

## **THE MUSEUM OF ARTS AND CRAFTS IN THE INDEPENDENT STATE OF CROATIA – A CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWING THE HISTORY OF THE MUSEUM**

**ARIJANA KOPRČINA, PHD**

Museum of Arts and Crafts

*arijana.koprcina@muo.hr*

The period of the Second World War and the Independent State of Croatia (NDH) in the context of the activities of the Museum of Arts and Crafts and other museums in Croatia is an insufficiently researched topic.<sup>1</sup> Although it is often assumed that museums and cultural institutions were peaceful or at least calmer oases in unstable times, political events and events at the state level did not pass them by. The influence of political decision-making and the decisions of the state authorities of the NDH during the Second World War marked the museum's history, which was followed in the post-war period by the policy of the new state of the Democratic Federative Yugoslavia, afterwards the FNRJ, which also carried out highly political decision-making. Therefore, wartime and the Independent State of Croatia with its problems and the post-war period in the new state of Yugoslavia with its peculiarities left an indelible mark until today. The Independent State of Croatia, created under the influence of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, was proclaimed on April

10, 1941. It was proclaimed by Slavko Kvaternik, first officially in the Banski dvori at 1 p.m.,<sup>2</sup> then on Radio Zagreb with a proclamation at 2 p.m., while German troops were entering the eastern part of the city. On the same<sup>3</sup> or the following day,<sup>4</sup> Slavko Kvaternik sent a telegram to Adolf Hitler with a request for recognition of the NDH (the NDH was recognised on April 15). Two days later, on April 12, all officials had to take an obligatory oath to the NDH, which was done by all employees of the Croatian National Museum of Arts and Crafts, and on April 15, in the early morning hours, Ante Pavelić came to Zagreb. The next day, April 16, a government was appointed, officially called the Croatian State Government, in which the museums and institutions with which the Museum cooperated, other museums and the Conservation Institute were under the administration of the Ministry of Religious Worship and Education, afterwards dubbed the Ministry of Public Education. The first minister was Mile Budak, and all communication with museums and decisions of the Ministry were carried out by a separate department, the Sub-Department for Higher Education and Scientific Institutes, later dubbed the Department for Higher Education and Scientific Institutes, headed by Božidar Murgić, PhD since the arrival of the new government.

That period is largely unknown; the monographic overview of the Museum's history has not been published in its entirety so far, and only some articles cover the period of the Second World War.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, this contribution brings an insight into three special topics, indicating the complexity of the events from 1941 to 1945, as well as an insight into the official procedures in the Independent State of Croatia.

During that period, the most important work of the museum was the cataloguing of works of art, the acquisition and protection of heritage, in which all museum experts and the entire staff of the Museum participated. But state authorities, along with professionalism, also demanded obedience to political dictates. Two museums – the Museum of Arts and Crafts and the Archaeological Department of the National Museum – had to hand over objects from the museum collection for the diplomatic needs of the leader who wanted to use them to prove himself to Hitler. This extremely unprofessional request could not be refused, but it allowed the Museum a certain freedom and individuals survival despite the legal provisions of the NDH.

### THE ROLE OF MUSEUM EXPERTS IN REGISTERING OF ART AND VALUABLES

The legislative framework of the NDH and its implementation had a decisive influence on the work of museum institutions. The entire legislative framework, both general and special, resulted from the complete takeover of power by the Ustasha ruling group, the leader and the NDH government.<sup>6</sup>

The first provision passed shortly after the declaration of the state was fundamental; already on April 17, 1941, the *Legal Provision for the Defence of the People and the State* was passed, followed by others that related to the preservation of the “pure Croatian nation and pure Croatian space.”<sup>7</sup> They enabled racial policy and the deprivation of civil rights and the confiscation of property of “non-Aryans,” primarily Jews, but the provisions also applied to

Serbs, Roma and others. Some of them are listed here, and the others were brought along with them:

- April 18, 1941, *Legal Provision on the Preservation of Croatian National Property*
- April 30, 1941, *Legal Provision on Citizenship*
- April 30, 1941, *Legal Provision on Racial Origins*
- April 30, 1941, *Legal Provision on the Protection of Aryan Blood and the Honour of the Croatian People*, which, in addition to a series of prohibitions against Jews, foresees the right of the leader to, by personal decision, grant citizenship to non-Aryan persons who, before April 10, “contributed to the Croatian people” – “honorary Aryan status”
- June 4, 1941, *Legal Provision on the Protection of the National and Aryan Culture of the Croatian People*
- June 4, 1941, *Order on the Organization and Work of the Racial Political Commission*
- June 4, 1941, *Order to Change Jewish Surnames and the Labelling of Jews and Jewish Companies*
- June 4, 1941, *Order on Determining the Racial Origins of Civil and Autonomous Officials and Executors of Free Academic Titles*
- June 5, 1941, *Legal Provision on Preventing the Concealment of Jewish Property*
- June 5, 1941, *Legal Provision on the Compulsory Reporting of Jewish Property and Business Enterprises*
- June 5, 1941, *Implementing Regulation on the Compulsory Reporting of Jewish Property and Business Enterprises*

- August 27, 1941, *Provision on the Acquisition and Administration of Jewish Apartments, Buildings and Properties*
- October 6, 1941, *Legal Provision on the Nationalisation of Jewish property and Jewish businesses*
- November 25, 1941, *Legal Provision on the Referral of Undesirable and Dangerous Persons to Forced Stay in Concentration and Labour Camps*.<sup>8</sup>

A special legislative framework was valid for works of art and other valuables. Art, private collections of various content, numismatic and archaeological, then libraries, archives and other valuable movables, not only as private property, but also as the property of religious communities and other institutions, were at the centre of attention of the Ministry of Religious Worship and Education, later dubbed the Ministry of Public Education. Therefore, for the protection of heritage, including movable property, several provisions were passed that were the basis for dealing with cultural heritage during the NDH. Associated with the general provisions, they were also used to implement the NDH policy, that is, to confiscate property.

The inventory and work with historically and artistically valuable materials, archives, libraries, works of art and valuables was carried out by experts appointed for this purpose, museum staff and employees of the conservation service. This also meant everything was determined, the participants and the way of working, and the acceptance of cooperation was assumed.

Museum experts and museum staff participated in three types of work. The fundamental engagement was registering works of art, archives, libraries and other

material in private possession, for which the Conservation Institute was responsible. In parallel with that, materials from Orthodox churches and monasteries in the NDH were listed and taken over, which was under the jurisdiction of the Museum of Arts and Crafts. The third type of inventory was related to participation in the commissions for the inventory of gold and valuables seized from Jews and Serbs, which was under the jurisdiction of the police and later the Croatian State Bank, about which the least is known.

All actions related to art during the NDH are based on the regulation from the period of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. It is about the *Provision on the Preservation of Antiquities and Natural Monuments*<sup>9</sup> adopted on July 25, 1940, which was the fundamental document on the preservation of heritage in the territory of the Banovina of Croatia within the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. It was used to gain insight into private art and other collections, heritage and natural values, as well as insight into the art market. The provision prescribed the establishment of conservation institutes and the systematisation of jobs according to qualifications and experience (a conservator had to have a doctoral thesis in cultural and historical sciences and twelve years of conservation or museum practice, an assistant conservator a diploma in cultural and historical sciences, a professional exam and three years of conservation or museum practices). In summary, the *Provision* “protected all movable and immovable cultural-historical (archaeological, historical, ethnographic, architectural and artistic) and natural monuments,” they were to be taken care of by “authorities for the protection of monuments: the district

and city governments and the Conservation Institutes according to the scope of the Provision.” The *Provision* further explains that “Conservation Institutes are institutions for the study of all cultural and historical monuments, and it is their duty to compile and maintain a list of these monuments.”<sup>10</sup> Immediately after the adoption of the *Provision* in 1940, the Conservation Institute requested the financing of four permanent positions (conservator, assistant conservator, secretary and caretaker),<sup>11</sup> which were filled during 1941. From the beginning of 1941, the Institute was gradually professionalised, despite Gjuro Szabo’s attempt to continue the previous practice of part-time employment. Although at the beginning of 1941, acting head conservator Gjuro Szabo tried to hire Ivan Bach, PhD<sup>12</sup> as a part-time assistant, he was refused on the grounds that he was already employed as a curator at the Museum of Arts and Crafts. Therefore, in March, Tihomil Stahuljak was permanently employed as an assistant conservator.<sup>13</sup> During the first half of 1941, the Institute was led by acting head conservator Gjuro Szabo, then from October 1, by Ljubo Karaman, PhD,<sup>14</sup> who was appointed from August.<sup>15</sup>

However, the most important thing for further events related to movable property was that the *Provision on the Preservation of Antiquities and Natural Monuments* of July 25, 1940, prescribed the keeping of a list of monuments, including movable property, and it was determined that “if the owner of the monument does not care enough about its maintenance, the monument can be expropriated. If the monument is movable, it will be transferred and deposited in the competent Museum.”<sup>16</sup>

The *Provision on the Preservation of Antiquities and Natural Monuments* from 1940

is supplemented by the regulations of the NDH. The first document on the protection of heritage in the NDH was the *Proclamation regarding the protection of artistic and historical objects from destruction*,<sup>17</sup> which the Conservation Institute sent to the Ministry of Religious Worship and Education on May 10, 1941, prescribing the mandatory preservation of heritage.

The *Proclamation* was followed on the same day by a memo to the Ministry of Religious Worship and Education entitled *Cultural-historical and artistic objects in private collections*.<sup>18</sup> The memo states that with the establishment of the NDH, numerous objects with their “decorations” or individual items that were once owned by private individuals or former authorities have passed or are passing into the ownership or possession of the state authorities. Among them are those that have greater or lesser cultural and historical significance. It goes on to state: “It is in the interest of the progress of Croatian science and the development of Croatian museums, from which these private collections, with their more abundant financial resources, seized important artistic or historical objects, that the objects of private collections have to mentioned, whether they are owned or only used by state authorities, now they have to be taken out of use and handed over to state museums, which are the only place where these objects belong.”<sup>19</sup> It is proposed that a committee composed of experts from the Conservation Institute and various museums be established to review the collections and evaluate the works of art. The memo was signed by acting head conservator Gjuro Szabo, director of the Croatian National Museum of Arts and Crafts Vladimir Tkalčić, director of the Croatian National Ethnographic



Museum Milovan Gavazzi, PhD and the director of the Croatian National History Museum Viktor Hoffler, PhD.<sup>20</sup>

All of the above was the basis for the *Legal Provision on the Prohibition of the Alienation and Export of Antiques and Artworks, Cultural, Historical, and Natural Monuments from the Territory of the Independent State of Croatia*, promulgated on May 12, 1941 (*Legal Provision of the Head of State No. LXXVIII-135 Z. p. / 1941*).<sup>21</sup> The aforementioned *Provision* stipulated that “all state, self-governing and religious institutions are obliged to carefully guard or store in safe places. The same applies to private persons who own any ancient artistic, cultural-historical and natural monuments, even those that have a distinct family and personal character.” It is further stated that “institutions and individuals who could not carefully preserve their ancient artistic, cultural-historical and natural monuments by themselves should hand them over to any Croatian National Museum of the NDH, which will issue them a written confirmation of deposit receipt or purchase on behalf of the NDH.”<sup>22</sup> The third important decision made during the NDH, which relates to movable heritage, was the decision of the Office for Nationalised Property of June 12, 1942, authorising Croatian state museums for deaccessioning and taking over objects free of charge in accordance with the *Provision* of May 12, 1941.<sup>23</sup> It is not yet known how long this decision was implemented.

## REGISTER OF PRIVATE COLLECTIONS

Based on the above, the establishment of commissions for listing private collections was initiated, which consisted

of members from the Conservation Institute and members from individual museums. They received written powers of attorney confirmed by the Conservation Institute and official identification cards confirmed by the law enforcement authorities.<sup>24</sup> In connection with the *Legal Provision on the Prohibition of the Alienation and Export of Antiques and Artworks, Cultural, Historical, and Natural Monuments from the Territory of the Independent State of Croatia*, a *Warning to the Owners of Antiquities* was later issued, which explained the procedure, suggested the beneficial impact for collection owners, the benevolence of the staff, and expected cooperation with the owners.<sup>25</sup>

The Conservation Institute instructed delegates to list, record and study the objects.<sup>26</sup> Afterwards, the owners were given certificates, that is, lists of works of art as information about what they owned, and the objects were supposed to remain in the possession of the owners. In the case of selling a piece of art or an antique object, the right of first purchase went to the City or Regional Administration for the competent museum with the appropriate profile.<sup>27</sup> But, understandably, there were individuals, owners of the collections, who were distrustful. Therefore, on May 23, 1941, the Conservation Institute requested the help of the Police Directorate to register artistic and cultural-historical objects.<sup>28</sup> It is known that the Conservation Institute issued powers of attorney on several occasions. The first time, on May 17, 1941, it did it for Vladimir Tkalčić, director of the Museum; Ivan Bach, curator; Zdenka Munk, curator; Ruža Zanon, assistant accountant; Zdenko Vojnović, librarian; Tihomil Stahuljak, diarist assistant of the

Conservation Institute; Marija Hanževački, employee of the City Museum in Zagreb.<sup>29</sup> Also, on May 30, it requested confirmation of official IDs for Vladimir Tkalčić, Ivan Bach and Zdenko Vojnović from the Police Directorate.

Then, on July 19, 1941, the Conservation Institute sent the Police Directorate a list of five more holders of identification cards of the Conservation Institute: Franjo Buntak, curator of the City Museum of the City of Zagreb; Mirko Šeper, PhD, archivist of the Croatian National Archaeological Museum in Zagreb; Mira Sablić, curator trainee of the Croatian National Museum of Arts and Crafts; Držislav Švob, PhD, curator of the Croatian National History Museum in Zagreb; and again (!) Zdenko Vojnović, librarian of the Croatian National Museum in Zagreb.<sup>30</sup>

For the third group, on July 29, 1941, the Conservation Institute sent to the Directorate of the Ustasha Police ten more names of the owners of identification documents of the Conservation Institute. The list included: Milovan Gavazzi, acting director of the Croatian National Ethnographic Museum; Tereza Paulić, textile restorer of the Croatian National Ethnographic Museum; Katarina Elegović Zaić, accountant of the Croatian National Ethnographic Museum; Zdenka Sertić, academic painter of the Croatian National Ethnographic Museum; Ljerka Topali, curator of the Croatian National Ethnographic Museum; Ljubomir Migić, employee of the Croatian National Ethnographic Museum; Marcel Davila, photographer of the Croatian National Ethnographic Museum; Anđela Horvat, professor working at the Croatian National Museum of Arts and Crafts; Marcel Gorenc, professor working at the Croatian National Museum of Arts

and Crafts; and Zvonimir Jovan, working at the Croatian National Museum of Arts and Crafts.<sup>31</sup>

The head of the Sub-Department for Higher Education and Scientific Institutes, Božidar Murgić, reported on the register on July 26, 1941, giving a *Report on the Implementation of the Legal Provision of the poglavnik from May 12, 1941*,<sup>32</sup> in which he states that “the representatives of the museum quickly listed private collections, some immediately deposited them in the museum for storage.” He points out the collection of Doctor Artur Marić, which was stored in the Museum, the Hinko Lederer collection, which was stored in the Gypsotheca even before the *Provision*, and the Žiga Herzog collection, which was plundered before the registrars arrived, and what remained of the collection was stored in the Museum. The *Report* further states that the Milan Marić collection is still in a private space, as is the Julije König collection.<sup>33</sup>

Private collections and privately owned objects were stored in the Museum from 1941 onwards.<sup>34</sup> Then, in June 1943, the acting head conservator Ivan Bach,<sup>35</sup> invited private owners to store works of art in the basement of the Museum, where an air raids shelter was arranged.<sup>36</sup> The invitation was sent to the addresses where private collections were kept, some of which remained in the Museum even after the fall of the NDH, after the change of government and the establishment of a new state.<sup>37</sup>

## REGISTER OF ARTEFACTS FROM ORTHODOX CHURCHES AND MONASTERIES

The listing of artistic, archival, library and other materials from Orthodox churches

and monasteries was the responsibility of the Museum of Arts and Crafts by the decision of State Secretary Veršić as Deputy Minister of Education, prompted by the mediation of the director of the Museum Vladimir Tkalčić and with the confirmation of acting head conservator Gjuro Szabo.<sup>38</sup> The decision regarding the jurisdiction of the Museum over Orthodox artefacts was initiated by Vladimir Tkalčić, and supported by Božidar Murgić, who drafted the text of the decision.<sup>39</sup> It was ordered to list and transport all materials to the Museum. First, the material was mostly collected in the field, sometimes with the cooperation of experts from other museums, and only afterwards was the inventory made in the Museum. According to Vladimir Tkalčić, he oversaw the inventory alongside Ivan Bach, Zdenko Vojnović and the supervisors Josip Gjekić and Marijan Gionechetti. From the Conservation Institute, there was supervisor Ivan Kanižanec, from the Archaeological Museum Mirko Šeper, preparator Jakov Pavelić and supervisors Nikola Kasun and Antun Tuđan, from the “History Museum” Držislav Švob as well as assistant Marcel Davila and supervisor Josip Novak from the Ethnographic Museum.<sup>40</sup> Everything from Orthodox churches and monasteries was delivered to the Museum, as Tkalčić testified at the hearing after the change of government and the establishment of the State of Yugoslavia. He stated that the artefacts were taken from the Fruška Gora monasteries: Beočin, Bešenovo, Đipša, Grgeteg, Hopovo, Jazak, Krušedol, Kuveždin, Privina Glava, Rakovac, Ravanica, Šišatovac, Petkovic and Velike Remete. Material was taken from Gomirje and Plaško, from parish churches in Srijem, from the Patriarchal Palace and three

Orthodox churches in Karlovci, and from other localities. From his words, we learn that the Museum was only authorised to take over artefacts from church buildings, therefore the numismatic collection from Karlovci was taken over by Mirko Šeper. Liturgical objects and furnishings as well as libraries, archives and all valuables in church buildings or monasteries were taken over, and soon the museum spaces were full. The list of objects was regularly given to representatives of the monastery<sup>41</sup> in accordance with the *Legal Provision on the Prohibition of the Alienation and Export of Antiques and Artworks, Cultural, Historical, and Natural Monuments from the Territory of the Independent State of Croatia*. After the items were delivered to the Museum, they were processed successively, and in 1945 the Commission for the Handover of Orthodox Objects was established in the Museum of Arts and Crafts.<sup>42</sup>

## REGISTER OF GOLD AND VALUABLES

During the NDH, inventory and control commissions were organised on several occasions for the list of gold, silver and valuables confiscated from Jews and Serbs. These are lists of nationalised and un-nationalised assets.<sup>43</sup> The inventory was carried out in the premises of the police (Police Directorate) and the Croatian State Bank afterwards. Inventories were carried out by various state and bank officials, regularly officially appointed on behalf of the institutions, and only in certain cases was the participation of museum employees prescribed.

As early as May 1941, the Conservation Institute asked the Police Directorate in

Zagreb to inspect the seized gold objects of artistic and cultural-historical value, primarily old money and jewellery. In the memo dated May 23, it was stated that “during the handing over of the gold coins of the Zagreb Jews into the hands of the Croatian state authorities, those that have historical or artistic value (antique coins, artistic jewellery, etc.) were collected” and the Conservation Institute requested that the experts of the Croatian National Museum and the Conservation Institute allow inspection and selection for the Museum’s collections.<sup>44</sup> Then, on May 26, 1941, Božidar Murgić also wrote that confiscated art objects, including those made of gold and silver (antique carpets, porcelain, glass, special gold pieces), are located at the Police Directorate in Zagreb in Petrinjska Street, under the supervision of adviser Britvić, who agreed that everything should be looked at by museum experts first and asks the professor (unnamed) to plead with Minister Artuković for permission to remove valuable items for the Museum.<sup>45</sup>

At the end of the year, on December 9, 1941, the inventory of seized valuables began in the premises of the Directorate for Public Order and Security at Petrinjska 7. At first, museum experts were not involved in the commission’s work, but Vladimir Tkalčić, Ivan Bach, Marcel Gorenc and Zdenka Munk were included from December 20. It can be assumed that the decision to include the Museum is related to the earlier correspondence from May 1941, but it seems that the procedure was not clearly established because Vladimir Tkalčić and Ivan Bach took over some objects for the Museum on December 20 and then on December 23 they were handed back to the Directorate.<sup>46</sup> After that, in

early January 1942, the Museum informed the Commission for the Handover of Money and Valuables at the Directorate for Public Order and Security about the change of representatives, and Mira Sablić and Marcel Gorenc were appointed as representatives of the Museum, with Vladimir Tkalčić, Ivan Bach and Zdenka Munk as their deputies.<sup>47</sup>

Then, from March 1942, money and valuables were inventoried in the Office for Nationalised Property, in which the Museum did not participate.<sup>48</sup> However, in the middle of that year, on June 12, the Office for Nationalised Property decided that Croatian state museums were authorised to extract and take over objects free of charge in the accordance with the *Provision* of May 12, 1941.<sup>49</sup> So far, it is not known how well the implementation of that decision was accepted.

Gold and valuables were managed unprofessionally, and already in late 1942, the Ministry of the State Treasury investigated the handling of valuables, which began on December 15 and ended on December 30, 1942, with the examination of witnesses.<sup>50</sup> Also, individuals involved in inventorying, trained to evaluate gold and jewellery, questioned the financial profitability of the previous way of taking valuables. Therefore, in late 1942, Josip Zlatarić, a member of the Commission for the Evaluation of Valuables to be handed over to the Croatian National Bank, sent a proposal to the National Treasurer, that is, to Superintendent Barić. He proposed dividing the seized assets according to materials, considering that certain types of objects should be offered for sale, and the damaged ones should be melted down to obtain funds for the Croatian National Bank in the form of precious metals.<sup>51</sup>



In early 1943, all valuables were handed over to the Croatian National Bank<sup>52</sup> and, by the decision of the Minister of National Property, they had to be reclassified.<sup>53</sup> It seems that during 1943 the Museum did not participate in these activities, only in 1944. In May 1944, the Minister of National Treasury of the NDH decided on the *Commission for classification of valuables and money and handover to the Croatian National Bank for deposit* on the premises of the Croatian Mortgage Institute in Zagreb, where the proposals from 1942 were accepted. The decision also stipulates the participation of representatives of the Croatian State Museum of Arts and Crafts. The museum was asked to suggest experts, and on June 6 it was decided that representatives of the museum, Vladimir Tkalčić, PhD, director, Mira Sablić, curator, with Marcel Gorenc, curator, and Olga Klobučar, curator as their deputies.<sup>54</sup>

Valuables were classified according to a special arrangement – gold coins, gold objects, gold objects with precious stones, while the stones were classified according to type and quality, with brilliants in first place. The melting of scrap metals had to be defined by a special order. Objects made of “base metal – alpaca, argentor, China-silver” were to be sorted for use and sale or for scrap. It is particularly important that the decision stipulated that religious items and money of numismatic value were not to be deposited with the Croatian National Bank and to be classified, but were to be handed over to the Croatian Art Museum for Arts and Crafts.<sup>55</sup> From May to July 1944, members from the Museum also took part in the sorting, then by decision of the minister they were to be invited only for the purpose of collection

for the Museum. According to the records dated until July, some objects were taken over for the Museum, but it is not known if they remained in the collection because it is not possible to identify them yet. Afterwards, from July until the end of sorting on October 30, 1944, it appears that everything examined was melted down. A brief overview of the extremely important topic of cataloguing works of art, movable property, gold and valuables gave an insight into how the Museum’s cooperated with other institutions, primarily with the Conservation Institute and other museums, but also with state institutions. The aforementioned inventories of private collections and materials from Orthodox churches and monasteries are mostly known to the professional public, while participation in commissions for inventorying gold and valuables is an unknown part of museum history.

### **THE EMERGENCE OF THE NEW STATE – MUSEUM OBJECTS AS DIPLOMATIC GIFTS TO THE FÜHRER**

Leader Ante Pavelić, the head of the Independent State of Croatia, with the help of ministries and other state bodies, had all the power and influence in decision-making in all areas, including activities of cultural institutions. The interest of the leader and the affirmation of the new government are the basis of the donation of museum objects to the Führer, which was organised by his emissary Božidar Murgić. The short and extremely unprofessional episode has not been highlighted so far, not even the professional public fully knows that objects from the Museum of Arts and Crafts were also presented to Hitler. Everything

was organised immediately after the declaration of the new state.

The Croatian government was appointed on April 16, and the day after its appointment, on April 17, Božidar Murgić came to the Museum by order of the leader and took four museum items from the director Vladimir Tkalčić, remarking that “they should be deleted from the inventory.”<sup>56</sup> His arrival was probably preceded by some explanation, perhaps a written communication, but it is not known. However, what is known is that he took over a box under inventory number MUO 2620, a cashmere shawl inv. number MUO 5394, oriental textile inv. number MUO 5384 and oriental textile inv. number MUO 7790. Two objects (cashmere shawl inv. number MUO 5394 and oriental textile inv. number MUO 7790) were later returned to the Museum and are held in the museum collection.

This was about the selection of diplomatic gifts for Ante Pavelić’s first visit to Adolf Hitler, who received him in the company of Hermann Göring on June 6, 1941, in the Berghof mountain house located near the small town of Berchtesgaden. The meeting was prepared by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, various political topics were planned, and at the end of the meeting gifts were presented, as it was extremely well shown in the German newsreel with the most important details of the meeting, including the presentation of these gifts, with the visible delight of Hitler and Göring.<sup>57</sup> On that occasion, Ante Pavelić was accompanied by minister Andrija Artuković, Branko Benzon, emissary in Berlin, state secretaries Mladen Lorković and Vladimir Košak and Deputy Marshal Vladimir Laxa.<sup>58</sup> In addition, the official delegation in Salzburg during

the various meetings that day included Vjekoslav Vrančić, Ivan Werner, Mato Jagatić, Adolf Sabljak and six ustashas who were Pavelić’s personal entourage.<sup>59</sup> The newspapers of the time also reported on the event, for example *Hrvatski narod: glasilo hrvatskog ustaškog pokreta* on June 10 published photos of the gifts and the accompanying “Charter to the Führer” (Figs. 1–3).<sup>60</sup> The main gifts were the flag and chess of Frederick II from the collection of the Archaeological Department of the National Museum, confiscated during the Seven Years’ War. The flag was confiscated during the Battle of Kolin on June 18, 1757, in which the Habsburg army defeated the forces of the Prussian King Frederick II, and it came to the museum collection as a gift from the parish office in Gospić. Frederick II’s chess set was confiscated as part of a larger cargo by lieutenant colonel Stjepan Kovačić, the ancestor of the Antun Vakanović family, who donated the chess set gave to the Archaeological Department of the National Museum.<sup>61</sup> Although it was announced that an “old art box”<sup>62</sup> was also given to Hitler, it has not been mentioned that it was excluded from the collection of the Museum of Arts and Crafts.<sup>63</sup> A photo of the box was published in the newspaper, while the textile was not mentioned anywhere.<sup>64</sup> The museum’s inventory book describes the box as “a brown, wooden, polished casket, decorated with ebony and ivory marquetry on the sides, as well as geometric and stylised twigs, and upright ivory edges.” It was intended for stationery and contained several compartments.<sup>65</sup> Since the textile is not mentioned, and the inventory book describes it as “a fragment of brocade, with rows of larger and smaller stars of gilded

and silvered wire woven onto a red satin background,”<sup>66</sup> it can be assumed that it was inserted into the box or that the interior was lined with it, which could have equipped the cassette nicely, but there is no information about it.

The objects were taken from the Museum immediately in April after the establishment of the new state. From the point of view of the Ustasha authorities, the object’s historical value was intended to highlight the meaning of those for whom they are intended to get even closer to the centre of power. Therefore, it is not surprising that the objects intended as gifts were displayed to the guests during the leader’s reception in Banski dvori on April 19, which the German Plenipotentiary General Edmund Glaise von Horstenau describes as: “A series of beautiful baroque rooms testify to the old Austrian western culture. In one room, museum objects were arranged: Baron Trenk’s weapons<sup>67</sup> as a gift to Göring and a very beautiful chess set as a birthday present for the Führer.”<sup>68</sup> The German plenipotentiary general may have known that Pavelić was to be received by the two highest figures of the Third Reich, but it was not established whether the objects were to be a gift for Hitler’s birthday (April 20) or for another occasion. However, in early June 1941, Pavelić asked for a reception with Hitler and received an invitation for June 6, when the first diplomatic meeting with Hitler took place accompanied by Göring where he gifted them the extremely valuable museum materials.<sup>69</sup>

The authorities obviously expected obedience, the handing over of gifts from the collection could not be refused. Still, the participation in all of the above, consistent execution of orders and good rela-

tions with superiors, primarily with the Ministry of Education, enabled director Vladimir Tkalčić to operate more freely, and circumvent the rules occasionally. It is likely that Zdenko Vojnović stayed in the Museum despite the provision of the NDH, due to these privileges.

## ZDENKO VOJNOVIĆ’S STATUS

We know a lot about Zdenko Vojnović as he was a top intellectual and erudite, a scholar of the French government before the Second World War, a renowned theoretician and promoter of contemporary museology. He was also the director of the Museum from 1952 to 1954.<sup>70</sup> Although he was a well-known museum figure, the details of his career during the NDH, when despite the racial laws he survived and continued to work at the Museum, are unknown. Data on his origin should not normally be a research topic, but in the context of understanding the events during the NDH, they point to an unknown side of the museum’s history.

Zdenko Vojnović started volunteering in the Museum’s library in 1940, and in early February 1941, he got the position of a librarian. Then, like all public employees in the NDH, he took the oath to the NDH on April 12 and participated in all museum duties. He participated in cataloguing works of art with Vladimir Tkalčić, Ivan Bach, Zdenko Munk and Ruža Zanon, and he also received a card from the Conservation Institute, which was confirmed by the Police Department, i.e., the police.<sup>71</sup> However, on June 4, 1941, the *Order on Determining the Racial Origins of Civil and Autonomous Officials and Executors of Free Academic Titles* was promulgated and published on June 5.<sup>72</sup> The museum

received the *Order* on June 16, 1941, from the Sub-Department for Higher Education and Scientific Institutes of the competent Ministry of Religious Worship and Education. Data on employees was also requested. Director Tkalčić promptly responded, citing himself and other employees, noting that according to their own statements, no one has non-Aryan ancestors. He lists employees Ivan Bach, Ruža Zanon, Zdenka Munk, Toma Bogdanić, Josip Gjekić and Marijan Gionechetti.<sup>73</sup> He also claims that there are no other employees and does not name Zdenko Vojnović (!).

Based on the *Order on Determination of Racial Origins*, statements on racial origin of all the employees and their spouses had to be collected. A special list of “non-Aryan” and suspicious persons had to be made and sent to the Ministry. Along with the Order, the Ministry also issued an instruction on who should be immediately dismissed from service<sup>74</sup> and an instruction that dismissed officials should not be included on the lists.

This is exactly what Vladimir Tkalčić did. After Zdenko Vojnović filled out a form stating that his late father was Jewish, and only after a form was prepared with a list of employees with “non-Aryan ancestors” with Vojnović’s name on it (and the forms were not signed by Tkalčić as director), he dismissed him and informed the Ministry of Religious Worship and Education, the Museum Office, the Main Accounting Office and the Court of Accounts about the dismissal.<sup>75</sup> Vojnović was no longer employed, the Museum had no “non-Aryan” employees and, according to the Ministry’s instructions, his name should not have been on the list of employees. However, it appears that the data forms from the *Order on Determination*

*of Racial Origins* were not sent outside the Museum.

According to what we know so far, it was crucial for the further development of events that after Vojnović’s employment in February 1941, the Museum was only asked in late June (June 25) for a certificate about a paid “military service” dated June 19,<sup>76</sup> i.e., about expenses to those who were exempted from military service for health reasons, as was Vojnović. Since his dismissal and the search for a paid military service happened simultaneously, the documents on his dismissal were apparently not implemented, so the Museum, based on paid military service, later sent a decision to cancel the dismissal to the Ministry of Education,<sup>77</sup> which was confirmed by the Accounting Court by invalidating the decision on the dismissal on October 23, 1941.<sup>78</sup>

However, the ambiguous status and uncertainty continued throughout 1941. The unemployed Zdenko Vojnović worked in the Museum from June until the end of 1941 and cooperated with the Conservation Institute, performing museum duties and only occasionally receiving compensation for helping with these tasks. His status began to be resolved in early 1942, when the Museum informed the Accounting Court Zagreb about the “appointment of Zdenko Vojnović.”<sup>79</sup> Parallel to that, the fact that the Racial Political Commission was dissolved on January 19 is not unimportant for understanding the events.<sup>80</sup> Vojnović’s status was really resolved when he became a contract librarian in early September 1942 and finally in June 1943 when he became a librarian trainee.<sup>81</sup> Then, in early February 1944, he asked to be appointed librarian,<sup>82</sup> at the same time when Zdenka Munk asked to be appoint-



ed curator,<sup>83</sup> and together they fled to the partisans on February 20, avoiding arrest at the last moment.<sup>84</sup>

The analysis of all this in the context of the NDH framework raises the question as to how such a development was possible. In all official relations, the museum was directly subordinated to the Ministry of Religious Worship and Education and the Sub-Department for Higher Education and Scientific Institutes, and the assumption of the support of that body is imposed. The Head of the Sub-Department was Božidar Murgić, who was inclined towards the Museum and Vladimir Tkalčić,<sup>85</sup> and systematically confirmed the annual evaluations of the work of individuals. So, in early 1943,<sup>86</sup> he confirmed that Vojnović had been continuously employed at the Museum since February 1941, although he probably knew about the period of unemployment. Also, Zdenka Munk states in her biography, in which she describes the time when she was part of the resistance movement in Zagreb organised by the communist party, that she and Vojnović were “warned/threatened by the Head of the Ministry to be careful because if anything happens in the museum, we will be hanged.”<sup>87</sup> This indicated that he knew what they were doing, as leftists and communists, and that he was aware of illegal activities that the “Head of the Ministry” had no influence on. The explanation of the decision-making as well as the events is not yet known, and it is probably found in personal relationships, primarily between Vladimir Tkalčić and Zdenka Munk,<sup>88</sup> and Zdenko Vojnović, who was her lifelong companion. Vladimir Tkalčić had the greatest influence on the implementation or circumvention of the procedure, with the indispensable support of the Ministry of Education.

In conclusion, three prominent issues, one permanently present during all four years of the NDH and two almost unknown episodes, only indicate the complexity of the events at the Museum of Arts and Crafts during the NDH. It is indisputable that the adroit management of director Tkalčić and his good relationship with the authorities were the basis for business operations without major visible problems. However, the good relations continued afterwards as the basis for an unencumbered transition to the new state, the Democratic Federative Yugoslavia and then the Federative People’s Republic of Yugoslavia, in which the Museum maintained its fundamental professional role determined primarily by caring for heritage.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Complete reviews of the events related to cultural heritage during the Second World War are rare in the literature. See: Ante Grubišić, “Spašavanje kulturne baštine tijekom Drugog svjetskog rata na osječkom području,” *Povijest u nastavi* 33, no. 1 (2022): 245–276; Martina Juranović Tonejc, *Institucionalni razvoj zaštite pokretne umjetničke baštine u Hrvatskoj od 1850. do 1990. godine* (Zagreb: Ministarstvo kulture i medija Republike Hrvatske, 2021), 185–227.

<sup>2</sup> Nada Kisić Kolanović, *Vojskovođa i politika: Sjećanja Slavka Kvaternika* (Zagreb: Golden marketing, 1997), 150.

<sup>3</sup> Hrvoje Matković, *Povijest Nezavisne države Hrvatske* (Zagreb: Naklada Pavičić, 2022), 59.

<sup>4</sup> Kisić Kolanović, *Vojskovođa i politika: Sjećanja Slavka Kvaternika*, 30.

<sup>5</sup> Anđela Horvat, “Tkalčić i konzervatorski rad,” in: *Tkalčićev zbornik: zbornik radova posvećenih sedamdesetogodišnjici Vladimira Tkalčića*, vol. I, ed. Ivan Bach (Zagreb: Muzej za umjetnost i obrt, 1955), 209–216; Stanko Staničić, “Zdenka Munk – mjesto i uloga u hrvatskoj muzeologiji,” *Informatica Museologica* 32, no. 1/2 (2001): 31–36;

Sanja Grković, “Vladimir Tkalčić i fotografsko dokumentiranje baštine“, *Informatica Museologica* 49 (2018): 110–119; Jasmina Fučkan, “Muzej za umjetnost i obrt u Zagrebu kao generator novih institucija u vrijeme ravnatelja Vladimira Tkalčića (1933. – 1952.),” *Etnološka istraživanja* 27 (2022): 36–56.

<sup>6</sup> Nada Kisić Kolanović, “Podržavljenje imovine Židova u NDH,” *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 30, no. 3 (1998): 431.

<sup>7</sup> Matković, *Povijest Nezavisne države Hrvatske*, 175.

<sup>8</sup> These and other provisions are in: Kisić Kolanović, “Podržavljenje imovine Židova u NDH,” 431. For more details on the provisions and their impact see: Ivo Goldstein and Slavko Goldstein, *Holokaust u Zagrebu*, 2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition (Zagreb: Profil, 2024).

<sup>9</sup> “Uredba o čuvanju starina i prirodnih spomenika,” in: *Zbirka zakona i uredaba* 14, vol. I–XII, no. 1–659 (1940), 645–648; Martina Juranović Tonejc, “Zakonska regulativa u zaštiti pokretne baštine u doba Nezavisne države Hrvatske,” *Godišnjak zaštite spomenika kulture Hrvatske* 33/34 (2009/2010): 16; Juranović Tonejc, *Institucionalni razvoj zaštite pokretne umjetničke baštine u Hrvatskoj od 1850. do 1990. godine*, 181–183.

<sup>10</sup> “Uredba o čuvanju starina i prirodnih spomenika,” 645–648.

<sup>11</sup> Ministry of Culture and Media of the Republic of Croatia, Central Documentation in the Field of Cultural Heritage (hereinafter: MKM – SDKB), Collections of Older Material, Documentation materials of the Conservation Institute, 35/1940.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 7/1941.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 29/1941, 45/1941, 58/1941, 83/1941.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 201/1941.

<sup>15</sup> Appointed on August 19, 1941. *Ibid.*, 167/1941.

<sup>16</sup> “Uredba o čuvanju starina i prirodnih spomenika,” 645–648. More on the topic in: Iva Pasini Tržec, “Contentious Musealisation Process(es) of Jewish Art Collections in Croatia,” *Studi di memofonte* 22 (2019): 41.

<sup>17</sup> MKM – SDKB, Collections of Older Material, Documentation materials of the Conservation Institute, 81/1941; Juranović Tonejc, “Zakonska

regulativa u zaštiti pokretne baštine u doba Nezavisne države Hrvatske,” 17.

<sup>18</sup> MKM – SDKB, Collections of Older Material, Documentation materials of the Conservation Institute, 82/1941.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> A. Mataić, ed., *Nezavisna Država Hrvatska: Zakoni, zakonske odredbe i naredbe proglašene od 11. travnja do 26. svibnja 1941.*, book I, vol. 1–10 (Zagreb: Naklada knjižare St. Kugli, 1941), 227–228; Juranović Tonejc, *Institucionalni razvoj zaštite pokretne umjetničke baštine u Hrvatskoj od 1850. do 1990. godine*, 221.

<sup>22</sup> *Nezavisna Država Hrvatska: Zakoni, zakonske odredbe i naredbe proglašene od 11. travnja do 26. svibnja 1941.*, 227–228.

<sup>23</sup> Croatian State Archives, Božidar Murgić Collection of the museum activities from the 1920s to the 1940s (hereinafter: HR-HDA-1149), I – 2.10.7.

<sup>24</sup> Example procedure: MKM – SDKB, Collections of Older Material, Documentation materials of the Conservation Institute, 84/1941, 145/1941, 149/1941.

<sup>25</sup> Isto, 90/1941; Juranović Tonejc, *Institucionalni razvoj zaštite pokretne umjetničke baštine u Hrvatskoj od 1850. do 1990. godine*, 189–227.

<sup>26</sup> Covered extensively in: Juranović Tonejc, “Zakonska regulativa u zaštiti pokretne baštine u doba Nezavisne države Hrvatske,” 17; Juranović Tonejc, *Institucionalni razvoj zaštite pokretne umjetničke baštine u Hrvatskoj od 1850. do 1990. godine*, 189–227.

<sup>27</sup> MKM – SDKB, Collections of Older Material, Documentation materials of the Conservation Institute, 90/1941.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 87/1941.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 84/1941.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 145/1941.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 149/1941.

<sup>32</sup> For more details on the *Report* see: Iva Pasini Tržec, “O sudbini pet privatnih zbirki za grebačkih židovskih obitelji za vrijeme i nakon sloma Nezavisne Države Hrvatske,” *Peristil* 64 (2021): 97–113.

<sup>33</sup> HR-HDA-1149, I – 2.10.1.

<sup>34</sup> About stored collections, see: Pasini Tržec, “O sudbini pet privatnih zbirki zagrebačkih židovskih obitelji,” 97–113; Naida-Michal Brandl, *Oduzimanje židovske imovine u Hrvatskoj: Zagreb kao studija slučaja* (Zagreb: Leykam International, 2022).

<sup>35</sup> He held this position from April 16, 1943, to January 31, 1944. MKM – SDKB, Collections of Older Material, Documentation materials of the Conservation Institute, 196/1943, 37/1944.

<sup>36</sup> A memo from June 19, 1943, also has a list of collections: Erwin Weiss, Boškovićeve 2; Camilla Radovan, Mošinskoga 56; Anka Gvozdanović, Visoka 8; Vojko Schauf, Opatička 12; Lato Mihalović, Demetrova 5; Benko Horvat, Vlačka 102; Jelisava Drašković, Remetska 9; Jelka Kugli, Mesnička 3; Janko Jelačić, Basaričekova 2; countess Zlata Lubienski, Jurjevska 27; Blanka Kolmar, Jurjevska 13; engineer Marko Frangeš, St Rok’s Park 2; Ivo Spevec, Trumbićeva 8; Vladimir Arko, Basaričekova 24; family Josephu, Mletačka 10; Ljubica Vickerhäuser, Lopašićeva 6; Vladimir and Milan Gmaz, Ilica 32; Emil Zima, Gundulićeva 8; Marija Deutsch, Solovljeva 10; countess Fanika Kulmer, Jezuitski Square 1; Lotta Marić, Hatzova 2 or 4; family Gerersdorfer, Demetrova 7; Emil Laszowski, Krajiška 17; Franjo baron Sallis-Saavis, canon bishop, Kaptol; Antun Ullrich, Ilica 54; Erich Alexander, Mihanovićeva 32. *Ibid.*, 205–43.

<sup>37</sup> Antonija Dejanović covered the period of post-war in the new state, also for the purposes of a conference as part of *Pilot Project to Determine the Provenance of Museum Objects Confiscated During and After WWII*. On private collections after the Second World War see: Pasini Tržec, “Contentious Musealisation Process(es) of Jewish Art Collections in Croatia,” 44–45.

<sup>38</sup> MKM – SDKB, Collections of Older Material, Documentation materials of the Conservation Institute, 143/1941.

<sup>39</sup> Museum of Arts and Crafts Archive (hereinafter: MUO Archives), *Tkalčić* Archive, record on October 15, 1945.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>43</sup> Details about confiscation of various assets in: Goldstein and Goldstein, *Holokaust u Zagrebu*, 168–202.

<sup>44</sup> MKM – SDKB, Collections of Older Material, Documentation materials of the Conservation Institute, 86/1941.

<sup>45</sup> HR-HDA-1149, I – 2.10.3.

<sup>46</sup> Croatian State Archives, Ministry of State Treasury of the Independent State of Croatia, Department of Finance, State Property and Debt, Office for Nationalised Property (PONOVA) (hereinafter: HR-HDA-1076), 3.15, box 1745, Directorate for Public Order and Security file, envelopes handed over to the Classification Committee.

<sup>47</sup> MUO Archives, Central record, no. 9, 1942, memo dated January 7, 1942.

<sup>48</sup> HR-HDA-1076, 3.15, box 1745, Office for Nationalised Property file, covers handed over to the Committee for the Classification of Covers, sessions handed over to the Office for Nationalised Property (76/L od 8-II 1944).

<sup>49</sup> HR-HDA-1149, I – 2.10.7.

<sup>50</sup> HR-HDA-1076, 3.15, box 1746.

<sup>51</sup> Memo dated November 25, 1942. HR-HDA-1076, 3.15, box 1747, file 2629/42.

<sup>52</sup> HR-HDA-1076, 3.15, box 1747.

<sup>53</sup> Decision dated May 12, 1943. HR-HDA-1076, 3.15, box 1747, file 22338/43.

<sup>54</sup> Order dated May 22, 1944. HR-HDA-1076, 2.3, box 573, file T 898.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> MUO Archives, Central record, no. 238, 1941.

<sup>57</sup> Ljerka Dulibić and Iva Pasini Tržec, “Trans-CultAA: Diplomatic Gift-Giving in the Age of Fascism – the Case of The Independent State of Croatia” (Zagreb: Strossmayer Gallery of Old Masters, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2018), <https://exhibit2.transcultaa.eu/> (accessed July 25, 2024). The virtual exhibition brings a film journal: *Die Deutsche Wochenschau*, no. 562, Das Bundesarchiv, Abteilung Filmarchiv, Berlin, June 10, 1941, DW 41/0562.

<sup>58</sup> “Povijesni sastanak u Berghofu. Pojediniosti posjeta kod Führera koji je Poglavnika neobično

srdačno dočekaao,” *Hrvatski narod: glasilo hrvatskog ustaškog pokreta* 115, June 9, 1941, 8.

<sup>59</sup> Matković, *Povijest Nezavisne države Hrvatske*, 171.

<sup>60</sup> “Povijesni podaci o zastavi i šahu Fridricha Velikog,” *Hrvatski narod: glasilo hrvatskog ustaškog pokreta* 116, June 10, 1941, 5; “Njemački tisak o Poglavnikovom putovanju,” *Hrvatski narod: glasilo hrvatskog ustaškog pokreta* 116, June 10, 1941, 5.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>62</sup> Matković, *Povijest Nezavisne države Hrvatske*, 172.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>64</sup> Photo published in: “Povijesni podaci o zastavi i šahu Fridricha Velikog,” 5.

<sup>65</sup> Inventory number MUO 2620.

<sup>66</sup> Inventory number MUO 5384.

<sup>67</sup> The flag was wrapped on a banner ending in a spear, it could look like a weapon. According to word of mouth, Baron Trenk seized both objects, the flag and chess, from Frederick’s tent. In: Matković, *Povijest Nezavisne države Hrvatske*, 172.

<sup>68</sup> Edmund Glaise von Horstenau, *Zapisi iz NDH*, ed. Peter Broucek (Zagreb: Disput, 2013), 95.

<sup>69</sup> Matković, *Povijest Nezavisne države Hrvatske*, 171.

<sup>70</sup> Stanko Staničić, “Zdenko Vojnović: prilog povijesti Muzeja za umjetnost i obrt,” *Informatica Museologica* 38, no. 1/2 (2007): 96–103.

<sup>71</sup> MKM – SDKB, Collections of Older Material, Documentation materials of the Conservation Institute, 84/1941.

<sup>72</sup> Kisić Kolanović, “Podržavljenje imovine Židova u NDH,” 437.

<sup>73</sup> MUO Archives, Central record, no. 278, 1941.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 279, 1941.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 283, 1941.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 294, 1941.

<sup>77</sup> Requested on July 23, decision received on August 12. *Ibid.*, no. 370, 1941.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 732, 1941.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 7, 1942.

<sup>80</sup> Kisić Kolanović, “Podržavljenje imovine Židova u NDH,” 440.

<sup>81</sup> MUO Archives, *Zdenko Vojnović* personal file, “Kretanje u službi.”

<sup>82</sup> MUO Archives, Central record, no. 50, 1944.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 48, 1944.

<sup>84</sup> Staničić, “Zdenko Vojnović: prilog povijesti Muzeja za umjetnost i obrt,” 99.

<sup>85</sup> Tkalčić testifies in 1945 to Božidar Murgić’s positive attitude. In: MUO Archives, *Tkalčić* Archive, hearing on October 15, 1945.

<sup>86</sup> HR-HDA-216, box 1472.

<sup>87</sup> MUO Archives, *Zdenka Munk* personal file, “Biografija.”

<sup>88</sup> Zdenka Munk states in her biography that she was born as an illegitimate child of Zlatko Tkalčić, MD and Vera Munk, so some connection with Vladimir Tkalčić can be assumed. Vladimir Tkalčić selflessly supported both regardless, having objective reasons for concern, including fear for his own existence. In: MUO Archives, *Zdenka Munk* personal file, “Biografija.”

## LITERATURA/BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brandl, Naida-Michal. *Oduzimanje židovske imovine u Hrvatskoj: Zagreb kao studija slučaja*. Zagreb: Leykam International, 2022.

Dulibić, Ljerkica i Iva Pasini Tržec. „TransCultAA: Diplomatic Gift-Giving in the Age of Fascism – the Case of The Independent State of Croatia“. Zagreb: Strossmayer Gallery of Old Masters, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2018. <https://exhibit2.transcultaa.eu/> (pristupljeno 25. srpnja 2024.).

Fučkan, Jasmina. „Muzej za umjetnost i obrt u Zagrebu kao generator novih institucija u vrijeme ravnatelja Vladimira Tkalčića (1933. – 1952.)“. *Etnološka istraživanja* 27 (2022): 36–56.

Glaise von Horstenau, Edmund. *Zapisi iz NDH*. Prir. Peter Broucek. Zagreb: Disput, 2013.

Goldstein, Ivo i Slavko Goldstein. *Holokaust u Zagrebu*. 2., dopunjeno izdanje. Zagreb: Profil, 2024.

Grković, Sanja. „Vladimir Tkalčić i fotografsko dokumentiranje baštine“. *Informatica Museologica* 49 (2018): 110–119.



Grubišić, Ante. „Spašavanje kulturne baštine tijekom Drugog svjetskog rata na osječkom području“. *Povijest u nastavi* 33, br. 1 (2022): 245–276.

Horvat, Anđela. „Tkalčić i konzervatorski rad“. U: *Tkalčićev zbornik: zbornik radova posvećenih sedamdesetogodišnjici Vladimira Tkalčića*, sv. I, ur. Ivan Bach, 209–216. Zagreb: Muzej za umjetnost i obrt, 1955.

Juranović Tonejc, Martina. *Institucionalni razvoj zaštite pokretne umjetničke baštine u Hrvatskoj od 1850. do 1990. godine*. Zagreb: Ministarstvo kulture i medija Republike Hrvatske, 2021.

Juranović Tonejc, Martina. „Zakonska regulativa u zaštiti pokretne baštine u doba Nezavisne države Hrvatske“. *Godišnjak zaštite spomenika kulture Hrvatske* 33/34 (2009/2010): 15–22.

Kisić Kolanović, Nada. „Podržavljenje imovine Židova u NDH“. *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 30, br. 3 (1998): 429–453.

Kisić Kolanović, Nada. *Vojskovođa i politika: Sjećanja Slavka Kvaternika*. Zagreb: Golden marketing, 1997.

Mataić, A., ur. *Nezavisna Država Hrvatska: Zakoni, zakonske odredbe i naredbe proglašene od 11. travnja do 26. svibnja 1941.* Knj. I, sv. 1–10. Zagreb: Naklada knjižare St. Kugli, 1941.

Matković, Hrvoje. *Povijest Nezavisne države Hrvatske*. Zagreb: Naklada Pavičić, 2022.

„Njemački tisak o PoglavlNIKOVOM putovanju“. *Hrvatski narod: glasilo hrvatskog ustaškog pokreta* 116, 10. lipnja 1941., 5.

Pasini Tržec, Iva. „Contentious Musealisation Process(es) of Jewish Art Collections in Croatia“. *Studi di memofonte* 22 (2019): 41–49.

Pasini Tržec, Iva. „O sudbini pet privatnih zbirki zagrebačkih židovskih obitelji za vrijeme i nakon sloma Nezavisne Države Hrvatske“. *Peristil* 64 (2021): 97–113.

„Povijesni podaci o zastavi i šahu Fridricha Velikog“. *Hrvatski narod: glasilo hrvatskog ustaškog pokreta* 116, 10. lipnja 1941., 5.

„Povijesni sastanak u Berghofu. Pojednost posjeta kod Führera koji je Poglavnika neobično srdačno dočeka“. *Hrvatski narod: glasilo hrvatskog ustaškog pokreta* 115, 9. lipnja 1941., 8.

Staničić, Stanko. „Zdenka Munk – mjesto i uloga u hrvatskoj muzeologiji“. *Informatica Museologica* 32, br. 1/2 (2001): 31–36.

Staničić, Stanko. „Zdenko Vojnović: prilog povijesti Muzeja za umjetnost i obrt“. *Informatica Museologica* 38, br. 1/2 (2007): 96–103.

„Uredba o čuvanju starina i prirodnih spomenika“. U: *Zbirka zakona i uredaba* 14, sv. I–XII, br. 1–659 (1940), 645–648.

## IZVORI/SOURCES

Arhiv Muzeja za umjetnost i obrt (Arhiv MUO):

- Arhiv *Tkalčić*
- Personalni dosje *Zdenka Munk*
- Personalni dosje *Zdenko Vojnović*
- Urudžbeni zapisnik

Hrvatski državni arhiv (HDA):

- Ministarstvo državne riznice NDH, Odjel za novčarstvo, državnu imovinu i dugove, Ured za podržavljeni imetak (PONOVA), HR-HDA-1076
- Zbirka Božidara Murgića o muzejskoj djelatnosti u Hrvatskoj od 1920-ih do 1940-ih, HR-HDA-1149

Ministarstvo kulture i medija Republike Hrvatske, Središnja dokumentacija s područja kulturne baštine (MKM – SDKB), Zbirke starije građe, Dokumentacijska građa Konzervatorskog zavoda

## MUZEJ ZA UMJETNOST I OBRT U NEZAVISNOJ DRŽAVI HRVATSKOJ – PRILOG POZNAVANJU POVIJESTI MUZEJA

Članak donosi uvid u nedovoljno istraženu povijest Muzeja za umjetnost i obrt u vrijeme Nezavisne Države Hrvatske (1941. – 1945.) kada je djelovanje Muzeja posve ovisilo o državnim vlastima. Istražen je zakonodavni okvir i službene procedure NDH-a koje su određivale u to doba najvažniji muzejski posao – popisivanje umjetni-

*na iz privatnih zbirki. U članku su sabrane uredbe i zakoni NDH-a koji su bili temelj za oduzimanje umjetnina, ali i podloga za postupanje i popisivanje umjetnina u privatnim zbirkama, zatim umjetnina i drugih vrijednosti u pravoslavnim crkvama i manastirima, što je bilo u nadležnosti Muzeja za umjetnost i obrt, te podloga za treći, nepoznati vid rada – sudjelovanje muzejskih stručnjaka u pojedinim povjerenstvima za popis zlata i dragocjenosti oduzetih Židovima, Srbima i drugima, što je bilo u nadležnosti policije i Hrvatske državne*

*banke. Popisivanje zbirke bilo je u nadležnosti Konzervatorskog zavoda, a popisivači su bili stručnjaci iz raznih muzeja, ovisno o obilježjima zbirke. U članku se obrađuje i tema diplomatskih poklona iz fundusa Arheološkog odjela Narodnog muzeja i Muzeja za umjetnost i obrt koje je Ante Pavelić poklonio Adolfu Hitleru te opstanak i rad muzejskog knjižničara Zdenka Vojnovića, po ocu Židova, kojega je ravnatelj Vladimir Tkalčić vješto održao u Muzeju do 1944. godine kada je Vojnović pobjegao u partizane.*