

ANTUN STARČEVIĆ AND THE CROATIAN “SCHOOL” OF RACISM. ON THE PERCEPTION OF SERBS, SLAVS AND JEWS IN THE WORKS OF CROATIAN INTELLECTUALS – FOLLOWERS OF THE PARTY-OF-RIGHTS IDEOLOGY

Abstract: *This paper is dedicated to the study of racist ideology that was developed in Croatia during the 19th and 20th centuries. Racist views were first formulated by the founders of the Party of Rights, Antun Starčević and Eugen Kvaternik, and a number of Croatian intellectuals followed them. This is how a kind of “school” was created, under the influence of which Croatian nationalism also took on racist characteristics. Ante Pavelić and the Ustasas transposed the ideology of Croatian racist nationalism into a political program, which they managed to achieve to some extent, including the genocide of Serbs, Jews and Roma.*

Keywords: Ante Starčević, Ante Pavelić, Party of Rights, racism, Croatian nationalism, Ustasha, genocide, Croats, Serbs, Jews

The Enlightenment era, in addition to some blessings, also brought modern ideologies to humanity, including – racism. That is why the ideology of “scientific racism”¹ is sometimes said to be “the dark side of the Enlightenment.”² It is believed that there are three basic types of racism: 1) aristocratic racism; 2) antinegroism; 3) anti-Semitism.³ Aristocratic racism includes cultural and religious differences between the elite and the broad strata of the people, on the basis of which social, political and economic hierarchies are created and aristocratic privileges legitimized.

¹ John Gray, *Black mass. Apocalyptic Religion and the Death of Utopia* (London: Penguin books, 2007), 37–38.

² George L. Mosse, *Toward the Final Solution. A History of European Racism* (Madison / London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2020), xiii.

³ Aleksandar Molnar, *Narod, nacija, rasa. Istorijska izvorišta nacionalizma u Evropi* (Beograd: Beogradski krug / Akapit, 1997), 161–191.

Political science research has led to the conclusion that “[a] form of implicit racism is associated with conservative nationalism. It is based on the belief that stable and successful societies must be connected by a common culture and common values.”⁴ What originated as aristocratic racism is in scientific literature sometimes called social racism, and can be combined with religious intolerance, nationalism and cultural differences. Thus, various variations of conservative ideology can be obtained, which are not necessarily less violent than explicit racism.

Particular attention should be paid to one form of racism. Namely, “the concept of race is based on biological differences between people, but these differences do not always have to be visible. It was precisely in Europe from the 18th century onwards that the concept of race would take shape, which would be increasingly linked to an invisible biological difference (which may or may not have visible manifestations), and that is blood. [...] The emancipation of blood as a transmitter of racial characteristics results in an empty creation, which tends to be filled with numerous explosive contents – among which there can also be national, emotional, no less than cultural ones. It is [...] the place where the development of nationalism and racism intersect, creating a hybrid that will surpass in its destructiveness anything seen before.”⁵ In this type of ideology, “[...] racism can take on identical features as nationalism [...]”, as a result of which it “[...] acquires the most irrational forms and unites the worst sides of both racism and nationalism, creating a special form of racist nationalism [...]”⁶ This type of racism, which developed during the second half of the 20th century, was given special attention in this research, although its other forms were not neglected either.

Thousands of books have been written to date on the topic of racism and its consequences, but few of them deal with racism in the countries of the South Slavs. In this sense, the variegated space of the Habsburg Monarchy, which experienced numerous political and ideological experiments, is particularly interesting. In historiography, there has long been a controversy about the character of the ideology of the Party of Rights. Some of the key questions are: Is racism an integral part of that ideology? Who were the supporters of racial theories in Croatia in the 19th and 20th centuries and what was their attitude towards the Party-of-Rights ideology? What kind of attitude did the Ustashas have towards the ideology of Ante Starčević? Can we talk about the Croatian “school” of racism?

⁴ Andrew Heywood, *Political ideologies: An introduction* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 221.

⁵ A. Molnar, *Narod, nacija, rasa*, 162–163. Italics by Molnar.

⁶ *Ibid*, 164.

This research starts from the hypothesis that the Ustasha ideology and practice are not anomalies in the history of Croatian nationalism, created under specific circumstances and under the influence of Fascism and Nazism, ut are the result of the development of the ideas of Antun Starčević and his followers. A lot of brutality and bizarreness was expressed in the texts of Party-of-Rights ideologues, but until the end of the 19th century there was no opportunity to actually apply any of it. There is ample evidence that the Ustasha regime developed and consistently implemented Party-of-Rights ideas to the extreme, which include racist dehumanization and chauvinistic denigration of entire peoples and which had the potential to lead to genocide. That is why it is more appropriate to use the term "Croatian 'school' of racism", which includes the phenomenon of *racist nationalism* developed in Croatia during the 19th and 20th centuries, than, for example, the term "Ustasha racial theory,"⁷ which links this phenomenon to the Ustasha movement, which was founded in 1930 and destroyed under that name in 1945.

Antun Starčević's racism – for and against

The author who was the first, back in 1911, to mention the racial element in the ideology of Ante Starčević, was his ardent follower, the writer A. G. Matoš: "Racial, tribal and political, state-legal moments are not rarely amalgamated in that nationalist thought. In this matter, he speaks now like Gobineau and Gumplowicz, later like Renan, then the identifiers of state and national thought."⁸ Publicist Mato Hanžeković wrote in 1938 that Starčević "[...] raised several generations in complete racial hatred of everything Serbian,"⁹ Philosopher and Ustasha Julije Makanec believed that, „[...] although Starčević was a devotee of the ideas of the French Revolution, he did not accept the idea of human equality, but moved along paths that brought the concept of people into direct connection with the concept of race and blood.”¹⁰ Branko Petranović stated: "Starčević ideology

⁷ Срђа Трифковић, *Усташе. Балканско срце таме* (Београд: Catena Mundi, 2016), 69–81.

⁸ Antun Gustav Matoš, „Dr. Ante Starčević“, in: *O hrvatskoj književnosti II*, (Zagreb: JAZU / SN Liber, 1976), 125. First time published in the Party-of-Rights newspaper *Hrvatska sloboda*, y. IV, no. 42, 1–2; no. 43, 1, 20. and 21. II 1911.

⁹ M. Gabrijel [Mate Hanžeković], *Otac domovine Dr. Ante Starčević* (Zagreb: Tiskara Danica, [1938]), 196.

¹⁰ Julije Makanec, „Ante Starčević“, *Hrvatski vidici. Nacionalno-politički eseji* (Zagreb: Društvo hrvatskih srednjoškolskih profesora 1944), 43. First published in: *Veliko razkršće* (Zagreb: Promičba Ustaške mladeži, 1943), 18–27.

contributed to the development of Croatian national self-awareness, but on the other hand it permanently burdened it with nationalist-racist radicalism.”¹¹ Aleksa Đilas noted that along with Starčević “[...] the idea permanently entered Croatian politics that those who have a different national consciousness or their political ideas are an obstacle to the realization of full Croatian sovereignty, expansion and homogeneity, are racially inferior and, basically, evil beings.”¹² According to Srđa Trifković, “[...] on the basis of Croatian state law, a nationalist and racist ideology emerged that was articulated in the 1860s by a publicist and political activist Ante Starčević [...]”¹³ Historian Jonathan Gumz has no dilemma either: “Ustas has adopted the racist ideology of the Croatian nationalist Ante Starčević [...]”¹⁴ Researching the emergence of racial anthropology in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, historian Rory Yeomans noted that “the father of Croatian nationalism”, Ante Starčević, “proved that Serbs belonged to a degenerate and inferior race” and that they should be “exterminated from the nation.”¹⁵ Historian Irina Ognjanova (Ljubomirova) agreed that with Ante Starčević “[...] the idea that all those who had a different national consciousness (mainly Serbs) were racially inferior and fundamentally evil beings entered Croatian politics permanently.”¹⁶

Mirjana Gross offered an interesting interpretation of Starčević’s attitude towards racism. In 1973, she noticed that Starčević often used the terms “breed” and “impure blood”, which is why some “consider him a racist.”¹⁷ To explain this, Gross wrote that Starčević “[...] used the term ‘breed’ in the sense that the term race has in the French language. That term means the sum of ancestors and descendants of a family or people.”¹⁸ With that, in a roundabout way, she has con-

¹¹ Branko Petranović, *Srbija u Drugom svetskom ratu 1939–1945* (Beograd: Vojnoizdavački i novinski centar, 1992), 122.

¹² Aleksa Đilas, *The Contested Country: Yugoslav Unity and Communist Revolution 1919–1953* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 107.

¹³ С. Трифковић, *Усташе*, 26.

¹⁴ Jonathan Gumz, “Wehrmacht Perceptions of Mass Violence in Croatia, 1941–1942”, *The Historical Journal*, 44, 4, (2001), 1025.

¹⁵ Rory Yeomans, “Of ‘Yugoslav barbarians’ and Croatian Gentlemen Scholars: National Ideology and Racial Anthropology in Interwar Yugoslavia”, in: *Blood and Homeland. Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe 1900–1940*, edited by: Marius Turda & Paul J. Weindling, (Budapest / New York: CEU Press, 2007), 102–103.

¹⁶ Irina Ognjanova, “Nationalism and National Policy in Independent State of Croatia (1941–1945)”, u: *Topics in Feminism, History and Philosophy*, vol. 6, edited by: Dorothy Rogers, Joshua Wheeler, Marina Zavacká & Shawna Casebier, (Vienna: IWM, 2000), 12. She obviously read *Contested Country* by Aleksa Đilas.

¹⁷ Mirjana Gross, *Povijest pravaške ideologije* (Zagreb: Institut za hrvatsku povijest, 1973), 204.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

firmed that "breed" means ethnos and race. Then, after more than a page of presenting evidence, she concluded: "But it is certain that the basis of Starčević's ideology did not allow for biological racism. Starting from the axiom that the population of the Slavic south (excluding the Bulgarians) [...] is still Croatian, Starčević had to create a construction that declared Croats a spiritual category and not a consequence of origin."¹⁹ However, apart from the fact that there are other forms of racism besides the biological one, Gross already knew then that Ante Starčević had reduced his political opponent to a "subhuman."²⁰ Thirty years later, Gross noted Starčević's "assertions about the inequality of people",²¹ reiterated that he had found "subhumans",²² that Kvaternik had also written about "people with a sick subhuman nature"²³ and that Starčević "[...] imagines the homogenization of Croatian society by cleansing individual social strata of 'impure blood'".²⁴ Despite these observations, Gross concluded: "The frequent use of the term 'breed' and 'impure blood', which he also finds in other nations, is not a biological term for Starčević, i.e. it does not denote an 'inferior' race with traits that are given through inheritance and cannot be changed."²⁵ And she claimed all this, despite the fact that Ante Starčević had mentioned "blood" many times, which means biological inheritance. He himself disputed her conclusion when he openly stated that "Slavoserbs" "cannot be better or worse than they are,"²⁶ and that "no knowledge can change a Slav [...] he always remains the same."²⁷ It can be seen who he was referring to from Jaroslav Šidak's conclusion that he identified the "Slavoserbian bred" not only with his political opponents, but also "[...] with the Serbian people in the Croatian regions in general."²⁸

In order to somehow mitigate the degree of dehumanization to which Starčević exposed the hated "breed", Gross presented his concepts as economic

¹⁹ *Ibid*, 206. She missed the fact that Starčević sometimes, although rarely, also "Croatized" Bulgarians. See: Starčević, A[n]te, *Na čemu smo?* (Zagreb: Dionička tiskara, 1878), 4.

²⁰ He writes about this in: M. Gross, *Povijest pravaške ideologije*, 143.

²¹ Mirjana Gross, *Izorno pravaštvo. Ideologija, agitacija, pokret* (Zagreb: Golden marketing, 2000), 22.

²² *Ibid*, 18.

²³ *Ibid*, 297.

²⁴ M. Gross, *Povijest pravaške ideologije*, 176; Idem, *Izorno pravaštvo*, 293. Similarly on p. 349.

²⁵ M. Gross, *Izorno pravaštvo*, 348.

²⁶ Ante Starčević, „Na štioća.“, in: *Pisma Magjarolacah I*, (Sušak: Primorska tiskara, 1879), IX.

²⁷ Idem, *Pisma Magjarolacah II*, (Sušak: Primorska tiskara, 1879), 2.

²⁸ Jaroslav Šidak, „Starčević, Ante“, u: *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, 8, Srbija-Ž, (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod, 1971), 129. What exactly are "Croatian regions" Šidak did not say, and it would be interesting to know.

and social, i.e. as an inclination toward a nomadic way of life. Immediately afterwards, she disputed that too, writing that Starčević “only once, in ‘The Eastern Question’, mentions the alleged differences in the shape of the head between Serbs and Croats.”²⁹ Despite this, in the very next paragraph she again asserted that Starčević’s Croatianness had nothing to do with origin. Racism, social or biological, is one of the elements that connect Party-of-Rights doctrine with Ustasha ideology, but Gross explicitly rejected it during the polemic with Ekmečić in the early 1970s. However, she never offered a definitive and unequivocal answer to the question about the racist component in Ante Starčević’s ideology. The reason why she addressed that topic in such a complicated and contradictory way should be found in the social and political circumstances in which she wrote. She seemed to have understood much more than she was willing to let on.

Trying to present the use of the words “racism” and “genocide” as unfounded in relation to Ante Starčević’s ideology, Mario Jareb recommended Srđa Trifković, who had written that the Ustasha ideology stemmed from Starčević’s, to take in his hands “[...] some of numerous works of Mirjana Gross. As a Croatian historian of Jewish origin, she is certainly the last person who would want to justify any kind of racism or genocide.”³⁰ However, it would make more sense to comb through Starčević’s texts again and check if there is any hierarchization of peoples and dehumanization of people in them. If there is, it does not matter whether he used the word “race” or some synonym for it, or how Gross interpreted it. Hierarchizing peoples, and especially comparing them to animals, unequivocally proves racism, and racism is connected with Ustasha ideology.

After Mirjana Gross, Fikreta Jelić-Butić also claimed: “The effort to use Starčević’s ideas to support theses about the non-Slavic origin of Croats, and to even make Starčević a forerunner of fascism and racism, represented obvious falsifications.”³¹ It is interesting that Irina Ljubomirova (Ognjanova) finds that the Ustasha took over from the nineteenth-century Party-of-Rights doctrine, among other things, anti-Semitism and the understanding of the “racial affiliation” of the peoples.³² In this, she refers exactly to the place in the Jelić-Butić’s book where such interpretations were

²⁹ M. Gross, *Izvorno pravaštvo*, 348.

³⁰ Mario Jareb, *Ustaško-domobranski pokret od nastanka do travnja 1941. godine* (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2006), 155. Although ethnic origin cannot be a guarantee of someone’s scientific reliability, Jareb nevertheless obscured Starčević’s racist nationalism with the “Jewish origin” of Mirjana Gross.

³¹ Fikreta Jelić-Butić, *Ustaše i Nezavisna Država Hrvatska 1941–1945* (Zagreb: SN Liber, 1978), 45.

³² Ирина Любомирова, *Национализъм и национална политика в Независимата хърватска държава 1941–1945* (София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2001), 58.

called “the grossest falsifications.”³³ The Bulgarian historian obviously did not understand literally what she had read, but in sense contrary to what was written. She favored facts over interpretation. Fikreta Jelić-Butić, of course, wrote in the same social and political environment as Mirjana Gross.³⁴

In recent times, Tomislav Jonjić also rejects racism as an element of Starčević’s ideology, claiming that his frequently used expression “breed” does not mean only “race”, but also “strain, species”, and that it should not be considered that it was used in a racist sense.³⁵ Jonjić is a supporter of the interpretation according to which Starčević had used the coined term “Slavoserbs” to denote people of a certain character and certain political positions, and not “racial” characteristics of the people, and as evidence he states that he also used the term for some Croats (Jelačić, Mažuranić, Rački, Strossmayer).³⁶ However, Starčević himself discovered how things really were with terminology, by approving that the word “breed” in one of his texts be translated into German as “die Rasse.”³⁷ Finally, Starčević subjected *only some* Croats – his political opponents – to racist degradation, while he no longer treated Serbs, who would agree to be “political Croats”, as racially inferior. This shows that his racism was also manipulative – he used it as a tool of political pressure. However, this fact does not affect the evaluation of the character of Party-of-Rights doctrine – every ideology has a manipulative side.

Australian historian Nevenko Bartulin tried to explain Ante Starčević’s attitude towards racism in his book *Honorable Aryans*, but he ran into a contradiction. First, he wrote that “Starčević was a strong supporter of civic nationalism and was usually opposed to the ethnic and racial understanding of Croatian nationality.”³⁸ Then he stated that Starčević “occasionally used racial arguments”, but immediately noted that his “[...] racial ideas were somewhat confused and contradictory, because they stood in theoretical opposition to his ide-

³³ F. Jelić-Butić, *Ustaše i NDH*, 143.

³⁴ Fikreta Jelić-Butić and her husband Ivan Jelić, (who, among other things, was involved in determining the number of victims of the Jasenovac concentration camp), died in April 1992 from the consequences of a fire in their apartment.

³⁵ Tomislav Jonjić, „Rasno učenje i eugenika u hrvatskim zemljama do sredine 1930-ih godina“, *Pilar – Časopis za društvene i humanističke studije*, y. X, no. 19(1)–20(2), (2015), 81–90.

³⁶ *Ibid*, 83–84.

³⁷ Compare: A. Starčević, *Na čemu smo?*, 8–9; *Ibid*, *Woran Wir sind* (Agram: Actien-Buchdruckerei, 1878), 10; Милорад Екмечић, *Стварање Југославије 1790–1918*, 2 (Нови Сад: Православна реч / Архив Војводине, 2021), 194. At the beginning of the German edition it is written: “Autorisierte uebersetzung aus dem kroatischen” = “Authorized translation from Croatian”.

³⁸ Nevenko Bartulin, *Honorary Aryans. National-Racial Identity and Protected Jews in the Independent State of Croatia* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 9.

ology of Croatian civic nationalism.”³⁹ Although it seems contradictory, the above is not difficult to explain. Ideology does not have to be logically coherent or consistent: it is either believed or not. Its creator is not verified by followers, but adored. Starčević took from various theories what suited him at a certain moment; in other circumstances, he could claim something completely opposite. His views evolved over time towards more and more radical racism, but at the same time he also referred to civic nationalism. The incoherence of the ideology did not bother him, as it did other ideologues of racist nationalism, which includes elements of anti-Semitism and aristocratic racism.

Another great admirer of Antun Starčević’s personality and work was Franjo Tuđman, who “[...] studied his speeches and writings, relied on his historical insights and state-building postulates.”⁴⁰ As the first president of the Republic of Croatia, Tuđman proposed that Starčević’s character be on the largest Croatian 1.000 kuna banknote and that his bust adorned the presidential palace, and he also wrote the foreword for the new edition of Starčević’s *Speeches*.⁴¹ Franjo Tuđman and other leaders of the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) – Vladimir Šeks and Šime Đodan – repeatedly expressed anti-Semitism.⁴²

Racism of the Party of Rights: forms of manifestation

The basic characteristic of racism is that it divides people into more or less worthy or worthless, and determines their rights based on that; among other things, the right to life. For the content of a text to be racist, the word “race” does not have to be mentioned in it. Hierarchizing people based on their culture, mentality, morals, origin (“blood”), skin color or head shape reveals the author of such writing as a racist. The division of people in such a way is based on the racial theories of the 18th century, whose authors believed that there was a *scala naturae* – a continuous hierarchical series that connects all living beings, including humans and animals. The mentioned scale determines the position of certain nations in relation to other nations and human beings in relation to animals.⁴³ That ladder is a fundamental

³⁹ *Ibid*, 24.

⁴⁰ Pavo Barišić, *Ante Starčević. Ideali slobode i prava* (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2022), 7.

⁴¹ *Ibid*, 7–8.

⁴² Ласло Секељ, „Антисемитизам у Југославији након 1945“, *Нова српска политичка мисао*, vol. VII, no. 1–2, (2000), 78.

⁴³ G. Mosse, *Toward the Final Solution*, 5–16; Džordž Mos, *Istorija rasizma u Evropi* (Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2003), 27–39. Instead of Mosse’s expression “great chain of being”, the Serbian translation reads “scala naturae”.

means of separating humans from “subhumans,” even if it was only implied. The fact that someone compares or identifies people with animals reveals that he believes in the scale and uses it as an argument. But regardless of whether the “arguments” used are historical, cultural, psychological, or biological – hierarchizing people indicates racism.

The fact that, in some cases, the creators of racial theories and those to whom these theories refer are of the same skin color – does not mean anything. In ideological systems, facts do not have the same purpose and meaning as in science. Authors of ideological texts sift through certain data in order to support the accuracy of their thesis and the correctness of the policy based on it. In the hands of race theorists, who are often intelligent and educated people, the facts can be twisted as they see fit. European people can become African, if someone needs it. If there is a political need, the same cultural basis can be interpreted in a completely opposite way. The same fact can be denied or emphasized, depending on the needs of current politics. It is difficult to say where the line that separates manipulation from prejudices and misconceptions lies in the mind of ideologists. Even the advocates of such ideas are often unaware of it. If a transgression is committed in relation to facts, method and morals, then there are only two ways: either to stop immediately and repent, or to continue toward new, even greater transgressions, in order to cover up or justify the previous ones.

Hierarchizing the people

The idea of a hierarchy of peoples was transferred from the West to the relationships among the South Slavs. The western society closest to the Balkans is Italy, so the connections with it and the influences therefrom were the strongest. There is a long history of looting and colonial conquests of the Venetian Republic on the eastern coast of the Adriatic. In the Middle Ages, the Venetians traded in slaves in a grand style, and they acquired a number of slaves in the Balkans as well. It is believed that this is how the synonymy of slaves and Slavs arose.⁴⁴ For other Balkan Slavs, this fact was not an obstacle to serve as soldiers and officers in the Venetian and other Western armies, until today.

A Franciscan from Vrlika and a military priest in Venice, Filip Grabovac (1697–1749), made interesting observations on the subject in 1747 in the book *Cvit razgovora naroda i jezika iliričkog aliti rvackoga! The Flower of the Conversation of*

⁴⁴ Kerubin Šegvić, *Toma Splićanin. Državnik i pisac 1200.–1268. Njegov život i njegovo djelo* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1927), 26.

*the Illyrian or Croatian People and language.*⁴⁵ He noticed that a divided and unaware people serves a foreigner, who calls them brothers while he needs them, and then: “He does not caress, but punishes, / roasts the living, rips the dead.”⁴⁶ Grabovac criticized his compatriots who, serving in the Venetian army, quickly and easily rejected their language, folk customs and costumes.⁴⁷ Caught in the scissors of privileges and punishments, they strove to identify themselves with the representatives of the power that had conquered and exploited the people from which they came: “As each of them arrives in Italy / they pretend to be Italians / and say: We are not ‘us’ anymore.”⁴⁸ Such people no longer “Know their parent / or have a friend.”⁴⁹ Grabovac was disturbed by this attitude of his compatriots, so he harshly criticized them in his book, which was confiscated because of it, and he ended up in a Venetian prison and died soon after his release.⁵⁰

Serbian poet and philologist Pavle Solarić “[...]” stayed in Venice for a long time and every day had the opportunity to hear how the Slavs were called ‘slaves’ or ‘servants’ and thus were labeled as peoples of a lower race [...].⁵¹ Solarić left a poetic testimony that arrogance and contempt for their own people were also nurtured by certain Serbs from the upper class. In his poem *Huda Serbkinja / Evil Serbian Girl* he described one of his female compatriots, who “Hates Serbs and whatever is famous for that name, / Turns her heart away from us and slanders us publicly.” [...] Ashamed of her own, she loves foreigners / And if she could, she would undress, showing her aching skin. [...] She looks for the ugliest side in everything, / If it were as pure as the sun, she would find a flaw in it.”⁵² Adopting Western culture, some Slavs have also adopted their prejudices, trying to exempt themselves from the humiliation and degradation they had been subjected to for centuries. Kerubin Šegvić noticed that Thomas the Archdeacon, when he wrote contemptuously about the Croats in the 13th century, referred to them “[...]” as the ‘Sklavi’ for them. That is how people from

⁴⁵ Filip Grabovac, *Cvit razgovora naroda i jezika iliričkog aliti rvackoga*. Priredio Tomo Matic (Zagreb: JAZU, 1951). As can be seen, Grabovac equated Illyrians with Croats.

⁴⁶ F. Grabovac, „O naravi i ćudi rvacke“, *Cvit razgovora*, 206.

⁴⁷ More about this: Lovorka Ćoralić, „‘Knjige opasnih namjera’ dalmatinskog pisca fra Filipa Grabovca (1697.–1749)“, *Acta Histriae*, 12, (2004), 1, 254.

⁴⁸ F. Grabovac, „Esortazione amorosa [Опомена из љубави]“, *Cvit razgovora*, 212.

⁴⁹ Ibid, „O naravi i ćudi rvacke“, 206.

⁵⁰ Tomo Matic, „Život i rad Filipa Grabovca“, in: F. Grabovac, *Cvit razgovora*, 7.

⁵¹ Persida Lazarević Di Giacomo, „Per Inductionem et Deductionem: Etymologia Proxima et Remota Solarićevog istraživanja porekla Slovena (sa appendixom o Iliriji)“, *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina*, X/I, (2014), 131–132.

⁵² Павле Соларић, *Гозба. Сабране пјесме* (Београд: СКД „Зора“, 1999), 75–76.

Split use the word 'Vlaj' today."⁵³ Grabovac's Dalmatian officers did the same in the 18th century and Solarić's young Serbian woman in the 19th century. Ante Starčević did not invent anything new – with the coin word "Slavoserbs", which he often used, he repeated the Italian terms *schiavo* (slave) and *servo* (servant), trying to connect them to the Serbs and to his political opponents among the Croats.⁵⁴ His denial that the Croats were a Slavic people originates from there.

However, it is not easy to escape racist prejudices. Expressions of Italian origin "Slabs" and "Slovacco" crossed the ocean and awaited the Slavic immigrants to America. Italian immigrants who had previously arrived and had run restaurants in California, used such expressions to discriminate against competition from the Balkans, especially Croats from Dalmatia. Other derisive terms, which referred to physical appearance or clothing, were used to refer to Serbs, Croats and other Slavs in other American cities.⁵⁵ Historian and journalist Lothrop Stoddard openly claimed: "The 'Slavic' peoples who occupied most of Eastern Europe have Asian Mongolian and Turkish blood. 'Scratch a Russian and you will find a Tatar' does not only refer to Russians, but also, to varying degrees, to other Slavs from Eastern Poland to the Balkans. [...] Eastern Europe, therefore, represents a bewildering complexity of races, religions and cultures, which finds its peak in the Balkans, that unfortunate home of irritating and even semi-barbaric peoples [...]."⁵⁶

Ante Starčević also had his own hierarchy of peoples, on the basis of which he claimed: "I consider the French and the English to be the most enlightened peoples."⁵⁷ In contrast to them, he considered the Germans "among the most insignificant peoples."⁵⁸ When it came to the Croats, he divided them into his supporters and opponents: "Slavoserbs, unable to get out of their own worthlessness, and become equal with humans, tried to attract others to them [...]", so "[...] by their actions they excluded themselves from the Croats, excluded themselves from humans."⁵⁹ With this, he unequivocally placed the Croats among the

⁵³ K. Šegvić, *Toma Splitsanin*, 159.

⁵⁴ See: Ante Starčević, *Ime Serb* (Zagreb: Slovi Karla Albrechta, 1868); Ibid, *Bi-li k Slavstvu ili ka Hrvatstvu? Dva razgovora (Iz Zvekanu.)* (Zagreb: Tisak Dragutina Bokana, 1876).

⁵⁵ Dinko Tomašić, *Politički razvitak Hrvata* (Zagreb: HKN Neovisnih književnika, 1938), 202–203.

⁵⁶ Lothrop Stoddard, "The permanent menace from Europe", in: *The Alien in our Midst*. Edited by: Madison Grant & C.S. Davison (New York: The Galton Publishing, 1930), 227, 228. See also: D. Tomašić, *Politički razvitak Hrvata*, 194. Stoddard was a member of the Ku Klux Klan, and he also influenced the Nazis.

⁵⁷ A. Starčević, *Bi-li k Slavstvu ili ka Hrvatstvu?*, 22.

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 24.

⁵⁹ [Ante Starčević], „Slavoserbi.“, *Hrvatska*, y. I, no. 39, 24. IX 1871, [3].

people, while he excluded political opponents from his people and the human race. The term “Slavoserbs” was Starčević’s basic tool for distinguishing “humans” from “subhumans.” However, where are the Croats in relation to the Western European “peaks” and German “insignificance”, where are they in relation to other nations? According to Starčević, “[...] no, remember, no nation of Europe living today has greater majesty in its past than the Croatian people.”⁶⁰ And not only that, but, in his opinion, “[...] the beginning of Croatia was more significant than of any other state. [...] No nation could even remotely match us in this, let alone stand shoulder to shoulder with to us.”⁶¹ Finally, according to Starčević, “Croatian nationality is the oldest, it is an oak, and all other Slavic nationalities are nothing but acorns and pinecones.”⁶² Croats, therefore, are among the tops of European nations, and there are very few that they could look up to. In order to interpret the apparently unenviable position of the Croats in his time, Ante Starčević offered the reader a simple-minded explanation that such a people had become victims of other people’s malice “for their benevolent nature.”⁶³

His fellow soldier Eugen Kvaternik was also inclined to hierarchize peoples. At the beginning, the basic difference was that Kvaternik considered the Croats to be a Slavic people, while Starčević did not.⁶⁴ Where does this disagreement come from? Kvaternik tried to act abroad, so for him the Slavism of the Croats and the possibility that they would side with Russia on the basis of it served as a threat to the West, from which he expected to receive support for the Croatian state project.⁶⁵ But nobody there responded to his purely theoretical “offers” and “threats.” In order to interest Europe in the Croatian question, in 1859, Kvaternik anonymously published the book *Hrvatska i italijanska federacija / Croatia and the Italian Federation*.⁶⁶ The Russian Slavist and diplomat Alexander Hilferding (1831–1872) well understood the meaning of that book, and he ended its review with the words: “If Croats recognize as their goal what is proposed to them

⁶⁰ A. Starčević, *Bi-li k Slavstvu ili ka Hrvatstvu?*, 26.

⁶¹ *Ibid*, 31.

⁶² A. Starčević, *Pisma Magjarolacah I*, 138. Here, by mistake, he included the Croats among the Slavs.

⁶³ [A. Starčević], „Slavoserbi.“, [3].

⁶⁴ „Pismo Eugena Kvaternika Nikoli Tomaseu“ (22. IV 1860, from Paris), Eugen Kvaternik, *Politički spisi. Rasprave, govori, članci, memorandum pisma*. Edited by Ljerka Kuntić (Zagreb: Znanje, 1971), 93.

⁶⁵ On one occasion, he threatened the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Austria. See: „Pismo Eugena Kvaternika grofu J.B. Rechbergu (1)“ (12. VII 1860, Zürich), E. Kvaternik, *Politički spisi*, 128.

⁶⁶ [Eugen Kvaternik], *La Croatie et la confédération italienne* (Paris: Amyiot, 1859).

in the analyzed book, i.e. the state of Croatia in its widest historical scope, established with the help of Western Europe, they will be servile in front of the West, and proud and exclusive before their brothers the Slavs."⁶⁷ In 1860, it was not difficult for Hilferding to see how geopolitical aspirations shaped the collective mentality – the Russians had certain experiences with the Poles.

Based on Kvaternik's ideology, Mirjana Gross stated that "[...] Serbs in his interpretation stand as a people-person incomparably lower than Croats."⁶⁸ She repeated several times that the idea of the position of Croats in relation to Serbs and other Slavs was mostly influenced by the idea of the "chosen Croatian people" who have a mission to "save" the Christian (Roman Catholic) culture, while the idea of Croatia's position in relation to other countries was influenced by the idea of "Bulwark of Christendom", which the rightists had adopted from earlier writers.⁶⁹ Convinced of the historical mission of the Croatian people, Kvaternik began the second volume of his book *The Eastern Question* with the words: "God, defend Your Croats, whom You have more than once appointed to be the defenders of all that is beautiful and sublime: *Christianity, universal freedom and civilization!*"⁷⁰ Mesmerized by his interpretation of the Croatian past, he was proud of the imagined "[...] primacy and leadership of the Croats in civilization among the Slavic peoples."⁷¹ To him, says Mirjana Gross, "[...] Croatianness symbolizes light and freedom, while Serbianism symbolizes darkness and slavery. In a small scale, Croatia and Serbia have, according to Kvaternik, the same importance as France and Russia on the European scale."⁷² Kvaternik apparently believed that "[...] 'general judgment or opinion' in Europe was for the **first six centuries** exclusively in all-round support of the Croats against the Serbs, especially as far as the reputation of national and state power is concerned."⁷³ It is not difficult to understand Kvaternik's motives. According to the interpretation of Mirjana Gross, "to stimulate the self-awareness of a small nation, he strove, like all ideologues, to elevate it above all neighboring nations as a 'chosen nation'. In his historical interpretation, he reduced the Hungarians to the lowest le-

⁶⁷ See: Александр Гильфердинг, „Историческое право Хорватскаго народа“, in: *Собрание сочинений II*, (Санкт Петербургъ: Печатня В. Головина, 1868), 165.

⁶⁸ M. Gross, *Povijest pravaške ideologije*, 47.

⁶⁹ Ibid, *Izvorno pravaštvo*, 34, 70, 72–73, 133, 171, 235–237, 268, 312, 653, 671.

⁷⁰ Eugen Kvaternik, *Istočno pitanje i Hrvati. Historično-pravna razprava II* (Zagreb: Štamparna Dragutina Albrechta, 1868), 2. Italics by Kvaternik.

⁷¹ Ibid, *Istočno pitanje. Historično-pravna razprava I* (Zagreb: Štamparna Dragutina Albrechta, 1868), 107.

⁷² M. Gross, *Izvorno pravaštvo*, 268.

⁷³ E. Kvaternik, *Istočno pitanje I*, 68. Highlighted word and italics by Kvaternik.

vel compared to the glorious past of the Croats. For Kvaternik and Starčević, the Germans are always the embodiment of the worst human traits [...]. Kvaternik also tried to build a fence toward the Serbs against the feeling of supremacy, as a response to the Serbian self-awareness that stemmed from the existence of the Serbian state.⁷⁴ Such a position was therefore built consciously and with a purpose.

The Party-of-Rights ideologues legitimized their position with an understanding similar to the one according to which the role of “Shield of Europe” or “Antemurale christianitatis” – which includes the concept of messianism and providentialism – was played by Poland in Eastern Europe from the 16th to the 18th century.⁷⁵ The nobles from the Frankopan family described the role of Croatia in the 16th century with the same words – the “Bulwark of Christendom.”⁷⁶ There is a lot of similarity between the understanding of the rightists and the older Polish model, whose basic ideologemes are: “[...] messianism, faith in the special purpose of the Polish people and the class exclusivity of the Polish nobility in society.”⁷⁷ The only difference was that the role of the Croatian nobility had ended in the past. Similar theories were identified in other Roman Catholic countries that bordered with Islam and Orthodoxy: in Poland, Hungary and Lithuania.⁷⁸ The need for the hierarchization of the peoples in the Croatian national ideology did not remain without a historiographical explanation. Eric Hobsbawm wrote that the Croatian nationalists, who had gained their foothold in the lower middle class, “[...] had neither their own language nor race to mark their chosen people in relation to others, thus so the historical mission of the Croatian nation is to defend Christianity from the invasion from the east served to give the layers that lacked self-confidence the necessary sense of superiority.”⁷⁹ In the territorial sense, the extremely ambitious task, which they had set for themselves and their pe-

⁷⁴ M. Gross, *Izvorno pravaštvo*, 171.

⁷⁵ Мария В. Лескинен, *Мифы и образы сарматизма. Истоки национальной идеологии Речи Посполитой* (Москва: Институт славяноведения РАН, 2002), 145, 168–169; Сергей Н. Бухарин and Николай М.Ракитянский, *Россия и Польша. Опыт политико-психологического исследования феномена лимитрофизации* (Москва: Институт русской цивилизации, 2011), 29, 98, 101, 116, 127, 454, 928.

⁷⁶ Ivo Žanić, „Simbolični identitet Hrvatske u trokutu raskrižje–predziđe–most“, in: *Historijski mitovi na Balkanu*, zbornik radova (Sarajevo: Institut za istoriju, 2003), 166; Дарио Кршић, „Улога хрватских митологема у генерисању србофобије: Хрватска као ‘предзиђе хришћанства’ и Срби као ‘Власи’“, *Политичка ревија*, у. (XXX) XXI, no. 1, (2021), 86–87.

⁷⁷ М. В. Лескинен, *Мифы и образы сарматизма*, 21.

⁷⁸ I. Žanić, „Simbolični identitet Hrvatske“, 166.

⁷⁹ Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and nationalism since 1780. Programme, myth, reality* (Cambridge: University press, 2000), 120. Hobsbawm referred to the research of Mirjana Gross.

ople, had to lead them to exactly such a relationship with the West and other Slavs. And before all – towards the closest neighbors.

Led by such convictions, in 1865, Eugen Kvaternik, in a letter to his friend Jozef Vaclav Frič, made a sharp distinction between Serbs and Croats: "But I cannot fail to condemn that phrase, with which you say that you chose that vile name of Serbianness to denote Yugoslavism, supposedly 'in accordance with the local jargon'. Thank you very much for such an excuse! as a Pole would say if his name was identified with a Russian or a *Moskal*? [...] To identify that barbaric abomination in relation to us Croats, people of Western civilization, with Yugoslavia: forgive me, my friend, everyone is free to do that, but it is not *fair*! That is the *last word* you will hear from me about that stench."⁸⁰ In 1876, his friend Ante Starčević criticized the editor of the book *Die Freiwillige Theilnahme der Serben und Kroaten an den vier letzten österreichisch-türkischen Kriegen/ Voluntary Participation of Serbs and Croats in the Austro-Turkish Wars*,⁸¹ for comparing those two peoples: "[...] no honest person would even dare to compare Croatsians with Serbs, to compare this breed with people [...]."⁸² In their interpretation, Serbs were losing the status of both a nation and humans: that is "abomination" and "stench."

Hate as an element of the political doctrine of the Party of Rights

Hate has long been identified as an important element of the ideology of the Party of Rights. Politician and publicist Ivo Pilar wrote during the First World War: "Starčević's political doctrine is rooted in his hatred of Austria, Hungary and Serbia."⁸³ According to Pilar's interpretation, Starčević hated Austria because of absolutism, Hungary because of the period 1790-1848, and the 1868 Settlements, and he also hated "[...] Serbs, whose danger he was the first to correctly comprehend. In articles written with the purpose of defending against Serbs, he mostly accurately presented the history of the origin of the Serbs."⁸⁴ However, it cannot be the same

⁸⁰ Kvaternik from Turin to Frič 9. VII 1865, in: Mira Kolar, „Deset pisama Eugena Kvaternika iz Italije Josefu Vaclavu Friču (1865.–1866.)“, *Starine*, 62, (2004), 152. Italics by Kvaternik.

⁸¹ F. Berlic, *Die Freiwillige Theilnahme der Serben und Kroaten an den vier letzten österreichisch-türkischen Kriegen. Dargethan in einer Sammlung gleichzeitiger geschichtlicher Urkunden* (Wien: Keck & Pierer, 1854).

⁸² A[n]te Starčević, *Pasmina slavoserbska po Hervatskoj* (Zagreb: Lav Hartman i družba, 1876), 55.

⁸³ Ivo Pilar, *Južnoslavensko pitanje i svjetski rat. Pregledan prikaz cjelokupnoga problema* (Zagreb: Institut društvenih znanosti „Ivo Pilar“ / Školska knjiga, 2021), 338.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* It refers to Starčević's texts. *Ime Serb* (1868), *Bi-li k Slavstvu ili ka Hrvatstvu?* (1876) and *Pasmina slavoserbska po Hervatskoj* (1876).

when the objects of hatred are *states and peoples* – states are hated because of their politics, and peoples because of their being. Politics can change, but being – cannot. About twenty years later, Mato Hanzeković explained more precisely than Pilar what stood between Serbs and Croats: “When Serbs, in defense of their national name and their national individuality, openly supported anti-Croatian regimes, Starčević called them derogatory names and raised several generations in complete racial hatred to everything that was Serbian.”⁸⁵ That hatred, indeed, proved to be more long-lasting than the hatred towards Austria and Hungary.

The significance of hatred for the understanding of Antun Starčević’s personality and his ideology was also stated by Stanko Lasić: “Hatred for the traitors of Croatia strengthened his monologue, it made Starčević blind, pushed him into extreme monomania. Hard hatred. Cold. This hatred led him in 1895 to an even more extreme ‘purity’ than the one in which he had lived until then. It has extended throughout history and continues to this day. It also resonates in our monologues.”⁸⁶ However, knowing how repulsive hatred is, Ante Starčević sometimes claimed: “I don’t hate anyone or anything in the world. I despise the Germans and their literature.”⁸⁷ Lasić wondered over that statement: “[...] what would be the difference between contempt and hatred, if not in cunning to cover up one’s own hatred. The father of the homeland really taught us to speak: we are all little verbal terrorists.”⁸⁸ Lasić’s observation is significant not only because it points to hatred as an important element of Starčević’s ideology, but also because it highlights its far-reaching effects. That conclusion is close to the opinion expressed by Mate Hanzeković: “The rightism was Croatian morality. And every Croat is unconsciously partly a rightist.”⁸⁹ Political differences are not very important here, so the same author says: “Starčević’s opponents too often appeared as rightists as well, and that is why Starčević was the voice of the Croatian national collective.”⁹⁰

At the end of the 19th century, Josef Holeček, a Czech writer and journalist, noticed that Starčević’s doctrine exuded hatred: “Long before us Czechs, the Serbs had their Mommsen, Ante Starčević. Both are preachers of brutal violence against unfavorable neighbors, who stand in the way of their chauvinistic dreams. Both are in the service of the Drang nach Osten, and it him with both evil and good. [...]”

⁸⁵ M. Gabrijel, *Otac domovine Dr. Ante Starčević*, 196.

⁸⁶ Stanko Lasić, *Autobiografski zapisi* (Zagreb: NZ Globus, 2000), 299.

⁸⁷ A. Starčević, *Bi-li k Slavstvu ili ka Hrvatstvu?*, 24.

⁸⁸ S. Lasić, *Autobiografski zapisi*, 295.

⁸⁹ M. Gabrijel, *Otac domovine Dr. Ante Starčević*, 246.

⁹⁰ *Ibid*, 247.

Therefore, Ante Starčević differs from Mommsen in that he did not preach hatred and violence towards another tribe, but towards a Slavic one.⁹¹ Holeček was referring to the historian Theodor Mommsen (1817-1903), who on 31 October 1897 wrote in the Vienna newspaper *Neue freie Presse* that the Czechs were "apostles of barbarism" who would push German cultural achievements into the "abyss of their unculturedness." He also added that the German answer must be firm, because "[...] the Czech skull is impervious to reason, but it is susceptible to blows."⁹² Similar recommendations in relation to the "Slavoserbs", but with mention of axes, knives, stakes and ropes, were made by Starčević in his brochures.⁹³

Social racism

Sarmatism, the ideology of the Polish Szlachta, in addition to the idea of mission, is also characterized by aristocratic or social racism.⁹⁴ Similar phenomena can be observed in other countries of Central and Eastern Europe. One form of social racism was formulated in 1851 by the Hungarian author József baron Eötvös (1813–1871), who thought that a nation is created by the merging of the conqueror and the conquered population. According to his understanding, "[...] a nation is not a community of languages, but a historical product of the mixing of various races in one state. By mixing unequal races, a new nation is created."⁹⁵ Similarly, Starčević announced in 1867: "Every nation is a mixture of different nations, different cultures. [...] Ethnicity is like salt or leaven, cleverly used, of course: they permeate all food, and so they themselves, in a pure form, are not in the food. The Croatian nationality, the ruling people, inspired the entire population of our homeland, although this pure nationality is nowhere to be found today."⁹⁶ He often varied this position: "Croats are the ruling people, they extended their Croatian nationality to all the peoples who had once lived in our home-

⁹¹ Josef Holeček, *Hrvatski Mommsen* (Dubrovnik: Srpska dubrovačka štamparija A. Pasarića, 1899), 3.

⁹² Hugh LeCaine Agnew, *The Czechs and the Lands of the Bohemian Crown* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2004), 149.

⁹³ See: A. Starčević, *Bi-li k Slavstvu ili ka Hrvatstvu?*, 14, 38; Ibid, *Pisma Magjarolacah I*, XLI–XLII; Ibid, *Pisma Magjarolacah II*, 116.

⁹⁴ About the social (aristocratic) racism maintained by the Polish nobility, see: С. Н. Бухарин and Н. М. Ракитянский, *Россия и Польша*, 23–24, 115, 927.

⁹⁵ М. Екмечић, *Стварање Југославије 1790–1918*, 2, 188.

⁹⁶ A. Starčević, *Bi-li k Slavstvu ili ka Hrvatstvu?*, 37. How can *nationality* be "cleverly used"? It can be said that Starčević carelessly stated here that he considered the nation to be a utilitarian construct.

land.”⁹⁷ Starčević believed that by “mixing the blood” a particularly noble fruit would be produced: “Only those Swabians, who are mixed through marriages with real peoples, with pure human blood, only they give real human generations. It is exactly the same as with that eastern breed that settled in Croatia over the centuries: where for example, in the cities, they marry among themselves, they remain animals as they have always been; and where they are mixed with true Croatian blood, they produce the real, best Croatians.”⁹⁸ Here, Starčević was probably referring to the son of a German officer and a woman from Senj – Pavao Ritter Vitezović – whose numerous ideas were incorporated into the Party-of-Rights ideology. But he did not forget himself, as “the best Croat”, because his mother Milica Bogdan belonged to the “eastern breed.”⁹⁹

Two decades later, Ante Starčević changed his approach, rejected the idea of inclusion and advocated for segregation: “In France, under the collective name ‘Cagots’ there were a number of special names that were borne by certain populations in a dozen provinces. All the Cagots were known by the name of “cursed breeds” (races maudites); both the spiritual and secular authorities held them all as convicts; and they prosecuted them almost incessantly. All Cagots had to live far from cities; in order to be able to distinguish them from other people, they had to wear red dresses with a picture or sign of goose or duck leg on them; they could only enter the church through a special door; in it they stood in a special corner; they were not allowed to reach into the baptismal font, [...] they were often denied a church burial; they were not allowed to talk to other people; [...] they were always under all kinds of pressure.”¹⁰⁰ Starting from the maxim: “Throw a grain of mud into a glass of the clearest water, and all the water will become cloudy”, Starčević considered it a “mistake” that the Convent in France “[...] took Cagots as people. It did the same with the Jews [...] extended all the public rights to that breed.”¹⁰¹ This contradicted his deepest convictions.

⁹⁷ *Ibid*, 31.

⁹⁸ [Ante Starčević,] „Zadnji rat Napoleona III“, *Hrvatska*, y. I, no. 4, 22. I 1871, [s.p.].

⁹⁹ Josip Horvat, *Ante Starčević. Kulturno-povijesna slika* (Zagreb: Antun Velzek, 1940), 45–47; Виктор Новак, *Вук и Хрвати* (Београд: Научно дело, 1967), 298, 319; M. Gross, *Povijest pravaške ideologije*, 205; *Ibid*, *Izvorno pravaštvo*, 348–349. In her book *Povijest pravaške ideologije* (1973) Gross wrote that Starčević “must have” been referring to his Croat and Serbian parents, while in the book *Izvorno pravaštvo* (2000) she no longer “knows” whether he was referring to his Catholic father and Orthodox mother. What happened in the meantime that she wavered so much? The socio-political context has changed: since 1990, the Party-of-Rights ideology has once again been ruling in Croatia.

¹⁰⁰ A[nte] Starčević, *Ustavi Francezke* (Zagreb: Scholz i Kralj, 1889), 188.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*, 189.

The influence of Count Joseph-Arthur de Gobineau (1816–1882) on Starčević is sometimes disputed, but it was this French theoretician of racism who shared with him the opinion that “[...] the ‘name Serb’ is not a national but a social concept, and that this people came from Roman slaves, as a derivative of the Latin word ‘Servi’ for slaves.”¹⁰² The fact that Gobineau had influenced Starčević’s ideology was first identified by Milorad Ekmečić, during a polemic with Mirjana Gross in 1974.¹⁰³ About ten years later, Ekmečić interpreted that “[...] after the defeat of the democratic revolution in 1848, some political parties of Southeast Europe tried to replace them with Gobineau’s theory that nations were historically ‘marriages of unequal races’. Such an attempt was made in Hungary in 1851, with the identical theory of József Eötvös. In Croatia, the party of the Croatian Historical Right, whose leader and main ideologist was Ante Starčević, transferred these theories to the area of the Balkans.”¹⁰⁴

Eötvös understanding of the origin of nations was inclusive, in contrast to the exclusive concept of Gobineau, who saw a negative phenomenon in the “mixing of blood.” But both approaches are based on the belief that there is a hierarchy of “better” and “worse” peoples. It is interesting that, just as Starčević did not mention Eötvös by name, he also did not mention Gobineau by name. However, attentive readers of Starčević’s texts, such as Matoš and Ekmečić, recognized in them the influence of those authors, as well as the influence of Ludwig Gumplowicz (1838–1909).¹⁰⁵ It is understandable that Starčević could not refer to authors who had put Hungarians or Germans at the top of the hierarchy of peoples, because that would make his concept meaningless. But that does not mean that he did not use them in his works. Their ideas were also taken by other Party-of-Rights follower – Đuro Deželić openly referred to Eötvös and Gumplowicz.¹⁰⁶ Mirjana Gross claimed that Gobineau, who considered Germans the “purest” pe-

¹⁰² М. Екмечић, *Стварање Југославије 2*, 189. See also p. 192, where he writes about Starčević’s beliefs.

¹⁰³ Милорад Екмечић, „Одговор на неке критике Историје Југославије (XIX век)“, in: *Срби на историјском раскрићу*, (Нови Сад: Православна реч / Архив Војводине, 2021), 131–217. First published in: *Југословенски историјски часопис*, 1–2, (1974), 217–281.

¹⁰⁴ Милорад Екмечић, „Шта је било европско у балканским националним покретима, 1790–1918?“, in: *Срби на историјском раскрићу* (Нови Сад: Православна реч / Архив Војводине, 2021), 224. The name of the party is not stated correctly. It was called: *Party of Rights*, and from 1895: *Pure Party of Rights*.

¹⁰⁵ А. Г. Матош, „Dr. Ante Starčević“, *О хрватској књижевности II*, 125; М. Екмечић, *Стварање Југославије 2*, 189–194, 303, 416, 621.

¹⁰⁶ Ђуро Дежелић, *Хрватска народност илити душа хрватскога народа. Повијестно-филозофска разправа* (Zagreb: Lav Hartman, 1879), 76–77, 97–98, 122, 404.

ople, could not have influenced Starčević, who hated Germans.¹⁰⁷ As if Starčević could not have taken over his concept and replace the roles of the subjects. In relation to Gobineau's ideas, Party-of-Rights doctrine is an inverse racist nationalism, in which Croats are assigned the role of a superior, ruling nation.

Biological racism

Starčević's concept of hierarchizing the people was not always the same. In addition to the original, social, a biological ladder also appeared. That kind of racism was manifested through the comparison of humans with animals, in accordance with the understanding that the *scala naturae* connects the entire living world. Those peoples who had been subjected to racist degradation were placed on the border between the human and animal worlds, or, sometimes, they were even placed below the position of animals. Starčević did not spare epithets and comparisons with which he dehumanized and humiliated some nations and individuals he hated – Slavs, Serbs, Germans and political opponents among the Croats. It is interesting that some historians, although they know that Ante Starčević equated some people with “fowl” that “moos, bleats and grunts”, still claim that he “did not advocate racism.”¹⁰⁸

Did he really not?

In 1879, Ante Starčević wrote the following for “Slavoserbs” in the book *Pisma Magjarolacah/Magjarolac's Letters*: “They are a slave breed, an animal worse than all other. Let's take three levels of perfection in a man: the level of the animal, the level of reason, and the level of mind, spirituality. Slavoserbs have not fully reached even the lowest level, and they cannot rise from it.”¹⁰⁹ These are, therefore, inferior beings, for whom Starčević says are “[...] fowl which, after monkeys, are the most resembling of man.”¹¹⁰ In his own style he further “discusses” this topic: “If, therefore, you think that Slavoserbs are deeply below the level of dumb animals, that they are not a real slave breed: show me another animal, which does not move away from the side from which it receives blows. Give that flock a crust of bread,

¹⁰⁷ Compare: M. Gross, *Povijest pravaške ideologije*, 205; Ibid, *Izvorno pravaštvo*, 347.

¹⁰⁸ See, for example: Tomislav Markus, „Društveni pogledi Ante Starčevića“, *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, br. 3, (2009), 840, 844–845.

¹⁰⁹ A. Starčević, *Pisma Magjarolacah I*, VIII–IX. He published this thought several times: [Ante Starčević], „Stranke u Hervatskoj“, *Hrvat 1868*, 34–35 (in: *Misli i pogledi: pojedinac-Hrvatska-svijet*. Edited by Blaž Jurišić (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska 1971), 112–113; [A. Starčević], „Slavoserbi.“, *Hrvatska*, in. I, no. 39, 24. IX 1871, [3].

¹¹⁰ A. Starčević, *Pisma Magjarolacah I*, 27.

then hit him, then flay him to the bone, that is how you have him for every evil, you have him against the Croat."¹¹¹ Then he presented it as a principle, according to which people "[...] seeking only what is pleasant, remain a dumb animal, looking only for what is useful, they become an angry dumb animal, looking only for what is right and good, they approach God, and represent him on earth [...]"¹¹² "Slavoserbs" are such low beings, Starčević claimed, that for the "name of cattle" they should "kiss the hands and feet" of members of his party.¹¹³ In the same book, he claimed that "Slavoserbs" "[...] have nothing human except for a monstrous external image."¹¹⁴ That is why "[...] the Slavoserbs grunt like that animal on which bacon grows. And after several blows, you look at the real dogs from those same Slavoserbs, who all run away while one is hit."¹¹⁵

Where did that, so persistent and fierce, comparison of people with animals come from?

Apart from the hatred and general racist convictions, in this case there could have been immediate inspiration. Starčević could have read an example of the dehumanization of the Slavic peoples by comparing them to animals in *Danica Ilirska* in 1841. He claimed later, in his *Memoirs*, that he had read everything the Illyrians had published.¹¹⁶ He probably did. At that time, Ivan Kukuljević reported in *Danica Ilirska* that he had read an anonymous article in the Munich magazine *Das Ausland*, whose author "[...] refers to 'brandy' as 'the common spirit' of Slavic life [...]" He compares level of cleanliness of Polish Slavs with hideous animal [...]" And in regard to religion and law, on the level of pagans and heretics. [...]" He states that '*procrastination, alcoholism and thievery*' constitute a rooted Slavic sin [...]" Finally, he puts those savages from America in all the lower aspects of life above the Slavs!!! [...]" O Slavs! I swear to heaven and earth we didn't really deserve this, for our people to be compared to dumb animals, and that the same miserable savages are favored over us."¹¹⁷ Kukuljević notes that "[...] this arrogant man who writes so beautifully about us is not alone."¹¹⁸ Certainly – he is not. But

¹¹¹ *Ibid*, 76.

¹¹² *Ibid*, II, 160.

¹¹³ *Ibid*, I, 94.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid*, 128.

¹¹⁵ Ante Starčević, *Nekolike uspomene*, (Zagreb: Narodna tiskara, 1870), 25.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid*, 4.

¹¹⁷ Ivan Kukuljević, „Dopis iz Milana.“, *Danica ilirska*, y. VII, no. 30, 24. VII 1841, 123–124. Italics by Kukuljević. Compare with the article: “Streifzüge durch Oberschleisien.”, *Das Ausland*, Nr. 124, 4. V 1841, 493–494.

¹¹⁸ I. Kukuljević, „Dopis iz Milana.“, 124. Italics by Kukuljević.

it should also be noted that the vocabulary of the author of that slanderous article is the same as that of the later Starčević's: "hideous animals", "feces", "heretics", "dumb animals", "savages" reign here.

This is the same verbal abuse and degradation that had been coming from the West for centuries, and from which Starčević tried to protect himself by taking that vocabulary and applying it to the people who lived further east, reserving for himself and his nascent nation a place west of the invisible curtain that divided Europe. The Party-of-Rights ideology is, among other things, also utilitarian, because Starčević claimed that the West "[...] is always stronger than Russia and all Slavs."¹¹⁹ As shown by the examples presented earlier by Filip Grabovac and Pavle Solarić, contact with Western culture caused contempt and hatred for their own identity among part of the members of the Slavic peoples. Today, this phenomenon can be found in scientific literature under several names: *self-hatred*, *genus-hatred*, *inverse ethno-nationalism*, *auto-chauvinism* and *self-denial*.¹²⁰ The root of that phenomenon lies in Western implicit racism, which is an integral part of their culture.

The name "Turks" appears in Starčević's work in two different meanings: as a nation of conquerors who came from Asia and conquered the Balkans, but also as a designation for the rest of the "old Croats" among Bosnian Muslims. Starčević interpreted the success of the Ottoman conquests by the fact that "[...] the Croatian breed was overcome by an impure breed in Albania, Raška and Serbia, and poisoned in Bosnia [...]", while where the resistance to the Turks had been more successful, such as in Dalmatia, he saw the reason in the fact that "the human race was being defended" there.¹²¹ It is known which one. About ten years before the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Starčević wrote about the "Turks" quite differently: "Every nation is a mixture of different peoples, of different blood. [...] there is nowhere the pure blood of the Croats from the 7th century, or of any nation from that era. Over the centuries, it has been mixed to the extent that that every nation, of its own kind, is Corinthian alloy. The purest Croatian blood we have is in the nobility of Turkey, it has been the least mixed with other people's blood in these 400 years. As with blood, so it is

¹¹⁹ [A. Starčević], „Slavoserbi.“, *Hrvatska*, g. I, br. 39, 24. IX 1871, [3].

¹²⁰ More about this: Dušan Kecmanović, „Inverzni etnonacionalizam“, in: *Etnička vremena* (Beograd: XX vek, 2002), 97–107; Zoran Avramović, „Jugoslovenstvo (i komunizam) – izvori srpske samomržnje“, *Kultura polisa*, g. VIII, (2011), br. 15, 87–106; Ibid, *Родомрци* (Нови Сад: Графомаркетинг / Култура полиса, 2009); Слободан Антонић, *Вишијејевска Србија* (Београд: Чигоја штампа, 2011), 146–150, 168; Мило Ломпар, *Дух самопорицања. Прилог критички српске културне политике* (Београд: Catena mundi, 2015).

¹²¹ A. Starčević, *Pasmina slavoserbska*, 34–35.

with our nationality, with language: there are no pure Croats from the 6th century even according to the language."¹²² Here he, completely consistently, applied Eötvös and Gobineau's concept of the origin of nations. In the same book, Starčević claimed that there was a continuity of the people: "We are, therefore, in totality, the children of the Croatian people of that time."¹²³

The meaning of Starčević's interest in the Turks and the Ottoman Empire can be seen from the book *Iztočno pitanje*, which he wrote in 1876, but was not published until 1899, three years after his death. At that time, he claimed that the "Turks" were of Croatian origin, i.e. that they were "[...] the generation of those lions who conquered the right of the Danube Croatia from the Avars [...]", while he wrote about the Bosnian nobility that "[...] the Dubrovnik nobility originated from them, while they engaged in warfare, married among themselves, so purity of the blood was preserved. – That nobility was never of the Greek faith; they did not like the Catholic either as it was known to them, so publicly they somehow identified with it, but secretly they preserved the faith of Bogomils".¹²⁴ The flattery to Muslims was driven by the uprising that broke out in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1875, while the mention of Bogomils was an attempt to present that area as an ancient specialty. This was in line with Vienna's interest in keeping Bosnia and Herzegovina away from Serbia. But the essence of Starčević's policy lies in something else: the Turks were important to him only if and while they were against the Serbs. If it ever turned out that "[...] the Turkish breed is too weak to live, it should be sacrificed, and peoples who are fit for life should be put in its place. Those peoples Bulgarians and Croats would, in a short time, be enlightened in such a way that they could form states strong enough to live in harmony without harming other peoples."¹²⁵ For the Serbs, as can be seen, there is no place there. The radicalism of the solutions offered is probably the reason why the book was not published at the time of the Great Eastern Crisis.

A particular way of degrading individuals and nations, which Starčević willingly used, was the comparison with Gypsies.¹²⁶ He wrote about the immigrants to

¹²² A. Starčević, *Bi-li k Slavstvu ili ka Hrvatstvu?*, 37. See also: *Djela III: Znanstveno-političke razprave*, (Zagreb: Odbor Kluba Stranke prava, 1894), 40. In the later edition, the 7th century is written in both places, which is correct.

¹²³ A. Starčević, *Bi-li k Slavstvu ili ka Hrvatstvu?*, 35.

¹²⁴ Ante Starčević, *Iztočno pitanje* (Zagreb: Prva hrvatska radnička tiskara, 1899), 28–29.

¹²⁵ *Ibid*, 45–46.

¹²⁶ Ante Starčević did not consider Gypsies (Roma) to be politically significant, so he mentioned them only to humiliate other peoples. That is why his attitude towards the Roma is not separately addressed here.

Croatia: “They all became Croatian, but for a long time they had been called by the names they had brought with them. Thus they were called Albanians, Vlachs, Greeks, etc. [...] Only no one wanted to be called a Gypsy, although most of them were Gypsies. But the Gypsies were the first to take the name ‘Našinac’ (TN: ‘*Našinac*’ is a derivative of ‘our compatriot’, which is a synonym for ‘Slavoserb’), the name they still serve faithfully and righteously.”¹²⁷ He further claimed that Gypsies were more valuable and better than “Našinaci”, i.e. “Slavoserbs”.¹²⁸ With this, he assigned to Serbs, Slavs and the followers of the People’s Party a place in the hierarchy of nations. Sometimes he allowed himself to compare Hungarians with Gypsies: “[...] the man who conducts such colorful diplomacy, the man who is officially known by the name of Count Gyula Andrassy, was born a Gypsy [...]”.¹²⁹ Regarding Hungary, Starčević said that there “[...] they consider those with the most Gypsy blood to be the most excellent one [...]”.¹³⁰ This is again an allusion to Gyula Andrassy (1823–1890). He also wrote that “Macedonians of recent times are mostly Aromanians and Gypsies, a population that, they say, is not the most noble, neither Croatian nor ‘Slavic’.”¹³¹ The Party-of-Rights followers nurtured this mannerism in the future as well: “Dr. Drinković, when he angrily shouted to Svetozar Pribičević: ‘You will not drink Croatian blood, you Gypsy!’ – was a rightist.”¹³² This outburst of chauvinism and racism was not an obstacle for Mate Drinković (1868–1931) to be a minister in several governments of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. After identifying the Serbs with the Gypsies, the state created by the Serbs had to be like that as well. In 1941, *Ustaša* newspaper wrote that Ante Pavelić “[...] behind the bitter experience in Gypsy Yugoslavia led a manly struggle for the revival of Croatian national aspirations according to the teachings of Ante Starčević.”¹³³

After many years of using the imprecise term “blood”, Ante Starčević turned to biological racism in the book *Iztočno pitanje/Eastern Question*, which was written in 1876: “By the shape of the head, by the whole appearance and by the significance, you will more easily distinguish a Serb from a Croat than for example a Russian from a Spaniard.”¹³⁴ A mixture of physical and social racism is

¹²⁷ A. Starčević, *Pisma Magjarolacah I*, 84.

¹²⁸ *Ibid*, 96.

¹²⁹ Ante Starčević, „Govor od 14. listopada 1878“, u: *Djela I: Govori* (Zagreb: Odbor Kluba Stranke prava, 1894), 87. A newspaper in Austria allegedly wrote about it.

¹³⁰ Ante Starčević, „Govor od 8. listopada 1885“, *Djela I*, 286.

¹³¹ A. Starčević, *Ime Serb*, 41.

¹³² M. Gabrijel, *Otac domovine Dr. Ante Starčević*, 246.

¹³³ N.T. „Otac Domovine i Poglavlak“, *Ustaša*, y. XI, no. 4, 19. VII 1941, 14.

¹³⁴ A. Starčević, *Iztočno pitanje*, 41.

also contained his statement that those who “don’t have long noses” and “don’t stink of goose fat” are “not Jews.”¹³⁵ Starčević’s racist concept was a kind of political tactic at first, but it was developed over time, until it became a branched and layered secular religion or pseudo-religion.¹³⁶ As far back as 1911, Jovan Skerlić noted: “Everything that Starčević promises his believers is more a national religion than a political doctrine, and it is the least practical program of a political party.”¹³⁷ At the beginning of the 20th century, it was unimaginable for Skerlić that a political program could be derived from the Party-of-Rights ideology and that this program could be implemented under appropriate circumstances. Thirty years later – it was implemented.

The dilemmas regarding the nature of Starčević’s ideology are all the more strange if one considers that he did not hold back at all from writing the following: “Keep your humanity, your politeness, for the people; traitors of the people and homeland should be called by their real name. Those [...] whose every step, every word is aimed to embarrass, humiliate and enslave one’s people, they are villains who will face the axe already in this world.”¹³⁸ He did not need a special reason, when he wrote that he “[...] intends, with one ax, one blow, to cut off the heads of all Hungarians and Slavoserbs at once. – What else? They are not fit for anything else.”¹³⁹ Finally, in his most voluminous book, he presented a series of degrading epithets for Slavs, among other things: “A Slav is sheep. Both sheep and the Slav are kept for their fleece, until they come under the knife.”¹⁴⁰ Finally, for the “Rascian (*TN: Serbian*) border guards (i.e. the Serbs), Starčević says: “The gallows, for that breed, used to be the most terrible type of death. Whether the Croats didn’t know it, or whether they were overcome by anger, they didn’t hang the culprits: the people of Senj in Perušić impaled them on a stake and then roasted them.”¹⁴¹ Exactly the way animals are treated.

Starčević’s ideology is characterized by arbitrariness and contradiction, which came about because he tried to “merge” political/civic nationalism (the concept of “political Croats”) with cultural/racial (“spirit is inherited by blo-

¹³⁵ A. Starčević, *Pisma Magjarolacah II*, 87.

¹³⁶ About this phenomenon, see: G. Mosse, *Toward the Final Solution*, xxxvii; M. Gross, *Izborna pravaštvo*, 33; J. Gray, *Black mass*, 60–64.

¹³⁷ Јован Скерлић, „Анте Старчевић“, *Српски књижевни гласник*, bk. 28, no. 263, vol. 2, (1911), 141.

¹³⁸ A. Starčević, *Bi-li k Slavstvu ili ka Hrvatstvu?*, 38.

¹³⁹ A. Starčević, *Pisma Magjarolacah I*, XLI–XLII.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid II*, 116.

¹⁴¹ A. Starčević, *Pasmina slavoserbska*, 42.

od”).¹⁴² That is why this ideology sometimes manifests itself as social racism, sometimes as biological racism, sometimes as racist nationalism, and often as all three at the same time. This is in obvious collision with his second position: that all the inhabitants of the imagined “great Croatia” should be – Croats. As less valuable and worthless beings, Starčević sees those who “don’t know” that they are Croats, but only until they “realize” it and accept the Croatian name, i.e. until they “become Croats.” It is a kind of utilitarian racism, designed to be a means of extreme verbal violence against members of hated nations and political opponents among Croats. Another Party-of-Rights ideologue, Eugen Kvaternik, did not deny that Croats were also Slavs, but he nevertheless claimed that it was the Croatian people who were “chosen” to save European culture.¹⁴³ Despite their mutual differences, both were mythomaniacs and megalomaniacs frustrated by historical circumstances, but convinced of their own excellence. Among other things, they left behind a “school” of thought.

Croatian “school” of racism

Over time, as a result of changes in circumstances and political needs, the Party-of-Rights ideology acquired different elements, but it also had one constant: it strove in every way to prove the “superiority” of Croats in relation to Serbs, “Slavoserbs”, Vlachs, Jews, Gypsies and other “inferior” and “enemy” nations. On the basis of that “argument”, Croatia’s “right” to annex the South Slavic area west of the Drina was also derived. Although the series does not end with them, the core of the “school” of thought founded by Ante Starčević consists of the following authors:

Čiril Ćiro Truhelka (1865–1942), archaeologist, historian, curator and director of the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a Party-of-Rights follower.¹⁴⁴ He advocated the Party-of-Rights thesis that Croats of the Roman Catholic and Islamic faith lived in Bosnia and belonged to the superior blonde-haired Slavic race, while those who present themselves as “Serbs” are in fact “dark-blooded” Vlachs, anthropologically and morally inferior.¹⁴⁵ Truhelka proved the existence of

¹⁴² Nevenko Bartulin, *The racial idea in the Independent State of Croatia. Origins and Theory* (Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2014), 39–40, 42.

¹⁴³ M. Gross, *Povijest pravaške ideologije*, 42, 46, 47, 71, etc.

¹⁴⁴ Ćiro Truhelka, *Uspomene jednog pionira* (Zagreb: HIBZ, 1942), 5, 19, 103.

¹⁴⁵ [Ćiro Truhelka], *Hrvatska Bosna (Mi i „oni tamo“)*. Preštampano iz „Hrvatskog Dnevnika“ (Sarajevo: Hrvatski dnevnik, 1907). On p. 136 of *Uspomene Truhelka* stated that he was the author of the anonymous pamphlet *Hrvatska Bosna/Croatian Bosnia*.

"[...] already in the Stone Age there was a huge difference in cultural phenomena [...]" between Bosnia and Serbia.¹⁴⁶ That border "[...] was once a demarcation between the Roman province of Dalmatia and Moesia[,] the eastern and western Roman Empire, the eastern and western churches, Byzantium and the European Enlightenment, Islam and the Cross, blond-haired Slavs and dark-skinned Vlachs, culturally active and passive breed, Croats and Serbs, progress and stagnation, life and death."¹⁴⁷ Truhelka developed Starčević's ideas about Serbo-Croatian relations and used the terms "breed" and "Slavoserbs."¹⁴⁸ Among other things, he tried to determine who had more rights to Bosnia and Herzegovina based on the shape of the skulls. He claimed that "[...] *dolichocephaly*, i.e. the typically pronounced length of the skull, is considered a trait of old culturally inferior races, and the more the tribe advances in the field of education, the more the human skull becomes rounded and turns into *brachycephaly*."¹⁴⁹ In his opinion "brachycephaly" is pronounced among Bosnian Catholics and Muslims, but not among the Orthodox, on the basis of which he contested that the Serbs "[...] are entitled to the intellectual primacy and leadership over the rest of the people."¹⁵⁰ He used the "dark blood", which separated the Vlachs from the Serbs (and Croats), also to mark the biological, cultural and moral diversity within the Orthodox Serbian corpus, trying to stratify the Serbian nation. He claimed that there were "permanent races" (*Dauerrasse*), which do not change their traits, and he classified Jews, Armenians and Vlachs among them, calling them "cultural parasites."¹⁵¹

Stjepan Radić (1871–1928), political scientist, politician, lawyer, leader of the Croatian Peasant Party (HSS). Milan Sufflay called his party rightist "in the spirit", although not "formally."¹⁵² He wrote that Radić "[...] embraced Starčević's idea. This idea of rightism united the Croatian peasantry into an unbreakable phalanx."¹⁵³ Mate Hanžeković je also noted that "HSS is a happy variation of rightism."¹⁵⁴ Politician and publicist Vitomir Korać claimed that Radić "copied Starče-

¹⁴⁶ [Č. Truhelka], *Hrvatska Bosna*, 1.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid*, 4.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid*, 11–15, 30.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid*, 14.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid*, 15.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid*, 28.

¹⁵² Milan Sufflay, „Uoči izbora. Ognjeni stup pravaštva“, in: *Izabrani politički spisi*. Edited by Du-bravko Jelčić (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2000), 203. First published in: *Hrvatsko pravo*, XVII, no. 4920, 6. II 1925, 1–2.

¹⁵³ Milan Šufflay, „Radić, Bethlen i Mussolini“, in: *Hrvatska u svjetlu svjetske historije i politike. Dvanaest eseja* (Zagreb: Merkantile, 1928), 28.

¹⁵⁴ M. Gabrijel, *Otac domovine Dr. Ante Starčević*, 325.

vić down to the last detail.”¹⁵⁵ Radić himself said at Starčević’s grave: “today, all of us Croats are rightists.”¹⁵⁶ Right after the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908, Radić made claims about the “unculturedness” of Serbs and Hungarians: “With Hungarians, this unculturedness is at least understandable, because they, like true Asians, feel an instinctive aversion to everything that is truly European; but the Serbs cannot even be understood, let alone justified [...]”¹⁵⁷ While, on the one hand, like Truhelka, he wrote that “[...] in terms of their cultural and economic abilities [...] the Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina are unconditionally the first and most important element. We can be unwaveringly convinced of this as soon as we compare the Bosnian Muslims and Orthodox with the Croatian element.”¹⁵⁸ In 1906, in his treatise *Židovstvo kao negativni elemenat culture/ Jewishness as a negative element of culture*, Radić expressed enthusiasm for the criticism of the Jewish character in Otto Weininger’s book *Geschlecht und Charakter*, which he considered to be comparable in richness and depth of thought and logic of facts to Houston Stuart Chamberlain’s book *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century (Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts)*.¹⁵⁹ In his brochure, Radić wrote that the Jew “has always been an enemy of the state”, “relatively immoral”, “a being who needs someone else’s rule”, “a man without religion.”¹⁶⁰ He ends the booklet with the words: “As true Christians, we cannot possibly be anti-Semitic according to the German model [...] Instead of anti-Semitism, we should therefore implement a-Semitism the most rigorously: instead of unworthy struggle against Jews, we should work persistently without Jews.”¹⁶¹ The editor of the brochure, M. Kozjak, also says that: “Until the end of his life, President Stjepan Radić remained faithful to his views.”¹⁶² Philosopher and minister in the government of the Independent State of Croatia

¹⁵⁵ Ivan Mužić, *Stjepan Radić u Kraljevini Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca* (Zagreb: HKD sv. Ćirili i Metod, 1987), 187–188.

¹⁵⁶ Stjepan Radić, „Govor na grobu Ante Starčevića. U Šestinama 11. lipnja 1922.“, in: *Politički spisi. Autobiografija / članci / govori / rasprave*. Edited by Zvonimir Kulundžić (Zagreb: Znanje, 1971), 400.

¹⁵⁷ Stjepan Radić, *Živo hrvatsko pravo na Bosnu i Hercegovinu* (Zagreb: Hrvatska pučka seljačka tiskara, 1908), 53.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 54.

¹⁵⁹ Stjepan Radić, *Židovstvo kao negativni elemenat kulture* (Zagreb: Hrvatsko kolo, 1937), 6. Compare with: Otto Weininger, *Geschlecht und Charakter. Eine Prinzipielle Untersuchung* (Wien / Leipzig: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1909), 409–452. In the Serbian translation by Irma Šosberger, chapter XIII *Jewishness* is missing.

¹⁶⁰ S. Radić, *Židovstvo*, 8, 9, 11, 14.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid*, 16.

¹⁶² M. Kozjak, „Predgovor“ in: S. Radić, *Židovstvo*, 3.

(NDH), Julije Makanec, wrote that the newspaper "[...] 'Hrvatska misao', published by Radić, did not want to accept ads from Jewish advertisers."¹⁶³ Radić's understanding of relations between peoples is well illustrated by the speech he gave at the HRSS assembly on 15 April 1923. Speaking about the colonial troops that participated in the occupation of Germany in 1918, Radić pointed out that the Entente "made one mistake": "[...] to bring the blacks to the Rhine, that meant, maybe we will also experience the fact that the whites will have to leave Africa."¹⁶⁴ What were these "whites" doing in Africa anyway – the leader of the HSS did not find it necessary to explain. After Radić's death, there was no critical review of his legacy in the HSS, on the contrary – his heroic cult was developed.¹⁶⁵

Filip Lukas (1871–1958), theologian, Roman Catholic priest, historian, geographer and geopolitician, president of Matica Hrvatska from 1928 until 1945.¹⁶⁶ He was not a member of the Ustasha movement, but he gave their ideology intellectual legitimacy.¹⁶⁷ He was a consistent Party-of-Rights follower, who explained Starčević's conflict with Strossmayer as the result of "[...] opposition of race, upbringing, social and natural environment", since Strossmayer, there, "[...] could not have lived the past of the Croatian people, because he had neither fully inherited it by blood nor received it with tradition as an integral part of his being."¹⁶⁸ As a contrast to Strossmayer, he used the model that he had chosen to follow himself: "Starčević is a distinct racial type, born to peasants, among the mountains of Lika. Mountains are like fortresses, so the remnants of old races, peoples and countries are preserved in them according to physical law. Thus, according to the geographical environment, Starčević emerged from a racial reservoir, the purest in our nation."¹⁶⁹ This is his interpretation of the opposition between Germans and Croats, which had already been created by Starčević, with the difference that even Starčević did not find the "purest racial reservoir" in Lika. Lukas admired Starčević, finding in his personality a "heri-

¹⁶³ J. Makanec, „Put hrvatskog nacionalizma“, in: *Hrvatski vidici. Nacionalno-politički eseji* (Zagreb: Društvo hrvatskih srednjoškolskih profesora, 1944), 14.

¹⁶⁴ S. Radić, *Politički spisi*, 431.

¹⁶⁵ See: Stipica Grgić, „Radić nakon Radića: Stvaranje kulta heroja Stjepana Radića (1928–1934)“, *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, no. 3, (2010), 723–748.

¹⁶⁶ Mladen Švab, „Lukas, Filip“, in: *Tko je tko u NDH? Hrvatska 1941.–1945.* (Zagreb: Minerva, 1997), 243.

¹⁶⁷ Nevenko Bartulin, „Ideologija nacije i rase: ustaški režim i politika prema Srbima u Nezavisnoj Državi Hrvatskoj 1941–1945“, *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu*, vol. 39, (2007), 222.

¹⁶⁸ Filip Lukas, „Starčević“, in: *Ličnosti, stvaranja, pokreti*, (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1944), 22.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid*, 19.

tage of blood and race,”¹⁷⁰ a person “[...] who knew how to summarize from the biology of our race the most important conditions for our survival [...]”.¹⁷¹ Lukas is a consistent admirer of Starčević, even when he connects “spirit” and “blood.” In a speech given in 1937, at the commemoration of the 41st anniversary of Starčević’s death, Lukas claimed “[...] as the people represent the ethnobiological species, it also represents the spiritual species. In this way, the people becomes a community of blood, therefore a community of freedom. This creates a double connection of individuals in the nation, a connection of blood and a connection of the spirit.”¹⁷² Even Starčević himself did not formulate this so succinctly. Lucas often referred to the racial “argument” in his writings.¹⁷³ He believed that “[...] already at the beginning of history, the blood separation of Croats from Serbs, from which various affections originate, according to which their development was carried out differently.”¹⁷⁴ It was important for him to emphasize that the Swiss anthropologist Eugène Pittard (1867–1962) “[...] looking at Croats and Serbs, found that their skull index, as well as the color of their eyes, were different”, and that “[...] Croats and Serbs, apparently in all aspects, did not come from the same primordial ethnic groups.”¹⁷⁵ What Eugène Pittard raised as a scientific *question*, which was yet to be resolved, Lukas tended to present as a *conclusion* that Serbs and Croats were “two separate groups.” Lukas, “[...] with his writings about the racial anthropological traits of Croats and Serbs followed in the footsteps of Pilar and Truhelka.”¹⁷⁶ After World War II, Lukas was sentenced to death in absentia.

Ivo Pilar (1874–1933), lawyer, geopolitician and Party-of-Rights follower, associate of Archbishop Josip Stadler. He was engaged in both legal and illegal political work, often published under pseudonyms, and died under unclear circumstances.¹⁷⁷ The words “race”, “blood”, as well as Truhelka’s and Starčević’s names, are often mentioned in his book *Južnoslavensko pitanje / The South Slavic Question*, in which he varies the old Party-of-Rights thesis that “[...] Serbia has

¹⁷⁰ F. Lukas, „Poviestno djelo Ante Starčevića“, *Ličnosti, stvaranja, pokreti*, 41.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid*, 57.

¹⁷² *Ibid*, 37.

¹⁷³ See: Filip Lukas, *Ličnosti, stvaranja, pokreti*, 31, 76, 85, 99, 122–123, 214–215, 231, 232.

¹⁷⁴ Filip Lukas, „Bosna i Hercegovina u geopolitičkom pogledu“, *Poviest hrvatskih zemalja Bosne i Hercegovine od najstarijih vremena do godine 1463* (Sarajevo: HKD Napredak, 1942), 67.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid*, 67–68.

¹⁷⁶ Stipe Kljajić, *Nikada više Jugoslavija. Intelektualci i hrvatsko nacionalno pitanje (1928.–1945.)* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2017), 170.

¹⁷⁷ Srećko Lipovčan, „Dr. Ivo Pilar (1874.–1933.): Život i djelo“, *Pilar–Časopis za društvene i humanističke studije*, y. I, no. 1(1), (2006), 12, 15–17.

multiplied even through the Orthodox Vlachs who lived or originated on Croatian territory. As a consequence, the Serbs have received much more Vlach blood, and as the Vlachs were dark-skinned Romani, there are comparatively more dark-skinned types among the Serbs than among the Croats.”¹⁷⁸ Pilar pretended that, unlike Starčević, he “addressed the Vlach question” in a scientific way, and he also paid full attention to Truhelka’s work, whose pamphlet *Hrvatska Bosna / The Croatian Bosnia* he considered to be a “very scientifically written brochure.”¹⁷⁹ Pilar tried to establish scientific credibility with his style, but it is precisely on the “Vlach question” that it is noticeable to what extent he was burdened by racial and other prejudices and how tendentious he was: “With today’s Serbs, we no longer encounter exclusively or at least predominantly Slavic, but predominantly Balkan-Romanian national character [...]. Therefore, we must establish that both the nomadic and the robber traits of the mountain shepherds are still very well preserved in the national character of the Serbs, which are clearly manifested especially in their social and political behavior as a multitude.”¹⁸⁰ Pilar claimed that the “Vlachs” were burdened with “hatred of the disinherited, that they nurtured “antisocial impulses that destroy culture”, that they are “quick”, “brave”, “bloodthirsty”, “mutually solidary so that they strike fear into everyone” and, most importantly: “Those instincts still live in Serbia today.”¹⁸¹ Pilar did not distinguish between Montenegrins and Serbs by character, because even in “Montenegro’s veins there is enough Vlach blood.”¹⁸² In contrast to them, he claimed for Croats that they were “faithful followers of Rome and the West”¹⁸³ and that “[...] the Croatian noble race Slavenized the Catholic Balkan Romanians.”¹⁸⁴ Pilar interprets the economy of the Serbs with stereotypes that are similar to those of the Jews: “[...] where there is an increased possibility of earning, a high economic conjuncture, there they are, the nomads, they are the first also with their religious connection and enormous solidarity they create a ring and harvest the cream before the others manage to find their way (and these are usually Croats). Here is an example: since Zagreb became a big city and the center of South Slavic culture, the Serbs are multiplying there in large numbers.”¹⁸⁵ Who and what, actually,

¹⁷⁸ I. Pilar, *Južnoslavensko pitanje*, 241.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid*, 258.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid*, 259.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid*, 260–261.

¹⁸² *Ibid*, 261.

¹⁸³ *Ibid*, 26.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid*, 241.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid*, 264.

Serbs are, he defined in one sentence: “[...] dangerous traits, traditions and tendencies of the Byzantine Church found an extremely effective complement in the Serbian people in the form of penetration of the Balkan-Romanian nomadic blood, which, with their greed for appropriation, anti-social tendencies, destructive rage and gift for destruction, typical of that race, make the Serbs a first-class danger for all neighboring nations and countries.”¹⁸⁶ Pilar could have taken the bizarre “argument” of “nomadism” and its consequences on the character of Serbs from Ante Starčević, who often referred to him. Despite the degrading and enduring generalizations about the character of entire peoples that Pilar made, there are authors who persistently deny his racism.¹⁸⁷ What cannot be denied, however, is that Starčević’s *Izabrani spisi / Selected Writings*, Pavelić’s *Strahote zabluda / Horrors of Delusions* and Pilar’s *Južnoslavensko pitanje / South Slavic Question* were compulsory high school reading in NDH.¹⁸⁸ The fact that a scientific institution in Zagreb was named the ‘Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar’ shows the attitude of the authorities of the Republic of Croatia towards Pilar’s personality and legacy.

Milan Sufflay (1879–1931), doctor of philosophy, Albanologist, member of the administration of the Croatian Party of Rights. It is uncountable how many times he used the words “blood” and “race” in his texts.¹⁸⁹ Sufflay’s articles have characteristic titles: *Hrvatska krv i zemlja / Croatian Blood and Land*, *Cincarska krv / Aromanian Blood*, *Glas hrvatske krvi / The Voice of Croatian Blood*, etc. and are full of Starčević’s recognizable mixture of social and biological racism: “The Croatian people are not only peasants, they are rightist. But their leaders have forgotten that the Croatian nation is on the border between West and East, Catholicism and Orthodoxy, European culture and barbarism. [...] Whoever rushes to the Balkans poisons Croatian blood. Whoever is in favor of any agreement, except for *separation*, has the chaos of Balkan blood in him.”¹⁹⁰ Sufflay developed Starčević’s quasi-scientific claims about the genesis of the Balkan peoples, fitting

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid*, 267.

¹⁸⁷ See, for example: Tomislav Jonjić, „Ivo Pilar prema rasnom učenju i eugenici“, *Pilar – Časopis za društvene i humanističke studije*, y. XI, br. 21(1), (2016), 44–111.

¹⁸⁸ Tomislav Jonjić, „Pred jednom legendarnom knjigom i njezinim autorom“, in: I. Pilar, *Južnoslavensko pitanje*, 627.

¹⁸⁹ M. Šufflay, *Hrvatska u svjetlu svjetske historije*, passim; M. Sufflay, *Izabrani politički spisi*, passim.

¹⁹⁰ Milan Sufflay, „Glas hrvatske krvi“, in: *Izabrani politički spisi*. Edited by Dubravko Jelčić, (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2000), 179. First published in: *Hrvatsko pravo*, y. XVII, no. 4875, 10. XII 1924, 1–2.

them into the current political context of a joint state with the Serbs. Already in 1924, he wrote: "Western Catholic Croats have nothing to look for in the Orthodox Balkans. Today, it is the domain of the Serbs, who have been completely adapted to it through a long series of generations. Even if Dušan's empire was broken and federations were created, it would be a purely Balkan creation. In it, Croats would lose what is best in them, according to the Party of Rights, and what is best in them, according to Radić. They would lose their sense of Western civilization and of – humanity."¹⁹¹ Persistently repeating Starčević's racist oppositions of *human-inhuman* and *civilized-barbaric*, he dehumanized the entire Serbian people on a "scientific basis." Prone to broad sweeps, Sufflay wrote that the course of history "is conditioned mainly by blood and soil."¹⁹² In those years, such theses gained popularity, especially in Germany. Sufflay, like Starčević, interpreted the origin of nations with a conservative theory about the subjugation of Slavs by other tribes: "Croats and Serbs alike, in the Balkans, layered over a slightly older and completely related Slavic population. But they did not receive an equal amount of foreign blood. Turanian, Avar blood had a much stronger influence on the Croats [...]."¹⁹³ According to other sources, Sufflay advocated the thesis of the Iranian origin of the Croats, which is why he claimed that the Slavs had brought the dualistic "Zarathustra faith" to the Balkans.¹⁹⁴ It is not unimportant, and not only when it comes to Sufflay, that the German race theorists of the time considered Iranians to be Aryans.¹⁹⁵ Turning to the West and expecting support from that side were part of the Party-of-Rights traditions, and Sufflay, like Starčević and Kvaternik before him, insisted on this: "Croatian nationalism does not mean only love for the homeland and the Croatian homes on it, it does not mean local patriotism, but loyal service to the entire white West. And for that it is absolutely positive."¹⁹⁶ Hilferding could have agreed with him about the function of Croatian nationalism, but not about its valuation. On the anniversary of Sufflay's death,

¹⁹¹ M. Šufflay, „Radić, Bethlen i Mussolini“, 29. Dušan's empire = The Kingdom of SHS.

¹⁹² Milan Šufflay, „Hrvatska krv i zemlja“, in: *Hrvatska u svjetlu svjetske historije i politike. Dvanaest eseja* (Zagreb: Merkantile, 1928), 30.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, 32.

¹⁹⁴ See: Dr. Milan pl. Šufflay, „Starohrvatska baština iz pradomovine“, in: *Izabrani eseji, prikazi i članci*. Priredili Darko Sagrak i Musa Ahmeti (Zagreb: Darko Sagrak, 1999), 120; Milan Šufflay, „Hrvati u sredovječnom svjetskom viru (1931.)“, in: *Izabrani politički spisi*. Priredio Dubravko Jelčić (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2000), 307, 310, 313–314.

¹⁹⁵ Nevenko Bartulin, "The ideal Nordic-Dinaric racial type: Racial anthropology in the Independent State of Croatia", *Review of Croatian History*, vol. 5, no. 1, (2009), 204.

¹⁹⁶ Milan Šufflay, „Značajke hrvatske nacije“, in: *Hrvatska u svjetlu svjetske historije i politike. Dvanaest eseja* (Zagreb: Merkantile, 1928), 41.

this thought of his was quoted by the newsletter of the Ustasha organization – *Ustaša*.¹⁹⁷ Sufflay was killed in 1931, it is believed – by order of the authorities.¹⁹⁸ But he did not disappear without a trace: in historiography it is considered that he had “[...] a noticeable influence on the later ideology of the Ustasha movement and Croatian nationalism.”¹⁹⁹

Ivan Sisarić (?–after 1938), doctor, Party-of-Rights ideologue and member of HSS, wrote the book *Hrvatski mit XX. stoljeća: ideologija Hrvatskog seljačkog pokreta: apologija hrvatskog nacionalizma / Croatian myth of the 20th Century: The Ideology of the Croatian Peasant Movement: an Apology for Croatian Nationalism*. The book is, in fact, an apology for the HSS ideology, which the author considered superior to communism, fascism or Nazism, and with which he often compared it: “Radić’s science has nothing in common with communism, but rather with National Socialism, and maybe it is bad that it wasn’t felt and noticed in time.”²⁰⁰ Sisarić highly valued the Party-of-Rights ideologue, so he considered that “[...] a thousand-year Croatian dream, a Croatian historical myth, embodied in the image of fate and the guard of the national genius Ante Starčević [...]”²⁰¹ Like the founder of the Party-of-Rights ideology, Sisarić was looking for ways to show Croatian “superiority” and “right”: “The ruling talent of a nation, which gives it, like an individual, a certain moral right to leadership in a constant historical moment, manifests itself in an irresistible force of will [...]”²⁰² Then he tried to fit this “right” into contemporary circumstances: “The Fascist idea of the will, the National Socialist idea of race, the Croatian-peasant idea of home are essentially one and the same – an internal instinctive principle inherent in every ruling nation [...]”²⁰³ And for Croats, the “right” to rule is immanent: “The idea of race is not a reality, but a feeling, not a scientific knowledge, a myth [...]. That feeling, that myth, is the Croatian race, the race of the Croatian ruling people.”²⁰⁴ He rounded off and closed his theory of the Croatian nation: “A Croat can learn and improve only through

¹⁹⁷ „Šufflay – naš žrec i vidovnjak“, *Ustaša*, y. XI, no. 18, 2. XI 1941, 7.

¹⁹⁸ Darko Sagrak, „Kulturološka, znanstvena i politička baština Milana pl. Šufflaya“, in: Dr. Milan pl. Šufflay, *Izabrani eseji, prikazi i članci*. Priredili Darko Sagrak i Musa Ahmeti (Zagreb: Darko Sagrak, 1999), III–IV, VII, X.

¹⁹⁹ S. Kljajić, *Nikada više Jugoslavija*, 35.

²⁰⁰ Ivan Sisarić, *Hrvatski mit XX. stoljeća, ideologija hrvatskog seljačkog pokreta: apologija hrvatskog nacionalizma* (Zagreb: Hrvatski tiskarski zavod, 1938), 72.

²⁰¹ *Ibid*, 87.

²⁰² *Ibid*, 182.

²⁰³ *Ibid*, 196.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid*, 197.

the Croatian word of Croatian law, Croatian history and other Croatian racial heritage."²⁰⁵ His attitude towards the Jews is typical of the 1930s: "The Germans, just like the Jews, on the basis of race, want to distinguish themselves and thus stand out and rise above other peoples. 'Deuteronomium' found in the temple of Jerusalem during the reign of King Joshua, is nothing but a deteriorated edition of Hitler's regulations and anti-Jewish laws. In its every instruction and provision, they pray and swear to Yahweh to 'allow the Jews to devour all the nations'."²⁰⁶ It is not far from such a position to the position that "[...] the Croatian corrupt gentleman was created mainly as a reflection or casting of the mold of the international, global, asphalt, corrupt Jew. This slowly led to the fact that in some cities and branches of economy the Croat almost became a servant in his own house [...] With the Dinaric agility, impetuosity and assertiveness, that Jewish-Croatianness needs to be stopped with a foot on the chest [...]."²⁰⁷ Sisarić interpreted the HSS ideology as double racism: social and anti-Semitic.²⁰⁸

Stjepan Buć (1888–1975), doctor of law, MP and member of the Main Board of the HSS, joined the Croatian Party of Rights in 1925. Both before and during the existence of the NDH, Buć advocated a pro-German policy, and in accordance with it, he gave lectures at the "Ante Starčević" Cooperative. By ideological conviction, Buć was a National Socialist, and according to some data, he clashed with the Ustasha from those positions.²⁰⁹ In the brochure from 1936, *Temeljne misli nauke Dra. Ante Starčevića / Fundamental Thoughts of Science of Dr. Ante Starčević*, Buć claimed that Croats are descendants of the Goths.²¹⁰ And, as sociologist Dinko Tomašić says, "[...] the theory about the Gothic origin of the Croats is nothing but a branch of the theory about Nordic superiority, because the Goths were Nordic, so in that regard the Croats would also have the

²⁰⁵ *Ibid*, 258.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid*, 274. "Deuteronomy" = The fifth book of Moses.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid*, 276. Corrupt gentleman = cliché about people from cities.

²⁰⁸ Olivera Milosavljević did not mention Sisarić's racism, although she studied his book in detail. See: Olivera Milosavljević, *U tradiciji nacionalizma ili stereotipi srpskih intelektualaca XX veka o „nama“ i „drugima“* (Beograd: Helsinški odbor za ljudska prava u Srbiji, 2002), 312–314.

²⁰⁹ Bogdan Krizman, *NDH između Hitlera i Mussolinija* (Zagreb: Globus, 1983), 37, 338, 457; M. Jareb, *Ustaško-domobranski pokret*, 510–511; *ibid*, „Jesu li Hrvati postali Goti? Odnos ustaša i vlasti Nezavisne Države Hrvatske prema neslavenskim teorijama o podrijetlu Hrvata“, *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, no. 3, (2008), 875.

²¹⁰ Stjepan Buć, *Temeljne misli nauke Dra. Ante Starčevića. Predavanje održano dne 15. veljače 1936. Hrvatskoj Sveučilišnoj Omladini* (Zagreb: Tiskara Danica, [1936.]), 5–6.

right to consider themselves superior.”²¹¹ Buć wrote that Ante Starčević in particular was a representative of a type of people who “have all the traits of the chosen race”, as well as that he was “a product of pure Croatian blood.”²¹² In the section entitled *Racial thought is the basis of Starčević’s work*, Buć wrote: “Seventy years ago, Starčević highlighted the racial idea on which Adolf Hitler based his program for the revival and organization of German national life. [...] Starčević, like Hitler so many decades later, emphasized the value and cult of the chosen, high-quality, national element [...].”²¹³ According to Rory Yeomans, Buć “discovered Starčević as a National Socialist.”²¹⁴ Perhaps not as a National Socialist, but certainly as a racist. In the 1941 booklet *Naši službeni povjesničari i pitanje podrijetla Hrvata / Our Official Historians and the Question of the Origin of the Croats*, Buć, referring to Starčević, denied that the Croats had any connection with the Slavs, whom he proved to be of “slave blood” and “a bad race”, and that they “resembled more beasts than humans”, that the Croatian state was “founded by the Germanic Goths”, that art is a “mirror of the race”, etc.²¹⁵ After the war, Buć emigrated to Germany, where he was a member of the Croatian People’s Committee, founded by Pavelić’s former associate Branimir Jelić.²¹⁶ He continued to publish in the same spirit.²¹⁷

Ante Pavelić (1889–1959), doctor of law, politician, founder of the Ustasha organization, head of the NDH.²¹⁸ Julije Makanec claimed that Pavelić was a student and follower of Ante Starčević from his youth.²¹⁹ In his texts, Pavelić used the term “breed” less often than Starčević, and far more often the words “blood”, “bloody”, “pure-bloodied”, “bleeding”, “bloody”, “bloodshed”, “bloodthirsty”, etc.²²⁰

²¹¹ D. Tomašić, *Politički razvitak Hrvata*, 169.

²¹² S. Buć, *Temeljne misli nauke Dra. Ante Starčevića*, 5–6.

²¹³ *Ibid*, 30.

²¹⁴ R. Yeomans, „Of ‘Yugoslav barbarians’ and Croatian Gentlemen Scholars“, 112.

²¹⁵ Stjepan Buć, *Naši službeni povjesničari i pitanje podrijetla Hrvata* (Zagreb, s.n. 1941), 4, 10, 11, 16, 20. Buć interpreted the word “breed” as “race”.

²¹⁶ I. Mužić, *Stjepan Radić u Kraljevini SHS*, 200; Zdravko Dizdar, „Buć, Stjepan“, in: *Tko je tko u NDH?* (Zagreb: Minerva, 1997), 52–53.

²¹⁷ Stjepan Buć, „Posljedice slavomanije za našu povijest i politiku“, *Hrvatska revija*, y. XI, vol. 1–2 (41–42), (1961), 35–36; *ibid*, „Problemi etnogeneze Hrvata“, *Hrvatska revija*, y. XX, vol. 4 (80), (1970), 919–958.

²¹⁸ Slaven Ravlić „Pavelić, Ante“, in: *Tko je tko u NDH?* (Zagreb: Minerva, 1997), 306–310.

²¹⁹ J. Makanec, „Temelji Poglavnikove politike“, u: *Hrvatski vidici. Nacionalno-politički eseji* (Zagreb: Društvo hrvatskih srednjoškolskih profesora, 1944), 62. Претходно objavљено у: *Veliko razkršće*, 35–45.

²²⁰ Ante Pavelić, *Strahote zabluda* (Zagreb: Knjižara Stjepan Kugli, 1941), passim; *Poglavnik govori* (Zagreb: Ured za promičbu GUS, 1941), passim.

Pavelić referred to Starčević on numerous occasions,²²¹ and he also read and appreciated the work of Ivo Pilar.²²² The Ustasas tried to portray Pavelić as a "historical figure who realized the ideas of Ante Starčević and Stjepan Radić."²²³ Ustasha youth aged 15-18 were called Ustaška Starčevićeva Mladež (*Starčević's Ustasha Youth*) and published the magazine *Starčevićeva mladež*.²²⁴ One of the more important terms used by Pavelić and the Ustasas was *Volksgemeinschaft*, that is, *people's community*, with which they tried to abolish individualism and for the whole nation to become "one family."²²⁵ The authorship of that term is attributed to Adolf Hitler, and the equivalence of the two terms was confirmed by Pavelić himself.²²⁶ It is a concept according to which political rights and obligations stemmed from origin. Ante Pavelić did not declare the Gothic theory as an official position, but flirted with it in order to position the Ustasha movement in relation to Germany and its ideology.²²⁷ For example after a meeting with his associate Slavko Kvaternik in 1941, Hitler mentioned the "Gothic" origin of the Croats, but already in 1942 he was talking about how that people should be "Germanized."²²⁸ The analysis of the position of the Croats in relation to the Nazi racial theory showed that, like the Estonians, Latvians and others, they would probably have the role of *Perioeci*, above whom would be the Germans as *Spartiates*, and below whom would be the Slavs as *Helots* of the New European Order.²²⁹ Such a "hierarchical ladder" of peoples, according to which the Serbs were at the very bottom, rested on the Austro-Hungarian pro-

²²¹ E.g. Ante Pavelić, *Putem hrvatskog državnog prava: Poglavnikovi govori, izjave i članci prije odlaska u tuđinu*, Uvod i pogovor Darko Sagrač (Zagreb: Darko Sagrač, 1999), 77, 78, 79, 160, 172, 360, 395, 497, 547–548; *Poglavnik govori*, 8, 29, 30, 66, 72, 87–89.

²²² A. Pavelić, *Putem hrvatskog državnog prava*, 523.

²²³ Tihomir Cipek, „‘Stoljeće diktatura’ u Hrvatskoj“, in: *Hrvatska politika u XX. stoljeću. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa što je održan u palači Matice hrvatske 27–29. travnja 2004*. Editor Ljubomir Antić (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2006), 295, 303.

²²⁴ See: Ante Pavelić, „Zakonska odredba o djelovnju ‘Ustaške mladeži’“, in: *Ustaša*, (Zagreb: Ured za promičbu GUS, 1941), 53; *Starčevićeva mladež: priručni list za dužnostnike i voditelje radnih jedinica Starčevićeve mladeži*. Editor Rudolf Pavlek.

²²⁵ Aleksandar Seitz, *Put do hrvatskog socializma* (Zagreb: Glavni savez staliških i drugih postrojbi, 1943), 45, 180, 283.

²²⁶ See: A. Seitz, „Tajna njemačkog uspjeha“, u: *Put do hrvatskog socializma*, 180; N. Bartulin, „Ideologija nacije i rase“, 219.

²²⁷ More about this in: M. Jareb, „Jesu li Hrvati postali Goti?“, 869–882.

²²⁸ *Hitler's Table Talk 1941–1944. His Private Conversations*, introduction and preface H. R. Trevor-Roper, (New York: Enigma books, 2000), 95, 473.

²²⁹ N. Bartulin, *The racial idea in the ISC*, 198–199. In ancient Sparta, *Spartiates* were the ruling caste of warriors, *Perioeci* were conquered peasants-natives without civil rights, and *Helots* were state slaves.

paganda base. During World War II in Southeastern Europe, Jews and Gypsies were added to them.²³⁰ American historians Stanley Payne and Sabrina Ramet wrote about the racism of Ustasha ideology, citing Gothic theory as evidence.²³¹ Mario Jareb criticized them, because that theory was not officially an element of Ustasha ideology, but he is wrong when he reduces the question of Ustasha racism to the question of Gothic theory, which, after all, had been allowed by the NDH censorship. Fikreta Jelić-Butić once stated that the racist component was clearly expressed in the *Principles of the Croatian Ustasha movement*.²³² In that case too, Jareb contested the racism of the Ustasha, citing the first two articles of their *Principles* as proof of the absence of racism, but he kept silent about the articles that state: “11. In the Croatian state and national affairs in the Independent State of Croatia, no one who is not a member of the Croatian nation by blood and genealogy may decide [...] 12. *The peasantry is the foundation and source of all life, and as such is the first holder of all state power in the Croatian state.* Moreover, all classes of the Croatian people make up one national unit, since the other classes in the Croatian nation, whose members are members of Croatian blood, have not only their roots and origins, but also a permanent family ties with the village. Anyone in Croatia who does not come from a peasant family is in ninety cases out of a hundred not of Croatian origin and blood, but an immigrated foreigner.”²³³ Such deprivation of political rights on the basis of “genealogy”, “origin”, “blood”, “roots” cannot be characterized otherwise than as racist. In addition, the NDH adopted the *Legal Provision on Racial Affiliation* (30 April 1941) and the *Legal Provision on the Protection of Aryan Blood and the Honor of the Croatian People* (30 April 1941), which were directed against Jews and Gypsies.²³⁴ A Racial Political Commission was also established within the NDH Ministry of Internal Affairs, whose members were university professors Boris Zarnik, Zdravko Lorković and Đuro Vranešić.²³⁵ On 1 May 1942, a large *Croatian Anti-Jewish Exhibition* was opened in Zagreb.²³⁶ Finally, the racist policy, which was ma-

²³⁰ Milan Ristović, *Nemački „novi poredak“ i Jugoistočna Evropa 1940/41–1944/45*. (Beograd: Vojnoizdavački i novinski centar, 1991), 87–88.

²³¹ M. Jareb, „Jesu li Hrvati postali Goti?“, 870.

²³² F. Jelić-Butić, *Ustaše i NDH*, 23.

²³³ Ante Pavelić, „Načela Hrvatskog Ustaškog Pokreta“, in: *Ustaša* (Zagreb: Ured za promičbu GUS, 1941), 9. Italics by Pavelić.

²³⁴ *Zakoni, zakonske odredbe i t.d. proglašene od 11. travnja do 26. svibnja 1941. Knjiga I. (svezak 1.–10.)*, urednik Adam Mataić (Zagreb: St. Kugli, 1941), 109–115.

²³⁵ N. Bartulin, *The racial idea in the ISC*, 153.

²³⁶ Ivan Raos, „Židovi – neprijatelji svih naroda“, *Hrvatska revija*, y. XV, no. 6, (1942), 338–339. The author of the exhibition review is the author of the novel *Beggars and Sons*.

nifested through the extermination of undesirable peoples, was consistently implemented by the NDH until the last day of its existence.

Dominik Mandić (1889–1973), doctor of theology, historian, held the high position of general treasurer in the Franciscan order.²³⁷ Scientific criticism has proved that in his works, Mandić misquoted sources and literature, arbitrarily interpreted and translated documents and even – invented sources.²³⁸ According to his interpretation, Serbs are not an Indo-European people and come from Asia Minor, during the Ottoman era in the Balkans they mixed with Vlachs, who are descendants of Roman soldiers from Mauritania in North Africa, while Croats are of Sarmatian-Iranian origin.²³⁹ Mandić wrote that in the Balkans there were "groups of dark-skinned people" and that Croats called "all Serbs Vlachs, especially those with dark skin", and that he used "[...] the name Vlach in its ethnic meaning, for members of those dark-skinned groups of people in Europe, whose blood descended from the medieval dark-black Vlachs of the Romanian language."²⁴⁰ This is how he explained the skin color of Karađorđe Petrović and his descendants, as well as Svetozar Pribićević.²⁴¹ Mandić's books are – like Starčević's – ideological pamphlets written in scientific form.²⁴² The most important, but also the most obvious Mandić's tendency is to separate Serbs and Croats in every possible way. He does not state the racial hierarchy explicitly, aware that this would compromise his interpretation, but it is clear that he is addressing those who accept the racial theory. A vivid example of his "method" is the section in which he presents the "qualities" and "flaws" of Vlachs (especially Aromanians). The "traits" of Vlachs are "[...] combativeness, realistic coping in new, especially difficult situations; easy adaptation to the environment they come to. As for their needs, they are satisfied with little. They are physically strong, nimble and fast. They are ardent patriots of the people they submit to."²⁴³ He devoted a page and a half to their "flaws" and divided

²³⁷ Neven Budak, „Dominik Mandić i njegovo djelo“, in: Dominik Mandić, *Hrvati i Srbi, dva stara različita naroda* (Zagreb: NZ Matice hrvatske, 1990), 6. First edition of the book from 1971.

²³⁸ *Ibid*, 10–11.

²³⁹ D. Mandić, *Hrvati i Srbi*, 17–18, 22–23, 191–195, 269, 271; D. Mandić, *Hrvatske zemlje u prošlosti i sadašnjosti* (Chicago / Rim: Ziral, 1973), 178–179.

²⁴⁰ D. Mandić, *Hrvati i Srbi*, 191.

²⁴¹ *Ibid*, 214, 225, 253.

²⁴² Sometimes he referred to Starčević. See: Dominik Mandić, *Bosna i Hercegovina. Povijesno kritička istraživanja III* (Torino / Zürich / Roma / Chicago: Ziral, 1982), 461, 462, 491; *ibid*, *Hrvati i Srbi. Dva stara različita Naroda* (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, 1990), 235, 242, 243; Krunoslav Draganović i Dominik Mandić, *Herceg-Bosna i Hrvatska* (Split: Laus, 1991), 56.

²⁴³ D. Mandić, *Hrvati i Srbi*, 225.

them into four groups: 1) “semi-nomadic and warrior life”, “weak and superficial religious instruction”, “moral deviations and faults, which have [...] grown into the habits and permanent vices of the Vlachs”, “pretense”, the proclivity to “fraud, lie and swindle, which over time have passed into the blood of the Vlachs.” Among the Serbs, who are descendants of the Vlachs, “[...] fraud, lies, especially swindle, are not considered moral evil, but heroism [...]” 2) “[...] they robbed other people’s goods, appropriated them and lived on other people’s pain.” 3) “[...] appetite for shedding human blood, murder and conspiracies [...] underestimating human life, bloodlust and cruelty”, which, according to Mandić, can explain “[...] the slaughter of Croats, Catholics and Muslims during World War II and immediately after it.” 4) “Excessive boasting, ostentation and emphasizing personal traits. [...] They are contentious and big partisans.”²⁴⁴ Like Starčević, Truhelka and Pilar, Mandić aimed to divide the Serbian national corps into two “racial” components and thereby weaken and reduce it.²⁴⁵ Despite the numerous negative clichés and generalizations presented, Mandić’s work is still widely received today.²⁴⁶

Mirko Kus-Nikolajev (1896–1961), doctor of sociology and ethnology. He was a librarian in the General Directorate for Publicity (Propaganda) of the NDH. After the war, he was sentenced to prison.²⁴⁷ He claimed that Croats were members of the “Dinaric race” with strong admixtures of the “Nordic racial element.” He combined the Gothic and autochthonous theories, according to which “[...] the Dinaric type is still so unique in its main traits that it cannot be considered an offshoot or relative of any other European race known today.”²⁴⁸ Autochthonism was sometimes advocated by the Ustashas as well, and Ante Pavelić himself once claimed that “[...] Croats are not Slavs by race, they are Croats by origin and nothing more.”²⁴⁹ That is Starčević’s old thesis from the book *Bi-li k Slavstvu ili ka Hrvatstvu? / Would You Side with the Slavism or Croatianness?* Kus-Nikolajev interpreted the origin of

²⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 225. The following are examples with which Mandić tries to prove these claims.

²⁴⁵ He often quoted Truhelka’s works. See: D. Mandić, *Hrvati i Srbi*; *ibid*, *Crvena Hrvatska u svjetlu povijesnih izvora* (Chicago / Rim: Ziral, 1973); *ibid*, *Bosna i Hercegovina I–III*.

²⁴⁶ *Fra Dominik Mandić (1889.–1973.). Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog simpozija održanog u prigodi 40. obljetnice njegove smrti (Mostar–Široki Brijeg, 24. i 25. listopada 2013.)*, edited by Robert Jolić (Mostar / Zagreb: Hercegovačka franjevačka provincija Uznesenja BDM - Franjevačka knjižnica Mostar / Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2014) – 38 texts on 1031 pages.

²⁴⁷ Josip Bratulić, „Kus-Nikolajev, Mirko“, u: *Tko je tko u NDH?* (Zagreb: Minerva, 1997), 222.

²⁴⁸ Mirko Kus-Nikolajev, „Rasni sastav Hrvata: nordijske primjese pojačavaju i onako visoku životnu i kulturnu vrijednost hrvatskog naroda“, *Spremnost*, 12. VII 1942, 5.

²⁴⁹ Pavelić’s interview for *Il Giornale d’Italia*, 15. V 1941. Quoted from: F. Jelić-Butić, *Ustaše i NDH*, 140.

medieval Croatian art using the “Nordic-Germanic thesis” of the Austrian art historian Josef Strzygowski (1862–1941), known for his racist views. He wrote that the ornamental “troplet” (a type of interlace) could have been brought to Croatian regions by “[...] peoples of the Nordic race, (e.g. Celts) and it was only subsequently revived under the influence of the Iranian Croats, who were also of the Nordic race [...].”²⁵⁰ The “troplet” once again gained a significant place in the visual design of the official Croatian identity in 1990, when the HDZ came to power. The hierarchization of “races” is best seen from Kus-Nikolajev’s position: “Strengthening the Nordic element in the Dinaric race would also mean strengthening the positive traits in our people.”²⁵¹ When he stated this, he immediately “strengthened” the “Nordic admixture” in Croats, connecting them “[...] with the prehistoric Illyrians, who belonged to the Nordic race.”²⁵² Thus, in the circumstances of World War II, the Croats were “taken care of” as part of the superior race of the Aryan masters of the world, which advanced on all fronts. But already since the Battle of Stalingrad, which began five days after the publication of the article about the “troplet”, new dark clouds appeared on the horizon.

Mladen Lorković (1910–1945), doctor of law, supporter of the Croatian Party of Rights, then Ustasha and close associate of Ante Pavelić, was the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the NDH government, killed in prison for the conspiracy against Pavelić and Germany.²⁵³ He is the author of texts in which he “proved” the Iranian-Slavic origin of Croats and that they are “racially” identical with Bosnian Muslims. For him, Serbs are “remnants of Balkan-Romanian and Gypsy mixed race.”²⁵⁴ In his opinion, “[...] on the stage of Croatian history, Starčević and Pavelić are one: the prophet and awakener Ante, after giving the nation a thought and a goal, turns into Ante the statesman, revolutionary and soldier, who turns the thought into action.”²⁵⁵ Even before the war, Lorković advocated a conservative ideology according to which the warrior Iranian tribe of Croats, whom he placed in “Asian Sarmatia”, had subdued the Slavs in the Pryazovia region and organized the state, receiving the language and customs from the Slavs: “The original people of the Iranian Croats merged with the Slavic subjects.”²⁵⁶ The con-

²⁵⁰ Mirko Kus-Nikolajev, „Nordijsko podrijetlo starohrvatskog pletenca“, *Spremnost*, y. I, no. 7, 10. IV 1942, 7.

²⁵¹ Ibid, „Rasni sastav Hrvata“, 5.

²⁵² Ibid, 5.

²⁵³ Slaven Ravlić, „Lorković, Mladen“, in: *Tko je tko u NDH?* (Zagreb: Minerva, 1997), 237–239.

²⁵⁴ C. Трифковић, *Устауе*, 78. First published in: *Neue Ordnung*, 7. IX 1941.

²⁵⁵ Mladen Lorković, „Zadaci našeg naraštaja“, *Hrvatsko kolo*, bk. XXII, (1941), 1–2.

²⁵⁶ Ibid, *Narod i zemlja Hrvata*, (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1939), 4–6.

viction of the superiority of those ancestors of the Croat and the aspirations of a great state are revealed in his expressions “Ancient-Iranian leaven” which began to create “Great or White Croatia” in the “Slavic dough”, as well as the thought that “Croats were the state ferment of Sam’s monarchy” which was called the “Great Croatia.”²⁵⁷ Starčević also wrote about the Croats as “leaven” in *Bi-li k Slavstvu ili ka Hrvatstvu? / Would You Side with the Slavism or Croatianness?* The *Ustasha* newspaper claimed: “According to the historical evidence, which has been accepted by our science, and which Dr. Mladen Lorković especially emphasized in his book ‘Narod i zemlja hrvata’ (*Croatian People and Land*), *Croats are an old warrior people of Iranian origin.*”²⁵⁸ However, this does not mean that the Iranian theory was part of the Ustasha ideology, because it did not appear in party or state documents, but rather it was one of the three permitted interpretations of the origin of the Croats: 1) Gothic; 2) Iranian; 3) Dinaric (i.e. autochthonous). Lorković’s racism also included anti-Semitism. Already in 1941, he wrote that one of the tasks consisted in “[...] preserving the Croatian race and ending the economic enslavement of the Croats by the Jews. Much more than it seems at first glance, Croatia was already diluted by the influx of Jewish blood into the upper Croatian strata, which entailed the weakening of all healthy national feelings and forces and the tendency to degenerate.”²⁵⁹ Territories claimed by the *Volksgemeinschaft* (Croatian national community), Lorković defined as the NDH, with the addition of Sanjak of Novi Pazar, the Montenegrin coast to Budva, as well as Rijeka, Istria and Kvarner.²⁶⁰

Boris Zarnik (1883–1945), Slovenian, doctor of biology, university professor in Zagreb.²⁶¹ The biological branch of the Croatian “school” of racism had its fullest and most systematic expression during the NDH. In the *Croatian Encyclopedia*, under the entry *Man*, there is a part entitled *Human races*, with sections: *Concept and definition of race*, *Origin of races*, *Hereditary differences of man*, *Development of the science of human races*, *Division and description of human races*, *Races and nation*, etc.²⁶² The author pointed out the physical cha-

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 6.

²⁵⁸ J. P. „Vojnički narod Hrvata“, *Ustaša*, y. XI, no. 5, 3. VIII 1941, 4. Part of the text highlighted in the original.

²⁵⁹ M. Lorković, „Zadaci našeg naraštaja“, 2–3.

²⁶⁰ С. Трифковић, *Устауе*, 78.

²⁶¹ Stjepan Zimmermann, „Prof. Borisu Zarniku in memoriam“, *Spremnost*, y. IV, no. 153, 21. I 1945, 7.

²⁶² Boris Zarnik, „Čovjek“, in: *Hrvatska enciklopedija*, IV, Cliachit-diktis (Zagreb: HIBZ, 1942), 346–366.

racteristics of people, such as body constitution and skin color, which was abundantly illustrated with photographs, drawings and graphs. His interpretation presents something new, because he believes that races and the science of them exist, but at the same time he claims that “[...] there can be no talk of ‘inferior’ or ‘superior’ races, or more or less worthy, because each race has merged with its environment into a harmonious whole”, as well as that “racist efforts have no basis in the science of races.”²⁶³ He therefore rejected the social and political use of racism, but not the racial prejudice itself or the “science” of it. In addition, he was a member of the Racial Political Commission in the NDH and one of the three authors of racist legislation. The other two were Zdravko Lorković and Đuro Vranešić. In this endeavor, they collaborated with Chief Ante Pavelić, President of the Legislative Commission Milovan Žanić, Minister of Internal Affairs Andrija Artuković and other members of the NDH government.²⁶⁴ Before Zarnik’s article in the *Encyclopedia*, Dinko Tomašić’s book appeared in 1938, in which he clearly separated the scientific from the ideological in the Croatian thought about their own identity and concluded: “There is no ‘race’ whose racists would not consider their race to be ‘superior’.”²⁶⁵ This, however, had no impact on the development of events.

Conclusion

Racist ideology in Croatia developed within the national ideology of Antun Starčević and the Party of Rights. From the mid-19th century, when he started an independent political career, his ideology gradually changed and won new supporters. The inherent contradiction of the Party-of-Right ideology, which included diverse elements, ended with the victory of conservative values over liberal ones. This study has researched the thesis that racism is an integral element of that ideology, which formed a branched-out “school” over time. This ideology was sometimes manifested as aristocratic racism (emphasizing the social, cultural and moral “superiority” of Croats), sometimes as anti-Semitism, sometimes as antinegroism (referring to “blood”, “breed”, “race” and physical traits), and sometimes as all that at the same time. The Croatian “school” of racism ended its evolution as racist nationalism. The eclecticism and incoherence of the Party-of-

²⁶³ Ibid, 352, 355.

²⁶⁴ Zoran S. Mirković, „Rasno zakonodavstvo u Nezavisnoj Državi Hrvatskoj“, in: *Pravni poredak Nezavisne Države Hrvatske*, editors Boris Begović and Zoran Mirković (Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu / Pravni fakultet, 2018), 42–43.

²⁶⁵ D. Tomašić, *Politički razvitak Hrvata*, 185.

Rights ideology, which gave birth to that “school”, was not a problem for the followers, because the ideological system does not have to be logically coherent or consistent: one either believes in it or does not. That is why modern political ideologies are called secular religions or pseudo-religions.

For Starčević and his supporters, “sub-humans” were those who “didn’t know” that they were Croats, but only until they “realized” it and accepted the Croatian name, i.e. until they “became Croats.” In the beginning, it was a kind of utilitarian racism, conceived as a means of verbal violence against non-Croats and political opponents among Croats. But even at that stage, Starčević expressed brutal and slanderous views that had the potential to lead to mass violence in certain historical circumstances. Over time, with the adoption of new ideas about “races”, as well as due to changes in the political and intellectual context, variations of the basic racist postulate have emerged, according to which there is an immutable hierarchy of peoples. Thus, new explanations of the “superiority” of the Croatian “ruling” nation and “rights” arising from “blood” were created, up to the extermination of “inferior” and “harmful” individuals and peoples. The analysis of sources and literature has showed that we can talk about the existence of an autochthonous Croatian “school” of racism, whose founder was Antun Starčević. Several of the most important elements of his doctrine have been identified: 1) hierarchizing peoples based on their “qualities” and “significance”; 2) hatred as an element of political doctrine; 3) social racism, which originates from the aristocratic racism of earlier centuries; 4) biological racism that was adopted at a time when it was believed that racial prejudice could be scientifically proven; 5) traditional anti-Semitism which is of religious origin and was backed by “science.”

Some Croatian authors of racist texts were followers of the Party-of-Rights doctrine, some referred to the texts of Starčević, Truhelka, Pilar, Sufflay and other early writers from the same “school”, but they often added some new elements to that ideology, referring to Gobineau, Gumplowicz, Weininger, Chamberlain... The list of fourteen names mentioned here should not be considered final, but sufficient to speak of followership and “school.” In cases where the members of that “school” do not explicitly refer to Starčević or Kvaternik, it can be determined from their texts that they adopted the most important postulates of the Party-of-Rights ideology, including racial ones.

The culmination of the development of Croatian racist nationalism is the formation of the Independent State of Croatia, in which racist and chauvinist ideas were implemented with unprecedented consistency and brutality. Apart from the fact that racist legislation was passed and the *Principles of the Ustasha Move-*

ment contained the provisions that political rights derived from origin, the extermination of Serbs, Jews, Gypsies (Roma) was also carried out on the basis of military, police and administrative decisions, and often on the basis of independent initiative of members and sympathizers of the Ustasha regime. The implementation of that policy on the entire territory of the NDH and the fact that due to the primitive methods of extermination many people had to be involved in that process, shows that the ideology that not only enabled, but also required widespread violence, had taken deep roots.

The founder of the Party-of-Rights ideology and the progenitor of the racist “school”, Antun Starčević, has been celebrated among his followers as the “Father of the Homeland” since the end of the 19th century, and during the NDH, his name was used to legitimize the Ustasha ideology and policy. That policy was nothing but the realization of the intellectual efforts of several generations of highly educated authors. Hardly anyone in that list did not hold the title of Doctor of Science, and many were actively engaged in scientific, journalistic and other intellectual work. They also have in common that they were deeply involved in the political struggle, some were leaders or members of political parties that fostered the Party-of-Rights ideology, and Ante Pavelić was also the chief of the NDH.

Although several researchers have thus far identified racial prejudices in the ideology of Croatian nationalism, scientific analysis of the racist aspect of the Party-of-Rights ideology has been absent for easily understandable reasons: during Yugoslavia, such research was limited by the social and political climate in the multinational federation, and after its collapse, the new Croatian state was founded exactly on the ideology of Ante Starčević. The lack of scientific interest in this topic outside of Croatia can be explained by inertia and conformity.

