

DIMITRIJE MITRINOVIĆ:
CHAMELEON, GOOD EUROPEAN, AND EXILED YUGOSLAVIST

by

DAVID GRAHAM PAGE
B.A., The University of British Columbia, 2001

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(European Studies)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
August 2005

© David Graham Page, 2005

Abstract

This present work is an assessment of the life and thought of Dimitrije Mitrinović (1887–1953) during his formative years, from his childhood through to 1920, when he resigned from the service of the newly created Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. His Yugoslavism has yet to be adequately contextualized, at least in the literature accessible to English language readers; Chapter 1 of the present work begins to fill this gap. Mitrinović's struggle against the Hapsburg domination of the South Slavs is the subject of Chapter 2, in which the influence on Mitrinović of T. G. Masaryk's thought is detailed. The focus in Chapter 3 is on Mitrinović's attempt to organize a movement for European unity whilst the continent staggered on the brink of the First World War. The theoretical literature on balkanism is taken as the point of departure in Chapter 4, in which Mitrinović's ambivalent attitude to balkanist discourse is subjected to scrutiny.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Dedication and Acknowledgements	iv
INTRODUCTION Dimitrije who?	1
CHAPTER 1 Colonialism on the Cheap.....	5
CHAPTER 2 The Chameleon	15
CHAPTER 3 The Good European	36
CHAPTER 4 The Exiled Yugoslavist	43
CONCLUSION Three-parts Forgotten	50
Notes	51
Bibliography	63

Dedication

To Kristin, for the Danube and beyond

Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge Prof. Ivan Avakumović, my *de facto* research supervisor, who gave generously of his time, and shared with me his vast knowledge of the period. Prof. Avakumović's insights and suggestions improved my work immeasurably.

I wish to express my gratitude to Alison Cullingford (Special Collections Librarian at the J. B. Priestley Library, University of Bradford) for her assistance during my research in the New Atlantis Foundation Dimitrije Mitrović Archive, as well as for her subsequent provision of reprographic material.

My work also benefited from comments by Dr. Rob Nelson, who stepped in to become my research supervisor at a late stage, Prof. Peter Petro, my second reader, Prof. Merje Kuus, the external examiner, and Prof. Anne Gorsuch, who commented on earlier versions of the first two chapters.

It is a special pleasure to acknowledge my partner, Kristin van der Leest, for all her support, and especially for undertaking a painstaking reading of the manuscript in its entirety.

I owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Sima Godfrey, Dr. Rob Stoddard, and Prof. John Torpey of the UBC Institute for European Studies, who have provided guidance and encouragement throughout my time at the Institute.

My mother, Maureen Page, has given me support beyond words.

My debts to scholars will be fully apparent from the text and notes.

Introduction

Dimitrije who?

In his review of *Initiation and Initiative: An Exploration of the Life and Ideas of Dimitrije Mitrinović*¹ by Andrew Rigby,² George Feaver asked: “Dimitrije who?”³ Thomas A. Emmert, in his 1985 review of the same monograph, regretted that Dimitrije Mitrinović was “not exactly a household name,” even among scholars of the Balkans.⁴ Now a generation has passed since the last major study of Mitrinović appeared.

On 21 October 1887, Mitrinović was born to Serbian Orthodox parents in a village near the town of Stolac, in Herzegovina. In his youth, Mitrinović was the “undisputed ideological and aesthetic leader” of his generation in Bosnia and Herzegovina,⁵ and was one of the leaders of the *Mlada Bosna* (Young Bosnia) movement. While Mitrinović was still in his twenties, Jovan Skerlić included him in his history of modern Serbian literature.⁶ Mitrinović was a prominent Yugoslavist: he favoured the union of the peoples of Serbia, Montenegro, and the South Slav lands of the Dual Monarchy in an independent federal state.⁷ In 1913 he moved to Munich to pursue his studies. There, he worked with Wassily Kandinsky on plans to publish a mundialist yearbook – provisionally entitled *Towards the Mankind of the Future through Aryan Europe* – in which the creation of “a federation of European nations”⁸ was to be proposed as the first step towards world federation. In 1914 Mitrinović found refuge in London, where he was based for the last four decades of his life. Throughout the First World War, he worked in the pay of the Serbian government. Then, following a stint as a *New Age* columnist, Mitrinović established the English branch of the Adler Society in 1927. In 1931 he founded the New Europe Group⁹ (NEG), “perhaps the first real European-federal group.”¹⁰ Mitrinović “talked European Federation when many of the people clamouring for it to-day sneered at the idea and at him.”¹¹ The circulation of NEG publications peaked at 70,000,¹² but in 1935 the group returned to the political wilderness from which it had emerged. Mitrinović died on 28 August 1953, in Richmond-upon-Thames, Surrey.

Hiramoy Ghoshal has remarked that only “a man who could stand apart from the world and regard it as a globe” could have pronounced ideas as Mitrinović did.¹³ Rigby has admitted that some of

Mitrinović's proposals "invite dismissal as the bizarre ramblings of a somewhat deranged dreamer," yet he credits the vision of an individual "willing to risk censure and ridicule in pursuance of a grander idea of the future."¹⁴ Throughout his life, Mitrinović manifested a commitment to the integration of the South Slav peoples, the peoples of Europe, and, ultimately, of all of humankind, for the sake of peace and liberty. This utopianism stood him in stark contrast to the politically unimaginative societies that he sought to transform. For that reason alone, he should be raised from the footnotes of history.

After Mitrinović's death, Philip Mairet supposed that "there will be no works on the shelves of libraries, no name preserved in history, no biography – probably not even any obituary in *The Times*."¹⁵ There was no obituary in the *Times*, but in 1977 Predrag Palavestra¹⁶ published his biography of Mitrinović – entitled *Dogma i Utopija Dimitrija Mitinovića: Počeci srpske književne avangarde*¹⁷ – that was followed seven years later by Rigby's monograph. Palavestra's work has not been published outside Serbia, but it has been privately translated into English.¹⁸ Whilst *Dogma i Utopija Dimitrija Mitinovića* represents admirable research, the work is not without its methodological problems. Palavestra speculates¹⁹ about what Mitrinović "thought" (without citing written evidence) and "felt."²⁰ Predrag Protić has tacitly criticized the biography, claiming it "can be read like first-class novelistic writings."²¹

In his Preface, Rigby concedes that Mitrinović is "virtually unknown," despite his "great abilities and formidable intellectual energy and imagination."²² Rigby wrote *Initiation and Initiative* in an effort to "retrieve" Mitrinović from obscurity,²³ but Feaver has challenged "the dubious claims" to any "posthumous celebration" of his life and thought.²⁴ Mitrinović was certainly a controversial figure in his day. Ivo Andrić – whose first literary work was published in 1911 with Mitrinović's backing – called him "Mita Dinamika" ("Dynamic Mita").²⁵ That same year, A. G. Matoš – one of Mitrinović's Croatian detractors – referred to him as a hired "Slav-monger and bag-carrier."²⁶ Paul Klee considered Mitrinović to be simply a "nice man with a pleasant face."²⁷ In London, Edwin Muir remembered that Mitrinović "flung out the wildest and deepest thoughts pell-mell," and sent "dynasties and civilizations flying,"²⁸ while Willa Muir recollected that he could "imitate Serbian bagpipes with zest."²⁹ Several individuals dismissed Mitrinović as a quack, or accused him of charlatanism, but from the accounts of his life there

can be no doubting his charisma.

About their subject, Rigby and Palavestra have each raised many questions, several of which are related to wider fields of enquiry that are relatively under-researched. This present work is an assessment of the life and thought of Mitrinović during his formative years, from his childhood through to 1920, when he resigned from the service of the newly created Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. Rigby paid “very little attention to Mitrinović’s contributions to the Yugoslav idea.”³⁰ His Yugoslavism has yet to be adequately contextualized, at least in the literature accessible to English language readers; Chapter 1 of the present work begins to fill this gap.

Mitrinović’s struggle against the Hapsburg domination of the South Slavs is the subject of Chapter 2, in which the influence on Mitrinović of T. G. Masaryk’s thought is detailed. Masaryk’s influence was of crucial importance to Mitrinović’s intellectual development. Although many South Slav intellectuals were influenced by Realism, none of them embraced Humanitism as tightly as did Mitrinović. His thought was imbued with it: his nationalism was devoid of chauvinism (which is not to say that he was not proud of his nation), which was extraordinary in the circumstances. His was a truly liberal nationalism: he believed relations between different groups would become more harmonious if they were free to pursue their own national development. This distinguishes him from almost all the other ideologues in the South Slav lands.³¹ He did not detest the oppressors of the South Slavs, but rather he hated the oppression, and the suffering of the oppressed.

The focus in Chapter 3 is on Mitrinović’s attempt to organize a movement for European unity whilst the continent staggered on the brink of the First World War. Mitrinović did not advocate merely the political unification of Europe: he wanted it to become “the instrument of the intelligent organisation of the world,” which required spiritual and cultural unification to a greater extent than political or military unity.³² The problem of the integration of cultures occupied a special place in his programme; to this day, this issue bedevils the European integrationist project. The theoretical literature on balkanism is taken as the point of departure in Chapter 4, in which Mitrinović’s ambivalent attitude to

balkanist discourse is subjected to scrutiny.

These aspects of Mitrinović's life and thought are by no means the only ones deserving of further research. Palavestra and Rigby will not have the last word on Mitrinović. Later generations of scholars will no doubt discover Mitrinović anew.

Chapter 1

Colonialism on the Cheap

In July 1878, high-ranking diplomatic representatives assembled in Berlin and took part in a congress of the great European powers. The Congress of Berlin was convened to resolve the Eastern Crisis, the cluster of geopolitical issues that had arisen as a result of the seeming inability of the bankrupt Ottomans to rule much of south-eastern Europe. Bosnia and Herzegovina had been ruled by the Turks for four hundred years, but had descended into chaos when Ottoman authority collapsed in the two provinces in 1875. This collapse resulted in the greatest population migration in the Balkans since the sixteenth century: by 1878, tens of thousands of families had fled from Bosnia to neighbouring Austria-Hungary.³³ The *Times* of 31 May 1878 reported that inhabitants of Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina, were “dying of starvation.” The population of these provinces³⁴ numbered approximately 1,160,000,³⁵ and was 43 percent Serbian Orthodox,³⁶ 38 percent Muslim, and 18 percent Roman Catholic.³⁷

Prior to the opening of the Congress, it had been “thoroughly agreed” that “questions of strategic interest” were to have “precedence over all ethnographical considerations.”³⁸ In fact, the plenipotentiaries completely disregarded the aspirations of the populations most directly concerned by the proposed changes. These populations were objects to be moved around in a game of musical territories.³⁹ The attitude of the delegates was summed up in a single phrase of Prince Otto von Bismarck, who referred to the lands of the Balkans as “places of which no one ever heard before.”⁴⁰ Prince Alexander of Battenberg described the result of the settlement, the Treaty of Berlin, as “a monstrous monument of European diplomatic ignorance.”⁴¹ Bosnia and Herzegovina were amputated from the Ottoman Empire, and arrogated to the Austro-Hungarians, to occupy and administer. The *Times* reported on 24 June 1878 that the “occupation of undetermined duration” authorized by Article 25 of the Treaty will “amount to annexation, and inevitably end in it.” But Bosnia and Herzegovina remained – nominally – provinces of the Ottoman Empire: the Hapsburgs had “no objection to the Sultan’s retaining the title,” but did not “consent to his exercising the functions”⁴² of sovereign.⁴³ By the

end of 1878, the Hapsburgs exercised authority over Bosnia, but formal sovereignty continued to be vested in Istanbul for the next three decades. This anomalous situation led J. G. C. Minchin, who travelled to Bosnia in the mid-1880s, to describe “occupied and administered Bosnia” as “neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good red herring.”⁴⁴

The Imperial and Royal Navy was incapable of supporting an overseas expansion of the Dual Monarchy, so Austria-Hungary could gain territory only to its south-east. Count Andrassy (the Foreign Minister of Austria-Hungary from 1871 to 1879) was contemptuous of Austria-Hungary’s Balkan neighbours, and in 1873 he had described them as “wild Indians who could only be treated like unbroken horses, to whom corn should be offered with one hand while they are threatened with a whip in the other.”⁴⁵ But Andrassy knew that Turkey was the “sick man of Europe,” and that if Austria-Hungary failed to occupy Bosnia, Serbia might claim her “inheritance”⁴⁶ after the demise of the Ottoman Empire. This was the overriding reason why the Hapsburgs had “poked around in a Slav wasp’s nest” during the Congress.⁴⁷ Austria-Hungary had to occupy and administer Bosnia⁴⁸ in order to pre-empt the creation of a strong South Slav state.⁴⁹ The occupation of Bosnia would preclude the union of Serbia and Montenegro because the Hapsburgs could then exercise control over a buffer zone between these independent states.⁵⁰ The Hapsburgs hoped that the acquisition of Bosnia and Herzegovina would restore the prestige of the Dual Monarchy, and compensate for the loss of territory on the Italian peninsula. Austria-Hungary stood to gain a new market for her goods, and control over a vast supply of raw materials. A further benefit was that Dalmatia, another Hapsburg possession,⁵¹ would be invulnerable once its hinterland was pacified.⁵²

Andrassy spoke the received wisdom in Vienna when he stated that it would take no more than “two squadrons of hussars and a mounted band” to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁵³ Yet in the event, it took 278,000 soldiers – one third of the fully mobilized combat capability of the Imperial and Royal Army – almost three months to occupy Bosnia. The Austro-Hungarian soldiers saw themselves as liberators, but their arrival was welcomed only by the Roman Catholics. The Muslim and Serbian Orthodox inhabitants viewed the Imperial and Royal Army as an incoming oppressor. The 53

battles of the campaign were extremely hard-fought: 946 soldiers were killed by small arms fire from Muslim and Serbian Orthodox men,⁵⁴ but as many as nine thousand died from typhus and dehydration.⁵⁵ On 19 August 1878 infantry units entered Sarajevo, where – according to an official bulletin of the 13th Corps – they were fired upon “from every house, from every window, and every door.”⁵⁶ In Sarajevo, women took an active part in the combat, and even the sick and wounded in the military hospital roused themselves to join the fight. In the words of Arthur J. May, the Hapsburgs suffered a “loss of military prestige such as a giant sustains when he unleashes the sword against a pigmy.”⁵⁷ By the winter of 1878, only bands of insurgents remained at large, oblivious to the hopelessness of their cause. The Imperial and Royal Army had disarmed most individuals with violent intent, and thus insured that large-scale violence was no longer a viable means by which the inhabitants of Bosnia could hope to achieve their political aims.⁵⁸ Despite defeat, memories of the tenacious resistance were enshrined in the popular ballads and folk legends of Bosnia, which were passed on to younger generations.⁵⁹

From the outset, the occupation had a severe psychological impact on the Muslims inhabitants of Bosnia,⁶⁰ who lost the benefits of participating in a unified Islamic cultural and political entity.⁶¹ Between 1878 and 1883, approximately 100,000 irreconcilables emigrated from Bosnia to the rump Ottoman Empire.⁶² The newly arrived Austro-Hungarian officials insisted on working only in German or Hungarian, which alienated many of the inhabitants of Bosnia.⁶³ The Hapsburg authorities consolidated their power more readily in urban environments than in rural areas, and with greater ease in Sarajevo than in the provincial towns.⁶⁴ In the words of Misha Glenny, “the Double Eagle built its nest in every town and in every village.” Initially, the Austro-Hungarians could not assert their authority in the areas of Herzegovina that border Montenegro, but after the construction of 37 watchtowers – known as the “Chinese Wall”⁶⁵ – they managed to seal the border.⁶⁶

In November 1881, rebellion broke out in response to the introduction of conscription, which separated young men from their families – and farmland – for the duration of their military service.⁶⁷ The Muslim and Serbian Orthodox inhabitants of Bosnia found common cause in their opposition to the policy that forced young men into the service of their oppressor.⁶⁸ In 1882, brigands and villagers

expelled many Hapsburg officials and overran several gendarme posts,⁶⁹ but the authorities invoked martial law, and the rebellion was suppressed.⁷⁰ Opposition to the administration waned after 1882, but the era of tranquility did not last long: in 1890 urban-based movements emerged to protest and petition against specific Hapsburg policies.⁷¹ Those who opposed Hapsburg rule in principle had little choice but to engage in illegal forms of political activity.⁷²

Neither the rulers of the Austrian half nor the Hungarian half of the Dual Monarchy welcomed the prospect of governing more Slavs. In any case, Bosnia and Herzegovina were notional provinces of the Ottoman Empire, and their incorporation into either half of the Dual Monarchy was not sanctioned by the Treaty of Berlin.⁷³ From Berlin, Andr ssy had sent a telegram to the Emperor suggesting that they find a way around the “difficult and unpleasant question [of] whether and how the territory should be included in Austria or Hungary.” The Hapsburgs decided to administer Bosnia and Herzegovina as a *corpus separatum*, so as not to upset the balance of nationalities within the Dual Monarchy.⁷⁴ The territories were entrusted to the Common Ministry of Finance, which was one of the three ministries that owed allegiance to the Crown, rather than to either of the two halves of the Dual Monarchy. After 1880, the Common Minister of Finance was effectively the proconsul of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and served only incidentally as the manager of the finances of the Dual Monarchy.⁷⁵ In his person were concentrated the executive, legislative, judicial and administrative powers over the territories.⁷⁶ Bosnian policy was thus determined by civil servants, rather than by legislators.⁷⁷

The Penal Code introduced in Bosnia in 1879 was based on the Austro-Hungarian military code, the only set of laws common to both halves of the Dual Monarchy. Bosnian policy was a sensitive issue in both Vienna and Budapest, so the military code was selected in order to avoid giving preference to either the Austrian or the Hungarian penal codes.⁷⁸ The Penal Code was supposedly a set of civil laws, but its provisions allowed for the imposition of penalties otherwise used only under martial law.⁷⁹ In 1898, Dr. Eduard Richter, a geographer and professor at the University of Graz, wrote that Bosnia was “the colonial possession of the Monarchy. It is true that it is neither Java, nor India. But when Bosnia is compared with the colonies that other European states obtained during the last decades, we have to

admit that Austria acquired a region that is of much more worth and much more favorably situated than the majority of the other countries did.”⁸⁰ The Muslim and Serbian Orthodox inhabitants especially resented the colonial character of the administration. William Miller, who travelled in Bosnia during the 1890s, described the Hapsburg administration as “a benevolent autocracy.”⁸¹ Many of the Serbian Orthodox inhabitants considered the Austro-Hungarians to have simply replaced the Ottomans as the impediment to Serbia expanding to her natural frontiers.⁸²

On 22 February 1880, the “Austrian Law Respecting the Administration of the Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Execution of Article [XXV] of the Treaty of Berlin of 13 July, 1878” was promulgated in Vienna. Article Three decreed that the administration of these territories was “to be so carried on that the expenditure does not exceed the revenue.”⁸³ All expenses and capital investments were to be defrayed out of the revenues of the territories: this provision ensured that Bosnia and Herzegovina would not prove to be a financial liability for either the Austrian or Hungarian half of the Dual Monarchy.⁸⁴ The Hapsburg administration of Bosnia was always envisioned as “colonialism on the cheap.”⁸⁵ The authorities used *corvée* labour, for the most part, to build 1000 kilometres of railways – mostly in line with the needs of the Imperial and Royal Army – and more than 6000 kilometres of new roads in the territories between 1878 and 1914.⁸⁶ Bosnian transport policy was an example of an area in which the two halves of the Dual Monarchy were locked in a permanent bureaucratic battle to undermine each other.⁸⁷ Even so, the infrastructure expedited the commercial penetration of Bosnia by cartels that plundered the forests and exploited the mineral wealth of the territories.⁸⁸ The expansion of the forestry industry between 1893 and 1904 was so rapid that Bosnian timber exports became a threat to international market stability.⁸⁹

At first, the Austro-Hungarian occupation had brought the Bosnian economy to a standstill. The customs and monopolies legislation, which came into effect on 1 January 1880, favoured the economic interests of the Austrian and Hungarian halves of the Dual Monarchy, and retarded the development of the middle class in Bosnia. Local manufacturers suffered, and the British Consul in Sarajevo reported that “the trade of the native merchants” was “ruined by the immense influx of

Austrian speculators.”⁹⁰ This influx – as recalled by an acquaintance of Rebecca West – “had something of the atmosphere of the Klondike rush.”⁹¹ The authorities encouraged capitalists to invest in Bosnia, but then nationalized several large-scale private enterprises as soon as they became profitable. Many inhabitants found work in the mines, but were subject to harsh treatment: in 1898, the Common Ministry of Finance had to forbid the beating of mine workers by foremen.⁹² Industrialization eventually brought a measure of prosperity, but the peasantry remained mired in low-productivity agriculture. Few foreign observers disagreed with R. W. Seton-Watson, who wrote in 1908 that the material transformation wrought in Bosnia “has no modern parallel, save in the Egypt of Lord Cromer.”⁹³ Maude Holbach, who visited Bosnia in 1908, remarked that the Austro-Hungarians had “brought peace and prosperity to a land which little more than a generation ago was given up to bloodshed and sedition.”⁹⁴ Yet two years before, the Imperial and Royal Army had been used to put down a general strike that had spread to seventeen towns.⁹⁵ Frances Hutchinson, an American traveller who visited Bosnia in 1908, remarked upon the “air of prosperity” in Banja Luka.⁹⁶ But only 264,754 inhabitants of Bosnia were based in towns (in 1910); 1,606,862 lived in rural areas, where conditions were markedly different.⁹⁷ Two years after Hutchinson’s visit, the poverty-stricken peasants who inhabited the countryside around Banja Luka rebelled against their landlords.⁹⁸ The 1910 rebellion threatened to develop into a general agrarian insurrection until the Imperial and Royal Army intervened.⁹⁹

The Hapsburg authorities retained the feudal system of land tenure which had been the worst feature of Turkish rule.¹⁰⁰ The authorities did little to solve the agrarian problem, because they relied on the grudging cooperation of the wealthy Muslim landlords,¹⁰¹ and on the tax revenues generated by the tithe system.¹⁰² The preservation of the Ottoman statute of 1859 meant that the peasantry continued to suffer under wretched conditions: 6,000 Muslim landowners kept more than 100,000 Serbian Orthodox peasants under feudal conditions.¹⁰³ Most of the Roman Catholic inhabitants continued to work as indentured sharecroppers.¹⁰⁴ Farming remained inefficient: in 1891, T. W. Legh wrote that after twelve years of Hapsburg administration, “an improvement upon the methods employed in the time of Abraham might reasonably be expected.”¹⁰⁵ The peasantry suffered from a worsening of the terms of

trade between town and country: the cost of goods increased, while there was a fall in prices for agricultural products.¹⁰⁶ Eventually, the authorities made timid attempts at land reform, but the process moved “at the pace of a tortoise,” according to Baron von Belinski, who became Common Minister of Finance in 1912.¹⁰⁷ The Hapsburg approach to the agrarian problem satisfied neither the peasants nor the landowners: the former gained far too little, and the latter lost too much for their liking.¹⁰⁸ In early 1914, there were still 93,368 *kmets* families working on estates that represented roughly one third of all arable land in Bosnia.¹⁰⁹ Popular discontent was fuelled by the knowledge that Serbian peasants owned the land they tilled.

Peasants struggled with the increased tax burden, and complained that collectors flagrantly robbed them.¹¹⁰ The Hapsburg officials – most of whom were from Croatia – were generally despised.¹¹¹ In 1886, J. G. C. Minchin wrote that Bosnia was “the Botany Bay of Austrian officials.” He elaborated: “The better class do not like coming here. The result is that you find two classes of official here—either young men without experience, or old men without character.”¹¹² These words echoed those of the British Consul in Sarajevo, who in 1880 wrote: “we have nothing here but the scum of the Austrian official world, and bribery is as important a factor as ever.”¹¹³ By 1908, there were 9,533 Austro-Hungarian officials in the territories.¹¹⁴ The Hapsburg administration was the start of the bureaucratic age in Bosnia.¹¹⁵

Béni Kállay presided over this corrupt administration from 1882 – when he was appointed Common Minister of Finance – until his death in 1903.¹¹⁶ Kállay had first held office as Consul-General in Belgrade from 1868 to 1875. He had begun his career as a Serbophile, but later opposed any links between Bosnia and Serbia.¹¹⁷ He had reported as early as 29 September 1868 that “the chief force of attraction is exercised by Serbia on Bosnia. Serbia is the only country to which the Christians of Bosnia would attach themselves with joy.”¹¹⁸ He had long understood that “nothing can change the fact that the Serbs count upon one day possessing Bosnia” (17 December 1868), and that “Bosnia is the sensitive point for all Serbian politicians: it is the centre round which all their desires and hopes have long turned” (6 July 1870).¹¹⁹ For two decades before the Congress of Berlin, Bosnia and Herzegovina had been a

priority in Serbian politics. The Serbian political class had aimed to absorb the Ottoman provinces into their principality. But after 1878, the westward expansion of Serbia was obstructed by the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, though members of the Serbian political class continued to regard the territories as part of the Serbian patrimony. For a generation, Serbian expansionism was diverted from Bosnia towards Macedonia, where it was anticipated that Serbia would make gains at the expense of the nascent Bulgarian state.¹²⁰ In spite of that change in official Serbian policy – which was (unofficially) reversed around 1909 – the integration of Bosnia and Herzegovina into the Dual Monarchy was guaranteed to sharpen Serbian nationalist resentments.¹²¹ Kállay was convinced that the Hapsburgs could successfully integrate the territories, but only if living standards could be improved. Thus, he envisioned the transformation of Bosnia and Herzegovina into territories that would showcase the material and cultural benefits of Hapsburg rule.¹²²

The authorities in Vienna performed an elaborate charade, pretending that the Hapsburg “civilizing mission”¹²³ was conducted in conditions of “perfect tranquillity.”¹²⁴ But from time to time, foreign journalists drew attention to the make-believe. For instance, the *Times* correspondent in Vienna reported on 23 June 1885 that the authorities issued “a very stringent decree requiring passports of all travellers who enter or leave Bosnia and Herzegovina,” a measure “rendered necessary by some recent doings of Pan Slavist agitators.” The absorption of almost a million Serbian Orthodox persons – whose allegiance was claimed for Serbia by Serb nationalists – meant that Austro-Hungarian foreign policy and domestic issues of nationality became impossible to unravel.¹²⁵

Kállay wanted his administration to be acknowledged as the cultural initiator (*Kulturträger*) in Bosnia.¹²⁶ At the Budget Committee of the Austrian Delegation in Vienna, on 6 November 1884, Kállay spoke of the cultural work undertaken by his administration, and compared the task to the one faced by the pioneers in the American West.¹²⁷ His administration used cultural policies in an attempt to socially engineer a homogenized regional identity, “Bosniakdom.”¹²⁸ The only inhabitants of Bosnia who had – during the Ottoman period – referred to themselves as “Bosnians” (*Bošnjaci*) were those Muslims from Bosnia. Under the Ottomans, the Roman Catholics inhabitants had referred to themselves as *latinci*

(Latins) or *krišćjani* (Christians), and the Serbian Orthodox inhabitants had called themselves *Vlasi* (Vlachs) or *hrisćjani* (another word for Christians).¹²⁹ The authorities promoted a “Bosnian” language – officially called the *Landessprache* (language of the land)¹³⁰ – into which many German words were infiltrated. Petar Kočić complained that its artificial syntax desecrated Serbo-Croat: “In this dismemberment of our beautiful, free language we can feel our general servitude and subjugation.”¹³¹

The Hapsburg authorities did not wish to stimulate “Bosnian” nationalism.¹³² Rather, “Bosniakdom,” was intended to foster allegiance to the Dual Monarchy,¹³³ and differentiate the inhabitants of Bosnia from Serbdom and Croatdom. For centuries, the peasant inhabitants of Bosnia had felt kinship only for those persons from their locality who shared their own religious traditions: if their horizons had extended beyond their villages, it was to the nearest market town. But around 1890 the authorities faced the rise of Croat nationalism and Serb nationalism in Bosnia. In response, they suppressed political activity based upon “national” identities.¹³⁴ Yet try as they might, they could not put an end to the spreading of Croat and Serb nationalisms¹³⁵ by priests and schoolteachers.¹³⁶ The Roman Catholics who were supposed to feel part of “Bosniakdom” started to develop Croat “national” consciousness; similarly, the Serbian Orthodox inhabitants began to develop Serb “national” consciousness. Though the Roman Catholic and Serbian Orthodox elites in both cases identified with adjacent polities, the Hapsburg authorities were more afraid of the Serb strain of nationalism, simply because Serbian irredentist claims to the territories grew as Serb nationalism took root in Bosnian soil. Nevertheless, the promotion of “Bosniakdom” was meant to sterilize both Serb and Croat nationalisms.

In 1897, H. C. Thomson wrote that the difficulty “of welding all these conflicting Slav elements” lay in “the bitter antagonism that exists between the Orthodox and the Catholic churches.”¹³⁷ He concluded that there seemed “little hope of amalgamation.”¹³⁸ Indeed, the concept of “Bosniakdom” (*bošnjaštvo*) held attraction only for some of the Muslim inhabitants of Bosnia: politically articulate Muslims in Sarajevo interpreted the idea as a natural continuation of the tradition of seeking autonomy under the Ottomans.¹³⁹ Nevertheless, Serb nationalists pressured young Muslim intellectuals to identify with Serbdom, while Croat nationalists had a little more success persuading Muslims to identify with

Croatdom.¹⁴⁰ Many Muslims were political opportunists, and vacillated between the two identifications: alignments were always fluid.¹⁴¹ The Muslims themselves lacked a formally articulated ideology and had no outstanding intellectual spokesmen.¹⁴² They entered the twentieth century as a distinct political community, but lacked a “national” consciousness of their own.¹⁴³

Ultimately, Kállay was unsuccessful in his attempt to promote “Bosniakdom”: he failed to inoculate the inhabitants of Bosnia against what he considered to be the diseases of Serb nationalism and Croat nationalism.¹⁴⁴ From the outset, there had been little chance of success for Kállay’s policy, which was too closely associated with the Hapsburg oppressors to be accepted by the Serbian Orthodox inhabitants.¹⁴⁵ In any case, both Serb and Croat nationalisms had rapidly gained momentum in Bosnia. Of the three basic criteria by which the Serb and Croat nations established and distinguished themselves during the period – history, language and religion – the only one that applied in Bosnia was religion. Bosnia and Herzegovina had a distinct history, to which the Hapsburg authorities drew attention.¹⁴⁶ The contours of the linguistic map cut across all religious boundaries.¹⁴⁷ Yet the Hapsburgs never granted any (meaningful) institutional autonomy, and the fact that Bosnia lacked a living state tradition¹⁴⁸ was emphasized by both Serb and Croat nationalists, who appealed to existing (though embellished) histories of Serbian and Croatian state individuality. Both Serb and Croat nationalists also pointed to institutional links to the past, respectively, the Serbian Orthodox Church, and the parliament in Zagreb. But Serbians, and Croats (within the framework of the Dual Monarchy), laid claim to Bosnia and Herzegovina¹⁴⁹ because they perceived possession of the territories to be of strategic importance for the survival, development, and regional pre-eminence of their respective polities.¹⁵⁰ Their claims were not, in the first instance, based on the notion that “Serbs” or “Croats” lived in Bosnia.

Serb and Croats nationalisms, however, did not long remain the only nationalisms that were spread in Bosnia. During the last decade of Austro-Hungarian rule in the territories, both Serb and Croat nationalisms were eclipsed by Yugoslavism, a non-particularist (but ambiguous) South Slav nationalism that held appeal for those who rejected the two exclusive nationalisms.

Chapter 2

The Chameleon

By the turn of the century, a small cadre of educated young persons – predominantly Serbian Orthodox teenagers – had emerged to oppose not just the policies of the Hapsburg administration in Bosnia, but Austro-Hungarian rule in principle. The network of secret societies they created came to be known (after 1918) as *Mlada Bosna*, and Mitrinović became its intellectual leader.

Mitrinović was born to Serbian Orthodox parents in 1887, in Donje Poplat, a village near the town of Stolac, in Herzegovina.¹⁵¹ Mitrinović's mother was from Novi Sad, the cultural centre of the Serbs in Vojvodina.¹⁵² She cared for her ever-growing family, taught in the village school, and also instructed the local girls in matters of personal hygiene, the preparation of food, and the management of the home. Mitrinović's father had taught himself Greek and Latin, and on the modest salary of a teacher he amassed a library of several hundred books.¹⁵³ He also advised local villagers on plant propagation.¹⁵⁴

As a small boy, Mitrinović went with his mother on outings to the homes of local Muslim women, but these visits ended when he turned seven, from which age he came to be regarded as a man. Mitrinović's parents made great sacrifices in order to help their son develop his talents. One day, Mitrinović asked his parents to buy him a violin: his father returned from town having spent all their money on the musical instrument, and the family went without the household articles they needed.¹⁵⁵

At the age of twelve, Mitrinović's parents sent him to board at the High school in Mostar, the capital of Herzegovina, and the pre-eminent Serbian Orthodox cultural centre in the territories during the 1880s and 1890s. It was in Mostar that the cultural traditions of the Serbian Orthodox inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina were preserved.¹⁵⁶ Blair Jaekel wrote that the heterogeneous population of Mostar numbered 14,000, of which half were Muslims, and "two thousand of the remaining half" were "the troops of an Austria-Hungarian garrison."¹⁵⁷ Robert Dunkin wrote of the "babel of languages" spoken in Mostar in the 1890s: every one "of the provinces of polyglot Austria" was "well represented in

this little town.”¹⁵⁸ He also noted that Mostar was “strongly fortified”¹⁵⁹ with “a permanent military camp at each end,”¹⁶⁰ and that everything in the town reminded the inhabitants that they were “under a military occupation.”¹⁶¹ The occupation was bitterly resented by the Serbian Orthodox boys at the High school in Mostar, which had been founded in 1893.¹⁶² When Mitrinović arrived there, these schoolboys had just formed their first secret societies opposed to Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia. Mitrinović later recounted how they had kneeled on one knee only in church when prayers were said for the Imperial family, and had hoped that this would render their prayers ineffective.¹⁶³

Mitrinović was a gifted pupil: he learned German, French, Italian, and the classical languages, and was able, by the age of fifteen, to translate Virgil.¹⁶⁴ He excelled in his studies, but risked expulsion in 1904 when he established a secret library for the use of his schoolfellows.¹⁶⁵ Despite a literacy rate measured in 1879 at below 1 percent,¹⁶⁶ the Hapsburg authorities were strict censors: the possession or dissemination of forbidden periodicals and books carried the penalty of a fine that ranged from 50 to 300 crowns, or a prison term of between one and three months.¹⁶⁷ Kállay was accused of banning the history of the Serbs that he himself had written in 1877.¹⁶⁸ Issues of *Srpska Rječ* (*Serbian Word*) – a Sarajevo newspaper which was believed to be subsidized by the Serbian government – were often confiscated as a result of vitriolic attacks upon the Hapsburg administration.¹⁶⁹

From 1905 to 1907, Mitrinović led *Matica* (Mainstream), a secret literary group, and was also one of the leaders of *Sloboda* (Freedom), a secret political society. Amongst the members of *Sloboda* were Bogdan Žerajić and Vladimir Gaćinović,¹⁷⁰ who – along with Mitrinović – became the most prominent Young Bosnians.¹⁷¹ Many of the members of *Sloboda* attended the meetings of *Matica*. The main activity of *Matica* consisted of a weekly gathering at which the pupils recited their own poems and writings, and debated current literary questions.¹⁷² Borivoje Jevtić later recalled how schoolboys of that generation in Bosnia “had only the joy of reading”: in their “decrepit, damp Bosnian hovels” they read by the light of “smoky oil lamps and wretched candles” that ruined their eyesight.¹⁷³ Several members of *Sloboda* spoke from the position of Serb nationalism: for example, Gaćinović argued that “we should not pour Croat water in our pure Serbian wine.”¹⁷⁴ In contrast to the Serb nationalism advocated by some of his

schoolfellows, Mitrinović took a “reasonable and tolerant position.”¹⁷⁵ He spoke in favour of Yugoslavism, and argued that the cultural and literary convergence of Serbs and Croats would greatly contribute to the development of Yugoslav consciousness.¹⁷⁶ Yugoslavism, he reasoned, was the only viable solution to the problems experienced by the peoples of the South Slav lands. Later, Mitrinović explained Yugoslavism as “the complete spiritual unity and equality of Serbo-Croatians and Slovenes, and as the necessity of creating a new and great modern Yugoslav culture.”¹⁷⁷ He genuinely believed that differences based on separate linguistic and literary state traditions, and religious allegiances, could be overcome by a sustained and determined activism.¹⁷⁸ Mitrinović thought that the unity of the South Slavs was necessary if they were to resist Austro-Hungarian domination.¹⁷⁹ All Croats and Slovenes were subjects of the Dual Monarchy, but this was not the case with the Serb people. In 1878, the great European powers had grudgingly recognized the independence of Serbia, and Montenegro. Since then, Montenegro had exercised a degree of influence disproportionate to its diminutiveness, yet it was hardly in a position to serve as the standard bearer for a Yugoslav state. Many Serbian Orthodox inhabitants of Bosnia considered Serbia (aligned with Austria-Hungary from 1878 to 1903) to be not only a kin-state, but a potential South Slav Piedmont. After 1903, Serbia’s status was enhanced by its return to constitutional government, and it seemed possible that Serbia might one day be in a position to unite the South Slavs in their own state.

When the pupils graduated from the High school in Mostar, they carried their ideas and methods to other towns in Bosnia. In 1907, Mitrinović completed his schooling and travelled to Sarajevo, where he showed schoolboys how to form their own secret societies. While in Sarajevo, he secured funding for his university studies from *Prosvjeta* (Enlightenment), a society that supported the educational advancement of gifted but poor Serbian Orthodox students from Bosnia.¹⁸⁰ On his way to the University of Zagreb, he visited Belgrade, and established contacts with Serbian nationalists, and with Yugoslavist groups. In Belgrade, he also secured funding for his education, and for his political activities, which included launching periodicals in which Yugoslavism was promoted.¹⁸¹ In the words of Predrag Palavestra, he “moved in mysterious ways, and often met an open door where others could not

even knock.”¹⁸² In Zagreb, his studies of philosophy, psychology and logic took second place to his political activities.¹⁸³ From Zagreb, Žerajić wrote to Gaćinović: “Mito is here. He’s living quite well. Now and then he goes to Sarajevo to plunder, then returns loaded (translator: with money), lives off it for a while, then once again ...”¹⁸⁴ Veljki Petrović remembered Mitrinović as a man gifted with an amazing ability to acquire money seemingly without effort. On one of his frequent visits to Sarajevo he treated ten students to an expensive meal at one of the best restaurants in town.¹⁸⁵ On one occasion he gave Gaćinović a suit, shirt, shoes and even handkerchiefs.¹⁸⁶

Gaćinović recognized Mitrinović as the “best ideologist” amongst the Young Bosnians.¹⁸⁷ Mitrinović earned his subsidies, in part, by the talks he gave as he travelled around the South Slav lands, propagating the idea of Yugoslavism. Mitrinović linked up scattered student societies,¹⁸⁸ and organized reciprocal visits.¹⁸⁹ Mitrinović promoted cultural relations between the South Slav peoples, with a view to the forging of a Yugoslav nation.¹⁹⁰ According to Jevtić, Mitrinović taught the value of “mutual national tolerance,” and explained “the great idea of the Unity and brotherhood of the Yugoslav peoples.”¹⁹¹ Jevtić remembered that “Mitrinović had the semblance of some world-traveller who had stumbled by chance into sad and gloomy provincial surroundings.”¹⁹² Radmilo Grdić recalled that he could “listen silently for hours to the brilliant Mita Mitrinović, seized by the magic of words ...”¹⁹³ Mitrinović held “clandestine nocturnal discussions” with Sarajevo schoolboys in 1911, when he inspired the organizers of the first Yugoslavist secret society in Sarajevo (*Srpsko-Hrvatsku Naprednu Organizaciju*).¹⁹⁴ Its members – including its first president, Ivo Andrić – were verbally attacked by Serb nationalists and Croat nationalists. Its supporters were accused of being traitors to their nations, and were derided as “chameleons.”¹⁹⁵

By this time, Mitrinović had gained a reputation as the Young Bosnians’ arbiter on national issues in art and literature.¹⁹⁶ His writings are among the basic sources of information for an understanding of the underlying philosophy of the Young Bosnians.¹⁹⁷ Although Mitrinović’s writings were frequently reprinted from paper to paper,¹⁹⁸ he is most closely associated with the Sarajevo monthly *Bosanska Vila: list za zabavu, pouku i književnost* (*Bosnian Muse: paper for entertainment, instruction and literature*),

to which he first contributed in 1906.¹⁹⁹

In the spring of 1912, Mitrinović addressed the members of a group organised around the Belgrade paper *Preporod* (Renaissance). Vladimir Simić later recalled how they were all “profoundly taken by Mitrinović’s intellectual brilliance,” and “wholeheartedly accepted his ideas” regarding the equality of the South Slav peoples.²⁰⁰ Until then, there had been few genuine Yugoslavists in Serbia, a state inhabited almost entirely by Serbs. The young Serbian Orthodox persons from Bosnia – who lived alongside Roman Catholics and Muslims in the territories – tended to have a more tolerant attitude towards their fellow South Slavs.²⁰¹

Mitrinović exerted influence over schoolboys as young as those in the seventh form. On 14 July 1914, Vojislav Vasiljević, a pupil of the Tuzla gymnasium, was interrogated by the authorities at the district court. He confessed: “I know the program of the ‘National Unity’, as I got it from someone. It seems to me that I heard that that programme was made by the writer Dimitrije Mitrinović.”²⁰² In 1912, Mitrinović had authored the “First draft of a programme for a youth club to be called National Unity.” A leaflet detailing the programme was printed in the editorial office of the Belgrade paper *Piedmont*, from where it was distributed to all South Slavs lands.²⁰³ Mitrinović stipulated that the central nationalist dogma of the youth club was that “a national culture is impossible without a national society, and that a national society is impossible without a national state.”²⁰⁴ Here, Mitrinović invokes Mazzini’s conception of territorial unity as an instrument for the gathering of moral forces.²⁰⁵ But many of his fellow South Slav intellectuals – however well-disposed to Mitrinović, and sympathetic to his goals – must have questioned whether he was not putting the cart before the horse when he argued that the creation of a national state was a necessary condition for the creation of a national culture.

The contents of the programme show the marked influence of the teachings of Masaryk. The first point concerned the need to oppose that which was “antinational” in the material and spiritual life of the South Slav peoples by:

- (a) Radical anticlericalism.
- (b) Radical elimination of destructive alien influence and promotion of Slavization of our culture against Germanization, Magyarization and Italianization.
- (c) Fighting against attitudes of servility, sneaking and contemptibility and raising of national honour and pride.
- (d) Expropriation of estates, liquidation of all prerogatives of aristocracy and all social privileges and the democratization of political consciousness and the political awakening of people.²⁰⁶

In the second point was a call for South Slav youths to act “against alien spiritual and material forces” and to conduct “a national offensive to reawaken the subjugated and half-lost parts of our people by spiritual and material means.”²⁰⁷ The invocation of a “people,” rather than “peoples,” immediately differentiated Mitrinović’s Yugoslavism from the platforms of the exclusive Serb, and Croat, nationalists. He was even more explicit in a 1914 article in *Vibor*:

And for the nationalists of Serbo-Croatia and Slovenia, for the sons of the uncreated Yugoslavia, there is nothing more exalted than the struggle, and nothing sweeter than the great victory ... Hopes and beliefs, you nationalist youth! From the saving idea of Yugoslavia and from her unbreakable basis and the national union of the Serbs and Croats, let us set to work on the nationalist creation of ourselves, on strengthening, preparation, and perfection. Forward to our goal, to the Idea of the Nation of the Southern Slavs, and to Freedom! Through the National Union of Serbo-Croats and Slovenes let us step to their National Unification.²⁰⁸

Here, Mitrinović distinguishes between “Serbo-Croats” and Slovenes, yet for him they were all part “of the Nation of the Southern Slavs.” This line of thought was consistent with the attempt of the Young Bosnians, as Vladimir Dedijer has put it, “to rise above the religious and national strife” that raged amongst the South Slavs.²⁰⁹

The name *Mlada Bosna* was first mooted in 1907, and then popularized after it was used in a 1911 article by Gaćinović. *Mlada Bosna* was intended to signify a broad intellectual movement against Hapsburg rule in Bosnia,²¹⁰ and no single group ever operated under that name.²¹¹ *Mlada Bosna* did not have the characteristics of a hierarchic organization, but was rather a network of groups bound together by a readiness to contest the Austro-Hungarian domination of Bosnia: the Young Bosnians knew more about what they did not want than about what they did want.²¹²

Mazzini’s *Giovane Italia* (Young Italy) was the model for *Mlada Bosna*.²¹³ The Young Bosnians

were inspired by the successes of the Italian liberation movement, and also by Mazzini's conception of the role of the young in national liberation. Gaćinović, as a fifteen-year-old boy, called himself "a Garibaldino," then later metamorphosed into a "Bakunist."²¹⁴ A history of the Italian liberation movement was published in several instalments in *Zora (The Dawn)*, a paper founded by Mitrinović for Serb students in Vienna.²¹⁵

The Young Bosnians took *inspiration* from the deeds of Italian nationalists (particularly Mazzini and Garibaldi), but they were *influenced* by thinkers who were fellow Slavs. One of the Young Bosnians counted Herzen among their "best teachers"²¹⁶ and another regarded him as one of their "most esteemed writers."²¹⁷ Herzen had placed great emphasis on the need to force the already existing political regime to become a less despotic one. On that point, Mitrinović took a more revolutionary position. Nonetheless, he agreed with Herzen's reasoning: any oppressive political system could be replaced by another of a similar kind, unless the ground had been prepared for a true social revolution.²¹⁸ The Young Bosnians were also influenced by the writings of the revolutionary Chernyshevsky: they passed *What is to Be Done?* from hand to hand, copied whole pages from it, and even learned passages by heart.²¹⁹

In general, it is difficult to prove – rather than just infer – that the actions of any historical personality have been directly induced by exposure to certain ideas. But this is especially the case when the subject or subjects in question operated at varying levels of secrecy, and hardly ever produced potentially incriminating evidence of their activities.²²⁰ It is, however, possible to demonstrate that Mitrinović was greatly influenced by Masaryk's ideas. It is also *necessary*, because Mitrinović adhered to many of the tenets of Masarykism throughout his life, as is clear from the sum of evidence related to the development of his thought. But the influence on Mitrinović of Masaryk's ideas has not yet been adequately explored. Indeed, the connection has even been neglected by some of the scholars who have written about Mitrinović.²²¹ Rigby has stated that Mitrinović was instrumental in the 1908 formation of *Rad (Work)*, a cultural society of South Slav students at the University of Vienna whose work was greatly influenced by the teachings of Masaryk.²²² Palavestra has ascertained that, in June 1914, Mitrinović

attempted to contact Masaryk to solicit a contribution to the mundialist yearbook on which he and Kandinsky were working.²²³ Mitrinović owned both the German²²⁴ and English²²⁵ editions of Masaryk's *Rußland und Europa (The Spirit of Russia)*.²²⁶ Luisa Passerini has identified Masaryk as "an inspiring figure for the generation of militant Central and Eastern European intellectuals following his own, such as Mitrinovic and his Dalmatian friend Mestrovic, who sculpted a bust of Masaryk,"²²⁷ but she does not elaborate further. Evidently, Masaryk inspired South Slav intellectuals, but he was not *merely* an inspirational figure. In fact, he was most inspirational when he asserted his moral authority in the aftermath of the Austro-Hungarian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908.²²⁸ However, his influence over South Slav students diminished as a consequence of the annexation: many students took it as proof of the ineffectiveness of Masarykian gradualism.

Masaryk had begun to exert influence over South Slav intellectuals in 1893, when Serb and Croat students were first attracted to his lectures at the University of Prague.²²⁹ The Slovene students who studied in Prague considered it the most promising centre in which to develop their Slavic consciousness.²³⁰ Although South Slav students were more numerous in Zagreb, the number of students studying in Prague reached 154 by 1914.²³¹ These students did not view the university experience as a mere scholarly retreat: they esteemed Masaryk not only as a professor, but also as a spokesman on behalf of their national interests.²³² They also appreciated the friendly relations that he maintained with his students, which were unusual at that time. Students from Bosnia were officially forbidden to attend university in Prague,²³³ but the value they placed on Masaryk's teachings is evinced by the fact that so many defied the authorities, and risked severe penalties by so doing. On 19 October 1892, Masaryk protested against this ban – and against many other restrictions to which inhabitants of Bosnia were subject – during an Austrian parliamentary debate.²³⁴

In 1895, Masaryk published *Česká otázka (The Czech Question)*. South Slav students pored over Masaryk's volume, and applied its ideas to the analogous problems with which they were confronted.²³⁵ One Young Bosnian claimed: "We accepted his ideas in our soul and hearts, and we brought them back to our homeland in order to sow them and to reap the fruits of freedom and popular culture."²³⁶ At that

time, a prominent political journalist wrote: “When you look for the source of all this new conciliation [between the South Slav peoples], you are sure to run into a pupil of Masaryk, someone who has sat in his classroom and learned to cooperate with his fellows.”²³⁷ From *The Czech Question*, and other writings by Masaryk – notably his 1901 volume *Ideály humanitní* (*The Ideals of Humanity*) – South Slav intellectuals derived an understanding of how they could solve the problems faced by their peoples. Indeed, the methods advocated by Masaryk were not styled exclusively to the aspirations of Czechs and Slovaks: they could be adapted to suit the emancipatory struggles of any of the small nations of Austria-Hungary. In any case, for Masaryk, the emancipation²³⁸ of the Czechs and Slovaks incorporated the goal of all other emancipatory movements within the Dual Monarchy. A true patriot must strive “for the liberation of *all* subject peoples, and not merely for the liberation of his or her tribe.”²³⁹ Arguably, Masarykism gained greater popularity among South Slavs students than among educated Czechs and Slovaks. Mitrinović especially valued two ideas: Realism and Humanism.

Masaryk was original only in the sense that he revitalised a set of pre-existing ideas by dint of his unique synthesis. Out of this synthesis he developed Realism, a simple concept – a *method* rather than an ideology – but one that he never systematized.²⁴⁰ René Welleck has argued that it would be wrong “to describe this conscious lack of system as incoherence or inconsistency. It is simply a necessary sequel of Masaryk’s refusal to believe in any finality of human reasoning.”²⁴¹

Realism was a specific form of political conduct that had less to do with institutionalised political life, and more to do with fostering popular national consciousness that would eventually result in deeper and more far-reaching political changes than could be achieved by institutional reforms.²⁴² Proponents of Realism aimed at the popularisation of a particular *Weltanschauung* (world-view) rather than direct political influence.²⁴³ Masaryk’s emphasis on the political dimension of cultural activity – his “non-political politics” – was a departure from the way “politics” was understood by his contemporaries. He criticized existing political life for its superficiality.²⁴⁴ Progressive political activity, in his view, was activity that encompassed the totality of social and individual life as opposed to political activities limited to the established and institutionalised framework of politics.²⁴⁵ Masaryk envisaged a cadre of serious

and thoughtful persons who would disregard their specific political loyalties, and embrace the method of Realism in their activities in all fields of human life.²⁴⁶ Above all, Realism entailed work. Masaryk's teachings were infused with appeals to translate ideals, taught in university cloisters, into realities. "If you love your country," he implored, "don't talk about it, but *do* something worthwhile; that is what matters."²⁴⁷ He deplored martyrdom, and considered the true criterion of patriotism to be the work undertaken by an individual to improve the educational, cultural, and economic health of his or her nation. Masaryk also disapproved of those nationalists who mystified the past, and deified the nation. Their verbiage was worthless: patriotism ought to be measured by deeds, not words.

Masaryk argued that it was necessary for members of a small nation to develop their national consciousness²⁴⁸ in order to preserve national existence.²⁴⁹ National consciousness was to be developed through cultural work undertaken in temperance, literary, and cultural groups (such as *Rada*). The work was especially valuable if it involved those who had previously been excluded from the cultural life of the nation. These participants would come to realize that they formed part of a distinct national group among other nations. Sustained work counted for more than isolated philanthropic acts; this work was to be consistent with the highest moral principles, and conscientiously carried out. Masaryk taught that if means cannot be justified in themselves, the end which they serve can add little to the moral quality of an action. The manner in which ends are attained forms an integral part of what is to be achieved.²⁵⁰ If the work seemed inconspicuous or petty, no matter; if it was thankless, all the better. So long as it was oriented towards the national reawakening of an oppressed people, it would contribute in a small way to the eventual emancipation of their nation. The quality and quantity of work performed would prove decisive in the struggle for national emancipation. Masaryk wrote in *The Ideals of Humanity*: "He who believes in progress will not be impatient."²⁵¹ But emancipation would be expedited by advances in the field of education.²⁵² Masaryk continually asserted the importance of science, literature and journalism, and access to knowledge in general: educated individuals rejected superstition, and were more receptive to rational ideas.²⁵³

For Masaryk, education was an effective way to raise self-respect among individuals. A

nationwide improvement in intellectual standards – and the expansion of educational opportunities for women in particular – would increase the likelihood of a nation reaching political maturity.²⁵⁴ By European standards, the amount of funding for educational provision in the Dual Monarchy was low, but it was even lower in Bosnia, where education was subject to malign neglect by the authorities. Kállay had declared: “For my mission, one gendarme is worth five teachers.”²⁵⁵ Tax revenue was in a large measure allocated to the forces of law and order, which stunted the growth of publicly-funded schooling. In 1906, the authorities invested almost three times as much money in the construction of military barracks and the purchase of police equipment as they spent on the provision of education: the budget set aside 3,750,000 crowns for the maintenance of law and order, and a mere 1,300,000 crowns for educational institutions.²⁵⁶ The administration funded vocational training at the expense of theoretical studies, and thus did not found a university in Bosnia.²⁵⁷ By 1902, only 30 university-educated individuals had returned to Bosnia after the completion of their studies.²⁵⁸ The 1910 census of Bosnia disclosed a literacy rate of just 12.16 percent. On 21 June 1906, Baron Burián (the Common Minister of Finance from 1903 to 1912) had told the Budget Committee of the Hungarian Delegation that “every child prefers the confectioner to the teacher.”²⁵⁹ During the 1911–12 school year, only 48,425 children (17 percent of the eligible age group) received elementary schooling.²⁶⁰ The administration endowed one school for every thousand migrants from the Austrian and Hungarian halves of the Dual Monarchy, but there was only one school for every six thousand inhabitants of Bosnia.²⁶¹ During the four decades of Austro-Hungarian rule, only 200 primary schools were built.²⁶² The evidence lends support to the view that the administration “aimed rather at order than progress”²⁶³ and was thus content to perpetuate the tutelage of the territories.²⁶⁴ Despite limited educational opportunities, many of the Young Bosnians from peasant backgrounds worked as servants in the homes of wealthy families, and used their earnings to pay for their schooling.²⁶⁵

In Masaryk’s view of the struggle for national emancipation, leadership was to be assumed by those individuals who undertook the greatest amount of cultural work.²⁶⁶ For Masaryk, individuals who were politically, economically or intellectually advantaged had a moral obligation to strive for the

betterment of the underprivileged.²⁶⁷ Mitrinović agreed wholeheartedly with this sentiment:

In our politics there still rules a spirit of authoritarianism, so that our politics are usually not the politics of reason and wisdom, but the politics of authoritarianism and rhetoric ... The sacred ambition to possess a conscience and intellectual integrity have almost disappeared ...

Less caprice, more principle! This should be the motto of those who are able to do something to transform our swampy and senseless society into a different society, healthy and vital.²⁶⁸

For Masaryk, work was most valuable when it was undertaken alongside those most in need of assistance. Less privileged individuals were to join local societies and associations, in which they would be encouraged to present their views on matters of national importance. Those committed to work would promote the dignity of the individual, the rights of women, and the strengthening of civic virtues. They were to campaign for universal suffrage, a free press, and freedom of assembly, speech, and conscience, all of which were crucial to national development.²⁶⁹ They would aspire to democratize not only institutions, but human relations.

There can be no mistaking the influence of Realism in an article written by Mitrinović for *Bosanska Vila*, in which he emphasizes – in a Masarykian vein – the need to work:

Our national tasks are very difficult, but urgent. Our enemies are very powerful: however our social, spiritual and physical milieu is too weak for hopes of victory to be close or sure. Our job today is to awaken dormant national energies, to make use of anything that may serve our ends, to raise the irresolute, to goad the lazy, to educate the unconscious, to show the path, and follow it as the best example, to encourage, spur on without pausing, to assemble and organise national energies and differentiate these energies for various great and arduous tasks.²⁷⁰

But these calls to work were not heeded by all Mitrinović's contemporaries. A letter written by Gavriilo Princip in 1912 is revealing in this regard:

It was really satisfactory to have your letter which I am now answering, in spite of my great laziness. As you know we have two groups: The Serb nationalists (also called radicals) and the progressives....

... [Vladeta] Bilbija and I put forward a proposal for fusion with the "radicals" (among whom there were a lot of neutrals and progressives), since there were hardly any differences between us. On both sides there was little understanding ...

We had ... to unite so that our members, if the Croats founded a progressive organisation, should be in one united club. So it was, and the Croats came in with us.

We split off from the radicals and set to work. I say “work”, but the fact is no one did anything; the word “work” was always in our mouths, but in fact it was – nothing.

They [the radicals, i.e. the Serb nationalists] at once began to attack us in all possible terms and especially accused us of not being Serbs. There was a deep gulf and horrible hatred between us. At that time the thing developed further. Our organisation had 35–40 members, Serbs and Croats (not including Moslems)....

In the meantime no work could be done, for among us these personal things played a greater part than usual

We did all that we could to get things in order and to put an end to stupid and useless hatred

With our Croatian brothers we have made common cause, whilst they [the radicals] have unfortunately hated them ... we began to work among all the youth without respect of national origin, so that with one enthusiastic manifestation we could demonstrate our solidarity, and they – the national chauvinists – were against it.

.... We went to work on our own, but as you know, our wretched politics and particularism in public interrupted us, and with their disgusting party sectarianism brought us to the present split and hatreds.

.... You ask: what line were we following, that of “Zora” or that of “Val”. In answer I can say that our organisation is on the line of “Zora” where Serbs and Croats are united ... because we stand by the revolutionary programme of Mitrinovic.²⁷¹

Here, Princip details the strain between the radicals (the Serb nationalists) and the progressives (the Yugoslavists), though in actuality there was “hardly any difference” between them in terms of outlook. Princip notes how petty factional politics interfered with their professed intention to work, to the extent that “no one did anything.” Mitrinović, who hoped to bring the Serb chauvinists round to Yugoslavism, had railed against such “stupid and useless hatred,” “wretched politics and particularism,” and “disgusting party sectarianism” as early as 1908, in his article “The Democratization of Science and Philosophy.”²⁷² He had argued that the “greater part of our activities, particularly in domestic party politics, have not arisen from reasonable and principled convictions, but from spite, envy, egoism, hatred and similar unworthy motives.” He had then warned that: “We shall never make any fundamental progress as long as the majority of our actions are not undertaken with serious and noble intentions ... often a naive and sentimental enthusiasm for ‘harmony’ is ridiculous, but party politics should not descend from the heights of principle to the depths of petty and unworthy disputes.” Mitrinović, like Princip, was attacked for being “un-Serb.” In a 1913 letter written by Mitrinović in 1913, he suggests that “scoundrels” in Belgrade deem him an “Austrian hireling,” perhaps on account of his unwillingness to abandon Realism for more radical methods:

There reached me today a letter from Belgrade which in a friendly way speaks scowlingly and gives advice; it states that I'm terribly hated and people would like to crack me. It's interesting that the snarlings are much more thunderous when I'm not there; and that few friends and innumerable enemies is a rule. I know this, and I don't get excited about it. Only if there is anything at all that materially affects life and wants to destroy me, please tell me ruthlessly; and if some rogue wants to make me an Austrian hireling or in general deform me morally publicly and privately, again don't spare me: for scoundrels can by moral rebukes make it hard and reduce success, and we don't want to lose force. As for intellectual evaluations of me, let anyone do what they must ...²⁷³

These Serbian chauvinists no doubt wanted to "crack" Mitrinović because they disapproved of his progressive Yugoslav beliefs, in which case he was assailed for being "un-Serb" for the same reason that Princip had suffered abuse the previous year.

According to Masaryk, those engaged in work for the nation were to oppose clericalism, intolerance, and indifference. It is evident from the writings of Mitrinović that he shared Masaryk's anti-clericalism: "People suffer from the lawlessness of state power, of ecclesiastical power, and the evil multitude of forces that have arisen against man and who tirelessly plunge the Earth into disaster."²⁷⁴ For Masaryk, efforts were also to be devoted to promoting economic well-being and to achieving practical equality, which he defined as "that inequality which is bearable."²⁷⁵ The inhabitants of Bosnia had to improve their standard of living by means of economic self-help, because the Hapsburg authorities did little to reduce poverty and deprivation. In 1908, for example, the denizens of Stolac (the nearest town to the birthplace of Mitrinović) initiated a plan to build a waterworks, which they duly constructed.²⁷⁶ Outside of the main urban centres, the authorities invested in the water supply only for the resorts frequented by officials and army officers.²⁷⁷

Masaryk also emphasized the benefits of bodily hygiene, health, and fitness: alcoholism²⁷⁸ and sexual promiscuity were to be avoided.²⁷⁹ Mitrinović and the other Young Bosnians upheld the ascetic principles that had been enumerated by Masaryk in the context of national emancipation. Gaćinović wrote to Leon Trotsky: "In our organization there is a rule of obligatory abstinence from love-making and drinking, and you must believe me when I tell you that all of us remain true to this rule."²⁸⁰ The Young Bosnians believed their adherence to ascetic principles distinguished them from the decadence of

their oppressors, and were convinced that the Hapsburg authorities wanted to morally corrupt the inhabitants of Bosnia. They saw evidence of this in the number of brothels sanctioned by the authorities²⁸¹ – a total of seven in Sarajevo alone – which was far in excess of the requirements of soldiers, officials and businessmen.²⁸² Many Young Bosnians bitterly speculated that officials countenanced prostitution because the authorities wanted venereal disease to spread within a hitherto chaste society, to dissolve the strong family bonds that were integral to life in Bosnia.²⁸³ Many of these bonds had already been dissolved by emigration. The net emigration from Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United States in the period from 1883 to 1905 was approximately 28,500 persons. Figures for gross emigration were much greater, and Herzegovina – home to many of the Young Bosnians – suffered a disproportionately high loss.²⁸⁴ Jevto Dedijer wrote in a 1907 essay, “Herzegovina and Herzegovinians,” that the urge to emigrate to the United States had become “so contagious that in many parts of Herzegovina it is difficult to see a young man.” The development of the railways had destroyed the livelihoods of young men involved in carting and river trades. Villages around Trebinje and Bileća were “full of spinsters” and girls who had “no chance of marrying.” Dedijer concluded that emigration had “shaken the whole social life” of Bosnia.²⁸⁵

The Young Bosnians believed that their elders – with few exceptions – were prone to philistinism, torpor, and resignation to their lowly status as subjugated persons. Gaćinović cried on one occasion that “our fathers, our tyrants, have created this world on their model and are now forcing us to live in it.”²⁸⁶ He wrote in 1908: “We, the youngest, must begin to create a new history. We have to bring the sun into our frigid society, activate the benumbed and reach the resigned. We have to wage a decisive war against pessimism, faint heartedness and dejection.”²⁸⁷ The Young Bosnians were disgusted by the tendency of their elders to revere the emperor as *stari otac* (our old father).²⁸⁸ Andrić extended his antipathy to almost all the inhabitants of Bosnia: “The whole of our society is snoring ungracefully; only the poets and revolutionaries are awake.”²⁸⁹ Mitrinović drew attention to the gulf between generations in 1911, when he criticized the editors of the *Serbian Literary Herald* for not including on their board “someone who is not an old man.”²⁹⁰ He was horrified by the mutual intolerance of the Serbian

Orthodox, Muslim and Roman Catholic middle classes in Bosnia.²⁹¹ Little is known about how these older individuals perceived the Young Bosnians in their midst.²⁹²

The Young Bosnians disapproved of those who adopted the customs, and dressed in the fashions, of the Austro-Hungarian occupiers. In 1903, William Eleroy Curtis, a correspondent of the *Chicago Record-Herald*, remarked that the “rich families” of Bosnia bought “all their clothing at Vienna or Budapest,” which made it “difficult to distinguish them from the Austrians.”²⁹³ The Young Bosnians scorned those opportunists who sought to profit from the occupation. For example, during the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913 – when several hundred thousand Austro-Hungarian soldiers were deployed in Bosnia – several municipal leaders sent delegations to the Hapsburg authorities to request that as many soldiers as possible be garrisoned in their towns, to bolster demand for goods and services.²⁹⁴

Mitrinović and his fellow South Slav intellectuals were deeply influenced by Realism.²⁹⁵ Many of them read the periodicals in which the tenets of Realism were articulated, including *Čas (Time)*, and *Naše doba (Our Age)*, which was edited by Masaryk.²⁹⁶ At the University of Prague, Slovene and Croat students joined *Šumadija*, the Serb students’ society. Together they published their ideas – mostly in the spirit of Masaryk – in *Novo doba (New Times)*, a paper they founded in 1898.²⁹⁷ Especially talented students from Bosnia were offered scholarships to the University of Vienna, but the authorities revoked the funding of those who took part in political activities.²⁹⁸ Stanoje Stanojević included references to Masaryk in his widely-read 1908 history of the Serbs,²⁹⁹ in which he explained that Masarykism proved attractive to “all Serb and Croat university students,” and prevailed in the South Slav student societies in Zagreb and Vienna.³⁰⁰ But by the time this volume was published, Masaryk’s influence over the younger generation of students had waned. Initially, he had earned the respect of South Slavs by eloquently defending their interests. Although his reputation for integrity was enhanced by his indefatigable campaign for truth in the aftermath of the annexation of Bosnia, it was this declaration of *de jure* sovereignty that caused the younger cohorts to renounce Realism.

For Masaryk, revolution was diametrically opposed to Realism. He defined revolution as any

attempt to violently destroy the political and social structures of a polity. He believed that revolution could be conscionable only in cases where the use of exclusively non-violent means would not prove sufficient to preserve the integrity of a people facing the prospect of collective annihilation, or suffering unbearable tyranny. In such circumstances, there should be a resort to revolution only if it would seem likely to ameliorate the situation.³⁰¹ If these two criteria are met, then revolution becomes *resistance* and thus is not only ethically justifiable, but a moral duty.³⁰² Except for in such cases, the perpetration of violence could never – for Masaryk – be a morally permissible means of achieving political goals.

A thorough analysis of the shortcomings of Realism is beyond the scope of this work; in any case, the problems inherent in Realism have been elucidated elsewhere.³⁰³ But some weaknesses are immediately apparent. Masaryk acknowledged the influence of the Fabians, whose writings he had read in English.³⁰⁴ It is revealed in letters seized by the Austro-Hungarian police that the Young Bosnians had discussed the ideas of the Fabians.³⁰⁵ In Realism – as in its twin, Fabianism – the primacy of *reason* was an article of faith. But the force of reason could not *make* those with power (except – purportedly – Realists and Fabians) use it to further the common good. Moreover, Masaryk focused on the question of how a society ought to be influenced, but largely ignored the questions³⁰⁶ of how the exercise of power should be regulated, conflicts of interest resolved,³⁰⁷ and different attitudes reconciled.³⁰⁸

Mitrinović understood the problems associated with Realism, but he could not solve them. In lieu of a credible alternative to Realism, the contributions he made to the struggle for liberation were consistent with the tenets of that method. But alongside Realism, Mitrinović valued another Masarykian precept, one that in his estimation greatly enriched Masarykism. The most durable of Masaryk's teachings, it was an idea that Mitrinović advocated throughout his life: Humanitism. Anglophone scholars coined the neologism Humanitism, a translation of *ideály humanitní* that Masaryk himself favoured. Masaryk explained that Humanitism had its origins in Christianity, and thus must be distinguished from secular humanism, as well as atheism.³⁰⁹ Nor should Humanitism be confused with humanitarianism. Humanitism was Masaryk's synthesis of the values of antiquity (truth, goodness, beauty, justice and courage), the values of Christianity (love for one's neighbour, and responsibility for

one's acts and thoughts before a transcendent Divine Person), the values of the Enlightenment (the critical faculty, toleration, equality, and respect for the rights of the individual), and the values of socialism (social justice and solidarity).³¹⁰ Eva Schmidt-Hartmann has argued that the intellectual uniqueness of Masaryk lay much more in his synthesis of various elements of thought than in the originality of his ideas.³¹¹ Mitrinović was also far from being a paradigmatic thinker, but he too was able to synthesize the thought of those who had come before him.³¹² Mitrinović, like Masaryk, could kindle ideas with a spark of originality, though before 1914 Mitrinović espoused a universal ideal that was indistinct from Humanitism.

Masaryk rejected Christian dogma, and the reactionary influence of the Roman Catholic Church in public life, and instead favoured the separation of Church and State. He was influenced by Hume's conception of "benevolence" as the basic principle of morality, but even more so by Kant's categorical imperative.³¹³ Masaryk invoked Kant's idea when he explained what he meant by Humanitism. Since every individual was to be treated as an end in himself or herself, it follows that no one can be rightly enslaved, killed, injured or violated. Moreover, each individual must be treated as a rational being: he or she cannot be coerced in defiance of his or her conscience. Every individual, therefore, has inviolable rights, and above all the right to live in obedience to a moral law which is valid only so long as it is freely obeyed, and consciously adopted.³¹⁴

Masaryk was convinced of the complementariness of nationalism and Humanitism, and allied the two philosophies in *The Ideals of Humanity*. Nationalism acquired moral status as a political idea if it was imbued with Humanitism; without it, nationalism was indistinguishable from chauvinism. But Humanitism could only take substantive and intelligible form within nationalism.³¹⁵ In the pages of *Bosanska Vila*, Mitrinović stated clearly – in a 1908 article entitled "The National Milieu and Modernism" – that "an individual is not only a member of a national group but also a member of the human race."³¹⁶ This line of thought bears comparison to Mazzini's universalism, his notion that the world of nation-states was merely a transitory stage before the organization of all humanity.³¹⁷ Masaryk argued that nationalism was a means to promote the welfare and unity of humankind, and could never justify actions

that were contrary to Humanitism.³¹⁸ He insisted that individual conscience and supreme moral principles must never be sacrificed to the supposed interests of any collective.³¹⁹ He wrote: "I have to stress explicitly that I do not accept nationalism which subordinates all social forces to the national idea."³²⁰ In any nationalism imbued with Humanitism, there was no place for fanaticism, intolerance, or prejudice. Other nations should not be belittled, Masaryk explained. Freud wrote that "it is always possible to bind together a considerable number of people in love, so long as there are other people left over to receive the manifestations of their aggressiveness,"³²¹ but for Masaryk it was neither sufficient nor "necessary to hate another nation in order to love one's own."³²² An individual should strive for justice for his or her nation, and for all nations. He wrote in *The Czech Question*: "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity certainly hold not only for us, but also for all people."³²³

For Masaryk, the nation was only an aggregate of individuals, because they alone were bearers of consciousness. Individuals who experienced feelings of belonging in a national community could each experience national consciousness, but a nation itself could not have its own "consciousness." The "national spirit" was merely an expression that described the shared attitude to commonly recognized values. Masaryk argued that when the cohering force of these common values was weakened, the "national spirit" faded. The preservation of the nation depended on individuals who resisted forces that threatened such values.³²⁴ In this respect, a state-nation – a polity in which extensive nation-building did not precede state formation³²⁵ – was weaker than a nation-state strengthened by the undivided loyalty of its citizenry. The historical experience of Serbians, and the Serbian Orthodox inhabitants of Bosnia, was markedly different to that of Croats, and Slovenes. In view of these differences, an acute French observer who toured Croatia early in the twentieth century had concluded that the idea of uniting Croats and Serbs was nothing more than "wishbone politics."³²⁶

Masaryk considered language, rather than common historical experience, to be the primary criterion of nationality. Schmidt-Hartmann has explained that for Masaryk, language was the unchanging and undeniable bond between the individual and his environment and, as such, it was the crucial constitutive element of human culture.³²⁷ He argued that if languages differed from each other,

national cultures must differ as well. The debate about the distinctness of the Croatian and Serbian languages, fuelled by “the narcissism of minor differences,”³²⁸ continues to this day, but at that time it was generally accepted that the South Slavs (excepting the Slovenes) spoke a single language: Serbo-Croat. But despite the shared language, the Serbs, Croats, and the peoples of Bosnia shared few common values that were exclusive to them. The South Slav peoples all valued the right to self-determination, a principle compatible with the formation of either a confederal or federal South Slav state. But the political task of state formation was one thing, the cultural task of nation-building another. Masaryk recognized that even the incessant promotion of unifying values could not protect a small nation from the aggressive actions of powerful states.³²⁹ Within democracies, the administration of the people, by the people and for the people was assured by mechanisms designed to settle disagreements between parties.³³⁰ But the free existence of small nations could be secured only if democracy was extended to the system of international relations, entailing an inter-state democratic order. Thus, Masaryk rejected the notion that nationalism and internationalism were mutually exclusive.³³¹

Mitrinović was profoundly influenced by Masarykian precepts (especially Humanitism): Masarykism was not just a transitional phase in his political development, as it was for those South Slav students who gave up on Realism after 1908. On 4 March 1913, Mitrinović wrote to Velimir Rajić to inform him that for the time being he would not devote himself entirely to the South Slav liberation struggle, because he considered it “superfluous to rouse the world to something that is accomplished only in spirit and will and for which you still have to wait and for which it is necessary to work.” He promises Rajić that he will take his nationalism “even more strongly and deeper and more seriously later on,” after the completion of his studies, when he will be “more useful everywhere.”³³² Here, Mitrinović suggests that he has not given up on Realism, but rather that he will not participate actively in the struggle until his fellows overcome their reluctance to work for the cause.

After 1913, Mitrinović remained as faithful as ever to the principles of conduct associated with Realism. Masaryk considered any attempt by an individual to change his or her nationality to be a morally despicable act.³³³ In his youth, Mitrinović had possessed two passports: he was entitled to an

Austro-Hungarian passport, but his government contacts in Belgrade supplied him with a Serbian passport, too. Although he spent the last four decades of his life in Britain, Mitrinović never applied for naturalization.³³⁴ Once in exile, Mitrinović no longer had any political use for Realism: his role from 1914 to 1919 was to influence foreigners who might prove useful to the South Slav cause. But he never ceased to espouse the Humanitism that was largely absent from the South Slav liberation movement. Mitrinović's devotion to Humanitism must be contrasted with the chauvinism of, say, the unnamed Serb who sent a letter to *Zora* complaining that: "It is a scandal that you write in Latin script to me, a Serb."³³⁵ An article published in 1907, in the Austrian semi-official paper *Neue Freie Presse*, had pointed out that in "the South Slav regions confession and nationality coincide," meaning that all talk of Yugoslavism was a "fantastic illusion."³³⁶ Yet it was an illusion that Mitrinović worked hard to create. But despite these efforts, Mica Julcin's statement in a 1912 issue of *Zora* was prescient: Serbs and Croats could feel "all the same, one body," but "alas, only through [the] misfortune" of being misruled by the Hapsburgs.³³⁷

In 1912, Mitrinović had begun to develop an interest in the idea of individual and social change on a much deeper and wider scale than he had previously contemplated. He became concerned not only with the transformation of the South Slavs, but with the transformation of the peoples of Europe, and of the world. Yugoslavism was dovetailed into his new utopian conception of the world. This change in focus reflected his increasing familiarity with different cultures and world-views.³³⁸ Mitrinović decided to pursue his studies in Germany, and confessed to his friends: "I've turned round and decided to finish my studies as God has ordained; otherwise it's not possible among us to be influential and nobody believes in anybody's wits and capacity to do anything."³³⁹ Despite this explanation, his decision was incomprehensible to his friends and associates.³⁴⁰ In 1926, Čedomil Mitrinović travelled to London, and asked his brother why he had never returned to live in his homeland. Mitrinović's reply was cryptic: "The torch flares, the fire has been lit. I am the sower who does not reap the harvest."³⁴¹

Chapter 3

The Good European

In early March 1913, Mitrinović arrived in Munich³⁴² without an obvious means of financial support.³⁴³ He intended to study art history under the supervision of Heinrich Wölfflin, the famous Swiss scholar.³⁴⁴ Peter Selz has claimed that Munich was – by the turn of the century – second only to Paris as a place in which to study art.³⁴⁵ Felix Klee has remarked that a “strange juxtaposition of Bavarian rusticity, bock beer, [and] philistinism,” existed in Munich from 1906 to 1914, alongside an avant-garde movement that led “something of an underground existence.”³⁴⁶ The most significant cultural development during that period was the emergence of the school of abstract painting, led by Kandinsky, who was acknowledged as the leader of the artistic community in Munich.³⁴⁷

At the time of Mitrinović’s arrival, Kandinsky and Paul Klee resided in Schwabing, a suburb north of Munich. Between 1897 and 1903 Schwabing had become an intellectual centre through the activities of *Die Kosmische Runde* (the Cosmic Circle), which had been founded by the followers of the poet Stefan George. The residents of Schwabing had gained a reputation for Bohemian living, and more artists and writers had congregated there following the establishment of the *Neue Künstler Vereinigung* (New Artists’ Association) in 1909. Its founders were European artists who had banded together to share the work of planning exhibitions. Their meeting places included Café Stephanie, and The Eleven Executioners cabaret, noted for its irreverent mockery of the bourgeoisie of Wilhelmine Prussia.³⁴⁸

The first exhibition of works by members of the *Neue Künstler Vereinigung* had met with public hostility at the end of 1909.³⁴⁹ In December 1911, Kandinsky and Franz Marc had resigned from the association after its members rejected Kandinsky’s *Composition 5* for the winter exhibition.³⁵⁰ Kandinsky and Marc had then hastily pulled together an exhibition entitled “*Der Blaue Reiter*” (“The Blue Rider”). The title had subsequently become the name of Kandinsky and Marc’s new association of expressionist artists.³⁵¹ *Der Blaue Reiter* – like the *Neue Künstler Vereinigung* before it – differed from most other groups of the period: it was loosely organized, it lacked a manifesto, and it welcomed participation

by foreign artists. Kandinsky was a Russian expatriate, predisposed against the jingoistic attitudes of many of his fellow avant-gardists.³⁵² By January 1912, Kandinsky and Marc had recruited Klee as a member of *Der Blaue Reiter*. That year, Klee had noted in his diary (entry 905) that “a great moment” had arrived: the “currents of yesterday’s tradition” were “really becoming lost in the sand.” He had hailed “those who are working toward the impending reformation. The boldest of them is Kandinsky.”³⁵³ It had not been easy for Kandinsky to keep to the path on which he had struck out: his dedication in Paul Klee’s copy of the association’s almanac hinted at the difficulties he had overcome: “To my dear colleague Klee in memory of the evil days.”³⁵⁴

The association’s almanac had been published in May 1912. The editors had manipulated the visual imagery with a view to obscuring the boundaries of chronology, culture, nation and style.³⁵⁵ Members of *Der Blaue Reiter* promoted the integration of the arts: in their almanac they had included musical scores and analysis, dramaturgical theory, and reproductions of book illustrations, sculptures, and paintings (from cave art to contemporary works), in the hope of bonding their respective potentials.³⁵⁶ In 1912 Mitrinović, too, had argued – in “Aesthetic Contemplations” – that the barriers between artistic disciplines needed to be demolished.³⁵⁷ In fact, Mitrinović had much in common with Kandinsky: both men were critical of materialism and positivism, and both believed in the spiritual and reformatory powers of art. They shared an interest in mysticism, and were equally familiar with the Slavonic cultural milieu.³⁵⁸

When and how Mitrinović first made Kandinsky’s acquaintance is unrecorded. But by 17 February 1914 they were on sufficiently familiar terms for Kandinsky to mention in a letter to Marc that he was “delighted” by Mitrinović’s plan to give a lecture on his paintings, and that the prospect had become “gigantically exciting.”³⁵⁹ On 27 February 1914 Mitrinović delivered a lecture – accompanied by lantern slides and an exhibition of Kandinsky’s works – in the Great Hall of the Deutsches Museum in Munich.³⁶⁰ In “Kandinsky and the New Art: Taking Tomorrow by Storm” Mitrinović interpreted Kandinsky’s work as a cultural barometer of the period.³⁶¹ Klee recorded the occasion in his diary (entry 924): “Mitrinovic, a Serbian, came to Munich and gave a lecture about the new art, Kandinsky, etc. He

also approached me. Had me lend him some of my works so he could immerse himself in them Often comes to our music sessions. Made this classic utterance: 'Yes, Bach knew how to write it, you know how to play it, and I know how to listen to it.'"³⁶²

Mitrinović's highly developed syncretism held appeal for Kandinsky, because it confirmed his beliefs and orientation during 1913–14.³⁶³ Mitrinović was attracted by Kandinsky's vision of the intrinsic links that existed between the spiritual realm, the creative work of the artist, and the transformation of humankind.³⁶⁴ Both men were familiar with the work of Vladimir Solovev, who claimed that an individual needed to maintain a bond with the universal cosmic order, and that understanding was to be attained through adherence to both Christian revelation and scientific method.³⁶⁵ Kandinsky posited the insufficiency of rational thought alone,³⁶⁶ and was convinced that an artist could use abstract forms – untainted by materialism – to express transcendental ideas. Kandinsky yearned for a new age of spirituality to follow the “nightmare” years of materialism, during which life had been turned “into an evil, senseless game.”³⁶⁷ There can be no doubt that passages from Mitrinović's “Aesthetic Contemplations” – such as “we are beaten black and blue with their ‘dread-noughts’ and their stock exchanges” – had resonance for Kandinsky.³⁶⁸ Marc, in his opening essays in the almanac, had presented mysticism of the soul as a weapon that must be “savagely” used in everyday life to fend off technological advances and the encroaching spirit of colonialism.³⁶⁹ But in a letter to Klee written three years later, Marc criticized Kandinsky for his “personal intellectual crotchets.” This comment suggests that Kandinsky had shared more ideas with Mitrinović than with his fellow artists in *Der Blaue Reiter*.³⁷⁰

It was Kandinsky who introduced Mitrinović to the writings of Erich Gutkind. Mitrinović discovered a kindred soul in Gutkind, whose work bore similarities to “Aesthetic Contemplations.” For Mitrinović, Gutkind affirmed the ultimate unity of all humanity, and the bankruptcy and sterility of the contemporary world.³⁷¹ Gutkind stressed the necessity of social change through individual personal transformation and cooperative effort, rather than through class conflict and the struggle for political power. Gutkind was convinced that the “old realities” of the person, the class, the nation and the race

were ineluctably drawing to their end.³⁷² “From now on democracy should cease to mean mob rule and should mean common sharing,” Gutkind argued. He continued: “Aristocracy should no longer mean oppression, but a seraphic leading of the way.”³⁷³ Intellectuals were to play a key role in sowing the seeds of the new age.³⁷⁴ Gutkind and Frederik van Eeden put forward the idea of a “Blut-bund” (blood-brotherhood), understood as an aristocracy of persons – qualitatively superior, in mind and spirit, to the masses – who would lead humankind out of the wilderness of materialism.

Gutkind believed that the “Blut-bund” should, and could, exert a moral force that would lead the world in the direction of peace and harmony.³⁷⁵ By their moral and spiritual example, members of the “Blut-bund” would draw the rest of humanity away from selfishness and greed, and into a realm of freedom and cooperation.³⁷⁶ Members of the “Blut-bund” were to raise themselves above the curse of human weaknesses, and value other individuals as much as they valued themselves.³⁷⁷ These enlightened representatives of humankind could then transcend the conflict between the interests of the individual and the needs of others.³⁷⁸ Mitrinović was attracted to this idea, which he characterized as an “organization for a pan-human little brotherhood of the most world-worthy³⁷⁹ bearers of present day culture.”³⁸⁰ Mitrinović decided to dedicate himself to the “Blut-bund,” whose policy of pan-human love he hoped would transform the multitudes.³⁸¹

Mitrinović and Kandinsky decided to transform the planned second almanac of *Der Blaue Reiter* into a “Yearbook which prepared to unite all spiritual disciplines.”³⁸² In a letter to Marc dated 17 February 1914, Kandinsky had declared Mitrinović to be “very useful to the Blaue Reiter,” because “he goes to the heart of things like lightening.”³⁸³ But Marc soon realized that his prime editorial role had been usurped by Mitrinović, and expressed – in a letter to Kandinsky, dated 13 March 1914 – scepticism about the project, and about the possibility of three editors working creatively together.³⁸⁴ Although Mitrinović had assumed the role of *Hauptgeschäftsträger* (managing editor) and steered the development of the project, Kandinsky gave it his support.³⁸⁵ Shulamith Behr has argued that Kandinsky’s involvement should not be belittled by claims that he was disinterested in political matters, “a strategy often employed by art historians wishing to preserve the heritage and sanctity of ‘aesthetic experience.’”³⁸⁶

Mitrinović planned to include in the Yearbook contributions from political, sociological, philosophical, religious and cultural thinkers, several of whom were associated with the “Blut-bund” idea. In June 1914, he entered into consultations with Delphin Verlag, the Munich publishing house, in the hope that the Yearbook might be published in the spring of the following year.³⁸⁷ At the same time, Mitrinović prepared articles for various European journals on the idea of the “Blut-bund,” and on the significance of the ideas of potential contributors to the Yearbook.³⁸⁸ Kandinsky’s reputation and connections helped Mitrinović to access circles where he was himself “completely nameless.” His request to Kandinsky that he provide him with a letter of introduction to Gutkind was not without humour: “I do absolutely demand and shall coerce you with magic deeds from the far distance (don’t believe me; I can’t do anything like that).”³⁸⁹ In the same letter, Mitrinović explained that he was working on “the basic outlines” of “ideas concerning society and politics,” but that he would leave the ideas to “specialists” for “reshaping and deepening.” Mitrinović wrote letters to “specialists,” who included Rosa Luxemburg, H. G. Wells, Henri Bergson, George Bernard Shaw, Pablo Picasso, F. T. Marinetti, Anatole France, Maxim Gorky, as well as Gutkind, van Eeden, Masaryk, Sinclair, Kandinsky, and Meštrović.³⁹⁰ It is clear from the rough copies of Mitrinović’s letters to these prospective contributors that he tailored his descriptions of the project to fit with their respective attitudes. Although Mitrinović attempted to link with his own ideas the views of these prospective contributors, he never abandoned his own principles.³⁹¹

The Yearbook was provisionally entitled, *Towards the Mankind of the Future through Aryan Europe*. Despite the racist connotations of this title, it was meant to imply an initiative to unite with other Europeans the Russians – along with the Finns, the Hungarians, and the Jewish populations of Europe – in a cultural movement that would begin in Europe, then spread to America, Australia and India.³⁹² Although the concept of Aryanism derived from various racist teachings fashionable at the time, it was not invoked with any anti-Semitic intent. In fact, Mitrinović invited contributions from many Jewish thinkers.³⁹³ Mitrinović based his conception of Aryanism on culture, not on blood. Mitrinović proposed the “Liberation of Colonies and Democracy of Nations, Racial interpenetration, the abolition

of small languages, their transformation into great ones.”³⁹⁴ For him, Aryanism was something noble and generous pertaining to an aristocracy of the mind; it was close to the Nietzschean idea of the aristocratic.³⁹⁵ It was through this spiritual quality that “the empire of the world might be brought about and world peace be offered.”³⁹⁶

Mitrinović considered it time that “all races and classes, all states and all continents began to unite into the all-inclusiveness of mankind and the world.”³⁹⁷ He argued for “the fundamental transformation, and all-embracing drawing together, an all-involving integration” of peoples, united around the ideals of “the pan-human idea and the idea of a united Europe,” and “a world state and eternal peace.” Mitrinović considered his “main aim” to be the “vitalising and exalting criticism of the ideas concerning mankind and its life, the emphasising of the ideal of a world culture”³⁹⁸ The Eurocentrism of the movement was thus to be reflexive, rather than essentialist. Europeans would ultimately be “be forced to unite for the sake of exalting their mutual life maintenance; but such a humanity may create itself only in an alliance of *European Republics*.” But this process was to be ongoing: “the union of progressive movements and institutions in Europe and Slavdom will bring closer the union of nations just as the nations united in brotherhood would have to further develop every advance; so the understanding of peoples will be deepened when justice is done to the societies of peoples, when the nations will be truly the leaders of their own politics.”³⁹⁹

In creating this scheme, Mitrinović drew from all kinds of messianic and utopian ideas from both Eastern and Western traditions.⁴⁰⁰ But his attempt to promote an idea of Europe in which cultural and spiritual elements were united with political ones was not entirely new. A similar idea was associated with the Theosophical Society, founded in 1875 by the Russian spiritualist Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, whose aim was to promote universal brotherhood and develop the latent faculties of human beings.⁴⁰¹

On 28 June 1914, Mitrinović visited H. S. Chamberlain, who he admired for his work on Kant.⁴⁰² It was in Chamberlain’s home that Mitrinović heard the news of Princip’s assassination of Franz Ferdinand.⁴⁰³ Mitrinović realized that if he returned to Bosnia the Austro-Hungarian authorities

would either take him into custody, or conscript him into the Imperial and Royal Army. He decided to flee to Britain, and managed to leave Germany just prior to the outbreak of the First World War. He reached Belgium, where at Ostend he boarded one of the last ferries that crossed the Channel to England.⁴⁰⁴

Chapter 4

The Exiled Yugoslavist

A modern mystic from Serbia
Enlightened the minds of Suburbia
Under each camisole
Sighed a synthetic soul
With thoughts too superb and superbia

[Suburbia is not a place but a state of soul
in which the sufferer sees himself
superior to his fellows]⁴⁰⁵

Mitrinović was penniless when he boarded the ferry in Ostend. During the crossing, he learned that the immigration authorities in Dover granted entry only to solvent individuals. Mitrinović borrowed five pounds from a black man he met on the boat, then returned the money to his benefactor after he had passed through customs and passport control.⁴⁰⁶ Like Herzen, Mazzini and Bakunin before him, Mitrinović found safe refuge in Britain.

Mitrinović arrived in London in early August 1914, and presented himself at the Legation of the Kingdom of Serbia. On 15 August, the staff of the Legation telegraphed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs with a request for permission to appoint Mitrinović to a position within the Legation. On 29 August, the staff sent a second dispatch, in which they stressed the importance of Mitrinović's knowledge of the South Slav question. On 14 September, the staff made arrangements for his appointment as a clerk, but Mitrinović soon grew dissatisfied with routine office work. He wrote to Nikola Pašić, the Serbian Prime Minister, and offered his services as a publicist for the South Slav cause.⁴⁰⁷ He explained:

Be so kind as to forgive me for troubling you with this letter, since I have realised that I am not suited to office work I have had to resign the charge with which you and Monsieur the Minister have favoured me. I take the liberty of informing you personally why I have ceased working at the Legation so that my action may be rightly understood. In the meantime I hold that my national duty and my great obligation to the government of Serbia, which for years has assisted my education, will be best served if I devote myself to the propaganda of Yugoslav cultural and political thought among the peoples who may best be of assistance to Serbia and to Yugoslavia.⁴⁰⁸

At the end of November, Pašić sent a cipher telegram to the Legation, informing the staff that they should "Let Mitrinović work as he proposes."⁴⁰⁹ No longer deskbound, and freed of official duties,

Mitrinović concentrated on enlightening British “political thinking” on the South Slav question.⁴¹⁰ On 19 November 1914, Mitrinović wrote to Slavko Grujić, the Serbian Foreign Minister, and declared that

it is categorically necessary to enlighten public political thinking in Europe and America about Serbia and the brotherhood with the Croats and the Slovenes, it is necessary to gain the respect of Europe, and of humanity in general, for the cultural works which Yugoslavia has already achieved: for the national art, literary, musical and textile ... It is necessary to advise the wide world of the high moral value of the Serbian peasant, not only when he is putting up a superhuman fight for his life; and of the human content and greatness of Yugoslav history. At this moment it is not opportune ... to begin such propaganda in England⁴¹¹

Here, Mitrinović deems conditions in England to be “not opportune” for the dissemination of propaganda that would further the South Slav cause. The British people respected Serbia as a plucky ally in the war against the Central Powers, but that did not translate to broad based enthusiasm for the South Slav struggle. Maria Toderova has called the assassination of Franz Ferdinand the “original sin” of the Balkans, and has claimed that it left an indelible mark on all assessments of the region.⁴¹² Twenty years later, Rebecca West – after admitting that she “quite simply and flatly knew nothing at all about the south-eastern corner of Europe” or its peoples, nor had she “come across anybody who was acquainted with them” – viewed the Balkans as a place which was “a source of danger to me, which indeed for four years threatened my safety and during that time [the First World War] deprived me forever of many benefits.”⁴¹³ However greatly the British people valued “superhuman” Serbian contributions to the war effort, they perceived – at the time, and for decades afterwards – that Serbs *caused* the war.

Mitrinović recognized the need not only to “enlighten public political thinking” but to “gain” for the South Slavs the “respect of Europe.” The British cared little and knew less about the South Slavs. In 1898, Miller had noted that it was “no exaggeration to say that many regions of Africa” were “more familiar to the cultured Englishman or German than the lands which lie beyond the Adriatic.”⁴¹⁴ In the 1880s, an English traveler had remarked – in a fashionable London drawing room – that he had just been in Sarajevo. “Oh, do tell us,” begged one of his fellows, “the latest news of Stanley then. You must have seen him quite lately!”⁴¹⁵ The comparison of Africa and the Balkans was perhaps not so uncommon at that time, when imperialists had partitioned the world into nations destined to rule, and

regions fated to be ruled: there was no doubt that the Balkans, like Africa, fell into the latter category.⁴¹⁶ Under Disraeli, Britain had shored up Ottoman rule in the Balkans in order to check Russian ambitions in the region.⁴¹⁷ The British strategy had been to maintain a stable arrangement in the Balkans, in order to protect lines of communication to the empire in the East, as well as to ensure the harmony of the Great Powers in Europe.⁴¹⁸ Not only was support for the aspirations of the Balkan peoples absent from British policy, but the success of the policy depended on the continued subjugation of these peoples.⁴¹⁹ It suited the British that the Balkan peoples should be subject to colonial rule, so the Balkan peoples came to be understood as *suited* to subjugation, and *incapable* of self-rule.

The peoples of the Balkans were treated – in Victorian and Edwardian textual representations – as if they required governance from an external source.⁴²⁰ These representations – regardless of whether they were explicitly pursued by an author, or left implicit for his or her readership to discern⁴²¹ – legitimized Ottoman rule over the Balkan peoples, and thus vindicated British policy.⁴²² These representations were found primarily in popular journalistic and quasi-journalistic literary forms (especially travelogues). The similarities of these representations reinforced the view of the Balkans as a region characterized by violence, discord and backwardness,⁴²³ and the general uniformity of the representations lent credibility to these characterizations.⁴²⁴ In the early twentieth century these representations calcified into a discourse which Todorova has called “balkanist.”⁴²⁵ Balkanist discourse was fashioned from discursive material fitted for use on the colonial object; but the representation of the Balkan peoples sometimes differed in degree – though never in kind – from the representations of the indigenous peoples of Britain’s colonies.⁴²⁶

Perhaps no one event hardened balkanist discourse as much as the 1903 regicide (and defenestration) of King Aleksandar Obrenović and Queen Draga of Serbia. This event shaped public awareness and shocked royalists throughout the rest of Europe.⁴²⁷ In 1920, Edith Durham wrote of the regicide, “not even in Dahomey could it have been accomplished with more repulsive savagery.”⁴²⁸ According to Durham, this savagery was typically Balkan: “West Europe was, in 1903, quite ignorant of the state of primitive savagery from which the South Slavs were but beginning to rise.”⁴²⁹ She

continued: "In the breast of every human being there is a wolf. It may sleep for several generations. But it wakes at last and howls for blood. In the breast of the South Slav, both Serb and Montenegrin, it has not yet even thought of slumbering."⁴³⁰ Durham implies that the wolf slumbers in west Europeans, yet just a few years before the regicide, at least 20,000 Afrikaner women and children and 12,000 Coloured people died as a direct result of their internment in British concentration camps during the final phase of the Boer War.⁴³¹ In the years following the regicide, the Germans of Deutsch-Südwestafrika perpetrated the genocide of the Herero and Nama peoples. But for Durham, it was "the Balkan Slav" that would commit "further brutality" unless restrained by "civilization."⁴³²

One of the ironies of balkanism is that the calcification of balkanist discourse occurred at the very moment when the British altered their pro-Turkish policies as a result of Germany's penetration into the Ottoman Empire, and Austria-Hungary's annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The British fear of German infiltration to the East over-rode the belief that the independence of the Balkan Slavs necessarily involved the spread of Russian influence in that part of Europe.⁴³³ The schizophrenia in British "official" attitudes that resulted from the policy shift can be gauged from *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, a handbook that was "Prepared under the Direction of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office," and published by H. M. Stationary Office in 1920, though it had obviously been written in the preceding years. Early in the volume, it is claimed that "the general oriental outlook of the inhabitants was responsible for laziness and scorn of bodily labour,"⁴³⁴ but later it is admitted that while "the Christian Slavonic" peasant is "backward in culture and primitive its industrial methods," this can be put down "to his discouragement at seeing his land in the hands of the Moslem and his political destiny at the disposition of Austria."⁴³⁵ Rebecca West wrote that after the First World War, which proved the Dual Monarchy and Russia to be "soft as rotten apples, and the Serbs as strong in the saving of European civilization, many Englishmen lamented that the Balkan peoples were not under the tutelage of the charming, cultured Austrians."⁴³⁶ Around the same time, staff at the Foreign Office coined a noun – "Balkanics" – to denote the particular character of disputes in the Balkans.⁴³⁷

From Mitrinović's realization that conditions in England were "not opportune" for the

dissemination of propaganda, it is certain that he had an understanding of the pervasiveness of balkanist discourse. From his literary criticism, it is likewise certain that he had an understanding of how power is structured. In 1932, Konrad Berkovici wrote “like the poor, the Balkans shall always be with us.”⁴³⁸ Mitrinović, in his review of Arno Holz’s *The Book of Times*, wrote that Holz was a “rebel against the social order and false morality, who ... hears the cries of the hungry who have no right to exist because they are not *reputable*.”⁴³⁹ He goes on to say that in *The Book of Times*, “thousands of oppressed and unknown found a voice, those whose sole offence was being born.” Despite conditions that were “not opportune,” Mitrinović – with his propaganda – gave voice to the millions of poor, hungry, ill-reputable, oppressed and unknown South Slavs.

Mitrinović’s first piece of propaganda was an article entitled, “Who Should Possess Trieste?” which appeared in the *Outlook* on 26 September 1914. Ever true to his Yugoslavism, he does not propose a unitary state:

The Southern Slavs dwell in Serbia and Montenegro, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in Croatia, in the Serbian parts of Hungary, in Dalmatia, Istria and Krain; and the Slavonic inhabitants of all these territories desire to unite, to form a single State, and to establish a civilisation of their own. The inhabitants of the territories mentioned have various names. They are called Croatians, Slovenes, Serbians, etc. However, all these are at bottom one tribe and one nation. They dream of a Yougoslavia [*sizi*], which means a Southern Slav State, of a Greater Serbia, which, in conjunction with Bulgaria, would form a federation. Such a federal State should reach from Trieste to Constantinople, and Serbia should be its centre and its key-stone, for Serbia seems to be destined to be not only the liberator, but also the leader, of the Southern Slavs. However, Serbia should not rule the Southern Slavs arbitrarily. She should not be another Austria-Hungary. Greater Serbia should be established on the firm rock of self-government for the various Slavonic races included in it.⁴⁴⁰

Rather, he proposes a Balkan federation, an idea that placed him at odds with the Serbian nationalists, especially the more chauvinist ones.

In 1915, the Croatian poet S. P. Tucić edited a book in the *Daily Telegraph* “War Library” series entitled *The Slav Nations*.⁴⁴¹ For this Mitrinović prepared an article, “Buried Treasure,” in which he reviewed the historic mission of Serbia as “a bulwark for Europe and Christianity against the invasions of Turkish barbarians and Islam.”⁴⁴² This sentence contains an example of “nesting orientalism,” the process by which the peoples of the Balkans construct their own hierarchies of less and more

“orientalized” members within their own peninsula, and thus stratify their stigmatization.⁴⁴³ Paul Selver reviewed *The Slav Nations* in the *New Age* of 28 January 1915.⁴⁴⁴ His review was uncomplimentary in general, but critical of “Buried Treasure” in particular. Selver failed “to see why only the Southern Slavs should get a hearing.” He was “dissatisfied and disappointed” with the volume, and castigated Mitrinović’s epilogue on the grounds that it was “extremely inexact.” In particular, Selver objected to Mitrinović’s treatment of the Slovenes: “he refers in a casual way to the Slovenes, who, the reader would imagine, are all a part of the great Servian race. Yet the fact is that they have traditions, aims, and a language of their own.” Selver’s opinion of the volume was so uncomplimentary that he considered it necessary in his review to “classify” its “defects” in three divisions. Selver remarked that “the proportion of space allotted to the different Slav races” was “most strange”: “considerably more than half the book” was “devoted to the Southern Slavs.”⁴⁴⁵ There was “no excuse for filling page upon page with details of recent Servian history.” Selver characterized the volume as “partisan” to “an extreme degree,” and produced “in a grossly careless manner.” In spite of the harshness of this review, Mitrinović arranged a meeting with Selver. “Hardly had I shaken hands with Mitrinović,” Selver recounted, “than I found myself so affected by his mere presence that I nearly lost consciousness.” Mitrinović agreed that “he had been guilty of serious blunders,” and that he “fully accepted” Selver’s criticisms. Mitrinović explained that the volume “had been brought out very hurriedly,” and that haste accounted “for some, though not all of its blemishes.”⁴⁴⁶ Selver described – in orientalist language – his first impression of Mitrinović: he possessed “many of the attributes with which novelists ... equip mystery men from the Near East who form the centre of a highly tangled plot. Yes, Mitrinović outwardly fulfilled all the requirements in this respect, with his shaven head, his swarthinness, his dark garments and his hypnotic eyes.”⁴⁴⁷ Twenty years later, Charles Purdom also described Mitrinović in orientalist language: “No doubt there is not a little Turkish blood in him.”⁴⁴⁸

Towards the end of 1915, Mitrinović travelled to Paris, where he remained until late February 1916. His official business was to help with the arrangements for the staging of the exhibition of Meštrović’s works.⁴⁴⁹ In Paris, Mitrinović re-established contact with some of his colleagues from

Young Bosnia, including Gaćinović and the Croat symbolist poet Tin Ujević who used to gather at the Café Rotonde, which was also frequented by Cocteau, Modigliani, and Picasso.⁴⁵⁰ Mitrinović had a bitter argument with Ujević, one consequence of which was a growing disillusionment on his part with Yugoslav émigré circles in Europe. It appeared to Mitrinović that his ideal of a federation of the South Slav peoples was being distorted and corrupted by professional politicians and career diplomats. He wrote to his friend Meštrović that the dream of a new Yugoslavia was being sabotaged by “the shamelessness and folly of politicians who are demolishing it before it is built.”⁴⁵¹

By 1919, Mitrinović “no longer had his heart in the work.”⁴⁵² Philip Mairet recalled that Mitrinović questioned whether he should serve as a propagandist now that “his inspiration for that cause had dried up at the source? He was repelled by the thought.” Mairet explained that Mitrinović did not want to postpone “committing himself to the greater cause he had discussed with Gutkind and Van Eeden – the cause he had preached to passionately to others. And if he once postponed this, out of fear of the consequences, might it not be for ever?”⁴⁵³ Mitrinović, mentally crippled by “a fearful dilemma,” took to bed “with something like a mysterious illness.” Ultimately, he decided that he “could not and would not ... work any more for those political people. There was nothing in it for him, except that they paid him.” In 1919, he decided to devote his life to a greater vision of a recreated world order. He told Mairet that he was “jumping off into nowhere.”⁴⁵⁴ He resigned from the service of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in the summer of 1920.⁴⁵⁵

Conclusion

Three-parts Forgotten

Mark Garnett has described Mitrinović as “three-parts forgotten.”⁴⁵⁶ Yet there is much for which Mitrinović deserves to be remembered beyond that which has been discussed in this work. Although contemporary scholars may find his “Europe-centered discourse” to be “unsettling,”⁴⁵⁷ there can be no doubt that it was reflexive, rather than valorizing. Mitrinović was one of the few individuals willing – in the early 1920s – to draw attention to the sufferings of the peoples subject to colonial rule from the European states. He pointed out that Europeans have perpetrated “unimaginable ... crimes” on “the Black and Yellow races.” For example, “incredibly little of all that Europe has hitherto done to China lies outside the definition of crime.” More specifically, it is “unimaginable to the complacent European mind what crimes have been perpetrated by Europe on the Black race. All-in-all, since the re-discovery of Africa alone, a hundred million Blacks have been enslaved or put to death in the supposed interest of Europe, not to mention the example of America. It would appear, indeed, as if the governing purpose of Europe were to divide up the Black race and administer it solely to Europe’s good.”⁴⁵⁸ He was adamant that “good Europeans must be ashamed of the chicanery which Europe practices in her relations with the other races.”⁴⁵⁹ Of course, Mitrinović’s sensitivity in this regard can be accounted for by the fact that he and the other inhabitants of Bosnia had a first-hand understanding of life as colonial subjects. Mitrinović’s contributions to the debate about what constituted a “good European” were therefore all the more valuable then, as they are today.

- ¹ Andrew Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative: An Exploration of the Life and Ideas of Dimitrije Mitrinović* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1984).
- ² Andrew Rigby is currently Director of the Centre for the Study of Forgiveness and Reconciliation at Coventry University.
- ³ George Feaver, review of *Initiation and Initiative: An Exploration of the Life and Ideas of Dimitrije Mitrinović*, by Andrew Rigby, *American Historical Review* 91, no. 1 (1986): 117.
- ⁴ Thomas A. Emmert, review of *Initiation and Initiative: An Exploration of the Life and Ideas of Dimitrije Mitrinović*, by Andrew Rigby, *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 19, no. 2 (1985): 235. Emmert concluded (p. 236) that Mitrinović “is a fascinating twentieth century thinker, and this work will no doubt encourage others to continue the exploration into his life and ideas.” But in 1990 Emmert lamented that it was now “unlikely that we will ever experience a renaissance of interest” in Mitrinović: see Thomas A. Emmert, review of *Certainly, Future: Selected Writings by Dimitrije Mitrinović*, ed. by H. C. Rutherford, *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 24, no. 1 (1990): 67. Currently, Christophe Le Dreau (of Sciences Po Paris) is conducting research on Mitrinović, but only as part of a larger project encompassing all the “British Federalist [*sic*] and Pan-European Associations” from 1929 to 1951. See Christophe Le Dreau, e-mail to H-Net Discussion Network, December 23, 2003, <http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=halbion&month=0312&week=d&msg=V926TyW4TDgUgqCrt4%2bvPg&user=&pw=>.
- ⁵ Dejan Đuričković, “The Poets of Young Bosnia,” *Survey Sarajevo* 2 (1975): 78. In subsequent references – for reasons of brevity – “Bosnia” will denote the geographical unit of Bosnia and Herzegovina. To avoid ambiguity, the long form (“Bosnia and Herzegovina”) will be used in geopolitical and legal contexts, to designate the Ottoman provinces that were ruled as Hapsburg territories after 1878, and then annexed outright by Austria-Hungary in 1908.
- ⁶ Nenad Petrović, “Dimitrije Mitrinović,” TS, trans. D. Shillan, 1976, 1, New Atlantis Foundation Dimitrije Mitrinović Archive, Special Collections, University of Bradford Library (hereafter cited as Mitrinović MSS). This TS is a translation of a 1967 pamphlet written in Serbian, which has since been republished in *Огледи о смислу и заблудама* (Belgrade: Književne Novine, 2002).
- ⁷ Predrag Palavestra, “Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher,” in *The Dogma and Utopia of Dimitrije Mitrinović*, TS, trans. D. Shillan and E. D. Goy, ca. 1980, 10, Mitrinović MSS.
- ⁸ Mitrinović to Kropotkin, London, 16 August 1914, TS, trans. R. Meuss, Mitrinović MSS.
- ⁹ Recently, Luisa Passerini has situated the NEG within the wider movement for European unification in interwar Britain. See Luisa Passerini, *Europe in Love, Love in Europe: Imagination and Politics in Britain between the Wars* (London: Taurus, 1999), 126–45.
- ¹⁰ Walter Lippgens, *A History of European Integration*, vol. 1, *The Formation of the European Unity Movement*, trans. P. S. Falla and A. J. Ryder (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 162.
- ¹¹ D. R. Davies, *In Search of Myself: The Autobiography of D. R. Davies* (London: Bles, 1961), 119.
- ¹² Davies, *In Search of Myself*, 131.
- ¹³ “Commemoration Meeting to Dimitrije Mitrinovic held at Norfolk Lodge, Richmond, August 28th, 1954,” 1954, 2, Watson Thomson Fonds, Special Collections, University of British Columbia Library, Vancouver.
- ¹⁴ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 5–6.
- ¹⁵ Philip Mairet, “3rd September, 1953,” TS of his letter of condolence, 1953, Mitrinović MSS.
- ¹⁶ Predrag Palavestra is currently Secretary of the Department of Language and Literature at the Serbian Academy of Science and Arts.
- ¹⁷ Predrag Palavestra, *Dogma i Utopija Dimitrija Mitinovića: Počeci srpske književne avangarde* (Belgrade: Slovo Ljubve, 1977).
- ¹⁸ *The Dogma and Utopia of Dimitrije Mitrinović*, TS, trans. D. Shillan and E. D. Goy, ca. 1980, Mitrinović MSS.
- ¹⁹ See Appendix III (“Assumptions on Mitrinović’s thoughts and feelings for which Dr. Palavestra has no evidence”) in “Critique of the last chapter of Dr. Predrag Palavestra’s book *Dogma i Utopija Dimitrija Mitinovića* by the Trustees of the New Atlantis Foundation,” TS, 1980, 39–41, Mitrinović MSS.
- ²⁰ Furthermore, the historical accuracy of *Dogma i Utopija Dimitrija Mitinovića* is undermined by the author’s inclusion of at least 22 factual errors. See “Critique of the last chapter,” 71–72, Mitrinović MSS.
- ²¹ “Review by Predrag Protić in ‘Književne Novine’ (Literary News) Belgrade 1.12.77. of Predrag Palavestra: ‘The Dogma and Utopia of Dimitrije Mitrinović,’ Slovo ljubve, Belgrade 1977,” TS, trans. D. Shillan, 1978, 1, Mitrinović MSS.
- ²² Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 4.
- ²³ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 6.
- ²⁴ Feaver, review of *Initiation and Initiative*, 118.
- ²⁵ Borivoje Jevtic, “Dimitrije Mitrinovic: An Aquatic Flower, On the occasion of Dimitrije Mitrinovic’s death,” TS, trans. n.d., date n.d., 19. Originally published in 1953 in *Zivot*, vol. 2, no.13 (pp. 260–63), no.14 (pp. 357–60), and no. 15 (pp. 433–40). Mitrinović MSS.
- ²⁶ Palavestra, “Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher,” 28, Mitrinović MSS.
- ²⁷ Paul Klee, *The Diaries of Paul Klee 1898–1914*, ed. Felix Klee (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1964), 280.
- ²⁸ Edwin Muir, *An Autobiography* (London: Hogarth, 1954), 174.

- ²⁹ Willa Muir, *Belonging: A Memoir* (London: Hogarth, 1968), 41.
- ³⁰ Emmert, review of *Initiation and Initiative*, 235.
- ³¹ Only the nationalist ideology of the Macedonian revolutionary Goce Delčev (1872–1903) was as liberal as the ideas professed by Mitrinović. See Fred Singleton, *A Short History of the Yugoslav Peoples* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 99.
- ³² Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 81.
- ³³ Dimitrije Djordjevic, “The Berlin Congress of 1878 and the Origins of World War I,” *Serbian Studies* 12, no. 1 (1998): 4.
- ³⁴ There were also small numbers of Jews and gypsies in Bosnia. After 1878, small numbers of Protestants migrated to Bosnia; they were the only element of the population on whose support the administration could always rely.
- ³⁵ Djordjevic, “The Berlin Congress,” 2.
- ³⁶ To avoid ambiguity, terminology is used with consistency throughout this work. “Serbians” denotes the Serbs who lived in Serbia. “Serbs” denotes people of Serbian Orthodox faith, who were found in some areas of the Hungarian half (Vojvodina, in particular) of the Dual Monarchy, and some parts of the Austrian half, too; in Bosnia and Herzegovina; in Montenegro; and, of course, in Serbia. Toponymic qualifiers (e.g. Croatian Serbs) designate Serbs from any particular land outside of Serbia, except for in the case of “the Serbian Orthodox inhabitants” of Bosnia and/or Herzegovina. Similarly, the “Muslim inhabitants” and the “Roman Catholic inhabitants” of Bosnia and/or Herzegovina denote those from Bosnia or Herzegovina, so in the latter case excludes approximately 100,000 Roman Catholics who by 1910 had either willingly migrated from the Austrian and Hungarian halves of the Dual Monarchy, or had been stationed in the territories in the service of the Hapsburgs. The terms “Bosnian Serb,” “Bosnian Croat,” and “Bosniak” are not used because these ethnicities calcified only in the twentieth century.
- ³⁷ Robin Okey, “A Trio of Hungarian Balkanists: Béni Kállay, István Burián and Lajos Thallóczy in the Age of High Nationalism,” *Slavonic and East European Review* 80 (2002): 236.
- ³⁸ The *Times* of 24 June 1878.
- ³⁹ Misha Glenny, *The Balkans 1804–1999: Nationalism, War and the Great Powers* (London: Granta Books, 1999), 144.
- ⁴⁰ W. N. Medlicott, *The Congress of Berlin and After: A Diplomatic History of the Near Eastern Settlement 1878–1880*, 2nd ed. (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1963), 38. At one stage in the proceedings, Benjamin Disraeli claimed that “Montenegro need have no port, only a little garden to grow cabbages and potatoes.” See Vladimir Dedijer, *The Road to Sarajevo* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1966), 45.
- ⁴¹ R. W. Seton-Watson, “The Role of Bosnia in International Politics (1875–1914),” in *Proceedings of the British Academy 1931*, 335–68 (London: Milford, 1931), 356.
- ⁴² The *Times* of 16 August 1878.
- ⁴³ One of the reasons why the Hapsburgs agreed to this provision was that it ensured that the Ottomans remained responsible for the pre-1878 debts of Bosnia and Herzegovina.
- ⁴⁴ Omer Hadžiselimović, ed., *At the Gates of the East: British Travel Writers on Bosnia and Herzegovina from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 2001), 220.
- ⁴⁵ Mark Mazower, *The Balkans* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2000), 91–92.
- ⁴⁶ The *Times* of 18 July 1878.
- ⁴⁷ *Berliner Tageblatt* of 15 July 1878.
- ⁴⁸ According to the *Times* of 23 July 1878, occupation was the only way for the Hapsburgs “to twine a rope of sand.”
- ⁴⁹ Historically, more often than not it was outsiders who united large swathes of the mountainous Balkan peninsula, which lacked a natural centre around which a great state might evolve.
- ⁵⁰ The Serbians would have gained direct access to an Adriatic seaport had Serbia and Montenegro become contiguous.
- ⁵¹ The South Slav possessions of the Austrian half of the Dual Monarchy were Dalmatia, Istria, and the Slovene lands. Croatia, Slavonia, and Vojvodina were possessions of the Hungarian half.
- ⁵² Noel Malcolm, *Bosnia: A Short History* (London: Macmillan, 1994), 136.
- ⁵³ John R. Schindler, “Defeating Balkan Insurgency: The Austro-Hungarian Army in Bosnia-Hercegovina, 1878–82,” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 27, no. 3 (2004): 530.
- ⁵⁴ Very few Roman Catholic inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina fought against the Imperial and Royal Army in 1878. The alliance between the Muslim and Serbian Orthodox inhabitants reflected a temporary coincidence of interests, rather than a basis for a future partnership.
- ⁵⁵ Schindler, “Defeating Balkan Insurgency,” 537.
- ⁵⁶ Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 65.
- ⁵⁷ Arthur J. May, *The Hapsburg Monarchy 1867–1914* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960), 134.
- ⁵⁸ Robert J. Doina, “The Hapsburg Imperial Army in the Occupation of Bosnia and Hercegovina,” in *Insurrections, Wars, and the Eastern Crisis in the 1870s*, ed. Bela K. Kiraly and Gale Stokes, 375–91 (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1985), 375.
- ⁵⁹ May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 134.
- ⁶⁰ Glenny, *The Balkans*, 268.

- ⁶¹ Robert J. Doina, "The New Bosniak History," *Nationalities Papers* 28, no. 2 (2000): 355.
- ⁶² Malcolm, *Bosnia*, 140. This wave of emigration of Muslims from Bosnia was of a lesser magnitude than the exodus of Turkish-speaking Muslims from the newly independent Bulgaria. See Malcolm, *Bosnia*, 282.
- ⁶³ Glenny, *The Balkans*, 275.
- ⁶⁴ Robert J. Doina, *Islam under the Double Eagle: The Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1878–1914* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1981), 34.
- ⁶⁵ Jelena Milojković-Đjurić, "Benjamin von Kállay's Role in Bosnia-Herzegovina 1882–1903: Habsburg's Policies in an Occupied Territory," *Serbian Studies* 14, no. 2 (2000): 213.
- ⁶⁶ Doina, *Islam under the Double Eagle*, 34.
- ⁶⁷ May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 408.
- ⁶⁸ Doina, *Islam under the Double Eagle*, 33.
- ⁶⁹ According to Robert J. Doina, the gendarmerie never became a self-policing force of local citizens, but remained "an alien tool of imperial policy." See Doina, "The Hapsburg Imperial Army," 386.
- ⁷⁰ Doina, "The Hapsburg Imperial Army," 387.
- ⁷¹ Doina, *Islam under the Double Eagle*, 30.
- ⁷² Glenny, *The Balkans*, 255.
- ⁷³ A. J. P. Taylor, *The Hapsburg Monarchy 1809–1918: A History of the Austrian Empire and Austria-Hungary* (London: Penguin Books, 1976), 166.
- ⁷⁴ Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 68.
- ⁷⁵ Doina, *Islam under the Double Eagle*, 11.
- ⁷⁶ Peter F. Sugar, *Industrialization of Bosnia 1878–1918* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1963), 28.
- ⁷⁷ Doina, *Islam under the Double Eagle*, 11.
- ⁷⁸ This is an example of a solution that represented an Austro-Hungarian compromise, rather than one designed to improve the governance of Bosnia. The character of Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia was influenced by the tensions that existed between the two halves of the Dual Monarchy. Disagreements about the policies of the administration in Bosnia aggravated those tensions still further. For example, officials from the Austrian half of the Dual Monarchy resented the fact that they had to wear the uniforms worn by officials in the Hungarian half.
- ⁷⁹ Sugar, *Industrialization of Bosnia*, 31.
- ⁸⁰ Stijn Vervaet, "Some Historians from Former Yugoslavia on the Austro-Hungarian Period in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1878–1918): A Reality of Imperialism versus the Golden Years of the Double Eagle?" *Kakanien Revisited* (2004): 4, <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/fallstudie/SVervaet1.pdf>.
- ⁸¹ William Miller, *Travels and Politics in the Near East* (London: Unwin, 1898), 118.
- ⁸² André Gerolymatos, *The Balkan Wars: Myth, Reality, and the Eternal Conflict* (Toronto: Stoddart, 2001), 31.
- ⁸³ Snežana Trifunovska, ed., *Yugoslavia through Documents: From Its Creation to Its Dissolution* (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1994), 104.
- ⁸⁴ Michael Palairet, "The Hapsburg Industrial Achievement in Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1878–1914: An Economic Spurt that Succeeded?" *Austrian History Yearbook* 24 (1993): 143.
- ⁸⁵ Glenny, *The Balkans*, 273.
- ⁸⁶ Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 78. A total of 121 bridges were constructed in the territories during the same period.
- ⁸⁷ Glenny, *The Balkans*, 252.
- ⁸⁸ The forests of Bosnia and Herzegovina covered a greater extent than those of any country in Europe except Finland. Bosnian timber was re-exported from Trieste as far afield as Argentina, South Africa, and China.
- ⁸⁹ Palairet, "The Hapsburg Industrial Achievement," 140.
- ⁹⁰ Sugar, *Industrialization of Bosnia*, 46.
- ⁹¹ Rebecca West, *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon: A Journey through Yugoslavia* (1941; repr., New York: Penguin Books, 1994), 443.
- ⁹² Sugar, *Industrialization of Bosnia*, 173.
- ⁹³ May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 406.
- ⁹⁴ Maude M. Holbach, *Bosnia and Herzegovina: Some Wayside Wanderings* (London: Lane, 1910), 172.
- ⁹⁵ Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 202.
- ⁹⁶ Frances Kinsley Hutchinson, *Motoring in the Balkans: Along the Highways of Dalmatia, Montenegro, the Herzegovina and Bosnia* (Chicago: McClurg, 1909), 289.
- ⁹⁷ Ivan Lovrenović, *Bosnia: A Cultural History*, trans. Sonja Wild Bičanić (London: Saqi Books, 2001), 149.
- ⁹⁸ During the course of 1910, more than 13,500 peasants and *kmets* (serfs) were accused of not paying their tributes and taxes, and were evicted from the land they tilled. See Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 203.
- ⁹⁹ May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 407.
- ¹⁰⁰ Taylor, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 167.
- ¹⁰¹ Glenny, *The Balkans*, 274.
- ¹⁰² The aristocracy of Hungary opposed – on the principle of respect for private property – any policy of forcible land expropriation and redistribution in Bosnia. These landowners refused to consider the long-term implications for Bosnia,

and took into account only the short-term impact of reform on the Hungarian, Croatian, Romanian, Serbian, and Slovakian peasants over whom they ruled.

¹⁰³ Gerolymatos, *Balkan Wars*, 38.

¹⁰⁴ Sugar, *Industrialization of Bosnia*, 38.

¹⁰⁵ Hadžiselimović, *Gates of the East*, 445.

¹⁰⁶ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 8.

¹⁰⁷ Professor Grünberg, of the University of Vienna, calculated that under the new system the last *kmet* would not own his land before 2025. See H. M. Stationary Office, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Handbooks Prepared under the Direction of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office 12 (London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1920), 56.

¹⁰⁸ The Hapsburgs had codified and regulated peasant obligations, and had annulled some prerogatives that the Ottomans had granted the Muslim landowners. As a result, the landowners were – in general – less rapacious under Hapsburg rule than they had been under Ottoman rule. See Doina, *Islam under the Double Eagle*, 27.

¹⁰⁹ Malcolm, *Bosnia*, 141.

¹¹⁰ May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 273.

¹¹¹ Most of the Serbian Orthodox inhabitants hated the Hapsburg officials, and detested the rulers of the Dual Monarchy, too. In 1906, Hapsburg officials in Trebinje had resorted to the offer of a payment of 30 crowns to every individual who agreed to cheer the Archduke Franz Ferdinand during his visit. After his assassination eight years later, 37 Serbian Orthodox inhabitants of the town were hanged in reprisal.

¹¹² Hadžiselimović, *Gates of the East*, 221.

¹¹³ Sugar, *Industrialization of Bosnia*, 29–31.

¹¹⁴ In 1907, Mostar's *Narod* declared that unless all Hapsburg officials and soldiers were evacuated there would be a violent revolution. In that event, the Dual Monarchy would be wrecked as easily as a bomb destroys a house. See May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 410.

¹¹⁵ Sugar, *Industrialization of Bosnia*, 29.

¹¹⁶ Kállay came to be referred to as “the uncrowned king” of Bosnia and Herzegovina. He ruled the territories as his personal fiefdom, and resented outside interference. According to Misha Glenny, he used “his own brand of evasive double-speak” when dealing with parliamentarians from the Dual Monarchy. See Glenny, *The Balkans*, 273.

¹¹⁷ Okey, “A Trio of Hungarian Balkanists,” 237.

¹¹⁸ Seton-Watson, “The Role of Bosnia,” 344.

¹¹⁹ Seton-Watson, “The Role of Bosnia,” 345.

¹²⁰ Djordjevic, “The Berlin Congress,” 9.

¹²¹ Palairt, “The Hapsburg Industrial Achievement,” 148.

¹²² Palairt, “The Hapsburg Industrial Achievement,” 136.

¹²³ The *Times* of 26 February 1908.

¹²⁴ The *Times* of 7 November 1885.

¹²⁵ Glenny, *The Balkans*, 254.

¹²⁶ Jelena Milojković-Đjurić, “Articulating Cultural Policies in an Occupied Territory: Bosnia-Herzegovina in the Aftermath of the Berlin Congress,” *Serbian Studies* 13, no. 2 (1999): 37.

¹²⁷ Ilijas Hadžibegović, “The Role of the Social Democratic Party of Bosnia-Herzegovina in Political Life before the First World War,” *Survey Sarajevo* 2 (1975): 64.

¹²⁸ These cultural policies included measures taken with the intention of romanticizing the cultural traditions of Bosnia, such as the introduction of a coat-of-arms and a flag, and the preservation of medieval tombstones. See Milojković-Đjurić, “Articulating Cultural Policies,” 52.

¹²⁹ Malcolm, *Bosnia*, 148.

¹³⁰ Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 81.

¹³¹ Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 485.

¹³² Dušan T. Bataković, *The Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina* (Paris: Dialogue, 1996), 65.

¹³³ Okey, “A Trio of Hungarian Balkanists,” 246.

¹³⁴ Glenny, *The Balkans*, 275.

¹³⁵ Senor Ussigli, the Italian consul in Sarajevo, reported that Serb nationalists expressed fear that Bosnia might lose its “essenzialmente serbo” character and become instead “croatizzato.” See Glenny, *The Balkans*, 256.

¹³⁶ Malcolm, *Bosnia*, 149.

¹³⁷ Hadžiselimović, *Gates of the East*, 375.

¹³⁸ Hadžiselimović, *Gates of the East*, 376.

¹³⁹ Malcolm, *Bosnia*, 148.

¹⁴⁰ Serbs nationalists warned the Muslims that if they made common cause with the Croat nationalists, they would be forcibly converted to Roman Catholicism, and assimilated into Croatdom. The Croat nationalists countered this claim with the argument that the Muslims could only hold on to their faith and traditions in the tolerant embrace of Croatdom. See Glenny, *The Balkans*, 269.

- ¹⁴¹ Doina, "The New Bosniak History," 355.
- ¹⁴² Glenny, *The Balkans*, 271.
- ¹⁴³ Malcolm, *Bosnia*, 152.
- ¹⁴⁴ After 1903, his successors sought to "divide and rule," which remained the Hapsburg strategy in Bosnia until 1914.
- ¹⁴⁵ Glenny, *The Balkans*, 272.
- ¹⁴⁶ In 1884, the authorities co-opted an initiative by some residents of Sarajevo – who had collected cultural artefacts to prevent them being scattered (presumably to the museums of Vienna and Budapest) – and the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina was eventually inaugurated as a state institution in 1888. See Borivoj Čović, ed., *Through the Collections of the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, trans. Ferdinand Dobrowolsky (Sarajevo: Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine, 1971), 1.
- ¹⁴⁷ Malcolm, *Bosnia*, 148.
- ¹⁴⁸ Branka Magaš, "On Bosnianness," *Nations and Nationalism* 9, no. 1 (2003): 20.
- ¹⁴⁹ In Herzegovina, during the 1890s, a war of words broke out between the propagandists of Greater Croatia and Greater Serbia. The Croat newspaper *Glas Hercegovca* (Voice of the Hercegovinian) claimed Bosnia and Herzegovina as integral parts of Croatia. The Serbs countered with the claim that they were exclusively Serb lands. See Glenny, *The Balkans*, 269.
- ¹⁵⁰ Magaš, "On Bosnianness," 20–21.
- ¹⁵¹ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 7.
- ¹⁵² Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 5, Mitrinović MSS.
- ¹⁵³ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 9.
- ¹⁵⁴ Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 2–3, Mitrinović MSS.
- ¹⁵⁵ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 9.
- ¹⁵⁶ Mihailo Djordjevic, "Mostar: A Serbian Cultural Center in the 1880s and 1890s," *Serbian Studies* 7, no. 2 (1993): 79–80.
- ¹⁵⁷ Blair Jaekel, *The Lands of the Tamed Turk; Or, The Balkan States of To-day* (Boston: Page, 1910), 171.
- ¹⁵⁸ Hadžiselimović, *Gates of the East*, 272.
- ¹⁵⁹ Hadžiselimović, *Gates of the East*, 447.
- ¹⁶⁰ Hadžiselimović, *Gates of the East*, 273.
- ¹⁶¹ Hadžiselimović, *Gates of the East*, 447.
- ¹⁶² Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 177.
- ¹⁶³ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 9.
- ¹⁶⁴ Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 7, Mitrinović MSS.
- ¹⁶⁵ All schoolboys – whether Serbian Orthodox, Roman Catholic, or Muslim – were forbidden to take part in any public society. Athletic associations were banned in the territories. See Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 176.
- ¹⁶⁶ May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 118. During Mitrinović's teenage years, the Mostar booksellers Paher and Kisić ran one of the very few bookshop in Bosnia. See Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 6, Mitrinović MSS.
- ¹⁶⁷ Milojković-Đurić, "Benjamin von Kállay's Role," 213. Censorship was slightly relaxed between 1907 and 1912.
- ¹⁶⁸ Okey, "A Trio of Hungarian Balkanists," 237.
- ¹⁶⁹ May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 409.
- ¹⁷⁰ Gaćinović died in Switzerland in August 1917. His cause of death is unknown, but according to some accounts he was poisoned, possibly by agents from the Austro-Hungarian secret service.
- ¹⁷¹ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 10.
- ¹⁷² Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 10.
- ¹⁷³ Jevtic, "Dimitrije Mitrinovic: An Aquatic Flower," 20.
- ¹⁷⁴ Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 215. Gaćinović later became an ardent supporter of collaboration with the Croats. See Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 216.
- ¹⁷⁵ Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 10, Mitrinović MSS.
- ¹⁷⁶ Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 10, Mitrinović MSS.
- ¹⁷⁷ Petrović, "Dimitrije Mitrinović," 8–9, Mitrinović MSS.
- ¹⁷⁸ Ivo Banac, "The Origins and Development of the Concept of Yugoslavia (to 1945)," *Yearbook of European Studies* 5 (1992): 3.
- ¹⁷⁹ Jevtic, "Dimitrije Mitrinovic: An Aquatic Flower," 2, Mitrinović MSS.
- ¹⁸⁰ Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 17, Mitrinović MSS.
- ¹⁸¹ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 11.
- ¹⁸² Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 12, Mitrinović MSS.
- ¹⁸³ Passerini, *Europe in Love*, 106.
- ¹⁸⁴ Žerajić to Gaćinović, Zagreb, 12 December 1910, in "Letter from Bogdan Žerajić to Vladimir Gaćinović in Belgrade. dated [sic] Zagreb, 12/1. 10," TS, trans. n.d., date n.d., n.p. Mitrinović MSS.
- ¹⁸⁵ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 11.

- 186 Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 17, Mitrinović MSS.
- 187 "Extract from a work by Vladimir Gaćinović on the activities and aspirations of 'Mlada Bosna,'" TS, trans. n.d., date n.d., n.p., Mitrinović MSS.
- 188 Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 22, Mitrinović MSS.
- 189 Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 13, Mitrinović MSS.
- 190 Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 13, Mitrinović MSS.
- 191 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 17–18.
- 192 Jevtic, "Dimitrije Mitrinovic: An Aquatic Flower," 19, Mitrinović MSS.
- 193 Extract from the weekly *Voice of Canadian Serbs*, 11 February 1965, TS, n.p., Mitrinović MSS.
- 194 Jevtic, "Dimitrije Mitrinovic: An Aquatic Flower," 19.
- 195 Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 216.
- 196 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 18.
- 197 Ante Kadić, review of *Književnost Mlade Bosne*, by Predrag Palavestra, *Slavic and East European Journal* 12, no. 2 (1968): 257.
- 198 Cedomil Mitrinović, "Dimitrije Mitrinovic (facts for a biography)," TS, date n.d., 2, Mitrinović MSS.
- 199 Petrović, "Dimitrije Mitrinović," 3, Mitrinović MSS.
- 200 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 16.
- 201 Indeed, in 1918 the Serbian Orthodox people of Bosnia refused to unite with Serbia in advance of the establishment of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. See Magaš, "On Bosnianness," *Nations and Nationalism* 9, 21.
- 202 "Extract from the interrogation of Vojislav Vasiljević, a pupil in the seventh form of the gymnasium in Tuzla, which took place on July 14th 1914, at the district court of Tuzla," TS, trans. n.d., date n.d., n.p., Mitrinović MSS.
- 203 Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 29, Mitrinović MSS.
- 204 Petrović, "Dimitrije Mitrinović," 8–9, Mitrinović MSS.
- 205 Luigi Salvatorelli, *The Risorgimento: Thought and Action*, trans. Mario Domandi (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), 93.
- 206 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 15–16.
- 207 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 16.
- 208 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 16.
- 209 Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 213.
- 210 Glenny, *The Balkans*, 294.
- 211 Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 477.
- 212 Nikola Babić, "The Place and Role of Young Bosnia in the History of the Peoples of Bosnia-Herzegovina," *Survey Sarajevo* 2 (1975): 16.
- 213 Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 178.
- 214 Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 226.
- 215 Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 178.
- 216 Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 226.
- 217 Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 178.
- 218 Monica Partridge, "Alexander Herzen and the South Slav Liberation Movements of the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century: Some Observations and Comments," *Slavonic and East European Review* 56 (1978): 363.
- 219 Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 178.
- 220 For example, during the trial of the assassins of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, none of Princip's writings were used as evidence against him and his fellow conspirators.
- 221 Palavestra includes only two brief references (pp. 268 and 299) to Masaryk in *Dogma i Utopija Dimitrija Mitrinovića*. Ante Kadić has criticized Palavestra's *Književnost Mlade Bosne* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1965) because Palavestra does not "stress" the "initial infatuation of the Young Bosnians with the teachings of Thomas Masaryk." See Ante Kadić, review of *Književnost Mlade Bosne*, by Predrag Palavestra, *Slavic and East European Journal* 12, no. 2 (1968): 257.
- 222 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 11.
- 223 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 30.
- 224 Tomas Masaryk, *Rußland und Europa: Studien über die geistigen Strömungen in Rußland* (Jena: Diederichs, 1913).
- 225 T. G. Masaryk, *The Spirit of Russia: Studies in History, Literature and Philosophy*, trans. Eden Paul and Cedar Paul (London: Allen and Unwin, 1919).
- 226 In 1956, approximately 2,800 volumes from Mitrinović's library were bequeathed to the University of Belgrade, where they are held by Svetozar Marković Library. In 1994, the remainder of Mitrinović's library was gifted to the University of Bradford, where it is held (along with the New Atlantis Foundation Dimitrije Mitrinović Archive) by the J. B. Priestley Library. Details of the volumes by Masaryk collected by Mitrinović are found at: http://ipac.brad.ac.uk/ipac20/ipac.jsp?session=11129D24C8B93.3523&profile=dial&uri=link=1100003@!S27733@!1100001@!1100002&aspect=basic_search&menu=search&ri=2&source=143.53.238.60@!dial&term=Masaryk%2C+T.+G.+%28Toma%CC%81s%CC%8C+Garrigue%29%2C+1850-1937&index=AA.
- 227 Passerini, *Europe in Love*, 105–6.

²²⁸ Baron Aehrenthal (the Foreign Minister of Austria-Hungary from 1906 to 1912) instigated the annexation in 1908 for several reasons. Aehrenthal sought to prove the Dual Monarchy's great power credentials, to humiliate Serbia, and to pre-empt the renewal of Ottoman claims to Bosnia and Herzegovina by the newly-ascendant Young Turks. The annexation entailed the flagrant breach of Article 25 of the Treaty of Berlin, which did not sanction the outright ownership of Bosnia and Herzegovina by the Hapsburgs. Not only South Slavs were angry about the annexation: in Prague, martial law was declared in response to pro-Serb demonstrations in December 1908. Aehrenthal's policy was widely denounced in the European press. The annexation precipitated a diplomatic crisis that was resolved only after the Dual Monarchy paid 2,500,000 Turkish pounds to the Ottomans. Aehrenthal made a belated attempt to justify the annexation by fixing a show trial, in Zagreb, of 53 Croatian Serbs, all of whom were low-ranking members of the moderate Croatian-Serbian Coalition. The Hapsburg authorities hoped the treason trial would foment anti-Serb sentiment. They also wanted to stigmatize the Coalition, to slow its political momentum (especially in Dalmatia), and to destroy the spirit of cooperation between the Croats and Serbs of the Dual Monarchy that it represented. None of the accused – several of whom were former students of Masaryk – were guilty of sedition: all the charges were fabricated, and all the evidence forged. Masaryk wrote a book about the trial; he confessed that he found it difficult to decide if the court proceedings were an operetta, a comedy, or an inquisition. Masaryk's interpellations in the Zagreb trial and its equally farcical sequel, the Friedjung trial ("a crude swindle"), along with his exposure of the associated Vasić scandal, ensured him the gratitude of a great many educated South Slavs. The two trials and the scandal were the moral ruin of Austria-Hungary, and the Dual Monarchy lost its respectability throughout the world. In the Reichsrat, Masaryk pilloried Aehrenthal as "Annexander the Great" and demanded his resignation. Aehrenthal went on leave in March 1911 and never returned to office.

²²⁹ One of the first South Slav students taught by Masaryk was Stjepan Radić, who founded the Croatian Peasant Party in 1904. Although he initially opposed the formation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, he later became its most prominent Croat politician. In 1928, he was shot and mortally wounded during a heated debate in the National Assembly.

²³⁰ Irena Gantar Godina, "The Influence of T. G. Masaryk on the Slovenes up to 1914," in *T. G. Masaryk (1850–1937)*, vol. 1, *Thinker and Politician*, ed. Stanley B. Winters (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990), 116.

²³¹ Arnold Suppan, "Masaryk and the Trials for High Treason against South Slavs in 1909," in Winters, *T. G. Masaryk (1850–1937)*, 211.

²³² Paul Selver, *Masaryk: A Biography* (London: Joseph, 1940), 165.

²³³ Edward Polson Newman, *Masaryk* (London: Campion, 1960), 48.

²³⁴ Selver, *Masaryk: A Biography*, 165.

²³⁵ Selver, *Masaryk: A Biography*, 165.

²³⁶ Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 179.

²³⁷ Donald A. Lowrie, *Masaryk Nation Builder: The Man who Changed the Map of Europe* (New York: Association Press, 1930), 173.

²³⁸ *Emancipation*, rather than *liberation*, is used in this context. In peacetime Austria-Hungary, Masaryk advocated his own brand of radical Austro-Slavism. Prior to the First World War, he made no public statement in support of the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary. Instead, he urged the reformation of the Dual Monarchy on a consociational basis: each nation would attain a greater degree of control over their own affairs in a democratized and federalized Austria-Hungary. There would be no place for dilettantish statecraft. An association of isonomic constituent regions would supersede a union enforced by oppression. Masaryk viewed dualism as merely a two-fold centralism. The political incoherence of the Dual Monarchy had been increased by the *Ausgleich*, after which a common name for the non-Hungarian half of the Dual Monarchy could not even be found. For Masaryk, only a federal constitution could justify the continued existence of Austria-Hungary. After 1908, he became increasingly critical of the policies and disillusioned with the institutions of the Dual Monarchy; around 1910 he began to despair. Even so, he defended Austria-Hungary as long as there seemed the faintest possibility of fundamental reform, but only then because the Dual Monarchy protected its Slav nations from German and Russian absolutism. Masaryk always remained sceptical (even after he founded the Czechoslovak Republic) that the national life of a small nation could be guaranteed by formal independence. Mitrinović was not so ambivalent about statehood. Those inhabitants of Bosnia who opposed Hapsburg rule tended to demand absolute liberation, because they experienced greater suffering than any of the peoples in the Dual Monarchy (except for the gypsies). Mitrinović was an ardent political Yugoslavist, and used the term "liberation" more frequently than he did "emancipation."

²³⁹ Roger Scruton, "Masaryk, Kant and the Czech Experience," in Winters, *T. G. Masaryk (1850–1937)*, 55.

²⁴⁰ Eva Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism: Origins of a Czech Political Concept* (Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag, 1984), 139.

²⁴¹ René Welleck, "Masaryk's Philosophy," in *On Masaryk: Texts in English and German*, ed. Josef Novák, 17–26 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988), 17.

²⁴² Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, 176.

²⁴³ Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, 189.

- ²⁴⁴ Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, 139.
- ²⁴⁵ Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, 183.
- ²⁴⁶ Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, 139.
- ²⁴⁷ May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 207.
- ²⁴⁸ Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, 139.
- ²⁴⁹ This argument resonated with Slovene intellectuals in particular. The Serbs and Croats of the Hungarian half of the Dual Monarchy had resisted Magyarization, but the Slovenes had succumbed to Germanization in every sphere but the linguistic. Slovenes experienced acute difficulties: they controlled few schools and no university facilities. Their national struggle had been restricted to the demand for equal language rights in all fields of public life, but in 1897 intellectuals authored newspaper articles on Masaryk and his ideas, and transplanted Realism into their body politic. In 1914, Gaćinović wrote that the Slovene youth group *Preporod* (Rebirth) – of all the South Slav secret societies – was “the most active and most methodical.” See Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 219.
- ²⁵⁰ Frederick M. Barnard, “Humanism and Titanism: Masaryk and Herder,” in Winters, *T. G. Masaryk (1850–1937)*, 38.
- ²⁵¹ W. Preston Warren, *Masaryk's Democracy: A Philosophy of Scientific and Moral Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941), 206.
- ²⁵² Antonie van den Beld, *Humanity: The Political and Social Philosophy of Thomas G. Masaryk* (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), 138.
- ²⁵³ Beld, *Humanity*, 45.
- ²⁵⁴ Hanus J. Hajek, *T. G. Masaryk Revisited: A Critical Assessment* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1983), 147.
- ²⁵⁵ H. M. Stationary Office, *The Jugo-Slav Movement*, Handbooks Prepared under the Direction of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office 14 (London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1920), 13.
- ²⁵⁶ Vervae, “Some Historians from Former Yugoslavia,” 4.
- ²⁵⁷ H. M. Stationary Office, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, 30.
- ²⁵⁸ Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 176.
- ²⁵⁹ Hadžibegović, “Social Democratic Party,” 65.
- ²⁶⁰ Palairet, “The Hapsburg Industrial Achievement,” 151.
- ²⁶¹ Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 202.
- ²⁶² Malcolm, *Bosnia*, 144.
- ²⁶³ H. M. Stationary Office, *The Jugo-Slav Movement*, 13.
- ²⁶⁴ H. M. Stationary Office, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, 29.
- ²⁶⁵ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 8.
- ²⁶⁶ Warren, *Masaryk's Democracy*, 205.
- ²⁶⁷ Marie L. Neudorfl, “Masaryk and the Women's Question,” in Winters, *T. G. Masaryk (1850–1937)*, 260.
- ²⁶⁸ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 14–15.
- ²⁶⁹ Roman Szporluk, *The Political Thought of Thomas G. Masaryk* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1981), 79.
- ²⁷⁰ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 14.
- ²⁷¹ Princip to Marko Maglov, Sarajevo, 17 April 1912, in “Gavrilo Princip on His Political Ideas: An Unpublished Letter,” Vojislav Bogicevic, TS, trans. n.d., date n.d., 8–10. Originally published in *Pregled* (Sarajevo, September 1953: 167ff.). Mitrinović MSS.
- ²⁷² Dimitrije Mitrinović, “The Democratisation of Science and Philosophy,” TS, trans. n.d., date n.d, n.p. Originally published in *Bosanska Vila* (Sarajevo, 1908). Mitrinović MSS.
- ²⁷³ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 25.
- ²⁷⁴ Dimitrije Mitrinović, “Aesthetic Contemplations,” TS, trans. n.d., date n.d, n.p. Originally published in *Bosanska Vila* (Sarajevo, 1913). Mitrinović MSS.
- ²⁷⁵ Szporluk, *Political Thought*, 77.
- ²⁷⁶ Ale M. Poljarević, *Stolac: Architectural Heritage in Continuity of 2500 Years*, trans. Klara Poljarević and Sonja Kovačić (Mostar: Micro Book Publishing House, 1999), n.p.
- ²⁷⁷ Beautification projects undertaken by the Hapsburg administration were satirized by the Young Bosnians in commentaries such as “Oh These Poor Birds,” which was published in a 1914 issue of *Zvono* (*The Bell*). Danilo Ilić wrote: “To the great joy of the whole people in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Provincial government has issued an important announcement that the number of singing birds in Sarajevo has increased. For this extraordinary step forward in the cultural life of our fatherland, we must be grateful to the industrious sacrifices of the municipal authorities who have painstakingly constructed, in gardens and parks, shelters where the poor magpies and sparrows are fed in winter. And you poor, suffering people who bear on your bowed backs the whole weight of this social edifice, in vain you have waited for years for somebody to take care of you and to build proper houses with sweated tax money so that you do not have to die a miserable death in filthy hovels. Why are we not birds too?” See Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 307. In Sarajevo, on 3 February 1915, Ilić was hanged for his part in the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. The Hapsburg authorities refused to release his body to his family for burial. See Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 349–50.

- 278 Masaryk promoted the work of temperance societies not least because he sought to ease the suffering of women and children, the innocent victims of alcoholism.
- 279 Hajek, *T. G. Masaryk Revisited*, 46.
- 280 Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 208.
- 281 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 13.
- 282 West, *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon*, 443. The fact that supply outstripped demand kept prices low for the patrons, amongst whom were the very same officials who permitted so many brothels to operate in Sarajevo's red-light district. Most of the young women who became prostitutes were from large peasant families, and had travelled to Bosnia from the Hungarian half of the Dual Monarchy.
- 283 Glenny, *The Balkans*, 295–96.
- 284 H. M. Stationary Office, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, 40.
- 285 Vladimir Dedijer, *The Beloved Land* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961), 77.
- 286 Vladimir Dedijer and others, *History of Yugoslavia* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), 464.
- 287 Đuričković, "The Poets of Young Bosnia," 78.
- 288 Mazower, *The Balkans*, 95.
- 289 Dedijer, *Road to Sarajevo*, 230.
- 290 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 13–14.
- 291 Dedijer and others, *History of Yugoslavia*, 464.
- 292 Stojan T. Tomić, "Reflections on Young Bosnia," *Survey Sarajevo* 2 (1975): 70.
- 293 William Eleroy Curtis, *The Turk and His Lost Provinces* (Chicago: Revell, 1903), 287. Consumer preferences changed in the aftermath of the annexation. In 1910, the British Consul in Sarajevo complained that Austrian manufacturers branded their products with "fictitious trade marks and designations in English," and that the "English label affixed to a hat or overcoat of Austrian manufacture" would "often decide a wavering customer to buy the article. See H. M. Stationary Office, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, 66–67.
- 294 Babić, "The Place and Role," 14.
- 295 Charles Jelavich, *South Slav Nationalisms: Textbooks and Yugoslav Union before 1914* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1990), 20.
- 296 H. Gordon Skilling, *T. G. Masaryk: Against the Current, 1882–1914* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994), 131.
- 297 Godina, "Influence of T. G. Masaryk," 116.
- 298 May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 406. It was common for students from Dalmatia and Istria to attend university in Vienna, Prague or Graz. Few undertook a course of study in their mother tongue, because the diploma granted by the University of Zagreb was not recognized in the Austrian half of the Dual Monarchy. In 1904, Serbia and Montenegro were the only two independent states in Europe that lacked a university. In 1905, the University of Belgrade was founded. See Jelena Milojković-Đurić, *Tradition and Avant-Garde: Literature and Art in Serbian Culture, 1900–1918* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1988), 67–68.
- 299 Jelavich, *South Slav Nationalisms*, 179.
- 300 Selver, *Masaryk: A Biography*, 165.
- 301 Beld, *Humanity*, 141.
- 302 Beld, *Humanity*, 139.
- 303 For a comprehensive analysis, see Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, passim.
- 304 Szporluk, *Political Thought*, 113.
- 305 Singleton, *A Short History*, 115.
- 306 These kinds of problem characterized public life in the interwar South Slav state.
- 307 Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, 176.
- 308 Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, 185.
- 309 Beld, *Humanity*, 40.
- 310 Karel Hrubý, "The Philosophical Roots of Masaryk's Political Outlook," in *T. G. Masaryk in Perspective: Comments and Criticism*, ed. Milič Čapek and Karel Hrubý, 119–38 (n.p.: SVU Press, 1981), 128.
- 311 Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, 189.
- 312 In the early 1930s, Basil Boothroyd remarked that Mitrinović had a neurosis the size of Nelson's Column and it was called "synthesis." See Upton Sinclair, *The Autobiography of Upton Sinclair* (London: Allen, 1963), 196.
- 313 Beld, *Humanity*, 47.
- 314 Roger Scruton, "Masaryk, Kant," 50–51.
- 315 Barnard, "Humanism and Titanism," 37.
- 316 Dimitrije Mitrinović, "The National Milieu and Modernism," TS, trans. n.d., date n.d., n.p. Originally published in *Bosanska Vila* (Sarajevo, 1908). Mitrinović MSS.
- 317 Salvatorelli, *The Risorgimento*, 11–12.
- 318 Szporluk, *Political Thought*, 121.

- 319 Hajek, *T. G. Masaryk Revisited*, 50.
- 320 Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, 186.
- 321 Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, trans. and ed. James Strachey (1962; repr., New York: Norton, 1989), 72.
- 322 Beld, *Humanity*, 53.
- 323 Beld, *Humanity*, 46.
- 324 Hrubý, "Masaryk's Political Outlook," 128.
- 325 The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes – which came into existence on 1 December 1918 – is an example of a state-nation.
- 326 May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 380.
- 327 Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, 186.
- 328 Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, 72.
- 329 In 1941, the dissolution of the interwar South Slav state resulted from the aggression of the Axis powers.
- 330 Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, 183–84.
- 331 Beld, *Humanity*, 60.
- 332 Mitrović to Velimir Rajić, Munich, 4 March 1913, in Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 31–32, Mitrović MSS.
- 333 Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism*, 186.
- 334 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 171.
- 335 Bogicevic, "Gavrilo Princip," 7, Mitrović MSS.
- 336 Robin Okey, "Austro-Hungarian Diplomacy and the Campaign for a Slavonic Liturgy in the Catholic Church, 1881–1918," *Slavonic and East European Review* 70 (1992): 259.
- 337 Bogicevic, "Gavrilo Princip," 6, Mitrović MSS.
- 338 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 21–22.
- 339 Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 15, Mitrović MSS.
- 340 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 24.
- 341 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 25.
- 342 In *The Road to Sarajevo*, Vladimir Dedijer erroneously states (on p. 231) that Mitrović resided in Munich after the First World War, when in fact he left Bavaria in the summer of 1914.
- 343 Predrag Palavestra, "Utopian Messianism," in *The Dogma and Utopia of Dimitrije Mitrović*, TS, trans. D. Shillan and E. D. Goy, ca. 1980, 1, Mitrović MSS.
- 344 Shulamith Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrović; Pan-Christian Universalism and the Yearbook 'Towards the Mankind of the Future through Aryan Europe,'" *Oxford Art Journal* 15 (1992): 81.
- 345 Mark Roskill, *Klee, Kandinsky, and the Thought of Their Time: A Critical Perspective* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 67.
- 346 Felix Klee, *Paul Klee*, trans. Richard Winston and Clara Winston (New York: Braziller, 1962), 35.
- 347 Roskill, *Klee, Kandinsky*, 61.
- 348 Roskill, *Klee, Kandinsky*, 31.
- 349 The *Müncher Neueste Nachrichten* accused its members of being either "incurable madmen" or "shameless charlatans."
- 350 Roskill, *Klee, Kandinsky*, 31–32.
- 351 The name *Der Blaue Reiter* was derived from Kandinsky's love of the colour blue, and Marc's enthusiasm for horses. While riding a horse on patrol at the Battle of Verdun on 4 March 1916, Marc was killed by a grenade explosion.
- 352 Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrović," 81.
- 353 Paul Klee, *The Diaries of Paul Klee 1898–1914*, 266.
- 354 Felix Klee, *Paul Klee*, 35.
- 355 Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrović," 82.
- 356 Roskill, *Klee, Kandinsky*, 32–33 and 48.
- 357 Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrović," 82.
- 358 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 27.
- 359 Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 37, Mitrović MSS.
- 360 Seven years later, Ezra Pound wrote to Mitrović from the French Riviera, and asked him to solicit "a short article from Kandinsky – for *The Dial*" and to write "a still shorter 2 page (about 800 word) article on Kandinsky for same honoured publication." See Pound to Mitrović, St Raphael, 2 July 1921, MS, n.p., Mitrović MSS.
- 361 Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrović," 82.
- 362 Paul Klee, *Diaries of Paul Klee*, 280.
- 363 Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrović," 82.
- 364 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 28.
- 365 Roskill, *Klee, Kandinsky*, 41–42.
- 366 Roskill, *Klee, Kandinsky*, 42.

- 367 Wassily Kandinsky, *Concerning the Spiritual in Art, and Painting in Particular* (New York: Wittenborn, 1947), 24.
- 368 Mitrinović, "Aesthetic Contemplations," n.p., Mitrinović MSS.
- 369 Roskill, *Klee, Kandinsky*, 33–34.
- 370 Marc to Klee, n.p., 10 May 1915, in Felix Klee, *Paul Klee*, 47.
- 371 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 32.
- 372 Henry Le Roy Finch, introduction to *The Body of God: First Steps toward an Anti-Theology; The Collected Papers of Erich Gutkind*, by Erich Gutkind, ed. Lucie B. Gutkind and Henry Le Roy Finch (New York: Horizon, 1969), 11.
- 373 "Siderische Geburt," TS, trans. Gladys MacDermot and Leo Kohlberg, date n.d., 63, Mitrinović MSS.
- 374 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 34.
- 375 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 34 and 38.
- 376 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 35.
- 377 Palavestra, "Utopian Messianism," 11, Mitrinović MSS.
- 378 Palavestra, "Utopian Messianism," 22, Mitrinović MSS.
- 379 In the literature related to the "Blut-bund" no mention is made of any contributions by individuals from the southern hemisphere.
- 380 Mitrinović to Gutkind, Munich, 27 June 1914, TS, trans. n.d., Mitrinović MSS.
- 381 Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrinovic," 85.
- 382 Kandinsky to Marc, Munich, 10 March 1914, in Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrinovic," 81.
- 383 Kandinsky to Marc, Munich, 17 February 1914, in Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrinovic," 81.
- 384 Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrinovic," 87.
- 385 Palavestra, "Utopian Messianism," 2, Mitrinović MSS.
- 386 Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrinovic," 86.
- 387 Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrinovic," 84.
- 388 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 30–31.
- 389 Mitrinović to Kandinsky, Munich, 25 June 1914, TS, trans. n.d., Mitrinović MSS.
- 390 Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrinovic," 86.
- 391 Palavestra, "Utopian Messianism," 3, Mitrinović MSS.
- 392 Palavestra, "Utopian Messianism," 7, Mitrinović MSS.
- 393 Behr, "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrinovic," 85.
- 394 Palavestra, "Utopian Messianism," 18, Mitrinović MSS.
- 395 Passerini, *Europe in Love*, 116.
- 396 Palavestra, "Utopian Messianism," 13, Mitrinović MSS.
- 397 Palavestra, "Utopian Messianism," 6, Mitrinović MSS.
- 398 Palavestra, "Utopian Messianism," 9, Mitrinović MSS.
- 399 Palavestra, "Utopian Messianism," 8, Mitrinović MSS.
- 400 Palavestra, "Utopian Messianism," 4, Mitrinović MSS.
- 401 Passerini, *Europe in Love*, 107.
- 402 Passerini, *Europe in Love*, 116.
- 403 Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 38, Mitrinović MSS.
- 404 Palavestra, "Conspirator, Prophet or Preacher," 39, Mitrinović MSS.
- 405 "M – VITCH," an anonymous limerick about Mitrinović, TS, date n.d., n.p., Mitrinović MSS.
- 406 Predrag Palavestra, "The Quest for Pan-humanity," in *The Dogma and Utopia of Dimitrije Mitrinović*, TS, trans. D. Shillan and E. D. Goy, ca. 1980, 1. Originally published as *Dogma i Utopija Dimitrija Mitinovića: Počeci srpske književne avangarde* (Belgrade: Slovo Ljubve, 1977). Mitrinović MSS.
- 407 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 41.
- 408 Palavestra, "The Quest for Pan-humanity," 4, Mitrinović MSS.
- 409 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 42.
- 410 Palavestra, "The Quest for Pan-humanity," 4, Mitrinović MSS.
- 411 Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 43.
- 412 Maria Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 119.
- 413 West, *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon*, 19 and 21.
- 414 Miller, *Travels and Politics*, xv.
- 415 May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 410.
- 416 Andrew Hammond, "The Uses of Balkanism: Representation and Power in British Travel Writing, 1850–1914," *Slavonic and East European Review* 82 (2004): 603.
- 417 Hammond, "The Uses of Balkanism," 609.
- 418 Hammond, "The Uses of Balkanism," 605.
- 419 Hammond, "The Uses of Balkanism," 613.
- 420 Hammond, "The Uses of Balkanism," 603.

- ⁴²¹ Hammond, "The Uses of Balkanism," 605.
- ⁴²² Hammond, "The Uses of Balkanism," 613.
- ⁴²³ Hammond, "The Uses of Balkanism," 601.
- ⁴²⁴ Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans*, 19.
- ⁴²⁵ Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans*, 39.
- ⁴²⁶ Hammond, "The Uses of Balkanism," 603.
- ⁴²⁷ John B. Allcock, "Constructing the Balkans," in *Black Lambs and Grey Falcons: Women Travellers in the Balkans*, ed. John B. Allcock and Antonia Young, 170–91 (Bradford: Bradford University Press, 1991), 186.
- ⁴²⁸ Edith Durham, *Twenty Years of Balkan Tangle* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1920), 74.
- ⁴²⁹ Durham, *Twenty Years of Balkan Tangle*, 79.
- ⁴³⁰ Durham, *Twenty Years of Balkan Tangle*, 80.
- ⁴³¹ Thomas Pakenham, *The Boer War* (New York: Avon Books, 1979), 549.
- ⁴³² Durham, *Twenty Years of Balkan Tangle*, 238.
- ⁴³³ Dušan Puvačić, "East is East and West is West: Travels of an Englishwoman in Bosnia and Hercegovina," *South Slav Journal* 17, no. 1–2 (1996): 4.
- ⁴³⁴ H. M. Stationary Office, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, 41.
- ⁴³⁵ H. M. Stationary Office, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, 77–78.
- ⁴³⁶ West, *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon*, 1096.
- ⁴³⁷ Patrick Finney, "Raising Frankenstein: Great Britain, 'Balkanism,' and the Search for a Balkan Locarno in the 1920s," *European History Quarterly* 33 (2003): 326.
- ⁴³⁸ Konrad Berkovici, *The Incredible Balkans* (New York: Loring and Mussey, 1932), 3.
- ⁴³⁹ Predrag Palavestra, "The Beginnings of Serbian Expressionism: The Poetry of Dimitrije Mitrinović," TS, 1973, 6, Mitrinović MSS.
- ⁴⁴⁰ "Article by Dimitrije Mitrinovic, Secretary of the Narodne Ujedinjenje (the Serbo-Croat Organisation for Political Union) which appeared in *The Outlook* September 26th 1914. Who Should Possess Trieste?" TS, 1, Mitrinović MSS.
- ⁴⁴¹ S. P. Tucić, ed., *The Slav Nations* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915).
- ⁴⁴² Tucić, ed., *The Slav Nations*, 181.
- ⁴⁴³ Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans*, 58. See also Milica Bakić-Hayden, "Nesting Orientalisms: The Case of Former Yugoslavia," *Slavic Review* 54, no. 4 (1995): 917–31.
- ⁴⁴⁴ Paul Selver, "Partial Truth about the Slavs," *The New Age*, January 28, 1915, <http://www.modjournal.brown.edu/mjp/navall/nav16/na1613.pdf>.
- ⁴⁴⁵ Selver was irked by the fact that the treatment of the Czechs amounted to a mere nine pages, which was the same amount of space allotted to discussion of the Montenegrins.
- ⁴⁴⁶ Paul Selver, *Orage and the "New Age" Circle: Reminiscences and Reflections* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1959), 56–57.
- ⁴⁴⁷ Selver, *Orage and the "New Age" Circle*, 57.
- ⁴⁴⁸ Extract from Charles Purdom's *Life over Again*, TS, 1951, 2, Mitrinović MSS.
- ⁴⁴⁹ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 48.
- ⁴⁵⁰ At the Rotonde, the Young Bosnians discussed issues that remained unresolved in 1939, the year in which neo-Cubist works by Picasso were exhibited in Belgrade. A cartoonist in *The Shaven Hedgehog* – a satirical paper – depicted two Serbian peasants standing before one of the least intelligible paintings, one saying to the other: "Look, friend! Even the French have painted a picture of the Croatian problem!" See Lovett F. Edwards, *Yugoslavia* (London: Batsford, 1971), 244.
- ⁴⁵¹ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 49.
- ⁴⁵² Philip Mairet, "Notes by Philip Mairet from a talk which he gave in Oct. 1971 to friends at Norfolk Lodge," TS, 1971, 3, Mitrinović MSS.
- ⁴⁵³ Mairet, "Notes by Philip Mairet," 4, Mitrinović MSS.
- ⁴⁵⁴ Philip Mairet, *Autobiographical and Other Papers* (Manchester: Carcanet, 1981), 130.
- ⁴⁵⁵ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 197.
- ⁴⁵⁶ Mark Garnett, review of *Europe in Love, Love in Europe: Imagination and Politics in Britain between the Wars*, by Luisa Passerini, *Political Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (1999): 359.
- ⁴⁵⁷ Emmert, review of *Certainly, Future*, 67.
- ⁴⁵⁸ Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative*, 80–81.
- ⁴⁵⁹ Passerini, *Europe in Love*, 116.

Bibliography

- Allcock, John B. "Constructing the Balkans." In *Black Lambs and Grey Falcons: Women Travellers in the Balkans*, ed. by John B. Allcock and Antonia Young, 170–91. Bradford: Bradford University Press, 1991.
- Babić, Nikola. "The Place and Role of Young Bosnia in the History of the Peoples of Bosnia-Herzegovina." *Survey Sarajevo* 2 (1975): 9–16.
- Bakić-Hayden, Milica. "Nesting Orientalisms: The Case of Former Yugoslavia." *Slavic Review* 54, no. 4 (1995): 917–31.
- Banac, Ivo. "The Origins and Development of the Concept of Yugoslavia (to 1945)." *Yearbook of European Studies* 5 (1992): 1–22.
- Barnard, Frederick M. "Humanism and Titanism: Masaryk and Herder." In Winters, T. G. *Masaryk (1850–1937)*, 23–43.
- Bataković, Dušan T. *The Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Paris: Dialogue, 1996.
- Behr, Shulamith. "Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrinovic; Pan-Christian Universalism and the Yearbook 'Towards the Mankind of the Future through Aryan Europe.'" *Oxford Art Journal* 15 (1992): 81–88.
- Beld, Antonie van den. *Humanity: The Political and Social Philosophy of Thomas G. Masaryk*. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.
- "Commemoration Meeting to Dimitrije Mitrinovic held at Norfolk Lodge, Richmond, August 28th, 1954," Watson Thomson Fonds, Special Collections, University of British Columbia Library, Vancouver.
- Čović, Borivoj, ed. *Through the Collections of the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Translated by Ferdinand Dobrowolsky. Sarajevo: Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine, 1971.
- Curtis, William Eleroy. *The Turk and His Lost Provinces*. Chicago: Revell, 1903.
- Davies, D. R. *In Search of Myself: The Autobiography of D. R. Davies*. London: Bles, 1961.
- Dedijer, Vladimir. *The Beloved Land*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961.
- . *The Road to Sarajevo*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1966.
- Dedijer, Vladimir, and others. *History of Yugoslavia*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Doina, Robert J. "The Hapsburg Imperial Army in the Occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina." In *Insurrections, Wars, and the Eastern Crisis in the 1870s*, ed. Bela K. Kiraly and Gale Stokes, 375–91. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1985. Distributed by Columbia University Press.
- . *Islam under the Double Eagle: The Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1878–1914*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1981. Distributed by Columbia University Press.
- . "The New Bosniak History." *Nationalities Papers* 28, no. 2 (2000): 351–358.
- Djordjevic, Dimitrije. "The Berlin Congress of 1878 and the Origins of World War I." *Serbian Studies* 12, no. 1 (1998): 1–10.
- Djordjevic, Mihailo. "Mostar: A Serbian Cultural Center in the 1880s and 1890s." *Serbian Studies* 7, no. 2 (1993): 72–85.
- Durham, Edith. *Twenty Years of Balkan Tangle*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1920.
- Đuričković, Dejan. "The Poets of Young Bosnia." *Survey Sarajevo* 2 (1975): 74–87.
- Edwards, Lovett F. *Yugoslavia*. London: Batsford, 1971.
- Emmert, Thomas A. Review of *Certainly, Future: Selected Writings by Dimitrije Mitrinović*, ed. by H. C. Rutherford. *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 24, no. 1 (1990): 65–67.
- . Review of *Initiation and Initiative: An Exploration of the Life and Ideas of Dimitrije Mitrinović*, by Andrew Rigby. *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 19, no. 2 (1985): 235–36.
- Feaver, George. Review of *Initiation and Initiative: An Exploration of the Life and Ideas of Dimitrije Mitrinović*, by Andrew Rigby. *American Historical Review* 91, no. 1 (1986): 117–18.

- Finch, Henry Le Roy. "Introduction." In *The Body of God: First Steps toward an Anti-Theology; The Collected Papers of Erich Gutkind* by Erich Gutkind, ed. Lucie B. Gutkind and Henry Le Roy Finch, n.d. New York: Horizon, 1969.
- Finney, Patrick. "Raising Frankenstein: Great Britain, 'Balkanism,' and the Search for a Balkan Locarno in the 1920s." *European History Quarterly* 33 (2003): 317–42.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Translated and edited by James Strachey. New York: Norton, 1989. First published in 1962.
- Gantar Godina, Irena. "The Influence of T. G. Masaryk on the Slovenes up to 1914." In Winters, T. G. *Masaryk (1850–1937)*, 114–29.
- Garnett, Mark. Review of *Europe in Love, Love in Europe: Imagination and Politics in Britain between the Wars*, by Luisa Passerini. *Political Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (1999): 359–60.
- Gerolymatos, André. *The Balkan Wars: Myth, Reality, and the Eternal Conflict*. Toronto: Stoddart, 2001.
- Glenny, Misha. *The Balkans 1804–1999: Nationalism, War and the Great Powers*. London: Granta Books, 1999.
- H. M. Stationary Office. *Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Handbooks Prepared under the Direction of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office 12. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1920.
- . *The Jugo-Slav Movement*. Handbooks Prepared under the Direction of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office 14. London: H. M. Stationary Office, 1920.
- Hadžibegović, Ilijas. "The Role of the Social Democratic Party of Bosnia-Herzegovina in Political Life before the First World War." *Survey Sarajevo* 2 (1975): 64–67.
- Hadžiselimović, Omer, ed. *At the Gates of the East: British Travel Writers on Bosnia and Herzegovina from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 2001. Distributed by Columbia University Press.
- Hajek, Hanus J. *T. G. Masaryk Revisited: A Critical Assessment*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1983. Distributed by Columbia University Press.
- Hammond, Andrew. "The Uses of Balkanism: Representation and Power in British Travel Writing, 1850–1914." *Slavonic and East European Review* 82 (2004): 601–24.
- Holbach, Maude M. *Bosnia and Herzegovina: Some Wayside Wanderings*. London: Lane, 1910.
- Hrubý, Karel. "The Philosophical Roots of Masaryk's Political Outlook." In *T. G. Masaryk in Perspective: Comments and Criticism*, ed. Milič Čapek and Karel Hrubý, 119–38. N.p.: SVU Press, 1981.
- Hutchinson, Frances Kinsley. *Motoring in the Balkans: Along the Highways of Dalmatia, Montenegro, the Herzegovina and Bosnia*. Chicago: McClurg, 1909.
- Jaekel, Blair. *The Lands of the Tamed Turk; Or, The Balkan States of To-day*. Boston: Page, 1910.
- Jelavich, Charles. *South Slav Nationalisms: Textbooks and Yugoslav Union before 1914*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1990.
- Kadić, Ante. Review of *Književnost Mlade Bosne*, by Predrag Palavestra. *Slavic and East European Journal* 12, no. 2 (1968): 255–58.
- Kandinsky, Wassily. *Concerning the Spiritual in Art, and Painting in Particular*. New York: Wittenborn, 1947.
- Klee, Felix. *Paul Klee*. Translated by Richard Winston and Clara Winston. New York: Braziller, 1962.
- Klee, Paul. *The Diaries of Paul Klee 1898–1918*. Edited by Felix Klee. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1964.
- Lipgens, Walter. *A History of European Integration*. Vol. 1, *The Formation of the European Unity Movement*. Translated by P. S. Falla and A. J. Ryder. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Lovrenović, Ivan. *Bosnia: A Cultural History*. Translated by Sonja Wild Bičanić. London: Saqi Books in association with the Bosnian Institute, 2001.
- Lowrie, Donald A. *Masaryk Nation Builder: The Man who Changed the Map of Europe*. New York: Association Press, 1930.
- Magaš, Branka. "On Bosnianness." *Nations and Nationalism* 9, no. 1 (2003): 19–23.
- Mairet, Philip. *A. R. Orage: A Memoir*. New York: University Books, 1966.
- . *Autobiographical and Other Papers*. Manchester: Carcanet, 1981.
- Malcolm, Noel. *Bosnia: A Short History*. London: Macmillan, 1994.

- Masaryk, Tomas. *Rußland und Europa: Studien über die geistigen Strömungen in Rußland*. Jena: Diederichs, 1913.
- . *The Spirit of Russia: Studies in History, Literature and Philosophy*. Translated by Eden Paul and Cedar Paul. London: Allen and Unwin, 1919.
- May, Arthur J. *The Hapsburg Monarchy 1867–1914*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Mazower, Mark. *The Balkans*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2000.
- Medlicott, W. N. *The Congress of Berlin and After: A Diplomatic History of the Near Eastern Settlement 1878–1880*. 2nd ed. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1963.
- Miller, William. *Travels and Politics in the Near East*. London: Unwin, 1898.
- Milojković-Đurić, Jelena. “Articulating Cultural Policies in an Occupied Territory: Bosnia-Herzegovina in the Aftermath of the Berlin Congress.” *Serbian Studies* 13, no. 2 (1999): 37–58.
- . “Benjamin von Kállay’s Role in Bosnia-Herzegovina 1882–1903: Habsburg’s Policies in an Occupied Territory.” *Serbian Studies* 14, no. 2 (2000): 211–20.
- . *Tradition and Avant-Garde: Literature and Art in Serbian Culture, 1900–1918*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1988. Distributed by Columbia University Press.
- Muir, Edwin. *An Autobiography*. London: Hogarth, 1954.
- Muir, Willa. *Belonging: A Memoir*. London: Hogarth, 1968.
- Neudorfl, Marie L. “Masaryk and the Women’s Question.” In Winters, T. G. *Masaryk (1850–1937)*, 258–82.
- New Atlantis Foundation Dimitrije Mitrinović Archive. Special Collections. University of Bradford Library.
- Okey, Robin. “A Trio of Hungarian Balkanists: Béni Kállay, István Burián and Lajos Thallóczy in the Age of High Nationalism.” *Slavonic and East European Review* 80 (2002): 234–66.
- . “Austro-Hungarian Diplomacy and the Campaign for a Slavonic Liturgy in the Catholic Church, 1881–1918.” *Slavonic and East European Review* 70 (1992): 258–83.
- Pakenham, Thomas. *The Boer War*. New York: Avon Books, 1979.
- Palairret, Michael. “The Hapsburg Industrial Achievement in Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1878–1914: An Economic Spurt that Succeeded?” *Austrian History Yearbook* 24 (1993): 133–52.
- Palavestra, Predrag. *Dogma i Utopija Dimitrija Mitinovića: Počeci srpske književne avangarde*. Belgrade: Slovo Ljubve, 1977.
- . *Književnost Mlade Bosne*. 2 vols. Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1965.
- Partridge, Monica. “Alexander Herzen and the South Slav Liberation Movements of the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century: Some Observations and Comments.” *Slavonic and East European Review* 56 (1978): 360–70.
- Passerini, Luisa. *Europe in Love, Love in Europe: Imagination and Politics in Britain between the Wars*. London: Taurus, 1999.
- Petrović, Nenad. *Ogledu o smislu i zabudama*. Belgrade: Književne Novine, 2002.
- Poljarević, Ale M. *Stolac: Architectural Heritage in Continuity of 2500 Years*. Translated by Klara Poljarević and Sonja Kovačić. Mostar: Micro Book Publishing House, 1999.
- Puvačić, Dušan. “East is East and West is West: Travels of an Englishwoman in Bosnia and Herzegovina.” *South Slav Journal* 17, no. 1–2 (1996): 1–15.
- Rigby, Andrew. *Initiation and Initiative: An Exploration of the Life and Ideas of Dimitrije Mitrinović*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1984. Distributed by Columbia University Press.
- Roskill, Mark. *Klee, Kandinsky, and the Thought of Their Time: A Critical Perspective*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992.
- Salvatorelli, Luigi. *The Risorgimento: Thought and Action*. Translated by Mario Domandi. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Schindler, John R. “Defeating Balkan Insurgency: The Austro-Hungarian Army in Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1878–82.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 27, no. 3 (2004): 528–52.
- Schmidt-Hartmann, Eva. *Thomas G. Masaryk’s Realism: Origins of a Czech Political Concept*. Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag, 1984.

-
- Scruton, Roger. "Masaryk, Kant and the Czech Experience." In Winters, T. G. *Masaryk (1850–1937)*, 44–59.
- Selver, Paul. *Masaryk: A Biography*. London: Joseph, 1940.
- . *Orage and the "New Age" Circle: Reminiscences and Reflections*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1959.
- . "Partial Truth about the Slavs." *The New Age*, January 28, 1915. <http://www.modjournal.brown.edu/mjp/navall/nav16/na1613.pdf>.
- Seton-Watson, R. W. "The Role of Bosnia in International Politics (1875–1914)." In *Proceedings of the British Academy 1931*, 335–68. London: Milford, 1931.
- Sinclair, Upton. *The Autobiography of Upton Sinclair*. London: Allen, 1963.
- Singleton, Fred. *A Short History of the Yugoslav Peoples*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Skilling, H. Gordon. *T. G. Masaryk: Against the Current, 1882–1914*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994.
- Sugar, Peter F. *Industrialization of Bosnia 1878–1918*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1963.
- Suppan, Arnold. "Masaryk and the Trials for High Treason against South Slavs in 1909." In Winters, T. G. *Masaryk (1850–1937)*, 210–24.
- Szporluk, Roman. *The Political Thought of Thomas G. Masaryk*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1981. Distributed by Columbia University Press.
- Taylor, A. J. P. *The Habsburg Monarchy 1809–1918: A History of the Austrian Empire and Austria-Hungary*. London: Penguin Books, 1976.
- Todorova, Maria. *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Tomić, Stojan T. "Reflections on Young Bosnia." *Survey Sarajevo* 2 (1975): 68–73.
- Trifunovska, Snežana, ed. *Yugoslavia through Documents: From Its Creation to Its Dissolution*. Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1994.
- Tucić, S. P., ed. *The Slav Nations*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915.
- Vervaet, Stijn. "Some Historians from Former Yugoslavia on the Austro-Hungarian Period in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1878–1918): A Reality of Imperialism versus the Golden Years of the Double Eagle?" *Kakanien Revisited* (18 July 2004): 1–5. <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/fallstudie/SVervaet1.pdf>.
- Warren, W. Preston. *Masaryk's Democracy: A Philosophy of Scientific and Moral Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941.
- Welleck, René. "Masaryk's Philosophy." In *On Masaryk: Texts in English and German*, ed. Josef Novák, 17–26. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988.
- West, Rebecca. *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon: A Journey through Yugoslavia*. New York: Penguin Books, 1994. First published 1941 by Viking.
- Winters, Stanley B., ed. *T. G. Masaryk (1850–1937)*. Vol. 1, *Thinker and Politician*. Basingstoke: Macmillan in association with the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, 1990.