

FRANJO IVANIČEK – LIJEČNIK, ANTROPOLOG I RASNI HIGIJENIČAR

FRANJO IVANIČEK – PHYSICIAN, ANTHROPOLOGIST AND RACIAL HYGIENIST

Ana Solter

Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu
Trg Nikole Šubića Zrinskog 19
HR – 10000 Zagreb
asolter@amz.hr

Ana Solter

Archaeological Museum in Zagreb
Trg Nikole Šubića Zrinskog 19
HR – 10000 Zagreb
asolter@amz.hr

UDK / UDC: 572-05 Ivaniček, F.
Izvorni znanstveni rad / Original scientific paper
<https://doi.org/10.52064/vamz.54.1.29>

Ovaj rad prati profesionalnu i znanstvenu karijeru Franje Ivaničeka, prvog bioarheologa u Hrvatskoj. U vrijeme Drugog svjetskoga rata ustaški poručnik Ivaniček školovao se na Institutu cara Wilhelma za antropologiju, znanost o ljudskom nasljeđivanju i eugeniku u Berlinu, mjestu stvaranja većine znanstvenih teorija nacističke eugenike i rasne higijene. Provodi rasistička antropološka istraživanja u skladu sa službenom rasnom politikom NDH, što ga 1944. godine dovodi na poziciju rukovoditelja Hrvatskog državnoga antropološkog zavoda u Zagrebu. Nakon rata, postaje voditelj Antropološkog odsjeka Biološkog zavoda na Medicinskom fakultetu Sveučilišta u Zagrebu te mijenja znanstveni diskurs u proučavanje geneze među staroslavenskom i suvremenom populacijom Jugoslavije kako bi opovrgnuo njemačke i mađarske znanstvene teorije o naseljavanju Nijemaca i Avara na teritoriju Jugoslavije.

Ključne riječi:

Franjo Ivaniček, NDH, antropologija, Bijelo Brdo, Ptuj, KWI-A

This paper focuses on the professional and scientific career of Franjo Ivaniček, the first bioarchaeologist in Croatia. During World War II Ivaniček, an Ustaša Lieutenant, was educated at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Genetics and Eugenics in Berlin (KWI-A), place of birth of most scientific theories of Nazi eugenics and racial hygiene. He conducted racist anthropological research following the official racial policy of the Independent State of Croatia (NDH), thus becoming the head of the Croatian State Anthropological Institute in Zagreb in 1944. After the war, he became the head of the Anthropological Department of the Institute of Biology at the School of Medicine of the University of Zagreb. Ivaniček completely changed the scientific discourse of study of the genesis of the Old Slavic and modern Yugoslav populations to refute German and Hungarian scientific theories of German and Avar settlement in Yugoslavia.

Key words:

Franjo Ivaniček, NDH, anthropology, Bijelo Brdo, Ptuj, KWI-A

Uvod ¹

Franjo Ivaniček (Dapci kraj Čazme, 18. 1. 1906 – Michigan, Sjedinjene Američke Države, 23. 6. 1974.), antropolog, etnolog i liječnik, prvi je bioarheolog u Hrvatskoj koji istražuje modernog čovjeka. Objavio je dva opširna rada na tu temu: *Istraživanje nekropole ranog srednjeg vijeka u Bijelom Brdu i Staroslavenska nekropola u Ptuju, rezultati antropoloških istraživanja*.² Njegovo kratko djelovanje u antropološkoj disciplini, bez nekog širega znanstvenog odjeka, gotovo je u potpunosti zaboravljeno.³ Ivaniček je nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata vodio prva sustavna iskopavanja groblja

Introduction ¹

Franjo Ivaniček (Dapci, near Čazma, 18/01/1906 – Michigan, United States of America, 23/06/1974), anthropologist, ethnologist and physician, was the first bioarchaeologist in Croatia to research modern man. He published two extensive papers on the subject: *Istraživanje nekropole ranog srednjeg vijeka u Bijelom Brdu* (Excavation of the early-medieval cemetery at Bijelo Brdo) and *Staroslavenska nekropola u Ptuju: Rezultati antropoloških istraživanja* (Old Slavic cemetery in Ptuj: Results of anthropological research).² His brief work in the anthropological discipline,

¹ Zahvaljujem se profesoru emeritusu Mitji Guštinu jer me potaknuo u pisanju ovog rada i prof. dr. sc. Rajni Šošić-Klindžić na pomoći.

² Ivaniček 1949; 1951.

³ Rajić Šikanjić 2005,764; Šlaus 2006, 18; 2009, 142.

¹ I would like to thank Professor Emeritus Mitja Guštin for encouraging me to write this paper. I sincerely appreciate the guidance of Prof. Rajna Šošić-Klindžić.

² Ivaniček 1949; 1951.

ranoga srednjeg vijeka na području Hrvatske, Slovenije i Srbije kako bi antropološki dokazao genezu između staroslavenske i suvremene populacije Jugoslavije i opovrgnuti njemačke i mađarske znanstvene argumente o naseljavanju Nijemaca i Avara na teritoriju Jugoslavije. Etnogenetska istraživanja u pretpovijesnoj i ranosrednjovjekovnoj arheologiji dominantna su u Jugoslaviji nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata.⁴ Ivaniček se prije 1946. godine nije zanimao za arheologiju. Tijekom Drugoga svjetskog rata provodio je antropološke analize suvremenog čovjeka kroz rasnu antropologiju zasnovanu na rasnoj ideologiji Nacional-socijalista u Njemačkoj.⁵ Ivaniček je bio dio kruga znanstvenika, antropologa, etnologa i arheologa (Boris Zarnik, Vladimir Dvorniković, Božo Škerlj, Niko Županić, Stevan Ivanić i Branimir Maleš)⁶ s prostora jugoistočne Europe koji su se ili školovali u Njemačkoj ili bili pod snažnim utjecajem njemačke antropologije koja je uvodila nove ideje eugenike, biološke nejednakosti među ljudima, nordijskih rasnih ideja. Većina je ovih znanstvenika insistirala na biološkom determinizmu kako bi ili Hrvate ili Srbe (time i Jugoslavena) prikazali kao narod čistoga arijejskog porijekla za koje postoji mjesto u „novom europskom poretku“. Ivaniček u radovima, koje objavljuje 1944. i 1945. godine, tvrdi da su muslimani i katolici u Bosni i Hercegovini (BiH) primjeri „najčišćih etničkih naroda i rasni element hrvatske nacije“ te naglašava različitost od Srba u BiH koje smatra pripadnicima „prednjoazijske“ rase (*vorderasiatische Rasse*).⁷ To odgovara ideološkom diskursu Nezavisne Države Hrvatske (NDH) koji se temelji na rasnoj, kulturnoj i socijalnoj razlici između sjedilačkih indoeuropskih Hrvata (dominantnog nordijsko-dinarskog rasnog tipa arijejskog Hrvata) i nomadskih „prednjoazijskih“ Vlaha-Srba, Židova i Roma.⁸ Ivaniček je u svojim radovima predlagao da se na temelju rezultata istraživanja rasnog sastava naroda donesu odgovarajući državotvorni zakoni, podržavajući spregu rasne antropologije i rasne politike. Rasnim teorijama, koje je objavljivao u ustaškom glasilu *Spremnost*, propagirao je ustašku percepciju dominacije arijejskih Hrvata nad tamnoputom prednjoazijskom srpskom rasom.⁹ Međutim, Ivaničekova profesionalna karijera i ideološka predanost rasnoj antropologiji u vrijeme Drugoga svjetskog rata bili su u kontraktornom položaju s njegovim osobnim životom, oženivši se zagrebačkom Židovkom Helenom Herzberger.

without any broader scientific impact, is almost completely forgotten.³ After World War II, Ivaniček conducted the first systematic excavations of early-medieval cemeteries in Croatia, Slovenia and Serbia to anthropologically prove the genesis between the Old Slavic and modern Yugoslav populations and to refute German and Hungarian scientific arguments about the settlement of Germans and Avars in Yugoslavia. Ethnogenetic research in prehistoric and early-medieval archaeology was dominant in Yugoslavia in the period after World War II.⁴ Ivaniček was not interested in archaeology before 1946. During World War II, he conducted anthropological analyses of modern man through racial anthropology based on the racial ideology of the National Socialists in Germany.⁵ Ivaniček was a member of a wider circle of south-eastern European scientists: anthropologists, archaeologists and ethnologists (Boris Zarnik, Vladimir Dvorniković, Božo Škerlj, Niko Županić, Stevan Ivanić and Branimir Maleš)⁶ who were either educated at German racial-science institutes or strongly influenced by German anthropological thinking: eugenics, biological inequalities among people, Nordic racial ideas. Most of these scholars insisted on biological determinism to portray either Croats or Serbs/Yugoslavs as a people of pure Aryan origin for whom there is a place in the ‘new European order’. In his papers, published in 1944 and 1945, Ivaniček claims that Muslims and Catholics in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) are examples of “the purest ethnic peoples and a racial element of the Croatian nation”. He emphasizes the difference from Serbs in BiH, considering them to be members of the ‘Near Eastern’ race (*vorderasiatische Rasse*).⁷ His discourse corresponds to the official racial politics of the Independent State of Croatia (NDH), based on racial, cultural and social differences between settled, warrior Indo-European Croats (dominant Nordic-Dinaric racial type of Aryan Croat) and nomadic Near Eastern peoples, consisting of Vlach-Serbs, Jews and Roma.⁸ In his papers based on the results of research on the racial composition of the people, Ivaniček proposed the enactment of appropriate state-building laws, supporting a combination of racial anthropology and racial politics. With racial theories, which he published in the Ustaša newspaper *Spremnost*, he propagated the Ustaša prehesion of the domination of the Aryan Croat over the dark-skinned Near Eastern Serbian race.⁹ However, Ivaniček’s professional career and ideological commitment to racial anthropology during World War II were in an adversarial position with his personal life, being married to Helena Herzberger, a Jewish woman from Zagreb.

4 Slapšak, Novaković 1996, 288–289.

5 Yeomans 2013, 224; Bartulin 2014, 179–181.

6 Malović 2008; Milosavljević 2012; Bartulin 2014, 71–92.

7 Ivaniček 1944a; 1945.

8 Bartulin 2012, 200.

9 Ivaniček 1944b; 1945.

3 Rajić Šikanjić 2005, 764; Šlaus 2006, 18; 2009, 142.

4 Slapšak, Novaković 1996, 288–289.

5 Yeomans 2013, 224; Bartulin 2014, 179–181.

6 Malović 2008; Milosavljević 2012; Bartulin 2014, 71–92.

7 Ivaniček 1944a; 1945.

8 Bartulin 2012, 200.

9 Ivaniček 1944b; 1945.

Varšava – Zagreb, ustaški pokret

Ivaniček je studirao na Filozofskom fakultetu u Zagrebu, gdje je slušao geografiju (A), etnologiju s etnografijom (B) i narodne historije (C). Diplomirao je 7. listopada 1932. godine Antropogeografsku (XIII.) grupu. Na istome je fakultetu 1936. godine doktorirao tezom *Donje Polonje zapadno od Moslavačke gore (Nekoliko različitih antropoloških opažanja Donjeg Polonja kao prilog poznavanju njihovih rasnih osobina)* kod Milovana Gavazzija i Milana Šenoa.

U antropološkim disciplinama isprva se usavršavao u *Antropološkom laboratoriju Međunarodne sekcije za ispitivanje mekih dijelova tijela u Varšavi*, gdje je boravio nekoliko godina na stipendiji poljske vlade (od 1936.) kod Edwarda Lotha (1884. – 1944.).¹⁰ Loth, medicinar i antropolog, voditelj *Odjela za anatomiju Sveučilišta u Varšavi*, bio je omiljen i cijenjeni znanstvenik te aktivni borac protiv njemačke okupacije u Drugome svjetskom ratu.¹¹ Međutim, 1926. godine Loth je upleten u antisemitski slučaj tzv. pitanje leša (*afera trupia*).¹² Naime, od studenoga 1926. godine na varšavskom je sveučilištu židovskim studentima medicine bilo dopušteno učiti anatomiju samo na mrtvim tijelima židovske populacije, što je, zbog vjerskih razloga, studentima stvaralo velik problem. Studenti su, pak, uspjeli uvjeriti rabina i nabavili osam tijela, ali Loth je broj proglasio nedovoljnim i zabranio židovskim studentima sudjelovanje u nastavi. Loth nije prihvatio niti mišljenje fakultetske komisije koja je naredila da se studentima obiju vjeroispovijedi omogući prisustvovanje disekciji. Dapače, zahtijevao je da se pokrene disciplinski postupak protiv Židova. Cijeli je slučaj trajao nekoliko tjedana te je u konačnici završen zahvaljujući dekanu Jerzyju Modrakowskom (1875. – 1945.) koji je naredio povratak stare odredbe – svi dostupni leševi jednako se dijele među studentima. Loth je u to vrijeme bio jedan od vodećih zagovornika eugenike u Poljskoj.¹³

Dok je boravio u Poljskoj, Ivaniček je stavljen pod policijski nadzor zagrebačke policije.¹⁴ Policija je sumnjala da Ivaničekova zaručnica Helena Herzberger (1911. – 1985.) posjeduje tajnu tiskaru u kojoj tiska separatističku i frankovačku propagandu te da ih uz pomoć zaručnika šalje u inozemstvo. Nju i njezine roditelje, Izidora i Juliju, zagrebačka je policija sumnjivala da su *austrofili*, koji u i van kuće govore njemački jezik te su *neprijateljski raspoloženi prema našem narodu*. Zagrebačka je policijska uprava pokrenula postupak diskretnog praćenja kretanja i rada Franje Ivaničeka pod sumnjom da prima i dijeli u Varšavi separatistički propagandni materijal te je naredeno da se na granici, prilikom ulaska i izlaska u Hrvatsku, izvrši detaljan pretres nad njim i njegovim stvarima. Termin separatisti i frankovci u to doba koristi se generički za sve hrvatske nacionaliste, odnosno sve koji zago-

Warsaw – Zagreb, Ustaša movement

Ivaniček studied at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb: geography (A), ethnology with ethnography (B) and folk history (C). He graduated on 7 October 1932 from the Anthropogeographic (XIII) group. At the same faculty, in 1936, he received his doctorate defending the thesis *Donje Polonje west of Moslavačka Gora (Several different anthropological observations of Donje Polonje as a contribution to the knowledge of their racial characteristics)* under Milovan Gavazzi and Milan Šenoa.

His first specialization in anthropological disciplines was at the *Anthropological Laboratory of the International Soft-Body Examination Section in Warsaw*, where he spent several years (from 1936) on a Polish government scholarship under the supervision of Edward Loth (1884 – 1944).¹⁰ Loth, a physician and anthropologist, head of the *Department of Anatomy at the University of Warsaw*, was a well-renowned and respected scientist and an active fighter against the German occupation in World War II.¹¹ However, in 1926, Loth was involved in an anti-Semitic case of the so-called ‘cadaver affair’ (*afera trupia*).¹² From November 1926, Jewish medical students at the University of Warsaw were allowed to study anatomy only on the dead bodies of the Jewish population, which, for religious reasons, created a big problem for the students. The students managed to persuade the rabbi and procured eight cadavers, but Loth declared the number insufficient. Thus, he forbade Jewish students from participating in classes. Loth did not even accept the opinion of the faculty committee that ordered that students of both denominations be allowed to attend the dissection. On the contrary, he demanded that disciplinary proceedings be instituted against the Jewish students. The whole case lasted several weeks and eventually ended thanks to Dean Jerzy Modrakowski (1875 – 1945). The Dean ordered the return of the old provision: all available corpses shared equally among the students. Loth was one of the leading proponents of eugenics in Poland at the time.¹³

While in Poland, Ivaniček was placed under police surveillance by the Zagreb police.¹⁴ The police suspected Helena Herzberger (1911 – 1985), Ivaniček’s fiancée, of owning a hidden printing house in which she printed separatist and Frankist propaganda, and then distributing it abroad with the help of her fiancé. She and her parents, Izidor and Julija, were suspected by the Zagreb police of being ‘Austrophiles, who speak German in and out of the house and are hostile to our nation’. The Zagreb Police Department initiated unobtrusive monitoring of the movement and business of Franjo Ivaniček on suspicion of receiving and distributing separatist propaganda material in Warsaw. The police additionally ordered an intensive search of his person and

10 Nova Hrvatska 1944.

11 Zaorski 2020.

12 Aleksius 2012, 327–342.

13 Majewski 2016, 275.

14 HR HDA 1354 Režimske i reakcionarne organizacije 1919. – 1941., 949, Uprava policije u Zagrebu šalje Ministarstvu unutrašnjih poslova podatke za Herzberger Helenu i Ivaniček Franju pod sumnjom za širenje separatističkih ideja.

10 Nova Hrvatska 1944.

11 Zaorski 2020.

12 Aleksius 2012, 327–342.

13 Majewski 2016, 275.

14 HR HDA 1354 Regime and Reactionary Organizations 1919 – 1941, 949, the Zagreb Police Administration sends data to the Ministry of Internal Affairs for Herzberger Helena and Ivaniček Franjo on suspicion of spreading separatist ideas.

varaju ideju raskida zajednice sa Srbima. Izvorno se termin odnosio na pristaše Čiste stranke prava Josipa Franka i obnovljene Hrvatske stranke prava koji su zagovarali neprijateljstvo sa Srbima. Iz tih se redova razvija i jača ustaški pokret, hrvatska ultranacionalistička i fašistička organizacija. Ivaniček se nakratko vraća u Zagreb u prosincu 1937. godine, kada je stavljen pod konstantni policijski nadzor, ali nije otkriveno *ništa sumnjivo*. Ivaniček i Herzberger te su se zime vjenčali (9. siječnja 1938.), a Ivaniček se vratio u Varšavu. Međutim, školovanje je morao prekinuti nešto ranije od očekivanog nakon što ga je „neki njegov prijatelj” prijavio kod nadležnog poslanstva u Varšavi da se oženio Židovkom. Nakon povratka iz Poljske u Zagreb, Ivaniček je i dalje pod stalnim policijskim nadzorom.¹⁵

Osnivanjem Nezavisne Države Hrvatske (NDH), marionetske države za vrijeme Drugoga svjetskog rata u okviru poretka sila Osovine, Ivaniček postaje ustaški poručnik. Svoj je utjecaj pokušao upotrijebiti kao garanciju za Heleninu sestru Paulu Herzberger (1906. – ?), glumicu Hrvatskoga narodnog kazališta. P. Herzberger otpuštena je krajem srpnja 1941. godine po *Zakonskoj odredbi o zaštiti narodne i arijske kulture hrvatskog naroda*¹⁶ kojom je *Židovima po rasi* bilo zabranjeno zapošljavanje, pod izlikom da joj „samo“ nije produžen ugovor iako je bila dio stalnog ansambla od 1932. godine.¹⁷ P. Herzberger u svibnju 1941. godine predaje zahtjev za dodjelu arijevske prava, kao i prava oslobođenja nošenja židovskog znaka. U pismu garancije Ivaniček navodi da je P. Herzberger, zajedno sa svojom sestrom Helenom, njegovom suprugom, još početkom 1930. godine pomagala umnažati i raspačavati letke i brošure koje je od tada kao ustaški povjerenik primao od Ustaške organizacije iz Belgije (Liege ustaša Stjepan Milas). Kao dodatan argument, navodi da tijekom kasnijih godina — do povratka iz Poljske 1938. godine — nikada mu P. Herzberger nije odbila ni jednu molbu u vezi raspačavanja i širenja ustaških letaka i novina, pa čak ni onda kad je sam bio uhićen i proganjan. Pismo je potpisao kao *ustaša poručnik Dr. Franjo Ivaniček*.¹⁸

Paula je rat preživjela, čini se, zahvaljujući pomoći svog šogora. Niti ona niti njezina sestra Helena, koja je cijeli rat provela u Zagrebu, nisu doživjele tragičnu sudbinu zagrebačkih Židova koji su većinom, u razdoblju od 1941. do 1943., bili deportirani i odvedeni u logore smrti. Nije poznato da je Helena Herzberger predala zahtjev za dodjelu arijevske prava, ali je očigledno pripadala redu počasnih arijevac. Imala je na to pravo po *Zakonskoj odredbi o rasnoj pripadnosti* točka 6. koja glasi: „Osobama, koje su se prije 10. travnja 1941. iskazale zaslužnima za Hrvatski narod, napose za njegovo oslobođenje, kao i njihovim bračnim drugovima, s kojima su sklopile brak prije stupanja na snagu ove zakonske odredbe i potomcima iz takvog braka, u koliko bi se

belongings at the border when entering and leaving Croatia. At that time, the terms ‘separatists’ and ‘Frankist’ were used generically for all Croatian nationalists, and specifically for all those who advocated the idea of breaking up the community with the Serbs. Originally the term referred to supporters of Josip Frank’s Pure Party of Rights and the renewed Croatian Party of Rights, which both advocated hostility with Serbs. The Ustaša movement, Croatian ultranationalist and fascist organization, developed and strengthened from these ranks. Ivaniček briefly returned to Zagreb in December 1937, when he was under constant surveillance, yet police discovered nothing suspicious. Ivaniček and Herzberger were married that winter (9 January 1938), and Ivaniček returned to Warsaw. After “a friend of his” reported Ivaniček’s marriage to a Jewish woman to the embassy in Warsaw, he was forced to drop out of college earlier than expected. After returning from Poland to Zagreb, Ivaniček was under constant police surveillance.¹⁵

With the founding of NDH, World War II puppet state of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, Ivaniček became an Ustaša lieutenant. He tried to use his influence for Helena’s sister Paula Herzberger (1906 – ?), an actress at the Croatian National Theatre, who was fired at the end of July 1941 under the *Law Decree on the Protection of the National and Aryan Culture of the Croatian People (Zakonska odredba o zaštiti narodne i arijske kulture hrvatskog naroda)*,¹⁶ which prohibited “Jews according to race” from employment, although she had been a member of the permanent ensemble since 1932.¹⁷ In May 1941, P. Herzberger submitted a request for the granting of Aryan rights, as well as the right to exemption from wearing the Jewish badge. Ivaniček states, in the letter of guarantee, that P. Herzberger – together with her sister, and his wife, Helena – helped in the early 1930s to reproduce and distribute leaflets and brochures that he had since received from the Ustaša organization from Belgium (Liege Ustaša Stjepan Milas). In an additional argument, he states that during later years – until his return from Poland in 1938 – P. Herzberger never denied him any favours regarding the distribution and dissemination of Ustaša leaflets and newspapers, even when he was arrested and persecuted. He signed the letter as Ustaša Lieutenant Dr Franjo Ivaniček.¹⁸

It seems that Paula survived the war with the help of her brother-in-law. Neither she nor her sister Helena, who spent the entire war in Zagreb, experienced the tragic fate of the Zagreb Jews, most of whom, in the period from 1941 to 1943, were deported and taken to death camps. It is unknown whether Helena Herzberger applied for Aryan rights, but it is possible that she belonged to the ranks of ‘honorary Aryans’. She could apply for

15 HR HDA 1354 Režimske i reakcionarne organizacije 1919. – 1941., 949, Uprava policije u Zagrebu šalje Ministarstvu unutrašnjih poslova podatke za Herzberger Helenu i Ivaniček Franju pod sumnjom za širenje separatističkih ideja.

16 Narodne novine 1941.

17 Banović 2012, 304, bilj. 1066.

18 HR HDA 252 Ravnateljstvo ustaškog redarstva. Židovski odsjek, 24/1941, 27175, Herzberger Paula – nošenje židovskog znaka, rješenje.

15 HR HDA 1354 Regime and Reactionary Organizations 1919 – 1941, 949, the Zagreb Police Administration sends data to the Ministry of Internal Affairs for Herzberger Helena and Ivaniček Franjo on suspicion of spreading separatist ideas.

16 Narodne novine 1941.

17 Banović 2012, 304, n. 1066.

18 HR HDA 252 Ustaša Police Directorate. Jewish Section, 24/1941, 27175, Herzberger Paula: wearing a Jewish badge, decision.

na te osobe mogla odnositi ova naredba, može poglavar države izvan propisa ove naredbe priznati sva prava, koja pripadaju osobama arijskog podrijetla.¹⁹ Ustaše su za nekolicinu Židova smatrali da posjeduju arijske „duhovne“ karakteristike, što je opravdalo njihovo uključivanje u red počasnih arijevac. Prema članku „Tumačenje rasnih zakonskih odredbi“ u *Hrvatskom narodu* od 3. svibnja 1941. godine, čiji je autor najvjerojatnije biolog Boris Zarnik, sudbina počasnih arijevac bila je potpuna asimilacija u Hrvatski narod.²⁰ U iznimno rijetkim slučajevima ustaše su Židovima dodjeljivali status počasnog arijevac: samo je 100 Židova dobilo legalan status od sveukupno 36000 – 40000 Židova u NDH.²¹ Helena je podržavala ustaški pokret prije rata i borila se za hrvatsku samostalnost te je pripadala „iznimnim pojedincima“ za koje se smatralo da posjeduju dovoljno arijevacih karakteristika za dodjeljivanje počasnog statusa i asimilaciju.²²

Ivaniček u KWI-A

Ivaniček se u vrijeme Drugoga svjetskog rata nije dugo zadržavao u Hrvatskoj. Na daljnje usavršavanje odlazi u zloglasni *Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik* – KWI-A (Institut cara Wilhelma za antropologiju, znanost od ljudskom nasljeđivanju i eugeniku) u Berlinu. KWI-A je osnovan 1927. godine pod vodstvom Eugena Fischera (1874. – 1967.) te je poznat kao mjesto stvaranja većine znanstvenih teorija nacističke eugenike i rasne higijene. Znanstvenici KWI-A dobrovoljno su sudjelovali u zločinima Nacionalne Socijalističke Njemačke na različitim nivoima i funkcijama te su se, kada su u pitanju bili eksperimenti na ljudima u logorima, uključivali u istraživanja isključivo na vlastitu inicijativu:

„Znanstvenici instituta nisu imali problema s provođenjem antropoloških ispitivanja na ljudima kojima je pravo o odlučivanju o sudbini na vlastitim tijelima bilo ili djelomično ili u potpunosti oduzeto: na Sintima i Romima u ‘logorima za prikupljanje cigana’ (Adolf Würth, Brigitte Richter, Eva Justin, Georg Wagner, Karin Magnussen), na Židovima u okupiranom Łódžu (Harry Suchalla, Christian Schneck), na ‘obojenim’ kolonijalnim vojnicima i vojnicima Crvene armije u ratnim zarobljeničkim logorima (Wolfgang Abel, Otto Baader) ili na Židovima, Sintima i Romima u koncentracijskom logoru za istrebljenje u Auschwitzu (Siegfried Liebau, Karin Magnussen).“²³

the position under the *Legal Statute on Race Affiliation*, article 6: “To a person who has proven their service to the Croatian nation, especially to its liberation, as well as their spouses with whom they were joined in matrimony before 10 April 1941 and the descendants of such a marriage, the head of state may recognize, outside the provisions of this legal act, all the rights belonging to a person of Aryan origin”.¹⁹ In official NDH racial politics, there was a position that there existed a small minority of Jews who possessed Aryan ‘spiritual’ characteristics, which justified their inclusion in the ranks of the NDH’s ‘honorary Aryans’. According to an article *Interpretation of the Racial Law Decrees* – probably written by the biologist Boris Zarnik – explaining the Ustaša racial law decrees in *Hrvatski narod*, from 3 May 1941, the fate of the honorary Aryans was to be their complete biological assimilation into the Croat nation.²⁰ The Ustaše granted Jews the status of honorary Aryans in rare cases: only 100 Jews attained this legal status out of a total Jewish population of 36,000–40,000 people.²¹ Helena supported the Ustaša movement before the war, fighting for Croatian independence. She might have been one of the ‘exceptional individuals’ who possessed sufficient Aryan characteristics to be granted honorary status and assimilation.²²

Ivaniček at KWI-A

Ivaniček did not linger in Croatia during World War II. He went to the infamous *Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik* – KWI-A (the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Genetics, and Eugenics) – in Berlin for further training. KWI-A, founded in 1927 under the leadership of Eugen Fischer (1874 – 1967), was the place of creation of most scientific theories of Nazi eugenics and racial hygiene. KWI-A scientists voluntarily participated in the crimes of National Socialist Germany at various levels and functions, and when it came to experiments on people in the camps, they were involved in research solely on their own initiative:

“The institute’s scientists had no problem with carrying out anthropological examinations on humans whose right to dispose over their own bodies was severely curtailed or completely revoked: on Sinti and Roma in “Gypsy collection camps” (Adolf Würth, Brigitte Richter, Eva Justin, Georg Wagner, Karin Magnussen), on Jews in German-occupied Łódź (Harry Suchalla, Christian Schneck), on “colored” colonial soldiers and soldiers of the Red Army in war prison camps (Wolfgang Abel, Otto Baader), or on Jews, Sinti, and Roma in the Auschwitz concentration and extermination camp (Siegfried Liebau, Karin Magnussen).”²³

19 Zakonska odredba o rasnoj pripadnosti od 30. travnja 1941.

20 Hrvatski narod 1941; Bartulin 2013, 70.

21 Bartulin 2013, 74; Yeomans 2013, 224–228.

22 O mogućnosti asimilacije izuzetnih *pojedinaца ili manjih skupina u jedan narod, kojemu oni po krvi i rasi ne pripadaju koji se svom novom narodu tako duhovno priljube i s njime se stope, da potpuno gube ideale svoje rase i naroda* pisao je još 1934. godine Šalković-Frajsman u ustaškim novinama *Nezavisna Hrvatska Država: Godišnjak 1934* (Šalković-Frajsman 1934, 31).

23 Schmuhl 2008, 409–410.

19 Legal Statute on Race Affiliation of 30 April 1941.

20 Hrvatski narod 1941; Bartulin 2013, 70.

21 Bartulin 2013, 74; Yeomans 2013, 224–228.

22 On the possibility of assimilating exceptional “individuals or small groups into one nation”, to which “they do not belong by blood and race, they so spiritually attach and merge with their new nation that they completely lose the ideals of their race and nation”, wrote Šalković-Frajsman in 1934 in the Ustaša newspaper *Nezavisna Hrvatska Država: Godišnjak 1934* (Šalković-Frajsman 1934, 31).

23 Schmuhl 2008, 409–410.

Ivaniček je u KWI-A stigao stipendijom NDH kao Fischerov doktorand 1942. godine na temi „Australiskih lubanja“.²⁴ Fischer, profesor medicine, antropologije i eugenike, koautor je knjige (s Erwinom Bauerom (1875. – 1933.) i Fritzom Lenzom (1887. – 1976.)) *Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene von Erwin Bauer, Eugen Fischer [und] Fritz Lenz* (Priručnik za ljudsko nasljeđivanje i rasnu higijenu),²⁵ ključnog djela nacističke eugenike koje je imalo velik utjecaj u Njemačkoj, pogotovo na Adolfa Hitlera (1889. – 1945.) koji je neke ideje koristio u svojem dijelu *Mein Kampf*.²⁶

Zanimljivo je napomenuti da je Fischer u javnom predavanju *Rassenkreuzung und geistige Leistung* (Rasno miješanje i mentalna postignuća) 1. veljače 1933. godine, dva dana nakon dolaska Hitlera na vlast, zagovarao miješanje rasa. Posebno se osvrnuo na pitanje miješanja nordijskih rasa i Židova te je postavio biološku razliku između starosjedilačkih njemačko-židovskih obitelji i nedavno pristiglih *Ostjuden*. Miješanje nordijskih rasa s Njemačkim Židovima nije smatrao problematičnim, ali je u potpunosti isključio mogućnost miješanja s *Ostjuden*. Ovakve ideje nacistima nisu bile prihvatljive pa je Fischer svoje stavove brzo prilagodio radikalnijoj nacističkoj poziciji.²⁷ Međutim, vjerojatno je Ivaniček podržavao mišljenje svog mentora o biološkim razlikama između pojedinih asimiliranih Židova i rasno neprihvatljive većine. To bi objasnilo kako je pomirio svoju profesionalnu i ideološku predanost rasnoj antropologiji sa svojim privatnim životom, ponajviše time što je bio u braku sa Židovkom.²⁸

Fischer je bio ravnatelj KWI-A sve do srpnja 1942. godine, kada je preselio u Freiburg nakon što je saznao da mu je sin Hermann poginuo u akciji na istočnom frontu.²⁹ Ravnatelj KWI-A tada postaje Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer (1896. – 1969.), Lenzov učenik, voditelj Odjela za ljudsku genetiku na KWI-A i ravnatelj *Institut für Erbbiologie und Rassenhygiene* (Institut za genetsku biologiju i rasnu higijenu) u Frankfurtu.³⁰ Von Verschuer je aktivno surađivao u „rasnim istraživanjima“ na otkrivanju serološki rasnih markera za Židove sa svojim bivšim doktorandom i asistentom u Frankfurtu Josefom Mengeleom (1911. – 1979.) koji je bio stacioniran u Auschwitzu kao glavni liječnik logora.³¹ Nije u potpunosti jasno je li Mengele sam tražio to namještanje, vjerojatno uz preporuku von Verschuera, ili je otišao po naređenju. Mengele je provodio eksperimente na ljudima kao dio postdoktorskog rada pod von Verschuerom. Riječ je o nastavku njihova istraživanja iz

Ivaniček arrived at KWI-A in 1942 as a doctoral student under Fischer with a thesis on ‘Australian skulls’.²⁴ Ivaniček had a scholarship from the Independent State of Croatia. Fischer, professor of medicine, anthropology and eugenics, was the co-author of the book (with Erwin Bauer (1875 – 1933) and Fritz Lenz (1887 – 1976)) *Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene von Erwin Bauer, Eugen Fischer [und] Fritz Lenz* (Manual for human inheritance and racial hygiene)²⁵ – a crucial work of Nazi eugenics that had a vast influence in Germany, even on Adolf Hitler (1889 – 1945), who used some of its ideas in his work *Mein Kampf*.²⁶

It is interesting to note that, two days after Hitler’s seizure of power, on 1 February 1933, Fischer delivered a public lecture on “Racial Mixing and Mental Aptitude” (*Rassenkreuzung und geistige Leistung*), in which he argued that the mixing of races generally had a beneficial effect on offspring. He explicitly addressed the question of race-mixing between the Nordic races and Jews. Fischer made a biological distinction between the long-resident German-Jewish families and the recently arrived *Ostjuden*. Mixing the Nordic races with German Jews was unproblematic, while mixing with the *Ostjuden* was not. This kind of thinking was not acceptable, and Fischer quickly adjusted his views to conform to the more radical Nazi position.²⁷ However, Ivaniček probably continued to think in similar terms as his mentor on the biological difference between individual assimilable Jews and the racially unacceptable majority. This would explain how he reconciled his professional and ideological commitment to racial anthropology with his personal life, i.e. being married to a Jewish woman.²⁸

Fischer was director of KWI-A until July 1942, when he moved to Freiburg after his son Hermann was killed in action on the Eastern Front.²⁹ The newly-appointed director was Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer (1896 – 1969), Lenz’s student, head of the Department of Human Genetics at KWI-A, and director of the *Institut für Erbbiologie und Rassenhygiene* (Institute for Genetic Biology and Racial Hygiene) in Frankfurt.³⁰ Von Verschuer actively collaborated in ‘racial research’ on the discovery of serologically racial markers for Jews with his former doctoral student and assistant in Frankfurt, Josef Mengele (1911 – 1979), then stationed in Auschwitz as the camp’s chief physician.³¹ It is not entirely clear whether Mengele himself sought that placement, possi-

24 Schmuhl 2008, 281, bilj. 150.

25 Bauer, Fischer, Lenz 1921.

26 Hutton 2005, 219–220; Schmuhl 2008, 152.

27 Wetzell 2017, 151–154.

28 Za usporedbu je slučaj njemačkoga rasnog antropologa Ludwiga Ferdinanda Claussa koji je bio u vezi sa svojom židovskom asistenticom Margarete Landé. Iako je, zbog te veze, bio izbačen 1943. godine iz Nacionalističke njemačke radničke stranke (NSDAP), nastavio je biti aktivan u rasnim istraživanjima te uživao potporu SS-a. Clauss je Landé uspio spasiti od deportacije (Hutton 2005, 218; Wiedemann 2012, 328–329). Određeni broj vođa, aktivista i intelektualaca ustaškog pokreta bili su, ili oženjeni Židovkama, ili su i sami bili Židovskog podrijetla (Yeomans 2013, 225).

29 Schmuhl 2008, 264–265.

30 Hutton 2005, 222–223.

31 Weiss 2012, 667.

24 Schmuhl 2008, 281, n. 150.

25 Bauer, Fischer, Lenz 1921.

26 Hutton 2005, 219–220; Schmuhl 2008, 152.

27 Wetzell 2017, 151–154.

28 For comparison in the German case, one could point to the relationship between the Nazi racial anthropologist Ludwig Ferdinand Clauss and his Jewish research assistant, Margarete Landé. Although Clauss was expelled from the National Socialist German Workers’ Party (NSDAP) in 1943, he continued to be active in racial research, enjoyed the support of the SS, and managed to protect Landé from deportation (Hutton 2005, 218; Wiedemann 2012, 328–329). Several of the Ustaša movement’s leaders, activists and intellectuals either were married to Jewish women or were of Jewish origin themselves (Yeomans 2013, 225).

29 Schmuhl 2008, 264–265.

30 Hutton 2005, 222–223.

31 Weiss 2012, 667.

Frankfurta na blizancima radi utvrđivanja povezanosti između naslijeđenih osobina i utjecaja okoline. Mengele je u Auschwitzu izgradio čitav istraživački centar, gdje je provodio eksperimente na ljudima, često sa smrtnim ishodom, te je najmanje u dva navrata u KWI-A dostavio ljudske uzorke: u razdoblju između 1943. i 1944. godine Karin Magnussen (1908. – 1997.) dostavio je oči s heterokromijom šarenice i von Verschueru 200 uzoraka krvi ljudi različitih rasa.³² Čini se da je von Verschuer izabrao ne pitati za detalje pod kojim je okolnostima Mengele nabavljao uzorke; možda je znao dovoljno da nije niti morao pitati. Magnussen je, pak, poticala Mengelea da „pomogne“ u smrti Sinti i Roma za čije oči je bila zainteresirana.³³ Von Verschuer je nakon rata zaničeo da je znao što se događalo u Auschwitzu, ali je priznao da je čuo određene glasine s kojima je konfrontirao Mengelea. No Mengele mu je odgovorio da između njega i zatvorenika vlada samo harmonija. Genocidni karakter „konačnog rješenja židovskog pitanja“ bio vrlo jasan Fischeru i von Verschueru te ni jedna druga znanstvena institucija u Njemačkoj nije imala lakši pristup znanju o zločinima u Auschwitzu od KWI-A.³⁴

Ivaniček je na KWI-A boravio tijekom Drugoga svjetskog rata sve do 1944. godine. Njemački su znanstvenici zapošljavani sporadično, npr. spomenuta Karin Magnussen. Na Institutu su radili stranci iz neutralnih ili njemačkih savezničkih zemalja (bilo ih je od pet do osam godišnje). Institutu se pridružilo i nekoliko stranih doktoranada, među kojima je i Franjo Ivaniček. Znanstvenici iz jugoistočne i središnje Europe su u razdoblju od 1931. do 1942. dominirali na KWI-A. Bio je to pokazatelj njemačkog interesa prema istoku te priprema za rasne deportacije, etničko čišćenje i genocid unutar *Generalplan Ost* (*Glavni plan Istok*).³⁵ Eugen Fischer, Ivaničekov mentor, izravno je sudjelovao u izradi plana.³⁶

Ivaniček se tijekom boravka u Berlinu, od 1942. do 1944. godine, dopisivao sa zagrebačkim arheologom i etnologom Zdenkom Vinskim (1913. – 1996.).³⁷ Vinski, porijeklom iz stare zagrebačke židovske obitelji, bio je početkom rata žrtvom mnogobrojnih rasnih zakona, iako je krštenjem 1937. godine prešao na rimokatoličku vjeru. Međutim, imao je veze kod visokopozicioniranih ustaša te je predao zahtjev za dodjelu arijevske prava. Nema dokaza da mu je dodijeljen status počasnog arijevske, ali Vinski je ipak uživao povlastice koje nisu bile dopuštene drugim za-

bly on von Verschuer's recommendation, or went by command. Mengele conducted experiments on humans as part of his post-doctoral thesis under von Verschuer. He continued their research from Frankfurt on twins to determine the link between inherited traits and environmental influences. Mengele built an entire research centre in Auschwitz where he conducted experiments on humans, often with fatal outcome, and submitted human samples to KWI-A on at least two occasions: between 1943 and 1944, Karin Magnussen (1908 – 1997) received from Mengele a series of pairs of eyes for her 'eye colour' project, and von Verschuer around 200 blood samples for his 'specific proteins' project.³² Von Verschuer preferred not to ask for any details about the circumstances under which Mengele procured blood samples. Perhaps he knew enough that he did not have to ask. Magnussen encouraged Mengele to 'help' in the deaths of Sinti and the Roma with heterochromous eyes in whom she was interested.³³ After the war von Verschuer denied that he had known what was going on in Auschwitz but admitted that he had heard certain rumours about which he had confronted Mengele. In response Mengele said that there was only harmony between him and the prisoners. The genocidal character of the 'final solution to the Jewish question' was very clear to Fischer and von Verschuer, and no other scientific institution in Germany had easier access to knowledge of the crimes in Auschwitz than KWI-A.³⁴

Ivaniček stayed at KWI-A during World War II until 1944. German scientists, such as the above-mentioned Karin Magnussen, were recruited sporadically. The positions at the Institute were filled instead with foreign guest scholars from neutral or allied states (five to eight scientists a year). The institute was joined by several foreign doctoral students, including Franjo Ivaniček. Scientists from Southeast and Central Europe dominated KWI-A from 1931 to 1942. It was an indicator of Germany's interest in the East and preparations for racial deportations, ethnic cleansing and genocide within the *Generalplan Ost* (General Plan East).³⁵ Eugen Fischer, Ivaniček's mentor, was involved directly in elaborating the plan.³⁶

During his stay in Berlin (1942 – 1944), Ivaniček corresponded with the Zagreb archaeologist and ethnologist Zdenko Vinski (1913 – 1996).³⁷ Vinski, as a member of an old Zagreb Jewish family, was

32 Schmuhl 2008, 362–371, 390–391; Weiss 2012, 667.

33 Schmuhl 2008, 410.

34 Schmuhl 2008, 342–348, 370–371. Von Verschuer nakon rata i dalje radi kao vodeći njemački genetičar, čak pokušava ponovno pokrenuti rad KWI-A. Ipak, kada su mu 1956. godine posvetili broj *Acta Geneticae Medicae et Gemellologiae*, iz biografije su izostavljeni njegovi rasistički radovi, što uključuje i dva izdanja *Leitfaden der Rassenhygiene* (Priručnik za rasnu higijenu; Ehrenreich 2007, 67).

35 Weindling 2007, 272; Schmuhl 2008, 281–282. Ideja *Generalplan Ost* bila je naseljavanje 10 milijuna Nijemaca u idućih 20 godina na područje Istoka (Poljska, baltičke zemlje, Bjelorusija, dijelovi Rusije, Ukrajine i Krima). 31 milijun ljudi od sveukupno 45 milijuna, koliko je živjelo na tom području, smatrali su se „rasno nepoželjnim“. Prema *Generalplanu Ostu*, 80–85 % stanovništva Poljske, 64 % stanovništva zapadne Ukrajine i 75 % stanovništva Bjelorusije trebalo je nestati. Trebali su umrijeti od gladi ili biti protjerani u Sibir. Ostatak je trebao biti „germaniziran“ ili služiti njemačkoj „glavnoj rasi“ kao „heloti“ (Schmuhl 2008, 348–349).

36 Schmuhl 2008, 348–357.

37 Solter 2020, 35–37, 43–45. Pisma se čuvaju u Arhivu Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu (AAMZ 210–3, Ivaniček, Franjo).

32 Schmuhl 2008, 362–371, 390–391; Weiss 2012, 667.

33 Schmuhl 2008, 410.

34 Schmuhl 2008, 342–348, 370–371. After the war, von Verschuer continued to work as a leading German geneticist, even trying to reopen KWI-A. However, when the Italian medical journal *Acta Geneticae Medicae et Gemellologiae* dedicated a special edition in his honour in 1956, his racist works were omitted from his biography, which includes two editions of *Leitfaden der Rassenhygiene* (Handbook of Racial Hygiene; Ehrenreich 2007, 67).

35 Weindling 2007, 272; Schmuhl 2008, 281–282. The idea of *Generalplan Ost* was to settle 10 million Germans over the next 20 years in the East (Poland, the Baltic countries, Belarus, parts of Russia, Ukraine and Crimea). Of a total of 45 million people living in the area, 31 million were considered 'racially undesirable'. According to the *Generalplan Ost*, 80 – 85 % of the population of Poland, 64 % of the population of western Ukraine, and 75 % of the population of Belarus should disappear. They were to die of starvation or be banished to Siberia. The remainder were to be 'Germanized' or to serve the German 'main race' as 'helots' (Schmuhl 2008, 348–349).

36 Schmuhl 2008, 348–357.

37 Solter 2020, 35–37, 43–45. The letters are stored in the Archive of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (AAMZ 210–3, Ivaniček, Franjo).

grebačkim Židovima (zaposlenje 1944., brak s katolkinjom 1942. godine). On i njegova obitelj odlukom iz studenoga 1941. godine bili su nakratko zaštićeni od svakog progona. Unatoč moćnim zaštitnicima, Vinski nije uspio spasiti oca i baku od deportacije. U kolovožu 1942. godine uhićeni su i odvedeni u Auschwitz, gdje su oboje ubijeni.³⁸ Ovo nam ponovno pokazuje koliko je restriktivna bila kategorija počasnih arijevaca u NDH.

Ivaniček, u pismu od 11. veljače 1942. godine, moli Vinskog da iskoristi svoja poznanstva i sugerira čelnim ljudima u Matici hrvatskoj da objave knjigu Otmar von Verschuera *Leitfaden der Rassenhygiene* (Priručnik za rasnu higijenu) na hrvatskom jeziku (po Ivaničekovu prijevodu).³⁹ Ivaniček tvrdi da će knjiga zanimati svakoga tko proučava „*suvremeni problem nauke i politike. Opća antropologija napose Erbbiologija nemože se bolje zamisliti. Tako jednostavno i shvatljivo, a kraj toga na naučnoj razini.*“ Ako Vinski kojim slučajem ne uspije uvjeriti Maticu hrvatsku, Ivaniček piše kako će knjigu tiskati o vlastitu trošku.⁴⁰ Ivaniček i von Verschuer poznaju se još iz Frankfurta, kada je Ivaniček bio na edukaciji u eugeničkoj ambulanti Instituta.⁴¹ Međutim, pet mjeseci kasnije, nakon što Vinski javlja da Matica hrvatska ipak nije zainteresirana za tisak knjige, Ivaniček nije nimalo iznenađen jer vjeruje da će knjiga ubrzo postati nezanimljiva, osim možda još kojem medicinskom povjesničaru.

Čini se da Ivaniček za svog boravka u Berlinu nastavlja studij medicine. Piše Vinskome da su mu preostala još tri ispita (uključujući ginekologiju) te da zbog ispita iz otorinolaringologije nije stigao previše razgovarati s ministrom Milom Starčevićem (1904. – 1953.) i Božidarom Murgićem (1901. – ?) kada su bili u posjetu KWI-A.⁴² Ivaniček je medicinu na kraju diplomirao na Medicinskom fakultetu Sveučilišta u Zagrebu akademske godine 1943./44.⁴³

Tijekom boravka u Berlinu, Ivaniček, na prijedlog Zdenka Vinskog, piše kratak pregled hrvatske rasne povijesti *Beiträge zur Anthropologie und Rassengeschichte der Kroaten* (Prilozi antropologiji i rasnoj povijesti Hrvata).⁴⁴ Čini se da je Vinski, unatoč židovskom porijeklu, „pristaša“ određenih aspekata ustaške rasne ideologije.⁴⁵ Ivaniček u radu iznosu tezu da je hrvatsko stanovništvo NDH bilo uglavnom dinarskoga rasnog tipa, uključujući značajnu manjinu plavokosih dinaraca i da u cijeloj Europi nema mjesta s tako čistim dinarskim tipom te da su najčišći predstavnici di-

the victim of numerous racial laws at the beginning of the war, although he was baptized in a catholic church in 1937. However, he had connections with high-ranking Ustaše and applied for Aryan rights. There is no clear proof that he obtained the status of honorary Aryan. However, he enjoyed privileges not allowed to other Zagreb Jews (employment in 1944, marriage to a catholic woman in 1942). He and his family were briefly protected from any persecution in November 1941. Despite powerful protectors, Vinski failed to save his father and grandmother from deportation. In August 1942, they were arrested and taken to Auschwitz, where they were both killed.³⁸ Again, this highlights how restrictive the category of ‘honorary Aryans’ in NDH was.

In a letter dated 11 February 1942, Ivaniček pleads for Vinski to use his acquaintances and suggests, to the leading people in *Matica hrvatska*, that they publish Otmar von Verschuer’s book *Leitfaden der Rassenhygiene* (Handbook of Racial Hygiene) in Croatian (translated by Ivaniček).³⁹ Ivaniček insists that the book will be of interest to anyone who studies “the contemporary problem of science and politics. General anthropology, Erbbiology cannot be better imagined. So simple and understandable, and on a scientific level”. Ivaniček writes that he will print the book at his own expense if Vinski fails to persuade *Matica hrvatska*.⁴⁰ Ivaniček and von Verschuer had known each other since Frankfurt, where Ivaniček studied briefly at the Institute’s eugenics clinic.⁴¹ However, five months later, after Vinski reported that *Matica hrvatska* was not interested in publishing the book, Ivaniček was not surprised, because he believed that the book would soon become uninteresting, except perhaps to a medical historian.

It appears that Ivaniček continued his medical studies during his stay in Berlin. He wrote to Vinski that he had three more exams left, including gynaecology. Due to the otorhinolaryngology exam, he did not have much time to talk with Minister Milo Starčević (1904 – 1953) and Božidar Murgić (1901 – ?) when they visited KWI-A.⁴² Ivaniček eventually graduated in 1943/44 at the Medical Faculty of the University of Zagreb.⁴³

During his stay in Berlin, Ivaniček wrote a brief overview of Croatian racial history, *Beiträge zur Anthropologie und Rassengeschichte der Kroaten* (Contributions to the Anthropology and Racial

38 Solter 2020, 40–43.

39 Von Verschuer 1941; Solter 2020, 35–37, 43–45. Zakonskom odredbom o izdavanju prijevoda iz tuđih književnosti od 13. listopada 1941. odlučeno je da izdavanje znanstvenih djela stranih autora pripada isključivo *Matici hrvatskoj* (Aralica 2009, 465).

40 Solter 2020, 44.

41 AAMZ 210–3, Pismo F. Ivaničeka Z. Vinskome od 20. 5. 1942.

42 AAMZ 210–3, Razglednica F. Ivaničeka Z. Vinskome od 29. 7. 1943.

43 <http://stariweb.mef.hr/studmef/diplomand/svi-diplomirani/diplomirani-1943-1947-2.html> (11 November 2020).

44 Ivaniček 1944a, 177–192; Bartulin 2014, 179–181; Solter 2020, 45.

45 Vinski je 1940. godine pisao o mogućim etničkim vezama između Iranaca i Hrvata (Vinski 1940). Jedne od prihvaćenih teorija od porijeklu Hrvata u NDH (Bartulin 2019).

38 Solter 2020, 40–43.

39 Von Verschuer 1941; Solter 2020, 35–37, 43–45. The Law Decree on the publication of translations from foreign literature of 13 October 1941 stated that the publication of scientific research by foreign authors exclusively belonged to *Matica hrvatska* (Aralica 2009, 465).

40 Solter 2020, 44.

41 AAMZ 210–3, Letter from F. Ivaniček to Z. Vinski, 20 May 1942.

42 AAMZ 210–3, Postcard from F. Ivaniček to Z. Vinski, 29 July 1943.

43 <http://stariweb.mef.hr/studmef/diplomand/svi-diplomirani/diplomirani-1943-1947-2.html> (11 November 2020).

narske rase smješteni u sjeverozapadnom, središnjem i južnom dijelu NDH.⁴⁶ Rad se temeljio na istraživanju antropoloških karakteristika 248 učenika u dobi od 7 do 17 godina iz Mostara i okolice (Hercegovina). Ukratko iznosi argumente da dinarskom tipu isključivo pripadaju muslimani i katolici u BiH, koji su ujedno i najčišći etnički i rasni element hrvatskog naroda, dok su pravoslavci uglavnom pripadali tamnoputoj prednjoazijskoj rasi.⁴⁷ Ivaničekova dinarska rasna teorija odgovara duhu ustaške rasne politike dominantnog nordijsko-dinarskoga rasnog tipa arijevske Hrvata. Hitler Hrvate ne smatra Slavenima, već ih izjednačava s dinarskom rasom te zaključuje da bi germanizacija Hrvata bila dobrodošla s rasnog stajališta.⁴⁸ Srbe, koji žive na prostoru NDH, ustaški je režim službeno klasificirao kao „grčko-istočnjake“, dok su Srbi iz Srbije bili Srbi ili Srbijanci te ustašama nisu bili ni od kakvog interesa. Ustaška rasna propaganda često bi grupirala grčko-istočne Srbe ili Vlahe zajedno sa Židovima i Romima, ostalim ne-arijevcima, budući da se smatralo kako ih velik dio ima dosta *ciganske* ili *prednjoazijske* krvi.⁴⁹ Ivaniček u svom radu pravoslavno stanovništvo grupira u skupinu tamnopute prednjoazijske rase i striktno ih odvaja od muslimana i katolika, za koje smatra su rasno jednaki. Službena NDH politika propagira pripadnost bosanskih muslimana hrvatskoj naciji po načelima pravaša da je BiH povijesno dio hrvatske države.⁵⁰ Ante Starčević (1823. – 1896.), osnivač Stranke prava, smatrao je, koristeći antropološke argumente (*svjetliji tip*), muslimane u Bosni etnički najčišćim Hrvatima te se takvo razmišljanje nastavilo u istraživanjima Čire Truhelke, Ive Pilara, Filipa Lukasa, Mirka Kus-Nikolajeva i dr.⁵¹

Hrvatski državni antropološki zavod u Zagrebu – Odjel za obće narodno prosvjetljivanje, Ministarstvo narodne prosvjete

Hrvatski državni antropološki zavod u Zagrebu osnovan je 11. listopada 1944. godine, a Ivaničeku je povjerena služba upravitelja. Zavod je privremeno smješten u prostorijama Odjela za obće narodno prosvjetljivanje, Ministarstva narodne prosvjete. Od 1. studenoga 1944. kao asistent-volonter u Zavodu se zaposlio Zdenko Vinski (zahvaljujući vjerojatno statusu počasnog arijevca) unatoč

History of the Croats), at the suggestion of Zdenko Vinski.⁴⁴ Vinski, despite his Jewish background, appears to have had some ‘understanding’ of aspects of Ustaša racial ideology.⁴⁵ In this paper, Ivaniček explains that a Dinaric race was the predominant racial type found in NDH, including a significant minority of blonde Dinarics. As Ivaniček argued, in no other part of Europe could one find such a pure Dinaric type. He claims that the purest representatives of the Dinaric race reside in the north-western, central and southern NDH.⁴⁶ The paper was based on an anthropometric survey of 248 pupils between the ages of 7 and 17 in Mostar and its surroundings, in Hercegovina. In short, he argues that the Muslims and Catholic Croats of BiH are exclusively Dinaric in type and are the purest ethnic and racial element of the Croatian people, but the Orthodox population mostly belongs to the dark-skinned ‘Near Eastern’ race.⁴⁷ Ivaniček’s Dinaric racial theory corresponds to the Ustaša racial policy of the dominant Nordic-Dinaric racial type of the Aryan Croat. Hitler did not consider the Croats to be Slavs, but predominantly Dinaric. For that reason, he argued that the Germanization of the Croats would be welcome from the racial point of view.⁴⁸ The Ustaša regime officially classified the Serbs living in the territory of the NDH as ‘Greek-Easterners’. The Serbs from Serbia were Serbs or Serbians, and were of no interest to the Ustaše. Ustaša racial politics would often group Greek-Eastern Serbs or Vlachs as racially similar to Jews and Gypsies – other non-Aryans – because they had Gypsy or near-eastern blood.⁴⁹ In his paper, Ivaniček groups the Orthodox population into a group of dark-skinned Near Eastern race and strictly separates them from Muslims and Catholics, whom he considers racially equal. Official NDH policy propagates the affiliation of Bosnian Muslims to the Croatian nation according to the principle, held by supporters of the Party of Rights, that BiH is historically part of the Croatian state.⁵⁰ Ante Starčević (1823 – 1896), the founder of the Party of Rights, considered Muslims in Bosnia, using anthropological arguments (e.g. lighter type), to be the most ethnically pure Croats, and such thinking continued in the work of Čiro Truhelka, Ivo Pilar, Filip Lukas, Mirko Kus-Nikolajeva et al.⁵¹

The Croatian State Anthropological Institute in Zagreb – Department of General Public Education, Ministry of Public Education

The Croatian State Anthropological Institute in Zagreb was founded on 11 October 1944, with Ivaniček as director. The Institute was temporarily located in the Department of General Public Education, Ministry of Public Education. On 1 November 1944, Zdenko Vinski was employed as an assistant volunteer at the Institute (probably due to the status of honorary Aryan),

46 Ivaniček 1944a, 180.

47 Ivaniček 1944a, 192.

48 Bartulin 2009, 214.

49 Bartulin 2007, 209–241; 2014, 203–211.

50 Kisić Kolanović 2007, 64–68.

51 Bartulin 2009, 194–195, 203–207.

44 Ivaniček 1944a, 177–192; Bartulin 2014, 179–181; Solter 2020, 45.

45 Having written (in 1940) about the probable ethnic links between Iranians and Croats (Vinski 1940). Iranian theory of the origin of the Croats was one of the accepted theories, next to Gothic theory, in NDH (Bartulin 2019).

46 Ivaniček 1944a, 180.

47 Ivaniček 1944a, 192.

48 Bartulin 2009, 214.

49 Bartulin 2007, 209–241; 2014, 203–211.

50 Kisić Kolanović 2007, 64–68.

51 Bartulin 2009, 194–195, 203–207.

*Zakonskoj odredbi o zaštiti narodne i arijske kulture hrvatskog naroda*⁵² kojom je Vinskom kao ne-arijevcu bilo zabranjeno bilo kakvo zaposlenje.⁵³ Zasluge za osnutak Antropološkog zavoda imali su Ministar obrazovanja NDH Julije Makanec (1904. – 1945.), voditelj Katedre za biologiju na Medicinskom fakultetu Zdravko Lorković (1900. – 1998.), pročelnik za visoku nastavu Pavao Tijan (1908. – 1997.), sveučilišni docent Milan Gjučić (1899. – 1981.) i savjetnik ministarstva obrazovanja Ivan Esih (1898. – 1966.). Među prvim ciljevima rada novoosnovanog zavoda bili su istraživanje rasnog sastava i etnogeneze Hrvata, istraživanje starih hrvatskih nekropola i paleoantropologije.⁵⁴ Ivaniček u pismu od 9. srpnja 1944. godine Ministarstvu obrazovanja NDH o potrebi osnivanja Zavoda iznosi da bi se Zavod trebao voditi suvremenim rasnim i eugeničkim načelima te da bi u tu svrhu trebao surađivati s KWI-A, Kriminološkim institutom i Zavodom za kolonizaciju.⁵⁵

Ivaniček za časopis *Spremnost, misao i volja ustaške Hrvatske* 1944. godine piše rad *Naša antropologija*, u kojem donosi *misli prilikom predradnji oko osnutka Hrvatskog antropološkog zavoda*.⁵⁶ Ivaniček u članku donosi definiciju rase prema E. Fischeru kao skupini ljudi koja ima niz jednakih nasljednih tjelesnih i duševnih osobina po kojima se baš i razlikuje od ostalih skupina. Isto tako, navodi da se po svim naprednim zemljama nastoji osigurati što brojnije zdravo potomstvo jer o broju zdravog potomstva, sposobnog za kulturno stvaranje, ovisi i sudbina određenog naroda. Taj cilj postiže se biološkim proučavanjem naroda, što prije svega čine antropolozi, te na temelju biološke konstitucije naroda, odnosno rasnog sastava određenog naroda, stvaraju se odgovarajući državotvorni zakoni, određuje se pravac odgoja mladeži, a za odrasle uvodi se kulturna promidžba putem vjerskih i društvenih zajednica. Kao primjer dobre prakse navodi Njemačku i napominje da brigu o zdravom potomstvu u kulturnim zemljama vode antropološki, odnosno eugenički zavodi. Dakle, prema Ivaničeku, zadatak Instituta bio bi osposobljavanje nove skupine liječnika kao „praktične eugeničare“ koji će iskorijeniti nasljedne bolesti u korist budućih generacija.

Krajem iste godine Ivaniček za *Spremnost* piše još jedan rad: *Antropologija Hrvata. Prvi zadatci Hrvatskog državnog antropološkog zavoda*. U radu iznosi kao prvi cilj Zavoda *pitanje dinarskog tipa*, osvrćući se na različita mišljenja srpskih i hrvatskih znanstvenika.⁵⁷ U članku se Ivaniček osvrće na rad Stanoje Stanojevića (1874. – 1937.), srpskog povjesničara koji u formiranju srpskog naroda ističe dinarski rasni tip, koji naziva i „srpskom rasom“, kao dominantnim tipom među Srbima i Hrvatima. Ivaniček posebno ističe da Stanojević „pripisuje toj svojoj rasi samo superlative, koji su kod svih rasističkih ideologa isti, a to su slobodoljubivost, hrabrost, uztrajnost, intelektualna i moralna superiornost, na temelju čega kao konačni posljedak proizlazi zahtjev za kulturnim i političkim vodstvom. Drugim riječima, on pokušava

despite the *Law Decree on the Protection of the National and Aryan Culture of the Croatian People*,⁵² which prohibited Vinski, a non-Aryan, from any employment.⁵³ The credit for the establishment of the Anthropological Institute went to the Minister of Education of NDH, Julije Makanec (1904 – 1945), head of the Department of Biology at the Faculty of Medicine, Zdravko Lorković (1900 – 1998), Head of Higher Education, Pavao Tijan (1908 – 1997), a university assistant professor, Milan Gjučić (1899 – 1981), and an advisor to the Ministry of Education, Ivan Esih (1898 – 1966). Among the first goals of the newly established institute were research into the racial composition and ethnogenesis of Croats, research into old Croatian necropolises, and palaeoanthropology.⁵⁴ In a letter to the Ministry for National Education of NDH, dated 9 July 1944, Ivaniček, elaborating the need for the Institute, stated that the Institute should be guided by modern racial and eugenic principles, and to that end it should work closely with KWI-A, the Criminological Institute and the State Bureau for Settlement and Colonization.⁵⁵

Ivaniček wrote the paper *Naša antropologija* (Our Anthropology) in 1944 for the journal *Spremnost, misao i volja ustaške Hrvatske*, where he “outlines the ideas of the preliminary work on the founding of the Croatian Anthropological Institute”.⁵⁶ In the paper, Ivaniček presents the definition of a race, according to E. Fischer, as a group of people who have many of the same hereditary physical and mental characteristics, by which they differ from other groups. He also states that advanced countries are trying to ensure as many healthy offspring as possible. The fate of the nation in question depends on the number of healthy offspring capable of cultural creation. This goal is achieved by the biological study of the nation, done by anthropologists. Appropriate state laws should be created, and the citizens educated through religious and social communities based on the biological constitution of the nation, the racial system of the nation. He praises Germany as an example of good practice. Ivaniček emphasizes that, in cultural countries, anthropological and eugenic institutes take care of healthy offspring. So, according to Ivaniček, the task would be training a new cohort of physicians as ‘practical eugenicists’ who would eradicate hereditary diseases for the benefit of future generations.

At the end of the same year, Ivaniček wrote another paper for *Spremnost*, titled *Antropologija Hrvata: Prvi zadatci Hrvatskog državnog antropološkog zavoda* (*The Anthropology of the Croats: The first tasks of the Croatian State Anthropological Institute*). Ivaniček writes about the first goal of the Institute, “the question of the Dinaric race”, referring to the different opinions of Serbian and Croatian scientists.⁵⁷ In the papers, Ivaniček writes about the work of Stanoje Stanojević (1874 – 1937), a Serbian historian who claims a prominent role in the formation of the

52 Narodne novine 1941.

53 Solter 2020, 35–49.

54 Nova Hrvatska 1944.

55 Yeomans 2013, 224.

56 Ivaniček 1944b.

57 Ivaniček 1945.

52 Narodne novine 1941.

53 Solter 2020, 35–49.

54 Nova Hrvatska 1944.

55 Yeomans 2013, 224.

56 Ivaniček 1944b.

57 Ivaniček 1945.

va antropološki opravdati ekspanzivne i imperialističke težnje tadašnjeg srpskog vladajućeg sloja, koji je bio jasno uperen na nas Hrvate.“ Prema Ivaničeku, postoje razne varijante dinarske rase, pogotovo u Srbiji, pa prigovara srpskim znanstvenicima da zaziru od antropometrijskih istraživanja kako ne bi opovrgnuli svoje rasističko-političke ciljeve. Ivaniček, pak, naglašava da najčišće predstavnike dinarskog tipa nalazimo diljem južne i sjeverozapadne Hrvatske koje karakterizira visok stas, truplo prema udovima razmjerno kratko, lubanja kratka sa zatiljkom posve plosnatim, kao odsječenim, lice duguljasto sa značajnim crtama, nos u profilu ravan ili blago izbočen. Boja kose, kože i šarenice je tamna. Od psihičkih osobina pripisuje dinarskoj rasi slobodoljubivost, osjećaj časti, neobičnu povezanost s rodnom grudom i čestu povodljivost za osjećajima. Premda zamjera Stanojeviću rasističku ideologiju, Ivaniček pri opisivanju Hrvata koristi isti diskurs, ističući superiornost ne samo u biološkoj nadmoći već i u duhovnim karakteristikama.

U svibnju 1945. godine, završetkom Drugoga svjetskog rata, dolazi do Ivaničekove smjene, a privremeni rukovoditelj Antropološkog zavoda postaje Zdenko Vinski. Vinski je u srpnju iste godine trajno zaposlen u Arheološkom muzeju u Zagrebu te Antropološki zavod prestaje postojati pod tim imenom i ustrojstvom.

Antropološki odsjek na Medicinskom fakultetu Sveučilišta u Zagrebu – Arheološka istraživanja Ptuja i Bijelog Brda

Unatoč bliskosti s ustaškim režimom, Ivaniček u novoj Jugoslaviji 1946. godine postaje predstojnikom novoosnovanog *Antropološkog odsjeka Biološkog zavoda na Medicinskom fakultetu Sveučilišta u Zagrebu*.⁵⁸ Voditelj Biološkog zavoda u to vrijeme bio je Zdravko Lorković koji je Ivaničeku pomogao i kod osnutka prvoga Antropološkog zavoda 1944. godine.⁵⁹ Nakon donošenja plana o organizaciji Antropološkog odsjeka, odlučeno je da se za prvi rad provede istraživanje jednog „staroslavenskoga“ groblja kako bi se proučila geneza između staroslavenske i suvremene populacije Jugoslavije. Na preporuku Odsjeka, 1946. godine je započelo istraživanje nekropole u Ptuju.⁶⁰ Formirane su dvije radne ekipe, arheološka i antropološka. Prvu je vodio arheolog Josip Korošec (1909. – 1966.), kojem je povjereno vodstvo iskapanja i obrade arheološkog materijala. Vodstvo antropološke ekipe, kao i obrada osteoloških nalaza, povjerena je Ivaničeku.

Serbian people for the Dinaric racial type, which he also calls the “Serbian race”, as the dominant type among Serbs and Croats. Ivaniček especially points out that Stanojević “attributes to his race only superlatives, the same for all racist ideologues, i.e. love of freedom, courage, perseverance, intellectual and moral superiority, with the outcome of demanding cultural and political leadership. In other words, he is trying to anthropologically justify the expansive and imperialist aspirations of the then Serbian ruling class aimed at us Croats”. According to Ivaniček, there are various variants of the Dinaric race, especially in Serbia. He reproaches Serbian scientists for being wary of anthropometric research in order not to refute their racist-political goals. Ivaniček writes that the purest representatives of the Dinaric type are throughout southern and north-western Croatia. Their specific characteristics are tall stature, relatively short body towards the limbs, short skull with occiput completely flat, almost as if cut off, face oblong with significant lines, nose straight or slightly protruding. The colour of hair, skin and iris is dark. The physical traits he attributes to the Dinaric race are libertarianism, a sense of honour, an unusual connection with the homeland and pliable emotions. Although he resents Stanojević’s racist ideology, Ivaniček uses the same discourse when describing Croats. He emphasizes superiority not only in biological domination but also in spiritual characteristics.

In May 1945, at the end of World War II, Zdenko Vinski became the temporary head of the Anthropological Institute after Ivaniček’s dismissal. In July of the same year, Vinski became permanently employed at the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, and the Anthropological Institute ceased to exist under that name and structure.

Anthropological Department of the Biological Institute at the School of Medicine of the University of Zagreb – Archaeological research at Ptuj and Bijelo Brdo

In the new Yugoslavia Ivaniček became the head of the newly established Anthropological Department of the Biological Institute at the School of Medicine of the University of Zagreb (1946), despite his closeness to the Ustaša regime.⁵⁸ The head of the Biological Department was Zdravko Lorković, who had also helped Ivaniček with the founding of the first Anthropological Institute in 1944.⁵⁹ Ivaniček decided, as the first task of the Department, to study the genesis between the Old Slavic and modern populations of Yugoslavia by excavating an ‘Old Slavic’ cemetery. The archaeological excavation of the early-medieval cemetery in Ptuj, on Ivaniček’s recommendation, started in 1946.⁶⁰ There were two working teams: an archaeological and an anthropological. The first was led by archaeologist Josip Korošec (1909 – 1966), entrusted with leadership of the excavation and processing of archaeological material. Ivaniček led the anthropological team and did the processing of osteological findings.

58 Ivaniček 1951, 7.

59 Bulić-Jakuš 2017, 420.

60 Ivaniček 1951; Janžeković 2017, 218–228.

58 Ivaniček 1951, 7.

59 Bulić-Jakuš 2017, 420.

60 Ivaniček 1951; Janžeković 2017, 218–228.

Ivaniček se u novoj Jugoslaviji vrlo brzo snašao, a prilagodio je ne samo svoju „znanstvenu“ interpretaciju već i kontakte. Prva je sezona iskopavanja Ptuja završena isključivo zahvaljujući njegovu lobiranju i vezama.⁶¹ Zanimljivo je da je Ivaniček potpisnik pisma skupine arheologa poslanog 1946. godine potpredsjedniku Jugoslavije Slovencu Edvardu Kardelju, u kojem tvrde da bi mogli opovrgnuti sve njemačke i mađarske znanstvene argumente o naseljavanju Nijemaca i Avara na teritoriju Jugoslavije, ali im je potrebna snažna financijska potpora za istraživanje staroslavenskih grobalja. U pismu se naglašava kako će istraživanjima dokazati identičnosti i analogiju na području cijele Jugoslavije.⁶²

Drugo istraživanje, koje Ivaniček provodi, iskopavanje je groblja Bijelo Brdo-Bajer tijekom 1947. i 1948. godine.⁶³ Ivaniček na arheološkim koštanim ostatcima srednjovjekovne populacije s nekropole Bijelo Brdo i Ptuj iznosi rezultate paleodemografskih i kranio metrijskih istraživanja. Međutim, njegov rad nije pobudio veće zanimanje znanstvene zajednice u Hrvatskoj te, moguće zbog jezične barijere, nije bio zapažen ni na međunarodnoj razini.⁶⁴ U istraživanju u Bijelom Brdu sudjeluje i Zdenko Vinski, tada zaposlenik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, kao „arheolog-promatrač“, o čemu piše u dva navrata. Prvi rad objavljuje iste godine kada i Ivaniček, u kojem donosi pregled arheoloških nalaza.⁶⁵ Dvije godine kasnije, Vinski objavljuje mnogo oštiri i kritičniji tekst u kojem izražava nezadovoljstvo činjenicom „da antropolog samovoljno vodi specifično arheološka iskopavanja nazivajući ih „ekshumacijama“, pa i tada, kada je on u stanju provesti tehnički uzorno samo iskopavanje, jer sam ne može dati potrebnu obradu arheološkog materijala“ budući da nije dorastao interpretaciji.⁶⁶ Ovaj je drugi rad Vinski napisao u ljeto 1948. godine nakon što ga Ivaniček više nije pozvao da sudjeluje u istraživanju kao „arheolog-promatrač“ (umjesto njega angažiran je Korošec) u drugoj kampanji iskopavanja lokaliteta Bijelo Brdo-Bajer. Pozadina raskola dugogodišnjega kolegijalnog i za sada još pomalo zagonetnog odnosa Vinski – Ivaniček nije poznata.

Treće istraživanje, na poziv Srpske akademije nauka u Beogradu 1949. godine, Ivaniček izvodi sa svojim tehničkim osobljem na nekropoli Hinga kod Subotice.⁶⁷ Međutim, antropološka analiza te srednjovjekovne nekropole nije objavljena.

Intenziviranje arheološkoga terenskog rada nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata na prostoru tadašnje Jugoslavije prati primjena novih i suvremenih metoda iskopavanja. Ivaniček u svojim iskopavanjima primjenjuje „tehnički najdotjeraniju metodu iskopavanja, jer je imao uza se geodeta i ostalo tehničko osoblje i

Ivaniček very quickly adapted to the politics of the new Yugoslavia and adjusted not only his scientific discourse but also his contacts. The first season of the Ptuj excavation ended thanks to his lobbying and connections.⁶¹ It is interesting that, in 1946, Ivaniček signed a letter with a group of archaeologists sent to the Yugoslav Vice-President, Edvard Kardelj (1910 – 1979) of Slovenia. They claimed that they could refute all German and Hungarian scientific arguments about the settlement of Germans and Avars in Yugoslavia, but needed financial support for research on Old Slavic cemeteries. The signatories emphasized that this research would prove oneness and analogies throughout Yugoslavia.⁶²

The second archaeological excavation carried out by Ivaniček was research on the Bijelo Brdo-Bajer cemetery between 1947 and 1948.⁶³ In 1949 Ivaniček published the results of palaeodemographic and craniometric analysis done on the archaeological bone remains. However, his work did not arouse much interest in the scientific community in Croatia; and, possibly due to the language barrier, it was not noticed at the international level.⁶⁴ Zdenko Vinski, then an employee of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, also took part in the research in Bijelo Brdo, as an ‘archaeologist-observer’, about which he wrote on two occasions. He published his first paper in the same year as Ivaniček, in which he gave an overview of archaeological findings.⁶⁵ Two years later, Vinski published a much sharper and more critical text, in which he expressed dissatisfaction with the fact that “the anthropologist arbitrarily conducts specific archaeological excavations, calling them ‘exhumations’; even though he can carry out technically exemplary excavations, he cannot give the necessary analysis of archaeological material”.⁶⁶ This second paper Vinski wrote in the summer of 1948, after Ivaniček had failed to invite him to participate in the research as an ‘archaeologist-observer’ (hiring Korošec instead) in the second campaign to excavate the Bijelo Brdo-Bajer site. The background of the split, in the long-standing collegial and, for now, still somewhat enigmatic relationship between Vinski and Ivaniček, is not known. A third piece of research, at the invitation of the Serbian Academy of Sciences in Belgrade in 1949, Ivaniček did with his technical staff at the Hinga necropolis near Subotica.⁶⁷ However, an anthropological analysis of that medieval necropolis was not published.

The intensification of archaeological fieldwork after World War II was accompanied by the application of the new, modern techniques in excavation. During his excavations, Ivaniček applied “the most technically refined method of excavation, because

61 Janžeković 2017, 225–227.

62 Janžeković 2017, 220–221; Guštin 2019, 21.

63 Ivaniček 1949.

64 Rajić Šikanjić 2005, 764; Šlaus 2006, 18.

65 Vinski 1949, 225–238.

66 Vinski 1951, 304–305.

67 Шафарик, Шулман 1954, 15.

61 Janžeković 2017, 225–227.

62 Janžeković 2017, 220–221; Guštin 2019, 21.

63 Ivaniček 1949.

64 Rajić Šikanjić 2005, 764; Šlaus 2006, 18.

65 Vinski 1949, 225–238.

66 Vinski 1951, 304–305.

67 Шафарик, Шулман 1954, 15.



SLIKA 1. Sastanak na Pristavi 1949. godine. S lijeva na desno: Jože Kastelic, Franjo Ivaniček, Zdenko Vinski, Stane Gabrovec (Pleterski (ed.) 2008, 21).

FIGURE 1. Meeting at Pristava in 1949. From left to right: Jože Kastelic, Franjo Ivaniček, Zdenko Vinski, Stane Gabrovec (Pleterski (ed.) 2008, 21).

pomagala“. Ivaničekove je metode Vinski i dalje primjenjivao na istraživanju u Mrsunjskom lugu, uz pomoć geodeta Antropološkog odjela. Istu je metodu prihvatio i Narodni muzej u Ljubljani, u iskopavanjima nekropole na Bledu. Većina hrvatskih arheologa je 1950. godine na *Savjetovanju arheologa FNRJ* u Niškoj Banji naglasila potrebu za novom tehnikom iskopavanja i potrebu za suradnjom s antropolozima. Međutim, protivili su se tome da iskopavanja vodi ne-arheolog jer ne može dati potpunu interpretaciju arheološkog materijala. Ovakvo su stajalište zauzeli i svi zaposlenici Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, gdje je radio i Vinski. Posebno su naglasili da se trebaju odrediti *granice arheološkog rada i kompetencije na terenu, da ne bi predstavnici srodnih struka prestizali u području arheologije*.⁶⁸

he had a surveyor and other technical staff and aids with him“. Vinski applied Ivaniček’s methods to the research in Mrsunjski Lug, with the help of a surveyor from the Anthropological Department. The same methodology was accepted by the National Museum in Ljubljana on the excavations of the necropolis in Bled. In 1950, at the Conference of Archaeologists of Yugoslavia in Niška Banja, the Croatian archaeologists emphasized the need for a new excavation technique and for cooperation with anthropologists. However, they objected to the excavations being conducted by a non-archaeologist, because they could not give a complete interpretation of the archaeological material. All employees of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, where Vinski worked, were unanimous on this position. They especially emphasized “that the boundaries of archaeological work and competences in the field should be determined so that representatives of related professions do not take over in the field of archaeology”.⁶⁸

68 Degmedžić 1950, 267.

68 Degmedžić 1950, 267.

Odlazak u Sjedinjene Američke Države

Nakon što mu više nije bilo omogućeno voditi arheološka istraživanja u Jugoslaviji, Ivaniček odlazi u Sjedinjene Američke Države kao stipendist UNESCO-ve stipendije za antropologiju 1951. i stipendije Wenner-Gran iz New Yorka 1952. – 1953. godine. O Ivaničku radu nakon odlaska u SAD znamo vrlo malo, i to ponajviše iz osmrtnice objavljene 1975. godine:

„Franjo Ivaniček (Francis Ivanichek), antropolog, odgojitelj, liječnik i redoviti član Hrvatske akademije Amerike umro je u Monroeu u Michiganu. Ivaniček je rođen u Dabcima u Hrvatskoj, 1936. stekao je doktorat iz antropologije i diplomirao medicinu 1941. godine na Sveučilištu u Zagrebu. Dobitnik je UNESCO-ve stipendije za antropologiju 1951. i stipendije Wenner-Gran iz New Yorka 1952. – 1953. godine. Također je bio izvanredni profesor antropologije na Sveučilištu u Zagrebu 1952. – 1953. godine. Karijeru u Sjedinjenim Državama započeo je u bolnici Fordham, Bronx, New Yorku (1953. – 1954.). Bio je liječnik u Državnoj bolnici, Ancora Hammonoton, New Jersey (1956. – 1959.); psihijatar u Psihijatrijskom institutu Aljaske u Anchorageu (1962. – 1964.); ravnatelj Klinike za mentalnu higijenu, Butte, Montana (1964. – 1965.); viši psihijatar u Psihijatrijskom institutu Cleveland (1966. – 1967.), i ravnatelj Klinike za mentalnu higijenu, Monroe, Michigan od 1967. do smrti“.⁶⁹

Nije se više bavio antropologijom.

Zaključak

Znanstveni diskurs Franje Ivaničeka u vrijeme Drugoga svjetskog rata bazira se na temeljnim rasnim razlikama između dominantne dinarske rase (Hrvata i muslimana u BiH) i nomadske „prednjoazijske“ rase (Srba u BiH). Iako je službena NDH rasna politika u „prednjoazijsku“ rasu grupirala Srbe ili Vlahs zajedno sa Židovima i Romima, Ivaniček u svojim radovima ne iznosi antisemitsku propagandu. Na taj je način Ivaniček doista mogao pomiriti s iskrenom predanošću svoj brak sa Židovkom Helenom Herzberger, kao i blisku suradnju sa Židovom Zdenkom Vinskim, i svoj znanstveni rad na rasnoj antropologiji i rasnoj politici. Moguće je da se Ivaniček vodio razmišljanjem svog mentora Eugena Fischera i vidio biološke razlike između pojedinih asimiliranih Židova (počasni arijevac) i rasno neprihvatljive većine.

Njegov znanstveni uspjeh nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata je za sada neobjašnjiv, osim kroz snalažljivost i brzu promjenu znanstvenog diskursa, od ustaše do dokazivanja panslavizma. Prestanak Ivaničekova rada u jugoslavenskoj arheologiji došao je kao pritisak od strane hrvatskih arheologa na čelu sa Zdenkom Vinskim. Čini se da to nije bila odluka bazirana da njegovu radu u vrijeme Drugoga svjetskog rata, već pokušaj arheologa da preuzmu dominaciju nad velikim istraživanjima ranosrednjovjekovnih groblja. Hrvatski su mu arheolozi 1950. godine poručili da se od njega *zahtijeva suradnja, a ne dirigriranje*.⁷⁰

Leaving for the United States

When he was no longer allowed to conduct archaeological research in Yugoslavia, Ivaniček went to the United States on a UNESCO Scholarship for Anthropology (1951) and the Wenner-Gran Scholarship of New York (1952 – 1953). What very little we know about Ivaniček after leaving for the USA comes principally from an obituary published in 1975:

“Franjo Ivaniček (Francis Ivanichek), an anthropologist, educator, physician and regular member of the Croatian Academy of America, died in Monroe, Michigan. Ivaniček was born in Dabci, Croatia, obtained his Ph.D. in Anthropology in 1936 and M.D. in 1941 at the University of Zagreb. He was granted UNESCO fellowship in anthropology in 1951 and a New York Wenner-Gran Federation fellowship in 1952 – 1953. He was also an associate professor of anthropology at the University of Zagreb in 1952 – 53. His career in the United States began with his internship at Fordham Hospital, Bronx, New York (1953 – 1954). He was a resident doctor at State Hospital, Ancora Hammonoton, New Jersey (1956 – 1959), staff psychiatrist, Alaska Psychiatric Institute, Anchorage (1962 – 1964), clinical director, Mental Hygiene Clinic, Butte, Montana (1964 – 1965), senior Staff Psychiatrist, Cleveland Psychiatric Institute (1966 – 1967), and Director of the Mental Hygiene Clinic, Monroe, Michigan, 1967 till his death”.⁶⁹

He no longer practised anthropology.

Conclusion

Franjo Ivaniček's scientific discourse during World War II is based on fundamental racial differences between the dominant Dinaric race (Croats and Muslims in BiH) and the nomadic 'Near Eastern' race (Serbs in BiH). Although the official NDH racial policy grouped Serbs or Vlachs with Jews and Roma into a 'Near Eastern' race, Ivaniček does not present anti-Semitic thoughts in his works. In this way, Ivaniček reconciled his professional and ideological commitment to racial anthropology with his personal life with sincere devotion – i.e. being married to a Jewish woman, Helena Herzberger, and his close collaboration with the Jew Zdenko Vinski. Ivaniček, possibly influenced by the thinking of his mentor Eugen Fischer, perceived biological differences between certain assimilated Jews ('honorary Aryans') and the racially unacceptable majority.

His scientific success after World War II is inexplicable for now, except through resourcefulness and the rapid change of scientific discourse, from Ustaša to researcher of Pan-Slavism. The cessation of Ivaniček's work in Yugoslav archaeology came as pressure from Croatian archaeologists led by Zdenko Vinski. It does not seem to have been a decision based on his work during World War II, but an attempt by archaeologists to reclaim dominance over the excavations of early-medieval cemeteries. In 1950, Croatian archaeologists told him that “he was required to cooperate, not to orchestrate”.⁷⁰

69 Journal of Croatian Studies 1975.

70 Degmedžić 1950, 267.

69 Journal of Croatian Studies 1975.

70 Degmedžić 1950, 267.

KRATICE

ABBREVIATIONS

AAMZ – Arhiv Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu / The Archaeological Museum in Zagreb Archive

HR HDA – Hrvatski državni arhiv / Croatian State Archives

BIBLIOGRAFIJA

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aleksius 2012 – N. Aleksius, Jewish Students and Christian Corpses in Interwar Poland: Playing with the Language of Blood Libel, *Jewish History* 26 (3/4), 2012, 327–342.
- Aralica 2009 – V. Aralica, Matica hrvatska u političkom životu Hrvatske 1935. – 1945., *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 41/2, Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2009, 447–482.
- Banović 2012 – S. Banović, *Država i njezino kazalište. Hrvatsko državno kazalište 1941. – 1945.*, Profil, 2012.
- Bartulin 2007 – N. Bartulin, Ideologija nacije i rase: ustaški režim i politika prema Srbima u Nezavisnoj Državi Hrvatskoj 1941. – 1945., *Radovi zavoda za hrvatsku povijest* 39, 2007, 209–241.
- Bartulin 2009 – N. Bartulin, The ideal Nordic-Dinaric racial type: Racial anthropology In The Independent State of Croatia, *Review of Croatian History* 5, 2009, 189–219.
- Bartulin 2012 – N. Bartulin, Intellectual Discourse on Race and Culture in Croatia 1900 – 1945, *Review of Croatian History* 8/1, 2012, 185–205.
- Bartulin 2013 – N. Bartulin, *Honorary Aryans: National – Racial Identity and Protected Jews in the Independent State of Croatia*, Palgrave Macmillian, 2013.
- Bartulin 2014 – N. Bartulin, *The Racial Idea in the Independent State of Croatia: origins and theory*, Central and Eastern Europe regional perspectives in global context 4, Brill, 2014.
- Bartulin 2019 – N. Bartulin, Slavs, Goths and Iranians: The Theory of the Nordic Herrenschaft and Croat Racial Origins in the NDH, *Zbornik Janković* 4, 2019, 275–306.
- Bauer, Fischer, Lenz 1921 – E. Bauer, E. Fischer, F. Lenz, *Grundriss der menschlichen Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene von Erwin Bauer, Eugen Fischer [und] Fritz Lenz*, München, 1921.
- Bulić-Jakuš 2017 – F. Bulić-Jakuš, Katedra za medicinsku biologiju i Zavod za biologiju, in Pećina, M., Klarica, M. (eds.), *Medicinski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu : 1917. – 2017.*, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Medicinski fakultet, 2017, 419–428.
- Degmedžić 1950 – I. Degmedžić, O radu Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu (prilog općem saveznom referatu „O stanju arheološkog rada u Jugoslaviji od 1945.–1950.“ na Savjetovanju arheologa Federativne Narodne Republike Jugoslavije u Niškoj Banji svibnja 1950.), *Historijski zbornik* 3, 1950, 267–273.
- Ehrenreich 2007 – E. Ehrenreich, Otmar von Verschuer and the “Scientific” Legitimization of Nazi Anti-Jewish Policy, *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 21, Oxford University Press, 2007, 55–72.
- Guštin 2019 – M. Guštin, The Formative Period Of Slovenian Early Medieval Archaeology, *Archaeologia Medievale* 46, 2019, 17–26.
- Hrvatski narod 1941 – Hrvatski narod, Tumačenje rasnih zakonskih odredbi, *Hrvatski narod* 80, (3 May 1941).
- Hutton 2005 – M. Hutton, *Race and the Third Reich: Linguistics, Racial Anthropology and Genetics in the Dialectic of Volk*, Cambridge Polity Press, 2005.
- Ivaniček 1944a – F. Ivaniček, Beiträge zur Anthropologie und Rassengeschichte der Kroaten, *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie* 4, 1944, 177–192.
- Ivaniček 1944b – F. Ivaniček, Naša antropologija. Misli prilikom predradnji oko osnutka Hrvatskog antropološkog zavoda, *Spremnost, misao i volja ustaške Hrvatske* 114, 1944, 9.
- Ivaniček 1945 – F. Ivaniček, Antropologija Hrvata. Prvi zadatci Hrvatskog državnog antropološkog zavoda, *Spremnost, misao i volja ustaške Hrvatske* 149–150, 1945, 4.
- Ivaniček 1949 – F. Ivaniček, Istraživanje nekropole ranog srednjeg vijeka u Bijelom Brdu, *Ljetopis Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 55, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1949, 111–144.
- Ivaniček 1951 – F. Ivaniček, Staroslavenska nekropola u Ptujju. Rezultati antropoloških istraživanja, *Razred za zgodovinske in družbene vede, Classis I: historia et sociologia* 5, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, 1951.
- Janžeković 2017 – I. Janžeković, Mnogo hrupa za nič (1. del), Potek in ozadje odkritja staroslovanskega svetišča na ptujskem gradu, *Zgodovinski časopis* 71, Zveza zgodovinskih društev Slovenije, 2017, 208–245.
- Journal of Croatian Studies 1975 – Journal of Croatian Studies, Franjo Ivaniček, *Obituaries, Journal of Croatian Studies* 16, 1975, 187–188.
- Kisić Kolanović 2007 – N. Kisić Kolanović, „Islamska varijanta” u morfologiji kulture NDH 1941. – 1945., *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 39, 2007, 63–95.
- Majewski 2016 – P. M. Majewski, Społeczność akademicka 1915 – 1939, in Majewski, P. M. (ed.), *Dzieje Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego 1915 – 1945*, Monumenta Universitatis Varsoviensis 1816 – 2016, Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego 2016, 273–276.
- Malović 2008 – I. Malović, Eugenika kao ideološki sastojak fašizma u Srbiji 1930ih godina XX veka, *Sociologija* 50, 2008, 79–96.
- Milosavljević 2012 – M. Milosavljević, Niko Županić i istorijska antropologija balkanskih narod, *Issues in Ethnology and Anthropology* 7/3, 2012, 682–708.
- Narodne novine 1941 – Narodne novine, Zakonska odredba o zaštiti narodne i arijske kulture hrvatskog naroda od 4. lipnja 1941, *Narodne novine* 43, 1941.
- Nova Hrvatska 1944 – Nova Hrvatska, Osnovan je Hrvatski državni antropološki zavod, *Nova Hrvatska* 272, (23 November 1944).
- Pleterski (ed.) 2008 – A. Pleterski (ed.), *Zgodnjesrednjeveška naselbina na Blejski Pristavi. Najdbe / Frühmittelalterliche Siedlung Pristavain Bled. Funde*. Opera Instituti Archaeologici Sloveniae 14, Institut za arheologijo, Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti, Založba ZRC, 2008.
- Rajić Šikanjić 2005 – P. Rajić Šikanjić, Bioarchaeological Research in Croatia – A Historical Review, *Collegium antropologicum* 29, 2005, 763–768.
- Schmuhl 2008 – H. W. Schmuhl, *The Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics, 1927 – 1945: Crossing Boundaries*, Springer, 2008.

Slapšak, Novaković 1996 – B. Slapšak, P. Novaković, Is there national archaeology without nationalism? Archaeological tradition in Slovenia, in Diaz-Andreu, M., Champion, T. (eds.) *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, University College of London Press, 1996, 256–293.

Solter 2020 – A. Solter, Zdenko Vinski u vrtlogu Drugoga svjetskog rata, in Jarak, M., Bunčić, M. (eds.), *Zdenko Vinski – život i znanstveni rad, Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog u Zagrebu 2016. godine*, Collectanea archaeologica Musei archaeologici Zagrabensis 4, Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Odsjek za arheologiju, Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, 2020, 35–49.

Шафарик, Шулман 1954 – O. Шафарик, М. Шулман, Хинга. Средньовековна некропола код Суботице, *Рад војвођанских музеја* 3, 1954, 5–55.

Šalković-Frajsman 1934 – Z. Šalković-Frajsman, Hrvatska nacionalna ideja, *Nezavisna Hrvatska Država: Godišnjak 1934.*, 31.

Šlaus 2006 – M. Šlaus, *Bioarheologija: demografija, zdravlje, traume i prehrana starohrvatskih populacija*, Školska knjiga, 2006.

Šlaus 2009 – M. Šlaus, Arheologija 20. st. Bioarheologija starohrvatskih populacija, in Balen, J., Čečuk, B. (eds.), *Hrvatska arheologija XX. stoljeća*, Matica Hrvatska, 2009, 135–150.

Vinski 1940 – Z. Vinski, *Uz problematiku starog Irana i Kavkaza s osvrtom na podrijetlo Anta i Bijelih Hrvata / Zur Problematik des alten Iran und Kaukasus mit Hinblick auf die Herkunft der Anten und Weissen Kroaten / The problem of Old Iran und Caucasus with regard to the origins of Antae and the White Croatians*, self-published, 1940.

Vinski 1949 – Z. Vinski, Prethodni izvještaj o arheološkim značajkama elemenata materijalne kulture nađenim pri iskanjanju nekropole ranog srednjeg vijeka u Bijelom Brdu u siječnju 1948. godine, *Ljetopis Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 55, 1949, 225–238.

Vinski 1951 – Z. Vinski, K izvještaju o iskanjanju nekropole u Bijelom Brdu, *Historijski zbornik* 1–4, 1951, 304–311.

Von Verschuer 1941 – O. F. von Verschuer, *Leitfaden der Rassenhygiene*, Georg Thieme, 1941.

Weindling 2007 – P. J. Weindling, Central Europe Confronts German Racial Hygiene: Friedrich Hertz, Hugo Illis and Ignaz Zollschan as Critics of Racial Hygiene, in Turda, M., Weindling, P. J. (eds.), *Blood and Homeland. Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900 – 1940*, Central European University Press, 2007, 263–280.

Weiss 2012 – S. F. Weiss, The Loyal Genetic Doctor, Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer, and the Institut für Erbbiologie und Rassenhygiene: Origins, Controversy, and Racial Political Practice, *Central European History* 45, Cambridge, 2012, 631–668.

Yeomans 2013 – R. Yeomans, Eradicating Undesired Elements: National Regeneration and the Ustasha Regime's Program to Purify the Nation, 1941 – 1945, in Weiss-Wend, A., Yeomans, R. (eds.), *Racial Science in Hitler's New Europe, 1938 – 1945*, University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln and London, 2013, 200–236.

Zaorski 2019 – A. Zaorski, Profesor Edward Loth (1884 – 1944), *Encyklopedia Medyków Powstania Warszawskiego*, 2019, http://lekarzypowstania.pl/tajnestudia_medyczne/wykladowcy/profesor-edward-loth-1884-1944/, (11 November 2020).

Wetzell 2017 – R. F. Wetzell, Eugenics, Racial Science, and Nazi Biopolitics. Was There a Genesis of the Final Solution from the Spirit of Science?, in Pendas, D. O., Roseman, M., Wetzell, F. F. (eds.), *Beyond the Racial State. Rethinking Nazi Germany*, Cambridge University Press, 2017, 147–175.

Wiedemann 2012 – F. Wiedemann, The North, the Desert, and the Near East: Ludwig Ferdinand Clauß and the Racial Cartography of the Near East, *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 12/2, 2012, 328–329.