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Viktor Novak's manuscripts are stored in the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts in Belgrade (sign. no. 14.474). In the files containing the written material regarding his book MAGNUM CRIMEN there are also sheets of two chapters not published in the final version of the book. One of these chapters, number XIV, entitled ECCLESIA MILITANS AT WAR WITH THE IDEOLOGY OF TYRCH, is printed on 25 sheets and the other, number XV, LIBELLUS ACCUSATIONIS is printed on 4 sheets. Professor Novak has corrected all the errors in these sheets with his own hand. The shape and dimension of the letters are the same as those in the book MAGNUM CRIMEN from which they were omitted at the very last moment.

Those who know that during the process of writing MAGNUM CRIMEN Viktor Novak was under the pressure of censorship and those who could witness about that are probably no longer among the living. His close friends and associates were familiar with that fact and were not silent about it. Sima Simič, a respected publicist and author of several outstanding books on the ustaši movement and Roman Catholic clericalism, told me that Viktor Novak was compelled to omit the chapter on the Sokol Movement under the pressure of Maks Batša, a high official of OZNA (Police in Tito's Yugoslavia) from Croatia who was an extended hand of Vladimir Bakarić, the supreme police authority in Croatia. This chapter had to be omitted because it completely unMASKS the top of the Roman Catholic church revealing that it was anti-Yugoslav, ultra clerical and pro fascist. The same applies to the chapter LIBELLUS ACCUSATIONIS, actually a pro memoria of Frano Ivanšević, a great and devoted supporter of Yugoslavism, addressed to Archbishop Stepinac.

The editors of the second edition of MAGNUM CRIMEN were aware of the fact that some chapters had been omitted in the first edition under the pressure of the Croatian political top but, unfortunately, they simply could not find the omitted chapters in over one hundred big files of randomly stored manuscripts Viktor Novak left as his heritage. Since these chapters, previously omitted for political reasons, have been discovered, we think that they should be published now. With them MAGNUM CRIMEN will be finally completed. The public will be in a position to get acquainted with their


Kada je pripremamo drugo izdanje Magnum crimen-a znalo se da su neki delovi Novakovog rada, pod pritiskom političkog vrha Hrvatske, bili izostavljeni. Međutim, priredaći drugog izdanja te knjige tada nisu imali mogućnosti da duđe do izostavljenih poglavlja, jer preobima Novakova rukopisna zaostavština, koja ima više od stotinu arhivskih kutija, ona nije bila sredena. Sada, kada smo došli do tih poglavlja, koja su iz političkih razloga bila izostavljena, smatramo da zaustavljamo da budu objavljenja. Njima će se Magnum crimen, očigledno, kompletirati. Javnost će biti upoznata sa sadržajem tih izostavljenih poglavlja a nauka obogaćena novim sazna-
content and science enriched with a new knowledge about the attitude of the Croatian Roman Catholic Episcopate towards Yugoslavia and the Yugoslavs, towards the Sokol Movement and the reasons why it (the Episcopate) was so vehemently hostile to it.

The chapter ECCLESIA MILITANS AT WAR WITH THE IDEOLOGY OF TURCH has been found among the manuscripts of Viktor Novak type written. The difference between this type written text and the text on the sheets is negligible. Only some words are Croatized and some minor editing correction made. Since Novak has with his own hand corrected the already printed text we deem that he has thus authorized it. This is the reason why we decided to publish the thus latest version printed on the sheets and omitted from the book MAGNUM CRIMEN.

Viktor Novak's texts we are publishing are identical with the texts on the sheets. Nothing has been changed. Only some printing errors have been corrected.

We would like to emphasize that remark no. 29 in the text of ECCLESIA MILITANS could not be found either in the type written text or in the text printed on the sheets. Remarks no. 93 and 103 refer to chapter XVI of MAGNUM CRIMEN entitled ENTHUSIASTIC WELCOME – NDH (Independent State of Croatia) – AN OLD AND LONG COVETED DREAM. Due to the omission of chapters XIV and XV all chapters in the book have been renumbered and some of their titles changed BLOODY HARVEST was the over title of the chapter entitled NDH AN OLD AND LONG COVETED DREAM which was chapter XVIII on the sheets.

njima o odnosu hrvatskog rimokatoličkog episkopata prema Jugoslaviji i Jugoslovenima, kao i prema sokolskom pokretu i razlozima zbog kojih mu se odlačno suprotstavio.

U zaostavšćini Viktoru Novaku sačuvan je i pisačim mašinom prekucan tekst Ecclesia militans ratiues s Turskom ideologijom. Razlika između njege i teksta odsampanog na sifovima je neznatna. Ona je lektorske prirode i, bezmalno, svodi se na hrvatizovanje Novakovog jezika. Kako je Novak svojom rukom obavio korekturu već odsampanih tekstova, smatramo da ih je time i autorizovao. zbog toga smo se i odlučili da stampamo poslednje verzije sa sifovima, koje su izostavljene iz knjige Magnum crimen.


Dužni smo da kažemo da u tekstu Ecclesia militans napomene br. 29 nema ni u rukopisu prekucanom pisačom mašinom, niti u tekstu odsampanom na sifovima. Napomene pod br. 93 i 103 odnose se na poglavije koje u knjizi Magnum crimen nosi br. XVI, s naslovom Zaneseni doček. – NDH – „Davno sanjani i željkovani ideal”. Izostavljanjem XIV i XV poglavlja došlo je do prenumerationi odeljaka knjige i do izvesnih promena u njihovim naslovima. Krvava želja bio je nadnadam ispod poglavlja naslovljenog s NDH – „Davno sanjani i željkovani ideal”. To poglavije odsampano u sifovima nosilo je br. XVIII.
The first Sokol (Falcon) Society was founded in Prague in 1862, soon after the fall of Bach’s absolutism and the failure of the policy of national alienation and assimilation of non-German ethnic groups, practiced in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy according to elaborate plans. The ideological founding fathers of this new organization were Jiřích Fügner and Dr. Miroslav Tyrš. This was one of the many organizations founded in Bohemia according to the same pattern within the of national renaissance drive. Their aim was to revive and enhance national awareness and promote the mental and physical health of Czech people through physical and moral education. The slogan of the Sokols LET US GET STRONGER implied not only physical strength and stamina, but also vigor and toughness of character as spiritual assets, moral awareness, love for the native country, love for freedom and independence. MENS SANA IN CORPORE SANO, a healthy mind in a healthy body, was the slogan adopted in the XIX-th century in the aim of strengthening the ideals of the nationally awakened nation, within the Slavic Renaissance as a much broader movement. In 1871, on the eve of the Tenth Anniversary of the Sokols, Tyrš spelled out the fundamental aims of the whole movement:

“Our first and primary tasks is to safeguard the vitality of our people, the kind of vitality that secures their survival and prevents their extinction, help promote their physical, mental and moral health and thus enable them to successfully cope with serious difficulties, including various calamities such as aggression and backwardness, the worst crime of all inflicted on a nation.”

The Sokol Movement very quickly emerged in other Slavic countries. In Ljubljana the Sokol Society was founded in 1863 under the title SOUTHERN SOKOL. The Austrian authorities dissolved it in 1867, but it reemerged the following year, in 1868 under a slightly altered title: THE SOKOL.

1 „ALL SOKOL, RALLY IN PRAGUE, JN 2 1938“ (Svesokolski slet u Pragu.) Beograd I.
GYMNASTIC SOCIETY IN LJUBLJANA. The FIRST RALLY OF SLAVIC SOKOL SOCIETIES took place in 1888, with the participation of the Czechs, as founders of the Movement. In the 96's of the XIX-th century Dr. Viktor Murnik developed in Slovenia the idea of the Sokol Movement, in the spirit of Tyrl, his ideology and his principles in gymnastics. In Zagreb the first Sokol Society was founded in 1874. In Serbia the Sokol Movement was reorganized in 1882. In Croatia and Slovenia the first Sokol Alliances were founded at the beginning of the XX-th century. The Sokol Rallies greatly helped develop solidarity among the South Slavs and with other Slavs and nationalities. ALL Sokol RALLIES developed into prominent public manifestations of Slavic mutualiy. In 1911 the All Sokol Rally in Zagreb brought together the Sokols from: Croatia, Slovenia, Serbia, Bulgaria, Bohemia, Poland and Russia. Evidently, the Sokol Movement in the Slavic countries greatly contributed to the promotion of the idea of Slavic mutualiy and offered to Slavic people the opportunity to get to know better one another.

In view of the nature of the principles they promote and the importance of their objectives it is understandable why the Bishop of Đakovo Strossmayer liked the Sokol Movement from its very foundation and was giving it not only his love and attention, but also his great support. Strossmayer fully approved the tasks of the Slavic, and within that framework the Croatian Sokol Movement, and generously supported the Yugoslav and Czech Sokols. When the Sokols in Istria decided to build their Center (called HOME) he was the first to send his blessing, his contribution and a very significant letter in which he emphasized the patriotic task the Croatian Sokols are expected to fulfill in the endangered Istria. On their part the Sokols reciprocated the Bishop's favorable attitude towards them by expressing love and respect for him, the great supporter of the idea of brotherhood among all South Slavs. In his lifetime Strossmayer epitomized the lofty ideals of the Sokol Movement. Later, his memory was cherished as a national and moral lodestar. Actually, Strossmayer's first encounter with the Sokols took place in Prague, only a year after the foundation of the Movement, at the end of October 1863. On that occasion the Bishop also met its leaders: Fügner and Tyrl. Strossmayer was one of the first honorary members of the Czech Sokol. At the celebration of Strossmayer's Jubilee in Đakovo, in 1888, the Slovenian and Croatian Sokols were also present. At the celebration of the second Jubilee in 1898, in Đakovo, Dr. Lazar Tzar (Grl.), on behalf of the Croatian Sokols, in his speech expressed some views and ideas which every Catholic Bishop would  

**Notes:**
2. Josip Juraj Strossmayer, 829, 842.
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readily support. In his speech Dr Tzar emphasizes that the Sokols has never been an anti-religious organization, nor is it now. On the contrary. A great number of Slovenian and Croatian Catholic priests are not only its members but also leaders of its local branches. Moreover, the Sokol Center in Zagreb was the venue of the First Eucharistic Congress held in 1900, which proves that the Sokols were not regarded as an anti-religious and impious movement, the proof being the presence at the First Croatian Sokol Rally of Dr. Ante Bauer, at that time Archbishop-Coadjutor, the delegation of the Capitul and the parish priests of Zagreb. Even the Chairman of the First Catholic Congress, Count Miroslav Kulmer, attended the event. At that time none of them viewed the Sokols as an anti-religious or impious organization.

By 1911 the Croatian and all other Sokol organizations in Slavic countries had fully adopted the principles established by Miroslav Tyrih, actually the perennial Sokol principles. It was in 1912, at the ALL SLAVIC Sokol Rally, held in Prague that for the first time unification of the Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian Sokols was discussed as a possibility. Ten days before the assassination in Sarajevo, at the meeting held in the Croatian Sokol Center in Zagreb, the representative of the Slovenian and Serbian Sokols expressed themselves in favor of unification which implied joint work, use of the same terminology, use of the same flags, the same commands, orders, etc. Even common Rule were drafted in that aim. The First World War was a serious challenge to the Sokol Movement. The THIRD ALL Sokol Rally was scheduled for August 1914 in Ljubljana. It never took place, being prohibited by the Austrian-Hungarian government already on June 20, 1914. The Serbian Sokols were the most persecuted in Sremski Karlovci, Zagreb, Sarajevo, etc. In Slovenia too. The Sokols were among the first arrested and in a great number.

After the end of the First World War The Sokols resumed their activities in the spirit of the proposals adopted in 1912 and 1914. The Extraordinary Sokol Assembly was held in Zagreb, on May 11, 1919. Dr. Vlasto Maček (Mačeš), one of the speakers, addressing the Assembly said:

"We are all Yugoslavs! Therefore, all South Slavs, the Serbs, Croats, Slovenes and Bulgarians should be members of the same Slavic organization. The Sokols have nothing to do with politics and this fundamental principle should be honored by both the Sokols..."

1. Josip Juraj Strossmayer, 829, 842.
and the politicians. Also, as of today the Sokol Alliance should keep the fourth seat vacant for our Bulgarian brothers."

On June 15, 1919, the Meeting chaired by Dr. Lazar Tzar decided that all Croatian Sokols should merge with the Serbian and Slovenian Sokols into one, united Sokol Alliance. The FIRST SOKOL CONVENTION which took place in Novi Sad, from 28 to 30 June, 1918, adopted a new organizational pattern of the Sokols. A month later the FIRST REGIONAL SOKOL RALLY took place in Maribor and on that occasion the Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian Sokols changed their name into THE YUGoslav Sokol Alliance. Its first Declaration provides guidelines for the Sokol activities in the new state. At the end it reads as follows:

"Rejuvenated, renewed and united the Sokol Movement of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes is most cordially greeting all of you! Our people for whose freedom, progress and blossoming all Sokols are ready to sacrifice themselves. We strongly believe that the victory of the national idea and the ideal of truth and justice will bring happiness and peace to all of us. We also remain devoted to the idea of Slavism which epitomizes our cultural and ethical strength and which, we hope, will continue to keep our human soul alive even after the death of old Gods."

It is interesting to note that already in 1919 and 1920 the Croatian Sokols left the Alliance and founded their own national organization. This happened before 1921 when differences between the Zagreb Sokol Society and the Yugoslav Sokol Alliance emerged due to internal conflicts on political grounds. It was actually a conflict between the concept of particularism and separatism, on the one hand, and the concept of integral Yugoslavism, on the other. However, the Croatian Sokol remained faithful to the Sokol principles of Tysh and his progressive ideology. Even the separatism prone Croatian clergy did not deny support to Croatian Sokols. They did not refuse to bless their flag; in spite of the fact that the Leaders and Senior members of the Croatian Sokol still fostered the ideals and ideology of their founding fathers. At that time the clerical organization ORLOVI (The Eagles) was founded with the support of high Catholic clergy, the Seniorate and Episcopate. The idea was to take young people away from the Sokols and attract them to join the new independent gymnastic clubs. When in 1919 the Ministry of Education issued a directive to all schools to organize physical education

---

7 THE YUGOSLAV GAZETTE (Jugoslavenske novine) September 2, 1937.
8 THE SOKOL HERALD (Sokolski glasnik), 1919, 20, 1, 1.
according to the principles of the Sokol Movement the document was discussed by the Yugoslav Episcopate at its Conference held in April 1920. It was at this Conference that a negative attitude against the Sokols was taken for the first time. The presence of Nuncio Cherubini at the Conference was publicly discussed and commented in all papers in different ways. The Episcopate even lodged a protest with the Ministry of Education under the pretext that all aspects of school education should be based on religious principles and conducted in the religious spirit. The Catholic Church could not accept the Sokols who bring together the Catholics, Orthodox and Moslems, who launch the idea that a brother is dear regardless of his faith and who promote true religious tolerance, affection and love for the brothers irrespective of their confession. Actually, the clerics considered religious tolerance and progressive ideals as extremely dangerous to the Catholic Church. Moreover, The Sokol protests in support of the brothers in Julian Alps region during the pro-fascist period the Italian press qualified as an imperialist provocation. According to both clerical and non-clerical Italian press the Sokols were viewed as a threat to the Italian Eastern border Dr. Laza Popović (Popović), and outstanding and old member of the Sokols, refuted all these accusations on the ground of valid arguments.7

The members of the Clerical Party and their supporters (in further text CLERICALS) tried to disguise the political background of their anti-Sokol campaign by transferring the whole issue to the sphere of religious education. It was for the very first time that they brought up the problem of philosophical naturalism and indifference to the principles of Christianity in the learning of Tyrsh, assessing them as dangerous to perennial Christian values. Actually, the clericals, favoring separatism, were much more apprehensive of the idea of Yugoslavism than of the philosophy of Tyrsh. One month before the Meeting of the Episcopate (March 1920) the Yugoslav Sokol Alliance issued a Declaration on its attitude to the idea of Yugoslavism, which reads as follows:

"The Revolution of the Yugoslav peoples for liberation and unification, brought to its successful end in 1918, epitomizes its greatest achievement – the idea of Yugoslavism which implies freedom, unity, independence, survival and progress of all Yugoslav nations living united in one state. The idea of the Sokol Movement actually stems from the national idea of Yugoslavism. Its aim is to unite all

---


---

8 Laza Popović, Katolički episkop protiv Sokolsa, "JUGOSLAVENSKA OBNOVA NIJVE", 1920, no. 32, pp. 485-496.

---

9 "Sokolski glasnik" 1920, 145-146.
form ethnic Sokol societies into one Sokol organization and thus overcome all regional, ethnic, religious and class differences and help our people get stronger and improve their physical, intellectual and moral qualities so as to be ready to cope with all challenges along that way, including struggle for life... In the struggle for the unity of the movement all Sokols should spare no effort to translate their ideals into reality and help them take deep roots in the Movement... Within the common strive to keep the idea of Yugoslavism alive all of you are equally great, equally useful and equally valuable... 

The idea of Yugoslavism and the principles of the Sokol Movement based on brotherhood and self-sacrifice as a prerequisite for national revival and progress were a serious threat to all promoters of separatism, particularly the Croatian clericals and their supporters. Most of the Sokol leaders, particularly during the initial stage of the Movement, were sincere supporters of the Sokol ideology that the Movement should exclusively serve the national interests. However, it should be emphasized that the hostile ideas of some politicians jeopardized the Sokol Movement and the idea of Yugoslavism. But a similar damage to the Sokol Movement and the idea of Yugoslavism was done by those who encouraged education of the Sokols in the spirit of Monarchism and support to the Royal Family, or abused the Sokols in promoting the interests of some political parties, or against some social movements. It is from these positions that most criticism, not always unjustified, was addressed to the promoters of the Sokol idea which till 1918 had played a positive role in the struggle for Slavic solidarity. The Catholic Episcopate and the clericals very smartly took advantage of these differences and transferred the whole issue to the sphere of education. They were not only against secularization of religious education but also against general education promoting national features and features of national cultural heritage, not organized or approved by the Church. Evidently, the Sokols who promoted brotherhood and equality of all religious schools had a great enemy in the Catholic Church for whom religious tolerance was equal to religious indifference and as such a great enemy of the Church and religion.

The conflict of these totally opposing concepts of the progressive and conservative, the Yugoslav and exclusively Croatian, tolerance and intolerance, continued in Zagreb and in all regions populated by Croats and was gaining impetus with the increasing resistance of the clerical movement to the idea of Yugoslavism, brotherhood and religious tolerance, from its ma... 

---

8 THE SokOL HERALD ("Sokolski glasnik"), 1920., pp.145-146.
jor strongholds: the ORLOVI (Eagles) and CATHOLIC ACTION Movement (Katolička acija).

The chasm between these two concepts surfaced at the ALL SOKOL RALLY in Prague, in 1926, where due to Deputy Nuncio’s intrigues the Polish Sokols decided to abstain from participation. In November 1926 the Polish Sokols submitted the documents revealing the clandestine influence of the Vatican, hostile to the Government of Czechoslovakia, and particularly its Foreign Minister Dr. Edvard Beneš, because of some problems with the Nuncio. At first the Polish Sokols were ready to massively participate in the Rally, but when applications were to be submitted Deputy Nuncio Msgr. Arata warned the Poles of the secret intention of the organizer to turn the Rally in Prague into a demonstration of anti-Catholicism. Actually, the Nuncio in Warsaw, Cardinal Kacwski Archbishop of Warsaw and Polish high clergy exercised a strong pressure on the Polish Sokols not to participate and they obeyed. The documents also reveal that the Archbishop, on the ground of his allegedly incontestable proofs, claimed that the Prague Rally was conceived as a protest against the Pope. In this connection the Nuncio said: The Holy See would regard participation in Prague as a gross offense against the Catholic Church and the Holy Father. This is how the Vatican managed to break up the Slavic unity in connection with that particular event. On the other hand, during the Rally not a single negative gesture against the Church was noticed.9

Evidently that this smartly orchestrated campaign involving one Deputy Nuncio (Msgr Arata) and one Nuncio was undertaken on the instructions of the Vatican. Actually, it was a well pondered and planned coincidence of interests of the Vatican, on the one hand, and fascism constantly attacking the Sokols, on the other. Thousands of South Slavs who participated in the event took back home with them a bitter feeling, having realized that all of them living along the banks of the rivers: Vltava, Warta and Socha have the same ethnicity. It is with this awareness in mind that they started developing their national strategies which were not in line with the interests of the Vatican and fascism. The Sokol Movement very well understood the reasons for the hostility of the Roman Curia against them and the implications of the hostility which had nothing to do with religion. The Roman Curia simply could not accept brotherhood between the Poles-devoted Catholics and the liberal, progressive sons of the people of Jan Huss, Jan Ziska, Prokop and Jan Amos

---

9. "THE VATICAN AND ITS INTRIGUES AGAINST THE ALL SOKOL RALLY IN PRAGUE!" The Poles brought up interesting details of the policy conducted by high clergy behind the scene (Vatikanske spletke protiv svesokoljskog sletu u Pragu...), WORD ("RIJEČ"), 1926 no. 277.
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Komensky, “the national teacher”, a Galileo of education who were proud to be called the people of Komensky. The first anti-Sokol Epistle of the Catholic Episcopate in Yugoslavia and later on the attitude of the Nuncio in Belgrade, Cherubini, reveal a similar approach, which proves that the strengthening of the Slavic idea and its dissemination through the progressive and freedom loving Sokol Movement was equally unacceptable to both the Vatican and its obvious ally-fascism.

The Archbishop of Sarajevo, Sharitch and his close associates reproached the Croatian Sokols for not joining the Eagle Movement (Orlov) since they share the same feelings of national exclusiveness and separatism. Aleksandar Freidereich, one of the Sokol leaders, delivered in Sarajevo a lecture on the Sokol Movement, which ignited a very interesting discussion between the Sarajevo clericals and the representatives of the Croatian Sokol. The Sarajevo clericals and their supporters were appalled to hear from Freidereich that: “it is absolutely irrelevant whether one wears a fez on his head, or a cross, whether while praying one crosses himself or keeps bowing because religion motivated by ethics is a matter of heart. We respect everyone’s religion.” Sharitch’s KATOLICKI TJEDNIČIK (Catholic weekly) of May 15, 1927 vehemently reacted to this statement warning the Catholic parents to take this idea seriously: “If you believe that the Catholic Church is the only stronghold of everlasting celestial and earthly happiness then you must know that the movement disseminating the ideas contrary to the Gospel is not the right place for your children.” Evidently, the idea of tolerance the Sokols were disseminating was rejected with bitterness. The polemics that followed was a good opportunity for Freudereich to give a long lecture on tolerance and brotherly love in the spirit of the Jesus: “Love your next...” and emphasize that the Sokols simply cannot transform love for the next into hatred of a brother of different religion which is neither his merit, nor his guilt.

It should, however, be emphasized that all Catholic Bishops did not share the views of Archbishops Sharintich and Bauer on the Sokols. It is interesting to note that in his letter of July 30, 1928 to the Sokol Society in Vinkovci Bishop Akšamović (Aksamovic) thanks them for the Memorial Book and at the end says: “Greetings Sokols! (Zdravo Sokol) God bless you all and help you get stronger and stronger!“


11 Organizacija Saveza sokola Kraljevine Jugoslavije, Jljubljana, 1930, 7, 18.
As a result of the political changes of January 6, 1929, and the establishment of dictatorship the EAGLES, the YUGOSLAV and CROATIAN SOKOLS and the YUGOSLAV SOKOL ALLIANCE were all abolished and on December 5, 1929, the Government founded the SOKOL ALLIANCE OF THE KINGDOM OF YUGOSLAVIA. A great number of "old" Sokols left the organization believing that the new Sokol Alliance had nothing to do with the perennial one. On the other hand, the old members who adhered to the new Sokol were often and rightly criticized for supporting the organization indirectly serving the dictatorial regime, thus granting legitimacy to compromised ideas. Many leaders of the new Sokol Alliance of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia headed by Engelbert Gangle and Otton Gavrančič who were using their best effort to keep alive the ancient tradition of the Movement, bad serious problems because the Government, the supporters of dictatorship and various political fellow travelers tended to compromise the perennial ideas of the Sokol Movement. The same applies to the idea of Yugoslavism, compromised to the point of humiliation by the state imposed Yugoslavism. The clericals, traditional enemies of the Sokols, continued their old hostilities against the new Sokol, for the same reason. Namely, the Statute of the Sokol Alliance of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, Article 11 of the General Provisions reiterates the idea of Tyrs that: "The Sokol societies organize physical, moral and national education as envisaged by the Rules and Regulations issued by the Main Board and the Boards of the local societies called ZUPA." In its MANIFESTO of January 28, 1930 the Sokol Alliance of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia spells out the major objectives of the reorganized Sokol, which are: Yugoslavism, Slavic solidarity, the spirit of progress and tolerance for all nations and ethnic groups, irrespective of their religion, and respect of all principles laid down by the founders of the Movement: Tyrs and Fügner. These ideas were still alive in the minds of the new Sokol leaders. The clerics and their supporters in Croatia and other Slavic countries did not like this new, reorganized Sokol either. Nor did the Italian clerics, their supporters and Italian fascists in whose eyes the Sokol Alliance of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was a military organization with the primary task to neutralize their appetite for some Yugoslav lands.

The book PUTEVI I CILJEVI (Ways and Objectives) adopted by the General Assembly of the Sokol Alliance of the Kingdom Of Yugoslavia of March 29, 1931, is devoted to the ideology of the old (perennial) Sokol Movement and its approach to the concept of relations on the national level, on the level of the state and on the level of the Slavic community. Already at that time the clericals accused the Sokols of promoting religious indifferentism and slovenian klerikalcima, nego i talijanjskim, a tako i fašistima in Italia, koji su u Sokolstvu, već ranije, a pogotovo po pojavu SKJ vidjeli u tome jednu vojničku organizaciju – uperenu prvenstveno protiv njihovog apeti- ta s obzirom na Jugoslaviju. Cjelokupna ideologija Saveza sokola Kraljevine Jugoslavije razrađena je u knjizi „Putevi i ciljevi“ koje je prilazila glavna skup- ština SKJ 29. III 1931. „Putevi i ciljevi" jesu u prvom redu rezultati shvaćanja stare sokolske ideje i pogleda na sva pitanja, javnog, nacionalnog, državnog i opće slavenskog života. Jer se već tada prigovaralo od strane klerikalaca da Sokol zastupa ideju vjerskog indiferentizma, u „Putevima i ciljevima“ dodirnuto je i ovo pitanje. „Sokolstvo priznaje slobodu uvjerenja i mizi svakog pojedinca. Sokolstvo poštuje svako vjersko uvjerenje i osjećanje, jer smatra da je vjera najistinadnu dio unutrašnjeg duševnog života. Sokolstvo usvaja načelo vjerske nošljivosti“.11

U zasebnom glavi „Sokolstvo i vjera“ ovaj je stav još preciznije određen.

„Sokolstvo kao ideja slobode uvjerenja i slobodnoj životnoj budućnosti svakog pojedinca. Od svog članstva zahvala, poštuje sve slobodno i iskreno uvjerenje i mišljenje državljana i u tome da čuva čistoču sokolske ideologije. Sokolstvo naročito poštuje i svaku vjersku uvje- renje i osjećanje, jer smatra da je vjera najistinadnu dio unutrašnjeg života svakog pojedinca. Svaki pripadnik sokolske organizacije može slobodno da izrašava svoje zapovijedi i propise svoje vjere i crkve.“

Na otet ni ovim nikad nisu bili zadovoljni klerikalci, ni episkopati. Pogotovo kada je Sokolstvo i sada bilo još veće i osnovano nego ranije sa školom, osnovnom i srednjom. Jer cjelokupni česni odgoj u srednjim i stručnim školama imao se provoditi po sokolskom sustavu. Orlstvo i clerikalanizam osjetili su da je zakonom o osnivanju Sokola Kraljevine Jugoslavije i njegovom funkcijom u osnovnoj i srednjoj školi uveliko pogodan deožekose plan o njihovom klerikalno-separatistickom djelovanju. Kao što je Zakon o SKJ primijenjen na velikim negodovanjem od jugoslavenskih klerikalaca i episkopata on je podvrgnut kritici u talijanskoj fašističkoj stampi kao i u onom službenom i poluzlužbenom u Vatikanu. Nema sumnje da je Vatikan bio izvještaj od pojedinih biskupa i nadbiskupa o značenju tog novog zakona, a zacijelo sa komentarima, koji su se podudarali sa političko-separatističkom orientacijom crkvenog velikodostojnika. Pa i sam nuncjači već po svojoj funkcijibio je u tom pogledu u prvom planu. Kako će se vidjeti da je već ranije ulagao protestne nove radi sokolskog zakona kao i uvedenja fizičkog odgoja u školi. Ako su se 1925. pojedini jugoslavenski

11 Putevi i ciljevi, 21.
ence. This book (Ways and Objectives) devotes due attention to the Sokol's approach to religion...The idea of the Sokol Movement is full respect for all religious beliefs and feelings as the most intimate aspects of spiritual life of each individual and full support to the principle of religious tolerance."

The book deals in details with the topic of religion in a separate chapter entitled: THE SOKOL MOVEMENT AND RELIGION.

"The Sokol ideology implies the right of the individual to freedom of thought and belief. Its members are expected to respect all other religious beliefs and feelings as the most intimate aspects of spiritual life of each individual, and each member of the Sokol is free to honor the principles of his religion and church and behave accordingly."

The clericals and the Episcopacy did not like this approach, particularly now when the Sokol Movement got more closely linked to the elementary and secondary school education. Actually, the entire concept of physical education at school was developed according to the Sokol system.

The clericals and the supporters of ORLOVI (Eagles) realized soon enough that the establishment of THE ALLIANCE OF THE KINGDOM OF YUGOSLAVIA and its role in the elementary and secondary school education will seriously impede their separatist activities. The Act on the Sokol of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was vehemently criticized not only by the Yugoslav clericals, their supporters and the Yugoslav Episcopacy, but also by the Italian fascist press and the official and semi-official Vatican press. Evidently, some bishops and archbishops were involved in the campaign with the task not only to keep the Vatican informed about the implications of the new law, but also to send their political comments with special emphasis on the prospects of separatism in view of that law. By the very nature of his position the Nuncio was prominently active in this campaign. He is known for leading protests against the Act on the Sokol of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. In the talks with the Yugoslav delegation in Rome negotiating the CONCORDAT Cardinal Gasparri said that already in 1925 some Catholic bishops in Yugoslavia were hostile to the state of Yugoslavia (at that time called the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) and in Rome conducted a campaign against it.12

In the light of that fact it is not difficult to assume

11 WAYS AND OBJECTIVES (Poseti i ciljevi), p. 21.
12 See Chapter X.
the nature of their comments on the Sokols. Since censorship during the 6-th of January regime was very strict the bishops smartly decided to use the authority of the Holy See and its Encyclical devoted to general matters with special emphasis on Christian education. Everything in the Encyclical dealing with education refers to Yugoslavia, without mentioning its name. The Vatican also reacted promptly. On December 31, 1929 Pius XI announced his Encyclical on Christian Education of the young. In the introduction the Pope explains that it is the nature of education in different countries and the wish expressed by a number of bishops and their believers to hear his views on that subject that he decided to openly announce them in this Encyclical.13 Evidently the suggestion came from Yugoslavia where in November 1929, a month before the Encyclical, a Law on the Sokol Alliance of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and a Law on School Education was enacted. The clericals and their supporters were profoundly dissatisfied with both of these laws. To the best of our knowledge at that time this issue was not raised in any other country; except Italy which resulted in a conflict between Mussolini and the Pope over the role of the CATHOLIC ACTION. Pius XI admits that according to church principle it is the church, the state and the family that share the responsibility for the education of the young, but emphasizes that church education has priority with regard to the other two because the spirit of the church as a supreme and most reliable teacher of religion, should permeate the complete school education.

The Church is, therefore, entitled to open and support schools and other institutions teaching science and arts and culture, on all levels. The same applies to physical education which should also be under the motherly care of the Church because in view of its nature this education may be developed to the benefit, or detriment, of Christian education in general...14 Furthermore, it is an inalienable right and imperative duty of the Church to monitor in all public and private schools and institutions not only the program of religious education but also all other aspects of teaching involving religion and ethics. The use of that right should not be interpreted as interference of the Church because it only reflects its motherly care for the children and their protection against all kinds of dangerous scientific and moral poisons.14

---

13 THE ENCYCICAL OF THE HOLY FATHER PIUS XI ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION OF YOUTH (Enciklika Svetog oca Pape o kućanstvu mladeži), Zagreb, 1930.
14 Reprinted from the „KATOLIČKA LIST“ 1930.
15 THE ENCYCICAL: (Enciklika) 6-7.
This means that in all public and private schools and institutions of learning the state has to respect the natural rights of the Church and parents and secure Christian education for their children. The State should guarantee that right to the Church according to the principles of proportionate distribution, so as to avoid any aspect of possible state monopoly. Moreover, it is inadmissible, against the spirit of Christianity and the principle of equality to exercise any physical or moral pressure on the parents to send their children to public schools. This, however, does not mean that the state should be excluded from the process. On the contrary. The State is responsible for the administration, management of public affairs, defense of the country and internal and external peace, in the interest of public good. In that aim the State should open professional schools providing special, including military education, indispensable for securing services of special state interest. Only, the State should always be very careful never to infringe on the rights of the Church and family in this field of education either.

At this point we feel it our duty to draw attention to a phenomenon of nationalism which is nowadays spreading in its artificial and exaggerated version and which is, as such, an enemy of peace and progress. This also applies to physical education for boys (and girls too, although it is against their natural features) which include some elements of military drill. Moreover, such activities are often organized on Sundays and Church holidays which should be devoted to church and family life. Our intention is not to criticize the beneficial effects of this kind of education fostering courage and discipline; we only want to say that aggressiveness should not be a substitute for courage and noble feelings of valor as a basic principle of all activities undertaken in the defense of the native country and its peace and public order. The only thing we want to criticize is the exaggerated importance attached to athletics which already in the era of paganism brought about degeneration and disintegration.

We would like to reiterate and endorse their statements (those of Pius IX and Leo XIII) and recall the Canonical Rules according to which Catholic Youth is prohibited to attend non-Catholic, neutral or mixed schools, namely the schools equally accessible to Catholics and non-Catholics. The Ordinaries is the only entitled to allow exceptions to the Rule, in special circumstances and upon serious de-

va Crkve i obitelji na kršćanski odgoj; a kako je dužna izvršava-
ti distributivnu pravednost. Zato je nepravedan i nedopušten svaki uzgojni ili školski monopol, koji bi fizički ili morašno sliše obitelji na polazak državnih škola protiv obveze kršćanskih svesti ili protiv opravdanog davanja prednosti drugima. To dakako ne isključuje, da se država zbog valjana uprave javnih poslova i zbog unutarnje i vanj-
ske obrane mira – stvari – koje su tako nužne za opće dobro i koje trae posebnu upravnu i posebnu spremu – pridrži osnivanje i upravljanje stručnih škola za nekoje svoje službe, napose za vojni-
sku, samo da imade brigu da se ne povrijede prava crkve i obitelji u onome, što spada na njih. Nije beskorisno ovdje napose ponoviti ovu opominu. U naša se naime vremenom (kada se širi neki nacionalizam, koliko pretjerani i lažni, jednako “olikolik nepristojeli mira i napretka”, običajno prekoračiti pravedne granice u tome, što se na vojnicičku ureduje takozvani fizički odgoj dječaka (a kadkad također i djevoj-
ocica, premda je to protiv same naravi ljudskih stvari), koji k tome često puta na dan Gospodnji preko mjere zaštićeno u ono vrijeme, koje mora biti posvećeno vjerskim dužnostima i sveratu obiteljskoga ži-
vora. Ustalom nećemo Mi da pokudimo ono, što u tim metodama može biti dobra u duhovni discipline i prave srčanosti, nego samo kudimo svaki eksces, kakav je na primjer duh sigovitosti koji se ne smije zamijeniti s duhom hrabrosti ni s plemenitim osjećajem voj-
ničke vrline u obrani domovine i javnog porekla; a i ono useljavanje atletizma, koji je za pravi fizički odgoj već u klasično pogansko doba značio degeneraciju i raslo.”

“Mi obnavljamo i potvrđujemo njihove izjave (tj. papa Pija IX. i Lava XIII.), a ujedno i propise svetih kanona po kojima je katoličko mladeži zabranjeno pohajanje uakrilčekih, neutralnih ili mjeslovi-
tih škola, tj. onih koje su jednako tez razlike otvorene katolicima i nekatočima... To se pohajanje može trpeći i to jedino po sudi Ordinarija i u određenim prilikama vremena i mjesta i pod osobitim oprezima. Ne može se za katoličke dopustiti ni ona mješovita škola... u kojoj mladež dobiva dođušne napose vješku obrazu, ali ostaju obu-
ku prima ona od učitelja nekatočika i u zajednici sa svim nekatočkim pitomcima... Potrebno je da se stava i sav uređaj škole: učitelje, nastavnici, ostavne i knjige i to u svim predmetima protiv kršćanskih duh pod upravljanjem i materinskim nadzorom crkve tako da vjeru bude uistinu temeš i krunga cijele obuke u svim stepenima, ne samo
laborations on the case. The Catholics are also prohibited to attend raised schools—namely the schools which provide separate religious education for Catholics, but where all other subjects are taught by non-Catholic teachers and where they attend class with non-Catholic pupils. ... The curriculum, the whole teaching process, the teachers, the books and all teaching aids should be permeated with the spirit of Christianity and under the auspices and motherly care of the Catholic Church. This means that religion should be the foundation and the crown of the whole teaching process not only in elementary schools, but also in the secondary and high level education. We cannot accept the explanation that this approach to education is too expensive in a multi-confessional country because neutral and mixed schools also cost. ... In the regions with a multi-confessional population the situation is different. There, the Catholics themselves finance Catholic schools for their children, with the help of the Episcopate, the clergy and other Catholic donors. In spite of being a heavy financial burden on them they accept it voluntarily, out of conscious commitment to their Church and pious religious feelings. ... In case this right is denied to them, or in any way jeopardised, the Catholics will use their very best efforts to defend their schools on the ground of the Law on Education guaranteeing them that right.26

It is evident that in this Encyclical Pius XI refers to the circumstances in Yugoslavia, both in the political and in the field of education, because there is no other country in the world with such confessional diversity. But, in spite of the presence of other religions too, the Pope requires only Catholic teachers in mixed schools. According to Pius XI in multi-confessional states CATHOLIC ACTION (Koloniška akcija) has a special task to fulfil. Therefore, the Catholics all over the world, regardless of their nationality and ethnic origin, should support Catholic schools for their children. It should be emphasized that this request has nothing to do with politics. It only means commitment of the Catholics to their faith and their conscious choice.27

It should be noted that the Encyclical was not written in Latin—universal language of the Roman Catholic Church, but in the language of the fascist Italy. Written in Italian language this Encyclical denies the universal nature of the Catholic Church and shows that it is actually Italian and universal only to the extent it serves the imperialist strivings of the Italian fascists to revive the Roman Empire. The Fascists were very happy with the content and

ostovne nego i srednje više škole. ... Neka se ne kaže da je u narodu, koji je podijeljen na više vjeroispovijesti državi nemoguće, da se za javna izobražavanje posvrški drukčije nego sa neutralnom ili mješovitom školom... U drugim krajevima izmiješanih vjeroispovijesti događa se protivno (tj. da se pomažu katolički i konfesionalne škole), dakako na teški teret katolika, koji pod zaštitom i vodstvom Episkopa i uz neumorna sankciju svjetovnog i redovnog klera uzdržavaju sa svim svojim trouštvenom katoličku školu za svoju djecu, jer to traži preteška obvezna njihove savjesti... A gdje se i ta osnovna sloboda sprečava ili na razne načine kraji, katolici neće nikada dosta nastojati, da makar i pod cijenu ogromnih zrtava uspješno i hrane svoje škole i da se brinu da se uzakone pravedni školski zakoni.26

Koliko je ovim stavom Enciklika Fio XI zahvatio u jugoslovenske prilike, školske i političke samo je po sebi jasno jer je u toj imao poredjenja sa na kojim zanimljava svijet, gdje pristojNight sverke religioznosti. Pa opet on traži da u tim mješovitim školama učitelji i profesor budu isključivo katolički. Pio XI je u takvim vjerskim mješovitim državama ranije zasnovao susednu dužnost i zadaćak K. A. "Zato katolici bilo kojem narodu na svijetu brinući se za katoličku školu svoje djece – neka bude glasno proglašeno i neka dobro razumije i priznaju svi – ne čine stranačkog političkog djela nego vjersko djelo, koje im je neodoljivo nalako njihova savjest."27


16 Enciklika, 22-26.
message of the Encyclical and their enthusiasm for the Roman Curia at that particular moment was almost unprecedented in the history of their mutual relations.

The Encyclical was very soon published in Yugoslavia in some papers of the ORDINARIUM and in JANUARY 1930 as a separate booklet. Thus, the Encyclical was given wide publicity and very soon attracted great public attention as a significant and open political move of the Roman Curia. The Episcopate and the clericals welcomed it with great enthusiasm because it meant support from a high place to their negative attitude towards the existing school education and the Sokol. The Encyclical immediately aroused animated discussions on the political level. At that time the situation in foreign policy was very complex and unfavorable. Revisionism was in full swing in Austria and Hungary and wholeheartedly supported by fascist Italy. The Encyclical on Education of Youth may be interpreted as part of the same effort. According to Milanese CORRIERE DELLA SERA the Encyclical on Christian education of Youth primarily addresses the circumstances in Yugoslavia. For evident reasons OSSERVATORE ROMANO of January 16, 1930 rejects the accusation and its connection with fascist ideology and insists that the Encyclical has in view all states and reflects the attitude of the Catholic church to education of youth in general. On January 23, 1930 Roman TRIBUNA published an article by its Budapest correspondent under the title: "Anti-Catholic Aspects of Serbian Struggle against Croats" in which the author makes biased comments on the situation in Yugoslavia. He even goes so far as to claim that the laws adopted by the 6-th of January regime endanger the property of some Croatian religious societies and institutions. He also mentions the case of NAPREDAK which decided to transfer its whole property to the Catholic Archbishopric of Sarajevo. All these comments indicate that negotiations on the CONCORDAT will not be continued. This and some other cases from time to time discussed in the Austrian, Italian and Hungarian press represent only smart links in the chain of activities undertaken and campaigns launched by the Vienna clerical REICHPOST and very keenly taken over by the Italian fascist and the clerical press. The counter-attack was published soon in the article entitled: AN ARTIFICIAL EFFORT TO CREATE A CATHOLIC FRONT. The author of the article signed CROAT CATHOLIC, evidently on the ground of relevant information and data from the Foreign Ministry, discusses a number of developments in foreign policy aimed against the interests of Yugoslavia and

svim svojim snagama u Madžarskoj i Austriji kao što ga je uveliko podupira- 
la fašistička Italija. Nema sumnje da izvješće podudarnosti daju osjetljivije i za pojavu papinske Enciklike o odgoju omladine. Milanski „Corriere della 
Serà“ podvukao je da je Enciklika o kršćanskom odgoju odnosi u prvom 
redu na jugoslovenske prilike. Mada je ovu fašističku tezu „Osservatore 
Romano“ 16. i 1930. iz sasvim shvatljivih razloga demastirao i izjavljuv, da se 
a Enciklika odnosi na sve države bez razlike, jer sadrži nasu katoličku crkvu 
o odgoju mladeži. Osim toga rimska „Tribuna“ objavila je 23. i 1930. od sveg 
pešačkog dopisnika komentalne o situaciji u Jugoslaviji sa karakterističnim 
naslovom „Antikatolički izgled srpske borbe protiv Hrvata“. U čitavom nizu 
ocigledno tendencioznih navoda dopisnik saopšćuje da su došla u pitanje 
imovina izvjesnih hrvatskih drustava i ustanova vjerskih karaktera pogodi 
ze zakonima šestosjanuarskog režima. Tu se navodi slučaj sarajevskog „Napretka“ koji je prenio svoju imovinu na nadbiskupiju što daje nasluđivati 
đa da se nikako ne misli na obnovu pregovora za zaključivanje konkordata. Ovaj 
nesaslanjen slučaj od čitavog niza koji se pojavljuju čak i u austrijskoj, čas u 
talijanskoj, čas u madžarskoj, samo je jedan vješt sačinjen lanac akte 
ja i kampaženje koju je započeo bečki klerikalni „Reichpost“ a obječuju 
u prihvatila talijanska, fašistička i klerikalna stupa. Ovo sve je podvrgav kri 
tici anonimnih pisac članka „Ujedno stvaranje katoličke svete“. Znalo se 
de da je pisac dobio podatke od Ministarstva vanjskih poslova. Anonimni autor 
„Hrvat kroat" obuhvatio je čitav splat vanjsko-političkih zbivanja usmjere 
jenih protiv interesa Jugoslavije i njene konsolidacije. U članak je pisac obja 
šnio prije svega pojačanu nervozu katoličkog episkopata u vezi sa zakonom o 
školama i zakonom o SKJ. Stoviše i sam nuncij Pellegrini uputio je protes 
tne note Ministarstvu vanjskih poslova kao i ostalim nadležnim ministar 
ima. Mjerodavni su tvrdili da su note bile tendenciozne i da nije ni jednom zakonom 
bilo pred očima da bilo u sumu o malom ili sudbinu polojnosti katoličke nauke 
je. To se najbolje vidjeo što je ministar prosvjete mogao da izda Pravilnik 
u dnu tog ishodišta školskog zakona i da formulisu primjenu toga zakona na 
takav račun da je formulacija mogla potpuno zadovoljiti najviše predstav 
ke katoličkog episkopata u državi. Sasvim je bilo priredno da šestosjanuarski 
režim nije hio da namjereno izazove sukob sa katoličkom crkvom, posto je 
v ladi bio od 6. januara 1929. do 30. siječnja 1931. ministar dr. Anton 
Korošec. Stoviše, dačima je dozvoljeno da se izvan škole udržavaju u katoli 
čkim društvima. Međutim, klerikalci su bili neobiščice nezadovoljni zato što

18 The author was actually Milan Marjanović, Director of PRESS BUREAU. The note cited above was a reaction to the article, but remained in office.

19 Sada se zna da je pisac bio Milan Marjanović, tadašnji ispredirektor. Ćitanje je umenim i ministar Korosćeca, mada je on dalje ostao u vladini.
its consolidation. He starts by explaining why the Catholic Episcopate is so irritated by the Law on Education and the Law on the Sokol of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Nuncio Pellegrini even led a written protest with the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and other relevant ministries in this regard. But the relevant ministries rejected these protests as groundless, since, according to them, the Law in no way underestimates or jeopardizes the role of the Catholic Church. The Minister of Education even issued the RULES OF CONDUCT and INSTRUCTIONS for their implementation. The wording of these documents absolutely meets the requirements of the Catholic Church and the Episcopate in Yugoslavia. Naturally, the 6-th of January regime did not want to enter into conflict with the Catholic Church owing to the fact that Dr. Anton Koroščet (Korošec) was one of its ministers from January 6, 1929 to September 30, 1931. Catholic pupils were free to attend Catholic institutions outside school. The clericals, particularly irritated by the status of the new Sokol and its presence in schools, denied to the Eagles (Orlovi), decided to react. Thanks to a smart maneuver they dealt a severe blow on the Government by converting the Eagle Movement into a religious organization in disguise, under a new name GREAT FRATERNITY OF CRUSADERS (VELIKO KRIZARSKO BRATSTVO). In spite of its Statute of an exclusively religious organization it was conceived so as to enable the EAGLE to continue its political engagement. Moreover, the clericals started spreading rumors that, within its efforts to impose the unitarian (centralized) regime, the State intends to confiscate the property of all Catholic institutions which do not follow its Rules of Behavior. The point was to find a pretext for giving up their property to the benefit of the Church. In their negative campaign they went even so far as to claim that these institutions would have to merge with other religious or ethnic organizations in view of making them uniform. This was only one of numerous attempts to justify the transfer of property to the Catholic Church. Following this example NAPREDAK from Sarajevo handed over to Archbishop Sharitch (Sarić) its several million worth property. The Croatian Public Reading Room in Tonči grad did the same. In his circular letter fra Mihitić, (Mišić) Bishop of Mostar, calls on all Croatian institutions to seek refuge under the auspices of the Catholic Church. The aim of these efforts and activities was to make the most of the already created specific atmosphere and psychosis in which some bishops would act not only as protectors and defenders of the dissolved Croatian institutions, but also become the leaders of their members. This approach was adopted in view of creating je Sokol mai i u iznijenjenom obliku ušao u školu, a Orlovi su bili zabranjeni. Međutim, klerikalci su na drugoj strani iznijeli osobit manevr i zadali dohar udarac vlastima, kad su Orlovoštvo pretvorili u kamuflirani vjesku ustanovu. Naime, orlovske organizacije pretvorile su se u Veliko križarsko bratstvo, koje je prema statutima popuno vjesku ustanovu, ali je tako vješto organizirana, da u potpunosti zamijenjuje izvljavajuće političkih tendencija nekadašnjih orlova. Iz klerikalnih krugova proturane su vijesti kako država prema novim unifikatornim težnjama namjerava konfiscirati imovinu svim onim društvima koja se ne žele uniformirati, a to samo stoga, kako bi ta društva prenijela ovu svoju imovinu na crkvu. Stoviše, aigiralo se da će se vjeska i plemenska društva morati stopti sa inostranim i inoplemenskim, pa će biti bolje ako ga predaju crkvenim vlastima. Tako je sarajevski „Napredak“ predao veliku milijunsku imovinu nadbiskupu Šariću a tako i hrvatska čitaonica u Tomislavgrad. Mostarski biskup fra Mišić pružao je okružnicom hrvatske društva da se sklone pod okrilje katoličke crkve. Sve je to učinjeno da se iskorištiti jedna psihologija i da pojedini biskupi tako postanu ne samo zaštićenici i branitelji nego i vode članstva tih hrvatskih rasturenih društava. Sve je to učinjeno u očiglednoj namjeri da se stvori jedan naročit katolički front prema svim drugima i prema čitavoj državi. Nije bez značenja da se sva ta akcija podudara sa stvaranjem Lateranskog pakta, sa izmjenjenjem Massolinija i Pia XI, i sa odlaskom Ante Pavelčića u inostranstvo, najprije Bugarsku pa onda u Italiju, gdje je našao na puno podršku za svoje ruševne ciljeve protiv Jugoslavije. Postoje jasni znaci da se ustvari ova akcija ne vodi iz Hrvatske, nego izvana i za tudi račun. U Hrvatskoj ta akcija ide za tim da kanaliziraostatke starog nezadovoljstva kako bi se povezao plemenski moment sa konfesionalnim, da se sugerira masama, pa i inteligenciji da jedini oslonac Hrvatima može da bude u njihovoj borbi, u jednoj internacionalnoj konfesionalnoj organizaciji. Uočit tomo, što hrvatsko pitanje nikad nije bilo postavljeno kao konfesionalno. To najutjecajnije pokazuju obe njegova vode, oba antiklerikalca Ante Starčević i Stjepan Radić. Sada bi se svi trebali staviti pod vodstvo crkve, pod vodstvo kojemu je sjedište Rim. Bečki katolički i reakcionalni elementi ne podržavaju bez razloga tezu o srpskim antikatoličkim tendencijama u Jugoslaviji opravdavajući time stvaranje katoličke fronte. U Beču i Rimu prikazuju se stvari tako da Hrvati ne mogu doći do ravno-pravnosti u Jugoslaviji, i to ne zato što su Hrvati, već stoga što su katolici. Kad se uoči akcija papinskog nuncijsa u Beogradu, koji na upadan način kritizira prosvjetnu politiku u Jugoslaviji, prebrojava broj stanovništva i činovništva u

18 See op. cit. Chapter XI.
19 Vid prijedlog poglavije XI.
a Catholic front against all others and the whole state. Some other interesting developments along these lines should also be mentioned: the signing of the LATERAN TREATIES, reconciliation between Mussolini and Pius XI and the trip of Ante Pavelitch (Pavel) to Bulgaria and Italy where he obtained full support for his destructive activities against Yugoslavia. According to evidence, these activities were not conducted from Croatia, but from abroad, to serve foreign interests in the first place. The aim of combining the ethnic with the religious aspect was to bring together all dissatisfied Croats, not only Croatian masses, but also Croatian intellectuals, and persuade them that the Catholic Church as an international religious organization is the only one capable of providing them the support they need for their struggle. It should, however, be recalled that the Croatian question has never been a religious issue. The case in point are two Croatian leaders: Ante Starčević (Ante Starčević) and Stepin Raditch (Stepan Radic) who both maintained anti-clerical political views. Now, the idea was to accept the leadership of the church and the Holy See in Rome. In Vienna the Catholics and reactionaries accused Serbia for being anti-Catholic. Actually it was only their pretext within the effort to establish a Catholic front. In Vienna and Rome best endeavors were being used to sell the idea that the Croats were denied equality in Yugoslavia, not as Croats but as Catholics. The Nuncio in Belgrade vociferously criticized the policy of education in Yugoslavia. Also, he organized the population census in the Banovinas on religious grounds and compared the number of Catholics with their number employed in the regional administration head offices (Banovina) in order to determine the percentage of Catholics in public administration. The point was to impose some kind of a “key” in the employment policy on that level.

This approach was in line with the plans of Croatian clericals, the Episcopate, the policy of fascist Italy and the Roman Curia. In their view this was the right moment for pressure on Yugoslavia to sign the CONCORDAT. In his circular letter the Bishop of Ljubljana, Jeglic (Jeglic) vehemently criticized the new laws and regulations on education and the status of the Sokol, calling on the devoted members of Catholic church to close ranks and persevere in their resistance. The author of the article continues by quoting the Encyclical in which the clericals call on Catholic parents to send their children to Catholic schools only, although they are under some kind of state control. Actually, in spite of their independent administration and autonomous development all churches, including the Catholic Church, are not separated from the state because the state partly budgets their activities and salaries of clergy. It is difficult to believe that the Vatican did not banovinama prema njihovim vjerospo-
vjestima i nabacuje pitanja o vjerskim „ključevima” kod namještajana činovni-
ka, onda se može uočiti povezanost ove akcije u vremenu, tendencijama i plano-
vima hrvatskih klerikalaca, Episkopata i politike fašističke Italije i Rimskih Kurije, koja je smatrala da je situacija u Jugo-
slaviji povoljna da je se stigne i prilazi na konkordat. Ljubljanski biskup Jeglic u svojim okružnicama veoma je oštro na-
pao nove školske zakone i odredbe a tako i Sokole i poziva je vjernike na
otpor. Sto se tiče papina Enciklike, pisac kaže, da papa poziva katolički svijet da
svoju onladimu daje samo u katoličke škole, iako se zna da su škole podrža-
vljene i da katolička crkva, kao i ostale
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know anything about these activities of the church. Evidently, the aim of the anti-Yugoslav harangue was to antagonize the law abiding Catholics against Yugoslavia and ignore the benefits and rights they enjoy in it as citizens and believers. Evidently the intention was to leave the impression with the international community that there is no religious tolerance in Yugoslavia and that Catholicism is jeopardized. In such an atmosphere the call for a front in defense of the Catholic faith and Catholic Church sounds natural and was actually planned as a smokescreen for the political aspect of the whole campaign.

It should be emphasized that all Croatian Catholic priests did not participate in that campaign, inspired from abroad and in the country conducted by a few fanatics who were very skillfully maintaining high tension. They obediently follow the instruction by listening to the voice from abroad and are deaf for the call of their own flesh and blood, in the effort to bring under their wing the whole Catholic clergy and all Catholics in Yugoslavia. These circle are not prone to the efforts of the Yugoslav government which is using its best efforts to reach a favorable agreement with the Vatican and solve the problems jeopardizing their mutual relations. It does not occur to them to support the request of the Government from 1924 that when appointing the bishops the Holy See should select them from the list of candidates proposed by the Bishops’ Council of that particular region. The Roman Curia does not accept that limitation. The author of the article goes on by wondering whether the clerical circles have the slightest feeling for the national aspect. If they are sincere Croats they should support this request of the Yugoslav government and thus prevent foreigners, Italians, Arnauts (Albanians), Hungarians or Germans, to be appointed bishops in Dalmatia, Croatia, Slovenia and Voyvodina. Efforts are being made to uproot from memory the old request of Croatian priests to use the Gleagolitic missal for Catholics on the whole territory of Yugoslavia. Why, wonders the author of the article and answers: “Because it is not in the interest of the political background of the whole campaign in support of the establishment of a Catholic front in Yugoslavia. Actually, this is not in line with the old Croatian tradition and their struggle for national identity. This is an obscure machination which Bishop Strossmayer would call Furtim, which means a specific, psychotic atmosphere created in view of achieving a given aim. This high tension is very smartly designed. The intention is to attract numerous former followers of Stjepan Raditch (Radic) who used to insist on the religious, but NOT on the confessional and clerical aspect, and also attract the inteligentias, always progressive, in the spirit of Starchevitch or Strossmayer, and put them all un-

biti ograničena predlozima biskupa jedne provincije. Ali, pita se pisac, ako naši crkveni krugovi imaju doista osjećaja za nacionalnom momenat i ako u njima doista Hrvati treba da nada oslonac svojim nacionalnim nastojanjima, zašto oni ne podrže ovo zahtjevanje vlade, po kome bila spriječena opasnost, da jednoga dana u jugoslavenskim biskupijama na sjeveru i na jugu, a naročito na zapadu u Dalmaciji, u Hrvatskoj, u Sloveniji i u Voyvodini, ne osvuna biskupi iz reda Talijana, Arnauta, Madžara ili Nijemaca? Zašto su tako temeljito zabašurili stari zahtjev Hrvata za uvođenje glagolice u katoličkom bogoslužju na cijeloj teritoriji Jugoslavije? Napravio stoga, odgovara sasvim pravilno pisac, jer te stvari nisu u interesu one političke pozadine koja stoji iza čitavog ovog forsiranog nezadovoljstva i forsiranog formiranja katoličke fronte u Jugoslaviji. Sve je to protivno i daleko od stare hrvatske tradicije i čitave narodnoj pa i plemenskoj borbi Hrvata. Može se nešto pokušati sa kripticenim, zaoblazanim načinom koji je Strossmayer nazvao „furtimskin“: Jedino „furtim“, „furtimatinom“ može se podvati ovako nešto Hrvatima, iskoristivajući postojeće i stvarajući novu psihosu medu njima. Ova se psihosu stvara jednim prepričanim načinom, da se one mase, koje je do nedavnog vodio Rudić i uzgajao ih u religioznom, ali ni u konfesionalnom, klerikalnom pravcu, i onu inteligenciju koja je u duhu bilo Starčevića, bilo Strossmayera, bila uvijek napredna i kulturna, podredi vodstvu nekoliko fanatika iz provincije, ili političara iz Ljubljane, a pod uticajem Pešte, Beča i Rima.20

Ovakav prikaz političke atmosfere toga vremena u vezi sa klerikalnim akcijama bio je uistinu vijetan odrez stvarnosti koje će u kasnijem zbivanju naići na punu potvrdu, naročito u uvodu u ustašku NDH, a u samom ustaštvu dat će hiljadu naknadnih dokaza za njihovo ranije postojanje, pa i onovremenih klerikalne akcije. U tom trenutku, kada se pristom ukazalo na ovu klerikalnu akciju, klerikali su u koru pokušali da su to najopakije i najnepra- vednije denuncije. Odalo je i odlučna reakcija zagrebačkog nadbiskupa Bauera na članak koji je u umjerenom i stvarnom izlaganju bez ikakvih licnih uvreda samo iznio opće uvjerenje sih, naprednijih krugova u Jugoslaviji. Nadbiskup Bauer ustvrdio je da je teško ikako kroz ovo 50 godina što prati javni život u Hrvatskoj iako u javnosti teži napajati na glavu katoličke crkve, kojoj pripada hrvatski narod i gotovo polovina pučanstva Jugoslavije kao i na katoličku crkvu točnije Međutim, u tom trenutku je zazvuko zahvatio nadbiskup Bauer na postojanje recimo zagrebačkog „Hrvatskog daka“, „Pokreta“, „Slobodne misli“, „Vala“, šibenskog „Naprednjaka“, splitske

the leadership of a few provincial fanatics, or politicians from Ljubljana under the strong influence of Budapest, Vienna and Rome.20

Tras description very faithfully reflects reality which later on culminated in the establishment of the fascist Independent state of Croatia - NDH and the USTAŠI movement, proved that it had its roots in this clerical campaign as well. Those who tried to expose the background of that clerical campaign were immediately unanimously accused by all clerics of being dirty denouncers. It is exactly in this spirit that Bishop Bauer vehemently reacted to this article which, in a moderate tone and offended no one, publicly and openly only expressed the opinion of the progressive circles in Yugoslavia.

Archbishop Bauer claims that for fifty years of his following the public life in Croatia there has never been a more vehement attack on the Head of the Catholic Church and the fascist Church in general which is the church of all Croats and almost of one half of the population in Yugoslavia. It is obvious that the Archbishop decided to ignore many papers such as HRVATSKI DJAK (Croatian schoolboy), POKRET (Movement), SLOBODNA MISAO (Free Thought), VAL (Wave) and VIHOR (Wind), published in Zagreb. NAPREDNJAK (Progressive), published in Shibenik), ZASTAVE (Flags), published in Split, PREPOROD (Renaissance), published in Ljubljana which were all engaged in hot discussions on anti-clerical issues. Even the Zagreb paper RIJEČ (Word) in 1929 published several extremely critical articles on this issue. NOVOSTI (News) criticized the Vatican and fascists for their anti-Yugoslav policy before and after the conclusion of the LATERAN TREATIES. Obviously, the Archbishop disregarded the articles in JUGOSLOVENSKA NIVJA (the Yugoslav Field) and in Old Catholic magazines REFORMA (Reform) and PREPOROD (Renaissance). He had in mind something else. He wanted to send a message to a "particular group" which was actually the source of all relevant information. It is with the "source" that the Archbishop wanted to argue in his effort to refute all accusations against the Holy See, the Episcopate, Nuncio Pellegrinetti and the CATHOLIC ACTION. The Archbishop particularly emphasized that all of them had always conducted activities strictly within the framework of Law. Had Archbishop Bauer lived to witness the developments in 1941 he would have probably been ashamed of the CATHOLIC ACTION and e.g. KRŽAR (Crusader) which bragged about the contribution of that organization to the destruction of Yugoslavia and establishment of NDH (Independent State of Croatia). At the end of this argument the Archbishop, in his capacity of Chairman of the Bishop


Conference declared that as a Croatian Archbishop and Ordinarius of Zagreb he could claim in all sincerity and with full responsibility, that the Episcopate and clergy share the same love for their Holy Mother Church, the Holy Father, their co-nationals with whom they live and work and for the State and its legal authorities; that the Episcopate and the clergy unanimously accept to carry out their duties and that there is no might or power which could force the Church to swerve from its path." This time too the Archbishop is using his best efforts to exculpate the Episcopate and clergy and throw all the blame on "international dark forces" (meaning free masons accused of supporting the 6th of January regime) whose aim is to ignite religious conflicts in Yugoslavia and launch a persecution campaign against the Catholic Church.22

This polemics has, undoubtedly, postponed the implementation of the Encyclical, primarily on education and Sokol. It was decided that the moment was not right for raising these issues because of their possible serious implications which may produce a negative affect on the authority of the Holy See and Pius XI himself. Under the circumstances they decided to patiently follow the developments in Yugoslavia and at the most appropriate moment take action, but only upon approval of the Roman Curia.

The discussion continued after the ALL SOKOL RALLY organized on VIDOVĐAN (June 28). Croatian clericals decided to counteract by organizing their own Rally as an event parallel to the Eucharistic Congress in Zagreb, in August, in order to show how strong they are. The public opinion rightly concluded that the Eucharistic Congress was a smartly conceived reaction to ALL SOKOL RALLY in Belgrade. Both, the organizers of the event and the participants admitted that fact. The atmosphere surrounding both events revealed the intentions and goals of each organizer. The Eucharistic Congress lasted from 14 to 17 August 1930. Nuncio Pellegrinetti was the Envoy of the Holy Father. Archbishop Bauer explained the reasons for organizing the Eucharistic Congress "and why it required so much money, effort and sac-

22 „Croatian Metropolitan“, (”Hrvatski metropoliten”) is an arbitrary term, invented and launched by Croatian press. The Roman Curia has never used it. Metropolita Crotica does not exist. And never did. There is only the METROPOLITA of the Zagreb bishopric. Metropolita Crotica was invented as a counterpart to the Hungarian Primas Hungary. The term Primas Serbiæ does exist, but Metropolita Crotica does not. The clergy that supported the return requested that the Archbishop of Zagreb be renamed to the PRIMAS OF YUGOSLAVIA. It is interesting to note that Archbishop Bauer also calls himself PRIMAS. A. Serpertina, his successor, will use the same title.


„Izražavaju nadalje svoju vjernost i odanost Rimskoj Apostolskoj Stolici i Vašoj Svetoći kao zamjeniku onoga Isusa Krista, čijoj prisutnosti u presvetoj Eucharistijskoj hoci ovaj kongres odati poštovanje i slavu, uvjereni da je zalegal nijhove narodne budućnosti ljubav prema katoličkoj crkvi i nježnoj vidljivoj glavi na zemlji. Konačno može od Vaše Svetoći blagoslov u svome radu i zborenju, koje ima za cilj da presveta Eucharistija preporodi duhovni život svih vjernika i zalada našim javnim životom."24

Prpravne koje su činjene za taj kongres u klerikalnoj, s i u ostaloj sepa-ratičkoj, orijentiranoj štampi u Zagrebu, Sarajevu, Splitu i drugdje, a tako i
rifice. Jesus is not only our Savior He is also our King and we should bow to him. Therefore, we shall take him to the streets of Zagreb in a solemn procession so that everyone can publicly bow before him and by doing so expiate for all wrongs done to Him and give Him satisfaction for all sins committed against him."

The Vicar Bishop Premush (Premus), Chairman of the Organizing Committee, reiterated the message, with which he concluded his opening address to the Congress. "Expressing hope that the Congress will take place in a favorable atmosphere he particularly emphasized that thanks to the presence of Msgr Pellegrinetti, Envoy of the Holy Father, Christ is among us through his representative on Earth."23

The Congress sent a telegram to the King in Belgrade and the Pope in Rome. The Croats and Slovenes most cordially thanked the Holy Father for the tribute he paid to the Congress by sending his Nuncio to represent him.

The participants in the Congress also made a solemn pledge of allegiance, faithfulness and devotion to the Roman Apostolic See and the Holy Father who represents Jesus Christ on Earth and who, through the Envoy of the Holy Father, is also present among us. It is to his presence at this Holy Eucharistia that this Congress wants to pay tribute and respect to our Lord, convinced that the future of our people lies in love for Catholic Church and its visible LORD on Earth. The Participants beg your Holiness to bless Congress and support it in its efforts to help the Eucharistia enrich the spiritual life of all believers and take the lead in our public life.24

All information about the Congress in the clerical and other press advocating separatism in Zagreb, Sarajevo, Split and elsewhere and the atmosphere surrounding the Congress revealed that the connection between Eucharistia and true religious feelings, on the one hand, and the Congress, on the other, was only formal. The general public understood the message coming from the organizers and within that effort took part in violent demonstrations staged in favor of separatism. There was not a single flag hoisted in Zagreb, simply because Croatian flags, as ethnic, were prohibited and the State flags were not acceptable. Actually, the absence of the state flag is indicative of the state of mind both of the organizers and participants. Only an enormous flag of the Holy See was hoisted on the tower of the Old Cathedral with two tiny Yugoslav flags at each side, to meet the legal requirement.

23 „POLITIKA“, August 16, 1930.
24 Idem.
This Congress was successful in rallying thousands and thousands of separatists who tacitly, but publicly, openly and spitefully demonstrated their attitude towards the Kingdom of Yugoslavia where the Congress was taking place. Not one single prayer was offered for Yugoslavia. On the other hand, particular attention was devoted to the links between Croatian people and the Holy See and Rome. Ante Pavelitch (Pavelic) an Ustasha emigrant, availed himself of the opportunity to get in touch with clerio-fashists, not yet united at that time. Actually, Ante Pavelitch followed with keen interest the preparations of this massive protest of the Croats who did not accept some of the solutions envisaged by the 6-th of January regime. Aware of what was going on Pavelitch sent a message from Italy to his supporters in which he says: „The Pope and Rome will liberate the Roman Catholic Croats from Orthodox Serbs“.

All the time the Congress kept glorifying the idea of Christ-the-King, in all addresses, speeches and lectures. Actually, it was Pius XI who particularly insisted on that idea. The Croatian clericals further developed that same idea insisting on the divinity of God-the-king on Heaven as opposed to the Serbian Orthodox King on Earth in Belgrade. This idea of celestial monar chism in Croatia was not an attempt to sell the republican idea in disguise, but rather encourage the already existing anti-Orthodox feelings of the clerics and the Croatian masses calling for separatism.

Pius XI very strongly supported and disseminated the idea launched by Benedictus VIII, according to which the Pope, being the King-of-Kings, is the envoy of Jesus Christ on Earth. Thus, in the eyes of the believers the Holy Father is the supreme Lord on Earth, above all others. Even before the LUTERAN TREATIES the Pope in Rome and the clericals in Yugoslavia found this idea very useful in politically turbulent circumstances. Propaganda in Catholic Churches and papers was conducted in that same spirit. All Catholics pilgrimage from Croatia were in Rome received by the Envoys of Christ-the-King. When in 1925 the Croatian Bishops decided to mark the Thousandth Anniversary of the Croatian Kingdom they organized the ceremony at the feet of the Envoys of Christ-the-King. Further elaborating on the idea of separatism the Croats decided to also get their own Croatian Queen by crowning the statue of the Holy Mother of Bistrica, on the 7-th of July, 1935. The intention was more than evident so that it was very difficult to put it under the umbrella of devotion to Holy Eucharistia and the Holy Mother.

---

22 Nikol Petrović, „EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS IN ZAGREB“ (Nikol Petrovic Zagrebački Eukharistički Kongres), „NÁŠA SLOGA“, August 22, 1930.

In his speeches Nunsio Pellegrinetti insisted on the same idea: Jesus Christ is the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords. In his prayer dedicated to the Holy Heart the idea of Christ-the-King comes first, Christ, who is to be the King of all Catholic Croats. This idea fostered by clerical circles, was earlier disseminated through KATOLICKI LIST and the writings of Stjepan Raditch, university professor and a clerical. He launched the following militant slogan: "We do not have our king, but we have Jesus Christ, the Almighty." In 1930 this play on words was the same as that in 1926, actually a sting addressed to Stjepan Raditch who turned coat, gave up republicanism and became a monarchist. The Old Catholics and their opponents very well understood the background and implications of that monarcho-republican game and its connection with Eucharistia. To hail Christ before Eucharistia reminded of the scene in which the Jews, wearing scarlet gowns and crowns of thorns on their heads derisively saluted Christ by chanting: "Hail King of Judea!" When gatherings under the auspices of Eucharistia are used to glorify the church and its Head in this way it is nothing but desecration of Eucharistia, it is actually sacrilege.26

The introduction of the prayer to the Eucharistic Heart of Jesus Reads as follows: "We, your Croatian people are fully aware that our beautiful country is a gift of your merciful generosity so that we may freely live in it and prosper .... Thanks to the gift of your love the Croats were among the first in Europe to adhere to the Catholic Church. Thus you have protected us from the sin of heresy and assigned us the task to serve as ante murus Christianitatis for centuries... We bow to your celestial wisdom, your celestial power and love with which you rule over Croatian People. Today, together with the entire Croatian people we pledge devotion to you—our King... In you believe because you are TRUTH and in your hands we put our lives and all our hopes, convinced that your true faith will bring us freedom and your Commandments peace to our mind."27

In 1930 the Episcopate actually revives Mahnich (Mahnić) and his thought from 1917 and 1918 when he spoke about unification of the churches according to the principle of unitarianism (centralism). The implication of the prayer to the Holy Heart is that Christ is not yet in the hearts of all other non-Catholic Slavic brothers.

"We pray to you, our celestial king to ignite our hearts with the flame of your love and devotion to the Sacred Roman Catholic

26 "EUCHARISTIA" (Eukaristija) "STAROKATOLIK", August 31, 1930., 1.
27 MORNING PAPER ("Istanić list"), July 18, 1930.

U "posvetnoj molitvi hrvatskoga naroda Eucharističkom Sruču Isusovu", kaže se u uvodu, da "hrvatski tvoj narod priznaje da je od tvoje dobrote primio lijepe svoju domovinu, da se u njoj slobodan razvija... Dar je ljubavi tvoje, što si ga među prvim narodima Evrope pozvao u svetu katoličku crkvu, što si ga sačuvao od krvovijestja i jačao, te je bile zlostavljačkih predizara kršćanstva... Mi se klanjam tvojoj božanskoj mudrosti, moći i ljubavi, kojom vladai hrvatskim narodom... Telli se eva danas s nama sav hrvatski narod posvećuje kao svome kralju, Telli izraza sebe i sve svoje. U tebe, koji si istina, put i život stavljam svu našu svoju, uvjereni da će nas istina vjere Tvoje osloboditi, put zapovijedi Tvojih mir nam povratiti."28

I sada 1930. vraća se episkopat za Mahnića, misli iz 1917., i 1918., kad govorio o sjedinjenju crkava, na način koji nedvosmisleno umjetani. U "posvetnoj molitvi" naime aludira se da Krist još ne vladala srca ostale slavenske, nekatoštanih braće.

"Molimo Te, daleko, o Božanski Kralju naš, da žarkom ljubavi srca svoga razhari srca naše te Ti ostanemo vjerni u svetoj rimokatoličkoj crkvi. Ti nas vodi i blagoslov, da izvrsno narednu zaduću svoju, koju nam ljubeznom Provodnošću namenjene da preko nas Tijeplasa u srca ostale slavenske braće naše te se vri u Tbei radujemo u svetnoj vremenosti i vječnoj domovini. Amen."29

Narod, koji je već odavna bio naučen da mu se u crkvi tumačiti politika u alegorijama i aluzijama, umio je dodati od čega će ga Krist, Kralj nad kra-

prijevača ovoga kongresa željela je da na najgrubiji način iskoristi opću političku psihozu u državi. Sta više, njoj su podlegli i najvijedniji hrvatski intelektualci, koji su osuđivali šestobajamarski rezim.30 Prije početka kongresa razgovarao sam sa dr. M. Dežamanom, urednikom "Obzora" o političkoj po-

njih liberalnih, jugoslavenskih i Strossmayerovski, sada se dao u službu izrazitog klerika, jačajući se za što uspješniji rezultat kongresa, kako bi što veći broj Hrvata tih dana došao u Zagreb. Dr. Dežman mi je objašnjavao da su Hrvati, svi bez razlike koji su nezadovoljni s režimom u Beogradu, koji hoće

27 "Istanić list" 18. VII. 1930.
29 Autor nije dao komentar.
Church. Lead us and bless our efforts to fulfill our next task you have kindly assigned us in your divine providence, that through us we win the hearts of all our Slavic brothers so that together. In you we all find joy and an eternal, happy homeland. AMEN”

People very well understood the figurative language of the Church and from whom Jesus, the King of Kings, through his envoy on Earth, will liberate them and restore their peace of mind. The message Pavelitch sent from Italy was spreading from mouth to ear, always spiced with some personal comments. The most radical organizers of the Congress wanted to take advantage of the atmosphere prevailing in the country in the most aggressive way possible. Eminent Croatian intellectuals who condemned the 6-th of January regime joined forces with them. Before the beginning of the Congress I talked to Dr Dežman, editor of OBZOR, about the Congress and its political background, obvious even to the much less informed. OBZOR started as a liberal paper which fostered the ideas of Strossmayer and Yugoslavidism, but later changed its political stands. Now it was giving its full support to the Congress and tried to bring to Zagreb as many Croats as possible to support the event. Dr Dežman tried to explain that all Croats, with no exception, do not support the Belgrade regime. They want freedom and independence and in pursuing that aim they are ready to pull forces with the devil himself, even with the black International, with everybody willing and ready to help them achieve their goal.

“This Congress very well serves our purpose. We shall use this occasion to openly demonstrate our hostility. We can feel the political atmosphere surrounding the Congress, which makes us particularly happy, because it contributes to our success too. The clericals believing that all these people are there for their sake will brag about it. Their illusion is irrelevant. Let them enjoy in their daydreaming. Let them. It does not matter. In view of the prevailing circumstances we all have to join forces and be on the same side: the clericals, conservatives, liberals or progressives. The Croats are fortunate enough to have the Catholic Church through which they can speak both at home and abroad.”

29 Ne comment by the author.
30 Prof. I. Tkalčitch (Tkalčić) and Prof. Tch. Licher (C. Licher) also participated in the talks which took place in mid August 1930, in the summer house of Dr. Ing. Peyer, on the island of Korčula (Korčula).
Further talks revealed that through the Vatican the Zagreb Curia had already rendered important political services to the Croatian opposition advocating separation. Dr. Milivoj Dežman was the very detail familiar with the secret machinations of the Croatian politicians. The articles published in OBZOR at that time are the case in point.

The Eucharistic Congress in Zagreb was, undoubtedly, the first and most courageous condemnation of the King and his policy, more than any other political act at that time and those that followed. Only stronger in that respect will be some later political "punctuations" and Epistles of the Yugoslav Episcopal against the Sokol. In his effort to win the Episcopate over to his side, even at the cost of golden chains, King Alexander only played into their hands. He was not smart enough to understand the problem. Even the medal KARADJORDJEVA ZVEZDA he took off his chest and put it on the chest of Bishop Bauer did not do any good. The offensive of Clericalism was in full swing and they wanted everything. It was the order from abroad.

Like the Eucharistic Congress in Zagreb all other local and district congresses always had the same political background. Therefore, frequent conflicts with the police force, which was under strict orders to implement the Law prohibiting ethnic intolerance. The masses were coming to the congresses mainly for political and not religious reasons and in order to manifest opposition to the regime. All these politically challenging controversies, which often times ended up in physical conflicts had nothing to do with the respect for Eucharistia or prayers to Christ-the King. The police reacted to the violation of the Law according to which all tribal flags were prohibited. The clergy did not respect that Law and used to carry these flags along with the statues of the Holy Mother and the statues of other saints. Actually, neither the Episcopate, nor the clergy respected the Church and State laws in force. On the contrary. All these activities were, actually, a smart mixture of Catholic and religious feelings, on the one hand, and political aggressiveness and intolerance, on the other. A highly respected Catholic priest Dr. Mirko Perković (Perković) in his article says openly and courageously:

"Dangerous phenomenon-Dumping Jesus" very bravely writes about a phenomenon already present for two years, which may be very dangerous for future cultural and political life. This phenomenon is accompanying all religious events taking place in all Catholic parts of Yugoslavia. Nothing is wrong with such events when they remain restricted to religious life. But this is not the case. All these events have a political and nationalist background. Obviously, their organizers have different, not religious objectives in mind. The

lovali ni savjetovali svih crkvenom i postojećim zakona. Naprotiv. Sve je to vijeto spajalo katolicitu i vjerske manifestacije sa političkom nesnoljivom isključivocom. O tome je hrabo i bez ustanjanja progovorio jedan bez sumnje uzorni katolički svećenik, dr. Mirko Perković u članku:


Sistematski i organiziraniji ofenzivni potez kljerikalizma u vezi sa Enciklikom Pija XI zapazio se, pored ostalih akcija pojedinih biskupa u kojima su napadali i novije ublaženje Pravilne o školskom zakonu, u anti-sokolskoj akciji krčkog biskupa dr. Josipa Srebrnića u njegovoj korizmnoj poslanici pod naslovom "Presvetoj Bogorodici Mariji".

Narame, u toj poslanci, krčki biskup, ma da je ona posvećena temi stvaranja Bogorodice, posvećuje čitav jedan pasus ideologiji Miroslava Tyrša. Tako se prvi put desilo, i to službeno, da se o Miroslavu Tyršu govorilo u crkvama i njegovu ime, dakako sa ovodom, pronijelo kroz božje hramove. Ovo što je uradio krčki biskup u Jugoslaviji, to nije učinio nijedan češki biskup, ni onaj koji je živio u Turskoj vrijeme rada, kao što to ni u nekoj pjesni pot decenija iza njegove smrti. Svaka, katolička crkva u Jugoslaviji imala je naročitih razloga da koristi dotadašnji propust češkog episkopa. Ali, jasno je bilo da je ovaj udarac preko Tyrševa groba, bio u stvari namijenjen utori koja je bila njegovo životno dijelo t. j. Sokolsku.

U posljednje doba, riječi su biskupa Srebrnića, počeo se nari vati neprijatelj Presvete Bogorodice u novom podrazumijevkom obliku. Hvali i preporuča, širi i hvata Tyršev duh, Tyrševu ideologiju, Tyršev način mišljenja o svijetu, o čovjeku, o naciji, o drzavi. Tyršev je duh, duh naturalizma i materijalizma. Tyrš je izumio svoje ideje najprije od njezina filozofa Schopenhauera, zatim je kasnije tjesne kultura pogašnixDrinka, učio se također od muhamedanaca te prešao u materijalističko shvatanje ljudskoga društva i svijeta uo..."
organizers, actually the bishops and priests, want to put the heritage of Stepan Radich, a great Slav and Croat, under the hat of Jesus. Following in the wake of the Encyclical some bishops also launched an intensive campaign against the amended law on schools. In his Epistle addressed to the Holy Mother Bishop Dr Josip Srebnič (Srebnič) vehemently attacks the Sokol.

Although devoted to the cult of the Holy Mother in his Epistle Bishop Srebnič devotes a whole paragraph to Miroslav Tyrš and his ideology which was severely criticized in all churches where the Epistle was read. What Dr Srebnič, Bishop of Krk, said was unprecedented in church practice. In Bohemia it never occurred to any of the bishops, at the time of Tyrš, or fifty years upon his death to launch a campaign in the style of Dr Srebnič, Bishop of Krk. Evidently the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia had a special reason to even belatedly raise up for the omission of the Bohemian Episcopate. Actually, this blow to death Tyrš was addressed to his life achievement—the Sokol Movement.

This is what Dr Srebnič says in his Epistle: „As of lately the enemies of the Holy Mother have decided to change the tactics and act meanly. They started extolling and disseminating the spirit and ideology of Tyrš and his views on the world, the man, nation, state… Tyrš is a state of mind. He fosters the spirit of naturalism and materialism. At first Tyrš was under the influence of the German philosopher Schopenhauer and later fell in love with the physical culture of pagan Greeks. He also fell under the influence of some Mohammedi ideas and adopted the materialistic view on human society and the evolution of human species according to Darwin’s theory. His ideology does not recognize God, nor the eternal life of the Soul… Tyrš preaches freedom, brotherhood and equality in the sense of naturalistic humanism… He calls for education of the human mind and strength of will thanks to which man will love his country and his people, love freedom, be ready to defend his people, support education and moral values, but all that as part of secular culture, without God, without Christ, without Church, without prayer, even without the Holy Mother, because his ideal is the Greek ideal of Man. According to him „no one in history has ever created a better man than the Greeks.” This was the approach Tyrš, the founding father of numerous organizations for education of youth, was promoting in his work, eliminating every possible religious, pče prema Darvinovoj teoriji. Njegova ideologija ne poznaje Boga ni neumrle duše… Propovijeda slobodu, bratstvo i jednakost u smislu naturalističkog humaniteta… Hoće se da odgaja um, volja i čuvstvo u čovjeka za ljubav prema narodu i državi, za slobodu i stegu, za narodnu odbranu, za prosvjetu i moral, ali dakako u svijetu ovozennite kulture te dosljedno bez Boga, bez Krista, bez crkve, bez molitve – pa i bez Presvete Bogorodice, jer njemu je ideal grecki čovjek; „boljeg većeg čovjeka nije proizvelo ni jedno kamsije doba”, ovako se sam izjavio. Tyrš je medju Cesima otac opsežnih omladinskih odgoskih organizacija: u smislu svoje ideologije izlučio je iz njihova odgojnog rada svaki upliva religioznih naročito katoličkih momenata te je neprestano djelovalo da budu u vjerskom obziru ateističke. Ovo je Tyrševa ideologija. Nitko je od dobrih katolika ne može prihvatiti, jer je ona jednostavno negacija ne samo čitavog katolicizma, nego i uopće vjere u Boga… Apsolutno je dakle za nas isključeno, mirno dopustiti odgoj ili bratstvo u smislu Tyrševa duha kao što je uopće suprotno katoličkoj aući, da je ma bilo koji odgoj isključiva stvar laičkih elemenata dotične crkvene vlasti… Ta ideologija je najveća pogibao za našu djecu… Ta se ideologija danas preporuča i širi i mnogi zbog svojoj položaji niti ne mogu da je mimolaze, premda je iz dna duše mrze i osuđuju, Ali mi hoćemo da se protiv nje borimo, da se borimo za slobodu savjesti roditeljskih prava pod vodstvom nebeske Bogorodice! Ne stoji ona na strani Tyrševa ideologiji! Silna, jaka žena iz raja, Presveta Bogorodica Marija, ona je u nas. Mi nesamo Tyrša, mi hoćemo u odgoj djece i mladeži Bogorodici Mariji.32

Ovakvo je Miroslav Tyrš, svijetlo ime u generaciji českich preporoditelja XIX. stoljeća, svojom nekriticom bio upoređen daškač na svoju štetu sa Bogorodicom Marijom. Miroslav Tyrš, čovjek velike duhovne kulturne i univerzalne naobrazbe, profesor univerziteta, historičar umjetnosti, kritičar, filozof, estetičar, političkar, odgojitelj omladine, propovijednik idealnog zdravlja fizičkog i moralnog nije ni smoljio da će jednom doći u priliku da ga se uporeduje i unizuje u vezi sa Maternom Božjom. Tyršev nacionalizam nije bio ni uskogrudan, ni sovinskički, nego oplemenljen i snojljiv. Tyrš je vjeroval da u svijetu treba da zavala duh ljubavi i prosvećenosti koji će pobjediti laž, mržnju i nesobljivost i otvoriti vrata idealima čovječanstva i čovječnosti. Ovakvim su smatrali sokoli svoga osnivača, a onako je o njemu mišljenje i svojim vjernicima predstavljao Tyrša krck biskup Srebnič. Dobri poznavaoći

31 „JUGOSLAVIJA“ (Zagreb), July 23, 1932.

32 Korzimea podnemica 1933: „Presvete Bogorodici Mariji.“
particularly Catholic influence in this regard. This was actually his ideology. No good Catholic could accept it because it simply denies not only Catholicism, but religion as such and God in the general sense. ... We simply cannot recognize education based on the philosophy of Tyrsh because Catholic Church does not accept any form of secular education. Actually, secular approach to education ... is fatal for our children. ... Nowadays this ideology enjoys support by people on high positions. In spite of the fact that they strongly condemn its implications they support and disseminate it only because it helps them make a career. But we want to fight against this ideology, we want to fight for the rights of the parents and for the freedom of conscience under the leadership of the Holy Mother! The Holy Mother is not on the side of Tyrsh and his ideology, the Holy Mother is on our side. We want the Holy Mother to be present in the education of our children.32

This is how Miroslav Tyrsh, an outstanding Czech reformer and one of the most prominent personalities of his generation, although innocent, was set against the Holy Mother as a negative example. A man of remarkable spiritual culture and general education, a university professor, historian of art, critic, philosopher, aesthete, politician, educator of youth disseminating the principles of ideal moral and physical health, could have never dreamed of being compared to the Holy Mother in such a humiliating context. The nationalism of Tyrsh was neither narrow minded nor chauvinistic. His nationalism was noble and based on tolerance. He believed in a world of love and enlightenment, a world without hatred, falsehood and intolerance, a world based on humane feelings. This is what the Sokols thought about the founder of their movement, which was in sharp contrast to what Dr Srebničev, Bishop of Krk preached about him to his believers. Those familiar with the life and work of Miroslav Tyrsh claim that he never denied or attacked God and the church. Dr Srebničev has confirmed such conclusions. On the other hand, Bishop-Franco Uccellini-Tite, a highly educated and learned theologian with a rich pastoral experience, had a different opinion. He said: „I have thoroughly analyzed the principles of the Sokol Movement and in them I did not discover anything that could have a negative affect on religious feelings“33

---

32 LENT PUSTILE TO THE HOLY MOTHER (Korizma poslanica posvećena Pravoslavog bogorodici Mariji), 1931.
33 Ivan Ivančič: THE SOKOLS AND RELIGION (Ivan Ivančič: Sokolstvo i vjera), „SOKO NA JADRANU“, 1931, NO3, 47.
The Epistle not only aroused great interest but also triggered a hot controversy. The Sokols responded in an article entitled TYRSH ON THE STAKE in which they refute all accusations concocted by Srebrenich.

"In 1415 John Huss was burnt alive. By the same token, now in 1884, 47 years after his death, a Roman Catholic priest is trying to destroy the founder of the Sokols by burning him on the stake of his hatred... Against this new attack of the militant Catholic Church with pride and dignity we set our chests and honor, convinced that we shall be able to cope with that wave of hatred. We, Sokols know it perhaps better then the Bishop of Krk that if we die with them with them we live; if we suffer with them with them we triumph!"

The ensuing polemics was only an introduction to an organized attack against the Sokols. Actually, the attack on its privileged status within the school system and its ideology was only an attack in disguise on Yugoslavia and a smart effort to bring to the attention of the international community the difficulties the Catholic Church is allegedly facing in Yugoslavia. In vehement protests emphasis was placed on the evident fact that Srebrenich was only the first link in a smartly concocted clerical-fascist campaign. "In spite of different messages coming from Rome we are fully aware that the progress in the Yugoslav intelligentsia will come true only if we develop a strong national awareness, severe religious links with Rome, set up a national church and create a genuine Yugoslav amalgamation. The ideology of Tyrsh may be helpful in this regard, because it is the ideology of truth and progress." This message came from Sushak (Susak) the most vulnerable point on the Yugoslav-Italian border and was addressed to the Bishop of Krk, highly respected by Italian fascists. Fascism was triumphing because it had found an ally against the Sokols. A reliable one, there was no doubt about it.

At that time only at the mention of these activities and only a finger pointed at someone of them triggered violent reaction and protests against cruel and unjust denunciations.

Archbishop Bauer vehemently reacted to that article claiming that Bishop Srebrenich wanted to justify his views on the ideology of Tyrsh by producing more convincing proofs. For that purpose two new brochures were published: FIAT LUX and THE SPIRIT OF TYRSH, which, according to Bishop Srebrenich, "contain some ideas very important for the education of our

These two brochures prove that the whole controversy is actually a conflict between two different concepts of life and the fatherland, in other words Yugoslavia, which were getting increasingly incompatible. Srebrenich reiterated his call on Roman Catholics and Old Catholics to adopt a negative attitude towards Tyrisch and his ideology because:

"In that ideology there is no room for God; there is no room for the King of all the centuries and our Savior Christ who should be venerated by all of us and before whom, our God and Lord, we all should bow; there is no room for the Catholic Church, nor the Pope representing Jesus Christ on Earth, at the head of His flock leading it along the road of truth; there is no room for Celestial Providence governing this world with great wisdom... A good Catholic cannot be expected to entrust the education of his children to the system fostering that spirit. On the contrary. Every good Catholic should reject such system of education with indignation!" 26

The views of Dr Srebrenich, Bishop of Krk, spilled over the local boundaries and were disseminated in all Catholic Dioceses and by all ordinaries, except in the Kotor Dioceses headed by the old Bishop Frano Ucelinni-Trke. Srebrenich was in constant conflict with the Sokola. When the SOKOLS OF THE KINGDOM OF YUGOSLAVIA decided to mark the Hundredth Anniversary of their founding father Miroslav Tyrio on March 5 or 6, 1932, only a few days before the envisaged event, on February 25, 1932, Bishop Srebrenich circulated his Epistle to all Sokol Societies in which he argues with the ideology of Tyrio in his well known manner, rejecting it as impious and dangerous for true Catholics. His request that the Epistle be read during the ceremony aroused division among the Sokols. In his Epistle Srebrenich does not mention the Encyclical the Holy Father announced on Christian education because he did not want to jeopardize his authority. The Holy Father was not openly engaged in the anti-Sokol campaign, following it from the shade. Actually, Srebrenich took advantage of every opportunity to engage in conflict with the Sokola, which is evident from the letters they exchanged. e.g. in 1932, the Bishop's reaction to their invitation to celebrate the morning mass on St. George's Day (Djurdjevski uranak), or his angry comments on the privileged status of the Sokols who on state holidays always had a prominent place in the Cathedral. When in the Summer of 1932 the Sokol Society in Supetar asked the priest to bless its flag he asked Bishop M. Pushitch (Pusich) for permission.

26 Jesup Srebrenich, "JERUSALEM HUM 118: CHURCH?" (Crkvi dobrod), Zagreb, 1932, 31.


Primjerom nadbiskupa Bauera ići će i dobarokokski biskup Aškamović, koji je još prije kratkog vremena onako lijepo pisao vinkovačkom Sokolu. Sve je...
who agreed to give it the provided the Society accepted to previously condemn in written the anti-religious, cultural and educational principles maintained by Tysh. On September 4, 1932 the paper KRIŽ NA JADRANU (Cross on the Adriatic) published the text of the Bishop's decision which ignited a hot discussion. At the same time the Bishop of Zagreb prohibited his priests to bless the flag of the Sokol of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, under the pretext that the Alliance is based on the ideology of Tysh. This religious act cannot be allowed because “Dr. M. Tysh was not only a man without religion, he was an atheist, particularly hostile to Catholic religion and the Catholic Church. Evidently, his ideology is materialistic and naturalistic” which means that it is anti-religious and anti-Christian. Blessing a society fostering such ideology would, at least, mean support to religious indifference. This is the reason why I cannot allow the blessing of the flag.” In 1932 the Archbishop forgot that in 1911, as Archbishop-Coadjutor, together with the representatives of his Capitoll he attended the All Sokol Rally in Zagreb and the festivities dedicated to the memory of Tysh. But, at that time there was neither Musolini, nor the cler-fascist directives coming from these sources.

Akshamovitch (Aksamović) Bishop of Diakovo, followed in the wake of Archbishop Bauer, the same Bishop Akshamovitch who shortly before the controversy expressed his positive opinion about the Sokol organization in Vinicović.82 Which added new heat to the polemics.

It was only the introduction to a decisive attack of the Episcopate on its most hated institution. At the Conference of the Yugoslav Episcopate, on November 17, 1932 all Bishops denounced Tysh and, consequently, the Yugoslav Sokols. Before the Conference Bishop Srbrenič published a booklet FREEDOM FOR THE CHURCH (Crkvi slobodu) in which he was trying to accuse Yugoslavia for persecuting the Catholic Church. In this booklet

---

82 “MORNA,” (published in Sadulci), in its article of September 1, 1932, comparing the activities of the Italian Patriarchs across the Yugoslav border with those of the Yugoslav Bishops with regard to the Sokols, among other things says: “In the Church of St. Vitus, Celso Constantini, Bishop of Rijeka, blessed the dagger; a gift of sexually obsessed women to D’Annunzio, but the Prelate never asked D’Annunzio to publicly refuse in front of the church all dirty words he has used against Christ and Catholic morality” in his books on the Index of Prohibited Books. And the Holy Father, Pius XI: He very well knows who Musolini is and what he is doing. He also knows that in Geneva, in front of some friends, Mussolini claimed that there was no God. ... Before he blessed Musolini and decorated him with the high Order Medall of the Golden Spur did the Holy Father ask him to publicly, in front of the church, refuse this blasphemy? NO! And before decorating the notorious bandit and assassin Guinto and some fascists directly involved in the murder of the honest man Matteotti did the Pope ask them to repent in public for the committed crimes? NO! After his recent reconciliation with the Duke did the Pope ask him to stop persecuting our priests in the Julian region? NO.

83 "SOKOJSKI GLASNIK," July 14, 1932.
Šrebnitch for the first time makes reference to the Encyclical only in connection with two major subjects: general school education and physical education for youth.

Only the enemy of the Church and its Cestal mission, only those who know nothing about the Church, only those who deny God and immortality of the Soul, only those who believe that human life is only life on Earth dare deny the Church the right to educate young people. Church will never give up that right. The future existence of the Catholic Church depends on its right to perform that mission. Therefore, it should be emphasized that the Church is, in fact, persecuted in every state which denies or in any way jeopardizes that right to the Church.39

Evidently, Dr. Šrebnitch wanted to emphasize that in Yugoslavia life is very difficult for the Catholics under the hegemony of the Orthodox. Serbs. This was the only intention of the booklet Also, this was music to the ears of both centers of Italian nationalism which actually feared the consolidation of Yugoslavia. Dr. Josip Šrebnitch was an absolute champion in conducting a hypocritical, Machiavellian and Jesuitical policy. He was definitely superior to Dr. Ivan Sharitch (Saric) otherwise a grand master of that skill. Speaking about the status of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia Dr. Šrebnitch, being what he was, completely distorted the truth and his comments were sheer falsehood. It was not his blunder. It was part of a well pondered campaign with a perfectly defined aim. At the end of his book Šrebnitch makes the following comment:

"Bitter is the freedom which the Catholic Church enjoys in Yugoslavia. Freedom of Church in Yugoslavia is sheer irony... Every kind of slavery is a crime and the greatest of all crimes is to deprive the Church of its rights and reduce to slavery the loftiest Celestial Providence turned into reality on Earth, in the aim of alienating the believers and push them to impiety... High State officials should be better acquainted with Church Canons, its spirit, its history and its organizational pattern. Our High officials do not know or do not want to know, anything about that... This is the source of all our conflicts, crisis, dissatisfaction, deviations from the right course and so much injustice done to our Catholic Church and to the Catholics! Before concluding I would like to launch and appeal: FREEDOM..."


zločinilišti Crkvu njezine slobode i njezin prav, te nastojati, da bude Ona, najlepša realnost Božjih zamisli na zemlji, rokopinjom, te pač sustavno ići za tim da se narod Crkvi otiudi i zavede u bezvješt... Državnici bi morali tu Crkvu temeljito poznati, do dna bi morali poznati njezin Zakonik, duh Crkve, njezinu prošlost i njezin ustroj. Naši je državnici nažalost ne poznaju ili neće da je poznaju. Radi toga, eto toliko nezadovoljstva, toliko kriza, toliko lupanja, pa i toliko velikih nepravdi Crkvi i nama katolicima... Završavaj: Crkvi Slobodu! U Crku, na blagdan Majske Božje. Kraljice Svete Krunice, 27. listopada 1932."40

Srebnitčev misao prevela je najmognobrojnija organizacija K. a. sa „Hrvatske slobode". Ovde su se tako sustekle dvije misli koje su se i jednako dogunjale i poznalje.

Na drugoj strani, u talijanskoj fašističkoj stampli, sve su ove pojave u Jugoslaviji bile registrirane i na svoj način komentirane. Kad je SKJ priredio izložbu u Beogradu, bili su prikazani i oni jugoslovenski djelovi koji su poslije Rapalla došli u sklop talijanske države, a u kojinoj je nekad cvjetalo sokolstvo. Naročito Rijeka, Zadar, Gorica i Tist bila su mjesto iz kojih je zracila sokoška misao. Zastavice, zavite u crno uz imena ovih gradova na velikoj geografskoj karti za milanski „Corriere della Sera“ bile su stražnica pravdopodobnija. Jer, „one pokazuju da još ima braće koju treba osloboditi i da je čiji sokola da prapravi njihovo otkupljenje“.41 Zato istodobni fašistički i jugoslovenski klerikalni napadi na SKJ dovodeni su u uzročnu vezu kod velikog dijela rodomlja, pa i takvih koji su bili prema sokolu u kritičkom stavu, što je pristao da radi pod diktatorskim režimom. „Jugoslovenski katolički episkop i talijanski fašizam kao po dogovoru, u isto doba, našli su se na istom terenu u borbi protiv sokolstva. Najnovija dva ispad protiv sokolstva, jedan sa strane fašista, a drugi sa strane našeg episkopata, pokazuju, jer su istodobni, da se borba protiv sokolstva vodi s jedne zajedničke fronte po jednom skupnom planu sa svim raskolovativim sredstvama...“42 Svim redoljudjima bila biva ova stvar zapoženata da nije bila i odvije očigledna. Jer decenijama je postojalo sokolstvo, decenijama su se blagosvijali sokolski domovi i zastave... Decenijama je svečestvo bilo naklonjeno sokolstvu, koje je uvijek radilo u duhu Tyranse ideologije. I sad se najednom otkrilo da je sve to bila jedna ogromna zabluda, da su blagosvijali ustanovu, njene zastave i domove, koja se osnivala na bezvješkim načelima.

40 Josip Šrebnitch, „Crkvi slobodu", 42-43
FOR OUR CHURCH! Krk, on the Day of the Holy Mother, Queen of the Rosary, October 27, 1932.40

CATHOLIC ACTION, the organization with the most massive membership, took over the ideas of Srbina and published them in the paper HRVATSKA SLOBOĐA (Croatian Freedom). This was actually the convergence of two complementary ideas.

The Italian fascist press closely followed these developments in Yugoslavia, informing about them and commenting on them from their angle of vision. When the SOKOLS OF THE KINGDOM OF YUGOSLAVIA organized their exhibition in Belgrade they also indicated on the maps the parts of Yugoslavia which after the RAPPALO TREATIES were handed over to Italy, because the Sokol Movement used to flourish there, particularly in Rijeka, Zadar, Gorica and Trieste. According to CORRIERE DELA SERA it was an unprecedented provocation to put the flags wrapped in black next to the manes of these places, because it means „that some of our brothers are not free and that the Sokol intend to bring them freedom.” 41 Many patriots, even those who criticized the Sokols for accepting to continue their activities under the dictatorship, recognized the connection between the simultaneous attacks of the Fascists and Yugoslav clericals and their supporters on the Movement „The Yugoslav Catholic Episcopate and the Italian Fascists, as if by agreement, are side by side struggling against the Sokol Movement. The two simultaneous attacks on the Sokol Movement, one coming from the Fascists and the other from the Yugoslav Episcopate are evidently part of a joint front organized according to the same plan and with all available means”42 Everything was so evident that there was nothing enigmatic about it. The Sokol Movement has existed for decades and for decades their centers and flags have been ceremonially blessed. For decades the crier had been prone to the Sokol Movement, always faithful to the ideology of Tysh. All of a sudden they discovered that everything was only a blander, that they used to bless the centers and flags of an institution based on religious indifference. Evidently, the issue was raised for completely different reasons and by different circles, both from Yugoslavia and abroad.

On November 22, at the end of its work the Bishop Conference adopted a Resolution later published in CATHOLIC GAZETTE (Katolički list), the

Svakako sve je to dalo povodu da je trebalo na drugoj strani tražiti uzroke, u i izvan zemlje.


„Katolički episkopat Jugoslavije sakupljen 22. novembra ove godine na svojim godišnjim konferencijama pretresao je važne crkvene administrativne poslove i crkveno-politička pitanja. Nakon svestranog raspravljanja stvoreni su vrlo važni zaključci i među ostalim donesene su ove rezolucije:

1. Episkopat najdužije prosvjedi protiv nekulturnih napada, što ih sustavno provode neprijatelji crkve i pripadnici nekatoličke vjeropravosti na vrhovnog glavara katoličke crkve Svetog Oca Papi i katoličke svetinje.

2. Episkopat odlučno traži, da se pitanja, koja spadaju u zajednički djelokrug crkvene i državne vlasti, rješavaju međusobnim sporazumom. Napose traži, da se pitanje vijesne nastave na osnovnim, srednjim i njima sličnim te stručnim školama rješavaju na način da dođu do jasnoga izražaja prava crkve i roditelja.

3. Episkopat konstatira, da se u školskim udžbenicima obrađuju mnoga pitanja na način, koji teško vrijedi vjeru i moral katoličke.
official gazette of the Zagreb Diocese. The Public Prosecutor, being absolutely independent, decided to prohibit it as „a threat to state interests.“ It was a mistake because the uninformed general public was thus led to believe that everything in the Resolution was true and that the prohibition meant persecution of justice. Otherwise, the issue would have aroused only a limited public interest with no detrimental effect on the interests of the State. In the meantime the Episcopate managed to disseminate the Resolution. It was even published in some clerical papers, e.g. in Dubrovnik NATIONAL AWARENESS (Narodna svijest) of November 30, 1932, which was immediately prohibited.

Here is the whole text of the Resolution:

„At its regular Annual Conference held in November of this year the Catholic Episcopate in Yugoslavia discussed important Church and administrative matters and political issues regarding the Church. After a very detailed discussion some important conclusions were arrived at and the following Resolutions adopted:

1. The Episcopate strongly protests against uncivilized attacks on the Holy Father and Catholic holy objects by non-Catholics and enemies of the Church;

2. The Episcopate demands that the Church and the State, by mutual agreement, find a solution to all issues of common interest. Religious education in elementary and secondary schools and professional schools of the same level should be devoted special attention so as to fully guarantee the rights of the Church and parents;

3. The Episcopate has come to the conclusion that in school text books many topics are presented in a way insulting to the Catholic Church and its moral standards and grounded on distorted historical facts. The Episcopate demands immediate corrections;

4. The Catholic Episcopate protests against evident injustice done to Catholic parents by appointing mostly or exclusively non-Catholic teachers for their children. According to the Law on Education secular school teachers may also teach religion, which is unacceptable and makes this protest fully justified;

5. Owing to the fact that the Sokol of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia fosters the naturalist philosophy of Tyrsh the Catholic Church demands that Catholic youth be spared the fatal influence of that educational system;

6. The Catholic Episcopate condemns the insults and various other forms of persecution Catholic bishops, priests and Orthodox in intelligentsia are exposed to through mean denunciations. This prac...

143 U sedmoj točki rezolucije preporuča se svečanству i vjerima katoličku akciju.
tice has a negative effect on peace and harmony between the Church and state authorities.¹⁴³

A confidential report based on information coming from one of the Capitul Curiae in Zagreb, addressed to the Prime Minister in December 1932, describes the militant spirit prevailing at the Bishop Conference. These information are absolutely reliable. According to the Report, the most intransigent and hostile with regard to the state were: Dr. Sharitch, Bishop of Sazaevou and Dr. Srebrettich, Bishop of Krk. Both demanded a more severe and vehement resolution, including sabotage of state authorities, establishment of closer contacts with the opposition and recall of Nuncio Pellegrinetti in view of breaking off diplomatic relations between Yugoslavia and the Vatican. It was Nuncio Pellegrinetti who came to the Conference in Zagreb on the last day that persuaded them to withdraw these demands. According to the Report the Conference developed in line with the instructions of the Jesuits who insisted on the right of the Catholics to found their own, Catholic athletic clubs. The CRUSADEERS (Križari) should be in charge of these Athletic clubs (Gymnastic societies), like in Austria and Germany and organize them according to the military system. Therefore, all former Austrian officers who were not accepted in the Yugoslav Army were called upon to join the CRUSADEERS. At the end the Conference assigned Bishop Garic (Garic) and Jesuit Muller to maintain contacts with the opposition, particularly with the FRANKOVIĆ-USTASHA wing and its leader Dr Mile Budak, the closest collaborator of Dr Ante Pavelitch, in emigration. Juretic added, using his best efforts to persuade the opposition parties to overcome their differences and together with the clericals and ustahs establish a united front, not only against the government but also against the state. This newly established united front was particularly active during the elections for the National Assembly in November 1931. Archbishop Bauer convened in a conference all prominent members of the Capitul, Catholic priests and members of the CATHOLIC ACTION and asked them to boycott the elections, but at the proposal of Canon Dr Raditchevitch (Radiević) the Capitul rejected this idea with a great majority of votes. Only Archbishop Bauer and his closest collaborators were in favor of the proposal. Before the elections Secretary to the Archbishop, Dr Slamitch (Slamić), in a confidential circular letter, requested the boycott of elections, which was in line with the decision of the opposition. One of the conclusions of particular interest was the call of this

¹⁴³ Item seven of the Resolution recommends the priests and devoted Catholics to engage in charitable activities.
Conference for an open and decisive struggle against Orthodox religion. Dr Janko Shimrak (Šimrak) editor-in-chief of HRVATSKA STRAŽA (Croatian guard) was assigned leader of that project. Dr Shimrak published his article in KATOLICKI LIST (Catholic Gazette) under the pen name of K.V. (Kosta Bohačevski). His representative in Belgrade is Dr Augustin Yuretitch (Juretić).

The Bishop Conference decided to address the clergy and believers an Epistle signed by all bishops present, to be read on January 8, 1933. This decision of the Episcopate coincides with the political action of Dr Korochetz (Koročec) who published his PUNCTATIONS (Punkcijacije) both in the Yugoslav and foreign press. Namely, Dr Koroshetz resigned from government on September 30, 1931 and in October 1931 joined the vehement opposition. In his PUNCTATIONS Dr Korochetz calls for the reorganization of the state on the federal principle, thus repeating the request made the previous year by the PEASANT-DEMOCRATIC COALITION (Seljačko-demokratska koalicija). He also requested that all Slovenian regions be united into one single unit.

The Epistle of the Catholic Episcopate was published not only in the papers of all Catholic Dioceses but in the whole Yugoslav press as well. The wide publicity of this Epistle in clerical and secular press was almost unprecedented. The fascist press published its summarized version with comments. The Epistle repeats the well known arguments against Tyrs and his ideology and condemns all those who follow in his wake. It should be emphasized that the Epistle only speaks about the YUGOSOKOL and does not mention the CROATIAN Sokol, which was prohibited three years before. THE SOKOL OF THE KINGDOM OF YUGOSLAVIA means for them the same YUGOSOKOL from before 1929, because they share the same ideology and therefore deserve the same condemnation. They support this statement by quoting a high-ranking Sokol official who, on January 11, 1933 said in

---

45 The copy of the original document was provided by the author of this Report. The news about the plans of the Episcopate, particularly regarding the break off of diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia leaked out and was published in Austrian and Czech press. (Narodny List) and (Neue Wiener Tagblatt). (LUČIJEVSKO UTRO) (Ljubljana Morning Paper), in December 1932 published the article entitled: CONFERENCE OF YUGOSLAV SOKOLS IN ZAGREB... Sensational news in foreign newspapers on the course and conclusions of the Conference of Bishops in Zagreb. Deriving the persecution of the Catholic church in Yugoslavia and describing the forms of persecution of the church in the Italian region, the paper reported that there is no country in Europe in which the interests of the church and the religious feelings of the people are more respected than in Yugoslavia.

46 “Dr. KORONČETŽ AND HIS PUNCTUATIONS” (Dr. Koronec i njegove “PUNKTAČIJE”), NOVOST (News), January 12, 1933.
Viktor Novak

Prague that „the ideas of the Sokol Movement live unchanged in the hearts and minds of all Sokols. All our Sokol societies are organized in the spirit of the old tradition of Sokol brotherhood promoted by Tyrsh. As long as we, old Sokols, stay at its head the old spirit of Slavic Sokol brotherhood will prevail in our new organization.”

Actually, the Episcopate was in favor of separatism and therefore vehemently opposed to the idea of Slavic brotherhood. Engelbert Gangle, a Slovenian by nationality, ten years later, when cooperation of Bishop Dr Gregor Rozman with the greatest enemy of Slavism and the Yugoslav peoples became open and evident, discovered that already in 1933 this bishop secretly worked for Roman clero-fascists. Naturally, the Sokols and the general public were greatly disturbed by the Epistle and embittered against the Episcopate, the clericals and their supporters. The Sokols, the clericals and liberals of all colors were engaged in very animated polemics.

„Offended and embittered SOKOLSKI GLASNIK (the Sokol Herald) initiated the polemics by publishing the editorial signed by Engelbert Gangle, illustrated with a picture of the funeral of Miroslav Tyrsh, taken on November 9, 1884 at Vatslav Square in Prague, showing the participation of clergy in the procession. The article discusses the problem in a very detailed manner, emphasizing that this Epistle is not an isolated case and that it has nothing to do with the interests of clerical puritans at home. The article assesses it as a very well planned action within the campaign Italy has been conducting against Yugoslavia for a long time.

With the fall of the Austria-Hungarian monarchy the Roman Curia lost the most powerful stronghold of its political authority. After the First World War the idea of ULTRAMONTANISM and the efforts of the Vatican to enhance its influence in all Catholic countries were greatly jeopardized. In spite of that the Roman Curia was not ready to give up its empire on earth, which is, obviously, the Vatican’s first priority with regard to the Celestial one. These aspirations of the Vatican were obvious even to the less familiar with the developments in international politics. These activities were conducted under the guise of protection of the Catholic Church and Christianity. Best efforts were used to sell political aspirations under the label of religious matters. Many peoples trying to get rid of the Vatican’s tutelage had to engage in similar struggles in which the smell of human blood replaced the scent of incense to the glory of the Almighty. Nowadays struggle is replaced by refined diplomatic means and patience. The approach actually depended on the circumstances in which the

rättavaju, čas otvorenije čas skrivenije, već prema diktatu potreba. Rimska Kurija majstorski uspeva da identificira svoje težnje za političkim gospodstvom sa pitanjima vjere i Kristove nauke. Ispravno držanje jednog dijela svećenstva, koje umije da diferencira politiku Rimske Kurije od Kristovog nauka smatra se u Vatikanu kao i od jugoslavenskog episkopata otvorenom nepokornošću prema crkvi, pa su tački svećenici podložni presijama, prijetnjama, pa i kaznama, ako se ne pokore diktatu svojih ordinarija. Plod ovakve višegodišnje politike hrvatskog i slovenskog episkopata je i antisokolska, antityševa poslanica, koju je potpisalo 19 katoličkih nadpastira i njihovih zamjenika. Pri čitanju ove poslanice pojedini svećenici dali su maha ne samo svojoj fantaziji, nego i razini prema sokolstvu, u stvari jugoslavenu, u komentarima ispred oltera Boga ljubavi i zapovijesti o bližnjemu.” Odlučno odbijajući sve, što se u tom pastirskom pismu pokazuje, jednovremeno sve to označuje kao „proste i nečuvne klevete, tim nečuvnije, što dolaze iz istjaja Kristovih sljedbenika, čime oni kaljaju velika i sjiveo ime Božije.”

Izvršni odbor SKJ-e održao je sjednicu u Beogradu 16. i 17. 1933. i donio je potrebne odluke povodom ove poslanice. Poslije svestrane diskusije prihvaćena je rezolucija koja je preko štampe upucena svoj jugoslavenskoj javnosti, u kojoj se odbijaju sve uvrede i klevete episkopata.

„U tome „pastirskom pismu”, koje u nizu sustavskih napadača na Sokolstvo za posljednjih nekoliko godina iz redova visokog katoličkog klera pretstavlja najbezobzirniji i najotočniji, nastoji se zlonamjerno i na način nedostojan onako visokog tijela: tendencijom, nevjejnom i neustinitim prikazivanjem sokolske ideologije i sokolskog rada, proizvoljnom generaliziranjem i ocijenjeno krivim zaključivanjem, misifikacijama i provokacijama, obilježiti Soko Kraljevine Jugoslavije kao ne samo protukatoličku nego i protuveršku i bezbožnu organizaciju, koja pijanjama, širenju odvratne golotinje i rušenju morala u našoj omladini i u našem narodu uopće potkapa i ubija vjerski i moralni život, kao i pokret koji je „nepriznavanjem poštvenog hrvatskog odnosno slavenskog imena“ protiv tradicije i svetina ovih dijelova našeg naroda.

Savez Sokola Kraljevine Jugoslavije najodlučnije odbija od sebe sve ove nečuvne insinuacije i objede, koje najječitije pobjuđuju svi.
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89 Vidi niže slučaj biskupa Bonetačca i don Frana Ivanševića.
Viktor Novak

Nunciature manipulated the mentality and political attitude of the general public. Also, depending on the circumstances, these activities were more or less open and evident. The Roman Curia is a true virtuoso in dovetailing its political aspirations into the matters of religion and Christianity. The Vatican and the Yugoslav Episcopate accuse of disobedience those Catholic priests who make a difference between the political activities of the Roman Curia and Church matters. They are exposed to pressure, threats, even punishments if they do not follow the orders of their Ordinaries. This anti-Tyrsh and anti-Sokol Epistle signed by 19 members of Catholic high clergy is the result of a policy for many years practiced by the Croatian and Slovenian Episcopates in Yugoslavia. During the reading of this Epistle some did not know what to think and some did not hide their hatred for the Sokols which was actually hatred for Yugoslavia, and they expressed it openly in front of the Almighty, a symbol of love, his Altar and his Commandments. The author of the article rejects with indignation all allegations in the Epistle „as mere insults coming from the followers of Christ, which is deplorable because in this way they besmirch the lofty and luminous name of the Almighty.”

At its Meeting held in Belgrade on January 16, 1933, the Executive Board of the SOKOL OF THE KINGDOM OF YUGOSLAVIA, after a detailed discussion about the Epistle, adopted a Resolution addressed to the Yugoslav public and published in the Yugoslav press, refuting all insults and falsehoods concocted by the Episcopate.

„This Pastoral letter is, undoubtedly, the most brazen of all numerous affronts and attacks against the Sokol in the last few years. Coming from Catholic high clergy the text is bellow all standards; it is biased and gives a false picture of the Sokol ideology and the activities of that Movement. Generalizations are arbitrary, the conclusions evidently wrong, mystification and sophisms cheap. The main objective is to present the Sokols not only as an impious, but as an anti-religious movement which by organizing drinking parties, tolerating nudity and destroying moral principles in our youth and people in general actually undermines and destroys the religious and moral life. Moreover, by refusing to accept the honest Croatian, ma dobro poznati sokolski ciljevi i težnje, kao i pred svima širom odkriveni sokolski život i rad, te koje mogu da proizlaze samo iz zle volje, političkog računa ili fanatičke zaslijetljenosti.

Savez Sokola Kraljevine Jugoslavije s ogorčenjem u duši diže svoj glas protiv ovakvog načina borbe najviših predstavnika katoličke crkve u državi protiv sokolstva, koje tu borbu ničim nije izazvalo i sa žaljenjem utvrđuje, da se baš sa onog mesta odlake treba da Krišćanska ljubav i poripljivost zarače na cijeli naš narod i cijelu našu zemlju, u tako nado sve ožbiljno vrijeme nacionalnog i državnog života, nastoji u široke slojeve našeg naroda unijeti razdor i mržnju, i rasprijevremi vjerskih i plensmenskih strasti, te unošenjem zabune i uznemirenošči oslabiti otpornu snagu jugoslavenskog naroda, baš onda kada mu je ona najpotrebnija.

SKJ na prvoj svojoj skupštini od 29. martine 1931. godine u Beogradu, u onde jednoglasno primljenim rezolucijama, imio je na jedino mjeredovan nacin svoje stanovite u odnosu Sokolstva prema vjeri, i, u potpunu suglasnosti sa tradicionalnim sokolskim shvaćanjima, utvrdio: Sokolstvo kao ideja slobode, priznaje i slobodu uvjerenja i misli svakog pojedinca, i da naročito poštuje svako vjersko uvjerenje i osjećanje, smatrajući vjeru najsvetijim i vrlo unutrašnjim života svakog čovjeka; da sljedstveno jednako poštuje i ispoljava svakog vjerskog uvjerenja i osjećanja, i da svaki pripadnik sokolske organizacije može slobodno da izravi zapovijesti i propise svoje vjere i crkve.”

U savršenoj podudarnosti episkopskog napadaja, u kome se pri kraju kaže pozivajući vjerani da ostanu čvrsti u vjeri otaca i neka ne se daju od te vijere odvratiti od Sokolstva „koje neće da znade za Spasitelja našega ni za pošteno naše hrvatsko i slovensko ime“, dolazio je i napadaj glavnog organa fašističke stranke u Italiji („Lavore Fascista”) koji je 12. januara 1933., dakle poslije čitanja pastirskih poslanice nazvao SKJ „zlinačkom i nemoralnom organizacijom“ bacići na nj mu pomogla.

Sa svih strana zemlje gdjegd je bilo sokolskih društava, naročito iz Hrvatske i Slovenije iz posve katoličkih krajeva stizali su protesti telegrami protiv ove biskupske poslanice. Ali ne samo i sokolska društva, nego i brojne druge nacionalne ustanice osudile su ovaj biskupski postupak koji se pojačao u trenutku najviše fašističke antijugoslavenske akcije. U tim trenucima

80 See the case of Bishop Bonifacijich and don Franjo Ivanštevich, later in the text.
81 „THE PASTORAL PAPER” (Pauški list) OF THE CATHOLIC EPISCOPATE AGAINST THE SOKOLS-declaration of cultural war„ „SOKOLSKI GLASNIK“, January 13, 1933.
82 „Politika” 17. I. 1933.
also Slavic, name in the title, the Sokol Movement actually stood up against our tradition and everything sacred to our people."

THE SOKOL ALLIANCE OF THE KINGDOM OF YUGOSLAVIA strongly rejects all these groundless and appalling accusations and insults. The aims and aspirations of the Sokols are very well known. In their life and work there is nothing hidden from the public eye. It is the facts that refute all these slanders concocted by ill will, political calculations and fanatical blindness.

THE SOKOL ALLIANCE OF THE KINGDOM OF YUGOSLAVIA, with bitterness raises its voice against the kind of campaign the highest representatives of the Catholic Church in this country are waging against the Sokols who have not provoked it in any way. The Sokols deplore the fact that at this crucial moment in the life of our people and our country, instead of disseminating Christian love and tolerance, the highest representatives of the Catholic Church disseminate hatred and dissent, instigate religious and ethnic intolerance and thus confuse and disturb the Yugoslav people and undermine the indispensable defensive ability of the country.

In one of the Resolutions adopted by its Assembly held in Belgrade, on March 29, 1931, the Sokols presented their attitude to religion and in line with the Sokol tradition declared that: "The Sokol Movement is based on the idea of freedom and freedom of thought and belief. The Sokols respect all religions. Every member of the Sokol Movement is free to express his religious feelings which are viewed as the most sacred aspect of his life as an individual. This means that every member of the Sokol Movement is free to respect the principles of his faith and Church and behave accordingly." 48

At the end of its attack on the Sokols the Episcopate calls on the believers to remain devoted to the faith of their forefathers and do not allow the Sokols to persuade them to give up that faith, because "the Sokols reject our Savior and our honest Croatian and Slovenian name. At the same time another attack came from the top of the Fascist party in Italy (LAVORE FASCISTA) which, on January 12, 1933, after the reading of the Epistle, addressed dirty insults to the Sokol Alliance of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, even calling it "a criminal and immoral organization."

The Sokols, from all over the country, particularly those from the Catholic Croatian regions and Slovenia, massively reacted to the Epistle by sending telegrams of protest. Numerous other national institutions also condemned

48 "POLITIKA", January 17, 1933.

Očekivalo se u javnosti što će reći o svemu tome oni narodni svećenici, koji su ostali vjerni nekadašnjem Strossmayerovom stavu prema Sokolstvu.

Uskoro se čuo glas kotorskog biskupa Frana Uccellini-Tice. Upitan od suradnika „Politike”, kako gleda na tu poslanicu, pošto on nije prisustvoval konferenciji episkopata već njegov zamjenik, starac je spomenuo i odlučno odgovorio:


Ova izjava kotorskog biskupa odjeknula je senzacionalno u narode, Sokolskju kao i među klerikalnim krugovima. Vise nego ma koja polemična knjiga ili održani mitinzi, odjeknulo je isdarac koji se spustio na glave njegovih drugova.

49 "Politika" 29.1. 1933.
this move of the Bishop Conference, at the moment of the most vigorous fascist anti-Yugoslav campaign. The general public expected to hear the opinion of those priests who have remained faithful to Strossmayer and his views on the Sokol Idea.

In his interview to the Belgrade daily POLITIKA Frano Uccellini-Titze, Bishop of Kotor, asked to comment the Epistle said:

"I know what I am going to say and what to expect after having said it. I have never hesitated to say what I think and feel, nor will I do it today. IT WAS NOT A RELIGIOUS ISSUE. That is why I did not sign the Epistle and it was not read in my bishopric. If they invite me to bless their work I will do it, in the name of God and for His sake. Contrary to what is said in the Epistle I have nothing to reproach to the activities of the Sokols in my bishopric and believe that there will be no reproach in the future either."59

The statement of the Bishop of Kotor greatly impressed the general public, the Sokols and the clergy and caused a true sensation. His blow on the heads of his colleagues produced a stronger effect than any polemical book on that issue, or any public protest.

When they heard what the Bishop said the Sokols from Cetinje decided to go to Kotor and personally thank the old bishop for his courage and his words which were a balm on the souls of the slandered and insulted. The old Bishop was sincerely touched by their words of gratitude. Emphasizing that their national work has always been correct and in line with the principles of Christianity, he also said: "Our only true salvation lies in the harmony among the brothers of the same blood: the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. I have been fostering this ideal since my young days and under Austria I dedicated my DIVNA GLUMA (Perfect Acting) to the harmony and love between the Serbs and Croats. I have always cherished that idea and I am not going to give it up now! Dear brothers, thank you for coming and continue to foster and disseminate the feelings of love!" On that same day the Sokols took part in the procession headed by the Bishop himself.60

The Meeting of the Executive Board of the Sokol Alliance, held on February 6 and 7, 1933, forwarded to Bishop Uccellini-Titze a letter of gratitude for his nice words of consolation and promised to continue to behave according to the highest moral principles and respect the faith and Church. When Tzarевич (Carević) the Bishop of Dubrovnik refused to bless the

Kad se pročulo za ovu biskupovu izjavu, crnogorski sokoli sa Cetinja, pozvali su sa Cetinja na Tripunadan u Kotor da se zahvale starom biskupu za junacki stav koji je oblagodorio duše povrijetenih i napadnutih. Tople i zahvale riječi crnogorskih sokola dirnule su starog vladića. Odgovarajući im i priznavši njihov ispravan nacionalni rad koji nikad i nigdje nije dolazio u sukob s moralnim kršćanskim načelima, on im je rekao između ostalog i ovo: "Jedino što nas može potpuno i konačno najtešće vezati i spasiti jest slog jednokrvene braće Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca. Od najmlađih svojih dana gojio sam ovu misao, a u teškim vremenima, pod Austrijom, posvetio sam muo "Divnu glumu" baš "slozi i ljubavi Srba i Hrvata". Ta mi misao uvijek pratila i s njom sam se zaspio pa kako ne bi i sada! Širitе braće ljubav i hvale vam što ste dosli!" Sokoli su istoga dana učestvovali i u svećanoj procesiji koju je predvodio sam biskup.62


Još je jednom biskup Uccellini-Tice dao izjavu, poslije godinu dana, kad je spomenuo da se u poslanice samoga Svetog Oca pape mogu kritizirati 14. maja 1934., kazao je:


86 ṢOKOLSKI GLEANER" 17. II. 1933.
89 Franj Uccellini-Tice, biskup kotorski, "Dubrovnik" 8. VI. 1937.
90 Senat i poslanici u poseti kotorskom biskupu. "Stampa" (Beograd) 15. V. 1934.
flags of the Sokols from the surroundings of Dubrovnik it was the Bishop of Kotor Ucelline-Titze who did it. On that occasion, in his patriotic address, the Bishop, mentioning the Epistle, said: “I refused to sign the Epistle because it was slanderous. The Sokols did not commit the things they are accused of. The Epistle is a great error. That is why I criticized it. It was not based on true facts and consequently condemned the Sokols on false grounds. Tears were coming to my eyes.”

A year later, on May 14, 1934, Bishop Ucelline-Titze made a statement in which he said that the Epistle of the Holy Father could also be subject to criticism.

“The Sokols are not guilty of what they accuse them for. In my bishopric they are beyond reproach. I immediately told them (the bishops) that they were wrong. We in Dalmatia live differently. I told one of them: ‘If you don’t change they will start spitting us in the face. Their Epistle is a big mistake. Therefore I criticized them. The facts they mention are not reliable. Their accusations against the Sokols are false. Tears were coming to my eyes!” This is what the old bishop said speaking about the same thing in 1933 and 1934.

The Bishop of Kotor was not the only one to condemn the Epistle. Several priests met in Split and also condemned the Epistle and its demagogical political messages as damaging for the Church. One of the Catholic priest present at the meeting even sent a letter to NOVOSTI (News) a Zagreb newspaper, in which he explained their views. High clergy and the clericals were enraged. It was a new and vigorous condemnation of high clergy. The letter spoke about distortion of facts, lack of precision and falsehood. In addition to that he author of the letter commends the Sokols for sincerity, openness and generosity, qualities fully in line with the idea of Catholicism.

“The Epistle is sheer demagoguery. Its intention is to instigate intolerance and Pharisaism. It grossly violates the Constitution of our Kingdom. Those who should be the first to respect the law are setting a deplorable example. The Epistle is sheer Pharisaism which is very sad. The Sokols have always respected the same principles and they decided to attack them only now.”

---

51 „FRANO UCELLINE-TITZE, BISHOP OF KOTOR,” „DUBROVNİK”, June 8, 1937.

---
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Međutim kotorski biskup unutar svećeničkih redova nije bio osamljen u osudi ove poslanice. U Splitu našlo se na okup, povodom objave poslanice, nekoliko svećenika koji su jednodušno osudili postupak episkopata, osjetivši da u demašskim i političkim tendencijama poslanice ima više štete nego koristi za crkvu. Jedan od njih formulirao je njihovo gledište i uputio ga u zagrebačke „Novosti”. Ovo pismo katoličkog svećenika, koji je govorio u ime mnogih drugih, izazvalo je navo ogorčenje u klerikalnim i visokim hjerarhijskim redovima. Bila je to nova i teška osuda crkvenih veštedostojnika. U tom uvodnom članku govori se o grubom izvršavanju cinjenica, netočnostima i neistinama. Stoviše, dotični tvrdi da Sokol načuva iskrenost, otvorenost, nesebičnost u punom skladu sa naukoi katoličke crkve.

„Poslanica je naprotiv plod demagogije; iz nje izvire namjera potpirivanja strasti u duhu nesnosljivosti i farizejaštine. Po tom i tajkom sadržaju ona je u očitoj i gruboj opreći sa temeljnim zakonom, sa Ustavom naše kraljevine. I time, oni koji bi u postizanju zakona morali prednjašiti, daju grub primjer, pegujan primjer. Rekao sam da je poslanica farizejska. To je vrlo teško za nju. Jer, odavna, od uvijek, ima Sokol ista načela, pa kako to, da su se presjetili gospoda sjeta sada... da Sokol napadnu. Čudne li baš koincidencije, da ova poslanica dolazi istodobno kad i razne „punctacije”, razne izvježe žalosnih emigranata i otvorena kampanja nama neprijateljske štampse! Nego, recimo otvoreno i bez uvijanja: ne napada se Sokol zbog navodnog protivjerskog djelovanja i naročito zato i zbog toga što je on jugoslavenska nacionalna ustanova! Ja sam uvijen da ne grijehim kad kažem, da izvor napadaju na Sokol treba tražiti izvan naših granica. Napadaj na Sokol ima svoju osnovu i u strahu, da ne bi Sokol okupio svu našu omladinu i oncno rudio time razne „Kzidere”, ili slične anacionalne ustanove i pokrete. Kažem anacionalne, jer se uzalud traži u izjavama takvih ustanova ili pokreta, u njihovoj štampi i jedna riječ „nacionalne svijesti! Napadaj na Sokol izazvan je dalje i strahom da ne bi povampireni plemenski separatizam naše svoj put i mirno i protiv klerikalnog pokreta. Odatle ono demaško nadicitiranje prema raznim punctacijama.”

Ovaj članak izazvao je postupak biskupa splitskog dr. Klementa Buneačića protiv don Tmana Ivanševića, koga je biskup osuđivao kao autora. Naime biskup Buneačić bio je još i više uvjeren da članak potiče od don Tmana Ivanševića jer je on na nekoliko dana ranije održao u solinskoj sokola-
Why only now? Oddly enough, the Epistle comes together with different PUNCTATIONS; statements made by miserable emigrants and an open campaign conducted by hostile press.

Let us be open and straightforward. They do not attack the Sokols for their anti-religious activities. They attack the Sokols as a Yugoslav national institution! I believe that the attacks on the Sokols come from foreign sources. The attack is also orchestrated out of fear that the Sokols may attract to their ranks all our young people, which would greatly jeopardize the activities of various CRUSADEERS (Krizari) and similar anti-national organizations and movements. I say anti-national because in their statements and in their press there is not a single word about the national aspect. The attacks on the Sokols are also motivated by the fear that the clericals and their supporters could lose control over various efforts of ethnic separatism which, in the final account, might even turn against them. This is the explanation for demagogical bargaining in connection with various PUNCTATIONS.

Dr. Klement Bonefatchich (Bonefačić), Bishop of Split, reacted to this article, accusing don Franjo Ivanštevitch (Ivanšević) of authorship. Namely, several days before the publication of this article don Franjo Ivanštevitch, in his lecture delivered in the Sokol Center of Solin said that 120,000 red Yugoslav shirts are ready to stand up and give their lives against 400,000 black shirts. The Bishop sent to don Franjo Ivanštevitch a copy of his letter to Dr. Rachitch (forwarded on January 17, 1933) regarding the Epistle of the Episcopate in which he says:

I have heard the big bell of the masons ringing through you in the effort to hustle up the truth. On my personal behalf and on behalf of all Bishops I reject with indignation all falsehoods meant to persuade the uninformed public that the Epistle is closely connected with the Punctuations, the fascist declaration and what not! The Epistle was drafted and adopted by the Bishop Conference held on November 17, 1932... and then we looked up the calendar in order to determine the most appropriate date for reading it in public. The following were the weeks of Advent and you know that there are no sermons on these Sundays. Then came Christmas and on the 8-th of January the Holiday of the Holy Family, a very suitable day for the Epistle. On the 17-th and 19-th November this was the only thing we had in mind. It did not occur to us to connect the Epistle

33 LETTER OF A CATHOLIC PRIEST, „NOVOSTI“, January 23, 1933.

34 Pismo biskupa dr. Bonefačića don Franji Ivanševiću (17. XI. 1933.). Prepis s originala.
with any other document. Only pernicious free masons are capable of planting such falsehoods.\textsuperscript{54}

This is how Bishop Uccellini-Titze, don Frano Ivanishevitch and a highly respected reverend Vjetoslav Spinitch (Spinčić) were promoted into "the ringing bell of free masons." In his answer to the Bishop (already on the following day, January 18), Frano Ivanishevitch describes the situation and the living conditions of our people in the Julian Alps region and speaks about an organized fascist campaign against Yugoslavia. He is of the opinion that in view of the situation Yugoslavia should mobilize its patriotic forces for defense.

"We also rejected the criticism of the Bishop that war is not a topic for priests to discuss. I emphasize that in my speech I was not calling for war. On the contrary, I only spoke against the war. In my opinion in peacetime the priest should speak against an aggressive war concocted in the head of Mussolini and against his appetite for our coat. I tackled that issue in several of my public speeches in Yugoslavia, as Chairman of the JUGOSLOVENSKA MATICA and deputy of JADRANSKA STRAŻA and so far no one in his right mind has reproached me for discussing that subject in public." Don Frano also rejects the insinuations of the Bishop that "he enjoys listening to the big bell of free masons", emphasizing that "he only listens to the voice of his conscious and behaves according to the criteria of his wisdom. "In my modest work Continued don Frano-faithful to the principles of Bishop Strossmayer, I have always tried to strike the right balance between the ethnic and the religious, between the notion of Faith and the notion of the fatherland. I have never swerved from that path and I note with great satisfaction that my attitude has always been well accepted. And now, with all due respect for you as my Spiritual Father, strictly speaking about the interest of the Catholic Church only, I feel free to tell you that by attacking the Sokols the Catholic Episcopate has gone too far. It does not stand to reason, nor is it honest to say that it was you who wanted to endanger our country and particularly compromise its reputation abroad, because that would be a crime punishable by law and you could be held responsible and tried for that. Now, when Italy is supplying Hungary with weapons and concocting intrigues in the effort to flare up a war in the Balkans and Europe, Catholic Bishops..."

\textsuperscript{54} LETTER OF BISHOP Dr. BONEFAČIĆ TO DON FRANO IVANISHEVITC, (November 37, 1933), copy of the original document.

---

Ovim pismom nije završena polemična prepiska između don Frana Ivanisjevića i biskupa Bonefačića. Ona će na kraju završiti upotrebom duhovne sile, koja je bila na raspolaganju Bonefačiću, upotrebom crkvenih kazni kojima će biskup udariti na sjajnog slugu božjeg, starca i rođoljuba svećenika koji je bio uistinu integer vita!

Kad su stigle u Split zagrebačke "Novosti" sa člankom "Pismo katoličkog svećenika" uzmirila se Bonefačićeva kurija. Tu se odmah pomislio da je autor članka don Frana Ivanisjević. 3. februara 1933. obratio se biskupu na don Frana saopćio mu pismene sumnje splitskih kao i zagrebačkih klerikalaca

\textsuperscript{55} Don Frano Ivanisjević biskupu dr. Bonefačiću, 18. I. 1933. Prepis s originala.
have no justification for declaring a religious war against the Sokols and the State. Because the Yugoslav Sokol was established by a legal decision, it has the status of a semi-official organization and it represents a shield against foreign propaganda and subversive elements inside the country. Would it occur to any Catholic Bishop in Italy to engage in a similar campaign against Mussolini, a militant atheist? Never, because state interests would be at stake. But, when it comes to Yugoslavia state interests, apparently, do not count...

This was not the end of the argument between don Frano Ivanishevitch and Bishop Bonefachitch. At the end the Bishop used the authority of the Church to punish the old priest, a patriot, a devoted servant of the Almighty, a true INTEGER VITAE!

When the Zagreb paper NOVOSTI (News) with the article entitled A LETTER OF A CATHOLIC PRIEST reached Split the Curia of Bishop Bonefachitch got extremely disturbed and immediately concluded that don Frano Ivanishevitch must be its author. In his letter of the 3rd of February the Bishop informed don Frano about his personal and the suspicions of the clergy of Split and Zagreb regarding the authorship of the LETTER published in NOVOSTI. In support to this conclusion the Bishop quotes don Frano’s letter of the 18-th of January in which the reverend expressed similar views.

“The very fact that only your name is mentioned in connection with the LETTER is very compromising for you as a priest, for your honor, for the honor of the clergy of your Diocese and for the clergy of Dalmatia in general. In case it is planted by the Editorial Board it would be your sacred duty to offer a public apology and thus take the suspicion off your name and dissociate yourself from the LETTER... The Bishop, the Ordinariat of the Bishopric, the clergy of the Diocese and all devoted Catholics expect you to do your duty without any official warrant and thus behave accordingly to the moral standards a Catholic priest is bound to honor.”

At that time don Frano Ivanishevitch was in Belgrade and visited me on the 2-nd of February, 1933. On that occasion I asked my old friend to tell me all about the argument surrounding the Epistle and the background of the whole issue. I wanted the whole country to hear his voice, like in the case of Bishop Utićenli-Tita.

DON FRANO IVANISHEVIĆ TO BISHOP DR. BONEFACHITCH, January 18, 1933, copy of the original document.

BISHOP DR. BONEFACHITCH TO DON FRANO IVANISHEVIĆ, February 5, 1933, no 320, copy of the original document.
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MAGNUS CRIMEN XIV
I emphasized that his publicly expressed opinion greatly contributed to shedding light on this very painful and gloomy situation. As expected, the opinion of don Franjo Ivanštevitču fully coincided with the views of the Bishop of Kotor. Moreover, he gave me the authorization to publish his views in the daily POLITIKA, which I did, on the very following day. Our conversation was faithfully reproduced, without any of my personal comments.

This is what don Franjo told me: “In spite of feeling ill at ease I decided to speak up in the hope that what I know about this subject may serve a good cause, because conflicts and blunders stem from ignorance of what the whole campaign is really about… I have been following the developments in our national life since 1880, which means for over 50 years. I am familiar with the cultural and political situation on both sides of the Drina river and Mount Velebit and I speak from personal experience. The Sokol Movement was founded in Bohemia and introduced to Dalmatia via Croatia and Slovenia. I claim with full responsibility that in the eyes of our clergy the Sokols have always been an eminent national institution whose aim, in addition to strengthening the muscles, is to strengthen the spirit in order to prepare our youth to successfully cope with foreign subversion. Nothing else. The priests close to the people support the Sokols because in their activities they have never noticed a trace of any anti-religious feeling. On the contrary. The priests from the rural areas tell me that the Sokols are their best Christians and most devoted Catholics, that they take part in Church processions, sing in church choirs and play music at church events and festivities. I am not familiar with the scholarly views of Dr. Tyrsh. In my opinion a distinction should be made between Dr. Tyrsh, the scholar and Tyrsh the Sokol. Qui bene distinguat bene docet. I have never noticed that Tyrsh used the Sokols for disseminating atheism. In 1908, as a delegate of the Yugoslav Parliamentary Club in Vienna I attended the ALI. SOKOL. RALLY IN PRAGUE. In 1920 I attended the same event, but this time as member of the Yugoslav delegation, together with numerous Catholic dignitaries and members of High Clergy in Prague. The Nuncio of the Holy See, next to the Pope in Church hierarchy, attended the banquet in honor of the Sokols, actually the organization founded by Tyrsh. If the Sokols were a hotbed of atheism this would be easily revealed in the fatherland of Tyrsh, in the first place, and the Catholic Church would not have been represented at the RALLY and the BANQUET. The political aspect of the Epistle is something very serious and totally inappropriate in the period of consolidation.
Viktor Novak

of our State, when the most sacred duty of all its sons, regardless of their name, ethnic origin, religion or profession, is to close ranks against foreign aggression and domestic subversion... We must not undermine our national unity, intentionally, or unintentionally, because our survival and salvation depend on our national unity. No one should deny the right and duty of the Episcopate to take care of the spiritual education of the Catholics and work on the eradication of poisonous weeds, if they, by any chance, start growing in the pasture of Heavens, but we should be very careful not to damage the healthy wheat, as in case of the Epistle. The reaction to it should have been anticipated because such serious cuts are always risky. Therefore, an experienced surgeon, dealing with the physical and spiritual aspects of human life should avoid all negative consequences. To anticipate developments means to be open for the right counsel and guidance. As I have already said, this direct attack on the Sokols, and on top of that THE SOKOLS OF THE KINGDOM OF YUGOSLAVIA, the national organization which fosters the idea of Yugoslavism and stands in defense of its interests, is a state issue. The reaction of the state officials and all those to whom the interests of Yugoslavia are sacred is, therefore, understandable. Even the Church itself never denied the importance of state interests. It must be very painful for Yugoslav patriots to read in Italian papers their comments of the Epistle announced by the Croatian Catholic Episcopate in Yugoslavia. On the other hand, these Italian papers have never discussed the Policy of the Italian Episcopate, their baili- las, or the attitude of the Czech and Polish Episcopate towards the Sokols. The country hostile to Yugoslavia is faced with enormous problems, but Italian press does not write about them. Also, some Austrian papers again report in the old style, from the period before the First World War, spreading falsehood that for the Catholics in Yugoslavia life is unbearable. As an old priest I very well know what was the status of the Catholic Church like before the First World War and what it is now. I therefore claim in full honesty that in the former Austria-Hungarian Monarchy the Catholic Church did not enjoy the rights and support it is enjoying today in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. It is gratifying to witness the development of the Catholic Church here in Belgrade where it now has 5 Dioceses. The Catholic Church is welcome among the citizens of Belgrade who are over 80% Orthodox. The Municipality of Belgrade has granted a five million dinars worth site for the construction of the Cathedral! I have also korov, zahvatio je i zdravu pšenicu, te nanio više štete nego li i korist, kao što se zbilo, čini mi se, i sa biskupskom poslanicom. Trebalo je prije predvidjeti kakva će reakcija nastati, jer su ovakve teške ope- racije uvijek skopčane sa komplikacijama, koje vješt kirurg, fizički i duhovni, treba da nastoji izbjegnuti. Znati predvidjeti znači dobro upraviti. Kazao sam da ovaj direktni nastup protiv „Sokola“ i to „Kraljevine Jugoslavije“ tangira direktno i državu, za čije se interese i ideale zalaže osobito taj isti „Sokol“. Stoga se može i lako pojmiti i osjetljivost državnih faktora, ali i sve javnosti, kojoj su interesi do- movine svetinja prvoga reda, svetinjina, kojoj i crkva nije održala svoj nužni važnost, sav njen značaj. Koliko samo boli mora da osjeti sre trodoljuba, koji čita talijanske novine, koje na svoj način komentiraju ovaj istup hrvatskog episkopa, one iste novine, koje nisu imale priliku, da kritiziraju ili hvale svoj talijanski episkop u pogledu njihovih balila. Jer, nepoznato mi je, da se sa talijanski biskup diši protiv balila, ili češki i polski protiv svojih sokola. Koliko nevolja zemlji u inostranstvu koje nije Jugoslaviji prijateljski naklonjena! Nisako ne odgovara vrijestima talijanskih novina, a onda je i one povamprene austrijske štame, koja propagira lažne vijesti, kao da je nepodrobnjivo stanje katolika u našoj državi. Meni su kao starije generacije dobro poznate crkvene prilike od prije i sada, te Vam mogu kategoriči uvri- diti ovo: katolička crkva nije nikada u bilojo Austrougarskoj monar- hiji učinila toliku slobodu i potporu toliku učinu danas u Kraljevini Jugoslaviji. Dosta je pogledati ovdje na Beograd kako se lijepo razvija katolička crkva, koja ima ovdje sada pet čupija. Uživa veliku susretli- vost građanstva, koje je više nego 80% druge vjeroispovijesti: pravo slavne. Općina grada Beograda ustupila je besplatno teren za novu katoličku katedralu, koja se ima graditi, a taj teren predstavlja vrijed- nost od pet miliona dinara! Sve ovo što sam Vam kazao, kazao sam i nekim biskupima u najboljoj namjeri da se spor što prije izgledi, jer je to u interesu crkve i države.”

Dakako, ova izjava don Frana Ivanuševića, koju je i ostala štama pretjel- la, bila je nov udar i novo ozbiljne za don Franinog biskupa dra Bonefačića. Čim je stigao 6. II u Split odgovorio je don Frano na biskupovo pismo od 3. II 1933. U tom odgovoru don Frano Ivanušević održiće da je on autor članka u „Novostima“ i da je upravo radi toga što su i njega neki pitali da li je on

57 Viktor Novak, Don Frano Ivanušević o poslanici katoličkog episkopa „Politika“ 3. II. 1933.
informed several Bishops about everything, including that valuable
donation, in the best intention to help overcome the controversy, as
soon as possible, because it is in the interest of both the Church and
the State.57

This statement, reprinted in many other papers, was a new blow
to Bishop Bonefačić, who was very annoyed by what was go-
ing on. Immediately upon arrival to Split, on the 6-th of February,
1933, don Frano answered the Bishop’s letter of the 3-rd of February,
1933. In his answer he denies authorship of the LETTER published
in NOVOSTI and explains that the purpose of his talks with pro-
fessor Novak in Belgrade, later published in an official newspaper,
was to reject all such insinuations and publicly express his personal
views.58

This letter crossed with a new letter the Bishop sent to don Frano on the
6-th of February, 1933, in which he talks about the article in POLITIKA and
asks whether the text is authentic, or not.

„The Ordinariwm of Bishops wants to know whether you have
really talked with Dr. Viktor Novak about that issue, whether the
article faithfully reflects your words, or whether it is a partial, or
total mystification? You are requested to inform the Ordinariwm, at
your earliest convenience, in what way you intend to make up for
the damage caused by the ARTICLE, regardless of the veracity of its
content.59

I have no comment. I only suggest that these letters serve as a ground for
assessing the approach of the Bishop to freedom of conscious and evaluat-
ing his moral concepts within his effort to refute the truth and distort it into
falsehood. Again, the two letters crossed on the same day. In his letter of the
8-th of February don Frano Ivanševi ć replies to the Bishop:

„I confirm what I told you in my letter of the 6-th of this month,
namely that I authorized Dr. Viktor Novak to publish in POLITIKA
my talks with him about the Epistle which he did. There are some
slightly different nuances in the wording and style, but this is irrele-
vant. I take full responsibility for the content of the article because

57 Viktor Novak. „DON FRANO IVANŠEVIĆ ABOUT THE EPISODE OF THE CATHOLIC
ARCHBISHOP“, POLITIKA, 3 February 1933.
58 DON FRANO IVANŠEVIĆ TO BISHOP DR. BONEFAČIĆ, February 8, 1933, copy of
the original document.
59 DON FRANO IVANŠEVIĆ TO BISHOP DR. BONEFAČIĆ, February 6, 1933, copy of
the original document.
it actually reflects everything I said. My conscious is clear because I only wanted to slightly dull the edge of sharpness of the Epistle and mitigate its venomous effect on good politics and Catholics. The Right Reverend, I am repeating it for the third time: Everything I have done so far and everything I intend to do in the future has been and will be in the interest of the Catholic Church and its reputation. I have proofs for what I am saying.

First, reacting to the great concern aroused by the Epistle I have used my very best efforts to convince some Sokols that it is far from being a call for religious conversion and that such interpretation of the Epistle is totally wrong. My words have produced a positive effect. Second, when the message came from Zagreb and Sushak that we should establish a new, Yugoslav Catholic Church separated from Rome, I managed to dissuade the proponents and supporters of the idea to take action in this regard. Third, during my visit to Belgrade, when I heard that the Financial Committee of the National Assembly is drafting a proposal to the Assembly to abolish the subsidies to our Bishoprics I contacted some Members of Parliament and tried to persuade them to reject that proposal, explaining that such a move would only aggravate an already hot situation which both sides should endeavor to calm down.

The Right Reverend, I feel free to tell you in strict confidentiality that in the evening of Wednesday, February the 1st, I had a rather long audience with His Majesty in the Royal Palace, at Dedinje. On that occasion we also tackled the issue of the Epistle against the Sokols and discussed how to overcome the conflict. If you are interested to hear more about that encounter I am ready to submit to you my oral report, as already mentioned in my letter of the 6th of this month.

I claim that everything I said is true and that I have proofs for every word I uttered. You also mention the effect of "abominatio" produced by my words. I can only tell you that a possible "blaming" effect of my words is only a far cry of the negative reaction of our people to the Epistle, which, God forbidding, may have very serious negative effects on the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia if we do not put down the big fire immediately.

Acting according to their moral principles the Right Reverend Uccellini-Titze, Bishop of Kotor and many other Reverends negatively reacted to the Epistle. So did I and for the same reason, in the effort to mitigate the negative attitude towards our Church. I hope

zanimali, da se ta misao otišel što mi je dosada uspelo. Treče, kad sam zadnijih dana u Beogradu boravio i doznao da se u financijskom odboru Narodne skupštine predlaže ukinuti državne dotacije našim biskupima, nastojao sam kod nekih poslanika da se tome protive, jer bi se takvim neopreznim mjerama sve to više zaostirilo ovo pitanje, koje treba nastojati i jedne i druge strane, da se izravna. U tu svrhu, mogu Vam, Preuzvišeni, i ovo povijetlivu kazati, da sam dne 1. februara u sjedu u veće bio u dužoj audijenciji Njegova Veličanstva Kralja na Dedinju, kojom prigodom poveo se govor i o biskupskoj poslanici protiv Sokolu i o načinu kako bi se sukob izravnio. O tomu, kako sam Vam već pisao 6. ov. mj. spreman sam ako želite usmeno da Vas izvjestim.

Za ispravnost moje izjave spravan sam navesti dokaze i uvjetiti Vas, da odgovara potpuno istini. Što se tiče "Sablazni" koju je, po Vasišim riječima prouzrokovala moja izjava, mogu Vam reći, Preuzvišeni, da ona nije ni sjena istine zlovolje, koja je prosječkova kod čitanja biskupske poslanice u našem narodu i koja, ne dan Bog, može dati povodu teškim brigama i sudbom osobnim poslijedicama crkvi katoličke u Jugoslaviji, ako se pažar odumah u početku ne ugaši.

Kao što je, Preuzvišeni biskup kotorski Uccellini Titze i mnogi drugi odlični svećenici, bili ponukovani od svoje savjesti, da iskažu svoje negodovanje prava te osnove, ti su isti motivi vodili i mene, da se onako izjavim u cilju, da se zaprijeđe zlovolja prava našoj crkvi, što se je istinom djelomično i postiglo. Nemojte mi zamijetiti, Preuzvišeni, što Vam sve ovo napominjem, jer mi se čini, da Vam nije poznato što se misli, govori i radi van zidina Vaše biskupske palace, pak je meni dužnost kao odanom sinu i svećeniku katoličke crkve, da Vas na to upozorim i očitujem moje misli i pobjede. Takve su misli i pobjede mene vodile kroz svih 47 godina moje svećeničkog života, takve pobjede želim da me prate i dalje do groba u istom pravcu, u neodvojenju radu za Boga i narod, za vjeru i domovinu.89

Sa ovim pismom don Franja Ivanševića mimošlo se biskupovo od 8. II.

"Budući Vasini odgovorom od 6. ov. mi, glede članka u "Novostima" poručiti svaki uđe u njem, niste udovoljni pozivu, a još manje on rasprava i može da raspravi sumnu koja se medu svećenstvom u katoličkoj javnosti uporno drži, da ste Vi auktor njegov;

to have, at least, partially succeeded. The Right Reverend, I apologize for talking about all these matters at such great length, but I have the impression that you are not familiar with what is going on outside the walls of your Palace and that you have no idea of what people think and talk about. As a devoted son of the Catholic Church I feel it my sacred duty to bring to your attention what actions I have undertaken and what were the ideas and motives that induced me to act. During my 47 years of priesthood my ideas and feelings have not changed, and I hope they will remain the same till the day I die. In my work I have never made a difference between God and my people, nor between my Faith and my Fatherland. 

This letter crossed with the Bishop’s letter of the 8-th of February, in which he says:

“In your letter of the 6-th of this month you deny authorship of the LETTER published in NOVOSTI, but you did nothing to dispel this doubt prevailing among the Catholic priests and the Catholic public. You are, in fact, the co-author, because you admit to have authorized Dr. Viktor Novak to publish in POLITIKA what you told him about the Epistle and also authorized the reprinting of the same article in JADRANSKA STRAZA (Adriatic Cost Guard) and NOVO DOBA (New AGE). The readers and the public were abhorred, particularly in view of your claim that all your actions were motivated by the principle: QUI BENE DISTINGUIT BENE DOCET.

I therefore call on you to publicly deny any connection with the LETTER published in NOVOSTI, publicly revoke the content and wording of the article by Dr. Viktor Novak published in POLITIKA and publicly repent. In case of the contrary the ORDINARIUM OF BISHOPS will have to take action in line with the Canonic Rules.”

On the 11-th of February Bishop Bonefachitch sent a private, confidential letter to don Frano Ivanishевич in which he does not question his good intentions, but reproaches him for publishing his views in POLITIKA, as if, in that way, he wanted to teach a lesson on patriotism to the Bishops, in a language used by the informers and free masons, and taking into account the political aspect only. The Bishop once again called on don Ivanishевич to revoke his statement, if he wanted to avoid punishment.

In his reply to his letter don Ivanishевич says: “As I already said in my letter of the 8-th of this month I take full responsibility.

---

BISHOP DR. BONEFACHITCH TO DON IVANISHVICE, February 8, 1933, copy of the original.

---

a priznajete, da je u „Politici” po Vašem ovlaščenju iznesao dr. Viktor Novak. Vaš razgovor s njime, baš radi toga samovračenja po Vašem mišljenju i pisanju o biskupskoj poslanici – po Vašem nalogu preslikanoj u „Jadransko Politi” i u „Novo Doba” – objavljivanjem toga razgovora je zgraja u javnosti još veće postalo, jer se držali postavljenog načela: Qui bene distinguunt, bene docent.

Stoga Vas pozivam da posebnom izjavom kategorički odbijete od sebe svaku sumnju za članak u „Novostima” kao također da požalite i pred javnošću opozovate razgovor sa dr. V. Novakom u formi i sadržaju kako je objavljen, jer inače biskupski ordinarijat bit će ponukan da pozvati prema kanonskim propisima.

Biskup Bonefačić je, međutim, 11. II, uputio don Frano Ivanševiču privatno i povjerljivo pismo, u kome mu ne održi dobre namjere, ali mu prijavio da je izjavom u „Politici” želi da biskupima dijeli lekcije o patriotismu i da piše u žargonu masonstva i denuncijantstva, jer da gleda sve kroz političke naočare. I sada ga pozivaju neka opozove svoju izjavu, inače neka čeka kaznu.

Na ovo je don Frano Ivanšević, kao i na pismo od 8. II odgovorio.

„Kako sam u mojem odgovoru 8. ov. mi. izjavio uzimaljem svu odgovornost za izjavu u „Politici” a mogu da odgovaram za članke u „Novostima”, jer ih nisam napisao uistinu, kako sam već izjavio,
for the statement published in POLITIKA, but, in spite of its similarity with my statement, I cannot be held responsible for the LETTER published in NOVOSTI, because I have not signed it. On the other hand, you call on me to refute the article in NOVOSTI and take full responsibility for the statement in POLITIKA, which would be preposterous. Since both articles have a similar content, serious people would make fun of me and I definitely do not want to become a public laughing stock. It would be even more deplorable if, at your order, I accepted to revoke everything I said to Dr. Novak and he published in POLITIKA with my permission.

The Right Reverend, you know me very well. I am not an irresponsible young boy, but a serious old man and an experienced writer who thinks twice before putting his thoughts on paper. This means that everything I said was the result of my thorough consideration of the matter, in the best intention to put down the first small flame of a big fire ignited by the Epistle. I am not a renegade. I am a devoted believer and a devoted son of the Catholic Church. I was born and educated as a Catholic, I am an ordained Catholic priest and with God’s help I hope to die as a Catholic. I did not achieve what I intended to, but I am not embittered in my disappointment. I accept things as they are because I am in the service of the Almighty, not in the service of any earthly power, nor in the service of men. It is not his position, or salary, that makes a man a man. A true Man is endowed with spiritual wealth and works for lofty aims. You demand that I revoke the statement written by my soul and my pen. That would mean lying to myself and lying to you. I do not think that there is a justification for such a demand. Does it make sense? It would be a mystification, an immoral act, and a moral suicide which my conscious and my honor do not allow me to commit. I would also like to inform you that JADRANSKA POŠTA (Adriatic Post) did not publish my statement at my request. I returned from Belgrade to Split on the 4-th of this month at 8 p.m. and the article was published in the morning edition of that same day. The statement published in JADRANSKA POŠTA was so distorted that I asked the editor of NOVO DOBA (New Age) to publish the original integral text, which he did, in order to help the reader understand the core of the problem and my good intention.

The Right Reverend, among many letters I also got this one from a Bishop83 in which He inform me about how my statement

81 THIS IS BISHOP UCCCELLINI-TITZE.

83 To je biskup Uccellini-Tiće.
was received and commented by the Catholic priests and devoted Catholics. Here are some excerpts:

"I have carefully read twice your article published in POLITIKA and I subscribe to every word written in it. In my view our Episcopate has exposed itself too much just at the moment when irrational PUNCTUATIONS were brought to the attention of the general public. You behaved as a patriot and did a great service to the Church. I fully share your views. I am old and have nothing to lose, or gain, but my face and honor come first. Yet, in spite of my long memory and a rich experience I simply could not imagine that the Episcopate in Yugoslavia would draft such an ugly Epistle to be read from the Altar!"

I also got a letter from a very learned priest from Split in which, among other things, he says: "Many of us are positively impressed by your sober and courageous reaction to the Epistle, for which I cordially congratulate you. Rest assured that you have the support of our best priests."

Also, two respectable Franciscans have visited me, one from the surroundings of Dreniš (Draži), and the other from Tretina (Četina), near Sinj. Both fully endorse my way of reacting to the Epistle as useful for the Church at this moment. A number of respectable citizens, some of whom are members of Church Boards and for sure good Catholics, also support the way I reacted to the Epistle as useful for the Church. I thought that these information could interest you.

In your letter of the 8th of this month you call on me to revoke my statement or else you intend to take action against me according to the Canonie Rules. You are fully entitled to use that right. You are my Senior. I am under your authority and you are duty bound to monitor my work. I very well understand your position and your responsibility to your conscious and to the Bishops who signed the Epistle. I admit to have violated the Rules of Church Discipline by publicly commenting the decisions of my Seniors. But, if you take into account the seriousness of the circumstances that induced me to react in this emergency situation of inflammatory feelings of hatred against our Church and an evidently pending tragedy you will understand that one of us had to breach the rules, jump over the fence and put down the fire... My reaction should not be judged as a sin but rather appraised as a merit. I am convinced that my statement was beneficial for the Church because it mitigated the negative feelings and public bitterness against our Church and I personally

ali ne bi se bio nikada nadao, da bi mogla ovakva greška izazeti na svijetlo potpisati od jugoslovenskog episkopa s naredbom, da se štije s oltara!"

Od jednog vrlo učenog svećenika iz Splita primio sam list u kojemu mi piše: „Vaš trijezni i odvajni nastup učinio je i na mene i na druge najjači utisak, pa Vam srdačno čestitam. Budite uvjereni, da stoje iza Vaših leda najvjerniji elementi našeg svećenstva."


U spomenutom dopisu od 8. ov. mi. Vi mi, Preuzvišeni, javljate, da ako ne opozovom svoju izjavu, da ćete postupiti prema meni po kanonskim propisima. To je Vaše osepsipravo pravo. Vi ste moj crkveni starijina, ja spadam u Vašu nadležnost, jer je Vaša dužnost da kontrolirate moj rad. Pojedinim dobro Vaš položaj i odgovornost prima svojoj savjeti i ostalim biskupima potpisanim na poslanici. Ja sam se, pruženjem ogrješio o crkvnoj disciplini kad sam u javnosti prenjeo sretrets djela svojih pretpostavljenika; ali ako uvažite okolnost i pobude, koje sa me potakle, u onom prvom času požara, strašne zlovole proti crkvi i ocije pogibelji, da netko iz naših katoličkih redova istupi i prekoži ogradu dužne discipline, samo da požar ugasni, mislim da njegovu djelo, ne smije se uspasti u grijeh nego u aslug. Potpuno sam uvjeren i zadožen u svojoj savjeti da je ona izjava puno doprinijela koristi crkvi, jer je skuplja u narodu oporbenje i njegove posljedice. Ja ću svaku Vašu opomenu i naredbu dragovoljno od Vas primiti, bude li opravdana i cijelo duhodna, ali moim Vas, Preuzviesni, nemojte da čupaju korov zahvatite i zdravo plenice, te se ne dogodi novissimus error pejor priori.

Još ću Vas za jednu uslugu, Preuzvieseni, u interesu iste stvari zamoliti, da prilikom Vašega sastanka u Zagrebu date do znanja Preuzviesnom nadbiskupu ovu moju razjašnjenja, ako li smatraće shodnim. Puno me vesele glasov, koji dolaze iz Beograd i Zagreba, po kojima rek bi već se nastoji, da se ovaj sukob izgleda. Za ovu ple..."
feel very happy for having done it. On the other hand, I am ready and willing to accept from you every reprimand serving a given purpose, but I beg you, the Right Reverend, to be cautious and by trying to pull out the weeds not to also pull out healthy plants. I beg you not to take any action resulting in NOVISSIMUS ERROR PEJOR PRIORI.

The Right Reverend, in the interest of the same cause I would kindly ask you for a favor. Namely, when you see the Archbishop of Zagreb if you deem it pertinent, please bring to His attention my explanation for what I have done. I hear from the circles in Belgrade and Zagreb that efforts are being used to overcome this conflict, which I most cordially welcome. If you find that my modest self could be of any help in this regard I am wholeheartedly at your disposal. 662

On the 15-th of February don Frano Ivanšević answered the Bishop's private letter of the 11-th of February, in a style which reflected stoical patience, modesty and readiness to help his Church in a difficult situation. On his part, the Bishop retaliated by vehemently attacking the old patriot who only wanted to draw the Bishop's attention to the possible negative effects of the Epistle on state interests. Being a patriot, like many other patriots, he was convinced that the Epistle served the interests of those who undermine our state unity, although personally he did not believe that the Episcopate did it deliberately.

"We should not close our eyes, nor turn a deaf ear to what is going on around us and to what people talk about. I wonder whether the Right Reverend Bishops have read the statements of Prime Minister Herriot and the former Italian Minister Sforza in which they openly speak about Mussolini's intention to invade our whole Adriatic coast and all our islands. I can understand the attitude of Bosnian Bishops and the Bishops in the hinterland. They are far from the coast. But we, living along the coast, the first target and the first to bear the brunt, must never forget that this tragic development will take place if we weaken the position of our state. The Right Reverend, I am deeply convinced that all those working against the unity of our state now, in the present political circumstances, are actually working against its survival. The reaction of the State is, therefore, not surprising. The strict measures are meant to save the State from destruction. The actual behavior of our Church is not wise...

662 DON FRANO IVANŠEVIĆ TO BISHOP DE BONEFAÇHITČI, February 13, 1935, copy of the original document.

...menitu svrha, ako li moja malenost može išta doprinijeti, stavljam Vam se od svega sreća na raspoloženje. 662

Don Frano Ivanšević odgovorio je 15. II. i na biskupovo privatno pismo od 11. II. i opet pravom stoičkom strpljivću, skromnošću i gotovošću da pomogne crkvi u teškoj situaciji. Međutim, biskup je zavihtao oštro nad glavom starog i zašlužog rodoljuba, koji je biskupa upozorio, još jednom, od kolike je šetje ta poslanica za državu. I sada on se ne može da otme uvjerenu svome i mnogih rodoljuba da se je sa poslanicom crkva postavila u službu rušitelja državnog jedinstva, iako on lično ne misli da je tu svrhu imao pred očima episkopat.

...Ne treba ipak zvatvoriti eći i uši na sve ono, što se oko nas govori i događa. Jesu li preuzvišeni biskupi čitali što je bivši ministr predsjednik Herriot izjavio, što je bivši talijanski ministar Sforza napisao o aspiracijama Mussolinija da nam svu obalu s otocima osvoji? Ne čudim se bosanskim biskupima i drugim u zaleđu, oni su daleko, ali mi sa primorja moramo imati uvijek pred očima ovu nezabijčivu pogibelj, ako li se rastojamo bilo radi koga razloga i oslabimo položaj naše države, mi smo prvi na udaru. Moje je tvrdo uvjerenje, Preuzvišeni, da u današnjim teškim političkim okolnostima, tko radi protiv jedinstvu naše države, taj radi i protiv svrhu našeg naroda, pa onda nije ništa začudno, ako država poduze ne korake i oštire mjere bez obzira na ma koga, a da se od propasti očuvava, le i pametno, da se naša crkva tako izlaze te stvara, iako nehotice i sebi i državi nepričaka? Sve me je ovo potaklo, da u mojoj izjavi utvrdim, kako je i ona poslanica u ovakvim političkim vremenima sasvim nezgodna... 663

Biskup Kvirin Klement 18. II. 1933. završio je svoju predgovor da se Don Franom Ivanševićem, koji je od starog svećenika tražio da u interesu crkvene discipline poređe jednu istinu, uštrivi da laže. U tome izrazio je splitski biskup inkvizitorsku presudu nad svećenikom koji se nije htio pokriti zahtjevima, blokova biskupa da pred citavim svijetom poreže što je pri zdravoj svijesti rekao s uvjerenjem da koristi crkvi. Cestitom don Frani biskup je oduzeo titulu počasnog kanonika Stolne crkve u Splitu, šest dana mu je zabranio čitanje službe Bože, a za godinu dana mu je zabranio ispunjavanje i propovijedanje i naredio trodnevne duhovne vježbe. Sve je to bilo stoga, što je don Frano „pruzoročio sažeta te stoga zašlužio primjerenu kaznu... uočiv kanone C. Z. i 27, i 386 § i, 2300, 23244 i 2355, a u smislu zaključka
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cause it is detrimental both to the Church and the State. Taking into account all the above I was induced to say in my statement that at the present political moment the Epistle is absolutely pointless...

On the 18-th of February, 1933 Bishop Kvrin Klement sent his last letter to don Frano Ivanishevitch calling on the old priest to revoke his statement in the interest of Church discipline. In other words, he asked him to lie. Since the old priest did not repent the Bishop of Split found him guilty, according to the Canonical Rules of Inquisition, only because the old priest refused to publicly and in his right mind deny a statement he strongly believed was in the best interest of the Catholic Church. „The honest don Frano lost his title of Honorable priest of the Cathedral of Split, was prohibited to celebrate the mass for six days, preach sermons and take confessions for one year and was ordered to practice spiritual exercises for three days. This was an exemplary punishment for his „abomination“, according to Canonical Law i 27 and 385 and paragraphs: 2 300, 22 344 and 2 355. The Consistorium pronounced the verdict at its Meeting of the 14-th of February, for non-compliance with the order of the Ordinariurn to publicly repent for the committed evil.“

Falsehood and mystification were behind the order „to repent for the committed evil."

The old priest was appalled and deeply offended by the unjust punishment and even more hurt by the fact that in the XX-th century coercion and punishment were used against moral scruples and wisdom. The intention was, on the one hand to stigmatize and humiliate the liberal opponent, and on the other, help the Episcopate improve its compromised reputation. Don Frano Ivanishevitch found consolation in the letters he had exchanged with the old Bishop Uccellini-Titze who completely shared his views. These letters prove that Bishops: Srebrnic, Jeglicit and Bonefacht, each of them in his own way, tried to convince the old priest to revoke his statement as planted on him! These letters also prove how low one may fall by using the power of senior authority in the effort to justify an erroneous approach.

When in his answer of the 7-th of February, 1933, don Frano informed Bishop Uccellini-Titze about the statement the Bishop expressed his full agreement with every word in the text. The Bishop was also against the whole campaign launched at the politically most inappropriate moment, consider-
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ing don Franjo's statement an act of patriotism. After repeating some ideas already quoted in don Franjo's letter to Bishop Bonefachitch, he also said:

"I am very old. I have a very long memory and I have very much pardoned in my life, but I could never dream that the Catholic Episcopate in Yugoslavia would one day announce such an abominable Epistle to be read from the Altar! Be it only the last misfortune paragraph and the Conclusions. This is a trick. And the so called proofs! You have disqualified them all! You helped me a lot by proving what I tried to prove, but did not succeed. You proved that they were lying. Now our Bishops will raise hue and cry against you, like they did against me. But both of us have the same friend. This is our CONSOLATION. I am sending you His picture so that you can have Him close to you."

Don Franjo Ivanisevitch continued informing Bishop Uccellini -Titze about the course of the conflict with the Bishop, enclosing the copies of the relevant letters. Two letters by Bishop Uccellini, one of the 19-th and the other of the 23-rd of February shed new light not only on the anti-Sokol Epistle, but also on the moral scruples of Bishops: Dr. Vrebnič, Dr. Žeglčič and Dr. Bonefachitch, who all three called on the old Bishop to revoke his public statements against the signatories of the Epistle.

On the 19-th of February, irritated by the reaction to don Franjo's statement and his controversy with Bishop Bonefachitch, Bishop Uccellini Titze made the following comment:

"I have never experienced anything similar in my life, nor did I expect it to happen to me. Stand firm on the ground and mind the traps. Those who speak the truth praise God. Bonefachitch is a great surprise to me, but if he decides to go too far try to contact Rome through the Nuncio in Belgrade. Yesterday I received a letter from Fra Miloshevitch (Milosevic) about his visit to the Nuncio in Belgrade. We also discussed these issues He told me about numerous letters he had received, signed and anonymous. He does not agree with the anti-Sokol Epistle either. He is of the opinion that it was a mistake to generalize some cases and mention Croatia and Slovenia at the end of the Epistle. According to him the task of the Bishops is to understand and disseminate religion in the right way and behave...

---

19. II 1933, piše biskup Uccellini-Tice, ogorčen nad svime što se događa, kao refleks don Franjih njihova i raspravljanja sa biskupom Bonefachitcem.


Na mene se obratio pismeno biskup krkić, jer da sam strašno sahranio kod njeg cijeli svijet, pak hoće da povučem što su o meni pisali listovi - ali odrešito, a da će me on braniti! Da ga ovlastim! Kratko sam mu odgovorio, ali fino i aprepano. Između ostalog: da oni nesretni dočeku opogonio cijelu poslanicu. Naputao sam ga i na 'Ivoja pisana u Politici', i krene biskup ljudjanski, jučer je me molio da se izjavim, je li istina što piše o meni 'Vreme'? Uputio sam njega na broj 7, 'Sokola' od 10. II, koji se tiska u ljubljani, pa da će vidjeti 'ogromnu štetu, što su nanijeli biskupu katoličke crkve, osobito u ovim stranama.

U ovom pitanju, moj drug Frane, evo kako mislim ja. Naši biskupi javno su optužili i javno osudili Sokole; pa su tu osudu sajvečani onima na božjem domu, s otara i s amvona kroz blagdanšće svog organa samo pametno i zakonito. To im se ne smije zanjekati. Svi koji su ih tako svečano i ostro javno osudili, dužni su po savjesti i svakom ljudskom božjem pravu pomno savjesno i počišće biti ova opravdanja, pa nađu li da su ih krivo osudili, javno poreći, kako su ih javno osudili. Ne učine li, za vijeće su se osramotili i nanijeli ogromnu štetu svetoj crkvi.

Neka se kopruju koliko hoće, oni se neće opravdati. Da ti odgovorim s darom na dar, šaljem ti fotografiju što sam učinio prošlo-

---
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baby up to the Holy Father. And now I have to stop and have my lunch.67

On the 23-rd of February Bishop Uccellini-Titzi got a letter form Bishop Bonefachitch in which, like the previous two bishops, he asks him to refute his statement.

While waiting for your answer to my letter in which I inform you about the talks between don Antun Milosevitch and the Nuncio in Belgrade I received from the Curia of the Bishops the information about your verdict. Here is my strictly confidential answer, just for you.68 The Slovenian bishops, followers of Koroschetz, wanted to muzzle me as well, first Srebrić, Bishop of Ljubljana and now Bonefachitch, Bishop of Istria. In my opinion the accusation against you is groundless and the verdict is not legal. If you decide to appeal to Rome against the verdict let me know.

Take it easy, dear friend. Something similar happened to me at the beginning of my Episcopate. I was prohibited to pontificate for four months, although it could have been much longer. Why? For doing something that I deemed would be pleasing to God and honorable and beneficial for my episcopal. My conscience was clear and I only lost then five hours of peaceful sleep. In order to make honorable amends they appointed an assistant to solio pontifico. In my view, as a priest and patriot you can also say: my conscience is clean before God and the whole world and those who did you wrong should remember that they can deceive men but they cannot deceive God. I will stop now, expecting your answer to my last letter to you.69

This very important exchange of letters ended with the letter don Franjo Ivanševitch sent to the Bishop of Kotor on the 28-th of February.

I admire your courage and perseverance, the qualities accompanying you all your life. We who know you since your school days are very well aware of them. You displayed these qualities also now in this conflict with shortsighted people with hazy views. I was very surprised by the order I received from Bishop Bonefachitch to refute what I have declared in full awareness and after a serious consideration of the effects of my words, having in mind only the interests of
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the Catholic Church. But I have not yet lost my temper. I see from your letters that you have been contacted by three bishops who demanded that you also refute your statement. Believe me, the Right Reverend, I simply cannot understand how they do that. This is an attempt on your conscious. They should understand that the act of your refuting the statement would be equal to moral suicide of your honesty, your face and soul. In my view such requests are immoral.

On the other hand, all their attempts prove that their conscious is not clean and that from the loitest place of Truth, the Altar, they were trying to disseminate falsehood instead of truth, which is surfacing and acting against them. I have contacted our people in Belgrade and Zagreb, all good Croats and Catholics and they all agree that the Catholic Church should be thankful to Bishop Uccellini, reverend Ivanishevitc and professor Sprachitc that after the reading of the anti-Sokol Epistle hundreds of thousands of Catholics did not give up their church. One of them was professor Shilovitch (Silovic), former Ban of the Croatian Banovina (Banovina Hrvatska) an outstanding scholar and a devoted Catholic.

The Right Reverend, thank you for having been so open with them and for advising them to be reasonable and come half way back before it is too late. Enclosed please find a copy of the verdict of the Ordinariun of the Bishops against me. Four sentences, can you believe it? And for what? For having prevented hundreds of thousands of Catholics from giving up their church. You rightly said that something similar had never happened in Dalmatia. Of course, the unjust punishment hurts a lot. But, my conscious is clean.

In the verdict there is an item against which I protested with the Ordinariun. It explains the root of the whole falsehood because the decisions sounds as if I had admitted the abomination caused by my statement published in POLITIKA. On the contrary, the letters I exchanged with Bishop Bonitchich clearly show that I believed in what I was doing and was doing it for the benefit of the Catholic Church, because it is their Epistle that gave rise to great disappointment and abomination. I only admitted to have formally violated the Rules of Church Discipline according to which the priests are not allowed to write about church matters without a previous approval of church authorities. For that I could have been reprimanded and my further writing prohibited. On the other hand, the only intention of my statement was to help overcome the conflict to the satisfaction...

120

Uzvijet

izdavati anakfe preotše kazne kao za kakova kriminalnog složenja ili razvratnog svečenika, kakavim se ja pred Bogom i narodom ne osjećam, što i oni dobro znaju. Tako ja shvaćam, Preužvimljeni, a tako mislim da je i Vaše shvaćanje. Sada na zatlučak: Quid faciendum? Što mislite. Preužvimljeni, bi li zasluživao, da se protiv ovoj osudi pri- tuzim preko Nunciju na Rim? Molim Vas, Vi me posavjetujete, ia se nisam nikada našao u svakom slučaju, bit ću Vam puno hrbtna u usluzi...” 20

U ovoj intmitnoj propisi dva uzornna svećenika, oboj rodoljuba, a na vi- sokim položajima, ugledna i priznata u narodu, odražava se unutrašnja slika metode kojom se predstavnici klerikalizma mogu poslužiti samo da postignu izjemu svrhu, ma da tom metodom i sa tom svrhom stoji u suprotnosti sa osnovnim zakonima kršćanskog moral.

Dok je don Frano Ivanishević raspravljao svoje pitanje sa biskupom Bone- faščem i savjetovao se sa biskupom Uccellinišem, dok su trojica biskupa nastojala da sklene Uccelliništa da demantira svoju vlastitu izjavu, pojavila se na užas episkopata još jedna nova prosokerska i antiposloška izjava u beogradskoj “Politici” 19. II. 1933., koju je sva ostala štampa prenijela i dala joj najširi publicitet. Bila je to izjava starog narodnog torca i istarskog pre- poroditelja Vjekoslava Špiniča, uzornog svećenika, koji je u svojim visokim godinama živio u rodom Kastvu, na domak rapalske granice, preko koje je taj rodoljub sa boli gledao na bracu koja su ostala u talijanskom ropstvu, u kome nisu uživali ni vjersku slobodu.

I stari Vjekoslav Špinič bio je užasnut pojavom episkopatske poslanice. Kad je javnost zaželjala da čuje i Špiničevu misljenje, on se najspremnije oda- zvao i dopustio jednom dugogodišnjem sokolskom radniku dru Miloradu Dragiću, da razgovor sa njime objavi u beogradskoj „Politici”.

of both the Church and the State. The sentence is too severe. I am not a criminal, nor a debauch priest, and they know it very well. The Right Reverend, I believe that you share my view. And now QUID FACIENDUM? WHAT TO DO? Do you think that I should lodge an appeal with Rome, through the Nuncio? I beg your advice because I have never been in a similar situation before and I simply do not know what to do. I would be very thankful to hear from you...”

Two exemplary priests, on high positions in Church hierarchy, highly respected, both of them patriots, in their letters reveal that the clerics, in view of achieving a given goal, do not hesitate to resort to the methods contrary to the basic principles of Christianity.

While don Frano Ivanishevitch was discussing his issue with Bishop Borefachitch and seeking advice from Bishop Uccellini and while the other three bishops were using their best efforts to persuade Bishop Uccellini to refate his statement the Episcopate was shocked by a new pro-Sokol and anti-Epistle statement published in POLITIKA of February 19, 1933, which was reprinted by all other papers and had a wide public echo. Its author was Vjekoslav Spinchitch (Spinčić), an old fighter for the national cause from Istria, an exemplary priest who was living in his native town Kastav, close to the Italian border established by the Rapallo Treaties, so that he literally could see his brothers living under Italian occupation, deprived of their religious rights.

The old Vjekoslav Spinchitch was also shocked by the Epistle. When he was asked to publicly express his opinion on that issue he did not hesitate to give an interview for POLITIKA to an old Sokol Dr. Milorad Dragitch (Dragić).

He was far more open and vehemently against the Epistle than Bishop Uccellini–Titze and don Ivanishevitch. Vjekoslav Spinchitch was a Sokol already in high school (1868) which he attended in Rijeka and later during his studies in Prague from 1872 to 1875. He realized that the Sokol Idea embodied the loftiest patriotic ideals. As Member of Parliament in Vienna he established contacts with Czech patriots who were all, without exception, Sokols. He never heard that the Sokols had anything to do with atheism, and he personally knew some who were devoted believers. Later on, during his work for the national cause he got familiar with the Sokol Movement in Istria. Their

79 DON FRANO IVANISEVITCH TO BISHOP UCELLINI–TITZE. February 28, 1933., copy of the original document.
activities were restricted to the field of national education and culture only and they were always in the first line of struggle for the renaissance of Istria...

"In view of my past experience I was shocked by the Epistle... I was appalled to hear from our bishops that Tyrsh grounded the Sokol Movement on atheism because I know that the Catholic priest celebrated his funeral mass. The Sokol Movement has been existing for seventy years. During all that time neither our, nor the Czech Catholic priests and bishops, or anyone else had a word of reproach in that regard. Catholic priests and bishops used to attend the Sokol events, and many of them were active members of the Sokols. For that reason I have recently accepted the invitation of the Sokols in Kastra to bless their flag.

I was shocked by the Epistle because I personally know many good Sokols who are also good Christians and good Catholics. I was shocked by the Epistle because I have never seen anything immoral or indecent at any of their events. I was shocked by the Epistle particularly because I deem that the Sokols are an eminent national organization whose primary task is to foster mutual love and tolerance among our peoples and prepare them to defend the country in case of danger.

For all these reasons the Epistle dismayed all our peoples I particularly have in view the priests who are great supporters or friends of the Sokol Movement and their pain when they had to read the Epistle in their churches, from the altar or the pulpit. The Sokols, good Catholics and their friends were also dismayed. They were all so dismayed that they did not know what to do... They simply cannot believe that the Holy See and its Nuncio in Yugoslavia did not know anything about it. They are all good Catholics and they want to remain good Catholics! But the Epistle hurts, particularly in the light of the fact that the Holy See goes hand in hand with the founder of fascism, the Duce.

Protests against the Epistle were organized all over the country. The closer to the Italian border the more vehement they get. People living in the border region are particularly hurt by the Epistle, which explains why the Bishop of Kotor and Deputy Bishop of Bar did not allow the reading of the Epistles in the churches of their respective dioceses. In many churches in Dalmatia the Epistle was not read either. The protests against the Epistle were most vehement in Sushak (Sušak), Kastra, Trzic-Kenita (Crkvenica), Novi, Rab and Krk. People in these regions very well know and remember what is
the neighboring country doing and speaking against us. Both the secular and clerical Rome. They very well remember that Andrey Karlin, Bishop of Trieste and Kopar, now Bishop of Maribor, was forced by the Holy See to leave Trieste and his service there. They also know that the bishopric in Rijeka was established in great haste, for purely political and not religious reasons. They also know that the official Rome appointed Bishop Isidor Sain, who was installed by a Cardinal. But, Bishop Sain did not speak our language and therefore could not carry out his duties. However, Bishop Sain founded in Rijeka a Clerical school (Sjemensite) for education of priests. The students were prohibited to communicate in their mother tongue—Croatian. The violation of that rule was considered a sin which they had to admit at confession.

People from the coastal region also remember the case of Sedey who had to resign at the request of the Holy See... Soon after he was replaced by the Italianized fascist Giovanni Siroth he died of pain and sorrow. People of that region very vividly remember all that and are therefore even more hurt by the Epistle.

They also know about the Lateran Treaties between the secular and clerical Rome. According to that Treaties priests and spiritual shepherds of the ethnic groups under Italy do not have to speak their language. On the other hand, many priests—missionaries learn the languages of wild tribes so as to be able to properly teach them religion and spread Christianity. This is the reason for empty churches and a decreasing number of devoted believers.

I think that we should also speak about fascism in Italy. Fascism could not care less for religion and religious education. Some of their activities are an offense to Christianity. In spite of that the bishops over there, either as individuals, or in corps have never raised their voice against fascism... And these fascists and their Duce do not discriminate love, but hatred, they do not want peace, they want war. Their teachers on the other side of our border brainwash our children by advising them not to go across the border because „they may be attacked, beaten even killed by the people living there.” Summary courts kill one Mateotti, one Morzini and people like them in old Italy. In Istri, Trieste and Gorizia they kill our people by the name of Gorton, Bdvac, Marushich (Marutic), Milos (Miloš) and Valentić (Valentić). Fascist attack all people they find suspicious, particularly those of our origin. They beat them to death, maltreat them, break into their homes, burn their houses, break into our churches and drive the priests out. Over there we once had several

narendne škole kojih je bilo više stotina; rasturena su sva naša društva - provijetna i privredna. 

Našem narodu u Istri ne dozvoljava se da pređe preko granice u našu državu na Trst da se pomoli trstskoj Marići Božjoj. Pa sve ovo nije pokrenulo ni Sveto Stolico ni talijanski episkopati da uzmute u zaštitu povrijeđeni principe vjere i pobožnosti. A čovjek, pod čijom upravom strašno pati naš narod u Italiji najviše vatanjski dostojanstvenici nazivaju provizorijskim čovjekom, postali od Boga za dobro talijanske države. Taj čovjek želi da uz pomoć Svete Stolice obnovi Rimsko carstvo, a najprije da osovi našu Dalmaciju. A što to znači znamo iz starine kao iz svega onoga što se zbiva u Istri, Trstu i Gorici, namje: Rimiljanin gospodar, a stanovništvo zauzetih zemalja - robljeb.  

Kad na sve to mislim, poslanica mi postaje još teža po svome značaju. Narocito kad pomislim na dobu u kome se pojavila. Italija prijeti svakoga dana, naoružava se, gradi tvrđave, brodove, nastoji da pridobije i naoruža i druge države rudi toga cilja. Sve akcije urene su protiv nas. Izdržava i neke naše emigrante koji davaju toj zemlji Dalmaciji za tobožnju Hrvatsku, kada bi nesumnjivo postala pjenionom Italije i Mađarske. Uopće naslanjaju nekih naših ljudi na vanjske neprijatelje pretstavlja najodravatniju pojavu u našem životu. To je izdajstvo. Svi smo dužni da radimo unutra, u svojoj državi, da nam se kuća uredi i da jačamo ono što su nagorještavali vjemčici bolje budućnosti, zašto su dali svoje životne stotine žilaza naših ljudi... I baš u ovo vrijeme u koje podijal glavu razmi protivnici nasi, u vremenu kada Italija jasno i otvoreno govori što hoće protiv nas, u to doba pojava poslanice daje još koraznije. I to se može vidjeti još i iz toga, što je talijanska štampa, a narocito ričeka, prihvatila ovu biskupsku poslanicu sa najvišim oduševljenjem. 

Sta treba Sokolstvo sada da raditi? Trebalo da prikupi sve svoje sile da se u hrvatskim, slovenskim i srpskim krajevima što više pomnoži broj sokola, uvijek razumije se kao i do sada što nisu bili ni bez vjeri ni protivjerci, i da sve svoje sile posvete dobru naše mlade Jugoslavije; da intenzivno rađe na duševnom stapanju i probudljevanju jugoslavenskog narodnog jedinstva i da ovakvim odgojnim radom pripremaju narodu sretnu budućnost...?"

Ovako je Vjekoslav Spinčić na zašlu svoga života, kao prvoklasni poznavač jugoslavenskih i talijanskih prilika, svjetovnih i crkvenih, svih političkih aspiracija fasizma i Vatikana, kroz prizmu talijanske šampe, obuhvatio
hundred schools in Croatian language and now they are all closed and all our cultural, educational and economic societies dissolved.

Our people living in Istria are not allowed to cross the border to go to Trst to the Church of the Holy Mother of Trst for prayer. In all these cases the Holy See and the Italian Episcopate did not react to the violation of the principles of religious freedom. Moreover, for the highest dignitaries of the Vatican the man most responsible for the sufferings of our people in Italy is a God sent savior of the Italian state and its well being. This man has the ambition to restore the Roman Empire with the help of the Holy See, but before that he wants to take our Dalmatia. We know from history and from the situation in Istria, Trieste and Gorizia what that means: the Romans will be the masters and the population of the invaded countries—slaves…

In the light of these facts the Epistle acquires an even more tragic meaning, at this particular moment. Italy is accumulating weapons, building fortresses and ships and trying to attract to its side and arm other countries in the pursuit of the same objective. All these actions are organized against us. They also financially support some emigrants from Yugoslavia ready to give up Dalmatia in exchange for an allegedly free Croatia which would very soon fall prey to Italy and Hungary. The support some our people accept from our enemies is the most despicable phenomenon in our national life. This is treason. It is our duty to be active inside our country, establish order at home and work in favor of our better future because these were the goals for which hundreds of thousands or our people had given their lives… And right now, when our enemies are raising their heads, when Italy is clearly and openly expressing its appetites for parts of our country. In such a situation the effect of the Epistle sounds even more terrifying, the proof being a very enthusiastic reaction to the Epistle in the whole Italian press, particularly in Rijeka.

What is the Sokol Movement expected to do? It should use its very best efforts to increase the number of its members in Croatia, Slovenia and Serbia, who, like the previous members, are not atheists or hostile to religion and work hard to the benefit of our young Yugoslavians:

Work hard on the unity of all our Yugoslav peoples and through education in this spirit pave the way to our better future.…”73

---

73 „POLITIKA“, February 19, 1933 and „NOVO SORA“ (New age), February 23, 1933.
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These are the words of Vjekoslav Spinčić, perfectly familiar with the situation in Yugoslavia and Italy, both in the secular and clerical field and fully aware of the political aspirations of fascism and the Vatican, clearly expressed in Italian press. On the ground of his life experience and living his last days he very well understood the implications of the Epistle and therefore condemned it as TREASON.

Telegrams of gratitude for his courage started pouring on Vjekoslav Spinčić from all over Yugoslavia, and particularly for having revealed the background of the problem. The Catholic Episcopate, all clerics and particularly the Nuncio were appalled and embittered. In his letter Bishop Uccellini mentions that Vicar Antun Milošević told him about the negative attitude of the Nuncio to the Epistle. This was, evidently, only a cheap maneuver of the Nuncio aware that he was talking to the Vicar of the Bishop of Kotor in order to dispel every suspicion about the possible involvement of the Holy See and the Vatican. This statement was particularly valuable because Spinčić was an exemplary priest and respectable politician, who over sixty years actively participated in the public life of Istria and Croatia as one of its most prominent public figures. His statement dealt a severe blow on the Episcopate and the enemies of Yugoslavia, who were particularly shocked when they realized who was ready to unmask the Episcopate, so hypocritically concerned for God and faith in connection with the ideology of Tyrrh. along with Italian borders.

Now Dr Starchevitch (Starčević) Bishop of Senj, in whose diocese Vjekoslav Spinčić lived, got the task to use the same method in his case Bonefachitch, Serbrnitch and Yeglich applied in the case of Bishop Uccellini and Reverend Ivanščević. Namely, on the 3rd of March Bishop Starchevitch delegated two priests to contact Spinčić and deliver him personally a written order of the Ordinariat of Senj to officially answer their questions, namely: is his statement published in POLITIKA trustworthy; and what are the names of other newspapers that have reprinted it; whether he was ready to refute his statement regardless of its truthfulness; to explain the reasons behind his attack on the Holy See and the Catholic Episcopate and whether he accepts, or not, that by making that statement he has violated the principle of subordination. Spinčić answered all these questions frankly and directly. He acknowledged authorship of his statement published in POLITIKA emphasizing that it only reflects his views on the Sołoth and claimed that he did not attack the Holy See and the Episcopate. He only thought that the Pope and the bishops in Italy should be equally just towards all peoples, which is not the case now. By saying that he actually wanted...
to once again raise the case of Archbishop of Gorizia, Sedey, which he described in details in his statement. After that news spread that Spinčić was threatened with suspension „a divinis“, which gave rise to new protests. This piece of news was also announced in POLITIKA and printed and abundantly commented in all dailies.

„On second reading and in view of suspension „a divinis“ for Spinčić there is a small difference between the case of the late Archbishop Sedey in Italy and the case of professor Spinčić in Yugoslavia as a free country. Spinčić was a victim of his national beliefs and Sedey was sacrificed as a fighter for our national and religious rights in fascist Italy. Spinčić raised his voice in defense of our national rights and against those who, under foreign influence, were trying to usurp them in free Yugoslavia. If he is to be sacrificed he will be sacrificed to the same Rome to which Sedey was sacrificed. Is it possible that the zone of influence of the united Rome could in such a short time spread from Gorizia to Zagreb and Senj?“

The Inquisition in Senj and Zagreb did not have time to complete the procedure because the old man died in the meantime. Thus, death interrupted his argument with the Ordinariun. Professor Spinčić died on the 27th of May, 1933. His funeral was up to the respect he commanded. Viktor Trar Emin (Viktor Car Emin) an outstanding writer and his collaborator in his necrology for Spinčić mentioned their „encounter on Easter when he visited the ill professor. On that occasion Spinčić showed him the document the Bishop of Senj wrote on the 3rd of March, 1933 which fully endorsed the views published in POLITIKA about the action of the Bishops against Spinčić. At the end Viktor Trar Emin emphasized that his attitude to the Episkop and his statement in POLITIKA stem from his steadfast principles and his awareness of the tragic history of Istria.

Adherence to the principles was the most outstanding feature of his strong personality. As an independent mind he was an open enemy of the Vatican policy which has always been hostile to our people. Spinčić was a good Christia, like all of us who worked with him. But, he never missed the opportunity to reveal the machinations of Italian clerics of all grades and on all levels, who have always worked and are still working against the vital interests of our people. In Istria Spinčić was openly against the ill-famed Bishop

je Spinčić bio samo dosljedan svome životnome djelu i tiskom političkim iskustvima iz mačkeničkih proslosti Istre, kad je reagirao u „Politici“.

„Dosljednost je bila jedna od najmarkantnijih odlika njegove snažne ličnosti. Otvad je stao svojom glavom da misli, Spinčić je bio otvoren protivnik vatikanske politike, koja je našem narodu bila oduvijek dušmanska. Spinčić je bio dobar krsjanin, kao što smo i svi mi, koji smo s njime radili, ali on nije nikada propuštao zgodu, da ne pokaže prstom na makedonske talijanske mantijaše, onih malih i onih najvećih, koji su našem narodu radili o glavi, kao što to rade i sada. U Istri nije Spinčić otvoreno ustajao samo protiv zloglasnog biskupa Furlana Flappa, već je često i našim narodnim biskupima prigovarao, kad bi možko propustili nasladi latinarizatorima“.


Ovo tvrdnje protivnika zlobna je kleveta ispresena samo zato da se može protiv lusovaca podići hajka i bura i da se tko neđe bar neki izgovor za njihov izgon iz Jugoslavije. Ja naprotiv znam, i ovdje na javnost iznesem da su se već odavno u Beogradujavili probitijeva da se lusovci protjeraju iz Jugoslavije; o tome se već pisalo u javnim glasilima.“ Jednako je nadbiskup Bauer ogorčen kad brani Svetu Stolicu

72 Vojislav Spinčić i Biskup ordinarij u Senj, „Novosti“, Marš 29,1933
73 „What Does It Mean?“, „Nowist“ (News), March 17, 1933.
Furlan Flapp, but he also openly reprimanded our bishops whenever they did not strongly oppose the imposed Latinization.274

The reaction to the anti-Sokol Epistle was further flared up by the polemical articles in clerical newspapers and the journals of the dioceses, and in KATOLICKI LIST (Catholic Journal) in particular, in which Dr. K.V. (Kosta Bohačevski or Dr. Janko Šimak) published several polemical articles mostly arguing with Don Franjo Ivanštevich. The Episcopate did not change its attitude in the least, in spite of the statement made by Archbishop of Zagreb Dr. Ante Bauer, published on the 27-th of January, 1933. Don Franjo Ivanštevich, Bishop Uccellini and professor Spinčitch in fact reacted to Bishop Bauer’s statement. The Archbishop was using his very best efforts to clear the Roman Curia of the responsibility for the Epistle. According to the Archbishop the vehement reaction to the Epistle is only part of a continuous campaign against the Episcopate and the Catholic Church. To all "incompetent attacks, insults, slanders and disgust" the Archbishop reacted by saying, "Forgive them, O God...!" Thus, Uccellini, Ivanštevich and Spinčitch "became part of a continuous campaign against the Episcopate and the Catholic Church." In other words they participated in a campaign against themselves. Archbishop Bauer also denies any connection between the Epistle and Punctuations and insists on the conclusion that the Jesuits have not only conceived but also drafted the Epistle. The public opinion reacted by requesting the expulsion of Jesuits from Yugoslavia.

"...this is a mean slander conceived to launch hue and cry against the Jesuits and to thus find a pretext for their expulsion from Yugoslavia. I know that Belgrade has been fostering this idea for a long time, which was also published in the media." Archbishop Bauer is also vehement in defending the Holy See and denying any connection between the Epistle, on the one hand and the Holy See and Mussolini’s aspirations, on the other. "Only the most successful against the Catholic Church...is it possible that professor Spinčitch and Bishop Uccellini internally hated their Church??!!" could concoct such a lie and use it to antagonize the uninformed against the Catholic Church... We, the Catholic Bishops in Yugoslavia are the only responsible ones for the Epistle. We have announced it for purely religious reasons, deeply convinced that it will be beneficial for the Catholic Church and the Christian religion in general, and also beneficial for the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Its success is the fact that so many thoughts se-

274 Viktor Car Eмин: "VIROŠLAV SPINČIC", NOVOSTI", May 29, 1933
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credly fostered in the heart have been revealed" (St. Luke 2:35) and now everybody knows how numerous the enemies of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia are. 

This statement is in striking contrast with those given by Ucellanli, Ivanishevitch and Spinchitch in the approach to the same issue and in the tone and spirit of the discussion. Bishop Ucellanli was ready to bless the Sokol flags even after the Epistle and continued to respect the Sokols for their patriotic efforts, don Ivanishevitch and professor Spinchitch did not consider them atheists and impious and all three of them recognized the link between the Epistle and the clero-fascist press and its enthusiastic reaction to it. On the other hand, Archbishop Bauer sees nothing but „the infernal hatred for the Catholic Church“ and „identifies numerous enemies of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia“. Archbishop Bauer and Bishops Jeglitch, Bonefachtich, Srebrnicich and Starchevitch did not manage to persuade the three exemplary Catholic priests to change their mind with regard to the Epistle, nor did they manage to change its general effect. Archbishop Bauer did not manage to exculpate the Zagreb Jesuits either (He failed like in 1891 when he tried to convince the Croatian Parliament (Hrvatski sabor) to let them come to Croatia). Actually, long before that the opinion prevailed among the intellectuals that the Jesuits stand behind all important moves and actions undertaken by the Croatian and Slovenian Episcopate.

After the Archbishop’s statement SOKOLSKI GLASNIK (the Sokol Herald) once more reacted to the Epistle placing emphasis on its spirit in line with the political views of the FRANKOVIĆ and revealing its political, rather than religious aims.

The dirtiest accusation against the Yugoslav Sokols is the slander that they reject the honest Slavic and Croatian name. What else can it be than politics, politics against our State based on the idea of national unity and the Yugoslav name! No wonder that the Epistle was announced first abroad, in Italian press, and then in Yugoslavia. Like in 1931, during the vehement conflict between the CATHOLIC ACTION and fascism in Italy, when the Monsignories smuggled across the border the Encyclical of Pius XI and announced it abroad, and only later in Italy. . . The purpose of the Epistle and the aim of its authors are something quite different. Actually, High Catholic Clergy was trying to use the Epistle as a tool for its rather aggressive interference in daily politics. Their „struggle for religious and cultural enemeljene na narodnom jedinству i jugoslovenskom imenu! I zato nije ni čudo što se za poslanicu saznalo ranije u inostranstvu nego kod nas, i što je ona objavljena prvo baš u talijanskoj fašističkoj štampi. Baš kao što je 1931. godine za vrijeme ogorčene borbe između K. A. i fašizma u Italiji Enciklika Pia XI, koju su monsignori avionom prenijeli preko granice, inostranstvo upoznao prije „same Italije… Pravi cilj poslanice ima se tražiti na drugoj strani, prave težnje njenih tvoraca utorene su u drugom pravcu. Tom poslanicom visoki katolički kler na pričično brutalan način zahvata u dnevnici politiku sa očiglednom namjerom da stvaranjem novih teškoća i zastrašivanjem sa vjerskom i „kulturnom borbom“ utiče na politički raspoloženje i da tako olakša i omogući ostvarenje svojih osnovnih težnja: osvaja nje isključivog prava odgoja omladine ne samo u vjerskom nego i u etičkom i duhovnom pogledu. U tome nas potkrepljuje i činjenica da se od sedam točaka u rezoluciji sa biskupске konferencije od 17. XI prošle godine, četiri bave isključivo pitanjem odgoja omladine u školama i van nje. Na taj način biskupskom poslanicu načet je osnovni problem odnosa Crkve i Države i borbje oko pitanja: iako između njih ima prvenstveno pravo na duhovnu i etičko odgajanje i podizanje omladine i time na kulturno formiranje cjelokupnog našeg društveno-gospodarskog i nacionalnog života uopće. U tome je težište poslanice i njezin eminentalno politički važnost."


Međutim, ovaj odnos i podudarnost pojave antisočkome poslanice sa antisočkom fašističkom propagandom, a i vatikanskom pozadinom, vidjeli su i katoličkom inostranstvu. Tako je jedan francuski poslanac istaknuo u „La vie catholique“ da mu „izgleda, prema izvjesnim informacijama, da je Vatikan u službi fašističke vlade i da radi protiv jugoslavenskog jedinstva."
tural rights" was nothing but a maneuver in the effort to secure for the Catholic Church the exclusive right to overall education for the young, and not only in the religious, spiritual and ethical fields. The proof can be found in the Resolution of the Conference of Bishops, held on the 17-th of November last year. In its Conclusions out of seven items four exclusively deal with education of the young, at school and outside school. Actually, by raising the issue of education the Epistle has raised the fundamental problem underlying the Church-State relations concerning the priority in organizing not only the spiritual and ethical education of the young but also priority in shaping our overall social and national life. This is the point of the Epistle and this is what gives it a primarily political character.75

While in Yugoslavia the Encyclical on education of youth had the above described political aim in Italy, in the Summer of 1931 the same issue triggered a conflict between CATHOLIC ACTION and fascism. The Vatican was forced to comply with Mussolini's warning, probably because it was the Vatican that proclaimed him "leader sent by providence." Mussolini said that "the priests should stay out of politics and that the state is the only responsible for education of the young." It is a notorious fact that Mussolini has used police force to dissolve the CATHOLIC ACTION. Later on, on the ground of an Agreement according to which Archbishop of Gorizia, Sessa, was sacrificed, the activities of CATHOLIC ACTION were restricted to the social sphere only. After that, till the fall of fascism relations between Mussolini and the Vatican remained harmonious.

The Catholics abroad also noticed the link between the anti-Sokol Epistle and the anti-Sokol fascist propaganda with the Vatican in the background. LA VIE CATHOLIQUE (Catholic life) published a statement of a Member of French Parliament, who said: "According to some information the Vatican could be in the service of the Italian government in their joint effort against Yugoslav unity. In more explicit terms, Mussolini is using Pius XI to deepen the internal crisis in Yugoslavia. The French liberal Herriot expressed a similar opinion."76

It should be noted that in the Catholic regions 345 priests refused to read the Epistle, and some only read it in excerpts.77

It was not only the Sokols, a few priests, scholars, public personalities and some national institutions that protested. In many cities and towns

75 THE POLITICAL ASPECT OF THE EPISTLE SOKOLSKI GLASNIK, February 3, 1933.
76 LET US BE OPEN AND SINCERE, "NOVOSTI" March 12, 1933.
77 THE MOST REV. DR. ANTE BAUER, "NOVOSTI" January 29, 1933.

78 Gliorovit otrvorno i iskreno, "Novosti" 12 III, 1933.
82 Zakonski prijedlog za ratovno crkve i države u Jugoslaviji, "Starokatolički" 1933., br. 2, 6.
gatherings (called Assemblies) were organized and from their rostrums the Epistle was severely criticized. At its meeting of the 27-th of January, the Boards of the Croatian Banovina vehemently criticized the Epistle. In his statement Reverend Dr. Mate Novosel said that the bishops should reprint the text by Bishop Strossmayer in which he says:

"Many will be coming to you, trying to persuade you to stay away from Serbs, others will keep repeating that you should protect the Catholic religion from the Orthodox, but BSFAWA, because all these advisers could not care less for Croatian and Catholicism, they only want to stir up discord and disseminate hatred between the brother of the same blood. A true friend of our people, be he a Serb or a Croat, is the one who disseminates love between brothers of the same blood. On the other hand, the one who stirs up discord and disseminates hatred, be he a Serb, or a Croat, is an internal monster."

The National Assembly also had the topic of the Epistle on its Agenda. On the 16-th of January 1933 Dr. Milan Metikosh (Metkoš) in his interpretation to the Prime Minister asked him to explain this attack coming from the bishops. In his opinion the Epistle reflects the political ambitions of the Catholic Episcopate which claims that the Epistle was written in a Jesuit monastery and reveals its connection with the anti-Yugoslav activities of Italian Fascists.

On the 7-th of February, 1933 Dr. Nikola Keseljentic (Keslijević) submitted to the National Assembly a draft law on separation of the Church and State. According to that law all schools in Yugoslavia are secular; church property as a national good becomes state property and the following year it is to be distributed to the members of the church, former owner of that property; civil marriage is the only legally contracted marriage; the municipal administration is in charge of the registers of the born, married and deceased; the priests of all ranks and all confessions are before law citizens with the same duties and responsibilities like all others. On the 17-th of February Ante Kovač (Kovač) on behalf of a group of MPs in their interpretation to the Minister for Physical Education asked his explanation for the anti-Sokol Epistle.


1. Za ovim gorje nego ovo Zlo te snade po zlomobnom času; Stopa gorje, jer bišaše nov, A ko dobro najviše na glasu: Ono crno sjeme Ložnivco I po tvojoj zemlji se rastu, I rodi ti jadove i čemern Stopa velom nego potres mjerom.

Jednak ruku sam iskopa sebi, Kad ne primiti se nebesku pčelu; Koja medom lasatav se tebi,

52 Napadaj na Sokols pred Narodnom skupštinom, „Novosti“ 19. 11. 1933.
In the general agitation against aggressive clericalism the idea was gaining increasing support that the main source of the problem should be eliminated, namely that the Jesuits should be prohibited to continue their activities in Zagreb, Sarajevo, Ljubljana and elsewhere. The promoter of the action that followed was Dr Oton Gavrančić (Gavrančić), Member of Parliament and a Sokol of long standing.

In spite of some merits for the development of education in Croatia in the XVI-th and XVIII-th century (described with due respect by Pavao Stooks, poet and priest, by Ante Mazuranić (Mažuranić) an outstanding scholar, by the historian and priest Ivša Tkatchić (Ivša Tkalčić) and later by Strossmayer and Rachy) the Jesuits have left dark traces in the national history of Croatia. All outstanding Croatian intellectuals used every opportunity to emphasize the negative influence of the Jesuits and their spirit on Croatian clericalism. Petar Preradovitch (Preradović), an outstanding Croatian poet, expressed his anti-Jesuit revolt in his patriotic poem DUBROVNIK, written in 1849, later included in his Collection of Patriotic Poetry called RODOLUPKE, published in 1873, by the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts (Franjo Rachky was chairman of the Board of Editors). In this poem Preradovitch sings about the glory of Dubrovnik, deplores its great tragedy caused by the severe earthquake that struck it in 1667, and speaks about the Jesuits in Dubrovnik as the greatest calamity of all:

"At the tragic moment even a greater calamity struck, Worse than the former one. Hundreds and hundreds times worse, Because it was new and unknown.

And announced as a great blessing. The black seed of Loyola Was spilt all over the country, Your country as well, and bare fruit, Fruit of pain and sorrow. Hundreds and hundreds times worse than the strike of the quake.

When I welcomed that celestial bee I did not know I was digging my own grave; While flattering you with the mouth full of honey, The celestial bee was secretly buzzing

U samom početku osnivanja hrvatske clerikalne stranke, historičar Natko Nodilo, profesor Svetuilista u Zagrebu i veliki prijatelj Strossmayera, inače istinski religiozan, ali nekompromisno antiklerikalan, 1903. rekao je ovo:

"Da je jezuitski duh opasan, osobito po našu slabu prosvjećenju Dalmaciju, to stoji. Jezuiti mrže na sve tekovine francuske revolucije i ludo hoće u pogledu političkom i društvenom čuvanjestvo potječi dragu u mračni i grozni srednji vijek, uz staleže nejednake, sa prevelasti crkvene hijerarhije i u samim svjetvenim poslovima. A i u crkvi površina je pobožnost njihova."


Donosimo ga u cijelosti.

83 Kad sam sa starijim osnovom Uscelliniom 1933. i 1936. duže razgovarao o njegovoj mladosti, sa počinjenom je istražio kako su mu jezuiti u Dubrovačkoj gimnaziji nasilićno promijenili njegovu ćer Tic, čiji pred državu u Hrvatskog, u Uscellini i tako mu je kroz sva dokumenta promijenjeno ime. Zato se kaže Uscellini potpisava: Uscellini-Tice.

Uscellini-Tice.
§ 1. Redu družbe Isusovaca (societas jezu) zabranjuje se na
stanba, zadržavanje i djelovanje na cijelom području krajevine
Jugoslavije.

Ni red kao pravno lice, ni pojedini njegovi članovi nemaju prava
od dana stupanja na snagu ovoga zakona, da se zadržavaju u ko-
jem mjestu krajevine.

§ 2. Onim članovima reda koji su jugoslavenski državljani opre-
djeljuje se kao mjesto stanovanja Otok Vis, ako ne žele iseliti se.

Ono lice, jugoslavenski državljani, a pripadnik reda Družbe
Isusovaca, koje se na temelju ovoga zakona iseli, neće imati više prava
da se povrati u zemlju, kao da je inostrani državljanim.

§ 3. Članovima zabranjene Družbe Isusovaca jugoslavenskim
državljanima ne dozvoljava se zajedničko stanovanje na otoku Visu,
već imadu svaki za sebe da žive baveći se bilo kojim poslom. Oni ne
mogu da steknu nikakvim pravnim poslovima ni među živim, a
niti za slučaj smrti nepokretnim imovinu.

Zateže li se 48 sati poslije stupanja na snagu ovog zakona ma
koji član reda spomenutoj u § 1. unutar granica države, odnosno
jugoslavenski državljani, a član reda, izvan granica otoka Vis, bit
će kažnjen radi policijskih prestupaka do 30 dana zatvora, a poslije
održane kazne stražarstvo proveden preko granice, odnosno na otok
Vis.

§ 4. Zateku li se na području Kraljevine, odnosno izvan otoka
Visa, poslije vremena naznačenog u § 3. ovog Zakona, bilo koji od
članova reda Družbe Isusovaca, da izvršava bilo kakvo crkveno ili
građansko djelovanje, bit će krivi prestupka i kažnjeni do 5 godina
zatvora, a poslije održanja kazne stražarstvo proveden preko granice,
odnosno na otok Vis.

§ 5. Territorijalno nadležne prvostepene upravne vlasti popisat će
čim ovaj Zakon stupa na snagu cijelu imovinu nepokretnine i pokre-
tnine reda Družbe Isusovaca.

Ovu će imovinu unovćiti na javnim licitacijama, a utržak uložiti
će se koristonosno kod Državne hipotečarne banke. Od toga novca
osnovat će se zaklada za uzgoj rimokatoličkih svećenika u jugoslav-
venskom nacionalnom duhu i za potporu siromašnih rimokatoličkih
šuma. Bliže odredbe donesti će ministar pravde i ministar prosjete
zakladnicom, kojoj se priznaje zakonska snaga.

§ 6. Ovaj se zakon proteže i na Lazarište, na Družbu svog srca
Isusovog kao i na svaki drugi red muški ili ženski, za koji se utvrdi da
stoji u neposrednoj vezi sa redom Družbe Isusovaca.
As of the day of entering of this Law into effect the members of the Society of Jesus have no right to find themselves in any place on the territory of Yugoslavia.

2. Those members of the Society of Jesus who are Yugoslav citizens and do not want to emigrate are entitled to settle and live on the island of Krk.

The Yugoslav citizens - members of the Society of Jesus who on the ground of the provisions of this Law decide to emigrate lose their Yugoslav citizenship and if they decide to come back to Yugoslavia have the status of foreigners.

3. Members of the Society of Jesus-Yugoslav citizens are not allowed to live in groups on the island of Krk. They have to live separately and work for their living. They are not allowed to own property, either purchased, or inherited.

If one of them finds himself on the territory of Yugoslavia 48 hours upon entering into effect of this Law, or outside the island of Krk if he is a Yugoslav citizen, he will be arrested by police and sentenced to 30 days of prison. Upon having served his term he will be deported across the border, or to the island of Krk if he is a Yugoslav citizen.

4. If after the time determined by this Law a member of the Society of Jesus is discovered involved in any church, or secular activity, he will be prosecuted by the Criminal Court and sentenced to 5 years of prison. After having served the term he will be deported across the border, or to the island of Krk if he is a Yugoslav citizens.

5. Immediately upon entering into effect of this Law the relevant authorities on each territory will make an inventory of the movable and immovable property of the Society of Jesus.

This property will be sold at public auctions and the money profitably invested with the State Mortgage Bank (Državna hipotekarna banka). This money will partly go the Fund for education of Catholic priests in the Yugoslav national spirit and partly used for financial support to the poor Roman Catholic dioceses. The Minister of Justice and the Minister of education will issue special Decrees to regulate that matter in more details. The Decrees will have legal force.

6. This Law also applies to the Lazarists, to the Order of the Sacred Heart and all other orders of monks and nuns directly linked to the Society of Jesus.

7. This Law goes into effect after having been signed by the King and officially promulgated.

§ 7. Ovaj Zakon stupa na snagu kad ga kralj potpisće i kad bude zakonito proglašen.

Obrazloženje


Po svom kućnom redu Isusovci su obvezani, da zatome svaki individualitet, radilo se o kakvom bilo prohijenju ili kakvom bilo sposobnosti pojedinca. Jednako su obvezani na bezuslovno služenje pokornost svojim starjšinama, na takozvanu pokornost ljetina. Treba imati na umu da je organizacija uređena sasvim po vojnički. Sve njihove provincije stoje u stalnom poslušu prema generalu i svaki član ima siljego da služi svaki nalog svoga starijeg, koji su u praksi mahom profesij. I koji su opet obvezani na siljego pokornost prema generalu i svom ocu papi.

Kad promotrimo ovu organizaciju sa spomenutom dužnom okolnosti sa gledišta naše države i našega raznovjerskoga naroda, dolazimo do ovih konstatacija:
JUSTIFICATION

"Society of Jesus was founded by Ignatius Loyola with the task to fight for the recognition of Pope as supreme authority. Since its foundation to date the Jesuits have been using their best efforts to realize that aim in all countries in which they are active. Their See is in Rome, headed by their General called the Black Pope. The Society is divided into provinces. The head of the province is called Provincial (Provincial). The See of the Croatian, not Yugoslav, province is in Zagreb. The centers of their activities are the monasteries which they call colleges. The Society has four grades (levels). The lowest grade are the novices and they spend two years in that status. During that time they live in special institutions and practice obedience and self-sacrifice. After two years the novices take three vows of monasticism. The next is the grade of scholar, which take 8-15 years. This is actually the period of learning. The third is the grade of coadjutor and the students are divided into two groups: the secular (temporales) trained to deal with the matters connected with secular live, and spiritual (spirituales) trained for teachers of the young, preachers or confessors. The fourth is the grade of professors, usually with a university degree in Theology. They take a special vow of unconditional obedience to be Holy Father. The title professor actually comes from quator voto. The General, his Assistant, the heads of provinces (Provincials) and all high ranking officials of the Society of Jesus are elected from among the professors.

The Jesuits have to totally obliterate their individuality, every personal desire or propensity. They have to blindly obey their superiors, as if they were cadavers. The Society is organized according to the military pattern. All their provinces are subordinate to the General and every member has to blindly carry out the orders of his superiors, mostly professors, who, on their part, are blindly subservient to their General and the Holy Father.

The analysis of this organization from the point of view of our state interests and the interests of our multi-confessional population leads to the following conclusion: Jesuits cannot be patriots because of their commitment to blind obedience to their superiors and their General. All of them are practically depleted of national feelings and without any possible understanding for national matters. They are internationalists due to up rooted individualism. Thus they all turn into machines, each of them is reduced to one part of the machine operated by the Grand General in Rome. In their practical activities
there is no individualism, there is no room for any national feeling, after so many years of intensive training during the first and second stage (novice and scholar).

At the end of the fourth grade they take a Vow of Obedience to the Holy Father, thus recognizing him as a supreme sovereign, which is not in line with the concept of authority in individual countries and personal responsibilities in this regard. Judging by the examples from the history of Jesuits there is no doubt that the professors will always give priority to their Vow of obedience to the Holy Father (a foreign sovereign) and the lower level will always give priority to their seniors: professors, provincials and others, whom they have to obey blindly.

In view of their knowledge, abilities and influence on secular priests, even the highest ranking ones, in all Catholic countries and owing to their vow, their role may be fatal for peace and order in our country.

Their leading principle is that the end justifies the means ("si finis est licitus, etiam media sunt licita"). All over the world they are famous for their religious intolerance. Bishop Strossmayer best described their detrimental effect on our state and people. In a letter to his friend Ratchky the Bishop says: "If Jesuitism take root at our Faculty of Theology it will be very detrimental to our people. Atheism and Jesuitism are equally dangerous for our people. Please use your best efforts to prevent a tout prix the appointment of Jesuits. Their fanaticism is just an excuse for their misdeeds." (February 22, 1874.)

In his letter of the 6-th of January, 1875 Strossmayer writes to Ratchky: "It is the duty of our Ban (Mazuranich) and our government to prevent the spreading of Jesuitism. Very few are aware of how fatal for all of us they are. Many of those who pretend to be clever and smart are in fact intellectually nearsighted." Evidently, the Bishop as a high ranking official of the Catholic Church, was familiar with Jesuitism and fully aware of the implications of their activities. We do not a have better justification for our approach to Jesuitism than the views expressed by Bishop Strossmayer, father of the idea of Yugoslavism.

Some may find the Bishop's arguments obsolete believing that nowadays the Jesuits are different from the ones Bishop Strossmayer had in view. This comment is out of place. The work of the Jesuits today is absolutely the same as at the time of Bishop Strossmayer zabaci. Rađ u djelovanju jezuita danas je jednak, a njihova nacionalnost, da, protunacionalnost ista. Ništa se u organizaciji Isusovca pomjenilo. Promijeneno se samo državno stanje u kojem živi naš hrvatski svijet za vrijeme Strossmayera i danas. Tada smo živjeli u katoličkoj Austriji, a danas živimo u Jugoslaviji, u kojoj je katolička vjera izjednačena sa svima drugim priznatum i vjerama i crkvama.


Iz naše je zemlje po Hrvatskom saboru prije 60 godina izazna. Naša država koja treba vješki mir, koja želi snosljivost između svojih građana koji pripadaju raznim konfesijama, koja želi da se u njoj poštujte naša narodna mudrost: "brat je mio a koje vjere bio" ne može dozvoliti djelovanje reda Isusovaca, koji propovijeda protivno načelo vješke snosljivosti. Redu kojem je naš Isus Krist dosao na zemlju ne da donese ljubav među ljude bez obzira na konfesiju, nego razdor, tome redu nema mjesta u našoj zemlji. Nastaje pitanje, možemo li mi izaznati jugoslavenske državljane jezuite iz svoje zemlje. Građani koji su najsvetijom prisom obvezani na sljepu pokornost tudem suverena, ma to bio i Sveti Otac papa, ne mogu biti dobru građani ove zemlje. Ne mogu se ni smatrati državljanimi jugoslavenskim, ma to formalno i bili, već državljanci na onog suverena, kojemu po danoj prizeti imadu sa služe. Ipak treba poštovati i formu. No treba radi reda i sigurnosti svoje zemlje
and their feelings equally a-national as ever. The organizational pattern of the Society of Jesus has remained unchanged. Only the state in which the Croats lived at the time of Bishop Strasser was the state in which they are living now, is different. Then we lived in Catholic Austria and today we are living in Yugoslavia which recognizes all churches and confessions.

If in Catholic Austria Strasser felt the danger of Jesuitism and requested prohibition of their activities, his view is even more valid today when Catholicism is no longer the state religion as in his time. But like in his time Jesuits still get instructions from Rome which is not in Yugoslavia and which has never been its friend. There is no difference between the Vatican and the Quirinal because their policy has always been identical, particularly since the Lateran Treaties - pro-Italian. In our country we feel the effects of their work. Their subservice work cannot be tolerated. Their allegedly legitimate work is aimed against our national and state interests. The state is entitled to use all available means to prevent these activities. The legal means we recommend are not new. The Society of Jesus was expelled from the Catholic countries: France from 1594 to 1603 and again in 1864 and 1880; from Portugal in 1752 and 1834; from Spain in 1835, 1868 and 1877 and from multi-confessional countries Russia in 1820, Switzerland 1847, Germany 1872, etc.

The Jesuits were expelled from Croatia sixty years ago, by decision of Hrvatski Sabor (the Croatian Assembly).

We need peace in the country, we want to foster religious tolerance in our multi-confessional state, we want to live by the principle according to which “a brother is dear regardless of his religion.” The Jesuits who disseminate religious intolerance cannot be tolerated in our country. The Society of the name of Jesus who disseminated love among people cannot be allowed to spread discord. In our country there is no place for them.

What about Jesuits, our citizens? Do we have the right to expel them too? The citizens committed by vow to obedience to an alien sovereign, be him the Holy Father, cannot be good citizens of this country. They cannot be considered as Yugoslav citizens, although from the formal point of view they are. They are the citizens of the sovereign to whom they pledged their obedience. However, the formal aspect should be respected. On the other hand, our citizens should be prevented from undermining our state. Therefore, all Jesuits, Yugoslav citizens, should be allowed to stay at one place, onemogućiti svojim državljanima da potkopavaju temelje na kojima je ona sazidana. Radi toga predviđa zakon za one Isusovoce, koji su jugoslavenski državljani, dozvolu boravka na jednom samom mjestu, na otočju Visu. Nego ni tu se ne smiju da bave crkvenim stvarima i ne smiju da žive zajedno, već svaki posebno. Time se želi spriječiti njihovo razorno djelovanje. Jugoslavenski državljani, koji jednom ostave naše granice ne mogu se više da povrate. Uzima se da su se odrekli našega državljanstva čim su ostavili našu zemlju. Našoj ze-
mlji potrebno je danas spokojstvo i vjesni mir.\footnote{Prijedlog... dra Gavranića o raspadu i izgonu Isusovaca... „Koljački list” 1933, br. 8, 81-82.}

Ovime je ponovljen prijedlog Narodnog Vijeća iz 1918. Ovime je ukaza-no da je i 1933. bilo potomaka starih lilacija koji su 1849. upozoravali Hrvate: „Si cum Jesu its, nolite ire cum Jesuitis” („Ako idete s Isusom, nemojte ići s Isusovicama”).


„Povod pohodu dodašo nedavni pokušaji neprijatelja ka-toličke crkve kod nas, da duboko u srce rane vješke osjećaje zagrebačkih katolika i hrvatskog naroda uopće, a napose prigodom nedavnog objelodanjenog prijedloga protucrvenog zakona za izgon reda Isusovaca iz naše države.” Msgr. Beluhana je u svojoj propovijed-i, koju je održao pred crkvom u Remetama, istaknuo „kako su se Hrvati Zagrebačani u svakoj svojoj nevolji utjecali u pomoć svojoj
nebeskoj Kraljici. Tako se i ovaj put Hrvati katušci Zagrepčani utje- ču u pomoć nebeskoj Kraljici u teškim vremenima, kad su neprijat- telji katoličke Crkve kod nas duboko povrijedili naše vjerske osnove i javno napali na naše katoličke svetnje. Narodio je nepravedan izazov, koji je nedavnno učinjen u hirogradskom parlamentu, kad je iznesen od nekih poslanika zakon o izgonu Isusovačkog reda preko granica naše države..." Mrgr. Beluhan se narocito zastavio na Gavraničevoj motivaciji o benediktovskoj poslušnosti prema sv. Ocu Papi, dakle o onome „što upravo mora da bude na najveću čast i po- hvalu ovim redovnicima, jer se iz toga vidi da u njima živi pravi duh Crkve.“ Ocvrtavi naslage jesuita za hrvatsku kulturu, zadržao se i na njihovom suvremenom radu kao voditelja 17 raznih Marijinih kon- gregacija u Zagrebu, raznih listova i drugih publikacija, veoma raš- renog pastoralnog rada. Stoviše, Mrgr. je rekao i priznao da se „učinio njih tako reči uistinu točne sav organizator rad Katoličke Akcije..."  

Načelnou politiku u „Katoličkom listu“ pveli su profesor univerziteta dr. Stjepan Bakšić i fra Petar Grbic, analizirajući Gavraničevo prijedlog i pobi- jajući sa klerikalnom gledišta svaki pojedinačni član kao i čitavo obrazloženje...  

Vladi i kralju su stizale rezolucije sa organiziranih zborova svećenika i protesti protiv prijedloga dra Gavranića iz raznih dijeca Jugoslavije. U jednom protestu se kaže da je ovaj prljavšća, u „teškoj opremi sa osnovnim načelima grada vijest, koje su zajamčene ustavnim, te se time poga- da red, prenosaželjen za vjerski i čudesni odgoj hrvatskog naroda, kao i za ugo zemlji svogostinjerasan teritorijalnih velikana“. U drugome se traži od vlade i Narodne skupštine da se „u interesu pravde, međusobne ljubavi i vjerskog mira u državi odbije prijedlog o izgonu Isusovaca, kao što je odmah iza pri- kaza bio odbijen prijedlog zakona o rastavi Crkve i Države..."  

Dakako, i na suprotnoj strani se nije mirovalo. U neklerikalnoj štampi se kroz nekoliko sedmaca o jezuitima više pisalo i polemiziralo nego onoliko decenijama. Oživela se uspomena na boravak Isusovaca u hrvatskim strana- ma i o aferama u vezi s njihovim odgojem u Požegi, Dubrovniku, Kraljevici i o njihovom sramotnom bijegu. Iscrpno se objašnjava morala Alfonka Liguera kao i sav historijski splet zakluznog djelovanja teritorij u Evropi u prošlim stoljećima. Za neobavještena bila su savremeno neobična znanja da

88 Zarjeća procesija Zagrepčana u Remete. „Katolički list“, 1933, br. 8, str. 83.
89 Stjepan Bakšić, Zahtjev Izusovaca boravi u progenotvi. „Katolički list“, 1933, br. 8, Petar Grbic, Humanitarni i pravni podlogi zakon. prijedloga dr. Gavranića i drugoga o izgonu Isusovaca. „Katolički list“, 1933, br. 8, 70-80.
90 I azvane svećenice... „Katolički list“, 1933, br. II, 121-122.
have deeply hurt our religious feelings and publicly attacked every
ting that is sacred to us. The draft law on the expulsion of the
Society of Jesus from Yugoslavia is the latest, most hostile challenge of
the Parliament in Belgrade against us. Msgr. particularly insist-
ated on unconditional obedience to the Holy Father, which was the
main motivation of Dr. Gavrančić to submit that draft law. For
the Monsignor unconditional obedience to the Holy Father is the
greatest honor for the members of that order and a proof that a true
spirit of the Church is living in them." Msgr. Beluhan continued his
sermon by recalling the merits of the Jesuits for Croatian culture and
praising their present work as leaders of 17 different Congregations
of the Holy Mary in Zagreb, as editors of journals and other publica-
tions and as very active in the pastoral field. Actually, the Monsignor
admitted that: "the Jesuits are at the heart of all organised work of
the CATHOLIC ACTION."96

Dr. Stjepan Bakić (Bakić) university professor and Fra Petar Grab-
 bitch (Grabić) published in KATOLIČKI LIST the draft law and from the
clerical point of view refused each of its articles and the justification.

The Government and the King were overwhelmed with protests against
the draft law, coming from numerous Catholic dioceses in Yugoslavia. In one
protest the draft law is qualified as "a gross violation of the fundamental free-
doms of the citizens, guaranteed by the Constitution and an attack against a
Society which has great merits for the religious and secular education of all
Croats, including their outstanding writers of the older generation. The other
protest requests the Government and the National Assembly to reject the
draft law on behalf of justice, mutual love and religious peace in the country,
as was the case with the draft law on the separation of church and state.98

The other side did not sit with its arms crossed either, but reacted in its
way. A few weeks later the non-clerical press devoted to the Jesuits more at-
tention and polemical articles than decades ago. The topics were the revived
memories of their scandals in Poszega (Zožega), Dubrovnik, Kraljevica
(Kraljevica), and their shameful escape. The Moral Principles of Alfonzo
Liguori and all underground machinations of the Jesuits in Europe during

96 "THE PROCESSION FROM ZAGREB TO REMETE. KATOLIČKI LIST", 1933, no. 1, p.3.
97 Stjepan Bakić: WHY EXPUL THE JESUITS? (Stjepan Bakić: Zašto Isušćeva tijesak na progon-
strvo?" KATOLIČKI LIST", 1933, no. 4, Peter Grabitch: THE HUMANITARIAN AND LEGAL
BASIS OF THE DRAFT LAW ON EXPULSION OF JESUITS" (Peter Grabitch: "Kamn litar i prav-
na podloža zavjet privrednici Dr. Gavrančića i drugova o iznosi Isusovca", KATOLIČKI LIST,
1933, n.8, pp.79-80.
98 "THE PRIEST SAY...", KATOLIČKI LIST, 1933, no. II., pp.121-122.

su se protiv jezuitska izjašnjavanja ne samo napredniji mislioni, nego se među
njihovim protivnicima našlo i papa, kardinala, nadbiskupa, biskupa, kanoni-
ika, katolički univerziteti, profesori bогословие i crkvene historije, brojni
svrstenici, katolički vladari, državnici i političari.

Da bi bila posve jasna ova teta dosta je bilo upozoriti na obrazloženje
pape Klementa XIV., kad je 21. VII. 1773. ukinuo jezuitski red sa znameni-	 tim breven "Dominus ac redemptor noster". Papa Klement XIV. je priznalo
ja se da su se uzalud trudili njegovi prethodnici da uklone toliko optužbe proti
nega reda. I njegovom prethodniku Klementu XIII. posudjivat je, kao i njemu
prijedloga. 1.3. jek su se prijedloga "pridružiti mnogi biskupi i drugi po
poziciji i učenosti i pobožnosti odlični mučenici"; to se on poslije zrelo razmišljanja želeći crkve da povrati pravu i trajnu mi,
ali i užas rečen družbu, sve njihove urede i službe, njihove domove i škole, koljija.99 Ovaj Klementov breven potvrdo je i njegov nasljednik Pio VI. sa
tri kasnija brevena 1783. jer "ništa nije na to pomisli i neček na to
misliti, da učini ma i najmanji prigovor taj dekret".90

Poslije sloma francuske revolucije i pada Napoleona, a iza povratka
reacije, Pije VII 1814. vraća sa bolum "Sollicitudo omnium" red Držbe
Isusove a s time i nove stalne borbe u i izvan krila katoličke crkve. I doista, još
od vremena osnivača reda (ignacija Loyole, kad se 1554. izjasnja protiv reda
pariska Sobona, "koji je postao opasan za vjeru i sposoban da ugrozi mir
krve... sposoban više za razaranje nego za podizanje", a tom se mišljenju
prijedvođen pariski nadbiskup i više francuskih biskupa.94 Nije čudo da se od
1814. diže sve novi i novi prigovori djelovanju jezuita u Evropi. Nije naka-
ko iznenadjenje da su i najveći umovi Hrvatske – Preradović, Strossmer,
Rakić, Nodilo, Radić i toliki drugi – zastraženi od njih i u mnogo ih slučajeva
pobjedili.

Jezuitizam i hrvatski klerikalizam u stvari su i prije, a naročito poslije
1900. sinonimni pojmovi. Hrvatski jezuitizam bio je osnovan nosilac hrvat-
skog klerikalizma i poticalj svih antijugoslovenskih i antiliberalnih akcija
hrvatskih klerikalaca. Jer, hrvatski klerikalizam prekajen jezuitskim duhom
bio je uvjerenja da je ispravno naučanje jezuita Ota Zimmernassa koji je
formulirao tezu da je "jezuitsko uvjek u temu ako se narodnost ne podlo-
the past centuries were analyzed and explained in detail. The average readers were appalled to learn that in the past not only progressive intellectuals, but also one Pope, several Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops, Canons and the Catholic University, professors of theology and Church history, numerous priests, Sovereign of Catholic religion, statesmen and politicians were against the Jesuits.

It is noteworthy to recall the explanation of Pope Clemens XIV for abolishing the Society of Jesus (on the 17-th of July, 1773) by his famous Brevet „Dominus ac redemptor noster“. Clemens XIV admitted that his predecessors in vain tried hard to keep the accusations against the Jesuits under cover. His predecessor, Clemens XIII was also asked to abolish the Society of Jesus for the sake of peace in the Christian world. When he received the same request supported by „many Bishops and other respectful personalities known as outstanding scholars and devoted Catholics „after having thoroughly considered the matter“, he decided to abolish the Society of Jesus and all its services, centers, schools and collegiums for the sake of a permanent and true piece in the Church. This Brevet was later approved by his successor, Pius VI and reinforced by three more Brevets he issued in 1783 „to prove that he had no objection whatsoever to the Brevet issued by Clemens XIII."

After the French Revolution, the fall of Napoleon and restoration of re-actionary forces Pius VII in 1814 with his Bulla on „Solicitudo omnium“ restored the Society of Jesus and thus revived permanent conflicts inside and outside the Catholic Church. It is interesting to note that at the time when Loyola founded the Society of Jesus the Paris Sorbonne was against it „as dangerous for the religion and a threat to peace in the Church, more capable to destroy than build."

The Bishop of Paris and several French Bishops gave support to that view. As of 1814 the number of protests against the Jesuits has been constantly increasing. It is not surprising that the most outstandingCroats Preradović, Strossmayer, Rachky, Nodilo, Raditch and many others did not trust them and in many cases were even against them.

Jesuitism and Croatian clericalism before, and particularly after 1900 are one and the same. Actually, Croatian Jesuitism was the main promoter of Croatian clericalism and the master brain of all anti-Yugoslav and anti-liberal activities of Croatian Clericals. Imbued with the spirit of Jesuitism.

---

Croatian clericals fully subscribed to the view of Jesuit Otto Zimmerman who said: "Faithless are those who are not subservient to the faith... in case of conflict between the national and religious interests it is the religious that always prevails over the national." In spite of a resolute support to the draft law by the progressive Yugoslav public opinion like in 1978 the clericals won the day. Only in 1978 it was the NARODNO VJEC (the National Council) in Zagreb that yielded to the pressure of Archbishop Bauer, and now, in 1953 King Aleksandar was too permissive. Actually, at the suggestion of the King the proposal of the draft law submitted by Dr. Gavrančič was not put on the Agenda of the National Assembly. Ante Pavlič (Pavelić) organizer of the assassination of the King in Marseilles, a former pupil of the high school in Travnik, sponsored by Jesuits, paid him due tribute for drafting that law. When the fascist NEZAVISNA DRŽAVA HRVATSKA was founded and the Jesuit „Civitas Dei” re-established Dr. Oton Gavrančič was taken to the extermination camp of JASENOVAC (Yasenovac) and died a horrendous death beyond imagination of the most pathological mind of the Inquisition.

The National Assembly had the anti-Sokol Epistle several more times on its Agenda, and particularly in connection with the budget for physical education. A significant number of the Members of Parliament stood up in defense of the Sokols and its activities and condemned the anti-patriotic background of the Epistle.

In his address to the Assembly on the 16-th of March, 1933, Prime Minister Dr. Milan Šršek (Srški) defined the views of the Government on the legal and political relations between the State and Church. The Prime Minister rejected the accusation of the Catholic church that it is persecuted in Yugoslavia emphasizing that even the Law on Education was changed for the sake of the Catholic church, that all confessionals schools are in place, that regarding the problem of church land property in Dalmatia the church no longer has to pay the contribution to the colonist fund (kolonizacijski fond), which has increased the compensation for church land by 20%. Regarding the physical education of youth the Prime Minister emphasized that according to the law it is to be neutral and without any religious symbols.

In his statement Dr. Lavoslav Hanzek (Hanžek) argued with the Episcopate and defended Tyrs and his ideology which, according to some Czech priests is not contrary to the religious principles. Dr. Hanzek made a

---

92 Idem, 4.
93 See the last chapter of THE BLOODY HARVEST.
detailed analysis of the Epistle, particularly the views of Bishop Serbrnitch, and concluded that the Epistle was a failure. At the end Dr. Hanszep emphasized the importance of the Sokols of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and expressed his thanks to the Polish Sokols for their solidarity with the Yugoslav Sokols against the Epistle. The Minister recalled that once the Holy Father himself blessed the Polish Sokols regarding them as a Catholic sports society without reproach. In defense of the Sokols, evidently it was necessary to recall all these details!

This was the official attitude towards the Epistle. Some concessions have been made in allowing confessional schools to continue their work, but there was no concession with regard to physical education on the national level. The last echoes of this conflict indicated that even the most aggressive, militant clericalism was on the defensive. It became particularly evident with regard to the charge the Sokols brought against the Episcopate filed with the First District Court in Zagreb. Dr. Gavranitch, the attorney for the Sokols, accused the Episcopate for insult in the Epistle. Since the Episcopate had no proofs for its statement in the Epistle it referred itself to the Church Canon no. 120 according to which it is not possible to file a charge, civil or criminal, against the Episcopate without previous approval of the Holy See. The court hearing took place on the 15-th of May, 1933 before the First District Court in Zagreb. The objection of the defense attorney was rejected and the Court established that Canon no. 120 was not in line with Chapter XXVIII of the Yugoslav Criminal Law and it (the Court) has to comply only with its own Rules of Procedure. The bishops then referred themselves to PRIVILIGIUM FORI provided for by the old Concordat between Austria and the Vatican, according to which the Bishops can be only charged before the Holy See and the Monarch, and not before regular civil courts. But this was not an international agreement, nor an agreement with the Kingdom Of Yugoslavia. Moreover it was abrogated in 1870 by the Austria-Hungarian Monarchy. This outdated Concordat is not in line with paragraph 3. 1 of the Criminal Law which says that „this Law applies to all who commit a criminal violation in Yugoslavia”, which means that the indicted do not enjoy the ex-territorial status. The ex-territorial status enjoy only those express verbs mentioned in the Law. Chapter XVIII of the Criminal Law applies to all state employees and representatives of the church.

Afraid to appear before court, due to lack of evidence, the bishops decided to take advantage of the previous Austrian privilege, which left a bad

---

94 "THE SOKOLS AND THE DEBATE ON THE BUDGET IN THE ASSEMBLY OF THE KINGDOM OF YUGOSLAVIA" (Sokolstvo i budžetski debati Narodne skupštine Krajevine Jugoslavije), Ljubljana, 1933, pp. 7-35.
impression on the Yugoslav public opinion. It was also a hard blow on the Yugoslav Episcopate. Again, under the pressure of the King to withdraw the charge for gross insult the Sokols decided to comply. On the 15-th of May Dr Gorančich on behalf of the Sokol declared that the incriminated did not withdraw their insults, nor offered any satisfaction customary in similar situations:

_We note that they have not even tried to produce evidence before this Court for their insults in the Epistle, which proves that the insults are groundless. For us it means moral satisfaction because the indicted would have been condemned. But owing to their high position in church hierarchy and society and in view of the above conclusion we withdraw our charge._

The Sokols negatively reacted to both interventions of the King in favor of the Episcopate and were unhappy about the course of action in this regard. In their view the Episcopate did not deserve such permissiveness.

At the moment when the conflict seemed to be over a new sting came from abroad and unmasked the true enemy of the Sokols and who was behind the Croatian and Slovenian Episcopate in Yugoslavia. Namely, at the meeting of the League of Nations the Italian delegates raised the issue of the Sokol Alliance of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and in the discussion vehemently accused only Yugoslavia of being a hotbed of imperialism and as such a threat to its neighbors. Fearing the strength of the Army of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia the Italian delegates requested the Sokols to be considered as part of active army. Thus, the official Italian delegates revealed that their views on the Sokols are identical with those presented in their press, the press which was the first to publish the anti-Sokol Epistle and on that ground accuse the Sokol Alliance of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia of being a threat to peace of Yugoslav neighbors, Italy in particular. PICCOLO DELLA SERA, (Trieste) raised the same issue discussing the confessional and ethnic circumstances in Yugoslavia in the spirit and tone of the Yugoslav clerical enemies of the Sokols. These articles actually preceded the discussion in Geneva. Obviously, a continuous anti-Sokol campaign of the enemies of the Sokol ideology in Yugoslavia was closely connected with the campaign against the state of Yugoslavia. This attack was particularly venomous because it came from the official state representatives from the rostrum of the League of Nations, an international institution of the highest level.

---

85 „NOVOSTI“, May 16, 1933.
"From a lofty rostrum the official representatives of one country were in prudent enough to present before an outstanding international forum a totally biased and groundless view. But, in spite of being groundless, in view of the place from which the attack on the Yugoslav Sokols was launched and the style of its wording this accusation produces an even more serious effect." These are the words of Dr. Milan Dragić who further on spoke about the seven decades long history of the Sokols in Slavic countries and emphasized that the basic features of their ideology and the main ideals of their founder-Tyrs are humanism and democracy. Nationalism of the Sokols is not based on hatred. It is based on love and has nothing to do with chauvinism. And above all, the attack on this organization came from the delegates of fascist Italy whose Duce sent the following message to Italian youth:

"Love your guns, adore machine guns and always have in mind the dagger... Learn to hate!" Carlo Sforza, leader of Italian fascist youth, has the following advise: "It is mean not to hate the enemy. Fascism must vehemently hate its enemies and openly express this hatred. Hatred for the enemies of fascism is the noblest form of its defense. Fascism is a purely religious idea. Fascism wants to draw its inspiration from those moments in history when both the cross and dagger, poison and torture were used and burning at the stake and expulsion practiced. Fascism should adhere to this school of thought-the school of overwhelming hatred. It is primarily the young generation that should be raised in that spirit if the young are to become an army-the fascist army." In his message to the girls Turatti said: "You will be good mothers only if aware that your children are primarily born to serve the country and fight its wars. The loftiest ideal of fascism is to see girls competing in target shooting." The insurmountable gap between the ideology of the Sokols and the ideology of fascism was further increased by Mussolini's following message: "War implies a paramount effort of overall human energy and ennobles the people brave enough to engage in it."96

Italy was, actually on the verge of war against Abyssinia (Ethiopia) with the support of the Catholic church in Italy. This was the reason for attacking the neighbor who did not approve imperialism and was ready to militarily oppose it. The Catholic church did not pronounce an anathema on this new fascist religion based on hatred, threatening with burning at the stake, expulsion, torture, poison and the holy dagger as it did in case of the Sokols.

96 Milorad Dragić, "ITALIAN DELEGATES IN GENEVA AND THE YUGOSLAV SOKOLS (Milorad Dragić, Talijanski delegati u Ženevi i jugoslovensko sokolstvo)."
Ženević, Enciklika Pie XI, jugoslavenski episkopat sa svojom poslanicom i sa čitavom klerikalnom armaturom i bojnim redovima hrvatske i slovene-
ske Eclesiae Militantis. Bio je to vanredno uspio bačiti novi uvalac 1933. kao
priprema za događaje od 1935. i u Jugoslaviji od 1941. do 1945. Tako se u
jednom decenijskom rasponu od 1933. pa dalje „nova religija - fašizam“ ra-
zmahala u svoj najslavitiji uspon ali i najzramotniju kataklizmu, povukavši
za sobom u provalju Danteovog „Inferno“ i - „nova religija - fašizam“.
Iste 1933. još se jednom raspravljalo u Narodnoj skupštini kao i u Senatu
po ovom pitanju i problemima vezanim sa sokolskom ustanovom. 22. no-
vembra raspravljalo se u Senatu o zakonskom predlogu o obaveznom tjele-
snom odgoju, koji bi imao za cilj da putem fizičkog odgoja poradi na pobolj-
šanju općeg narodnog zdravlja. Među predlagacima toga zakonskog predlo-
ga bio je i senator don Frano Ivanšević. Prvi govor kojim se je Ivanšević u
Senatu istakao dodirnuo je ovo pitanje u istom onom duhu kakvim je prozeo
svoje misli kad je mjeseca februara zajedno sa biskupom Uccellinijem branju
Sokol. Dakako on se dodirnuo i antitsokolske poslanice čije je zle tendencije
odbila i ugušila probuđena svijest Jugoslavens. Zanimljivo je da je u svom
velikom govoru Ivanšević označio krčkog biskupa Srebrića kao prvog ini-
cijatora, kao što je objasnio i neprijateljski stav nadbiskupa Šarića.
„Austrijska vladavina u Bosni bazirala se na kroz konfesional-
nom temelju… Sva politika austrijska u Bosni sastojala se u tome
kako će podupirati borbu između 400.000 katolika, 600.000 muslima
i 800.000 pravoslavnih Srba. To je ona poznata politika: „divi-
de et impera“! Razumijelo je da ljudi koji su proveli vijek u takvim
pričkama gledaju na stvari jednostrano… Nikako ne odobravam da se
metode koje su se primjenjuvala u bivšoj anacionalnoj i namu ne-
prijateljskoj Austro-ugarskoj monarhiji… Stoga je bilo potrebno da
se stavi u harmoniju i pojam crkve i države, i pojam vjere i domovi-
je… Sto se tiče katoličke crkve, meni su dobro poznate prilike i sad
i od prije. Ja sam nared 25 godina bio član bečkog parlamenta sa
nekim mojim drugovima koji su ovdje prisutni. Ja vam mogu ovdje
svečano izjaviti da katolička crkva nije nikad u bivšoj Austriougarskoj
monarhiji uživala te slobode ni toliko materijalne i moralne potpore
kao što danas uživa u Jugoslaviji, (Aplauz i živo odobravanje). To je
istina koja se ne da ničim pobiti.“97

97 Stenografske bilješke Senata kraljevine Jugoslavije. 1933., I, V, 9-12.
Yugoslavia, (A round of applause and approval). There is no argu-
tment that could refute that truth.\footnote{Shorthand notes of the Senate of the Kingdom of Jugoslavia, 1933, I, V: 9-12.}

In his speech don Frano Ivanisević was very open and resolute, in
spite of the sentence "inflicted" on him by Bishop Dr. Boneafitch, which
he had to serve in February.

The conflict did not wither away in 1933 but, spilled over to 1934. On be-
half of the Episcopate Archbishop Sharitch and Bishop Srebnitch continued
their attacks against the Sokols, to the delight of the fascist press. Since his
former attacks on the Sokols were not successful Archbishop Sharitch pro-
duced a new accusation "horrible dicta", according to which the Sokols are
not only faithless and impious but also republicans. The whole press reacted
accordingly. At the same time Bishop Srebnitch attacked the Sokols in his
Easter Epistle (1934). Thanks to preventive censorship in force the censor
deleted many of these attacks. Only the Bishop and the Curia knew about the
censorship, but nevertheless very soon LA VEDETTA D’ITALIA, a fascist
paper in Rijeka published the news under the sensational title: "LA PASQUA
CATHOLICA PROIBITA DA BELGRADO! L’APPELLO DEI VESCOVO DI
VEGLIA AI FEDELI IMPEDITO DELLA CENSURA JUGOSLAVA – LIBERTA
DEMOCRATICHE!" (Catholic Easter prohibited by Belgrade! Appeal of the Bishop of Krk to his believers prohibited by the Yugoslav cen-
sorship. Democratic freedom!). The source of the news was more than evi-
dent and thanks to whom it was announced in the fascist newspaper, includ-
ing the passages deleted by censorship, known only to the Bishop himself.\footnote{S.C. Hara}.

Commenting on the attacks of Sharitch, Srebnitch and the fascist news-
paper from Rijeka SOKOLSKI GLASNIK emphasizes the coincidence in time
and a common ideological approach of these jointly orchestrated attacks.

"Had we altered the school curriculum in the way the fascist
Duce did in Italy before he bought from the Vatican for one bil-
lion liras the Lateran Treaties, of crucial importance for his policy,
the Italian press would for sure have announced that the Catholic
church in Yugoslavia was counting its last days and that in the re-
ligious sense we were worse than the Bolsheviks. In our country all
are free to celebrate their Easter in the way they choose, whereas in
fascist Italy they are allowed to celebrate it only under the insignia of
their licors."\footnote{Idem.}

---

\footnote{S.C., Hara}.

---

Don Frano Ivanisević govorio je tako slobodno i odlučno, da ma je mje-
seca februara imao da izdrti kaznu kojom ga je nagradio za njegov stav jne-
gov biskup dr. Boneafić.

Refleksi ovih borbi nisu okončani 1933. Oni se produžavaju i 1934. Od
strane episkopata nadbiskup Šarić i biskup Srebnjić dalje su produžili da
napadaju Sokol na radost fašističke štampe. Nadbiskup Šarić, videći da ne
uspjeva naročito protiv Sokola poslužio se novim sredstvom optužiši so-
kolstvo da nije samo bezvjersto nego i horribile dictu, i – republikansko.
Ova Šaričeva izjava izазвala je svakovrsne komentare u cijelokupnoj štampi.
U isto vrijeme biskup Srebnjić je svoju uskršnji poslanicu (1934.) posvetio
opet napadajućima na sokolstvo. Kako je postojala preventivna cenzura, to je
cenzor znatan dio tih napada izbacio. Ma da je ovaj posao cenzuriranja
bio poznat samo biskupu i ljudima iz Kurije, o njemu je vrlo brzo progovo-
rila riječka fašistička „La Vedetta d’Italia” pod alarmantnim naslovom „La
Pasqua Cattolica proibita da Belgrado! – L’appello del Vescovo di Veglia ai
fedeli impedito dalla censura Jugoslava – Libertà democratiche” („Katolički
uskrs zabranjuje Beograd! – Apel krškog biskupa vjernicima zabranjen od
Yugoslovenske cenzure. — Demokratske slobode”). Naravno, bilo je sasvim
jasno odakle je ta vijest potekla i ko ju je dostavio fašističkom listu. Stvori,
fašistički list donio je cenzurirane stavove koje je imao samo biskup.\footnote{S.C., Hara}

„Sokolski glasnik” komentirajući Šaričevi i Srebničevi napadaje, kao i
rijecnik fašističkog listova, ukazuje na podudarnosti, vremensku i idejnu, ovih
zajedničkih napada.

„Da smo mi ono izbacivali propela iz školskih programa, kako je
to učinio voda fašizma, dok nije kupio od Vatikana miliardama
lira potrebni mu Lateranski sporužum, sigurno bi talijanska šampa
om pomisla, kako je u Jugoslaviji katolička crkva u izdijasi, i kako
smo u religioznom pogledu gori od boljevika. U našoj zemlji slobo-
dno svakako svako svoj Uskrs kako hoće, a u fašističkoj Italiji samo
u značku liptorskih znakova...”\footnote{Idem.}

Sa oba napada, nadbiskupa Šarića i biskupa Srebnjice zabavio se SKJ
na svojoj godišnjoj skupštini krajem aprila 1934. Zamjenik starješine Gangl
veoma je odlučno i oštro odgovorio Šariću kao i Srebnjiću.

„Sarajevski vladači ponovno proglašavaju naše bezvjerstvo kod
kuće, a poslanica vladike na Kruš otprilike je preko naše granice i
kao crna ptica gražljiva ugnjezdila se u talijanskom novinstvu da
At the Annual Assembly of the Sokols of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, held in April 1934, Gangl, Deputy leader (zamenik stareline) sharply and openly answered to Sharitch and Srebničić:

"The Bishop of Sarajevo accuses us here in Yugoslavia of being faithless and impious and the Epistle of the Bishop of Krk, like a black bird of prey, has flown across the border to build its nest in Italian press and thus, from a safe and comfortable surrounding, conduct its shameful campaign against the Sokols and everything that is Yugoslav! The master brain of this scenario, whoever he might be, has committed a despicable act which we condemn and reject with disgust. The idea of republicanism which Bishop Sharitch is trying to artificially transplant from Tyrsh to the Yugoslav Sokol is utter arrogance which we also condemn and reject with disgust! The Right Reverend does not even try to provide proofs for his statement addressing it to the top level, which makes the deceit even more mean, because there is no proof that the Sokols are impious, from the top to the grass root level. This is the moral of the Jesuits who behave according to the principle that the end justifies the means."

While Sharitch and Srebničić continued to unscrupulously attack the Sokols one of the signatories of the Epistle apparently turned away from his colleagues. It happened at the Sokol Rally in Petrovaradin, on September 9, 1934. Bishop Akšamovitch did not have a firm stand with regard to the Sokols. Sometimes it was positive and sometimes negative, depending on circumstances. But, on this occasion he was to speak before the King and the Ministers, which means that his words were conceived so as to produce an appropriate effect. However, on this occasion the Janus-faced bishop-chameleon did not behave as a convert who decided to repent for having signed the anti-Sokol Epistle. His speech proves it.

After having paid tribute to "our dear heir to the throne and Leader of the Sokols, Crown Prince Peter" the Bishop emphasized that it is heroism, a God–given, inborn quality of our people, that inspires the young to join the Sokol movement, which makes the SOKOLS OF THE KINGDOM OF YUGOSLAVIA a strong organization... Dear Sokols, boys and girls! Today solemnly entering this home, which, unfortunately is not yet completed, your sacred pledge for life should be to protect, foster and to highest level of

bi joj lakše i uspješnije bila omogućena sramotna rabota protiv nas sokola, i protiv svega što je naše! Tko je to učinio, izvršio je dostiuko podlo djelo, koje osuđujemo i odbijamo svom odlučnošću i koje možemo da kvitiramo samo najdubljim prezirom. Podmetanje republikanstva, koje biskup dr. Sarić o Tyrsevoj sokolskoj ideji prenosi na nas jugoslovenske slike, drskost je prvoga reda, koju – kako je prije rečeno – odbijamo i osuđujemo svom odlučnošću! To podvajanje je užitkino drske i zlobine, jer ga taj crkveni dostojanstvenik i ne pokusava da dokaže, i jer ga namjerice i hotimice upravila gore, kao što je prebačeno ali i ne i dokazano, – jer se dokazati ne može sokolsko bezvjerstvo bilo upravljeno dolje, na najšire slojeve, jer bi nas taj crkveni dostojanstvenik htio da onemogući na sve strane i sa svim silama, kojima se služi jezuitski moral, ravnačajući se prema načelu, da cijel opravdava sredstvo."\(^{100}\)


Većljavi kralj kao i vrhovnog starišća SKJ "naše prijelonašednica dragog kraljevica Petra" i "vitezki duh koj. je našem narodu urođeni dar od Boga privlači našu mladost u sokolske redove, te Sokol kraljevine Jugoslavije stoji danas kao jaka organizacija... Sokoli i sokolicše! Kad danas svečano ulazite u svoj dom, koji, istina, nije još potpuno završen, neka vam bude zavij, svet i trajan: čuvati, njegovati i do heroizma usavršavati duh državnog i narodnog jedinstva pod visokom egidom Nj. V. kralja Aleksandra, a pod vodstvom Nj. Kr. Vis. prijestolonaslednika Petra... Genij roda našeg nije promjenjiv, on ne posrće, ne ide stranputicom, on je od provodnosti božje, vodi sigurnim putem. U presudnom dobu svet- skog rata bratska ljubav je povijela, a svjetskom rata ujedinila, Srbe, Hrvate i Slovence u jednu državu svima nama dragu Jugoslaviju...\(^{100}\)"
heroic valor promote the spirit of national and state unity with his Royal Highness at its head... Our national genius is steady and unswerving and with God's blessing always following its straight path. At the crucial moment in history, the First World War, brotherly love brought together all Serbs and the end of that war brought together the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes united in one state—our dear Yugoslavia... In front of all of them I see today the celestial picture of the great hero and Liberator, King Peter I together with the Bishop of Djakovo Strossmayer the great promoter of the idea of Yugoslavism... We should learn from them. Their energy should be the source of our strength and human qualities... etc. The rest of the speech was devoted to glorifying the King of Yugoslavia and the Sokols of the Kingdom.101

In the afternoon the ceremony of blessing of the flags took place, after which the Bishop made a short speech.

"Let our King, as a precious gift to all of us, be a lofty inspiration for further development of our Sokols of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Dear Sokols, boys and girls, you will be worthy of the importance vested in you only if you honor and promote the ideas of the Sokol Movement, faithfully and to the point of self-sacrifice. God bless our King and the Royal Family. God bless the Leader of the Sokols of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia Crown Prince Peter and God bless our beautiful and united Kingdom of Yugoslavia."102

The speech of Bishop Akshamovitch was a great surprise. He was praised by all and from all sides with great enthusiasm. For most who heard the speech it meant victory. Only a small number of the well-informed did not trust the Bishop's words, who ten years later will glorify with the same enthusiasm Dr. Ante Pavelitch, leader of the Ustasha Independent State of Croatia during the Second World War and after the fall of fascism address similar words of praise to Tito, Marshal of Yugoslavia. This meant keeping pace with time out of personal interest and in the interest of the Catholic Church.103

His superior, Archbishop Dr Bauer, did not share his view. At the time of the Sokol event in Petrovaradin the Sokols of Karlovac (Karlovac) invited their priest to bless their Center (Home) in July 1934. The Bishop decided to

101 THE SPEECH OF BISHOP AKSHAMOVITCH (Govor biskupa Akšamovića), "POLITIKA", September 10, 1934.
103 See the last chapter of the book BLOODY HARVEST.

Ispred svih mi se danas kao neko posebno nebesko viđenje javlja duh velikog oslobodinca kralja Petra i heroja, u pratnji velikog ideologa jugoslovenske misli biskupa dako-vaćkog Strossmayera... Nijihov rad neka bude naša škola. Nijihova energija neka bude naša snaga i naša vrlina... Itd., itd. u veličanju kralja Jugoslavije i Sokola kraljevine Jugoslavije."103

Poslije podne istoga dana bilo je na sletištu osvećenje zastave. Poslije blagoslova održao je biskup jedan kraći govor.

"Ovaj dragocijen dar, rekao je biskup Nj. V. Kralja, neka bude svijetlo znamenje za razvoj jugoslovenskog sokola. Sokoli i sokolice, za-hvalite se dostojno pažnji koja vam je ukazana a to ćete učiniti samo na taj način, ako budete sokolsku ideju čuvali vjerno i požrtvovano. Neka Sveučilišnji Gospod blagoslovi i poživi našeg kralja, naš kraljevski dom i stariješinu Sokola kraljevine Jugoslavije Prijestolonasljednika Petra, našu divnu i nedjeljivu kraljevinu Jugoslaviju!"105

Svijet je bio iznenaden nad ovim "ebračanjem" biskupa Akšamovića. Sa svih strana osude su se na ovog dako-vačkog biskupa pohvalile, priznaje, ve-ličanja i kliktaji pobjede. Samo mali broj upućenih nije povjerovao riječima ovog čovjeka, koji će poslije deset godina jednako emfazom glorificirati dr. Antu Pavičića, a poslije njegova sloma i maršala Jugoslavije Tita! Dakle, sve to radi ljudskih i klirskih interesa.106

Medutim ovako nije uživo njegov šef na biskupskim konferencijama nadbiskupa dr. Bauera. Upravo tih dana kad su se spremao svečanosti u Petrovaradinu, karlovački sokoli obratili su se svome župniku za dozvolu da im posveti njihov dom mjeseca jula 1934. župnik se obratio na nadbiskupa, a ovaj je postavio dva uslova koja je trebalo usvojiti pa da iskaz dozvolu za posvet. Nadbiskup je zatražio da sokolsko društvo u Karlovcu izdala pismena izjavu da stoji na kršćanskom uzgojnom stanovništvu i da iza katoličkog dušobržnika a ni prije njega niko drugi ne hrabri blagoslov.107

Ovim svojim stavom nadbiskup je otkrio jednu vrlo važnu pozadinu cje-lokrupnog pitanja. Ruš nije mogao dopustiti da se pored katoličkog svećeni ka na istoj svećanosti i pri istom crkvenom činu pojavi koji drugi predstavnik druge vjerskopravne. Sokoli su bili spremljeni da povoljno odgovore na prvi uslov, ali na drugi nisu mogli pristati jer je u društvu bilo članova nekatolika

104 Govor biskupa Akšamovića, "Politika" 10. IX. 1934.
106 Vidi posliješnje poglavlje: Krupna žuta.
107 Interesantna prepiska između Sokola, župnika i nadbiskupa, "Politika", 2. IX. 1934.
grant the permission under two conditions: that the Sokols submit a written statement of commitment to the principles of Christian education and that before the catholic priest no one celebrated a mass of blessing. 104

The Bishop's attitude actually revealed a very important background of the whole issue. Rome could not accept the presence of a priest of different religion together with the catholic priest on such occasions. The Sokols were ready to give a positive answer to the first question, but not to the second one because all their members were not Catholics, which required the presence of a priest of another religion as well. This is what the Sokols said in their answer to the Bishop:

"It is evident that you did not want to meet our kind request because the conditions you set for the Sokols are unacceptable. An attitude that does not deserve a comment. The believers only wanted the blessing of the Almighty for their work. That was all. And they were refused.

The conditions you set are very difficult and we could not take the responsibility for justified revolt of all our members against us if we accepted to meet them. The conditions you set directly hurt our human and national feelings and our feelings as Sokols.

We expected your first condition and even before this request were ready to comply with it. In our letter we emphasize that we have never been against any religion, or church, nor have we ever prevented any of our members from fulfilling regular Christian duties. Our answer is, therefore, clear.

On the other hand, your second condition is a great surprise and disappointment to us. You allow the blessing of a Catholic priest only, and no one else, before or after him.

Owing to the fact that a rather large percentage of our members are Orthodox their wish to get the blessing of their priest too is quite understandable. This is also the wish of all our members because we are equal brothers-Sokols, regardless of our ethnic origin, or religion. Complying with your second condition would mean dissemination of religious intolerance. The Sokols will never accept that. We do not want discrimination among the brothers on the confessional basis, nor shall we allow any one to hurt their religious feelings and beliefs. We shall open our Sokol center without a blessing and it

104 "INTERESTING LETTERS THE SOKOLS EVICED WITH A PRIEST AND AN ARCHBISHOP" (Interesantna prepiska između Sokola, župnika i nadbiskupa), "POLITIKA", September 1, 1934.
pravo iz Vrhovne Kongregacije Svetoga Oﬁcija u Rimu, koji je donio 14. XII. 1932., dakle taman poslije spremljene episkopske antisokolske poslanice. Možemo mirno reći da upravo u ovome gremu zec leži i da ova zabrana, koja je zapravo imala najviše da pogodi sokole, došla je u vezi sa pitanjem jugoslovenskog episkopa kako da u takvim slučajevima katoličko svećenstvo postupa. Ova su pitanja bila slijedeća, kako ih „Katolički list“ objavljuje, ne na hrvatskom, nego u originalu na latinskom jeziku, da ne bi dnevnoj štampi zapelo za oko. Ta pitanja biskupa kraljevine Jugoslavije glase:

„1. Smije li katolički svećenik podijeliti crkveni blagoslov jednoj te istoj stvari zajedno sa nekatoličkim svećenikom? 2. Smije li katolički svećenik crkveni blagoslov pedijeliti predmetu koji je već blagoslovjen od nekatoličkog svećenika ako katolički svećenik taj blagoslov ne obavlja istim činom i zajedno sa nekatoličkim svećenikom?“

Dakako, Vrhovna Kongregacija Svetog Oﬁcija u Rimu odgovorila je na oba pitanja negativno.

Više nego ma koja je izjava koja je kritički analizirala i pobijala antisokolsku poslanicu i više nego ma koja postavljena hipoteza o podudarnostima vatikansko-episkopske antisokolske akcije, iza ‘oje je bila puna i radosna suglasnost fašističke štampe, govori uvjerljivo kratki ali neobično sadržajni: Decretum S. R. Congregationis S. Officii ad dubia proposita ab Episcopis regni Jugoslavie de communicione in sacrifci.“

Daljne pojave u razvoju hrvatskog i slovenskog klerikalizma do sloma jugoslavije dati će nove dokumentacije o neprijateljskom odnosu klerikalizma i najvećeg dijela episkopa i znatnog dijela svećenstva prema Jugoslaviji.

will be your guilt. We believe that in spite of that God and his mercy will be with us if we cherish Him in our hearts. Zdravo! (the Sokole salute meaning Good health).105

Archbishop Bauer never explained the reasons behind the prohibition to Catholic priests to celebrate a mass of blessing together with a priest of a different confession, before or after him. Actually, this decision was taken by the Supreme Congregation of the Saint Officio in Rome, on December 14, 1932, exactly at the time of the anti-Sokol Epistle. It was the answer to the question of the Episcopate as to how the Catholic priests should behave in such cases. Actually, KATOLICKI LIST published these question, but in Latin and not in Croatian language so as to attract less attention.

The questions of the Bishops in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia are the following:

1. Is a Catholic priest allowed to celebrate a mass of blessing together with a non Catholic priest?
2. Is a Catholic priest allowed to celebrate a mass of blessing after the object has been previously blessed by a non-Catholic priest?

Decretum S. R. Congregationis S. Officii ad dubia proposita ab Episcopis regni Jugoslaviae de communicione in sacrifci is a short but a very valuable document because it refutes the anti-Sokol Epistle more convincingly than any other critical analysis or comment and reveals that the anti-Sokol Epistle was conceived by the Vatican and fully supported by the Italian fascist press.

Later developments connected with Croatian and Slovenian clericalism till the fall of Yugoslavia will provide a new body of evidence on the hostile policy of the clericals, most of the members of the Episcopate and a considerable number of Catholic priest against Yugoslavia.

105 Idem.
106 „KATOLICKI LIST“; 1933, no. 7, p.69.
Don Franco Ivanishević sa posveto prof. Viktoru Novaku
Don Franco Ivanishević with his dedication to Prof. Viktor Novak
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LIBELLUS ACCUSATIONS

(Promemoria on the attitude of the Yugoslav Catholic Episcopate don Frano Ivanšević submitted to Archbishop Stepinac in October 1934, and on November 1, 1934 to all Catholic Bishops in Yugoslavia).
Split, November 19, 1934.

Dr. VIKTOR NOVAK, university professor, Belgrade

I have been informed that you collect documents for you future book on the history of the development of our young state. Knowing you as a responsible writer and sincere patriot I would like to entrust you with a PROMEMORIA I have recently presented to the young Archbishop Coadjutor, Dr. Stepinac, in Zagreb, and its copy to all Catholic Bishops in Yugoslavia and the Nuncio in Belgrade. Since, for the time being, it is a private and confidential document I kindly ask you not to write or speak about it in public without my previous approval. Only after my death I authorize you to freely use this document if you find it useful for writing about the role of the Catholic Church in the development of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Also, in your book please emphasize that the patriotic Catholic priests-Croats advised the Episcopal to reach an agreement with the state and work jointly in its interest.

The promemoria was written in October of this year. At the suggestion of Bishop Uccellini, who had approved its content, this promemoria was signed on the 1-st of November of this year and a copy sent out to all bishops, together with a letter, a copy of which I also enclose to you, for your private needs only.

With deep respect and friendly feelings, I remain
Sincerely yours,

Frano Ivanšević, Senator107

107 Dr. Frano Ivanšević is no longer among the living. But, in 1937 he gave the permission to use his Promemoria during the conflict over the Concordat. I am very grateful to him and I am using this document for the sake of truth, the whole truth and nothing but truth, particularly in the light of
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LIBELLUS ACCUSATIONS

(Promemorija don Frana Ivanševića o stavu jugoslovenskog Episkopata prema državi, predana nadbiskupu Stepincu oktobra 1934., a 1. novembra 1934. svim biskupima u Jugoslaviji).

Gospodio dr. Viktor Novak, sveučilišni profesor, Beograd

Doznao sam da Vi sakupljate gradivo iz kojega ćete u svoje vrijeme napisati historiju o razvitku naše mlade države Jugoslavije. Poznavajući Vas kao savjestnu spisatelja i čestita rodom ljudca hoću da Vam povjerim jednu moju "Spomenicu" koju sam nedavno upravio mladom nadbiskupu Koadjutoru dr. Stepincu u Zagrebu, a koji sam u preisu dostavio svim katoličkim biskupima u Jugoslaviji kao što i papskom nunciju u Beogradu. Pošto je ona za sada privatne konfidenčne naravi molim Vas, da ber moje izričite dozvole ne biste o njoj u javnosti ništa pisali niti u društvu govorili, a tek iza moje smrti, bude li Vam potrebna, ovim Vas ovlašćujem da se slobodno poslužite kada budete pisali o ulozi katoličke crkve u razvitku kraljevine Jugoslavije, te napomenite da je iz krugova rodoljubivih svećenika Hrvata bio uporezen episkopat na sporazumni rad sa interesima države.

Spomenica je napisana 1. oktobra ove godine. Po naputku biskupa Ucellinina, koji je potpuno odobrio sadržaj i cilj ove spomenice, potpisana je 1. novembra ove godine poslao u preisu svim biskupima uz proprati list koji Vam prilažem, dakako samo za privatnu porabu.

Sa dubokim štovanjem i prijateljskim osjećajem bilježi se odani
Frano Ivanšević, senator107
Don Frano Ivanisević was an old fighter for the national cause and Glagolitic missal, one of the last from the generation of supporters of Strossmayer and his ideals. In Yugoslavia, being a national priest devoted to its people, his whole behavior was an example of how a priest should serve the interests of the state, without violating a single principle of his church, or faith. Defending this stand he was ready to cope with great difficulties and suffer injustice and condemnation of the high clergy. Nevertheless, he continued his work in the same way he decided to follow already in 1919 and 1920, when he took initiative to organize a Meeting of the clergy of Split and was the proponent of the now famous Resolution presented to the then Nuncio in Belgrade. Don Frano Ivanisević, Vjekoslav Spinčić and the old Bishop of Kotor Frano Uccellini-Titze were all three of the opinion that the Catholic Episcopate in Yugoslavia in fact misunderstood its role with regard to the state by assuming the attitude which only serves the interests of the enemies of Yugoslavia. We shall deal with Don Frano Ivanisević in the following chapters too. Here we only want to present in extenso his Promemoria on the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia he presented to the young Archbishop Coadjutor on October 1, 1934 and November 1 of the same year a copy of the Promemoria to each Catholic Bishop in Yugoslavia, personally. The Promemoria stems from the heart and mind of an exemplary patriot and is very important with regard to the time when it was written, the individuals to whom the Promemoria was addressed and the background which explains the attitude of the Yugoslav Episcopalate towards the state. The following text is a complete and unabridged original version.

TO THE MOST REVEREND DR. ALOIZ STEPINEC, ARCHBISHOP-Coadjutor of ZAGREB

The Most Reverend! The undersigned with great pleasure, the best hopes and due submissiveness congratulates you on your appointment as Coadjutor to the very meritorious spiritual shepherd of the Archdiocese of Zagreb, Dr. Bauer whose mind and heart the undersigned has been witnessing and deeply respecting for more than 40 years. The undersigned is, therefore, fully convinced that you, as his choice, will follow in his wake to the pride and benefit of the Catholic Church and the Fatherland.

of the fact that the document does not reveal anything new in the views of Dr. Ivanisević with regard to his previous attitude on this issue.

108 Only the parts of the text reflecting the previous well known views of Dr. Ivanisević have been omitted.

Propratno pismo don F. Ivanisevića kojim je svoju promemoriju dostavio V. Novaku

Don Ivanisević letter to V. Novak attached to his Promemoria
Don Frano Ivanšević, stari nacionalni borac i glagoljač, kao predstavnik još preostale generacije Strossmayerovih pristalica i njegovih ideala, u Jugoslaviji je u čitavom nizu svojih postupaka pokazao kako narodni svećenik treba da služi interesima države, a da se ne ograniči u jednom specifičnom državnom vjerima. Za to i za takvu uvjerenja oto je bio spremen da strada i da doživi neprijateljstvo i osude od svojih više državnih poglavlja. Utužio je, njega nije smetalo da produži i da radi dalje u istom smjeru kao što je on to pokazao već god. 1919 i 1920., kao inicijator splinskog sastanka svećenstva bio predlagao spomenuto, već znамenite rezolucije upućene užasom nuncijskom u Beogradu. Don Frano Ivanšević vidio je i osjećao jednačaj kao i narodni borac Vjekoslav Spinčić, ili stari biskup u Kotoru Frano Ucelini-Tice, da je katolički episkopat savjetom pogriješno ugravirao svoju ulogu u državi i da sa svojim stavom koristi njenim protivnicima. Sa dos Franoj Ivanševićem još čemo se sresti tokom sljedećih poglavlja. Ovdje donosimo u cijelosti njegovu promemoriju o katoličkoj crkvi u Jugoslaviji, koju je uputio mladom nadbiskupu koadiutoru dr. Alojziju Stepincu 1. oktobra 1934., a 1. novembra iste godine pojedinačno svim biskupima Jugoslavije. Spomenika koja potječe iz duše i plemenitog uzorokoluba i svećenika od velike je važnosti i za vrijeme u koje je nastala, za lica kojima je upućena kao i za svu pozadinu stava jugoslavenskog episkopata prema državi. Stoga je donosimo u cjelini. 108

Preuzivenom gospodnom dr. Alojziju Stepincu,
Nadbiskupu Koadiutoru – Zagreb.

Preuziven! Sa velikim zadržljivostom i najljepšom nadom po-
zdravio je pokornio potpisani Vaše imenovanje za koadiutora vrlo
zaduženom duhovnom pastiru zagrebačko nadbiskupu dr. Antu
Baueru, čije vrline uima i scra kroz dugu periodu od 40 godina pobli-
že poznaje i duboko poštije, pak je potpuno uvjeren, da ćete i vi kao
njegov odanac na toj slici stijeljte njegove stope na čast i uhar
krke i domovine.

Potpisani, koji Vam ove retke upravlja, jest svećenik starije dobe.
Rođen je 1863., ređen za svećenika 1886., obavio je razne službe
u splitskom sjemenjutu kao prefect, duhovnik i ekonom; bio je na
gimnaziji i realci u Splitu kao privremeni profesor, a u Vranjici -
Solum, pa u Jasenima, rano između svake godine. Bivao se i novinarstvom. Uređivao je nekoliko tjednika i mjese-
čnika za narodnu prosvjetu. Zanimao se narodnom privredom, osa-

108 Izostavljeni su samo nevažni dijelovi, koji su od ranije već dobro poznati iz stava don Ivanševića.
The undersigned addressing you these lines is a priest in advanced age. He was born in 1863, ordained priest in 1886, in the Sjeniste (Theological school) of Split, then he served as prefect and priest, was for a short time a high school teacher in High school in Split and for many years served as priest in Vranjice-Solun and Lasnice, his birth place. He was also a journalist and editor of several weekly and monthly magazines devoted to national education. The undersigned was also interested in national economy, particularly in cooperatives, and was member of their boards and also member of the Supervisory Board of the Agrarian Bank in Belgrade. At the request of his congregation the undersigned entered the field of politics and in the 1907-1911 period was the representative of the Sinj-Vrlika district at the Imperial Council in Vienna. Last year, 1933, the undersigned was appointed Member of the Senate of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia by Degree of His Majesty King Aleksandar and has the honor of still performing that duty.

The undersigned deemed it necessary to bring all these data to the attention of the Most Reverend to persuade Him that during his 71 year long life and 48 years of service the undersigned had ample opportunities to get acquainted with all aspects of our national life and that on ground express his modest opinion on the circumstances prevailing to day in our native country Yugoslavia. Therefore, he begs you, the Most Reverend, to accept his modest views of an old and experienced priest, presented in this confidential letter in the interest of the Catholic Church and Yugoslavia.

In every new state established after a war there are problems which cannot be avoided due to the development of some new elements, at first not sufficiently harmonized and which need time to consolidate. The historical decision... one name for the State, the flag and the question of unity of our State has been finally taken and its effects are taking root in the soul of our people. All patriots are duty bound to support the process of merging three tribal elements into one and speed it up in all spheres of our public and private life in view of developing a firm concept of one and united Yugoslavia, as conceived by our outstanding and famous the Most Reverend Bishop Strossmayer, Canon Rachky and others. The Kingdom of Yugoslavia is undergoing a period of consolidation. All secular and religious factors on the level of the State are called upon to support the consolidation efforts of the State in all their activities and institu-
tions, or at least not to, consciously or unconsciously, impede that unification process.

The undersigned is a Catholic priest and has been serving his church and his people for 48 years. He was born as a Catholic, educated in Catholic religion and with God’s blessing expects to close his eyes as a Catholic. Performing his activities, private, official or public, writing or preaching, the undersigned had always in mind and at heart primarily the interests and reputation of his Church. When in 1918 our people was liberated from foreign yoke and created a common state with his brothers, Serbs and Slovenians, the undersigned was using his best efforts to secure for the Catholic Church the respect it should command and help it develop its activities. In the new State the Catholic Church had the opportunity to establish closer contacts with the Orthodox Church. In this regard it is the duty of each Catholic priest to disseminate tolerance and foster good relations with others, in line with the paramount interests of the State. The population of Yugoslavia amounts to approximately 14 million; According to the latest population census there are 5,373,456 Catholics and 6,375,524 Orthodox, not counting the confessions with a small congregation. In spite of Orthodox majority in the State there are no signs of supremacy of one church over the other.

The Constitution guarantees freedom to all religions. This is not a dead letter on paper. It is implemented in practice. The case in point is the live and a great progress of the Catholic Church in the Capital city Belgrade, where the population is 90% Orthodox and the Catholics, in spite of that overwhelming majority, enjoy full religious freedom. The undersigned knows Belgrade very well, where he used to stay so many times. Catholic processions on religious holidays, like the First Communion, solemnly take place in the streets of Belgrade, in the presence of the representatives of state institutions and the Royal Court and are fully respected by the Orthodox population. A few figures illustrate the above statement.

Till the end of 1924 there were only five Catholic priests on the territory of the Belgrade Arch bishopric, and today there are fifteen. There were three priests in Belgrade, one in Nish, one in Krusevac (Kragujevac) for these three dioceses. There were also 12 nuns-nurses in Belgrade. Today there are 5 diocese in Belgrade and in addition to the already existing ones in Nish and Kragujevatz, the new ones were set up in: Smederevo, Shabatz (Sabac) and Bor.

dnici crkve je katolička došla u blizu vezu sa crkvom istočnoga obređenja i pravoslavne vjere, te se je namećala dužnost svakom svećeniku Hrvatu da uznostoj podžrati toleranciju i dobro odnosite u skladu sa vrhovnim interesima države. Od ukupnog pučanstva, 14 miliona otroliške žiteljstva u Jugoslaviji, crkva katolička broji, po zadnjem popisu, 5.373.456 svojih pripadnika, dokim istočna pravoslavna crkva broji 6.375.524 sjemnika, a da se ne uzmu u obzir druge manje vjeroispovesti. Iako je istočna pravoslavna crkva u većem broju naprma katoličkoj, ipak se ne opaža nikakva prevlast jedne crkve nad drugom… jer je Ustavom zajamčena u Jugoslaviji potpuna sloboda svakoj vjeroispovesti. To nije samo pisano na papiru, nego se to i u djelu provada. Dosta je pogledati na život i veliki razvoj katoličke crkve u samoj prijestolnici naše države Beogradu, gde 90% žitelja pripada pravoslavnoj crkvii, a gdje pripadnici katoličke crkve uživaju potpuno slobodu kao ni u jednom drugom mjestu. Potpisano je dobro poznat Beograd u koji već toliko godina zalazi i dugo boravi. Katoličke funkcije obavljaju se po beogradskim ulicama (kao na primjer Tijelovo), najsvršenijim načinom uz prisustvovanje pravosrednog državnog nadležnika i kraljeva dvora te sa velikim poštovanjem i obzirom sa strane pravoslavnoga građanstva. Toma na dokaz neka služe i ove brojke.

Do konca godine 1924. bilo je na teritoriji beogradske nadbiskupije samo 5 svećenika, dočim ih danas ima 15. U Beogradu bila su 3 svećenika, u Nišu 1, u Kragujevcu 1, kao potrebni za te tri župe. Osim toga bilo je u Beogradu 12 milosrdnih sestara bolničarki. Danas ima u Beogradu 5 župa, a osim Niša i Kragujevca, osnovane su još župe u Smederevu, Šapcu i Boru i dvije kuracije u Valjevu i Zaječaru, svega župa i kuracija 10. Danas ima u Beogradu 170 sestara, od kojih su 104 milosrdne sestre iz Ljubljane kao bolničarke u bolnici i sanatoriju Vračar, 48 su milosrdne sestre iz Zagreba, koje su dijelom bolničarke, a nekoje vode internat zavoda svetog Vinko i jedno za bavšta, dočim je 18 sestara iz Francuske (Asumpasionistkinje), koje vode veliki intrenat „Zavoda svetog Josipa“ i francusku žensku školu uz četiri razreda francuske gimnazije. U crkvama katoličkim potpisan je vidio vlastitim očima preko svećenih misa ugradnje pravoslavne vjere, koji dolaze u naše crkve da čuju pjevanje, poučno prijepovijedi od naših svećenika, koji su mnogo pošteniji radi svoje učenosti. Kada se obavljaju pobožnosti (kao na primjer u crkvi svećenog Ante), crkva je dupkom puna, a preko 50% prisutnih jesu pripadnici pravoslavne crkve. Koliko je grad Beograd susretljiv prema
and two curatiae in Valjevo and Žaječar (Zaječar), which makes a total of ten Catholic institutions. Today there are 170 nuns-nurses in Belgrade, 104 of them are from Ljubljana and they work in the hospital and the sanatorium „Vrnarac“ (Vračar), 48 nuns are in Zagreb, some of whom work as nurses, some are in charge of the „St. Vincent“ boarding school for pupils and a kindergarden and 18 are from France, in charge of the French secondary school for boys and girls „Saint Joseph“. The undersigned has personally noticed the presence of outstanding personalities of Orthodox religion attending our churches to listen to the music and hear the instructive sermons of our priests, held in high respect as scholars. On holidays (e.g. in St. Anthony church) Catholic churches are full to capacity and over 50% of the present are Orthodox people. The best proof of kindness towards the Catholic Church is a five million dinar worth plot the Municipality of Belgrade has donated for the construction of the new Catholic cathedral.

The Most Reverend, I mention this as a proof that our Catholic Church, thanks to its cultural strength, its vivid and scholarly catechization, vivid sermonizing and charitable work is getting increasingly attractive to all strata of our people. Several Eucharistic Congresses that have been organized in our country, with massive participation of the citizens, are the best proof of the freedom the Catholic Church enjoys in Yugoslavia and the respect it commands. Each Eucharistic Congress enjoyed full support of the government in securing various facilities, considering them as events which strengthen public moral and order and was solemnly marked as an important public event. This is the so called „penetration pacifique“ (peaceful penetration) which gives the Church great moral strength, helps its continuous development and consolidates its place in the public life of the country. This means that the Catholic side has no ground to take a hostile position towards the other Church which, in spite of its more numerous congregation, does not in the least impede the development of the other church with a smaller congregation. The strength of each cultural institution lies in its strength not ir numbers.

Now, the Most Reverend, the undersigned would like to bring to Your attention a crucial phenomenon at the root of various kinds of misunderstanding, namely our policy of tribal (ethnic) ap-

---

109 This was written in 1934. Data from 1937 are even more favorable.

proach which is in contrast with the fundamental idea of the state of Yugoslavia as one entity. We are all aware of the importance of the Catholic Church and its fundamental principle of universality. Unlike the Eastern Orthodox Church it is not confined within state boundaries: Russian, Bulgarian, Serbian Orthodox, Greek. The enormous strength of the Catholic Church in fact stems from its universality which is actually the source of its creative power. This is the ground for its presence even in the fields which are not Catholic, but only if they are in line with the state interests. Let us recall the words of the Most Reverend Bishop Strossmayer who said: “Everything for the Faith and Fatherland!”

Since the Church and the State have to go hand in hand, being two hands of the same body, in my modest belief it is up to the wisdom of the Church and its high clergy to avoid possible conflicts with State institutions and, by safeguarding its independence, establish the right balance between the interests of the Church and the interests of the State. As emphasized above, today the consolidation of all its parts is the paramount interest of Yugoslavia. Destructive trends and the negative attitude toward Yugoslavia particularly characteristic of us-Croats and some Slovenians, for ethnic reasons, should be eliminated from the state organism and the spiritual unity in the State achieved as soon as possible. This is in the best interest of our State, as our King in his Proclamation of the 6th of January, 1929, said: “The unity of our people and our State is the loftiest objective of my rule and the supreme law for me and for all of us.”

The undersigned follows with utmost attention all developments and phenomena in the public life of our Fatherland and notes with great regret that our Catholic Church does not take seriously that duty. On the contrary, under the guise of religion, intentionally or unintentionally, some from our Catholic Church undermine the efforts towards the merger of the three tribes into one political and state entity. Under the courageous leadership of our King today our international position is rather strong, mostly thank to the fact that our internal political frictions have been overcome, in other words thanks to our internal stability. Every political or religious friction, internal or external, weakens our international position, thus making our country vulnerable to aggressive appetites of our hostile neighbor. The undersigned is a Croat by nationality and speaks his mother tongue with pride. A Croat in his genes and a Yugoslav by political
option and as such devoted supporter of the Yugoslav national and state unity. The undersigned deems it his sacred duty not to insist on separate parts, which should not have prevalence over the whole, believing in the wisdom of the old Latin saying: „pars debet sacrificari pro toto.” This is, however, not the view of those who do not support the unity of Yugoslavia, particularly the Catholic priests who identify Croatia with Catholicism, which is detrimental for the reputation of the Catholic Church and a source of conflict with those who strongly support the unity of the State.

Allow me, the Most Reverend, to submit to Your attention a few proofs which illustrate my point. In its Proclamation the Church always place emphasis on Croats-Catholics! We very well know that in our country there are Catholics who are not Croat. When three years ago the Eucharistic Congress held in Sarajevo addressed its Proclamation to Catholic Croats over one thousand Slovenians living in Bosnia were deeply offended for being ignored. In their sermons our Catholic priests often call for defense of the allegedly jeopardized „Croatism” and „Catholicism”. This is not true. Croatian and Catholicism are not jeopardized in Yugoslavia! This gives rise to bad feelings towards the other side and naturally the State reacts to that on behalf of public order. In several case school authorities had to prohibit access to school to some religious teachers who in their teaching religion or religious subjects openly supported separatism to the detriment of state unity. U have recently received the Proclamation of the St. Jerome Society marking THE DAY OF ENLIGHTMENT. I used to be its member for 45 years and its representative for 30 years. The Most Reverend, from the enclosed copy of the Proclamation on only one page You will find 15 times mentioned: „Croatian education”, “Croatian people”, “Croatian village”, etc which sounds hostile to the people of a different name. At the end of that same page You will also find the following statement: „When the St. Jerome Society was founded in 1868 Bishop Strossmayer was among the first to welcome it. His words written then are still valid today, even more valid then at that time when He said: „Help our people by putting in their hands the right books to read, the books which will contribute to their material and social benefit, particularly now when some are trying to disseminate foreign books very often full of venom and hostility against our national being.” Bishop Strossmayer was a Croat, the greater benefactor of Croatian people, this is a generally adopted view on Him, but at that time he did not speak about poratka treba da istupi. Više se slučajeva zbilo da su školske vlasti bile prisiljene odaljeciti iz škole nekaje vjeroučitelje radi takova upadnog iščizanja separatističkih izraza na šetu državne cjeline.


Bog očuvao da bi kogod iz ovih redaka imao zaključiti kao da mi hoćemo zatajiti svoje ime, koje smo majčinim mlijekom usisali, ali nas „theologia moralis” ući da i najsvetije djelo, kao što je na primjer molitva, kada bi imao izazvati zvoljilju u javnosti na drugoj strani, mora se oprezno i skromno obaviti bez javnog iščizanja, samo da se izbjegne lošim posljedicama. To nalaže prudentsa koja je u javnom
Croatian people, he said „our people”, having in mind also the part of our people called Serbs. This is what he wrote in 1868, which means 66 years ago, when our people was separated. What would Bishop Strossmayer say now had he lived to see his people united you can imagine, the Most Reverend, because you are familiar with his Yugoslav ideals. One more thing. Next year the St. Jerome Society will Publish a book CROATIAN RENAISSANCE IN DALMATIA, which is fully in line with its historical role and importance of the whole movement. But the title CROATIAN RENAISSANCE is not correct because, particularly at the beginning (1868-1870), the Serbs and the Croats participated in an almost equal number. Therefore I think that by excluding their name from the title the Society does injustice to the Serbs whose merits are as great as the merits of their Croatian brothers, till the discord in 1880. But the trend of the Society is clear: to always places emphasis on Croatism as opposed to Yugoslavism.

For God's sake, no one reading these lines should conclude that we want to forget, or keep secret, our true name which we received from our mothers when they were breast feeding us, but our „theologia moralis” teaches us that even in the loftiest act, which is prayer, we should be very careful not to utter something that would hurt the other side or antagonize it. In public life we should be prudent because PRUDENCE is MAXIMA VIRTUS of public life. At the funeral of our outstanding personality Frano Bulić (Bulić) in Split in several obituary addresses and articles Yugoslavia was not mentioned at all, only „Croatian people” and the fatherland. And for Yugoslavia the late Frano Bulić fought and pledged his reputation at the Peace Conference in Paris, in 1919. Moreover, no one mentioned our King who decorated the late Frano Bulić with a Medal of the highest order. The participants noticed that some wanted to abuse the reputation of the outstanding scholar and exemplary priest to the detriment of Yugoslavia. I have also read in the papers about the initiative of a Boards of Priests to build a church dedicated to King Zvonimir and establish a Bishopric in Knin. The Proclamation says: „In this Jubilee year of redemption it would be right to revive the place of remote memories. If we cannot build a sumptuous Cathedral, we at least can build a modest church on the place where the CROATIAN

životu maxima virtus. Pri nedavné smrti a pogrebu našeho slavného Frana Buliča u Splitu i Solinu čulo se vše govor, čitalo se vše cla-naka, i na više mjesta spomenuto je „hrvatski narod” i „domovina”, a nijdje ime Jugoslavije, za koju je pokojnik išao godine 1919. na mirovne pregovore u Parizu i svojim ugledom mnogo doprinico, kao što ovom prigodom nije spomenuto ime našeg vrado, koj je vr- log pokojnika odlikovao najvišim ordenom. To je upalo u oko pro-matraocima učesnicima, koji su opazili, da su nekoji htjeli zorabiti ugled ogliđenog učenjaka i svećenika na štatu jugoslavenske misli i Jugoslaviji. Citao sam u novinama da se osnovao nek odbor između svećenika za podigneće crkve kralju Zvonimiru u Biskupiji kod Knina. U proglasu se veli: „U ovom jubilarnom godini ljudskog otkupljenja pravo je da oživimo sveto mjesto davnih uspomena. Ako ne možemo sijamku katedralu, a to moramo barem skromnu kružicu da podignemo na mjestu, gdje je „hrvatski” biskup pjevao Bogu hvale, gdje su „hrvatski” kraljevi sudili narodu pravici...” Tencenca je ovih riječi jasna. 


I u javnoj katoličkoj štampi opaža se isti postupak. Ako lije dnevniku „Hrvatska straža” glavni zadatak da branu katolička račela u našoj domovini, onda neka promijeniti naslov u „Katolička straža”, kao što je u svoje vrijeme bila u Dalmaciji „Katolička Dalmacija” pod uređivateljem don Ivana Prodana u Zadru. Iz tog se lista jasno vidi da se pod plaštom vjere (katolištva) hoće da ističe politika (hrvatsko),

110 I should be emphasized that Arch Bishop Stepnič also made a speech at that funeral.
Bishop celebrated God and where CROATIAN kings were imparting justice... The point of these words is clear.

The spirit prevailing in the Catholic Church was particularly obvious before 1930, when the Yugoslav flag was proclaimed the only flag in official public use. Before that two flags were in official public use: one tribal (Croatian) and the other state (Yugoslav). In some churches the Croatian flag was 3–4 meters long and the Yugoslav was hardly 2 meters long. This is an obvious demonstration against the state flag, so that police had to intervene several times. Another example, when the Charge d’Affaires of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia to Belgium (Brussels) asked two Franciscans from Dalmatia to bless the Yugoslav flag at an event in the workers’ settlement they refused and sided with those workers of Yugoslav origin who were against the unity of Yugoslavia. The Franciscan Provincial in Split personally revealed that incorrect action on the part of the two Franciscans.

The Catholic press is following in the same wake. If the main task of the Catholic daily HRVATSKA STRAŽA (Croatian guard) is to defend the principle of Catholicism in Yugoslavia it should change its title to KATOLIČKA DALMATIJA (Catholic Dalmatia), published in Zadar with Ivan Prodan as editor-in-chief. This journal clearly intends to use the guise of religion (Catholicism) to support its hostile to the unity of Yugoslavia, because without a united Yugoslavia there is no life either for the Serbs, Croats or Slovenes. The idea of the united Yugoslav state is successfully coping with all these open or secret problems and boldly marching towards that goal. I deeply believe that nothing will happen to compromise that goal, but as a Catholic priest I fear negative effects on our Church if it continues to insist on the tribal (ethnic) to the detriment of state unity. Allow me, the Most Reverend, to bring to Your attention a few more details which illustrate the spirit prevailing in some Catholic circle. Reverend - Dean Julius Nemetz (Julije Nemec) has recently celebrated the Jubilee of the Gold Mess in Karlovac (Kamensko). In Zagreb papers (OBZOR, NOVOSTI, JUTARNJI LIST) the Jubilee was mentioned, but in HRVATSKA STRAŽA there is not a single word about the event. I have the impression, because Reverend Nemetz is an enthusiastic supporter of the idea of Yugoslavism. On the other hand, this jour-

111 Herecon Frano BuninSheritsch means the Uzashi at that time in Belgium.
nal takes advantage of each opportunity to publish articles on and pictures of the priests—supporters of the idea of Croatianism. This is not Christian and pastoral love. Our Most Reverend Bishop Strossmayer recommends tolerance in communication with our brothers Serbs, which our Catholic moral teaching also recommends in communication with anyone of different opinion but this recommendation is not honored.

Last year when the Orthodox Patriarch, His Holiness Varnava, travelled through Bosnia and Herzegovina on his pastoral way to Dalmatia there was no one in Sarajevo to pay Him respect on behalf of the Capitul, except for the Franciscan Provincial who paid Him a visit. It was the same in Dubrovnik where there was no one either to pay Him respect on behalf of the Capitul or the Catholic Curia. On the other hand, the Orthodox Patriarch was very generous towards the city with the overwhelming majority of Catholics and its clergy. At the banquet in the IMPERIAL hotel, on September 25, 1933 He said: „Let us address our prayers to the Patron of this town, St Blaise (Sr. Vlaha), who had defended this town a thousand years, in the hope that he will continue to protect it in happiness and with God’s blessing.” St Blaise is a Catholic Saint and everybody knows it.

I would also like to bring to your attention some positive trends. Last month Dr. Maximilian, Orthodox Bishop (Vladika) of Gornji Karlovci (Karlovci) visited Kostajnica where both the Orthodox and Catholic population extended Him a most cordial welcome. Revered Catholic priests Slavko Venko and Ivica Kalir were among the Catholics welcoming the Orthodox Bishop. They were also invited to the banquet. On that occasion in His welcome address the Orthodox Bishop called on the priests of both confessions to disseminate brotherly love between the Croats and Serbs and embraced the present Catholic priests. Everybody got very excited and many were on the verge of tears. Also, Archbishop Roditc (Roditc) has recently visited Bečkerek (Bečkerek) to attend the Catholic Congress organized in that town. The population of both confession extended Him a very cordial welcome. At the railway station the old Orthodox Archpriest (Arhipelop) was there to welcome the Archbishop. Such cordiality is in the spirit of the teaching of our Lord and does not, in the least, jeopardize its dignity. On the contrary. It opens up a wider field for the expansion of the Catholic Church and through cooperation with the other church its active participation in moral education of our people, which is in our common interest and in the interest of

cedavnem dolasku nadbiskupa Rodića u Veliki Bečkerek, kada se priredvala velika svečanost za katolički kongres u tom mjestu, čitavo je gradnje jedne i druge crkve iskalo počast katoličkom nadbiskupu. Pri dočeku mu kolodvoru bio je prisutan zamjenik arhiepiskopa stari prota Stakić sa svojim svećenstvom. Ovako susretljivost jest u duhu Kristove nauke. Ona nimalo ne umanjuje dostojanstvo katoličke crkve, dapače otvara se polje jasnoj ekspanzivnosti, jer ne isključuje suradnju s drugom crkvom u onomu što nam je zajedničko dobro pri odgoju naroda u moralnom i materijalnom pogledu.

Vašoj Preuzvišenost dobro je poznato i pitanje Sokola. U ovim recima imate pred sobom svećenika, koji je mnogo toga u životu prokupao i zapamtilo, pa mu dozvolite da iskaže kako misli i osjeća. Istup protiv Sokolu kraljevine Jugoslavije sa strane jugoslovenskog episkopata, po mojoj dubokom uvjerenju bio je netaktičan korak, koji nije ništa koristio, nego dapače našlikao egzemplar slične crkve. Uz biskupa Uccellinija, narodnog poslanika gospodina Vjekoslava Spinića, Mgr. Kortina, dr. Ražgara i nekih drugih svećenika i potpisani se osjećao ponuđen, da javno osudi taj korak. To je on učinio u beogradском listu „Politika” od 3. februara 1933, i u Senatu 29. novembra iste godine. Motivi koji su ga na to potakli jesu u prvom redu religiozne naravi. Iza pročitane biskupsko poslanice bilo je nastalo u zapadnom dijelu našega naroda takvo silno užudenje i ogroženje protiv katoličke crkve, da je prijetila ozbiljna pogreša od širokih masa prelaza u drugu crkvu u slučaju kada bi se prijela druga crkva solidarno sa biskupskom poslanicom. Obzirom na to da preko 50% svećenstva, osobito na primorju, nije pročitalo onu poslanicu u crkvi, jer ju je smatralo skroz neumjetnom i pogubnom, oni koji su malo dublje poznavali u cilj poslanice, shvatili su da je zahvaljujući politička naruha pod plavim vijcem. Bio je i savremeno negodan čas, a ono doba kada se je u Zagrebu i Ljubljani govorilo o nekim „rezolucijama” i „punctacijama”, prema kojima bi se imala naša kraljevina preusvojiti u posebna administrativna tijela, nezavisna od centralne uprave u Beogradu, na način da bi i katolička crkva stekla svoju samostalnu upravu u Zagrebu. Takvo zamišljeno preusvojenje bilo bi na štetu državnog i narodnog jedinstva.

Protiv biskupskoj poslanici digli su se svečani protesti u narodu, a osobito iz redova Sokola, te danas postoji jedne godine danas, kada bi imali zaključiti bilans konačnog računa poslanice, moramo nažalost konstatirati pasiv uz ova dva losa rezultata: 1) Crkva se je
the material wellbeing of the whole population. The Most Reverend, I assume that you are well informed about the Sokols. The lines before you are written by a priest who has worked hard all his life and who has a long memory. I am deeply convinced that it was not rational of the Catholic Episcopate in Yugoslavia to adopt a negative attitude against the Sokols of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia because this decision had a negative effect, detrimental to the Catholic Church. The undersigned, together with Bishop Uccellini, Dr. Spinčič, Member of Parliament, Msgr. Kotník, Dr. Rachky and some other priests felt that he had to publicly condemn that attitude. The undersigned did it by making a statement for POLITIKA of the 3rd of February, 1933 and in the Senate on the 29th of November of the same year, primarily for religious reasons. After the reading of the Epistle people in the Western part of our country got so agitated and embittered against the Catholic Church that they were ready to give up the Catholic and adopt the Orthodox religion in case all Catholic priest support the Epistle. It did not happen thanks to the fact that over 50% of Catholic priests, particularly those from the coastal area, did not read the Epistle, considering it out of place and fatal because they understood the implications. They were aware of its political aims and religion was only a screen. Also, the Epistle was announced at the most inappropriate moment when from Zagreb and Ljubljana some RESOLUTIONS and PUNCTUATIONS were launched calling for the administrative division of Yugoslavia into units independent of the central administration in Belgrade. According to that concept Zagreb is to become the See of the Catholic Church in the country. Such redistribution and division would be detrimental to the state and national unity.

People all over Yugoslavia protested against the Epistle, the Sokols in particular. After one year the effect of the Epistle is the following: 1) From the point of view of the State the Catholic Church is an unreliable factor destroying everything the state is trying to build, including the Sokols, the organization fighting for the unity of Yugoslavia, whose Leader is the Heir to the Throne Petař II, himself; 2) By refusing to bless the Sokol flags the Catholic Church alienates a great number of young people, members of the Sokols, spiritually devoted to their Church. This means that the overall political and religious effect of the Epistle was only detrimental to the Catholic Church. Later on the Episcopate realized that fact and now it allows the blessing of the Sokols provided they make a short public
statement. This is not a good decision of the Episcopate because our main pastoral duty is to attract young people under the wing of our Church, and not to alienate them. Common sense has prevailed. The recent address of the Right Reverend Dr. Antun Akshamovitch (Aksamović), Bishop of Diakovo, at the consecration of the Sokol Center in Pertvaradin produced a positive effect on the population as a proof that the Catholic Church is not a hostile institution and that its aim is to work in favor of the unity and consolidation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia.

Before concluding this letter allow me, the Most Reverend to mention a few historical events from our recent past, which may be important for the evaluation of the political situation in Yugoslavia today. History is a great teacher. What happened at the end of the previous century and culminated in Italy only five years ago may be a good lesson to us. Catholics living in Yugoslavia and help us adopt the appropriate attitude towards the development of the State. Several decades after the historical change in France a very embittered fight over the form of state government was waged between the Monarchists and Republicans. Essentially conservative the Catholic Church supported the old Royal regime and called for the restoration of Monarchy, whereas the overwhelming majority of population gave its support to the republicans. In spite of being Catholics the French decided to support the opposite side which gave rise to a conflict threatening to develop into a great Chasm between the Catholics. When the wise Leo XIII was elected Pope he solved the problem by ordering the French Bishops to recognize the republican system and then use their very best efforts to prevent the election of people hostile to the Catholic church and religion. In this way the balance was established between the Church and the State.

The Renaissance in Italy is also marked by vehement conflicts between the Church and the State. After the unification of Italy in 1870 when the secular state of the Pope was abolished until 1929, which means full 60 years in Catholic Italy the struggle was also waged for the restoration of the secular state of the Pope, against the unity of Italy. Public knows what NON EXPEDIT MEANS PROHIBITS the Catholics to participate in the political life of Italy and the elections called for the Italian government which the Vatican did not recognize. In Catholic papers such as UNITA CATALCA in Torino, CIVITA CATECOLA, in Rome and others openly discussed this issue, particularly in case of a war in Europe involving Catholic Papinska svetovna država ukinuta. Od te dobe pa do 1929. godine, dakle punih 60 godina u katoličkoj Italiji vodila se borba za uspo- rjavu papinske svetovne države a protiv jedinstva Italije. Poznat je javnosti „Non expedit“ kojim se zabranjivalo katolicima da ne sudješu ni u političkim ni u administrativnim izborima italijanske vlade, koju Vatikan nije htio priznati. U katoličkim novinama „Unita Catolica“ u Torinu, „Civita Catolica“ u Rimu i druge otvoreno su raspravljale o pitanje u slučaju kakove ratne konfliktacije u Europi, računalo se na vojnu invernciju katoličke Španjolske, Francuske i Austrije, da ona ustanom silom izvojite papinsku državu. Potpisani je bio u Italiji godine 1888. i deset godina kasnije 1898. imao je prigode da govori u uglednim crkvenim licima i donazv za njihove političke nazoce, koji su se sastojali u ovome: provesti konferenciju bivših talijanskih pokrajina Pijemoneta, Venecije, Romanije, Napulja itd. Sa vrhovnim poglavicom rimskim papom, a protiv jedinstvene Italije pod dinastijom Savoja. Nešto slično kao što toče, tobož, i naši fede- ralisti, koji traže samostalnu Hrvatsku, Sloveniju, Srbiju, Bosnu itd. a ne jedinstvenu Jugoslaviju.

Kao u Francuskoj tako i u Italiji borba je dala sasvim negativan rezultat za katoličku crkvu. Od pape Pija X koji je ukinuo „Non expedit“, uvjerila se Sveta Stolica, da je ta borba uzaludna i neuspjeha, dapače šetna za crkvu te je u februaru 1929. godine papa Pio XI sklopio u Rimu Lateranski ugovor s današnjim italijanskim vladom Mussolinima, odrekao se prijašnjih zahtjeva u pogledu papinske države, priznao jedinstvo kraljevine Italije, ograničio se na „Grad Vatikan (Città di Vaticano)“, koji uživa potpunu teritorijalnu samostalnost. Tom prigodom papa je odlikovao najvećim ordenom predsjedniku vlasti Mussolinima i nazvao ga „provijedencijalnim čovjekom“, što je znao riješiti ovo pitanje koje je zadavalo teških briga i suhošta Svetoj Stolici. Treba zabilježiti da su Francuska i Italija eminentno katoličke države, što nije slučaj kod nas u Jugoslaviji.

Na pogled ovih «klantanih primjera iz nedavne historije, za- što, Preuzvki, mi da Hrvati katolici bez ikakva razloga izaziva- mo borbu u jednoj državi, gdje nam je potpuno zajamčena sloboda vjerouspovesti." Ima li ikakva razloga da podržavamo neku duševnu

* U vezi ovog teksta, koji je posve drugu korekturu, ova rečenica je, posle reči vjeroispovijesti, prekinuta. Tu je stavljena tabka. Međutim, u tekstu pripremljenom za prvu korekturu, posle reči vjeroispovijesti stoji zapeta, pa se ta rečenica nastavlja sljedećim rečima: „gdje imamo unutarnij vla- dara iz rudne dinastije, koja iako nije pripadnik katoličke crkve, ipak kao sini ove zemlje jednu kljucnom plemeničnim sinom osjeća za vjerske jedine i druge crkve, što on svakodan dokazuje ne samo riječima.
Spain, France and Austria, in view of establishing the secular state of the Pope by military force. In that regard an Agreement was signed in 1888 and in 1898 by outstanding representatives of High Clergy who shared the same political attitude. Their intention was to establish a confederation of the former Italian regions: Piemonte, Venezia, Romagna, Napoli, etc. The Pope would be at the head of this confederation, which was against the united Italy under the Crown of the Savoy Dynasty. Our federalists wish something similar. They call for an independent Croatia, Slovenia, Serbia, Bosnia, etc. and are against the united Yugoslavia.

Both in France and Italy the results of the conflict were negative for the Catholic Church. Pius X abolished the NON EXPEDIT. The Holy See realized the futility of such conflicts as detrimental to the church. In February 1929 Pius XI signed in Rome the LATERAN TREATIES with Mussolini, relinquishing all previous requests with regard to the establishment of the Papal state, recognized the unity of the Italian Kingdom and limited his territory to the CITY OF THE VATICAN (Città di Vaticano) with ex-territorial status. On that occasion the Pope decorated the Prime Minister Mussolini with a medal of the highest order and called Mussolini "a Man of Providence", who knew how to solve this difficult issue and a source of conflict within the Holy See as well. It should be recalled that France and Italy are predominantly Catholic states, which is not the case in Yugoslavia.

The Most Reverend, why we, Croats-Catholics, do not follow these historical examples and stop making problems to the country which fully guarantees or religious freedom. Is there a valid reason for our support to the spiritual split to the detriment of consolidation of our state and thus play in the hands of our hostile neighbors? Is there any justification for the Catholic Church to make imputable statements which bring about frictions and conflicts, instead of disseminating the teaching of the Holy Bible and promoting peace, brotherly love and culture, which is its sacred duty?

* In the second edition this sentence is cut after the word RELIGION. In the first version after RELIGION the text goes on: "we have an exemplary Ruler from a national Dynasty, who is not a Catholic, but as a son of this country in his generous heart he does not make any difference between the two religions, which he proves not only by his words, but also by his charitable deeds by abundantly subsidizing the Catholic Church and Catholic institutions." This favorable view about King Aleksandar was expressed only eight days before his assassination in Marseille to someone who obviously did not like it and was in a position to eliminate it from the final version of MAGNUM CRIMEN.
We must not reject our tradition and our past. Since the first days of the Illyrian Movement in 1835 our Catholic priest to date have always defended our national freedom while we were under foreign yoke, which means during a period of a whole century, from Strossmayer, the Bishop of Đakovo, the master brain of the idea of Yugoslavism up to Dr. Ante Bauer, Archbishop of Zagreb, a brave supporter of that idea, and as member of the of the Serbo-Croatian coalition was also member of the delegations to Budapest and the Parliament in Zagreb. We should continue to foster that noble tradition of love for the fatherland and consolidate it today when we are living in our own country and thanks God no longer under the foreign yoke. Our CATHOLIC ACTION should continue its activities according to the slogan launched by Bishop Strossmayer: “Everything for the Faith and Fatherland!”

I do not want to abuse any more on Your precious time. My intention was most honorable. I did not want to offend anyone, the least my Church and my country. By writing these lines I only wanted to prove my devotion. The Most Reverend, if you have time to read these lines and deem them useful I beg you to take them into consideration.

With deepest respect,

Devoted yours
Retired priest and Senator of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia
Franco Ivanishevitch

Split, October 1, 1934.

Don Franco Ivanishevitch (Ivanis'ević) as a priest and patriot, was using his very best efforts to help the people divided by religions and through his pastoral work enlighten them in the spirit of Strossmayer. Unfortunately, the young Archbishop-Coadjutor did not understand him and did not give him the answer that would satisfy his heart. Archbishop-Coadjutor Stepinac, performing that duty for only several months was still unknown to the relevant circles. He was not involved in any official activity. However, Archbishop-Coadjutor did not deem it his duty to answer this letter, like all other bishops. This was the destiny of this promemoria, which like all others, and on many other issues the priests-patriots have submitted to the attention of the Vatican, simply because they were not in line with the policy of the Roman Curia and the Captol, the See of the Archbishop of Zagreb. They had their far reaching aims-to establish a state in which the Catholic Church would be the only church and a supreme political factor. For them the end justified
the means and therefore they accepted support from all those who could help them in these efforts regardless of who they were. Less than seven years later the developments will show how deep was the blunder of don Franjo Ivičević, fostering the Utopian idea of Yugoslavism strongly supported by the King and the sincerity of alleged Yugoslavism of Dr. Bauer which, also at the time of Serbo-Croatian coalition was only a means for getting the approval for his high position. When at the time of that coalition he did not succeed to get the high nomination he tried to achieve it thanks to Ban Tomashitch (Tomašić), supported by Budapest and Vienna. On the other hand, Dr. Bauer had support of the Jesuits because he strongly supported their return before the Croatian Parliament (Hrvatski sabor) in 1899. Their support implied support of the Roman Curia, particularly at the time of Pius X and his Secretary Cardinal Mery del Val.

It was just another in a series of his disappointments. This is a tragedy of a great idealism destroyed by upstarts who were not up to his knee. The assassination of the King in Marseilles has postponed the answer ad infinitum. After that tragic event the situation completely changed and clericalism gained new impetus.
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