

Fascist Thought in Twentieth Century Europe

Case Study of Ante Pavelić

By

Goran Miljan

Submitted to
Central European University
History Department

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Constantin Iordachi

Second Reader: Professor Marsha Siefert

Budapest, Hungary

2009

“Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.”

Abstract

The case study of Ante Pavelić, *Poglavnik* (Leader) of the Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia, presents the first attempt to place Pavelić within the contemporary models of fascism. It also provides one of the first analyses of his ideological basis, in order to place him within European fascist thought in the 20th century. As to my knowledge, such research has not yet been done, and therefore presents an important aspect and new approach when dealing with Ante Pavelić.

The paper analyzes Ante Pavelić within two contemporary models of fascism. The models used in this paper are by Roger Griffin and Stanley G. Payne, the two most influential scholars of modern fascist theory. By method of comparison, based on these two models, I have demonstrated that when using and analyzing primary sources, Pavelić can be placed within the two models of fascism. Further on, the paper provides the first discourse analysis of Ante Pavelić's ideological and political thought, based on his writings and speeches, and establishes the presence and importance of fascist ideology in his ideological thought and political life.

By employing the above-mentioned methods of comparison and discourse analysis, I have elaborated the importance of fascism as the ideological and political basis of Ante Pavelić. By analyzing primary sources I have shown that fascism presented the core of Pavelić's ideology, and that Pavelić should be considered a fascist within the broader European context.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
I. Theoretical Approaches.....	8
II. Ante Pavelić (1889-1959)	16
II.a. Life, Politics and Emigration	16
II.b. Presence in Contemporary Literature on Fascism.....	25
III. Poglavnik [The Leader] and Contemporary Fascist Theory.....	31
III.a. The Two Models of Contemporary Fascist Theory	31
IV. One of the European fascists?.....	51
IV.a. Ante Pavelić – A Croatian fascist?.....	51
IV.b. State Building and Fascist Perspective	67
V. Conclusion	74
Bibliography	80

Introduction

Fascism in the twentieth-century Europe is still an open and in a sense controversial topic when it comes to its definition and characteristics. For the last thirty years several prominent experts have tried to come up an ‘ideal type’ definition of fascism or of the ‘fascist minimum’ which would serve comparative and definitional purposes, establishing what exactly might be defined as ‘genuine fascism’,¹ how various European movements and regimes which employed fascist ideas may or may not fit within such artificially constructed types. As Roger Griffin argued in his book “any definition or key generic term used in social sciences cannot be true in the descriptive sense, but only useful.”² It is exactly this usefulness of certain models of fascism that I plan to address, trying to establish the importance of fascist thought as an ideological basis within the intellectual thought and political practice of Ante Pavelić.

Ante Pavelić was a Croatian interwar politician known as the *Poglavnik* [The Leader] of the Ustashi movement and he later established the Independent State of Croatia (1941-1945). Even though my work is first and foremost an intellectual investigation, it will serve as the basis for further research on the Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia. Further investigation on this subject is necessary due to the fact that none of the modern fascist theoretical scholars has dealt with this question based on primary sources. Thus the evaluation of the Ante Pavelić, the Ustashi movement and the Independent state of Croatia is mostly based on secondary literature, supporting the conclusion that the Independent State of Croatia, as Stanley

¹ The term *genuine fascism* is referred mostly to Italian and Nazi Germany variant of fascism as “original” form, while the term *fascist minimum* constitutes certain notions which could be regarded as necessary components of any fascist movement or state organization.

² Roger Griffin. *The Nature of Fascism*. (London and New York: Routledge, 1996). 26.

G. Payne says, is merely a ‘puppet state’.³ Though judged on the basis of its legal proclamation this might be true, such conclusions leave an open field for further investigations of the state, economy and social dimensions of the Independent State of Croatia. Although I intend neither to base my work on the notion of the state, nor to provide Pavelić’s extensive biography, I believe that the ideological aspects of Ante Pavelić as *Poglavnik* of the Ustashi movement, presents a very important aspect of it. This becomes important especially when trying to answer the question of whether or not we might consider Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia as fascist.

This research will focus on the ideological and political thought of Ante Pavelić. My purpose is to establish whether or not Ante Pavelić might be looked upon as a fascist ideologist striving towards building a fascist state. The importance of such research is multiple. To my knowledge, such research has not yet been conducted and Pavelić was never confronted and analyzed within the contemporary models of fascism. By analyzing various sources, such as his books, speeches and pamphlets, I intend to establish the importance of fascism within his writings. I argue that fascism presented the core of Pavelić’s ideological thought, and that he was strongly influenced by it.

Furthermore, it remains to be seen whether Pavelić wanted the Germans to play a decisive role in the proclamation of the new state, or did he expect for Mussolini to play a crucial part as his ideological and political mentor. This issue becomes very important when we examine Pavelić’s intellectual and political life in the 1920s and especially during the 1930s when he

³ Stanley G. Payne. *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945*. (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1995).

spent most of his life and political activity under the sponsorship and influence of Mussolini and Fascist Italy.

Ante Pavelić was an active politician in the interwar period in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. He was a lawyer and an active member of the *Croatian Party of Rights*, which was known for its strong national political activities. During the 1920s Pavelić was in contact with some of the prewar Croatian politicians who fought against the establishment of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and who emigrated mostly to Austria or Hungary. In 1929, Ante Pavelić was charged with conspiracy against the state and was sentenced to death. This was the crucial moment in his political life and ideological thought. After he escaped to Italy, he associated himself with several extreme positioned Croatian emigrants and with the VMRO [Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization] with which he later organized the assassination of King Alexander in Marseille in 1934.

Ideologically and structurally, the 1930s present the most important and interesting period in the development of Pavelić's ideological thought. During that time, which he spent in Fascist Italy, Pavelić came under the strong influence and support of Mussolini and his closest allies. He received a substantial amount of money and training grounds for his paramilitary organization Ustashi, and started to promote and actively support the overthrow of the king and the abolishment of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. It is in this period that Pavelić produced two of his most important organizational and ideological works: *Načela Ustaškog pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement] (1933), which was later published in 1942 as the main organizational document of the newly established Ustashi movement, and also his 1938 book *Strahote Zablude* [The Horrors of Illusions], in which he writes about communism and

democracy as ‘contaminated’ political systems, and fascism as the new European and world system, which is yet to achieve its full strength and meaning on the world scale. Combined with the works and papers published after the establishment of the Independent State of Croatia, such as his speeches and newspaper articles, this constitutes the basis of my investigation of Pavelić’s ideological and political thought. The examination of his ideological base and ideas, especially presented in his book and pamphlets, and their comparative analysis within this time framework, will provide me with key insights into his ideological convictions and actions. This is very important, especially since Pavelić was a founder of the Ustashi movement and had enjoyed great support among its members. It is exactly this notion of undisputed leadership, which justifies the examination of Pavelić’s ideological basis. As *Poglavnik* of the Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia, Pavelić is to be considered as the establisher of their ideological foundation and structure.

My study of Ante Pavelić’s ideological and political thought aims at positioning him within the broader context of European fascism and fascist thought. With this research, I intend to initiate a discussion on the position of Ante Pavelić within broader European fascist ideology. Although the Independent State of Croatia is not classified as a fascist state, no author has dealt with Ante Pavelić’s ideological convictions and thoughts. Prominent scholars have mostly dealt with the Ustashi movement, which Payne defined as a fascist movement,⁴ and the establishment of the Independent State of Croatia regarding its position between German and Italian influence.

On April 10th, 1941 Slavko Kvaternik, the right hand of Ante Pavelić, proclaimed on Radio Zagreb the establishment of the Independent State of Croatia in which he stated “today,

⁴ Payne. *Fascism: Comparison and Definition*. (Wisconsin: the University of Wisconsin Press, 1980). 16-17.

before the day of the resurrection of our God's Son, the resurrection of our Independent State of Croatia has been decided.”⁵ At the time of the proclamation Ante Pavelić was in the city of Karlovac, some 40 kilometres away from Zagreb. The proclamation was being enforced by the German general Veessenmyer who was in charge of the situation after the German troops invaded the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. The absence of Ante Pavelić at the time of the proclamation poses several questions. Although he was in Croatia, Pavelić remained in the city of Karlovac waiting for further instructions from Italy, and he was probably uncertain of how the people might react once he entered Zagreb.

Having in mind the context of the 1941 state proclamation and its establishment, mostly the fact that the Second World War had already started, I come to the question of how much of what was present in Pavelić's ideological convictions and affinities he was able to achieve due to the circumstances of international war. Moreover, was the idea of establishing a fascist state, culture, society and economy already present in the goals of Pavelić and in what scope? These are questions which can be answered only by examining Pavelić's ideological and political standpoints.

My first chapter will be devoted to the theoretical framework within which this research will be conducted. The purpose is to show how scholars have reflected on fascism after the Second World War. I will present major theoretical models of fascism, starting from the end of the Second World War until nowadays. The aim is to show how the scholarly understanding of what fascism is has evolved. The chapter will also reflect on the 'domestic' ex-Yugoslav literature on fascism and their view of Ante Pavelić, Ustashi movement and the Independent

⁵ Petar Pozar. *Ustaša: dokumenti o ustaškom pokretu* [Ustashi: Documents on Ustashi Movement]. (Zagreb: Zagrebačka stvarnost, 1995).

State of Croatia. By doing this, I intend to show the prevalence of two currently most dominating fascist theoretical models, within which Pavelić's ideological and political basis will be examined and analyzed.

The second chapter will provide a short description of Ante Pavelić, his political activities and influences. With this I intend to acquaint the reader with his political background and ideological beliefs throughout the interwar and post-war period. The chapter will also reflect on the evaluation of Ante Pavelić, Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia within the contemporary literature on fascism. The purpose is to establish how western authors dealt with this subject, and which sources they used in their analysis.

The third chapter will focus on the ideological and political background of Ante Pavelić within the interwar and the Independent State of Croatia period. I intend to investigate his ideological and political beliefs during the 1920s and 1930s and in the period of the Independent State of Croatia using Roger Griffin's and Stanley G. Payne's models of fascism as the two most influential ones within modern scholars. By analyzing various sources regarding Ante Pavelić's ideological and political convictions, I intend to examine if the main components of fascism, as defined by Griffin and Payne, were present within his ideological convictions. The aim is to establish whether or not Pavelić could be seen and described as fascist within these taxonomies and definitions.

My fourth chapter will provide an in-depth analysis of Pavelić's ideological and political thought in his writings and speeches. Since, in my opinion, this was a period during which fascism exerted a strong influence on him, I will focus on several of his writings, such as, books, programs or pamphlets, published from the period of the 1930s till 1945. The answer which I

will provide is contained within the notion of the ‘fascist minimum’ as defined by two of the most influential scholars in this field, Roger Griffin and Stanley G. Payne. I will establish the presence of this notion within the ideological and political thought and activities of Ante Pavelić, before and after the 1941 proclamation of the Independent State of Croatia. This will enable me to answer the question of whether Ante Pavelić is to be considered as a fascist ideologist, or a product of Croatian radical nationalist thought.

My work will rely on two methodological aspects of investigation. First, I will conduct a comparative analysis of Pavelić’s ideological thought. By using the comparative approach and analysis regarding the two mentioned models of fascist theory, I will examine the presence of fascism within Pavelić’s writings, speeches and various newspaper articles. The second methodological approach which I will apply in this work is the analysis of Pavelić’s discourse on fascism. With this I intend to provide insights into his ideological beliefs and standpoints.

I. Theoretical Approaches

Ideologies constitute a core of twentieth century European history, whether we talk about communism, fascism, capitalism or any other-ism, they have been the motor of history. They have manifested themselves in various forms and aspects of human lives and societies in general. While some strived towards the total control over societies and had an aggressive note as their main ingredient, others remained focused on prosperity of societies within the notion of humanity and peace. What characterizes fascist ideology is the strong presence and emphasis on the aspect of transformation and renewal of nation and society, and it's striving towards the establishment of the new world order which would replace the existing one. Fascism as a term was coined in 1919 Italy and as such first appeared in Italy as a state system. Therefore it is commonly accepted that the term Fascism, with a capital F, is used for the description of Italian Fascism, while all other movements or state formations are classified as fascist, with the small f. This is the same terminology which I will use in my research and paper.

Ever since the Second World War scholars of different disciplines have engaged in the field of investigation and contextualization of the notion of totalitarian systems, specifically fascism and communism. They intended to perceive the main characteristics of such system and how it established and manifested itself among different societies in different times and spaces. The first elaborative perspective on the notion of totalitarianism was presented by Hannah Aarendt in her book *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, first published in 1948.⁶ The second elaboration of totalitarianism was done in 1956 by Friedrich Carl Joachim and Zbigniew

⁶Hannah Aarendt. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. (San Diego: A Harvest Book, 1968, c1948).

Brzezinski in their book *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*.⁷ They confronted Hannah Aarendt's analytical model with the functional one. The main difference between the two elaborative studies of totalitarianism is that the former one presents a model and not a theory, which makes it more static and closed for transformation.

At the beginning research has mostly been constrained within the European borders, although later it spread among different countries of the world. Fascism, as a totalitarian system, or at least one which strived toward becoming one, soon became the main core of such investigation. Ever since then, different notions, suggestions, definitions and models of what fascism is and which movements or state formations might be considered as fascist ones, were being presented. The vast amount of scholarly interpretations and periods of fascist scholarly investigations might be divided, as Gentile suggests, in the "three periods of renewal, first one from 1960s till 1970s, the second one in the period of the 1980s and the third one within the period of the 1990s."⁸

During the first period, which is commonly said to last from the middle of the 1960s till the end of the 1970s, fascism was seen and interpreted as anti-modern and anti-historical phenomenon. This caused the approach in which fascism was looked upon as the system without its own historical individuality. The most prominent scholar and representative of this first period

⁷Carl J. Friedrich and Zbigniew K. Brzezinski. *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*. (Cambridge, Massachussets: Harvard University Press, 1956).

⁸ Emilio Gentile. "Fascism, Totalitarianism and Political Religion: Definitions and Critical Reflections on Criticism of an Interpretation" in *Fascism, Totalitarianism and Political Religion*. (London: Routledge, 2005). 36.

was George L. Mosse, who together with Walter Laqueur founded the *Journal of Contemporary History* in 1966.⁹

The second period is distinguished from the first one by the printing of the book written in 1980 by Stanley G. Payne, *Fascism: Comparison and Definition*. In his book, Payne put forward a definition of fascism, which no longer saw fascism only within the negative perspectives and notions, but rather as “combining new and modern features, with its own ideology, culture and revolutionary components blended with traditional and reactionary ones.”¹⁰ Payne provided a typological definition of fascism using the broad varieties of ultra-right interwar movements by their different categorization within the interwar period.¹¹ Payne’s typological description of fascism consists of three important aspects which he categorizes as ‘the fascist negations’ followed by ‘ideology and goals’ and finally ‘style and organization’.¹²

It is within these three notions, which serve as certain, as Griffin says, “check-list”¹³, that Payne makes a distinction between what, he considers, can be defined as fascist or non-fascist movements. What becomes interesting in this case is that Payne sees the Ustashi movement as fascist and the Independent State of Croatia as the “puppet regime”¹⁴ regarding the role of the Nazi Germany in creation of the Independent State of Croatia, without any examination of the state and its social or economic structure and goals. This period is marked by the investigation of

⁹ Ibid. “Fascism, Totalitarianism and Political Religion: Definitions and Critical Reflections on Criticism of an Interpretation” in *Fascism, Totalitarianism and Political Religion*. 36-40.

¹⁰ Ibid. “Fascism, Totalitarianism and Political Religion: Definitions and Critical Reflections on Criticism of an Interpretation” in *Fascism, Totalitarianism and Political Religion*. 41.

¹¹ Griffin. *The Nature of Fascism*. 7.

¹² Payne. *Fascism: Comparison and Definition*. 7.

¹³ Griffin. *The Nature of Fascism*. 7.

¹⁴ Payne. *Fascism: Comparison and Definition*. 16-17 and 137-138.

individual movements, and gradually increasing skepticism when it comes to the theoretical framework and definition of fascism, especially in the late 1980s period.

The last and most recent research period started with the 1990s and the return towards the theoretical aspects of fascism, and its modernizing and aesthetic values. The turn was marked with the publication of Roger Griffin's book in 1990, *The Nature of Fascism*.¹⁵ In his book, Griffin proposed delineation of an ideal type of fascism, claiming that it "does not correspond to an objective entity"¹⁶ and instead argued and provided a concise one sentence definition of what fascism is and what might be constituted as such, in which he says that "Fascism is a genus of political ideology whose mythic core in its various permutations is a palingenetic form of the populist ultra-nationalism."¹⁷

As described above, the debate over what exactly constitutes genuine fascism and how to establish what may or may not be included within it is present even nowadays. Within different descriptions and theories I have noticed different notions and aspects which are either similar or different. During the last thirty years scholars have tried to come up with a certain model of what could be considered as common definition of fascism, that is, the certain ideal type of it. The attempts stretch from Ernst Nolte's "theory of generic fascism based on phenomenological principles"¹⁸, to Stanley Payne's "typological definition"¹⁹ and to most recent one presented by Roger Griffin and summarized in one concise sentence. Although such concise definition of fascism and its main core might seem attractive, and in a sense it is and therefore widely accepted, it only implies, if scholars agree with Griffin, that unless this 'fascist minimum' is

¹⁵ Ibid. *Fascism: Comparison and Definition*. 36-42.

¹⁶ Griffin. *The Nature of Fascism* 10.

¹⁷ Ibid. 26.

¹⁸ Ibid. 6.

¹⁹ Ibid. 7.

present, one cannot include various, and in many ways distinctive movements or state systems as being fascist. On the other hand, his notion of palingenetic myth as something which constitutes genuine fascism may also be found within, as Payne says, “Leftist, moderate, conservative and extreme right-wing nationalisms are also frequently palingenetic,”²⁰ and this might even be found within the communist idea of creating a new society in near future. Another important aspect which arises from such definition is that scholars need to reexamine various movements and regimes within this new core definition of fascism. Unfortunately, when it comes to the case or even comparative study of the Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia such reexamination has not been done. Such concise definition also raises the question of how can we define something which existed and manifested itself in various different ways and forms within such simple one sentence definition of ‘fascist minimum’.

The two most influential scholars dealing with fascism, Roger Griffin and Stanley G. Payne, have one thing in common when dealing with various fascist movements and organizations in Europe. Within their above mentioned works, both authors have tried to come up with the definition of fascism and historical overview of various movements and state organizations which they define either as fascist, proto-fascist or radical-nationalist one. Neither of them sees the Independent State of Croatia and its *Poglavnik* Ante Pavelić as product of European, or better say Italian, fascist thought and ideology. Why is that so, might be answered by investigating and more deeply analyzing not only their definitions, but also the literature and sources which both authors use when dealing with the Independent State of Croatia. Although the core of this research is not the Independent State of Croatia, but her main ideologue,

²⁰ Payne. *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945*. 5.

Poglavnik Ante Pavelić, the notion of state played an important aspect in his ideological and political thought.

The notion of the Independent State of Croatia has also been a subject of various prominent ‘domestic’ scholars in former Yugoslavia and nowadays Croatia. Unfortunately, for the last fifty years, their notion of the Independent State of Croatia and its *Poglavnik* Ante Pavelić was influenced by different ideological aspects which had a tremendous amount of impact on its historical investigation and interpretation.

In former Yugoslavia this was highly influenced by the ideological foundations of the communist regime which strongly emphasized its ant-fascist struggle and foundations on which it was built. Therefore, the question of whether the Independent State of Croatia and its protagonists were fascist or not, was never questioned as such within the theoretical frameworks posed by international scholars. Although none of the authors dealt with the theoretical aspects and definitions of fascism and how one may or may not merge the Independent State of Croatia within the European fascist movements, they provided, especially the books written by Bogdan Krizman²¹ and Fikreta Jelić-Butić,²² a vast amount of archival material and sources. Exactly due to their extensive source analysis and research, these are still one of the most referred books on this topic.

The second ideological influence, even more dangerous for scientific scholarship, appeared during the 1990s period of *Homeland War* in Croatia and Franjo Tuđman’s all embracing authoritarian regime. In this period, the Independent State of Croatia was presented as

²¹ Bogdan Krizman. *Ante Pavelić i Ustaše* [Ante Pavelic and Ustashi]. (Zagreb: Globus, 1978). *NDH između Hitlera i Mussolinija* [The Independent State of Croatia Between Hitler and Mussolini]. (Zagreb: Globus, 1983). *Ustaše i Treći Reich* [The Ustashi and the Third Reich]. (Zagreb: Globus, 1983).

²² Fikreta Jelić-Butić. *Ustaše i NDH* [Ustashi and The Independent State of Croatia]. (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1977).

the achievement of the long lasting Croat's historical battle for the creation of their own state. Interpretations, within which all the atrocities and crimes against those who did not support such exclusivist ideology were simply neglected, served to emphasize the importance of another historical moment within Croatian historical battle for the creation of the independent state. Such interpretations, which were influenced more by political than serious independent scholarly investigations, allowed for the Independent State of Croatia and its protagonists to be presented within the positive notion of state creation as the most important aspect of that historical period.²³

This politically motivated ideological influence changed with the new approach brought by professor Ivo Goldstein and his research on Jews in his book *Holokaust u Zagrebu* [Holocaust in Zagreb], published in 2001.²⁴ With this book and Goldstein's insistence on the opening of certain archival materials, the Independent State of Croatia once again became the subject of historical research and interpretations, hopefully, this time without any ideological premises or influences. Even though certain steps forward have been done within Croatian historical science regarding the interpretations of Ante Pavelić and the Independent State of Croatia, a systematical research which would encompass not only the history of it but also place it within the modern theoretical framework of European fascism is still missing.

The aspect of research which will be done in this paper requires to be placed not only within the scientific and scholarly gap of the two above mentioned ideologically influenced frameworks, but also within the modern and more theoretical framework of fascism. In my

²³ Mark Biondich. "We Were Defending the State: Nationalism, Myth and Memory in Twentieth Century Croatia" in *Ideologies and National Identities: The case of Twentieth-Century Southeastern Europe*. (Budapest - New York: Central European University Press, 2004). 72.

²⁴ Ivo Goldstein. *Holokaust u Zagrebu* [Holocaust in Zagreb]. (Zagreb: Novi Liber, 2001).

research the main focus point will be on the ideological aspects of Ante Pavelić's political and intellectual thought. By examining and analyzing the discourse of his writings, I intend to establish the extent to which the fascist ideology was present and had influenced him.

Why such research is important, not only from the point of view mentioned above, but also in more general research, can be found in the statement given by Sabrina P. Ramet in the journal *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religion*, where she said that "Even today, 60 years after the end of the Second World War, the NDH [the Independent State of Croatia] remains the subject of controversy."²⁵ I agree with the statement, but would also add that beside the existing controversies, Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia still remained one of the few interwar subjects, which have not been classified and compared within the present modern scholar theories of fascism and fascist thought in Europe.

²⁵ Sabrina P. Ramet. "The NDH – An Introduction" in *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religion*, Vol.7, No.4. (London: Routledge, December 2006). 399-408.

II. Ante Pavelić (1889-1959)

This chapter will present various factors which had a tremendous impact on Ante Pavelić and his ideological basis. I will describe him within the period when he was politically active in various political institutions as the member of the *Croatian Party of Rights*. The purpose is to provide relevant data regarding the context in which he acted as politician, as an emigrant and as the *Poglavnik* of the Ustashi movement the Independent State of Croatia. The description will also reflect on the period after the Second World War when Pavelić fled the country and was in exile until his death. The second part of this chapter will deal with the analyses of Pavelić's presence within the contemporary history of fascism. The purpose is to analyze how various scholars reflected on Pavelić, as well as on the Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia, within their histories of fascism and to present the existing lack of literature and source analysis.

II.a. Life, Politics and Emigration

Ante Pavelić was born on July 14th 1889 in a small village of Bradina in Herzegovina. His father descendent from Lika, one of the poorest Croatian regions, and had worked as the railroad constructor.²⁶ As a boy Pavelić lived shortly in Istria, finished elementary school in the Bosnian city of Jajce after which he went to study in the city of Travnik where he finished a Jesuit gymnasium.²⁷ Afterword, he attended a gymnasium in the city of Senj, on Croatian coast, which was, as Crljen says “the same gymnasium which was attended by Ante Starčević and

²⁶ Bernd J. Fischer, ed. *Balkan Strongmen – Dictators and Authoritarian Rulers of Southeast Europe*. (Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2007). 209.

²⁷ Ivo Bogdan. *Dr. Ante Pavelić riješio je Hrvatsko pitanje* [Doctor Ante Pavelić has Resolved Croatian Question]. (Zagreb: Naklada Europa, 1942). 4.

Eugen Kvaternik.”²⁸ Later on, Pavelić settled in Zagreb where he finished classical gymnasium in 1910 after which he was accepted as the law student at the University of Zagreb. In 1915 he obtained his Law School doctoral degree and was employed by Aleksandar Horvat in his private councilor’s office. Pavelić started to be politically active during his studies, when he became a member of *Croatian Party of Rights* youth organization.²⁹

In 1921, as a member of *Croatian Party of Rights*, Pavelić was elected as a Council representative for the city of Zagreb.³⁰ It was not until 1927 that he gained a more prominent role in political life of the Kingdom. That year Pavelić was elected in the Belgrade Parliament as the representative of the newly formed *Croatian Bloc* which consisted of *Croatian Peasant Republican Alliance*, *Croatian Federalist Peasant Party* and *Croatian Party of Rights*.³¹ In his first speech, Pavelić called for the unity of Croatian representatives in order to achieve Croatian independence.³² Soon afterwards, he became one of the most active members of the *Croatian Party of Rights*. His activities were pointed toward the neglecting of the existing state and the position in which Croatia was in, and the current condition which for him was created against the will of Croatian people.³³

His influence soon spread among the members of the *Croatian Radical Party Youth Organization*. Under his patron, the *Organization* was coordinated in more professional manner. In 1928 they organized their *Second Sabor* where they stated that their goal is the establishment

²⁸ Ante Starčević and Eugen Kvaternik were the main protagonist in developing and organizing *Croatian Party of Rights* in the second half of the nineteenth century. For Ustashi they presented the ‘founding fathers’ and first fighters for Croatian freedom.

²⁹ Danijel Crljen, ed. *Poglavnik – život, misao, djelo* [The Leader – Life, Thought and Deed]. (Zagreb: Povjereništvo za odgoj i promidžbu u postrojničtvu, 1944). 4.

³⁰ Krizman. *Ante Pavelić i Ustaše* [Ante Pavelic and Ustashi]. 9.

³¹ Jelić-Butić. *Ustaše i NDH* [Ustashi and The Independent State of Croatia]. 15.

³² Ivo Goldstein. *Hrvatska povijest* [Croatian History]. (Zagreb: Novi Liber, 2003). 248.

³³ Mijo Bzik, ed. *Putem Hrvatskog državnog prava* [On the Road of Croatian State Right]. (Zagreb: Tiskara Ustaškog Pokreta, 1942). 31.

of the independency. The youth organization was most active in Zagreb, where it managed to infiltrate itself among the University members. It is in this period that *Hrvatski domobran* [*Croatian Defender*] was established, which presents the high point in organizing Pavelić's followers prior to his emigration. Members of the *Croatian Defender* were mostly young people, students and high school pupils, which presented, as Jelić-Butić says "the most radical members of the Croatian nationalist youth."³⁴

In speeches prior to his emigration, Pavelić's stand was that current situation was created against the will of Croatian people, and therefore it must be changed in favor of them and their historical state rights. In a 1927 speech, given during the Parliament campaign, he said that "we must fight for Croatian homeland to be free, to be able to govern on her own, to have a decisive word, and not to be a servant, over whom one can have a free use of, according to the way how someone in Belgrade woke up and decided."³⁵ He also emphasized the unfairness which was done during the currency change, when one newly established *dinar* was said to be worth four Austrians *kruna*. Further on, he reflected on the taxes and their unfairness,³⁶ police brutality and fear which it caused among the peasants. The emphasis was also put on the deterioration of Croatian educational system and plans on closing or relocating several important educational institutions and various outbuildings. In regard to this Pavelić said that all this have caused the feeling among Croats that they have lost their freedom in 1918 and that their only choice is to regain their freedom again.³⁷

³⁴ Jelić-Butić. *Ustaše i NDH* [Ustashi and The Independent State of Croatia]. 16.

³⁵ Bzik, ed. *Putem Hrvatskog državnog prava* [On the Road of Croatian State Right]. 26.

³⁶ Ibid. 19.

³⁷ Ibid. 52.

Krizman says that it was in 1927 when Pavelić visited and made contacts with the group of Croatian emigrants.³⁸ Croatian political emigration mostly consisted of former politically active persons who refused to accept the newly formed Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, established in December 1918.³⁹ In May 1919 they formed the *Croatian Committee* with their headquarters in Graz, then Vienna and later moved to Budapest. The group soon started to disagree in many questions, especially the ones connected with further actions and objectives. The *Committee* soon divided into two opposition groups. The first group was the so called *legitimists*, led by Colonel General Baron Stjepan Sarkotić. The second group was led by Ivo Frank, son of the ex prominent member of the *Croatian Party of Rights*, Josip Frank. The main difference between the two groups was in their concept of how to achieve the independency of Croatia.⁴⁰ On his way to Paris, Pavelić met in Vienna with general Sarkotić, who arranged the meeting between Pavelić and the Italian Ministry. The meeting took place in Rome on June 1927, where Pavelić submitted the copy of the memorandum which Ivo Frank also delivered to the Italian envoy in Budapest, for which Tomashevich says that it has “in several ways presaged developments in 1941.”⁴¹

A decisive moment in Pavelić’s ideological and political development came with the Parliament shooting in June 1928. A member of *Serbian Radical Party*, Puniša Račić, opened fire on Croatian delegates killing two of them and lethally injuring the leader of the *Croatian Peasant Party* Stjepan Radić. The 1928 Belgrade Parliament shooting caused a radicalization of the political situation within the Kingdom. The demonstrations in Zagreb and Radić's funeral

³⁸Krizman. *Ante Pavelić i Ustaše* [Ante Pavelic and Ustashi]. 9.

³⁹Jozo Tomashevich. *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia: Occupation and Collaboration*. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001). 17.

⁴⁰Ibid. 17-18.

⁴¹Ibid. 30. For more on memorandum see Tomashevich. *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia: Occupation and Collaboration*. 30-31.

turned into a mass political manifestation of the Croatian people. As the demonstrations continued on January 6th, 1929 King Alexander decided to proclaim dictatorship.⁴² He enforced administrative changes by dividing the country into nine counties. Further, he abolished the freedom of press as well as all political parties. The name of the country was changed from Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes into the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, in order to generate a certain Yugoslav identity.⁴³ Immediately after the Parliament shooting Pavelić gave a statement to reporters in which he said that “This crime, committed towards the Croatian representatives is meaningful and well prepared.”⁴⁴ In the same interview he also stated that “In political situation there shall be a tremendous shift.”⁴⁵ This shift is connected with Pavelić’s decision to leave the Kingdom and to employ new ways and means in fight against it.

Jelić-Butić says in her book that Pavelić “in the night on 19/20 January 1929 left the country, crossing the Austrian border.”⁴⁶ Krizman also says that he left the country on 19th of January 1929.⁴⁷ The date is correct but Pavelić did not cross the Austrian border, as Jelić-Butić says, but the Italian border at the city of Rijeka (Fiume).⁴⁸ With this moment, Pavelić's life as emigrant and *Poglavnik* of the Ustashi movement started. In my opinion Pavelić became even more radical in his views and actions after he had been sentenced to death in July 1929. He was charged with conspiracy against the state due to his connections and meetings in Sofia with the VMRO [Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization].⁴⁹ As he was sentenced to death, the

⁴² Goldstein. *Hrvatska povijest* [Croatian History]. 249-251.

⁴³ Ivan T. Berend. *Decades of Crisis - Central and Eastern Europe Before World War II*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998). 327.

⁴⁴ Bzik, ed. *Putem Hrvatskog državnog prava* [On the Road of Croatian State Right]. 67.

⁴⁵ Ibid. 67.

⁴⁶ Jelić-Butić. *Ustaše i NDH* [Ustashi and The Independent State of Croatia]. 18.

⁴⁷ Krizman. *Ante Pavelić i Ustaše* [Ante Pavelic and Ustashi]. 51.

⁴⁸ Ante Pavelić. *Doživljaji* [The Experiences]. (Zagreb: Vratna Gora d.o.o. 1998). 206-211.

⁴⁹ Tomashevich. *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia: Occupation and Collaboration*. 32.

only possibility for his return to Croatia was if the old state was to disappear and the independence of Croatia achieved.

For the most of his emigration period Pavelić was in Italy where he organized Ustashi movement and gained strong support of Fascist Italy. In Italy he organized the first group of Ustashi in the small mountain place of Bovegno, after acquiring Italian passport and thus becoming an Italian citizen. As Slavko Kvaternik says in his memoirs “The goal and purpose of this organization was a violent fight against the Yugoslav state and the creation of the independent Croatian state with the Italian assistance.”⁵⁰ During the period of 1930s Pavelić lead and organized Ustashi as the movement, giving them proper form and organizational structure. The Ustashi executed various terrorist attacks on railroad infrastructure or bomb explosions placed in front of the state institutions. Beside such ‘small scale’ actions Ustashi also planned and organized operations whose purpose was to destabilize the Kingdom and achieve Croatian independence. These were the so-called *Lika Uprising in 1932* and the assassination of the King Alexander in 1934.

The *Lika Uprising*, although in later Ustashi propaganda presented as a big and successful moment, was a complete failure. The aim to destabilize the Kingdom by gaining large scale support among the Croats, failed. The uprising caused further police repression and more radical dictatorship of the King Alexander, which in a way, as Tomashevich says “gave the incident a lot of publicity and possibly even some prestige to the Ustashi.”⁵¹ The second terrorist act was successfully accomplished but it had several repercussions. The assassination of the Yugoslav

⁵⁰ Nada Kisić-Kolanović. *Vojskovođa i politika: sjećanja Slavka Kvaternika* [Soldier and Politics: Memories of Slavko Kvaternik]. (Zagreb: Golden marketing, 1997). 86.

⁵¹ Tomashevich. *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia: Occupation and Collaboration*. 33.

King Alexander and French Foreign minister Louis Barthou in Marseille clearly showed how extreme Pavelić and Ustashi became in their battle for independence. Although the assassination had caused huge international interest, it also caused the loss of support which Ustashi enjoyed from Fascist Italy and Hungary. Their training camps were closed in Hungary and Italy. In Italy, Pavelić was put under strong surveillance when he was released from prison while the Ustashi members were disarmed and detained on the Lipari Islands.⁵²

With the beginning of the Second World War, Ustashi's position grew stronger. Since Italy favored Pavelić, and Vladko Maček refused to be controlled by the Germans, Pavelić and his Ustashi were regarded as the only option. The Independent State of Croatia was proclaimed by Colonel Slavko Kvaternik on radio station Zagreb on April 10th 1941, with the strong support and influence of German military envoy Veesenmyer.⁵³ With the proclamation of the Independent State of Croatia Pavelić was able to return as a liberator and *Poglavnik*. Pavelić sought to establish Croatian state with the help of his allies Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, or as Pavelić referred to them in his speech given to the Ustashi female group on August 25th, 1941 "Two great men, two great revivers, Duce and Führer."⁵⁴ Throughout the period of the Second World War Pavelić was an undisputed Leader and main ideologist when it comes to organization and functioning of the state. He successfully managed to rid off any potential threat. Even the attempt to refute his leadership failed, although the actors were most prominent figures of the Ustashi movement and government.⁵⁵ His relationships with Hitler and Mussolini varied widely

⁵² Ibid. 33-35.

⁵³ Ibid. 47-61.

⁵⁴ Ante Pavelić. "*Poglavnikove riječi hrvatskim ženama*" [The Leaders Words to Croatian Women] in *Poglavnik govori* [The Leader Speaks]. (Zagreb: Tiskara matice Hrvatskih Akademikara, 1942). 67.

⁵⁵ The main protagonists were Mladen Lorković (1909-1945) and Ante Vokić (1909-1945). Lorković was a Minister of Foreign Affairs and Vokić General of the Army. For more on this subject see Jelić-Butić. *Ustaše i NDH* [Ustashi and The Independent State of Croatia]. 289-294.

and still present an open field for further investigations, especially within the comparative perspective.⁵⁶

In May 1945 Tito's partisan forces were approaching Zagreb and it became clear that the Ustashi and their allies lost the war. With the withdrawal of German forces, which already started in October 1944, Ustashi decided to escape to Austria. The command was not to surrender to the partisans but rather to the British troops stationed in Austria.⁵⁷ The amount of people withdrawing was around 100 to 150 thousand. Due to the agreement with the partisans, British army did not accept the surrender but had instead hand over them to Tito's partisans. The result of such policy was the mass killings conducted by the partisans. It is estimated that around 45 to 50 thousand people were killed on Bleiburg and forced marches.⁵⁸

The whereabouts on Pavelić in this period are still unknown and puzzling. For years, no one knew where he was and where did he escape. There were some indications and rumors that he is hiding in Austrian palaces or Italian monasteries.⁵⁹ The U.S. army military document, dated on the June 5th, 1945 contains information given to 6th and 12th Army Groups stationed in Austria which indicates that Pavelić might be in the area of their Headquarters.⁶⁰ One recently discovered document, from August 25th, 1945 reveals the arrest of Ante Pavelić by Allied forces

⁵⁶ For more on this subject of relations see Bogdan Krizman. *NDH između Hitlera i Mussolinija* [The Independent State of Croatia Between Hitler and Mussolini] and Mario Jareb. "The NDH's Relations with Italy and Germany" in *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, Vol.7, No.4. (London: Routledge, December 2006).

⁵⁷ Tomashevich. *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia: Occupation and Collaboration*. 751-753.

⁵⁸ Vladimir Žerjavić. *Opsesije i megalomanije oko Bleiburga i Jasenovca* [Obsessions and Exaggerations Over the Bleiburg and Jasenovac]. (Zagreb: Globus, 1992).

⁵⁹ Several documents regarding Pavelić's whereabouts have recently been published on the website www.pavelicpapers.com. The website is organized as the project which would provide documents related to the history of the Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia. The website and the project are headed by Siniša Djurić and Cali Ruchala.

⁶⁰ *Supreme Allied HQ to 6th and 12th Army Groups*, available at: <http://pavelic-papers.com/documents/pavelic/ap0003.html>. (Retrieved on May 19th, 2009).

in Austria.⁶¹ Another secret and recently discovered document, dated on March 15th, 1947 provides information that Pavelić was hiding in Austria and somehow managed to escape to Rome. The document states that “In Rome PAVELIC took refuge in a religious institution which enjoys the privilege of diplomatic immunity since it is under the jurisdiction of the Holy See.”⁶² The report stated that he is hiding in the Institute "COLLEGIO PIO PONTIFICIO IN PRATI" (Via Giocchino Belli, No. 3), and it also indicates that Pavelić’s family is in Rome.

The website www.pavelicpapers.com provides a variety of recently discovered documents which can shed a new light on Pavelić’s postwar hidings and life. For example, the document from January 8th, 1948 says “Pavelich reported to have had plastic surgery performed.”⁶³ What is known is that Pavelić, after probably spending some time in Europe, fled to Argentina. The CIA document, dated on December 2nd, 1948 says that “Ante PAVELIC, former head of the Independent State of Croatia and pro-Nazi war criminal is reported to have arrived in Buenos Aires on board the Italian ship SS SESTRIERE which docked on 6 November from Genoa, Italy.”⁶⁴ It is known that attempt was made to kill Ante Pavelić in Argentina. The same website provides a translation of the book *Two Bullets for Pavelić* written by Blagoje Jovović.⁶⁵ The attempt to kill Pavelić was executed in 1957, when Pavelić was shot and wounded, after which he escaped to Franco’s Spain. As the authors of the website say, this conviction lasted until Blagoje Jovović “Montenegrin returned to his homeland for the first time

⁶¹ *Rome CIC on Pavelic's Arrest in Austria*, available at: <http://pavelic-papers.com/documents/pavelic/ap0007.html>. (Retrieved on May 19th, 2009).

⁶² *CIC Memorandum from Agents Caniglia and Zappala*, available at: <http://pavelic-papers.com/documents/pavelic/ap0013.html>. (Retrieved on May 19th, 2009).

⁶³ *Telegram Received by G-2*, available at: <http://pavelic-papers.com/documents/pavelic/ap0029.html>. (Retrieved on May 19th, 2009).

⁶⁴ *Arrival of Ante Pavelic in Argentina*, available at: <http://pavelic-papers.com/documents/pavelic/ap0031.html>. (Retrieved on May 19th, 2009).

⁶⁵ For long time it was believed that Yugoslav Secret Police was involved in this action.

in fifty-five years and made a startling confession to Archbishop Amfilohije at the famous monastery at Ostrog, that he had fired the two bullets which killed Ante Pavelić.”⁶⁶ The website also provides an obituary published in *New York Times*, which says that on December 29th, 1959 Pavelić died in Madrid.⁶⁷

As shown, Ante Pavelić was an active politician, statesman and emigrant. His political thought and context varied widely and should be divided into two periods. First is the period of his political activity within the Kingdom, and the second during his emigration and period of being a Leader of the Independent State of Croatia. For the first period Pavelić can be characterized as the strong ultra-nationalist, fighting for the exclusive independence of Croatia. Within the second period, Pavelić combined his strong ultra-nationalism with the fascist ideology, especially influenced by Fascist Italy. In my opinion, these two periods present the time context of his main ideological development.

II.b. Presence in Contemporary Literature on Fascism

The contemporary literature on fascism is used here as a descriptive tool for the literature on fascism written after the Second World War. I intend to examine how the contemporary authors have referred to Ante Pavelić and his Ustashi movement, as well as the Independent State of Croatia. Of course, by this, I do not imply that I have examined all the existing literature on fascism, since that would require a substantial amount of time. I believe that the most important authors are presented in this short analysis. The analysis will mostly deal with the

⁶⁶ <http://pavelic-papers.com/features/tbfp.html>. The website also provides the free download of the book translated in English.

⁶⁷ News: *Ante Pavelic Dies in Madrid at 70*, available at: <http://pavelic-papers.com/documents/pavelic/ap0046.html>. (Retrieved on May 19th, 2009).

western scholars on fascism who in more or less concise way discuss and elaborate on fascism in Croatia.

One of the first comparative analyses on fascism was done by Eugen Joseph Weber. In his book *Varieties of Fascism – Doctrines of Revolution in the Twentieth Century*⁶⁸ Weber provides the analysis of European fascism and its development. By placing them in a comparative relation he emphasizes similarities and differences within various European interwar fascist movements. The book presents a certain backbone on the investigation of European fascism, but it does not mention Ante Pavelić nor Ustashi movement as part of the European fascist movements. In the book published in 1975 called *Fascism*⁶⁹ Alan Cassels mentions Pavelić and the Ustashi movement, but only in the context of Fascist Italy, as “The most important Yugoslav fascist group was the Croatian separatist Ustashi under Ante Pavelić.”⁷⁰ This is the only mentioning of this subject in the book. Another prominent scholar in this field, George L. Mosse, in his book *The Fascist Revolution*⁷¹ also makes no mentioning of Ante Pavelić or Ustashi movement.

In the book *Fascism – A Readers Guide*,⁷² edited by Walter Laquer, it is stated that the Ustashi movement hardly had any history prior to April 1941, and that it shall be discussed in brief manner. Although dealt in a brief manner the author, Bela Vago, described its main characteristics as being anti, either towards the systems or other nationalities. The author

⁶⁸ Eugen Joseph Weber. *Varieties of Fascism – Doctrines of Revolution in the Twentieth Century*. (New Jersey: d. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1964).

⁶⁹ Alan Cassels. *Fascism*. (Arlington Heights: AHM Publishing, 1975).

⁷⁰ Ibid. 260.

⁷¹ George L. Mosse. *The Fascist Revolution – Toward a General Theory of Fascism*. (New York: Howard Fertig, 1999).

⁷² Walter Laqueur, ed. *Fascism – A Readers Guide, Analysis, Interpretation, Bibliography*. (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1991, c1976).

mentions the book *Der Kroatische Ustasha Staat*, written by Andreas Hory and Martin Broszat, from which she provides and accepts their descriptive term of being pre-fascist or semi-fascist. What is interesting is that she explains the lack of literature on this subject and says that “No comprehensive or analytical work about the movement has yet appeared.”⁷³ In the book *International fascism, 1920-1945*, edited by two of that time most prominent fascist scholars and theoreticians, Walter Laquer and George L. Mosse,⁷⁴ Croatian fascism or Ustashi movement are not being dealt with. In Walter Laquer’s more recent book *Fascism – Past, Present, Future*, the author mentions Croatian fascists in one sentence, when stating that in obtaining the power “The Croatian fascist were luckier in establishing the state than the Iron Guard.”⁷⁵

The absence of Croatian fascism, especially of the Ustashi movement, within the above mentioned authors is certainly due to the lack of literature on this subject. But such an ‘apology’ is valid only until 1976 when Fikreta Jelić-Butić wrote first extensive analysis on the Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia. This was then followed by extensive research work done by Bogdan Krizman who published several books on various topics regarding the Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia.

In 1991, Roger Griffin published his book *The nature of Fascism*, in which he proposed a new definition and model for describing fascism. The book received much attention, but it also opened a debate on fascism and how one might be defined. In his book Griffin also dealt, though in only one passage, with Ante Pavelić, his Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia. In his ‘taxonomic verdict’ Griffin placed Ustashi movement under the non-fascist

⁷³ Ibid. 247.

⁷⁴ Walter Laqueur & George L. Mosse. *International fascism, 1920-1945*. (New York: Harper & Row, 1966).

⁷⁵ Walter Laqueur. *Fascism – Past, Present, Future*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

radical right. Griffin is referring only to Croatian separatist organization or UHRO [*Ustashi – Croatian revolutionary Organization*] established by Ante Pavelić. If this is the organization which Griffin is explaining, then his verdict is correct. If by this he meant Ustashi movement, then the verdict must be refuted, since in the year 1933 the *Principles of the Ustashi Movement* were written, which are considered to be the transformational program from organization into the movement.⁷⁶ When looked upon the sources, that is, the two sources which Griffin makes use of, this does not come as a surprise. Griffin's 'taxonomical verdict' is based in the usage of one book, *Der Kroatische Ustasha Staat* and the article *L'état 'Oustacha' de Croatie (1941-1945)*, both written in the 1960s. It is not to say that these works do not provide valid information's, but it is surprising that Griffin does not at all refer to Yugoslav historians and their elaborative analysis of the Ustashi movement. The reason for this certainly lies within the fact that these authors have not been translated and therefore the analysis of their work requires the knowledge of language in which they were written. Nevertheless, one should be aware of the literature when proposing or making a verdict, as Griffin does.

As to my knowledge it was not until Stanley G. Payne published his book *Fascism – Comparison and Definition* in 1980, that Ante Pavelić and his Ustashi movement became the broader subject of foreign scholar's investigations. Payne devoted three pages on this issue and his only source was the book *Der Kroatische Ustascha Staat, 1941-1945*. Though Payne did not elaborate on Ante Pavelić and Ustashi movement, in Table 2, in which he distinguishes three faces of authoritarian regimes, he placed the Ustashi movement under the term fascist.⁷⁷ In his

⁷⁶ Jelić-Butić. *Ustaše i NDH* [Ustashi and The Independent State of Croatia]. 21.

⁷⁷ Payne. *Fascism: Comparison and Definition*. 16-17.

later, more comprehensive book *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945*,⁷⁸ Payne provides a more elaborative and source supportive analysis of Ante Pavelić and his Ustashi movement. This book serves, as Payne says in his Preface, as “A completely new study designed to provide a narrative of generic European fascism and to extend the framework of analysis and interpretation.”⁷⁹ This is exactly what Payne did in regard to Ante Pavelić, his Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia. Payne uses various sources and also refers to various authors which dealt with different questions related to this subject. He also remains the only author who mentions Yugoslav prominent historians such as Bogdan Krizman and Fikreta Jelić-Butić, enumerating their various works.

Even in more recent book, such as *Fascism in Europe, 1919-1945* published in 2003 by Philip Morgan,⁸⁰ there is no mentioning of Ante Pavelić, Ustashi movement or the Independent State of Croatia. Why is that so becomes even more puzzling, since this book comes several years after Payne defined the Ustashi movement as being fascist. The reason might be that Morgan may have not been acquainted with Croatian fascism and therefore decided to leave it outside of his scope of research, or he disagrees with Payne’s definition of Ustashi as fascist movement. Nevertheless, this only shows the present lack of comprehensive study on this subject which would be based on contemporary aspects and theoretical approaches when dealing with European fascism.

In 2006, the journal *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religion*, which was established in 2000,⁸¹ devoted the entire issue to the Ustashi movement and the Independent

⁷⁸ Ibid. *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945*. (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1995).

⁷⁹ Ibid. Xiii.

⁸⁰ Philip Morgan. *Fascism in Europe, 1919-1945*. (London: Routledge, 2003).

⁸¹ The journal *Totalitarianism and Political Religion* was founded in 2000.

State of Croatia. The associates and authors of articles were some prominent Croatian scholars such as Ivo Goldstein and Nada Kisić-Kolanović, but also western scholars such as Sabrina P. Ramet and Stanley G. Payne. This issue presents the first attempt of introducing this problem in English language, by emphasizing various issues and themes. What is interesting is that, once again, only Payne dealt with the Independent State of Croatia within modern comparative fascist theory. Unfortunately, the approach of Croatian historians has mainly been reduced to political or ethnic/racial components present within the more complex history of the Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia.

In this chapter I have shown Pavelić's life from being an active politician to becoming an extreme emigrant. The turning point was certainly his 1929 emigration and this requires to be kept in my mind when analyzing his political and ideological beliefs and influences. The second part of the chapter serves to show the lack of detailed analysis and published sources when it comes to Ante Pavelić, Ustashi movement or the Independent State of Croatia. In my next chapter I will use two modern models of fascism in order to show how Ante Pavelić may be encompassed within them. I do not intend to refute either Griffins or Payne's theoretical model, but merely question them in regards to political and ideological aspects of Ante Pavelić's beliefs and actions.

III. Poglavnik [The Leader] and Contemporary Fascist Theory

As elaborated in the previous chapter, the ideological framework within which Pavelić's convictions and actions are being examined, should clearly distinguish between his political activity within the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and the activity after his emigration from the Kingdom. Such distinction is necessary in view of different contexts within which he acted and the ideas and goals he strived to achieve. It is possible to draw a clear division after the Belgrade Parliament shooting in June 1928, soon after which he emigrated and established the Ustashi movement under the strong patronage of Fascist Italy. It was during the 1930s and 1940s that Pavelić wrote and published most of his materials which will be analyzed here within the context of modern fascist theories as presented by Roger Griffin and Stanley G. Payne.

III.a. *The Two Models of Contemporary Fascist Theory*

The documents used for the analysis of Ante Pavelić's thought, ideological convictions and aims can be divided into two groups. The first group consists of the *Ustav-Ustaše, Hrvatske Revolucionarne Organizacije* [Constitution – Ustashi Croatian Revolutionary Organization] published in 1932,⁸² followed by *Načela Ustaškog Pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement] written in 1933.⁸³ For the purpose of this research I will also use the more elaborated version, edited by Danijel Crljen, which was published in 1942. Although the later edited version was not written by Pavelić himself, it is my belief that such elaboration could have not been

⁸² Nevertheless, it is believed that the document was written and signed on January 7th 1929. See Požar. 47.

⁸³ The year 1933 is considered to be the point of Ustashi transformation from the organization into the movement. In this year the name was changed into the Ustashi movement which is connected with the publishing of the above mentioned *Principles of the Ustashi Movement*. See Jelić-Butić. *Ustaše i NDH* [Ustashi and the Independent State of Croatia]. 21.

published without his authorization. The last source is his book *Strahote Zabluda* [The Horrors of Illusions] written in 1938 in Italian and later translated into Croatian and published in 1941.⁸⁴ The first two documents are strongly connected with the establishment, organization, activities and goals of the Ustashi movement, while the book presents a strong insight into Pavelić's own ideological convictions.

The second group of documents contains of Pavelić's speeches, published either in the newspapers such as *Ustaša*⁸⁵ [Ustashi], *Hrvatski narod - Glasilo Hrvatskog Ustaškog Pokreta* [The Croatian People – Messenger of the Croatian ustashi Movement] and *Narodne Novine - Službeni list Nezavisne Države Hrvatske* [The National Newspapers – The Official Magazine of the Independent State of Croatia]. I will also use the speeches collected and published as special editions which served as propaganda and educational instrument in the Independent State of Croatia and various Law Decrees, all signed and some of them written by Pavelić himself. Since Pavelić was an undisputed Leader of the Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia despite the temporarily established parliament and government, state legislation can serve as a source for analyzing certain aspects of his political and ideological convictions.⁸⁶

The documents and Pavelić's speeches will be examined and analyzed within the scholarly works of two contemporary experts on fascism, Roger Griffin and Stanley G. Payne. The authors have made a significant contribution towards the development and elaborations of

⁸⁴ This book was first published in Sienna, Italy in 1938, under the title "Errori a orrori", under the pseudonym: A. S. Mrzlodolski. See Jelić-Butić. *Ustaše i NDH* [Ustashi and the Independent State of Croatia]. 25, note 50.

⁸⁵ During the first years newspapers were called *Ustaša-Vjesnik hrvatskih revolucionaraca* [Ustashi-Messenger of Croatian Revolutionaries]. In the period of the Independent State of Croatia (1941-1945) the newspapers were issued under different name: *Ustaša - Vjesnik hrvatskog Ustaškog oslobodilačkog pokreta* [Ustashi - Messenger of the Croatian Ustashi Liberation Movement].

⁸⁶ On the notion of Pavelić's authority see Jelić-Butić. *Ustaše i NDH* [Ustashi and the Independent State of Croatia]. 148. and Tomashevich. *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia: Occupation and Collaboration*. 344-345.

the notion of generic fascism and wider range of certain fascist case studies within the last decades,⁸⁷ although they differ in their definitions of fascism, and which movements or states they include within this category. For the purpose of this study, the above mentioned theories were already explained in the first chapter and will be elaborated further within the scope of analyzing Pavelić's thought. However, it should be mentioned that both authors use their definitions or analytical notions as tools for analysis and comparison of the movements or established states. Since the scope and aim of this research is Ante Pavelić and his ideological thought, I am using their tools in order to establish the presence of fascist thought in Pavelić's writings.

One of the prime goals of Ante Pavelić was the establishment of the independent Croatian state. For this purpose he established and organized the Ustashi movement. The significance of this goal can also be seen by Pavelić's political activity even prior to his emigration. In the collection of his speeches from before 1929, Pavelić often speaks about the need for independence and the abuse and neglecting of Croatian state and rights by the Belgrade government.⁸⁸ The demand for independence is also present in the 1932 *Constitution of the Ustashi Movement* where it is stated that "Ustashi, Croatian Revolutionary Organization, has a task to, by the arm uprising liberate Croatia from the foreign rule so she may become completely independent on all of her national and historical territory."⁸⁹ The same demand is emphasized in the *Principles of the Ustashi Movement*: Article 8 stated that "Croatian people have the right to

⁸⁷ Aristotle A. Kallis. "The 'Regime-Model' of Fascism: A Typology" in *European History Quarterly*, 2000. 77-104.

⁸⁸ Bzik, ed. *Putem hrvatskog državnog prava* [On the Road of Croatian State Right]. 1942.

⁸⁹ Požar. *Ustaša: dokumenti o ustaškom pokretu* [Ustashi: Documents on Ustashi Movement]. 45.

establish their sovereignty on the entire unbroken national and historical territory.”⁹⁰ Independence, as the high political goal, was the basis of Ustashi actions and Pavelić’s political thought. It was strongly influenced by his membership and activity within the *Croatian Party of Rights* and its founder Ante Starčević who saw the *Party of Rights*, not as a Party but as “the only right expression of general will of Croatian people and therefore every educated Croat, who does not stand beside her, is the traitor of Croatian nation.”⁹¹

As one can see from these abstracts, the establishment of the independent Croatia was proclaimed and put forward as the main purpose and goal of Pavelić’s Ustashi, but also of Pavelić himself. Since Croatia in the interwar period was not an independent country, this continuity creates a certain specific circumstances which influenced Pavelić’s political and ideological convictions. I will further examine the territory within which independence was to be established and the principles of the future political, social and economical system. In the first section of this chapter these ideas will be studied from the perspective of Roger Griffin’s theory of fascism.

In *The nature of Fascism*, Griffin put forward a theory of fascism as based on the idea of palingenetic myth of renewal, of rebirth. Griffin points out several important factors which constitute and present characteristics of political palingenetic myth. The first is the belief “that contemporaries are living through or about to live through a ‘sea-change’, a ‘water-shed’ or ‘turning-point’ in the historical process” which is accompanied with a “characteristic sub-myth that a ‘new man’ is destined to appear.”⁹² Another important aspect concerning the usage of

⁹⁰ Danijel Crljen, ed. *Načela Ustaškog Pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement]. (Zagreb: Tiskara Matice Hrvatskih Akademikara, 1942). 46.

⁹¹ Mirjana Gross. *Izvorno Pravaštvo* [Authenticall Right]. (Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 2000). 24.

⁹² Griffin. *The Nature of Fascism*. 35.

palingenetic myth in analysis of ideology which Griffin emphasizes is that it must not be used in a sense of restoration, “the birth of the same”, but that instead the “arrow of time thus points not backwards but forward.”⁹³ Griffin also emphasizes the notion of “pervasive racism” within fascism which “usually implies the ethnic or cultural superiority of the reborn nation over certain peoples and cultures judged inferior.”⁹⁴ Another important notion within Griffin’s theory of fascism is that “fascism is an essentially charismatic type of political force,” thus refuting the traditionally accepted forms of authority and political power which relied on the support of the “inspired elite.”⁹⁵

The rebirth of the nation, as seen by Griffin, is also present within Pavelić’s thought and writings. This rebirth is strongly connected with the establishment of the Independent Croatia, but also with the territory of Herceg-Bosna⁹⁶ and the Croats living there. By encompassing this territory which was once part of Croatian medieval state, historical note of it cannot be neglected. However, Pavelić placed the main emphasis not on the territory but on the Croats who lived there, which fits Griffin’s palingenetic myth model. In his 1941 speech to the Muslim representative in Zagreb, Pavelić referred to Bosnian Muslims as the “blood of our blood, the flower of our nation.”⁹⁷ Also in his speech to the delegation of the former *Croatian Party of Rights*, Pavelić stated that “our brothers Muslims today represent the backbone of Croatian nation and Croatian state.”⁹⁸ Besides Pavelić’s notion of the Bosnian, in his view Croat people, there were also numerous articles in newspapers, written by others, which described the same

⁹³ Ibid. 35-36.

⁹⁴ Ibid. 42.

⁹⁵ Ibid. 42.

⁹⁶ Herceg –Bosna was the term used to describe the territory of the nowadays Bosnia and Herzegovina.

⁹⁷ Ante Pavelić. “*Poglavnikov govor predstavniku Muslimana*” [The Leaders Speech to the Muslim Representative] in *Poglavnik govori* [The Leader Speaks]. 13.

⁹⁸ Ibid. 91.

situation and developed idea. This might seem as the exact opposite of Griffin's definition, since it appeals for the 'rebirth of the same'. In the newspaper *Ustaša* from November 9th, 1941 in an article titled *The Blood Has Not Failed* the emphasis was put on the purity of the Bosnian population. There the "Croatianeesm is being saved in the new form of self preserving - the Bosnianees" and represents Croatianeesm as implemented in the 7th and 8th century AD."⁹⁹ The territory of Bosnia is not only important within the perspective of the historical state boundaries, which is not unusual if we know that the state establishment was the prime aim, but what is more significant is the strong belief in the purity of the Croats living on this territory. For Pavelić they presented the core of the 'real Croats' who speak "the purest Croatian language."¹⁰⁰

The second important idea is that Croatian society was for centuries contaminated by foreign rule. This idea could be seen in his work prior to Pavelić's emigration. He often claimed that the Serbs were not an organized nation and that this would prove to be fatal for Croatian nation since, as Pavelić said, "after the breakdown of Austro-Hungary we have not stayed at the same level, since today we do not even have what we had then."¹⁰¹ In that period he also emphasized the contamination and degradation of Croatian universities,¹⁰² the neglecting of Croatian history and contamination of language. He emphasized that this had been taking place

⁹⁹ *Ustaša – Vjesnik hrvatskog Ustaškog oslobodilačkog pokreta* [Ustashi - Messenger of Croatian Ustashi Liberation Movement]. No. 19. November 9th, 1941.

¹⁰⁰ Crljen, ed. *Načela Ustaškog Pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement] in Article 4. 30.

¹⁰¹ Ante Pavelić. "Velika povijesna borba" [Great Historical Fight] in *Putem Hrvatskog državnog prava*. [On the Road of Croatian State Right]. 10-12.

¹⁰² Ibid. "Hrvatsko Sveučilište" [Croatian University] in *Putem hrvatskog državnog prava* [On the Road of Croatian State Right]. 31.

from the earliest days of elementary school to the administration in which the Croatian language and Latin script were being neglected.¹⁰³

The legislation adopted in the Independent State of Croatia had its main aim to purify the Croatian nation from contaminated social, economic, and cultural elements. For the purpose of what was to become the national purification, various law decrees were issued. The way this purification was more or less achieved, and with which atrocities it has been implemented, falls outside the scope of this work, though, it presents a very important aspect when dealing with the history of the Independent State of Croatia.¹⁰⁴ Several laws condemned foreign, mostly Serbian, influence on the Croatian language. Such were the *Law Decree about the Preservation of Croatian Language*,¹⁰⁵ the *Law Decree on the Formation of Croatian State Language Office*¹⁰⁶ and the *Law Decree on Banning the Usage of Cyrillic Script*.¹⁰⁷

All three of these decrees have to be considered within the strong correlation with the interwar period and Pavelić's belief that the Croatian language had been purposely contaminated in order to destroy it. This is evident in his speech given at the closing session of the *Sabor* [Parliament] on February 28th, 1942 when he stated that "no matter how much we talked about the German or Hungarian influence, never throughout the centuries have Croatian people suffered so much when concerning their language as through this twenty three years" and

¹⁰³ Ibid. "Oslobodiše nas svega" [They Have Liberated Us From Everything] in *Putem Hrvatskog državnog prava* [On the Road of Croatian State Right]. 50-53.

¹⁰⁴ For more on the subject of committed atrocities, concentration camps, and racial politics in the Independent state of Croatia see Ivo Goldstein. *Holokaust u Zagrebu* [Holocaust in Zagreb]. (Zagreb: Novi Liber, 2001).

¹⁰⁵ *Ustaša - Vjesnik hrvatskog Ustaškog oslobodilačkog pokreta* [Ustashi - Messenger of Croatian Ustashi Liberation Movement]. August 24th, 1941. No. 8.

¹⁰⁶ Požar. *Ustaša: dokumenti o ustaškom pokretu* [Ustashi: Documents on Ustashi Movement]. 155.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid. 151.

therefore we need to “establish our language, pure, and the way it is.”¹⁰⁸ Pavelić often referred on the aspect of Croatian language as being contaminated and systematically underprivileged in respect to the Serbian language and Cirilic script. In his speech given at the Belgrade Parliament on March 8th, 1928 he stated that Croatian educational system now served only for the promotion of ‘fake Yugoslav history’, Serbian language and culture. He also stated that this influence had become so strong that even the people who used to write in the Latin script and *stokavian* dialect were now writing in the *ekavian* dialect and Cirilic script.¹⁰⁹ In a 1941 speech, given to the group of newspaper reporters, Pavelić said, that “the Croatian language has been corrupted for the last twenty years” and that it is their duty to fight against this problem.¹¹⁰ In the same speech, Pavelić blamed intellectuals for quickly accepting such contamination which he described as the “capitulation to the Balkan mentality in the most sensitive sphere of national life, capitulated on the field of language.”¹¹¹

Also connected to the notion of purification are the law decrees whose purpose was to guard the Croatian blood purity. These were the *Law Decree on the Racial Affiliation*,¹¹² the *Law Decree About the Preservation of the Arian Blood and Honor of Croatian people*,¹¹³ and the *Law Decree on the Citizenship*,¹¹⁴ as well as the *Law Decree on the preservation of the Croatian national belongings*.¹¹⁵ The implementation of these decrees caused, as Payne points out “The direct execution of possibly as many as 150,000 victims in the country of no more than six

¹⁰⁸ *Poglavnik Saboru i narodu* [The Leader to the Parliament and People]. (Zagreb: Tiskara Merkantil, February 28th 1942). 39-42.

¹⁰⁹ Ante Pavelić. “*Uništenje hrvatske prosvjete*” [The Destruction of Croatian Educational system] in *Putem Hrvatskog državnog prava* [On the Road of Croatian State Right]. 50-53.

¹¹⁰ Ante Pavelić. “*Poglavnikov govor novinarima*” [The Leaders Speech to Journalists] in *Poglavnik govori* [The Leader Speaks]. 62.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.* 63.

¹¹² *Narodne Novine* [The National Newspapers]. April 30th, 1941.

¹¹³ *Ibid.* April 30th, 1941.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.* April 30th, 1941.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.* April 19th, 1941.

million, even if in some cases the means were indirect, was an extraordinary mass crime, which at least in proportioned terms exceeded any other Balkan dictatorship and any other European regime save that of Hitler.”¹¹⁶

This multiplicity of thoughts, institutions and laws aimed at regaining the purity of the Croatian people and placing them, once again, side by side with the great nations of Europe. The greatness of Croatian nation and people can be found in Article 5 of the *Principles* which says that Croats were the “carriers of the idea of freedom and statehood to those masses of subdued Slavs”¹¹⁷ and had long been organized and committed to the benefits of the community.¹¹⁸ Thus becomes clear that by establishing the independent state, Pavelić wanted to regain the old glory and purity of Croatian nation. For him, that was lost throughout centuries of foreign rule and was becoming most lethal in the interwar period when “Serbia was oppressing the Croatian nation in the most horrible way.”¹¹⁹ It is exactly within this specific context of the non-existing state, which existed once but now needs to be established after centuries of foreign influence that Pavelić’s beliefs and actions need to be contextualized and analyzed.

In his book, Griffin argues that “The destruction which is necessitated both in theory and practice by the fascist revolution is seen by its activists not as an end in itself but as the corollary of the regenerative process by which society is to be purged of decadence.”¹²⁰ In my opinion this was also the case with the ideology present in Ante Pavelić’s thoughts, writings and speeches, but also in various newspapers articles and law decrees. It is also my opinion that the constant

¹¹⁶ Stanley G. Payne. “The NDH State in Comparative Perspective” in *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religion*, Vol.7, No. 4. (London: Routledge, December 2006). 412.

¹¹⁷ Crljen, ed. *Načela Ustaškog pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement] in Article 5. 34.

¹¹⁸ Ibid. Article 6. 39.

¹¹⁹ Ante Pavelić. “Poglavnik hrvatskom narodu” [The Leader to Croatian People] in *Poglavnik govori* [The Leader speaks]. 5.

¹²⁰ Griffin. *The Nature of Fascism*. 44.

presence of historical examples could be seen as the ‘rebirth of the same’, but only as a temporary process whose task called for the renewal of lost purity and thus provided Pavelić with a broad national appeal and support while at the same time setting a path forward. Was that to result in the rebirth of a new entity something reborn, yet new? Was that to be accomplished with the establishment of the independent state and the destruction of the old one, which *Principles* have named “cincar-balkan invention?”¹²¹ If yes, in which system and in which time would it exist?

These questions shall be dealt with in detail in the next chapter, when thorough examination and analysis of Pavelić’s writings and publications will be given. I have shown how Ante Pavelić can be implemented within Griffin’s model, which allows me to assume that he was fascist, and that he strived towards establishing fascist system. This can be concluded from the way in which he organized and led the Ustashi movement. It can also be seen within his speeches and published materials. The only question remaining is how did Pavelić saw fascism as the state and social system? In my further examination of Ante Pavelić, I will examine the notions present within the Stanley G. Payne’s typological definition of fascism. Payne’s model was elaborated in his books *Fascism – Comparison and Definition* and the later one *A History of Fascism – 1914-1945*. The reason for referring mostly to the later book is due to its more elaborated notion of the Independent State of Croatia.

Payne’s typological definition of fascism has three arguments, “negations”, “ideology and goals”, and “style and organization.”¹²² Payne’s broader definition differs widely from Griffins definition of fascism, because it is not based only on a core principle. Payne says that he is

¹²¹ Crljen, ed. *Načela Ustaškog pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement] in Article 7. 44.

¹²² Payne. *Fascism: Comparison and Defintion*. 7.

presenting an “analytical device for purposes of comparative analysis and definition.”¹²³ I present here a short summary of the main components.

Under his criteria of “ideology and goals” Payne emphasizes the creation of new “idealist, voluntarist creed.”¹²⁴ This notion is followed by the creation of modern nationalist authoritarian state whose economic basis would be structured on the integrated national economy, whether with national corporatist, socialist or syndicalist character. He also emphasizes the notion of expansion or radical change in the states foreign policy. His second criteria of “negations” are summed up in fascist criticism towards liberalism, communism or conservatism. The third aspect regarding the “style and organization” is characterized by the mass mobilization and mass militia. This is followed by the aesthetic structure of representation strengthened with the emphasis on the masculine principle and male dominance, especially among the younger generations, and the notion of creating authoritarian, charismatic style of leadership and command.¹²⁵

When dealing with Ante Pavelić within Payne’s model of fascism, as presented in his book *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945*, an important aspect requires special attention. Although Payne sees the Independent State of Croatia as merely a “Nazi puppet regime”¹²⁶ he also recognizes Pavelić’s Ustashi movement as fascist.¹²⁷ Since Payne defines Ustashi movement as fascist, especially in the second period of the 1930s,¹²⁸ this requires elaboration on the position of Pavelić as the undisputed Leader and main ideologue of the movement. By this I will examine

¹²³ Ibid. *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945*. 6.

¹²⁴ Ibid. *Fascism: Comparison and Definition*. 17.

¹²⁵ Ibid. *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945*. 7.

¹²⁶ Ibid. 404.

¹²⁷ Ibid. 15.

¹²⁸ Ibid. 406.

how much of what constitutes his thought and ideology as fascist within this period can be surveyed as his main political and ideological convictions.

Payne synthesizes the definition of fascism as “a form of revolutionary ultra-nationalism for national rebirth that is based on a primarily vitalist philosophy, is structured on extreme elitism, mass mobilization, and the *Führerprinzip*, positively values violence as end as well as means and tends to normatize war and/or military virtues.”¹²⁹ First let me reflect on the notion of ultra-nationalism within Pavelić’s thought. This notion is the same as Griffin’s also i.e. an important aspect in his concise definition of fascism. There is no dispute that Pavelić was a nationalist politician and it is certain that he became even more radical when sentenced to death on the charges of conspiracy against the state.¹³⁰ In speeches prior to his emigration, Pavelić emphasized that there should be no more politics of agreement and parliamentary discussions within the existing political system of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes for as long as Croatia was not to be independent.¹³¹ In the speech given on November 28th, 1928 he stated that “The ten year long Calvary of Croatian people cannot and must not be finished by some agreement, but only with the Resurrection.”¹³² The clearest examples of how far Pavelić was ready to go in order to achieve this ‘Resurrection’ are the so-called *Lika Uprising* in 1932 and the assassination of the king Alexander in 1934. The unsuccessful *Lika Uprising* had the aim of

¹²⁹ Ibid. 14.

¹³⁰ Jelić-Butić. *Ustaše i NDH* [Ustashi and the Independent State of Croatia]. 19-20.

¹³¹ Ante Pavelić. “*Za potpunu samostalnost Hrvatske*” [For the Complete Independence of Croatia] in *Putem hrvatskog državnog prava* [On the Road of Croatian State Right]. 23.

¹³² Ibid. “*Svako popuštanje značilo bi izdaju Hrvatske i oskrnuće lipanjskih žrtava*” [Any Giving Up Would Mean the Treason of Croatia and Disrespect Towards the June Victims] in *Putem hrvatskog državnog prava* [On the Road of Croatian State Right]. 67.

destabilizing the Kingdom by causing the insurrection based on mass support of Croatian people and infiltrated Ustashi members.¹³³

I consider the 1934 assassination of king Alexander as the high point of the Ustashi interwar extremism. It also presents the point from which the organization and Pavelić became marginalized by their foreign sponsors and supporters, especially Fascist Italy and Hungary.¹³⁴ Since the League of Nation condemned that act, and under the strong diplomatic pressure by Kingdom of Yugoslavia which accused Hungary for supporting Ustashi, Hungary closed Ustashi training camp of Janka Puszta.¹³⁵ Although Fascist Italy was the Ustashi's main supporter, the Yugoslavian government never publicly accused it, due to the French influence and her activities at that time towards reaching the agreement with Fascist Italy.¹³⁶

With the lost of support Ustashi movement became unable to execute any further actions which would cause destabilization of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and bring Croatian independence. Italian government disarmed most of the Ustashi members and interned majority of them at the Lipari Islands. Although Italy refused to extradite Pavelić and Eugen Kvaternik to France, they were both arrested and kept in detention for the next year and a half, and Pavelić was later placed under surveillance in Sienna and Florence.¹³⁷ It is my opinion that this presents the crucial point in Pavelić's further elaboration of his goals and ideological conviction. It was in this period that Pavelić published his book *Strahote zabluda* [The Horrors of Illusions] and a pamphlet dedicated to Nazi Germany called *Hrvatsko pitanje* [The Croatian Question].¹³⁸ There

¹³³ Tomashevich. *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia: Occupation and Collaboration*. 33.

¹³⁴ Krizman. *Ante Pavelić i Ustaše* 157-159.

¹³⁵ Tomashevich. *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia: Occupation and Collaboration*. 35.

¹³⁶ Ibid. 34.

¹³⁷ Ibid. 35.

¹³⁸ Ibid. 32-33.

are also several documents regarding the correspondence between him and Ustashi members detained on the Lipari Islands from this period. From various decrees and letters it is clear that Pavelić saw the assassination of the king as an act which introduced the world “with one big and important question, that is, the question of the Croatian people.”¹³⁹ He also referred to the present situation as something which every Ustashi member needs to accept because “Without the battle, sacrifice and dungeon there can be no freedom.”¹⁴⁰ Despite the fact that Pavelić was under strong surveillance and his Ustashi members isolated, he believed that freedom was near and that independency could be achieved, especially considering the development of international situation.¹⁴¹

The aspect of national rebirth was strongly connected with the political and social context within which Pavelić formed it and later implemented. As already mentioned, national rebirth, that is, purification of the Croatian people was conducted with atrocities and large scale mass killings and violence. For Pavelić violence presented the justified means when striving to achieve the independence and liberation. This is present within the Ustashi acts and was elevated on the large scale actions during the period of the Independent State of Croatia. In his article, published in *Ustaša* in February 1932, Pavelić said that if anybody had any further doubts about the ways in which Croatian freedom should be achieved, that man was unfamiliar with the development of the situation in the last decade. In the same article he emphasized the means through which this high goal was to be accomplished. He said that “Knife, gun, bomb and destructive machine, these are the idols that will return the lands to the peasants, bread to the worker and freedom to

¹³⁹ As quoted in Krizman. *Ante Pavelić i Ustaše*. 187.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid. 196.

¹⁴¹ Ibid. 194.

Croatia.”¹⁴² Terrorist acts of blowing up railroads or bomb explosions in front of the police stations and the assassination of the king are clear examples of violence viewed as the necessary tool in accomplishing the freedom. Violence grew even more with the establishment of the Independent State of Croatia, and was becoming more brutal and ethnic-racial.¹⁴³ It was mostly pointed towards the Jews, Serbs and Roma people and has culminated with the establishment of several concentration camps such as Jasenovac and Danica which served for their physical annihilation, especially the Serbs.¹⁴⁴ Article 7 of the *Principles*, while explaining the importance of the statehood in order for people not to lose their faith and basic instinct for life, proclaimed that “Within this lies the right and moral justification of all means which Croatian people have used against the enemies for the achievement of freedom and independence.”¹⁴⁵

Mass appeal or mass mobilization presents an unresolved problem when it comes to Pavelić and Ustashi movement. Since the movement did not participated in the political life of the Kingdom, it is impossible to get any data on how much support it actually had among the Croatian people. Although such data does not exist, approximate support could be established by using the electoral results of the *Croatian Party of Rights*, *Croatian Peasant Party* and other active Croatian parties and members of the Ustashi movement.¹⁴⁶ In his book *Ante Pavelić and Ustashi*, Krizman gives an account of Ustashi members stationed on Lipari Islands whose

¹⁴² *Ustaša – Vjesnik hrvatskih revolucionaraca* [Ustashi – Messenger of Croatian Revolutionaries]. February 1932.

¹⁴³ For more on the process of violence see Ivo Goldstein. “The Independent State of Croatia in 1941: On the Road to Catastrophe” in *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religion*, Vol.7, No. 4. (London: Routledge, December 2006).

¹⁴⁴ For more information on various aspects of Ustashi violence see Tomashevich. 397-415.

¹⁴⁵ Crljen, ed. *Načela Ustaškog Pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement] in Article 7. 45.

¹⁴⁶ Such examination would require various mathematical and statistical operations which might lead to the approximate percentage of support. It would also had to include aspects of prominent politicians who joined Ustashi movement after 1941 and the ir electoral and political influence, prior to it.

number was 509, most of whom were young men born between the 1900 and 1914.¹⁴⁷ Certain attempt in establishing the possible support is also present in Tomashevich's book *War and revolution in Yugoslavia, 1941-1945: Occupation and Collaboration*. He argues that Ustashi might have made a certain appeal at the beginning but that due to their extreme violence, and growing dependence on their allies followed by deteriorating economic situation they soon faced the situation in which their popular base was narrowing.¹⁴⁸ What also needs to be taken into account is the radio address of the *Croatian Peasant Party* leader Vladko Maček given after the proclamation of the Independent State of Croatia. In his proclamation Maček addressed his followers by saying "I call upon the entire Croatian nation to obey the new government and I call upon all the followers of the *Croatian Peasant Party* who are in various positions of administration, all county deputies, all mayors of communes and their council members, etc., to remain at their posts and to cooperate loyally with the new government."¹⁴⁹ It is known that Maček enjoyed a strong mass support among the population. His *Croatian Peasant Party* consisted of several well organized groups of his followers. It is my opinion that Maček's address certainly had an influence on its members. It is also certain that it helped Pavelić in establishing and keeping in function the state apparatus in the first months of consolidation. What was the real impact of the address and whether it caused the mass appeal for Pavelić and Ustashi remains unknown, but should not be neglected. The existence or nonexistence of mass appeal could be argued, but even Payne says that "Most fascist movements did not achieve true

¹⁴⁷ Krizman. *Ante Pavelić i Ustaše* 564-574.

¹⁴⁸ Tomashevich. *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia: Occupation and Collaboration*. 351-356.

¹⁴⁹ As quoted in Tomashevich. *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia: Occupation and Collaboration*. 53.

mass mobilization, but it was nonetheless characteristic that such was their goal.”¹⁵⁰ What is certain is that Pavelić strived towards insuring the mass support among the Croatian people.

The notion of *Führerprinzip* and the elite role, as described by Payne,¹⁵¹ is in strong relation with the mass support, and this will be elaborated in detail in the next chapter by analyzing Pavelić’s writing, position and how others wrote and perceived him. There are, however only two events in which Pavelić’s role might have been questioned, i.e. on two occasions Pavelić could have easily lost his leading position. The first is connected with his imprisonment and Ustashi detention after the assassination of the king Alexander. Although Pavelić was separated from his followers his position as a leader never came into question. In his book *Ante Pavelić i Ustaše* [Ante Pavelić and Ustashi] Krizman provides correspondence between Pavelić and his members, which show the strong position of Pavelić, despite the mentioned circumstances. The other one was the proclamation of the Independent State of Croatia at which moment Pavelić was still in Italy. Nevertheless, he was mentioned in the proclamation as the one thanks to whom this moment became possible.¹⁵² These two moments clearly show that Pavelić had a strong support and trust among his followers and was their undisputed Leader. The latter one shows that he also represented the most important factor of the movement and the established Independent State of Croatia.

Payne’s notions of populism and elitism that is, as he argues “The appeal to the entire people and nation, together with the attempt to incorporate the masses in both structure and myth, was accompanied by a strong formal emphasis on the role and function of the elite.”¹⁵³ I

¹⁵⁰ Payne. *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945*. 12.

¹⁵¹ Ibid. 14.

¹⁵² *Hrvatski Narod* [The Croatian People]. April 10th, 1941.

¹⁵³ Payne. *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945*. 14.

have shown that Pavelić and Ustashi strived to achieve the mass appeal among the Croatian people in various ways. One of the most significant was by emphasizing the old traditions and institutions of once existing Croatian state and glorious nation. This was done by recalling certain old Croatian institutions such as *Sabor* or Legal Decree on the establishment of the medieval king Zvonimir crown.¹⁵⁴ Emphasis was also put on the ancient organization and courage of Croats as soldiers and members of the conquering European nations in medieval period and during time of their settlement.¹⁵⁵ Such examples served to show the once existing homogeneity and uniqueness of Croats, especially when they lived in their own state. The unity of people presents the core of Pavelić's thought. This can clearly be seen in his speech given in *Sabor* on February 28th, 1942 when he called for the unity of the entire Croatian people and emphasized that there should no longer be any division between the Croats who are now living in their own independent state.¹⁵⁶

The aspect of elitism was strongly connected with the Ustashi members, at least in Pavelić's view. The Ustashi were to become a role-models and examples of virtue of the new Croatian nation and of each individual. In his speech given on March 29th, 1942 Pavelić said that "It is necessary for the Ustashi thought, the Ustashi idea, and the Ustashi Principles to be embraced in the whole of Croatian people, in all of his layers. It is necessary for the whole people to become harmonized in their work and everyday life with the Principles and learning's of the Ustashi movement."¹⁵⁷ In his speech given to University members of the Ustashi

¹⁵⁴ *Narodne Novine* [The National Newspapers]. May 15th, 1941.

¹⁵⁵ Crljen, ed. *Načela Ustaškog Pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement] in Article 4. 25.

¹⁵⁶ *Poglavnik Saboru i narodu* [The Leader to the Parliament and People]. 45-47.

¹⁵⁷ Ante Pavelić. "Tko ne bude radio društveno za hrvatski narod, taj ne će moći za sebe svojatati niti nikakvih prava [The One who will not Work for Croatian People, shall not have any Rights] in *Ustaška misao* [Ustashi Thought]. (Zagreb: Naklada Glavnog Ustaškog Stana, 1942). 86.

movement on April 8th, 1942 he stated that “Nowadays present University generation presents the seed from which a new Croatian man will grow, new intellectual, which will be the man of mind and heart.”¹⁵⁸ In the newspaper article, published on December 25th, 1942 it is said that “Ustashi thought and movement are creating a new man. New Croatian man, which means Ustasha, needs to be a man of duty, work, fight, dignity, bravery it has to be a complete man and a Croat.”¹⁵⁹ Pavelić strongly emphasized that the Ustashi ideals and principles need to be implemented into the educational and upbringing sphere. In his speech given on March 7th, 1942 to the high school commanders and functionaries he said “The new generation of Croats needs to be, not only Croatian, not only capable, but it needs to be in full sense of the meaning Ustashi one.”¹⁶⁰ In the Introduction to the *Principles of the Ustashi movement* it is said that they present “The law, upon which the entire young state shall rest and exist on.”¹⁶¹ If the state was to be organized on these principles, and they were the supreme law, then the Ustashi members, as the strongest followers of this *Principles* and the Leader, were to become the elite role-models.

The analysis of the fascist models presented by Roger Griffin and Stanley G. Payne, serves to show that Pavelić and his ideology can be integrated within their models. Although these models in first place serve as analytical and comparative tool for various movements and formed states, their analysis provides a useful mechanism for establishing the position of Ante Pavelić. As shown, Pavelić with his Ustashi movement can certainly be integrated within the models which for Griffin and Payne constitute fascism. In the next chapter I will analyze

¹⁵⁸ Ibid. 93.

¹⁵⁹ *Ustaša – Vjesnik hrvatskog Ustaškog oslobodilačkog pokreta* [Ustashi – Messenger of the Croatian Ustashi Liberation Movement]. No. 51-52. December 25th, 1942.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ Crljen, ed. *Načela Ustaškog pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement]. 3.

Pavelić's writings in order to show how much of his thought and ideological convictions, influenced by the mentioned specific context, can be defined as fascism.

IV. One of the European fascists?

The previous chapter provided an analysis of Ante Pavelić within the two contemporary models of fascism. This chapter will provide a discourse analysis of Pavelić's writings and speeches. The purpose is to determine the basis of his ideology and the vision Pavelić had when organizing the Ustashi movement and later the Independent State of Croatia. Analyses will be based on his own works and speeches, as well as works written by others on Pavelić or the organizational structure of movement, state, and society.

IV.a. Ante Pavelić – A Croatian fascist?

For Pavelić's analysis I will use materials written by him and his various speeches. Most of the mentioned sources were written in the 1930s, except for the speeches and *Principles* which, although written in 1933, will be analyzed in their edited version published in 1942.¹⁶²

First I will reflect on Payne's notions of *Führerprinzip*, as this will provide a clearer picture of Pavelić's position among his Ustashi members and his role in the Independent State of Croatia. As already pointed out, Pavelić was the undisputed leader of the Ustashi movement. He founded the movement, organized it and provided ideological and organizational basis and goals. Although he was not the first choice among the Nazi Germans when establishing the Independent State of Croatia, he became the Leader and remained as such until its end. As Jelić-Butić says "Pavelić, as the Ustashi Leader, was to establish himself on the examples of Hitler

¹⁶² Pavelić wrote *The Principles of the Ustashi Movement* in 1933 when developing Ustashi from organization into the Movement. For this analysis I will use the version edited by Danijel Crljen and published in 1942. In my opinion, such a significant document could not have been elaborated or published without Pavelić's approval.

and Mussolini as the Leader of the movement and the state.”¹⁶³ In which ways was he to achieve this and whether he succeed, will be further elaborated.

The statement with which the Independent State of Croatia was proclaimed says that “God’s Providence and the will of our allies...and the great sacrifice of our Leader...Have determined that today, before the day of the Resurrection of God’s Son, our own Croatian State be Resurrected as well.”¹⁶⁴ The theological connotations present in the proclamation can also be found within various articles and published materials regarding the life, deeds and achievements of Ante Pavelić. Such works provide a picture of how Pavelić was to be presented to the people and how the people looked upon him. In the book *Poglavnik – Život, misao, djela* [The Leader – Life, Thoughts and Deeds], edited by Danijel Crljen,¹⁶⁵ there are several theological allusions regarding the life and achievements of Ante Pavelić. It starts with the description of his childhood and how he encountered the peasants and workers and got to know their problems and needs. It is said that “It was the Providence itself which wanted, that the one, for whom it was determined to be a leader and ideologist, the rebuilder of Croatian state, to see and get to know, in the purest form, Croatian peasant and worker.”¹⁶⁶ The book further describes and explains his life as a student, politician, and emigrant. The book concludes that “It was the Providence itself which has sent us our Leader. It is the Providence which created the historical date, July 14th 1889.”¹⁶⁷ The book was clearly meant to serve as propaganda material. However, the theological aspects should not be discarded too easily. The last sentence provides a clear example of how

¹⁶³ Fikreta Jelić-Butić. “Ustaše u drugom svjetskom ratu“ [Ustashi in the Second World War] in *Fašizam i neofašizam* [Fascism and Neo-Fascism]. (Zagreb: Fakultet Političkih znanosti, 1976). 235.

¹⁶⁴ *Hrvatski narod* [The Croatian People]. April 10th, 1941.

¹⁶⁵ Crljen, ed. *Poglavnik – život, misao i djela* [The Leader – Life, Thoughts and Deed]. (Zagreb: Povjereništvo za odgoj i promidžbu u postrojništvu, 1944).

¹⁶⁶ Ibid. 4.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid. 16. This is the date of Pavelić's birth.

Pavelić was to be presented as the ‘God-sent’ persona, who was chosen to achieve the centuries old dream of Croatian people.

Another aspect of Pavelić’s almost ‘hypnotizing’ abilities is presented in the book *Dr. Ante Pavelić riješio je hrvatsko pitanje* [Doctor Ante Pavelić Has Solved the Croatian Question] written by Ivo Bogdan.¹⁶⁸ After the short description of his life and deeds, and translation of his book *Hrvatsko pitanje* [The Croatian Question], the last chapter is dedicated to his speeches. The author says that Pavelić enjoyed talking to his people, especially since he had been absent from the homeland for over a decade. Bogdan describes his ability to speak in these words “When the Leader speaks then everything from phenomenon to thoughts, which he develops, from the rhythm of the words, to the voice modulation, discloses completely built, carved personality. The listener is won over from the first moment. The listener is won by serious, manly vision, calm voice and that expression of immense kindness and peace, with which the Leaders character, thought and sentence are imbued with.”¹⁶⁹ The author also describes when Pavelić was in the city of Karlovac, how “The Leader, all by himself, came in front of the military academy building and started to talk in front of the thousands of people who gathered around him.”¹⁷⁰ This almost prophetic description of the Leader ‘preaching’ to the masses only further emphasizes the level to which Pavelić was to be elevated. Such elevation, to the almost ‘divine’ persona is also present in various newspaper articles in which Pavelić is often referred to in the

¹⁶⁸ Bogdan. *Dr. Ante Pavelić riješio je Hrvatsko pitanje* [Doctor Ante Pavelić has Resolved Croatian Question]. (Zagreb: Naklada Europa, 1942).

¹⁶⁹ Ibid. 36.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid. 36.

personal pronoun, with the capital letter. This is also evident in the document written and signed by the minister of education regarding the celebration of the Leaders name day.¹⁷¹

The document is dated on May 26th, 1942 and it contains instructions on how the celebration of the Leaders name day was to be organized in elementary and high schools. The document states that “Croatian people, thankful for their freedom to the Leader, shall celebrate His name day, in this way showing their gratitude.”¹⁷² Although Pavelić’s name is not mentioned, referring to him in the third close clearly shows not only how he was to be presented, but also the dignity and respect towards him are accentuated by his mentioning in the third close. The document further describes that God’s service will be given for catholic pupils and for those of Muslim religion. After the God’s service, principle or teacher shall, in strong lines, “introduce the person of the Leader as a patriot, politician and statesman, and will bring out certain moments of his struggle for liberation of Croatian people and the achievement of the Independent State of Croatia.”¹⁷³ The presentation was to be done in such a way that “Croatian youth should see in him the most shining example of love and sacrifice for their people.”¹⁷⁴ It is further said that once this is done, the singing and reciting of songs dedicated to the Leaders personality should take place. This was to be followed by the readings of certain excerpts from some of the Leaders published work. At the end it is said that “The ceremony should be held

¹⁷¹ The name day was on June 13th. The importance of this celebration is in connection and celebration of the name day of Ante Starčević, of which Pavelić was to be an accesor.

¹⁷² *Proslava Poglavnikov imendana* [Celebration of the Leaders Name Day] in Požar. *Ustaša: dokumenti o ustaškom pokretu* [Ustashi: Documents on Ustashi Movement]. 262.

¹⁷³ Ibid. 263.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid. 263.

with dignity, and be imbued with the deep reverence of youth towards the national genius, who had brought about the centuries long desire to his descendants.”¹⁷⁵

It is clear that by proscribing the exact way of the celebration, the purpose of it was to present Pavelić as the ‘father’, the strong figure which made the dream come true. He was to be presented not only by description of his life-long struggle, but also by the reading from the excerpts of his ‘scriptures’. Such readings of Pavelić’s political and ideological writings to the pupils had only one purpose, and that was to indoctrinate and develop great respect for their ‘father’ and Leader. Another fact which serves to prove the importance and the ‘divine’ mission of the Leader is seen in the *Law Decree on State Emblem, State Flag, the Leaders Flag, State seal and Seals of the states and Self-governing Offices*.¹⁷⁶ The peculiarity of this law decree is the fact that the Leader was awarded his own flag.¹⁷⁷ The Decree stipulates that Leaders flag was to be displayed at his office, his apartment, when he was there, and which was to be carried next to him during all public events.¹⁷⁸

It is clear that Ante Pavelić was to be presented not as an ordinary man, but a man of vision, wisdom, and courage who is supported in his just cause by the Providence itself. Ante Pavelić was represented as ‘the One’, the saviour of the Croatian nation, the father of once long separated but again gathered ‘Croatian family’, which he was going to lead through the path of freedom, renewal, to the new and better future. From the above mentioned, it is evident that a strong personality cult was established in order to further strengthen his position.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid. 263.

¹⁷⁶ Požar. *Ustaša: dokumenti o ustaškom pokretu* [Ustashi: Documents on Ustashi Movement]. 157-159. The law decree was issued 30th of April 1941.

¹⁷⁷ As to my knowledge this is the only such known case.

¹⁷⁸ Požar. *Ustaša: dokumenti o ustaškom pokretu* [Ustashi: Documents on Ustashi Movement]. 159.

Let me now examine Pavelić's ideological thought and convictions. In my opinion the notion of Pavelić's mission, as the Leader and the 'saviour' of Croatian nation and state also had strong ideological influence in the process of building the new state and new society.

In 1936 Pavelić wrote the article *Hrvatsko pitanje* [The Croatian Question] which was first published in German.¹⁷⁹ The purpose of the article was to introduce Croatian question to German population and Nazi German government. In it, Pavelić describes the mistakes and misfortunes of Versailles Agreement which mapped Europe after the First World War "in order to destroy any national unit, which might contribute to its destruction."¹⁸⁰ For him, one of such national unit was Croatian. He further explains the differences between the Croats and the Serbs emphasizing special values of Croatian people and their centuries-old individual development which was "transferred from one generation to another."¹⁸¹ Emphasis was put on Croatian national territory, claiming not only "the historical right to these territories, but also current right, since the Croatian people have been living there in undisrupted continuity and present the true people the majority."¹⁸² Further, Pavelić elaborates the purpose of Croatian freedom movement over the establishment of independent Croatian state, emphasizing that this goal is in full correspondence with "the will of the entire Croatian people, their life needs and undisputed historical rights."¹⁸³ At the end of the chapter he states that "From the new Germany, Croatian people might expect full understanding for their heroic fight against the Versailles."¹⁸⁴ In his last chapter he reflects on the Serbian government, the question of Jews, for whom he says that

¹⁷⁹ Ante Pavelić. *Die Kroatische Frage* [The Croatian Question]. (Berlin, 1936).

¹⁸⁰ Ante Pavelić. "Hrvatsko pitanje" [The Croatian Question] in Bogdan. *Dr. Ante Pavelić riješio je Hrvatsko pitanje* [Doctor Ante Pavelić has Solved the Croatian Question]. 13.

¹⁸¹ Ibid. 16.

¹⁸² Ibid. 21.

¹⁸³ Ibid. 22.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid. 23.

“Today in Croatia the whole monetary system and all trade is in Jewish hands.”¹⁸⁵ He puts emphasis on the notion that the Jews are against independent Croatian state, because in national chaos their institutions can function best, and their real aim is hidden.¹⁸⁶ While reflecting on the question of Communism he connects it with the Jews when saying that “Communism and Jews are completely complementary in that view and are working together against national liberation of Croatia.”¹⁸⁷ In the end Pavelić concludes that “In this fight for freedom and independence which Croatian people are conducting against the intrusive peace system, they strive for the sympathy of Hitler’s Germany as well as Mussolini’s Italy, seeing in them the most powerful fighters for natural right, true culture, and higher civilization.”¹⁸⁸

As the article shows, Pavelić wanted to secure the interest of Nazi Germany in the Croatian question and provide the basis for the independency. Pavelić clearly positioned himself on the side of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, by trying to present the independent Croatia as a future important factor in their foreign policies towards the Balkans. What influence the memorandum had, remains unknown. Jelić-Butić says that it got some attention in 1941 when it was published by German *Institut für Grenz und Ausland-studien* (Institute for Borders and Foreign Studies).¹⁸⁹ But the importance of this memorandum lies in Pavelić’s clear position on the Croatian independence, his strong anti-Semitism, anti-Serbianism, anti-communism, and his positioning on the side of the ‘New Order’, which was to come with the victory of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid. 25.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid. 25-26.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid. 27.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid. 32.

¹⁸⁹ Jelić-Butić. *Ustaše i NDH* [Ustashi and the Independent State of Croatia]. 24.

The notions of anti-Communism, anti-Semitism and the 'New Order' form the core of Pavelić's book, *Strahote Zabluda* [The Horrors of Illusions], in which he developed the idea about communism as a system of destruction. His claim is that it is not communism as such that needs to be elaborated but the form of it as "established by the Bolsheviks"¹⁹⁰ who were the first to "put it in practice."¹⁹¹ He asks "Is it not threatening with the destruction of all those real and well intended goods which humankind has created, and all that just for the attempt of creating one incredible and unrealizable idea?"¹⁹² It is clear that Pavelić saw communism, or more precisely, Bolshevik communism, as a certain destructive utopia which was to be established by a group of individuals, the Bolsheviks.

In the book's first few paragraphs Pavelić asks "Has not the East always been the key point for emergence of peculiar and exotic doctrines, sight of prophets and messiahs, in search of a dream, promised countries, rivers of life, phoenix-birds and nirvanas?"¹⁹³ Further on, he refers how in the western civilized countries such as Germany communism was introduced by "Marx, the eastern Semite."¹⁹⁴ It is clear that Pavelić saw the idea of communism as strongly related with the Jews, since in his view it was introduced by the Jews that is, 'Marx the Jew'. He explains this development in the following words: "One eastern parasitic race, so that one of their descendants tries to transplant the idea in foreign garden, carrying with him the hate of his own race against the others?"¹⁹⁵ It is seen that Pavelić was strongly convinced in the relation between the Bolsheviks and the Jews. Furthermore, he connected the Bolsheviks idea of international

¹⁹⁰ Ante Pavelić. *Strahote zabluda* [The Horrors of Illusions]. (Zagreb: Tiskara knjižare St. Kugli, 1941). 8.

¹⁹¹ Ibid. 21.

¹⁹² Ibid. 9.

¹⁹³ Ibid. 18.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid. 19.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid. 19.

communism with the idea of Jews as the chosen people, which through communism strive to establish their “governance over the whole humanity.”¹⁹⁶ For him there was no doubt that Jews presented the majority within the Bolsheviks: “Around the dictator Lenin, educated people and apostles have gathered, almost all of them Jews from Russia and the rest of the world.”¹⁹⁷ Strong anti-Semitism is also present in the Article 11 of the *Principles* where it is said that Croatian people need to abolish two servitudes, one described as political rule of the Serbs and the other as the need to “Erase lethal and all comprehensive economical influence of Jews.”¹⁹⁸ For Pavelić Bolsheviks communism was the system which had been destroying the basic human nature, family traditions, the institution of marriage, and society in general.

Towards the Bolsheviks notions of collectivism, and “payment by need and not accomplishment,”¹⁹⁹ Pavelić confronted the notions of competition and selection. He argued that these two notions were in the core nature of things and that everything from plants and microorganisms is involved in this process. He sees that as “Individuals competing among each other, one gender with the other, one tribe with the other tribe and one race with the other race.”²⁰⁰ Strong emphasis was also put on the destructiveness of the Bolsheviks pointed towards the western countries, which was directed in four ways. First, the destruction of economy and economic strength by organizing various strikes, second by destroying the moral of the people by implementing unmoral learnings and the destruction of the family, third by the destruction of religion and religious feelings, and last by destroying national consciousness.²⁰¹ In July 1941,

¹⁹⁶ Ibid. 19.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid. 152-153.

¹⁹⁸ Crljen, ed. *Načela Ustaškog pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi movement] in Article 11. 65.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid. Article 9. 56.

²⁰⁰ Ibid. Article 10. 57.

²⁰¹ Pavelić. *Strahote zabluda* [The Horrors of Illusions]. 225-229.

Pavelić gave a speech in which he said that German people were in war, and that by the decision of their leader the Führer they were “defending Europe against the Judeo-Bolshevik savagery.”²⁰² In his speech from September 16th, 1941 given to promoted soldiers, he said that “Jewish-Bolshevik economy was preparing to take control over the whole world.”²⁰³ Consequently, Pavelić regarded communism as the devastating system which aimed at erasing values cherished by western European civilization. He underlined the connections between communism, as the eastern exotic idea, and the Jews, and the notion of communist world proletarian revolution with the Jewish notion of themselves as the ‘chosen people’. Within these two notions, Pavelić managed to integrate his enemies into one, which he termed ‘Judeo-Bolshevism’.

Besides Pavelić's strong ultra-nationalism, anti-Semitism, anti-Serbianism and anti-communism, which are present in his writings and speeches, he also put forth the negative sides of western democracies and their liberal systems. In his speech to *Sabor* on February 28th, 1942 he clearly stated that democracy is not the only path “through which people might express their will” and that the word democracy should be erased from their dictionaries due to the “shameful memories which democracy has left behind.”²⁰⁴ Pavelić's speech, published in *Ustaša* newspapers on November 23rd, 1941 says that “Our inner political structure is and shall be such that people will be able to decide on their own, without the so-called democracies and political

²⁰² Ante Pavelić. “*Poglavnikov proglas za borbu proti boljševizmu*” [The Leaders Proclamation For the Fight Against Bolshevism] in *Poglavnik govori* [The Leader Speaks]. 51.

²⁰³ Ibid. “*Povijesni govor Poglavnika*” [The Leader's Historical Speech] in *Poglavnik govori* [The Leader Speaks]. 82.

²⁰⁴ *Poglavnik Saboru i narodu* [The Leader to the Parliament and People]. 10-11.

trade.”²⁰⁵ On August 25th, 1941 he stated that “Ustashi movement is not a democratic movement, because democracy is false.”²⁰⁶ It is interesting that Pavelić managed to connect his strong anti-Semitism with the capitalist and democratic states, where he claimed that the Jews also had strong economic influence. In his speech on March 29th, 1942 he said that “It is up to us to prevent, that on the burden of workers and peasants, mindless capitalists be created who do not see their priorities in the nation and state, but only their own profit...because in Croatian state there must be no room for Arian Jews.”²⁰⁷

Criticism of communism and economic liberalism is also present in the Article 16 of the *Principles* which states that communism and liberalism have destroyed families and that “Negative and destructive spirit has always found a way to conduct its misdeed, in Russia with the will and power of the Bolsheviks and in liberal states under the secret approval of determining factors.”²⁰⁸ Although unclear, it can be concluded that by the notion of ‘determining factors’ Pavelić meant the Jews. The criticism of liberalism and liberal states is also present in the Article 17 where it is stated that “followers of liberalism have strongly supported, in all aspects of public work and all fields of work complete freedom of the individual.”²⁰⁹ The Article concludes that the promotion of such individuality, where one is concerned only with himself, made “Selfishness and egoism the main characteristics of liberal society.”²¹⁰

²⁰⁵ *Ustaša – Vjesnik hrvatskog Ustaškog oslobodilačkog pokreta* [Ustashi – Messenger of Croatian Ustashi Liberation Movement]. November 23rd, 1941. No. 21.

²⁰⁶ Ante Pavelić. “Poglavnikove riječi hrvatskim ženama” [The Leaders Words to Croatian Women] in *Poglavnik govori* [The leader Speaks]. 66.

²⁰⁷ Ante Pavelić. “U hrvatskoj državi ne smije biti mjesta ni arijskom židovstvu [In Croatian State there must be no Room for Arian Jews] in *Ustaška misao* [Ustashi Thought]. (Zagreb: Naklada Glavnog Ustaškog Stana, 1942). 89-90.

²⁰⁸ Crljen, ed. *Načela Ustaškog pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement] in Article 16. 100.

²⁰⁹ Ibid. Article 17. 113.

²¹⁰ Ibid. 113.

It is thus clear that Pavelić's associated his strong anti-Semitism with the notions of communism and democracy, each from the different perspective. He criticized communism as a destructive system, when it came to values, but he also criticized democracy and liberal system as producing selfish individuals as the core of the society. If Pavelić was against the communist collectivism and at the same time against liberal individualism, the question which remains to be answered is which system, and which form of society and economy did Pavelić see as the possible replacement?

In various speeches Pavelić often referred to the notion of the 'New Order', which was to be created after the war "under the leadership of two great leaders, Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini."²¹¹ In a speech on the old Marco Square in Zagreb's old city, Pavelić said that being an allies to two great friends provided the right "That as a free nation and as the Independent State of Croatia we place ourselves into the new European Order, which the two great leaders of our friendly nations have started, created and with the help of God, and the prosperity of European nations, will soon achieve."²¹² This notion is present within Pavelić's speeches, especially when referring to people. On December 2nd, 1941 he gave a speech to the Croats living in the USA in which he said that on that day all people of the European continent were placing themselves within the unity of a New Europe, in which, as it was granted, Croatian people and Croatian state would have their place of dignity.²¹³

²¹¹ Ante Pavelić. "*Podjite sviestni, da se borite za sretnija i bolja vremena*" [Go With the Thought that You are Fighting for Better and Happier Times] in *Ustaška misao* [Ustashi Thought]. 25.

²¹² Ibid. *Poglavnik govori* [The Leader Speaks]. 24.

²¹³ Ibid. "*Hrvatski seljački i radni narod ostvaruje svoja prava u svojoj vlastitoj državi*" [The Croatian Peasant and Working People are Achieving Their Rights in Their Own State] in *Ustaška misao* [Ustashi Thought]. 23.

The aspect of the Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia as part of this 'New Order', or 'New Europe' were constantly appearing in the newspaper articles. An article from October 26th, 1941 said that "Croatian people have been among the first European nations which had synchronized their path with the one Hitler took in the creation of 'New Order'."²¹⁴ Another article published on December 14th, 1941 stated that "Ustashi Croatia was created in the momentum of new revolutionary Europe, it was created at the time when the new world was being created, the world of a new man and new future, the world of a new life."²¹⁵ In an article published on September 27th, 1942 it is said that "New Europe is creating fateful decision with her victories on the east, and the victory of the New Europe is the victory of a new Croatia."²¹⁶ The notion of the 'New Order', according to Pavelić, was the order initiated by Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy and it propositioned a new state and social structure. It was to be based on the victory against the communism and with the modifications of the existing European system.

The answer to the question what exactly was this 'New Order' of which new Croatia was to become part can also be found within Pavelić's writings and speeches. In the already mentioned book *Strahote zabluda* [The Horrors of Illusions], the last chapter titled *Fašizam i Boljševizam* [Fascism and Bolshevism] requires special attention, because it provides an explanation about the system which Pavelić sought to establish.²¹⁷ The title itself suggests that

²¹⁴ *Ustaša - Vjesnik hrvatskog Ustaškog oslobodilačkog pokreta* [Ustashi – Messenger of the Croatian Ustashi Liberation Movement]. October 26th, 1941. No. 17.

²¹⁵ Ibid. December 14th, 1941. No. 24.

²¹⁶ Ibid. September 27th, 1942. No. 39.

²¹⁷ The book was rewritten by Pavelić after the end of the Second World War and edited by his daughter Višnja Pavelić and republished in 1974. This edition contains only one important structural difference, beside small vocabulary changes, which is present in the last chapter. The book from 1941 finishes with the chapter titled *Fašizam i Boljševizam* [Fascism and Bolshevism] while the 1974 edition ends with the chapter titled *Zapadne demokracije i Boljševizam* [Western Democracies and Bolshevism]. The explanation for change is not given, but it can be concluded that it is in strong relation with the outcome of the Second World War. Since fascism was

Pavelić was confronting the corrupted and destructive Bolshevism with the new system, fascism. In the first sentence Pavelić says that “Today, fascism is no longer just a form of governance as introduced in Italy, but the term now serves as the description of the unique and new idea of national state formation, and society, and today it is of world’s significance.”²¹⁸ Remembering that Pavelić wrote this in 1937, it is clear that he viewed fascism as the ‘New Order’, which was spreading from Italy and was being implemented in Nazi Germany as well.

He saw fascism not only as a state system, but something with a broader meaning, as fascism also reflects itself upon the society. Pavelić said that fascism “has grown on the wreckages of democracy, which was not capable to confront Bolshevism.”²¹⁹ He further elaborates that in such ‘power’ constellation it was required for “something new, something stronger and more capable for the fight against Bolshevism and that new has manifested itself as fascism.”²²⁰ Pavelić further criticized Bolshevism for trying to present fascism as a system that wanted to engage into the war, which he neglected, and called it “one big over blow.”²²¹

What is perhaps more interesting is that, when describing and talking about fascism, Pavelić had in mind both Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. Though he used fascism in general he said that “the real fascism, as given by Italy and Germany, is the reflection of the people’s will and the general population.”²²² It can be concluded that Pavelić saw fascism as a system established in both of these countries, with certain peculiarities and differences, but he still saw it

defeated, for Pavelić, the only systems standing against Bolshevism are western democracies. It is now their responsibility to engage into the fight against Bolshevism, in which Pavelić shows certain doubts of success. Višnja Pavelić, ed. *Ante Pavelić - Strahote Zabluda* [Ante Pavelić - The Horrors of Illusions]. Madrid, 1974. 187-194.

²¹⁸ Pavelić. *Strahote zabluda* [The Horrors of Illusions]. 261.

²¹⁹ Ibid. 261.

²²⁰ Ibid. 261-262.

²²¹ Ibid. 264.

²²² Ibid. 265.

as one. In his later speeches he mentions Fascism and National-socialism, emphasizing certain differences between the systems. In a newspapers article published on March 15th, 1942 it is explained that “Fascism and National-socialism represent the greatest kinship in each aspect, in regards to principles, but their physiognomy is different regarding the framework of national souls.”²²³ The article further elaborates that “In the framework of European revolutions, based on the common principles with different national physiognomy, Ustashi movement has emerged.”²²⁴ For Pavelić such physiognomic differences did not provide a new or different system from fascism, but only a certain supplement according to national needs and peculiarities.

In his book Pavelić argues that “Fascism is only possible in one nation, unique by its blood, by its feelings and its unique will, and therefore it presents a fortress which Bolshevism cannot conquer and the force in front which it has to step back.”²²⁵ For him fascism arises from the people and it is exactly because of this that “it comes to power with natural force and is being kept there permanently with this force, which arises from the masses.”²²⁶ He further describes Mussolini’s Italy when he says that “Italian people are used to giving birth to great men, and therefore, at this decisive moment they gave from their masses the leader which was demanded by time, and who with his characteristics gave shape to the Fascist movement.”²²⁷ He praised the German people as well, saying that “The German people have from themselves, from the masses, given the leader, who in very short time managed to restore the great strength and values of his

²²³ *Ustaša - Vjesnik hrvatskog Ustaškog oslobodilačkog pokreta* [Ustashi – Messenger of the Croatian Ustashi Liberation Movement]. March 15th, 1942. No. 11.

²²⁴ Ibid. March 15th, 1942. No. 11.

²²⁵ Pavelić. *Strahote zabluda* [The Horrors of Illusions]. 265-266.

²²⁶ Ibid. 266.

²²⁷ Ibid. 270.

people.”²²⁸ In his concluding paragraph Pavelić claims that “Those who would like to limit fascism only on these two countries are wrong. Those who think that fascism is not for export are also wrong.”²²⁹

According to Pavelić's concept of fascism as the system within which the independent Croatian state would exist, it did not imply copying Fascist Italy or Nazi Germany as exact and perfect systems, but developing by its own peculiarities which would be incorporated on the basis of fascist system. On July 26th, 1942, under the section called *From the History of the Ustashi movement*, the newspaper published memorandum written by Pavelić (it is dated on February 2nd, 1941) where he wrote that “We need to be sincere in our point of view, as we have always been: to establish the Independent State of Croatia on the whole national and state territory, to be build on the system in harmony with Croatian national needs and Croatian national peculiarities and in accordance with the new order and new social understandings of New Europe.”²³⁰ In his address to *Sabor* on February 28th, 1942 he said “I have seen and I knew that the new world is coming, that new spirit and New Europe is coming. I have approached our friends, when I have already started the movement, which had a purpose to synchronize the interest of the Croatian people, the beliefs, the work, to synchronize the life conditions with those of new great movements, Fascism and National-socialism.”²³¹ Therefore, it is clear that Ante Pavelić was strongly standing on the basis of fascist ideology. The ideological component of Ante Pavelić could not have been anything else but fascism. He often refuted democracy and liberalism as selfish and individualistic systems, with the only purpose of neglecting people's

²²⁸ Ibid. 272.

²²⁹ Ibid. 273.

²³⁰ *Ustaša – Vjesnik hrvatskog Ustaškog oslobodilačkog pokreta* [Ustashi – Messenger of the Croatian Ustashi Liberation Movement]. July 26th, 1942. No.30.

²³¹ *Poglavnik Saboru i narodu* [The Leader to the Parliament and People]. 48.

needs and rights. Communism was never an option for Pavelić, since its ideology was created by ‘Marx the Jew’ and aimed at destroying all valuable family and national possessions.

The first historian who emphasized this fact was Fikreta Jelić-Butić. Although she devoted only one passage to the development of the system, and did not examine Pavelić’s ideological convictions, she concluded that “Political propaganda was first of all showing the tendency of emphasizing the Ustashi will to build the Independent State of Croatia on the role models of totalitarian systems, which helped it to be created in the first place.”²³²

Fascist ideology, as elaborated, presents the core of Pavelić’s ideological convictions. His position as the Leader and the ‘One’ certainly provided him with the opportunity to elevate and implement this on his Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia. We can agree with Payne that Ustashi movement was a fascist movement, but when it comes to the notion of the Independent State of Croatia, things become more complicated. In the following paragraphs I will present how much of Pavelić’s ideological basis was present in the state and on social level. What needs to be kept in mind is that these ideas were never fully accomplished, due to the Second World War, but their presence allows me to analyze and contextualized them.

IV.b. State Building and Fascist Perspective

As shown above, Ante Pavelić was an undisputed Leader of the Ustashi movement, as well as the Independent State of Croatia. Therefore, his ideological beliefs have certainly influenced people surrounding him, state ideologists and other commissioners in his state ruling organizations. Since the ideological basis of the newly established Croatian state was to be based

²³² Jelić-Butić. “Ustaše u Drugom svjetskom ratu” [The Ustashi in the Second World War] in *Fašizam i neofašizam* [Fascism and Neo-Fascism]. 235.

on fascism, one question requires to be answered: what was this newly established state to be organized like in economic and social sphere of its existence?

Articles 12 and 17 of the *Principles* serve as good indicators. In Article 12 Pavelić stated that “Peasantry is the foundation and source of every life, and therefore, as such is the real carrier of every governing in Croatian State.”²³³ The Article also states that “All classes compose one national unit,” and that whoever “Does not descend from the peasant family, he is in ninety out of hundred cases not of Croatian origin and Croatian blood, but an immigrant.”²³⁴ It is clear that peasantry was given an important role in Croatian society. This is not surprising having in mind the fact that the majority of the population lived in the countryside. Could this strong emphasis on peasantry be regarded as the peculiarity of the Independent State of Croatia? The Article emphasizes the neglect of class division and puts national good as the highest purpose of every individual. Elaborating further, the division on classes is strongly refuted by stating that none of the classes emerged on their own and that all the classes “Have their roots directly in the countryside.”²³⁵

On November 18th, 1941 Pavelić said “Today, when we the Croatian people, stepped forward, took a path of new thoughts, and threw away thoughts of selfishness and democracy, the whole nation is becoming one big family, or as Germans would say: *Volksgemeinschaft* (national unity).”²³⁶ Pavelić emphasized the character of the nation as united in one, as the whole and without the class divisions. In his speech given to the representatives of the *Croatian*

²³³ Crljen, ed. *Načela Ustaškog pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement] in Article 12. 68.

²³⁴ Ibid. 68.

²³⁵ Ibid. Article 12. 75.

²³⁶ Ante Pavelić. “*Država je narod, a napose kod nas seljački narod*” [The State are the People, and Especially in Our Case, the Peasant People] in *Ustaška misao* [Ustashi Thought]. 15.

Peasant Party, on August 10th, 1941 Pavelić said that “In the Independent State of Croatia today there is, and must be, only one class and only one political party. One class that is Croatian nation, and one party, which is the Ustashi workers, Ustashi workers with plough and how, Ustashi workers by pen and Ustashi fighters with rifle.”²³⁷ The notion of building the classless society, in which every individual would work for the benefit of the state and its people as a whole, is also constantly present in the newspapers articles.

Article published on February 8th, 1942 stated that the class organization is at its beginnings and cannot be achieved in a moment, but nevertheless certain foundations had been established upon which future social system would be built.²³⁸ The newspaper article dated on April 22nd, 1941, reports on a meeting held between the Leader Ante Pavelić and representatives of Croatian national Unions. The unknown author says that Pavelić said “In Croatian state there shall be unique and obligatory unions which shall be representatives of workers.”²³⁹ Under the title *Supreme Union Council is Established*, same newspapers reported on the meeting when the *Union* was established. The report says that “There shall still be *Croatian Workers Union* and *Association of Croatian Private Entrepreneurs*, but from now on, they shall act united over the *Supreme Union Council*, which from today is becoming the true and only representative.”²⁴⁰ Peasantry as the basis of society, and the creation of the *one* Union which would integrated the existing ones, provide a clear indicator of what was explained in previous part. The peculiarity of

²³⁷ Ibid. “Govor Poglavnika i Poglavnikova izjava povodom pristupanja narodnih zastupnika i prvaka bivše Hrvatske Seljačke Stranke Ustaškom pokretu” [The Leaders Speech and Statement During the Accession of the Former National Deputies of Croatian Peasant Party Members to Ustashi Movement] in *Poglavnik govori* [The Leader Speaks]. 71.

²³⁸ *Ustaša – Vjesnik hrvatskog Ustaškog oslobodilačkog pokreta* [Ustashi – Messenger of the Croatian Ustashi Liberation Movement]. February 8th, 1942. No. 6.

²³⁹ *Hrvatski Narod* [The Croatian People]. April 22nd. No. 69.

²⁴⁰ Ibid. April 26th. No. 73.

Croatian social strata taken together with the creation of the state Union shows that certain principles in building the state organizations are the same as those in Fascist Italy and Nazi-Germany.

The social basis of the state was presented by the peasantry, and it is on this basis that the new economic system was to be established. The basis of economy, especially agriculture, was to be renewed in the institution of *zadruga*.²⁴¹ Article 16 of the *Principles* says that it helps weaker individuals to stand on their feet and are making the process of cultivation and production much easier. It is further said that *zadruga* is to “have an important role in future economic life of Croatian state.”²⁴² Such peasant organization is to be connected with the controlled market and market transfers because commerce needed “To be only the device for the exchange of goods and products” and “needs to be subordinated to the benefit of national economy.”²⁴³ As seen, the economy of the state was to be put in favor of peasantry, since it represented the core of Croatian people. It was to be organized on the old Croatian institution and was to serve for the benefits of community and state.

The notion of unity among classes, their community production, and the role of the state are clear indicators that the state and society were to become one and were to work for the benefit of ‘collective’ and individuals. In a newspapers article titled *The Basis of New Social Order*, published on November 1st, 1942 the new social order was described as corporativism

²⁴¹ Zadruga was an ancient peasantry organizational structure within the Balkan societies. The main aspect of it was collective economy, mostly agriculture one. Zadruga played an important role in Croatian society as well, and was dealt with throughout 19th and first half of 20th century. For more on this aspect see Dragutin Pavličević. *Hrvatske kućne zadruge* [Croatian House Zadruga]. (Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada Liber, Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta, 1989) and Philip Edward Mosley. *Communal families in the Balkans: the zadruga*. (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, c1976).

²⁴² Crljen. ed. *Načela Ustaškog pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement] in Article 16. 103.

²⁴³ Ibid. 109.

which is compared with communism in order to “Become clear what it presents.”²⁴⁴ The article emphasizes the negative side of complete state control but also the negative side of individuals who are not controlled by the state. It further elaborates how the state control is to be achieved by organizing several groups of large handicrafts within which “special groups would consist out of workers and special out of employers.”²⁴⁵ Further in the article such division and grouping of similar branches of productions or employers is important “because over such organized work state will have the survey, and will be able to monitor and embrace everything.”²⁴⁶ The question which imposes itself is: what kind of a state system was needed and was argued for in order to achieve the above mentioned?

In Article 17 of the *Principles* Pavelić said that “Harmonious cultivation, promotion and perfection all of national virtues and branches of national life is the task of all public work and state governance, because they provide the guarantee of century long existence and prosperity of nowadays and future generations and the whole Croatian people.”²⁴⁷ Furthermore the article states that “People are afraid of the notion of totalitarianism, simply because they do not understand it.”²⁴⁸ The Article further states that “The Independent State of Croatia is a totalitarian state, because it integrates, connects and governs all sources of national strength, spiritual and real, because it takes on itself the care for all levels of population in all their life needs.”²⁴⁹ The elaboration goes even further by emphasizing that the state “Strives towards the

²⁴⁴ Ustaša – *Vjesnik hrvatskog Ustaškog oslobodilačkog pokreta* [Ustashi – Messenger of the Croatian Ustashi Liberation Movement]. November 1st, 1942. No. 45.

²⁴⁵ Ibid. No. 45.

²⁴⁶ Ibid. No. 45.

²⁴⁷ Crljen, ed. *Načela Ustaškog pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement] in Article 17. 112.

²⁴⁸ Ibid. 113.

²⁴⁹ Ibid. 113.

all embrative supervision, strives to lead, to govern and to put everything in order.”²⁵⁰ What can be concluded from the Article is that the state was to have control over everything. Its purpose and task was to preserve the uniqueness of Croatian nation and to develop it within the ‘New Order’. The control of economy, work, education, upbringing etc. were to be in the hands of the state or as the Article says “All national life is under the state supervision, and not to be limited and restrained, but that his development might be positively directed.”²⁵¹ While there is no question that state was seen as the regulator and router of life, what is also important is that the notion of ‘totalitarianism’ was also to be developed among each individual and society in general. As the Article says “The love towards all manifestations of Croatian elements must be totalitarian, comprehensive.”²⁵² In the end the Article articulates that “Today and in future, the people and the state are indivisible, because every Croat sees and knows, better than ever before, that without his state there is no life.”²⁵³

Although these were the first steps of organization, it is clear that the purpose was to establish one Union based on one class society within the totalitarian state. These notions were present in everyday discourse and in Pavelić’s ideological convictions. How much of this was put in function, and how much it relates to fascism as the all-comprehensive state system, still requires further research and analyses. Another important aspect when questioning that, is the context of that time situation. The Second World War, the partisan resistance, and the economy completely devoted to warfare production, are elements which need to be considered when interpreting state and social organization. The aim was to present certain aspects of how the

²⁵⁰ Ibid. 113.

²⁵¹ Ibid. 115.

²⁵² Ibid. 116.

²⁵³ Ibid. 117.

Independent State of Croatia was to be organized as a state and on which social bases from Pavelić's point of view. Whether this is comparable with other fascist states and their idea on state and economic and social building, remains outside the scope of this research.

V. Conclusion

The purpose of this research is to provide the first analysis of Ante Pavelić's thought within the contemporary theory of fascism, based on the examination of his writings, speeches, newspaper articles, and on materials written on him by his contemporaries. Within the analysis I have argue and proved that Ante Pavelić provides an interesting case study as a fascist intellectual, politician, emigrant and Leader. My aim is to fill the existing gap in this field, and to provide one of the first introductions into the existing primary sources on Ante Pavelić, his Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia.

Within the scope of the present research I have analyzed Pavelić's ideological basis employing two approaches. The first approach was the comparative analysis based on the two influential models of fascism advanced by Roger Griffin and Stanley G. Payne. My intention was not to refute their theories, but to show how, when dealing with the research based on primary sources, Ante Pavelić can be defined as a fascist ideologue within the taxonomy provided by the two models. This exercise had two aims: to expose the lack of reliable primary sources, especially in Griffin's research; and to question whether or not Pavelić might be employed within their models. I have proven that the notion of state, social transformation, the rebirth of the nation, strong emphasis on anti-communism and anti-liberalism, as well as an exclusive ultra-nationalism as well as other taxonomic features are all present within Pavelić's ideology.

The analysis of his thoughts and ideological convictions within these two approaches provided the basis for the second aspect of this research: an in-depth analysis of Ante Pavelić's writings. The analysis was based on several of his most important writings, speeches and

newspaper articles. I did not compare Pavelić's idea with the fascist ideology of other prominent fascist leaders or ideologists, as this would require a whole new perspective and a broader research. Instead, I have identified and analyzed key fascist themes and ideas which were at the basis of his ideological view. The research showed that Pavelić can be placed within the taxonomy of Griffin and Payne. This becomes even more evident when analyzing his works and extracting his presented ideas. As demonstrated in the last chapter, Pavelić's ideological basis was fascism. Not only did he mention fascism as the new system which should replace communism or liberalism, but he also saw it as the system which could provide the new opportunity for social and state organization of the mankind. It is clear that Pavelić saw fascism not only as an ideology, but as the world system which was to be established. His strong criticism of communism and liberalism discards them as possible future systems. I therefore conclude that, in Pavelić's view, fascism was an alternative to both communism and liberalism. Therefore, it is clear that Pavelić most likely considered his movement, as well as state, as fascist. The presence of fascist ideology within his writings allows me to conclude that he also saw himself as being fascist.

Pavelić's awareness of fascism as an world system is striking. He saw fascism as an economic, social and political system, which could be implemented within different societies based on their own peculiarities and needs. In my opinion, Pavelić's notion of fascism becomes even more interesting and enigmatic when trying to establish how the contemporary leaders and ideologists saw fascism. For Pavelić, fascism was a system which could be imported, i.e. a system for 'export'. Exporting, or in his case, importing fascism, required certain economic or social adjustments. The scale of the adjustments would vary widely and would probably depend on the society itself, at least in Pavelić's case. For him, this variation would be based on Croatian

peasant community called *zadruga* and the fact that social and economic basis is presented by peasantry's agricultural economy. Consequently, while importing fascism into Croatian society, certain modification would have to be made. In view of the adjustments that needed to be made in order to implement fascism, it should be further explored whether or not this system could be defined as fascist. Further on, if Pavelić was aware of certain modifications, the question remains do we compare this model with the genuine fascism as existing in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, in order to advance our evaluation of it. I wonder should we look upon Pavelić's model of fascism as the one with certain common basis as the 'genuine' ones, but integrated and adjusted to peculiar circumstances. Would that mean that we still talk about fascism or a certain peculiar form of it? If it's just a form of fascism, what still needs to be define are its features and ideological basis. Another important question is whether or not fascism could be looked upon as the developing and adjustable state, social and economic system?

Within the concept of fascism and what constitutes it, various movements, organizations, or states have been described as proto-fascist or semi-fascist. While this is true in some cases, the notion of Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia still remain under-researched. In the lack of comprehensive research, Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia has often been regarded as not fascist. The description and emphasis has mostly been put on extreme ultra-nationalism and ethnic/racial extremism. These two notions are important, but no research has ever been engaged with the ideological basis or structural level of the future state and social organization. The example of this is seen in Griffin's neglect of Ustashi as fascist and Payne's clear distinction of them as the fascist movement.

The complexity of Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia becomes even more visible when examining the position of the state itself. Many modern scholars see this state as a mere 'puppet state', under the strong control of Nazi Germany. Such conclusion is mostly based on the facts that Nazi Germany was instrumental in its proclamation and establishment, and that the Independent State of Croatia was economically dependent on Germany, and that it did not have the full control over its territories. While these points are certainly true, they should not be the only criteria to measure the nature of the Independent State of Croatia. The aspect of economic dependence requires further and more elaborative investigation, especially in the view of the fact that the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in the late 1930s was also completely dependent on German economy. Question of economic system also requires further analysis regarding the presence of corporatism as the system which should have been introduced. In my opinion both, the dependency on German economy and the idea of corporatism, present important structural factors. Any further research, which would examine the nature of the Independent State of Croatia and its ideological, economic and social foundations, will have to examine the presence and importance of these factors.

The control over state territory needs to be examined and viewed within the context of the state's existence. The Independent State of Croatia was formed during the Second World War. It was influenced by two most prominent actors, Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, and it soon faced severe communist resistance within its territory. When we combine this with Pavelić's belief that the fascist 'New Order', was to be established after the defeat of communism and victory of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, it is reasonable to assume that fascist system was yet to be fully implemented and accomplished in the Independent state of Croatia. Several steps towards such accomplishment have been taken though. As mentioned, there is the presence of the idea of

corporatist system as the basis of states economic organization and development, as well as the formation of one *Supreme Union Council* for all the workers, which would be under state supervision. Though these are just a few components of state organization, they provide a helpful insight into the nature of the Independent State of Croatia. Consequently, further research on this topic should be based not only on the relation with the two, but also on the idea and foundations on which this state was to be built on. Various law decrees, ideological basis, social reconstruction and state organization need to be examined, studied and compared with various fascist state organizations. If Pavelić saw Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany as built on the same fascist principles but adjusted to their certain economic and social peculiarities, it is very plausible that he saw the Independent State of Croatia as built on similar principles. In my opinion, it is exactly within this framework that any further research, which intends to deal either with the Ustashi movement or the Independent State of Croatia, needs to be positioned and based on.

Although neither the Ustashi movement nor the Independent State of Croatia have been the focus of this research, when analyzing Pavelić's ideological basis these aspects cannot be left aside. Furthermore, by accepting Payne's definition of Ustashi movement as fascist and that Pavelić's convictions were fascist, what was the nature of the Independent State of Croatia? By mere logic, it can be concluded, that if two out of three constituting elements are defined as fascist, the third one should not simply be disregarded as not fascist. Up to this day a thorough research based on primary sources, which would cover at least one of these aspects in broader European context, has not yet been done. I believe that such research, especially the one based on Ante Pavelić as the *Poglavnik* of the Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia would certainly provide modern scholars of fascism with an in-depth analysis and source review

regarding this subject. The research would also provide a clearer insight on how the contemporary leaders and ideologists of that time looked upon fascism as a state and social system. Such research should also emphasize the ways in which they might have copied or supplemented fascism, according to their states peculiarities, or even their own ideas.

It is my conviction that further research of this topic might answer some of the above posed questions. What is perhaps even more important is that such research might provide new insights into fascism as a system for export. According to my knowledge these aspects have not been dealt with, and therefore might provide a fresh insight into what exactly fascism was and how it manifested itself in different circumstances. It is commonly accepted that Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany were fascist systems, despite their differences. Such differences, also present within the Ustashi movement and the Independent State of Croatia, need to be examined, explained and defined in order to present a valid ‘taxonomic verdict’ of fascism.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Črljen, Danijel (ed.). *Načela Ustaškog Pokreta* [The Principles of the Ustashi Movement]. Zagreb: Tiskara Matice Hrvatskih Akademikara, 1942.

Djurić, Siniša and Ruchala, Cali (ed.). www.pavelicpapers.com.

_____. *Supreme Allied HQ to 6th and 12th Army Groups*.

_____. *Rome CIC on Pavelic's Arrest in Austria*.

_____. *CIC Memorandum from Agents Caniglia and Zappala*.

_____. *Telegram Received by G-2*.

_____. *Arrival of Ante Pavelic in Argentina*.

Pavelić, Ante. *Strahote zabluda* [The Horrors of Illusions]. Zagreb: Tiskara knjižare St. Kugli, 1941.

_____. *Die Kroatische Frage* [The Croatian Question]. Berlin, 1936.

_____. *Hrvatsko pitanje* [The Croatian Question] in *Dr. Ante Pavelić riješio je Hrvatsko pitanje* [Doctor Ante Pavelić has Resolved Croatian Question]. Zagreb: Naklada Europa, 1942.

_____. *Doživljaji* (The Experiences). Zagreb: Vratna Gora d.o.o. 1998.

Pavelić, Višnja (ed.). *Ante Pavelić - Strahote Zabluda* [Ante Pavelić - The Horrors of Illusions]. Madrid, 1974.

Poglavnik govori [The Leader Speaks]. Zagreb: Tiskara matice Hrvatskih Akademikara, 1942.

Poglavnik Saboru i narodu [The Leader to the Parliament and People]. Zagreb: Tiskara Merkantil, February 28th, 1942.

Putem Hrvatskog državnog prava – Poglavnikovi govori, izjave i članci prije odlaska u tuđinu [On the Road of Croatian State Right]. Zagreb: Tiskara Ustaškog Pokreta, 1942.

Ustaška misao [Ustashi Thought]. Zagreb: Naklada Glavnog Ustaškog Stana, 1942.

Newspapers

Hrvatski Narod – Glasilo Hrvatskog Ustaškog Pokreta [The Croatian People – Messenger of the Croatian ustashi Movement]. 1938-1945.

Narodne Novine – Službeni list Nezavisne Države Hrvatske [The National Newspapers – The Official Magazine of the Independent State of Croatia]. 1939-1945.

Ustaša – Vjesnik hrvatskog Ustaškog oslobodilačkog pokreta [Ustashi - Messenger of the Croatian Ustashi Liberation Movement]. 1932-1934.

Ustaša – Vjesnik hrvatskih revolucionaraca [Ustashi-Messenger of Croatian Revolutionaries]. 1941-1945.

Secondary literature

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. San Diego: A Harvest Book, 1968.

Berend, T. Ivan. *Decades of Crisis-Central and Eastern Europe Before World War II*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Biondich, Mark. “We Were Defending the State: Nationalism, Myth and Memory in Twentieth Century Croatia” in *Ideologies and National Identities: The case of Twentieth-Century Southeastern Europe*. Budapest - New York: Central European University Press, 2004.

Bogdan, Ivo. *Dr. Ante Pavelić riješio je Hrvatsko pitanje* [Doctor Ante Pavelić has Resolved Croatian Question]. Zagreb: Naklada Europa, 1942.

Cassels, Alan. *Fascism*. Arlington Heights: AHM Publishing, 1975.

Friedrich, J. Carl and Brzezinski K. Zbigniew. *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*. Cambridge, Massachussets: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Fischer, J. Bernd, (ed.). *Balkan Strongmen – Dictators and Authoritarian Rulers of Southeast Europe*. Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2007.

Gentile, Emilio. “Fascism, Totalitarianism and Political Religion: Definitions and Critical Reflections on Criticism of an Interpretation” in *Fascism, Totalitarianism and Political Religion*. London: Routledge, 2005.

- Goldstein, Ivo. *Holokaust u Zagrebu* [Holocaust in Zagreb]. Zagreb: Novi Liber, 2001.
- _____. *Hrvatska povijest* [Croatian History]. Zagreb: Novi Liber, 2003.
- _____. "The Independent State of Croatia in 1941: On the Road to Catastrophe" in *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religion*, Vol.7, No. 4, Routledge, December 2006.
- Griffin, Roger. *The Nature of Fascism*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Gross, Mirjana. *Izvorno Pravaštvo* [Authenticall Right]. Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 2000.
- Jareb, Mario. "The NDH's Relations with Italy and Germany" in *Totalitarian Movements and Political religions*, Vol.7, No.4. London: Routledge, December 2006.
- Jelić-Butić, Fikreta. *Ustaše i NDH* [Ustashi and The Independent State of Croatia]. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1977.
- _____. "Ustaše u drugom svjetskom ratu" [Ustashi in the Second World War] in *Fašizam i neofašizam* [Fascism and Neo-Fascism]. Zagreb: Fakultet Političkih znanosti, 1976.
- Kallis, A. Aristotle. "The 'Regime-Model' of Fascism: A Typology" in *European History Quarterly*. Vol. 30, No. 77, 2000.
- Krizman, Bogdan. *Ante Pavelić i Ustaše* [Ante Pavelic and Ustashi]. Zagreb: Globus, 1978.
- _____. *NDH između Hitlera i Mussolinija* [The Independent State of Croatia between Hitler and Mussolini]. Zagreb: Globus, 1986.
- _____. *Ustaše i Treći Reich* [The Ustashi and the Third Reich]. Zagreb: Globus, 1983.
- Kisić-Kolanović, Nada. *Vojskovođa i politika: sjećanja Slavka Kvaternika* [Soldier and Politics: Memories of Slavko Kvaternik]. Zagreb: Golden marketing, 1997.
- Laquer, Walter, (ed.). *Fascism – A Reader's Guide: Analysis, Interpretation, Bibliography*. Aldershot: Sclar Press, 1991, c1976.
- _____. *Fascism – Past, Present, Future*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Laquer, Walter & Mosse, L. George. *International fascism, 1920-1945*. New York : Harper & Row, 1966.
- Morgan, Philip. *Fascism in Europe, 1919-1945*. London : Routledge, 2003.

- Mosley, Edward Philip. *Communal families in the Balkans: the zadruga*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, c1976.
- Mosse, L. George. *The Fascist Revolution – Toward a General Theory of Fascism*. New York: Howard Fertig, 1999.
- Pavličević, Dragutin. *Hrvatske kućne zadruge* [Croatian House Zadruga]. Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada Liber, Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta, 1989
- Payne, G. Stanley. *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1995.
- _____. *Fascism: Comparison and Definition*. Wisconsin: the University of Wisconsin Press, 1980.
- _____. "The NDH State in Comparative Perspective" in *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religion*, Vol.7, No.4. London: Routledge, December 2006.
- Požar, Petar. *Ustasa: dokumenti o ustaskom pokretu* [Ustashi: Documents on Ustashi Movement]. Zagreb: Zagrebačka stvarnost, 1995.
- Ramet, P. Sabrina. "The NDH – An Introduction" in *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religion*, Vol. 7, No. 4. London: Routledge, December 2006.
- Tomashevich, Jozo. *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia, 1941-1945: Occupation and Collaboration*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Totalitarianism and Political Religion. London: Routledge: 2000-2009.
- Weber, Eugen Joseph. *Varieties of Fascism – Doctrines of Revolution in the Twentieth Century*. New Jersey: d. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1964.
- Žerjavić, Vladimir. *Opsesije i megalomanije oko Bleiburga i Jasenovca* [Obsessions and Exaggerations over the Bleiburg and Jasenovac]. Zagreb: Globus, 1992.