

ON THE ATTITUDE OF SLOVENE INTELLECTUALS IN BOHEMIA AND CROATIA TO JEWS

Irena Gantar Godina*

COBISS 1.02

IZVLEČEK

O odnosu slovenskih izobražencev do Židov na Češkem in Hrvaškem

Prispevek je le fragmentaren prikaz odnosa slovenskih izobražencev, začasnih in trajnih izseljencev na Češkem in Hrvaškem, do tam živečih Židov. Kot pravi slovanofili so na Hrvaškem in na Češkem, predvsem v Pragi, v slovanskem okolju, lahko še okrepili svojo pripadnost slovenstvu in slovanstvu, na drugi strani pa so mnogi še poglobili svoje predodke in odklanjanje židovskega naroda.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: Slovani, Židi, slovenski izobraženci-izseljenci, Češka, Hrvaška

ABSTRACT

On the attitude of Slovene intellectuals in Bohemia and Croatia to Jews

The article is only a fragmentary survey of the attitude of the Slovene intellectuals, be temporary or permanently emigrants in Bohemia and in Croatia, towards the there Jews. As true Slavophiles they could have in Bohemia as well as in Croatia, in Slavic *milieu* even deepened their Slovene and Slavic identity and appurtenance, while on the other hand many of them even strengthened their prejudices and their refusal of the Jewish nation.

KEY WORDS: Slavs, Jews, Slovene intellectuals-emigrants, Bohemia, Croatia

The Hilsner affair in Bohemia, also noted as “the Austrian version of Dreyfus affair”,¹ appeared at the turn of the century, in 1899, when the Slovene society was still or even more penetrated/permeated with anti-Semitic ideas and emotions, although they were only partly traditional and historically conditioned. In contrast to many Central European countries of that time, in Slovene lands and its capital Ljubljana the number

* Irena Gantar Godina, PhD, historian, Institute for Slovenian Emigration Studies Scientific research Center of Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, e-pošta: IrenaGG@zrc-sazu.si, Irena.Gantar-Godina@guest.arnes.si

¹ Steven Beller, *The Hilsner Affair: Nationalism, Anti-Semitism and the Individual in the Habsburg Monarchy at the Turn of the Century*, T. G. Masaryk (1850- 1937), Vol. 2, Thinker and Critic, ed. R. B. Pynsent, McMillan&SSEES, London 1989, p. 52. Beller quotes Masaryk's comments in E. Rychovsky (ed). *Masaryk und das Judentum*, Prague 1931, p. 269. See also Peter Vodopivec, *Devetdeset let po Dreyfusu*, NR, 24. 6.1988.

of Jewish families or individuals was negligible. It was as early as in 1515 when the last Jewish family was expelled or exiled from the Carniola society. In the time of Joseph II when the Edict of Tolerance was implemented, a negligible number of Jews, mainly salesmen came to live – for a short time – to Slovene towns.

Slovene society was penetrated with Anti-Semitic ideas even at the time of Metternich and Bach's regimes when any political or national work of non-German nations was prohibited. Also then, the Slovenes' first "enemy" was not only the German, but also the Jew.

On the other hand, when the Hilsner affair in Czech lands began the Slovenes still witnessed the dominating and oppressive policy of the Austrian Germans, i.e. dominating nation, which would not meet their crucial national demands presented in 1848: Slovene grammar schools, Slovene University, etc. Therefore, the Slovenes were traditionally bonded with the idea of Slav mutuality, be named Pan-Slavism, Austro-Slavism, or later Neo-Slavism, which was based upon the assumption that they had to create some sort of a common Slavic unit, not only to struggle against Slovenes' threatening neighbours, Germans at the North, the Italians at the West and the Hungarians at the East, but also against the Jews. Such a Slavic unit should have been capable of asserting breakthroughs of the Slavs within the frames of Austrian state, particularly in the fields of politics, culture and economy. In addition, many Slovenes connected their fears of German nationalism and expansionism with Jewish capital. They believed that the German nationalists could not have been so influential if the Jewish Liberals did not support them, including the press. The assumption of both, the Slovene Catholics as well as of the Slovene Liberals was that they were facing a sort of a Jewish conspiracy. Their assumptions were based on their belief that the Jews had adopted the extreme German nationalistic attitude to gain sympathies from the Germans. They believed that the Jews in Austria were even supported by the government although they believed that its position was in fact to stay neutral.²

At the same time Slovene Pan-Slavs, mainly of Liberal affiliation, or Austro-Slavs if they were Catholics, and independent intellectuals as well, agitated against Jewish newspapers, Jewish internationalism, against Jewish a-nationalism, and particularly against Jewish "non-Christianity".

After 1848 and 1868, respectively, Slovene sympathies for Slavic cause, for Slavic mutuality strengthened and became a prevailing ideology in the following decades, which was also one of the reasons for Slovene intellectuals to emigrate, be voluntarily or not.

In the early 50ies of 19th century a reasonable number of Slovene intellectuals were moved by Austrian authorities to work in Croatia; Bach's main goal was to prevent them to implement their national and political ideas, particularly Slavic and Pan-Slavic

² Despite being oppressed for centuries many Slovene Catholics followed the anti-Semitic attitude of Austrian Christian Social Party, led by Dr. Karl Lueger, and recognized it as an ally against the Pan-German ideas and the Jews.

ideas in their homeland. Although they did not move there voluntarily, they did not protest and even loved to move there. They found Croatia as a “South-Slavic” or, better, Illyrian country, where in contrast to Slovenia their own language in the schools was “allowed”. The then Croatian society was more critical of Slovene and Czech officials who would not meet the expectations of Croatian national workers and – it seemed – was less hostile toward Jews than the Austrian or the Czech ones. Nevertheless, there were Slovene intellectuals who noticed/were annoyed by the Jewish presence in Croatia. One of the first and very active Slovene intellectual-emigrant in Croatia was Janez Trdina. The authorities recognized him as a true Pan-Slav and romantic Russophile, devoted patriot and thus allowed him to employ only in Croatia. Although his attitude towards Jews was not as harsh as were of some other Slovene emigrants, e.g. Žepič or Marn, he could not but judge the Jews after the then general pattern. Like many Slovenes, Trdina also believed in a German-Jewish conspiracy primarily against Slavic nations in Austria. He was disturbed by the Jews in Varaždin, but his arguments differed from those of many others who refused the Jews *a priori*. Trdina’s judgement was founded upon their attitude towards Russia. Thus, he condemned the Varaždin Jews because they supported Turkey when in war with Russia and reproached them their “celebration” of Russian defeat. His idea how to solve the Jewish question was – in contrast to the ideas of Franjo Marn whose only solution was to convert the Jews to Catholicism – that the Jews should mingle with the nation among which they lived. Thus, in Croatia they should “Croatize” themselves. Nevertheless, Trdina pledged for mutual help, i.e., he called the Croats to offer their help by including the Jews into their societies, by making friendships, etc. He was convinced that the Jews might eventually begin “to be ashamed of their German language” and begin to speak “melodious national language”.³ Thus he advised the Varaždin Jews to follow good examples of Czech, Polish and also Russian Jews who declared their appurtenance after the majority nation.

A Slovene grammar school professor Sebastijan Žepič shared the same faith as Trdina. In addition, his political beliefs were noted as Pan-Slavic, and the Austrian authorities moved him already in late 50ies to Croatia, to Varaždin. In his letters, one might see his deepest devotion to Slavic mutuality, South Slavic and Slovene cause: Žepič considered the Croats as “the true Slavs and thus our people...I am quite well here, among others also because I am among the Slavs, so to say among the members of the family...”.⁴ On the other hand, one can notice also his utter animosity towards Jews. In the already mentioned Žepič’s correspondence he expressed his deep concerns about the constant Jewish “impact” upon the inhabitants of the Varaždin town where he worked: “Here, there are too many children of Israel, and they, wherever they nest themselves destroy it physically and spiritually. Thank God, that until now Ljubljana

³ *Janez Trdina Zbrana dela*, 3, DZS, Ljubljana 1951, pp. 114–116; see also Irena Gantar Godina, *Janez Trdina, izseljenec in “Slavjan”*, in *Zastavil sem svoje življenje: Janez Trdina 1830–1905*, (ed. A. Bjelčevič), Mengeš 2005, pp. 13–22

⁴ The letter to Josip Cimperman, 8.1.1856, MS 484, NUK, Ljubljana.

was free of this brood of vipers. These people are heartless, homeless, their God is money...".⁵ However, his prejudices were expressed in private letters; publicly he refrained from any political and thus anti-Semitic statements.

Since after 1848, the then Czech policy toward Germans and Austrian authorities was a traditional model to Slovenes in political, cultural and scientific spheres as well, many Slovene intellectuals who were devoted to Slavic idea, to Slavic solidarity and mutuality, decided to ignore Austrian German universities, Vienna and Graz, and enrolled to Charles University in Slavic Prague. Although it was still a German language university they found Slavic atmosphere in Prague very stimulating. Slovene emigrating intellectuals who left to study in Prague – mainly for political reasons – became also informers of Slovene readers on the conditions there. They were sending to Slovene papers several articles in which they informed the Slovenes of the Czech culture, and particularly of the Czech political practices, which they found very instructive/educational for the Slovenes.

One of those who decided to study in Slavic Prague already in the late 60ies was a gymnasium professor Franjo Marn, a devoted Slavophil and Catholic. He kept his bonds with homeland by sending his impressions to the Catholic paper *Zgodnja Danica*. His observations on the conditions in Prague were an exception particularly because he was one of the rare Slovenes not to be as enthusiastic about Prague as were the majority of the Slovenes. One of his first complaints was that Prague was not enough Catholic reproaching the Czechs or better to the citizens of Prague to be religiously too "lukewarm", too indifferent. He criticized the Czech religious press, particularly the fact that out of nearly 70 newspapers in Czech language only two were "Catholic-church newspapers...".⁶ But first and foremost, his complaints were directed/aimed against the Jews. He saw Prague "too crowded with 'the children of Israel'...there are about ten thousand of Israeli children... They live together in a special part of the town which is for this reason called/named a Jewish town; they also elect their representatives...". He pointed out their "non-Christianity" and "lust for money", and was unhappy that "the majority stick to the faith of their fathers...there are not many converts. But those who converted are most respected and educated men and good Catholics...".⁷ As a devoted Catholic, he suggested one and only solution of the Jewish question: they should convert to Catholicism to become accepted and respected by the then society. Lack of Catholicism and too many Jews were the main reasons for Marn to leave Prague and continue his studies in Graz.

The Slovenes who left for Prague, particularly after 1882,⁸ left mostly for political reasons, e. i., for Slavic and counter German sentiments, respectively. They could have followed not only a very consistent national attitude towards Austrian authorities,

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ These were *Blahovest* and *Casopis katolickeho duhovenstva*.

⁷ n., *Iz Prage*, *Zgodnja Danica*, 1866, p. 281.

⁸ In 1882, the Czechs succeeded to found a Czech University beside the German one. The same year T.G. Masaryk began to lecture there.

along with Masaryk's new realistic national politics and Kramař's Neo-Slav movement (1898) but also the attitude of the Czech society toward Jews. Slovene students could follow and be informed about it through numerous articles dedicated to the there Jewish society. These articles appeared not only in clearly declared anti-Semitic journals, newspapers and dailies as was *Česká obrana*,⁹ subtitled as Antisemitic Political Journal, but also in more "serious" newspapers as *Narodní listy*, etc., written by celebrated and well-known poets, as was Jan Neruda,¹⁰ who have already in 1869 published an anti-Semitic political essay¹¹, as well as other cultural workers and politicians.

Slovene students who decided to enrol in the Czech University did so primarily because of the lectures of the then most prominent Czech scholar and politician T.G. Masaryk. Slovenes as Anton Dermota, Dragotin Lončar and many others followed primarily Masaryk's promotion of the so-called "realistic philosophy of national and social question" within which there was no space for anti-Semitic feelings.

But in such a pro-Slavic and anti-Semitic mental atmosphere they have witnessed the outburst of the Hilsner affair in 1899, the trial against the supposed ritual murderer Joseph Hilsner, after Masaryk named Hisneriada.¹² Hilsner was accused of murdering a young Bohemian girl Aneřka Hrůzova in Moravian town Polna. It seemed that it was, along with the Dreyfus affair, again another great opportunity for the Czechs and for the Slovenes and their papers in Slovenia as well to continue their anti-Semitic writings, which eventually lost their point with the revision of the Dreyfus case. As for the Czech anti-Semites, for the Slovenes as well the murder was yet another possibility to improve the occasion to attack anything that was Jewish: their newspapers, Jewish writers,¹³ Jews¹⁴ in the Trieste Hospital, etc.

The conservative papers were the first to "inform" their readers about the so-called Jewish habits of "ritual murders" claiming that Christianity was in real danger because the Jews "to get Christian blood, slaughtered a poor Christian girl". The interpretations of Catholics and their papers were unique: "The ritual murder happened again", "the Jews are cruel murderers", "exploiters" and found Hilsner guilty beyond any doubt.

When the Czech University professor and politician T.G. Masaryk began his struggle to prove the process was more than irregular¹⁵ Slovene Catholics have been given another opportunity to attack him harshly. They condemned his doubts about the

⁹ *Organizujme se!*, *Česka obrana*, Politicki list antisemitski, 1898, I., No.1, pp.1–2 .

¹⁰ *Jan Neruda o otace židovske*, *Studentske smery*, 1899, No. 2, pp. 45–47.

¹¹ Jan Neruda, *Pro strach židovský*, reprinted in *Česka obrana*, 1898, No. 1, pp. 1–2.

¹² Karel Čapek, *Spisy, Hovory s T.G. Masarykem*, Praha 1900, p. 129.

¹³ *Pisateljska imena Židov /The writers' names of the Jews/*, Slovenec, No. 111, 1899. Actually the names of the Jewish writers were "betrayed" by Berlin paper *Gegenwart*.

¹⁴ *Judje v tržaški bolnici*, Slovenec, No. 12, 1899.

¹⁵ When the trial was ended Masaryk published two brochures *Nutnost revidovati proces Polenski*, Praha 1899; and *Vyznam procesu polenskeho pro poveru ritualni*, Berlin 1900. The first was immediately confiscated. In both he tried to prove that accusations against Hilsner had no substantial proofs. He claimed that the accusation was a construct, a shame for the Czech and Austrian law. Along with the defence of Hilsner he stood against anti-Jewish atmosphere and particularly against

investigation and regularity of the trial immediately exposing the racial component, too: “The Jews have cruelly murdered a Slavic girl and there is a professor, a Slav, who publicly defends the murderers. Is there any uglier demoralization? ... Let the Jews fry him for their “ritual purposes!” When the verdict of “Kutna hora” was announced the *Slovenec* wrote: “... The verdict of Kutna hora lightened a new light to the Christian nations and ended the supremacy of the Jews... It has revived the consciousness/perception that there was a stranger who misused their (Christian nations) 1000 years hospitality only to enslave them materially and morally; a stranger who pays back all the good by hating Christianity and Christian peoples with the passions of a beast...”. They expected that tragic events in Polna would evoke not only resistance against the Jews but would also renew the idea of Christian mutuality...”¹⁶ Thus, they felt no need to explain or to justify their anti-Semitic attitude toward Jews.

Masaryk’s numerous Slovene followers, many of them of Liberal and Social Democratic affiliation, silently attended these attacks, and were not ready to raise voice against it, not even his most ardent followers.

Slovene Liberals along with numerous independent cultural workers have tried for decades to differ distinctively from Slovene Catholics; they openly agitated for a more visible role of Austrian Slavs within the state, emphasizing the importance of Slavic mutuality and solidarity, agitating for closer cooperation with Russia. However, they could not avoid being anti-Semitic. Like the Catholics, they – in their daily paper *Slovenski Narod* and other papers – openly discussed and propagated ideas of the “inferiority” and “danger” of the Jewish people. In the case of the Hilsner affair, the Slovene Liberals reacted differently. They paid less attention and showed less hostility toward the supposed Jewish murderer. In contrast to the Conservatives, they tried to prove some “tolerance” and “methodical doubts”. They did not attack the Jews, they did not discuss “ritual murders”, and tried to remain neutral attacking Conservatives and their “intolerant” press. However, Slovene Liberal press also did not want to interfere or to react to Catholics’ attacks on T.G. Masaryk either. Among many reasons, why doing so was great impact of the Slovene students in Prague who could observe the Hilsner case *in situ*, particularly after Masaryk’s intervention. Indeed, there were some voices from younger sympathisers who took the side of T.G. Masaryk, believing that attacks – in Bohemia as well in Slovenia – could be noted as “clerical anti-Semitism” which almost destroyed “Czech Liberalism”.¹⁷ However, the Liberals took such a standpoint only in the Hilsner case.

As soon as the case was more or less forgotten – already in 1900 – a prominent Slovene emigrant in Prague, the scholar Ivan Žmavc,¹⁸ sociologist and philosopher began

Czech and Austrian anti-Jewish press. The only newspaper that offered him support was *Neue Freie Presse*, which published his doubts and ascertainment.

¹⁶ *Kutnohorska obsodba*, *Slovenec*, No. 215, 20 .9. 1899

¹⁷ *Demonstracije proti T.G. Masaryku*, *Slovenski Narod*, 15. november 1899

¹⁸ Irena Gantar Godina, Ivan Žmavc, slovenski znanstvenik v Pragi, *Zbornik Izseljencec* (ur. M. Drnovšek), Ljubljana 2002, pp. 77–79.

to publish anti-Semitic articles in the *Slovenski Narod*. By doing so, Slovene liberals confirmed that their standpoint in the Hilsner case was merely their political tactics.

Žmavc was one of the first Slovene Masaryk's students and followers of his philosophy and sociology, but he eventually abandoned Masaryk's philosophy and continued to work on his own. In his essay "The Essence of Judaism",¹⁹ Žmavc connected national and social questions very closely with the economic question. He believed it was closely linked also with cultural and national-political independence.

Particularly the economic question, he connected closely with Judaism and Social Democracy. He considered the Jewish question a tribal or racial question: "Since the Jewish religion is closely connected with tribe the Jewish question is a tribal question of race..." He recognized the Jewish question as a sort of a social disease, which could be cured/healed only by sincerity/openheartedness and veracity. ... We have to see the Jews the way they are...and only after a good diagnosis such a social disease could be cured..." He suggested to cure with ethical approach/question: "The great/huge capitalism and Judaism could be abolished only if the Aryan nations begin with their own inner ethical regeneration and physically and spiritually improve themselves; this should be a true gospel really convenient/proper also for the Slovenes...". Along with his utter repulse of the Jews he was also very critical of the "Aryans": "If the Aryans did not search the guilt for all the social evil only within the Jews but also within themselves they could have solved the Jewish question much sooner..."²⁰ The editors of the *Slovenski Narod* kept distance by claiming that "we do not agree with every Žmavc's thesis. But we do not see any point to ground our doubts/scruples since in Slovenia there are no Jews..."²¹

On the occasion of Anton Dermota's²² death, Ivan Žmavc sent a letter of condolences to Dragotin Lončar²³ in which he pointed out – among Slovenes a very common reproach to Social Democracy²⁴ – namely, that it was led by the Jews, which turned him off to join this Party: "As an opponent/enemy of the Jews I recognize Social Democracy as an avant-garde of capitalist Judaism... Dermota, I reckon, was independent

¹⁹ Ivan Žmavc, *Jedro židovstva. Zgodovinski ris nastanka židovskega naroda*, SN, No. 4, 4. 1. 1900.

²⁰ Ivan Žmavc, *Jedro židovstva. Zgodovinski oris nastanka židovskega naroda*, SN, št. 9, 12. 1. 1900.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Anton Dermota, one of the most ardent followers of Masaryk's ideas, as a temporary emigrant he studied in Prague, up to 1913 the editor of independent journal *Naši Zapiski* (Our Notes); in 1908 he became a member of Slovene Social Democratic Party.

²³ Also Dragotin Lončar studied in Prague, became acquainted with Masaryk's ideas; in his essay *What to Do?*, published in an Epistle to Slovene Youth in 1901 he actually copied Masaryk's work "Jak pracovat? Prednášky z roku 1898, Praha 1898–1899 (How to work? Lectures given in 1898).

²⁴ Many believed that the Slovene Social Democratic Party was under the influence of the Jews since they propagated "internationalism" and "religious indifference". They believed that founding of Social Democratic Party in Slovenia was most harmful "event" in Slovene political life, emphasizing the fact that the Jews in Social Democratic Parties in Germany and Austria were playing major roles.

but even if he was a Catholic I find it much more acceptable than if he was directly embraced by the Jews...".²⁵

According to the statement of one of his relatives, his ambition was to become Masaryk's assistant or at least to get a post at the University. As soon as Masaryk discovered Žmavc's anti-Semitic attitude and read his anti-Jews writings he thwarted his employment at the University.²⁶ Thus, Žmavc had to accept the post as a librarian at the University Library. In spite of being rejected by Masaryk he remained connected to him being one of the founders of the Masaryk's Academy of Work (Masarykova akademie práce), a publishing house, and also its general secretary. Žmavc was one of the very few Slovene intellectuals to stay in Prague for good and remain openly anti-Semitic.

All up to 1917, the majority of the Prague students were not politically affiliated,²⁷ but were devoted Masaryk's followers who avoided being openly anti-Semitic. Thus, in the case of Hilsner they did not discuss it or even write their views.

But the Slovenes who followed the ideas of other Czech politicians, e.g. Karel Kramář or Vaclav Klofač, based their political platform also upon anti-Semitism. While Kramář or the Neo-Slavs did not expose their anti-Jewish sentiments publicly, with the exception of Kramář's colleague Dr. Karol Baxa,²⁸ Klofač based the programme of his party, i.e. the struggle for national and social liberation of Slavic workers also upon anti-Semitism. He blamed the Jews for many of the troubles in Bohemia and believed that the misery of the proletariat was also a consequence of senseless and thoughtless Judaism: "Already by the character the Jew is an individualist.... The Jew is not and cannot be a socialist if he is not a carpenter, stonemason or a miner... His selfishness is imparted to him by religion ... he knows only his nation/people and no one else.... Today he is a representative of capital (bourse, banks, huge world cartels which are mainly in his hands), and he also gained the leadership of Social Democracy... For this reason many have dissuaded from Social Democracy... they could not believe that the Jews could have really wished to work for the benefit of the society...".²⁹ Thus, he firmly believed that the proletariat could live and work without Jews.

Klofač's ideas were followed also in Slovenia, mainly by the Slovene temporary emigrant in Bohemia Fran Radešček,³⁰ who founded the Slovene National Socialists' Party. Its programme was a thorough copy of the Czech one; Radešček was acquainted with Klofač's ideas already in the time of founding Klofač's Party in 1898 and 1902,³¹

²⁵ A letter to Dragotin Lončar, 30.5. 1914.

²⁶ In June 2001 his grandnephew, Franci Smrekar quoted Žmavc's daughter Helena.

²⁷ Some were also passionate Pan-Slavs or Russophiles.

²⁸ Baxa was the advocate of the Anežka Hružova family.

²⁹ Vaclav Jaroslav Klofač, *Program a zásady narodne-socialne strany*, Nakladem redakce Česka demokracie, Praha 1900, pp. 1–14. "Česke demokracie", Tiskem v Knihitiskarna narodno-socialního delnictva, Praha 1900, str. 1–14, and in V.J.Klofač, *Proč jsme narodni socialisti*, p. 82–96.

³⁰ In January 1911 he began to publish *Narodni Socijalist*, undertitled by Klofač's slogan "Equality of the Nation, Equality within the Nation". By doing this Radešček announced a complete copy of Klofač's programme.

³¹ Klofač's Česka strana narodne socialni (Czech National Social Party) was first founded as a group

respectively. Same as Klofač's basic reproaches to the Czech workers' leaders that they did not have their own (national) leaders and that they were entirely under the strong impact of the German-Jewish policy, were reproaches of his Slovene follower, too. In addition, Radešček and his colleagues, e.g. Slavoj Škerlj, believed that Slovene Social Democratic leaders worked against any benefit for the Slovenes or for the Slovene working-class. But it is likely to believe that Radešček's anti-Semitism even strengthened while he worked in Kolin upon Laba and in Prague in 1911 and 1912, respectively. One could explain his anger towards Social Democrats and Jews also with the fact that he did not leave Slovenia entirely voluntarily. The reason was that in February 1911 Radešček succeeded to organize a National Socialists' dancing party³² of the Kolinska factory workers. After this event, Slovene Social Democrats began to threaten to boycott the Kolinska products which led the leaders of Slovene Liberals to advise Radešček to withdraw from Ljubljana to Kolin. There he continued to study Klofač's party programme. In 1912, he was moved to Prague as an employee of the *Banka Slavija*, where he continued his political activities. However, when he returned home he could get employment only at the daily *Dan*. They sent him to Serbia to report on the preparations for the war with Turkey. All up to 1914, he worked at the Serbian railway; then he was an internee. When released he became a Serbian citizen and sent to the Serbian Army. He joined the Slovene volunteers, the so-called "dobrovoljci".³³ From 1914 up to 1921, he lived in Belgrade, and then moved back to Slovenia. In Novo Mesto he published the weekly *Sedanjost* /The Time Being/ in which he agitated for autonomous Slovenia. He died in Ljubljana in 1968.

Radešček's as well as Klofač's arguments against the Jews were very close to those of the Slovene Conservatives. His critical observations of German, Austrian and Slovene Social Democracy even deepened. He claimed that Jewish capital penetrated into all spheres of Austrian state policy, economy and culture and accused Slovene Social Democrats of not working for the benefit of Slovene and Slavic workers.³⁴ Thus, the main goal of both Klofač and Radešček was to establish "a Slavic type of Socialism" for the Slavic proletariat. Comparing the Jews', Germans' and the Slavs' understanding of capitalism led Klofač, and Radešček ardently followed him, to develop the idea of Slavic type of Socialism. He believed it could be particularly convenient for the Slavic middle – and working classes since "the Slavs were not capitalists... We cannot say we

of young workers gathered to found a new party, first named The Party of National Workers of Czechoslovakia; soon many city-boards of Bohemia and Moravia joined them. In January 30, 1898, a Politický klub narodní strany delictva Československeho a Morave was founded which a sort of preparation for the founding of the Party of the Moravian National Workers in March 27, 1898. At their first meeting in March 9–11, 1898, in Prague they named themselves National Socialist of Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, for Upper and Lower Austria. It was only at their third meeting that they changed their name to Narodní Sociální strana (National Social Party).

³² The first grand dancing party organized by predecessor of Slovene National Socialists, i.e. National Workers' Organization (NDO) took place already on February 20, 1909 in Ljubljana.

³³ *Dobrovoljci - kladivarji Jugoslavije*, Ljubljana 1929.

³⁴ *Narodnost in socijalizem na Slovenskem*, Narodni socijalist, No. 3, 1911.

are aristocracy... Our new Slavic movement could have its future if it brings our ideas among wider masses of the Slavic nations to enable a worker, a farmer or a craftsman to understand that we are struggling and working for him...".³⁵

The majority of the Slovenes leaving their homeland, voluntarily or not, to study or to work, in Bohemia or in Croatia, could not but remain anti-Semitic. They only followed examples of many of the then Slovene intellectuals at home, be it Slavophil or not, be it Liberal or Catholic.³⁶

Their devotion to the Slavic cause or Slavic mutuality to become equally recognized as the Germans was essential for their attitude towards Jews and it eventually became even stronger an argument against their "common" enemy. One might reckon that the Czechs and the Slovenes had to struggle against two traditional enemies, the Jews and the Austrian Germans. However, the Slovene emigrants in Prague and in Croatia considered the Jews more dangerous and harmful for the society than their traditional enemy, the Germans, or, in Croatia, the Hungarians.

The Slovenes' attitude toward Jews, including that of politicians, cultural workers and intellectuals as well, be at home or in emigration, was very tightly bonded with their general attitude toward Germans, for many also with their traditional Catholic religious affiliation. It reflected, on the one hand, a position of an unequal nation and their weakness to put in force themselves within the Austrian Slavs' society. Anti-Semitism of Slovene Slavophiles who left their homeland as a protest against the Austrian policy towards non-German nations reflected also their ambitions to fight their long-lasting inferior position within Habsburg Monarchy, as well as the ambitions to become an equal and equivalent partner of the dominating nation.

³⁵ *Pod vitoši!*, Česke Slovo, 12.7. 1910.

³⁶ Few examples: Josip Apih, *Židovstvo*, Letopis Slovenske Matice za leto 1886, Ljubljana 1886; Josip Vošnjak, *Socijalni problemi in kmetski stan*, Letopis Matice Slovenske za leto 1885, pp. 1–93; Josip Vošnjak, *Židovstvo*, Spomini, Slovenska Matica, Ljubljana 1982; Janez E. Krek, *Socijalizem*, V Ljubljani 1901, p. 345; Fran Podgornik, *Židovske novine*, Slovanski svet, No. 16, 1897.

LITERATURE

- Eva Holz, *Four Treatises on Jews in Carniola and in Ljubljana in the 19th Century*, in *Jews and the Slavs*, (ed. W. Moskovich et al.), Jerusalem in Slavic Culture, Vol. 6, Jerusalem–Ljubljana 1999, pp. 117–125.
- Hilsneriada, k 100. výroči 1899–1999* (ed. Bohumil Černý et al.), Polna 1999.
- Martin Swales, *Liberalism or Hedonism? Arthur Schnitzler's Diagnosis of the Viennese Bourgeoisie*, in *Intellectuals and the Future in the Habsburg Monarchy 1890–1914*, (ed. Laszlo Peter and Robert B. Pynsent), Studies in Russia and East Europe, McMillan, London 1988, pp. 13–28.
- Steven Beller, *The Role of Jews in Viennese Culture and Society at the Turn of the Century*, in *Decadence & Innovation: Austro-Hungarian Life and Art at the Turn of the Century*, ed. Robert Pynsent, Weidelfeld&Nicholson, London 1989, pp. 14–23.
- Marko Štepec, *Antisemitizem, Evropa in Slovenci*, in *Slovenci v Evropi (O nekaterih vidikih slovenske povezanosti s sosedi in Evropo)*, ed. Peter Vodopivec, Historia 5, Oddelek za zgodovino FF, Ljubljana 2002, pp. 61–85.
- Ljiljana Dobrovšak, "Privremena prisutnost" Židova u Kraljevini Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji u 17. i 18. stoljeću, *Povijesni prilozi (Historical Contributions)*, pp. 167–189.

SUMMARY

ON THE ATTITUDE OF SLOVENE INTELLECTUALS IN BOHEMIA AND CROATIA TO JEWS

Irena Gantar Godina

The contribution is a fragmentary survey of the relation of a part of Slovene intellectuals, temporary and permanent emigrants in Bohemia and in Croatia to the there living Jews. By political conviction, they were mainly nationally conscious intellectuals enthusiastic with Slavic mutuality; some of them were Russophiles. They went to study in Bohemia voluntarily, as a sign of protest against unequal position of Slavs in the state. They expected a genuine Slavic environment/atmosphere, which they actually experienced. In contrast to Slovenia, they were in Bohemia confronted with the existence of the Jewish community that did not exist in Slovenia. Consequently, they could witness the negative attitude of the Czechs towards Jews and through it – at least some, for example Marn and Radešček – deepened their own declinatory standpoints. Specific political circumstances in Croatia forced those employed by the authorities and those who because of their political convictions could not find work at home and forcibly "landed" in Croatia not to declare publicly their political convictions or the negative attitude towards Jews. Alternatively, they published them, for example Trdina, after they have left Croatia.