

## PRVA SECESIJA U DALMATINSKOJ NARODNOJ STRANCI 1873. GODINE



## THE FIRST SECESSION IN THE DALMATIAN PEOPLE'S PARTY IN 1873

Rad se bavi secesijom u dalmatinskoj Narodnoj stranci koja se dogodila 1873., nakon što su dalmatinski zastupnici u Carevinskom vijeću podržali zakon kojim su uvedeni izravni izbori za to vijeće. Narodna stranka oštro je osudila njihov postupak, napadajući ih zbog nasjedanja na obećanja bečke vlade i izdaje narodnog poštenja. Zastupnici su smatrali da su svojim postupkom zaštitili Dalmaciju od negativne reakcije vlade i omogućili joj napredak uz podršku te iste vlade. Sukob unutar stranke dosegnuo je vrhunac kada su se zastupnici odvojili od stranačke središnjice i osnovali Narodnu srednjačku stranku te pokrenuli list *Zemljak* po kojem su dobili nadimak „zemljaci“. Uslijedila je žestoka polemika između toga lista i *Narodnog lista*, glasila središnjice Narodne stranke. Rad analizira diskurs jedne i druge strane u tom sukobu te pokušava utvrditi s kakvih su ideoloških pozicija nastupale te kakav im je bio stav o protivničkoj strani. Analizira se razdoblje do prvih izravnih izbora za Carevinsko vijeće održanih krajem 1873. na kojima su i jedna i druga strana ostvarile rezultat slabiji od očekivanog.

Ključne riječi: Narodna stranka, *Narodni list*, *Zemljak*, Carevinsko vijeće, hrvatsko-srpski odnosi.

This paper deals with secession in the Dalmatian People's Party that took place in 1873, after the Dalmatian Representatives to the Imperial Council endorsed the law that introduced direct elections for the Council. The People's Party strongly condemned their actions, attacking them for being deceived by the promises of the Viennese government and betraying people's honesty. Representatives believed that their actions served to protect Dalmatia from the negative reaction of the Government and to enable Dalmatia's development by support of the same government. The conflict within the party peaked when Representatives seceded from the party centre and established the Mainstream Folk Party, called *Zemljačka* (Eng.: Compatriotic) after its publication *Zemljak* after which they were nicknamed "Zemljaci" (Eng.: Compatriots). A fierce controversy ensued between *Zemljak* and *Narodni list*, a newspaper of the People's Party centre-piece. It analyses the period until the first direct elections to the Imperial Council held in late 1873 in which both sides achieved weaker than expected outcome.

The paper analyses discourse of both sides in this conflict and tries to determine what ideological positions they came from and their position on the opposing side.

Keywords: People's Party, *Narodni list*, *Zemljak*, the Imperial Council, Croatian-Serbian relations.

## Uvod

Rane sedamdesete godine 19. stoljeća donijele su žestoko političko previranje u austrijskom dijelu Austro-Ugarske Monarhije. Nakon preustroja države i uspostave dvojne monarhije 1867., u austrijskom je dijelu izbio sukob između centralista i federalista. Slavenski narodi, u prvom redu Česi, zalagali su se za federalizam, a njihovi su zahtjevi ometali rad Carevinskog vijeća, parlamenta koji je okupljao predstavnike zemalja iz austrijskog dijela Monarhije. Kako bi uspostavili red, predstavnici bečke vlasti odlučili su promijeniti način biranja zastupnika tako da ih više ne određuju pokrajinski sabori, nego birači na izravnim izborima. Najprije je provedena privremena izborna reforma za slučaj potrebe, a kasnije je način biranja zastupnika trajno promijenjen.

Dalmacija je, kao pokrajina u sastavu austrijskog dijela Monarhije, sudjelovala u tim zbivanjima. Narodna stranka 1870. prvi je put dobila većinu u Dalmatinskom saboru i morala se suočiti s novim izazovima. Svoj glavni cilj, ujedinjenje Dalmacije s banskom Hrvatskom, nije uspjela ostvariti. Osvojivši većinu, odlučila je svoj odnos prema bečkoj vladi utemeljiti na kompromisu. Poslala je svoje zastupnike u Carevinsko vijeće, ali je naglasila privremenost položaja Dalmacije unutar Monarhije i nastavila je raditi na oblikovanju preduvjeta za ujedinjenje. Dalmatinski su zastupnici u Carevinskom vijeću izazvali kontroverzije kada su poduprli privremenu izbornu reformu, ali je Narodna stranka naposljetku prihvatila njihove razloge i podržala njihov postupak. Međutim, kada su ti isti zastupnici podržali prijedlog trajne izborne reforme, stranka ih je oštro napala. Naposljetku su oni osnovali vlastitu, Narodnu srednjačku stranku. Žestoke polemike vodile su se preko *Narodnog lista*, glasila središnjice Narodne stranke, i *Zemljaka*, lista koji su pokrenuli zastupnici kao glasilo svoje nove stranke. Polemike su bile žestoke tijekom 1873., a smirile su se krajem iste godine, nakon što su održani prvi izravni izbori za Carevinsko vijeće. Narodna srednjačka stranka, odnosno „zemljaci“, osvojila je samo jedan mandat te je postalo jasno da nije značajna u političkom životu Dalmacije. To je bila prva secesija u

## Introduction

The early seventies of the 19th century brought severe political turmoil in the Austrian part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. After the reorganization of the state and the establishment of the dual monarchy in 1867, a conflict between centralists and federalists erupted in the Austrian part. Slavic nations, primarily Czechs, were in favour of federalism, and their demands were interfering with the work of the Imperial Council, a parliament which gathered Representatives of countries in the Austrian part of the Monarchy. In an effort to restore the order, the Representatives of the Viennese authorities decided to change the way they elect Council Representatives so that they are no longer determined by the provincial councils but by direct elections. First, a temporary electoral reform was carried out as an emergency aid, and later the Representatives' election method was permanently changed.

Being a province within the Austrian part of the Monarchy, Dalmatia participated in these events. In 1870, the People's Party won a majority in the Dalmatian Parliament and had to face new challenges. Its main goal, the unification of Dalmatia with Banovina of Croatia failed to succeed. Having won a majority, it decided to base on compromise its relationship with the Vienna government. It sent its Representatives to the Imperial Council, but emphasized the temporary nature of Dalmatia's position within the Monarchy and continued to work on preconditions for unification. Dalmatian Representatives in the Imperial Council caused controversy when they supported temporary electoral reform, but the People's Party eventually accepted their reasons and supported their actions. However, when these Representatives supported the proposal for permanent electoral reform, the party attacked them sharply. Eventually, they founded their own party called Mainstream Folk Party. A fierce controversy ran through *Narodni list*, the newspaper of the People's Party centrepiece, and *Zemljak*, the newspaper initiated by the Representatives' new party. The controversies were fierce during 1873, and have subsided at the end of the same year, after the first direct elections to the Imperial Council were held. Mainstream Folk Party, or Zemljaci, won only one term and it became clear that they were not significant in political life of Dalmatia. That was the first secession in Dalmatian People's Party, also significant because it highlighted the issue of Croatian-Serbian relations in Dalmatia. A few years later this question will

dalmatinskoj Narodnoj stranci, značajna i zbog toga što je istaknula pitanje hrvatsko-srpskih odnosa u Dalmaciji. To će pitanje nekoliko godina kasnije dovesti do konačne podjele Narodne stranke po etničkim linijama.

### **Austrijski dio Monarhije uoči secesije u Narodnoj stranci**

Prva secesija u dalmatinskoj Narodnoj stranci dogodila se u uvjetima krize koja je potresala austrijski dio Monarhije nakon sklapanja Austro-ugarske nagodbe. Česi, koji su živjeli u austrijskom dijelu, nisu se slagali s odredbama Nagodbe. Potaknuti uvođenjem dvojne monarhije, tražili su da se njihove zemlje (Češka, Moravska i Šleska), koje su inače predstavljale industrijsko središte Monarhije, na temelju povijesnog prava ujedine u Kraljevinu Bohemiju koja bi imala status kakav je Nagodbom stekla Ugarska. Nastojeći ostvariti svoje nacionalne ciljeve, češki su političari bojkotirali Carevinsko vijeće i zemaljske sabore.<sup>1</sup> Austrija nije mogla prihvatiti češke zahtjeve. Taylor piše da se u navedenom slučaju radilo o sukobu dvaju povijesnih prava. Na jednoj je strani stajalo zapravo imaginarno češko povijesno pravo, a na drugoj njemačko povijesno pravo temeljeno na nekadašnjoj pripadnosti čeških zemalja Svetom Rimskom Carstvu, čiji je nasljednik bila Austrija. U svijesti Nijemaca češke su zemlje ustvari bile njemačke zemlje.<sup>2</sup>

Bečkim vlastima sukob s Česima nije odgovarao jer je slabio austrijski dio Monarhije i otvarao prostor za jačanje ugarskog dijela. Zato je austrijski premijer Eduard Taaffe pokušao postići sporazum. Nudio je Česima „pošten tretman“ u njihovim zemljama, a zauzvrat je od njih tražio sudjelovanje u radu Carevinskog vijeća zbog očuvanja jedinstva Austrije. Češki politički vođe nisu prihvatili njegov prijedlog, inzistirajući na tome da su Česi konstitutivan narod u svojim zemljama kao što su Mađari u Ugarskoj i htjeli su izbjeći mogućnost da ih se tretira kao manjinu u Austriji.<sup>3</sup> Zato su potražili pomoć od stranih sila, Rusije i Francuske, ali bez uspjeha.<sup>4</sup>

lead to the final division within the People's Party according to the ethnicity.

### **Austrian part of the Monarchy on the eve of secession in the People's Party**

The first secession in Dalmatian People's Party took place in conditions of crisis that shook Austrian part of the Monarchy after the conclusion of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise. The Czechs, who lived in the Austrian part, disagreed with provisions of the Compromise. Encouraged by the introduction of a dual monarchy, they demanded that their countries (the Czech Republic, Moravia and Silesia), which otherwise represented the industrial centre of the Monarchy, be unified in the Kingdom of Bohemia on the basis of historical law. It would have the status accorded to Hungary by the Compromise. In an effort to achieve their national goals, Czech politicians boycotted the Imperial Council and the National Assemblies.<sup>1</sup> Austria could not accept Czech requests. Taylor writes that the case in question was a conflict of two historical rights.

On one side stood in fact the imaginary Czech historical right, and on the other German historical law based on the former Czech lands belonging to the Holy Roman Empire, whose successor was Austria. In the minds of Germans, Czech countries were in fact German countries.<sup>2</sup>

The Viennese authorities were not comfortable with the conflict with Czechs because it weakened the Austrian part of the Monarchy and opened up space for strengthening of the Hungarian part. That's why Austrian Prime Minister Eduard Taaffe tried to reach an agreement. He offered the Czechs "fair treatment" in their countries, and in turn asked them to participate in the work of the Imperial Council in order to preserve the unity of Austria. Czech political leaders did not accept his proposal, insisting that the Czechs were a constituent people in their own countries, such as the Hungarians in Hungary, and wanted to avoid being treated as a minority in Austria.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, they sought the help of foreign powers, Russia and France, but

<sup>1</sup> Mahoney 2011: 119; Taylor 1976: 142.

<sup>2</sup> Taylor 1976: 142-143.

<sup>3</sup> Taylor 1976: 143.

<sup>4</sup> Mahoney 2011: 119.

<sup>1</sup> Mahoney 2011: 119; Taylor 1976: 142.

<sup>2</sup> Taylor 1976: 142-143.

<sup>3</sup> Taylor 1976: 143.

Nakon što su Taaffeovi pokušaji propali, liberalno usmjereni njemački ministri početkom 1870. predložili su uvođenje izravnih izbora za Carevinsko vijeće.<sup>5</sup> Naime, Carevinsko vijeće, parlament austrijskog dijela Monarhije, konstituiralo se tako da su sabori zemalja austrijskog dijela Monarhije birali zastupnike. To je značilo da zastupnici u Carevinskom vijeću odražavaju stavove saborske većine koja ih je izabrala. Izravne izbore njemački su ministri promatrali kao sredstvo za okretanje situacije i slamanje češkog otpora.

Međutim, položaj njemačkih liberala oslabila je politika Friedricha Beusta, ministra vanjskih poslova Monarhije. On je, kao protivnik pruskog kancelara Bismarcka, pokušavao okupiti europsku koaliciju protiv Pruske. Nije uspio, a konačan poraz njegovoj politici nanijela je pobjeda Pruske u ratu protiv Francuske, koja ju je dovela na čelo ujedinjene Njemačke.<sup>6</sup> Car Franjo Josip tada se okrenuo od njemačkih liberala i na čelo vlade doveo Karla von Hohenwarta čiji je glavni suradnik bio ministar trgovine Albert Schäffle. Njih su dvojica vjerovala u federalizam kao sredstvo jačanja Monarhije.<sup>7</sup> Tijekom 1871. vođeni su pregovori između vlade i Čeha. Raspravljalo se o položaju Nijemaca i Čeha u češkim zemljama, o izbornom sustavu, federalizaciji Monarhije i položaju Slavena u njoj.<sup>8</sup> Pregovori nisu urodili plodom i Česi su nastavili s bojkotom Carevinskog vijeća.<sup>9</sup>

Na čelo vlade tada je postavljen njemački liberal Adolf Auersperg koji je trebao prekinuti češki bojkot. S tim je ciljem 1872. izglasan „Zakon o izborima za nevolju“, kojim je određeno izravno biranje zastupnika u Carevinsko vijeće u slučaju da ih zemaljski sabori odbiju izabrati, ili da izabrani zastupnici odbiju sudjelovati u radu Carevinskog vijeća. Sljedeći korak njemačke liberalne vlade bio je pokušaj definitivne izborne reforme kojom bi biranje zastupnika u Carevinsko vijeće bilo izuzeto iz nadležnosti zemaljskih sabora i povjereno biračima na izravnim izborima.<sup>10</sup>

without success.<sup>4</sup> After Taaffe's attempts failed, the liberal-minded German ministers proposed the introduction of direct elections to the Imperial Council in early 1870.<sup>5</sup> Namely, the Imperial Council, as the parliament of Austrian part of the Monarchy, was constituted from the elected Representatives within the assemblies of the countries in Austrian part of the Monarchy. This meant that the members of the Imperial Council reflected the views of the parliamentary majority that elected them. The direct elections were viewed by German ministers as means of turning the situation around and breaking the Czech resistance.

However, the position of the German Liberals was weakened by the policy of Friedrich Beust, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Monarchy. As an opponent of Prussian Chancellor Bismarck, he was trying to rally a European coalition against Prussia. He failed in his intention and his policy was ultimately defeated by the victory of Prussia in the war against France, which brought it to the fore.<sup>6</sup> Emperor Franz Joseph then turned from the German Liberals and brought Karl von Hohenwart to the head of the government. His chief associate was Minister of Commerce Albert Schäffle. The two believed in federalism as a means of strengthening the Monarchy.<sup>7</sup> The negotiations between the government and the Czechs were held during 1871 on the issues of the position of the Germans and the Czechs in Czech countries, the electoral system, the federalization of the Monarchy and the position of the Slavs in it.<sup>8</sup> The negotiations were not successful and the Czechs continued to boycott the Imperial Council.<sup>9</sup>

At that time a German Liberal Adolf Auersperg who was supposed to end the Czech boycott was appointed at the head of the government. To this end, in 1872 the Emergency electoral law was enacted, which provided direct election of Representatives to the Imperial Council in case the National Assemblies refuse the elections, or if the elected Representatives refuse to participate in work of the Imperial Council. The next

<sup>5</sup> Taylor 1976: 144.

<sup>6</sup> Taylor 1976: 144-145.

<sup>7</sup> Taylor 1976: 145-146.

<sup>8</sup> Rajčić 2014: 218.

<sup>9</sup> Šidak *et al.* 1968: 106.

<sup>10</sup> Rajčić 2014: 218-219.

<sup>4</sup> Mahoney 2011: 119.

<sup>5</sup> Taylor 1976: 144.

<sup>6</sup> Taylor 1976: 144-145.

<sup>7</sup> Taylor 1976: 145-146.

<sup>8</sup> Rajčić 2014: 218.

<sup>9</sup> Šidak *et al.* 1968: 106.

## Narodna stranka uoči secesije

Narodna stranka nastala je u okolnostima preustroja državnog uređenja Monarhije. Bachov apsolutizam, koji je bio na snazi pedesetih godina, pokazao se neuspješnim, pogotovo nakon državnog bankrota i neuspješna rata protiv Sardinije i Francuske u kojem je Monarhija izgubila vlast nad Lombardijom. Car Franjo Josip stoga je odlučio reformirati državu, a rezultat toga bila su dva dokumenta, Listopadska diploma iz 1860. i Veljački patent iz 1861., kojima je apsolutizam zamijenjen ustavnim poretom, a Monarhija organizirana prema federalnom načelu.<sup>11</sup> Iz te obnove ustavnog života, koja je svoj odjek imala i u Dalmaciji, izrasla je Narodna stranka.

Narodna stranka od početka se svoga djelovanja vodila dvjema ključnim idejama. Prva je bila težnja za ujedinjenjem Dalmacije s banskom Hrvatskom na temelju prirodnog i povijesnog prava,<sup>12</sup> a druga zalaganje za uvođenje hrvatskog jezika u javni život Dalmacije umjesto tada službenog talijanskog. Narodnjaci su se nadali da bi promjena državnog okvira nakon ukidanja apsolutizma mogla dovesti do ujedinjenja, ali to se nije dogodilo. Veljačkim patentom Dalmacija je stekla određenu autonomiju te je ustanovljen zemaljski sabor sa sjedištem u Zadru za koji je car odobrio izborni red.<sup>13</sup> Stoga je borba za rušenje prevlasti talijanskog i uvođenje hrvatskog jezika u javni život postala glavni cilj narodnjaka, iako je misao o ujedinjenju i dalje ostala prisutna kod njih.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Petrović 1982: 205-207.

<sup>12</sup> Prirodno (narodno) pravo proizlazi iz shvaćanja prema kojem je narod u Dalmaciji etnički istovjetan narodu u banskoj Hrvatskoj. Povijesno (državno) pravo temelji se na nekadašnjoj pripadnosti Dalmacije srednjovjekovnoj Hrvatskoj. Narodnjaci su se, dakle, zalagali za ujedinjenje Dalmacije i banske Hrvatske smatrajući da u tim dvjema zemljama živi isti narod i da su u prošlosti bile ujedinjene pa bi se stoga ponovno trebale ujediniti.

<sup>13</sup> Perić 2002: 172.

<sup>14</sup> Stranačko glasilo pokrenuto je 1862. na talijanskom jeziku pod imenom *Il Nazionale*. Talijanski jezik korišten je da bi se doprlo do pripadnika dalmatinske elite koji su uglavnom bili obrazovani na njemu. List je izlazio s književnim prilogom nazvanim *Prilog k Narodnom listu* u kojem je korišten hrvatski jezik.

step of the German Liberal government was to attempt a complete electoral reform that would exempt the election of members to the Imperial Council from the jurisdiction of Land Assemblies and entrust it to voters with direct elections.<sup>10</sup>

## The People's Party on the eve of secession

The People's Party was formed under the circumstances of restructuring of the state structure of the Monarchy. Bach's absolutism, that was in effect in the 1850s, proved to be unsuccessful, especially after the state bankruptcy and unsuccessful war against Sardinia and France, in which the Monarchy lost reign over Lombardy. The emperor Franz Joseph therefore decided to reform the state, resulting in two documents, the October Diploma of 1860 and the February Patent of 1861, which replaced absolutism with the constitutional order and organized the Monarchy according to the federal principle.<sup>11</sup> The People's Party emerged from this renewal of constitutional life which echoed in Dalmatia as well.

The People's Party has been guided by two key ideas since its inception. The first was the aspiration for the unification of Dalmatia with Banovina of Croatia on the basis of natural and historical law,<sup>12</sup> and the second was the commitment to introduce Croatian language into the public life of Dalmatia instead of then official Italian language. Its members hoped that a change of state framework after the abolition of absolutism could lead to unification which did not happen. Dalmatia gained some autonomy with the February Patent and established a National Council based in Zadar for which the emperor approved the electoral order.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, the struggle against the Italian language dominance and the introduction of Croatian language into public life became the main

<sup>10</sup> Rajčić 2014: 218-219.

<sup>11</sup> Petrović 1982: 205-207.

<sup>12</sup> Natural (national) law stems from understanding that people of Dalmatia are ethnically equal to people of Banovina of Croatia. Historical (state) law is based on Dalmatia's former affiliation to medieval Croatia. The Populists, therefore, argued for the unification of Dalmatia and Banovina of Croatia, believing that the same people live in the two countries and that they were united in the past and should therefore be reunited.

<sup>13</sup> Perić 2002: 172.

Tko su bili pripadnici Narodne stranke u prvom razdoblju njezina postojanja? U gradovima je imala malo pristaša. Uglavnom se radilo o trgovcima, pomorcima, odvjetnicima, javnim bilježnicima, profesorima te manjem broju liječnika, svećenika i činovnika.<sup>15</sup> Gradski narodnjaci gospodarski su bili slabi i stoga prisiljeni oslanjati se na ostatke dalmatinskog plemstva i svećenstvo.<sup>16</sup> Svećenstvo je bilo posebno značajan dio Narodne stranke u njezinim početnim godinama. Pripadali su joj svi pravoslavni svećenici, većina franjevaca, dio župnih svećenika iz priobalja i dio svjetovnjaka koji su u gradovima radili kao učitelji, profesori ili crkveni službenici.<sup>17</sup> Niže svećenstvo iz dalmatinskog zaleđa bilo je posebno važno jer je bilo u neposrednu dodiru sa seljacima, daleko najbrojnijom društvenom skupinom u Dalmaciji, i služilo kao njegova veza s gradskim narodnjacima, obrazovanim na talijanskom jeziku.<sup>18</sup>

Gradski su se narodnjaci razlikovali od onih iz zaleđa po ideološkim shvaćanjima. Pripadnici građanske inteligencije prošli su liberalno obrazovanje na talijanskom jeziku te su bili neskloni njegovu potpunom izbacivanju iz javnog života, a u nacionalnom su se smislu zalagali za slavenski identitet Dalmacije. Niže svećenstvo, među kojim se isticao don Mihovil Pavlinović, zagovaralo je hrvatsku nacionalnost i jezik te konzervativni svjetonazor. Tako su u stranci postojale dvije struje koje su međusobno znale dolaziti u sukob.<sup>19</sup> Kao jedina stranka koja se zalagala za ujedinjenje Dalmacije i banske Hrvatske te uvođenje „domaćeg“ jezika u javni život, Narodna stranka u početku je okupljala pripadnike i hrvatske i srpske narodnosti. Srbi su u početnom razdoblju bili čvrst oslonac stranke, koja je u krajevima u kojima su oni predstavljali većinu stanovništva redovito osvajali saborske mandate. Srpski

goal of the Populists, although the idea of unification still remained.<sup>14</sup>

Who were the members of the People's Party in the first period of its existence? There were few supporters in the cities. These were mostly traders, sailors, lawyers, notaries, professors and smaller number of doctors, priests and clerks.<sup>15</sup> People's Party members in towns were economically weak and therefore forced to rely on the remnants of the Dalmatian nobility and clergy.<sup>16</sup> The clergy was particularly significant part of the People's Party in its early years. Those were all Orthodox priests, most Franciscans, part of the parish priests from the coast and part of secular people who worked in the towns as teachers, professors or church officials.<sup>17</sup> The lower clergy from the Dalmatian hinterland was especially important because it was in direct contact with the peasants, by far the largest social group in Dalmatia, and served as its liaison with the People's Party members in towns who were educated in Italian language.<sup>18</sup>

City folk differed from those in the hinterland in ideological terms. Members of People's Party intelligence in towns had undergone a liberal education in the Italian language, and were reluctant to fully exclude it from the public life, but in the national sense they advocated for the Slavic identity of Dalmatia. The lower clergy, among whom Don Mihovil Pavlinović stood out, advocated for Croatian nationality and language as well as the conservative worldview. Thus there were two streams in the party that occasionally came into conflict with each other.<sup>19</sup> As the only party that advocated the unification of Dalmatia and Banovina of Croatia with introduction of "native" language into public life, the People's Party initially brought together members of both Croat and Serb nationalities. In the initial period, the Serbs gave firm

<sup>15</sup> Petrović 1982: 103, 106. Perić kao protagoniste Narodne stranke navodi nacionalno osviještenu domaću inteligenciju, plemstvo, razne posjednike, dio trgovaca i većinu nižeg svećenstva (Perić 1978: 53).

<sup>16</sup> Petrović 1982: 109.

<sup>17</sup> Petrović 1982: 114.

<sup>18</sup> Petrović 1982: 109.

<sup>19</sup> Petrović 1982: 109-110.

<sup>14</sup> Party newsletter, launched in 1862 on the Italian language, was named *Il Nazionale*. Italian was used to reach members of the Dalmatian elite who were mostly educated in Italian. The newspaper was published with a literary supplement called *Prilog k Narodnom listu* (Eng. Annex to the Narodni list) in which the Croatian language was used.

<sup>15</sup> Petrović 1982: 103, 106. Perić cites nationally-aware indigenous intelligence, nobility, various landlords, part of the merchants and most of the lower clergy as protagonists of the People's Party (Perić 1978: 53).

<sup>16</sup> Petrović 1982: 109.

<sup>17</sup> Petrović 1982: 114.

<sup>18</sup> Petrović 1982: 109.

<sup>19</sup> Petrović 1982: 109-110.

su birači birali narodnjačke kandidate bez obzira na to jesu li ti kandidati bili srpske ili hrvatske narodnosti.<sup>20</sup> Međutim, to će jedinstvo biti postupno narušavano sve dok ne dođe do konačna raspada stranke po etničkom načelu, a jedna od faza bila je i situacija oko zemljaštva.

Suprotstavljena politička opcija narodnjacima su šezdesetih godina bili autonomaši, protivnici ujedinjenja i zagovornici talijanskog kao službenog jezika. Neki od njih isticali su zaseban slavenski identitet Dalmacije, dok su neki otvorenije naglašavali njezino talijanstvo. Autonomaši su dolazili iz redova dalmatinske elite i smatrali su da upravo elita treba odlučivati, iako je malobrojna u odnosu na seljaštvo.<sup>21</sup> Vjerovali su da bi ujedinjenje zapravo predstavljalo podčinjavanje Dalmacije Zagrebu i isticali su slogan „Slaveni sutra, Hrvati nikad“.<sup>22</sup> Njihova snaga šezdesetih godina uglavnom je proizlazila iz povezanosti s režimom. Austrijski činovnici bojali su se ujedinjenja jer su vjerovali da bi ih ono dovelo do gubitka položaja.<sup>23</sup> Razjedinjenost je odgovarala i austrijskim vlastima. Ako bi došlo do ujedinjenja, ojačala bi Ugarska jer bi ujedinjena Trojedna kraljevina bila pod ugarskom krunom te bi se javila opasnost da se taj, ojačani ugarski dio Monarhije u potpunosti osamostali. Nasuprot tomu, razjedinjenost je omogućavala Austriji iskorištavanje banske Hrvatske za obuzdavanje Ugarske, korištenje Vojne krajine za dobivanje jeftine vojske, a Dalmacija i Istra osiguravale su joj izlaz na more.<sup>24</sup> Stoga je Austriji odgovaralo postojeće stanje, pripadnost Dalmacije austrijskom dijelu Monarhije i njezina odvojenost od banske Hrvatske.

Pored činovnika, autonomašima su pripadali i pripadnici drugih zanimanja, razni posjednici te malen broj stranaca, većinom Talijana. Uglavnom ih je toj stranci privlačila želja za zaštitom svoga gospodarskog položaja, kao i vjerovanje da su talijanski jezik i kultura oznaka veće vrijednosti. Sebe su proglašavali njihovim zaštitnicima,

support to the party, which regularly won parliamentary seats in areas where they represented the majority of the population. Serbian voters chose ethnic candidates, regardless of their Serbian or Croatian origin.<sup>20</sup> However, this unity was gradually disturbed until it reached the final collapse of the party on the ethnic principle, and one of the stages was the situation regarding the compatriotism.

The opposing political options to People's Party in the sixties were Autonomists, who opposed the unification and advocated for the Italian as the official language. Some of them emphasized Dalmatia's distinct Slavic identity, while some more openly emphasized its Italian identity. Autonomists came from the Dalmatian elite and believed that it was the elite that had to make the decision, although it was small in number in relation to the peasantry.<sup>21</sup> They believed that unification would in fact represent the subjugation of Dalmatia to Zagreb, and emphasized the slogan "We'll be Slavs tomorrow too, but never Croats".<sup>22</sup> Their strength in the sixties was largely due to their affiliation with the regime. Austrian officials feared unification because they believed it would cause loss of their positions.<sup>23</sup> The disparity also was useful to the Austrian authorities. In case of unification, the Hungary would be strengthened because the united Triune Kingdom would be under the Hungarian crown and posing a danger that this strengthened Hungarian part of the Monarchy would become completely independent. Disunity, on the other hand, allowed Austria to exploit Banovina of Croatia in order to restrain Hungary, using the Military Frontier to obtain a cheap army, and Dalmatia and Istria provided its exit to the sea.<sup>24</sup> Therefore, Austria had benefits from the existing situation, the affiliation of Dalmatia with the Austrian part of the Monarchy and its separation from Banovina of Croatia.

Apart from clerks, the Autonomists also gathered members of other professions, various landowners and a small number of foreigners, mainly Italians. In this party they mainly shared the desire to protect their economic position, as well as considering the Italian language and culture to be of higher value.

<sup>20</sup> Petrović 1982: 132-133.

<sup>21</sup> Vrandečić 2002: 88.

<sup>22</sup> „Slavi anche domani, Croati mai.“

<sup>23</sup> Vrandečić 2002: 89.

<sup>24</sup> Perić 2002: 180.

<sup>20</sup> Petrović 1982: 132-133.

<sup>21</sup> Vrandečić 2002: 88.

<sup>22</sup> „Slavi anche domani, Croati mai.“

<sup>23</sup> Vrandečić 2002: 89.

<sup>24</sup> Perić 2002: 180.

iako često nisu bili odgajani u duhu talijanske kulture niti su dobro poznavali talijanski jezik.<sup>25</sup> Za razliku od nižega katoličkog svećenstva koje je bilo možda najčvršći oslonac narodnjaka, viši je kler podržavao autonomaše. Njegovi pripadnici su većinom bili stranci koji nisu znali hrvatski jezik, ili domaći ljudi obrazovani na stranom jeziku koji su zaboravili na svoje podrijetlo. U svakodnevnom životu i za vođenje crkvenih poslova koristili su talijanski jezik. Bili su povezani s bogatijim građanima, a za dolazak na visoke crkvene položaje i ostanak na njima trebala im je naklonost austrijske vlade, pa je bilo razumljivo da pristaju uz režimsku opciju.<sup>26</sup>

Odnos snaga u Dalmatinskom saboru šezdesetih je godina bio povoljan za autonomaše. Zastupnici su birani prema kurijalnom sustavu. Postojale su četiri kurije odnosno razreda: kurija veleporoznika, kurija gradova, trgovačko-obrtnička kurija i kurija vanjskih (seoskih) općina. Takav izborni sustav bio je skrojen po mjeri autonomaša jer je davao prednost građanima kojih je u Dalmaciji tada bilo oko 40.000, od ukupno 425.000 stanovnika.<sup>27</sup> Sam Mihovil Pavlinović izjavio je da u Dalmaciji 15.000 Talijana može birati 23 zastupnika, a 410.000 Hrvata ima pravo odabrati najviše 20 zastupnika i to pod uvjetom da nema izbornog nasilja.<sup>28</sup> Međutim, krajem desetljeća autonomaši su izgubili jedan od najvažnijih izvora svoje političke snage, potporu režima.

Narodna stranka prvi je put osvojila većinu u Dalmatinskom saboru na izborima 1870., održanima u uvjetima sukoba centralista i federalista u Carevinskom vijeću. Na mjesto austrijskog premijera došao je Alfred Potocki, a na mjesto ministra unutarnjih poslova već spominjani Eduard Taaffe. Potonji je izjavio da austrijska vlada želi Dalmatinski sabor učiniti istinskim predstavništvom Dalmacije koje će joj pomagati u upravljanju pokrajinom. Istinsko predstavništvo značilo je da bi većinu u Saboru trebala imati ona opcija koja je imala veću podršku u narodu, a to su bili narodnjaci. Jedino što je vlada tražila zauzvrat bio je odabir

They proclaimed themselves patrons of Italian culture, although they were often not raised in the spirit of Italian culture or had a good command of the Italian language.<sup>25</sup> Unlike the lower Catholic clergy, which was perhaps the strongest support of the Populists, the higher clergy supported the Autonomists. Its members were mostly foreigners who did not speak Croatian language, or local people educated in a foreign language who had forgotten their ancestry. The Italian language was present in their daily lives and in the conduct of church affairs. They were associated with wealthier citizens, and in order to reach high church positions and remain on them, they needed the affection of the Austrian government, so it made sense to agree to the regime's option.<sup>26</sup>

The balance of power in the Dalmatian Parliament of the sixties was favourable to the Autonomists. The Representatives were elected according to the curial electoral system. There were four curiae, that is, categories: the Curia of Large Taxpayers, the Towns, the Chamber of Trades and Crafts, and the Village Districts. Such electoral system was tailor-made for Autonomists, as it favoured about 40,000 citizens in Dalmatia of that time, out of a total population of 425,000.<sup>27</sup> Mihovil Pavlinović himself stated that 15,000 Italians in Dalmatia can elect 23 Representatives, and 410,000 Croats have the right to elect a maximum of 20 Representatives, provided that there is no electoral violence.<sup>28</sup> However, at the end of the decade, Autonomists lost one of the most important sources of their political strength, the regime's support.

The People's Party won the majority for the first time in the Dalmatian Parliament in the elections of 1870 that were held in the face of a conflict between centralists and federalists in the Imperial Council. Alfred Potocki replaced the Austrian Prime Minister and already mentioned Eduard Taaffe became Minister of the Interior. The latter stated that the Austrian government wanted to make the Dalmatian Parliament a true representative of Dalmatia that would help it to govern the province. The true representation meant that the majority in Parliament should have had an option of greater support among the people, namely the People's

<sup>25</sup> Perić 1978: 54-55.

<sup>26</sup> Petrović 1982: 117.

<sup>27</sup> Petrović 1982: 222.

<sup>28</sup> Vrandečić 2002: 105.

<sup>25</sup> Perić 1978: 54-55.

<sup>26</sup> Petrović 1982: 117.

<sup>27</sup> Petrović 1982: 222.

<sup>28</sup> Vrandečić 2002: 105.



i slanje zastupnika u Carevinsko vijeće.<sup>29</sup> Na promjenu stava potaknuo ju je i Krivošijski ustanak iz 1869. u kojem su se stanovnici Boka kotorske pobunili protiv pokušaja uvođenja opće vojne obveze. Ključnu ulogu u smirivanju ustanka odigrao je general Gavriilo Rodić, koji će nešto kasnije postati dalmatinski namjesnik. On je izradio memorandum na temelju kojeg je vlada naposljetku provela pacifikaciju. Za razliku od tadašnjega dalmatinskog namjesnika Johanna Wagnera, koji je tvrdio da je ustanak potaknut izvana i da ima jugoslaven-ski i panslavistički karakter te da stoga može ugroziti opstojnost Monarhije, Rodić je smatrao da je njegov karakter lokalni i da mu je uzrok nepoznavanje nacionalnih potreba od strane vlasti. Car je prihvatio njegov plan koji je predviđao promjenu stava vlade prema Dalmaciji u smjeru zadovoljavanja težnji slavenske većine.<sup>30</sup>

Dobivši većinu u Dalmatinskom saboru, narodnjaci su trebali odlučiti o slanju zastupnika u Carevinsko vijeće. To je moglo biti problematično, jer bi uključivanje dalmatinskih zastupnika u rad Carevinskog vijeća značilo da Dalmacija priznaje ustroj Monarhije iako do ujedinjenja s banskom Hrvatskom nije došlo. Prevladalo je načelo kompromisa. Narodnjački vođa Miho Klaić u Dalmatinskom je saboru govorio o pravu Dalmacije na ujedinjenje s banskom Hrvatskom, ali je dodao da zbog teška stanja u objema zemljama, teške međunarodne situacije i vjernosti Dalmatinaca kruni, ujedinjenje ne treba tražiti pod svaku cijenu, nego treba poslati zastupnike u Carevinsko vijeće i tražiti od cara oblikovanje pravnih preduvjeta za ujedinjenje u budućnosti. Na istome saborskom zasjedanju prihvaćena je adresa kojom se od cara tražilo ujedinjenje Dalmacije s banskom Hrvatskom na temelju državnog prava, o kojem bi odlučivali legalni predstavnici jedne i druge zemlje. U adresi je istaknuta nada u pozitivan odgovor cara i odlučeno je da će dalmatinski predstavnici otići u Carevinsko vijeće. Određena su petorica dalmatinskih zastupnika iz redova narodnjaka: Stefan Ljubiša, Ivan Danilo, Josip Antonnietti, Đuro Vojnović i Pero Budmani.<sup>31</sup>

Party. The only thing the government asked for in return was to select and send Representatives to the Imperial Council.<sup>29</sup> It was also encouraged to change its attitude by The Krivošije uprising of 1869 (Croatian: Krivošijski ustanak), in which the people of Boka Kotorska rebelled against an attempt to introduce a general military obligation. General Gavriilo Rodić, who would later become the Dalmatian governor, played a key role in calming the uprising. He drafted a memorandum on the basis of which the government eventually conducted the pacification. Unlike Johann Wagner, a governor of Dalmatia at that time, who claimed that the uprising was externally driven and had a Yugoslav and Pan-Slavic character and could therefore jeopardize the existence of the Monarchy, Rodić believed that it had local character caused by the lack of understanding of the national needs caused by authorities. The emperor accepted his plan, which envisaged a change of attitude of the government towards Dalmatia in satisfying the aspirations of the Slavic majority.<sup>30</sup>

Having won majority votes in Dalmatian Parliament, the People's Party needed to decide on sending the Representatives to the Imperial Council. This could have been problematic, since the inclusion of Dalmatian Representatives in the work of the Imperial Council would mean that Dalmatia recognized the constitution of the Monarchy even though it did not unite with Banovina of Croatia. The principle of compromise prevailed. Populist leader Miho Klaić spoke at the Dalmatian Parliament about Dalmatia's right to unite with Banovina of Croatia, but added that due to the difficult situation in both countries, the difficult international situation and the Croat's loyalty to the Crown, unification should not be sought at all costs. He stated that the Representatives should be sent to the Imperial Council and asks the Emperor to formulate the legal preconditions for unification in the future. A letter asking the emperor to unite Dalmatia with Banovina of Croatia on the basis of state law was adopted at the same parliamentary session, and to be decided upon by legal Representatives of both countries. The letter highlighted the hope of a positive response from the emperor and it was decided that the Dalmatian Representatives would go to the Imperial Council. Five Dalmatian Representatives were

<sup>29</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 173-174.

<sup>30</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 150-151.

<sup>31</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 178-179.

<sup>29</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 173-174.

<sup>30</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 150-151.

## Izbori za nevolju i prijedlog izborne reforme

Izbori za nevolju služili su popunjavanju Carevinskog vijeća u slučaju da neki od zemaljskih sabora odbije izabrati zastupnike, ili u slučaju apstinencije izabranih zastupnika. To su bili izravni izbori kojima bi se pribjegavalo ako se Vijeće ne bi moglo popuniti na standardni način. Petorica dalmatinskih zastupnika u Carevinskom su vijeću podržala Zakon o izborima za nevolju i upravo su njihovi glasovi bili presudni. Od ukupno 203 zastupnika, zakon su poduprla 93 njemačka liberala te šestorica talijanskih zastupnika iz Istre, Trsta i Gorice. Uz glasove petorice Dalmatinaca, Zakon o izborima za nevolju u Carevinskom je vijeću prošao s tijesnom većinom od 104 glasa. Bečka vlada zauzvrat je dalmatinskim zastupnicima dala određena obećanja: uvođenje hrvatskog jezika u upravu Dalmacije, imenovanje nekih istaknutih narodnjaka na položaje u dalmatinskim upravnim tijelima te početak radova na izgradnji željeznica u Dalmaciji i isušivanju močvarnog ušća Neretve.<sup>32</sup>

Kontroverzan postupak pokušao je opravdati jedan od petorice, Ivan Danilo, u knjižici pod naslovom *Izbor za nevolju i dalmatinski zastupnici na Carevinskom vijeću*, gdje je nastojao dokazati da je podrška dalmatinskih zastupnika spornom zakonu za narod bila korisna, a ne štetna. Pozivao se na dvije adrese koje su uputili caru nakon što su izabrani prvi put 1870. i ponovno 1871. U njima su zatražili ujedinjenje Dalmacije s banskom Hrvatskom na temelju narodnog prava te veće ovlasti Dalmatinskog sabora i veću samostalnost u upravi. Adresama je predviđeno slanje dalmatinskih zastupnika u Carevinsko vijeće, ali je istaknuta privremenost veze između Dalmacije i ostalih zemalja zastupanih u njemu.<sup>33</sup> Ništa od toga, prema Danilu, podržavanjem Zakona o izborima za nevolju nije prekršeno jer pitanje ujedinjenja rješavaju sabori u dogovoru s carem, a ne Carevinsko vijeće. Također, Danilo u izborima za nevolju nije vidio korak prema trajnu uvođenju izravnih izbora za Carevinsko vijeće.

appointed: Stefan Ljubiša, Ivan Danilo, Josip Antonietti, Đuro Vojnović and Pero Budmani.<sup>31</sup>

## Emergency electoral law and the proposal for electoral reform

Emergency electoral law served to complete the Imperial Council in case some of the National Councils refused to elect Representatives, or in the case of abstention of elected Representatives. These were direct elections to be resorted to if the Council could not be completed in the standard manner. Five Dalmatian Representatives endorsed the Emergency electoral law in the Imperial Council, and their votes were crucial. Of the 203 Representatives, the Law was supported by 93 German Liberals and 6 Italian Representatives from Istria, Trieste and Gorizia. With the votes of five Dalmatians, the Emergency electoral law passed a narrow majority of 104 votes in the Imperial Council. The Viennese government, in turn, made some promises to Dalmatian Representatives: the introduction of the Croatian language into the administration of Dalmatia, the appointment of some prominent Populists to positions in the Dalmatian governing bodies, the commencement of construction work on railways in Dalmatia and the drainage of the Neretva wetlands.<sup>32</sup>

Ivan Danilo, one of the five, tried to justify the controversial process in a booklet entitled *Emergency electoral law and Dalmatian Representatives at the Imperial Council*, where he sought to prove that the support of Dalmatian Representatives was controversial and not harmful to the people. He referred to the two letters they sent to the emperor after being elected for the first time in 1870 and again in 1871. In them, they demanded the unification of Dalmatia with Banovina of Croatia on the basis of the national law and the greater authority of the Dalmatian Parliament. Also they demanded greater independence in the administration. The letters stated sending of Dalmatian Representatives to the Imperial Council, but emphasized the temporary nature of the connection between Dalmatia and the other countries represented in it.<sup>33</sup> According to Danilo, none of this has been violated by supporting the Emergency electoral law

<sup>32</sup> Rajčić 2014: 219.

<sup>33</sup> Danilo 1872: 7.

<sup>31</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 178-179.

<sup>32</sup> Rajčić 2014: 219.

<sup>33</sup> Danilo 1872: 7.

Njihov je jedini cilj, isticao je, osigurati trajnu popunjenost Carevinskog vijeća.<sup>34</sup>

Danilo je također tvrdio da dalmatinski zastupnici nisu izdali federalistička i panslavistička načela Narodne stranke jer među Slavenima u Monarhiji ionako nema sloge. Po njemu je u revoluciji 1848. posijano sjeme slavenske uzajamnosti, ali ono nije dalo ploda zato što je svaki od slavenskih naroda u Monarhiji, nakon državnog preustroja 1860., brinuo za svoje, a ne za slavenske interese. Počelo se govoriti o federalizmu, ali nije bilo zajedničkog djelovanja slavenskih naroda u tom smjeru.<sup>35</sup> U takvim uvjetima slavenske nesloge, govorio je dalje Danilo, dalmatinski zastupnici morali su postupiti u skladu s interesima svoje zemlje i svoga naroda, a podržavanjem izbora za nevolju to su i učinili. Tvrdio je da bi vlada svakako imala potrebnu većinu, jer bi joj se vjerojatno priklonilo i 38 neodlučnih poljskih zastupnika, a čak i da zakon nije dobio potrebnu većinu, ne bi bila srušena. Da je opstanak vlade ovisio o njegovu izglasavanju, smatrao je Danilo, Nijemci bi se nagodili s Poljacima kako bi spriječili pad vlade i opasnost od federalizacije. Prema tome, dalmatinski su zastupnici glasovanjem protiv Zakona o izborima za nevolju mogli naštetiti jedino Dalmaciji.<sup>36</sup>

Danilo je isticao pozitivan stav bečke vlade prema narodnjačkoj vlasti u Dalmaciji. Govorio je da su neki ministri tvrdili da su narodnjaci poboljšali upravu u Dalmaciji i da su spremni i ubuduće podržavati vlast koja je u duhu narodne većine. Takav stav bečke vlade smatrao je korisnim za Dalmaciju i naglasio je da bi neposluh mogao tu istu vladu navesti na ponovno pružanje potpore autonomašima.<sup>37</sup> Jedini koji su oštećeni postupkom dalmatinskih zastupnika bili su upravo autonomaši, odnosno narodni dušmani, kako ih Danilo naziva, jer im je propala prigoda da povrate kontrolu nad Dalmacijom i ponovno narod gurnu u stare nevolje.<sup>38</sup> Danilo je zaključio da su se dalmatinski zastupnici u Carevinskom vijeću vodili načelom narodnosti, tražeći ono što

because the issue of unification was to be settled by the councils in agreement with the Emperor and not by the Imperial Council. Also, Danilo saw no basis towards the permanent introduction of direct elections to the Imperial Council in the Emergency electoral law. Their sole aim, he emphasized, was to ensure the permanent fulfilment of the Imperial Council.<sup>34</sup>

Danilo also claimed that Dalmatian Representatives did not betray the federalist and Pan-Slavic principles of the People's Party because there was no consensus among Slavs in the Monarchy anyway. According to him, the seeds of Slavic Reciprocity were sown in the revolution of 1848, but it did not bear fruit because each of the Slavic peoples in the Monarchy cared for their own and not the Slavic interests after the state reorganization in 1860. The federalism became conversation subject, but there was no concerted action by the Slavic peoples in that direction.<sup>35</sup> In such conditions of Slavic dissent, Danilo further said, Dalmatian Representatives had to act in accordance with the interests of their country and their people, and by supporting the Emergency electoral law they did so. He claimed that the government would certainly have the required majority, as the 38 undecided Polish Representatives would probably favour it, and even if the law did not get the required majority, it would not be overthrown. Had the survival of the government been dependent on his vote, Danilo believed, the Germans would have made a deal with the Poles to prevent the government from collapsing and the danger of federalisation. Therefore, the Dalmatian Representatives could only hurt Dalmatia by voting against the Election Law.<sup>36</sup>

Danilo emphasized the positive attitude of the Viennese government towards the populist government in Dalmatia. He said that some ministers claimed that the Populists had improved administration in Dalmatia and that they were ready to continue to support a majority oriented government in the future. He considered such an attitude of the Viennese government useful for Dalmatia, and emphasized that disobedience could lead the same government to support the Autonomists again.<sup>37</sup> The only ones who were harmed by the actions of the Dalmatian Representatives were the

<sup>34</sup> Danilo 1872: 7-8.

<sup>35</sup> Danilo 1872: 11-14.

<sup>36</sup> Danilo 1872: 20-23.

<sup>37</sup> Danilo 1872: 23-25.

<sup>38</sup> Danilo 1872: 33.

<sup>34</sup> Danilo 1872: 7-8.

<sup>35</sup> Danilo 1872: 11-14.

<sup>36</sup> Danilo 1872: 20-23.

<sup>37</sup> Danilo 1872: 23-25.

je najbolje za Dalmaciju. Tako postupaju i ostali narodi, a to što se načela slavenstva i federalizma nisu ostvarila, nije njihova krivnja.<sup>39</sup>

Neki su narodnjaci bili nezadovoljni postupkom petorice zastupnika. Među takvima isticali su se Dubrovčani Pero Čingrija i Rafo Pucić koji su napustili saborski klub Narodne stranke. Međutim, Klaić se složio s postupkom, smatrajući da je on koristan za Dalmaciju i usklađen s pragmatičnom politikom kakvu su narodnjaci prihvatili nakon pobjede na dalmatinskim izborima 1870. Takav je bio i stav *Narodnog lista*, stranačkog glasila. Postupak je opravdavao i Stefan Ljubiša, jedan od te petorice, tvrdeći da on čak otvara prostor za dobivanje većine u Carevinskom vijeću.<sup>40</sup> Podrška dalmatinskih zastupnika Zakonu o izborima za nevolju nije značajnije oštetila Narodnu stranku. Jedino je jedan od petorice, Pero Budmani, pod pritiskom nezadovoljnog dijela javnosti podnio ostavku pa ga je zamijenio Josip Fontana.<sup>41</sup> Česi su i dalje bojkotirali Carevinsko vijeće pa se pojavila mogućnost trajnog uvođenja izravnih izbora za Carevinsko vijeće. Ta je opcija Narodnoj stranci bila potpuno neprihvatljiva.

*Narodni list* zauzeo je beskompromisan stav prema mogućnosti izborne reforme. Hvalio je Čehe koji su odlučili staviti na stranu osobne razmirice i ujediniti se protiv pokušaja uspostave Velike Njemačke te je pozvao na proširenje sloge na sve Slavene „od Balkana do Vltave“ kako bi se uništili dušmani i njihovi sramotni okovi.<sup>42</sup> U izbornoj reformi vidio je udarac na narodnu slobodu i samostalnost pod krinkom zakona. Pisao je da bi se reformom ukinuo najvažniji plod slobode, mogućnost odabira svojih ljudi u sabor koji onda odabire narodne zastupnike za Carevinsko vijeće. Ti se zastupnici zajedno s kraljem brinu da se narodu ne čini nepravda. Sada se, tvrdio je *Narodni list*, „Bečlijce“,<sup>43</sup> koji su navikli „šibom i mamuzom narode tjerati“ trude ukinuti to pravo slavenskim narodima koji su „grane istog panja“, zbog straha da ne budu preglasani i tako izgube mogućnost

Autonomists, that is, the national enemies, as Danilo calls them, because they had missed the opportunity to regain control of Dalmatia and put the people back into the old troubles.<sup>38</sup> Danilo concluded that Dalmatian Representatives in the Imperial Council were guided by the principle of nationality, seeking what was best for Dalmatia. Other peoples do the same, and it is not their fault that the principles of Slavism and federalism have not materialized.<sup>39</sup>

Some Populists were dissatisfied with the treatment of the five Representatives. Pero Čingrija and Rafo Pucić from Dubrovnik, who left the People's Party parliamentary club, particularly stood out. Nevertheless, Klaić agreed with that decision, considering it to be useful for Dalmatia and in line with the pragmatic policy accepted by the Populists after winning the 1870 Dalmatian elections. Such was the attitude of the party newspaper *Narodni list*. Stefan Ljubiša, one of the five Representatives, justified the proceedings, claiming that it was even opening the space for a majority in the Imperial Council.<sup>40</sup> The support of Dalmatian Representatives for the Emergency electoral law did not significantly damage the People's Party. The only one of the five, Pero Budmani, resigned under pressure from unsatisfied part of the public and was replaced by Josip Fontana.<sup>41</sup> The Czechs continued to boycott the Imperial Council which led to a possibility of permanent introduction of direct elections to the Imperial Council. This option was completely unacceptable to the People's Party.

The newspaper *Narodni list* has taken an uncompromising stance on the possibility of electoral reform. It praised the Czechs who have decided to put aside personal differences and unite against attempts for establishing a Greater Germany and called for expansion of unanimity among all Slavs “from the Balkans to the Vltava” in order to destroy enemies and their shameful shackles.<sup>42</sup> It saw electoral reform being under the disguise of law a powerful blow to national freedom and independence and it wrote that the reform would abolish the most important fruit of freedom, the possibility of electing its people to the parliament, which

<sup>39</sup> Danilo 1872: 32-33.

<sup>40</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 187-188.

<sup>41</sup> Rajčić 2014: 219.

<sup>42</sup> “Sloga u Českoj”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 4.

<sup>43</sup> Misli se na članove austrijske vlade.

<sup>38</sup> Danilo 1872: 33.

<sup>39</sup> Danilo 1872: 32-33.

<sup>40</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 187-188.

<sup>41</sup> Rajčić 2014: 219.

<sup>42</sup> “Sloga u Českoj”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 4.

tlačenja Slavena. Ako bi uspjeli, stvorili bi situaciju jedinstvenu u svijetu, da u austrijskom dijelu Monarhije jedan narod, štoviše jedna stranka, nameće svoju volju svim ostalim narodima.<sup>44</sup>

*Narodni list* u predloženoj je izbornoj reformi vidio opasnost od značajna smanjenja broja slavenskih zastupnika u Carevinskom vijeću. Predviđao je organiziranje izbornih kotara na način da bi većinu zastupnika dobili krajevi u kojima žive njemački obrtnici i trgovci, dok bi općine sa slavenskom većinom jedva dobile ponekog zastupnika. Prijedlogu reforme zamjerao je i naklonost bogatim biračima, ironično dodajući da poštteni državljani moraju još pričekati da sazrije njemačka ustavnost prije nego dobiju pravo glasa.<sup>45</sup> Zaključio je da njemački prijedlog izborne reforme nije bezopasan kao izbori za nevolju, već nasrće na narodno pravo i ponos, a oni se ne mogu kupiti, čak niti obećanjem izgradnje dalmatinske željeznice.<sup>46</sup>

Na tragu stavova iznesenih u *Narodnom listu* bio je i stav saborskog kluba Narodne stranke. Na sjednici održanoj 11. veljače 1873. donesena je jednoglasna odluka prema kojoj su dalmatinski zastupnici trebali glasovati protiv izborne reforme te napustiti Carevinsko vijeće ako ga napuste i Poljaci. *Narodni list* odbacio je spekulacije da će dalmatinski zastupnici podržati izbornu reformu potaknuti vladinim obećanjima, tvrdeći da oni neće trgovati svojim poštenjem i poštenjem svoje domovine te da je Dalmacija iz svake neprilike izašla čista i da u njoj nema odmetnika.<sup>47</sup> Međutim, ishod glasovanja provedena 6. ožujka bio je drugačiji. Poljaci su napustili Carevinsko vijeće, ali dalmatinski zastupnici nisu krenuli za njima, već su poduprli reformu koja je i usvojena uvjerljivom većinom od 120 glasova „za“ i samo dva glasa „protiv“.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>44</sup> „Njemačka ustavnost I.,” *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 9.

<sup>45</sup> Kod izravnih izbora za Carevinsko vijeće također se koristio kurijalni izborni sustav. On nije odgovarao Slavenima jer oni, osim Poljaka, nisu u većem broju pripadali bogatijim društvenim slojevima. U Dalmaciji nije bilo njemačkih obrtnika i trgovaca u značajnijem broju, ali narodnjaci su u kurijalnom sustavu vidjeli opasnost od ponovnog jačanja autonomaša.

<sup>46</sup> „Njemačka ustavnost II.,” *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 10.

<sup>47</sup> „U Zadru, 26 veljače,” *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 17.

<sup>48</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 191.

then elects Representatives for the Imperial Council. These Representatives, along with the King, make sure that no injustice is done to the people. Now, according to *Narodni list*, the “Viennese”<sup>43</sup> who are used to “chase the people with the whip and the lure” are trying to abolish this right to Slavic peoples who are “branches of the same stump” for fear of being overpowered and thus lose the possibility of oppressing the Slavs. If they succeeded, they would have created a unique situation in the world, which in the Austrian part of the Monarchy one nation, moreover one party, would impose its will on all other nations.<sup>44</sup>

In the proposed electoral reform, *Narodni list* saw the danger of a significant reduction in the number of Slavic Representatives in the Imperial Council. It envisaged organizing electoral districts in such a way that the majority of the Representatives would be given the places where German artisans and traders live, while the municipalities with the Slavic majority would scarcely receive some Representatives. It also resented the affection for wealthy voters, ironically adding that honest citizens still have to wait for German constitutionality to mature before they can vote.<sup>45</sup> It concluded that the German proposal for electoral reform was not harmless as the Emergency electoral law, but invades the national law and pride which could not be bought, even with the promise of building a Dalmatian railway.<sup>46</sup>

In the wake of the views expressed in *Narodni list* was the attitude of the People's Party Parliamentary Club. At a session held on February 11, 1873, a unanimous decision was made that the Dalmatian Representatives should vote against the electoral reform and leave the Imperial Council if left by the Poles as well. *Narodni list* has rejected speculation that Dalmatian Representatives will support electoral reform, boosted by promises of the government, claiming that they would not trade their and honesty of their homeland, and that Dalmatia has always come out

<sup>43</sup> It refers to members of the Austrian government.

<sup>44</sup> „Njemačka ustavnost I.,” *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 9.

<sup>45</sup> In the direct elections to the Imperial Council, the Curial election system was also used. It did not suit the Slavs because they, except the Poles, did not belong to the richer social classes. In Dalmatia there were no German craftsmen and traders in significant numbers, but the Populists saw in the curial system the danger of re-strengthening the Autonomists.

<sup>46</sup> „Njemačka ustavnost II.,” *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 10.

Usljedila je žestoka reakcija *Narodnog lista*. Dva dana nakon izglasavanja izborne reforme objavljeno je prosvjedno pismo koje su petorici zastupnika uputili istaknuti narodnjaci Miho Klaić, Edvard Takoni, Ivan Vranković, Kažimir Ljubić, Josip Paštrović i Mihovil Pavlinović. Potpisnici pisma zastupnike su prozvali zato što su podržali izbornu preinaku koja vrijeđa temeljno pravo pokrajinskih sabora i ugrožava narodnu slobodu Slavena u Monarhiji iako im je bio poznat stav Dalmacije o tom pitanju.<sup>49</sup> U istom broju petorica su zastupnika proglašena odmetnicima koji su se „prodali“ obećanjima bečke vlade, riječima: „Ako joj se dade u cieniu glasa, kako se pohvali i lani i ove godine, željeznica, pokrajinska vlast u ruke, narodni jezik preko zubi, tad ćemo znati da je prodala izmorena prvorodjenstvo svoje za pladanj leće.“<sup>50</sup> *Narodni list* tom se prigodom oodrekao petorice zastupnika, rekavši da će ih rado darovati vladi, a da će narod na sljedećim izborima odabrati nove zastupnike, neovisne i poštene.<sup>51</sup> U narednim brojevima *Narodnog lista* objavljeno je više poruka narodnjaka i njihovih pristaša koji su izražavali podršku prosvjednom pismu.<sup>52</sup>

Petorica zastupnika branila su svoj postupak sličnim argumentima kao i u slučaju glasovanja za Zakon o izborima za nevolju. Tvrdili su da su svojim glasovanjem za izbornu reformu zaštitili Dalmaciju od negativne reakcije vlade koja bi sigurno uslijedila da su glasovali protiv. Osim toga, tvrdili su da nisu dobili službenu uputu od saborskog kluba jer se on nije ni sastao. Ivan Danilo u svome je odgovoru na prosvjedno pismo naveo da je klub zastupnicima dao slobodu odlučivanja i da su oni svojim postupkom pridonijeli glavnom cilju stranke, razvoju narodnosti i jezika te je podsjetio da je saborska većina godinu dana ranije prihvatila Zakon o izborima za nevolju. Također je dodao

clean and had no apostates in it.<sup>47</sup> However, the outcome of the March 6 vote was different. The Poles left the Imperial Council, but the Dalmatian Representatives did not follow them. They supported the reform, which was adopted by a convincing majority of 120 votes and only two votes against.<sup>48</sup>

A fierce reaction from *Narodni list* ensued. Two days after the vote on the election reform, a letter of protest was issued, sent to five Representatives by prominent Populists Miho Klaić, Edward Takoni, Ivan Vranković, Kazimir Ljubić, Josip Paštrović and Mihovil Pavlinović. The signatories called on the Representatives because they supported an electoral modification that offended the fundamental right of the Provincial Councils and threatened the Slavs' national freedom in the Monarchy, even though they were aware of Dalmatia's position on the issue.<sup>49</sup> In the same issue, five Representatives were declared apostates who "sold themselves" to the promises of the Viennese government, saying: "If given the price of a vote, praised last year and the present, the railway, provincial power, the vernacular spoken, then we shall know that it sold its weary birth right for a tray of lentils."<sup>50</sup> On this occasion *Narodni list* renounced the five Representatives, saying that it would gladly donate them to the government, and that the people would choose new Representatives in the next elections, who would be independent and fair.<sup>51</sup> The following issues of *Narodni list* published several messages written by Populists and their supporters expressing support to the protest letter.<sup>52</sup>

The five Representatives defended their procedure using similar arguments as in the case of voting for the Emergency electoral law. They claimed that by voting in favour of electoral reform, they had protected Dalmatia from the negative reaction of the government, which would surely have followed had they voted against. In addition, they claimed that they had not received official instruction from the Parliamentary Club because it had not even met. In his response to

<sup>49</sup> *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 20.

<sup>50</sup> Aludira se na biblijsku priču o Izakovu sinu Ezavu, koji je bratu Jakovu prodao prvorodstvo za zdjelu leće (Post 25, 29-34). U stvari se govori da su zastupnici jeftino prodali nešto jako vrijedno, a to je narodno poštenje.

<sup>51</sup> "Šest ožujka 1873.", *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 20.

<sup>52</sup> *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 21, 22, 23, 24.

<sup>47</sup> "U Zadru, 26 veljače", *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 17.

<sup>48</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 191.

<sup>49</sup> *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 20.

<sup>50</sup> Alludes to the biblical story of Isaac's son Esau, who sold the birthright to his brother Jacob for a bowl of lentils. In fact, it is said that Representatives sold something very valuable for cheap price, which is people's honesty.

<sup>51</sup> "Šest ožujka 1873.", *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 20.

<sup>52</sup> *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 21, 22, 23, 24.

da šestorica potpisnika prosvjednog pisma ne predstavljaju saborsku većinu.<sup>53</sup> *Narodni list* pokušavao je objasniti u čemu je razlika između izbora za nevolju i izborne reforme. Pisao je da su dalmatinski zastupnici glasovanjem za izbore za nevolju poručili vladi da joj neće praviti probleme ako bude pravedna prema narodu. To je bio pragmatičan postupak u kojem se prije svega gledao interes Dalmacije. Izborna je reforma, s druge strane, sredstvo kojim se pokušava saborima oduzeti njihovo temeljno pravo i tako „vezati noge i ruke“ Slavenima u Monarhiji. Jedino što bi Dalmacija dobila zauzvrat bio bi jedan ili dva zastupnika više u Carevinskom vijeću i postupno uvođenje ravnopravnosti hrvatskog i talijanskog jezika i to pod uvjetom da „bečka gospoda“<sup>54</sup> uzmu u obzir želje Dalmatinskog sabora.<sup>55</sup>

Dalmatinski zastupnici u Carevinskom vijeću smatrali su da je potpora izbornoj reformi također pragmatičan čin. Tvrdili su da njihovi glasovi ne mogu srušiti reformu, ali zato mogu potaknuti vladu na ponovnu suradnju s autonomasima te su vjerovali vladinim obećanjima da će podupirati narodnjake, širiti hrvatski jezik, započeti s izgradnjom željeznice i regulacijom Neretve te razvijati poljoprivredu.<sup>56</sup> S druge strane, vodstvo Narodne stranke smatralo je da su oni tim činom izdali dalmatinsko poštenje. Upravo je pojam poštenja bio čest motiv u napadima *Narodnog lista* na petoricu zastupnika. Tako je u Listu objavljen komentar na proglaš koji su zastupnici uputili narodu poručivši mu da prosudi tko mu bolje čini, oni koji nude prazne riječi, ili oni koji mu nastoje osigurati materijalni i duhovni napredak. U odgovoru *Narodnog lista* stoji da je petoricu zastupnika izabrao Dalmatinski sabor, a oni su glasujući za izbornu reformu pogazili njegovo temeljno pravo. Ističe se poštenje u ime kojeg se i prosvjeduje protiv postupka petorice, a koje oni smatraju praznom riječi. Narod koji ne gleda na poštenje, pisao je *Narodni list*, lopovski je i ropski narod. Nakon

the letter of protest, Ivan Danilo stated that the Club had given members the freedom to decide and that through their actions they had contributed to the main goal of the party that is the development of nationalities and languages, and reminded that the parliamentary majority had adopted the Emergency electoral law a year earlier. He also added that the six signatories to the letter of protest did not represent the parliamentary majority.<sup>53</sup> *Narodni list* sought to explain the difference between Emergency electoral law and election reform. It wrote that by voting for the Emergency electoral law they sent the message to the Government that they would not cause problems if it was fair to Dalmatian people. It was a pragmatic action in which the interest of Dalmatia was primarily viewed. Electoral reform, on the other hand, is a means of trying to deprive parliament of their fundamental right and thus “tie feet and hands” of the Slavs in the Monarchy. The only thing Dalmatia would receive in return, would be one or two more Representatives in the Imperial Council and the gradual introduction of equality between the Croatian and Italian languages, provided that the “gentlemen of Vienna”<sup>54</sup> take into account the wishes of the Dalmatian Parliament.<sup>55</sup>

Dalmatian Representatives in the Imperial Council considered support for electoral reform to be also a pragmatic act. They claimed that their votes could not overthrow the reform, but that they could encourage the government to re-engage with the Autonomists, and they believed the government's promises to support the Populists, spread the Croatian language, start building railways and regulating the Neretva River and developing agriculture.<sup>56</sup> On the other hand, the leadership of the People's Party considered that they had betrayed Dalmatian honesty. The very notion of honesty was a frequent motive in the attacks on the five Representatives by *Narodni list*. Thus, a commentary was published on the proclamation sent to the people by the Representatives, calling them to make their own judgement on who is doing better for them, those who offer empty words, or those who seek to secure their material and spiritual progress. *Narodni list* responded that the five Representatives were elected

<sup>53</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 192.

<sup>54</sup> Opet se misli na članove austrijske vlade.

<sup>55</sup> “K položaju”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 22.

<sup>56</sup> Rajčić 2014: 220.

<sup>53</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 192.

<sup>54</sup> Again, referring to members of the Austrian government.

<sup>55</sup> “K položaju”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 22.

<sup>56</sup> Rajčić 2014: 220.

što su izdali poštenje,<sup>57</sup> petorici zastupnika ostaje samo suradnja s vladom i njezina obećanja materijalnog napretka. Na taj način mogu steći neke pristaše, ali narod će ih se odreći, zaključio je *Narodni list*.<sup>58</sup>

Posebno se žestoko na zastupnike obrušio Lovre Monti. On je u pismu upućenu Klaiću pisao da je saborska većina pogriješila što ih nije uklonila čim su podržali izbore za nevolju. Nije čudno, govorio je Monti u pismu, što su autonomasi, dok su predstavljali Dalmaciju u Carevinskom vijeću, surađivali s vladom na gušenju narodnog duha, ali druga je stvar kada uz vladu pristaju zastupnici „iz narodnog tabora“. Monti je smatrao da su zastupnici trebali postupati po saborskim uputama, dakle zajedno s ostalim slavenskim zastupnicima tražiti što veća i jednaka prava za Slavene u austrijskom dijelu Monarhije. Svojim se pismom pridružio prosvjedima protiv zastupnika, smatrajući da je njihov postupak bio potaknut prijetnjama ili praznim obećanjima. Na kraju je najavio da Dalmatinci nikada neće klonuti duhom i da će uvijek braniti svoju čast i prava, čak i ako to znači da će Dalmacija uvijek ostati zanemarena od vlade i da će se narodni protivnici još čvršće povezati s dušmanima izvana.<sup>59</sup>

## Secesija u Narodnoj stranci

Kulminacija situacije koju je izazvala potpora izbornoj reformi od strane dalmatinskih zastupnika u Carevinskom vijeću dogodila se kada su se ti zastupnici odvojili od Narodne stranke i osnovali vlastitu Narodnu srednjačku stranku, okupljenu oko novoga političkog lista nazvana *Zemljak*. Od tog su trenutka u Dalmaciji djelovale dvije frakcije Narodne stranke. Prva je bila središnjica stranke okupljena oko *Narodnog lista*, a druga nova stranka čije je članove javnost

by the Dalmatian Parliament, and they voted against its fundamental right by voting for electoral reform. Fairness is being emphasized in the name of protesting the five, which they consider to be an empty word. The people who do not look for honesty, wrote the *Narodni list*, are a rogue and slavish people. After they betrayed honesty,<sup>57</sup> the five Representatives could only remain in cooperation with the government and its promises of material progress. In this way, they could gain some supporters, but the people would give them up, concluded *Narodni list*.<sup>58</sup>

Attacks at the Representatives by Lovre Monti were especially fierce were. He wrote in a letter to Klaić that the parliamentary majority had made the mistake of not resolving them off duties right after they supported the Emergency election law. It doesn't surprise, Monti wrote, that the Autonomists cooperated with the government in suppressing the people's spirit while representing Dalmatia in the Imperial Council, but it is another matter when Representatives "from the people's camp" agree with the government. Monti believed that the Representatives should have followed the parliamentary instructions, and together with other Slavic Representatives, they should have requested as much and equal rights for the Slavs in the Austrian part of the Monarchy. In his letter, he joined the protests against Representatives, believing that their action was fuelled by threats or empty promises. In the end, he announced that the Dalmatians would never die in spirit and would always defend their honour and rights, even if it meant that Dalmatia would always remain neglected by the government and that its opponents would connect with the outsiders more firmly.<sup>59</sup>

## Secession in the People's Party

The culmination of the situation triggered by the Dalmatian Representatives' support to electoral reform in the Imperial Council occurred when these Representatives seceded from the People's Party and

<sup>57</sup> Kada se u *Narodnom listu* postupak petorice zastupnika opisuje kao „izdaja poštenja“, ne želi se reći da su oni počinili neko kriminalno djelo. Misli se na izdaju obraza, časti i dostojanstva, koja je počinjena prihvaćanjem prijedloga bečke vlade.

<sup>58</sup> „U Zadru, 14 ožujka“, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 22.

<sup>59</sup> „Otvoreno pismo. Dru. Mihovilu Klaiću narodnome zastupniku“, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 23.

<sup>57</sup> When *Narodni list* described actions of the five Representatives as “betrayal of honesty” it was not to say that they committed a crime, but rather a betrayal of pride, honor and dignity, which was committed by accepting the proposal of the Government of Vienna.

<sup>58</sup> „U Zadru, 14 ožujka“, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 22.

<sup>59</sup> „Otvoreno pismo. Dru. Mihovilu Klaiću narodnome zastupniku“, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 23.



nazivala „zemljacima“ prema listu koji su izdávali.<sup>60</sup>

Osnovna načela nove stranke istaknuo je urednik *Zemljaka* Josip Tončić u uvodnom članku prvog broja. Pisao je da se zemljački program temelji na dvjema adresama o sjedinjenju koje je Dalmatinski sabor uputio caru. Međutim, dok se to pitanje ne riješi, treba raditi na zaštiti i razvoju hrvatske i srpske narodnosti u Dalmaciji, a to znači prilagoditi se postojećem stanju i raditi na zadovoljavanju stvarnih potreba naroda. Tek kada narodnost ojača, a to se ne može ostvariti bez materijalnog napretka, može se odabrati smjer daljeg djelovanja. Tončić je dodao da zemljaci slavensku uzajamnost ne odbacuju, ali da im je ipak na prvom mjestu razvoj hrvatske i srpske narodnosti u Dalmaciji.<sup>61</sup> Smjer politike koji je zastupao *Narodni list* zemljaci nisu podržavali, smatrajući da je to „velika politika“ koja narodu ne koristi. *Zemljak* je pisao da je Narodna stranka, nakon što je osvojila većinu u Dalmatinskom saboru, uspjela uvjeriti bečku vladu da će ostaviti visoku politiku, odnosno pitanje ujedinjenja, za bolja vremena i raditi na razvoju narodnosti, popravljajući materijalno stanje i uvođenju narodne uprave.<sup>62</sup> Međutim, Narodna stranka i *Narodni list* naprasno su napustili takav smjer politike, a zemljaci će ga se i dalje pridržavati.<sup>63</sup>

Rajčić ističe da zemljaci nisu bili homogena skupina, ni u političkom smislu ni po pitanju narodnosti.<sup>64</sup> Njihov najistaknutiji član i zapravo vođa stranke bio je Stefan Ljubiša, poznata osoba u dalmatinskoj politici. On je bio Srbin iz Boke kotorske i jedan od najznačajnijih narodnjačkih političara u

formed their own Mainstream Folk Party (*Zemljaci*), gathered around a new political newspaper called *Zemljak*. From that moment there were two factions of the People's Party operating in Dalmatia. The first was the centrepiece of a party gathered around *Narodni list*, and the second was a new party whose members were called „Zemljaci“ according to the newspaper they published.<sup>60</sup>

Basic principles of the new party were emphasized by Josip Tončić, editor of *Zemljak*, in the introductory article of the first issue. He wrote that the Mainstream Folk Party's program was based on two letters on unification sent by the Dalmatian Parliament to the Emperor. However, until this issue is resolved, it is necessary to work on protection and development of the Croat and Serb nationalities in Dalmatia, which means adapting to the existing situation and working to meet the real needs of the peoples. The direction of further action can be chosen only when the nationality is strengthened which cannot be achieved without material progress. Tončić added that *Zemljaci* did not reject Slavic Reciprocity, but that the development of the Croat and Serb ethnicity in Dalmatia was their first priority.<sup>61</sup> *Zemljaci* did not support the policy direction advocated by *Narodni list*, believing it to be a “grand policy” that does not benefit the people. *Zemljak* wrote that after winning the majority in the Dalmatian Parliament, the People's Party was able to persuade the Viennese government that it would put aside high politics, i.e. the issue of unification for some better times, and work on developing nationalities, improving material status and introducing national administration.<sup>62</sup> However, the People's Party and *Narodni list* have abandoned such a policy direction, and *Zemljaci* will continue to adhere to it.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>60</sup> Treba napomenuti da političke stranke onog doba nisu funkcionirale na način na koji funkcioniraju današnje političke stranke. Onodobne stranke nisu bile čvrste organizacije čiji članovi posjeduju članske iskaznice, nego skupine ljudi koji dijele mišljenje o nekome važnom političkom pitanju i uglavnom se okupljaju oko novina putem kojih se obraćaju javnosti. Važno pitanje koje je razlikovalo dvije frakcije dalmatinske Narodne stranke bilo je pitanje odnosa prema vladi. Narodna srednjačka stranka postojala je dok je izlazio list *Zemljak*. Nakon što se on ugasio, secesija je prestala, iako su njezine posljedice ostale.

<sup>61</sup> “Naša politika”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 1.

<sup>62</sup> “Narodna stranka u većini”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 2.

<sup>63</sup> “Narodni list’ u prošloj godini”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 3.

<sup>64</sup> Rajčić 2014: 221.

<sup>60</sup> It should be noted that political parties of that time did not function in the way today's political parties function. At the time, the parties were not solid organizations whose members held membership cards, but groups of people who shared an opinion on an important political issue and mostly gathered around newspapers through which they addressed the public. An important issue that distinguished the two factions of the Dalmatian People's Party was the issue of relations with the government. The Mainstream Folk Party existed while the *Zemljak* newspaper was published. After it was extinguished, the secession ceased, although its consequences remained.

<sup>61</sup> “Naša politika”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 1.

<sup>62</sup> “Narodna stranka u većini”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 2.

<sup>63</sup> “Narodni list’ u prošloj godini”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 3.

tom kraju. Obnašao je funkcije predsjednika Dalmatinskog sabora i Zemaljskog odbora<sup>65</sup>, kao i zastupnika u Carevinskom vijeću. U svome političkom djelovanju zalagao se za umjerenost i lojalnost prema bečkoj vladi, što je bilo usklađeno s nastojanjima dalmatinskog namjesnika Rodića, čija je namjera bila oformiti provladinu stranku sastavljenu od umjerenost nastrojenih narodnjaka i autonomiša.<sup>66</sup>

Zemljaci nisu bili brojni, a ubrzo će se pokazati da nisu bili niti naročito privlačni biračima, ali su bili značajni zato što su otvoreno istaknuli pitanje hrvatsko-srpskih odnosa u Dalmaciji. Narodna stranka u početku je okupljala jedno i drugo „pleme“ u borbi za ujedinjenje Dalmacije s banskom Hrvatskom i ponarođivanje javnog života. Zemljaci su, s druge strane, isticali srpske interese i protivili se hrvatskoj nacionalnoj ideologiji i klerikalizmu, koje je po njima zastupao Mihovil Pavlinović, jedan od najistaknutijih narodnjaka.<sup>67</sup> Srpska nacionalna ideja u Dalmaciji se nije pojavila sa zemljacima, već je njihovo djelovanje dio otprije postojećeg kontinuiteta. Još su tridesetih godina 19. stoljeća Đorđe Nikolajević i Božidar Petranović pokrenuli *Srpsko dalmatinski magazin*. Oni su srpstvo temeljili na pravoslavlju, dodajući mu prosvjetiteljsko-književne elemente. Povezivanje srpstva i pravoslavlja bilo je tipično za pravoslavne svećenike i trgovce, u to vrijeme nositelje srpskoga nacionalnog pokreta.<sup>68</sup>

Iako su šezdesetih godina dalmatinski Srbi sudjelovali u borbi za ujedinjenje i uvođenje narodnog jezika u javni život, ipak su isticali vlastite partikularne zahtjeve, ponekad suprotne načelima Narodne stranke. Pokretači tih zahtjeva najčešće su bili pripadnici pravoslavne vjerske elite. Ipak, srpski se političari tih godina zbog pragmatičnih razloga nisu odvajali od Narodne stranke. Srpski nacionalni pokret tada nije

Rajčić points out that Zemljaci were not a homogeneous group, both politically or nationally.<sup>64</sup> Their most prominent member and in fact the leader of the party was Stefan Ljubiša, a well-known figure in Dalmatian politics. He was a Serb from Boka Kotorska and one of the most prominent national politicians in the area. He served as President of the Dalmatian Parliament and the Provincial Government<sup>65</sup>, as well as a member of the Imperial Council. In his political activities he advocated moderation and loyalty to the Viennese government, which was in line with the efforts of the Dalmatian governor Rodić, whose intention was to form a pro-governmental party composed of moderately inclined Populists and Autonomists.<sup>66</sup>

Zemljaci were not numerous, and soon it was shown that they were not particularly attractive to voters, but they were significant because they openly raised the issue of Croatian-Serbian relations in Dalmatia. The People's Party initially brought together both "tribes" in the fight for the unification of Dalmatia with Banovina of Croatia and the rebirth of domestic public life. Zemljaci, on the other hand, emphasized Serbian interests and opposed Croatian national ideology and clericalism, which, according to them, was represented by Mihovil Pavlinović, one of the most prominent Populists.<sup>67</sup> The Serbian national idea did not appear in Dalmatia with Zemljaci. It is part of the already existing continuity. As early as the 1830s, Đorđe Nikolajević and Božidar Petranović started the *Srpsko dalmatinski magazin* (Eng.: Serbian Dalmatian Magazine). They based Serbian nationality on Orthodoxy by adding Enlightenment literary elements to it. The connection between Serbian nationality and Orthodox religion was typical of Orthodox priests and merchants who were holders of the Serbian national movement at that time.<sup>68</sup>

Although the Dalmatian Serbs participated in the struggle for the unification and introduction of the national vernacular into public life in the 1860s, they nevertheless emphasized their own particular demands,

<sup>65</sup> Izvršna je vlast u austrijskoj Dalmaciji bila organizirana na dvjema razinama. Postojalo je Namjesništvo kao tijelo podređeno središnjoj vlasti u Beču i Zemaljski odbor kao izvršni organ Dalmatinskog sabora.

<sup>66</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 195.

<sup>67</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 196.

<sup>68</sup> Rajčić 2005: 342.

<sup>64</sup> Rajčić 2014: 221.

<sup>65</sup> Executive power in the Austrian Dalmatia was organized on two levels. There was a Governor's Office as a body subordinated to the central authorities in Vienna and Provincial Board as the executive body of the Dalmatian Parliament.

<sup>66</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 195.

<sup>67</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 196.

<sup>68</sup> Rajčić 2005: 342.

mogao opstati samostalno, ponajviše zbog društvene strukture dalmatinskih Srba, u kojoj su dominirali seljaci.<sup>69</sup> Na buđenje srpske nacionalne svijesti u Dalmaciji utjecali su i pravoslavno sjemenište i gimnazija u Zadru, kao i učeničko društvo Prvenac povezano s vojvođanskom Ujedinjenom omladinom srpskom. Iz istih krajeva dolazio je i list *Zastava*, glasilo Srpske narodne slobodoumne stranke koju je predvodio Svetozar Miletić. Na razvoj srpske misli u Dalmaciji utjecao je i spis „Načertanije“ Ilije Garašanina, tajni plan za uspostavu Velike Srbije, kao i uvođenje dualizma, kojim je značajno smanjena mogućnost ujedinjenja Dalmacije s banskom Hrvatskom.<sup>70</sup> I pobjeda Narodne stranke na izborima za Dalmatinski sabor 1870. dala je svoj doprinos osamostaljenju srpskog nacionalnog pokreta. Budući da su nakon nje autonomasi počeli gubiti političku snagu, nije više bilo potrebe da strah od nametanja talijanskog jezika i kulture povezuje Srbe s narodnjacima.<sup>71</sup>

### Polemike Narodnog lista i Zemljaka

*Narodni list* prenio je dopis Ivana Danila u kojem on u ime petorice zastupnika najavljuje osnivanje lista *Zemljak*. Danilo je na početku toga dopisa naveo da se, nakon što je *Narodni list* napao i osudio zastupnike, a da nije čuo njihov glas, u Dalmaciji pojavila potreba za novim političkim listom, namijenjenim ne samo onim rodoljubima koji podržavaju zastupnike nego i svima koji ne žele donositi preuranjene sudove o onome o čemu ne znaju dovoljno činjenica, kao i onima koji su možda već zavedeni na preuranjenu osudu. Istaknuo je i svrhu lista, a to je „pretresivati dnevna politička pitanja u njihovu odnošaju na naš narod u Dalmaciji.“<sup>72</sup>

*Narodni list* Danilov je poziv objavio zajedno s komentarom u kojem je odgovorio na navod da je napad na petoricu zastupnika stvorio potrebu za novim političkim listom u Dalmaciji. Autor članka

sometimes contrary to the principles of the People's Party. The initiators of these claims were most often members of the Orthodox religious elite. Yet, for pragmatic reasons, Serbian politicians did not secede from the People's Party in those years. The Serbian national movement at that time could not survive on its own, mainly because of the social structure of the Dalmatian Serbs, dominated by peasants.<sup>69</sup> The awakening of Serbian national consciousness in Dalmatia was also influenced by the Orthodox Seminary and the Grammar School in Zadar, as well as by the student association Prvenac affiliated with United Serbian Youth from Vojvodina. From these areas came the newspaper *Zastava*, the gazette of the Serbian National Liberal Party, led by Svetozar Miletić. The development of Serbian thought in Dalmatia was also influenced by the writings of „Načertanije“ by Ilija Garašanin, as a secret plan for the establishment of Greater Serbia, as well as the introduction of dualism, which significantly reduced the possibility of unification of Dalmatia with Banovina of Croatia.<sup>70</sup> The victory of the People's Party in the elections to the Dalmatian Parliament in 1870 contributed to the independence of the Serbian national movement. After the Autonomists began to lose political power, there was no longer need for connecting Serbs with the Populists due to fear of the imposition of the Italian language and culture.<sup>71</sup>

### Controversies between Narodni list and Zemljak

*Narodni list* published a letter from Ivan Danilo who announced on behalf of the five Representatives the founding of the newspaper *Zemljak*. Danilo stated at the beginning of this letter that after attacks of *Narodni list* condemning the Representatives without hearing their voice, it was clear that there was a need for a new political newspaper to appear in Dalmatia, intended not only for patriots who support Representatives, but also for all those who do not want to make premature judgments about issues they don't know much about, as well as those who may have already been misled into premature conviction. He also emphasized the purpose

<sup>69</sup> Rajčić 2005: 343-344.

<sup>70</sup> Detaljnije o utjecajima na razvoj srpske nacionalne misli u Dalmaciji v. u Rajčić 2005: 342-346.

<sup>71</sup> Rajčić 2005: 346.

<sup>72</sup> „Gledajte 'Zemljaka'“, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 26.

<sup>69</sup> Rajčić 2005: 343-344.

<sup>70</sup> More on the influences on development of the Serbian national thought see in Rajčić 2005: 342-346.

<sup>71</sup> Rajčić 2005: 346.

tvrdio je da to nije istina, jer su zastupnici odmah nakon glasovanja u svojim brzojavima pisali da preuzimaju odgovornost za svoj postupak i da će ga braniti, a budući da *Narodni list* ne može i ne smije promijeniti mišljenje, najavili su izdavanje drugih novina. U komentaru se postavlja i pitanje u kojem će pravcu *Zemljak* „pretresivati dnevna politička pitanja“. Hoće li to biti pravac koji zauzimaju režimski listovi, ili onaj koji zauzima *Narodni list* i uz koji su i zastupnici do glasovanja pristajali? Danilovu tvrdnju da on sam jamči za čisto narodni pravac lista, *Narodni list* komentira riječima: „Dakle pravac u smislu gori pomenutoga istinoljubja raichsratljâ,<sup>73</sup> i sadašnje njihove nezavisnosti.“<sup>74</sup> Zemljaci su tvrdili da se iz spomenutih brzojava vidi samo to da su zastupnici bili spremni izdavati novi list, a hoće li ga izdavati ovisilo je o stavu *Narodnog lista*.<sup>75</sup> Nakon što ih je *Narodni list* napao i nakon što je počeo voditi sentimentalnu politiku, nije bilo nikoga tko bi zastupao program bečke petorice pa su smatrali potrebnim pokrenuti novi list.<sup>76</sup>

*Narodni list* pitao se koji je zapravo program *Zemljaka*. Pisao je da se iz njegovih članaka to ne može iščitati, već da on tvrdi kako je postao ono što je *Narodni list* bio, uz odbacivanje slavenske uzajamnosti kao jedine razlike. Također je pozvao zemljake da napokon javno kažu kakvu su točno korist priskrbili Dalmaciji i dodao da su Poljaci također stekli željeznicu, da im sabor nije raspušten te da su čak uputili poslanike da caru iznesu potrebe svoje zemlje, a da uza sve to nisu podržali izbornu reformu. *Zemljakove* tvrdnje da narodno poštenje, onda kada ne donosi korist, treba prepustiti političkim pjesnicima i sanjarima, *Narodni list* oštro je napao govoreći da to ni najgori protivnici nikada nisu tvrdili. Bez poštenja nema reda ni pouzdanja, a ako čovjek radi samo ono što mu donosi korist, pretvara se u „nerazboritu živinu“.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>73</sup> Njemački naziv za Carevinsko vijeće je Reichsrat. Više vidjeti u: *Encyclopædia Britannica* (<https://www.britannica.com/topic/Reichsrat-Austrian-imperial-council>). Pristup ostvaren 17. 12. 2019.

<sup>74</sup> „Gledajte ‘Zemljaka’”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 26.

<sup>75</sup> „Eto posljedice!”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 1.

<sup>76</sup> „Narodna stranka u većini”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 2.

<sup>77</sup> „Suvremena povjest”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 38.

of the newspaper, which is to “discuss the daily political issues in their relation to our people in Dalmatia.”<sup>72</sup>

*Narodni list* issued Danilo’s invitation, along with a comment in response to the allegation that the attack on five Representatives created the need for a new political newspaper in Dalmatia. The author of the article claimed that this was not true, as Representatives immediately after voting in their telegrams wrote that they were taking responsibility for their proceedings and that they would defend them, and since *Narodni list* cannot and should not change their minds, they announced the publication of other newspaper. The comment also raised the question of direction in which *Zemljak* will “shake up daily political issues”. Will it be the direction presented by the regime papers, or the one of *Narodni list* that was also followed by Representatives until the vote? Danilo’s claim that he himself guarantees the purely national direction of the newspaper, was commented by *Narodni list* with the words: “the direction in the sense of the above-mentioned truthfulness of the “raichsratlje”,<sup>73</sup> and their present independence.”<sup>74</sup> Zemljaci claimed that the only thing visible from these telegrams was that the Representatives were ready to publish a new paper, but whether it would be published, depended on the position of *Narodni list*.<sup>75</sup> After *Narodni list* attacked them and after they began to conduct sentimental politics, there was no one to represent the program of the Viennese five, so they considered it necessary to launch a new newspaper.<sup>76</sup>

*Narodni list* contemplated what the Mainstream Folk Party’s program was. It wrote that it could not see it in *Zemljak’s* articles, but claimed that it has become what *Narodni list* was, except for rejection of Slavic Reciprocity as the only difference. It also called for Zemljaci to finally publicly state what were exactly the benefits they provided to Dalmatia, adding the fact that the Poles also acquired the railway, that their parliament was not dissolved, and that they even sent Representatives to present the needs of their country to the emperor without

<sup>72</sup> „Gledajte ‘Zemljaka’”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 26.

<sup>73</sup> German word for the Imperial Council is Reichsrat. More in *Encyclopædia Britannica* (<https://www.britannica.com/topic/Reichsrat-Austrian-imperial-council>; accessed 12/17/2019).

<sup>74</sup> „Gledajte ‘Zemljaka’”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 26.

<sup>75</sup> „Eto posljedice!”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 1.

<sup>76</sup> „Narodna stranka u većini”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 2.

Na pitanje što je zapravo *Zemljak*, *Narodni list* odgovorio je u članku pod naslovom „Došla lija na omêku“, u kojem je tvrdio da se ovaj napokon razotkrio kao vladin kadar i prigovorio mu što se nije otpočetak tako izjasnio, nego je nastojao zamesti tragove. Autor članka kao razliku između *Zemljaka* i *Narodnog lista* istaknuo je to što je prvi vladin, a drugi narodni i najavio da će *Narodni list* podupirati *Zemljak* kad bude s vladom na pravom putu, a odupirati mu se kad ne bude. Na kraju će narod presuditi i ako bude zadovoljan vladom, *Narodni list* odustat će od borbe, zadovoljan jer je narod zadovoljan.<sup>78</sup> *Zemljak* nije vidio problem u tome što ga se proglašava vladinim. Pisao je da je i *Narodni list* bio smatran vladinim kad je zagovarao slogu s vladom, ali da mu to nije smetalo i da nije zbog toga prestao biti narodni. Još je dodao da mu nije jasno zašto je *Narodni list* odbacio takvu politiku baš sada kada je vlada počela sve jasnije pokazivati namjeru da živi u miru s narodom.<sup>79</sup> Kada vladina obećanja nisu ispunjena, *Zemljak* je tvrdio da je to zbog stavova *Narodnog lista*. *Narodni list* odgovorio je da to nije istina i pozvao je zemljake da priznaju da ih je vlada prevarila jer bi tako dokazali da su ipak imali poštene namjere i narod bi im oprostio.<sup>80</sup>

Zemljaci su optuživali narodnjake okupljene oko *Narodnog lista* da su upravo oni narušili narodnu slogu koja je Dalmaciji donijela velike koristi u razdoblju nakon što je 1870. osvojena većina u Dalmatinskom saboru. *Zemljak* je pisao da je upravo narodna sloga uništila neprijatelje koji su prije toga imali vlast u Dalmaciji, a to se ne bi ostvarilo da je nakon osvajanja većine objavljen rat Beču. Sada je dio narodnjaka objavio rat vladi, a za neslogu optužuju petoricu zastupnika. Da su oni postupili po njihovim željama, izazvali bi reakciju vlade i raspuštanje sabora, čime bi se ostvarila sloga u nevolji. Ipak, pisao je *Zemljak*, svi razumni ljudi podržavaju postupak petorice pa ga tako u dubini duše podržavaju i oni koji pozivaju na rat.<sup>81</sup>

supporting electoral reform. *Narodni list* sharply attacked *Zemljak's* claims that people's honesty, when it does not bring benefits, should be left to political poets and dreamers at times, saying that such was never claimed even by the worst opponents. Without honesty, there is no order or trust, and if one does only what benefits them, they turn into "irrational poultry."<sup>77</sup>

When asked what *Zemljak* really is, *Narodni list* responded in an article entitled "Došla lija na omêku" [The fox came to the sauce], claiming that it finally revealed itself as a government cadre and resented it for not declaring itself initially as such instead of trying to cover the tracks. The author of the article pointed out the difference between *Zemljak* and *Narodni list* as to first one being governmental and the second of the people and announced that *Narodni list* would support *Zemljak* when it gets on the right track with the government and otherwise resist it. In the end, the people will decide, and if they are satisfied with the government, *Narodni list* will give up the fight being satisfied because the people are satisfied.<sup>78</sup> *Zemljak* saw no problem in being declared as governmental. It wrote that *Narodni list* was also considered governmental when it advocated a plea with the government, not bothering much about it at the time, and that this fact did not change its national identity. *Zemljak* also added that it was unclear why *Narodni list* rejected such a policy right when the government began to show more clearly its intention to live in peace with the people.<sup>79</sup> When the government's promises were not fulfilled, *Zemljak* claimed that it was because of the views expressed in *Narodni list*. *Narodni list* replied that this was not true and urged Zemljaci to admit that the government had deceived them and in that way prove that they had fair intentions so the people would forgive them.<sup>80</sup>

*Zemljaci* accused the Populists gathered around *Narodni list* for being the ones who violated the national harmony that had brought great benefits to Dalmatia in the period after the 1870 when majority was won in the Dalmatian Parliament. *Zemljak* wrote that it was precisely national harmony that destroyed the enemies who had previously held power in Dalmatia, and it would not have come to pass had the war been declared to Vienna

<sup>78</sup> "Došla lija na omêku", *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 57.

<sup>79</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 36.

<sup>80</sup> *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 34.

<sup>81</sup> "Slogom rastu male stvari, a nesloga sve pokvari", *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 17.

<sup>77</sup> "Suvremena povjest", *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 38.

<sup>78</sup> "Došla lija na omêku", *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 57.

<sup>79</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 36.

<sup>80</sup> *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 34.

I *Zemljak* je govorio o razlikama između sebe i *Narodnog lista*. U članku pod naslovom „Mi i oni“ još je jednom ponovio da je *Narodni list* taj koji je napustio smjer narodnjačke politike. Još prethodne godine, tvrdio je *Zemljak*, *Narodni list* pisao je da dalmatinski Slaveni najmanje od svih naroda u Austriji mogu voditi veliku politiku i da je ne oponirati vladi korisno za njih. Pozivao je na ostavljanje velikog cilja za budućnost i pripremanje njegova ostvarenja vođenjem male politike, odnosno davanjem podrške onoj vladi koja bude razvijala jezik, poštivala narodnost i popravljala stanje u pokrajini, da bi sada odbacio takvu politiku i potaknut češkim primjerom počeo zagovarati rat protiv vlade, ali ne otvoreno jer zna da se narod s time ne bi složio. *Zemljak*, s druge strane, nije za rat i to narodu otvoreno daje do znanja te izražava žaljenje što kod narodnjaka okupljenih oko *Narodnog lista* nije bilo manje strasti i više pameti. Da jest, mogli su zajedno sa zemljacima raditi na ostvarenju narodne koristi, a ovako će narod morati odabrati između jednih i drugih.<sup>82</sup>

Iako je *Narodni list* svu petoricu zastupnika prozivao zbog izdaje narodnog poštenja, nasjedanja na vladina obećanja, narušavanja slavenske uzajamnosti i slično, ipak nije svakoga od njih tretirao jednako. Tako je u članku pod naslovom „Petorica se nadalje odmeću“ pisao da su zemljaci, kako bi se nametnuli narodu i Narodnoj stranci, u prvi plan istaknuli dvije osobe. Prvi je Ivan Danilo, „najljepše ime i najbolje pero“ koje ima za cilj „mazati, vabiti i okupljati“. Njega se u članku ne osuđuje oštro, s jedne strane zato što je dokazan rodoljub, a s druge zato što iskazuje neozbiljna shvaćanja. Misli se pritom na njegov stav da *Zemljaku* ne treba program jer mu on jamči narodni pravac i na vjerovanje da će troškove njegova izdavanja moći snositi petorica i njihovi malobrojni pristaše. Stoga članak o Danilu zaključuje da, iako je „zabrazdio“, još ima vremena i prostora da se osvijesti.<sup>83</sup>

Druga je osoba o kojoj članak govori Stefan Ljubiša. On je pak prikazan kao prevarant i lažljivac

after winning the majority. Now a part of Populists has declared war on the government, and five Representatives are blamed for the disagreement. If they had acted according to their wishes, they would have provoked a reaction from the government and the dissolution of the assembly, which would lead to harmony in trouble instead. Still, *Zemljak* wrote, all reasonable people support the process of the five, and so in the depths of their souls, do those who call for war.<sup>81</sup>

*Zemljak* too wrote of the differences between itself and the *Narodni list*. In an article entitled “Mi i oni” [Us and them] it again declared that *Narodni list* was the one who left the populist policy direction. Last year, *Zemljak* claimed, *Narodni list* wrote that the Dalmatian Slavs are the least of all nations in Austria that could lead a great policy and that it is useful to them not to oppose the government. It was calling for setting a great goal for the future and preparing for its realization by pursuing a small policy, which is, supporting a government that developed language, respected nationalities and improved the situation in the province. It now rejected such a policy and, inspired by the Czech example, began advocating the war against the government, but not openly because it knew that the people would disagree. *Zemljak*, on the other hand, did not advocate war, on what it openly addressed people and expressed its regret that the Populists gathered around *Narodni list* did not show less passion and more intelligence. If so, they could work together with Zemljaci to achieve benefits for the people instead of having people to choose between the two.<sup>82</sup>

Although *Narodni list* called on all five Representatives for betraying people’s honesty, being misled by the government promises, violating Slavic Reciprocity, and the like, it did not treat each of them equally. Thus, in an article entitled “Petorica se nadalje odmeću” [The five further apostatize], it wrote that Zemljaci had highlighted two people in order to impose themselves on the people and the People’s Party. The first was Ivan Danilo, “the most beautiful name and the best feather” whose goal is to “smear, lure and gather.” He is not harshly condemned in the article, on the one hand because he is a proven patriot, and on the other because he shows frivolous understandings. This refers to his

<sup>82</sup> “Mi i oni”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 33.

<sup>83</sup> “Petorica se nadalje odmeću”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 29.

<sup>81</sup> “Slogom rastu male stvari, a nesloga sve pokvari”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 17.

<sup>82</sup> “Mi i oni”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 33.

vođen koristoljubljem.<sup>84</sup> Članak se žestoko suprotstavlja njegovim tvrdnjama da su sukob izazvali narodnjaci svojim natražnjaštvom, nametanjem svoga stava zastupnicima, progonima srpstva i pravoslavlja i govori da njega ne treba dodatno opisivati, već je dovoljno spomenuti njegovo ime na području od Budve do Raba i svatko će znati tko je „ta sramota na našoj zemlji i na našoj stranci“. Članak navodi i ostalu trojicu zastupnika i govori da oni osim glasanja za izbornu reformu nisu ništa zgriješili te da još uvijek nije kasno da se odmaknu od „mrtva odmetnika svake vjere i svakoga poštenja“.<sup>85</sup>

Novi napad na Ljubišu uslijedio je u članku pod naslovom „Vitez Mujko i njegova lažitorba“, kojim je odgovoreno na njegove navode o uspjehima zemljaka iznesene u zagrebačkim *Narodnim novinama*. Ljubiša je tvrdio da su zemljaci nabavili željeznicu, isušili Neretvu, uveli narodni jezik u javni život, podigli škole, popravili ceste te oslobodili zemlju od talijanštine i birokracije. *Narodni list* jedan je po jedan Ljubišin navod proglasio za laž, navodeći razloge zbog kojih ga takvim smatra. Na kraju je zaključio da je jedini rezultat rada Ljubiše i njegovih kolega taj da su „obeščastili uzvišeni pojam narodnosti“, naveli mnoge da „malaksaju u ljubavi narodnoj“, a vladu da pomisli da se sve Dalmatince može kupiti plaćom i praznim riječima. Njihove tvrdnje da je spas za Dalmaciju u suradnji s vladom, članak komentira riječima: „Vi ste odmetnici, i hoćete da okupljate četu odmetnika!“<sup>86</sup>

*Narodni list* Ljubišu je napao i u kontekstu *Zemljakovih* tvrdnji o napadima narodnjaka na srpstvo, posebno na ćirilicu. *Zemljak* je ćirilicu kao sredstvo političke borbe prvi put upotrijebio u članku pod naslovom „Kud se čela ćirilica?“, u kojem se žalio na njezin loš položaj. Pisao je

view that *Zemljak* does not need the program because it guarantees the people's direction and believes that the costs of its issuance will be borne by the five and their few supporters. Therefore, the article about Danilo concludes that, although he “went astray,” he still has time and space to come to his senses.<sup>83</sup>

The other person the article talks about is Stefan Ljubiša. He is portrayed as a fraudster and a liar driven by self-interest.<sup>84</sup> The article vehemently contradicts his claims that the conflict was caused by the Populists with simple mildness, imposing their attitude on Representatives, persecutions of Serbs and Orthodoxy, saying that he needs no additional description and that it is enough to mention his name in the area from Budva to Rab and everyone would recognize who is “that shame on our country and our party.” The article also cites the other three Representatives, saying that apart from the election reform vote they have not done anything wrong, and that it is still not too late for them to move away from “dead renegades of all faiths and all honesty.”<sup>85</sup>

A new attack on Ljubiša followed in an article titled “Vitez Mujko i njegova lažitorba” [Knight Mujko and his Lie-bag], which responded to his allegations in *Narodne novine* from Zagreb on the success by Zemljaci. Ljubiša claimed that Zemljaci procured the railway, drained the Neretva, introduced the vernacular into public life, erected schools, repaired roads, and freed the country from Italianism and bureaucracy. *Narodni list* declared all Ljubiša's allegations, one by one, a lie, providing arguments for considering them as such. In the end, it concluded that the only result of the work of Ljubiša and his colleagues was that they “dishonoured the sublime notion of nationality”, led many to “faint in the love of the people”, and made government think that all Dalmatians could be bought with salary and empty words. The article comments their claims that

<sup>84</sup> Središnjica Narodne stranke Ljubišu je često optuživala da svoje političko djelovanje usmjerava prema izvlačenju materijalne koristi. Tako su ga optužili da je, podržavanjem izravnih izbora za Carevinsko vijeće, priskrbio koncesiju za izgradnju dalmatinske željeznice konzorciju osnovanu 1869., čiji je član bio zajedno s još nekim narodnjacima i autonomašima. Članovi iz redova narodnjaka, Klaić, Monti i Vranković, istupili su iz konzorcija ne želeći da se i oni optuže za izvlačenje koristi (Petrović 1982: 282).

<sup>85</sup> “Petorica se nadalje odmeću”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 29.

<sup>86</sup> “Vitez Mujko i njegova lažitorba”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 30.

<sup>83</sup> “Petorica se nadalje odmeću”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 29.

<sup>84</sup> People's Party's centrepiece has often accused Ljubiša of directing his political activities toward material gain. He was thus accused of supporting a direct election to the Imperial Council by obtaining a concession for the construction of Dalmatian railways in a consortium established in 1869, to which he was member along with some Populists and Autonomists. Populist members Klaić, Monti, and Vranković, left the consortium not wanting them to be accused of benefitting from it. (Petrović 1982: 282).

<sup>85</sup> “Petorica se nadalje odmeću”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 29.

da osim pravoslavnog sjemeništa u Zadru nema drugog mjesta gdje bi daci mogli učiti ćirilicu, a ne postoji ni čitanka koja bi služila u tu svrhu. U članku je pisalo i da je ćirilica protjerana iz Učiteljskog zavoda baš kada se, nakon velike borbe, uspio popuniti narodnim učiteljima te da ju se pokušava protjerati iz Matice dalmatinske koju je osnovao Srbin.<sup>87</sup> Usljedio je odgovor *Narodnog lista* u kojem je Ljubiša prozvan mutikašom koji, nakon što je uvidio da ga narod ne prihvaća, koristi tobožnje napade na ćirilicu i srpstvo ne bi li privukao barem nekoga na svoju stranu. Ćirilica, prema *Narodnom listu*, niti je napadnuta niti je isključivo srpsko pismo, a Ljubiša ju koristi kako bi dijelio narod. Citat iz članka vrlo zorno ilustrira potpuno negativan stav *Narodnog lista* prema Ljubiši: „Mutikaša, laži po zakutcima, veži se još bolje s Lapennom<sup>88</sup>, obetavaj u tmini samostalnost Boke kotorske samo da tebe bira zastupnika, i tuste prepelice u kreatim loncima njemačkim, nagovaraj svoje birače proti saboru dalmatinskomu, kojemu si član: možda ti podje za rukom zvesti sliapa, i hroma, i gluha; zdrava i razumna neće nikad te neće. Ali ne izlagaj na dalje na pazar tvoje bezočstvo; dosta ti se svieta i onako u brk smije.“<sup>89</sup>

U nastavku polemike *Zemljak* je optužio *Narodni list* da je svojim zanemarivanjem ćirilice i srpskog imena otjerao srpske pretplatnike i naveo ih da se okrenu listovima iz Srbije i Vojvodine. Pozvao ga je na prestanak unošenja razdora i povratak starim načelima. To znači da treba narod zvati hrvatsko-srpskim imenom, ne dirati mu u osobnost, ne navoditi ga da „kuca na neprijateljska vrata“ i ne tjerati ga na „obraniteljni rat“. Prema tvrdnjama *Zemljaka*, upravo su Srbi, kod kojih nije bio izražen talijanski utjecaj, bili najzaslužniji za uspjeh Narodne stranke i srpsko se ime u Dalmaciji ne može pokopati.<sup>90</sup> Odgovor *Narodnog lista* stigao je preko Mihovila Pavlinovića, kojega

the salvation for Dalmatia rests in cooperation with the government with the words: “You are outlaws, and you want to gather a company of outlaws!”<sup>86</sup>

*Narodni list* also attacked Ljubiša in the context of *Zemljak's* claims about the attacks of the Populists on Serb nationality, especially the Cyrillic script. *Zemljak* first used the Cyrillic script as a means of political struggle in an article entitled “Kud se đela ćirilica?” [Where did the Cyrillic script disappear?] complaining about its poor position. It wrote that apart from the Orthodox Seminary in Zadar, there is no other place for students to learn Cyrillic script, and there is no textbook to serve for this purpose. The article also stated that the Cyrillic script was expelled from the Teacher's Institute just after a great struggle for it to be able to hire national teachers, and that it was trying to expel it from the Matica Dalmatinska founded by a Serb.<sup>87</sup> This was followed by the response of *Narodni list*, in which Ljubiša was called a troublemaker who, after realizing that he was not accepted by the people, used alleged attacks on Cyrillic script and Serbian origin in order to attract at least someone to his side. According to *Narodni list*, Cyrillic script is neither attacked nor is it exclusively Serbian script, and Ljubiša uses it to divide the people. The quotation from the article very clearly illustrates the completely negative attitude of *Narodni list* towards Ljubiša: “Troublemaker, go on, sell your lies, bond even better with Lappen,<sup>88</sup> and promise the independence of Boka Kotorska from the darkness only to elect you for representative, and dull quails in creative German pots, persuade your voters against Dalmatian Parliament of which you are a member; you might succeed to seduce the blind, the limping or the deaf; but never a healthy and sensible person, never that. But do not further expose your iniquity to the market; a lot of folk laughs in your face anyway.”<sup>89</sup>

Continuing the controversy, *Zemljak* accused *Narodni list* of neglecting Cyrillic script and Serbian names by expelling Serbian subscribers, making them turn to newspapers from Serbia and Vojvodina. It urged *Narodni list* to stop bringing discord and to return to the

<sup>87</sup> Maticu dalmatinsku 1862. osnovao je Božidar Petranović kao društvo koje ima za cilj širenje narodne svijesti. “Kud se đela ćirilica?”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 28.

<sup>88</sup> Luigi Lapenna, autonomasški vođa.

<sup>89</sup> “Zadar, 2 srpnja”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 53.

<sup>90</sup> “Odgovor na odgovor. ‘Gđe se đela ćirilica.’”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 33.

<sup>86</sup> “Vitez Mujko i njegova lažitorba”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 30.

<sup>87</sup> Matica dalmatinska was founded in 1862 by Božidar Petranović as a society aimed at spreading national consciousness. “Kud se đela ćirilica?”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 28.

<sup>88</sup> Luigi Lapenna, Autonomist leader.

<sup>89</sup> “Zadar, 2 srpnja”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 53.



su zemljaci optuživali za klerikalizam i hrvatski ekskluzivizam. On je odbacio *Zemljakove* navode tvrdeći da nijednom Srbinu članak ili dopis nije bio odbijen zato što je pisan ćirilicom ili potpisan srpskim imenom. Ćirilice u *Narodnom listu* ima malo zato što ju koristi samo malen postotak njegovih čitatelja. Pavlinović je istom prigodom podsjetio kako gleda na pitanje narodnosti: „Narodnost je naša slovinska, u kojoj je mjesta jednaka i po Hrvatima i po Srbe; narodnost je naša jedna, a imena su joj dva. Političko naše pravo jest hrvatsko, zemlja naša jest hrvatska.“ Hrvatski narod, prema Pavlinoviću, u svojoj zemlji ima narodno i državno ime, kao što ga ima i svaki drugi narod u svojoj zemlji, a Srbima nitko ne brani da koriste svoje ime i pismo i da ispovijedaju svoju vjeru, ali ne mogu im se priznati zasebna politička prava.<sup>91</sup>

I jedna i druga strana pokušavale su sebe predstaviti kao „narodnu“ stranu. *Narodni list* tvrdio je da su svojim pristajanjem uz vladu izdali narodno poštenje i ako ono što je uslijedilo zovu ratom, tada će narodnjaci okupljeni oko njega ratovati dok budu živi, boreći se protiv narodnog nepoštenja i poniženja. Zamjerao je zemljacima što govore o „narodnom barjaku“ nakon što su izdali slavensku uzajamnost, unijeli razdor u svoj narod i što se „pred našim očima rukuju sa zakletim dušmanima jezika i imena našega“.<sup>92</sup> *Zemljak* je na te navode odgovorio tvrdeći da su njegovi pristaše prihvatili narodni barjak nakon što su ga, još prije njegove pojave, razdrli narodnjaci okupljeni oko *Narodnog lista*. Na optužbe za povezivanje s dušmanima jezika *Zemljak* je odgovorio pitajući se tko to zapravo radi, oni ili *Narodni list*.<sup>93</sup> *Zemljak* je često pisao o jeziku kritizirajući njegov još uvijek nepovoljan položaj u javnoj upravi. Pisao je da se borba za jezik svodi na novinske članke, a da se odvjetnici, svećenici i članovi Zemaljskog odbora ne služe njime. Položaj bi mu se popravio kada bi ga počeli koristiti svi narodni uredi i zavodi, jer bi na taj način vlada bila prisiljena koristiti ga za polovicu svojih poslova. *Zemljak* je tvrdio da je za loš položaj narodnog jezika djelomično odgovoran i *Narodni list*, koji još

old principles. This means that the people should be called by the Croatian-Serbian name, not interfering in its nature, nor urging them to “knock on the enemy door” and driving it to “defensive war”. According to *Zemljak*, it was precisely the Serbs, who had no Italian influence, who were most responsible for the success of the People's Party, so the Serb name could not be buried in Dalmatia.<sup>90</sup> The response of *Narodni list* came through Mihovil Pavlinović who was accused by Zemljaci of clericalism and Croatian exclusivism. He rejected *Zemljak's* allegations, claiming that no Serb was ever denied an article or letter because it was written in Cyrillic script or signed with a Serbian name. Cyrillic script is rarely present in *Narodni list* because only a low percentage of its readers read it. On the same occasion, Pavlinović reminded on his views at the question of nationality: “Nationality is our Slavic, in which places are equal for both Croats and Serbs; our nationality is one and its names are two. Our political right is Croatian, our country is Croatia.” According to Pavlinović, the Croatian people have a national and state name in their country, just as every other nation, and no one forbids Serbs from using their name and script as well as to practice their faith, but they cannot be granted separate political rights.<sup>91</sup>

Both sides were trying to present themselves to be on the “people's” side. *Narodni list* claimed that Zemljaci betrayed the people's honesty by agreeing with the government, and if what followed was called a war, then the people gathered around it would fight as long as they live, fighting against national dishonesty and humiliation. It resented Zemljaci their talk about the “people's flag” after betraying Slavic Reciprocity, bringing discord to their people, and “shaking hands before our eyes with the sworn enemies of our language and our name.”<sup>92</sup> *Zemljak* responded to these allegations by claiming that its supporters had adopted the people's flag after it was torn apart by the Populists gathered around *Narodni list* before *Zemljak's* appearance. On the allegations of connection with the language enemies *Zemljak* responded contemplating on which of the two papers was doing it so.<sup>93</sup> *Zemljak* often wrote

<sup>91</sup> “Tajni i neiskreni šapuri”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 57.

<sup>92</sup> “Prijatelj do duše”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 59.

<sup>93</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I., br. 39.

<sup>90</sup> “Odgovor na odgovor. ‘Gđe se dela ćirilica.’”, *Zemljak*, G. I., br. 33.

<sup>91</sup> “Tajni i neiskreni šapuri”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 57.

<sup>92</sup> “Prijatelj do duše”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 59.

<sup>93</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I., br. 39.

uvijek koristi svoj talijanski naslov *Il Nazionale* i tako zapravo podupire jezičnu neravnopravnost protiv koje se navodno bori.<sup>94</sup>

### Prvi izravni izbori za Carevinsko vijeće

Narodnjaci okupljeni oko *Narodnog lista* žestoko su se protivili izravnim izborima za Carevinsko vijeće, no kada su uvedeni, preostalo im je samo da istaknu svoje kandidate i pokušaju osvojiti većinu od devet zastupničkih mjesta, koliko je Dalmaciji pripalo izbornom reformom. *Narodni list* korišten je kao medij u predizbornoj kampanji, a osnovno načelo koje je propovijedao bila je sloga birača. Razdvajati se i svađati, pisao je, bilo bi ravno samoubojstvu.<sup>95</sup> *Narodni list* jasno je istaknuo da se na izborima bori za narodnost, državno pravo i slavensku uzajamnost te je naglasio da svaki svjestan narod traži najprije slobodu i poštenje pa tek onda korist.<sup>96</sup> Također je upozorio na one koji će pokušati unijeti razdor među narod podmetanjima, obećanjima i ulagivanjem te dodao da se na to ne smije pristati, jer se brane prvobitna načela koja nitko pošten ne smije odbaciti.<sup>97</sup> Zaključak *Narodnog lista* bio je da će narod, ako bude složan, sve protivnike „razagnati kao maglu“.<sup>98</sup>

Dok se središnjica Narodne stranke žestoko protivila izborima, zemljaci su ih podržavali tvrdeći da ovlasti pokrajinskog sabora nisu velike i da se o svim važnim pitanjima odlučuje u Carevinskom vijeću, a narod sada ima priliku odabrati zastupnike koji će ga tamo predstavljati. Narod je, pisao je *Zemljak*, imao priliku upoznati ljude koji ga zastupaju i zna da nije rodoljub onaj koji zbog svojih fantazija zanemaruje njegove potrebe, već onaj koji te potrebe uvijek ima pred očima i koji je uvijek spreman žrtvovati se za njihovo ostvarenje.<sup>99</sup> *Zemljak* je i dalje pozivao na očuvanje sporazuma s vladom zbog narodne koristi. Otpor prema vladi opravdan je jedino u slučaju

about the language, criticizing its still disadvantaged position in public administration. It wrote that the fight for language was reduced to newspaper articles, and those lawyers, priests and members of the Provincial Government did not use it. Its position would be improved when all the national offices and institutes began to use it, because in this way the government would be forced to use it for half of its actions. *Zemljak* claimed that *Narodni list*, which still used its Italian title *Il Nazionale*, was partly responsible for the poor vernacular position, thus actually supporting the linguistic inequality which it allegedly fights against.<sup>94</sup>

### The first direct elections to the Imperial Council

The Populists gathered around *Narodni list* fiercely opposed the direct elections to the Imperial Council, but when these elections were introduced, all they could do was to select their candidates and try to win the majority of the nine seats that Dalmatia had received through electoral reform. *Narodni list* was used as a medium in the election campaign, and the basic principle it preached was voters' unity. To split and quarrel, it wrote, would be equal to suicide.<sup>95</sup> *Narodni list* made it clear that the elections represent struggle for nationality, state law and Slavic Reciprocity, emphasizing that every conscious nation first seeks freedom and honesty, and only then come benefits.<sup>96</sup> *Narodni list* also warned of those who would try to bring dissension among population by imputing, promises and flattering, adding that this should not be accepted, because the original principles were to be defended and no honest person should reject them.<sup>97</sup> *Narodni list* concluded that, if united, the people would “disperse all enemies like a fog.”<sup>98</sup>

While the centrepiece of the People's Party strongly opposed the elections, Zemljaci supported them, saying that the powers of the Provincial Government were not great and that all important issues were decided by the Imperial Council. Thus, they claimed, the nation now has the opportunity to choose Representatives who will

<sup>94</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 26.

<sup>95</sup> “A sad?”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 31.

<sup>96</sup> “A sad?”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 31.

<sup>97</sup> “Nedajmo se!”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 79.

<sup>98</sup> “A sad?”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 31.

<sup>99</sup> “Pripravljajmo se na izbore!”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 60.

<sup>94</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 26.

<sup>95</sup> “A sad?”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 31.

<sup>96</sup> “A sad?”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 31.

<sup>97</sup> “Nedajmo se!”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 79.

<sup>98</sup> “A sad?”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 31.

da ona odbaci sporazum, ali *Zemljak* je smatrao da se to jamačno neće dogoditi.<sup>100</sup>

Obje su strane isticale okupljanje „pod narodnom zastavom“, zaštitu narodnosti i sprječavanje vraćanja u stare nevolje, ali su imale potpuno suprotno shvaćanje tih načela. *Narodni list* u tome je vidio opoziciju prema vladi u ime slobode, poštenja i slavenske uzajamnosti, a one koji to ne zastupaju nazivao je narodnim protivnicima. *Zemljak* je smatrao da se narodnost štiti pragmatičnim sporazumom s vladom, ali samo onom koja tu narodnost bude poštivala i pomagala njezinu razvoju. Za zemljake narodni su protivnici bili oni koji se protive tom sporazumu.<sup>101</sup>

Objema su strankama protivnici na izborima bili autonomaši. Doduše, zemljaci su s njima uoči izbora vodili pregovore o koaliciji, ali do dogovora nije došlo.<sup>102</sup> I jedni i drugi, potaknuti narodnjačkim osvajanjem većine u Dalmatinskom saboru, vjerovali su da im autonomaši ne predstavljaju opasnost. *Narodni list* pisao je da bi bila ludost bojati ih se, jer oni glasove mogu dobiti samo od ponekoga narodnog otpadnika ili činovnika.<sup>103</sup> *Zemljak* je pisao da autonomaši nisu problem jer više nisu vladino oruđe. Vlada sada podupire narod.<sup>104</sup> Oba su lista veću pozornost posvetila međusobnom obračunu u kojem je glavni cilj bio ocrniti drugu stranu. *Narodni list* nije propuštao podsjetiti čitatelje da su zemljaci odmetnici koji su se prodali vladnim obećanjima<sup>105</sup> te da im to nije dosta, nego zbog svojih interesa pokušavaju zavaditi narod isticanjem narodnosti i vjere te izazvati raspad Narodne stranke.<sup>106</sup> *Zemljak* je također o svojim političkim protivnicima govorio kao o odmetnicima koji onemogućuju slogu kojom je Narodna stranka u prošlosti svladavala sve poteškoće i koji, skrivajući se iza narodnog poštenja, vode

represent them there. *Zemljak* wrote that people had the opportunity to meet those who represented them, and know that they are not patriots who neglect people's needs because of their own fantasies, but are the ones who always put those needs in the first place and who are always ready to sacrifice themselves for their realization.<sup>99</sup> *Zemljak* continued to call for preservation of the agreement with the government for national gain. Resistance to the government is justified only in the event that it rejects the agreement, but *Zemljak* believed that this would certainly not happen.<sup>100</sup>

Both sides emphasized gathering “under the national flag”, protecting nationalities and preventing return to old troubles, but had a completely opposite view of these principles. *Narodni list* represented the opposition to the government in the name of freedom, honesty and Slavic Reciprocity, addressing those who did not represent it as national opponents. *Zemljak* believed that nationality is protected by a pragmatic agreement with the government, but only if it respects nationality and aids its development. For Zemljaci, the people's opponents were those who opposed the agreement.<sup>101</sup>

Autonomists were opponents to both parties in the elections. Nevertheless, Zemljaci had been negotiating on coalition with them on the eve of the elections, but no agreement was reached.<sup>102</sup> Encouraged by the populist majority votes in the Dalmatian Parliament, both parties believed that the Autonomists posed no danger to them. *Narodni list* wrote that it would be crazy to fear them, because they can only get votes from some national apostate or clerk.<sup>103</sup> *Zemljak* wrote that Autonomists were not a problem because they were no longer a tool of the government. The government now supports the nation.<sup>104</sup> Both newspapers paid more attention to their conflict, in which the main goal was to outshine the other side. *Narodni list* never missed a chance to remind readers that Zemljaci were outlaws who had sold themselves for government promises<sup>105</sup> and moreover, that due to their interests, they were trying to mislead

<sup>100</sup> “Pomaljaju se izbori”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 36.

<sup>101</sup> “Izborna borba”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 37.

<sup>102</sup> Rajčić 2014: 222.

<sup>103</sup> “A sad?”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 31.

<sup>104</sup> “Izborna borba”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 37.

<sup>105</sup> “A sad?”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 31; “Rieč u svoje vrijeme”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 76.

<sup>106</sup> “Rieč u svoje vrijeme”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 76; “Nedajmo se!”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 79; “A mi skladno!”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 83.

<sup>99</sup> “Pripravljajmo se na izbore!”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 60.

<sup>100</sup> “Pomaljaju se izbori”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 36.

<sup>101</sup> “Izborna borba”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 37.

<sup>102</sup> Rajčić 2014: 222.

<sup>103</sup> “A sad?”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 31.

<sup>104</sup> “Izborna borba”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 37.

<sup>105</sup> “A sad?”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 31; “Rieč u svoje vrijeme”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 76.

borbu potaknutu osobnim strastima. Jedinim odmetnicima smatrao je one koji unatoč pozivima naroda na mir, zagovaraju rat.<sup>107</sup>

Često se u *Zemljakovim* člancima pojavljivala teza da narodnjaci okupljeni oko *Narodnog lista* nameću narodu rat protiv vlade koji on ne želi. Oni bi, pisao je *Zemljak*, htjeli u Dalmaciju dovesti borbu kakva je vođena u Češkoj. Ne samo da bi ta borba za Dalmatince bila puno pogubnija nego za Čehe, ve se i sami Česi, tvrdio je *Zemljak*, kaju što su se u nju upuštali.<sup>108</sup> Zemljaci su narodnjake okupljene oko *Narodnog lista* optuživali i za neiskrenost, tvrdeći da oni svoju politiku ne zagovaraju javno jer znaju da ju narod nikada ne bi prihvatio. Na temelju takva postupanja svojih protivnika zemljaci su zaključivali da je narod uz njih i da se protiv političkog smjera koji zastupaju ne smije otvoreno nastupati.<sup>109</sup> *Zemljak* je *Narodni list* prozvao i za pogubljenost tvrdeći da njegovi pristaše zapravo ne znaju što hoće, a što neće.<sup>110</sup> U jednom je trenutku ustanovio da je *Narodni list* počeo i sam zagovarati sporazum s vladom te je zaslužnim za to smatrao sebe i svoje napore da dokaže kako se narod ne može zavarati bučnim riječima. Ipak mu je predbacio što je svejedno nastavio napadati zemljake, iz čega je zaključio da je to njegovo pozivanje na sporazum s vladom samo „mazanje očiju“.<sup>111</sup>

Uzrok zagovaranju takve, po njima pogubne politike, zemljaci su vidjeli u prethodno spomenutim osobnim strastima narodnjaka okupljenih oko *Narodnog lista*. *Zemljak* je upozoravao da nije svako protivljenje vladi znak neovisnosti jer može biti potaknuto ovisnošću o vlastitoj taštini i strastima, a od njih narod nikada nije imao koristi.<sup>112</sup> U odbijanju poziva na mir koje upućuje narod *Zemljak* je vidio zločin protiv toga istog naroda kojim središnjica Narodne stranke pokazuje da joj je stalo samo do inata, prkosa i samovolje.<sup>113</sup> Iako narod vapi za mirom, narodnjaci okupljeni oko

the people by emphasizing nationality and religion and to cause the People's Party to collapse.<sup>106</sup> *Zemljak* also referred to its political opponents as outlaws who prevented harmony which helped People's Party overcome all difficulties in the past, and who lead a struggle fuelled by personal passions while hiding behind the idea of people's honesty. Those who despite the people's call for peace, advocated war *Zemljak* considered the only outlaws.<sup>107</sup>

Often, the articles of *Zemljak* suggested that the Populists gathered around *Narodni list* impose on the people a war against a government that people don't want. *Zemljak* wrote that Populists would bring fight to Dalmatia like the one fought in the Czech Republic. Not only would this fight be much more devastating for Dalmatians than for the Czechs, but the Czechs themselves argued, *Zemljak* claimed, for having indulged in it.<sup>108</sup> Zemljaci also accused the Populists of insincerity, claiming that they did not advocate their policy publicly because they knew the people would never accept it. On the basis of such actions of their opponents, Zemljaci concluded that the people supported them and that one should not openly oppose the political direction they represent.<sup>109</sup> *Zemljak* also called *Narodni list* being confused, claiming that its supporters do not actually know what they want.<sup>110</sup> At one point, it established that *Narodni list* itself started advocating an agreement with the government, crediting itself for that due to its efforts to prove that the people could not be fooled by mere noisy words. However, *Zemljak* resented *Narodni list* for continuing attacks on Zemljaci, from which it concluded that the call for an agreement with the government was merely "pulling wool over people's eyes" by *Narodni list*.<sup>111</sup>

Zemljaci saw the cause of advocating such a destructive policy in the previously mentioned personal passions of Populists gathered around *Narodni list*. They warned that not all opposition to the government is a sign of independence because it can be fuelled by dependence

<sup>107</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 64.

<sup>108</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 36.

<sup>109</sup> "Izborna borba", *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 63.

<sup>110</sup> "Kako se vojuje", *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 39.

<sup>111</sup> "U Zadru, 19 kolovoza", *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 49.

<sup>112</sup> "Pripravljajmo se na izbore!", *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 60.

<sup>113</sup> "U mir ljudi!", *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 71.

<sup>106</sup> "Rieč u svoje vrieme", *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 76; "Nedajmo se!", *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 79; "A mi skladno!", *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 83.

<sup>107</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 64.

<sup>108</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 36.

<sup>109</sup> "Izborna borba", *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 63.

<sup>110</sup> "Kako se vojuje", *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 39.

<sup>111</sup> "U Zadru, 19 kolovoza", *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 49.

*Narodnog lista* inzistiraju na beskorisnu sukobu s vladom i to će ih, najavio je *Zemljak*, pokopati na izborima.<sup>114</sup>

Značajno mjesto u kampanji zauzelo je pitanje hrvatsko-srpskih odnosa. *Narodni list* pozivao je na međuplemensku slogu i odbacivanje slike koju je *Zemljak* stvarao o tim odnosima. Pisao je da zemljaci pokušavaju pod imenom bratstva i ravnopravnosti razdvajati iste suplemenike potpirujući među njima vjerske strasti. Hrvati i Srbi u Dalmaciji, prema *Narodnom listu*, mogu „u jednom narodnom kolu zaigrati, na temelju istoga jezika, jednakih običaja i povjestnih predaja!“ Oni imaju iste težnje i istu budućnost na području slobode, prosvjete i napretka, kao i zajedničke uspomene na tuge i radosti iz prošlosti. Razdvajati ih značilo bi ponovno gurati narod u staro ropstvo. *Narodni list* i dalje je odbacivao *Zemljakove* navode o zanemarivanju srpstva, tvrdeći da nije nimalo odstupio od naglašavanja narodne ravnopravnosti i državnopravne jednakosti Hrvata i Srba u svakoj prigodi te je dodao da će zdrava hrvatsko-srpska narodna svijest poslužiti kao zaštita od *Zemljakovih* laži.<sup>115</sup>

*Narodni list* pozvao je na oprez protiv „smutljivaca“ koji pokušavaju „nebratskim rovanjem“ na svoju stranu privući „neznalice i slabiće“, kojih ima u svakom narodu. Pametnijim i viđenijim ljudima iz obaju plemena poručivao je da je njihova rodoljubna dužnost suprotstaviti se takvima i odbaciti njihov „otrovni korov“. Tom je prigodom još jednom istaknuo ravnopravnost Hrvata i Srba tvrdeći da oba imena svjedoče o slavnoj prošlosti i da se obje vjere u narodu poštuju, a zaštitu im jamči i Dalmatinski sabor.<sup>116</sup> One koji rade protiv hrvatsko-srpske sloge *Narodni list* nazivao je „Brankovićima“, aludirajući na čovjeka čija je izdaja, prema legendi, odlučila ishod Kosovske bitke i omogućila Turcima da zavladaju Srbijom.<sup>117</sup>

*Zemljak* je na optužbe o korištenju vjere s ciljem razdvajanja naroda odgovarao jednakim

on one's vanity and passions, bringing no benefit to the people.<sup>112</sup> *Zemljak* considered Populists' refusal to call for peace, a crime against the people they represented by which the centrepiece of the People's Party showed that it cared only for the spite, defiance and arbitrariness.<sup>113</sup> Although the people long for peace, the Populists insist on a futile conflict with the government, and that, said *Zemljak*, will bury them in the elections.<sup>114</sup>

The issue of Croatian-Serbian relations took a prominent place in the campaign. *Narodni list* called for an inter-tribal harmony and a rejection of the image of these relations created by *Zemljak*. It wrote that Zemljaci were trying to divide the same tribes under the name of brotherhood and equality by fostering religious passions among them. According to *Narodni list*, Croats and Serbs in Dalmatia “can play in one national circle dance, based on the same language, equal customs and historical traditions!” They share the same aspirations and the same future in the area of freedom, education and progress, as well as shared memories of the sorrows and joys of the past. Separating them would mean pushing people back into old slavery. *Narodni list* continued to reject *Zemljak's* allegations of Serb neglect, claiming that it never deviated from the emphasis on ethnic equality and state equality of Croats and Serbs at every opportunity, adding that a healthy Croatian-Serbian national consciousness would serve as a protection against *Zemljak's* lies.<sup>115</sup>

*Narodni list* call for caution against “troublemakers” who try to draw the “ignorant and weak” people, present in every nation, on their side through „un-brotherly fight“. It sent message to smarter and more prominent people of both tribes that it was their patriotic duty to oppose Populists and to reject their “poisonous weed.” On this occasion, it once again emphasized the equality of Croats and Serbs, claiming that both names testify to the glorious past and that both religions are respected in the people, under the guaranteed protection of the Dalmatian Parliament.<sup>116</sup> *Narodni list* named “Branković” all those who work against Croatian-Serbian harmony, alluding to the man whose betrayal, according

<sup>114</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 67.

<sup>115</sup> “Rieč u svoje vrieme”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 76.

<sup>116</sup> “A mi skladno!”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 83.

<sup>117</sup> “Nedajmo se!”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 79; “A mi skladno!”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 83.

<sup>112</sup> “Pripravljajmo se na izbore!”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 60.

<sup>113</sup> “U mir ljudi!”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 71.

<sup>114</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 67.

<sup>115</sup> “Rieč u svoje vrieme”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 76.

<sup>116</sup> “A mi skladno!”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 83.

optužbama. Pisao je da su narodnjaci okupljeni oko *Narodnog lista* vabili narod govorom o vjeri i slavenskoj uzajamnosti kako bi ga podijelili. Dio naroda time su odbili, a dio su prevarili potaknuvši ga na inat umjesto sloge. Međutim, pisao je *Zemljak*, narod, osim što poznaje svoje dušmane, zna razabrati i između vlastitih sinova, a oni se dijele u dvije skupine. Na jednoj su strani oni koji zavađaju braću, kojima ne smeta narodna nevolja, već žele da on pod svaku cijenu slijedi njihovu politiku, koji traže saveznike svugdje osim među svojom krvnom braćom i koji „turskim djelom“ razdvajaju dvije vjere. Na drugoj su strani ljudi koji su uvijek gledali narodnu korist, koji zagovaraju mir i slogu bez obzira na vjeru i stalež te koji se žele držati dogovora s vladom dok god ona radi na korist naroda.<sup>118</sup> U stavu *Narodnog lista* prema vjeri zemljaci su vidjeli prijetvornost. Tvrđili su da je narod odbacio politiku njegovih pristaša pa su se oni, uvidjevši da im druga sredstva ne pomažu, okrenuli govoru o vjeri kako bi ocrnili svoje političke protivnike.<sup>119</sup> Kada je *Narodni list* one koji razdvajaju Hrvate i Srbe usporedio s Brankovićem, *Zemljak* je pisao da se raduje tim riječima, ali je dodao da, s obzirom na dosadašnje postupanje *Narodnog lista*, ne može biti siguran da dolaze iz srca i da nisu samo sredstvo predizborne agitacije koje će biti odbačeno kad više ne bude potrebno.<sup>120</sup>

Dva dopisa koja je *Zemljak* objavio pobliže prikazuju stav Srba o hrvatsko-srpskim odnosima u Dalmaciji i razlozima zašto su oni takvi kakvi jesu. Prvi je dopis upućen iz Kninske krajine i predstavlja odgovor dopisniku *Narodnog lista* koji je pisao o pravoslavnim svećenicima koji su se pretplatili na *Zemljak*. *Zemljakov* je dopisnik pisao da pravoslavni svećenici, kao i svaki čovjek, na srcu nose svoje plemensko ime. To plemensko ime, koje je u njihovu slučaju srpsko, *Narodni list* počeo je zapostavljati i promovirati „ голу hrvaštinu“. Zbog toga su se okrenuli *Zemljaku* koji ravnopravno tretira oba plemena. Ipak se ne treba, govorio je dopisnik, zbog toga bojati razdvajanja

to the legend, decided on the outcome of the Kosovo battle and allowed the Turks to rule Serbia.<sup>117</sup>

*Zemljak* responded to allegations of using religion to separate peoples with equal accusations. It wrote that the Populists gathered around the *Narodni list* invited the people to talk about religion and Slavic Reciprocity in order to share it. This made part of the people leave their side, and part of the people were cheated by being prompted to spite instead of harmony. However, *Zemljak* wrote, besides knowing their spirits, people can also discern between their own sons, and they are divided into two groups. On the one hand, those who make a breach among brothers are not bothered by the affliction of the people, but want their policy followed at all costs, they seek allies everywhere but among their blood brothers, and divide the two faiths by “Turkish deed system”. On the other hand, there are people who have always looked for the nation’s benefit, who advocate peace and harmony regardless of religion and status and who want to keep a deal with the government as long as it works for the benefit of the people.<sup>118</sup> *Zemljaci* saw a deceit in the attitude of *Narodni list* regarding religion. They claimed that people had rejected the policies of its supporters, realising that other means did not succeed, and turned to religion subjects in order to defame their political opponents.<sup>119</sup> When *Narodni list* compared those who separate Croats and Serbs with Branković, *Zemljak* wrote that it rejoiced in those words, but added that, given the conduct of *Narodni list* so far, it could not be sure whether they came from the heart or were they only a means of election agitations that will be discarded when they will be no longer needed.<sup>120</sup>

Two letters published by *Zemljak* show closely the position of Serbs on Croatian-Serbian relations in Dalmatia and the reasons why they are such. The first letter was sent from the Knin region and represents a response to a correspondent of *Narodni list* who wrote about Orthodox priests who subscribed to *Zemljak*. *Zemljak’s* correspondent wrote that Orthodox priests, like any person, bear their tribal name on their hearts.

<sup>118</sup> “U mir ljudi!”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 71.

<sup>119</sup> “Izborna borba”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 63; “U mir ljudi!”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 71.

<sup>120</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 68.

<sup>117</sup> “Nedajmo se!”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 79; “A mi skladno!”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 83.

<sup>118</sup> “U mir ljudi!”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 71.

<sup>119</sup> “Izborna borba”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 63; “U mir ljudi!”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 71.

<sup>120</sup> *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 68.

naroda. Svećenici će zajedno sa *Zemljakom* stati uz narodni barjak i nastaviti se boriti za zaštitu i blagostanje svoje srpsko-hrvatske narodnosti.<sup>121</sup> Drugi su dopis na sam dan izbora uputili srpski birači iz kninsko-drniškoga izbornog kotara. U njemu su pisali da su Srbi Narodnu stranku podržavali još od 1861. zbog bratskog obzira prema Hrvatima i borbe protiv talijanštine. Na izborima su uvijek birali kandidate koje im je preporučivao *Narodni list*, bez obzira na vjeru. Međutim, *Narodni list* promijenio je smjer, zbog čega su mu svi slobodoumni ljudi okrenuli leđa. Srbi su, da ih se ne bi optuživalo za razbijanje stranke, šutjeli i čekali da se *Narodni list* vrati na pravi put, ali to se nije dogodilo. Stoga su se počeli pozivati na svoje ime i narodnost.<sup>122</sup>

U *Narodnom listu* objavljen je predizborni proglas koji je potpisao Narodni izborni odbor središnji. U njemu je središnjica Narodne stranke poručila biračima da su na kocki rezultati dvanaest godina teške političke borbe. Narod na izborima mora odgovoriti na pitanje čija je zemlja na kojoj živi i je li voljan ponovno robovati tuđem jeziku, samovolji i obijesti, ili želi živjeti na svojoj zemlji sa svojim jezikom, mirom, slobodnom dušom i pod svojim barjakom. Mora birati između narodnosti, slobode, poštenja, napretka i svjetlosti na jednoj i tuđinstva, poniženja, sramote, nazatka i mraka na drugoj strani. U proglašenju se spominju i narodni protivnici, autonomaši i zemljaci. Za jedne se kaže da žele uništiti jezik, a za druge da žele izazvati razdor među braćom. Proglas je pozvao narod na izbore uz najavu da će, vođen vjerom u Boga i poštenje, odabrati ispravno.<sup>123</sup> Središnjica Narodne stranke bila je optimistična uoči izbora. *Narodni list* pisao je da je, sudeći prema vijestima iz pokrajine, narodna pobjeda već osigurana, ali je također upozoravao na lukavstvo neprijatelja koji su sposobni u zadnji tren varkama i potkupljivanjima utjecati na izborne rezultate.<sup>124</sup> *Zemljak* je pak pisao o nedostatku predizborne agitacije, što je tumačio činjenicom da su se razvili ustavni život i ljubav prema

That tribal name, in this case Serbian, *Narodni list* began to neglect and promote “pure Croatian legacy”. That is why they turned to *Zemljak* which treats both tribes equally. However, the correspondent wrote, one should not fear the separation of nations due to this reason. The priests will stand by the national flag along with *Zemljak*, and continue to fight for the protection and well-being of their Croatian-Serbian nation.<sup>121</sup> The second letter was sent on the very day of the election by Serbian voters from Knin-Drniš constituency. It stated that Serbs had supported the People's Party since 1861 because of their brotherly regard for the Croats and the fight against the Italianism. In the elections, they always chose the candidates recommended by *Narodni list*, regardless of religion. However, *Narodni list* has changed its course, which is why all free-spirited people have turned their backs on it. To avoid accusations of breaking the party, Serbs remained silent and waited for *Narodni list* to return to the right path which did not happen. So they started referring to their name and nationality.<sup>122</sup>

*Narodni list* published a pre-election proclamation signed by the Central Election Committee. In it, the People's Party centrepiece addressed voters stating that the results of the twelve years of difficult political struggle were at stake in the forthcoming elections. The people who vote must ask themselves whose country they live in, and whether they are willing to re-enslave to foreign language, arbitrariness and arrogance, or want to live on their own land with their language, peace, free soul and under their flag. They must choose between nationality, freedom, honesty, prosperity and light on the one side, and alienation, humiliation, shame, regression and darkness the other. The proclamation also mentions Populist's opponents Autonomists and Zemljaci. One party is said to want to destroy the language, while the other want to cause strife among the brothers. The proclamation called the people to the election with the announcement that they would choose the right thing guided by faith in God and honesty.<sup>123</sup> The centrepiece of the People's Party was optimistic of the elections. *Narodni list* wrote that, according to news from the province, a populist victory had already been secured, but it also warned of cunning of enemies capable of influencing election results in the

<sup>121</sup> “Iz kninske krajine, 15/27 Avgusta”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 56.

<sup>122</sup> “Domaće”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 81.

<sup>123</sup> “Narode!”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 80.

<sup>124</sup> “Zadar, 18 listopada”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 84.

<sup>121</sup> “Iz kninske krajine, 15/27 Avgusta”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 56.

<sup>122</sup> “Domaće”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 81.

<sup>123</sup> “Narode!”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 80.

javnim poslovima. Zaključio je da, budući da je vlada sada na strani naroda, narod nema moćna protivnika i može na izbore i bez pripreme.<sup>125</sup>

Rezultati izbora nisu bili povoljni ni za jedne ni za druge. Središnjica Narodne stranke od devet je dalmatinskih zastupničkih mjesta osvojila samo tri. U Carevinsko vijeće uspjeli su ući Miho Klaić, Mihovil Pavlinović i Lovre Monti. Zemljaci su osvojili samo jedno mjesto. Izabran je Stefan Ljubiša zahvaljujući vjernu biračkom tijelu u Boki kotorskoj, a pomogla mu je i potpora dalmatinskog namjesnika Rodića te crnogorskog kneza Nikole koji je imao presudan utjecaj na bokeljske Srbe. Većinu, odnosno pet mandata, osvojili su autonomasi, potpomognuti djelomično i režimskim nasiljem.<sup>126</sup>

Dva su se suprotstavljena lista u danima nakon izbora osvrtała na rezultate. *Narodni list* pisao je da je narod ovoga puta protiv sebe, osim starih dušmana, imao i zavedene prijatelje te je i jednima i drugima, koji su mu nudili „pune šake novca“, morao dokazati da mu je više stalo do svoga dičnog imena nego do koristi. Navodio je i nedaće s kojima se narod tijekom izbora susretao, a to su „nagovaranje vladinovaca, skrojni napori dušmanâ, nečuvene majstorije, zadjevice, pociepanje, mlitavost, zdvojnost, nebratska mržnja i podmećanja“ te je zaključio da su ipak sve prevladane jer je narod tijekom vremena razvio „samosviest časti i narodnoga ponosa“. *Narodni list* osudio je nečasne radnje koje su presudile na nekim mjestima, ali je izrazio zadovoljstvo što su u najvažnijim kotarima izbore dobili narodni kandidati. Zaključio je da su izbori, unatoč vladinim pritiscima i višemjesečnoj *Zemljakovoj* propagandi, označili potpun poraz politike bečke petorice. Narod, na koji su se toliko pozivali, pokazao im je da ne stoji uz njih. Nitko od njih, osim Ljubiše, nije dobio značajniji broj glasova, a i njegovi su rezultat spletkarenja i bezakonja. Poštteni Bokelji, tvrdio je *Narodni list*, propustili su izbore i nisu glasovali za Ljubišu pa se postavlja pitanje koga će on zapravo u Carevinskom vijeću predstavljati.<sup>127</sup>

last minute by deception and bribery.<sup>124</sup> *Zemljak*, however, explained the lack of pre-election agitation, with the already developed constitutional life and affection for public affairs. It concluded that since the government is now on the side of the people, they have no powerful opponent and can vote without preparation.<sup>125</sup>

The election results were not favourable to either. Out of nine Dalmatian Parliamentary seats, only three were won by the People's Party centrepiece. Miho Klaić, Mihovil Pavlinović and Lovre Monti managed to join the Imperial Council. Zemljaci won only one seat. Stefan Ljubiša was elected thanks to a loyal electorate in Boka Kotorska, and was aided by the support of the Dalmatian governor Rodić and the Montenegrin Duke Nikola, who had a decisive influence on Serbs in Boka. Majority of mandates, five of them, were won by Autonomists, aided in part by regime of violence.<sup>126</sup>

In the days following the election, two opposing newspapers looked back on the results. *Narodni list* wrote that this time, apart from the old enemies, people had a deceived friends who offered them “hands full of money”, to whom both they had to prove that they cared more for their proud name than for their benefits. It also cited misfortunes the people encountered during the election, such as “persuading of the government, planned efforts of the enemies, unprecedented mastery, feuds, splitting, looseness, indecisiveness, non-fraternal hatred and bribes” and concluded that they were all overcome since over time people developed “self-consciousness of honour and national pride.” *Narodni list* condemned the dishonourable actions that overruled in some places, but expressed satisfaction that the populist candidates received the majority in the most important districts. It concluded that the elections, despite government pressure and several months of *Zemljak's* propaganda, signalled the complete defeat of the policies of the five Representatives (the Vienna five). The people, whom they appealed upon so much, showed them that they do not support them. None of them, except Ljubiša, received a significant number of votes, and his votes were the result of intrigue and lawlessness. According to *Narodni list*, the honest people of Boka missed the elections and did not vote for Ljubiša, so the question

<sup>125</sup> “IZBORI”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 66.

<sup>126</sup> Rajčić 2014: 224.

<sup>127</sup> “Zadar, 25 listopada”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 86.

<sup>124</sup> “Zadar, 18 November”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 84.

<sup>125</sup> “IZBORI”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 66.

<sup>126</sup> Rajčić 2014: 224.



*Zemljak* je pokušavao pronaći opravdanje za izuzetno loš rezultat stranke koju je predstavljao. Pisao je da to što su zemljaci osvojili samo jedno zastupničko mjesto ne znači da narod ne podržava njihov sporazum s vladom te je uzrok poraza vidio u djelovanju narodnjaka okupljenih oko *Narodnog lista*, koji su varali narod hineći sporazum s vladom i unoseći pitanja vjere u politiku. Zemljaci su tvrdili da su se protiv njihovih spletki borili samo svojim programom. *Zemljak* je pisao da je Ljubiša izabran u Boki jer do tamo nije doprlo „varkanje“ i hvalio je Bokelje koji su izabravši Ljubišu pokazali političku zrelost i mudrost. Također je najavio da će se narod ubrzo ugledati na njih, kada shvati da narodnjaci okupljeni oko *Narodnog lista* nisu njegovi zastupnici, već zastupnici vlastite samovolje.<sup>128</sup>

*Zemljak* je zbog jačanja autonomaša rezultate izbora proglasio narodnim porazom i prozvao je *Narodni list* zbog slavljenja pobjede. Iz toga je zaključio da njegovim pristašama nije važno koliko će narod imati zastupnika, nego samo da mu oni budu zastupnici. Također je izrazio strah da će vlada prestati podržavati narodnu opciju i dodao da će, ako se to ipak ne dogodi, zaslužna biti petorica sada već bivših zastupnika u Carevinskom vijeću.<sup>129</sup> Prema *Zemljaku*, *Narodni list* nakon izbora svoju je lošu politiku pokušavao opravdati pozivanjem na slavensku uzajamnost, točnije tvrdnjom da je narodu osvjetlao obraz pred drugim Slavenima. To je, pisao je *Zemljak*, beskorisno jer drugi Slaveni vode drugačiju politiku i neće nimalo pomoći narodu da se pridigne iz propasti koju su mu narodnjaci okupljeni oko *Narodnog lista* priredili.<sup>130</sup>

Izbori su pokazali da zemljaci nisu politička opcija koja može značajnije ugroziti Narodnu stranku. Njihov loš rezultat uvjerio je pripadnike središnjice stranke da su bili u pravu i da je stav koji su zauzeli prema „otpadnicima“ ispravan.<sup>131</sup> Ipak, situacija oko zemljaštva kod Klaića je izazvala strah od daljeg narušavanja jedinstva stranke pa je, da bi to spriječio, predložio nacrt

was whom would he actually represent in the Imperial Council.<sup>127</sup>

*Zemljak* was trying to find justification for the extremely poor result of the party it represented. It wrote that the fact that Zemljaci won only one seat does not mean that the people do not support their agreement with the government. The cause of the defeat was seen in the actions of the Populists gathered around the *Narodni list*, who cheated the people by simulating the agreement with the government and bringing issues of religion in politics. Zemljaci claimed that they fought these intrigues only with their program. *Zemljak* wrote that Ljubiša was elected in Boka because “cheating” did not yet reach it, and praised people of Boka who showed political maturity and wisdom by choosing Ljubiša. *Zemljak* also announced that the people would soon look up to them when they realize that the Populists gathered around *Narodni list* were not their representatives, but of their own arbitrariness.<sup>128</sup>

Due to Autonomists' strengthening, *Zemljak* declared the election results a people's defeat and called on *Narodni list* for celebrating the victory from which it concluded that populist supporters did not care how many Representatives would present people's interest but only seeing themselves as Representatives. It also expressed fear that the government would stop supporting the people's option, adding that, if that did not happen, the five now-former members of the Imperial Council would be credited.<sup>129</sup> According to *Zemljak*, after the elections, *Narodni list* tried to justify its bad policy by invoking Slavic Reciprocity, more precisely by claiming that it brought honour to its people in front of other Slavs. This, *Zemljak* wrote, was useless because other Slavs were pursuing a different policy and wouldn't help the nation at all to rise up from the ruins where people around the *Narodni list* lead them.<sup>130</sup>

The elections showed that Zemljaci were not a political option that could significantly threaten the People's Party. Their poor result convinced the People's Party centrepiece members that they were right and that the attitude they took towards the “apostates” was correct.<sup>131</sup> However, Klaić recognized the situation around

<sup>128</sup> “Nakon prvoga izbora”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 78.

<sup>129</sup> “U Zadru, 30 listopada”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 79.

<sup>130</sup> “U Zadru, 30 listopada”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 80.

<sup>131</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 197.

<sup>127</sup> “Zadar, 25 listopada”, *Narodni list*, G. XII, br. 86.

<sup>128</sup> “Nakon prvoga izbora”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 78.

<sup>129</sup> “U Zadru, 30 listopada”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 79.

<sup>130</sup> “U Zadru, 30 listopada”, *Zemljak*, G. I, br. 80.

<sup>131</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 197.

novoga stranačkog programa u kojem je u prvoj točki istaknuo ujedinjenje Dalmacije i banske Hrvatske, ali je ipak glavni naglasak stavio na očuvanje stranačkog jedinstva, slavenstvo Dalmacije i potpunu jednakopravnost Hrvata i Srba uz slobodu vjeroispovijesti. Stranački je klub u prosincu 1873. usvojio taj nacrt, a nisu ga prihvatili Pavlinović i Kosta Vojnović koji su isticali načela hrvatskoga povijesnog prava i konzervativnog katoličanstva.<sup>132</sup>

Narodna srednjačka stranka nastavila je postojati do 1876. kada se ugasila zajedno s listom *Zemljak*. Iako se nije pokazala kao naročito snažna opcija, ipak je izvršila značajan utjecaj na Narodnu stranku i dalmatinsku politiku. Za razliku od narodnjaka okupljenih oko *Narodnog lista*, koji su inzistirali na narodnoj jednakosti i jednakopravnosti Hrvata i Srba, zemljaci su isticali razlike među njima i zahtijevali zadovoljavanje interesa srpske strane. To je bio dio kontinuiteta srpske politike u Dalmaciji, koja je još od šezdesetih godina bila usmjerena na zadovoljavanje vlastitih partikularnih interesa, u početku uz pragmatičnu suradnju s Narodnom strankom. Zemljaci su počeli kao opcija koja se zalagala za pragmatizam, u ovom slučaju s osloncem na bečku vladu, a budući da su se odvojili od središnjice Narodne stranke, mogli su otvoreno isticati srpske interese. Birači ih nisu podržali, ali je njihov pogled na hrvatsko-srpske odnose odnio pobjedu nad narodnjačkim pogledom. Kontinuitet srpskog partikularizma u Dalmaciji se nastavio i konačno je doveo do raspada Narodne stranke prema etničkom načelu 1879. i osnivanja Srpske narodne stranke na Primorju godinu dana kasnije.

## Zaključak

Prva secesija u dalmatinskoj Narodnoj stranci dogodila se u vremenu političkih promjena u austrijskom dijelu Monarhije. Kako bi prekinule bojkot Carevinskog vijeća od strane Čeha, bečke su vlasti odlučile promijeniti način biranja njegovih zastupnika. Prvi korak u tom smjeru bio je Zakon o izborima za nevolju, kojim je

Zemljaci as fear of further violation of party unity, so he proposed a draft of a new party program in order to prevent it. In the first paragraph he emphasized the unification of Dalmatia and Banovina of Croatia, but nevertheless stressed out the preservation of party unity, the Slavic origin of Dalmatia and the complete equality of Croats and Serbs with freedom of religion. The Party Club adopted this draft in December 1873 but was not accepted by Pavlinović and Kosta Vojnović who emphasized the principles of Croatian historical law and conservative Catholicism.<sup>132</sup>

The Mainstream Folk Party continued to exist until 1876 when it was dissolved along with the newspaper *Zemljak*. Although it did not prove to be a particularly powerful option, it did exert considerable influence on the People's Party and Dalmatian politics. Unlike the Populists and *Narodni list*, who insisted on the national equality and equal rights for Croats and Serbs, Zemljaci addressed the differences between them and demanded that the interests of the Serbian side be met. This was part of the continuity of Serbian politics in Dalmatia, which aimed at satisfying its own particular interests since the 1860s, initially with pragmatic co-operation with the People's Party. Zemljaci began as an option that advocated pragmatism, in this case relying on the Viennese government, and since they separated from the centrepiece of the People's Party, they could openly emphasize Serb interests. The voters did not support them, but their view of Croatian-Serbian relations won over the populist view. The continuity of Serbian particularism in Dalmatia continued and finally led to the dissolution of the People's Party according to the ethnic principle in 1879 and the establishment of the Serbian People's Party in Primorje a year later.

## Conclusion

The first secession in the Dalmatian People's Party occurred at a time of political change in the Austrian part of the Monarchy. In order to end the Czech Republic's boycott of the Imperial Council, the Viennese authorities decided to change the way they elected Representatives to the Imperial Council. The first step in this direction was the Emergency electoral law, which introduced temporary direct election of Representatives in the event that the filling of the seats in the

<sup>132</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 198-199.

<sup>132</sup> Cetnarowicz 2006: 198-199.

uvedeno privremeno izravno biranje zastupnika u slučaju da se Vijeće ne uspije popuniti na standardan način, odabirom zastupnika od strane zemaljskih sabora. Petorica dalmatinskih zastupnika u Carevinskom vijeću glasovala su za taj zakon smatrajući da postupaju pragmatično. U tom zakonu nisu vidjeli opasnost za Dalmaciju i vjerovali su da svojom podrškom pokazuju lojalnost vladi i osiguravaju njezinu potporu. Unatoč glasovima nekih nezadovoljnih članova, Narodna stranka složila se s odlukom petorice zastupnika i prihvatila njihov stav koji je bio u skladu s kompromisnim stavom koji je zauzela prema vladi nakon osvajanja većine u Dalmatinskom saboru 1870.

No kada su ti isti zastupnici podržali izbornu reformu kojom su trajno uvedeni izravni izbori za Carevinsko vijeće, reakcija Narodne stranke bila je znatno drugačija. Zastupnici su ponovno tvrdili da bi glasovanje protiv izazvalo negativnu reakciju vlade te su vjerovali njenim obećanjima koja su išla u smjeru razvoja narodnosti i gospodarskog napretka Dalmacije. Stranka, koja je od njih tražila da glasuju protiv, ovoga se puta nije složila s njihovim postupkom, već ih je žestoko napala putem svoga glasila, *Narodnog lista*. Nazivala ih je otpadnicima koji su zbog vladinih obećanja izdali narodno poštenje i stavili se u službu politike koja teži nametanju njemačke hegemonije Slavenima u Monarhiji. Radilo se o sukobu dviju političkih filozofija. Zastupnici su zagovarali pragmatizam, vjerujući da će suradnja s vladom više pomoći Dalmaciji od isticanja slavenske uzajamnosti u koju nisu vjerovali. Narodna je stranka, s druge strane, nastupala s pozicija svojevrsna političkog idealizma, smatrajući da su poštenje i obraz iznad svake materijalne koristi.

Zastupnici su naposljetku osnovali Narodnu srednjačku stranku i pokrenuli list *Zemljak*. Između njega i *Narodnog lista* vodile su se žestoke polemike u kojima su obje strane pokušavale dokazati da svojim postupanjem štite narodnost i da ih narod podržava, dok su postupci druge strane štetni za narod. Važno mjesto u tim polemikama zauzelo je pitanje hrvatsko-srpskih odnosa u Dalmaciji. *Zemljak* se žalio na loš tretman Srba od strane narodnjaka okupljenih oko *Narodnog lista* tvrdeći da im oni uskraćuju prava, da

Imperial Council. Five Dalmatian Representatives in the Imperial Council voted in favour of the law, considering their proceedings pragmatic. In that law, they saw no danger to Dalmatia and believed that with their support they showed loyalty to the government and secured its support. Despite the comments of some disgruntled members, the People's Party agreed with the decision of the five Representatives and accepted their position, which was in line with the compromise position it had taken against the government after winning the majority in the 1870 Dalmatian Parliament.

But when the same Representatives supported electoral reform that permanently introduced direct elections to the Imperial Council, the reaction of the People's Party was significantly different. The Representatives again argued that a vote against would provoke a backlash from the government, and they believed in government's promises, which went in the direction of development of the nationality and economic progress of Dalmatia. The party, which asked them to vote against, did not agree with their actions this time, and had attacked them fiercely through its newsletter *Narodni list*. It called them apostates who, because of government promises, betrayed people's honesty and put themselves in the service of a policy that seeks to impose German hegemony on Slavs in the Monarchy. It was a conflict of two political philosophies. Representatives advocated pragmatism, believing that cooperation with the government would help Dalmatia more than emphasizing the Slavic Reciprocity they did not believe in. The People's Party, on the other hand, acted from the standpoint of a kind of political idealism, holding that honesty and honour were above all material gain.

Eventually the Representatives formed the Mainstream Folk Party and launched the newspaper *Zemljak*. Fierce controversy ensued between *Zemljak* and *Narodni list*, in which both parties tried to prove that they were protecting the nation by their actions and that the people supported them, while the other party's actions were harmful to the people. The issue of Croatian-Serbian relations in Dalmatia took an important place in these controversies. *Zemljak* complained about the poor treatment of Serbs by the Populists gathered around *Narodni list*, claiming that they were depriving Serbs of their rights, promoting Croatian exclusivism and clericalism while neglecting Cyrillic script and the like. However, it should be noted that the conflict within the party did not occur due to the issue of Croatian-Serbian relations. The

promiču hrvatski ekskluzivizam i klerikalizam, da zanemaruju ćirilicu i slično. Ipak, treba napomenuti da se sukob unutar stranke nije dogodio zbog pitanja hrvatsko-srpskih odnosa. Osnovni razlog zbog kojeg su se zemljaci odvojili bio je njihov stav prema vladi, različit od stava središnjice Narodne stranke. Kako se zaoštravala polemika s *Narodnim listom*, tako je pitanje hrvatsko-srpskih odnosa počelo dobivati na važnosti. *Narodni list Zemljakove* optužbe promatrao je kao sredstvo pomoću kojeg zemljaci pokušavaju zavaditi narod zbog osobne koristi i suprotstavljao im se ističući tradicionalne narodnjačke stavove o narodnoj jednakosti i jednakopravnosti Hrvata i Srba u Dalmaciji. Posebno je na udaru *Narodnog lista* bio Stefan Ljubiša, najistaknutiji zemljak, koji je proglašavan prevarantom, lažljivcem, mutikašom i slično. Ni *Zemljak* nije ostajao dužan, tvrdeći da narodnjaci okupljeni oko *Narodnog lista* vode prijatvornu politiku potaknutu osobnim strastima. Takvu politiku, pisao je *Zemljak*, narod odbacuje jer je štetna pa stoga *Narodni list* vrši hrvatsku ekskluzivističku propagandu pokušavajući ipak privući narod na svoju stranu.

Pobjednici prvih izravnih izbora za Carevinsko vijeće bili su autonomasi, koji su iskoristili sukob u Narodnoj stranci, izborni sustav koji im je išao na ruku te režimsko nasilje. Središnjica Narodne stranke osvojila je tri mandata, a zemljaci samo jedan, čime je postalo jasno da se nisu prometnuli u značajnu političku opciju. Njihova stranka nastavila je postojati do gašenja lista *Zemljak* 1876., ali je njihov pogled na hrvatsko-srpske odnose ipak opstao. On je bio dio kontinuiteta srpske partikularističke politike koja je u Dalmaciji bila prisutna još od šezdesetih godina. Naposljetku je taj partikularizam doveo do izdvajanja Srba iz Narodne stranke i osnivanja Srpske narodne stranke na Primorju.

main reason why *Zemljaci* separated was their attitude towards the government, different from the position of the centrepiece of the People's Party. As the controversy with *Narodni list* intensified, so the issue of Croatian-Serbian relations began to gain importance. *Narodni list* viewed *Zemljak's* accusations as a means by which *Zemljaci* tried to mislead the people for its personal gain, and opposed them by emphasizing traditional populist views on the ethnic equality and equality of Croats and Serbs in Dalmatia. The most prominent *Zemljak* Stefan Ljubiša was particularly at the stroke of *Narodni list* whom it proclaimed a fraudster, a liar, a troublemaker and the like. *Zemljak* replied in the same manner, claiming that the Populists gathered around the *Narodni list* were pursuing a threatening policy fuelled by personal passions. *Zemljak* wrote that such a policy was rejected by the people because it was harmful which was why *Narodni list* conducted Croatian exclusivist propaganda, trying to draw the people to their side.

The winners of the first direct elections to the Imperial Council were the Autonomists, who took advantage of the conflict in the People's Party, the electoral system that came to their advantage, and the regime's violence. The centrepiece of the People's Party won three seats and *Zemljaci* won only one, making it clear that they did not succeed as a significant political option. Their party continued to exist until the close of the newspaper *Zemljak* in 1876, but their view of Croatian-Serbian relations persisted. It was part of the continuity of Serbian particularistic politics that had been present in Dalmatia since the 1860s. Eventually, this particularism led to the separation of Serbs from the People's Party and the establishment of the Serbian People's Party on the Primorje.

## Bibliografija / Bibliography

### Popis izvora / Literary sources

*Narodni list*

*Zemljak*

### Popis literature / Literature

Cetnarowicz 2006 – Antoni Cetnarowicz, *Narodni preporod u Dalmaciji: od slavenstva prema modernoj hrvatskoj i srpskoj nacionalnoj ideji*, Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2006.

Danilo 1872 – Ivan Danilo, *Izbor za nevolju i dalmatinski zastupnici na Carevinskom vieću*, Zadar: vlastita naklada, 1872.

Mahoney 2011 – William Mahoney, *The History of the Czech Republic and Slovakia*, Santa Barbara: Greenwood, 2011.

Perić 1978 – Ivo Perić, *Dalmatinski sabor 1861.-1912. (1918.) god.*, Zadar: JAZU, 1978.

Perić 2002 – Ivo Perić, *Hrvatska državotvorna misao u XIX. i XX. stoljeću*, Zagreb: Dom i svijet, 2002.

Petrović 1982 – Rade Petrović, *Nacionalno pitanje u Dalmaciji u XIX stoljeću*, Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1982.

Rajčić 2005 – Tihomir Rajčić, Srpski nacionalni pokret u Dalmaciji u XIX. stoljeću, *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru*, 47, Zagreb, 2005, 341–361.

Rajčić 2014 – Tihomir Rajčić, Politički i nacionalni aspekti fenomena “zemljaštva” u Dalmaciji (1873.-1878.), *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru*, 56, Zagreb, 2014, 213–233.

Šidak et al. 1968 – Jaroslav Šidak, Mirjana Gross, Igor Karaman & Dragovan Šepić, *Povijest hrvatskog naroda g. 1860-1914*, Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1968.

Taylor 1976 – A. J. P. Taylor, *The Habsburg Monarchy 1809-1918: A History of the Austrian Empire and Austria-Hungary*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1976.

Vrandečić 2002 – Josip Vrandečić, *Dalmatinski autonomistički pokret u XIX. stoljeću*, Zagreb: Dom i svijet, 2002.

