Original paper
UDC: 070.13(497.584)“1905/1914“
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.21857/ypn4ocd249
https://dx.doi.org/10.21857/ypn4ocd249
Submitted: 10.1.2017
Accepted: 1.4.2017

POLITICAL CENSORSHIP IN DUBROVNIK NEWSPAPERS *CRVENA HRVATSKA*, *DUBROVNIK* AND *PRAVA CRVENA HRVATSKA* (1905 – 1914)

BARBARA ĐURASOVIĆ

Abstract: The analysis of the content of the political newspapers *Crvena Hrvatska*, *Dubrovnik* and *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* has brought to light numerous seizures (censorships) of articles which were exercised by the Austrian authorities in Dubrovnik. The fact that the original newspaper editions have been preserved allows for the reconstruction of the censorship policy in Dubrovnik newspapers in the period 1905-1914. This analysis has enabled a novel insight into the Monarchy’s position towards the policy and writing of the local newspapers, but also a more detailed understanding of the circumstances that governed the press censorship procedure.

Keywords: Dubrovnik political newspapers, censorship, *Crvena Hrvatska*, *Dubrovnik*, *Prava Crvena Hrvatska*, newspapers, seizure of articles, Austrian rule

Destruction of entire newspaper editions or ban on the publication of certain articles is the first thought that comes to mind when speaking about censorship and the suppression of the press. Lack of preserved newspaper material is the most frequent reason why the topic of newspaper censorship in the early twentieth

An expanded version of this article was published in Croatian as: »Politička cenzura u dubrovačkim novinama *Crvena Hrvatska*, *Dubrovnik* i *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* (1905-1914).« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* 56/2 (2018): pp. 647-751. Translated by Vesna Baće.

Barbara Đurasović, independent scholar. Address: Biokovska 18, 20000 Dubrovnik, Croatia. E-mail: barbara.djurasovic@gmail.com

century has not attracted more scholarly attention.[1] However, this has not been the case with the first party newspapers published in Dubrovnik—*Crvena Hrvatska*, *Dubrovnik* and *Prava Crvena Hrvatska*. Namely, until now the research into newspapers published in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century has failed to detect the existence of censored articles in their original form.[2] The significance of this discovery introduces us to the world of largely preserved and accessible articles whose public exposure was prevented, as they were seized by the Austrian authorities.[3]

---

[1] Censorship and surveillance of the press has been examined by Ivan Pederin, in his comprehensive work *Austrijska cenzura i nadzor nad tiskom u Dalmaciji*. In addition to newspapers and periodicals, Pederin also focuses on censorship relating to the publishing of books and literary works, impact of censorship on writers, but also on booksellers. Seizures in the journals of *Banska Hrvatska*, with emphasis on caricatures and illustrations, is discussed by Tamara Štefanac in two of her studies. She centres on the censorship of caricatures in the humorous-satirical *Vragoljan* magazine between 1881 and 1886, along with the censorship of the illustrated matter in the periodicals from 1883 to 1903. On the censorship and seizure of the newspapers Croatian authors mainly touch as part of their broader studies in which newspapers feature as an important source for a wider survey of the topic they tackle. See: Ivan Pederin, *Austrijska cenzura i nadzor nad tiskom u Dalmaciji*. Zadar: Matica Hrvatska Zadar, 2008; Tamara Štefanac, »Cenzurirane karikature iz humorističkog časopisa Vragoljan (1881. – 1886.).« *Pro Tempore* 3/3 (2006): pp. 51-57; Tamara Štefanac, »Cenzurirani ilustrirani materijal u hrvatskim časopisima u vrijeme banovanja Károlya Khuena Héderváry (1883-1903).« *Libellarium* IV/1 (2011): pp. 23-38.

[2] Over a period of twenty-three years, Dubrovnik saw the parallel publishing of three political newspapers. *Crvena Hrvatska* (1891-1914) was launched by the Rightist Frano Supilo. Familiar with the political flaws of the People's Party, he embarked on a campaign for national awareness of Dubrovnik. After his departure for Rijeka in the late 1899, the newspaper was taken over by the People's Party under the leadership of Pero Čingrija, long-term mayor of Dubrovnik, and from 1905 *Crvena Hrvatska* became one of the main platforms for the promotion of the rapprochement policy between the Croats and Serbs. A year after the launching of *Crvena Hrvatska, Dubrovnik* started to be published (1892-1914), the paper of the Serb-Catholics in Dubrovnik who advocated the political goals of the Serbian Party in Dalmatia. Until 1905 these two political groups used the press for their fervent political, intellectual and national debates, in which both sides tried to prove either the Serbian or Croatian identity of Dubrovnik, or its surroundings. A new political direction of the rapprochement of the National Party members to the Serbs in Dalmatia, and with it, to the Serb-Catholics in Dubrovnik, stirred a small, independent group of the Rightists to reaction. They founded a new political newspaper based on Right principles, supported by *Crvena Hrvatska* in the early years of its issue. Virtually to the very last issue *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* (1905-1918) advocated the strengthening of the Croatian Right corpus, as well as the unification of Croatia and Dalmatia under the crown of the Habsburg Monarchy. See: Barbara Đurasović, »Hrvatsko-srpski odnosi u središtu proslave blagdana svetog Vlaha u Dubrovniku (1891-1914).« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* 58 (2020): pp. 285-286, note 7.

[3] The Appendix of the article on political censorship in the first party papers of Dubrovnik, published in the *Anali* journal, contains a complete list of the censored newspaper articles. The list is based on the decisions about censorship published in the papers *Crvena Hrvatska*, *Dubrovnik* and *Prava Crvena Hrvatska,* along with the archival material of the fund of the District Court in Dubrovnik. See: B. Đurasović »Politička cenzura u dubrovačkim novinama *Crvena Hrvatska*, *Dubrovnik* i *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* (1905-1914).«: pp. 698-751.

The analysis of the content of the seized articles in the period 1905-1914 enables a reconstruction of political censorship in the party papers of the contemporary Dubrovnik.[4] As a result, one is able to grasp the reason, timing and frequency with which the authorities exercised complete or partial seizure of newspaper articles, as well as the topics which the authorities prevented from being released in public.

The censorship occasionally converted the newspapers into white sheets. If, by chance, only the second prints of Dubrovnik newspapers had been preserved, i.e., those after the seizure, we would have been deprived of many valuable historiographic topics. Consequently, many studies that used newspapers as their source would never have been written.

Censorship implies the requirement that the state authorities inspect all manuscripts intended for print prior to the printing process.[5] In the case of Dubrovnik newspapers from 1905 to 1914, the censorship usually included the seizure of one or several articles or passages from a particular article after the newspaper had already been printed.[6] In the mentioned period more than 250 seizures have been recorded, for which we can rightly assert that they had been removed from the papers by the authorities.

---

[4] Although the newspapers *Crvena Hrvatska* and *Dubrovnik* were launched in 1891, that is, in 1892, the reason why the year 1905 has been taken as initial for the study of censorship is because that was the year when the third political newspaper, *Prava Crvena Hrvatska,* appeared. Each of the mentioned three newspapers promoted different political views, which ultimately shaped the major attitude towards the key issues of disunited Croatia.

[5] Since its beginning, the development of printing in Europe has been monitored or affected—albeit to different degrees—by various measures aimed to control it. Censorship as a means of communication control has existed since the ancient times. In the later period, it was the Church that imposed censorship, soon to be joined by the state institutions. Seventeenth-century England was the first to witness a campaign against censorship and for the freedom of the news, and by 1695 significant progress was made. In France and Germany, the freedom of press was achieved much later. In the history of Europe, censorship was not only used as a tool of the political, intellectual and cultural control within a state, but also for the prevention of cross-border transfer of information and ideas that were considered unacceptable. See: Jürgen Wilke, »Censorship and Freedom of the Press.« *European History Online (EGO), Leibniz Institute of European History (IEG), Mainz* (2013). URL: http://www.ieg-ego.eu/wilkej-2013a-en URN: urn:nbn:de:0159-2013050204 (accessed 17 May 2022).

[6] Confirmation of this, apart from the newspaper editions, we also find in the documents of the State Archives in Dubrovnik: *Sek "Pr" Tiskovine*, fund 340 (*Okružni sud*), vol. 1-3 (SAD), hereafter cited as *Tiskovine.*

The seizure procedure

The inspection of the published newspaper articles rested on two administrative bodies of the state, Imperial Royal State Attorney Office in Dubrovnik and the Imperial Royal District Court in Dubrovnik, as a court deciding matters related to the press. First, upon the issue of the original newspaper edition from print, the state attorney inspected the content and crossed out what he considered liable to censorship, and submitted a seizure indictment to the District Court in Dubrovnik. The latter was expected to approve the seizure of a given article, several of them or merely parts of an article.

The analysis of Dubrovnik newspapers, along with the three volumes of the *Tiskovine* fund of the District Court in Dubrovnik kept in the State Archives in Dubrovnik, leads to a conclusion that the authorities based their decisions on a succession of laws.[7] They found the grounds for censorship in the criminal codes, primarily in the "Zakon o kaznenom postupku u stvarih tiskovnih" (Criminal Procedure Act on Printed Matter), introduced on 30 June 1873. That law was part of the comprehensive "Criminal Procedure", which, according to the Austrian model, Francis Joseph introduced to his kingdoms and lands of the Imperial Council, and therefore also to Dalmatia,[8] as well as of the "Criminal Code Act on Crimes, Misdemeanours and Offences" from 1852.[9] These acts implied stricter,

[7] Ivan Pederin refers to the Austrian Press Code Act of 17 December 1862 and Press Code Act from 1869. He also cites the Basic Press Law from 1867. By relying on the correspondence from the archival documents of the State Archive in Zadar, Pederin erroneously interprets the name of that legal code. It concerns the Fundamental State Code Act on the General Civil Rights of Austria, whose Article 13 pertains to the press and the guarantee of the freedom of expression, as well as censorship. See: *Staatsgrundgesetz vom 21. Dezember 1867, über die allgemeinen Rechte der Staatsbürger für die im Reichsrathe vertretenen Königreiche und Ländern.* Reichs-Gesetz-Blatt für das Kaiserthum Oeseterreich, Vienna: LXI/142 (1867): p. 395. and Ivan Pederin, *Austrijska cenzura i nadzor nad tiskom u Dalmaciji*: pp. 228 and 277.

[8] *Dèržavo-zakonski vladni list za kraljevine i zemlje zastupane u vieću cesarevinskom*, Beč: XLII/119 (1873): pp. 397–501.

[9] The offences in newspaper articles most commonly concerned crimes and offences committed by publishing the content, along with the following crimes and offences: high treason (§§ 58-61 of the Criminal Code Act of 27 May 1852 and Article I of the Code Act of 17 December 1862); disturbance of public peace (§§ 65 and 66 of the Criminal Code Act and Article II of the Code Act of 17 December 1862); insurrection and rebellion (§§ 68-73 and 75); contempt of the orders issued by authority, and revolt (§ 300 Criminal Code Act and Articles III and IV of the Code Act of 17 December 1862); incitement to hostility (§ 302 of the Criminal Code Act). See: *Dèržavo-zakonski vladni list za kraljevine i zemlje zastupane u vieću cesarevinskom*. Vienna: XLII/119 (1873): 398 and *Sveobći dèržavo-zakonski i vladni list za Cesarevinu Austriansku*. Vienna: XXXVI/117 (1852): pp. 493–591.

most often monetary or prison penalties, yet the sanctions for inappropriate texts in Dubrovnik political newspapers, with an exception or two, usually was only the seizure of the articles.[10]

If such were the case, newspaper editors would then have to print a new, second edition of the newspaper, while the censored, original copy had to be destroyed and the typeset dismantled. The censored part or entire article, after the paper had been printed again, would appear as a blank space with the word "zaplijenjeno" (seized) printed across it. Furthermore, the decision on the seizure the editors published in the first forthcoming issue, most frequently on the front page. From 1911 the decision of the District Court was rarely printed in Dubrovnik papers, and if there was no announcement on behalf of the editors either, the censorship can hardly be discerned unless the second edition has been preserved.

It is most fortunate that the State Archives in Dubrovnik keeps much of the original editions of the mentioned publications, in which brief textual announcements confirm the seizures in the previous editions. The Archives also holds pages of the second editions, which bear witness to the seizure procedure and method. Copies preserved in both editions, the original and the second, are particularly rare. In the ten-year period under analysis, only five examples of this kind have been preserved.[11] Another valuable find is that among the documents of the District Court kept in the State Archives in Dubrovnik are the original newspapers which had been reviewed by the censors. Marked in blue pencil are the parts or entire articles which the Dubrovnik public had to be prevented from reading.[12]

City subscribers received the censored edition, whereupon the editors had to apologise at times for having to send a white edition, or on one occasion, that the

[10] By examining the *Tiskovine* fund of the District Court in Dubrovnik, we learn about a certain number of controversial censorships as a result of dissenting judicial opinions in the District Court regarding the seizure indictment submitted by the state attorney. In some cases, we cannot assert with certainty whether the decision was actually implemented. This is more extensively discussed in the Chapter "The censors' FOR and AGAINST seizure".

[11] State Archives in Dubrovnik holds the copies of the Dubrovnik periodicals as well as party papers, classified by the year of edition. The mentioned five copies are bound within the 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1914 editions. See: »Osuda pravaške mladosti radi demonstracija.« *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* (hereafter cited as: *PCH*) 300/19-11 (1910): p. 2.; »Subotnje provokacije.« *PCH* 340/2-9 (1911): p. 1; »A sad?.« *PCH* 372/13-4 (1912): p. 1; »Cinik ili denuncijant?.« *Dubrovnik* 3/12-3 (1914): p. 1; »Demonstracije i izgredi nepoznatih u Dubrovniku.« *Dubrovnik* 20/9-7 (1914): pp. 1-2.

[12] *Tiskovine,* vol. 1, 2 and 3.

subscribers received "the latest newspaper issue in virgin white".[13] Dubrovnik editors were also known to print the third edition of the newspaper intended for the subscribers in Dalmatia. In this edition they would completely change the content in the place of the seized passages or articles. Sadly, such copies from the period 1905-1914 have not been preserved, and only on the basis of the editorials, in which the editors referred or complained about the reasons for seizure from the previous issue, one may gather that the newspaper had to be printed out for the third time. They, however, referred to it as second edition, but as the extant seized newspapers are always marked as the second edition, the new edition with the altered content could in fact be considered as the third printed issue.[14] However, a genuine example of the third issue, due to double seizure, we find in *Crvena Hrvatska* in a somewhat earlier period than the one covered by this research, from 1899. The very heading of the paper testifies that it is the third edition, and in the next issue the editors explain how the censors seized the same issue twice. After the censors had removed two passages of the text printed on the front page, a new edition was printed, again with an intervention of the police commissary who censored a part of an article on the second page. That is why they had to print the third edition of *Crvena Hrvatska*.[15] Between 1905 and 1914 double seizures of articles were never executed, and it is because of the new newspaper print intended for the subscribers in Dalmatia that we refer to it as the third edition.

Dubrovnik newspaper was especially subject to controls and seizures.[16] The texts published in it promoted pro-Serbian political views and supported the Kingdom of Serbia in its territorial pretensions against Bosnia and Herzegovina, due to which the paper was under constant suppression of the Dubrovnik censors.[17]

---

[13] »Zaplijena našeg lista.« *Crvena Hrvatska* (hereafter cited as: *CH*) 58/22-7 (1912): p. 4.

[14] Although they write that for the external subscribers across Dalmatia they had the second edition printed, it is far more likely that it was the third print impression of the newspapers with an entirely altered content instead of the censored articles. See: »Posljedni broj našeg lista.« *Dubrovnik* 43/22-10 (1908): p. 6; *Dubrovnik* 46/12-11 (1908): p. 5; »Zapljena.« *Dubrovnik* 32/11-5 (1909): p. 3; »Zaplijena našeg lista.« *CH* 29/10-4 (1912): p. 3.

[15] *CH* 35/30-9 (1899): pp. 1 and 2; »Treće izdanje.« *CH* 36/7-10 (1899): p. 2.

[16] *Dubrovnik*, 3 July 1892 – 23 July 1914. The first owner, publisher and chief editor of the newspaper *Dubrovnik* was Stevo Vuk Vrčević. Editorial policy of that newspaper was articulated largely by Antun Fabris, prominent Serb-Catholic of Dubrovnik. Between 1909 and October 1910 the newspaper was issued twice a week.

[17] The newspaper of the Serb-Catholics had a special column entitled *Srpske zemlje* (*Serbian lands*), where besides the news from Serbia and Montenegro, the news from Bosnia and Herzegovina were also published. Given that Serbia denied the existence of Croatian nation on the territory of

The censorship of this paper regarding the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina had hardly finished when another topic emerged—*Dubrovnik* openly supported the traitors in the legal processes conducted in Croatia.[18] The main targets of suppression were the editorials, as well as critical articles published on the other pages of this paper.[19] A comparison between the number of seized articles in *Dubrovnik* and those in *Crvena Hrvatska* and *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* shows a striking discrepancy, as the censorship in the last two seems almost like an accidental occurrence.

The articles in *Crvena Hrvatska*[20] were written by the book, at least as far as the opinion of the Austrian authorities on the editorial policy of this newspaper of the Dubrovnik National Party was concerned, and later also of the Croatian-Serbian coalition under the leadership of Pero Čingrija.[21] Over a period of almost six years the State Attorney Office did not find their discerning, albeit critical

---

Bosnia and Herzegovina, *Dubrovnik* faithfully reflected such a view. From the perspective of *Dubrovnik*, the Catholics, that is, Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina existed only as an element of the German policy of *Drang nach Osten*. It represented the Monarchy as the main obstruction to the economic and political emancipation of the Kingdon of Serbia at the end of the nineteenth and in the early twentieth century. See: Pero Depolo, »Političke struje u Dubrovniku i aneksija Bosne i Hercegovine (II. dio).« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* 38 (2000): pp. 286, 290.

[18] In the midst of the annexation crisis, on 12 January 1909, an indictment against 53 arrested Serbs was published. The *Srpska stranka* (Serbian Party) in Dubrovnik, with its newspaper, openly supported these so-called traitors.

[19] Stjepan Ćosić describes the Serb-Catholic circle as "an ideal-typical example of unsuccessful national ideology shaped by the Ragusans, Catholics, who identified themselves as Serbs in terms of national origin". Ćosić emphasises the astonishing disproportion between "the modest number of the adherents of this ideology and the political influence which the Serb-Catholics managed to attain in such a short period. A small number of ethnic followers and a virtually non-existent influence outside the city confines, the Serb-Catholics compensated with agitation and effective political publishing". *Dubrovnik* was the most important political paper of the Serb Catholics and Serbian Party in Dubrovnik. See: Stjepan Ćosić »Nacija u stranačkim ideologijama: primjer Dubrovnika potkraj 19. stoljeća.« in: *Dijalog povjesničara – istoričara 3*, ed. Igor Graovac. Zagreb: Zaklada Friedrich-Naumann, 2001: pp. 58-59.

[20] *Crvena Hrvatska*, 7 February 1891 – 25 July 1914. Besides Frano Supilo, holding the post of chief editor were the following: Frano Kovačević, Filip Čaroki, Vlaho Kelez, Milan Marjanović, Ivo De Giulli, Milorad Medini, Antun Šapro, Ivo Arsete. From the beginning of November 1906, the paper was published twice a week, and from the first issue in 1913 until the end once a week.

[21] Pero Čingrija (Dubrovnik, 24 August 1837 – Dubrovnik, 13 July 1921). Leader of Dubrovnik *narodnjaci*, and from 1900 also president of the *Narodna stranka* (People's Party) in Dalmatia. He was four times elected mayor of Dubrovnik. Together with Ante Trumbić, in 1905 he formed *Hrvatska stranka* (Croatian Party), which promoted Croato-Serbian alliance. See: Ivo Perić, *Pero Čingrija*. Dubrovnik: Časopis *Dubrovnik*, 1988.

tone, offensive against Emperor Francis Joseph and his reign. From March 1905 to January 1911, not a single article in this paper was seized! Therefore, the title of the editorial published on 11 January "Oho, što je to!" (Oho, what is that!) comes as no surprise, after the first 1911 edition of the newspaper was seized on account of two short news reports in the *City chronicle* (*Gradska kronika*) column.[22] The perplexed editors of *Crvena Hrvatska* tried to analyse the reasons behind seizure, but also to define the changes that were taking place in Vienna. They were disappointed by the restriction of the expression of their critical opinion. This shift in the policy towards their paper, after initial disbelief, was soon followed by a counter attack. Thus, in the editorial they question the intentions of the government—whether it wished to stir riots and scandals in the south, warning that such steps could easily become a "double-edged sword".[23]

Considering that the next issue was published without any announcement of seizure, the mere reading of the paper provides no clue as to which two pieces of news prompted the censors towards such an abrupt procedure of removing the content. In his indictment, the state attorney wrote that of late Dubrovnik witnessed increasing disputes between the adherents of the Croatian and Italian parties.[24] In all likelihood, this censorship had a preventive goal, given that the state attorney emphasised that a population census would be conducted in January 1911, which in Dubrovnik too might take the form of political struggle. In his opinion, the already tense relations between the Croats and Italians could escalate, and he stressed that the articles in *Crvena Hrvatska* actually incited to hostility as well as much graver offences.[25]

In the editorial that followed after this seizure, *Crvena Hrvatska* touched upon yet another detail—agents provocateurs, highlighted in the same issue, in the local column entitled *City Chronicle*.[26] Apparently, the city saw the arrival of a

[22] From the state attorney's indictment, which as part of the *Tiskovine* is kept within the fund of the Dubrovnik District Court in the State Archives in Dubrovnik, we learn that it concerned the articles "Autonomaška drzovitost" (The Temerity of the Autonomist Party) and "Il Dalmata zadirkiva" (Il Dalmata Teases).

[23] »Oho, što je to!« *Crvena Hrvatska* 3/11-1 (1911): p. 1.

[24] *Tiskovine,* vol. 2, under Pr. 1/11/1. The state attorney mentions conflicts between several workers in Gruž, which resulted with harm to the Italian sailors. Also, he drew attention to a case of a brawl between the members of the *Forza e coraggio* society and *Sokol*, as well as a recorded case of a conflict in the municipal coffee bar between the adherents of the Croatian and Italian parties.

[25] *Tiskovine,* vol. 2, under Pr. 1/11/1.

[26] *CH* 3/11-1 (1911): p. 3.

larger number of secret police agents, and the newspaper complained that the atmosphere in Dubrovnik resembled that of a den of criminals. The agents were authorised to check the citizens' identity, while *Crvena Hrvatska* reports in indignation about a recent event involving an arrest of a fellow-citizen, lawyer Antun Knego, who was apprehended with his hands tied as if he were a common criminal. The newspaper questioned these procedures and their purpose.[27]

The first censored issue of *Crvena Hrvatska* in 1911 was not the only one that year, and therefore, we cannot speak of an incidental objection on behalf of the State Attorney Office in Dubrovnik. In March, the editors again decided to write about the autocracy of the greater district (*Kotar*) administration, which was soon followed by the seizure of the entire content of the article "Osveta, glupost, što li?" (Revenge, Folly or What?). According to the arguments provided in the censors' decision, the seized text aimed to humiliate the order issued by political authority and incite others to contempt and hatred.[28] In the censored article, whose original has been preserved, with a dose of irony *Crvena Hrvatska* wonders whether it was the matter of incompetence of the Greater District Administration (*Kotarsko Poglavarstvo*) or its ignorance of the law. Apparently, after the appeal of the State Attorney Office, *Kotarsko Poglavarstvo* took the case from the court into its own hands and settled it on the grounds of "Bach's patent". The editors wrote that they did not see the purpose of such an action, yet concluded that the political authority wished to undermine the faith into the existing laws.[29]

By referring to "Bach's patent", Dubrovnik newspapers meant the governmental decision of 14 September 1852 regarding new judicial organisation, which was implemented by the order of the Ministry of the Interior, Justice and Finance in February 1854. It concerned the political and judicial organisation of Dalmatia. Political issues were no longer decided only by the greater district courts, but by the *Kotar* administration as well.[30] It was not until 1868 that the political administration separated from the judicial, however, neither before nor after 1900 was the absolute division of the judicial from administrative authority achieved. The reason for this lay in the fact that in all development phases, the judges were

[27] »A gdje to mi živimo?.« *CH* 3/11-1 (1911): p. 3.

[28] »U ime Njegovoga Veličanstva Cara!« *CH* 23/22-3 (1911): p. 1.

[29] »Osveta, glupost, što li?« *CH* 22/18-3 (1911): p. 5.

[30] Frane Ivković, »Organizacija uprave u Dalmaciji za vrijeme druge austrijske vladavine 1814-1918.« *Arhivski vjesnik* 34-35 (1991-1992): p. 48.

appointed by the highest administrative organs, *Namjesništvo* or Ministry. This explains why judicial independence from the administrative-political bodies could not have been achieved in the true sense.[31] The proof of the implementation of the 1852 law, although officially repealed in 1868, we find in numerous examples from the Dubrovnik press.

Seizures in the service of "Bach's patent"

Criticism, as well as the mere mention of the *Kotar* authorities and State Attorney Office in a negative context, were reason enough for censorship. As a rule, *Crvena Hrvatska* commented the seizure in its *City Chronicle* column, where they wrote that it could be interpreted only by the increasingly agitated *Poglavarstvo*. Equally, they believed that the censorship aimed to obscure certain political actions and local decisions passed without the knowledge of the authorities in Zadar. *Crvena Hrvatska* was therefore determined to find a way to inform the broader public about all the developments in Dubrovnik.[32]

On the same topic, i.e., jurisdiction of the court being usurped by *Poglavarstvo, Dubrovnik* took an even more critical stand than *Crvena Hrvatska.* In the editorial of January 1911, *Dubrovnik* condemned the behaviour of individuals in the intelligence and detective service of the city.[33] The censors deleted the commentary on the Dubrovnik judicial authority. By decision of the District Court, the article was seized because it contained the offence of rebellion, but also insults against the central authorities of Dalmatia.[34]

The next issue of *Dubrovnik* did not publish the decision of the District Court, but on several places in *Dubrovnik Chronicle* (*Dubrovačka kronika*) column referred to the censorship as well as to the behaviour of the detectives.[35] They also reported how a "notorious" detective threatened to seek revenge against

---

[31] Vjekoslav Maštrović, *Razvoj sudstva u Dalmaciji u XIX. stoljeću.* Zadar: Institut Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti u Zadru, 1959: p. 75.

[32] »Zaplijena našeg lista.« *CH* 23/22-3 (1911): p. 3.

[33] »Quousque tandem.....?« *Dubrovnik* 2/12-1 (1911): p. 1.

[34] *Tiskovine,* vol. 2, under Pr. 2/11/2.

[35] »Zapljena.« *Dubrovnik* 3/19-1 (1911): p. 3; »Maler dektetiva Lovrića.« *Dubrovnik* 3/19-1 (1911): p. 3; »Dektetiv prijeti.« *Dubrovnik* 3/19-1 (1911): p. 3.; »Lov za "Dubrovnikom".« *Dubrovnik* 3/19-1 (1911): p. 3.

the editor-in-chief, Kristo Dominković,[36] on account of the publication of the article.[37]

Police repression executed by order of the City Authority was the topic that dominated in *Dubrovnik* in 1911, because some Serb-Catholics of Dubrovnik were summoned to court. On account of the charges filed by some Ragusans, the notorious detective and one of his colleagues were summoned to court. *Dubrovnik* reported on this in its editorial, without any pretensions to anticipate the decision of the court.[38] Only a day later, *Dubrovnik* printed an Extra Edition, celebrating justice. Detectives were found guilty! "Dubrovnik process", as this Serb-Catholic newspaper called it, showed all the weakness of the "police system" because among the accused were those who were responsible for maintaining security, peace and order. Despite his false testimony, the detective was sentenced to two days of confinement and had to settle the court costs. The result of the trial was to the editors' great satisfaction, as reported in the Extra Edition, because they persistently warned about the system which was determined to convert Dubrovnik into a breeding ground for rebels and traitors.[39] The Extra Edition too was subjected to partial seizure, as evidenced by a document in the District Court fund in Dubrovnik.[40]

The situation with "Bach's patent" escalated, and the editors of *Dubrovnik* ended up in confinement. Their 14-day confinement was announced in the column *Dubrovnik News*, in which the readers were informed that the next issue would be out not earlier than 22 June 1911.[41] In the editorial entitled "Naprijed u tamnice" (Forward to the Dungeons) they warned that they would fall victim of the same scheme as some of their fellow-citizens, Serbs.[42]

Upon the end of the two-week confinement (there is reason to believe that Kristo Dominković, the main editor, was also sent to prison), the editors resumed the publication of the newspaper. From an article on the rigorous implementation

---

[36] Kristo P. Dominković (Dubrovnik, 16 January 1877 – Dubrovnik, 20 October 1946), publicist and politician.

[37] »Dektetiv prijeti.« *Dubrovnik* 3/19-1 (1911): p. 3.

[38] »Prilog policajskom sistemu u Dubrovniku.« *Dubrovnik* 9/3-3 (1911): p. 1.

[39] »Pravda napokon pobjeđuje.« *Dubrovnik* 10/4-3 (1911): pp. 1-2 (Extra Edition).

[40] *Tiskovine,* vol. 2, under Pr. 5/11/1 and Pr. 5/11/2.

[41] »Dubrovačke vijesti.« *Dubrovnik* 24/8-6 (1911): p. 3.

[42] The bulk of the article "Naprijed u tamnice" (Forward to the Dungeons) was seized by the authorities, the paper being preserved in the original edition. See: »Naprijed u tamnice!« *Dubrovnik* 24/8-6 (1911): p. 1.

of "Bach's patent" in Dubrovnik, we learn that individuals were sentenced without having committed the crime they were accused of. Their message to the government in Vienna was that they should not make enemies where there were none.[43]

The newspaper of the Dubrovnik Right Party (*Stranka Prava*), *Prava Crvena Hrvatska*,[44] in the course of 1911 addressed the apprehension of the Ragusans and the agents' actions only superficially. The reason for this should be sought in the fact that they did not support the concord, cooperation and union between the Croats and Serbs, because of which the Rightists decided to start their own newspaper. Their attitude was condemned by the other two political newspapers of Dubrovnik. *Crvena Hrvatska* considered the Rightists as an extended hand of the state apparatus, and they wrote that the government had enslaved them in the commitment to the state interests and state goals.[45] Similar accusations on account of the Dubrovnik Rightists also came from the editors of the Serb-Catholic paper.[46] *Prava Crvena* reported about the arrests in Dubrovnik only after being provoked by *Dubrovnik*. They wrote that they would not state their views on the mentioned events while the hearing was still in process, and also emphasised that they did not protest against, as other papers stated, a swarming number of detectives and spies in the city, of whom they have no knowledge. They advised *Dubrovnik* not to occupy themselves with detectives and spies, as they were not engaged in any revolutionary actions so as to be fearful of the authorities.[47]

During 1911 *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* was censored only once, the reason being the editorial titled "Subotnje provokacije" (Sunday Provocations) and a report on the second page of the same issue covering the meeting of the Starčević Youth at the Hotel Imperial, the scene of an incident.[48] Yet this seizure procedure

[43] »Bahova patenta.« *Dubrovnik* 25/22-6 (1911): p. 2.

[44] *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* 19 March 1905 – 9 November 1918. Newspaper of the Dubrovnik Right Party, headed by canon Ante Liepopili and a circle of clerics. A total of 708 issues of the newspaper were published, under the editorship of Vlaho Kelez, Frano Schick and Ivo Birimiša. It was published every Thursday until the proclamation of the end of WWI. The weekly was printed in *Dubrovačka hrvatska tiskara*. See: Barbara Đurasović, *Prava Crvena Hrvatska i pravaši. Hrvatski nacionalizam u Dubrovniku početkom 20. stoljeća*. Zagreb – Dubrovnik: Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku, 2021.

[45] »Pravaštvo i "Pravaštvo".« *CH* 17/1-5 (1911): p. 1.

[46] »Ko brani špijune i dektetive u Dubrovniku!?« *Dubrovnik* 4/26-1 (1911): p. 1.

[47] »"Dubrovnik".« *PCH* 310/28-1 (1911): p. 2.

[48] »Bakljada – Komers – Incidenat s oficirima – Hrvatska himna i "Srbi" – Postupak političkog komesara Hruša – Uapšenja – Zaključak.« *PCH* 340/2-9 (1911): p. 2.

was expanded with an indictment against Frano Schick, chief editor of the Rightist paper, and Vlaho Kelez, typesetter in *Dubrovačka hrvatska tiskara.*

It should be noted that partly because of high fines, and also prison sentences which the chief editors and typesetters were known to face, the founders of the political newspapers filled these positions with persons, mainly party adherents, who were willing to accept the criminal liability determined by law. This concerned Frano Schick, chief editor of *Prava Crvena Hrvatska*, and the typesetter, Vlaho Kelez. It is noteworthy that in 1899 Kelez replaced the chief editor of the then Right *Crvena Hrvatska,* Frano Supilo.[49] Until the beginning of 1901 Supilo was the owner and publisher of *Crvena Hrvatska*, while Kelez remained in the position of the editor-in-chief until 1903.

In the two controversial, abovementioned articles *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* reported and commented on the solemn gathering of the Right Youth, during which a couple of citizens remained seated while the Croatian anthem "Lijepa naša" was played. Such an attitude of certain individuals, referred to as the so-called local aristocracy in the paper, embittered the young Rightists. The situation culminated when a navy officer, warned by the young men to stand up during the anthem, drew his sword. In *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* they regret about the incident which obscured the celebration, but they fully understand the reaction of the youth. They concluded that they were most offended by the demonstrative seated position of the "brothers Serbs", followed by a provocative and ironic cry "Long live our Serbian brothers". This triggered an untactical reaction of an ununiformed policeman and commotion, in which young Rightists threw glasses of beer at the guests, among which were two naval officers. Much to their indignation, *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* reported that the persons behind the incident and the main culprits were released, while the Rightists ended up in confinement.[50]

---

[49] Frano Supilo (Cavtat, Konavle, 30 November 1870 – London, 25 September 1917), prominent Croatian politician, journalist and publicist. Frano Supilo may rightly be identified as the founder of political journalism in Dubrovnik and in Croatia, and at the same time a leading political protagonist of the Dubrovnik area in the second half of the nineteenth and in the early twentieth century. As leader of the Right Party in Dubrovnik in 1891, at the age of twenty, he launched the party newspaper known as *Crvena Hrvatska*. In 1899 he set off for Rijeka, where he acted as the chief editor of *Novi list,* continuing his political path by promoting Croatian-Serbian concord. He was one of the founders of the Yugoslav Committee in 1915. He died in London in 1917, and the urn with his ashes was transported from London in 1927 to Dubrovnik via Sušak, with all the state honours. Barbara Đurasović, »Dubrovačka politička ostavština uz 150. obljetnicu rođenja Frana Supila.« *Dubrovački horizonti*, 55 (2020): pp. 11-24.

[50] »Subotnje provokacije.« *PCH* 340/2-9 (1911): p. 1.

The bulk of this text was removed by the District Court upon indictment of the State Attorney Office.[51] In the text the censors found parts that not only praised and justified forbidden actions but also incited to contempt and hatred against "governmental organs". The authorities believed that the published content severely criticised and insulted the honesty of the law enforcement commissioner who was exposed to public humiliation.[52] However, on account of the mentioned editorial and the article in which the paper reported on the event, State Attorney Office filed charges against the editor-in-chief Frano Schick for composing it himself, or as the chief editor for having read it and authorised the publication of the controversial articles. Besides him, the charges were also filed against the typesetter Vlaho Kelez for having supported the editor and for printing the articles. State Attorney Office proposed a sentence of six to twelve months of imprisonment, and ordered that the main hearing be held before the Judicial Court and the competent Jury Court.[53]

Although the report of the District Court reads that the state attorney proposed that, besides editor Schick, criminal liability be also extended to the author (without mentioning the name) of the seized articles, as well as to Ivo Birimiša, print house manager,[54] their names are not mentioned in the indictment. Regrettably, the documents do not contain the records of the main hearing and the ruling, only the indictment of the State Attorney Office. According to its wording, the testimony of editor Schick—that he alone had partially written the editorial and received the rest of the news items from anonymous young men—was not accepted. His explanation that the articles covered a city event within the limits of permissible criticism the authorities found disputable. As for Kelez, although he defended himself by stating that as a typesetter he could not be held liable, the authorities held him responsible for the mere fact that he accepted the manuscripts from the editor and printed them, knowing about their punishable content, and by so doing, supported the editor in his offence."[55]

Both Schick and Kelez objected to the indictment of the State Attorney Office by appealing to the president of the Council Chamber with the Judicial Court in Dubrovnik and the Judicial Court in Zadar for dismissal of procedure or "at least

[51] *Tiskovine,* vol. 2, under Pr. 18/11/2.
[52] *Tiskovine,* vol. 2, under Pr. 18/11/1.
[53] *Tiskovine,* vol. 2, under Pr. 18/11/14.
[54] *Tiskovine,* vol. 2, under Pr. 18/11/3.
[55] *Tiskovine,* vol. 2, under Pr. 18/11/14.

for the indictment to be rejected". In their objection they explained that, according to criminal code, no insult to honour was attempted, as it was a newspaper report with an overview and reflections on the incident, similar to the ones which can be found daily in all political papers. They claimed that it was a matter of pure criticism of a city event, and not an attack against personal honour or any kind of malicious forethought. Furthermore, they stated that editor Schick received the incriminated articles ready for print, authoring only a minor part on the basis of the information available to him. They also objected to the formulation of the indictment, claiming that all incriminating grounds should have been stated, and not only the initial and closing parts of the censored typesets, and they declined the criminal offence of insult against the commissary. According to the objection, they did not agree with the indictment charges against the typesetter Vlaho Kelez, as they claimed that he did not typeset nor even had the incriminated articles in his hands, because he was not engaged in the printing of that issue. Like any other reader, they quote, he read the articles after they had been printed. The mere fact that he was the first typesetter of the print house cannot make him liable, they concluded in their objection.[56] State Attorney documents were signed with the date 15 December 1911, while three days later, on 18 December, Schick and Kelez sent their objection to the courts in Dubrovnik and in Zadar.

As there are no other documents concerning this case in the District Court fund, we do not know what the District Court decided nor whether the Judicial Court in Zadar had a final say in this case. There are no data on the final ruling either. Given that in the next weeks and months Schick and Kelez resumed their functions as editor and typesetter, we may assume that they were not sentenced to prison but were probably fined instead.

As a rule, chief editors were known to be summoned to court upon the charges filed by the State Attorney Office. If this were the case, the censored article would have the elements of a serious criminal offence, while the chief editors would be charged for writing or publishing inappropriate texts of another author or for repeating the already censored articles in the next issues. The usual penalty for such offences was imprisonment, but the District Court would fine the offender with 50 crowns, which, if not paid, was replaced by five days in prison.[57]

---

[56] *Tiskovine,* vol. 2, under Pr. 18/11/15.

[57] Examples: *Tiskovine,* vol. 1, under Pr. 10/9/1-2; 4, 9, 16, 20; *Tiskovine,* vol. 2, under Pr. 15/13/1-13.

The censor's FOR and AGAINST

The mentioned case was not an exception in the relations between the censors and *Prava Crvena Hrvatska*, a paper often labelled as a herald of the regime by its opponents.[58] The newspaper saw its first seizure a year and two months after its foundation in May 1906, because of a minor piece of news on the departure of soldiers from Gruž, printed in the *City Chronicle* column. In the issue preserved in the original edition, the editors bring reliable information on the transfer of the military troops from the base in Dubrovnik. Three battalions stationed in Gruž were to be relocated to Herzegovina, Tivat in Boka kotorska, and to Šibenik. Besides the transfer of troops, they also reported about the transformation of the garrison in that only two battalions would remain stationed in Dubrovnik in the future.[59]

This article is found in issue 61, but already in the next issue *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* was obliged to print the seizure decision of the District Court. According to the decision passed "in the name of His Imperial Highness", the mentioned article contained offences defined by the article of law IX Z. 17/XII 1862 D.Z.L number 8 of the year 1863, by which the seizure was executed, further distribution of the article was banned, and the destruction of the seized printed samples in addition to those likely to be seized later, was ordered. The reasons for seizure were explained by the fact that by publishing the news on the movement of the military troops and other military provisions state interests were jeopardised.[60] In the same issue, the editors commented on the censorship from the previous issue, which, in their opinion, was a most "curious seizure" indeed. They justify themselves by stating that they had received the information from certain military officers who spread and circulated them. They argued that the official bulletins published the information about the movement of the general staff, which they did not publish so as to avoid any trouble with the court, as the latter could characterise the published information as an attack against the state interests.[61]

[58] The Rightists used the newspapers for the purpose of national enlightenment, the main goal of their political campaign being unification of Dalmatia and Banska Hrvatska into one state, Croatia, under the crown of the Habsburg Monarchy. Because of the connections of canon Jozo Crnica with the newspaper, but also with the Vienna court, *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* was labelled as an Austrophile newspaper by the opponents. It has been confirmed that *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* only on two occasions, in 1906 and 1907, received subvention from the Viennese government thanks to Jozo Crnica. See: B. Đurasović, *Prava Crvena Hrvatska i pravaši*: pp. 7, 122, 123, 327.

[59] »Promjene i odlazak vojništva.« *PCH* 61/12-5 (1906): p. 2.

[60] »U ime Njegova Veličanstva Cara!.« *PCH* 62/19-5 (1906): p. 2.

[61] »Čudnovata zapljena.« *PCH* 62/19-5 (1906): p. 3.

A couple of issues later, public interest also called for the seizure of a part of the article titled "Bosna i Hercegovina u delegacijama" (Bosnia and Herzegovina in Delegations), in which *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* comments on the interpellations of Ivan Šušteršić and Juraj Biankini on the state and tensions in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The article claims that both representatives submitted "infamous" accusations against Bosnian government, to which Minister István Buriáni responded. The Rightists considered his replica unfounded, and they characterised it as a huge lie.[62] Given that in the remainder of the text they critically remarked on Buriáni's response, the censors removed that part, but considering that the second print of the newspaper has been preserved, only an insight into the fund of the District Court in Dubrovnik may reveal the true reason underlying the seizure of the article. It concerns a short article of only 32 lines laid out on the first of five columns of *Prava Crvena Hrvatska*. With the exception of the introductory part, the rest of the article was removed.

An official document of the State Attorney Office in Dubrovnik states that *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* claims that the minister submitted untruths, and that they called him insulting names. This, they conclude, threatened to damage his reputation by inciting to hatred against him as the chief organ of the State Administration of the annexed provinces. State Attorney Office, as also confirmed by the District Court which decided the cases involving the press, found grounds for incitement to hatred and contempt against the State Administration in Bosnia and Herzegovina.[63]

Dated 26 June 1906 is a document also relating to a seizure of a part of the article "Bosnia and Herzegovina in delegation", published in *Prava Crvena Hrvatska*. Namely, the secretary of the District Court in Dubrovnik wrote a submission in which he expressed his disagreement with the entire seizure of a passage from the mentioned article. He advocated the redefinition of the penalty and the dismissal of the indictment. He elaborated his position by stressing that the programme of the party behind *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* bore no opposition to the Austrian administration in governing Bosnia and Herzegovina. The secretary of the District Court in Dubrovnik claimed that in the newspaper article he found no criminal elements of incitement to hatred and contempt against the administration. He explained that the attack was targeted at the method of administration, which

[62] »Bosna i Hercegovina u delegacijama.« *PCH* 67/23-6 (1906): p. 2.
[63] *Tiskovine,* vol. 1, under Pr. 3/6/1 and Pr. 3/6/4.

was not contrary to the constitution. In his submission, the secretary of the District Court stated that *Prava Crvena* expressed its critique of the freedom of press in Bosnia and Herzegovina due also to the seizure of *Hrvatski Dnevnik,* while the verbal insult targeted at Minister Buriáni the secretary justified by the latter's actions against the freedom of press. Moreover, he argues that the article brings eye-opening facts about the circumstances in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which seem to be far from what Buriáni presented to the Delegation.[64] Despite this submission, considering that he was the only person to object, the court decided on seizure. The newspaper was printed again and its second edition has been preserved. On the page where the article originally stood was merely a blank space with the word "zaplijenjeno" (seized) printed across.

The documents of the District Court also allow a reconstruction of the censorship procedure of the two state bodies responsible for the seizure of articles in the Dubrovnik press.[65] First, the State Attorney would submit a seizure indictment to be confirmed by the District Court. Each indictment on the removal of content from the newspaper was deliberated on the session of a four-member commission composed of a member of the State Attorney Office, usually its head, and judicial counsellors of the District Court.[66] Upon approval of the indictment, the commission submitted a decision to the attention of the State Attorney, as well as to the editors of the newspaper, that is, to the editor-in-chief.

Between 1905 and 1914, several officials of the District Court in Dubrovnik were responsible for the monitoring of the press and seizure of articles. They were mainly sought among judicial counsellors, who presided over the sessions and confirmed the censorship decisions.[67] In rare cases one of the members of the commission of the District Court disagreed with the indictment of the State Attorney Office. If such were the case, District Court confirmed the decision, and the censorship became effective by indictment of the State Attorney Office. However, in a number of cases the District Court rejected the decision of the State Attorney Office. The commission members, judicial counsellors, would unanimously

[64] *Tiskovine,* vol. 1, under Pr. 3/6/3.

[65] Imperial order of 14 September 1852, effective as of February 1854, established the Appeal Court in Zadar, four District Courts of First Instance (Split, Dubrovnik, Kotor and Zadar), in addition to 32 *Kotar* courts See: F. Ivković, »Organizacija uprave u Dalmaciji za vrijeme druge austrijske vladavine 1814-1918.«: p. 48.

[66] *Tiskovine,* vol. 1, 2 and 3.

[67] *Ibidem.*

decide not to approve the State Attorney's indictment, who was against or not attending the session. This would be followed by an appeal of the Dubrovnik State Attorney Office, and the case would be transferred to the Appeal Court in Zadar, which heard the case before the Supreme State Attorney Office in Zadar and issued a decision. The judge of the Hight Court confirmed, rejected or partially changed the decision on the seizure, after which the decision became effective. The decision of the Appeal Court was published in the official bulletin of Dalmatian Administration, *Objavitelj Dalmatinski*,[68] and the preserved copies of the newspaper may be found among the documents of the District Court in Dubrovnik, attached to the decision on seizure.[69]

Dissenting opinions regarding the seizure of content, because of which the case would end up in Zadar, were known to postpone seizure at times. The newspaper would not publish the court decision, on the basis of which we may assume that it was not implemented either. Examples regarding dissenting views over the decision on the seizure of the newspaper contents must have abounded, and the fact that not every indictment issued by the State Attorney Office has survived among the documents of the District Attorney Office, nor every ruling of the District Court regarding seizure, hamper the insight into the scope of the censored texts in the Dubrovnik newspapers. Even more so because the majority of the original newspaper copies have been preserved, due to which the censorship in *Crvena Hrvatska*, *Dubrovnik and Prava Crvena Hrvatska* has for decades remained an unstudied topic.[70]

Yet, there were cases when the decision on seizure of the Appeal Court in Zadar was ignored, and that of the Dubrovnik Court was implemented instead. This may also be concluded on the basis of a case involving Dubrovnik. In the issue 34, the State Attorney ordered seizure of two letters of the readers from Sarajevo and Bijeljina, printed in *Our Letters* (*Naši dopisi*) column, along with

[68] *Objavitelj Dalmatinski – Avvisatore dalmato* (1867-1920), official bulletin of the Administration (*Namjesništvo*) of Dalmatia. The bulletin published announcements on the administrative, legal and economic changes. This bilingual paper, published in Croatian and Italian, was printed in Schönfeld's printing house. See: Ante Bralić, »Zadarski *fin-de siècle* – Političke i društvene prilike u Zadru i Dalmaciji.« *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 3 (2007): pp. 744 and 747.

[69] *Tiskovine,* vol. 1, 2 and 3.

[70] See: »Narodno raspoloženje.« *Dubrovnik* 36/8-9 (1906): pp. 1-2*; Tiskovine*, vol. 1, under Pr. 6/6/4 and 6/6/5.

several extracts from another two articles in the same issue.[71] District Court confirmed the seizure of the readers' two letters, and entirely disregarded the two articles,[72] after which, according to an established procedure, the State Attorney filed an appeal to the Appeal Court in Zadar. Interestingly, the judge in Zadar partly confirmed the appeal of the State Attorney Office in Dubrovnik. He found ground for the offences of the disturbance of public peace in the proposed fragments of the articles "Rezultat 28-godišnje birokratske uprave" (The Result of the Twenty-eight-year Bureaucratic Administration) and "Izjava muftije Džabića" (The Testimony of Mufti Džabić), confirmed deletion of the parts of the articles from the letter of the Sarajevo reader on the grounds of the incitement to insurrection, yet rejected the indictment concerning the seizure of the letter from Bijeljina.[73] Despite such a decision, the decision of the District Court of Dubrovnik was implemented! This is attested by the publication of the decision on seizure in *Dubrovnik*, implemented by the District Court in Dubrovnik, in which only two passages of the article were deleted, both from the *Our Letters* column.[74] The reaction of the editors further affirms this assumption. In *Dubrovnik* they were surprised, they could not understand the meaning of it all, nor did they know how long they would have to wait for the solution of that riddle. They stated that the censorship included only certain segments which comprised a smaller part of what the "blue pencil" of the State Attorney deleted.[75]

If we go back to the case of the first seizure in the political newspaper *Crvena Hrvatska* in 1911 ("Autonomaška drzovitost" (The Temerity of the Autonomist Party), "Il Dalmata zadirkiva" (Il Dalmata Teases)), we shall observe yet another anomaly. Three members of the District Court unanimously rejected the indictment of the State Attorney Office, as they did not find grounds for the offence of the incitement to hostility against the peoples of the Monarchy. According to the minutes of the commission session, the General State Attorney filed a complaint against the mentioned conclusion.[76] Disagreement with the decision of the District Court implied that the State Attorney Office would appeal to the Appeal Court

[71] »Inscenirana hajka protiv Šerif. Eff Arnautovića.« *Dubrovnik* 34/26-8 (1906): p. 2; »Istina o bjeljinskoj "buni".« *Dubrovnik* 34/26-8 (1906): p. 2; »Rezultat 28-godišnje birokratske uprave.« *Dubrovnik* 34/26-8 (1906): p. 2; »Izjava muftije Džabića.« *Dubrovnik* 34/26-8 (1906): p. 2.

[72] *Tiskovine*, vol. 1, under Pr. 5/6/3.

[73] *Tiskovine,* vol. 1, under Pr. 5/6/5.

[74] »U Ime Njegova Veličanstva Cara!« *Dubrovnik* 35/2-9 (1906): p. 4.

[75] »Iz Uredništva.« *Dubrovnik* 35/2-9 (1906): p. 4.

[76] *Tiskovine,* vol. 2, under 1/11/2.

in Zadar. On this occasion, on 17 January Dalmatian High Court reconfirmed the decision of the District Court in Dubrovnik, since it did not find any ground for the offences defined by Article 302 of the Criminal Code Act and 493 of the Criminal Procedure Act.[77] However, the newspaper was censored, as testified by the earlier mentioned editorial in *Crvena Hrvatska* of 11 January 1911.[78] Here one may assume that the editors decided to publish such an editorial on the basis of the intervention of the State Attorney Office alone.

Dubrovnik — *most frequently subject to censors' suppression*

The texts on Bosnia and Herzegovina published in *Dubrovnik* rarely avoided seizure. The annexation crisis featured in that paper from 1906 up to the second half of September 1909, months after Emperor Francis Joseph had signed the document on the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.[79] Not a single seizure was recorded in 1905, but the political pressure against *Dubrovnik* started from the summer of 1906.[80]

In 1907 Austrian authorities intervened on eight occasions against the newspaper of the Serbian Party in Dubrovnik, regarding exclusively the news on Bosnia and Herzegovina. The pressure intensified during the annexation crisis in 1908 and 1909, when dozens of articles were seized. The authorities disapproved of the incitement to hatred and contempt against the administration in the occupied lands, as it was understood as an offence against public peace.[81] Dubrovnik censors generally had no doubt that *Dubrovnik* was determined to incite people to hatred and contempt by referring to Austria as occupier.

---

[77] *Tiskovine,* vol. 2, under 1/11/5.

[78] »Oho, što je to!« *CH* 3/11-1 (1911): p. 1.

[79] Annexation crisis lasted from 1908 to 1909. Annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the Austrian part of the Monarchy was officially proclaimed on 6 October 1908. The authors emphasise that even in the pre-annexation period Serbian bourgeoisie advocated the joining of Bosnia and Herzegovina with Serbia, while the Croatian middling ranks supported the union with Croatian lands. Annexation was not only of political concern for the Monarchy, disunited Croatia and Serbia, but part of the agenda of the great powers in their struggle for domination in the Near East. See: Jaroslav Šidak, Mirjana Gross, Igor Karaman and Dragovan Šepić, *Povijest hrvatskog naroda g. 1860 – 1914*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1968: pp. 238-240.

[80] See: »Pravac bos. her politike.« *Dubrovnik* 24/17-6 (1906): 1; »Odgovor g. Kosti Hermanu.« *Dubrovnik* 24/17-6 (1906): p. 1; *Dubrovnik* 25/24-6 (1906): p. 1; *Dubrovnik* 48/2-12 (1906): p. 1.

[81] See: »U Ime Njegova Veličanstva Cesara!.« *Dubrovnik* 12/21-3 (1908): p. 1; »Protekcija i korupcija u Bosni. Iz "Orient-Rundschau"-a.« *Dubrovnik* 11/14-3 (1908): p. 2.

A month after the official annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the editorial entitled "Dva rata" (Two Wars) provoked a new intervention of the censors. Despite seizure, the newspaper has been preserved in its original edition.[82] In order to supress the anti-Serbian campaign but also weaken the political "alliance" between the Croats and Serbs, Viennese authorities launched actions at court. Frequent seizures in the *Dubrovnik* paper continued until the summer of 1910. Just as the end of the trial of the Serbs accused of high treason in Zagreb neared, the pressure against the paper mounted. "Osuda je pala" (We Have the Verdict) was the headline in the Extra Edition published on a single newspaper sheet.[83] The traitors were called "the martyrs of the people" and the Court immediately seized this text.[84] In the next issues of *Dubrovnik,* the court rulings were not published regularly, while in the *Dubrovnik News* (*Dubrovačke vijesti*) column the editors complained of the situation the end of which they could not foresee. They were trying hard, but they could not "satisfy the censors' preference".[85]

In the middle of May 1910, the editorial discussed the "freedom of press", reporting that only a few issues of their paper "had not been subject to the blue pencil of the merciless censorship". Editors write that they had to weigh every word to avoid, albeit partially, seizure and thus diminish the relatively high costs. They wonder as to how they incited to hatred and contempt against Austro-Hungary. Editors hold that the practice of frequent seizures was conducted in their paper only, providing examples that they were even censored for publishing the news extracted from Serbian press or Viennese papers. They are convinced that the reasons for seizure could not even be accounted by the "gentlemen censors" themselves.[86]

With this editorial they evidently succeeded in their goal, as the censorship pressure eventually slackened. The seizures continued, but not to the extent witnessed in the previous period, and the censorship mainly concerned passages only and not entire articles. In the next issue the paper would publish the notification of the Court about those instances of censorship.[87]

---

[82] »Dva rata.« *Dubrovnik* 50/10-12 (1908): p. 1.

[83] »Osuda je pala!« *Dubrovnik* 73/5-10 (1909) (special edition).

[84] »U ime njegova veličanstva Cara!« *Dubrovnik* 74/8-10 (1909): p. 1.

[85] »Zapljena za zapljenom.« *Dubrovnik* 76/15-10 (1909): p. 3.

[86] »Sloboda štampe!!!« *Dubrovnik* 40/27-5 (1910): p. 1.

[87] »U ime njegova veličanstva Cara!« *Dubrovnik* 45/14-6 (1910): 1; »U ime njegova veličanstva Cara!« *Dubrovnik* 58/29-7 (1910): p. 1; »U ime njegova veličanstva Cara!« *Dubrovnik* 65/23-8 (1910): 1; »U ime njegova veličanstva Cara!« *Dubrovnik* 68/2-9 (1910): p. 1; »U ime njegova veličanstva Cara!« *Dubrovnik* 70/10-10 (1910): p. 1.

However, a considerable number of seizures placed the Serb-Catholic paper in an unenviable position. In 1919 *Dubrovnik* was censored on sixteen occasions, which was far less compared to 1912 and 1913, but it appears that the negative financial impact maximised with each year and the only solution was to cease the publication of the paper temporarily. In September 1910, they informed their readers that the paper would not be issued for a short period of time. The explanation is brief and reads as follows: "due to certain unforeseen technical impediments".[88] This was followed by the decision according to which the paper would in future be published only once a week.[89]

A month later, editors of *Dubrovnik* informed their subscribers again, reporting that the situation was not developing as they planned, and the blame was not on them but on "Serbian negligence". They write that they would easily stand up to the authorities but not to the negligence of the Serbian public, which seemed to go hand in hand with the suppression of the authorities. They leave the fate of Dubrovnik to the conscience of all Serbs, and petition for aid in contributions, subscriptions, and collaboration in order to continue.[90]

Apparently, this dramatic presentation of the paper's situation brought fruit. The readers and subscribers started sending money for the "*Dubrovnik* fund", and the editors published the names of the contributors and donations from Dubrovnik, Ston, Korčula, Kotor, Serbs from Montenegro, and even a contribution from as far afield as Seattle.[91]

"Commissariat in the Dubrovnik manner"

The censorship intensified in April 1912. By the end of January, Croatia was headed by a new *ban*, Slavko Cuvaj (1851-1931).[92] He began his mandate by

[88] »Iz uredništva.« *Dubrovnik* 72/16-9 (1910): p. 3.

[89] *Dubrovnik* 73/20-10 (1910).

[90] »Kô rak.« *Dubrovnik* 73/20-10 (1910): p. 1.

[91] See: »Pomoć "Dubrovniku".« *Dubrovnik* 73/20-10 (1910): p. 4; »U fond Dubrovnika.« *Dubrovnik* 74/27-10 (1910): p. 4; »U fond Dubrovnika.« *Dubrovnik* 75/3-11 (1910): p. 4; »U fond Dubrovnika.« *Dubrovnik* 77/17-11 (1910): p. 6; »U fond Dubrovnika.« *Dubrovnik* 78/24-11 (1910): p. 6; »Prilozi Dubrovnika.« *Dubrovnik* 81/15-12 (1910): p. 4; »Prilozi Dubrovniku.« *Dubrovnik* 2/12-1 (1911): p. 3; »Prilozi Dubrovniku.« *Dubrovnik* 5/1-2 (1911): p. 3.

[92] Cuvaj, newly installed *ban*, was a supporter of Rauch's government so that his choice paved the path to the absolutistic regime. He succeeded ban Nikola Tomašić, who relied on the Croatian-Serbian coalition during his governance. This helped Khuen to dissolve the coalition, with the intention of creating a majority in the Hungarian parliament. Tomašić ran for the Parliament (*Sabor*) elections in 1911 with his list but suffered defeat, which forced him to resign. See: J. Šidak, M. Gross, I. Karaman and D. Šepić, *Povijest hrvatskog naroda*: pp. 265-276.

dissolving Croatian Parliament, annulling the constitution and introducing a commissariat.[93] Witnessing the growing and rebellious pro-Austrian atmosphere, Dalmatia closely followed all the news from Banska Hrvatska. For this reason, the City Authority in Zadar adhered to the strict policy and accepted Cuvaj's regulations.

The introduction of the commissariat, with *ban* Cuvaj as commissary, meant, among other things, the restriction of the freedom of expression of the opposition press, introduction of censorship, high bails and the ban of colportage.[94] In his book *Povijest novinstva Hrvatske 1771-1939* (The History of Croatian Press 1771-1939), Josip Horvat writes that the new press legislation, besides that in the imperial Russia, was among the most rigorous in Europe. Cuvaj's law went even further than that of Bach from 1852. According to new regulations, print matter had to be submitted to the police for censorship, but not on a brush-obtained impression on soft paper, as defined by Bach's law, but as a printed copy of the whole newspaper. "Considering that virtually every copy was seized, the entire edition faced ruin, the papers suffered continuous damage."[95] At about that time, Dubrovnik censors too took a harsher approach, as evidenced from the texts in *Crvena Hrvatska* and *Prava Crvena Hrvatska*.

As early as the beginning of April, *Crvena Hrvatska* felt the first consequences. The editorial in which they supported the people of Banska Hrvatska, who, due to the annulment of constitution, found themselves in a difficult political situation, was seized. They believed that with a single stroke of the pen Croatia was "outlawed", as if it had never existed. They invoked constitutional traditions and "royal oaths" repealed by "Cuvaj's commissariat".[96] The confirmation of censorship was published in the next issue, in which they reported that because of the Easter holidays and extended workhours of the printers a new edition could not have been prepared.[97] *Crvena Hrvatska* continued to write about the state of emergency in Croatia, reminding of the first commissariat of 1883. In their opinion, Cuvaj's commissariat departed greatly from that of Khuen-Héderváry, because the current illegal measures

[93] On two occasions in Croatian history a commissariat was introduced: from September to December 1883, and Cuvaj's Commissariat, introduced on 3 April 1912 and lasted until early December 1913.

[94] J. Šidak, M. Gross, I. Karaman and D. Šepić, *Povijest hrvatskog naroda*: p. 277.

[95] J. Horvat, *Povijest novinstva Hrvatske 1771-1939.* Zagreb: Golden marketing, 2003: p. 324.

[96] »Obustava ustava u Hrvatskoj.« *CH* 28/6-4 (1912): p. 1.

[97] »Zaplijena našega lista.« *CH* 29/10-4 (1912): p. 3.

had been imposed to incite revolt and to suppress the will of the people. Entire Monarchy, *Crvena Hrvatska* reports, is responsible for the newly-developed situation, and they call for reaction and revocation of the scandalous decision.[98] This provided ample grounds for new seizures of the paper.

From Vienna they received information that helped illuminate this situation, that is, recurrent seizures. Namely, the general administration in Vienna, as reported by *Crvena Hrvatska*, instructed all State Attorney Offices in Dalmatia to act harshly in their censorship of the press regarding political circumstances in Croatia. That decree, according to *Crvena Hrvatska*, was issued upon the prompting of commissary Cuvaj. The editors expressed their concern over the fact that the "outside world" was certainly bound to learn of the decrees of this kind issued within the Monarchy.[99]

In an article entitled "Pismo iz Zagreba" (A Letter from Zagreb) this paper brings a detailed report of the "prosecution of the press" across Croatia. The newspapers had become colourless and resembled the journalism governed by an absolutistic regime of the 1850-ties, they reported. The censorship procedure itself consisted of the following: first, only a single copy of the newspaper was printed to be immediately delivered to the censors. The authorities would have to pass their decision within two hours upon monitoring it at the latest. However, the practice proved otherwise. Despite the fact that the censors had completed their duty, on occasion it took as many as ten hours to pass the decision, during which the editor waited at the Police Station. Once he received the decision, the space previously occupied by the seized text had to be replaced with a new one. In doing so, the editor had to remove even the slightest trace so that the readers would not suspect any attempt at censorship. For this to be accomplished, the editors needed at least one hour. A new copy of the newspaper went through the same procedure, and it too was occasionally subject to censorship. The final result of this procedure was that the paper reached the public with an eight to ten hours of delay, and even worse, the paper "was stripped bare of colour" and "political texts". The journalists faced a challenging task of preparing not only one issue, but several of them so as to be able to provide a substitute for the censored articles.[100]

---

[98] »Sudbonosni časovi.« *CH* 29/10-4 (1912): p. 1.
[99] »Zaplijena našega lista.« *CH* 30/13-4 (1912): p. 4.
[100] »Progon štampe.« *CH* 31/17-4 (1912): p. 1.

With regard to Dubrovnik papers, the situation was somewhat different, easier even, but they too complained about the censorship procedure, especially when the paper was dotted with seized articles. By decision of the Court, they were to dismantle the set type and prepare a new issue for the external subscribers.

"Commissariat in the Dubrovnik manner" achieved its purpose in the city papers, as testified by *Prava Crvena Hrvatska,* whose editorials recurrently concluded that so much was taking place that it was impossible to cover it all in a weekly, not event major events. Therefore, they were mainly confined to report only on the most important events.[101] They did not comment on them, but only reported on them so that the readers could have an insight into all the developments.[102] Uncritical writing of this kind was uncommon in the earlier years, which indicates that the editors resorted to self-censorship in fear of seizure, as well as high costs caused by repeated printing of the paper.

The columns of *Dubrovnik* were not particularly affected by the censorship apparatus, because their Serb-Catholic editors showed little interest in the newly-developed situation. They reported on events, but only on two occasions did the authorities find their opinion objectionable.[103] From May 1912, the authorities resumed their usual restrained rhythm regarding *Dubrovnik.*

Crvena Hrvatska makes no mention of their effort not to disturb the censors so as to avoid any problems with the publishing of the paper. However, severe pressure continued, and the editors grumbled that no criticism was allowed whatsoever.[104] When it seemed that the situation had been restored to normal, a series of assassination attempts at commissary Cuvaj followed.[105]

Crvena Hrvatska most actively reported on the new situation*,* while *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* did not even mention the assassination. The assassination gave

---

[101] »U Monarhiji.« *PCH* 380/8-6 (1912): p. 1.

[102] »Biše vedro, pak se naoblači.« *PCH* 374/27-4 (1912): p. 1.

[103] »Apsolutizam u Hrvatskoj.« *Dubrovnik* 15/11-4 (1912): p. 2; »Braći u nesretnoj Hrvatskoj.« *Dubrovnik* 16/18-4 (1912): p. 2.

[104] »Zapljene našega lista.« *CH* 57/17-7 (1912): p. 2.

[105] Over a very short period Slavko Cuvaj was the target of two assassination attempts. On 8 June 1912, Luka Jukić, a Croat from Bosnia and Herzegovina, fired shots at Cuvaj's car. Jukić fled but was soon apprehended, together with a group of younger men from Zadar, Dubrovnik, Split and Pag. Jukić was first sentenced to death by hanging, but the sentence was converted to life imprisonment. At the start of the Balkan Wars, I. Planinšćak made a second attempt to assassinate *ban* Cuvaj. The assassin killed himself after the abortive attempt. See: J. Šidak, M. Gross, I. Karaman and D. Šepić, *Povijest hrvatskog naroda*: pp. 282-283.

way to an increasingly tense situation in Dubrovnik, bringing "Bach's patent" back to the pages, because many citizens ended up before the Court of the City Authority.[106] Cuvaj launched action to detect the possible accomplices in the assassination in Banska Hrvatska and Dalmatia, as result of which six Dubrovnik gymnasium students were arrested, while *Crvena Hrvatska* suffered gravest consequences from the censorship for its detailed reports on the situation in the city.[107]

From October 1912, Dubrovnik papers were preoccupied with the latest developments on the Balkan warfronts.[108] Despite cheering support of the military campaigns of Serbia in the columns of the three city papers, the censorship remained fairly inactive. It was only in 1913 that, on a couple of occasions, the censors seized the articles in *Dubrovnik* which glorified the heroic actions of the Serbian army.[109]

Only two of all the 1913 issues, that of *Dubrovnik* and of *Crvena Hrvatska*, have been preserved as second edition, which led to a misleading conclusion that there was no censorship at all.[110] A record from the District Court fund testifies that during 1913 the censors intervened 23 times in the city papers, but given that in some issues they were known to seize several articles, that number may be doubled.[111]

As to how intense political pressure was is best illustrated in *Crvena Hrvatska,* which reports that the papers were seized "relentlessly". By commenting on the last censorship of the Serb-Catholic newspaper, they wrote that Croatia was more restrictive in terms of the freedom of expression than Bosnia and Herzegovina, where the papers were subject to preventive censorship.[112]

---

[106] »Bachova patenta u akciji.« *CH* 53/3-7 (1912): p. 2.

[107] »Dakle smo tako daleko došli.« *CH* 48/15-6 (1912): p. 1; »Premetačine i istraga. Zašto su đaci povedeni u zatvor?« *CH* 48/15-6 (1912): p. 4; »Quousque tandem...« *CH 51*/26-6 (1912): p. 1; »Ispiti zrelosti pri mjesnom gimnaziju.« *CH* 55/10-7 (1912): p. 2.

[108] The First Balkan War broke out in October 1912, and the press, regardless of political affiliation, saluted every victory in the liberation war. Although the Peace Treaty was signed on 30 May 1913, by which almost the entire territory of European Turkey fell to the conquerors, a month later the Second Balkan War broke out. See: J. Šidak, M. Gross, I. Karaman i D. Šepić, *Povijest hrvatskog naroda*: pp. 285-286.

[109] »Srbija i njena vojska.« *Dubrovnik* 14/3-4 (1913): p. 2; »Odjeci pada Skadra u Beogradu.« *Dubrovnik* 18/29-4 (1913): p. 1.

[110] *CH* 31/2-8 (1913): pp. 1-2.; *Dubrovnik* 37/11-9 (1913): p. 3.

[111] *Tiskovine,* vol. 3, under 1-23.

[112] »Zapljene.« *CH* 20/17-5 (1913): p. 3.

The censorship of *Dubrovnik* prompted the representative on the Imperial Council, Dubrovnik-born Melko Čingrija (1837-1921), to seek explanation from the Minister of Justice, holding that the seizures were a new proof of illegal practice that prevailed in Dalmatia. He made a direct inquiry with the minister as to what actions he intended to take regarding "the curbing of the abuse of the executive authority by the organs of the State Attorney Offices in Dalmatia?"[113]

Namely, the famous high treason affair of the staff colonel Alfred Redl filled the pages of the Dubrovnik press as well.[114] Melko Čingrija quoted the seized article published in issue 24, in which *Dubrovnik* complained that "high treason was pinned on the Serbs and fabricated, along with revolt and cross-border aspirations". Čingrija also quoted an unjust seizure of the article in which Redl addressed the citizens as "monkeys", whereupon the paper condemned this kind of behaviour.[115] In one of its issues from early June, *Crvena Hrvatska* elaborated the whole situation surrounding Redl and his fifteen-year intelligence career for the Russians. Owing to his military rank, he was well-informed about all the secrets and military plans. Being also a confidant of Berlin, he supplied Russia not only with the plans of the Monarchy but also with those of the German army, for which he was abundantly rewarded. It is assumed that he left a legacy of two million crowns. A mail money delivery revealed his military intelligence, after which he committed suicide. *Crvena Hrvatska* compared the Redl affair with

[113] »Upit.« *CH* 25/21-6 (1913): p. 2.

[114] Writer and journalist from Prague, Egon Erwin Kisch, discovered a case of espionage of "Colonel Redl". The Army headquarters tried to conceal the affair to such an extent that they did not even inform the Austrian heir to the throne about it. The story reached Kisch by chance, but he could not decide how to publish it. He knew that the newspapers would be immediately seized, and he came up with an idea to print it in the form of a retraction. His news, or more precisely, retraction, the authorities could not check nor easily seize, and more importantly, the news reached the public. Namely, the state attorney responsible for the press presumed that the news leaked from the military headquarters or a ministry in Vienna, and decided not to censor it. In the *Bohemian,* Prussian paper, Kisch wrote: "From a high position (implying the military) we have been asked to deny the rumours in the military circles that the chief of the General Staff of the Prague corpus, Colonel Alfred Redl, who day before yesterday committed suicide in Vienna, gave away military secrets and engaged in espionage for Russia. The committee which from Vienna was directed to Prague, headed by a colonel, in the course of yesterday Sunday afternoon, in the presence of the corpus commander Baron Giesl, forced entry into the official flat of Colonel Redl and searched the wardrobes and drawers, and during the three-hour investigation looked for the proof of negligence of an entirely different kind..." See: Michael Kunczik and Astrid Zipfel, *Uvod u znanost o medijima i komunikologiju*. Zagreb: Zaklada Friedrich Ebert, 2006: p. 15.

[115] »Upit.« *CH* 25/21-6 (1913): p. 2.

the high treason proceedings in Zagreb, those across Bosnia and Herzegovina, with Friedjung's process,[116] investigations, police search of property, judicial hearings, confinements throughout Dalmatia. They write that the Viennese gentlemen perceived Croats and Serbs as spies and traitors, but in fact it was Redl, a German,[117] who spied all along in a "composed and serene manner", while the spies were looked for among the locals. That caustic article, targeted against the government in Vienna, the censors in Dubrovnik never seized![118]

In the name of Emperor Francis Joseph...

On 28 June 1914, Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to the throne, was killed in Sarajevo, as well as his wife, Archduchess Sofie. *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* was the first paper in Dubrovnik to report on the assassination. This was preceded by an abortive assassination attempt by Nedeljko Čabrinović Vasov, a Serb national, who threw a grenade at the car but without serious consequences for the archduke. As he failed, the second assassin was Gavrilo Princip, who shot Ferdinand and his wife.[119] A state of uncertainty enveloped Croatia and Dalmatia. As elsewhere in disunited Croatia, Dubrovnik soon witnessed riots against Serbs. City papers were flooded with reports and analyses of the developments in the historical nucleus and at Pile. On Saturday of 4 July 1914, a commemoration mass

---

[116] Austrian historian Dr. Heinrich Friedjung published a series of articles in *Neue Freie Presse*, in which he accused Serbia of collaborating with the Hungarian Independent Party against the Habsburgs. The aim of the alleged conspiracy, dating from as early as 1903, was to help the Hungarians break away from Austria, whereas Bosnia and Herzegovina, as a reward, would be ceded to Serbia. Friedjung's "source" was the report of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Special importance was given to Frano Supilo, because he, reportedly, advised Nikola Pašić, the president of the Serbian government, to spend the vacation of 1907 in Crikvenica, which would facilitate his contact with the political friends from Hungary. A series of articles was to discredit Frano Supilo and the leaders of the Croatian-Serbian Coalition. The Coalition ended up in court, and the main hearing started on 9 December 1909. Friedjung and F. Funder, editor of *Reichspost* which also reported on the same topic, submitted counterfeit documents before the court on the basis of which the articles had been written. The process was concluded with a settlement, after the Hungarians agreed to a compromise with the Coalition, while the latter withdrew its charges against Friedjung and *Reichspost*. See: Livia Kardum, »Aneksiona kriza i Friedjungov proces.« *Politička misao* XXX/1 (1993): pp. 138-146.

[117] The city papers, but also the representative in the Imperial Council, Melko Čingrija, reported that the traitor from the heart of the regime, Colonel Alfred Redel, was German, but born in Galicia, which had recently become part of the Austrian Empire, and today of Ukrainian Lviv.

[118] »Kamo tražite špijune.« *CH* 23/7-6 (1913): p. 1.

[119] »Potankosti groznog čina.« *PCH* 479/30-6 (1914): p. 2.

for the assassination victims was held at the Cathedral, followed by riots which unsettled the Ragusans. In front of the Municipality building, as reported by *Dubrovnik*, some fifty people gathered, few inhabitants of Brgat and peasants, and "just as many to the Ragusans unfamiliar faces",[120] whereas *Crvena Hrvatska* claimed they were "from Brgat, Mohammedan workers and a couple of Arbanas individuals". They were determined to force their way into the building. Mayor Čingrija sent for the gendarmerie. The crowd was protesting against municipal authority and the Serbs. At one moment they dispersed towards Serbian political and cultural societies. Soon they demolished and plundered the Serbian school, the premises of the Sokol association, Serbian institutions *Zora* and *Matica*, along with the *Štionica*. The gendarmes arrested a couple of protesters, only to set them free soon after.[121] A similar article was published by *Dubrovnik*, but the bulk of its text was seized. Any mention of the gendarmerie, army and officers in the negative context was removed from the newspaper. Thus, an entire passage entitled "Vojska odbila pomoć" (The Army Refused Help) disappeared from the editorial, in which they wrote how at one point administrator Fillaus called army for help when he realised that the disturbances were well organised. Dubrovnik public was not to read about the details of the organisation and invitations to the gathering of the *Dušan Silni* association. The invitations to the members of *Dušan Silni* were sent, as reported in the paper, by the "organs of the local political administration" and through private channels, in an attempt to gather in large numbers and in uniforms, so that, together with the Croatian *Sokol*, they would participate as official guards in the commemoration honouring Archduke Francis Ferdinand assassinated in Sarajevo.[122]

Given that the reports on Saturday riots in the city occupied much of the space in *Dubrovnik,* all the mentioned details were removed from the original newspaper edition.[123] Issue 20 of *Dubrovnik* has been preserved in the original as well as second edition. Considering that they provide similar reports on the riots, one may conclude that *Crvena Hrvatska* too was subject to a similar censorship pressure. In the next issue of that paper, after a long gap in which the editors did

[120] »Demonstracije i izgredi nepoznatih u Dubrovniku. Pred općinskom zgradom.« *Dubrovnik* 20/9-7 (1914): p. 1.

[121] »Privilegovane demonstracije. Nesmetani izgredi, navale, rušenja i pljačkanje u Dubrovniku.« *CH* 21/11-7 (1914): p. 1.

[122] »Demonstracije i izgredi nepoznatih u Dubrovniku.« *Dubrovnik* 20/9-7 (1914): p. 1.

[123] »Demonstracije i izgredi nepoznatih u Dubrovniku« *Dubrovnik* 20/9-7 (1914): pp. 1-3.

not publish the emperor's decision, they printed the confirmation of seizure of several passages from two articles from the previous issue.[124]

Prava Crvena Hrvatska was not affected by censorship seizures, mainly because it was issued on 11 July 1914, seven days after the riots and disturbances, and devoted little attention to the Saturday events in the streets of Dubrovnik. It provided a short account of the demolition and breaking into Serbian property, as well as the tearing of Serbian flags, and condemned damage against another's property, but also focused on the motives underlying this violent behaviour. In their opinion, it was the voice and judgment of the people as a result of the continuous pressure to accept the union with the Serbs contrary to their will.[125]

Emperor Francis Joseph terminated diplomatic relations between Austria-Hungary and Serbia, with an ultimatum, after which he declared war to the Kingdom of Serbia. First World War started on 28 July 1914. This marked the end of two political newspapers in Dubrovnik by the "Decree on the press" issued by Emperor Francis Joseph. A day prior to declaration of WWI, on 27 July 1914, press law was revoked, and journalism in the Monarchy was subjected to preventive military censorship.[126] Among the first to disappear from the scene in Dubrovnik were the political papers *Crvena Hrvatska* and *Dubrovnik*. The last issue of *Dubrovnik* was printed on 23 July 1914, while *Crvena Hrvatska* published its last edition on 25 July 1914.

Prava Crvena Hrvatska was the only paper to remain on the Dubrovnik press scene. It found itself on the list of newspapers affected by the regulation according to which three hours prior to publication the paper had to be submitted to the censors for inspection.[127] Considering that only seven censorships were filed among the documents of the District Court in Dubrovnik during 1914, it is clear that the State Attorney Office and the District Court had little dealings with *Prava Crvena Hrvatska*.[128] Loyalty to the Monarchy was of essential importance for the future of the newspaper, but with the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, it too came to an end.

---

[124] »U ime Njegova Veličanstva Cara!« *CH* 22/18-7 (1914): p. 3.

[125] »Narod je progovorio!« *PCH* 481/11-7 (1914): p. 1.

[126] Josip Horvat, *Povijest novinstva Hrvatske 1771 – 1939.* Zagreb: Golden marketing, 2003: p. 330.

[127] In addition to *Dubrovnik* and *Crvena Hrvatska,* the publishing of *Srpska zora* was also banned in Dubrovnik, *Hrvatska Riječ* in Šibenik, *Sloboda*, *Pučka Sloboda* and *Zastava* in Split. See: »Službene Odredbe. Odredbe glede tiskopisa u Dalmaciji.« *PCH* 484/1-8 (1914): 3.

[128] *Tiskovine,* vol. 3.

Conclusion

Content analysis of the Dubrovnik newspapers *Crvena Hrvatska*, *Dubrovnik* and *Prava Crvena Hrvatska* confirms continuous activity of the censorship state apparatus in the period 1905-1914. The seizures exercised by the Monarchy authorities in Dubrovnik implied the removal of controversial articles or passages from the paper. After the decision regarding censorship, the editors had to remove the content from the issue, leaving a blank space with a notification "zaplijenjeno" (seized) written across, and according to law, by which they did not always abide, they were to publish the decision on the basis of which the censorship was implemented. Upon the issue of the papers, the Ragusans would read the censored editions, while for the subscribers in Dalmatia the editors were known to prepare the papers with the latest news instead of the news removed by the suppressive state apparatus.

More than a century after the publication of the first political newspapers in Dubrovnik, mainly because they have been preserved in the original print impressions, the censorship has escaped the attention of historiography. Owing to in-depth study of the newspaper material, along with the documents of the District Court in Dubrovnik, continuous seizures of articles which did not fit into the state policy have surfaced.

The number of seized articles over the period of ten years has been established, and the operation of the censorship apparatus in Dubrovnik reconstructed. These results allowed a clear insight as to when and how often the authorities exercised a comprehensive or partial censorship of newspaper articles, and more importantly, the study elucidates the reasons why the authorities did not wish certain papers to reach Dubrovnik public.

A special section of the article examined the institutions responsible for the control of press. Upon indictment of the State Attorney Office, the confirmation of seizure was implemented by the District Court, which decided the cases involving the press.

A conclusion that imminently follows from the content analysis is that *Dubrovnik* was subject to repressive censorship policy. On occasion, the mentioned paper was simply unreadable due to abundant seizures. The newspaper of the Dubrovnik Serb-Catholics was under particular restraint because of its open views and advocacy of the Kingdom of Serbia regarding its positions on Bosnia and Herzegovina. As the annexation crisis of Bosnia and Herzegovina intensified,

succeeded by high treason processes, the censors became increasingly occupied with that paper. Frequent seizures affected *Dubrovnik*'s financial standing, and in September 1910 the Serb-Catholic editors were forced to stop the publication of the paper.

The year 1911 was particularly challenging for both *Dubrovnik* and *Crvena Hrvatska*, because of the "Bach's patent", legal decree according to which Greater District (*Kotar*) Authority was given a decisive role. For reporting on the citizens' issues with the government, these two papers were most commonly censored. Otherwise, from 1905 to 1911 the censors had no objection concerning the texts published in *Crvena Hrvatska*.

The third and the youngest political paper in Dubrovnik, *Prava Crvena Hrvatska,* generally remained out of the censors' focus. In the period under study, no more than twenty-three seizures of its articles or extracts have been recorded, which testifies to the paper's affiliation with the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

Had, by some chance, only the second editions of the censored papers published at the start of the twentieth century in Dubrovnik been archived, we would have been deprived of an overall insight into the political life of the city. Owing to the fact that almost all original issues have been preserved, the censorship remained hidden for more than a century from the publication of the first political papers in Dubrovnik. Having confirmed the existence of a repressive apparatus that monitored the press, the results of this research provide a fresh insight into the attitude of the Monarchy administration towards the writing and expression of the first party papers in Dubrovnik, along with its impact on the creation of the political information that reached Dubrovnik public.