

DAMJAN GUŠTIN

**ZA ZAPAH**

Prebivalstvo Slovenije v okupatorjevih zaporih 1941-1945  
liberalizma 19. in 20. stoletja

Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino  
Ljubljana 2006

# Pregled vsebine

PREDGOVOR	11
UVOD	17
<i>Odvzem prostosti in institucija zapora</i>	19
<i>Zapori na slovenskem etničnem ozemlju v tridesetih letih</i>	22
Prvo poglavje: ZAPORI V ČASU VOJNE 1941-1945	31
<i>Prevzemi zaporov po okupaciji</i>	33
<i>Zapori kot ustanove v času vojne</i>	37
<i>Uprava in osebje zaporov</i>	71
<i>Pogodbeno osebje v zaporih</i>	86
<i>Zavarovanje in straža</i>	93
Drugo poglavje: ZAPORNIKI	97
<i>Izpuščanje zapornikov med aprilsko vojno in takoj po okupaciji</i>	99
<i>Sprejem v zapor</i>	102
<i>Zaporniki v preiskovalnem postopku</i>	117
<i>Sodno obsojeni zaporniki</i>	132
<i>Število zaprtih</i>	147
<i>Usode zapornikov</i>	176
<i>Premeščanja in transporti zapornikov</i>	217
Tretje poglavje: ŽIVLJENJE V ZAPORIH	235
<i>Bivanje</i>	239
<i>Hrana</i>	246
<i>Higienske razmere</i>	258

<i>Zdravje in zdravljenje jetnikov</i>	266
<i>Delo zapornikov v zaporih in zunaj njih</i>	274
<i>Tegobe zaporniškega življenja</i>	280
<i>Odnosi jetnikov z upravo in osebjem</i>	304
<i>Odnosi med jetniki</i>	319
<i>Samoorganiziranje jetnikov</i>	329
Četrto poglavje: ZAPORNIKI IN OKOLJE	351
<i>Stiki zapornikov z okoljem</i>	355
<i>Odnos prebivalstva do zaprtih</i>	373
<i>Posredovanja za izpuste iz zaporov</i>	379
<i>Reševanje jetnikov iz italijanskih kaznilnic in zaporov po kapitulaciji Italije</i>	396
<i>Nasilno reševanje jetnikov iz zaporov</i>	405
POVZETEK	417
SUMMARY	425
VIRI IN LITERATURA	435
UPORABLJENE OKRAJŠAVE IN KRATICE	451
OSEBNO KAZALO	453

## Povzetek

Obdobje štiriletne okupacije večine slovenskega ozemlja v času druge svetovne vojne je obdobje, ko je policijski in sodni odvzem prostosti prebivalstvu Slovenije dosegel svojo največjo razsežnost. Odvzem prostosti je sodil namreč med najbolj razširjene represivne ukrepe okupatorjev, posebej pri zatiranju slovenskega odporniškega gibanja. Zapori so tudi v vojnem času opravljali svojo funkcijo v zatiranju kriminalitete. Ta je v vojnem času sicer upadla, predvsem pa je postala za okupacijske oblasti manj nevarna. Zapori so se tako spremenili v prostore za številne v preiskovalnih postopkih, odkoder so jih pošiljali v koncentracijska in zbirna taborišča, v kraj izgona ali konfinacije.

Italijanski okupator, ki je zaseden del slovenskega ozemlja oblikoval v Ljubljansko pokrajino in ga hitro priključil že 3. maja 1941 državnemu ozemlju Kraljevine Italije, je ohranil sodne institucije in kazensko pravosodje v dotedanji obliki, uvedel pa je lastne, ki so sodile v tistih primerih, ko je bila ena od vpletenih strani v postopku italijanska. Italija je, čeprav je pokrajino anektirala, najdosledneje med vsemi tremi okupanti spoštovala predpise mednarodnega vojnega prava glede dopustnega ravnanja v okupirani deželi. Vzpostavila je lastno policijo, domačo pa deloma razpustila oziroma vključila posameznike kot pomožno policijo. Ni pa v pokrajino uvedla svojega kazenskega zakonika, niti sodišč, z izjemo vojaškega vojnega sodišča, ki je za pravno osnovo svojega delovanja imelo Mussolinijev odlok o uporabi določenih členov kazenskega zakonika in seznama kaznivih dejanj z dne 3. oktobra 1941. To sodišče je v svojem delovanju do dneva kapitulacije Italije tudi bilo tisto, ki je v 21 mesecih obravnavalo okoli 13.000 oseb, večinoma pripadnikov odporniškega gibanja. Kazenskim sodiščem, ki so ostala v funkciji, je preostalo le sojenje v kriminalnih zadevah.

Za podobno ureditvijo pravosodja je poseglo tudi madžarsko pravosodje na okupiranih in nato priključenih območjih. Poleg rednega sodstva je politične delitve obravnavalo naglo vojaško sodišče ali pozneje vojaško sodišče šefa generalštaba, ki je v hitrem postopku obravnavalo vsa dejanja zoper madžarsko državo in režim.

Nemški okupator, ki je zasedeno slovensko ozemlje nameraval hitro in povsem vključiti v svoje državno ozemlje, je vpeljal drugačen represivni sistem. Zato je še pred aneksijo, ki jo je zaradi odpora odložil do konca vojne, po takojšnjem izgonu 8 % prebivalstva podelil državljanstvo 90 % preostalega prebivalstva. Popolnoma je uničil pravosodni sistem,

saj je nameraval po aneksiji na ozemlje uvesti svojega. V vmesnem času, ki se je raztegnil na dve leti, sta najnujnejše kazenske zadeve obravnavala kar komandanta varnostne policije in varnostne službe na območju civilne uprave. V ta namen sta junija 1941 ustanovila poseben kazenski oddetek, ki je obravnaval zgolj zadeve strogo nepolitičnega značaja. Vsi delikti, kjer je bilo politično ozadje ali politične oznake, je sodilo v pristojnost same tajne državne policije (Gestapo). Ta je sama izvajala preiskovalni postopek, presodila dokaze in družbeno nevarnost vsakega od preiskovanih ter ga nato bodisi izpustila, predlagala odvedbo v koncentracijsko taborišče ali pa z osebno odločitvijo komandanta varnostne policije in varnostne službe obsodila na smrt. Tako je nemška okupacijska oblast obravnavala vse pripadnike in simpatizerje odporniškega gibanja. Šele v letu 1944 je bil manjši del takšni zadev predan političnim kazenskim zbornicam (na Gorenjskem) oziroma posebnemu sodišču za politične zadeve (na Štajerskem). Obe sodni ustanovi sta delovali izven rednega sodstva, ki je bilo na območju civilne uprave v kazenskih zadevah vzpostavljeno v letu 1943.

Pravosodni sistem, ki ga je nemški okupator uvedel na območju operacijske cone Jadransko primorje jeseni 1943, je formalno upošteval suverenost Italije. Ohranil je dotedanjo pravosodno in sodno ureditev, uvajal pa je poleg policijskih kazenskih ukrepov z izvensodnimi usmrtitvami, z odvažanjem v koncentracijska taborišča (od katerih je enega tudi postavil v Trstu) in na prisilno delo, posebna sodišča javne varnosti, ki so obravnavala politične delikte, »črno borzo«, preskrbo in gospodarske prestopke (delovala so v Trstu, Gorici in Ljubljani).

Tolikšen obseg policijske in sodne represije, tako proti odporniškemu gibanju kot običajnem kriminalu in posebnim omejitvam zaradi vojne (nedovoljeni prehodi meje, zatemnitev, policijska ura, nedovoljeno poslušanje radia) je povzročil, da kapacitete zaporov v nobeni slovenski pokrajini niso več zadoščale potrebam, zlasti ne na nemškem območju, kjer je prišlo do množičnih akcij odvzema prostosti kmalu po zasedbi.

Okupatorji so dobili ob zasedbi jugoslovanskega dela slovenskega ozemlja že izdelan sistem zaporov, ki je pred vojno zadoščal za potrebe policijskih in sodnih oblasti. Dva samostojna kazenska zavoda v Mariboru in Begunjah sta pomenila del širšega sistema kazenskih zavodov na ravni Kraljevine Jugoslavije. Bili so štirje zapori okrožnih sodišč in 49 zaporov okrajnih sodišč. Njihove zmogljivosti so znašale pri okrožnih zaporih med 120 in 290 jetniki, medtem ko so manjši sodni zapori okrožnih sodišč imeli med 10 in 40 mesti. Policijska oz. žandarmerijska oblastva so imela tudi policijske zapore; največji policijski zapor v Ljubljani je premogel okoli 50 mest.

Nemški okupacijski in represivni sistem je potreboval mnogo več prostora v zaporih za zapornike v preiskovalnem postopku. Na Gorenjskem si je zato uredil velik osrednji preiskovalni zapor v dotedanji ženski kaznilnici v Begunjah. S pridom pa je policija izrabila tudi manjše sodne zapore okrajnih sodišč, ki so postali ob ukinitvi sodišč in sodnih jetnikov predvsem preiskovalni zapori za politične zapornike. Območje Štajerske je bilo z velikimi zapori bolje preskrbljeno, saj sta na tem območju ostala kar dva okrožna zapora s po okoli 250 mesti vsak; poleg tega pa je bila na voljo še moška kaznilnica, v kateri je bilo tudi okoli 460 mest. Kaznilnica v Mariboru je bila edina, ki jo je nemška Državna pravosodna uprava obdržala v isti funkciji, saj je vso vojno služila za prestajanje kazni. Zapornike so dovažali tudi z območij izven slovenskega ozemlja, iz avstrijskih in čeških krajev, polovico pa so predstavljali tisti, ki jih je obsodil kazenski oddelek oziroma po 1943 sodišča. Ker je že v letih 1941 in 1942 primanjkovalo prostora v obeh osrednjih preiskovalnih zaporih, je komandant varnostne policije in varnostne službe osnoval poseben policijski zapor na gradu Borlu in zunanja izpostava mariborskega sodnega zapora v Strnišču, kjer so bili zaporniki zaposleni pri gradnji tovarne aluminija. V zadnjem obdobju vojne, že od jeseni 1943, so pravosodne oblasti na štajerskem delu območja civilne uprave ukinile 14 manjših, bolj izpostavljenih zaporov okrajnih sodišč.

V Ljubljanski pokrajini, kjer je italijanski okupator v največji meri ohranil predvojno pravosodno ureditev, so v enakih funkcijah ostali tudi sodni zapori, vključno z največjima v pokrajini, v Ljubljani in Novem mestu. Z zapiranjem preiskovalnih zapornikov, ki so bili v pristojnosti policijskih in vojaških oblasti se je postopoma spreminjala vloga sodnih zaporov. Z delom vojaškega vojnega sodišča v Ljubljani, ki je potrebovalo vojaški sodni zapor, je bila vloga sodnega zapora v Ljubljani določena za ves čas italijanske okupacije, saj je število sodišču izročenih zapornikov zavzemalo večji del kapacitet tega zapora. Zapor je bil v drugi polovici leta 1942, dokler oblasti niso ukrepale in večine pripornikov preselile v vojaški zapor v Belgijski kasarni v Ljubljani, tako prenapolnjen, da je število zapornikov dvakratno presevalo njegovo normirano zmogljivost. Od začetka leta 1943 je bil sodni zapor namenjen zgolj sodnim zapornikom v preiskovalnem postopku in na prestajanju kazni; takih zapornikov je bilo med 15 in 20%, ostali so čakali v zaporu na sojenje pred vojaškim vojnim sodiščem. V sodnem zaporu je prestajal kazen tudi tisti del njegovih obsojencev, ki je bil obsojen na krajše zaporne kazni do šestih mesecev. Vse preostale so italijanske pravosodne oblasti takoj po obsodbi pošiljale na prestajanje kazni v kaznilnice in zapore v Italijo. Zapornike so med transporti prehodno zbirali v zaporu v Kopru.

Vsi policijski organi in vojaške formacije v pokrajini, ki so se ukvarjale s policijskim delom, so vzpostavili svoje ločene preiskovalne zapore. Tako sta bila v Ljubljani še preiskovalni zapori fašistične milice in vojaških karabinjerjev. V slednjem so zbirali zapornike, ki so bili kot sumljivi poslani v koncentracijska taborišča v Italijo (Rab, zlasti pa Gonars, Renicci, Visco).

V obdobju po nemški okupaciji dotedanjih italijanskih pokrajin in njihovem upravnem preoblikovanju v operacijsko cono Jadransko primorje se je uveljavila predvsem izraba velikih zaporov v večjih središčih operacijske cone, saj je bilo narodnoosvobodilno gibanje že toliko močno, da je vojaško lahko resno ogrožalo manjša središča v pokrajinah. Aretirane med vojaško policijskimi akcijami na podeželju, pa tudi ujete pripadnike NOV in POS, so okupatorji vodili v vojaško zavarovanih transportih v zapore v Ljubljani, Trstu, Gorici, od koder so jih odpremljali dalje v koncentracijska taborišča in na prisilno delo.

Za vojni čas je značilna deprofesionalizacija nadzornega osebja v zaporih, ki je bila posledica avtonomnega ustanavljanja zaporov s strani vojaških enot in policijskih sil in podobnega. Zaradi tega so bili tudi jetniki izpostavljeni večjemu pritisku in manj strokovnemu ravnanju, saj so bili policisti, karabinjerji, vojaki, do zapornikov, zlasti političnih, bolj nasilni. Domače, slovensko osebje je v okupatorjevih očeh veljalo za manj zanesljivo in zapornikom, s katerimi jih je družila nacionalna pripadnost, bolj naklonjeno. Zato ne preseneča, da se je del nadzornega osebja po volji okupatorjev znašel tudi med zaporniki, ko so odkrili njihovo sodelovanje z osvobodilnim gibanjem ali nedovoljeno pomoč jetnikom. V pomoči jetnikom in sodelovanju z osvobodilnim gibanjem se je najbolj angažiralo osebje sodnega zapora v Ljubljani.

Represija, namenjena zatiranju narodnoosvobodilnega gibanja, je povzročila veliko spremembo v strukturi in položaju zapornikov in to v vseh delih okupiranega slovenskega ozemlja. Zaporniki so postali ena najbolj množičnih kategorij v obdobju druge svetovne vojne na Slovenskem. Upošteva le tiste, ki so bili v zaporih dlje kot dva meseca, je bilo v zaporih okoli 65.000 ljudi na območju, ki so ga zajemale povojne statistike; po drugih kriterijih, ob upoštevanju dejstva, da je bila mnogim ljudem odvzeta prostost za daljši čas, niso pa medtem bili v zaporih (del izgnanih, del interniranih, del konfiniranih) se število ljudi, ki so bili prizadeti z odvzemom prostosti dvigne na okoli 120.000 prebivalcev, kar bi pomenilo okoli 8 % prebivalstva. Kar okoli 90% je k njihovu številu prispevala kriminalizacija političnih dejanj in odpora proti okupaciji. Tako imenovane politične zapornike so tvorili člani in simpatizerji odporniških političnih organizacij, ki so bile vključene v osvobodilno gibanje,

kršilci omejitvenih odredb okupacijskih oblasti. Pomemben del zapornikov so bili tudi ujeti ali aretirani partizani. Postopek proti njim se, razen da je bil strožji zaradi pravne opredelitve njihovega ravnanja kot *oboroženega upora* ali *pripadanja oboroženim tolpom*, ni razlikoval od tistega proti civilnim osebam in so bivali v enakih razmerah in istih zaporih kot ostali politični jetniki. Politični jetniki so bili med preiskovalnim postopkom pogosto mučeni, ne glede na to katera policija jih je zasliševala. Mučenje zapornikov pri nemški tajni državni policiji je bilo eden od uradnih postopkov (»poostreno zaslišanje«), ki ga je odobral komandant varnostne policije in varnostne službe. Prav surovost preiskovalnega postopka in strah pred usmrčitvijo je označeval življenje političnega preiskovalnega jetnika, poleg neznosnih bivanjskih razmer zaradi prenapolnjenosti zaporov.

Sodnih obsojencev je bilo mnogo manj kot zapornikov v preiskovalnem postopku, saj je večje število obsojenih, okoli 3500, doseglo v svojem 21-mesečnem sodnem poslovanju italijansko vojaško vojno sodišče 2. armade v Ljubljani. Nemška posebna sodišča so obsodila na Slovenskem okoli 500 oseb. Večina od obsojenih jetnikov so bili odvedeni na prestajanje kazni v matične države okupatorjev. Okoli 750 obsojenih pred vojaškim vojnim sodiščem na kazni daljše od pol leta je bilo poslanih v zapore in kaznilnice v Italijo; njihovo premeščanje je trajalo od decembra 1941 do kapitulacije Italije. Tedaj so bili razporejeni v okoli 50 kazenskih zavodov od Tranija pri Bariju in Neaplja na jugu Italije do Alessandrije, in Benetk na severovzhodu. Slovenskemu Rdečemu križu je uspelo, da je med novembrom 1943 do aprilom 1944 dosegel njihovo izpustitev. V kazenske zavode v Nemčijo izven območja višjega deželnega sodišča v Gradcu sta bili avgusta 1944 poslani le dve skupini obsojencev z okupiranega območja v kaznilnici Aichach in Kassel-Wehlheiden. Obsojeni pred madžarskimi vojaškimi in civilnimi sodišči so kazni prestajali v zaporih v Szombathellyju, Čakovcu, kaznilnicah v Budimpešti, Vacu, Komarnem, Sopron-Köhidu.

Osrednji preiskovalni zapori v Ljubljani, Mariboru, Begunjah, Trstu so bili zaradi velikega števila zaprtih podobni velikim ranžirnim postajam, od koder so dnevno dovažali in odvažali po več desetih zapornikov in tudi več tisoč mesečno. Skozi ljubljanski sodni zapor je šlo od začetka vojne do italijanske kapitulacije okoli okoli 8.500, od česar je bilo 7700 političnih zapornikov. V sodnem zaporu v Mariboru je bilo v prvih treh letih vojne zaprtih 9900 zapornikov. V sodni zapor v Trstu je bilo v obdobju po nastanku operacijske cone Jadransko primorje pripeljanih 23.900 zapornikov.

V takih razmerah je bilo življenje zapornikov v zaporih predvsem čakanje pred naslednjo postajo. Nekateri zaporniki so bili z nedokazano krivdo usmrčeni kot talci ali v

povračilnih akcijah; drugi z dokazano krivdo so bili odvedeni v kaznilnice, kjer so bili še najbolj zaščiteni pred vojno vihro, tretji so bili z ne preveliko obremenitvijo odvedeni v koncentracijska taborišča. Prav sodne in policijske eksekucije obsojenih na smrt so bile sestavni del življenja v mnogih zaporih, saj so bila zaporniška dvorišča za nemške policijske oblasti primeren prostor za usmrčitve. Tako so še dodatno zastraševali zapornike in tudi okoliško prebivalstvo.

Življenje v zaporih se je razlikovalo od tistega na svobodi. Nosilo je vse slabosti, k jih nalaga življenje v skupini. Življenje je bilo formirano in predpisanemu redu so se morali podrežati vsi, ne glede na veliko prenapolnjenost. Označevala ga je utesnjenost bivanja v prenapolnjenem prostoru; v mnogih primerih so živeli zaporniki v razmerah, ki so bile daleč pod v mirnih časih predpisanimi normativi minimalnega prostora na zapornika. Tegobe izolacije, ki so jih čutili, so lažje premagovali tam, kjer so živeli v skupinah; to pa je bilo zaradi prenapolnjenosti zaporniških kapacitet običajno, v samicah so prestajali del kazni le obsojeni na najdaljše zaporne kazni. V italijanskih zaporih in kaznilnicah so si ponekod slovenski politični zaporniki upali zavračati določila hišnih redov glede obveznega dela in obiskovanja verskih obredov, s čimer so odnosi z upravami in osebjem zaporov postali bistveno bolj konfliktni. Res pa je, da je to upiranje krepilo samozavest zapornikov in notranjo homogenost skupin.

Okupatorjevi ukrepi so prizadeli tolikšno in takšno število ljudi, da se je spremenilo odzivanje prebivalstva na zapore in zapornike. Prejšnjemu nelagodju in odklanjanju stikov več ni bilo sledu; zapornike so sprejemali kot integralni del družbe v nenormalnih razmerah vojne. Mnogo več jih je bilo na različne načine pripravljenih pomagati zaprtim. Svojci, pa tudi drugi - znanci, prijatelji, ustanove - so poskušali pomagati s posredovanji za zaprte, jih obiskovali, poizvedovali pri oblasteh za njihovo usodo. Iskali so zveze do političnih, vojaških in policijskih oblastnikov v njihovo korist, bili so pripravljeni na podkupovanja, tveganje na ugledu in premoženju. Jetniki so z njihovim trdom v zapore dobivali pošto, pakete za življenjsko pomembno dopolnjevanje prehrane, obiskovali jih in jim prinašali perilo, kar je vse izboljševalo njihovo počutje v zavesti, da niso zapuščeni. Vse to seveda ne izključuje tudi koristoljubja, saj se je posredovanje v korist zaprtih v nekaterih primerih razvilo v donosno obrt, v kateri so sodelovali policijski funkcionarji, nadzorno osebje v zaporih in posredovalci.

V posredovanja se je vključeval tudi Rdeči križ, ki je, v kolikor mu je bilo dovoljenega manevrskega prostora, poskušal izboljšati tudi položaj zapornikov; prav iznajdljivo posredovanje Slovenskega Rdečega križa je omogočilo izpustitev skoraj vseh zapornikov, ki

so po kapitulaciji Italije ostali v njenih zaporih in kaznilnicah. Od novembra 1943 do maja 1944 so njegovi delegati s praviimi in ponarejenimi dovolilnicami policijskih oblastev dosegli izpustitev okoli 1800 zapornikov. Le manjši del zapornikov je tako bil odveden v Nemčijo na delo oziroma v koncentracijska taborišča. Zanje se je zavzemalo tudi narodnoosvobodilno gibanje, saj je bil velik del zapornikov pripadnikov tega gibanja. Pomagala jim je posebna organizacija Ljudska pomoč oz. Slovenska narodna pomoč. Iz zaporov je na različne načine, s podkupovanjem in na nasilen način poskušala rešiti za gibanje najpomembnejše jetnike. Njeni pripadniki so z orožjem nekajkrat vdrli v zapore in rešili zapornike (iz zaporov v Sevnici, Škofji Loki, Celju, Šmarju pri Jelšah, Begunj).

## 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 19<sup>th</sup> 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 19<sup>th</sup> century – the social issue.

In the mid-19<sup>th</sup> 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-19<sup>th</sup> 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 19<sup>th</sup> 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 19<sup>th</sup> 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 19<sup>th</sup> 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.