

THE PRINCIPLE OF SOLIDARITY AND FRATERNITY/ BROTHERHOOD IN SOCIALIST YUGOSLAVIA IN THE LIGHT OF THE CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING

Martina Sr. Ana BEGIĆ

Catholic Faculty of Theology, University of Zagreb
Vlaška 38, p.p. 5, HR – 10 000 Zagreb
ana.begic@gmail.com

Abstract

The paper is divided into two parts. The first part explains the concept of solidarity and fraternity on a theoretical level, especially in the light of Catholic social teaching. The second part analyzes the principles of solidarity and fraternity in Croatian society during the National Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. In addition to solving the national question under a specific aspect of brotherhood, this term was understood in the spirit of the communist ideology of brotherhood and unity of the Yugoslav peoples, and the ideology of solidarity was present predominantly in the form of self-governing socialism. The paper, therefore, shows how socialist Yugoslavia had many characteristics of a totalitarian system defined by communist ideology.

Keywords: fraternity, brotherhood, solidarity, Catholic social teachings, Yugoslavia, communism, self-governing socialism, national identity.

Introduction

Looking at the Church's social documents, we can say that they mention the principle of solidarity more often than the concept of fraternity, which in turn gets a central place in the documents of Pope Francis.¹ Therefore, the first part of the paper tries to clarify the relationship between the principles of

¹ Cf. PAPINSKO VIJEĆE »PRAVDA I MIR«, *Kompendij socijalnog nauka Crkve*, Zagreb, 2005., no. 192-208; IVAN PAVAO II., *Centesimus annus – Stota godina*, Zagreb, 1991., no. 49;

solidarity and fraternity at the theoretical level, especially in light of Catholic social teaching.² In the second part, we focus on the application of the principles of solidarity and fraternity in Croatian society, especially during communist Yugoslavia (National Federal Republic of Yugoslavia /1945-1963/, Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia /1963-1990/) when the concept of fraternity (brotherhood) was viewed under the guise of the communist ideology of brotherhood and unity, and solidarity was present in the ideological form as an attempt to realize self-governing socialism.³ The concept of brotherhood was undoubtedly influenced by the South Slavic idea. Without going into the history of the origin of South Slavic idea, it is essential to point out that the idea of the brotherhood of the South Slavic peoples certainly has its foothold in the ideology of Illyrianism, which »contained the idea of a special South Slavic, 'Illyrian' individuality, based on a common origin, language and name, within which Slovenes, Croats, Serbs and Bulgarians, as historically shaped individualities, have the characteristics of tribal ('genealogical') individuality. The South Slavic idea served as an ideological framework that included efforts to neutralize strong provincial particularisms and to gather the entire Croatian integration territory under one standard literary language for the political

BENEDIKT XVI., *Caritas in veritate*, Zagreb, 2009., no. 35; FRANJO, *Fratelli tutti. Enciklika o bratstvu i socijalnom prijateljstvu*, Zagreb, 2020., no. 103-105 (hereinafter: FT).

² On the development of Catholic social teaching see: Marijan VALKOVIĆ (ur.), *Sto godina katoličkog socijalnog nauka*, Zagreb, 1991., V-XXXII. Cf. PAPINSKO VIJEĆE »PRAVDA I MIR«, *Kompendij socijalnog nauka Crkve*, no. 62-75., 79-86.; John COLELAN, *Development of Church Social Teaching*, in: Charles CURRAN – Richard McCORMICK, *Official Catholic Social Teaching. Readings in Moral Theology*, no. 5, New York – Mahwah, 1986, 169-187; James V. SCHALL, *From Catholic »Social Doctrine« to the »Kingdom of Christ on Earth«*, in: Charles CURRAN – Richard McCORMICK, *Official Catholic Social Teaching. Readings in Moral Theology*, no. 5, 313-330.

³ The work was created as part of the postdoctoral studies at the Faculty of Social Sciences of the Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas – Angelicum in Rome and refers to the conducted research on the concept of fraternity/brotherhood and solidarity in the minds of today's young people in Croatian society. Due to its scope, the work will be published in two parts. The introductory part is published here, and the conducted research will be published in the second issue. Therefore, it is worth noting that the paper did not have the primary task of making a deeper analysis of the concept of brotherhood and solidarity in socialist Yugoslavia. The introductory part had the task of introducing the issue to see whether the Yugoslav ideology is still present in Croatian society and whether it affects the consciousness of young people. In addition, the paper was originally written in Italian, and the introductory part provided basic information about the communist ideology to professors and students of Angelicum who are entirely unfamiliar with that period of Croatian history. Precisely because of this, the absence of a deeper analysis of the communist era can be noticed in the paper, and the concept of fraternity/brotherhood itself is analyzed in more detail in the second part of the paper.

integration of the Triune Kingdom and its greater political independence in Hungary. At the same time, this idea enabled the political cooperation of Croats and Serbs in Croatia in preserving the separate political position of the Triune Kingdom against Hungarian expansionism because it enabled the Serbs to retain their ethnic identity. The ideology of Illyrianism was also accepted by a part of Slovenes from Styria and Carinthia, who lived with the German majority and were exposed to Germanization. Apart from that, the Illyrian national ideology did not find acceptance because it was held to be a danger to Slovenian and Serbian national individuality.⁴

However, with the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in 1918, the South Slavic idea was politically realized in the form of a unitary monarchy with a significant dominance of the Serbian dynasty and political elite. It is worth saying that unitary Yugoslavism was transformed into an official ideology by the proclamation of the dictatorship of King Alexander in 1929. However, the crushing defeat of the army of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in April 1941 and the absence of a unified resistance movement revealed the complete weakness of the links between individual nations in Yugoslavia. In the circumstances of the civil war and resistance to Nazism, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia offered its conception of Yugoslav federalism and the equality of all nations, including Macedonians and Montenegrins, and later Muslims. At least declaratively, such a conception began to be realized immediately after the country's liberation in 1945. However, although federalist Yugoslavism was the ruling doctrine in socialist Yugoslavia, in the first two decades, it was significantly limited by the centralized administration and the intense pressure of unitary Yugoslavism.⁵

1. Understanding solidarity and fraternity from the perspective of Catholic social teaching

Social teaching is an integral part of the evangelizing mission of the Church. As a concept, it is of recent date and originates from Pope Pius XI, who used the term to designate a doctrinal *corpus* referring to topics of social importance.⁶ Although social issues are present in many older church documents

⁴ Južnoslavenska ideja, *Hrvatska enciklopedija*, mrežno izdanje, Zagreb, 2021., in: <https://enciklopedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?ID=29667> (24. 03. 2023.)

⁵ Cf. *Ibid.*

⁶ Cf. PIO XI., *Quadragesimo anno*, no. 20., in: Marijan VALKOVIĆ (ur.), *Sto godina katoličkog socijalnog nauka*.

and theological works, the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of Pope Leo XIII is considered the beginning of Catholic social teaching.⁷ Namely, even though the Church has always been interested in social issues, the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* opens a new path in the social field, firmly based on a centuries-old tradition.⁸ Among the series of social documents that developed the social teaching of the Church, it is particularly worth highlighting the pastoral constitution of the Second Vatican Council *Gaudium et Spes*⁹ and the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*.¹⁰ For this work, it is important to mention several documents of the four post-conciliar popes: Pope Paul VI's encyclical *Populorum Progressio*;¹¹ Pope John Paul II's documents *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*¹² and *Centesimus Annus*;¹³ Pope Benedict XVI's *Caritas In Veritate*; and Pope Francis' documents *Evangelii Gaudium*¹⁴ and *Fratelli Tutti* (cf. FT, no. 181).

Reading the contemporary social documents of the Church, we can say that they point to the social dimension of the Christian faith and highlight its close connection with living and witnessing, that is, that the theory and practice of faith are like the obverse and reverse.¹⁵ At the center of Catholic social teaching is the human person and its inalienable dignity as the image of God, so we can say that it »rests on Christian personalism,«¹⁶ and coexistence in the community rests on the principles of solidarity and fraternity/brotherhood. However, Roland Minnerath points out that the social teaching of the Church »until recent times did not include the word 'fraternity'. Yet fraternity may appear as a new version of solidarity.«¹⁷

Stefano Zamagni says that »fraternity does not have the same meaning as brotherhood and even less as solidarity.«¹⁸ »He wants to distinguish between

⁷ Cf. PAPINSKO VIJEĆE »PRAVDA I MIR«, *Kompendij socijalnog nauka Crkve*, no. 87.

⁸ Cf. *Ibid.*

⁹ Cf. DRUGI VATIKANSKI KONCIL, *Gaudium et spes. Pastoralna konstitucija o Crkvi u suvremenom svijetu*, no. 63-76., in: *Dokumenti*, Zagreb, 1989.

¹⁰ Cf. PAPINSKO VIJEĆE »PRAVDA I MIR«, *Kompendij socijalnog nauka Crkve*, no. 62-65.

¹¹ Cf. PAVAO VI., *Populorum progressio*, in: Marijan VALKOVIĆ (ur.), *Sto godina katoličkog socijalnog nauka*, 314-349.

¹² Cf. IVAN PAVAO II., *Sollicitudo rei socialis – Socijalna skrb*, Zagreb, 1988., no. 41.

¹³ Cf. IVAN PAVAO II., *Centesimus annus – Stota godina*, no. 54-55.

¹⁴ Cf. FRANJO, *Evangelii gaudium*, Zagreb, 2013., no. 182-184.

¹⁵ Cf. Marijan VALKOVIĆ, *Razvoj katoličkoga socijalnog nauka od Lava XIII. do Pavla VI.*, in: *Bogoslovska smotra* 59 (1989.) 3-4, 250. (hereinafter: BS)

¹⁶ Špiro MARASOVIĆ, *Međudnos solidarnosti i općeg dobra u Hrvatskoj*, in: BS 75 (2005.) 4, 991.

¹⁷ Roland MINNERATH, *Fraternity as a Principle of Social Ethics*, in: Pierpaolo DONATI (ed.) *Fratelli Tutti*, Rome, 2021, 10.

¹⁸ Stefano ZAMAGNI, *Fraternity as a Principle of Social Order: Remarks on the Encyclical Letter Fratelli Tutti by Pope Francis*, in: Pierpaolo DONATI (ed.) *Fratelli Tutti*, 176.

brotherhood, with its Germanic root, and the equivalent term from Latin, fraternity. Zamagni sees brotherhood as an imminent, blood-based relationship that can all too easily create a sense of unity pitted against others. He wants to see fraternity as a relationship between all human beings, coming from God as Father: a universal bond, transcending the natural or historical divisions that separate us.¹⁹ Therefore, he understands fraternity as »the complement and the overcoming of the principle of solidarity. Indeed, while solidarity is the principle of social organization that allows the unequal to become equal, fraternity is the principle that allows the equal to be diverse.«²⁰ In this sense, »a fraternal society will also be one that practices solidarity, but a society that practices solidarity may not necessarily be fraternal. The difference that fraternity adds to solidarity is gratuitousness.«²¹

We can say that Zamagni sees fraternity as complementing and overcoming the principle of solidarity and points out that »gratuitousness goes beyond justice and is especially important for promoting hope. A perfectly just society, he says, would not be hopeful without fraternity and gratuitousness (what would there be to hope for if justice were perfect?), but even a perfectly just society can be one of hope if there is gratuitousness, for 'hope is nourished by superabundance.'²² On the other hand, Elżbieta Łazarewicz-Wyrzykowska posits another type of relationship between solidarity and fraternity and points out that: »Fraternity and social friendship are the 'soil' in which solidarity can grow and bloom, and which, in turn, solidarity enriches.«²³ In this paper, it is impossible to clarify all the issues related to these concepts, so we continue with the basic explanations of the principles of solidarity and fraternity in the light of Catholic social teachings.

1.1. Different notions of solidarity

To understand the concept of solidarity as clearly as possible, it is necessary to start with its etymological meaning. »The Latin language knows the adjective *solidus* (*soldus*) = solid, dense; hard, valid, sound; real, true; full, whole.

¹⁹ Helen ALFORD, Fraternity in *Fratelli tutti*: A Return to *Gaudium et spes*?, in: *Journal of Catholic Social Thought* 19 (2022.) 1, 43.

²⁰ Stefano ZAMAGNI, Fraternity as a Principle of Social Order: Remarks on the Encyclical Letter *Fratelli Tutti* by Pope Francis, in: Pierpaolo DONATI (ed.) *Fratelli Tutti*, 178.

²¹ Helen ALFORD, Fraternity in *Fratelli tutti*: A Return to *Gaudium et spes*?, 43.

²² *Ibid.*, 43-44.

²³ Elżbieta ŁAZAREWICZ-WYRZYKOWSKA, Invisible Solidarity, in: *Journal of Catholic Social Thought* 19 (2022.), 1, 106.

From this adjective came the verb *solidare* = to make dense, to densely pack, to densely populate, etc. But for our topic, the neuter noun formed from this root is more interesting, i.e., *solidum* = hard; hard soil; whole, the whole sum. Namely, in this latter sense, this noun entered the legal life of ancient Rome when one of the guarantors, in case all the others failed or died, had an obligation to return the debt, not only in a certain percentage but *in solido*, i.e., in the whole amount. That legal institute, based on which an individual assumed the obligation, in certain circumstances, to undertake the complete payment of a loan or debt, i.e., even the part that other guarantors should pay, forms the basis of the saying »all for one and one for all,« which in recent times appears as a typical formula of solidarity.«²⁴

Today, almost all authors agree in stating »that solidarity, as a word, is relatively young, although its roots are ancient. Namely, during the French Revolution, the adjective *solidaire*, that is, the noun *solidarité*, appeared for the first time – as a derivative from the Latin *solidus* = all, whole, total, that is, *in solido* = in total – and from there it entered all other European languages including the Croatian language.«²⁵ In sociology, the concept of solidarity refers to the type of social ties concerning the development of the division of labor. Societies with a lower degree of development of the division of labor are characterized by mechanical solidarity. In contrast, societies with developed modern industries have a more significant division of labor that characterizes the so-called organic solidarity. This causes integration from the adaptation of individuals to the different roles assigned to them by society and from their feelings toward their vocation. Contradictions between cooperation and competition and solidarity and conflict characterize modern society.²⁶ Thus, solidarity is closely related to law and the state, which regulate the resolution of the mentioned contradictions.

Interestingly, in the sociolinguistic sense, solidarity implies social closeness between people, which depends on the extent of their shared experiences and sociological characteristics like religion, sex, region of origin, profession, etc. Solidarity comes to the fore in addressing people, where the social relations between the speaker and the person being addressed are clearly outlined.²⁷ From a sociological point of view, solidarity is inseparable from con-

²⁴ Špiro MARASOVIĆ, Porijeklo i sadržaj pojma »solidarnost«, in: *BS* 74 (2004.) 2, 355.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 354-355.

²⁶ Cf. *Solidarnost, Hrvatska enciklopedija*, mrežno izdanje, Zagreb, 2021., in <https://www.enciklopedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?id=57063> (8.03.2023.)

²⁷ Cf. *Ibid.*

temporary politics of solidarity that form a set of public procedures, actions, and efforts that express and regulate social solidarity. This view of solidarity proceeds from the fact that solidarity is a state in which members of society have obligations to each other. This understanding is based on the perception of real interdependence of the members of society and the obligations that arise from it. Solidarity politics relate to different segments of the state, and they were created by separating the so-called closer or family and class forms of solidarity. There is a higher degree of solidarity between people who are closer and a much smaller degree between people where one has greater social power and prestige.

In older theological literature, we will not come across the concept of solidarity because its understanding fell mostly under *agape*, i.e., charity. And even though it is true that we cannot separate solidarity from love, it is still not its synonym. Namely, love is a virtue, and as such, it belongs to the area of human freedom, choice, and commitment. At the same time, solidarity is not based only on free will and choice but on the principle of a person who is relationally open to love.²⁸ Therefore, it is essential to emphasize that Christian solidarity stems primarily from friendship and charity (*agape*, *caritas*) and not purely human love. Christian solidarity is a demand of human and Christian fraternity and becomes a Christian virtue when it implies sharing spiritual goods more than material ones. However, if personal interest prevailed over love, we would speak of egoism and individualism. The contemporary interpretation of solidarity depends precisely on whether we view it as based on personalism, which is the case with most Christian authors, or individualism.²⁹

The modern meaning of solidarity is from the beginning of the 19th century. Namely, French and then German theologians of the first and second half of the 19th century wanted to find a middle way between liberalism, which, according to their understanding, did not solve the question of fraternity, and communism, which fell into collectivism by denying the right to private property and the transcendental dignity of the human person. They thus promote the concept of solidarism, which is not accepted as a synonym of Catholic so-

²⁸ It is worth pointing out that St. Thomas Aquinas distinguishes between human and Christian love, or charity. He places human love in the realm of passion, and he does not consider it a virtue, while he considers Christian love (*caritas*, *agape*) to be a virtue. Christian love arises from the gratuitousness of the gift and does not possess any personal interest. On the contrary, human love can be benevolent, selfish, and possessive. Cf. Toma AKVINSKI, *Summa Theologie*, pars I-II, q. 26-28; pars II-II, q. 23-26.

²⁹ Cf. Špiro MARASOVIĆ, *Porijeklo i sadržaj pojma »solidarnost«*, 358.

cial teaching.³⁰ Since the 19th century, solidarity has been associated with the idea of *social justice* to solve the labor problem before the challenge of liberalism and alienated collectivism.

In contrast to the sociological understanding of solidarity, Catholic social teaching observes solidarity as a moral and social behavior, a virtue, which St. John Paul II views as »*a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good*; that is to say to the good of all and of each individual, because we are *all* really responsible for *all*.«³¹ The Christian virtue of solidarity, therefore, stems from the awareness of the common fatherhood of God, of the fraternity of all people in Christ, »Sons in the Son,« of the presence and life-giving action of the Holy Spirit who will bring to our vision of the world a new criterion for interpreting it.³² Solidarity thus presupposes the effort for a more just social order where tensions are better able to be reduced and conflicts more readily settled by negotiation.³³ However, it cannot remain only at the level of individuals or groups because, in this way, it cannot gain the strength to influence social events significantly, especially the problem of unemployment or other economic issues. According to the Christian understanding, solidarity must be moral and juridical, i.e., legislated and deliberately aimed at the most vulnerable categories of people.

The state must especially guarantee the security that those who work and produce can enjoy the fruits of their work and feel encouraged to work efficiently and honestly.³⁴ Therefore, in the spirit of the Christian understanding, justice and solidarity complement each other and must be the jurisdiction of the legal and social state.³⁵ Solidarity is not a feeling of some vague sympathy or superficial emotion for the suffering of so many people, close or distant, but is »based upon the principle that the goods of creation are meant for all. That which human industry produces through the processing of raw materials, with the contribution of work, must serve equally for the good of all.«³⁶ It helps the members of society to fight against the sinful structures of society and to view the other »not just as some kind of instrument, with a work capac-

³⁰ Cf. *Ibid.*, 356.

³¹ IVAN PAVAO II., *Sollicitudo rei socialis – Socijalna skrb*, no. 38.

³² Cf. *Ibid.*, no. 40.

³³ Cf. *Katekizam Katoličke Crkve* (1992.), Zagreb, 1994., no. 1940.

³⁴ Cf. IVAN PAVAO II., *Centesimus annus – Stota godina*, no. 48.

³⁵ Cf. Josip GRBAC, *Solidarnost u civilnom društvu*, in: Stjepan BALOBAN (ur.), *Izazovi civilnog društva u Hrvatskoj*, Zagreb, 2000., 99-100.

³⁶ IVAN PAVAO II., *Sollicitudo rei socialis – Socijalna skrb*, no. 39.

ity and physical strength to be exploited at low cost and then discarded when no longer useful, but as our 'neighbor,' a 'helper' (cf. Gen 2:18-20).³⁷

Solidarity is thus manifested under two complementary aspects: under the aspect of *social principle*³⁸ and under the aspect of *moral virtue*, which transcends all individualism and particularism.³⁹ However, solidarity does not refer only to obligations in the area of law but also covers many other areas of social life and mutual relations. In this sense, we distinguish between mutual and one-sided solidarity. If the members of society are connected in such a way that everything that happens to one reflects on all the others, then we are talking about mutual solidarity. If, however, it is about the responsibility of only some members towards others, then it is a one-sided solidarity (e.g., of current generations towards future ones – pensions, or the rich towards the poor, etc.)

»Solidarity means a sense of social belonging, participation, and cooperation, which is a condition to be able to fulfill the requirements of social justice... solidarity must not mean tutelage over others but only help so that they can fulfill their duties and thus take care of themselves and the common good.«⁴⁰ Today, solidarity is defined as »the idea of active unity in the joint action of others,« i.e., looking for ways to help others, or as »readiness to help members of one's own or another community,« as striving for the good of others. Therefore, solidarity is not equated solely with providing material assistance to another but includes the good of man as a person. It is not a matter of sensitivity nor compassion for the other but an obligation or duty to participate in the lives and actions of others. John Paul II talks about the reciprocity between people, about their orientation towards each other, and that this reciprocity should be understood as a system that determines relations in the modern world with all its economic, cultural, political... components.

We can say there is a close connection between solidarity and the common good and solidarity and equality between people and nations.⁴¹ Namely, the term »solidarity« expresses the demand »to recognize in the composite ties that unite men and social groups among themselves, the space given to human freedom for common growth in which all share and in which they par-

³⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 39.

³⁸ Cf. *Katekizam Katoličke Crkve*, no. 1939-1941.

³⁹ Cf. *Ibid.*, no. 1942.

⁴⁰ Ivan DEVČIĆ, Društvena pravda, solidarnost i ljubav od enciklike »Rerum novarum« do »Centesimus annus«, in: *BS 62* (1992.) 3-4., 176.

⁴¹ Cf. IVAN PAVAO II., *Sollicitudo rei socialis – Socijalna skrb*, no. 17, 39, 45.; *Katekizam Katoličke Crkve*, no. 1941., 2438.

ticipate. The commitment to this goal is translated into the positive contribution of seeing that nothing is lacking in the common cause and also of seeking points of possible agreement where attitudes of separation and fragmentation prevail. It translates into the willingness to give oneself for the good of one's neighbor, beyond any individual or particular interest.⁴²

In addition, this principle fosters a sense of indebtedness to the society in which one is involved; that is, it encourages the feeling that everyone is a debtor »because of those conditions that make human existence livable, and because of the indivisible and indispensable legacy constituted by culture, scientific and technical knowledge, material and immaterial goods and by all that the human condition has produced. A similar debt must be recognized in the various forms of social interaction, so that humanity's journey will not be interrupted but remain open to present and future generations, all of them called together to share the same gift in solidarity.⁴³

Solidarity encourages the promotion of the inalienable dignity of every person, regardless of their skin color, social level, professed political or religious ideas, etc. It contributes to their personal development and encourages each person to act with awareness and responsibility. Solidarity is a dynamism that revives and makes socio-economic mechanisms and structures effective, not allowing them to turn into perverted mechanisms and structures of sin. Solidarity belongs equally to all; it is not only a virtue of an individual. Thus, it also contributes to establishing relations of universal fraternity consisting of more than just economic aid. Since »the virtue of solidarity goes beyond material goods,« material aid is only the first step of mutual aid.

1.2. *The concept of fraternity*

The concept of fraternity gained strength and voice in society today with Pope Francis' encyclical *Fratelli Tutti*, which is dedicated to fraternity and social friendship. If we mention the concept of fraternity in the context of Croatian society, then we mostly allude to the time of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia when »federalist Yugoslavism was the ruling doctrine, but federalism was significantly limited by a centralized administration and strong pressure from unitarist Yugoslavism. Despite the dogma of brotherhood and unity,

⁴² PAPINSKO VIJEĆE »PRAVDA I MIR«, *Kompendij socijalnog nauka Crkve*, no. 194.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, no. 195.

national tensions were universally present (although not always visible).⁴⁴ In the anti-fascist struggle, Croatian communists gathered members of different nations and social strata under the slogan of 'brotherhood and unity.'⁴⁵ Even though today, in Croatian society, we can still come across people who are nostalgic for past times, thanks to the teaching of the Catholic Church, the concept of brotherhood is put into a completely new context and understanding. »In observing the stratification of the category of brotherhood and its dominant notes in history, we see that man recognized a brother first in those who are of the 'same blood,' then in those who share the same ethnic or religious affiliation, but also in those who participate in the same movement or share the same values and goals. Here, it already becomes clear that the unifying principle of brotherhood is essentially particular, and, therefore, brotherhood regularly refers to some, that is, to those who are within the exclusivist framework as a firm boundary between brothers and those who are not.«⁴⁶

Therefore, it is understandable that throughout history, attempts were made to abolish particular brotherhood altogether by searching for a unifying principle that would guarantee universal fraternity. But despite this, human brotherhood knows no boundaries, and a partial approach abates universal fraternity. Historically, the danger has arisen precisely because the notion of the universal fraternity of men can quickly become an ideology.⁴⁷ The significance of fraternity for people will go as far as the reality of its unifying principle, and it will last as long as that principle remains strong.

Pope Benedict XVI talks about fraternity in the context of integral human development and points out that it »needs to make room for the principle of gratuitousness as an expression of fraternity.«⁴⁸ In light of Pope Benedict's thought, we can say that one »cannot talk about true development if it does not include every and entire person. As a vocation, charity should be at its center. The lack of fraternity among people and nations in the world leads to underdevelopment. Our globalized society makes us neighbors but not brothers. Therefore, we need a humanization of globalization with a real human

⁴⁴ Južnoslavenska ideja, *Hrvatska enciklopedija*, mrežno izdanje, Zagreb, 2021., in: <https://enciklopedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?ID=29667> (24. 03. 2023.)

⁴⁵ Cf. *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ Boris VULIĆ, Kršćansko bratstvo kao spašenost i ujedinjenost, in: *Diacovensia* 23 (2015.) 1, 72.

⁴⁷ Cf. *Ibid.*, 72.

⁴⁸ Cf. BENEDIKT XVI., *Caritas in veritate*, no. 34.

being at its center.«⁴⁹ As Pope Benedict XVI says, the realization of authentic fraternity is an important goal. We must mobilize ourselves with the 'heart' to ensure that current economic and social processes evolve towards fully human outcomes.⁵⁰ What Pope Benedict XVI emphasized in *Caritas in Veritate* is what Pope Francis tried to accomplish with *Fratelli Tutti* because it is through the concept of fraternity that we will achieve the process of humanization of globalization. A direct example of this process are precisely migrations, which play a pivotal role in the future of the world. As Pope Francis points out, in this context, we face the loss of the sense of fraternal responsibility that is the basis of civil society (cf. FT, no. 40).

Pope Francis believes that universal fraternity has its foundation in the social message of the Gospel and that it is written in the heart of every human being by the Creator. World peace and universal fraternity are much more than a mere sign of humanity today. The »golden rule« to which Jesus obliges his disciples as the way we should treat others, especially those in need, and the way we want others to treat us, is found in the Sermon on the Mount, but in one way or the other, it is found in all world religions and cultures. All religions call for peace and love. Fraternity is thus a fundamental rule of humanity that teaches us that we are called to respect every person as a human being and to meet them as a brother or sister. Pope Francis, therefore, focuses on the necessity of dialogue and social friendship so we do not fall into the trap of individualism and egotism, closed in ourselves. That is the only way to preserve creation and fight against the injustices that ensnare man.⁵¹

We can also define fraternity as a friendship between brothers or between those who perceive themselves as such. If we want to compare the concepts of fraternity and solidarity, we can say that fraternity is even more binding than solidarity and greatly exceeds it. Even though the Second Vatican Council uses both expressions, it always assumes that fraternity is more than solidarity. The Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity points out that Christians are called to promote solidarity and to transform it into a sincere and authentic fraternity.⁵² According to some authors, fraternity would be a way

⁴⁹ Luka TOMAŠEVIĆ – Ana BEGIĆ, Enciklika 'Caritas in veritate' – Ljubav u istini, in: *Služba Božja* 50 (2010.) 2, 167-168.

⁵⁰ Cf. BENEDIKT XVI., *Caritas in veritate*, no. 36.

⁵¹ Cf. Walter KASPER – G. AUGUSTIN, Prefazione, in: Walter KASPER – G. AUGUSTIN (ur.), *Percorsi di fraternità*, Brescia, 2022., 5-6.

⁵² Cf. DRUGI VATIKANSKI SABOR, *Apostolicam actuositatem*, no. 14., in: *Dokumenti*.

of being, what one is, and solidarity a way of acting.⁵³ Namely, what we are is manifested in what we do. It involves the whole person, what we think and feel, how we live, our entire life. Therefore, we can say that fraternity is a mysticism, like the one St. Francis lived with his first disciples, and solidarity is a program that stems from that mysticism. Solidarity can even be partial, but if it stems from mysticism, then it must be integral.⁵⁴

Therefore, we can say that mere respect for individual liberties does not automatically produce fraternity, nor does a certain regulated equality, because no matter how favorable those conditions are, they are not sufficient to necessarily bear the fruit of fraternity. Fraternity can make a positive contribution to freedom and equality. When fraternity is not consciously cultivated, liberty can become restricted, leading to loneliness, to pure autonomy to choose to whom or what we belong, or just to possess and enjoy. But this does not exhaust the richness of liberty, which is primarily directed to love (cf. FT, no. 103). If we generally declare that »all men and women are equal,« we do not thereby achieve equality; it is the result of conscious and careful cultivation of fraternity. Individualism does not make us freer, more equal, or more brothers. The sum of individual achievements alone cannot create a better world for all of humanity. Radical individualism is the most difficult virus to fight against; it is insidious and deceptive because it makes us think that everything consists in giving freedom to our own desires as if by the guise of pursuing ever greater individual ambitions and security, we could build the common good (cf. FT, no. 104).

In these thoughts, Pope Francis refers to the trap that is hidden in many communities today, whether it is religious communities, clerical communities, youth communities, etc., because these individual ambitions of an individual give the community an illusion that this person is building the common good when in reality they have no rational insight into the life of the community, and especially no developed feelings of empathy and concern for their neighbor. In such circumstances, we should be careful regarding fraternity. »We have had enough of immorality and the mockery of ethics, goodness, faith, and honesty. It is time to acknowledge that light-hearted superficiality has done us no good. When the foundations of social life are corroded, what en-

⁵³ Cf. Luis Gonzales CARVAJAL SANTABARBARA, Due concetti centrali nell'enciclica: fraternità universale e amicizia sociale, in: Walter KASPER – G. AUGUSTIN (ur.), *Percorsi di fraternità*, Brescia, 2022., 101.

⁵⁴ Cf. *Ibid.*, 102.

sues are battles over conflicting interests.«⁵⁵ In the end, we agree with Pope Francis that »the Church has a public role« over and above her charitable and educational activities. She works for the advancement of humanity and of universal fraternity. She does not claim to compete with earthly powers, but to offer herself as a family among families; this is the Church, open to bearing witness in today's world, open to faith, hope, and love...« (FT, no. 276).

2. Solidarity and fraternity in communist Yugoslavia

The unresolved national question, the supremacy of one people over others in the multinational Kingdom of Yugoslavia,⁵⁶ culminated in the collapse of that entity in 1941 and during World War II. In the commotion of war, the communists proposed the idea of brotherhood and unity of all Yugoslav peoples. Under the guise of fighting against fascism, they gathered representatives of the »Yugoslav« peoples and carried out a people's revolution. They created the People's Liberation Army, and according to Đilas, the peoples of Yugoslavia took their destiny into their own hands.⁵⁷ Therefore, the main task of the Yugoslav communists was the destruction of all remnants of bourgeois social relations and the realization of socialist ones to secure a new socialist government and form a new state apparatus which »signified the radical destruction of the old state apparatus and at the same time was the basic driving force of further socialist transformation and defense of the accomplished social changes.«⁵⁸ Ultimately, this meant that in the first phase of the revolution, all dissidents and opponents of communism had to be dealt with and destroyed. Then, in the second, the confrontation with the Stalinists culminated in 1948.

To achieve this goal, in May and June 1944, they established a special political police, the Department for People's Protection, the so-called OZNA. Its task was, among other things, to conduct military courts and to »cleanse« the territory of »the enemies of the people.« »On 24 May 1944, Tito's Yugoslavia

⁵⁵ FRANJO, *Laudato Si'*, enciklika o brizi za zajednički dom, Zagreb, 2015., no. 229.; FT, no. 113.

⁵⁶ On the position of Catholics in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia see: Andrija ŽIVKOVIĆ, *Naši putovi. 6. Katolicizam u Jugoslaviji*, in: Andrija ŽIVKOVIĆ, *Za istinu i kulturnu obnovu*, Rukopisi, članci, studije, Martina s. Ana Begić (ed.), Zagreb, 2020., 69-79. On the activity of Catholics between the two world wars in Croatian society, see more in: Vladimir DUGALIĆ – Stjepan BALOBAN, *Neke oznake solidarnosti u katoličkoj socijalnoj misli u Hrvatskoj od 1900. do 1945. godine*, in: *BS 74* (2004) 2, 493.-538.

⁵⁷ Milovan ĐILAS, *Članci 1941.-1946.*, 62.

⁵⁸ Predrag VRANICKI, *Historija marksizma*, II., Zagreb, 1975, 370. Cf. Milovan ĐILAS, *Članci 1941.-1946.*, 180.

was established as a communist totalitarian state under the exclusive rule of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, which at that time did not exist outside the Soviet Union.«⁵⁹ When the partisans entered a place, they would immediately form military courts and quickly kill all intellectuals and more prominent citizens, especially priests, who were, in the opinion of OZNA, enemies of the people. Đilas himself writes that such people should be »killed like dogs« and adds that wars, »especially revolutionary and counter-revolutionary ones, are conducted according to schematic, ideological criteria that during extermination turn to passion and practice.«⁶⁰

Even today, mass graves of those killed in 1944 and 1945 are still being discovered. The worst killing ground was indeed in May and June 1945, when, according to some estimates, around 400,000 discharged soldiers and civilians were killed, including many women and children. In Huda Jama alone, in today's Slovenia, they found the remains of 1416 people killed without trial.⁶¹ Around 15,000 prisoners of war were killed in Tezno, about 30,000 at Kočevski rog, and the exact number of those killed in the so-called Way of the Cross is still unknown today. After World War II, »the enemies of the people« and »political dissidents« were imprisoned in camps, the most famous of which were in Jasenovac, Stara Gradiška, Lepoglava, and later, on Goli otok. The exact number of those killed in these camps and prisons remains unknown. We can say that terror, as a form of systematic violence to take over and keep power and maintain the communist project,⁶² was present in Tito's Yugoslavia for forty-five years, from 1945 to 1990, and the first multi-party elections.

In his book *The History of Marxism*, Predrag Vranicki talks about the four phases of the development of Marxist thought in Yugoslavia. The first phase was from 1941 to 1945 when the Communist Party used the fight against fascism and international conflicts to seize power under the slogan of brotherhood, which was supposed to bring peace between nations. The second phase was from 1945 to 1950, a period of repression and physical elimination of all dissidents. During that time, there was a split with Stalin, and Yugoslavia proceeded independently. Therefore, we can say that the concept of brotherhood in communism was ideologized because, in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (until 1963, the National Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) as a mul-

⁵⁹ William KLINGER, *Teror narodu*. Povijest OZNE, Titove političke policije, Zagreb, 2014., 121.

⁶⁰ Milovan ĐILAS, *Revolucionarni rat*, Beograd, 1990., 407.

⁶¹ Cf. William KLINGER, *Teror narod*, 143.

⁶² Cf. Stephane COURTOIS, *Komunizam i totalitarizam*, Zagreb, 2011., 99-100.

tinational community, the ideology of brotherhood was used to create a new Yugoslav nation. The national identity of individual peoples was suppressed, and the brotherhood and unity of all peoples were imposed to create an artificial »Yugoslav« nationality. Any attempt to preserve national identity was condemned as a hostile action and forcibly removed under the guise of nationalism. If someone sang a patriotic song, he would be imprisoned and sent to re-education in prisons established specially for that purpose. This unnatural effort only intensified the international conflicts that culminated in the war in the 1990s because the ideological concept of brotherhood was imposed by force, and, as such, it never took root among many citizens.

The experience of Yugoslav communism shows that terror lasted the entire time, but it took different forms and became less visible. Psychological terror was prevalent, forcing citizens to fear and silence,⁶³ along with political terror, because if informants reported someone for speaking against the ideology and the regime, they would immediately take them to prison and hold a staged trial. That was done, in particular, to »suppress nationalism« that »opposed« the ideology of brotherhood and unity of the Yugoslav peoples; in reality, it was about erasing the cultural and historical identity of individual peoples in Yugoslavia.

In the third phase of the revolution, from 1950 to 1965, after they established firm political power and control of the system under the leadership of the Communist Party, and all other political options were prohibited, they began reckoning with the emerging bureaucracy that arose due to strong influence of the »political sphere and underdevelopment of the socio-economic structure.«⁶⁴ In an attempt to eliminate strong statism and centralism, the Yugoslav communists went their way to realize self-governing socialism. It manifested in the transformation of state ownership into social ownership, that is, in the attempt to have workers manage factories, but only members of the Communist Party. In this way, they wanted to achieve the withering away of the state and create an illusion of democracy. However, after ten years, it had already become clear that this project was doomed because the factories became unproductive and caused losses due to irrational employment so that no one would remain unemployed and the overgrown administrative apparatus. The resulting losses were covered by foreign loans and increasing government

⁶³ Cf. *Ibid.*, 263.

⁶⁴ Predrag VRANICKI, *Historija marksizma*, II., 383.

borrowing. All this led to confrontation within the Communist Party and the division into conservative and progressive currents.

The fourth phase of the revolution, from 1965 to 1989, manifested itself in dealing with the unprofitability of companies and the unreality of self-governing socialism. International problems emerged, and the state apparatus once more gained strength. Especially in the 1970s, the long-suppressed unresolved national issues came to light.⁶⁵ To solve accumulated problems, especially over-employment and growing poverty, the state opened its borders and allowed citizens to work abroad. This created a new form of intergenerational solidarity because many of them sent the money they earned to their families in Yugoslavia or tried to invest in some form of economic activity, usually hospitality, upon their return. After Tito died in 1980, all these problems became even worse, which led to the war in the 1990s and the breakup of Yugoslavia because Serbian politics, with the help of the Yugoslav Army, tried to preserve Yugoslavia, but in such a way as to »cleanse« certain areas of non-Serbian population and create Greater Serbia, applying the same methods from the end of World War II.

We can say that the Yugoslav model of self-governing socialism was utopian, although it also had some good marks of solidarity. Solidarity was manifested in the assistance state and was ideologized for the purpose of buying social peace. All citizens had to be employed, often leading to over-employment and production losses. Free education and complete health care were also provided to everyone, and solidarity costs were financed with expensive loans. On the other hand, personal freedom and the spirit of voluntarism were suppressed.

St. John Paul II analyzed such a society in the encyclical *Centesimus Annus* (1991), where he pointed out that the fundamental error of communism was anthropological in nature.⁶⁶ Since he himself lived in a communist society, he clearly points out that atheism and contempt for the human person in communism led to the dominance of the principle of force over the principle of reason and law. The communist system does not pursue the general good of society but the interest of one party and strives to destroy everything that opposes the communist ideology using all means, not excluding the use of lies and terror against civilians. These systems see the individual person only as a simple element, a single molecule of the social organism, »so that the good

⁶⁵ Cf. *Ibid.*, 420-421.

⁶⁶ Cf. IVAN PAVAO II., *Centesimus annus – Stota godina*, no. 14.

of the individual is completely subordinated to the functioning of the socio-economic mechanism. Socialism likewise maintains that the good of the individual can be realized without reference to his free choice, to the unique and exclusive responsibility which he exercises in the face of good or evil. Man is thus reduced to a series of social relationships, and the concept of the person as the autonomous subject of moral decision disappears, the very subject whose decisions build the social order.«⁶⁷

In this sense, all totalitarian systems have a certain mentality, which is much stronger and more rigid than authoritarian systems because, in totalitarian systems, ideology has the task of keeping the political class in power. While democratic systems rely on the spontaneous political participation of citizens, promote the ideas of freedom, equality, and solidarity, and express a certain tolerance towards diversity, totalitarian communist regimes seek to keep their society in a state of permanent mobilization as the revolution continues to change the society permanently and often to create a new man. Totalitarian communist regimes demand a permanent commitment to revolution, mobilization is constantly encouraged from the top against internal and external enemies, the line between private and public is erased, and citizens are required to devote all their free time to politics.⁶⁸ Although authoritarian and totalitarian regimes both have leaders, leaders have absolute power in

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 13.

⁶⁸ Author's note. At that time, anyone who was not a member of the Communist Party could not participate in performing political duties or assume responsible positions in society; they could especially not work in the education system, public administration, the police, and the command structure of the army. In this way, politics, in the broader meaning of the term, that is, as a commitment to the common good, was closely connected with ideology. From personal family experience and based on personal conversations and testimonies, as well as from the accounts of former members of the Communist Party, we can conclude that in such a situation, many joined the Communist Party out of personal interests to gain a particular position or job, and not out of personal convictions and acceptance of Marxist and communist ideology. Furthermore, there was a widespread network of informers, and every citizen had to be careful not to say anything that could be interpreted as »acting against the brotherhood and unity of the Yugoslav peoples« and against the Communist Party. There was a »verbal crime«, and if an informant reported someone for »hostile activity« and the spread of nationalism, that person would end up in prison. There were even prisons only for political prisoners where they carried out »political re-education«. The media was also entirely at the service of communist ideology. Believers were second-class citizens, pushed out of public life, and prohibited from holding certain positions and jobs. They were often eavesdropped and under the surveillance of the state apparatus. They especially controlled who went to holy mass on Sundays. In addition, it was not uncommon for the wife to politically control the husband and vice versa, and in the case of »hostile activity«, they would be reported to the state security authorities. Therefore, we can say that all life was »pervaded by politics«, which infringed on the private life of citizens. There

totalitarian systems. They often suspect their associates and eliminate them with ease.⁶⁹

In the end, we can say with certainty that the communist regime in Yugoslavia was totalitarian since it had all the characteristics of a totalitarian system. It rested on a very rigid Marxist-Leninist ideology that sought to unify and centralize everything,⁷⁰ which the Communist Party of Yugoslavia implemented through political terror and a repressive state apparatus. This ideology had utopistic and eschatological elements that led to the »withering away of the state,« and in reality, it used the method of terror. As we said, in the beginning, it was severe and brutal, and later, it took on different forms that, although less visible, were very present and real. They would imprison dissidents of the system in camps for political prisoners and submit them to »re-education.« They systematically built a network of whistleblowers to monitor what was said and report it to the repressive apparatus. Although they held elections, the Communist Party was the only one on the list, and it was a one-party system. All those who did not belong to that party were second-class citizens because they were not allowed to run for elections. In addition, they systematically destroyed any subjectification of society and the creation of associations and organizations that were not inspired by communist ideology. In this atmosphere, the Catholic Church was the only institution beyond communist control, and it should not be surprising that it was the target of communist persecution.

Likewise, as in other communist countries, there was a one-party system, a systematic development of a secret police and intelligence service for stalking citizens, there was a monopoly over the means of social communication, centralized control over all political and labor organizations within self-governing socialism (committees, labor councils), and especially over cultural and educational institutions, they introduced a specific economic system, the so-called worker self-management, and there was the total subordination of military forces to political power.⁷¹ The army was directly subordinate to Tito, and the police to his person of trust. To stay in power, they controlled each other by placing people of different nationalities in certain positions.

was no difference between private and public activity because even private and family life had to be in the service of communist ideology.

⁶⁹ Cf. Gianfranco PASQUINO, *Nuovo corso di scienza politica*, Bologna, 2009., 260-262.

⁷⁰ Cf. *Ibid.*, 257-259.

⁷¹ Cf. *Ibid.*, 264.

Concluding thoughts

From reading the documents on Catholic social teaching, we see that they mention the principle of solidarity more often than the concept of fraternity, which in turn has a central place in the documents of Pope Francis. The paper, therefore, tried to clarify the relationship between these two principles of Catholic social teaching and how they were applied and lived in Croatian society during the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia. The first part of the paper thus emphasized the theoretical discussion on the principles of solidarity and fraternity. In contrast to the social teaching of the Church, in sociology, the term solidarity refers to the type of social ties regarding the development of the division of labor. Societies with a lower degree of development of the division of labor are characterized by mechanical solidarity, in contrast to societies with developed modern industry and with a more significant division of labor characterized by organic solidarity. Solidarity thus also implies social closeness between people, and it depends on the extent of mutual experiences and shared sociological characteristics like religion, sex, region of origin, occupation, etc. In addition, the concept of solidarity is also connected to the idea of *social justice* to solve the labor problem before the challenge of liberalism and alienated collectivism.

On the other hand, according to the Church's social teaching, coexistence in the community and promoting the common good rest precisely on the principles of solidarity and fraternity. In contrast to the sociological understanding of solidarity, Catholic social teaching observes solidarity as a moral and social attitude, a virtue, which St. John Paul II views as *a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good*. The Christian virtue of solidarity stems from the awareness of the common fatherhood of God, of the fraternity of all people in Christ, and from the presence and life-giving action of the Holy Spirit, which gives our view of the world a new criterion for interpreting it. Solidarity thus presupposes the effort for a more just social order where tensions can be reduced more easily, and conflicts more readily settled by negotiation. Solidarity thus appears under two complementary aspects: *social principle* and *moral virtue*, which transcends all individualism and particularism. It is not equated solely with providing material assistance to another but includes the good of man as a person. Therefore, there is a close connection between solidarity and the common good and solidarity and equality between people and nations, and according to the Christian understanding, solidarity must be moral and juridical, i.e., legislated and deliberately aimed at the most vulnerable categories of people.

In contrast to solidarity, fraternity was often understood as closeness to those of the »same blood,« i.e., it was cultivated between those who share the same ethnic, religious, or ideological affiliation, that is, those who share the same values and goals. This approach to fraternity is often particularistic and exclusivist. Pope Benedict XVI, therefore, says that fraternity must be cultivated in the context of integral human development as a vocation and must spring from true Christian charity. On the other hand, Pope Francis sees the concept of fraternity as a means to realize the humanization of globalization and social friendship. He believes that universal fraternity is founded on the social message of the Gospel and that it is written in the heart of every human being by the Creator. According to some authors, fraternity would be a way of being, what one is, and solidarity a way of acting. In other words, fraternity is a mysticism, and solidarity is a program that emerges from this mysticism.⁷²

Looking at these principles from the Croatian perspective, we can say that fraternity in Yugoslavia was fundamentally connected to the national question, and it served to preserve and build a systematically suppressed national identity. In communist Yugoslavia, the concepts of fraternity and solidarity were both understood ideologically. Fraternity in the form of the artificial creation, most often by terror, of a new Yugoslav nation based on the phrase »brotherhood and unity,« and solidarity in the ideological promotion of self-governing socialism, which, in the spirit of the Marxist ideology of the withering away of the state, that is, in the transformation of state property into social property, was an attempt to have factories managed by the workers themselves, but by members of the Communist Party. However, after ten years, it had already become clear that this project was doomed because the factories became unproductive and caused losses due to irrational employment so that no one would remain unemployed and the overgrown administrative apparatus. The resulting losses were covered by foreign loans and increasing government borrowing. All this led to confrontation within the Communist Party and the division into conservative and progressive currents. Thus, Yugoslavian society, especially from the end of the 1960s until the collapse of this entity, faced the unprofitability of companies and the unreality of self-governing socialism.

We can say that the Yugoslav model of self-governing socialism was utopian, although it also had some good marks of solidarity, such as free education and complete health care. The problem, however, was in the assistance state,

⁷² Cf. Luis Gonzales CARVAJAL SANTABARBARA, Due concetti centrali nell'enciclica: fraternità universale e amicizia sociale, 101-102.

where solidarity was ideologized for the purpose of buying social peace. All citizens had to be employed, which often led to over-employment and created losses in production, the overgrowth of the administration to the detriment of production, and the costs of solidarity were financed with expensive loans. On the other hand, personal freedom and the spirit of voluntarism were systematically suppressed, as St. John Paul II stated in the encyclical *Centesimus Annus* (1991), where he pointed out that the fundamental error of communism was anthropological in nature. Namely, atheism and contempt for the human person led to the fact that, in communism, the principle of force prevailed over the principle of reason and justice. The communist system did not pursue society's general good but one party's interests. It sought to destroy everything that opposed the communist ideology and used lies and terror against civilians. The good of the individual was wholly subordinated to the functioning of the economic-social mechanism, and man was reduced to a series of social relationships. The concept of the person as the autonomous subject of moral decision disappeared, the very subject whose decisions build the social order.

Sažetak

NAČELO SOLIDARNOSTI I BRATSTVA U SOCIJALISTIČKOJ JUGOSLAVIJI U SVJETLU KATOLIČKOG SOCIJALNOG UČENJA

Martina s. Ana BEGIĆ

Katolički bogoslovni fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu
Vlaška 38, p.p. 5, HR – 10 000 Zagreb
ana.begic@gmail.com

Rad je podijeljen na dva dijela. U prvom dijelu objašnjava se na teoretskoj razini, osobito u svjetlu katoličkog socijalnog nauka, pojam solidarnosti i bratstva. U drugom dijelu, analizira se primjena načela solidarnosti i bratstva u hrvatskom društvu u vrijeme Federativne Narodne Republike Jugoslavije i Socijalističke Federativne Republike Jugoslavije. Osim rješavanja nacionalnog pitanja pod određenim vidom bratstva, ovaj pojam je bio poiman u duhu komunističke ideologije bratstva i jedinstva jugoslaven-skih naroda, a ideologija solidarnosti osobito u obliku samoupravnog socijalizma. Rad, stoga, pokazuje kako je Socijalistička Federativna Republika Jugoslavija imala mnoge oznake totalitarnog sustava koji je bio određen komunističkom ideologijom.

Ključne riječi: bratstvo, solidarnost, katolički socijalni nauk, Jugoslavija, komunizam, samoupravni socijalizam, nacionalni identitet.