

Ideja o osnivanju Univerziteta u Sarajevu početkom 20. stoljeća: austrougarska vlast u Bosni i Hercegovini između kulturne misije i političke realnosti

The Idea of Establishing the University of Sarajevo at the Beginning of 20th Century: Austro-Hungarian Authority in Bosnia and Herzegovina Between Cultural Mission and Political Reality

Amila Kasumović

Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, Bosna i Hercegovina / Faculty of Philosophy, University of Sarajevo, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
akasumovic80@gmail.com

Informacije o članku / Article Info

Primljen / Received 12. 10. 2020.
Prihvaćen / Accepted 4. 11. 2020.
Dostupan online / Available online: 15. 12. 2020.

Ključne riječi / Keywords

univerzitet, Sarajevo, austrougarska uprava, Zajedničko ministarstvo finansija, Zemaljska vlada u Sarajevu

university, Sarajevo, Austro-Hungarian rule, Joint Ministry of Finance, Provincial Government in Sarajevo

Sažetak / Abstract

Početak 20. stoljeća brojne krize potresale su Balkan, a one poput Aneksione (1908–1909) i Balkanskih ratova (1912–1913) snažno su utjecale na gibanja u bosanskohercegovačkom društvu. Suočena s vrlo kompleksnom političkom situacijom na Balkanu, Austro-Ugarska je morala izgraditi strategiju jačanja svog utjecaja na ovom području. U tom smislu, Sarajevo je trebalo odigrati vrlo važnu ulogu. U ovom radu se želi pokazati kako je austrougarska vlast u Bosni i Hercegovini, plasirajući ideju da bi se u Sarajevu mogao osnovati univerzitet, lavirala između davno zacrtane kulturne misije u datom području i političkih mahinacija kojima se trebao anulirati rastući utjecaj Srbije. Reakcija javnosti, kako one u Bosni i Hercegovini, tako i one u Monarhiji, na ideju o osnivanju sarajevskog univerziteta, primorala je njene glavne zagovornike na propitivanje vlastitih političkih rezona.

At the beginning of the 20th century, the Balkans was the epicentre of numerous crises and some of them (the Annexation Crisis 1908–1909 and the Balkan Wars 1912–1913) had a major effect on social activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Therefore, faced with a very complex political situation in the Balkans, Austro-Hungary was about to develop a strategy of increasing its own influence in the mentioned area. Consequently, Sarajevo was bound to play an important role in these plans. This paper argues that, by promoting the idea of establishing a university in Sarajevo, the Austro-Hungarian authorities were actually oscillating between their previous plan of conducting a cultural mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina and political machinations aimed at the annihilation of Serbian influence. The public reactions in Bosnia, as well as in the remainder of the Monarchy, forced the solicitors of this idea to re-examine their own political considerations.

Uvod

Prošle godine Univerzitet u Sarajevu slavio je 70 godina svoga postojanja. Da su u prošlosti društvene i političke okolnosti bile nešto drugačije, Univerzitet u Sarajevu bi danas možda imao stoljetnu tradiciju.

Prvi povjesničar koji je ukazao na iznimno važno pitanje mogućnosti osnivanja sarajevskog univerziteta, koje je bilo aktualno 1913. godine, bio je Hamdija Kapidžić. On je u kratkom članku, baziranom na tri dokumenta iz fonda Privatna registratura Arhiva Bosne i Hercegovine, čije je izvode docnije i objavio (Kapidžić 1973, 427–428, 445–446), analizirao stavove koje su u prepisci iznosili zajednič-

Introduction

Last year, the University of Sarajevo celebrated 70 years of its existence. If the social and political circumstances had been somewhat different in the past, the University of Sarajevo would perhaps have a century-old tradition today.

The first historian to point out the exceptionally important question of the possibility of establishing a university in Sarajevo, which was current in 1913, was Hamdija Kapidžić. In a short article, based on three documents from *Privatna registratura Arhiva Bosne i Hercegovine* (Private Registry of the Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina), whose extracts he later published (Kapidžić 1973, 427–428,

ki ministar financija Biliński i poglavar Zemaljske vlade u Sarajevu Potiorek, a ticali su se pitanja osnivanja univerziteta u Sarajevu (Kapidžić 1961, 293–295).

Cilj ovog rada je da, s jedne strane, pokaže da je ideja o osnivanju univerziteta u Sarajevu bila predmetom javne rasprave već krajem 19. stoljeća i da je povremeno aktualizirana sve do momenta koji je uočio Kapidžić, a koji je predstavljao već završnu fazu u promišljanjima o osnivanju jedne visokoškolske ustanove u okupiranom/anektiranom području. S druge strane, u radu se želi pokazati kako je ideja osnivanja sarajevskog univerziteta bila prihvaćena u javnom diskursu i tiskanim medijima,¹ kako u Bosni i Hercegovini, tako i u Monarhiji. Takav diskurs Kapidžić uopće nije problematizirao u svom radu, a trebao je, budući da je upravo javno mnijenje, između ostalog, utjecalo na odluku da se ideja o osnivanju univerziteta u Sarajevu ostavi za neka druga vremena.

Također, Kapidžić je problem sarajevskog univerziteta promatrao isključivo kroz prizmu kolonijalnog odnosa Austro-Ugarske prema Bosni i Hercegovini, koju je najprije okupirala 1878, a potom i anektirala 1908. godine (Kapidžić 1961, 293). Stoga je njegov fokus bio na kulturnoj misiji Monarhije, dok je kontekst Balkanskih ratova izostao. U radu se želi pokazati da je austrougarskom narativu o kulturnoj misiji u Bosni i Hercegovini bio suprotstavljen sve jači nacionalni narativ domaćeg stanovništva i politička realnost koja je primoravala Dvojnu monarhiju da pažljivo kreira svoje politike na periferiji.

Sarajevski univerzitet na novinskim stranicama 1899–1913.

Pitanje osnivanja univerziteta u Sarajevu bilo je aktualno za vrijeme tri zajednička ministra financija, koji su bili direktno odgovorni za upravu nad Bosnom i Hercegovinom. O ovom pitanju izjašnjavali su se redom Benjamin von Kállay (1882–1903), Stephan Burián von Rajecz (1903–1912) i Leon Biliński (1912–1915), zauzimajući jednak stav, ali nudeći različite odgovore, sukladno njihovoj viziji o tome što bi trebalo biti učinjeno s Bosnom i Hercegovinom.

Na stranicama dnevne štampe ideja o osnivanju visokoškolske institucije u Sarajevu spomenuta je prvi put 1899. godine. To je bio vrlo osjetljiv povijesni moment: radila se rekapitulacija dvadesetogodišnje

445–446), he has analyzed the views expressed in the correspondence by the Joint Minister of Finance Biliński and the Head of the National Government in Sarajevo Potiorek, concerning the establishing of a university in Sarajevo (Kapidžić 1961, 293–295).

The aim of this paper is, on the one hand, to show that the idea of establishing a university in Sarajevo was the subject of public debate as early as the end of the 19th century and that it was occasionally actualized until the moment noticed by Kapidžić, which has already represented the final stage in the reflection on the establishing of a higher education institution in the occupied / annexed area. On the other hand, the paper seeks to show how the idea of establishing a university in Sarajevo was accepted in public discourse and the print media,¹ both in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in the Monarchy. Kapidžić did not problematize such a discourse in his work at all, and he should, because that public opinion, among other things, influenced the decision to leave the idea of establishing a university in Sarajevo for some other time.

Also, Kapidžić looked at the problem of the university of Sarajevo solely through the prism of the colonial attitude of Austro-Hungary towards Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was first occupied in 1878, and then annexed in 1908 (Kapidžić 1961, 293). Therefore, his focus was on the cultural mission of the Monarchy, while the context of the Balkan wars was missing. The paper seeks to show that the Austro-Hungarian narrative of the cultural mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina was opposed by the growing national narrative of the local population and the political reality that forced the Dual Monarchy to carefully create its policies on the periphery.

University of Sarajevo on newspaper pages 1899–1913

The issue of establishing a university in Sarajevo was current during the time of the three Joint Finance Ministers, who were directly responsible for the administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina. On this issue in turn spoke Benjamin von Kállay (1882–1903), Stephan Burián von Rajecz (1903–1912) and Leon Biliński (1912–1915), taking the same position but offering different answers, according to their vision of what should be done with Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The idea of establishing a higher education institu-

¹ Austrijska nacionalna biblioteka stoji iza projekta ANNO: digitalizacija periodike iz različitih razdoblja. Zahvaljujući tome, olakšano je istraživanje brojnim istraživačima.

¹ The Austrian National Library is behind the project ANNO: digitization of periodicals from different periods. Thanks to that, the research has been made easier for numerous researchers.

uprave Austro-Ugarske monarhije u Bosni i Hercegovini i valorizirao se pristup Benjamina von Kállaya pitanju tretmana okupiranog područja. Njegov prilično krut stav i težnja k apsolutističkoj upravi Bosne i Hercegovine, kao i težnja da uguši domaće nacionalne pokrete (Kraljačić 1987, 88–89), vodili su općem nezadovoljstvu jednog dijela bosansko-hercegovačkog stanovništva, posebno mladih koji su svoje obrazovanje nastavljali na univerzitetima u Monarhiji.

U jesen 1899. godine studenti južnoslavenskog porijekla protestirali su ispred zgrade Zajedničkog ministarstva finansija. Demonstracije su bile usmjerene protiv *Kállayevog režima* u Bosni i Hercegovini. List *Pester Lloyd*² iskoristio je navedeni trenutak kako bi svoje čitaoce upoznao sa stanjem u okupiranoj oblasti. Između ostalog, navedeno je da u Bosni i Hercegovini još uvijek, nakon dvadeset godina austrougarske uprave, nema *visoke škole* (*Pester Lloyd* 1899, 2).

Iako zvuči kao možebitna kritika, tekst članka uvodi pomirljiviji ton, jasno pokazujući težnju da opravda Monarhiju i njenu misiju na Balkanu, napose u zaposjednutom području. U tekstu se navodi da nije svrsishodno tumačiti razloge zbog čega nije došlo do osnivanja visoke škole u Sarajevu, nego da je dovoljna opaska kako osnivanje visoke škole mora biti rezultat stvarnih potreba, a ne imperijalnih želja. Time je (nepoznati) autor, najvjerojatnije urednik teksta, nastojao opravdati Zemaljsku vladu u Sarajevu, koja je za upravu nad Bosnom i Hercegovinom direktno odgovarala Zajedničkom ministarstvu finansija, pred javnošću u Monarhiji, a koja je očekivala rezultate dugogodišnjeg upravljanja *gotovo* kolonijom. Upravo se navedeni narativ suprotstavlja Kapidžićevom esencijalističkom poimanju odnosa Austro-Ugarske kao kolonijalne sile prema Bosni i Hercegovini, gdje je većina pitanja rješavana ne uzimajući u obzir potrebe okupiranog područja. Čak je i javnost u Monarhiji bila svjesna toga da se neprestano mora opipavati puls javnosti novostečene oblasti, kako bi se izradila adekvatna upravljačka strategija, a domaće stanovništvo umirilo. Osim toga, u tekstu je istaknuto da je Zemaljska vlada u Sarajevu brinula o dodjeli stipendija mladima iz Bosne i Hercegovine koji su školovanje željeli nastaviti na univerzitetima u Monarhiji. Taj dio analize autor je morao završiti s nešto malo, u to vrijeme vrlo popularnog, orijentalističkog diskursa tvrdeći da je dvadeset godina uprave zapravo malo da se *podigne* narod koji je više stoljeća bio pod

tion in Sarajevo was first mentioned on the pages of the daily press in 1899. It was a very sensitive historical moment: a recapitulation of the twenty-year administration of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy in Bosnia and Herzegovina was carried out and Benjamin von Kállay's approach to the treatment of the occupied territory was valorised. His rather rigid attitude and aspiration to the absolutist administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as his aspiration to stifle domestic national movements (Kraljačić 1987, 88–89), led to the general dissatisfaction of one part of the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina, especially young people who continued their education at universities in the Monarchy.

In the fall of 1899, students of South Slavic descent protested in front of the building of Joint Ministry of Finance. Demonstrations were directed against the *Kállay's regime* in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Newspaper *Pester Lloyd*² used this moment to acquaint their readers with the situation in the occupied area. Among other things, it was stated that in Bosnia and Herzegovina, after twenty years of Austro-Hungarian rule, there is still no *higher school* (*Pester Lloyd* 1899, 2).

Although it sounds like a possible critique, the text of the article introduces a more conciliatory tone, clearly showing the desire to justify the Monarchy and its mission in the Balkans, especially in the occupied territories. The text states that it is not appropriate to interpret the reasons why the higher school in Sarajevo was not established, rather, it is a sufficient remark that the establishing of a higher school must be the result of real needs, and not imperial wishes. Thereby, the (unknown) author, most likely the editor of the text, tried to justify the National Government in Sarajevo, which was directly responsible for the administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the Joint Ministry of Finance, in front of the public in the Monarchy, and which expected the results of many years of management of the *almost* colony. This narrative precisely opposes Kapidžić's essentialist perception of Austro-Hungarian relations as a colonial power towards Bosnia and Herzegovina, where most issues were resolved without taking into account the needs of the occupied area. Even the public in the Monarchy was aware that the pulse of the public of the newfound region must be constantly felt, in order to develop an adequate management strategy, and calm the local population. In addition, the text points out that the National Government in Sarajevo took care of awarding scholarships to young people from Bos-

² Izlazio je u Budimpešti na njemačkom jeziku.

² It was published in Budapest in German language.

turskom vlašću. Takvo opravdanje bilo je više nego prihvaćeno u tadašnjem javnom prostoru ne samo Dvojne monarhije nego i Evrope općenito.

Čini se da je novinarsku radoznalost podržavala politička elita oba dijela Monarhije. Prilika da se sazna nešto više o rezultatima uprave nad Bosnom i Hercegovinom pružala se delegatima austrijske i ugarske delegacije svaki put kada je zajednički ministar finansija davao informaciju o već odobrenom budžetskom proračunu za okupiranu oblast (Izvještaj o upravi BiH 1906, 21). Sredinom 1900. godine postavio je Redner, član delegacije pri austrijskom carevinskom vijeću, pitanje Kállayu da li će biti podignut univerzitet u Sarajevu, o čemu je štampa već pisala (Wiener Zeitung 1900, 10; usp. Neues Wiener Tagblatt 1900, 3) Kállay je odgovorio očekivano, u orijentalističkom duhu (Kraljačić 1987, 74-88). Ustvrdio je da još nije dostignut *visoki duhovni nivo domaćeg stanovništva* za takav poduhvat.³ Time je Kállay potvrdio imperijalistički, tutorski pristup Bosni i Hercegovini i tadašnje općeprihvaćeno uvjerenje vodećih evropskih sila da postoje oblasti u svijetu koje je potrebno civilizirati i prosvjeteliti. Ujedno, opravdao je upravu u Bosni i Hercegovini u smislu njenih dometa i onoga što se postiglo za nešto više od dvadeset godina.

No očigledno je kod bosanskohercegovačke inteligencije sazrijevala ideja o potrebi osnivanja univerziteta u Sarajevu, jer je nedugo nakon Kállayeve izjave u jednom feljtonu najavljeno da se iz Bosne i Hercegovine u Beč sprema deputacija koja bi, između ostalog, pregovarala i o pitanju univerziteta. I autor feljtona se, u Kállayevu duhu, zapitao treba li takva ustanova jednom narodu, da li su to njegove stvarne potrebe s obzirom na njegov kulturni razvoj (Pester Lloyd 1900, 2).

Sve do početka 1901. godine pitanje sarajevskog univerziteta uglavnom je promatrano kroz prizmu kulturnog razvoja okupiranog područja. No izvjesni je Berger, član Zastupničkog doma, prvi put, koliko je meni poznato, uveo politički faktor u problematiku, u svom vrlo ironičnom govoru koji je trajao tri sata, a koji je završio njegovom konstatacijom da on, u principu, nema ništa protiv slavenskog univerziteta u Sarajevu, ali da on mora biti srpski. Na tu konstataciju nasmijali su se slavenski zastupnici. Ipak, njegov govor je sigurno bio zanimljiv jer su čak tri dnevna lista prenijela njegove najinteresantnije dijelove (Wiener

nia and Herzegovina who wanted to continue their education at universities in the Monarchy. That part of the analysis the author had to end with a little, at that time very popular, Orientalist discourse claiming those twenty years of rule were actually not enough to *raise* a people that had been under *Turkish* rule for centuries. Such justification was more than accepted in the then public space not only in the Dual Monarchy but in Europe in general.

Journalistic curiosity seems to have been supported by the political elite of both parts of the Monarchy. The opportunity to learn more about the results of the administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina was given to the delegates of the Austrian and Hungarian delegations each time when the Joint Minister of Finance provided information on the already approved budget for the occupied area (Izvještaj o upravi BiH 1906, 21). In the middle of 1900, Redner, a member of the delegation of the Austrian Imperial Council, asked Kállay whether a university in Sarajevo would be built, which the press had already written about (Wiener Zeitung 1900, 10; cf. Neues Wiener Tagblatt 1900, 3). Kállay responded as expected, in a spirit of Orientalism (Kraljačić 1987, 74-88). He claimed that a *high spiritual level of the local population* had not yet been reached for such an endeavour.³ With this Kállay has confirmed the imperialist, tutoring approach to Bosnia and Herzegovina and the then generally accepted belief of the leading European powers that there are regions in the world that need to be civilized and educated. At the same time, he justified the administration in Bosnia and Herzegovina in terms of its scope and what has been achieved in just over twenty years.

But apparently the idea of the need to establish a university in Sarajevo was maturing in the BIH intelligence, because shortly after Kállay's statement, it was announced in one feuilleton that a deputation from Bosnia and Herzegovina was being prepared to Vienna, which would, among other things, negotiate the issue of the university. And the author of the feuilleton, in the spirit of Kállay, wondered whether a nation needed such institution, whether these were its real needs in view of its cultural development. (Pester Lloyd 1900, 2)

Until the beginning of 1901, the issue of the university of Sarajevo was mainly viewed through the prism of the cultural development of the occupied area. But a certain Berger, a member of the House of Representatives, is for the first time,

³ Čini se da se Kállay bavio idejom podizanja medicinskog fakulteta uz Vakufsku bolnicu u Sarajevu, no ideja je ubrzo napuštena (Neuigkeits-Welt-Blatt 1913, 3).

³ Kállay seems to have been working on the idea of building a medical faculty next to the Waqf Hospital in Sarajevo, but the idea was soon abandoned (Neuigkeits-Welt-Blatt 1913, 3).

Zeitung 1901, 21; usp. Grazer Tagblatt 1901, 14; Das Vaterland 1901, 4). Iako se stječe dojam da je govorio ironično, Berger je, zapravo otvorio Pandorinu kutiju, vrlo osjetljivo nacionalno pitanje u Bosni i Hercegovini, te indirektno ukazao na vrlo kompleksan odnos Zemaljske vlade u Sarajevu i srpskog stanovništva.

Kállayeva je smrt 1903. godine označila kraj jednog značajnog razdoblja u upravljanju Bosnom i Hercegovinom. Njegova se politika prema okupiranom području ocjenjivala kao politika *čvrste ruke* i posebno se osjećala na polju Kállayevog odnosa prema bosanskohercegovačkim nacionalnim elitama. Znatno liberalnija politika postepeno je postala prepoznatljiva kao izbor novog zajedničkog ministra finansija Buriána. Rezultirala je slobodnijim političkim životom u Bosni i Hercegovini i formiranjem prvih domaćih političkih stranaka. Bila je donekle uzburkana Aneksionom krizom (1908/1909), ali su se domaći politički krugovi nastojali umiriti donošenjem ustava i početkom rada bosanskohercegovačkog Sabora 1910. godine. U Buriánovo vrijeme privedeni su kraju pregovori sa srpskim i muslimanskim prvacima za vjersko-prosvjetnu autonomiju.

U takvim okolnostima pitanje sarajevskog univerziteta, koliko sam uspjela utvrditi, pojavilo se u tisku u dva navrata: 1906. godine i u vrijeme trajanja Aneksione krize. Nekoliko dnevnih listova pratilo je s velikim interesiranjem Buriánov govor pred ugarskom delegacijom u junu 1906. godine. Burián je govorio vrlo opširno o stanju u Bosni i Hercegovini. Kao i obično, delegati su mu postavljali pitanja. Delegat Krasojević je htio znati kani li Burián raditi na osnivanju univerziteta u Sarajevu, gdje bi nastava bila na domaćem jeziku (Agramer Zeitung 1906, 2). Zajednički ministar finansija je odgovorio da ni ne pomišlja na osnivanje univerziteta u Sarajevu, ali za razliku od Kállaya, koji je ovo pitanje nužno vezao s kulturnom elevacijom jednog naroda, Burián je ponudio dosta praktične razloge. Naime, u Bosni i Hercegovini je najprije trebalo napraviti mrežu osnovnih škola. Osim toga, nije bilo dovoljno ni potencijalnih polaznika, ali ni sredstava da se osnuje univerzitet. To je razlog koji je austro-ugarska vlast u Bosni često navodila kod spornih pitanja: ne mogu se riješiti zbog nedostatka finansija (sic!). Burián je nastavio s konstatacijom da su svi oni koji su htjeli nastaviti školovanje mogli to učiniti, zahvaljujući stipendijama, na nekom od univerziteta u Monarhiji. (Agramer Zeitung 1906, 2; usp. Grazer Tagblatt 1906, 21; Wiener Zeitung 1906, 10; Neues Wiener Tagblatt 1906, 5) Iako je

as far as I know, introduced the political factor into the issue, in his very ironic speech that lasted three hours, and which ended with his statement that he, in principle, has nothing against the Slavic University in Sarajevo, but it must be Serbian. Slavic representatives laughed at this statement. Still, his speech was certainly interesting because as many as three daily newspapers carried its most interesting parts (Wiener Zeitung 1901, 21; cf. Grazer Tagblatt 1901, 14; Das Vaterland 1901, 4). Although one gets the impression that he spoke ironically, Berger did actually open a Pandora's Box, a very sensitive national question in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and indirectly pointed to the very complex relationship between the National Government in Sarajevo and the Serb population.

Kállay's death in 1903 marked the end of a significant period in the administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina. His policy towards the occupied territory was assessed as a policy of a *firm hand* and was especially felt in the field of Kállay's attitude towards the BIH national elites. A much more liberal policy gradually became recognizable as the election of a new Joint Finance Minister Burián. It resulted in a more liberal political life in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the formation of the first domestic political parties. It was somewhat agitated by the Annexation Crisis (1908/1909), but they tried to calm down domestic political circles with the adoption of the Constitution and the beginning of the work of the BIH Parliament in 1910. In Burián's time, negotiations with Serbian and Muslim leaders for religious and educational autonomy were completed.

In such circumstances, the question of the university of Sarajevo, as far as I was able to determine, appeared in the press on two occasions: in 1906 and during the Annexation Crisis.

Several daily newspapers followed Burián's speech before the Hungarian delegation in June of 1906 with great interest. Burián spoke very extensively about the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. As usual, the delegates asked him questions. Delegate Krasojević wanted to know if Burián intended to work on the establishing of a university in Sarajevo, where classes would be in the local language (Agramer Zeitung 1906, 2). The Joint Finance Minister replied that he was not even considering establishing of a university in Sarajevo, but unlike Kállay, who necessarily linked this question to the cultural elevation of a nation, Burián offered quite practical reasons. In fact, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, a network of primary schools had to be created first. In addition, there were not enough potential students or funds

tisak pokazao veliku zainteresiranost za Buriánov govor pred ugarskom delegacijom, njegov odgovor nije ostavio mjesta daljim debatama u javnom diskursu. Tako je ideja o univerzitetu u Sarajevu ponovo, nakratko, pala u zaborav.

Samo mjesec dana prije proglašenja aneksije Bosne i Hercegovine Austro-Ugarskoj, objavila je Muslimanska svijest⁴ program Muslimanske napredne stranke. Kako je ova stranka okupljala uglavnom “napredne muslimane” koji su bili orijentirani na kulturni preporod (Imamović 2007, 218–224), ne čudi da su njeni predstavnici bili posvećeni i pitanju univerzitetskog obrazovanja muslimana. U Programu posebnu pažnju privlače tačke pet i šest pod stavkom Prosvjetni rad. Tu je bilo navedeno da će se nova stranka zalagati za širenje visokog obrazovanja među muslimanima. U tom smislu, išlo bi se sa zahtjevom prema vlastima da se u zemlji formira moderan vjerski fakultet, kao i da se u Sarajevu osnuje univerzitet i time se što većem broju muslimana osigura visoka naobrazba. (Muslimanska svijest 1908, 1; usp. Imamović 2007, 225)

O navedenim težnjama Muslimanske napredne stranke telegramskim putem je odmah obaviješten Neues Wiener Tagblatt. Iako je ovaj list prenio informaciju o programu stranke u kojem je mjesta našla i tačka koja se odnosi na univerzitet, komentari su izostali (Neues Wiener Tagblatt 1908, 4). Na sličan način isti časopis je pisao i nešto kasnije (Neues Wiener Tagblatt 1908b, 3). No popratni komentari su opet izostali i sve je ostalo na nivou informacije. Za pretpostaviti je da je intencija časopisa bila da javnosti Monarhije pokaže da ideja o univerzitetu, među domaćim stanovništvom u Bosni i Hercegovini, nije ugašena.

U vrijeme kada se smirivala Aneksiona kriza, u kojoj je Srbija imala posebnu ulogu, univerzitetski profesor Moritz Benedikt napisao je za novine Die Zeit članak u kojem je pitanje univerziteta u Sarajevu usko povezao s vrlo nezavidnom političkom situacijom na Balkanu. Naime, profesor Benedikt je smatrao da se u Bosni i Hercegovini moraju riješiti dva važna pitanja: prvo je bilo agrarno pitanje, a drugo se ticalo izgradnje Sarajeva kao kulturnog centra koji bi bio protuteža Beogradu (podvukla A. K.). U tom smislu, univerzitet u Sarajevu je trebao biti osnovan kako bi srpski element (u Bosni i Hercegovini) postao naklonjen Monarhiji. (Die Zeit 1909, 2)

⁴ Muslimanska svijest bila je organ Muslimanske napredne stranke koja je okupljala hrvatski orijentirane muslimane (Kreševljaković 1991, 264).

to establish a university. This is the reason that the Austro-Hungarian government in Bosnia has often stated on disputable issues: they cannot be resolved due to lack of finances (sic!). Burián continued with statement that all those who wanted to continue their education could do so, thanks to scholarships, at one of the universities in the Monarchy. (Agramer Zeitung 1906, 2; cf. Grazer Tagblatt 1906, 21; Wiener Zeitung 1906, 10; Neues Wiener Tagblatt 1906, 5) Although the press showed great interest in Burián's speech before the Hungarian delegation, his response left no room for further debate in public discourse. Thus, the idea of a university in Sarajevo fell into oblivion again, for a short time.

Only a month before the proclamation of the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to Austria-Hungary, *Muslimanska svijest*⁴ (Muslim awareness) has published a programme of *Muslimanska napredna stranka* (Muslim Progressive Party). Because this party gathered mostly “progressive Muslims” who were oriented towards cultural revival (Imamović 2007, 218–224), it was not a surprise that its representatives were also committed to the issue of Muslim university education. In the Programme, special attention draw points five and six under the item Educational work. It was stated there that the new party will advocate for the spread of higher education among Muslims. In that sense, there would be a request to the authorities to establish a modern religious faculty in the country, as well as the establishment of a university in Sarajevo and thus providing higher education to as many Muslims as possible. (Muslimanska svijest 1908, 1; cf. Imamović 2007, 225)

Neues Wiener Tagblatt was immediately informed by telegram about the stated aspirations of the Muslim Progressive Party. Although this newspaper transferred information on the party's programme, which included a university-related item, comments were missing. (Neues Wiener Tagblatt 1908, 4) The same newspaper in a similar way wrote a little bit later (Neues Wiener Tagblatt 1908b, 3), but the accompanying comments were missing again and everything remained at the level of information. It is to be assumed that the intention of the newspaper was to show the public of the Monarchy that the idea of a university, among the local population in Bosnia and Herzegovina, has not been extinguished. At a time when the Annexation crisis was calming down, in which Serbia had a special role, univer-

⁴ *Muslimanska svijest* was apparatus of the Muslim Progressive Party that brought together Croat-oriented Muslims (Kreševljaković 1991, 264).

Buriánova reakcija na ove novinske napise nije mi poznata. Univerzitet u Sarajevu postat će ponovo vruća tema u vrijeme nove krize koja je potresala Balkan 1912/1913. godine: u vrijeme balkanskih ratova.

Prije i u toku zveckanja oružjem 1912. i 1913. godine pisali su Kalendar SPKD Prosvjeta i Bosanska vila⁵ u nekoliko navrata o znanstvenom radu u Srbiji i o vodećim kulturnim i znanstvenim ustanovama u toj zemlji. Vrlo se afirmativno govorilo o Univerzitetu u Beogradu, koji je osnovan 1905. godine, i radu na polju različitih znanstvenih disciplina. (Kalendar SPKD Prosvjeta 1912, 64–68; usp. Kalendar SPKD Prosvjeta 1913, 209–214) Krajem 1913. godine napisao je Tin Ujević⁶ u časopisu Bosanska vila članak u kojem je zagovarao studiranje u Beogradu jer se tu moglo *okoristiti lekcijom energiskoga i praktičnoga nacionalizma*, dok na Zagrebačko sveučilište dolaze *štreberi i poklonici austriske nauke, svijetu nepoznate*. (Bosanska vila 1913, 246–247)

Svakako da su navedeni članci morali predstavljati znak za uzbunu Zemaljskoj vladi i Zajedničkom ministarstvu finansija. Nacionalno i konfesionalno podijeljeno bosanskohercegovačko društvo i vrlo kompleksna politička situacija na Balkanu uznemiravali su vladajuće krugove u Monarhiji. Bilo je to vrijeme Balkanskih ratova koji su dodatno usložnili situaciju na Balkanu, ali posebno u Bosni i Hercegovini. Srbija je tada, zahvaljujući vojnim uspjesima iz 1912. godine, uživala u prestižu, posebno tamo gdje je bila jaka južnoslavenska ideja (Donia 2000, 184). U to vrijeme zajednički ministar finansija bio je Biliński za kojeg se vjerovalo da je zagovarao naglašeniju kulturnu misiju u Bosni i Hercegovini (Kapidžić 1961, 293). Tačnije, Biliński je vjerovao da bi uspješan razvoj Bosne i Hercegovine svakako doprinio rješavanju južnoslavenskog pitanja unutar Dvojne monarhije (Matković 2004, 26).

Od sredine 1913. godine u tisku se ponovo javlja pitanje osnivanja univerziteta u Sarajevu. Iznosena je vijest kako Biliński pregovara s vladama u Beču i Budimpešti o osnivanju univerziteta u Sarajevu kao tačke koja bi privlačila mlade ljude koji žele studirati a porijeklom su s Balkana. Iako se u članku tvrdilo da Zagrebački univerzitet već predstavlja centar za Južne Slavene, zbog političkih se okolnosti nije nametnuo i kao kulturno središte uopće. Da je politički faktor u pitanju osnivanja sarajevskog

city professor Moritz Benedikt wrote a newspaper article for *Die Zeit* in which he closely linked the issue of the university of Sarajevo to the very unenviable political situation in the Balkans. Thus, professor Benedikt believed that two important issues must be resolved in Bosnia and Herzegovina: the first was the agricultural question, and the other concerned the construction of Sarajevo as a cultural centre that would be a counterbalance to Belgrade (underlined by A. K.). In this sense, the university in Sarajevo was to be established in order for the Serbian element (in Bosnia and Herzegovina) to become inclined to the Monarchy. (*Die Zeit* 1909, 2)

Burián's reaction to these newspaper articles is not known to me. The university of Sarajevo will again become a very live topic during the new crisis that shook the Balkans in 1912/1913: during the Balkan wars.

Before and during the rattling of weapons in 1912 and 1913, Calendar of SPKD *Prosvjeta* (Serbian Cultural and Educational Society *Prosvjeta*) and *Bosanska vila*⁵ wrote on several occasions about scientific work in Serbia and about the leading cultural and scientific institutions in that country. The University of Belgrade, which was established in 1905, and the work in the field of various scientific disciplines were discussed very affirmatively. (Kalendar SPKD *Prosvjeta* 1912, 64–68; cf. Kalendar SPKD *Prosvjeta* 1913, 209–214) At the end of 1913, Tin Ujević⁶ wrote in the journal *Bosanska vila* article where he advocated studying in Belgrade because it *could benefit from a lesson in energetic and practical nationalism*, while to the University of Zagreb are coming *nerds and admirers of Austrian science, unknown to the world* (Bosanska vila 1913, 246–247).

Stated articles most certainly have been a wake-up call to the National Government and the Joint Ministry of Finance. Bosnia and Herzegovina's nationally and confessionally divided society and the very complex political situation in the Balkans have disturbed ruling circles in the Monarchy. It was the time of the Balkan Wars that further complicated the situation in the Balkans, but especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina. At that time, thanks to the military successes in 1912, Serbia enjoyed prestige, especially where there was a strong South Slavic idea (Donia 2000, 184). At the time, the Joint Finance Minister was Biliński, who was believed to have advo-

⁵ Izdavač lista bilo je Srpsko prosvjetno-kulturno društvo Prosvjeta.

⁶ Augustin Josip "Tin" Ujević (1891–1955). Postao je dijelom nacionalnog omladinskog pokreta nakon 1912.

⁵ The publisher of the journal was the Serbian Educational and Cultural Society *Prosvjeta*.

⁶ Augustin Josip "Tin" Ujević (1891–1955). He became a part of the national youth movement after 1912.

univerziteta igrao značajnu ulogu, proizilazi iz nastavka teksta u kojem se tvrdi kako bi Sarajevo kao centar (Južnih Slavena) moglo biti opasno budući da bi se tu mogao okupljati slavenski nepodoban element, dok je Zagreb ipak privlačio one koji su bili odani (habsburškoj) dinastiji i carstvu. (*Neuigkeits-Welt-Blatt*, 1913, 3)

Ostale novine u Monarhiji pozivale su se na *Bosnische Korrespondenz*, uvodeći u narativ o sarajevskom univerzitetu ponovo koncept kulturne misije. Za autore članaka bilo je nesumnjivo da je Bosna i Hercegovina za vrijeme austrougarske uprave doživjela kulturni i privredni razvoj i zaista bi podizanje univerziteta predstavljalo krunu kulturnog rada Monarhije. Međutim, kalajevski pristup osjetan je i u ovom članku, jer se na kraju teksta navodi da bi bilo preuranjeno razmišljati o univerzitetu zbog političkih i društvenih razloga. (*Grazer Volksblatt* 1913, 2)

Nije se moglo ni bez političkog momenta: u jednom članku Biliński je optužen da je idejom o gradnji univerziteta u Sarajevu htio pridobiti Srbe u Bosni i Hercegovini koji su mu bili opozicija; tako bi sarajevska visoka škola imala karakter srpskog univerziteta. Za autora članka takav bi poduhvat mogao biti iznimno opasan jer bi novi univerzitet mogao postati stjecište srpskih iredentista. Budući da je sa sobom mogao vezati različite probleme, smatralo se da je najbolje odustati od ideje univerziteta u Sarajevu. (*Grazer Tagblatt* 1913, 2)

U drugom članku se donosi i informacija više: da je Biliński ozbiljan u naumu osnivanja univerziteta u Sarajevu, govori i podatak da ministar namjerava već u naredni budžetski proračun uvrstiti sumu koja bi poslužila za izobrazbu nastavnog kadra koji bi radio na univerzitetu. (*Grazer Tagblatt* 1913a, 14; usp. *Pester Lloyd* 1913, 18) Time se po posljednji put u javnom diskursu nametnulo pitanje sarajevskog univerziteta kao ozbiljan problem.

U Bosni i Hercegovini listovi nisu obraćali previše pažnje na univerzitetsko pitanje. Naime, smatrali su da to nije najvažniji problem i da bi se austrougarska vlast prvo trebala pozabaviti nekim drugim gorućim društvenim pitanjima (*Glas slobode* 1913, 2).

Stoga se na ideju osnivanja univerziteta u Sarajevu značajnije osvrnuo jedino Hrvatski dnevnik, prvobitno jednim kratkim člankom, a potom i dužom analizom. Naime, Hrvatski dnevnik je prihvatio stav da bi sarajevski univerzitet predstavljao uslugu Srbima koji su bili opozicija Bilińskom. Hrvati i muslimani su se tome jako protivili, iako ova tvrdnja ne može biti potpuno tačna, jer je ranije navedeno

cated a more prominent cultural mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Kapidžić 1961, 293). Specifically, Biliński believed that the successful development of Bosnia and Herzegovina would certainly contribute to resolving the South Slavic issue within the Dual Monarchy (Matković 2004, 26).

From the middle of 1913, the issue of establishing a university in Sarajevo reappears in the press. The news was that Biliński was negotiating with the governments in Vienna and Budapest on the establishing of a university in Sarajevo as a point that would attract young people who want to study and are originally from the Balkans. Although the article claimed that the University of Zagreb was already a centre for the South Slavs, due to political circumstances it did not impose itself as a cultural centre at all. That the political factor in the issue of establishing a university in Sarajevo played a significant role, arises from the continuation of the text in which it is claimed that Sarajevo as the centre (of the South Slavs) could be dangerous since a Slavic unsuitable element could gather there, while Zagreb nevertheless attracted those who were loyal to the (Habsburg) dynasty and empire (*Neuigkeits-Welt-Blatt*, 1913, 3).

Other newspapers in the Monarchy referred to the *Bosnische Korrespondenz*, reintroducing the narrative of the university of Sarajevo into the concept of cultural mission. For the authors of the articles, there was no doubt that Bosnia and Herzegovina experienced cultural and economic development during the Austro-Hungarian rule and indeed the building of a university would be the crown of the cultural work of the Monarchy. However, the Kállay's approach is also perceived in this article, because at the end of the text it is stated that it would be premature to think about the university for political and social reasons. (*Grazer Volksblatt* 1913, 2)

It was not possible without a political moment: in one article, Biliński was accused of trying to win over Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina who were his opposition with the idea of building a university in Sarajevo; thus, Sarajevo higher school would have the character of a Serbian university. For the author of the article, such an endeavour could be extremely dangerous because the new university could become a meeting place for Serbian irredentists. Because it could tie different problems with itself, it was considered best to abandon the idea of a university in Sarajevo. (*Grazer Tagblatt* 1913, 2)

The second article also provides more information: that Biliński is serious about intending to establish a university in Sarajevo, the fact that the Minis-

da je Muslimanska napredna stranka, hrvatska po orijentaciji, u svoj program uvrstila i tačku o gradnji univerziteta. Dakle, samo je dio muslimana mogao stati uz proteste Hrvata. Oni su smatrali kako je Zagrebački univerzitet već prepoznat kao središte Južnih Slavena i kako mu se treba dati reciprocitet s austrijskim univerzitetima. Osim toga, ni sami bosanskohercegovački Hrvati nisu bili jedinstveni. Dio njih je podržavao *slavensku stvar*, dok je struja oko Hrvatskog dnevnika smatrana germanofilskom i tuđinskom. (Radulović 1988, 148–150)

Slovenci, iako nisu imali puno dodira s bosanskohercegovačkom kompleksnom društvenom situacijom, također su prosvjedovali protiv ideje osnivanja sarajevskog univerziteta, tvrdeći da su njihovi zahtjevi za univerzitetom stariji i da se prvo kod njih treba osnovati jedna takva institucija (Hrvatski dnevnik 1913, 3).

Naknadno je Hrvatski dnevnik problematizirao i tvrdnju da bi univerzitet u Sarajevu predstavljao krunu rada austrougarske uprave u Bosni i Hercegovini. U jednom cinizmom obojenom članku, koji je izašao na naslovnoj strani, konstatirano je *da razni ministri imaju razne ukuse*: tako se Kállay više posvećivao gospodarstvu,⁷ dok se Biliński okrenuo duhovnoj kulturi sada već anektirane oblasti. Autor članka se pitao da li Biliński zna da u Bosni i Hercegovini tek na 150 četvornih km dolazi jedna osnovna škola i da je u zemlji 90% nepismenog stanovništva? *Pa mu se eto sažalilo, i on je odlučio, da će nam dati univerzu.* (Hrvatski dnevnik 1913a, 1; usp. Besarović 1974, 174) Narod je već bio sit Kállayevih eksperimenata i nije im htio svjedočiti i na polju kulture. Jednostavno, autor je smatrao da univerzitet neće prosvijetliti narod i da je suvišan budući da jedan već ima u Zagrebu, te budući da bi lako moglo doći do hiperprodukcije akademskog kadra (zbog čega je nepotreban i univerzitet u Ljubljani).⁸ Za očekivati je bilo da jedan domaći časopis ne vjeruje u kulturnu misiju koju je zdušno zagovarao Biliński.⁹ Zato u članku i jeste istaknuto pitanje sarajevskog univerziteta kao čisto političko pitanje, koje je bilo direktno usmjereno protiv Hrvata, zbližavanja Bosne i Hercegovine s Banovinom, a koje bi išlo na ruku nekim autonomaškim tendencijama. (Hrvatski dnevnik 1913a, 1) Stav Hrvatskog dnevnika nimalo ne iznenađuje uzmu li

ter intends to include in the next estimated budget an amount that would be used for the training of teaching staff who would work at the university also speaks for itself (Grazer Tagblatt 1913a, 14; cf. Pester Lloyd 1913, 18). Thus, for the last time in public discourse, the issue of the university of Sarajevo was imposed as a serious problem.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, newspapers did not pay too much attention to the university issue. Thus, they believed that this was not the most important problem and that the Austro-Hungarian government should first address some other burning social issues (Glas slobode 1913, 2).

Therefore, only Hrvatski dnevnik significantly commented on the idea of establishing a university in Sarajevo, originally by one short article, and then with a longer analysis. In fact, Hrvatski dnevnik accepted the view that the university of Sarajevo would be a service to Serbs who were in opposition to Biliński. Croats and Muslims have strongly opposed to this. Although this statement may not be completely true, because it was previously stated that the Muslim Progressive Party, Croatian in orientation, included in its program a point on the construction of university. So, only a part of the Muslims could stand with the protests of the Croats. They felt that the University of Zagreb was already recognized as the centre of the South Slavs and that it should be given the reciprocity with Austrian universities. In addition, the BIH Croats were not united. Part of them supported the *Slavic cause*, while the current around *Hrvatski dnevnik* was considered as Germanophile and foreign. (Radulović 1988, 148–150)

Slovenes, although they did not have much contact with the complex social situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, also protested against the idea of establishing a university in Sarajevo, arguing that their requests for university were older and that such institution should be established at them first (Hrvatski dnevnik 1913, 3). Subsequently, *Hrvatski dnevnik* also problematized the claim that the university of Sarajevo would be the crown of the work of the Austro-Hungarian administration in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In one cynically coloured article, which came out on the front page, it was observed *that different ministers have different tastes*: so Kállay devoted himself more to the economy,⁷ while Biliński turned to the spiritual culture of the now already annexed area. The author of the article won-

⁷ No i za Kallaya se smatra da je od Bosne i Hercegovine htio stvoriti kulturno središte Balkana (Okey 2007, 222).

⁸ Ljubljana je univerzitet dobila 1919. godine.

⁹ Mogla su se čuti i mišljenja da bi univerzitet u Sarajevu trebao doprinijeti smirivanju uzavrele situacije na Balkanu (Volksfreund 1913, 3).

⁷ However, Kállay is also considered to have wanted to make Bosnia and Herzegovina the cultural center of the Balkans (Okey 2007, 222).

se u obzir vrlo delikatni konfesionalni i nacionalni odnosi u bosanskohercegovačkom društvu pred Prvi svjetski rat.

Upravo toga je bio svjestan autor članka koji je izašao u časopisu *Fremden-Blatt*. Pisanje Hrvatskog dnevnika protumačio je kao odraz nacionalnih i konfesionalnih proturječnosti koje su bile karakteristične za politički život u Bosni i Hercegovini početkom 20. stoljeća. Autor članka zamjera Hrvatskom dnevniku povezivanje pitanja osnivanja sarajevskog univerziteta s političkom situacijom u zemlji, smatrajući da se to pitanje može razmatrati samo u domenu kulture. U tom smislu, osnivanje univerziteta ne bi bilo proturječno težnji i da se izgradi mreža osnovnih škola. Svaka zemlja koja vodi računa o kulturi trebala bi imati svoj univerzitet, jer više inteligencije doprinosi njenom kulturnom razvoju (*Fremden-Blatt* 1913, 25).

Od drugih bosanskohercegovačkih listova na ideju osnivanja univerziteta u Sarajevu vrlo kratko su se osvrnuli *Glas slobode* i *Narod*. U *Glasu slobode* je prepričana suština članka koji je izišao u Hrvatskom dnevniku. Naglasak je stavljen na protivljenje hrvatskih i muslimanskih krugova navedenoj ideji te moguće nanošenje štete Zagrebačkom univerzitetu ako bi projekt bio realiziran. Navedeno je da je Biliński već odustao od ideje. No autor ovog kratkog priloga uopće nije iznosio vlastito mišljenje. (*Glas slobode* 1913, 2)

List *Narod* je također preuzeo informacije od drugih, ali je stavio naglasak na druga pitanja vezana s osnivanjem univerziteta: stavka za proračun za 1914. godinu (suma za izobrazbu univerzitetskog kadra), osnivanje filozofskog i potom pravnog fakulteta. Za razliku od *Glasu slobode*, kratki prilog završen je pitanjem "Čemu to?" te konstatacijom da je bolje osnivati više osnovnih škola jer je upravo sramota da državnih škola ima svega nešto preko tri stotine. (*Narod* 1913, 4)

Na koncu, prašina se slegla kada je objavljen zvaničan stav zajedničkog ministra finansija o ideji osnivanja univerziteta u Sarajevu. U službenom listu objavljena je informacija u kojoj je prvo objašnjeno kako je ponovo otvoreno ovo pitanje. Izgleda da je za sve bio zaslužan zastupnik Rosner, koji je govorio pred Carevinskim vijećem. Potom je navedeno da će se ministar Biliński baviti idejom osnivanja univerziteta kada se za to stvore potrebni preduvjeti kao što su kulturni napredak zemlje, smanjenje broja nepismenih, razvoj osnovnoškolskog i srednjoškolskog obrazovanja i izobrazba kadra koji bi mogao biti uposlen na univerzitetu. (Hrvatski

dered if Biliński knows that in Bosnia and Herzegovina there is only one primary school per 150 square kilometres and that 90% of the country's population is illiterate? *So he became compassionate, and decided to give us a university* (Hrvatski dnevnik 1913a, 1; cf. Besarović 1974, 174). The people were already fed up with Kállay's experiments and did not want to witness them in the field of culture either. Simply put, the author believed that the university would not educate the people and that it was redundant since one is already in Zagreb, and since there could easily be an overproduction of academic staff (which is why the university of Ljubljana is also unnecessary).⁸ It was to be expected that one local newspaper did not believe in the cultural mission that Biliński wholeheartedly advocated.⁹ That is why the article highlights the issue of the university of Sarajevo as a purely political issue, which was directly concentrated against the Croats, the rapprochement of Bosnia and Herzegovina with the Banovina, and which would go hand in hand with some autonomous tendencies. (Hrvatski dnevnik 1913a, 1) The stand of *Hrvatski dnevnik* is not at all surprising if the very delicate take into account the confessional and national relations in BIH society before the First World War.

This is exactly what the author of the article published in *Fremden-Blatt* newspaper was aware of. The writing of *Hrvatski dnevnik* was interpreted as a reflection of national and confessional contradictions that were characteristic of political life in Bosnia and Herzegovina at the beginning of the 20th century. The author of the article criticizes *Hrvatski dnevnik* for linking the issue of establishing a university in Sarajevo with the political situation in the country, thinking that this issue can be considered only in the domain of culture. In this sense, the establishment of a university would not contradict the aspiration to build a network of primary schools. Every country that cares about culture should have its own university, because more intelligence contributes to its cultural development. (*Fremden-Blatt* 1913, 25)

Among other BIH newspapers, *Glas slobode* and *Narod* commented very briefly on the idea of establishing a university in Sarajevo. *Glas slobode* summarized the essence of the article that was published in *Hrvatski dnevnik*. Emphasis was laid on the disagreement of Croatian and Muslim circles to this idea and the possible damage to the University

⁸ Ljubljana got the university in 1919.

⁹ Opinions could also be heard that the university of Sarajevo should contribute to calm down the heated situation in the Balkans (Volk-sfreund 1913, 3).

dnevnik 1913b, 3) Zvaničnim saopćenjem ministra okončana je priča o sarajevskom univerzitetu.

Biliński vs. Potiorek: Treba li Sarajevu univerzitet?

Zajednički ministar finansija Biliński i poglavar Zemaljske vlade u Sarajevu Potiorek nisu dijelili jednake vizije o ulozi Austro-Ugarske monarhije na Balkanu, kao ni o tome u kojem bi pravcu trebalo ići po pitanju uprave u Bosni i Hercegovini. Biliński je povremeno stjecao dojam da mu se Potiorek opire i da nije spreman postupati po njegovim sugestijama. (Kamberović 2004, 76, 78)

Iako potraga za opširnijom prepiskom između Zajedničkog ministarstva finansija i Zemaljske vlade u Sarajevu nije urodila plodom, na osnovu skromne arhivske građe može se doći do zaključka da se Biliński i Potiorek nisu slagali ni po pitanju osnivanja univerziteta u Sarajevu. Biliński je usitinu razmišljao o osnivanju jednog pravnog i filozofskog fakulteta u Sarajevu, koji bi postali duhovni i znanstveni centar i protuteža Beogradu.¹⁰ Čak je razmišljao i o davanju stipendija za izobrazbu budućeg kadra, koji bi bio angažiran u radu na sarajevskom univerzitetu, a koji bi se školovao u Beču i Budimpešti. Ta svoja promišljanja iznio je u nacrtu jednog šireg programa koji je predstavio u pismu upućenom Potioreku 22. 12. 1912. godine. (Juzbašić i Šehić 2015, 297)

Potiorek se potrudio, u čak nekoliko navrata, budućći da mu je Biliński ponovo u maju 1913. spomenuo svoj program (Juzbašić 2002, 310), da uvjeri zajedničkog ministra finansija da je njegova ideja o osnivanju visokoškolskih institucija u Sarajevu preuranjena. On je jednostavno nije mogao podržati. Smatrao je da bi osnivanje navedenih ustanova vodilo hiperprodukciji kadra koji bi završavao u javnim službama. Osim toga, smatrao je da univerzitet u Sarajevu ne bi mogao doseći nivo univerziteta u Monarhiji, na prvom mjestu onih u Beču i Budimpešti, dok je, što je signifikantno, Zagrebački univerzitet spomenuo u zagradi. Stoga se zalagao za to da se bosanskohercegovački službenici i srednjoškolski profesori još dugi niz godina obrazuju upravo na univerzitetima u Monarhiji.¹¹ Potiorek je bio spreman vidjeti Sarajevo jedino kao centar za istraživanje Balkana. U tom smislu, smatrao je da bi se trebalo raditi na jačanju Zemaljskog muzeja i In-

of Zagreb if the project were realized. It is stated that Biliński has already given up on the idea. But the author of this short article did not express his own opinion at all. (Glas slobode 1913, 2)

Newspaper *Narod* also took information from others, but laid emphasis on other issues related to the establishing of a university: item for the 1914 budget (the amount for the training of university staff), establishing of the Faculty of Philosophy and then the Faculty of Law. Unlike *Glas slobode*, the short article ended with the question “For what?” and stating that it is better to establish more primary schools because it is a shame that there are only a little over three hundred state schools. (Narod 1913, 4)

Finally, the dust settled when the official position of the Joint Finance Minister on the idea of establishing a university in Sarajevo was announced. The official newspaper published information where it was first explained how this issue was reopened. It seems that representative Rosner, who spoke before the Imperial Council, was responsible for everything. It was then stated that Minister Biliński would deal with the idea of establishing a university when the necessary preconditions were created such as the cultural progress of the country, reducing the number of illiterates, development of primary and secondary education and training of staff who could be employed at the university. (Hrvatski dnevnik 1913b, 3) The official statement of the Minister ended the story about the university of Sarajevo.

Biliński vs. Potiorek: Does Sarajevo need a university?

Joint Minister of Finance, Biliński, and Head of the National Government in Sarajevo, Potiorek, did not share the same visions of the role of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in the Balkans, as well as in which direction it should go in terms of administration in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Biliński occasionally got the impression that Potiorek was resisting him and that he was not ready to act on his suggestions. (Kamberović 2004, 76, 78)

Although the search for more extensive correspondence between the Joint Ministry of Finance and the National Government in Sarajevo have been unsuccessful, based on modest archival material, it can be concluded that Biliński and Potiorek did not agree on the establishing of a university in Sarajevo. Biliński was really thinking about establishing a Law and Philosophy faculty in Sarajevo, which would become a spiritual and scientific centre and

¹⁰ Na polju prosvjete i kulture austrougarska uprava je najviše ulagala u Sarajevo (Kruševac 1960, 393).

¹¹ Arhiv Bosne i Hercegovine, Privat-Registratur, 1913, br. 20 (Potiorek-Biliński, 4. 1. 1913.). Usp. Kapidžić 1973, 427; Juzbašić i Šehić, 2015, 305–306.

stituta za istraživanje Balkana.¹² Uza sve navedeno, očigledno se i Potiorek plašio da bi budući univerzitet u Sarajevu bio mjesto okupljanja *nepodobnog elementa*, odnosno, uz nediscipliniranu omladinu iz srednjih škola, pojavili bi se takvi slični studenti. (Juzbašić i Šehić 2015, 376)

Budući da su se navedeni Potiorekovi rezoni preklapali s pisanjima u tisku, Biliński je shvatio da se od ideje o osnivanju univerziteta u Sarajevu, kao duhovne i znanstvene protuteže Beogradu i krune kulturne misije Austro-Ugarske u Bosni i Hercegovini, mora odustati. Njegova ideja pojavila se u vrlo nezgodnom momentu koji su obilježili Balkanski ratovi (1912–1913) i nacionalna vrenja u Bosni i Hercegovini. (Juzbašić 2002, 459) Sagledavši navedenu situaciju, a duboko svjestan vrlo osjetljivog političkog trenutka, zajednički ministar finansija Biliński poslao je instrukcije Zemaljskoj vladi o potrebi demantiranja navoda koji su se pojavljivali u pojedinim listovima, a koji su problematizirali navedeno pitanje.¹³ Nakon objavljenog demanta u novinama, pitanje sarajevskog univerziteta stavljeno je po strani i posve zaboravljeno izbijanjem Prvog svjetskog rata.

Zaključak

Još od okupacije Bosne i Hercegovine 1878. godine, austrougarska uprava zanosila se idejom kulturne misije u ovoj zemlji. Vremenom je formiran narativ da se domaće stanovništvo treba europeizirati i uklopiti u moderne društvene tokove. Smatralo se da je potrebno uložiti ogromne napore kako bi se kulturni nivo naroda u Bosni i Hercegovini podigao. U tom smislu, trebalo je djelovati na više frontova, od kojih je onaj obrazovni svakako bio najbitniji. Kruna tog “civilizatorskog rada” bila bi realizacija ideje o podizanju univerziteta u Sarajevu.

S druge strane, Austro-Ugarska je u Bosni i Hercegovini zatekla konfesionalno podijeljeno društvo, s različitim nacionalnim pokretima u povoju. Predstavnicima domaće političke i intelektualne elite teško su mogli dopustiti stranoj upravi da potpuno ovlada svim segmentima života. Stoga su se već krajem 19. stoljeća mogli čuti zahtjevi za osnivanjem univerziteta u Sarajevu na kojem bi se obrazovali mladi južnoslavenskog porijekla. Želja za nacionalnom afirmacijom domaćeg elementa i težnje austrougarske uprave da nametne vlastite političke pozicije sudarile su se na pitanju sarajevskog univerziteta.

a counterweight to Belgrade.¹⁰ He even considered giving scholarships to train future staff, who would be engaged in work at the university of Sarajevo, and who would be educated in Vienna and Budapest. He presented his thoughts in a draft of a broader program, which he presented in a letter sent to Potiorek on December 22, 1912. (Juzbašić i Šehić 2015, 297)

Potiorek made an effort, on several occasions, as Biliński mentioned his program to him again in May 1913 (Juzbašić 2002, 310), to convince the Joint Finance Minister that his idea of establishing higher education institutions in Sarajevo was premature. He simply couldn't support the idea. He believed that the establishing of these institutions would lead to overproduction of staff that would end up in public services. In addition, he considered that the university of Sarajevo could not reach the level of a university in the Monarchy, in the first place the ones in Vienna and Budapest, while, which is significant, University of Zagreb was mentioned between parentheses. Therefore, he advocated that BIH officials and high school professors should be educated at universities in the Monarchy for many years to come.¹¹ Potiorek was ready to see Sarajevo only as a centre for the Balkans exploring. With that in mind, he felt that work should be done on strengthening the National Museum and the Institute for Balkan Studies.¹² In addition to all the above, Potiorek was obviously afraid that the future university in Sarajevo would be a gathering place for an *unsuitable element*, that is, with undisciplined high school youth, such similar students would appear. (Juzbašić and Šehić 2015, 376)

Because Potiorek's stated reasons overlapped with writings in the press, Biliński realized that the idea of establishing a university in Sarajevo, as spiritual and scientific counterweights to Belgrade and the crown of the Austro-Hungarian cultural mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina, has to be given up. His idea occurred at a very awkward moment marked by the Balkan wars (1912–1913) and national sizzling in Bosnia and Herzegovina. (Juzbašić 2002, 459) Considering the stated situation, and deeply aware of a very sensitive political moment, Joint Minister of Finance Biliński sent instructions to the National Government on the need to refute the allegations that appeared in certain newspapers,

¹² Ibidem.

¹³ ABiH, Privat-Registratur, 1913, br. 718 i 754. Usp. Kapidžić 1973, 445–446.

¹⁰ In the field of education and culture, the Austro-Hungarian administration invested the most in Sarajevo (Kruševac 1960, 393).

¹¹ Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Privat-Registratur, 1913, No. 20 (Potiorek-Bilinski, 4. 1. 1913.). Cf. Kapidžić 1973, 427; Juzbašić and Šehić, 2015, 305–306.

¹² Ibidem.

Situacija se dodatno usložnila izbijanjem Balkanskih ratova u kojima se Srbija, zahvaljujući vojnim uspjesima, počela nametati kao prestižna sila na Balkanu, Pijemont Južnih Slavena.

Određeni krugovi u Beču smatrali su da se Sarajevo treba nametnuti kao protuteža Beogradu. No ideja o sarajevskom univerzitetu izazvala je takve reakcije javnosti da se od nje, na koncu, moralo odustati. Strah od toga da bosanskohercegovačko stanovništvo nije postiglo toliko željeni kulturni stupanj s jedne, te opasnost da bi univerzitet u Sarajevu postao centar revolucionarne omladine, s druge strane, kao i disonantni tonovi koji su se mogli čuti o pitanju sarajevskoga univerziteta u javnom diskursu Monarhije, a koje je oblikovao tisak, natjerali su austrougarsku upravu da odustane od razmišljanja o univerzitetu.

and which problematized the stated question.¹³ After published denial in the newspaper, the issue of Sarajevo university was put aside and completely forgotten with the outbreak of the First World War.

Conclusion

Since the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1878, the Austro-Hungarian administration was fascinated by the idea of a cultural mission in this country. Over time, a narrative was formed that the local population should be Europeanized and fit into modern social trends. It was considered necessary to make enormous efforts in order to raise the cultural level of the people in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In that sense, it was necessary to act on several fronts, of which the educational front was certainly the most important. The crown of that “civilizing work” would be the realization of the idea of building a university in Sarajevo.

On the other hand, Austro-Hungary found a confessionally divided society in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with various national movements in their early stage. Representatives of the domestic political and intellectual elite could hardly allow the foreign administration to fully dominate all segments of life. Therefore, as early as the end of the 19th century could hear demands for the establishment of a university in Sarajevo to educate young people of South Slavic origin. The desire for national affirmation of the domestic element and the aspirations of the Austro-Hungarian administration to impose its own political positions collided on the issue of the university of Sarajevo. The situation was further complicated by the outbreak of the Balkan wars, in which Serbia, due to military successes, began to impose itself as a prestigious power in the Balkans, the South Slav Piedmont.

Certain circles in Vienna believed that Sarajevo should be imposed as a counterweight to Belgrade. But the idea of a Sarajevo university provoked such reactions from the public that in the end had to be given up. Fear that the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina has not achieved the much desired cultural level on the one hand, and the danger that the university of Sarajevo would become a center of revolutionary youth, on the other hand, as well as the dissonant tones that could be heard on the issue of the university of Sarajevo in the public discourse of the Monarchy, and which was shaped by the press, forced the Austro-Hungarian administration to give up thinking about the university.

¹³ ABIH, Privat-Registratur, 1913, No. 718 and 754. Cf. Kapidžić 1973, 445–446.

Izvori i literatura / Sources and bibliography

Neobjavljeni izvori / Unpublished sources

- Arhiv Bosne i Hercegovine (ABiH). Fond: Privat-Registratur

Objavljeni izvori / Published sources

- *Izveštaj o upravi Bosne i Hercegovine*. 1906. Zagreb: Kraljevska zemaljska štamparija.
- Juzbašić, Dževad, i Šehić, Zijad. (ur.) 2015. *Lične zabilješke generala Oskara Potioreka o unutrašnjopolitičkoj situaciji u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sarajevo: ANUBiH.
- Kamberović, Husnija. (ur.) 2004. *Bosna i Hercegovina u uspomenu Leona Biliškog*. Sarajevo: Institut za istoriju.
- Kapidžić, Hamdija. (ur.) 1973. *Naučne ustanove u Bosni i Hercegovini za vrijeme austrougarske uprave*. Sarajevo: ANUBiH.
- Radulović, Risto. 1988. *Izabrani radovi*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša.

Periodika iz austrougarskog perioda / Periodicals from Austro-Hungarian period

- Agramer Zeitung. 1906. "Die Delegationen. Ungarische Delegation. Die bosnische Debatte" 23. jun 1906: 2.
- Bosanska vila. 1913. "Za novu omladinu" (Augustin Ujević) 30. septembar 1913: 246–247.
- Das Vaterland. 1901. "Abgeordnetenhaus" 7. decembar 1901: 4.
- Die Zeit. 1909. "Nach dem Erfolg" (Moritz Benedikt) 8. april 1909: 2.
- Fremden-Blatt. 1913. "Der Plan einer Universität in Sarajevo. Eine Zuschrift" 4. juli 1913: 25.
- Glas slobode. 1913. "Napuštena namjera o osnivanju univerziteta u Sarajevu" 19. jun 1913: 2.
- Grazer Tagblatt. 1900. "Die Delegationen" 22. maj 1900: 15.
- Grazer Tagblatt. 1906. "Die Delegationen. Ungarische Delegation" 22. juni 1906: 21.
- Grazer Tagblatt. 1913. "Die Frage der südslawischen Universität in Sarajevo" 13. jun 1913: 2.
- Grazer Tagblatt. 1913a. "Die Frage der südslawischen Universität in Sarajevo" 25. juni 1913: 14.
- Grazer Volksblatt. 1913. "Die Frage der Errichtung einer Universität in Sarajevo" 13. juni 1913: 2.
- Hrvatski dnevnik. 1913. "Sveučilište u Sarajevu" 17. juni 1913: 3.

- Hrvatski dnevnik. 1913a. "Sveučilište u Sarajevu" 30. juni 1913: 1.
- Hrvatski dnevnik. 1913b. "Pitanje sveučilišta u Sarajevu" 7. juli 1913: 3.
- Kalendar SPKD Prosvjeta. 1912. "Naučni rad u Srbiji" (Pavle Popović) 1. janua 1912: 64–68.
- Kalendar SPKD Prosvjeta. 1913. "Kulturne ustanove" 1. januar 1913: 209–214.
- Muslimanska svijest. 1908. "Program Muslimanske Narodne Stranke" 2. septembar 1908: 1–2.
- Narod. 1913. "Pitanje univerziteta u Sarajevu" 15. jun 1913: 4.
- Neues Wiener Tagblatt. 1908. "Die bosnische Frage" 6. septembar 1908: 4.
- Neues Wiener Tagblatt. 1913. "Die Errichtung einer Universität in Sarajevo" 16. juli 1913: 6.
- Neuigkeits-Welt-Blatt. 1913. "Eine Universität in - Sarajevo" 8. jun 1913: 3.
- Pester Lloyd. 1899: 19. oktobar 1899: 2.
- Pester Lloyd. 1900. "Feuilleton. Aus Sarajevo" 28. juni 1900: 2.
- Pester Lloyd. 1913. "Ein Universität in Sarajevo" 25. juni 1913: 18.
- Volksfreund. 1913. "Allgemeine Rundschau" 9. august 1913: 3.
- Wiener Zeitung. 1900. "Delegation des österreichischen Reichstages" 22. maj 1900: 10.
- Wiener Zeitung. 1906. "Delegation des ungarischen Reichstages" 22. juni 1906: 8–10.

Knjige i rasprave / Books and discussions

- Besarović, Risto. 1974. *Iz kulturnog života u Sarajevu pod austrougarskom upravom*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša.
- Donia, Robert J. 2000. *Islam pod dvoglavim orlom: Muslimani Bosne i Hercegovine 1878.–1914*. Zagreb: Zoro; Sarajevo: Institut za istoriju.
- Imamović, Mustafa. 2007. *Pravni položaj i unutrašnja-politički razvitak Bosne i Hercegovine od 1878. do 1914*. Sarajevo: Magistrat, Pravni fakultete Univerziteta u Sarajevu.
- Juzbašić, Dževad. 2002. *Politika i privreda u Bosni i Hercegovini pod austrougarskom upravom*. Sarajevo: ANUBiH.
- Kapidžić, Hamdija. 1961. "Austro-ugarski političari i pitanje osnivanja univerziteta u Sarajevu 1913. godine" *Glasnik arhiva i Društva arhivista Bosne i Hercegovine* I (I): 293–295.
- Kraljačić, Tomislav. 1987. *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini (1882–1903)*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša.

-
- Kreševljaković, Hamdija. 1991. "Sarajevo za vrijeme austrougarske okupacije (1878–1918)" U *Izabrana djela IV*, 169–329. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša.
 - Kruševac, Todor. 1960. *Sarajevo pod austro-ugarskom upravom 1878–1918*. Sarajevo: Muzej Grada Sarajeva.
 - Matković, Stjepan. 2004. "Historiografski portret eminentnog upravitelja" U *Bosna i Hercegovina u uspomenama Leona Biliškog*, 9–37. Sarajevo: Institut za istoriju.
 - Okey, Robin. 2007. *Taming Balkan Nationalism. The Habsburg "Civilizing Mission" in Bosnia, 1878–1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.