

JURIJ PEROVŠEK

NA POTI V MODERNO

Poglavja iz zgodovine evropskega in slovenskega liberalizma 19. in
20. stoletja

Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino
Ljubljana 2005

Pregled vsebine

PREDGOVOR	9
LIBERALIZEM IN SOCIALNO VPRAŠANJE	15
<i>Schulze–Delitzscheva združnogospodarska doktrina kot liberalni odgovor na socialno vprašanje v 19. stoletju</i>	17
<i>Prilagoditev Schulze–Delitzschevih združnogospodarskih zamisli na Slovenskem v letih 1872–1895</i>	35
<i>Pogled na pojav socialnega liberalizma v evropski in slovenski politični misli in praksi</i>	43
<i>Socialni značaj slovenskega liberalizma v letih 1894–1918</i>	49
LIBERALIZEM, KATOLICIZEM IN KOMUNIZEM	61
<i>Duhovni in idejnopolitični oris Ivana Hribarja</i>	63
<i>Pogledi slovenskega liberalizma na poslanstvo in delo knezoškofa Antona Bonaventure Jegliča</i>	84
<i>Janez Evangelist Krek in slovenski liberalizem</i>	110
<i>Idejni, družbeni in narodnopolitični nazori Ivana Tavčarja po ustanovitvi Jugoslovanske demokratske stranke leta 1918</i>	124
MED NARODOM, POLITIKO IN DRŽAVO	145
<i>Polemika Ušeničnik–Rostohar o veri, narodnosti in etiki v letih 1912–1913</i>	147
<i>Slovenski liberalci in Jugoslavija. Nacionalna politika liberalnega tabora v letih 1918–1929</i>	159
<i>Nemški liberalizem in vprašanje naroda ter državne ureditve. Primerjava z Jugoslovansko demokratsko stranko/Samostojno demokratsko stranko v dvajsetih letih</i>	171
<i>Jugoslovanska nacionalna stranka in vprašanje slovenske banovine 1939–1941</i>	180

OB PRELOMNICAH V STRANKARSKEM IN MEDNARODNOPOLITIČNEM RAZVOJU	191
<i>Ustanovitev Jugoslovanske demokratske stranke leta 1918</i>	193
<i>Jugoslovanska nacionalna stranka in vojna 1939–1941</i>	223
POVZETEK	243
SUMMARY	249
VIRI IN LITERATURA	257
OSEBNO KAZALO	275

Povzetek

V odgovoru na vprašanje, kako predstaviti posamezne idejnopolitične tokove v novejši evropski in slovenski politični praksi, je najprej potrebno opozoriti na čas, v katerem so bila zgodovinsko opredeljena temeljna vprašanja modernega sveta. Opredelitev se veže na 19. stoletje, v katerem so se po prelomni francoski revoluciji leta 1789 izoblikovale še danes uveljavljene osnovne evropske idejne izbire – liberalna, konservativna in socialistična –, ki so se pričele razvijati tako kot teoretični koncepti kot tudi kot dejanska politična gibanja. Pri tem so v okviru posameznih osnovnih idejnih izbir obravnavala vsa bistvena vprašanja idejnega, družbenega, političnega, nacionalnega in socialnogospodarskega razvoja, ki spremljajo novejšo evropsko zgodovino. Tako se je tudi liberalizem opredelil glede teh vprašanj. Opredelil se je do ideje svobode, razumevanja (nacionalne) države, odnosa do demokratične misli in družbene ureditve, do naroda kot veznega člana med posameznikom, državo in družbo, do značaja imperializma in do razvoja struktur in ureditve gospodarskega življenja, torej do pglavitnega predmeta vseh političnih razmišljanj v 19. stoletju – socialnega vprašanja.

Evropski liberalizem je že sredi 19. stoletja priznaval, da predstavlja sestavni del družbenega in političnega življenja tudi socialni problem. Liberalna socialnopolitična misel je tedaj oblikovala družbenogospodarski koncept, katerega osrednji poudarek je bil, da je posameznikovo (politično) eksistenco potrebno utemeljiti v njegovi gospodarski in socialni varnosti, lastnini in izobrazbi. To naj bi uresničila socialna in politična graditev srednjeslojne meščanske družbe v predstavniški parlamentarni državi.

Nosilec tako zamišljenega družbenega programa je bil socialni liberalizem. Socialni liberalizem ni podpiral odprave kapitalizma, pač pa njegovo družbenoreformno korekcijo. Največji vpliv je imel v Angliji, kjer je pred prvo svetovno vojno prišel tudi na oblast. Takrat je bila izvedena vrsta socialnih reform (socialno, zdravstveno, invalidsko varstvo, uvedba starostnih pokojnin), ki so utemeljile moderno britansko državo blaginje. Podobno je bilo tudi v Italiji, medtem ko se je v Franciji in na Nemškem liberalna socialnoreformna doktrina omejevala na koncept družbene samopomoči in je v glavnem odklanjala državni intervencionizem. V Franciji je bila deloma uspešna glede varstva delavskih interesov, v Nemčiji pa je utemeljila gospodarsko podporo pomembnemu delu srednjega stanu ter

omogočila obrtniškem srednjemu sloju prilagoditev na industrijski razvoj.

Med obema svetovnima vojnama zaradi drugačnih liberalnih gospodarsko-socialnih konceptov socialni liberalizem idejno in družbeno ni bil ustvarjal. Po drugi svetovni pa so v sedemdesetih in osemdesetih letih 20. stoletja v evropskih liberalnih strankah (najbolj očitno v Zvezni republiki Nemčiji ter v Franciji in Italiji) uvideli potrebo po aktivni socialni politiki in obudili idejo socialnega liberalizma.

Eden od zgodovinskih utemeljiteljev evropskega socialnega liberalizma je bil nemški liberalni politik in socialni reformator Franz Hermann Schulze–Delitzsch (1808–1883). Sredi 19. stoletja je zasnoval sistem konzumnih, surovinsko–nabavnih, kreditnih in produktivnih združenj, oblikovanih na osnovi vzajemne solidarne samopomoči njihovih članov. Schulze–Delitzschevo združni sistem, ki je odklanjal državni intervencionizem, je predstavljal »tretjo pot« med kapitalistično in socialistično organiziranim gospodarskim načinom. Ker pa je bil socialnoreformni program njegove združne organizacije vezan na prehodni gospodarski stadij na poti v polno industrializacijo, ga je prehitel stopnjevanje industrijski razvoj v drugi polovici 19. stoletja. Schulze–Delitzsch v svojih prizadevanjih, da bi rešil socialni problem ni bil uspešen, kljub temu pa je imelo njegovo delo pozitiven socialnopolitičen učinek. Njegove združenja so namreč predstavljale gospodarsko oporo pomembnega dela srednjega stanu. S svojim delovanjem je vplival tudi na t. i. wilhelmski socialni liberalizem na prelomu iz 19. v 20. stoletje, ki je nasproti socialnopolitičnim izzivom industrijske družbe zagovarjal načelo umirjenega državnega intervencionizma, sodelovanje liberalnega meščanstva s socialnodemokratsko organiziranim delavstvom in ustavnopolitično integracijo sindikatov v nemško družbo. Schulze–Delitzschevo delovanje je vplivalo tudi na slovenski liberalizem. Na njegove združnogospodarske zamisli se je namreč v prvem obdobju svojega razvoja (1872–1895) opiralo slovensko združno gibanje, ki je bilo v tistem času pod liberalnim vodstvom; nato je vodenje slovenskega združništva prevzelo katoliško gibanje. Prilagoditev Schulze–Delitzschevih združnih načel na Slovenskem v letih 1872–1895 je pomenila enega od redkih sočasnih vplivov evropskega liberalizma na slovenski narodnopolitični in gospodarski razvoj. Kljub temu, da slovensko združno gibanje pod liberalnim vodstvom ni imelo socialnoreformne vsebine, so bili v letih 1872–1895 pod vplivom Schulzejevih načel in zamisli ustvarjeni gnotni pogoji za slovensko kulturnopolitično emancipacijo in postavljeni temelji za rast slovenskega narodnega gospodarstva in kapitala.

Slovenski liberalizem ni posvetil posebne pozornosti socialnemu vprašanju tudi po letu 1894, ko je bila v osrednji slovenski deželi – na Kranjskem – ustanovljena liberalna Narodna

stranka (kasneje Narodno napredna stranka). Zanimala ga je predvsem ohranitev družbene in gospodarske moči mladega slovenskega meščanstva nasproti delavnim stanovom slovenskega naroda. Take poglede so liberalci ohranili tudi po zlomu Avstro–Ogrske monarhije, čeprav se je ob ustanovitvi enotne vseslovenske liberalne stranke – Jugoslovanske demokratske stranke (vanjo so se junija 1918 združile Narodna stranka za Štajersko, Narodno napredna stranka za Goriško in Narodno napredna stranka za Kranjsko) – tudi na Slovenskem za kratek čas programsko uveljavila ideja socialnega liberalizma. Socialnogospodarski pogledi liberalcev so se v prvi jugoslovanski državi oziroma v času med svetovnima vojnama razvijali v smeri ohranjanja obstoječih družbenogospodarskih razmerij, ki naj bi jih izboljšanje položaja gospodarsko šibkih slojev ne ogrozilo. V tridesetih letih so zagovarjali načelo t. i. nacionalnega solidarizma, ki se je zavzemal za disciplinirano ali nadzorovano demokracijo, ki bo zmožna rešiti socialnogospodarske problema v interesu celote. Načelo skladnosti in solidarnosti vseh slojev, poudarjanje dirigiranega gospodarstva in priznavanje zasebne lastnine kot temeljnega pogoja za uspešen nadaljnji gospodarski razvoj so slovensko liberalno socialnogospodarsko doktrino v letih pred drugo svetovno vojno vpeli v koncept stanovske oziroma korporativne države.

V času med svetovnima vojnama slovenski liberalizem tudi ni upošteval nacionalnih teženj širokih plasti slovenskega ljudstva. V nasprotju z avstrijsko dobo, ko se je zavzemal za slovenske narodne interese in narodno avtonomijo, se je unitaristični in centralistični Kraljevini Srbov, Hrvatov in Slovencev, oblikovani leta 1918 (leta 1929 so jo preimenovali v Kraljevino Jugoslavijo), postavil na stran jugoslovanskega unitarističnega narodnega programa. Njegovo narodnopolitično izhodišče je namreč bilo, da je z nastankom jugoslovanske države nastopil čas vsejugoslovanske sinteze, v kateri se bo dotedanja slovenska narodna in jezikovno–kulturna individualnost prevedla v novo, višjo ter civilizacijsko, kulturno in politično–gospodarsko močnejšo nacionalno formacijo velikega Jugoslovanskega Naroda. Po tem gledanju naj bi predstavljala vsejugoslovansko narodno zlitje in njemu državnopravno edino ustrezna centralistično urejena država končni smisel vsega dotedanjšega slovenskega narodnopolitičnega razvoja in narodnoemancipacijskega napora. Liberalna politika je bila vodilni dejavnik, ki je na Slovenskem v času med svetovnima vojnama zagovarjal jugoslovanski unitarnocentralistični nacionalni program. Odločno je pobijala tedanja slovenska prizadevanja po spoštovanju slovenske narodne samobitnosti in oblikovanju avtonomne slovenske enote v jugoslovanski državi. V primerjavi z evropskim liberalizmom tistega časa, konkretno z nemškim v času Weimarske republike,

kjer je liberalizem po koncu prve svetovne vojne še ostal odločujoč politični dejavnik, je slovenski občel nacionalni problem. Nemški in slovenski liberalizem, ki sta se sicer ujemala v podpiranju centralističnega in narodno unitarističnega državnega razvoja, je ločila globoka vsebinska razlika. Medtem ko si je nemški v okviru zgodovinsko izoblikovane narodne skupnosti s podpiranjem narodnega unitarizma in državnega centralizma prizadeval na novo preurediti nacionalno in državno življenje po prvi svetovni vojni, kjer ne bi bilo prostora za hegemonijo enega, to je pruskega dela države, je slovenski liberalizem skušal izničiti slovensko narodno individualnost v korist namišljenega jugoslovanskega naroda in obenem dejansko podpiral velikosrbski hegemonizem. S tem se je onemogočil pri veliki večini Slovencev, saj so imele v slovenskem narodu tedaj in kasneje veljavo le tiste politične sile, ki so se bojevale za narodno emancipacijo ter suveren in enakopraven položaj slovenskega naroda v jugoslovanski državi.

Usklajenost med evropskim in slovenskim liberalizmom pa se je na političnem in idejnem področju pokazala v kritičnem vrednotenju vloge in položaja Cerkve v družbi. Pri tem je slovenski liberalizem v pomanjkanju domišljenega idejnega, socialnega in političnega programa vodila zavest o njegovem sekundarnem položaju nasproti dobro organiziranemu ter socialno in politično dejavnejšemu katoliškemu gibanju in s tem v slovenski družbi. Katoliški tabor je trdno obvladoval slovensko javno življenje, medtem ko je bil liberalizem močnejši le na gospodarskem področju, saj mu je materialno zaslombo zagotavljal liberalni bančni kapital. Obvladoval je tudi področje kulture, toda tu je liberalna inteligenca zašla v nepomirljiv kulturnobojni odnos do Katoliške cerkve in katoliškega gibanja. Liberalnemu taboru, ki načeloma ni posegal v verska in cerkvena vprašanja, a si je prizadeval z zakonom preprečiti zlorabljanje vere in Cerkve v politične namene (zlasti v šolstvu ter pri uvedbi splošne, neposredne, enake in tajne volilne pravice), sta tako pritisk političnega katolicizma ter neizgrajeni programsko politični koncept in ekskluzivistična svobodomislenska naravnost, onemogočila, da bi v slovenski družbi in politiki prevzel vlogo suverene demokratične korektiva. Obsodil se je na nerazsodno zavračanje vsega, kar je imelo katoliški predznak. V vihri političnih bojev, ki so zavladali v slovenskem javnem življenju po oblikovanju modernih političnih strank konec 19. stoletja, je takšna naravnost nato trajno izčrpavala slovenski liberalizem, ki so ga omejevali tudi ozki ideološki in socialnogospodarski interesi, po letu 1918 pa še unitaristični nacionalni program. Liberalizem je vedno bolj bledel kot dejavnik slovenskega družbenega in političnega razvoja. Ob koncu prve Jugoslavije se je politično izčrpan ter narodno in socialno izkoreninjen razcepil na množico različnih strank in skupin,

večjih in manjših, ki so imele sicer skupno provenienco, ločila pa so jih različna stališča do vseh bistvenih vprašanj tedanje dobe.

Omenjene značilnosti slovenskega liberalizma so se nazorno pokazale v idejnih in političnih pogledih vodilnih liberalnih politikov oziroma v njegovem odnosu do najvidnejših predstavnikov Katoliške cerkve na Slovenskem. Tako je v času po ustanovitvi Narodne stranke za Kranjsko liberalni tabor izkoristil vsako priložnost za napad na ljubljanskega škofa dr. Antona Bonaventure Jegliča (1850–1937), ki je v Ljubljani stoloval v letih 1898–1930. Škof Jeglič je s strani liberalnega tabora doživel najhujše napade v letih 1898–1899, ko se je odločil zgraditi katoliški konvikt z lastno (prvo) slovensko gimnazijo, leta 1909, ko je objavil brošuro *Ženinom in nevestam*, ki je vsebovala moralna napotila za zakonsko spolno življenje, in leta 1925, ko so mu liberalci v okviru njegovih škofovskih dejavnosti pripisovali osebno zlorabljanje Cerkve in vere v politične namene. Kritični so bili tudi do utemeljitelja slovenskega krščansko socialnega gibanja in združenja ter enega od najpomembnejših politikov katoliške Slovenske ljudske stranke, dr. Janeza Evangelista Kreka (1865–1917). Do Kreka najprej niso bili bojno razpoloženi. Zaradi njegovih ostrih protiliberalnih izjav v letih 1911–1912 pa so ga leta 1913 skušali politično in moralno izničiti z javnimi trditvami o domnevni ljubezenski zvezi z dunajčanko Kamilo Theimer. Slovenski liberalizem je kasneje t. i. afero Theimer obžaloval in Kreka ni več napadal, enako pa tudi Krek svojega odnosa do liberalizma ni več zaostroval. Najvidnejši nosilec ostre liberalne kulturnobojne politike je bil eden od prvakov slovenskega klasičnega liberalizma dr. Ivan Tavčar (1851–1923). Poleg izrazitega protikatoliškega stališča, ki ga je po prvi svetovni vojni nadomestil dosledni protikomunizem, je bilo zanj značilno tudi ekskluzivno meščansko družbeno in politično stališče, ki ni dopuščalo socialnogospodarske emancipacije drugih družbenih slojev, konkretno kmetov in delavcev. Od leta 1918 je bil tudi izrazit zagovornik jugoslovanskega nacionalnega unitarizma in državnega centralizma.

Od Tavčarja se je razlikoval drugi prvak slovenskega klasičnega liberalizma, Ivan Hribar (1851–1941). Tudi on je odločno nasprotoval pritegovanju Cerkve in vere v politično življenje, vendar je obenem nasprotoval tudi kulturnobojnemu liberalizmu in t. i. farški gonji. Tradicionalni spopad med političnim katolicizmom in liberalizmom ga ni privlačil. Hribar je imel na katoliški strani vrsto dobrih prijateljev, medtem ko je bil politično ali osebno nenaklonjen le malokateremu posamezniku iz katoliških vrst. Bil je eden od tistih, ki so si v boju med katolicizmom in liberalizmom na Slovenskem – upoštevaje obe strani – zaslužili

dostojanstveno mesto. Hribar se je opredelil tudi do fašizma in komunizma. O prvem je menil, da bo njegov konec »silno žalosten«. Glede komunizma pa je opozarjal, da je protinaravno in nemogoče poenotiti vse ljudi v smislu enakih potreb. Zato ni verjel v svetovno komunistično revolucijo, saj je bil prepričan, da ni mogoče ljudi raznih narodnosti, ločenih po religijah, izobrazbi in moralnih kriterijih, spraviti v sklenjeno vojno vrsto. S temi mislimi, zapisanimi malo pred smrtjo, je leta sklenil vrednotenje svojega časa in bistvenih zgodovinskih vprašanj, povezanih z njim. Življenje je končal sam, v protest proti italijanski okupaciji Slovenije leta 1941.

Vprašanje nove evropske in svetovne vojne je slovenski liberalni tabor – tako kot tudi druge politične sile doma in v tujini – zaposlovalo že od njenega začetka 1. septembra 1939. Liberalci so vojno, ki je od septembra 1939 spremenila velik del dotedanje Evrope, celovito ocenili. Opozarjali so na njen totalitarni značaj in na ideološko soočenje demokratičnega, fašističnega in komunističnega svetovnega nazora v njej. Ob tem niso spregledali, da je bilo ob sklenitvi nemško–sovjetskega pakta o nenapadanju avgusta 1939 ideološko načelo podrejeno velikodržavnim interesom obeh podpisnic. Temu načelu so pripisovali odločilno vlogo pri oblikovanju povojnega sveta, saj so napovedali velike spremembe v organizaciji človeške družbe. Izšle naj bi iz vojaškega, političnega in gospodarskega spopada med anglosaško demokracijo, ki bi se morala notranje prenoviti, in sistemi totalitarnih diktatur. Med njimi so posebej opozorili na Nemčijo, Italijo in Japonsko. Razdelitev t. i. »življenjskih prostorov« med njimi ob sklenitvi Trojnega pakta, septembra 1940, so že razumeli kot načrt za bodočo ureditev sveta. Odgovor na vprašanje, kako bo svet po vojni urejen in kdo bo zmagal v njej, pa so puščali odprt. Točno pa so napovedali, da bo nastopila nova doba, ko se bo prihodnja svetovna politika vodila v okviru velikih državnih blokov kontinentalnih obsegov. Ob tem so glede položaja jugoslovanske države poudarjali svojo narodnoobrambno usmeritev in odločenost da, če bo potrebno, z vsemi močmi branijo domovino.

Po vojaški zasedbi Slovenije in vzpostavitvi okupatorske oblasti aprila 1941, je nastopilo novo obdobje v razvoju slovenskega liberalizma. Liberalna idejnopolična tvornost se med drugo svetovno vojno na Slovenskem kljub odličnim poglobitvam v evropski in svetovni vojaškopolični razvoj po letu 1939 in svojemu patriotizmu, ni mogla učinkovito izraziti. Nov zgodovinski čas je slovenskemu liberalizmu namenil trde preizkušnje, še trše pa so z njim (in njegovimi predstavniki) ravnali po revolucionarnem prevzemu oblasti leta 1945, ko je bil za dolga desetletja izrinjen iz slovenske družbe. Liberalna politična izbira se je nato

na Slovenskem začela dejavno soočati z novimi idejnimi, socialnogospodarskimi in političnimi izzivi šele po ponovni vzpostavitvi večstrankarskega življenja leta 1990, v okviru slovenske narodnodržavne politike pa po oblikovanju Republike Slovenije leta 1991.

Summary

In dealing with the issue of how to present individual political-ideology streams in the contemporary European and Slovene political practice, one first has to look back at the times when the basic questions of a modern world were historically determined. They stem back to the 19th century, when after the French Revolution in 1789 today's European main ideology options were formed – liberal, conservative and socialist. It was then when not only their theoretical concepts were developed but they became the actual political movements. Each option dealt with the essential questions of the ideological, social, political, national and social-economic development which have accompanied the contemporary European history. Thus, also liberalism developed a stance on the issues such as an idea of freedom; the comprehension of a (national) state; the attitude to a democratic thought and the social system; the nation as a link between the individual, state and the society; the character of imperialism; and the development of structures and a system of economic life, i.e. on the main issue of all political thinking in the 19th century – the social issue.

In the mid-19th century, the European liberalism already acknowledged that a social issue should be incorporated in social and political life. The liberal social-political thought of that time formed a social-economic concept according to which an individual's (political) existence should be founded on his economic and social security, property and education. This was to be achieved by the social and political establishment of a middle-class society in a representative parliamentary state.

Such a social program was promoted by social liberalism. The social liberalism did not support abolition of capitalism, but is social-reform correction. It was the most influential in England, where its followers even came to power before the World War I. A number of social reforms were carried out then (social, health, invalidity security, introduction of old-age pensions), which founded a modern British welfare state. A similar situation was in Italy, whilst in France and Germany a liberal social-reform doctrine was only restricted to the concept of social self-assistance and mostly refused state interventionism. In France, it was partly successful in the protection of workers' interests, and in Germany it established economic support to a significant part of the middle class and enabled the craftsmen middle class to adjust to the industrial development.

Because of different liberal economic and social concepts, the social liberalism was

not ideologically or socially “creative” in the period between the two world wars. And even after the World War II, it was not before the 1970s and 1980s that the European liberal parties (in particular in Federal Republic of Germany and France) again acknowledged the need for an active social policy and revived the idea of social liberalism.

One of the historical founding fathers of the European social liberalism was a German liberal politician and social reformist Franz Hermann Schulze–Delitzsch (1808–1883). In the mid-19th century, he devised a system of various forms of cooperatives (for purchase of raw materials, credits and production) founded on mutual solidarity and self-assistance of their members. The Schulze–Delitzsch cooperative system, which refused state interventionism, represented the »third way« between the capitalist and socialist economic system. But the social-reform programme of his cooperative organisation was tied to the transitional economic stage on the path to full industrialisation, and this is why an accelerated industrial development in the second half of the 19th century eventually ran him down. Although Schulze–Delitzsch failed in his efforts to solve the social problem, his work had a positive social–political effect. His cooperatives provided economic support to a large part of the middle class. He also influenced the “Wilhelmin social liberalism” at the turn of the 19th century, which proposed as a response to social-political challenges of the industrial society a principle of a moderate state interventionism, cooperation of the liberal middle classes with socially–democratically organised workers and the constitutional integration of trade unions into the German society. The Schulze–Delitzsch activities influenced also the Slovene liberalism. In the first stage of its development (1872–1895), the Slovene cooperative movement was founded on his economic and cooperative ideas; at that time it was still under liberal leadership, but was later taken over by the catholic movement. The adoption of the Schulze–Delitzsch cooperative principles in the Slovene provinces in the period 1872–1895 meant one of the rare examples of a concurrent influence of the European liberalism on the Slovene national-political and economic development. And even though the Slovene cooperative movement under the liberals had no social-reform intentions, it was under the influence of the Schultze’s principles in the period 1872–1895 that the material grounds were established for a Slovene cultural-political emancipation and the foundations for the rise of Slovene national economy and capital.

Slovene liberalism paid no particular attention to the social issue even after 1894, when a liberal National Party (later on a National Progressive Party) was established in the central Slovene province – Kranjska. It was mainly interested in the preservation of social and

economic power of the emerging Slovene middle class vis-à-vis the working classes. Such views were preserved by liberals also after the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy; however, even in the Slovene provinces – for a short period of time though – the idea of social liberalism emerged in the programmes of the newly founded all-Slovene liberal party – Yugoslav Democratic Party (which was founded in June 1918 by merging of the National Party for Štajerska, National Progressive Party for Goriška and National Progressive Party for Kranjska). In the period between the two world wars, the social-economic views of the liberals in the first Yugoslav state evolved in the direction of preserving the existing social-economic relations, which should not be threatened by an improved position of economically weaker classes. In the 1930s, they advocated the principle of “national solidarity”, which supported a disciplined or controlled democracy capable of solving social-economic problems in the interest of all. By the principle of cohesion and solidarity of all classes, emphasising planned economy and recognising private property as a basic precondition for a successful economic development, the Slovene liberal social economic doctrine was incorporated into the concept of a social-class and corporative society in the years before the World War II.

In the period between the two world wars, Slovene liberalism paid no attention to the national aspirations of the wider strata of Slovene population. Unlike in the Austrian era when it advocated Slovene national interests and national autonomy, the liberalism under the unitarist and centralist Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes set up in 1918 (in 1929 renamed the Kingdom of Yugoslavia) decided for the Yugoslav unitarist national programme. Its main national political position was that by the emergence of the Yugoslav state there was time for an all-Yugoslav synthesis, through which the Slovene national, language and cultural individuality would be translated into a new, higher culturally and politically-economically stronger national formation of a large Yugoslav Nation. By these views, the all-Yugoslav national amalgamation organised in an only possible state-legal form – a centralist state, was to be the final goal of the Slovene national-political development and its national-emancipation efforts made by that time. Liberal policy was the principal advocate of the Yugoslav unitarist-centralist national programme in Slovenia in the period in-between the wars. It fiercely opposed all the Slovene efforts for a respect of Slovene national uniqueness and the formation of autonomous Slovene unity within the Yugoslav state. Unlike the European liberalism of that period, e.g. the German liberalism during the Weimar Republic which still preserved a decisive political power after the World War II, Slovene liberalism completely disregarded the national problem. Thus, there was a great substantive difference

between the German and Slovene liberalism – despite the same views regarding the centralist and nationally-unitarist state development. The German liberalism endeavoured – within the historically formed national community and by supporting the national unitarism and state centralism – to organise anew the life of a nation and the state after the World War I, by doing away with the hegemony of one, i.e. the Prussian part of the state. On the other hand, the Slovene liberalism tried to wipe out Slovene national individuality for the sake of an imaginary Yugoslav nation and by doing so in fact supported the Great-Serbia's hegemony. In turn, a great majority of Slovenes rejected it, as at that time and also later only those political forces prospered that fought for national emancipation and a sovereign and equal position of the Slovene nation within the Yugoslav state.

The European and Slovene liberalisms were, however, politically and ideologically more coherent as regarded the critical consideration of the role and position of the Church in the society. The Slovene liberalism in particular was – in the absence of a well thought-out ideological, social and political programme – guided by the awareness of its secondary position vis-à-vis a well-organised and socially and politically more active catholic movement. Whilst the catholic camp firmly controlled Slovene public life, liberalism was only stronger in the economic area, thanks to being materially backed by liberal banking capital. It also dominated culture, but here the liberal intellectuals started an uncompromising cultural fight with the Catholic Church and the catholic movement. Although the liberal camp in principle never interfered with the church's affairs but only tried to prevent by law any exploiting of the religion and the Church for political purposes (in particular in schooling and in introducing a universal, direct, equal and secret suffrage), the pressure of the political Catholicism, an incomplete political programme concept, and its exclusivist liberal orientation prevented liberalism to play a role of a sovereign democratic corrective in the Slovene society. It merely focused on an imprudent rejection of everything related to Catholicism. In the maelstrom of political fights which ravaged Slovene public life ever after forming of modern political parties in the late 19th century, such an orientation slowly exhausted Slovene liberalism. And above all, its expansion was further held back by its narrow ideological and social-economic interests and after 1918 also by a unitarist national programme. Liberalism as a factor of Slovene social and political development thus weakened, only to end up politically exhausted and nationally and socially eradicated at the end of the first Yugoslavia. Eventually, it split to a number of different parties and groups, some of them larger some smaller, all joined by a common provenience but divided by differing positions on the essential questions

of that time.

The mentioned characteristics of Slovene liberalism were clearly manifested in the ideological and political views of the leading liberal politicians as well as in their attitude to the most prominent representatives of the Catholic Church. Thus, when a National Party for Kranjska was established, the liberal camp used every opportunity to attack the Ljubljana bishop dr. Anton Bonaventura Jeglič (1850–1937), who resided in Ljubljana from 1898–1930. Bishop Jeglič had to endure the fiercest attacks of the liberal camp in the years 1898–1899, when he decided to build a Catholic boarding school and the adjacent (first) Slovene grammar school; in 1909, when publishing a brochure “To Bridegrooms and Brides” containing moral instructions for marital sex life; and in 1925, when being accused by liberals of a personal misuse of the Church and religion for political purposes. Liberals also criticised the founding father of Slovene Christian social movement and cooperative movement, and one of the most prominent politicians of the catholic Slovene People’s Party: dr. Janez Evangelist Krek (1865–1917). At first, they were not hostile to him. But his sharp anti-liberal statements in the years 1911–1912 made them try to politically and morally slander him in 1913 by bringing to public an alleged love affair with a Viennese Kamila Theimer. Later, Slovene liberals regretted the “Theimer affair” and stopped denouncing him, and also Krek eased his stance on liberalism. Dr. Ivan Tavčar (1851–1923), one of the leaders of Slovene classical liberalism, was the fiercest advocate of a sharp liberal policy of cultural fight. Apart from his extremely anti-catholic views, which were after the World War I replaced by consistent anti-communism, he advocated an exclusivist middle-class social and political position, denying any social-economic emancipation to other social classes, i.e. farmers and workers. As from 1918, he was also a fierce advocate of Yugoslav national unitarism and state centralism.

The second leader of the Slovene classical liberalism, Ivan Hribar (1851–1941), differed from Tavčar. He as well strongly opposed the intervention of the Church and religion in the political life, but at the same time, he also opposed the liberalism based on cultural fight and the “anti-church campaign”. He was not attracted by a traditional conflict between political Catholicism and liberalism. Hribar had a number of good friends also on the catholic side, and disagreed politically and personally only with a few individuals from that camp. He was one of the personalities who in the dispute between Catholicism and liberalism on the Slovene grounds earned a prominent and well-respected position on both sides. Hribar also had a clear stance on fascism and communism. He believed that the end of the former will be

“extremely sad”. Regarding the latter he warned that it was extremely unnatural and impossible to unify all the people on the grounds of the same needs. Therefore, he did not believe in a world communist revolution, as he was convinced that that people of different nationalities, religions, education and moral criteria could not be lined up in one “army”. With these thoughts which he noted down shortly before his death, he concluded his study of his times and of the essential historical issues related to it. He took his own life in protest against the Italian occupation of Slovenia in 1941.

The issue of a new European and world war occupied Slovene liberal camp – like all other political forces at home and abroad – from its very break out on 1 September 1939. They made a thorough review of the war, which from September 1939 by then already changed a large part of Europe. They warned against its totalitarian character and the ideological confrontation of democratic, fascist and communist world views. They also did not overlook that upon concluding of the German-Soviet non-aggression treaty in August 1939 the ideological principle was subordinated to the state interests of both signatories. They attributed the ideological principle a decisive role in the formation of the post-war world, forecasting great changes in the organisation of human society. They were to stem from the military, political and economic conflict between the Anglo-Saxon democracy, which was to be internally transformed, and the systems of totalitarian dictatorships. Of the latter, they particularly exposed Germany, Italy and Japan. The division of the »spheres of interest« among themselves upon the conclusion of the Triple Pact in September 1940 was already understood as a plan for the future world system. They however, left open the question of the post-war world system and of the winner of war. They correctly foresaw that a new era would start and the world politics would be led within the framework of great blocks of states of continental dimensions. As for the position of the Yugoslav state, they emphasised their national-defence orientation and determination to defend their home country.

After Slovenia had been occupied and the occupying authority established in April 1941, a new era begun for Slovene liberalism. Despite the excellent studies of the European and world military-political development after 1939 and strong patriotism, the ideological-political creativeness of liberals could not be efficiently expressed during the World War II. A new historical epoch put Slovene liberalism to severe tests, and its position even worsened after the revolutionary takeover of power in 1945, ousting it from the Slovene society for many decades. The liberal political option only started to actively face new ideas and social-

economic and political challenges after the reestablishment of a multi-party life in 1990, and it became engaged in Slovene national politics after the formation of the Republic of Slovenia in 1991.