

Neja Blaj Hribar

LJUBOMIR DUŠANOV JURKOVIĆ: The Question of Yugoslavism

Author: Ljubomir Dušanov Jurković

Title: Life and Work at the University of Ljubljana

Originally published: *Narodni dnevnik* 4, nos. 40–41, 42–46, 50–56, 58 (February 19–March 12, 1927); specifically “The Question of Yugoslavism,” *ibid.*, nos. 53–54 (March 7–8, 1927).

Language: Slovenian

About the author

Ljubomir Dušanov Jurković (1898, Benkovac–1982, Ljubljana) was an active writer, translator, teacher, and politician.¹ He published articles and translations in various newspapers and magazines throughout Yugoslavia. During the interwar period, he was publicly active, especially in Ljubljana and Dalmatia, where he even ran for parliament. He was a member of the People’s Radical Party (*Narodna radikalna stranka*, NRS), supported its social policies, and campaigned

¹ Jurković’s detailed biography has not yet been written. A sketchy biography is available in the Hrvatski biografski leksikon: “JURKOVIĆ, Ljubo,” *Hrvatski biografski leksikon* (1983–2024), online version. (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2024), accessed August 21, 2024, <https://hbl.lzmk.hr/clanak/jurkovic-ljubo>. Kosta Milutinović, “JURKOVIĆ, Ljubo,” in *Leksikon pisaca Jugoslavije*, vol. 2 (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1979), 686–87. This biography focuses on the interwar period and is mainly based on material from his archival fond at the Archive of the Republic of Slovenia in Ljubljana (Arhiv Republike Slovenije, SI AS 2070 Jurković Dušan Ljubomir) as well as his published works.

for a strong nation-state. The main topics of his writing, both popular and scholarly, were the national question and Yugoslavism.

Jurković was born in Benkovac, Dalmatia, in 1898. After the Italian occupation of northern Dalmatia following the First World War, he was sent into exile and consequently moved to Split, where he finished high school. After two semesters at the Technical College in Prague (1920–1921), he moved to Ljubljana. He initially enrolled at the University of Ljubljana's technical faculty to study architecture,² but transferred to the Faculty of Arts, majoring in philosophy. In 1926, he became a high school teacher for the Serbo-Croatian language. Simultaneously, he continued his studies and received a PhD in 1940 with the dissertation “Psihologija patriotskog osećanja” (The Psychology of Patriotic Sentiment), supervised by the philosopher France Veber.³ After the dissertation's evaluation by the doctoral defense committee and his supervisor, Jurković's work was selected to be published.⁴ However, during the printing process the Italian occupying forces destroyed it.

In addition to his studies and his work as a teacher, Jurković was also very active in Ljubljana's associational life. As a student, he was involved in various societies and clubs, such as the Council of University Attendees in Ljubljana (*Svet slušateljev ljubljanske univerze*) and the Club of the Slavic South (*Slovenski Jug*). Later, he was involved in the Yugoslav Translators' Association, the Yugoslav Professors' Association, the People's University of Ljubljana, and the Dalmatian Academic Society. He was connected to the Serbian community in Ljubljana primarily through the Orthodox municipality in Ljubljana, where he was active from 1927 to 1952 (as secretary, vice president, and from 1935 as president).⁵ Due to his functions in the municipality, he was instrumental in the construction of the first Orthodox church in Ljubljana, the Church of Saints Cyril and Methodius

2 In some articles, he is presented as an architect. Together with his brother Boris he designed the Narodni dom in Benkovac in 1934. Jelena Cvetko, “Temeljita rekonstrukcija i obnova Doma kulture Benkovac: Važan projekt za kulturni život grada,” *Jutranji list*, April 4, 2021, accessed August 30, 2024, <https://www.jutarnji.hr/domidizajn/interijeri/temeljita-rekonstrukcija-i-obnova-doma-kulture-benkovac-vazan-projekt-za-kulturni-zivot-grada-15063136>.

3 France Veber was a Slovenian philosopher, the first professor at the university and one with an almost complete philosophical system. He was a pupil of Alexius Meinong. See Tomo Virk, *Trojka s filozofske. Spisi o Vebru, Bartolu in Jugu* (Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani, 2017), 11–12. He had a great influence on Jurković's scientific work and his political stance. In philosophy, Jurković followed Veber's theory of objects (phenomenology) and psychology and, like Veber, he opposed both capitalist materialism and socialist collectivism and saw cooperativism as the solution to the agrarian question.

4 Alojz Cindrič, *Od imatrikulacije do promocije. Doktorandi profesorja Franceta Vebra na Oddelku za filozofijo Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani v luči arhivskega gradiva 1919–1945* (Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani, 2020), 188–89.

5 SI AS 2070, Box 1/2, Začasna vprašalna pola, Priloga A, B, C.

(built 1932–1936).⁶ On behalf of the Serbs living in Ljubljana, and as the president of the Orthodox municipality, he signed the “Deklaracija predsedniku SNOS-a, tov. Jopisu Vidmarju” (Declaration to the President of the Slovenian National Liberation Committee, Comrade Josip Vidmar) in May 1945, expressing their gratitude for liberation and their firm belief that the Democratic Federal Yugoslavia would ensure freedom and independence for all its peoples.⁷

Jurković was politically active from a young age. In Dalmatia, he belonged to the revolutionary Yugoslav (anti-Austrian) youth movement and was closely associated with the Slovenian *Preporod* movement (*preporodovci*).⁸ Jurković wrote many articles about the revolutionary youth movement (especially in Dalmatia) later in life and it is clear that this period was significant for him personally and foundational for his stance on Yugoslavism. He joined NRS before moving to Ljubljana. After establishing a local branch of the party in Ljubljana (October 1921), he began to participate actively in the party's activities as the branch's general secretary.

Like many others from the pre-war Yugoslav nationalist youth movement (especially from Dalmatia),⁹ he joined Orjuna (*Organizacija jugoslovenskih nacionalista*, the Organisation of Yugoslav Nationalists). He became editor of the organization's magazine, *Orjuna*, and was a deputy of the regional committee (Oblastni odbor za Slovenijo). However, he left Orjuna already in autumn 1923 after disagreements with the leadership.¹⁰ According to Jurković, the problem became his membership in the NRS. Orjuna was too attached to the Independent Democratic Party (*Samostalna demokratska stranka*, SDS) and attacked the NRS. He also disagreed with some of Orjuna's tactics and actions, but not with their stance on the national question.¹¹

6 See Bojan Cvelfar, *Srbska pravoslavna cerkev na Slovenskem med svetovnima vojnoma* (Ljubljana: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 2017).

7 SI AS 2070, Box 2/11, Deklaracija predsedniku SNOS-a, tov. Josipu Vidmarju, *Ljudska pravica*, May 27, 1945.

8 Revolutionary Yugoslav youth movements had close relations with each other. Preporod was a Slovenian-Yugoslav youth organization that gathered around the monthly magazine *Preporod* (after the politically oriented magazine of the same name from Belgrade) and saw the solution to the Slovenian national question in the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Jurković is listed as a member (described as the author of historical articles in *Preporod*). Evgen Lovšin, “Seznam Preporodovcev 1912–1914,” in *Preporodovci proti Avstriji*, ed. Adolf Ponikvar (Ljubljana: Borec, 1970), 191. He also had a personal relationship with Ivan Endlicher.

9 Ivan Bošković, “Splitski orjunaški list *Pobeda* i Stjepan Radić,” *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 39, no. 1 (2007): 119. Vasilije Dragosavljević, “Irredentist Actions of the Slovenian Organisation of Yugoslav Nationalists (the ORJUNA) in Italy and Austria (1922–1930),” *Prispevki za novejšo zgodovino* 59, no. 3 (2019): 33.

10 “II. redna skupščina oblastnega odbora Oriuna za Slovenijo. V Celju dne 2. februarja 1924. Tajniško poročilo,” *Orjuna* 2, no. 6, February 9, 1924, 1. Between summer and autumn 1923, some visible members left the organisation, which indicates there were disagreement within.

11 Ljubo D. Jurković, “Obračun,” *Radikalni glasnik* 1, no. 1, October 21, 1923, 1. For Orjuna's side, see “Ljubo D. Jurković,” *Orjuna* 1, no. 48, October 21, 1923, 2–3. “Taktika,” *Orjuna* 1, no. 49, October 27, 1923, 1.

From 1923, he wrote several articles in *Radikalni glasnik*, the organ of the NRS for the Slovenian-speaking territories of the SHS Kingdom. There, he wrote about his political convictions: he disagreed that the party had a Greater Serbian agenda or that it rejected national unity. He rather saw the NRS as a socialist party for all classes without internationalism. Jurković held the view that the solution to the national question should not be a matter of political parties, for they would only trigger a struggle between people for political gains. Instead, it was up to cultural and scientific organizations as well as private individuals to take up the task.¹²

In Jurković's postwar description of his political involvement in the interwar period, he wrote that the members of the radical student club Slovenski Jug considered him a supporter of Ljubomir Jovanović's politics.¹³ In the same text, he described the influence of the Slovenian section of the NRS as more or less a political bystander, without much influence, adding that the party was full of opportunists.¹⁴ He ran for parliament in his hometown of Benkovac in 1935 and 1938. Both times, the Yugoslav Radical Union (*Jugoslovenska radikalna zajednica*, JRZ) put up a candidate against him.¹⁵ Jurković described how his supporters were harassed and incapacitated even more than a Croatian challenger from the Croatian Peasant Party (*Hrvatska seljačka stranka*, HSS). After his second candidacy, Jurković was disappointed by the NRS (both the central party organization and the Slovenian section) and by the politics itself. He withdrew from all political activities, explaining that he was seen in political circles as a person without a sense of "Realpolitik," and was too much of a "professor."¹⁶

The national question was at the center of Jurković's political thought as expressed in his scholarly, popular, and literary writings.¹⁷ During the interwar period, his view of the nation changed only in minor details. He believed that the

12 Lj. D. Jurković, "Narodno edinstvo," *Radikalni glasnik* 1, no. 7, December 1, 1923, 1. See also Ljubo D. Jurković, "Zdravom politikom – boljoj budućnosti," *Radikalni glasnik* 1, no. 3, November 4–25, 1923, 1. Ljubo D. Jurković, "Za pošten in bratski sporazum," *Radikalni glasnik* 2, no. 28, July 9, 1924, 3.

13 Slovenski Jug was a student club associated with the Radical Party, although the party didn't support it, as other Slovenian political parties had other clubs. (SI AS 2070, Box 2/9, AD 1, Studentski radikalni klub »Slovenski Jug«, 2.) Ljubomir Jovanović was a politician and historian. He was a member of the Radical Party, a member of parliament, and a minister in the Kingdom of Serbia and the SHS Kingdom. After a disagreement with Nikola Pašić, he was expelled from the party. Jurković did not describe the policies on which they agreed, but only stated that they were in close contact in Dalmatia, where Jovanović campaigned for the NRS.

14 Ibid., 4.

15 Union of the NRS, the Slovenian People's Party (*Slovenska ljudska stranka*, SLS), and the Yugoslav Muslim Organization (*Jugoslovenska muslimanska organizacija*, JMO).

16 Ibid., 9.

17 In the review of Jurković's poetry book *Kotarke: pesme za narod*, Josip Prezelj wrote: "The poet is above all an enthusiastic patriot." – Josip Prezelj, review of *Kotarke: pesme za narod* by Ljuba D. Jurković, in *The Slavonic Review* 3, no. 7 (1924): 226.

Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes were once a nation with a common origin and a common national character, which was then divided by external forces (Germans, Turks, etc.).¹⁸ After the division of the nation, Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes began to drift apart both culturally and mentally. The Slovenes drifted away from the national character the most and moved closer to Western culture (also the Croats, but to a lesser extent).¹⁹ He never used the term “tribe” (*pleme*) and wrote only about separate Slovenian, Croatian, or Serbian nations, nevertheless believing that a Yugoslav nation would be reborn.

MOST IMPORTANT WORKS: Literature: *Kotarke. Pesme za narod* (Ljubljana: Zvezna knjigarna, 1927); *Mala kraljica noći* (Ljubljana: Pobratimstvo, 1934). Professional Works: *Komuniste i nacionalno pitanje* (Ljubljana: Studentski radikalni klub “Slovenski jug”, 1928); “Genetička psihologija mladosti,” *Misao* 32, no. 7–8 (1930): 499–503; “Borba za klasičnu kulturu u Sloveniji,” *Misao* 33, no. 1–4 (1930): 179–81; *Osnovi jugoslovenskog nacionalizma. Psihološka studija* (Ljubljana: Pobratimstvo, 1934); “Uloga naše omladine u oblikovanju kolektivne duše našega naroda,” *Slobodna misao* 15, no. 6 (February 9, 1936): 3; *O našim individualitetima* (Šibenik: Tipografija, 1940); with Kosta Milutinović, “Jugoslavenski nacionalnorevolucionarni omladinski pokret u Zadru (1910–1914),” *Zadarska revija* 14, no. 1 (1965): 1–26.

Context

In 1927, Ljubomir Dušan Jurković wrote the article “Življenje in delo na ljubljanski univerzi” (Life and Work at the University of Ljubljana) in support of the University of Ljubljana, which was founded in 1919 and threatened with abolition in the second half of the 1920s due to a lack of funds.²⁰ As the youngest university in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, the University of Ljubljana had fewer students and professors than the universities in Zagreb or Belgrade, which put it in a particularly precarious position. However, the proposals to close the university did not go down well with the Slovenian public. Ljubomir D. Jurković, a student at the university at the time, responded to this danger by writing a detailed article about life and work at the university and its significance.

At the beginning of the article, Jurković recognized the problems of a young university: insufficient staff, space, and equipment. On the other hand, he saw the

18 Ljuba D. Jurković, *Osnovi jugoslovenskog nacionalizma: psihološko-sociološka studija* (Ljubljana: Pobratimstvo, 1934), 7, 19–20.

19 Ibid., 9.

20 Ljuba D. Jurković, “Življenje in delo na ljubljanski univerzi,” *Narodni dnevnik* 4, nos. 40–58, February 19–March 12, 1927.

youth as an advantage. The professors were mostly young and full of enthusiasm; the whole university was full of vigor. Jurković cited the alleged promotion of Slovenian separatism, which he strictly rejected, as the second reason for the attacks on the University of Ljubljana. For him, the few separatist elements had no real influence at the university. The professors and students came from all over the Kingdom and spoke the language of their choice, Serbo-Croatian or Slovenian, or both, and yet they all understood each other. Jurković believed that the university would become a pioneer of Yugoslavism. In the article, he described the work of the student councils as well as the social, cultural, and political aspects of student life: problems with scholarships, the canteens, student health, and so on.

Jurković returned to the topic of Yugoslavism in the section “The Yugoslav Question,” in which he described the students’ views on this topic. He mentioned that although most of the students had already decided in favor of or against Yugoslavism, this was still one of the most discussed issues. Jurković’s description of the students’ views on Yugoslavism shows that it was never a homogeneous ideology. The Yugoslav idea existed even before the country was founded, and it had never been unified.²¹ The state’s official stance on Yugoslavism can also be divided into three (or four) periods, which collided with external political changes.²² However, official state policy on the issue of Yugoslavism did not agree with all political factions and varied depending on the region and time. Apart from day-to-day political issues such as taxation and the lack of a central administration, the organization of the state and dissatisfaction with centralism were probably the most important issues that influenced the perception of the Yugoslav state and thus of Yugoslavism. Dejan Djokić likewise pointed out that similar problems and debates occurred around the Yugoslav state and the ideology of Yugoslavism during Aleksandar Karađorđević’s royal dictatorship, and that the idea ultimately failed because it was seen as part of the regime.²³

21 Marko Zajc, “Slovenian Intellectuals and Yugoslavism in the 1980s: Propositions, Theses, Questions,” *Südosteuropäische Hefte* 4, no. 1 (2015): 48.

22 These can be divided into the (1) parliamentary era, 1918–1929, when the unitary Yugoslav state was compromised, followed by (2) the royal dictatorship, 1929–1935, with the prominence of integral Yugoslavism, then (3) the end of the dictatorship, 1935–1941, the period of so-called real Yugoslavism, as a permanent synthesis of the tribes. See Pieter Troch, “Yugoslavism between the World Wars. Indecisive Nation Building,” *Nationalities Papers* 38, no. 2 (2010): 229. Dušan Fundić proposes a fourth period between 1939 and 1941, known as “minimal Yugoslavism,” which begins with the Cvetković-Maček Agreement, when ‘Yugoslav’ only referred to citizenship. Dušan Fundić, “Being capable or incapable of governing a great Yugoslavia: The Serbian Right Wing and the Ideologies of Yugoslavism (1934–1941),” in *The Serbian Right-Wing Parties and Intellectuals in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, 1934–1941*, ed. Dušan Bakić (Belgrade: Institute for Balkan Studies, 2022), 282.

23 Dejan Djokić, “(Dis)integrating Yugoslavia: King Alexander and interwar Yugoslavism,” in *Yugoslavism: History of a Failed Idea 1918–1992*, ed. Dejan Djokić (London: C. Hurst & Co., 2003), 151.

Second, national identity was fluid and hardly tangible, especially given the confusion surrounding Yugoslavism and other sub- or non-national identities. As Lojze Ude, a Slovenian publicist, jurist, and historian, wrote in 1932, the problem lay in different understandings of the word 'nation' and the subjective perceptions of what a nation is.²⁴ Although he probably believed that there was a "precise" definition of nations, it is true that different perceptions of what a nation is led to even more confusion.

In order to understand Jurković's description of the students' position on Yugoslavism, it is necessary to take a closer look at his point of view. Unlike many others, Jurković's idea of a nation was quite elaborate, as he specialized in this issue. As already mentioned, he believed in the national unity of Slovenes, Serbs, and Croats. When it came to the question of how a Yugoslav nation would be (re)born, it is crucial to understand his concept of national character, which Jurković called the "national soul."²⁵ For him, national character was a spiritual reality that unites all individuals who are bound together by tradition, a common language and literature, as well as familial-social, cultural-economic, and other links of interest. Although general national character is static, the mentality of youth is not. The task of a nation's youth is to produce new individuals who will become new bearers of a new national character. The general national character has a great influence on the character of youth, but youth gives it new impulses and dynamics.²⁶ It is safe to say that, for Jurković, the Yugoslav youth would generate a new Yugoslav national character and thus a Yugoslav nation.

In the article below, Jurković uses the term "practical Yugoslavism." This term appeared before the First World War in connection with the gradual unification of South Slavic cultures and languages through familiarization.²⁷ Jurković also used the term in his text on revolutionary Yugoslav youth, describing it as the creation of Yugoslav literature through the publication of all South Slavic literary works in youth magazines.²⁸ Jurković understood his public work in the same way. Not only as a translator, but also because of his public engagement. At the end of 1923, he wrote that he worked among Serbs and Croats to make them get to know and love "their Slovenian brothers" and their homeland, and vice

24 Lojze Ude, "Josip Vidmar: Kulturni problemi slovenstva," in *Kriza Ljubljanskega zvona*, ed. Fran Albreht (Ljubljana: Kritika, 1932), 41.

25 National characterology was present in practically every European culture. In the interwar period, it occupied a central position in the cultural-political debates in East Central Europe, as there was no "other institutional framework of identification." See Balázs Trencsényi, *The Politics of "National Character". A Study in Interwar East European Thought* (London: Routledge, 2012), 17.

26 SI AS 2070, Box 2/9, Jugoslovenski revolucionarni nacionalizam. Psihološka analiza omladinskog jugoslovenskog nacionalističkog pokreta, 24–25.

27 For comparison, see Bogumil Vošnjak, "Praktično jugoslovanstvo," *Veda* 2, no. 3 (1912), 209–14. Iv. D., "Naše jugoslovanstvo v praksi," *Učiteljski tovarиш* 61, no. 17, April 21, 1921, 1.

28 SI AS 2070, Box 2/9, Jugoslovenski revolucionarni nacionalizam, 49.

versa, that he wanted to familiarize Slovenes with their brothers of “Serbian and Croatian name” by living together with the them.²⁹ Practical Yugoslavism would best describe Jurković’s idea of creating a Yugoslav nation: a new national character would be formed by getting to know each other and living together.

In “The Question of Yugoslavism,” Jurković ascribed support for Yugoslavism to almost all students; the differences lay in the details. It is interesting to note that the Catholic/clerical students, as Jurković states, were sincere Yugoslavs. He believed that they listened to their political leaders, but did not follow their party-political tactics. Jurković astutely observed that the Slovenian People’s Party (*Slovenska ljudska stranka*, SLS), although propagating an autonomist policy when it was in opposition, agreed that eventually a new Yugoslav national type would be constructed as a mixture of all national spirits.³⁰ The Catholic students, according to Jurković, worked to ensure that the best parts of Slovenianness would be incorporated into the Yugoslav nation. As historian Mateja Ratej has pointed out, although the SLS and the NRS had different political views on the national question, they were actually quite similar in terms of the concept of the nation. Especially in that not only language, culture, and character make up a nation, but also the will of the people (in the sense of Ernest Renan).³¹ Despite claims to Slovenian autonomy, the SLS based its concept of the nation-state on Yugoslavia and not on an independent Slovenia.³²

The Slovenian liberal parties (and some others) in the interwar period favored the idea of unitarism and centralism and considered the Yugoslav nation to be the logical conclusion of the historical process of the (re)unification of the Yugoslav tribes.³³ In this sense, Jurković’s account is not surprising. However, he believed that the usurpation of the issue by the Democrats (liberals) and Orjuna was detrimental to Yugoslavism and the perception of the Radicals, Agrarians, and other supporters of the Yugoslav idea. Jurković did not use the word “unitary” or “integral,” however. He only expressed that they agreed with the quoted saying that only a good Slovene (Croat, Serb) can be a good Yugoslav. This motto was widespread at the time and was associated with King Alexander I’s vision

29 Ljubo D. Jurković, “Iz naroda za narod!” *Radikalni glasnik* 1, no. 8, December 8, 1923, 1.

30 It is important to emphasize that the SLS and the NRS began to converge after 1926 and that they signed the “Bled Agreement” only a few months after the publication of the article (July 11, 1927).

31 Mateja Ratej, “(Ne)vrallična stičišča političnega sodelovanja Slovenske ljudske in Narodne radikalne stranke med obema svetovnima vojnoma,” *Zgodovinski časopis* 62, no. 3–4 (2008): 416.

32 Mateja Ratej, “Jugoslovani iz zadrege ali iz prepričanja in veselja? Razumevanje patriotizma in odnos do kraljeve dinastije Karađorđević pri Slovenski ljudski in Narodni radikalni stranki v letih 1918–1941,” in *Evropski vplivi na slovensko družbo*, ed. Nevenka Troha, Mojca Šorn, and Bojan Balkovec (Ljubljana: Zveza zgodovinskih društev Slovenije, 2008), 184.

33 Jurij Perovšek, “Slovenci in jugoslovanska skupnost med svetovnima vojnoma,” in *Preteklost sodobnosti. Izbrana poglavja slovenske novejše zgodovine*, ed. Zdenko Čepič (Ljubljana: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 1999), 68.

of (integral) Yugoslavism.³⁴ The Slovenian “liberal” political camp was divided throughout the interwar period, but they were united on Yugoslavism. This repelled some liberal-minded people. Jurković mentions some left-wing students—“free academics,” that is, students who did not belong to any of the existing clubs—who mostly sided with the Catholics on the issue of Yugoslavism.

The only ones who were against Yugoslavism were the Marxists. They claimed that the Slovenes had nothing in common with the Serbs and Croats and propagated complete autonomy on the basis of the right to self-determination. Jurković’s remark that they had only said this for election campaign purposes and because they had no other idea was probably one of the reasons why Jurković’s article provoked an indignant reaction from Ludvik Mrzel and other Marxists which led to a long dispute between them in the newspaper *Narodni dnevnik* (The National Journal).³⁵ This prompted Jurković to write a series of articles on Marxism and nationalism, which he later transformed into a book.³⁶ Mrzel accused him of Serbian radicalism and hegemonism, labelled him a guest in Slovenia, and even threatened him.³⁷ The Marxists saw Jurković as a national enemy because he was a Serb and a member of the NRS, whom the public perceived as an advocate of the idea of a Greater Serbia. Jurković replied to Mrzel that it would be interesting to know whether Slovenian ministers felt like guests in Belgrade, adding that he and other Serbs and Croats had never felt like guests in Slovenia and were always warmly welcomed.³⁸

However, going beyond the direct insults is necessary to analyze their political thought. Jurković’s response to Mrzel’s arguments on the fiscal inequality of Slovenes in Yugoslavia even more clearly presents the previously discussed problem of the influence of politics on the idea of Yugoslavism. Jurković succinctly replied to Mrzel that this way of writing gave the impression that taxes were only paid in Slovenia. He conceded that taxes were uneven, but in Vojvodina taxes were even higher, and yet there were no efforts to culturally and politically free themselves from the state.³⁹ Jurković took offence that, instead of working togeth-

34 “VI redovni sastanak senata Kraljevine Jugoslavije držan 19 marta 1936 godine u Beogradu,” in *Stenografske beleške senata kraljevine Jugoslavije: Redovan saziv za 1935 i 1936 godinu* 5, no. 1 (Belgrade: Štamparija Drag. Popovića, 1936), 64.

35 Ludvik Mrzel, “Slovenski akademiki in separatizem,” *Narodni dnevnik* 4, no. 64 (March 21, 1927), 3. See also Ivan Grohar, “Življenje in delo na univerzi. (odgovor marksistov),” *Narodni dnevnik* 4, no. 113, May 19, 1927, 3–4.

36 Ljubomir D. Jurković, *Komuniste i nacionalno pitanje* (Ljubljana: Studentski radikalni klub “Slovenski jug”, 1928).

37 Mrzel, “Slovenski akademiki,” 3.

38 Ljuba D. Jurković, “Separatistični nacionalizem slovenskih marksistov,” *Narodni dnevnik* 4, nos. 73–76, April 1–5, 1927.

39 Jurković, “Separatistični nacionalizem,” *Narodni dnevnik* 4, no. 76, April 5, 1927, 4.

er to stabilize the state and strengthen it socially, they were spreading separatist ideas.⁴⁰

In the article below, Jurković described the students' opinion on Yugoslavism.⁴¹ Although he analyzed their views based on political preferences, he added some internal insights and clearly showed how heterogeneous Yugoslavism was. He even accused the Democrats and Orjuna of harming other ideas by monopolizing Yugoslavism. In his view, the youth was of great importance for the formation of the national character, so his interest in the ideas of the students was not accidental. This article and the later dispute between "separatists" and a Yugoslav show how different factors influenced the varieties of Yugoslavism: politics, state organization, political ideology, and the understanding of what a nation is.

It is fair to say that Jurković simplified the view, but to better understand the students' ideas of Yugoslavism, their published works should be analyzed in the same way as Jurković's.

Acknowledgement

This contribution is a result of the infrastructure program *Research Infrastructure of Slovenian Historiography* (I0-0013), funded by the Public Agency for Research and Innovation of the Republic of Slovenia (ARIS).

LJUBA D. JURKOVIĆ “Life and Work at the University of Ljubljana” The Question of Yugoslavism

This question continues to fascinate all students, and its definition and solution are still being sought. Although all the groups have addressed this issue in principle in their written programs and either advocated for or against it, it remains of keen interest to all young students and is almost always a subject of discussion and debate. In Slovenia, Yugoslavism finds itself in a more difficult position than elsewhere because it still has to settle its relationship with Slovenianness, which is a more difficult and complicated matter than its

40 "We, the Radicals, demand the elimination of all national problems in order to remove them from the agenda as quickly as possible so that we can then begin to solve our social problems," in Jurković, "Separatistični," *Narodni dnevnik* 4, no. 73, April 1, 1927, 5.

41 For a detailed study of the student movement and also about student clubs, see Slavko Klemenšek, *Slovensko študentovsko gibanje 1919–1941* (Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1972).

relationship with Serbianness or Croatianness. Nevertheless, at least according to my personal understanding of this problem, the students in Ljubljana have solved this problem positively, and the practical results of our common life and work will soon become apparent, with the University of Ljubljana playing a particular role in this regard.

Here is proof. A few months ago, a congress was organized in Ljubljana for all the engineering students in the country. With regard to the technical-scientific questions and lecture notes, the congress decided that these should be published by a federal publishing house for all our engineers in the Ekavian dialect of the Serbian or Croatian language and in the Latin alphabet! Is this not practically Yugoslavism? (I should also mention that the Slovenian cinema audience has also practically solved the issue of subtitles in the theatres. Today, Slovenians can read Serbo-Croatian subtitles and laugh, cry, and understand everything easily, without an interpreter, just as the Latin script can be easily read in Serbia, Bosnia, and elsewhere!) Yugoslavism is paving its own way...

It is interesting to note that the so-called **Catholic (clericalist) students are Yugoslav-oriented**; the best of them are particularly distinguished by this feature. The youth have accepted what their leaders (Dr. Krek and Dr. Korošec) have been telling them and proving to them for so many years. Understandably, from a psychological viewpoint, the youth have not been discouraged by the poor performance of our central administration, the inequality of taxes, the struggle for an autonomous Slovenian administration, etc. Instead, they became aware of **this idea, adopted it enthusiastically, and became sincere Yugoslavs!**

The Catholic students recognize **the need for a national community with us Serbs and with our Croat brothers. They are even convinced that a common Yugoslav nation will arise from our common life, and they strive to contribute the maximum of their positive elements as Slovenians, which is the only way their notion of Yugoslavism should be interpreted.**

...

To be Yugoslav does not mean to stop being Slovenian. On the contrary, it means being a good Slovenian. All good Slovenians are simultaneously good Yugoslavs because if they are not, they are not good Slovenians, just as being a good Serb or Croat is also to be a good Yugoslav; one is a precondition for the other.

Such a *mutatis mutandis* understanding of Yugoslavism does not correspond to how this notion is understood by the Democrats and the members of Orjuna (who would like to monopolize this question for themselves

without realizing how much they are thus undermining the very idea) or by the Radicals, the members of the Agrarian Party, and others.

It is crucial that the Marxists (communists) and left-leaning students are very interested in this question. Although, as Marxists, they would have to deny the existence of any **special national question**, they consider that this question exists and, despite the late Marx, they attach particular importance to it. However, what is especially strange for these internationalists and cosmopolitans is that they have taken a stand **against Yugoslavism while proving the existence of a separate Slovenian nation that has no connections with Serbs and Croats, represents a separate cultural unity and is, as such, entitled to seek its political and economic “liberation” based on the nation’s right to self-determination!**

It may be that our communists did not mean and say this sincerely and that these are just election slogans. However, such statements have been repeated many times, and they should be registered, underlined, and emphasized as one of the causes of their steady decline. **It is also possible that they have resorted to these offensively separatist and chauvinist means due to a lack of other ideas for the youth. However, they have made a mistake because no one supports them in this regard.**

The second left-oriented group, the so-called “free academics,” does not yet have a definite position on Yugoslavism because they are an “ad hoc” group, of which it would be appropriate to say that it was formed as a sign of protest against the excessive integral Yugoslavism of the *Orjuna* organization and the evils of our poor administration with all their consequences. However, it seems that in this respect, they will also come closer to how the Catholics (**the special role of Slovenians in Yugoslavism**), as well as the Democrats (the *Jadran*, *Triglav*, and *Orjuna* organizations), the Radicals (the *Slovenski Jug* magazine) and the Agrarian Party (the *Njiva* magazine) understand this notion in general.

Finally, let me underline that **all students, regardless of their political orientation, are united in the question regarding our non-liberated brothers and that this question also strongly influences a profound sense of national unity—of Yugoslavism!**
