljena študija o zanimivi razsežnosti slovenskega narodnega zavedanja in vključevanja v mednarodne povezave. Gre za predstavitev in analizo vpetosti Slovencev v širši slovanski prostor, srečanja s posameznimi slovanskimi narodi, zanimanje zanje, seznanjanje z družbenopolitičnimi dogodki med njimi in za reakcije, ki so jih le-ti ponesli v slovenski prostor. Tako ali drugače so bili Slovenci povezani z drugimi slovanskimi skupnostmi, skrbeli za ohranjanje stikov z njimi, se od časa do časa do njih opredelili in neredko pri njih iskali pobude za sprejemanje političnih usmeritev. Monografija izvirno zariše značilnosti slovenskega samozavedanja in rasti v iskanju tako lastne izvirnosti kot povezanosti z drugimi slovanskimi okolji. Slednjič avtorjevo delo pokaže na pomembne stopnje oblikovanja slovenske državotvornosti, kar se je polno realiziralo v razglasitvi samostojne slovenske države.

prof. dr. Bogdan Kolar

Med raznimi osebnostmi Rusije prve polovice 20. stoletja je avtor posebej izpostavil tudi t. i. Rasputinov fenomen. K njegovemu delovanju v za ruski imperij prelomnih časih so se pred stoletjem in več vedno znova vračali tudi Slovenci. Najbolj se je v svojevrstnega ruskega preroka G. J. Rasputina poglobil pisatelj Vladimir Bartol, ki je v njem videl utelešenje kaotičnega stanja tedanje carske Rusije.

dr. Renato Podbersič

Cena: 25 EUR



Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino