

Filip Čuček

**THE QUESTIONS
OF THE NATIONAL
COHABITATION (OR
LACK THEREOF),
DEMOCRATISATION
AND POLITICAL
PLURALISATION
IN SLOVENIA IN
THE AUSTRIAN
CONSTITUTIONAL
PERIOD**

FROM PROVINCIAL TO NATIONAL ADHERENCE

If until the revolutionary year of 1848 “nobody had paid any attention to nationality”, in Slovenia (Austria) until that time and also later Slovenians were usually referred to as the rural population, while Germans (or Italians) were seen as the urban and town population. In the political sense, the majority population was distinctively provincially oriented. Cities and towns were considered German (or Italian) purely on the basis of linguistic differences with the countryside, as a sign of legal and social distinctiveness. After the restoration of the constitutional life, the nationalist aspirations led to a decisive push in the direction of nationalism, as the bourgeoisie was forced to declare itself nationally.⁸¹ In Carniola the Slovenian situation was the most favourable,⁸² while in Styria the German and the Slovenian side both started to consolidate their positions. While the ambitions of the Germans were easier to achieve due to the existing “German” estate situation,⁸³ the Slovenians had to start pursuing their goals in much more difficult circumstances. In Carniola a moderate conservative wing, headed by Janez Bleiweiss, was prevalent in the 1860s, while in Styria a liberal political orientation was formed under the agile leadership of Josip Vošnjak.⁸⁴ The conservatively oriented Slovenian politics in Carinthia was in a much worse situation due to the unfavourable electoral geometry.⁸⁵ In Istria the Slovenian population faced the fact that in order to achieve its national “rise” it should get rid of the Italian irredentism, constantly present in the Istrian politics since the middle of the 1860s. In the Gorizia region the population structure (except in Gorizia) was more or less clearly determined according to the Italian-Slovenian “national” key,⁸⁶ therefore the Slovenian politics (like in Carniola) had a more

81 Janez Cvirn: *Trdnjavski trikotnik. Politična orientacija Nemcev na Spodnjem Štajerskem (1867–1914)* [The “Trdnjava” Triangle. Political Orientation of Germans in Lower Styria (1867–1914)]. Maribor, 1997, pp. 9–12, 19–33.

82 Cf. Matić, *Nemci v Ljubljani*, pp. 11–42.

83 Janez Cvirn: *Boj za Celje. Politična orientacija celjskega nemštva 1861–1907* [Fighting for Celje. Political Orientation of the Celje Germans 1861–1907]. Ljubljana, 1988, p. 5.

84 Vasilij Melik: *Josip Vošnjak in njegovi spomini* [Josip Vošnjak and His Memoirs]. In: Vasilij Melik (ed.), *Josip Vošnjak: Spomini* [Josip Vošnjak: Memoirs]. Ljubljana, 1982, pp. 646–658.

85 Cf. Janko Pleterski: *Narodna in politična zavest na Koroškem. Narodna zavest in politična orientacija prebivalstva slovenske Koroške v letih 1848–1914* [National and Political Conscience in Carinthia. National Awareness and Political Orientation of the Population of Slovenian Carinthia from 1848 to 1914]. Ljubljana, 1965, pp. 164–204. Tone Zorn: *Andrej Einspieler in slovensko politično gibanje na Koroškem v 60. letih 19. stoletja* [Andrej Einspieler and the Slovenian Political Movement in Carinthia in the 1860s]. *Zgodovinski časopis*, 1969, No. 1–2, p. 31. Teodor Domej: *Slovenci v 19. stoletju v luči svojih lastnih oznak* [Slovenians in the 19th Century According to Their Own Characterisations]. In: Bogo Grafenauer (ed.), *Slovenci in država. Zbornik prispevkov z znanstvenega posveta na SAZU* [Slovenians and the State. A Collection of Contributions from the Scientific Consultation at the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts]. Ljubljana, 1995, p. 87.

86 Cf. Branko Marušič: *Pregled politične zgodovine Slovencev na Goriškem 1848–1899* [Overview of the Political History of Slovenians in the Gorizia Region 1848–1899]. Nova Gorica, 2005, pp. 231–236.

favourable starting point. The situation of the “Slovenians”⁸⁷ on the other side of the river Mura was increasingly defined by the Hungarian nationalism, while the voting right excluded the majority of the Slovenian population in Hungary from the political life.⁸⁸ The Venetian “Slovenians”⁸⁹ experienced a similar fate under the Italian assimilation pressure.⁹⁰

After the Slovenian politics had entered the Austrian parliamentary period in a relatively disorganised manner,⁹¹ the national impulse in Slovenia strengthened on the basis of the Maribor Programme of 1865 (nevertheless rejected by the “Young Slovenians”)⁹² and became apparent at the 2nd National Assembly elections in 1867, when Slovenians appeared with a clear political programme.⁹³ However, already by the end of the 1860s the relations within the Slovenian politics intensified in connection with the liberal legislation and the Concordat issues. The division between the “Old Slovenians” and the “Young Slovenians”, initiated already by Fran Levstik with the newspaper *Naprej* (1863), deepened even further. The Slovenian liberal politics culminated in the camps they organised, while the political conflicts also revealed themselves with the establishment of the conservative newspaper *Domovina* in the Gorizia region (1867)⁹⁴ and the liberal newspaper *Slovenski narod* in Maribor (1868).⁹⁵ Double (liberal and conservative)

Vasilij Melik: O razvoju slovenske nacionalpolitične zavesti 1861–1918 [On the Development of the Slovenian National-Political Awareness 1861–1918]. In: Vasilij Melik, *Slovinci 1848–1918. Razprave in članki* [Slovenians 1848–1918. Discussions and Articles]. Ljubljana, 2002, p. 217.

- 87 I am referring to Hungarian Slovenians in quotes because they did not establish national connections with the Cisleithanian Slovenian territories, where the Slovenian politics had already established certain elements of national awareness.
- 88 For more information about this see Károly Vörös: Die Munizipalverwaltung in Ungarn im Zeitalter des Dualismus. In: *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918, Band VII/2*. Vienna, 2000, pp. 2345–2382. Fran Zwitter: K vprašanju razvoja Slovencev v Prekmurju med 1860 in 1918 [On the Issue of the Development of Slovenians in Prekmurje between 1860 and 1918]. In: Bogo Grafenauer (ed.), *Prekmurški Slovenci v zgodovini* [Prekmurje Slovenians through History]. Murska Sobota, 1961, p. 109.
- 89 I am referring to Venetian Slovenians in quotes for similar reasons as in the case of Hungarian Slovenians. Cf. note 87.
- 90 For more information about this, see Branko Marušič: Beneški Slovenci in Slovenija [Venetian Slovenians and Slovenia]. In: Stane Granda and Barbara Šatej (eds.), *Slovenija 1848–1998. Iskanje lastne poti* [Slovenia 1848–1998. Finding the Individual Path]. Ljubljana, 1998, pp. 104–109.
- 91 Cf. Vasilij Melik: Problemi in dosežki slovenskega narodnega boja v šestdesetih in sedemdesetih letih v 19. stoletju [Problems and Achievements of the Slovenian National Struggle in the 1860s and 1870s]. In: Melik, *Slovinci 1848–1918*, p. 239.
- 92 Cvirn, *Razvoj ustavnosti in parlamentarizma*, pp. 112–113.
- 93 Vasilij Melik: Slovenska politika ob začetku dualizma [Slovenian Politics in the Beginning of Dualism]. In: Melik, *Slovinci 1848–1918*, pp. 296–297.
- 94 *Ibid.*, p. 311.
- 95 Cf. Janez Cvirn: Slovenska politika na Štajerskem ob koncu 60-ih let 19. stoletja [Slovenian Politics in Styria at the End of the 1860s]. *Zgodovinski časopis*, 1993, No. 4, p. 523. Franjo Baš: *Prispevki k zgodovini severovzhodne Slovenije. K zgodovini narodnega življenja na Spodnjem Štajerskem* [Contributions to the History of North-East Slovenia. On the History of National Life in Lower Styria]. Maribor, 1989, p. 20.

candidatures appeared at the Provincial Assembly elections in 1870.⁹⁶ The “Young Slovenians” nevertheless kept surrendering to the pressure of the “Old Slovenians” and finally accepted the Catholic etiquette, at least outwardly. However, when the Slovenian Catholic camp joined the Hohenwart’s club in 1871 and argued for a broad provincial autonomy based on the historical law, Christian principles in the constitutional and educational field and national equality, the Young Slovenians could not accept such a programme.⁹⁷ After the relocation of the *Slovenski narod* newspaper, Josip Jurčič and Josip Vošnjak to Ljubljana, the strengthened Carniolan liberal side intensified the ideological-political division, which became evident already in September 1872 at the meeting of the *Slovenska matica* society. The division was also apparent during the intense discussions in the Provincial Assembly and especially when the *Slovenec* newspaper was founded in 1873.⁹⁸ In the Gorizia region this became noticeable with the emergence of the conservative newspaper *Glas* in 1872 and the Gorica society a year later (after the split with the Young Slovenians Josip Tonki became its first president).⁹⁹ The dissolution of unity in Slovenia culminated at the National Assembly elections in 1873 and the Provincial Assembly elections in 1874, when the conservative camp supported the Church-political standpoints while the liberals were interested exclusively in the matters of national politics. Nevertheless, the intensified German (Italian) nationalism consolidated the Slovenian ranks in the middle of this decade, forcing them to return to the unification policy (for example, in the Gorizia region with the formation of the *Sloga* political society).¹⁰⁰ The passions finally calmed down in 1876, when the Young Slovenians entered Hohenwart’s club as well.¹⁰¹

The language of administration and education in Istria was Italian, and the Istrian towns were in Italian hands. The Italians responded to the Slovenian and Croatian demands for the equality of both languages with Italian in courts, offices and schools, with the statement that “Istria only knows Italian schools” and “whoever dislikes these schools should not attend them”.¹⁰² The Italians also succeeded to prevail in the completely Slovenian municipality of Pomjan, while the Slovenians had a slightly better representation in Milje. However, in

96 Cf. *Slovenski narod*, 25 August 1870.

97 Cf. Andrej Pančur: Uveljavitev slovenskega narodnega gibanja [Assertion of the Slovenian National Movement]. In: Jasna Fischer et al. (eds.), *Slovenska novejša zgodovina. Od programa Zedinjena Slovenija do mednarodnega priznanja Republike Slovenije* [Slovenian Contemporary History. From the United Slovenia Programme to the International Recognition of the Republic of Slovenia]. Ljubljana, 2005, pp. 29–30.

98 Vasilij Melik: Razcep med staroslovenci in mladoslovenci [Division Between the “Old Slovenians” and “Young Slovenians”]. In: Melik, *Slovenci 1848–1918*, pp. 470–483.

99 See Marušič, *Pregled politične zgodovine Slovencev na Goriškem*, pp. 239–277.

100 *Ibid.*, pp. 277–297.

101 Pančur, Uveljavitev slovenskega narodnega gibanja, p. 30.

102 Božo Milanović: *Hrvatski narodni preporod u Istri – knjiga prva (1797–1882)*. Pazin, 1967, p. 292.

1871 the Slovenian municipality of Dekani was established due to the persistent demands of the Istrian Slovenians, and several municipalities of the northern Istria gradually acquired a Slovenian aspect.¹⁰³ The Edinost society, established in 1874 (and the newspaper in 1876), acquired an increasingly important role in the public life in Istria in the second half of the 1870s. It gradually expanded its activities to the entire Austrian Littoral and co-ordinated them with the Sloga society.¹⁰⁴ The Edinost society also expanded its activities to the Croatian part of Istria in 1878.¹⁰⁵

In Carinthia the distribution of constituencies was “designed” in favour of the German population, which did not have to “put too much effort” into completely dominating that province. The situation was different in Styria, where the German population was forced to defend itself from the rising Slovenian “flood”. Regardless of the fact that in the middle of the 1870s the Trdnjava society called upon the Provincial Assembly to ensure the equality of languages in schools, offices and public life,¹⁰⁶ the development of the Slovenian politics was relatively poor,¹⁰⁷ especially after the cancellation of Trdnjava (1876), when no important Slovenian political societies existed in Carinthia (except for the Society of St. Mohor).¹⁰⁸

The Hungarian political elite denied the “Slovenians” east of the river Mura even the fundamental right of declaring themselves (in terms of their language) as Slovenians. The Hungarians had been referring to them simply as the “Tótok” or “Vendek” or non-native speakers of Hungarian. The Hungarian pressure intensified further with the adoption of “appropriate” legislation.¹⁰⁹ If the “Slovenian” part of the Železna and Zalska županija counties had already been brought together by the United Slovenia programme, the national idea was very slow to mature at the left bank of the river Mura.¹¹⁰ The Venetian “Slovenians”

103 Janez Kramar: *Narodna prebuja istrskih Slovencev* [National Awakening of Istrian Slovenians]. Koper, 1991, pp. 81–84. Cf. Melik, O razvoju slovenske nacionalnopolitične zavesti, pp. 218–219.

104 Cf. Marušič, *Pregled politične zgodovine Slovencev na Goriškem*, pp. 277–297.

105 Kramar, *Narodna prebuja istrskih Slovencev*, pp. 117–121.

106 Cf. Iris. M. Binder: *Der Kärntner Landtag. In: Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918, Band VII/2*. Vienna, 2000, p. 1734.

107 Cf. Bernhard Perchinig: *“Wir sind Kärntner und damit hat sich’s ...”. Deutschnationalismus und politische Kultur in Kärnten*. Klagenfurt, 1989, pp. 42–55.

108 Andrej Moritsch: *Politična zgodovina Celovca v drugi polovici 19. stoletja* [Political History of Klagenfurt in the Second Half of the 19th Century]. In: Darko Friš and Franc Rozman (eds.), *Od Maribora do Trsta* [From Maribor to Trieste]. Maribor, 1998, p. 38.

109 Cf. Metka Fujs: *Narodnopolitična razmerja med Slovenci in Madžari v Prekmurju v dobi dualizma* [National-Political Relations Between Slovenians and Hungarians in Prekmurje in the Period of Dualism]. *Zgodovinski časopis*, 2001, No. 3–4, pp. 459–460.

110 Cf. Metka Fujs: *Slovenska zavest in Slovenci v Prekmurju* [Slovenian Awareness and Slovenians in Prekmurje]. In: Granda and Šatej (eds.), *Slovenija 1848–1998*, p. 81. Darja Keréc: *Prekmurska zavest in slovenstvo* [Awareness and Slovenianism in Prekmurje]. In: Peter Štih and Bojan Balkovec (eds.), *Regionalni vidiki slovenske zgodovine* [Regional Aspects of the Slovenian History]. Ljubljana, 2004, p. 91.

were also politically “cut off” from the Slovenian national programme with the annexation to Italy in 1866, and their connections with the Slovenian provinces were hindered.¹¹¹

Nevertheless, the national co-existence had not yet been completely destroyed everywhere in Slovenia. While in Carniola the first stage of the national differentiation was complete already by the end of the era of Ambrož,¹¹² in Styria the committees of the (German) cities and towns also consisted of “eager” nationalists until as late as the municipal elections in 1876. The membership in non-political societies was binational until the end of the 1870s.¹¹³ After the final restoration of unity in the Slovenian ranks (in Carniola, the Gorizia region and Styria), the German politics revitalised. The Germans even won the 1877 Provincial Assembly elections in Carniola. However, already in the following year Auerperg’s government alleviated the pressure due to the “Eastern issue”. Kallina, who was favourably inclined towards Slovenians, became the provincial president of Carniola in 1878. The new orientation was even more obvious in Styria, where Slovenians won the elections in all of the rural electoral districts.¹¹⁴ At the end of the liberal 1870’s, after the first political division,¹¹⁵ the Slovenian politics was united when Taaffe came to power.

INCREASINGLY TENSE NATIONAL SITUATION

After Taaffe assumed power, the national relations between the Germans (Italians) and Slovenians deteriorated rapidly. In 1883 Slovenians yet again gained the majority in the Provincial Assembly of Carniola. Andrej Winkler was appointed as the provincial president. Due to the government’s “scrappy” politics, the liberal camp succumbed to disagreements (the flexible and the radical wing). The Slovenian national party (supporting unity) was, however, also split by the opposition between the liberal and conservative camps. The liberals accepted the Catholic standpoints only outwardly, and unity was constantly challenged. The opposing candidates from the liberal and Catholic ranks stood against the

111 Cf. Marušič, *Beneški Slovenci*, pp. 107–108.

112 Cf. Matić, *Nemci v Ljubljani*, pp. 42–73.

113 Janez Cvirn: *Deželna in narodna zavest na (spodnjem) Štajerskem* [Provincial and National Awareness in (Lower) Styria]. In: Dušan Nećak (ed.), *Avstrija, Jugoslavija, Slovenija. Slovenska narodna identiteta skozi čas* [Austria, Yugoslavia, Slovenia. Slovenian National Identity through Time]. Ljubljana, 1997, pp. 54–55, 80.

114 Vasilij Melik: *Slovenska politika v drugi polovici sedemdesetih let 19. stoletja* [Slovenian Politics in the Second Half of the 1870s]. In: Melik, *Slovenci 1848–1918*, pp. 486–487.

115 For more information about this see Dušan Kermavner: *Prvi taktični razhod slovenskih politikov v Taaffe-Winklerjevi dobi* [The First Tactical Dispute of the Slovenian Politicians in the Taaffe-Winkler Period]. Ljubljana, 1963.

official unification candidates at certain elections. The unification policy started crumbling after Jakob Missia was appointed as the Bishop of Ljubljana. The division of opinion became even more apparent when Anton Mahnič took over the professorship in theology in Gorizia. He achieved the final separation of spirits in 1888 with the *Rimski katolik* magazine.¹¹⁶ In Carniola the unification leadership was no longer able to present the complete candidacy for the Provincial Assembly elections in 1889. Under the influence of the second Austrian Catholic rally in 1889 and the more radical political Catholicism, the Catholic Political Society¹¹⁷ was established in Ljubljana in January 1890. Especially after the first Slovenian Catholic rally in Ljubljana in August 1892, this society encouraged the establishment of numerous Catholic political societies in Carniola. The organisation of the Catholic camp forced the liberals to establish the Slovenian Society in February 1891. In such circumstances the National Assembly elections in March 1891 and the by-elections in Ljubljana in the same year were the last occasions when the joint electoral committee nominated the candidates. Next year the joint Slovenian deputies' group in the Carniolan Provincial Assembly broke up.¹¹⁸

In Lower Styria the Slovenian political line limited the German politics to cities and certain towns.¹¹⁹ Especially in Celje the Slovenian side instigated an “attack” against the city after its victory at the municipal elections in Ljubljana in 1882. The mounting nationalism led to the point where the population of the mixed districts was forced to take sides.¹²⁰ After the arrival of Ivan Dečko to Celje in the middle of the 1880s, the Slovenian public optimistically observed Slovenian progress, which, in turn, definitely troubled the Germans in Celje and Lower Styria.¹²¹ Although the percentage of people in Celje, using Slovenian as their language of communication, diminished from 36 % to 26 % according to

116 Cf. Fran Erjavec: *Zgodovina katoliškega gibanja na Slovenskem* [The History of Catholic Movement in Slovenia]. Ljubljana, 1928, pp. 28–47.

117 Cf. *Slovenec*, 12 January 1890. *Slovenski narod*, 1 February 1890.

118 Andrej Pančur: Doba slogaštva [The Period of Unification Policy]. In: Fischer et al. (eds.), *Slovenska novejša zgodovina 1*, p. 30. Andrej Pančur: Nastanek političnih strank [Formation of Political Parties]. In: Fischer et al. (eds.), *Slovenska novejša zgodovina 1*, pp. 30–32. Andrej Pančur: Delovanje slovenskih strank [Activities of Slovenian Parties]. In: Fischer et al. (eds.), *Slovenska novejša zgodovina 1*, p. 38.

119 Janez Cvirn: Politične razmere na Štajerskem v času vlade grofa Taaffeja (1879–1893) [Political Situation in Lower Styria during Taaffe's Government (1879–1893)]. *Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje*, 2002, No. 1, p. 9. Vasilij Melik: Slovenska politika v Taaffejevi dobi [Slovenian Politics in the Taaffe Period]. In: Melik, *Slovenci 1848–1918*, p. 523.

120 Bojan Cvelfar: “Z narodnim domom se je celjskemu nemštvu razbila jedna čeljust ...”. Nacionalni izgredi v Celju na prelomu stoletja [“The Slovenian National Centre Was a Severe Blow Against the Celje Germans...”. National Unrest in Celje at the Turn of the Century]. *Celjski zbornik*, 1997, pp. 7–8. Cf. Janez Cvirn: *Kri v luft! Čreve na plot! Oris družabnega življenja v Celju na prelomu stoletja* [Put ‘Em Up! Come and Get It! An Outline of the Social Life in Celje at the Turn of the Century]. Celje, 1990, pp. 93–96.

121 Cf. *Südsteirische Post*, 31 August 1889.

the census in 1890 (due to an enormous pressure of the German Society),¹²² the dedication of the Slovenian political line homogenised the national politics in Lower Styria. Slovenian unity became apparent already at the first Slovenian Catholic rally in Ljubljana in 1892,¹²³ while in the middle of 1893 the Germans organised the “Parteitag” in Celje, attended by almost all of the leading German politicians of Styria.¹²⁴

The Slovenian political line in Carinthia was unable to match the increasingly stronger Slovenian breakthrough.¹²⁵ In this province one third of the population spoke Slovenian as their language of communication according to the census in 1880, yet it only had one Slovenian electoral district (for the Provincial Assembly) where Slovenians could (conditionally) count on having two deputies.¹²⁶ In view of the enormous German economic and political pressure there was no hope for the victory of Slovenian candidates in the rural curia. The supremacy of the German bourgeoisie was precisely the reason why the clergy assumed the leading position in the Slovenian politics in Carinthia.¹²⁷ A Slovenian party, restored in 1890 and named Catholic Political and Economic Society for Slovenians in Carinthia,¹²⁸ was the only political factor which led and coordinated the Slovenian politics (especially for the elections) in the following years.¹²⁹ In such circumstances the population census in 1890 revealed that the number of inhabitants who used Slovenian as their language of communication had decreased. A new aggressive phase of German nationalism in Carinthia began in 1892, with the founding general meeting of a German national party.¹³⁰

In the Gorizia region, Slovenians welcomed Taaffe’s government, hoping for better times.¹³¹ However, the appointment of Sisinio de Pretis, who was favourably inclined towards the German liberals, to the position of the Trieste deputy, promptly caused dissatisfaction in the Slovenian ranks. Nevertheless, the

122 Janez Cvirn and Andrej Studen: Etnična (nacionalna) struktura mest na Spodnjem Štajerskem (1880–1910) [Ethnic (National) Structure in the Lower Styrian Cities (1880–1910)]. In: *Prvi i drugi međunarodni seminar Zajednice Nijemaca u Hrvatskoj*. Varaždin, Zagreb, 2002, p. 119.

123 Cf. Janez Cvirn: Josip Serbec, rodoljub z dežele [Josip Serbec, Patriot from the Country]. In: Janez Cvirn (ed.), *Josip Serbec: Spomini* [Josip Serbec: Memoirs]. Celje, 2003, pp. 135–136.

124 Cf. *Südsteirische Post*, 12 April 1893.

125 *Mir*, 25 January 1882.

126 Melik, *Volitve na Slovenskem 1861–1918*, pp. 92–93.

127 Melik, O razvoju slovenske nacionalnopolitične zavesti, pp. 213–214. Pleterski, *Narodna in politična zavest*, pp. 133–138. Cf. Josef Till: Kirche und Geistlichkeit als Faktoren der “Nationalisierung” der Kärntner Slowenen. In: Tina Bahovec (ed.), *Eliten und Nationwerdung/Elite in narodovanje*. Klagenfurt, 2003, pp. 143–218.

128 *Mir*, 10 March 1890.

129 *Mir*, 10 May 1892.

130 Cf. Pleterski, *Narodna in politična zavest*, pp. 211–213, 217–231. Andreas Moritsch: Nacionalne ideologije na Koroškem [National Ideologies in Carinthia]. In: *Koroški Slovenci 1900–2000* [Carinthian Slovenians 1900–2000]. Klagenfurt, Ljubljana, Vienna, 2000/2001, pp. 17–20.

131 Cf. *Soča*, 26 September 1879.

Slovenian political line in the Gorizia region was in the best position (apart from Carniola). The common unity in the Gorizia region started to crumble already with newspapers *Edinost* and *Soča*, as the former stood for “flexibility” in politics while the latter (under the leadership of Franc Podgornik) argued for more radical approaches. Podgornik’s successor, Anton Gregorčič, initially (politically) oscillated between Anton Mahnič’s zealotry in the middle of the 1880s (when he argued for the thesis that religion preceded nationality) and his own more liberal ideas, which he adopted towards the end of the decade under the influence of the dynamic Andrej Gabršček. Thus he “clashed” with Tonkli’s and Mahnič’s circle. In 1890 Gabršček replaced the conservative leader Tonkli as the president of the *Sloga* society and defeated him at the National Assembly elections in 1891. Nevertheless, unity was not yet threatened and the turmoil on the Slovenian side had ceased. Meanwhile a strenuous fight broke out with the liberal (irredentist) Gorizia Italians and their defence organisations. In the middle of the 1880s an economic boycott was still impossible due to the anti-Slovenian policy of the Gorizia Italians. However, in the beginning of the 1890s the Slovenian political line strengthened enough for the *Soča* newspaper to state that Slovenians were turning into “an important factor in our town”.¹³²

Furthermore, in Istria Taaffe’s conservative-Slavic State Assembly coalition promised more concrete developments. In 1883 the government recognised the equal status of Croatian, Slovenian and Italian languages in courts. Despite the weak Slovenian-Croatian representation, the Provincial Assembly of Istria was one of the main battlegrounds of the fight for the right to use Slovenian and Croatian languages in administration and judiciary. This struggle was initiated by Matko Laginja in 1883, when he was the first person to speak Croatian in the Provincial Assembly, provoking a sharp response from the Italian side.¹³³ The Slovenian-Croatian political line had to work under significantly worse conditions due to the fact that no provincial centre had been established in Istria (the Provincial Assembly moved various times) and Istria had only “come to life” as a united province under the Habsburg dynasty in the constitutional period. Cities were mostly Italian, while the Slovenian population was predominantly rural. Due to the strenuous activities of the Italian municipalities (and defence societies), it was difficult for Slovenian language to assert itself in public in Istria.¹³⁴ The Slovenian side was in minority in Trieste, but it fought the Italian liberals and was strongly connected with the *Edinost* political society (and its newspaper).¹³⁵

132 Cf. Marušič, *Pregled politične zgodovine Slovencev na Goriškem*, pp. 297–317.

133 Darko Darovec: *Kratka zgodovina Istre* [Short History of Istria]. Koper, 2009, p. 203.

134 Janez Kramar: *Marezige. Trdnjava slovenstva v Istri 1861–1930* [Marezige. Slovenian Stronghold in Istria 1861–1930]. Koper, 1992, pp. 112–113.

135 Vasilij Melik: *Tržaške opredelitve* [Trieste Positions]. In: Branko Marušič (ed.), *Zahodno sosedstvo. Slovenski zgodovinarji o slovensko-italijanskih razmerjih do konca prve svetovne vojne* [The Western

However, if the all-around Slovenian development in the Taaffe period progressed well in Carniola, Styria and Gorizia region (leading to the political pluralisation in Carniola), that can by no means be claimed of Istria and Carinthia.¹³⁶ Unlike the Cisleithanian Slovenians (except the Venetian “Slovenians”), who, during Taaffe’s government (and even before), established a certain degree of integrating national elements, the so called “Vends” from the Prekmurje region could not establish links with the people on the other side of the river Mura due to their political separation, and they also did not establish their own national allegiance. The idea, which the Slovenians on the right bank of Mura had already “adopted”, first reached the “Slovenian” priests in the Prekmurje region and only slowly asserted itself among the simple folk.¹³⁷

THE FINAL SCHISM BETWEEN THE NATIONS

After the establishment of Catholic political societies, in Carniola a widespread Catholic political organisation formed. It was renamed as the Catholic National Party before the elections for the Provincial Assembly of Carniola in 1895.¹³⁸ In 1894 the liberals founded the National Party.¹³⁹ Within the Catholic camp a young generation of Christian socialists was increasingly gaining influence.¹⁴⁰ After the first Slovenian Catholic rally, the Catholic camp intended to infuse the entire society with Catholic principles. Considering that the peasant population represented the majority of the Slovenian population, the expansion of voting rights set the foundation for the growing election triumphs of the Catholic camp. The Catholic camp also endeavoured to increase its influence among workers in the framework of political and educational societies because it was afraid of the potential spreading of the social democracy, which, in turn, was not able to achieve any important successes even after the establishment of the Yugoslav Social Democratic Party in 1896 due to its small electoral base (especially workers in industrial plants).¹⁴¹

Neighbourhood. Slovenian Historians on the Slovenian-Italian Relations until the End of World War I]. Ljubljana, 1996, pp. 183–188.

136 Cf. Melik, *Slovenska politika v Taaffejevi dobi*, pp. 521–530.

137 Cf. Metka Fujs: *Prekmurci v dvajsetem stoletju* [Prekmurje Slovenians in the 20th Century]. In: Janez Balažič and Metka Fujs (eds.), *Prekmurje na obrobju ali v stičišču evropskih komunikacij* [Prekmurje at the Edge or at the Juncture of European Communications]. Murska Sobota, 2001, pp. 66.

138 Cf. *Slovenec*, 26 November 1895.

139 Cf. *Slovenski narod*, 1 December 1894.

140 Cf. Vasilij Melik: *Pomen Kreka za slovensko zgodovino* [Krek’s Importance for the Slovenian History]. In: Melik, *Slovinci 1848–1918*, pp. 629–636.

141 Pančur, *Nastanek političnih strank*, pp. 32–36. Andrej Pančur: *Nacionalni spori* [National Disputes]. In: Fischer et al. (eds.), *Slovenska novejša zgodovina 1*, p. 37.

At that time the Lower Styrian (and Carinthian) Germans intensified their political endeavours. The establishment of the German-Slovenian parallels in Celje in 1895 resulted in extreme radicalisation of the German political line in Celje,¹⁴² while the activities of Germans in Maribor and Ptuj were more tactical. The Slovenian side in Carinthia experienced genuine political failure.¹⁴³ The share of Slovenian voters was also declining in the Velikovci constituency. German dominance was not just a consequence of the economic dependence of the Carinthian Slovenians, but also resulted from the fact that the Slovenian side in Carinthia was unprepared for the expansion of voting rights. In Istria the situation failed to improve due to the Italian pressure.¹⁴⁴ Nevertheless, the fight for the right to use both languages continued. National tensions culminated for the first time in 1894, when the Ministry of Justice issued an ordinance on setting up bilingual inscriptions in courts in linguistically mixed areas. The government's intention provided Slovenians and Croats in Istria with additional motivation, while the Italian side strongly criticised it. Openly supported by the Istrian municipalities, the Italian side achieved the withdrawal of the ordinance (the bilingual inscriptions remained only in Piran).¹⁴⁵ On account of the Edinost society, the Slovenian workers in Trieste were actively joining the Yugoslav Social Democratic Party since 1896 rather than the Italian workers' associations (its role enhanced further in 1905, when the National Worker's Organisation started to function under its auspices).¹⁴⁶ Three parties were active in Trieste since 1897 (the Italian liberal, Slovenian national and social democratic parties).¹⁴⁷ Despite the political dominance of the Italians, the Slovenian side kept asserting itself nationally (especially in the cultural field) in this city.¹⁴⁸ However, Italians entirely prevailed and increased their pressure in other towns of Slovenian Istria (Koper, Izola, Piran). According to the census of 1880 the Slovenian population was in the majority on the outskirts of Izola. However, already at the next census the scales tipped in favour of the Italian side.¹⁴⁹ Slovenians only regained the majority before World War I.¹⁵⁰

142 See Cvirn, *Trdnjovski trikotnik*, pp. 170–241.

143 Pleterski, *Narodna in politična zavest*, pp. 212–213.

144 Jože Pirjevec: Socialni in nacionalni problemi v Trstu 1860–1914 [Social and National Problems in Trieste 1860–1914]. In: Friš and Rozman (eds.), *Od Maribora do Trsta*, p. 22. Viktor Novak and Fran Zwitter (eds.): *Oko Trsta* [Around Trieste]. Belgrade, 1945, p. 277.

145 Cf. Meta Černigoj: Boj za dvojezične napise v Istri v letu 1894 [The Struggle for Bilingual Inscriptions in Istria in 1894]. *Zgodovina za vse*, 2007, No. 2, pp. 69–86.

146 Pirjevec, *Socialni in nacionalni problemi v Trstu*, p. 24.

147 Melik, O razvoju slovenske nacionalnopolitične zavesti, p. 218.

148 Cf. Boris M. Gombač: Trst in Slovenstvo [Trieste and Slovenianism]. In: Granda and Šatej (eds.), *Slovenija 1848–1998*, pp. 96–101.

149 Cf. *Edinost*, 4 October 1890.

150 Melik, O razvoju slovenske nacionalnopolitične zavesti, p. 219.

In Gorizia, the relations with the Italians reached at that time a critical point and transformed into actual national struggles. Already in March 1893 Vjekoslav Spinčić warned the National Assembly about the deliberate Italian actions, aimed at forming a protective Italian circle around the town by establishing Italian schools and nurseries through Lega Nazionale. The Italian pressure was felt especially at the National Assembly elections in 1897, when the “Slovenian colours” were represented only by Anton Gregorčič and Alfred Coronini in the Gorizia region.¹⁵¹ The Slovenian political side supported the unification orientation in these matters in the 1890s, but the political polarisation was nevertheless becoming increasingly evident. When Jakob Missia was appointed as the Archbishop of Gorizia in 1897, the pace of the developments hastened. With the “aim” of dividing the liberal camp, Missia succeeded to disintegrate the unity in Gorizia already in the middle of the following year, when two completely separate political camps were formed.¹⁵² On the other hand, political pluralisation was also encouraged by the Slovenian economic successes, which also caused the Germans (along with the Italians) in Gorizia to feel increasingly threatened.¹⁵³

At the turn of the century Carniola seemed to be virtually a Slovenian province (the percentage of Germans was in constant decline in Ljubljana, and the urban curia was under complete control of the Slovenian side).¹⁵⁴ The communication language issue in relation to the population censuses was less problematic here than in the linguistically mixed provinces.¹⁵⁵ The daily politics, however, was becoming increasingly marked by the relations and conflicts within the Slovenian side. At the Carniolan Provincial Assembly elections in 1895 the Catholic camp completely defeated the liberals, who only kept their terms of office in the cities.¹⁵⁶ Given that no Slovenian party had the majority and unity was no longer possible, the liberals allied with the German large estate owners (the German-liberal alliance continued until 1908).¹⁵⁷ After the forceful German reaction to Badeni's ordinances, the Slovenian political side simultaneously discovered that the times of finding allies among the German conservatives in the National Assembly were over.¹⁵⁸ Although both sides supported the demand for national autonomy and signed the agreement on unity in March 1898, it was promptly disregarded as

151 Cf. *Soča*, 5 March 1897. *Edinost*, 3 March 1897.

152 Cf. Henrik Tuma: *Iz mojega življenja* [From My Life]. Branko Marušič (ed.). Ljubljana, 1997, pp. 242–248.

153 Marušič, *Pregled politične zgodovine Slovencev na Goriškem*, pp. 317–335.

154 Pančur, *Nastanek političnih strank*, pp. 32–36. Pančur, *Nacionalni spori*, p. 37. Melik, *O razvoju slovenske nacionalnopolitične zavesti*, pp. 210–212.

155 Cf. Emil Brix: *Die Umgangssprachen in Altösterreich zwischen Agitation und Assimilation*. Vienna, Cologne, Graz, 1982, pp. 177–182. Melik, *O razvoju slovenske nacionalnopolitične zavesti*, pp. 208–209.

156 Cf. *Slovenski narod*, 9 December 1895.

157 Pančur, *Delovanje slovenskih strank*, p. 39.

158 Cf. *Slovenski narod*, 18 September 1897.

it compromised the alliance between the liberals and the German large estate owners. In such circumstances, the Catholic party supported the idea (originally stemming from the liberal camp) of establishing closer ties with Croats.¹⁵⁹ The liberals, alarmed by the loss of their leading position in establishing connections with Croatian parties, refused the Catholic action (in Trsat). Although the Catholic camp announced the “Christian alliance of Austrian nations” as its goal, after the Whitsun Programme (1899) it realised that the point of no return had been crossed. The Slovenian-Croatian mutuality and approximation became an everyday political routine. Nevertheless, after the Rijeka Resolution, adopted by almost all Croatian parties in October 1905, the Slovenian political line was left completely on its own.¹⁶⁰ Unlike the firm party unity of the Catholic National Party, the ranks of the liberals became increasingly fragmented.¹⁶¹ Considering that after 1906 the liberals opposed the electoral reform in favour of the lower social strata and paid attention especially to the national question without drafting any economic and social programmes, they actually surrendered the lower strata to the Catholic party, which managed to establish an effective political, economic, social and societal organisation through the dedicated activities of the clergy (and the Church).¹⁶²

After the introduction of universal suffrage in 1907, Slovenians obtained 24 seats in the National Assembly, which corresponded to the share of the Slovenian population in Austria. However, the seats were not evenly distributed among the provinces (with the exception of Carniola all other provinces were not proportionally represented).¹⁶³ The universal suffrage was not established at the provincial level, though. Instead, the general curia was introduced, although with delay (in 1902 in Carinthia, 1904 in Styria, 1907 in the Gorizia region and 1908 in Istria, Trieste and Carniola). Slovenians were not represented appropriately (except in Carniola). The electoral reforms did not manage to solve the national conflicts at the provincial level,¹⁶⁴ but they had a particular impact on the new division of political power (especially in Carniola). The Slovenian People’s Party¹⁶⁵

159 Cf. *Slovenski narod*, 7 April 1897.

160 Peter Vodopivec: Jugoslovanska ideja in jugoslovansko gibanje [Yugoslav Idea and Yugoslav Movement]. In: Fischer et al. (eds.), *Slovenska novejša zgodovina 1*, pp. 43–47. For more information see Bergant, *Kranjska med dvema Ivanoma*, pp. 211–247. Cf. *Slovenski narod*, 12 October; 2 December 1905.

161 Pančur, *Delovanje slovenskih strank*, p. 39.

162 Cf. eg. *Slovenski narod*, 12 November 1906.

163 Cf. Vasilij Melik: Demokratizacija volilnega sistema (1907) in njeni učinki [Democratisation of the Electoral System (1907) and Its Effects]. In: Melik, *Slovenci 1848–1918*, pp. 655–662.

164 Cf. Andrej Pančur: Politično življenje po volilnih reformah [Political Life After Electoral Reforms]. In: Fischer et al. (eds.), *Slovenska novejša zgodovina 1*, pp. 40–41. Cf. Bergant, *Kranjska med dvema Ivanoma*, pp. 287–393.

165 For more information about the SLS politics see Andrej Rahten: *Slovenska ljudska stranka v dunajskem parlamentu* [Slovenian People’s Party in the Vienna Parliament]. Celje, 2001.

gained the absolute majority after the Provincial Assembly by-elections in 1908. The Catholic camp also became increasingly dominant in other provinces. The power of all provincial Catholic parties was made obvious in 1909, when they formed the All-Slovenian People's Party. Due to the exceptional success at the National Assembly elections, the Slovenian Catholic camp was also increasingly active in the Vienna Parliament.¹⁶⁶

While the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in October 1908 proved to be exceptionally appreciated, the Slovenian Catholic side considered it mostly as the solution of the Yugoslav question in the "third independent state body". In January 1909 Ivan Šušteršič argued for the concept of broader trialism¹⁶⁷ in the Carniolan Provincial Assembly. This also became the official orientation of the Catholic party. The liberals continued to support the trialist ideas, while the social democrats stated in the Tivoli Resolution that the principle of national autonomy was the only alternative to dualism, and that the "Yugoslav nations" as "elements" should establish a unified nation. After the merger of the parties of law into a single party, the All-Slovenian People's Party allied with the Croatian Party of Law (because of the fear that Slovenians would be left out of the plans for the solution of the Yugoslav question). However, due to dissimilar interests the alliance could not actually become viable and the greatest achievement was the improved cooperation between deputies in the Croatian-Slovenian National Assembly club in Vienna. The trialist ideas and Yugoslav plans were overshadowed by the Balkan Wars¹⁶⁸ and, ultimately, World War I.

Meanwhile, the conflicts between the nations in Styria reached the boiling point.¹⁶⁹ The pressure of the German side kept increasing also with regard to the population census. Nevertheless, the strength of the Slovenian party in Celje caused many concerns to the Germans as the Slovenian "presence" became clearly evident at the National Assembly elections in 1901 (Ivan Dečko won 642 of 725 votes in the rural curia).¹⁷⁰ While in Celje the liberal "bourgeois" wing was gaining strength, in Maribor the younger generation of Catholic politicians, headed by Anton Korošec, kept asserting themselves under the influence of the political differentiation in Carniola and focused their activities on the rural

166 Pančur, Nacionalni spori, p. 37. Pančur, Politično življenje po volilnih reformah, pp. 42–43.

167 Cf. *Slovenec*, 21 January 1909.

168 Peter Vodopivec: Aneksija Bosne in Hercegovine leta 1908 in jugoslovanska misel pri Slovencih [Annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908 and the Yugoslav Idea with Slovenians]. In: Fischer et al. (eds.), *Slovenska novejša zgodovina 1*, pp. 48–54. Peter Vodopivec: Balkanske vojne in njihov vpliv na jugoslovansko gibanje [Balkan Wars and Their Influence on the Yugoslav Movement]. In: Fischer et al. (eds.), *Slovenska novejša zgodovina 1*, pp. 54–58.

169 Cf. StLA, Statthalt. Präs., 8-1113/1898; 5/Ver – 2292/1898, 2328/1898, 2228/1899; 26 – 1668/1898.

170 Janez Cvirn: Celje – izginjajoči nemški otok na Spodnjem Štajerskem [Celje – the Vanishing German Island in Lower Styria]. In: Friš and Rozman (eds.), *Od Maribora do Trsta*, pp. 61–62.

areas. Due to the strong German pressure both political orientations were still unified at this point. However, the subsequent German successes decisively contributed to the internal division. The final separation took place after the National Assembly by-elections of 1906, when the liberal Ivan Rebek and the Catholic candidate Anton Korošec¹⁷¹ opposed each other in the general curia with no regard to Juro Hrašovec's warnings about the joint unification policy. In January 1907 the parties of both blocs were formed. The Germans of Lower Styria were forced to fortify their ranks.¹⁷² The intensification of German politics reached its peak in September 1908 (the Slovenian demonstrations in Ljubljana were the most violent incident, followed by the action of the Slovenian side, which consisted of removing the German inscriptions from commercial, trade and other premises).¹⁷³ Meanwhile, the Slovenian press started paying more and more attention to the activities of the German side, leading an excellently organised "attack" against the language border.¹⁷⁴ The results of these activities were clearly visible in Šentilj, where, "according to the latest population census in 1900 /.../ 503 Slovenians and 201 Germans, which means already almost 30 %", supposedly lived. For a long time the German side had strived to absorb the villages between Maribor and Šentilj, creating some kind of a "German bridge" towards the largest Lower Styrian German "fortress".¹⁷⁵ Due to numerous machinations and irregularities, the Celje society Naprej carried out a "private" census in Celje already at the end of 1910 and established a different population structure than presented in the official statistics.¹⁷⁶ This was also confirmed in Šoštanj after the demise of Ivan Vošnjak's Slovenian leather factory (under Mayor Hans Woschnagg), when numerous commissioners counted as much as 70 % of Germans in the 1910 census (in contrast to the previous census, when 15 %

171 Cf. Branko Goropevšek: *Štajerski Slovenci, kaj hočemo!* [Styrian Slovenians, and What We Want!]. Celje, 2005, pp. 19–23. See also *Slovenski gospodar*, 10, 26, 31 May 1906.

172 Franc Rozman: *Politično življenje Nemcev v Mariboru* [Political Life of Germans in Maribor]. In: Friš and Rozman (eds.), *Od Maribora do Trsta*, p. 54.

173 See Goropevšek, *Štajerski Slovenci*, pp. 84–96. Cf. *Slovenski gospodar*, 24 September; 1 October 1908. Vasilij Melik: *Problemi slovenske družbe 1897–1914* [Problems of the Slovenian Society 1897–1914]. In: Melik, *Slovenci 1848–1918*, pp. 601–602.

174 Cf. *Slovenski gospodar*, 21 August 1908. For more information about this see Cvirn, *Trdnjavski trikotnik*, pp. 295–314.

175 Janez Cvirn: *Volilne mahinacije v nacionalnih bojih na Štajerskem* [Election Machinations During the National Struggle in Styria]. *Zgodovinski časopis*, 1989, No. 3, p. 413. Cf. Pieter M. Judson: *Guardians of the Nation. Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria*. Cambridge, 2005, pp. 108–110 (in this regard see Janez Cvirn: *Med nacionalizmom in nacionalno koeksistenco* [Between Nationalism and National Coexistence]. *Zgodovinski časopis*, 2009, No. 1–2, pp. 228–238). Cf. *Slovenski branik*, 1 April 1908.

176 Cvirn and Studen, *Etnična (nacionalna) struktura mest*, p. 121. Emil Brix: *Številčna navzočnost nemštva v južnoslovanskih kronovinah Cislitvanije med leti 1848 do 1918* [Number of Germans in the South Slavic Crown Lands of Cisleithania Between 1848 and 1918]. *Zgodovinski časopis*, 1987, No. 2, pp. 297–307. Cf. *Slovenski branik*, 1 November 1910. *Marburger Zeitung*, 15 and 18 March 1911.

of Germans had been counted).¹⁷⁷ Mutual provocation between the nations had thus become regular practice.¹⁷⁸

The German national movement in Carinthia had a less complicated task than in Styria. The German propaganda attracted the farm proprietors with liberal inclinations, who were rather numerous in Carinthia in comparison with the other Slovenian provinces.¹⁷⁹ The distribution of power did not change significantly even after the arrival of lawyer Janko Brejc to Carinthia.¹⁸⁰ The Carinthian Germans kept intensifying their calls for unity and more decisive defence against the “Slovenisation”¹⁸¹ of the province, which never took place in the first place. In 1909 they also established “the society of German state employees in Carinthia” in order to protect their interests “against the increasing imposition of the people of the other nationality”. In view of the increased German pressure, the population census in Carinthia in 1910 “revealed” that the number of people using Slovenian as their language of communication had significantly decreased in comparison with the census of 1880 (from almost 30 % to slightly more than 18 %),¹⁸² and Brejc’s essay entitled *Aus dem Wilajet Kärnten* was sharply criticised by the German national ideology.¹⁸³

At that time the politics in the Gorizia, Istria and Trieste regions was marked by friction between Slovenians and Italians. The Italian fear of being deprived of their estate situation was similar to the German concerns in Lower Styria. In this spirit they even changed the Municipality Act, thus the municipal elections were no longer carried out in Istria after 1908.¹⁸⁴ Nevertheless, the electoral reforms created (at least partially) nationally homogenous electoral districts.¹⁸⁵ In 1907 the Catholic camp in the Gorizia region also established the Slovenian People’s Party,

177 Cvirn and Studen, *Etnična (nacionalna) struktura mest*, p. 116.

178 Cf. eg. StLA, collection *Statthalt. Präs.*, E91 – 1691/1911; E91 – 1828/1913; E91 – 1341/1914.

179 Melik, *Volitve na Slovenskem*, pp. 246–248.

180 Cf. Andrej Rahten: *Pomen Janka Brejca in drugih pravnikov za koroške Slovence* [The Importance of Janko Brejc and Other Lawyers for Carinthian Slovenians]. In: *Eliten und Nationwerdung*, pp. 9–26.

181 *Mir*, 11 April 1908.

182 Bogo Grafenauer: *Narodnostni razvoj na Koroškem od srede 19. stoletja do danes* [National Development in Carinthia Since the Middle of the 19th Century Until Today]. *Koroški zbornik*, 1946, pp. 165–196. Janko Pleterski refers to a 1910 census, indicating that 21 % of the population spoke Slovenian. – Janko Pleterski: *Pomen koroške preteklosti od srednjega veka do prve svetovne vojne* [The Significance of Carinthian Past from the Middle Ages to the First World War]. In: Franček Brglez et al. (eds.), *Koroški Slovenci v Avstriji včeraj in danes* [Carinthian Slovenians in Austria Yesterday and Today]. Ljubljana, Klagenfurt, 1984, p. 30.

183 Janko Brejc (ed.): *Aus dem Wilajet Kärnten*. Klagenfurt, 1913. The publication presented the catastrophic linguistic situation in Carinthia, while at the same time arguing for equal rights in Austria and rejecting the supposed Pan Slavist Aspirations of Carinthian Slovenians. – Andrej Rahten: *Pozabljeni slovenski premier. Politična biografija dr. Janka Brejca (1869–1934)* [A Forgotten Slovenian Prime Minister. A Political Biography of Dr Janko Brejc (1869–1934)]. Klagenfurt, Ljubljana, Vienna, 2002, pp. 145–155, 161–171.

184 Novak and Zwitter (eds.), *Oko Trsta*, p. 278.

185 Melik, *O razvoju slovenske nacionalnopolitične zavesti*, p. 220.

which cooperated with the Italian liberals for a while.¹⁸⁶ In Trieste, the Slovenian political line faced the enhanced national attitude of the Italian liberal majority. Despite the Italian pressure, the Christian-social part of the Catholic camp pulled away from the unification political line (gathered around the Edinost society). Due to the Italian pressure, the liberals and clericalists united their efforts at the Trieste municipal elections in 1909 and the National Assembly elections in 1911, although the establishment of the Slovenian People's Party for Trieste and Istria in 1909 and the establishment of the Catholic political society for Croats in 1911 clearly announced the gradual decline of the unification tradition.¹⁸⁷ Nevertheless, the Gorizia and Trieste Slovenians unanimously demanded a revision of the census count in 1910 due to the unlawful conduct of the municipal authorities. After the "reanalysis" of the census forms they managed to increase the number of Slovenians by more than 20,000 in Trieste and by almost 5,000 people in Gorizia.¹⁸⁸

Development in the Hungarian counties (and in Venetian Slovenia) was completely different from the "Slovenian" provinces. Venetian "Slovenians" lived in a different state framework and were thus in a difficult position to "establish" connections with Slovenians in Austria due to the political separation.¹⁸⁹ The (peasant) population of the Prekmurje region also failed to develop the feeling of national affiliation with Slovenians on the other side of the river Mura, since it was not yet aware of this concept. In 1897 the Hungarian educational society for Prekmurje was established in Sóbota, clearly indicating the intensified pressure of the authorities.¹⁹⁰ While "Slovenians" were still taken into account and entered under a separate heading in the population census in 1890, they were considered merely as the "others" (an ethnic group with another language)¹⁹¹ in the census of 1910, although the census in Hungary also included mother tongue, unlike the census in Cisleithania. The democratisation of the society and state – a pressing issue in Hungary since the beginning of the 20th century – only existed on the declarative level, as the Court politics proved to be extremely pragmatic regarding the solidarity between the dynasty and the Hungarian ruling circles on one hand and the voting rights on the other.

186 Cf. *Soča*, 14 December 1907 and 15 October 1908.

187 Erjavec, *Zgodovina katoliškega gibanja*, pp. 286–303.

188 Cf. *Soča*, 25 July 1912. Brix, *Die Umgangssprachen in Altösterreich*, pp. 166–177, 183–209.

189 Cf. Marušič, *Beneški Slovenci*, pp. 108–109.

190 Cf. Ivan Jerič: *Zgodovina madžarizacije v Prekmurju* [The History of Hungarianisation in Prekmurje].

Murska Sobota, 2001, pp. 6–8. Darja Keréc: Sóbota na prelomu 19. in 20. stoletja [Sóbota at the Turn of the 19th Century]. *Borec*, 2004, No. 617–620, p. 80.

191 Fran Zwitter: *Nacionalni problemi v habsburški monarhiji* [National Problems in the Habsburg Monarchy]. Ljubljana, 1965, pp. 177–178.