

ARCHIVAL SOURCES •
DOKUMENTATION

THE WORK OF THE POLLING COMMISSION IN 1945 IN ZAGREB

“CRIME ESTABLISHING BASED ON CULTURAL COLLABORATION WITH THE ENEMY”

Zoran KANTOLIĆ*

Introduction

Communism (Lat. *communis* – general, common, everybody’s) is, according to one of many interpretations, “a concept of a political system which has overcome private ownership over the society’s means of production, exploitation of people, division of labour into physical and intellectual, and established the equality of people, a really human community”¹.

However, it should be noted that the Communist doctrine in theory differs drastically from Communism in practice. Namely, one of the basic characteristics of that “realised or active” Communism was the application of systematic repression, as a ruling style, which in the 20th century resulted in the figure of around one hundred million people killed by Communist authorities all over the world.²

Communist Yugoslavia was one of the countries in which Communist doctrine ruled for almost half a century (1945-1990). The Communists’ assuming of power, and the creation of the second Yugoslavia, was preceded by the chaos of World War II, which was “a mixture of liberation and civil war, political conflicts and ethnic hatred, and all these marked with occupation”³. According to estimates, the total number killed in Yugoslavia during the war was “more than a million, out of a population of more than 16 million.”⁴ Communists gained full control over Yugoslavia in mid-1945.

But the most severe forms of repression did not stop in the territory of Communist Yugoslavia when the war ended. In Croatian territory, there were repeated mass executions, executions of prisoners of war by firing squad, and the killing of the wounded and members of the clergy. Striking

*Zoran Kantolić, Croatian Institute of History, Zagreb, Republic of Croatia

¹ Boris Kalin, *Povijest filozofije /History of Philosophy/* (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1991), p. 404.

² Stephane Courtois, *Crna knjiga komunizma /The Black Book of Communism/* (Zagreb: Politička kultura, 1999), p. 12.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 288.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 288.

examples of such methods were Bleiburg, “the Way of the Cross,” and post-war camps. The victims of that Communist terror were mainly Croats, who were labelled as Ustashas and fascists, although the Yugoslav Partisan movement during the war was most prominent in Croatia. Bleiburg and “the Way of the Cross” are probably among the severest tragedies in the history of the Croatian nation and represent one of the worst examples of Communist repression in general. The destiny of several hundred thousand Croatian civilians and soldiers, who were withdrawing towards Bleiburg with the intention of surrendering to the British Army, can be described in the following words: “what happened then was a slaughter so hideous that it can be described only through the memories of those who survived”.⁵ The vast majority of the survivors of the Bleiburg tragedy faced further atrocities of death marches and “the Way of the Cross”, which stretched from the Austrian border all the way to the south-eastern parts of Yugoslavia.⁶

The repression of the Communist authorities was manifested, in addition to the mass executions and camps, in the censoring of all media, closed borders, expulsion of dissidents, confiscation of property, persecution of the Catholic Church, staged trials, etc.

When the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ) came into power, the power over the public, or the public opinion, was established. The Communist Party of Croatia (KPH) established, through *Agitprop*, “the control and co-ordination of all basic points and the media in the sphere of superstructure (press, radio-programme, film production, theatre), by transmitting their reports to *Agitprop* of CK [give definition for CK – Central Committee] KPJ”.⁷ The control established could be well illustrated with the newspapers, the most powerful medium of that time, which was especially important in “educating the masses for socialism”.⁸ For example, “Borba” was the central paper of the KPJ, and in Croatian territory the party paper of the Croatian Communists was “Naprijed”, whose only function was propaganda and agitation. The first cases of newspaper bans occurred in those times, and the first ban was imposed on the first issue of “Narodni glas”, published by Marija Radić, Stjepan Radić’s wife.⁹ Bans were especially imposed on religious papers “because of their attitude towards the authorities and their way of writing about certain subjects”, which primarily applied to the paper *Gore srca*.¹⁰

⁵ N. Tolstoy, *Ministar i pokolji /The Minister and the Massacres/* (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, 1991), p. 105.

⁶ The map of “the Way of the Cross” and the death marches can be seen in: B. Vlašić and A. Vojinović, “Križni put” /The Way of the Cross/ (Zagreb: Start, 1991), p. 170.

⁷ B. Kašić, “Značajke partijske ideologije u Hrvatskoj (1945–1948.)” /The Characteristics of the Party’s Ideology in Croatia (1945–1948)/, *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 23 (in further text: ČSP) (1991), No. 1–3: 246.

⁸ Katarina Spehnjak, “Uloga novina u oblikovanju javnog mnijenja u Hrvatskoj 1945–1952.” (The Role of Newspapers in the Formation of Public Opinion in Croatia 1945–1952), ČSP 25(1993), No. 2–3: 166.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 179.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 171.

The KPJ's especially strong repressive strikes were aimed at the Catholic Church, not only due to Communist doctrine, but primarily because after 1945, the Catholic Church was the only institution left through which one could "obstruct the Communist regulation of social life" in Yugoslavia.¹¹ Aware of that situation, the KPJ directed all of available means (ranging from the confiscation of property to the persecution of the clergy) against the Catholic Church. Land was taken from the Church without any payment, many priests were imprisoned and killed, and the conflict between the state and the Catholic Church reached its peak with the launching of criminal proceedings against Archbishop Alojzije Stepinac.¹² The Archbishop was sentenced to sixteen years of imprisonment based on supporting material which has been characterized as "a skilfully staged trick".¹³ Such staged trials in post-war Croatia were not an unusual occurrence, but a common practice against a large number of persons who were displeasing to the KPJ.

Apart from those who co-operated or were closely related to the defeated NDH regime, the repression by the Yugoslav authorities in Croatia was particularly aimed at former members of the HSS [spell out – Croatian Peasant Party], the largest party in Croatia before the war. Although HSS followers were left without the leadership and party organisation at the beginning of the war, their influence was present after the war in all parts of Croatia, except in Istria where the HSS had not even been established. The post-war activities of individual HSS members were mostly limited to "referring to Croatian peasant ideology and the requirements for a democratic system."¹⁴ But even with that basically passive policy, the Yugoslav authorities saw in HSS members a great threat to the Communist authorities. Furthermore, the Communist authorities were applying especially systematic repression against Croatian intellectuals as holders of a middle-class world-view and democratic political ideas.

Namely, one of the most important characteristics of any Communist regime, and thus the Yugoslav case as well, is the destruction of real and potential political opponents. That was the very reason why, after the end of the war in Croatia, the regime started to get even with intellectuals with bourgeois views, who were unselectively being labelled as those "who had yielded to serve the occupier". Many Croatian intellectuals suffered misfor-

¹¹ Nada Kisić-Kolanović, "Problem legitimiteta političkog sustava u Hrvatskoj nakon 1945." (The Problem of Legitimacy of the Political System in Croatia after 1945), *ČSP* 24 (1992), No. 3: 178.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 184, Fragmentary data of the Church for the year 1945 state the figure of 169 imprisoned, 89 missing and 243 priests killed in accidents.

¹³ Nada Kisić-Kolanović, "Vrijeme političke represije: 'veliki sudski procesi' u Hrvatskoj 1945.-1948." /The Times of Political Repression: "Great Court Trials" in Croatia 1945-1948/, *ČSP* 25 (1993), No. 1: 15.

¹⁴ Zdenko Radelić, "Sudbina pristaša HSS-a u Hrvatskoj 1945.-1950." /Destiny of HSS Followers in Croatia 1945-1950/, *ČSP* 27, (1995), No. 1: 100.

tune, even those who had never been members of the Ustasha movement or its sympathisers.

Communists were depriving the Croatian nation of leaders through organised actions by various Yugoslav state bodies.

The Polling Commission, ZKRZ [spell out Croatian words] – whose activities in the Zagreb area will be presented in this paper, was one of the components of the Yugoslav repressive system, and was responsible for the persecution of persons, who had “been collaborating with the enemy in the field of culture”.

Establishment, Tasks and Review of the Polling Commission’s Work

The Polling Commission started working on 6 June 1945, as a department of the Land Commission for establishing the crimes committed by the occupiers and their accomplices, that is, “to establish the crime through cultural collaboration with the enemy.”¹⁵ The Land Commission was a constituent part of the State Commission for establishing the crime of the occupiers and their accomplices.

The impetus for the establishment of the State Commission came from the international War Crimes Commission, which had been established on 20 October 1943 in London. Namely, the Commission was encouraging the establishment of national commissions, and on 30 November 1943, AVNOJ [spell out] made “the Decision on the establishment of the State Commission.” According to the AVNOJ decision, the Commission’s task was to “establish responsibility, find and punish all persons responsible for the crimes which were committed during the war and still are being committed in Yugoslavia by the occupiers and their accomplices.”¹⁶ This leads to the

¹⁵ Croatian State Archive (in further text: HDA), *The fond of the Land Committee for the establishing of war crimes* (in further text: ZKRZ), box 689 o.B/1946 (1-59), doc.no. 50/46

This text is based mainly on the archival material. Apart from the archival material, several scholarly papers dealing with this matter have been used. These are: J. Grbelja, *Uništeni naraštaj /Destroyed Generation/*, (Zagreb, 2000), a book in which, especially in chapter “Progoni intelektualaca u Hrvatskoj ljeti 1945. godine” /Persecutions of Intellectuals in Croatia in Summer 1945/, the author presents and gives an explanation on the copies of documents of the Polling Commission in relation to some thirty Croatian intellectuals; A. Vais, “Rad Komisije za utvrđivanje zločina okupatora i njihovih pomagača” /Work of the Commission for the Establishing of Crimes of Occupiers and Their Accomplices/, *Annals of the Faculty of Law* 4 (Belgrade, 1961); J. Jurčević, *Nastanak jasenovačkog mita /The Beginnings of the Jasenovac Myth/* (Zagreb: Croatian Studies - Studia Croatica, 1998) Apart from these papers referring to the Polling Commission, the author used a feuilleton in *Večernji list* written by J. Grbelja: “Opasni dosjei” (Dangerous Dossiers), *Večernji list*, 4 August 1991, in which Grbelja presents copies of documents, in 28 installments, up to number 136. But, after the 136th document, which is the beginning of the third box, there are two more boxes which, together with the third one, contain around 300 documents, each one of them consisting of several official papers, some of them as many as several dozens.

¹⁶ J. Jurčević, *Nastanak jasenovačkog mita*, p. 16.

conclusion that, “given the Commission’s task defined in such way, its further activities and the “Announcements” issued, the task of establishing the victims of war was obviously out of the limelight and represented one of the tools intended to be used in order to achieve the main aim – to punish people who were considered criminals, from the point of view of the legal and political system created on the foundations of AVNOJ.”¹⁷

The Rules and Regulations on the work of the State Commission were made by the Presidency of the People’s Liberation Committee of Yugoslavia (NKOJ), on 8 May 1944, to which the Commission was accountable.¹⁸ Soon a pyramidal structure of commissions headed by the State Commission was established. The hastiness in the creation of the structure can be seen from the fact that “in the period between February and November 1944, six land (republic) commissions were established, one regional (Vojvodina) and two provincial (Kosmet and Sandžak).”¹⁹ Apart from those, commissions at lower levels were being established as well, “and in the period of their most intensive work, 65 district, 299 county and 1210 municipal commissions were active.”²⁰ The extent to which the State Commission “was very important for the Communist structure of the emerging Yugoslav state and the hastiness in the Commission’s activities can be clearly seen from the fact that almost the whole research part was finished within one year (from mid-1945 until mid- 1946).”²¹ In that period, “the commissions gathered more than 900,000 reports on war crimes and criminals submitted by damaged parties, victims who had survived, families of victims and other citizens.”²² All together, “the commissions issued nearly 120,000 decisions establishing around 65,000 war crimes, traitors and enemies of the people,” as well as “Announcements,” which were as a rule related to mass crimes with a number of culprits or groups of mutually related crimes.²³

It should also be mentioned that “the State Commission had very good relations with the international War Crimes Commission, from which it requested that around 5,000 persons be entered into the list of criminals, of which 2,700 such requests were granted.”²⁴ Additionally, “the State Commission had its delegations in the American, British and French occupation zones in Germany, at the Allied Control Council for Austria in Vienna, research teams in the American and British occupation zones in Austria, as well as a representative in the French occupation zone.”²⁵ Such

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁸ Ibid., p.16.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 17.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 17.

²¹ Ibid., p. 17.

²² Ibid., p. 20.

²³ Ibid., p. 20.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 21.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 18.

a network of branches and wide scope of work clearly show that the State Commission took its work very seriously, especially “the work in the international field.”²⁶

But, because of the zeal and promptness in the Commission’s work, and taking into account the quantity of work, the following question is raised: How professional, and on the other hand, how tendentious and superficial was the Commission’s work? The qualification level of the employees was very low, and “apart from some qualified and experienced professionals, most of them were lacking professional knowledge and experience, and many were complete beginners.”²⁷ And finally, “looking at the Commission’s published works from a half a century distance and from a different political environment, the most noticeable flaw was their drastic lack of objectivity, their ideologising and biasness in terms of terminology and interpretations, the explanation of which may be – on one hand – the political system being created in Yugoslavia and its pragmatic political needs in those days, and – on the other – the same belief of the individuals who were appointed and employed members of the Commission.”²⁸

In such a structure of commissions, there was the Polling Commission as well, with a special task or aim: “To identify and proclaim as criminals those persons, who placed their intellectual abilities at the service of the enemies and thus helped them enslave and disunite our people, who had been the intellectual originators of the crimes that were subsequently perpetrated by others.”²⁹ Having taken on that task, the Polling Commission started systematically persecuting Croatian intellectuals, actually believing that the end justified the means. And there were many means, or forms of repression, ranging from the loss of jobs, and total social marginalisation, to the liquidation of individuals with different views.

Despite the international standards that “All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law,”³⁰ it was not the case in Communist Yugoslavia. Also, “the right to freedom of

²⁶ Ibid., p. 17.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 24.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 25

²⁹ ZKRZ, HDA, Zagreb, box 685, doc.no. 18/45

³⁰ *Ljudska prava* /Human Rights/ (Zagreb: Školske novine, 1990), p. 31., Article 7, General Declaration on Human Rights. Although the Declaration was issued in December 1948; which was after the activities of the Polling Commission, it speaks of the foundations of every state, on the rights of the man, on whom the state rests, therefore on the values that were in existence long before 1948. Those rights and those values were not respected in Communist Yugoslavia, nor were they respected in other Communist countries, and the proof is in the persecutions of intellectuals and their executions, staged trials, camps and imprisonments that were occurring after 1948 as well. This is easily noticeable from the extensive literature about that period, and one of those works is the above mentioned “The Black Book of Communism”, as well as the published texts of Zdenko Radelić “Destiny of HSS Followers in Croatia 1945-1950”, Katarina Spehnbjak “The Role of Newspapers in the Formation of Public Opinion in Croatia 1945-1952” and many others.

opinion and expression”³¹ was not respected, which was made most explicit by the fact that many persons of different views were liquidated. In the post-war organised repression, the Polling Commission, as all other commissions, finished its work very quickly, taking into consideration only the quantity of the work.

According to the material saved, the whole work of the Polling Commission was related to the period between 6 June 1945, when the Commission started working, and 15 May 1946, when the annual report on the Polling Commission’s work was submitted.³²

The work of the Polling Commission and the contents of documents were presented in the second part of the report, which was divided into eleven items. According to “the Report”, the work of the Polling Commission consisted of the following:

- “1) 176 decisions on the crime of cultural and political collaboration with the enemy
- 2) Fifty-four reports to the Public Prosecutor on the violation of national honour
- 3) Five reports on the work of individual scientific workers of Croatia in the period of occupation
- 4) Five reports on camps / Đakovo, Lobar, Sisak, Jastrebarsko and Slano camps/
- 5) Five reports /on the military vicary, Notification no. 36 – Mass slaughter in Kukuljevići, Notification no. 35 – Maksimir graveyard, Notification no. 33 – Lobar camp, Notification no. 37 – Djakovo camp/
- 6) One letter sent to thirty-six cultural institutions instructing them to fill in the questionnaires
- 7) One letter sent to twenty-nine district N.O. concerning the establishment of District Polling Commissions
- 8) Fourteen letters sent to HAZU (Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts) in Zagreb, St. Jerome Society, Matica Hrvatska, State Conservatory, the Universities’ Academic Senate, the University in Zagreb Administration, and all faculties in Croatian Universities, instructing them to hand over the minutes from their meetings and their editions
- 9) Sixty-seven letters received, with filled-in questionnaires
- 10) Ten letters received, with minutes and editions under item 8)

³¹ *Ljudska prava*, p. 31, Article 19

³² ZKRZ, HDA, Zagreb, box 689, o.B/1946. (1-59), doc.no. 50/46

The annual report was in fact the review of the whole work of the Polling Commission, because the box contains only few documents coming after the report – one about the Danica camp near Koprivnica, “Announcement” no. 39, and two documents without a number. The report was divided into three items. The first was on the purpose of the Polling Commission, the second on the content of the documents, and the third said that the Polling Commission had its own registry and name list.

11) Ninety-one various documents and letters of the Commission sent by the Commission to various authorities and vice versa”³³

All these documents are stored in five archive boxes of the ZKRZ fond, starting with number 685 to 689, most of them being well preserved, and with only several “Decisions” missing from those listed above.³⁴ Those “Decisions” give us the best insight into the work of the Polling Commission, and their review illustrates the repressiveness of the system, which was persecuting Croatian intellectuals with views different to those of the Communist system.

Structuring of the District Polling Commissions

All the Polling Commission’s documents stored at the Croatian State Archive (HDA) pertain to the city of Zagreb, its institutions and persons who worked in Zagreb or were sent from Zagreb to some other parts of the NDH (Independent State of Croatia) and Europe. Apart from the Polling Commission of Croatia, which “was establishing crimes of cultural collaboration with the enemy” in Zagreb, twenty-nine more commissions were founded all over Croatia, and were called District Polling Commissions. The request for the founding of District Polling Commissions was sent by the central Polling Commission to twenty-nine District People’s Liberation

- | | |
|--|--|
| “1. Zagreb | 16. Buzet (Istria) |
| 2. Karlovac | 17. Pola (Istria) |
| 3. Osijek | 18. Dubrovnik |
| 4. Požega | 19. District NOO for Central Dalmatian islands |
| 5. Varaždin | 20. Makarska |
| 6. District NOO for the city of Zagreb | 21. Zadar |
| 7. Ogulin | 22. Šibenik |
| 8. Gospić | 23. Moslavina |
| 9. Sušak | 24. Bjelovar |
| 10. Pazin | 25. Krapina |
| 11. Split | 26. Našice |
| 12. Petrinja | 27. Nova Gradiška |
| 13. Delnice | 28. Slavonski Brod |
| 14. Rijeka | 29. Virovitica” ³⁶ |
| 15. Cazin | |

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Box 685 contains documents from number 3 to 74, box 686 contains documents from number 76 to 129, box 687 contains documents from number 130 to 200, box 688 contains documents from number 201 to 289, box 689, divided into three folders (A, B, C). Folder A/1945 contains documents from number 290 to 383, folder B/1946 contains documents from number 1 to 59, and folder C contains two documents without number (1st Marija Bistrica, building of the sanctuary, 2nd on the professional and public work of Dr. Ljubo Karaman).

Councils (NOO)³⁵. The letter of the Polling Commission sent on 9 June 1945 arrived to the following NOO:

These were standardised letters, and contained five copies of "Questionnaires" each as well as a letter instructing the District NOO what to do. The letter sent to the District NOO Krapina illustrates the tasks and guidelines given to the District Polling Commissions.³⁷ The introductory part of the letter stated: "We are informing the comrade addressee that the Polling Commission of Croatia has been founded in Zagreb for the establishing of crime of cultural collaboration with the enemy. The addressee is kindly requested to establish immediately, within the scope of its competence, a similar District Polling Commission with the same aim and the same task, and to inform this Polling Commission on all issues."³⁸ The letter also says that "in the Decisions"/ "Data"/ one needs to state in detail everything that is necessary for the launching of the proceedings and pronouncing of sentences against the guilty. If possible, attach the guilty person's respective work/ book, or the printed work, pictures, lectures, etc./, which is the subject of the proceedings. All notifications on the work of the District Commission shall be issued by this Polling Commission."³⁹ In further text, there followed the warning: "The work is most urgent and a detailed report on the work is to be sent to this Commission every fourteen days."⁴⁰ A clarification of what should be done with the questionnaires was also sent to NOOs: "five/ copies of the questionnaires are sent, which the District Commission shall copy in as many copies as needed, and send them to all cultural institutions in the area under the competence of that District NOO, with the request that the administration of the institute immediately deliver to its members and associates the questionnaire /one copy each/ so that they immediately fill it in and return to the institute or institution. Having gathered all the data, the institutions mentioned shall send the filled-in questionnaires to this Commission, with their reports and comments on each of the questionnaires, adding their own views on the characteristics of each individual. The respective institution shall, if possible, send an enclosed copy of the book or the printed work in question."⁴¹ In the end, there is a warning that "any passing over in silence or incorrect data shall be considered a criminal act"⁴². The letter was signed by Ferdo Čulinović, the President of the Land Commission for war crimes, and the Secretary of the Polling Commission.⁴³

³⁵ ZKRZ, HDA, box 685, doc. no. 11/45

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ ZKRZ, HDA, box 685, doc. no. 61/45

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ The secretary's signature is illegible.

The establishment of the District Polling Commissions meant the creation of a network covering all of Croatia, and the repression began against almost all Croatian intellectuals who were not members of the NOP (People's Liberation Movement). The scope and the quality of the activities of the District Polling Commissions are certainly questions which require answers in order to obtain a full picture on the repressiveness of the Communist system against Croatian intellectuals.

“Decisions” of the Polling Commission

Most of the documents in the archival boxes are the “Decisions on the establishment of crimes committed by the occupiers and their accomplices,” and they all refer to the “establishing of crime through cultural and political collaboration with the enemy”. Each “Decision” is in the form of a file containing the documents enclosed. In the first page of the file, there is a printed section with the title “Criminal”, for entering the basic identification data on a person; surname and name, approximate age, nationality, military unit, position and rank, permanent residence, most recent residence, and other personal data. The first page also contains the section “Victims of the crime” – which in all “Decisions” remained empty – as well as the section “Short description and qualification of crime”, where the “crime” was described in several ideologised sentences.

The second page of a “Decision” contains the section “Details on the crime”. The size of the section depended on how fruitful a writer or speaker the person was, or how much material the Polling Commission was able to find for examination. This section of the “Decisions” was between one and ten pages long.

After the section “Details on the crime”, there was the “Exposition”, in which the tone was similar to the one in “Short description and qualification of crime”, but with additional dwelling on significant points taken from the author's articles. Each Polling Commission's “Exposition” ended in pronouncing the subject person “guilty of the crimes” presented in “Details on the crime” and “Exposition”.

After the “Exposition” there was presented the “Evidence”, on the basis of which the crime was established. Under the “Evidence”, in most of the cases there was a list of printed media, in which the article or speech had been published (those were usually the newspapers “Spremnost” and “Hrvatski narod” [*italics for newspaper titles?*]). After that, there followed section “Damages” describing the contents of the damages, as well as the amount of the damages expressed in pre-war dinars. However, in all “Decisions” this section remained empty.

After the “Damages”, there was section “Accomplices”, in which almost as a rule there were listed newspaper editors-in-chief and executive editors. The last section was “Note”, which in most cases remained empty.

“Decisions” were signed by the clerk, secretary and president of a Polling Commission or ZKRZ. Their signatures are beside the date on the bottom of the last page.

“Decision” on Dr. Kvirin Klement Bonifačić – the Bishop of Split

The first “Decision” was related to the establishing of the “crime” committed by Dr. Kvirin Klement Bonifačić, the Bishop of Split.⁴⁴ The “Short description and qualification of the crime” says that in his speech in the St. Domnius Cathedral he “glorified the NDH and Pavelić and begged God to guard the NDH forever, and to enlighten and strengthen Pavelić and his accomplices”⁴⁵. It also states: “By saying that, he collaborated with the occupier and native traitors, politically and culturally, and committed a crime from Art. 2 of the Decision on the protection of national consciousness of Croats and Serbs in Croatia of 24 April 1945, no. 1057/4.”⁴⁶

The same “Decision”, under section “Details on the crime”, quotes segments of the Bishop’s speech in the Split cathedral on the occasion of the celebration of the third anniversary of the NDH (10 April 1944), during the solemn “Te deum”. The following has been quoted from Bonifačić’s speech: “Wittingly or unwittingly, many did not understand the sign of the time, did not feel the duty and need of every Croat, to hear the historical call of the Croatian people for their independent and free life in the national state...

...Only now, after the three ominous years, we are able to celebrate the anniversary of the founding of Croatia...

...We should be proud of our homeland, our state, founded as a result of work of the selfless great Leader; it is our only political refuge, our real Croatian life, our resurrection, that is, our survival, development and every progress among nations and in the community with other nations...

...We can and may, today in the cradle of the Croatian state, thank God’s providence for the establishment of the Croatian national state...

...For that purpose, we have gathered here in the oldest temple, where the first Croats must have been christened...into which entered, with their suites, the princes, viceroys and kings of Croatia...

...And on this historic solemn anniversary I, although worthless, have the great and holy honour, as the Bishop of Split, formerly of Solin, an heir to the throne of the Archbishop – the Primate of Dalmatia and the whole Croatia, to address the Almighty, before you, with this prayer: Thank you, Almighty God, for all the good that you gave our Croatian people in the past, and especially now for the founding of our own national state. Guard it and preserve it forever; and to that end, enlighten and strengthen its Leader and his assistants.”⁴⁷

⁴⁴ ZKRZ, HDA, Zagreb, box 685, doc. no. 10/45

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

After the quotes from the Bishop's speech, there was the section "Exposition": "Dr. Bonifačić delivered this speech in the St. Domnius Cathedral, in his words, the oldest Catholic and Croatian temple, on the occasion of the celebration of the third anniversary of the NDH, in front of the congregation gathered, before the service. He spoke as the Bishop of Split, dressed in the bishop's robe. Moreover, he spoke as an heir to the Primate of Dalmatia and the whole of Croatia. Thus, he put on a false authority of the representative of the Church and the people, in order make his speech even more significant and effective, ruthlessly using his high position in the Church and the religious feelings of the people. He fully supported the NDH, the German and traitor creation, the creation that was shameful and bloody; and he fully sympathised with the Ustasha movement. In his prayer, he addressed God, but in reality he addressed the people, for Pavelić and his bloody accomplices - Luburić, Vignević, Budak and other numerous plunderers and mercenaries.

This Commission therefore finds Dr. Kvirin Klement Bonifačić guilty of the above presented criminal act."⁴⁸

The speech was taken as evidence, which was published in full in "Spremnost"[ital], [put in footnote] on 30 April 1945, under the title: "Our Own Political Refuge". The aggravating circumstance for the Bishop was the fact that his speech from 1944 had been published in "Spremnost" [ital.] only eight days before the Partisans entered Zagreb. T. Mortigijja, at the time the director and editor-in-chief of "Spremnost", and Z. Petrak, the executive editor of "Spremnost", were declared accomplices of Dr. Kvirin Klement Bonifačić. The first "Decision" presented clearly shows the basic approach to the work of the Polling Commission, when the Bishop was declared a criminal based on a single speech.

"Decision" on Dr. Ljudevit Jurak – a university professor

The "Decision" on the establishment of "crime" of the university professor Ljudevit Jurak is especially interesting.⁴⁹ Professor Jurak was a member of the International Commission for the investigation of the mass slaughter in Vinica (the Ukraine) committed by Soviets on the local population there. When the research was completed, Jurak issued an article in "Hrvatski narod"[ital.] of 25 May 1943, [place in footnote], under the title "Mass Graves in Vinica". Based on that article and the photograph published (in the opinion of the Polling Commission) "of tendentious character", the Polling Commission accused him of "intentional and malevolent propaganda against the amicable Soviet Russia, and thus indirectly against the interests of our people."⁵⁰ Regarding the International Commission, the Polling

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ ZKRZ, HDA, Zagreb, box 685, doc.no. 17/45

⁵⁰ Ibid.

Commission found that its “task was to blame the amicable Soviet Russia for the mass slaughter in Vinica.”⁵¹

Furthermore, the “Decision” analyses Jurak’s text in every word. Namely, the International Commission found that the mass slaughter of the Ukrainian peasants happened before the war, in 1938 or 1939. That was based on the findings, including the state of decomposition of corpses, the density of the earth in the pits and the state of the vegetation (fern). Taking into account the years of the massacre, and the words of the local population, Soviet Russia was blamed for the massacre. Because of such a conclusion of the International Commission, the Polling Commission stated that the accused Professor Jurak was guilty of the crimes described. He was blamed for the alleged deluding of peasants, because he wrote in his article that that was a “horrible example of what the Bolsheviks were preparing for all peasant peoples that would find themselves under their rule.”⁵²

According to the documents preserved, the proceedings against Professor Jurak continued in such a way that the “Decision” was delivered to the Military Court of the Command of the City of Zagreb, with the proposal that the accused should be arrested “because of the possibility of escape.”⁵³ After that, the OZN [spell out = Department for Protection of the People] of Zagreb summoned Professor Jurak to appear on 15 August 1945 at 10 a.m. in room number 10, in order to give some information, and to bring his personal documents with him. The OZN’s summons (in the bottom) stated also that “unless the person acted as instructed, he would be taken in by the guards.”⁵⁴

The OZN’s summons would not be that significant – because many of the investigated by the Polling Commission received it – if on the same date, on 15th August 1945, the report did not arrive from the Military Court of the Command of the City of Zagreb saying that Professor Jurak had been executed by firing squad on 10 June 1945, two months before the “Decision” was written. It has not been clarified whether the Polling Commission knew of Professor Jurak’s execution, and still wrote the “Decision”, and if so, what was the reason for that. Nevertheless, the documents clearly show that Professor Jurak was executed by firing squad. It is also necessary to emphasise that forty-five years later (in the 1990s), the USSR admitted to the crimes in Katyn and Vinica.⁵⁵

“Decision” on Ivo Bogdan – a journalist

The “Decision” speaks of the “crime” of Ivo Bogdan “a journalist, general director of propaganda and the Ustasha commissioner for the press”, who was

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid., OZN’s summon.

⁵⁵ *Tko je tko u NDH /Who is Who in NDH/* (Zagreb: Minerva, 1997), p. 175

also the editor-in-chief of “Hrvatski narod” and “Spremnost”.⁵⁶ In the section “Short description and qualification of the crime”, Bogdan was described as follows: “Ivo Bogdan was one of the pillars of the Ustasha-Nazi propaganda throughout the occupation, he was writing daily political articles, delivering speeches and lectures on the radio, where he was always unscrupulously and malevolently haranguing against the People’s Liberation Movement and the allies. He was stirring up national hatred between Serbs and Croats, calling for a fight to the extinction on Germany’s side, with which Croatia was to stand and fall. Thus, he deliberately and malevolently assisted the enemy in pursuing the plan to destroy the people of Yugoslavia and incited mass atrocities /Art. 3 of the Decree on Military Courts/.”⁵⁷

The “Details on the crime” further in the text of the “Decision” lists seventy-five articles, speeches and lectures, which “confirm the deliberate and malevolent assistance to the occupier”. Then followed the conclusion: “This Commission therefore finds Bogdan Ivo guilty of the above listed criminal acts.”⁵⁸

On the basis of the post-war operation of the repressive Communist system, one can presume that Bogdan would have most probably shared Professor Jurak’s destiny had he been arrested in 1945. But, after the fall of the NDH, Bogdan managed to leave Croatia and find refuge in Argentina, where he lived until he died in 1971.⁵⁹

“Decision” on Tias Mortigjija – a journalist

Tias Mortigjija was a professor, and during the war, served as a journalist and the executive editor of “Hrvatski narod” and “Spremnost”.⁶⁰ In the “Short description and qualification of the crime”, the Polling Commission accused Mortigjija, as in Ivo Bogdan’s case, of “stirring up national hatred between Serbs and Croats and inciting fighting spirit among the deluded Croatian masses.”⁶¹

In the end, the commission concluded: “Thus, he deliberately and malevolently assisted the enemy in pursuing the plan to destroy the people and Yugoslavia, and incited the commission of mass atrocities against our people / Art. 13 of the Decree on Military Courts of 5 May 1944/.”⁶² As an evidence of that “crime,” they took thirty-seven articles, which were listed in the “Details on the crime”. In the “Decision”, each article was listed under a separate number, with a short explanation on what Mortigjija wrote in the article.

⁵⁶ ZKRZ, HDA, Zagreb, box 686, doc.no. 85/45

⁵⁷ Ibid..

⁵⁸ Ibid .

⁵⁹ *Tko je tko u NDH*, p. 43. Allegedly killed by the Yugoslav secret police.

⁶⁰ ZKRZ, HDA, Zagreb, box 686, doc.no. 108/45

⁶¹ Ibid .

⁶² Ibid .

For example;

“16./‘Ideology of the new Serbia’/ ‘Spremnost’ issue 27 of 30 August 1942, pp. 1,2 /: Serbs, under Yugoslav pretence, want to trick Croats and create a Greater Serbia.

17./‘Croatia’s reality’/ ‘Spremnost’ issue 41 of 6 December 1942, p. 2 /: The Ustasha movement is the enemy of Communism, its only opponent in the field...

21./‘Causes of Serbian tragedy’/ ‘Spremnost’ issue 46 of 10 January 1943, p. 1 /: Greater Serbian imperialism, also in the form of Yugoslavia, brings Serbs into unavoidable conflict with Croats and other nations. That’s why they lived to see their national and political tragedy...

34./‘Crisis, agony, death...’/ ‘Hrvatski narod’ issue 807 of 30 May 1943, p. 3 /: Speaks about the unavoidable fall of Yugoslavia as an artificial unsustainable Greater Serbian creation...

36./‘Ideologist of our national Europeanism’/ ‘Hrvatski narod’ issue 962 of 18 February 1944, p. 3 /: An apotheosis of the well-known traitor Milan Šufflay as a protagonist of Croatia’s Ustasha fight and movement.”⁶³

The clerk in this “Decision” of the Polling Commission was Dr. Josip Krmpotić; and it was completed on 4 July 1945. After the fall of the NDH, Mortigijja managed to leave for Austria, but the English military authorities arrested him in 1946 and extradited him to Yugoslavia, where he was sentenced to death and executed in October 1947.⁶⁴

The “Decision” on Mortigijja and the one on Bogdan contain almost identical accusations of “stirring up hatred among the fraternal peoples”, and the characteristic of all “Decisions” of the Polling Commission was a markedly emotional and negative approach to the persons who were held “guilty of cultural collaboration with the enemies”. With such biased presumption, the faith of almost all arrested was sealed with their initial characterisation of their “guilt”.

“Decision” on Vatroslav Murvar – a journalist

The “Decision” on Vatroslav Murvar⁶⁵, a journalist, is interesting because, in the “Short description and qualification of the crime”, he was accused of being a war criminal.⁶⁶ He was accused of “Betraying the people, inciting

⁶³ Ibid. .

⁶⁴ *Tko je tko u NDH*, p. 282 [entire citation not necessary].

⁶⁵ The lexicon *Who Is Who in NDH* does not contain any biographical data on Vatroslav Murvar. The biographical data on Murvar were obtained from Dr. Jere Jareb.

When the NDH collapsed, Murvar found refuge in Italy, from where he moved to the USA in 1955, earning his doctor’s degree in sociology at the University of Wisconsin. He died in the mid-1990’s. During the NDH, he wrote the book *Na izvorima neistina /At the Sources of Lies/*, published by “Mala knjižnica Matice Hrvatske”.

⁶⁶ ZKRZ, HDA, Zagreb, box 688, doc.no. 261/45

slaughters, murders and plunders, arrests, mass torturing in camps, organising of armed fight against the allies, military and political collaboration and serving under the occupier.”⁶⁷

In the section “Details on the crime”, there are listed Murvar’s four texts, on the basis of which he was found guilty. In the file of the “Decision”, there is also a letter to the Public Prosecutor for the city of Zagreb suggesting that the accused be “arrested, because of the risk of his escape or hiding.”⁶⁸ It is not really clear why the letter was sent, because under the section “Criminal” containing Murvar’s identification data, under “Last residence” there was written: “Zagreb, presently in flight.”⁶⁹

Apart from the letter to the Public Prosecutor, there is also a letter addressed to the OZN, requesting that the procedure of property sequestration be launched⁷⁰. Similar letters, requests for property sequestration, can be found in most of the “Decisions” on those accused, who at that time were inaccessible to Yugoslavia’s repressive system.

These five “Decisions” presented are very similar, and can be taken as show-pieces for other “Decisions” of the Polling Commission. One can easily notice that the “Decisions” were being written in an ideologised language, which shows the Polling Commission’s aversion for persons of different opinion. The most commonly used ideologised sentences included the following phrases: “spread enemy propaganda”, “stirred up national hatred between Serbs and Croats”, “malevolently and intentionally disseminated propaganda against the amicable Soviet Russia”, “incited slaughters, murders, plunder”, “glorified the Ustasha movement and Pavelić”, and many others. Besides that, all the “Decisions” have the same conclusion. Namely, in every “Decision”, the accused was found “guilty of the crime”, which means that they were held to be criminals because of their “cultural collaboration with the enemy”.

One can find numerous irregularities in the “Decisions”, in terms of orthography, but also in terms of the content and logics, such as those in case of Professor Jurak (confusion with the dates) and Vatroslav Murvar (request for taking him in order to prevent escape, when he was already in flight).

But, the most significant in every “Decision” is the word “Criminal” on the first page of a “Decision”, on top. Together with that word stands the name and surname of the person, and other identification data, which shows us, without having to read other sections of the “Decision”, that all persons processed by the Polling Commission were considered to be criminals even before their “guilt” was proven, or before the incriminations or the criminal acts they were charged with were substantiated.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

Questionnaires

Other documents, which are preserved in the archive boxes, speak of the Polling Commission's attitude towards Croatian intellectuals. This primarily applies to the Polling Commission's letters to educational and cultural institutions instructing them to fill in the "Questionnaires".

In its annual report (presented in page 9), the Polling Commission says that the letters instructing that the "Questionnaires" be filled in were sent to thirty-six cultural institutions in Zagreb.⁷¹ The figure of thirty-six cultural institutions is incorrect (probably a typing error). A document from 14 June 1945 says that the letter was sent to ninety-six educational and cultural institutions in Zagreb.⁷² Such letter consisted of the "Questionnaire" and the request that the educational and cultural institutions copy the "Questionnaire", depending on the number of employees, and that all employees fill in the form. The letter also included the request that the educational and cultural institutions return, as soon as possible, to the Polling Commission (at Margaretska 1/4) the filled in "Questionnaires", all editions (books, magazines, etc.) issued in the period between 1941 – 1945, as well as the minutes from all sessions held in that period. The letter with such requests reached all ninety-six institutions on the list. Apart from the cultural and scientific institutions, schools and institutes, and cultural, sports, choral associations and folklore clubs, the letter was also sent to hospitals, sanatoriums (Srebrenjak, Sanatorium for Nervous Diseases Zelengaj), "Society of Widows and Independent Women", "Germany's Friends Society" and many others.⁷³

According to the available documentation, some institutions were surprised at the letter. For example, "Sanatorium Srebrenjak" was surprised at the request for the material on its personnel, being a medical institution in which, during the NDH, surgeries and child-births had been carried out, so that they returned the letter to the Polling Commission with the question whether it really applied to them⁷⁴. There were other various cases, such as of "Germany's Friends Society", where the letter was returned with the remark that the Society no longer existed.⁷⁵

However, a large majority of institutions responded to the letter and filled in the "Questionnaires" consisting of thirteen questions.

On top of the sheet, there was the inscription "Cultural Institution", by which the name of the institution was to be entered on the empty lines. Under that followed the inscription written in upper case "QUESTIONNAIRE",

⁷⁰ Ibid .

⁷¹ ZKRZ, HDA, box 689, f.B/1946 (1-59), doc. no. 50/46

⁷² ZKRZ, HDA, box 685, doc. no. 12/45

⁷³ Ibid. The exact list of institutions [incomplete sentence].

⁷⁴ ZKRZ, HDA, box 685, doc. no. 24/45

⁷⁵ ZKRZ, HDA, box 685, doc. no. 12/45, U.Z.O. 51

and in lower case under the inscription there was written “for members and associates of the above mentioned institution”.

The first three questions were of identification type (name and surname, place and year of birth, and nationality). The fourth question referred to the occupation and the official position before 6 April 1941, and the fifth - to the occupation and the official position during the war, until 9 May 1945. The sixth question was about the family status, and the seventh about one's income. The purpose of the eighth question was to obtain data on the respondent's publications and other public works, and of the ninth question – on public lectures, exhibitions, events, etc., in which the respondent had taken part during the war.

The tenth question was about the decorations received during the war. The eleventh question was: “Was the person a member of the Ustasha or any other fascist organisation?”; and the twelfth: “Did he collaborate with or help in any manner the People's Liberation Movement?” Under number thirteen, there was a space for remarks, and in the bottom of the sheet, there was a warning: “any passing over in silence or incorrect data shall be considered a criminal act”.

In the bottom right corner of the “Questionnaire” there was a space for the respondent's signature, and on the back, a space for the “Institution's reports and remarks”, where the director or the manager of an institution was to give characteristics of the respondents. Sometimes, the characteristics were given in one word only – such as “anti-fascist”, and sometimes explanations were as long as several lines. In the end of the “Questionnaire” there was space for the seal of the institution and of its official representative.

Many institutions, especially schools, asked for more “Questionnaires”. For example, “The State Secondary Modern School for Boys” asked for twenty more “Questionnaires”⁷⁶, and the “State Secondary Technical School” asked for fifty-five additional copies.⁷⁷ As some institutions did not have the capacity to copy the “Questionnaires”, and did not receive a sufficient number of copies from the Polling Commission, many “Questionnaires” were re-typed or re-written in the respondent's handwriting, which means that the respondents first had to re-write the questions from the original “Questionnaire” and then answer them.

The filled-in sheets contain many interesting and significant answers. For example, the answer of Prof. Josip Zlatolas from the Primary School in Zagreb (Nova cesta) to question number 10 (about the decorations during the occupation). His answer was: “Despite of my express opposition, decorated for civil merits”⁷⁸.

Very similar is the “Questionnaire” of Dr. Blaž Jurišić, a lecturer at the “College of Education”, who had received the first-degree order with the star, but he also noted that he had not received the order officially, but

⁷⁶ ZKRZ, HDA, box 685, doc. no. 37/45

⁷⁷ ZKRZ, HDA, box 685, doc. no. 42/45

⁷⁸ ZKRZ, HDA, box 686, doc. no. 93/45

from “the college janitor, at the last moment”⁷⁹. On the back of Dr. Zlatolas’ “Questionnaire” there is a remark under “Institution’s reports and remarks”, in which the Head of the University, Dr. Danilo Medaković⁸⁰ wrote: “As an old follower of the ideas of the Party of Rights, he seems to have been close to the Croatian idea during the NDH, but he was surely opposing those bloody methods. What he wrote in the last four years shows his mentality of a Starčević’s follower, but he opposed the Germanophile views. He rejected the professorship at the University that was offered to him. There is no basis for accusing him of being a fascist accomplice”⁸¹.

The remarks on the majority of the “Questionnaires” must have had special value and weight for the Polling Commission, because they had been written by the persons appointed by the Yugoslav authorities in the end of the war to the highest positions at the cultural and educational institutions in Zagreb. In such way, those persons practically were holding in their own hands the destiny of their colleagues and associates, who were being threatened with punishments, ranging from executions to expulsion from work, as well as general status degradation and marginalisation in the society of those times. Therefore, it is interesting to mention several examples, which show the ways in which the heads of institutions were labelling their subordinates.

“Questionnaires” of the “State Third Secondary Modern School for Girls”

The teachers from the “State Third Secondary Modern School for Girls” filled in thirty-seven “Questionnaires” and sent them to the Polling Commission on 22 June 1945⁸². The temporary Headmistress of the School, Z. Tiljak, wrote remarks for every teacher.

For example, Professor Anđelka Kaić wrote in her “Questionnaire”, that during the war she had been publishing the text “In the Calendar of St. Anthony 1941 – 1943”, while the sections on public lectures and exhibitions, as well as on the affiliation with a fascist and Ustasha organisation, or collaboration with the People’s Liberation Movement, remained empty. The Headmistress, , [I think it is too repetitive to always include her name] wrote the following remark on Professor Kaić: “unmistakably clerical fascist”, and that she had been “lecturing at the courses for Ustasha high female officials, or something similar” and that she was “a mediocre teacher”⁸³.

⁷⁹ ZKRZ, HDA, box 686, doc. no. 94/45

⁸⁰ As above. The “Questionnaire” of Dr. Danilo Medaković shown that he was born in 1890 in Gračac, a Serb, and that by 10 April 1941 he was the headmaster of the State Fourth Modern Secondary School for Boys in Zagreb, and that he was pensioned already on 15 May 1941. In early June 1941, he fled from Zagreb, but still found himself in an Italian camp. In June 1944 he joined NOB, and became the head of University.

⁸¹ ZKRZ, HDA, box 686., doc. no. 94/45

⁸² ZKRZ, HDA, box 685, doc. no. 46/45

⁸³ Ibid.

Professor Kata Tijardović wrote in her “Questionnaire” that during the war she had been lecturing on Ante Starčević for the pupils as “instructed” and at the request of an inspector of the Ministry of Education, and that she had not been a member of the Ustasha or any other fascist organisation. The answer to the question if she assisted NOP was “no”. The Headmistress wrote the following about Professor Tijardović: “In terms of ideology, she was an Ustasha, but she was honest and did not harm anybody, neither did she have any material gain, and she lives in difficult material circumstances”⁸⁴.

Professor Zdenka Lorković’s answer to the questions on public lectures, decorations, affiliation to an Ustasha or fascist organisation, and co-operation with NOP was “no”. The Headmistress added: “Politically undeveloped. Sympathised with the Ustasas for family reasons, did not harm anybody, saved many of the persecuted.”⁸⁵

About Professor Pavao Fijan, she wrote: “Ustasha, smuggler, able, but lazy.”⁸⁶

“Questionnaires” of the “State Central Vocational School”

At the State Central Vocational School, thirty-nine “Questionnaires” were filled in.⁸⁷ The Headmaster, J. Pandić, wrote remarks about his colleagues .

For example, for Professor Zlatko Oltman, Pandić, wrote: “A Germanophile, in the beginning, believed in Germany’s victory, and considered that to be the only positive outcome for our nation and the others. He never harmed anybody personally. Since mid- 1944, he has completely changed his opinion. A good teacher and did not exert a bad influence on children.”⁸⁸

Regarding Professor Josip Ondres, the Headmaster , said: “Follower of Radić’s ideas, right wing, was not related with reactionaries surrounding Maček. As a teacher, good and accurate.”⁸⁹

About Professor Milivoj Baltar, Pandić, wrote: “sympathiser of NOP”⁹⁰

About Professor Ernest Burčibašić, he wrote: “Follower of Maček’s ideas, centre, was not collaborating with Maček during the occupation. Condemned Ustasha and German atrocities.”⁹¹

It should also be mentioned that some temporary headmasters did not write their remarks under “Institution’s reports and remarks”, as was the case of the “Croatian Engineers’ Society”, where 210 questionnaires were filled

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ ZKRZ, HDA, box 687, doc. no. 200/45

⁸⁸ As above.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Ibid .

in.⁹² There were also cases where the “Questionnaires” were not being filled in at all, for example at the “Primary Mixed School”, where the temporary Headmistress, Danica Franki, returned the letter to the Polling Commission with the following explanation: “As there were no such collaborators at this school, I am returning to the addressee these forms as unnecessary.”⁹³

Faculty of Philosophy

The example of the Faculty of Philosophy can serve as an illustration of the repressiveness of the Polling Commission against a university-level educational institution. The faculties of the University of Zagreb were of special importance for the Yugoslav Communist authorities for one reason: the new state needed to create its own cadre of intellectuals of Marxist orientation, who would be able to fulfil the task of “educating of masses for the socialist system.”⁹⁴ The Faculty of Philosophy was to play an important role in that, as it was creating the teaching cadre, who would be in direct contact with young generations through the schools. To that end, the Yugoslav authorities decided to eliminate from the facilities all the democratically orientated professors, and of course those who participated in the NDH power structures.

The Administration of the Faculty of Philosophy had to deliver to the Polling Commission all editions (books, magazines, etc.) as well as the minutes from the sessions held between 1941 and 1945, and the professors had to fill in the “Questionnaires”.⁹⁵ The Faculty of Philosophy sent to the Polling Commission 45 filled-in “Questionnaires”.⁹⁶ The Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy was Dr. Antun Barac, and the remarks on the colleagues were written by Dr. Nikola Majnarić.

For example, for Dr. Barac he wrote: “nationally and politically correct, maintained relations with relatives - Partisans”⁹⁷, and for Dr. Miho Barada, “opponent of Ustashas.”⁹⁸ For Dr. Albert Bazala, Dr. N. Majnarić wrote: “ideologically propagated NOP”⁹⁹, and for Dr. Rudolf Cesarac “protected people”¹⁰⁰. Dr. Zvonimir Dugački was, in Dr. Majnarić’s words, an “Ustasha sympathiser”, while Dr. Đuro Kurepa was “an unmistakable anti-fascist.”¹⁰¹ For Dr. Antun Mayer, he wrote “unmistakably inclined to Germans,”¹⁰²,

⁹² ZKRZ, HDA, box 689, f. A/1945., doc. no. 312/45

⁹³ ZKRZ, HDA, box 685, doc. no. 37/45

⁹⁴ B.Kašić, title [what is title], p. 246

⁹⁵ Editions of the Faculty of Philosophy and the minutes from the Faculty sessions are not stored in the boxes with the archive material.

⁹⁶ ZKRZ, HDA, box 686, doc. no. 119/45

⁹⁷ As above.

⁹⁸ As above.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ibid.

and for Dr. Ljudevit Hauptman he wrote: “before NDH – untihitlerite, during NDH lectured in Vienna and Graz”¹⁰³. According to Dr. Majnarić, Dr. Oppitz was “a clericalist, but a hard-working employee without the Ustasha characteristics.”¹⁰⁴ Regarding Dr. Grga Novak, Dr. Majnarić wrote: “anti-fascist, was in a camp, connections with NOP”¹⁰⁵.

Filling in “Questionnaires” and writing remarks (about a dozen presented here) was a regular practice in the testing of the teaching staff in other university-level educational institutions as well.

Apart from filling up the “Questionnaires”, the Faculty of Philosophy had to cope with a purge among the professors. They received “the list of the teaching staff and assistant teaching staff, who had come to the Faculty of Philosophy after 10 April 1941, and pursuant to the AVNOJ decision dated 3 February 1945, no. 132 were to be expelled from the Faculty.”¹⁰⁶[where is beginning of quote?] In other words, all those professors, who were employed after 10 April 1941, were dismissed.

There were twenty-eight persons on the list:

Professors: Dr. Mihovil Kombol, Dr. Josip Matasović, Dr. Ljudevit Barić, Dr. Rudolf Horvat, Dr. Slavko Ježić, Dr. Fran Škulje, Dr. Marin Katalinić

Readers: Dr. Mirko Šeper

Senior Lecturers: Dr. Karlo Kempni, Dr. Veljko Gortan, Dr. Tonko Šoljan, Dr. Ivan Bach, Dr. Jaroslav Šidak, Dr. Zoran Bujas

Assiatants: Dr. Ljudevit Jonke, Milan Ratković, Vladimir Miroslavljević, Dr. Emil Štampar, Dr. Radovan Domac, Josip Jernej, Dr. Branimir Marković, Milivoj Sironić, Štefica Štrkanec, Stjepan Hosu, Nada Klaić, Milan Mihailinović, Alma Usmiani, Karmela Žulj.

After this intervention, the Faculty of Philosophy, as an educational institutions and one of the focal points of the formation of Croatian consciousness, was seriously deteriorated, both quantitatively and qualitatively, and was then able to serve the purpose of the Yugoslav Communist authorities.

Some of the teachers from that list were subsequently returned to the Faculty of Philosophy, for example: Šidak, Bujas, Jonke, Sironić and Klaić.

Conclusion

The work of the Polling Commission, which was establishing of “crimes of cultural collaboration with the enemy”, can be presented as the work with two tasks and one aim. The first task was to declare criminals those who had participated in various NDH power structures, and who had been directly or indirectly promoting the NDH through their cultural work (articles

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

and texts in various printed media, public speeches or on the radio, books, exhibitions, paintings, concerts, etc.). The other task was, by means of various methods of pressure and the creation of an atmosphere of fear, to warn all Croatian intellectuals, who had not participated in the power structures of the NDH, (and had been working at schools, institutes, various cultural institutions, hospitals, etc.), that unlike-mindedness would not be tolerated in the new state. And thus, only in the Zagreb area, which is covered by this text, the Polling Commission found 176 persons guilty of “cultural collaboration with the enemy”; fifty-four reports were sent to the Public Prosecutor because of the violation of the national honour, and hundreds of “Questionnaires” were filled in. Those very “Questionnaires”, which were addressed to educational and cultural institutions, tested all intellectuals, created the atmosphere of fear, and served as a warning to Croatian intellectuals. Such work of the Polling Commission gave rise to various forms of repression of the Yugoslav Communist authorities (staged court proceedings, loss of job, imprisonment, and even executions).

Apart from the city of Zagreb, the pressure on Croatian intellectuals spread over the whole of Croatian territory through the District Polling Commissions, which the Polling Commission had had established with the same task and the same aim as its own.

Translated by Ida Jurković

Die Tätigkeit der Enqueten-Kommission 1945 in Zagreb

“Ermittlung von den durch kulturelle Zusammenarbeit mit dem Feind verschuldeten Verbrechen”

Zusammenfassung

In diesem sich hauptsächlich auf Archivdokumenten stützenden Beitrag wird die Tätigkeit der Enqueten-Kommission im Jahre 1945 in Zagreb dargestellt. Die Enqueten-Kommission befasste sich mit der Ermittlung von den durch kulturelle Zusammenarbeit mit dem Feind verschuldeten Verbrechen. Das bedeutete, dass jede Person zum Feind erklärt werden konnte, die während des Bestehens des Unabhängigen Staates Kroatien (NDH) im kulturellen oder wissenschaftlichen Bereich tätig war oder öffentliche Reden hielt.

