



UDC 329.78(497.15)"1878/1914"
Manuscript received: 03.09.2014.
Accepted for publishing: 23.09.2014.
Original scientific paper

Serbian Political Thought
No. 2/2014,
Year VI, Vol. 10
pp. 51-67

Radoslav Gaćinović¹
Institute for political studies, Belgrade

European Concept of the Young Bosnia Movement

Giving up freedom is giving up everything that is human: dignity, human rights, even one's own responsibilities.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau

Abstract

This paper is also an attempt to light up dimensions of depth of the political, social and economic factors in Bosnia and Herzegovina to the extent they encouraged members of the Young Bosnia movement (Mlada Bosna) to a decisive action. And indeed, to which extent did the assassination result from the social and political circumstances which were prevailing in a country where members of Young Bosnia were born and raised. The Young Bosnia members found their inspiration for the revolutionary action in similar youth organizations formed amongst the unfree nations of Europe since 1831. Through their activities they persistently propagated: the philosophy of nationalism and democratic political doctrines, building of national consciousness, creation of cult of national energy, work on the creation of modern national culture based on believes that national culture cannot be without national society, and national society cannot be without national state.

Keywords: Mlada Bosna (Young Bosnia), liberation movements, organization, Austria-Hungary.

Austria-Hungary occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina based on the Article 25 of the Berlin Congress from 1878 for a certain period of time i.e. for 30 years. During the occupation, Austria-Hungary at

¹ Research fellow
gacinovicr@gmail.com

the same time was spreading total propaganda in order to convince the Great Powers to change the time-limited mandate for occupation into a permanent occupation. Austria-Hungary and its allies believed that the occupation was founded on the international law and then, at the same time, tried to convince the global public opinion that it had been carried out on a state and legal basis and internal basis as well. According to the first interpretation, all legal measures of the occupation authority were temporary, whereas according to the second one, they were permanent. Behind the issue of the legal status of Bosnia lied the question of who the real master in those provinces was. According to the 1879 Convention, the Sultan's name and Turkish flags were just a symbol of Turkish power, however everything else carried the markings of Austro-Hungarian permanent presence in the provinces. The Serbian School of Law always stood by the conclusion that the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina had international legal, and not state legal characteristic, i.e. that it was an international and open rather than internal and closed issue. Following its arrival to the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, through its actions the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy presented itself as a real occupying power and thus caused the revolt of the people, in particular of the progressive intelligentsia from that region. Due to random and brutal violence, the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina established illegal cultural institutions and political organizations, led by the Young Bosnia movement whose members carried out an assassination of the Austro-Hungarian heir to the throne Franz Ferdinand. Many Bosnian and Herzegovinian youngsters were in the front rows of the Young Bosnia movement, as a general movement of the revolutionary youth. Bogdan Žerajić and Vladimir Gaćinović were role models to the young people, the former one with his personal sacrifice, and the latter one with his revolutionary propaganda and action (Slijepčević 1929: 209; Trišić 1935; Bogićević 1954: 301-303).

Near the end of the 19th century, only 30 Bosnians and Herzegovinians had academic background (Stojanović 1929). At the beginning of the 20th century, a new generation of intellectuals appeared in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Historical circumstances led to a very slow development of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian society compared to other European countries. Austro-Hungarian authorities systematically supported the backwardness and did not pay attention to mass education. In 1910, after thirty two years of the Vienna administration, 87% of the

population were illiterate and just 5 secondary schools for somewhat less than 2 million people in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Such an attitude of the Monarchy towards the citizens additionally motivated young Bosnian and Herzegovinian revolutionaries to fight for existence and survival, for education and cultural development of the young people (Gaćinović 2010: 446).

Charity educational association Prosvjeta immediately upon its establishment in 1902 started to give scholarships to the poor yet excellent pupils. This new intelligentsia had much more different political motives from the previous generations. Studying at world-renowned universities and working with the world's leading theoreticians of the academic institutions and universities of that time, it gained additional motivation to fight until the final liberation of the suffering people of their homeland². Violent politics of Austro-Hungary and Germany at that time, with its particular, inconsistent humanism, is only a confirmation that an attack on a human being was a universal reality back then, especially on the nations that they wanted to nullify, and yet they were not successful. Benjamin Kallay invested huge efforts in the forming of Bosnian nation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in the beginning of the 20th century he tried to declare the Bosnian language in that region, in times when the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was at the peak of its economic, political and military power, but he did not succeed. He did not succeed because nations can't disappear, because the main democratic principles rest on nations, that a human being has the natural right to freedom. Even though the Viennese government officially stated that, after the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, it was "territorially saturated", it was just the first stage of the Austro-Hungarian advancement to Thessaloniki and Germany to the east. In the next stage, war against Serbia and its annexation was planned, or division of Serbia between Austria, Bulgaria and Romania.

2 It was only by the establishment of Prosvjeta in 1902 that the situation gradually changed. Prosvjeta had the greatest influence on creation of the modern Serbian intelligentsia in BiH at the beginning of the 20th century. It was a broad organization which in 1911 had a network of 79 sub-boards, 266 commissaries and a few thousand helping members. Until the beginning of the Great War, this educational organization schooled 127 students at universities around the world and 220 secondary school students (Ekmečić 1996: 32-35).

Roots of the Young Bosnia Youth Movement Origins

The term "Young Bosnia" was first used by Petar Kočić in the "Otađbina" (Homeland) newspaper in 1907, and then by Vladimir Gaćinović in the Almanach of Prosvjeta in 1910 in the article called "Young Bosnia". Vladimir Gaćinović, as a founder of the youth liberation organisation "Young Bosnia," also became its conceptual leader. He had the highest credits for its popularization among members of all the nations of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Young Bosnia fought for the liberation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and unification of all the Slavic peoples. Its members fought against the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy as an occupier, which was by no means neither legal nor legitimate. It was imposed forcibly, it was not chosen by the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, after the occupation and annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908, more drastically than during the Ottoman Empire, violated human rights and freedoms of citizens. For all its citizens, days filled with the reign of terror and uncertainty began. In difficult circumstances that prevailed in Bosnia and Herzegovina after the annexation in 1908, its nations were forced to lose their identity and dignity under pressure. Standing up to the random violence, the Young Bosnia members, through their activities, persistently propagated: the philosophy of nationalism and democratic political doctrines, building of national consciousness, creation of cult of national energy, work on the creation of modern national culture based on believes that national culture cannot be without national society, and national society cannot be without national state.

Events that followed after the Russian Revolution in 1905 encouraged the interests amongst the Young Bosnia members not only in the solution of an agrarian issue but also in the Russian literature and history. The entire pages of Chernyshevsky's book *What is to be done?* were being transcribed and passed on from hand to hand. Apart from Chernyshevsky, they were reading Bakunin, Herzen, Dostojevsky, in particular his novel *Crime and punishment*, and Maxim Gorky (Parežanin 1927). They dedicated great attention to the Italian and German movements for the national liberation. For the Young Bosnia members, Giuseppe Mazzini was „a real and great man" (Ibid.). Italian revolutionary tradition from the period of *risorgimento* caught strong roots in Herzegovina. Both in the uprising in 1861 and in 1875–1878, the rebel serfs kept connections with Garibaldi followers. In the 2nd

uprising, even volunteer fighters from Italy participated. When he was just a fifteen-year-old young boy, Vladimir Gaćinović called himself a „Garibaldinian” (Gaćinović 1956: 185) and studied literature from the period of the national unification of Italy. Even the name Young Bosnia was based upon Mazzini’s Young Italy. Mazzini’s ideas that the youth must be the main power in the liberation of its homeland, that it has to create people of new caliber, ready for the biggest sacrifices, had a significant influence on the Young Bosnia members in the first years of their work and programme creation. During the trial, in October 1914, Gavrilo Princip and Nedeljko Čabrinović referred a few times to Mazzini as an example of how liberation and unification should be fought for (Bogićević 1954: 32; 63; 84).

The Young Bosnia members knew their people were enslaved, however they refused to be subdued no matter how strong the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was. The assassination of the Heir to the Throne Franz Ferdinand in 1914 in Sarajevo was treated at that time as a murder of any member of the occupying army. It must be pointed out that most countries did not recognise the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina as it was carried out against the will of the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the decisions of the Berlin Congress. After the occupation and annexation, Austria-Hungary treated Bosnia and Herzegovina as its ethnic territory, on one side, and its citizens as servants, on the other. It carried out terror on everyone: Serbs, Croats and Muslims, so the members of Young Bosnia were representatives of all nations. Many in the world thought that the Sarajevo assassination was an act of the revolutionary resistance toward the occupier, remembering the Old Testament, which mentions the cases of Aod and Jael, and the European tradition of tyrannicide, based on the theories of classic republicanism of the ancient Greece and Rome.

Murder of a tyrant in the ancient Greece and Rome was celebrated as the noblest human act, which was spoken of by Aristoteles, Platon, Marcus Tullius Cicero, Cornelius Tacitus... Catholic encyclopedia defines tyrannicide as a murder of a tyrant by an act of an individual for the common good (The Catholic Encyclopaedia: 108). Many Serbian poets in the first half of the 19th century had similar opinion. Sima Milutinović Sarajlija, in his utopias, thought that a prince (knjaz) was just the first chosen officer, and if he would break the Constitution, he was to be harshly punished by the Parliament – to be buried alive (Nedić 1959: 176).

Scholars and famous theoreticians of that time thought that sovereign power must always belong to people, and people transfer it to the rulers through an agreement that they conclude with them. People can never give up sovereign power in favor of the ruler—people entrust its performing to the ruler as long as the ruler does it in a good manner. The people, therefore, always keep the right to replace the ruler.

John Locke was the first one who formulated the theory of resistance more thoroughly. In his work on the civil government, *Two Treaties of Civil Government*, he gave the form for many revolutions in the world later on. He correlated his theory on the right to rebellion with the learning of the natural law on the social contract and gave the following definition: „Whoever uses force without right, puts himself in the state of war with those against whom he uses it, and in that state all former ties are cancelled, all rights cease and everyone has a right to defend himself and resist the aggressor” (Locke 1988: II; Ch. XIX).

The Young Bosnia members, amongst other things, built their programme on the theory of national sovereignty which was systematically exposed for the first time by Johannes Althusius in his work *Politica methodice digesta at que exemplis sacris et profanes illustrate*, because they thought that sovereign power belonged only to people. Taking into account the mentioned theories of tyrannicide, the Young Bosnia members thought that Franz Ferdinand was the biggest tyrant – tyrant occupier. For them and the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina, by his evil, he surpassed all the tyrants chosen by the people and that is why they were convinced they had the right to remove him. The people therefore thought that they had a multiple right to remove Franz Ferdinand as a tyrant occupier and tyrant who unlawfully and against the will of citizens carried out the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. If the Young Bosnia members were not free from the outer influence, then their ideas may be correlated with the aspirations of Mazzini’s Young Italy,³ difference being that ideas of

3 Guglielmo Oberdan, an Italian irredentist of the Slovenian origin (1858–1882), in the summer of 1878, stood up against the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and deserted the army in order to avoid being sent to Bosnia and Herzegovina. He fled to Rome and made contacts with the circles that fought for the liberation of the Trieste region from Austria-Hungary, and for its accession to Italy. When in 1882 a celebration marking 500 years anniversary of the Trieste accession to Austria was organized, which was attended by the Emperor Franz Joseph, Oberdan threw a bomb at him but the assassination failed. Sentenced to death for treason, Oberdan was hanged on 20 December 1882, to be declared a martyr for the freedom and a popular hero later on. City squares and streets have his name, and at the 100 years anniversary since his

the Young Bosnia members were the result of the living conditions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, of the tradition of Kosovo myth at times of great imperialistic conflicts that shook the world in the beginning of the 20th century. Young Bosnia members thoroughly studied all the revolutionary movements in the world, especially the messages of the American Revolution. One of the important messages of the American Revolution is: „It is the sacred right of an individual, group or nation to, even with weapons in their hands, stand up against foreign occupation or non-democratic rule.” And the other message that the Young Bosnia members accepted was: „The American Revolution was, in the beginning, a form of rebellious democracy, that soon and successfully turned into constitutional democracy, supported by appropriate democratic institutions” (Ilić 2013). It was these two principles of the American Revolution that Young Bosnia members advocated for.

At the time of the live revolutionary activity in Europe, especially in those countries that were under the occupation by the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Vladimir Gaćinović translated Catechism of a revolutionist by Sergey Nechayev. He added some of his viewpoints to the translation. That document has a special historical importance as it sheds a light on thoughts of the Young Bosnia members in general. Gaćinović mentioned that he was sending Catechism of a revolutionist only for reading purposes (Dedijer 1966: 366-367). As far as other Bakunin's texts, Gaćinović also sent to Preporod Bakunin's manifesto to the Russian students from 1869 (Ibid.: 367).

The Young Bosnia movement was not inspired by a similar organization in Serbia, because there was no such organization in Serbia, however, in the revision of history at the beginning of the 21st century, they pose the similar questions contrary to the academic facts and historical logic. Serbia was a free country back then, accepting progressive social-democratic ideas from France, Russia, Switzerland and other countries which the Serbian intelligentsia got to know during their education. Since the intellectual elite in Serbia knew what the position of the Slavic people was in the unfree monarchies, they wanted to improve that position, however they did not have any activities in creating youth or secret organizations. There were no experiences in the forming of youth political organizations in Serbia, and the Serbian Government gave up the right to allow any kind of activities

death, the president of the Italian Senate at that time, Giovanni Spadolini, compared Guglielmo Oberdan to Jesus Christ. (Kljakić 2013).

in their country against Austria-Hungary. The Young Bosnia members found their inspiration for the revolutionary action in similar youth organizations formed amongst the unfree nations of Europe since 1831. They followed the example of Young Italy by Giuseppe Mazzini that fought for the liberation and unification of all Italian countries into free Italy in two periods: 1831-1834 and 1840-1848. Approximately at the same time secret revolutionary organizations Young Germany and Young Switzerland were formed. Young Germany disappeared from the political scene in 1850, while a society of German writers continued to work under the same name. Young Poland lasted for a very short period of time: 1834-1836, when her founders fled to Switzerland. The Young Czech Party members were the "National liberal party" formed in 1874, which immediately began to be thorn by fraction conflicts with multiple ideas of which the following are the most important: Austria -Hungary should be transformed into a three-part empire with Slovenian element or to create an alliance of Slovenian people under the auspices of the Russian Empire. Shortly before and at the time of the formation of the Young Bosnia movement, there were Young Dalmatia and Young Croatia movements in the nearby neighborhood. Young Bosnia cooperated with the Young Croatia movement. At the beginning of 1912, Croatian students organized a general strike against the Austro-Hungarian regime in which a few students were slightly wounded. Similar demonstrations of Sarajevo students followed immediately, organized by Luka Jukić, from Bosnia, a law student in Zagreb, later the assassin of the Croatian ban Cuvaj. At the protests in Sarajevo, the most fervent speech against the anti-Yugoslav politics of Austria-Hungary was delivered by Tin Ujević, an emissary of the Zagreb students. In the Ottoman Empire itself, a movement of Young Turks for the creation of modern Turkey was formed in 1876, which under the leadership of Kemal Atatürk won at the internal plan to abolish the Sultanate in 1908, however, at the foreign political and military plan, it significantly weakened the empire. Before Gaćinović's brochure "Smrt jednog heroja" (Death of a hero) appeared, Mazzini's writings on the goals of the fighting of Young Italy had been well known and popular amongst the members of Young Bosnia. Few intellectuals were familiar with the socialist ideas of Marx and Engels, Marx's socialism, revolutionary ideas of Trotsky and anarchistic ideas of Bakunin. Gaćinović made a significant contribution for them to opt for the revolutionary struggle and sacrifice for the common good. They were also familiar with the revolutionary turmoil in Russia more than social-democratic ideas

brought by Svetozar Miletić, Svetozar Marković and Dimitrije Tucović in Serbia. No ideas or assistance for the organization of the Young Bosnia movement came from the official Serbia, where a secret and much more powerful organization “Ujedinjenje ili smrt” (Unification or death) was not to be formed for a long period of time. Unbearable life under the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy rule resulted in the occurrence of many assassinations before the Sarajevo assassination in the territory of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy itself. Analyzing the situation of that time, Ivo Andrić wrote: „Our entire society indecently snores, only writers and revolutionaries are alert”.

Political assassinations were a common occurrence at the turn of the 19th to the 20th century. The Young Bosnia members knew about a failed attempt by a Young Italy member Oberdank to assassinate the Austrian Emperor Franz Joseph. The assassin was executed in 1882, a monument to his honor was erected in Venice in 1912 and a favored cult was created around his character. They also knew about the assassination of the Austro-Hungarian Empress Elisabeth (Elisabeth Amalie Eugenie) carried out in Switzerland on 10 September by an Italian anarchist Luigi Lucheni in 1898. They were also familiar with the assassination of King Aleksandar Obrenović in 1903. They knew about the political assassination in the Hungarian Parliament in 1912 carried out by a member of the Parliament Gyula Kovács on the Count Tisza. During that year of 1912, Muslims Đulaga Bukovac and Ibrahim Fazlinović planned an assassination of the Emperor or Heir to the throne, whoever came to visit Bosnia and Herzegovina first. The assassination was never carried out as, in the meantime, the First Balkan War broke out in which they also participated as volunteers. In Zagreb, apart from the assassination attempt by Jukić on Viceroy Cuvaj, an assassination of the Austro-Hungarian Commissary Skerlec was attempted by Stefan Dojčić in 1913 and Jakov Šefer in 1914. A Young Bosnia member, Croat Srećko Džamonja intended to assassinate the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Austria-Hungary, Berthold. When he came to Belgrade to get the weapons, those he spoke with talked him out of his intentions, because “... it would do Serbia more harm than good”.

Was Princip's generation susceptible to the external influences? Were those Marxist ideas of gradualism or the social-democratic teaching that treats the fighting against the state terror with the emphasis on the mass resistance movement against harsh social and economic circumstances or, anarchistic theories on a widespread use of individual action against

an occupier? Based on the facts, science gave answers to those questions long time ago. Some writers claim that organization Ujedinjenje ili smrt (Unification or death) politically indoctrinated the Young Bosnia movement, which is easily confuted based on the historical facts. One of the Young Bosnia members Bogdan Žerajić attempted assassination on General Marijan Varešanin on 15 June 1910, when Ujedinjenje ili smrt organization did not even exist. It should be pointed out that, in the preparation of the assassination, Ujedinjenje ili smrt⁴ organisation offered significant support to the Young Bosnia members, but only material support, as Apis himself was against the assassination later on. Gavrilo Princip and Nedeljko Čabrinović stated at the trial that they intended to buy the weapons with their money, however, since they did not have enough money, they turned to Milan Ciganović for help, and, through his mediation, to Vojislav Tankosić. It is not known whether anyone else from the Black Hand knew about the assassination, but it was affirmed that neither the Government of Serbia nor the Supreme Command were informed about their plans (Mitrović 1983: 118-122). It is certain that Princip and his group ideologically differed from Ujedinjenje ili smrt organization. Differences were not only in the general philosophy of life but also in the views of resolving the national issue, internal problems among the South Slavs, and the structure of the new state after the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

Determination to Sacrifice for Freedom

In his 3 essays on Žerajić (Stojanović 1929), Vladimir Gaćinović glorified the sacrifice as the best method to create a new religious impulse among the Young Bosnia members. Part in the formation of his concept on sacrifice had Mark Andreyevich Nantanson⁵. Natanson

4 Ujedinjenje ili smrt (Unification or death) was a secret, conspiracy organization also known as Crna Ruka (Black Hand) established on 9 May 1911 in Belgrade. It was formed by a group of military officers and civilians, who participated in the May Coupe of 1903 (Majski prevrat 1903), with the aim to fight for the unification of all Serbs. It gained a significant political and social influence, so it often interfered with the Government. In the first days of 1917, a conflict between the White Hand and Black Hand began in Thessaloniki. After the trial of Apis and others (Salonika Trial), the organization disintegrated (Vojni leksikon 1981: 1104).

5 Mark Andreyevich Natanson Boborov (1850–1919), a socialist and revolutionary who had an important role in the Russian revolutionary movement in 1869. He was living as a migrant in Switzerland at that time, and Vladimir Gaćinović often visited him and respected him very much. (Gaćinović 1956: 241; Stojanović 1929),.

was teaching Gaćinović that the highest aim of life is the sacrifice of a human being and existence for the liberation of the repressed people. Sacrifice of Bogdan Žerajić, one of the founders of the Young Bosnia movement who, in the state of despair after the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, decided to assassinate the Emperor Franz Joseph, when he visited Mostar on 3 June 1914, particularly drew Young Bosnia members to the Kosovo myth. Žerajić changed his decision in the last moment, although he was only a few steps away from the Habsburg Emperor, with a revolver in his pocket. He returned to Sarajevo, and on the day when the new Bosnian parliament Sabor opened on 15 June 1910, he fired 5 bullets at the Provincial Governor General Marijan Varešanin, and shot himself with the sixth bullet, convinced that the assassination was successful (Dedijer 1966: 390). Although Žerajić was buried secretly, the Young Bosnia members found his grave and adorned it with flowers. After the arrest, Princip said in his statement that he had sworn at his grave that he would revenge his death, and when Princip visited Serbia for the first time, he brought back with him to Bosnia a handful of „free Serbian soil” (Lebedev 1936) and laid it on Žerajić’s grave, and the last time Princip visited Bogdan Žerajić’s grave together with Danilo Ilić and Neđa Čabrinović was on the eve of 28th June.

After the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bosnian and Herzegovinian students said that they would not recognize the annexation at any cost, as it represented nothing but a robbery, and that „if Austria-Hungary wants to swallow us, we will bite through its stomach”. (Dedijer 1966: 293) All Young Bosnia members had deep interests in literature and poetry, some of them became talented poets in their short life, and some became great writers (Ivo Andrić), philosophers, university professors (Pero Slijepčević, Vaso Čubrinović). They were especially inspired by the works of Friedrich Nietzsche, Henrik Ibsen, Oscar Wilde, Walt Whitman, and other protagonists of literary anarchism.

Situation in which the South Slavs found themselves just before 1914 was very complex. Most people were striving to express their revolt not only against national oppression but against the chains that were smothering the life in every field.

The Young Bosnia members were great patriots. Their longing for freedom must be observed and approached interdisciplinary, from psychological, sociological and philosophical aspects. For Young

Bosnia members, a special inspiration was the heroism of Miloš Obilić, his self-immolation in his battle against a tyrant and tyranny. Obilić was and remains the symbol of the Serbian heroism and following his example libertarian ideals and decisiveness were born to never and at no cost recognize the slavery. Heroic popular songs were reflecting the entire Kosovo legend upon which for centuries motivation and fearlessness of the Serbian people were built. Kosovo myth also developed the cult of revenge. The Serbian epic songs were read and translated into their languages with utmost respect by the greatest writers and poets in the world –Johann Wolfgang Goethe, Sir Walter Scott, Alexander Sergejevich Pushkin... The famous American journalist John Reed wrote: „Every Serbian common soldier knows what he is fighting for. When he was a child, his mother greeted him with words Hello, the avenger of Kosovo!” A great Serbian poet, statesman and bishop, Petar Petrović Njegoš, claimed that anyone who overthrows a tyrant fulfills God’s mission. In his work *Lažni Car Šćepan Mali* (The fake tsar Stephen the Little) he glorifies the revenge in the name of the higher God’s law. The same idea was expressed by Seneca: „No sacrifice is more pleasing to God than the blood of a tyrant”. However, the source of the right to resist a tyrant Njegoš did not find only in the God’s natural law, beyond nature, he also looked for its evidence in the nature of human society as such, in continuous rebellions of the South Slavic peasants against the oppressive Ottoman’s rule.

The Young Bosnia members would definitely be the most progressive part of the revolutionary movements of the South Slavs in the territory of the Habsburg Monarchy. For them, the assassination of the archduke Franz Ferdinand meant the murder of a tyrant, carried out for the common good based on the learning of the natural law that all people are born equal and as such can stand up against violence and those who break the human rights and freedoms of citizens. Especially since the South Slavs were among the last Europeans who managed to create their own national states.

From the annexation of Bosna and Herzegovina in 1908, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy continuously prepared to attack Serbia. Viennese bourgeois state official and diplomat Leopold von Berchtold was very aggressive towards Serbia, and his first associate count Janós Forgách fostered hatred and contempt towards the kingdom. The proof was his insisting on putting a maxim on all the offices of the Austrian Government on the Ballhausplatz: “Serbia should be destroyed (Serbija

delenda est),” and they greeted Serbs with the following words: ”Alle Serben müssen sterben”, meaning ‘All Serbs must die.’ The wave of Serbofobia engulfed the entire monarchy. A poet Karl Kraus made a historical slogan „Serbien muss sterben” („Serbia must die”), and paper slips with that wording were placed on the tables in all taverns in Sarajevo (Ekmečić 2010: 345).

The most influential revolutionaries –the young men in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bogdan Žerajić and Vladimir Gaćinović more than others mentioned the „Serbhood”. They had the greatest influence in Sarajevo (Slijepčević 1929: 188). The youngest, revolutionary Young Bosnia generation of Serb members from Bosnia and Herzegovina, had no unique, and particularly no clear viewpoints at that time regarding the Yugoslav issue, although it was exactly that generation that was considered the main carrier of the Yugoslav idea in that region before the World War I. However, its main ideologist, Vladimir Gaćinović, was no sentimental towards the idea of Yugoslavism and he saw it as „mixing the Croatian water with Serbian wine” (Dedijer 1966: 348). Programme articles he wrote at that time, were supremely permeated solely with the Serbian national idea and in them, up until the war, there was no mention of the Yugoslavianism as a possible solution of the Serbian national issue.

Unlike Gaćinović, Dimitrije Mitrinović, who has been considered the second main ideologist of the revolutionary youth, was a man of much different views and philosophy of life. Already in his high school days, he had the understanding for the Yugoslav idea, advocating for a unique literature of Serbs and Croats, which could have been the basis of their unification (Ibid.: 290). His views would only strengthen later on and formulate during his study in Zagreb, especially during his friendship with Ivan Meštrović, whom the contemporaries at that time considered „the only integral Yugoslav”.

The well known motto of the youth revolutionary movement Young Bosnia was: We want to either die in life or live in death. From this suggestive assertion of theirs, it is obvious that they did not fear death, and that their conscious was intrinsically permeated with the philosophy of necessity to die for the future and freedom. Vladimir Gaćinović met with Gavrilo Princip for the first time in Sarajevo, in the apartment of Borivoje Jevtić, where he usually stayed. He was leaving a strong impression on all Young Bosnia members, particularly on Mehmedbašić and Princip, and all his youth friends thought that it had

a crucial influence on them and prepared Princip and comrades for action. So did Borivoje Jevtić, for example, write in 1920: „On Princip, who mockingly look at people, Vladimir made an unusual impression... The first moments with Gaćinović became permanent for Princip. He was with Gaćinović even when he was not with him. He was impressed by his moral strength and his apostolicity, which in the name of the aim that it served calmly passed over all the sufferings, did not give in to obstacles, did not subside from persecution” (Gaćinović 2014: 247).

Science established long time ago that the assassination in Sarajevo was not the cause of the Great War 1914–1918, but its reason. On the other side, it was an unexpected gift from the god Mars to the belligerent Vienna side that, since the annexation crises 1908–1909, had been looking for a reason to attack Serbia and „appease” the South Slavs, expanding the Habsburg rule to the very doorstep of Thessaloniki. It is only in this context that national aspirations of the South Slavs and colonial conditions in Bosnia and Herzegovina may be discussed as one of the many reasons of the World War I. In this respect, there is much truth in the conclusions of the historian and economist Veselin Masleša, that Princip, with his gun wanted to stop *Drang nach Osten*” (Masleša 1945: 45).

Hypotheses according to which the assassination in Sarajevo was inspired by secret services of Russia, France and Great Britain, or similar organizations in Germany and Hungary, and the military intelligence service “EVIDENCBIRO” of Austria, either directly or indirectly, were not confirmed by historical studies, and insisting on these hypothesis clouds the relevant historical facts in the region of Bosnia and Herzegovina in time of the Austro-Hungarian terror at the beginning of 20th century. The Young Bosnia members did not want other state but their own and freedom in it, which is why that legitimate right must always be considered and respected. Science does not allow for improvisations, and it condemns any attempt with regards to the domination of politics over science, like the malicious thesis on the character of Young Bosnia. Such thesis are not harmless, but malicious and hazardous, as they distort the role of the Serbian people in history, and mislead public opinion. When Ferdinand arrived in Bosnia and Herzegovina to attend the maneuvers of the 15th and 16th Corpuses of the Austro-Hungarian army, he said: “In Bosnia and Herzegovina, I do not recognize any nation. They are all Bosnian to me, their flags do not exist, there is only the flag of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy

that exists,”⁶ which additionally irritated the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. After the assassination, Austria-Hungary started to use the most brutal violence, massive killings and arrest of innocent people, women and children, in Bosnia and Herzegovina⁷ especially in the Eastern Herzegovina – the centre of popular resistance and preparation of the people for the new uprising against the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

One month after the assassination by Princip,⁸ World War I began – following the Austro -Hungarian ultimatum to Serbia on 23 July 2014 and declaration of war on 28 July, and the German declaration of war against Russia on 1 August, France on 3 August and the British declaration of war to Germany 4 August 2014. That war changed the map of Europe more than any until then. Four empires failed, and with them the dynasties of Habsburg, Romanov, Hohenzollem and, the Ottoman dynasty, which ruled the empires for hundreds of years. Austria-Hungary had intentions to attack Serbia immediately after the Treaty of Bucharest, in the autumn of 1913, and had already carried out preparations and asked for the agreement of the allies. One statement of the official Italy turned away Austria-Hungary from taking that step. However, it only meant putting off the war, for which the Viennese military and political officials continued to prepare. According to the admission of the Emperor Franz Josephin a letter addressed to the Emperor Wilhelm soon after the assassination in Sarajevo, the Viennese government – in spite of the earlier Italian warning – still unrelentingly decided to go into war with Serbia. On the Ballhausplatz, back in the first days of June 1914, a memorandum for the Emperor Wilhelm was

6 Preparing for the Great War, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy took a loan of 400 000 000 crowns , which made all the European nations worry, including the English who brought the monarchy to Bosnia and Herzegovina. To that end, it also changed the ethnic structure of the BiH population. In the period from 1878 to 1914, 140 000 Muslims and 40 000 Serbs moved out of Bosnia and Herzegovina, while during the same period 230 000 Catholics moved into Bosnia and Herzegovina. Franz Ferdinand, at dinner in Ilidža, the day before the assassination, confided to the chief of his operative office, colonel Metzger that, „it was decided in Konopište that an immediate attack on Serbia is to be launched immediately after the maneuvers”. A meeting between the Emperor Wilhelm II and Franz Ferdinand in Konopište was held on 12 June 1914 (Gaćinović 2014: 116).

7 “Arad was a big, live Serbian ossuary, where 5.500 people from Bosnia and Herzegovina were interned, among them 400 children, of which 2.200 stayed in Arad forever” (Čorović 1920: 98).

8 On Saturday, 28 June, on Vidovdan (St. Vitus Day), at exactly 10.55 a.m. Gavrilo Princip, from a distance of 5-6 steps, assassinated the Austro-Hungarian Heir to the Throne Franz Ferdinand from semi-automatic pistol no. 19074 (Gaćinović 2014: 322).

drawn up including all the reasons why Austria-Hungary, at all costs, was trying to carry out armed action against Serbia. In the letter of the Austrian Emperor, it was explicitly emphasized that the memorandum had been written before the Sarajevo Assassination. The Emperor Franz Joseph delivered to the Emperor Wilhelm not only the views of his government – laid down in the memorandum – but his own views in relation to Serbia and its „hostile tendencies against Austria-Hungary.” In the letter he further claimed that Serbia had gained a huge increase in the territories and population, which made it become two times bigger, so its aggressiveness towards Austria-Hungary became two times more dangerous (Đorđević 1922: 13). It did not take much to convince the Emperor Wilhelm, who had been preparing for the war many years before that, constantly looking for the reason for the war. He enthusiastically accepted the Austrian intention and already on 23 July 1914 the Austro-Hungarian envoy in Belgrade, baron Giesl (Wladimir Rudolf Karl Freiherr Giesl von Gieslingen) could submit an ultimatum note to the Serbian Government, requesting its unconditional acceptance within 48 hours.

Leo Pfeffer in his book (Pfeffer 1938: 132-137) claims that it was clear to him from the beginning that the responsibility of the official Serbia in the assassination of Franz Ferdinand would not be proved, and that the result of his investigation confirmed his belief. In that respect, Vienna showed certain impatience, and sent a special envoy to Sarajevo who was supposed to get the information on the investigation and affect its course. It was a higher ranking official of the joint Ministry of Finance in Vienna, Friedrich von Wiesner, who, after a detailed investigation, found out that Serbia was not responsible for the assassination of Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo. A professor at the University of Belgrade and Pašić's advisor and academic, Stanoje Stanojević, although he did not like Apis, in his book published in 1923, claimed that neither Apis nor anyone from Serbia gave the initiative for the assassination, but rather that it came from Gavrilo Princip and his cohorts from Bosnia and Herzegovina. A French historian, Jean-Jacques Becker, university professor and president of the Centre of the Great War History, in his book "Year 14", edition 2004 and 2013, claimed that the assassination was "decided, organized and carried out by a small group of Bosnian students, enthusiastic nationalists, gathered around Princip." The best estimation of the political background of the Sarajevo Assassination was given by one of the participants in it: 'It was without any thinking, like when the water hits, without any systematicity.'

Bibliography

- Bogićević, V. (1954) *Mlada Bosna*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- The Catholic Encyclopaedia (1922) *Volume IV*. New York.
- Čorović, V. (1920) *Crna knjiga – patnje Srba Bosne i Hercegovine za vreme Svetskog rata 1914–1918*. Beograd-Sarajevo: I. Đ. Đurđević.
- Dedijer, V. (1966) *Sarajevo 1914*. Prosveta: Beograd.
- Dorđević, M. P. (1922) *Srbija i Jugoslaveni za vreme rata 1914–1918*. Beograd: Grafičko preduzeće Prosveta.
- Ekmečić, M. (1996) „Žalosna baština iz godine 1914“. In: Ekmečić, M. et al. (eds.) *Politički procesi Srbima u Bosni i Hercegovini 1914–1917*. Beograd – Laktaši: Institut za savremenu istoriju; Udruženje ratnih dobrovoljaca 1912–1918, njihovih potomaka i poštovalaca; Grafomark. pp.
- Ekmečić, M. (2010) *Dugo kretanje između oranja i klanja – Istorija Srba u novom veku (1492–1992)*. Beograd: Evro-Giunti.
- Gaćinović, R. (2010) „Mlada Bosna i srpsko nacionalno pitanje“, *Nacionalni interes* 9(1): 437–456.
- Gaćinović, R. (2014) *Mlada Bosna*. Beograd: Medija centar Odbrana: Belgrade, 2014.
- Gaćinović, V. (1956) *Ogledi i pisma*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Ilić, A (2013) „Princip i principi“, *Politika*, 17. oktobar 2013.
- Kljakić, S. (2013) „Revizija prošlosti u režiji velikih sila“, *Politika*, 9. jun. 2013.
- Lebedev, V. (1936) „Rođenje Gavrila Principa“, *Politika*, 28. septembar 1936.
- Locke, J. (1988) *Two Treatises of Civil Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Masleša, V. (1945) *Mlada Bosna*. Beograd: Kultura.
- Mitrović, A. (1983) „Suočavanje sa srednjoevropskim imperijalizmom“. In: Andrej Mitrović (ed.) *Istorija srpskog naroda*“, vol. VI-2. Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga. pp. 7–106.
- Nedić, V. (1959) *Sima Milutinović Sarajlija*. Beograd: Nolit.
- Parežanin, R. (1927) *Nekoliko reči o Žerajić – Principovom naraštaju*. Subotica: Književni centar.
- Pfeffer, L. (1938) *Istraga o Sarajevskom atentatu*. Zagreb: Nova Evropa.
- Slijepčević, P. (1929) *Mlada Bosna, napor Bosne i Hercegovine za oslobođenje i ujedinjenje*. Sarajevo: Izd. obl. odbora nar. odbrane.
- Stojanović, N. (1929) *O zadacima Bosne*. Novi Sad: Letopis Matice srpske.
- Trišić, N. (1935) *Slučaj Muhameda Mehmedbašića*. Sarajevo: Pregled.
- Vojni leksikon (1981) Belgrade: VIZ.

