

TRIALISM – THE ISSUE OF POLITICAL REORGANIZATION OF THE DUAL MONARCHY

TRIALİSM - ÇİFT MONARŞİNİN SİYASİ OLARAK YENİDEN DÜZENLENMESİ KONUSU

Filip NOVAKOVIĆ¹

Abstract

After the Spring of the Peoples 1848/49 it became obvious that the old state forms came to an end where the nation was represented through the figure of an absolute monarch. The times of nation-states has come and it is increasingly certain the old monarchies, composed of a multitude of nationalities, cannot in the end, as such, survive. The old Habsburg Empire was the most obvious example of a period that found its end in the first bourgeois revolutions. The changes were indispensable, the first of which was the Settlement of 1867 between the two largest people's Monarchies, the Germans and the Hungarians, followed by the Settlement between the parliaments of Budapest and Zagreb the following year. The author will analyze the events that followed, and at the potential solutions that tried to prevent the final collapse of the Danube Monarchy in 1918.

Keywords: Trialism, Austro-Hungary, Settlement, Triune Kingdom , Reorganization

Özet

Halkların Baharından Sonra 1848/49, ulusun mutlak bir hükümdar figürü aracılığıyla temsil edildiği eski devlet biçimlerinin sona erdiği aşıkardır. Zaman Ulus-devletlerin zamanıdır ve artık çok sayıda milletten oluşan eski monarşilerin hayatta kalamayacakları giderek daha da kesinleşmiştir. Eski Habsburg İmparatorluğu, sonunu ilk burjuva devrimlerinde bulan bir dönemin en bariz örneği olmuştur. Değişiklikler kaçınılmazdı, bunlardan ilki, en büyük iki halk monarşisi, Almanlar ve Macarlar arasındaki 1867 Uzlaşması ve ardından ertesi yıl Budapeşte ve Zagreb parlamentoları arasındaki Uzlaşma olmuştur. Yazar, takip eden olaylara ve 1918'de Tuna Monarşisinin nihai çöküşünü engellemeye çalışan olası çözümleri değerlendirecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Deneme, Avusturya-Macaristan, Yerleşim, Triune Krallığı, Yeniden Yapılanma.

1. INTRODUCTION

Decades after the end of the Napoleonic Wars with the Habsburg Empire we see the flourishing of reactionary forces and the firm belt of old absolutism and centralism that gripped the peoples of the Monarchy. The grip of the central government was so strong that it led to mass

1 Student at Faculty of Law, University of Banja Luka, ORCID: 0000-0001-9979-5824, filip.novakovic@student.pf.unibl.org

Makale Gönderim Tarihi(Manuscript Submit Date): 07.04.2021, Kabul Tarihi(Accepted Date): 23.12.2021, Basım Tarihi(Published Date): 30.12.2021, turnitin benzerlik oranı(turnitin similarity ratio): %3

revolutions and uprisings against the government in Vienna (this movement was particularly pronounced in Hungary, where even the government and entire state administration were formed). The revolution put two demands before the sovereign in Vienna: bourgeois-democratic reforms and political rights for all the peoples of the Monarchy (Šarkić, 1999, p. 249). Under great pressure, the emperor granted the position and proclaimed the abolition of feudal relations. During the revolution of 1848/49, the idea of political rapprochement of the South Slavic peoples in the Monarchy in order to create a counterbalance to the German and Hungarian oligarchy appeared in (Imamović, 2006, p. 88). This idea was once adopted under the name of trialism and essentially expressed the view of the federalization of the multinational Habsburg Empire. This attitude was unacceptable for the ruling circles in Vienna because it was considered that the united Kingdom of Croatia-Slavonia and Serbian Vojvodina must not become the basis for the creation of a single state of South Slavs (Kann, 1964, pp. 254-257; Matković, 2001, pp. 49-50; Hondius and Hondius, 1968, p. 80).

The imperial proclamation on the abolition of feudal relations, but also on the democratization of the country, was greeted with enthusiasm, but it did not last long. The uprising was suppressed by military intervention by Russia, and shortly afterwards, in 1851, the Constitution was repealed. There was a period of absolutism personified through the character of the Minister of the Interior Alexander Bach (the period from the 1851st to 1860th year can be called the period of Bach's absolutism) (Fernandez, 2015, pp. 9-10). After the defeat by Italy, Emperor Franz Joseph I had no choice but in 1860 to enact a new constitution known as the October Diploma. The following year, the February diploma was proclaimed, which narrowed the rights proclaimed by the Constitution. The ruling structures in Vienna have long argued over whether to give in and create a federation or to make a compromise with the Hungarian oligarchy and „re-vote“ other nations. After the war with Prussia, the answer was obvious. The negotiations between Vienna and Budapest were sequeled.

2. AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN AGREEMENT

The Habsburg monarchy represented a special community of several entities connected by the wreath of the Austrian ruler. However, the influence of that crown was weakly felt, from the time of the development of enlightened absolutism, as if the central state power was strengthening. Strengthening national and world expiry of wars and revolutions of the 18th and 19th centuries, th old monarchy was visibly weakened and territorialy reduced (the first blows were experienced by the Austrian Empire with the Napoleonic Wars (1804-1815), then the loss of territory in northern Italy in 1859, and finally the loss of leadership in the German

TRIALISM – THE ISSUE OF POLITICAL REORGANIZATION OF THE DUAL MONARCHY

Confederation by Prussia in 1866, after the Austro-Prussian War). The circumstances were such that a reaction from the highest circles within the Monarchy was required. It was necessary to change something. The Austrian Prime Minister, Count Friedrich Beust, one of the greatest advocates of the Austro-Hungarian compromise with the ruling class of the Hungarian aristocracy, launched a campaign „against the Slavic danger“ (Čulinović, 1961, p. 110). Francis Deak, then the master of the parliamentary majority and the first man of Hungarian liberals in the House of Representatives of the Parliament in Budapest, submitted a plan to the government in Vienna on the reorganization of the Habsburg monarchy (it is believed that the draft was made according to the aspirations of the Hungarian ruling circles on complete domination over the „Land of the crown of St. Stephan“) (Čulinović, 1961, pp. 110-115). The Emperor adopted this draft in his Rescript of February 17th 1867, and the first Hungarian Government was formed, headed by Count Gyula Andrassy. Thus, Austria and Hungary settled their relations in a single settlement (Šišić, 1962, p. 447). The monarchy is now and become a union composed of two entities. Each had its own organs that depicted its „statehood“. In addition to these, there were joint bodies of the Monarchy . The first among them is the monarch when they represent him as the father of the new state. Then we see the Joint Council of Ministers, as well as a joint body that is searched and the umbrella law solutions, so-called „Delegations“.

132

Austria and Hungary were henceforth two entities united through an emperor and a king (Kaiser von Österreich und Apostolischer König von Ungarn, the relationship between Austria and Hungary (the Austro-Hungarian settlement) was governed by the Law of 21st December 1867 RGBL No. 146 for Austria and Article XII of March 30, 1867 for Hungary) (Šarkić, 1999, pp. 250-252; Čulinović, 1961, pp. 110-115). Each part of the Monarchy now had its own state system. Austria was an empire with an emperor at the head of the state administration. He shared power with the Imperial Council, Parliament composed of two chambers – the House of Representatives and the House of Lords (the House of Representatives was represented by Member of the Parliament (hereinafter: MPs) elected by various curiae, while the House of Lords (Herrenhaus) was composed of representatives of the highest nobility and members of the church clergy). Cislaitanien (commonly used name for the Austrian part of the Monarchy, meaning „Land on this side of the river Laitha“) consisted of ten crown lands with limited autonomy. Thus, Austria had the characteristics of a typical constitutional monarchy of the 19th century. On the other hand, in the Land of the crown of St. Stephan (this was the official name of the Hungarian part of the Monarchy, in use was still the name Transleithnia (Transleithanien), which means „Land beyond the river Leitha“) we see a pronounced

parliamentarism where the government depends on a majority in the House of Representatives (not so much on members of the Upper House, the composition of the Upper House of the Hungarian Parliament was the same as in Austria). Thus, the Hungarian Parliament managed to gain a dominant role over the government. The passions between the two largest peoples of the Monarchy subsided with this agreement. Small nations from the southern borders of the now Dual Monarchy began to protest because they felt betrayed by the Vienna court, but also by their comrades-in-arms in the fight for freedom and equality of peoples. It was necessary to solve their national question as well.

3. CROATIAN-HUNGARIAN AGREEMENT

In 1866/67 Franz Joseph wrote the Croatian Parliament asking for an opinion on resolving the state issue. The Parliament sent three proposals to the Emperor. According to the first, the relations between the Triune Kingdom and the Kingdom of Hungary should remain unchanged, the second was based on the fact that the Croatian Parliament never adopted the laws in force in Hungary in 1848 and that the Triune Kingdom had no obligations to Hungary, and the third was that the Parliament independently resolve the issue of state-legal relations between Croatia and Austria, ie without the interference of Hungary (Šišić, 1962, p. 448). We see that the Croatian Parliament largely considered it possible to put the Triune Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia on an equal footing with Austria. The wind behind them was Count Richard Belcredi, the Prime Minister in Vienna, and a great advocate of the federalist idea. However, Belcredi soon resigned from that position, and his successors more or less made a compromise with their partners in Budapest, thus completely excluding the Croatian Parliament from the negotiations on the future state system.

A special provision in the Austro-Hungarian settlement referred to the issue of the Kingdom of Croatia. Vienna placed the issue in the hands of the new Hungarian government and expressed the belief that it was best not to interfere in the disagreements between Croats and Hungarians and let them resolve their relationship on their own. In October 1867, the emperor brought a new Croatian electoral order, according to which the number of virilists was significantly increased. This ensured a majority in the Croatian Parliament (Čulinović, 1961, p. 116; Šišić, 1962, p. 448) in favor of the proposed agreement by the Hungarian Parliament. The text was soon compiled and on September 28, 1868, the Croatian-Hungarian settlement was concluded, and most of the provisions of this agreement were unfavorable for the state and legal position of Croatia (Imamović, 2003, p. 215).

***TRIALISM – THE ISSUE OF POLITICAL REORGANIZATION OF THE DUAL
MONARCHY***

Examining the nature of this agreement, we see that the Croatian-Hungarian settlement is a bilateral agreement concluded between the parliaments of two „states“. By this act, the Kingdom of Croatia represented a special state legal entity within the borders of the Kingdom of Hungary, which again, according to the Austro-Hungarian settlement, had a special position and relationship with Austria. In principle, no law in Hungary could be passed without the participation of representatives of the Triune Kingdom, and therefore not at the state level. The authors, jurists, but also to historians have long wondered how and in the position of Croatia actually had, and conducted three different conclusion. The first, mostly Hungarian legal authors, disputed every statehood of Croatia, claiming that it was only a province within Hungary (Imamović, 2003, p. 216). Others felt that Croatia still retained a kind of statehood, even under conditions of dualism (Čulinović, 1961, p. 125), this thesis represented by Louis Le Fur. Le Fur states that, since the Croatian representatives still participate in the creation of the common policy, Hungary still has the characteristics of a federal state (Jevtić and Popović, 2003, p. 198). In particular, we have an interesting theory put forward by Josip Pliverić, professor at the University of Zagreb, and the German legal theorist Georg Jellinek, who in his famous book „Die Lehre von den Staatenverbindungen“, pointed out that „according to the Settlement, Croatia is more than a province, but less than a state“ (1882, p. 76), while the professor Pliverić agrees with him, saying that in his book „Die rechtliche Verhältniss Kroatiens zu Ungarn“, where the Jelinek elaborate theories in the so-called fragment states (1885, p. 57). Thus, we conclude that Pliverić and Jelinek represented a kind of „middle way“ (based on this, Jelinek set out his theory of the so-called fragment states).

Undoubtedly, after the Settlement, Croatia had its own territory, and in that territory some organization of government, but also its own political people (on the organization of government and the political people in particular, see Art. 59. and 60. of Croatian-Hungarian settlements). These terms, interestingly, did not refer to Dalmatia, which was under Austrian rule, but was considered by the Croatian Parliament to be part of the Triune Kingdom. According to the Settlement, the bearers of power were the Croatian Parliament and the Ban, who was the representative of the imperial and royal crown in Croatia. The Ban was appointed and dismissed by the sovereign on the proposal of the Hungarian Prime Minister. From this we can see that Croatia had a kind of truncated autonomy, because the first man of the administrative power in Zagreb often depended on the majority in the Hungarian Parliament. Ban was, therefore, at the head of the administrative authorities in Croatia and Slavonia, and

under him were three departments: justice, internal administration and education and worship. Everything else was in the hands of the government in Budapest.

4. SETTLEMENT REVISION

After the realization of the law on the regulation of relations between Croatia and Hungary, great dissatisfaction arose because the basic wishes of the Croatian people were not respected, but also because the achievements of the 1848 revolution were bypassed. During his visit to Croatia, Emperor and King Franz Joseph was convinced of this. Due to the text of the Settlement, a great struggle arose between the Croatian Ban Levin Rauch and members of the opposition People's Party. The oppositionists have been persecuted, accused for disturbing public order and even treason. Absolutist practice has revived in Croatia. After the expiration of the three-year term, the Ban is obliged to call new elections for the Croatian Parliament, which Ban Rauh did. These elections ended in the complete defeat of the ruling unionists, while the People's Party won 51 of the 65 seats (Unionists won 13, and Ante Starčević's party entered parliament with one seat).

The foreign policy situation at the time did not help the government in Vienna. Prussia won the war against France and proclaimed the German Empire. This seriously led the ruling circles in the largest city of the Habsburg Monarchy to consider the possible consequences that the relocation of forces on the world political scene would lead to. There was nothing better inside the country either. Representatives of the Czechs, Slovenes and Poles dissatisfied with the treatment by the Germans, left the Imperial Council. The Croatian-Serbian coalition gains a majority over the Italians in Dalmatia. The new Austrian Prime Minister, Count Karl Hohenwart, proposes to the Emperor to convene the Czech Parliament and, with his rescript, recognize all the rights of the Czechs as well as the Hungarians (Šišić, 1962, p. 456), and to establish this by being crowned with the Czech royal crown. The Emperor agrees. The Czech champions and Count Hohenwart put together the so-called 18 fundamental articles giving the Czech Republic and Moravia the same rights as Hungary a few years earlier. These were officially the first harbingers of federalist change that would put an end to dualism. Foreign Minister Boist and Hungarian Prime Minister Andrassy immediately opposed these solutions.

During all this time, the Croatian Parliament stood still. The constitutive session was postponed as many as three times. When the Parliament finally managed to meet and appoint Ivan Mažuranić in front of the president, Ban read the royal rescript according to which the Parliament was dissolved because no successful action could be expected (Šišić, 1962, p. 456). Ban Bedeković did not do well in that role, so the Hungarian government proposed Antun

Vakanović for ban. It is interesting that Vakanović's primary task was to convene new elections for the Croatian Parliament and implement the official policy of the Hungarian government. Vakanović continued the election practice of Ban Rauh, and persecuted the opposition. However, the people elected 47 people, and only 28 unionists (Šišić, 1962, p. 456). In order to equalize the forces, the ban invited 47 virilists to the Parliament, who turned out to be mostly unionists. The position of the opposition of the People's Party was very unfavorable.

During this time, the distribution of forces in Vienna changed. The federalist government was removed, and Count Andrassy joined the Joint Council of Ministers. Andrassy's successor in Budapest, Menhart Lónyay, realizing that the fate of the new Parliament would be the same as the previous one, invited the people's champions to the negotiating table. A joint delegation of the Croatian Parliament, composed of both populists and unionists, presented a package of demands to the Hungarian government regarding the revision of the Settlement. The first among them was that Croatia would appoint five members to the delegations for the joint parliament, without being elected by all members of Parliament, but only by elected representatives (virilists would be excluded from voting). The second concerned is the position of ban. They demanded that the ban be appointed by the king on the proposal of the parliamentary majority, and that the Hungarian parliament be excluded from his election. The ban should bear the title „ban-minister“ of the provincial kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia (Šišić, 1962, p. 457), which would especially emphasize his responsibility to the Croatian Parliament. The last request concerned the state treasury. Croatia would manage its own finances, but would give the exact amount on an annual basis for joint affairs, and it was requested that the Croatian minister in Budapest not influence Croatian autonomy and not interfere in the affairs entrusted to Parliament, but would represent the interests of the Triune kingdoms in the Hungarian parliament and government.

The proposals of the Croatian delegation, although after a long hesitation, were rejected, down to one. The delegation of the Croatian Parliament had to give in and gave in until the old Settlement remained, with only one change . Namely, from now on, Croatia will send 45 percent of its revenues to the joint treasury, instead of the previous lump sum of 2,200,000 forints (in 1889, the tangent was reduced to 44 percent). This change was also approved by the Croatian Parliament by a majority of 79 to 10 votes.

5. LATER SOLUTIONS AND THEIR INTERPRETATION

5.1. Thought of Dr. Ante Starčević

In his works, Ante Starčević explicitly advocates state independence, which according to him was a key item of every free nation (1943, pp. 416-418). We can say that his views were more crown-oriented than those of a republican nature, which is clearly seen in his discussion „Republika ili Kraljevina“ („Republic or Kingdom“), where he advocates the existence of a strong Kingdom of Croatia but in a union led by the Habsburg-Lorraine ruler (Starčević, 1943, pp. 428-429). In his political concept, he understands the necessity of including all countries inhabited by Croats and other South Slavic peoples in one state-legal entity within the Habsburg Empire. He states that the modern state system is based on a legally regulated state with especially emphasized obligations of its citizens, and especially civil servants. He sees the new civil service cleansed of the privileged nobility that has been ubiquitous in the official policy of the Monarchy for centuries. He believes that the state should be hierarchically organized with a strict delegation of authority from the top down (Starčević, 1943, p. 431). He expressed the belief that the sovereign power of the ruler came directly and only to the people, which he expressed through the view that the people's representation is the highest body of state power. He states that there should be a spirit of loyalty to the Monarchy in the army, but it is interesting that he does not separate generals and officers from politics, but believes that the two fields will naturally separate themselves and that the intervention of a sovereign state body is not necessary. However, Starčević's proposal is more of a philosophical basis for what should follow (Gross, 1973, pp. 289, 339). In his works, he does not offer concrete solutions to the crisis in the announcement, a crisis that has already begun to be felt in the air of the Danube climate. What we can conclude is that he watches positively towards Austria and Hungary as fraternal states in a multinational federation that should include Croatia (Mikulić, 2017, p. 148). It is concluded that he believes in Croatia as a third „entity“ more than as an independent state. In the end, the authors can only guess what Starčević really meant, and the federalization of the Monarchy is the conclusion of most of them.

5.2. The 1905 proposal

The first real solution to this problem is offered Prince Heinrich Hanau in 1905. Hanau considered that it is necessary to achieve maximum equality of all to the peoples that have done Monahriju. He therefore expressed the view that the lands under the Habsburg Crown should be divided into three equal entities. The first, ie the Empire of Austria, which would include the

area of Bohemia, Silesia, Moravia, Upper and Lower Austria, parts of Carinthia and Styria, Salzburg, Tyrol and Vorarlberg. These territories would be under the jurisdiction of the Imperial Council in Vienna. He then envisioned the Kingdom of Hungary (the lands of the crown of St. Stephen) headed by a Hungarian parliament and a government that would govern the territory of Hungary, Galicia and Bukovina. Finally, he believes that the Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia and the Kingdom of Bosnia and Herzegovina with its center in Zagreb should be established. This entity would consist of the countries of the same name with Slovenia (parts of Carantania and Styria), but also Istria, Trieste and Rijeka, and would be led by a ban who would report to Parliament. This proposal did not meet with the approval of officials in Vienna, but also in Budapest.

5.3. Proposal of Dr. Ivo Pilar

Ivo Pilar was considered one of the most prominent lawyers and politicians who are said to have laid the foundations of modern Croatian political thought.. He based his proposals for the reorganization of the Dual Monarchy on right-wing thought. We see this from his position that the reorganization of the Monarchy is based on a combination of state-historical law of the Kingdom of Croatia and the reality that the social, political, and military situation at the time represented. In his work „Jugoslavensko pitanje i Veliki rat“ („The South Slavic Question and the Great War“), he presents different views on the creation of a third state legal creation within the Habsburg monarchy (1918, pp. 340-380). This is where he explains the real threat of the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire under the influence of Italy and Serbia. He believed that the Monarchy was most affected by the inappropriate division of the keys of power between the Germans and the Hungarians, on the one hand, and the Slavs, on the other. Pilar believes that the unification of all South Slavic countries under the Austrian crown will lead to much-needed stabilization. In his individual works, he emphasizes the classic trialistic solution where the Kingdom of Croatia and Slavonia and the Kingdom of Dalmatia are joined by Bosnia and Herzegovina (Pilar, 1917, pp. 108-110). He believes that the merger of these three entities will create a single entity that will prevent either side from prevailing in the conduct of official state policy, and expresses the belief that this will achieve the necessary equality of the people. Pilar takes the proposals of his predecessors and states that this new entity, which should be called „Single Area of the Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia and Herceg-Bosna“, should be inextricably linked with Austria and Hungary through the Austro-Imperial Crown (Pilar, 1918, p. 339). What is most resented about his proposal is that he sees only Croats as the leaders of

the South Slavs in the Monarchy (Pilar, 1918, p. 398), and neglects Slovenes and Serbs, as well as other nationalities who lived in those areas and felt like South Slavs.

5.4. Draft by Nikola Zvonimir Bjelovučić

Nikola Zvonimir Bjelovučić, one of the greatest advocates of the right-wing idea, but also later a supporter of the Croatian Peasant Party, until the very end, that is, until 1918, held the position that it was necessary to carry out a political reorganization of the Habsburg monarchy. After joining the joint state of SCS, he advocated for a three-party structure of that state as well. In his work „Trijalizam i hrvatska država“ („Trialism and the Croatian State“), Bjelovučić enters in more detail than all previous proposals and presents the form, laws, name, symbols, administration and government of the proposed third state legal entity. According to Bjelovučić, the ruling right belongs exclusively to the imperial-royal Habsburg-Lorraine dynasty (Mikulić, 2017, p. 150). The ruler would bear the title „Emperor of Austria, Apostolic King of Hungary and King of Croatia“ or „Emperor and King of the Austro-Hungarian-Croatian Monarchy“ (Bjelovučić, 1907, p. 9). He states that the ruler must be appointed by the Croatian primate in Zagreb, where he should sign the Croatian royal conspiracy before the Parliament (document containing the oath of the Croatian-Slavonian-Dalmatian king). The scope of this third entity would include the area of Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Istria and all other South Slavic countries, with Trieste and parts of Istria inhabited by Italians becoming an autonomous area within that unit. The kingdom would be divided into counties, as lower administrative areas. The parliament would consist only of elected representatives, and the government would be ban, podban and Croatian royal ministers (Bjelovučić, 1907, p. 11). An important change in the proposal is also related to common affairs, ministers, institutions and finance. All joint ministries would be called „imperial and royal ministries“, as would ministers. A common government would pursue foreign policy (according to Bjelovučić, each state entity would provide 1/3 of diplomatic representatives), joint finances and there would be joint ministries of the army (based in Vienna, and each state body reserves the right to train and educate officers (it is interesting that Bjelovučić proposes that the share of soldiers, and especially officers in the Imperial and Royal Army, be proportional to the number of certain nationalities in the Monarchy. He also suggests that the training be conducted in the languages of the peoples to whom the soldiers belong), and the navy (based in Pula, where each state would bear 1/3 of the cost of maintaining it). Bjelovučić states that Croats, Slovenes and Serbs, who would make up the majority in the third part of the Monarchy, would have to be politically equal, both at the state and local level, where they would retain national freedom. The state coat

of arms and flag would consist of a red-white-blue tricolor with a crowned large coat of arms in the middle (the large coat of arms would consist of the coats of arms of Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina). The state flag would be used and would be displayed on all official state, administrative and military buildings and but the naval-merchant fleet. He believes that local self-government units and county districts should make their own decision on their own coat of arms and flag. In his work, Bjelovičić advocates a special register of nobility on the territory of the third unit, but also the equating of the Muslim nobility in Bosnia with that in Croatia. Croatian would be the official language, and Slovenian and Serbian would be used. Education would be entrusted to the Croatian royal government, and it also demands the establishment of higher military and naval schools on the territory of Croatia. The official churches would be Roman Catholic (in this connection, the Archbishop of Zagreb would rise to the rank of Croatian primate), Orthodox (but it would develop into the Serbian and Croatian Orthodox Churches) and Protestant. The official church language would be Croatian. Judaism would be equated with the official church, and the Sarajevo-based Islamic religious community would enjoy full autonomy in its affairs. Croatia to the government consisted of six royal ministries: finance, justice, trade and croatian colony (Croatian emigration), agriculture, home security and railways and transport.

6. THE GREAT WAR

The man who was to inherit the imperial-royal crown, Archduke Franz Ferdinand, was a great supporter of the idea of federalization of the country. Ferdinand gathered around him a group composed of the most learned men of the Monarchy, who came before him with a proposal - the United States of Greater Austria (Vereinigte Staaten von Groß-Österreich, the proposal was to create a federation similar to the United States from the Austro-Hungarian dual monarchy, some even call this draft the first step towards the creation of the EC / EU). The Archduke believed that the introduction of a new order would save the country from complete collapse. Most political factors in Vienna disagreed with him.

With the Sarajevo assassination (June 28, 1914) and the beginning of the Great War, all hope for a peaceful solution to the South Slavic question was lost.. The Balkan gunpowder barrel exploded and ushered the Old Continent into a world war. The Sarajevo assassination is a long-awaited excuse for the declaration of war on Serbia by the authorities in Vienna (Jovanović, 1929, p. 5), which was addressed to the Serbian government in a telegram dated July 28, 1914. The war lasted for the next four years. While the borders of the empires in the west, but also in the east, shifted, political life in the Dual Monarchy continued. The South Slavs remained

divided into two camps - one, which advocated the establishment of a trialist monarchy, and the other, which believed that all South Slavs should unite into one, common and independent state. A group of politicians who advocated a different position left the country and formed a Committee whose task was to coordinate with the Government of the Kingdom of Serbia in creating the ground for the establishment of a common state. The Yugoslav Committee, formed in Florence, took as its basis its program a small manifesto adopted by the Serbian government in Niš at the beginning of the war. The Corfu Declaration and, finally, the Vidovdan Constitution would have emerge from this program (Jovanović, 1930, p. 37).

Meanwhile, a wind of change was beginning to blow in the Habsburg Monarchy. With the death of Emperor and King Franz Joseph I at the end of 1916, and the arrival of young Emperor Charles as the head of state, there was renewed talk of a political reorganization of the Monarchy. Emperor Charles agreed to receive deputations from Zagreb who managed to convince him of the necessity of creating a South Slavic part of the Monarchy. In the end, Charles agreed, but on the condition that the Hungarian government agrees with that. The Hungarian parliament released the emperor and king from his oath and new authorities were formed. But it was too late for that in 1918.

7. NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SHS AND DISSOLUTION OF THE COUNTRY

In May 1917, in the Imperial Council, the president of the Yugoslav Club in that representative body, Dr. Anton Korošec, read the declaration of that club. The declaration (which has been known as the May Declaration) sets out a program for the unification of all South Slavs under the crown of the Austrian emperor. This statement requested that „on the basis of the people's leadership and Croatian state law“ (Janković and Mirković, 1997, p. 317). All the lands inhabited by Slovenes, Serbs and Croats were united into the still complete Habsburg Empire. The attitudes of bourgeois opportunists (as B. Stuli calls them) speak openly about the situation the Monarchy was facing. It was on the verge of collapse, both military and economic, but also political. It is interesting that the Imperial Council has not met once since the beginning of the war, but only now. This tells us that the desperate moves of the new authorities in Vienna began to be withdrawn in order to preserve the Monarchy to some extent. Therefore, it can be said that Yugoslav politicians were optimistic that their issue would finally be resolved in the way it should have been done much earlier. But the inertia of the government did its thing. Yugoslav politicians began to move away from the May Declaration program, and began to move closer to the Corfu Declaration program.

***TRIALISM – THE ISSUE OF POLITICAL REORGANIZATION OF THE DUAL
MONARCHY***

At the time when the Thessaloniki front was broken through, and the liberation of Macedonia and Serbia began, events related to resolving the Yugoslav national question were taking place in Zagreb (Janković and Mirković, 1997, p. 331). On October 6, 1918, Yugoslav politicians in the Monarchy formed the National Council of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs. The statement issued on that occasion states that the representatives from Slovenia, Trieste, Istria, Croatia, Slavonia, Damacia, Southern Hungary and Bosnia and Herzegovina reached an agreement, „both in the establishment and in the goal“ of the National Council of SCS. National Council was founded as a socio-political of the representative body of venous peoples within the empire, with the wishes of a „unification of all South Slavs in a single, unique and Independent dream State of Slovenians, Croats and Serbs, with democratic principles“. Thirteen days later, the National Council of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes issued a proclamation in which said that it was authorized to all people's parties and groups, and that it took care of all issues in political affairs.

Shortly after the adoption of the new proclamation, the Croatian Parliament passed a decision to withdraw from the joint state with Austria and Hungary and placed itself under the jurisdiction of the SCS National Council. In its proclamation, the Croatian Parliament stated that it was revoking all agreements signed from 1868 onwards, including all revisions of the Settlement, and stated that it would no longer have any state affairs with Austria and Hungary.

142

On October 29, 1918, the National Council of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes became the supreme state body of the State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs. On the same day, the Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia left the Dual Monarchy, and provincial governments were formed for Slovenia, Croatia and Slavonia, Dalmatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. At the end of October, the South Slavs in Hungary decided not to join the newly formed state and people's union, but to join the Serbian People's Committee in Novi Sad.

In order to avoid the complete collapse of the state, and to attract the People's Council to himself, Emperor Charles handed over to the People's Council of SHS the entire Austro-Hungarian Navy, together with the entire merchant fleet, all military ports, ammunition, equipment, fortifications with the entire arsenal. The People's Council of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes then contacted the Entente forces, and informed them that the navy was under their control, and that all hostilities on the Adriatic were being suspended. London and Paris accepted the news with relief and enthusiasm, but Italy did not. Ignoring that, the Italian navy near Pula completely destroys navy under the control of the People's Council of SHS. After that, Vienna signed an armistice with Italy, through which it allowed Rome to take over the territory under the control of the People's Council of the SCS.

TRIALISM – THE ISSUE OF POLITICAL REORGANIZATION OF THE DUAL MONARCHY

After the session of the SCS National Council on November 23 and 24, the supreme body of the State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs, fearing that Italy would gather the war on the Adriatic coast, announced the accession of that state union with the Kingdom of Serbia and Montenegro to a single Serb, Croat union. and Slovenes. A commission of 28 new members has been appointed to conduct negotiations with Regent Aleksandar Karađorđević. The delegation was led by Dr. Ante Pavelić. After this decision, Stjepan Radić's Croatian Republican Peasant Party (HRSS) withdrew from the government and ruling coalition, calling this move stupid, and to contradict everything that was made by the decisions of several months earlier. On December 1, Regent Aleksandar Karađorđević proclaimed the unification of „Serbia with the independent countries of the State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs into a united Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes“. National Council never ratified this, nor did it by the National Assembly of the Kingdom of Serbia. The last task of the National Council of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was to appoint delegates to the Constituent Assembly and the Provisional National Assembly at the beginning of 1919.

8. CONCLUSION

Contrary to the ruling absolutism and centralism, and to the outside world and dualism, we see within the borders of the Habsburg Empire, since the great revolutions of 1848/49, to appear movements and ideas for its political reorganization according to the system of trialism. The idea of trialism originated from the political rapprochement of all South Slavic peoples in the area of the Monarchy, with the aim of creating an adequate counterbalance to the ruling structures composed of Germans and Hungarians. In its essence, trialism contained the idea of federalization of a large multinational empire according to the system of people's sovereignty and equality, which was completely unacceptable to the ruling conservative circles. The military leadership of the Habsburg Monarchy, with Russian help, in 1848/49 shattered all hope for the freedom of small peoples and their political equality with the ruling Germans. Hopes for trialism returned in 1859 with the defeat of Austria by the Piedmontese army and the unification of Italy. This defeat put an end to the government of Minister Alexander Bach, the personification of Austrian absolutism and reaction. After Bach's fall, Emperor Franz Joseph decided to restore constitutionality and allow the convening of popular representations throughout the Monarchy. In those years, the Croatian Parliament also met, and with its decisions tried to emphasize the uniqueness of the Triune Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia, and to demand the federalization of the Austrian Empire. The wishes of the Croatian MPs were granted, but not in terms of what the Parliament envisioned. The Austro-Hungarian

settlement came and broke out small nations from the political stage. A year later, Austria allowed Croatia to resolve its relations with Hungary, which, after the Croatian-Hungarian settlement, put the South Slavic peoples in an even more difficult position. Years later, the Parliament fought for the revision of the Settlement and for the political equalization of Croats, Slovenes and Serbs with the rest of the peoples of the Monarchy. After the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, hopes for trialism revived. We see this in the proposals of political leaders from Zagreb, but also in the solutions provided by German nobles (Hanau, Franz Ferdinand). The philosophical basis was provided by Ante Starčević, the first concrete solutions were offered by Ivo Pilar and Heinrich Hanau, and the complete draft was made by Nikola Zvonimir Bjelovučić and Franz Ferdinand, whose solutions proved to be the most rational. None was accepted, and the Great War was the last blow that put an end to the existence of this complex state. These events from past give us an interesting insight into the social, political, but also legal life of the people from this area, and all those adversities he encountered on his way to his development and the creation of a South Slavs union state.

6. REFERENCES

- Andabak Fernandez, Katarina. (2015). *Bahov apsolutizam (note final paper, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek)*.
- Bjelovučić, Nikola Zvonimir. (1911). *Trijalizam i hrvatska država*. Dubrovnik, Nakladnik N.B.
- Bresić Mikulić, Ante. (2017). Veksiološka analiza i rekonstrukcija trijalističkih prijedloga do 1918. in *Obnova, Journal of Culture, Society and Politics*, 134-156, 9/2017 .
- Culinovič, Ferdo. (1961). *Državnopravna historija jugoslavenskih zemalja* Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Gross, Mirjana. (1973). *Povijest pravaška ideologije*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatsku povijest.
- Hondiu , Frederik Willem and Hondius, Frits Willem. (1968). *The Yugoslav Community of Nations* . Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Imamović, Mustafa. (2003). *Historija države i prava Bosne i Hercegovine*. Sarajevo: Magistrat.
- Imamović, Mustafa. (2006). *Osnove upravno-političkog razvitka i državnopravnog položaja Bosne i Hercegovine*. Sarajevo: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Sarajevu.
- Janković, Dragoslav and Mirković, Mirko. (1997). *Državnopravna istorija Jugoslavije*. Beograd: Draganić.

**TRIALISM – THE ISSUE OF POLITICAL REORGANIZATION OF THE DUAL
MONARCHY**

- Jellinek, Georg. (1882). *Die Lehre von den Staatenverbundungen*. Vienna: Alfred Holder, K. Hof- und Universitäts-Buchhändler.
- Jevtić, Dragoš and Popović, Dragoljub. (2003). *Narodna pravna istorija*. Beograd. Savremena administracija.
- Jovanović, Jovan M. (1929). *Stvaranje zajedničke države Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca, Knjiga druga*. Beograd: SKZ.
- Jovanović, Jovan M. (1930). *Stvaranje zajedničke države Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca, Knjiga treća*. Beograd: SKZ.
- Kann, Robert A. (1964). *The Multinational Empire: Nationalism and National Reform of Habsburg Monarchy 1848/49, Vol. I, Empire and nationalities*. New York: Octagon books.
- Matković, Stjepan. (2001). *Čista stranka prava: 1895-1903*. Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest.
- Pilar, Ivo. (1918). *Južnoslavensko pitanje i Veliki rat*. Vienna: UB.
- Pilar, Ivo. (1917). *Svjetski rat i Hrvati*. Zagreb: KMB.
- Pliverić, Josip. (1885). *Die rechtliche Verhältniss Kroatiens zu Ungarn*. Agram: Kugli und Deursh.
- Šarkić, Srđan. (1999). *Opšta istorija države i prava*. Belgrade: Draganić.
- Šišić, Ferdo. (1962). *Pregled povijesti hrvatskoga naroda*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Starčević, Ante. (1943). *Izabrana djela*, prepared by Blaž Jurišić. Zagreb: HIBZ.