

STUDIA <sup>11 p.</sup> 28  
BALCANICA

2506  
21

**Европа:  
нароги и граници**

ВЕРСАЙСКИЯТ МИР  
И НЕГОВОТО НАСЛЕДСТВО

# СЪДЪРЖАНИЕ

ПРЕДГОВОР .....	14
-----------------	----

## I. МИРЪТ

• <b>ОГНЯНА ХРИСИМОВА.</b> Невъзможният мир: Версайското статукво и доктрината за закрила правата на националните малцинства.....	14
<b>IGOR DESPOT.</b> The Short Existence of the State of Slovenes, Croats, and Serbs (from the Late October to December 1st, 1918) .....	34
<b>БОБИ БОБЕВ.</b> Въпросът за границите на Албания от обявяването на независимостта до окончателното им утвърждаване (1912–1926) .....	56
• <b>SABRI REXHA.</b> The Albanian Issue at the Paris Peace Conference, 1919 .....	77
<b>БИСЕР ПЕТРОВ.</b> Великобритания и окупацията на Албания от Италия.....	90
<b>КАЛИНА ПЕЕВА.</b> Третирането на териториалните и малцинствените проблеми в хода на Лозанската конференция (1922–1923).....	105
<b>ANDRZEJ MALINOWSKI.</b> The Issue and the Status of Danzig during the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 in the Pomeranian Press .....	115
<b>JAROSŁAW RUBACHA.</b> Polish-Ukrainian relations 1918–1919 .....	127

## II. НАСЛЕДСТВОТО

• <b>ХРИСТИНА МИРЧЕВА.</b> От Париж 1919 към Париж 1946 г. (Сравнителен анализ).....	148
<b>СВЕТЛОЗАР ЕЛДЪРОВ.</b> Българската православна църква и защитата на малцинствените права на българите в Югославия между двете световни войни (1919–1939).....	171

• <b>АНЕТА МИХАЙЛОВА.</b> Мирните конференции в Париж през 1919 и 1946 г. и следвоенната обстановка в Румъния.....	186
<b>SHALVA TCHKADUA.</b> Formation of the Political Map of Georgia in the 1920s–1939s: Causes and Results .....	207
<b>ДРАГОМИР КРЪСТЕВ.</b> Първата Чехословашка република – етноси, идентичности, проблеми.....	215
<b>JEDRZEJ PASZKIEWICZ.</b> The Problem of the Greek National Security against the Political Changes in the Balkans after the Signing the Peace Treaty in Lausanne (1923–1934).....	224
<b>ИРИНА ОГНЯНОВА.</b> Хърватският национализъм и разпадането на версайска Югославия през 1941 г. ....	244
<b>МАРИЯНА СТАМОВА.</b> Отражението на решенията на Парижката мирна конференция през 1947 г. върху албанския проблем в Титова Югославия .....	267
• <b>БИСЕР БАНЧЕВ.</b> Възстановяването на черногорската държавност като отхвърляне на наследството на Парижката мирна конференция.....	287

# CONTENTS

**INTRODUCTION..... 9**

## **I. THE PEACE**

**OGNYANA HRISSIMOVA.** The Impossible Peace: the Versailles Status quo and the Doctrine for the Protection of National Minorities Rights..... 14

**IGOR DESPOT.** The Short Existence of the State of Slovenes, Croats, and Serbs (From the Late October to December, 1st, 1918).....34

**BOBI BOBEV.** The Issue of Albanian Borders from the Declaration of Independence to its Final Settlement (1912–1926) .....56

**SABRI REXHA.** The Albanian Issue at the Paris Peace Conference, 1919.....77

**BISSER PETROV.** Great Britain and Italy's Occupation of Albania .....90

**KALINA PEEVA.** The Treatment of Territorial and Minority Issues in the Course of the Lausanne Conference (1922–1923) ..... 105

**ANDRZEJ MALINOWSKI.** The Issue and the Status of Danzig during the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 in the Pomeranian Press ..... 115

**JAROSŁAW RUBACHA.** Polish-Ukrainian Relations, 1918–1919..... 127

## **II. THE HERITAGE**

**HRISTINA MIRCHEVA.** From Paris 1919 Until Paris 1946 (Comparative analysis) ..... 148

**SVETLOZAR EL DAROV.** The Bulgarian Orthodox Church in Protection of Minority Rights of Bulgarians in Yugoslavia in the Interwar Period (1919–1939) ..... 171

**ANETA MIHAYLOVA.** The Paris Peace Conferences of 1919 and 1946 and the Post-War Situation in Romania ..... 186

**SHALVA TCHKADUA.** Formation of the Political Map of Georgia in the 1920s–1930s: Causes and Results ..... 207

<b>DRAGOMIR KRASTEV.</b> The First Czechoslovak Republic – Ethnicities, Identities, Problems .....	215
<b>JĘDRZEJ PASZKIEWICZ.</b> The Problem of the Greek National Security against the Political Changes in the Balkans after the Signing the Peace Treaty in Lausanne (1923–1934).....	224
<b>IRINA OGNANOVA.</b> The Croatian Nationalism and the Collapse of Versailles Yugoslavia in 1941 .....	244
<b>MARIYANA STAMOVA.</b> The Reflection of the Decisions of the Paris Peace Conference in 1947 on the Albanian Issue in Tito’s Yugoslavia .....	267
<b>BISER BANCHEV.</b> The Restoration of the State of Montenegro as a Denouncement of the Legacy of the Paris Peace Conference .....	287

## THE IMPOSSIBLE PEACE: THE VERSAILLES STATUS QUO AND THE DOCTRINE FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES RIGHTS

### (Summary)

The paper investigates two problems concerning the political philosophy and the character of the decisions of the Paris peace conference (1919-1920), which gave the framework and the essence of the inter-war peace order, so-called Versailles status quo. This international forum had several important consequences. In political-territorial aspect they were: the break up of Austro-Hungary; complete dislodge of the Ottoman Empire from its European territories; resurrection of several states after many centuries of foreign dependence and creation of new ones. Three main principles of the Versailles system are pointed out in the paper, mainly: elimination of the principle of historical belonging of territories; elimination of the factor "main ethnic element" in the state creation process and transition of enormous human masses beyond their ethno-state boundaries; and taking in mind only the political and strategic criteria of the "peace-makers". That is how the status quo was impossible from the very beginning.

The second problem is related to the creation of the first international organization during the Paris forum – the United Nations. That was the second significant act of the conference and it was a unique event in the world political history.

The third contribution of the Paris peace conference was the elaboration of the world doctrine for the protection of national minorities and instruments for its application, which was developed in the following decades. The mechanism (contracts, etc.), character, specifics, phases of development, limits and historical value of that act and its importance for the protection of the Versailles status quo is also elaborated in the paper.

## THE SHORT EXISTENCE OF THE STATE OF SLOVENES, CROATS AND SERBS (from the late October to December, 1 st 1918)

### (Summary)

At the end of the First World War a movement of South Slav politicians appeared with the aim of breaking the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. After the National Council of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs had been formed in early October 1918, State of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was created at the end of that month. That creation did not have characteristics of a real state – it did not have a defined territory, was not able to defend itself from Italy on the eastern Adriatic coast, it was not internationally recognized, so it was created as a pathway to union with Serbia and Montenegro into a common state.

Because most of the documents about the development, existence and the end of the state disappeared in 1919 and 1920, the aim of this study is to analyze actions of the leading politicians of the State of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and their efforts during the two month period from the creation of the National Council until the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. It is based on documents from Zagreb and on memories of the participants in the events. In the past twenty years in Croatian historiography a question whether Croatia (or State SCS) could survive as an independent country after the war has been arisen. Through the analysis of documents from that period this work would defend the thesis that it was neither possible, nor wanted by any significant political forces in Croatia. In the last decade before the First World War, the leading politicians of State of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes worked to overthrow the Austro-Hungarian Empire (many of them were in prison during the war with charges of treason), and they saw the destruction of the Monarchy only through the cooperation with neighboring free Serbia. At the moment that cooperation was achieved, they were ready for the creation of a common state, especially regarding Serbia as a Piemonte of Yugoslav countries.

## THE ISSUE OF ALBANIAN BORDERS FROM THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE TO ITS FINAL SETTLEMENT (1912 - 1926)

### (Summary)

The issue of re-mapping and re-establishing of the borderlines of the Balkan countries remains in the spotlight throughout the first half of the 20th century, including the two peace conferences following the end of the World War I and World War II. The most significant changes took place only in the course of a decade and were a result of war conflicts and decisions of the peace conferences that followed them. I am referring to the First Balkan War and the London Conference, the Second Balkan War and the Bucharest Conference, and the World War I and the Paris Conference. In all of the above mentioned cases we have witnessed changes being introduced into already existing borders.

The only exception is Albania. The Albanian state was in question several times - in the period of its creation and establishment of its borders. To make matters worse this interfered with a whole range of various political interests and visions of both - Albanian neighbour states and the Great Powers. This called for the gathering of special conferences, as the Ambassador Conferences in 1913 and 1921.

The Albanian Borders were finally established in 1913. Regardless of the few minor changes that happened during the 20th century, they were similar to the ones we know today. The decision for that was taken in 1913 and re-confirmed in 1921. It was purely political and did not take into consideration the ethnical and nationalist issues. Fair or not, these historical circumstances determined Albania as the country with the least number of changes in its borderlines throughout the 20th century, compared to the rest of the Balkan states.

## THE ALBANIAN ISSUE AT THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE 1919

### (Summary)

The Albanian issue appeared on the international scene at the Berlin's Congress (1878), which started the partition of the Albanian territories without taking into account the national and territorial interests of the population. Until 1912 Albanians were treated as Turks or turkophiles who should bear the fate of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkans. In the name of those allegations, out of 75.000 km territories that Albanians possessed at the London Conference (1913), they were shrunk to 28.000 km. From over 2.000.000, only 800.000 Albanians were included in the borders of the Albanian state. Over half of the Albanian population remained under the rule of Serbia, Montenegro and Greece and were subject to religious, national and proprietorship discrimination. These decisions made Albanians distrustful towards the Great Powers and their decisions.

Under the circumstances of partition of Albanian territories and the invasion of Albania by the neighboring countries after Prince William of Vild's resignation (September 1914), an anarchy exploded. The neutrality of Albania declared at London Conference (1913) was impinged and Albanians found themselves in a world war without declaring their orientation for Central Powers or Entente. Despite their indifference towards this war, Albanians became a subject of negotiations in the London Secret Treaty (1915) and the Paris Peace Conference (1919).

The Peace Conference started with a dilemma: to implement the principle of self-determination of nations proclaimed during the war, or to ratify the war secret treaties. Efforts were made to find a neutral stance in order to satisfy both parties. For the Albanians this Conference was connected with the prejudices that: a/ the independence of Albania was premature and under the pressure of Vienna, which lost the war; b/ under the pressure of Italy for the implementation of London Secret Treaty; c/ the pressure of neighbors to take territories from Albania and d/ the conviction that the anarchy in this country shows immaturity of Albanians to have their own state. Under such circumstances, the partition of Albania was considered as an easy and normal thing to satisfy war allies.

The hope of the Albanians to get justice at the Peace Conference quickly vanished. The international gathering did not correct the mistakes that were made toward Albanians at the Berlin's Congress (1878) and London's Conference (1913), but brought the existence of the Albanian State and its internationally recognized borders under question. The Conference held the position that some parts of Albania should be given to Yugoslavia, Greece and Italy. Military actions of the Albanian patriotic forces took place. The border of Albania was restored to the situation of 1913 only at the beginning of 1923, following the pressure of the League of Nations and the Ambassadors' Conference. The disagreements between Great Powers, Italy, on one side, and Yugoslavia and Greece, on the other, were a good fortune for Albanians. This conference left enough space in Balkans for conflicts that were taking place until the end of the 20th century.

## GREAT BRITAIN AND ITALY'S OCCUPATION OF ALBANIA

### (Summary)

The attention of Great Britain towards the occupied Albania dated as far back as its conquest in April 1939 but its attitude towards the country was secondary and derived from its policy towards Italy. In the context of its overall policy of appeasement, the British Chamberlain's government took a thoroughly wrong and shortsighted line of conduct towards Mussolini's aggressiveness, stemming from the conviction that Italy could come off the Reich's orbit through ostentatious benevolence and concessions. Not only did the British government turn a blind eye to the flagrant offense against the international law but also tried to minimize the annihilation of the Albanian independence.

And it did not stop at that. After the Italians had decided to close down the Albanian Ministry of foreign affairs, the Foreign Office suddenly faced the ticklish question of whether to keep its diplomatic mission in Albania, which had to be downgraded to the rank of Consulate General. London pretended that nothing serious had happened and still expected rewards in exchange of its favours. However, the government reckoned it was not time for bargaining, so on October 30<sup>th</sup>, 1939 the British ambassador in Rome applied before the Italian Ministry of foreign affairs in order to obtain an *exequatur* (a permission to exercise consular activity). Thus, His Majesty's government formally recognized the occupation and annexation of Albania.

## THE TREATMENT OF TERRITORIAL AND MINORITY ISSUES DURING THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE (1922–1923)

### (Summary)

The Lausanne Conference is the last peaceful conference, marking the end of the First World War. Upon signing the Lausanne Peace Treaty and the accompanying agreements, peace in Europe was finally restored and a number of resolutions, which were very important for the Balkan countries were taken.

The present study emphasizes on the diplomatic preparation and the decisions of the Lausanne Conference relevant to the definition of Turkey's European borders, as well as those stipulating the position of minorities and the regime for foreigners. The article reveals the positions defended by the Bulgarian and Turkish delegations on the matter of the status and affiliation of Thrace, as well as the rights of the Bulgarian minority in Turkey. The author attempts to clarify the options for ensuring the right of Bulgarian refugees from Thrace to return to their birth places and the way the Bulgarian diplomacy hopes to link this matter to the issue of minorities within the Turkish territory.

Andrzej Mallinowski  
Pomeranian University  
in Słupsk  
Poland

## THE ISSUE AND THE STATUS OF DANZIG DURING THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE IN 1919 IN THE POMERANIAN PRESS

### (Summary)

According to the Treaty of Versailles Danzig got a status of a free city, ruled by the League of Nations. It was not involved in any legal relationship with the German Reich. The Treaty of Versailles gave Poland the right to use the port, and to control the railways, roads and post. The city belonged to the Polish customs territory, and Poland had the right to represent its interests to the international community.

Free City of Danzig had its own government called Senate and own parliament. League of Nations was represented by the High Commissioner, who regulated the disputes between Poland and Danzig. Regardless of that, the city never became a part of the Polish customs territory.

The paper discusses the issue of Danzig at the conference at Versailles on a basis of a materials appearing in the press in the Pomeranian vil-  
lage (called *Pelplin*) (mainly in a newspaper named *Pilgrim*).

Jarosław Rubacha  
University of Warmia  
and Mazury in Olsztyn  
Poland

## **POLISH-UKRAINIAN RELATIONS, 1918–1919**

### **(Summary)**

The raise and the dynamic development of the national ideology in Europe during the second half of the XIX century caused a profound transformation within the social consciousness of the former citizens on the Old Continent. This resulted in the birth of the modern nationalistic movements, which were spread mainly among the nations without state their own, they fought for re-establishment of their lost independence or undertaking actions for the cause of establishment of state for the first time in history.

This state of affairs led to high tensions and conflicts across Europe at the turning point of the XIX and the XX century, and for sure, the Polish – Ukrainian dispute after the First World War was one of its components.

The several months resistance for East Galicia, leading to the Polish Russian War in 1920 finished with the signing of the Riga Peace Treaty, but it did not contribute to the final solution. The Ukrainian's attempts to establish independent state resulting to Poland's territorial losses within centuries, at the same time caused problems for the Ukrainian ethnic minority it can't cope with not until the break of the Second World War.

**FROM PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE  
1919 UNTIL PARIS PEACE  
CONFERENCE 1946  
(Comparative analysis)**

**(Summary)**

The aim of this paper is to offer a comparative study of two key events in the history of diplomacy – the Paris Peace Conferences in 1919 and 1946. Taking place in different historical circumstances, these Conferences have a lot of things in common, as well as specific characteristics that illustrate the developing processes in the contemporary diplomacy. In the course of extensive preparations, the Great Powers' diplomats selected mechanisms, created running committees, and held official and behind-the-scene talks. Thus, they built up experience and skills in the international collaboration in times of peace.

Later, the global diplomacy tested the achievements and developed new procedures. Twenty-five years after the first Paris Peace Conference, the one of 1946 was similar but used optimally the experience of the former forum. The intense ideological clashes influenced the normal proceeding of the Conference; the tolerance and the will for peace and democracy, however, overcame the arguments. This accumulated experience that was used throughout the next decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

## THE BULGARIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN PROTECTION OF MINORITY RIGHTS OF BULGARIANS IN YUGOSLAVIA IN THE INTERWAR PERIOD

### (Summary)

In the interwar period, as a prevailing religion in defeated country, the Bulgarian Orthodox Church (BOC) stands behind the rights of the Bulgarian minority in Yugoslavia mainly in line with the Christian peaceful movement. In 1920 it becomes a member of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches and takes part in all congresses, conferences and other initiatives of the Alliance. Since 1923 regional conferences of the National Unions of the Members States are organized. The Bulgarian National Committee makes its debut at these forums in 1924 in Sinaia, Romania. The BOC activity in protection of the minority rights of Bulgarians in Yugoslavia is divided into two periods. Until 1931, its representatives at international for a support the idea that the problem with the rights of minorities in Bulgaria is fairly solved and insist that the Bulgarians' rights in the neighboring countries to be ensured in the same way. The Yugoslavian representatives, dominated by the Serbian Orthodox Church, firmly deny any claims for recognition of the Bulgarian national identity of the population in Vardar Macedonia and ensuring its rights to mother tongue, education and religion. Thus, the fora of Christian peace-making turns to be a field for sharp but fruitless confrontation between the National Unions of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. In 1931, through a joint orthodox-catholic-protestant delegation, BOC appeals before the League of Nations in Geneva, before the spiritual leaders of the three religions in Europe, and before the governments in Paris, London and Berlin, but except compassion and promises, it achieves no other practical results. Since 1931 a new era in BOC activity is established in relation to the protection of the minority rights of the Bulgarians in Yugoslavia. Thus BOC initiates a new strategy – not opposing but bringing together, not debates at international fora, but bilateral relations and mutual compromises. In this way, during the decade before the Second World War, the Serbian Orthodox Church

gradually turns to be the most sincere and the best partner of BOC. The bilateral relations are developed in all directions, even to initiatives for common edition of Divine Service books. Therefore, during the years of the Second World War BOC expresses a loyal, compassionate and benevolent attitude to the remainders of the Serbian church administration in Serbia and Macedonia, which is in contrast with the position of the Bulgarian occupational authorities.

## THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCES OF 1919 AND 1946 AND THE POST-WAR SITUATION IN ROMANIA

### (Summary)

This is an attempt to outline the major characteristics of the world order established after the First and the Second World Wars and their reflection on a particular country, in this case Romania, and to analyze the impact of the decisions of two peace conferences both taking place in Paris (these of 1919 and 1946), but putting an end to two wars that were quite different in their nature, scale and consequences. The article presents an overall picture of the postwar Romanian society from the point of view of its political, economic, social, cultural development, public attitudes and expectations and how they were carried into practice. It comes up with the conclusion that if we have to outline the most specific characteristic of Romania in the wake of the two wars, it appears to be that while after the First World War, regardless of the variety of changes carried out in different spheres of the public life, in Romania is observed development of tendencies inherited from the previous period, where the social and economic structure of the society and the characteristics of the political system as a whole remain intact, after the Second World War Romanian society is struck by the feeling of radical change, of abrupt breaking with the past.

## FORMATION OF THE POLITICAL MAP OF GEORGIA IN THE 1920S–1930S: CAUSES AND RESULTS

### (Summary)

Georgia is situated in the central and western part of South Caucasus. Historically it represents a polyethnic state. For centuries about ten different ethnic groups have lived friendly and with equal rights on that territory: Ossetians, Apsues, Azerbaijani, Armenians, Russians, Ukrainians, Jews, Greeks, Kurds, Kists (tribe akin to the Chechens). In the period 1918–1921 historically, geographically, ethnically and economically the territory of Georgia was a finished, consolidated, perfect political unit, with 20 centuries of history, economy and culture. In the course of its history the political map of Georgia has passed through a variety of changes, but the formations from the 1920s–1930s were quite distinctive. During this period, Georgia either lost large territories or they became disputable. That was all inspired artificially and unjustly by Russia.

In 1921 the internationally recognized territory of Georgia was 107.600 km<sup>2</sup>, but nowadays its territory is 69.700 km<sup>2</sup>. 1/3 of this territory is under the control of Russian occupational troops, namely the regions of Abkhazia and Samachablo, or the so called South Ossetia. Georgia declared independence from the Russian Empire on May 26, 1918. It was independent de facto for almost a year. It was not internationally recognized because of fears not to irritate Russia, and Georgia was discussed in the context of the relations of the different countries with Russia. Argentina was the first country to recognize the independence of Georgia on September 13, 1919. The recognition of Georgia's independence by the rest of the world took place only when Russia itself recognized it.

In the period 1920–1931 the political map of Georgia was formed in the following way: by an order of Moscow Georgia ceded her own four regions to the neighbouring countries. Besides, on Moscow's initiative three autonomons regions were created on the indivisible territories of Georgia. These were the autonomons regions of Abkhazia, Achara and the so called South Ossetia. We focus the attention on three regions: Sochi, Atabagity of Samtskhe and Abkhazia, the western territories of Georgia.

## **THE FIRST CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC – ETHNICITIES, IDENTITIES, PROBLEMS**

### **(Summary)**

The ethnic characteristics, whose roots can be found in the vicissitudes in the Czech history as well as in the very political structure of the First Czechoslovak Republic outlines most of the problems facing the country in the period from World War II until the end of the twentieth century. In spite of all, the Czechs managed to pass through all hardships. The recipe for this can be sought in the intellectual approach to political challenges, in highly developed civil society and tolerance of the Czech nation. All this gives hope that the Czechs can thus solve their problems in the future.

## THE PROBLEM OF THE GREEK NATIONAL SECURITY AGAINST THE POLITICAL CHANGES IN THE BALKANS AFTER SIGNING THE PEACE TREATY IN LAUSANNE (1923–1934)

### (Summary)

The article deals with some aspects of the international position of the Greek state after the signing of the Lausanne Peace Treaty in 1923. From the Greek point of view, the negotiations and the peace treaty determined the territorial shape of Greece, which led to a change of the priorities in its foreign policy.

The main goal of the Greek diplomacy was the achievement of the harmonious balance in the relations with the so-called “international environment” – neighboring states and the Great powers. The violation of this state could cause conflicts and territorial changes. The proceedings of the Greek diplomats were based on the belief that due to the unextinguished territorial and national controversies on the issue of Macedonian and Thracian lands, Balkan states were dependent on each other on the international arena. Everything, which referred to the bilateral relations, usually influenced third countries, so plans of agreements between particular countries of this region were perceived in the context of the Balkan-wide security system.

On the other hand, the Greek diplomacy applied the tactics of “pulling the line”, aiming at the creation of less or more stable political constructions, which were to ensure their advantage over the competitors. The most important event for the strengthening of the international security of Greece was the agreement with Turkey. Thanks to the cooperation with that country, Greece was able to achieve significantly more in the relations with the neighbors and overcome the dangerous state of inertia. Its participation in the Balkan Pact was a sign of an active security politics, used for the establishment of the Versailles *status quo* and the Greek territorial integrity.

## THE CROATIAN NATIONALISM AND THE COLLAPSE OF VERSAILLES YUGOSLAVIA IN 1941

### (Summary)

At the end of the World War I Croatia came out of Austro-Hungary and was integrated with the new Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (called *Yugoslavia* in 1929), in which the winners-Serbs imposed their hegemony over all other nations. Thus, the national issue turned out to be the main problem in new, Versailles Yugoslavia.

The Serbo-Croatian contradictions became the sharpest ones. Almost during the whole inter-war period the demands of the Croats were limited to the ideas of federalism and decentralization, after "Cvetkovich-Maček" agreement in 1939 the position of the modest stream in the Croatian national movement (represented by the Croatian Peasant Party) was shaken. Preponderance was taken by the other basic stream in the Croatian nationalism – anti-Yugoslav and separatist, which proposed as a solution to the Croatian national issue the separation of Croats from Yugoslavia and a creation of their independent state. That trend was represented by the extreme nationalistic Ustasha organization, led by Ante Pavelich. In the inter-war period the Ustasha movement was illegal, revolutionary and separatist. It chose to lead its struggle against the Serbian authority with all possible means - armed, and when it was necessary – even terrorist. The Croatian nationalistic movement seek the international help from the states which demanded the revision of the Versailles peace treaties, as Italy, Germany, Hungary and Austria.

The fast solution of the problems came in April 1941 when Hitler took the decision for the break-up of Yugoslavia and realized its plan just for 12 days. Yugoslavia was broken into pieces between the two main forces of the Axis and their allies, and on its ruins the Independent State of Croatia (ISC) was created. Thus the Croatian issue was solved during the World War II from international factors, not the inner forces in the country.

Unfortunately, Usthas turned the history of their rule into history of ethnic persecution and genocide that is how the very idea of Independent Croatian state was compromised. Although they participated actively in the dissolution of First Yugoslavia as an unfair Versailles creation of the Great Powers, their ISC was its small replica, with the imposed by foreign powers boundaries and constant inner problems, caused by the multi-ethnic and multi-religious character of the new Croatian state.

## THE REFLECTION OF THE DECISIONS OF THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE IN 1947 ON THE ALBANIAN ISSUE IN TITO'S YUGOSLAVIA

### (Summary)

After the end of the Paris peace conference and the establishment of the new post-war order in Europe and the Balkans, the Albanian issue in Yugoslavia had a difficult development. Regardless of the declarations for loyalty towards the principles, essence and postulates of the proletarian internationalism and the thesis for the priority and importance of the building of Socialism in both neighboring countries – Yugoslavia and Albania, the national problems and their minority dimensions had reflections on the character and intensity of their relationship. From 1947 till the break-up of the multi-national Yugoslav federation at the beginning of the 1990s, the Albanian problem in Yugoslavia led to great changes in the Yugoslav-Albanian relationship: from declarations for sincere friendship, and ideas for creation of a huge Balkan state; to disruption of the relationship and its usage in a mutually hostile propaganda campaigns; quiet “Albanisation” of Kosovo, its transformation in a subject of the federation and establishment of direct connections and contacts between Pristine and Tirana.

## THE RESTORATION OF THE STATE OF MONTENEGRO AS A DENOUNCEMENT OF THE LEGACY OF THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE

### (Summary)

Montenegro was the only Balkan state which lost its independence within the frame of the Versailles System created by the Paris Peace Conference. If the hypothesis that the end of the Cold War brought the disintegration of the Versailles System is accepted, then this hypothesis can be most successfully implemented in the case of Montenegro. The restoration of the state of Montenegro did not simply follow the events of 1989. The reason is that the most people of Montenegro were supporters of the idea of a Yugoslav federation. The opposition against Belgrade in the period between the two World Wars was an expression of a disagreement with the centrist leanings of the Serbian political elite. After the World War II the Montenegrins accepted that within the new Yugoslavian federation their demands were satisfied. Therefore, in the 1990s they were against the dissolution of the federation. The referendum of 1992 in Montenegro demonstrated a full support for the creation of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The new union was viewed as a successor of the old federation.

At the same time in the 1990s a new political elite emerged in Montenegro. It did not suffer from the historical nostalgia for the dynasty of the Njegos but chose the economic power and the political confidence instead. Gradually this elite began to view Slobodan Milosevic's policy as a repetition of the centralist processes of the interwar period. The federation with Serbia was bringing more encumbrance than advantage to the Montenegrins. Montenegro took the course of independent foreign policy consistent with the EU regulations. The traditionally good relations with Italy and Russia were also restored. In 2006 a referendum for independence in which the EU had a leading part, took place. Thus, the state of Montenegro was restored with the help of the same states which chose to sacrifice it in 1918.