

# Protukomunistička „reakcija“ u Dubrovniku i djelovanje Frana Kolumbića

# Anticommunist “Reactionaries” in Dubrovnik and the Activities of Frano Kolumbić

**Blanka Matković**

blankamatkovic@gmail.com

Nezavisni istraživač / *Independent researcher*  
GB – Coventry

UDK/UDC: 329.61(497.584 Dubrovnik)“1953/1954“  
doi: 10.15291/misc.4739

Izvorni znanstveni rad / *Original scientific paper*  
Primljeno / *Received*: Received: 1. V. 2024.



**Ključne riječi:** Augustin Franić;  
Frano Kolumbić; Hrvatska seljačka  
stranka; Hrvatski oslobodilački  
pokret; Ivo Đenero; Joško  
Radica; komunistička represija;  
protukomunistički otpor; Trpimir  
Macan

U prvim godinama nakon Drugog svjetskog rata na većem dijelu hrvatskog prostora javljali su se vojni i politički oblici protukomunističkog otpora. Iako će djelovanje gerilskih križarskih skupina biti okončano početkom 50-ih god. 20. st., političke ilegalne organizacije nastavile su djelovati i nakon tog razdoblja. Ovaj je rad osvrt na jednu takvu grupu koja je djelovala u Dubrovniku 1953. i 1954., a čiji su članovi razotkriveni u srpnju 1954. i zatim osuđeni na zatvorske kazne. Riječ je o grupi s kojom je osuđen i istaknuti dubrovački HSS-ovac Frano Kolumbić čiji se dosje se čuva u Državnom arhivu u Splitu. Na temelju analiziranih podataka može se uočiti da je Kolumbićev slučaj potrebno pozicionirati u širi kontekst hrvatskog političkog protukomunističkog otpora tijekom 50-ih godina 20. stoljeća, naročito iz perspektive „ideološke izgradnje“ poslijeratne generacije sveučilištaraca u kojoj su značajnu ulogu mogli odigrati nekadašnji HSS-ovci.

**Keywords:** Augustin Franić; Frano  
Kolumbić; Croatian Peasants' Party;  
Croatian Liberation Movement;  
Joško Radica; Communist  
repression; anticommunist  
resistance; Trpimir Macan

In the first post-war years, military and political forms of anti-communist resistance operated in most of the Croatian territory. Although the activities of guerrilla crusader groups would end in the early 1950s, illegal political organizations continued to operate even after this period. This paper dwells on one such group that operated in Dubrovnik in 1953 and 1954, and whose members were exposed in July 1954 and then sentenced to prison. Prominent Dubrovnik HSS member Frano Kolumbić, whose file is kept in the State Archives in Split, was convicted with this group. Based on the data analyzed, it can be concluded that Kolumbić's case needs to be positioned in the broader context of Croatian political anticommunist resistance in the 1950s, especially from the perspective of “ideological building” of the post-war generation of university students in which a significant role could have been played by former HSS members.

## Uvod

Krajem 1944., ulaskom postrojbi Narodnooslobodilačke vojske (NOV) u dalmatinske gradove započinje razdoblje masovne komunističke represije koja je vrhunac dosegla u proljeće 1945. kada su slovenski i hrvatski prostor preplavile kolone kasnije nazvanog križnog puta. Kršenja ljudskih prava u različitim su se oblicima događala diljem tadašnje Jugoslavije, a nastavljena su i u prvim poslijeratnim godinama kada postupci nove vlasti izazivaju vojni i politički otpor. Pokušaji vojnog otpora bit će okončani tek šest godina nakon završetka Drugog svjetskog rata zarobljavanjem duvanjskog križara Mirka Kapulice 1950. te uhićenjem imotskog križara i nekadašnjeg pripadnika Kapuličine križarske skupine Nedjeljka Piplice 1951. godine. Piplica je strijeljan 1952.,<sup>1</sup> no protukomunistički otpor time neće nestati. Naime, nakon tog razdoblja nastavljeno je djelovanje različitih ilegalnih političkih organizacija,<sup>2</sup> poput Hrvatskog oslobodilačkog pokreta,<sup>3</sup> iako su takve skupine osnivane već u prvim poslijeratnim godinama kada su egzistirale paralelno s gerilskim, odnosno križarskim organizacijama.<sup>4</sup> U ovom radu autorica se usredotočuje na protukomunistički politički otpor na dubrovačkom području koji se ogleda u djelovanju istaknutog člana Hrvatske seljačke stranke (HSS) Frana Kolumbića koji je 1954. osuđen na tri godine zatvora. Kaznu je izdržavao u Kazneno-popravnom domu (KPD) Lepoglava, ali je zbog teško narušenog zdravlja bio uvjetno pušten kući 17. veljače 1956. godine. Neposredno po izlasku iz zatvora hospitaliziran je u bolnici „Rebro“ u Zagrebu, a pri pokušaju operacije utvrđena je velika aneurizma aorte u abdomenu kao vjerojatni uzročnik tegoba. Iz bolnice je uz pratnju otputovao u Dubrovnik gdje je odmah smješten u dubrovačku bolnicu u kojoj je i umro 26. prosinca 1956. godine.<sup>5</sup> U prvom dijelu ovog rada predstavljena je uloga HSS-a u prvim poslijeratnim pokušajima organiziranja protukomunističkog otpora te reagiranje jugoslavenskih represivnih organa i Komunističke partije Jugoslavije (KPJ) prema pristašama te stranke na dubrovačkom području.

<sup>1</sup> Matković 2023: 369.

<sup>2</sup> Krašić 2018.

<sup>3</sup> Utovac 2022: 5–10. Članovi navedene organizacije u svojim su iskazima spominjali i Trpimira Macana kojeg su željeli pridobiti za suradnju, ali se to nije obistinilo. Upravo je Macan 1954. osuđen u procesu protiv Kolumbića i ostalih.

<sup>4</sup> Matković 2017a: 145–160.

<sup>5</sup> Radica 2003: 480.

## Introduction

The arrival of the units of the National Liberation Army (NOV) in Dalmatian cities in the late 1944 marked the beginning of Communist repression on a massive scale. The repression culminated in the spring of 1945, when the columns of POWs began marching throughout Slovenia and Croatia – what was later to be known as “the Way of the Cross”. Various forms of violations of human rights that had been taking place in the then Yugoslavia continued in the first postwar years, when the methods of the new authorities triggered armed and political resistance. The attempts of armed resistance will endure for six years after the war and will only be terminated with the capturing of the Duvno Crusader Mirko Kapulica in 1950 and Nedjeljko Piplica, a former member of Kapulica’s Crusader group, in 1951. Piplica was shot in 1952,<sup>1</sup> but the anticommunist resistance will continue to exist: various illegal political organizations continued with their activities after that period,<sup>2</sup> such as Croatian Liberation Movement<sup>3</sup> (although such groups were founded in the first postwar years and operated simultaneously with the Crusader guerilla.<sup>4</sup> This paper addresses the anticommunist resistance in Dubrovnik area, with the focus on the activities of Frano Kolumbić, a prominent member of Croatian Peasants’ Party (HSS) who was sentenced to three years in prison in 1954. He served his prison term in Lepoglava Penitentiary, but was released on parole on 17 February 1956 due to deteriorated health. Soon after his release he was admitted to Rebro Hospital in Zagreb, where, during an attempted surgery, he was diagnosed with a massive aneurism of the abdominal aorta – the likely cause of his health problems. He was escorted to Dubrovnik, where he was immediately admitted to the local hospital, in which he died on 26 December 1956.<sup>5</sup> The first part of this paper deals with the role of HSS in the first postwar attempts of organizing the anticommunist resistance and the reaction of Yugoslav repressive organs and Yugoslav Communist Party (KPJ) against HSS supporters in the Dubrovnik area.

<sup>1</sup> Matković 2023: 369.

<sup>2</sup> Krašić 2018.

<sup>3</sup> Utovac 2022: 5–10. In their testimonies, the members of this organization mentioned the name of Trpimir Macan, claiming they had tried to ensure his cooperation but it never happened. In the 1954 trial of Kolumbić and others, Macan was sentenced to prison.

<sup>4</sup> Matković 2017a: 145–160.

<sup>5</sup> Radica 2003: 480.

## Uloga Hrvatske seljačke stranke u poslijeratnim pokušajima organiziranja hrvatskog protukomunističkog otpora

U prvim mjesecima nakon završetka Drugog svjetskog rata zapadne su sile nastojale izbjeći novi sukob, i to upravo s Titovom Jugoslavijom čije su postrojbe zauzele dio talijanskog prostora izazvavši time tršćansku krizu. Upravo su zategnuti odnosi između Jugoslavije i zapadnih saveznika bili dovoljni da u hrvatskoj emigraciji probude nadu u moguću protukomunističku ustanak i preokret u Jugoslaviji uz pomoć tih istih sila. Temelj budućem općem ustanku trebale su postaviti upravo križarske skupine, no pravnik i povjesničar Tomislav Jonjić upozorava da je križarski pokret u Hrvatskoj i Bosni i Hercegovini od samog početka bio osuđen na neuspjeh jer su na vanjskopolitičkom planu razbijanje Jugoslavije i uspostava neovisne hrvatske države ipak bili isključeni, a na unutarnjem su planu masovni pokolji i represija svakodnevno sužavali prostor djelovanja.<sup>6</sup>

Međutim, u trenutku nastajanja križarskih organizacija situacija se činila znatno kompleksnijom zbog čega povjesničar Ante Delić ističe da je potrebno analizirati međusobne odnose političkih i vojnih dužnosnika Nezavisne Države Hrvatske (NDH) kojima je uspjelo izbjeći zarobljavanje i izručenje, a koji su imali udjela u poslijeratnom organiziranju.<sup>7</sup> Ovdje napose valja istaknuti pragmatična razmišljanja Ante Pavelića o ulozi Vladka Mačeka, lidera HSS-a, čije su ime i ugled na zapadu imali znatno veću težinu od Pavelićeva. Stoga se od Mačeka očekivalo daljnje zalaganje za hrvatske nacionalne interese kod zapadnih saveznika, kako je već ranije, početkom svibnja 1945. godine, bilo dogovoreno u Zagrebu. Time bi Maček preuzeo političku borbu s ciljem ponovne uspostave hrvatske države, a unatoč njegovim razilaženjima s Pavelićem, nade u promjenu Mačekova političkog smjera podupirale su izjave njegovih suradnika. Čak je i Pavelićev bliski suradnik Erih Lisak komunističkim istražiteljima izjavio da je vjerovao u „uspješnu akciju Mačeka u inozemstvu“.<sup>8</sup> Dostupni britanski dokumenti također potvrđuju ugled koji je Maček

## The Role of Croatian Peasants' Party in the Postwar Attempts to Organize Anticommunist Resistance in Croatia

In the first months after the end of World War II, the Western powers tried to avoid new conflicts, including the one with Tito's Yugoslavia whose units had occupied parts of the Italian territory and had thus provoked the Trieste Crisis. It was these strained relations between Yugoslavia and the Western Allies that stirred hope among Croatian emigres that an anticommunist uprising and radical change in Yugoslavia would be possible with the help of these powers. And it was the Crusader groups that were supposed to provide a basis for the future uprising. However, Croatian jurist and historian Tomislav Jonjić points out that the Crusader movement in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina was doomed to fail since its inception because a) the situation on the international scene of the day ruled out the possibility of breaking up Yugoslavia and establishing an independent Croatia, and b) domestically, the widespread massacres and repression prevented such activities on a daily basis.<sup>6</sup>

But the situation seemed much more complex at the moment when Crusader organizations were being formed. According to historian Ante Delić, this is why the relations between the political officials and military officers of the Independent State of Croatia (NDH) who managed to avoid capturing and extradition and were involved in the postwar organizations should be analyzed.<sup>7</sup> We should particularly mention here Ante Pavlić's pragmatic reflections on the role of HSS leader Vladko Maček, whose name and standing carried more weight in the West than that of Pavelić. This is why Maček was expected to continue championing Croatian national interests among the Western Allies, as had been agreed in Zagreb in early May 1945. He would thus take the lead in the political fight for restoration of Croatian statehood. Despite his differences with Pavelić, the accounts of his associates inspired hope that Maček would change his political course. Even Pavelić's close associate Erih Lisak told his communist interrogators that he believed in "Maček's successful actions abroad".<sup>8</sup> British documents also confirm Maček's

<sup>6</sup> Jonjić 2007: 7.

<sup>7</sup> Delić 2016: 63.

<sup>8</sup> Delić 2016: 67.

<sup>6</sup> Jonjić 2007: 7.

<sup>7</sup> Delić 2016: 63.

<sup>8</sup> Delić 2016: 67.



uživao u inozemstvu zbog čega je zauzet stav da „nema govora o izručenju Mačeka Titu“.<sup>9</sup>

Međutim, Pavelićevu vjeru „da će Amerika obnoviti Hrvatsku i pomoći naše Oružane snage“ ipak nije podupirao general Vjekoslav Luburić koji je još 6. svibnja 1945. odlučio „otići u šume“ i „sakupiti sve zalutale ili one koji se odbiju predati“ s ciljem nastavka borbe protiv komunista.<sup>10</sup> No, dok su u zemlji osnivane brojne križarske skupine, situacija u emigraciji bila je znatno drugačija zbog razumijevanja šireg konteksta složenih međunarodnih odnosa tog vremena. Naime, kako Delić zaključuje, nedvojbeno je jedna od glavnih pretpostavki u poslijeratnom organiziranju bivših visokih dužnosnika NDH protiv jugoslavenske države bilo postojanje nesuglasica među zapadnim saveznicima bez kojih bi svi eventualni planovi bili unaprijed osuđeni na propast, no podjednako je važno bilo ustanoviti točnu situaciju u zemlji, naročito uzevši u obzir glasine o „jakim snagama“ koje su kolale.<sup>11</sup> Stoga je već u ljeto 1945. ustaški bojnik Ante Vrban otišao u Hrvatsku gdje je od seljaka doznao da križari „postoje i da su ih pune šume“.<sup>12</sup> Iako je sredinom 1945. bilo više prelazaka manjih skupina i drugih pojedinaca u Hrvatsku, Delić navodi da između njih i bivšeg vodstva NDH nije bilo kontakata, a posebno ne naloga za prebacivanje zbog čega se ne može prihvatiti zaključak povjesničara Zdenka Radelića da je sredinom 1945. došlo do intenzivnije djelatnosti Pavelića, Lisaka i Moškova „na povezivanju emigracije s križarima i na ubacivanju ustaških časnika u Hrvatsku“.<sup>13</sup> Doduše, valja također istaknuti da Radelić kaže da se „Ante Pavelić nije neposredno angažirao u okupljanju vodstva i organiziranju otpora“, nego je to činio iz pozadine.<sup>14</sup> Osim toga, na drugom mjestu isti autor navodi da „o odlasku Ericha Lisaka i Ante Moškova u Hrvatsku postoje kontradiktorne tvrdnje, od onih da su to učinili na svoju ruku do onih kako je to bilo dogovoreno s Antom Pavelićem.“<sup>15</sup> Riječ je o složenim događajima u razdoblju kada su

high reputation abroad, resulting in the position that “extraditing Maček to Tito is out of question”.<sup>9</sup>

Pavelić's belief that “America will restore Croatia and support our Armed Forces” was not shared by General Vjekoslav Luburić who, as far back as in 1945 (on 6 May), decided to “go to the woods” and “rally all those who are lost and who refuse to surrender” and continue the fight against communists.<sup>10</sup> However, while numerous Crusader groups were being formed in Croatia, the emigres were facing a much different situation due to better understanding of the broader context of the complex international relations of the day. As Delić concludes, there is no doubt that, for the former NDH officials, one of the main prerequisites for organizing their postwar activities against the Yugoslav state was a dissent between Western Allies without whom any future plans would be doomed in advance. It was also equally important to assess the domestic situation, especially when taking into account the rumor of “strong forces” there.<sup>11</sup> This is why, as early as in summer 1945, Ustasha major Ante Vrban went to Croatia. The peasants there confirmed to him that Crusaders “really exist and that woods are full of them”.<sup>12</sup> Although small groups and individuals entered Croatia in mid-1945, Delić states that there were no contacts between them and the former NDH leaders, not to mention orders of the latter to the former to do that. For this reason, historian Zdenko Radelić's conclusion that, in mid-1945, Pavelić, Lisak and Moškov intensified their efforts “to connect the emigres with Crusaders and infiltrate Ustasha officers in Croatia” cannot be accepted.<sup>13</sup> Admittedly, Radelić also points out that “Ante Pavelić was not directly involved in rallying the leaders and organizing resistance” and that he did that behind the scenes.<sup>14</sup> Also, in a different place, the same author states that “there are contradictory claims about Lisak and Moškov's departure for Croatia – some say it was on their own initiative and others say it was agreed with Ante Pavelić.”<sup>15</sup> Those were complex events that took place in the period when Croatian emigres faced

<sup>9</sup> Delić 2016: 67.

<sup>10</sup> Delić 2016: 68.

<sup>11</sup> Delić 2016: 68–69.

<sup>12</sup> Katalinić 2017: 59.

<sup>13</sup> Radelić 2011: 108. O ovim događajima opširnije v. Radelić 2002; Radelić 2011.

<sup>14</sup> Radelić 2011: 69.

<sup>15</sup> Radelić 2011: 112.

<sup>9</sup> Delić 2016: 67.

<sup>10</sup> Delić 2016: 68.

<sup>11</sup> Delić 2016: 68–69.

<sup>12</sup> Katalinić 2017: 59.

<sup>13</sup> Radelić 2011: 108. For more on these events, see Radelić 2002; Radelić 2011.

<sup>14</sup> Radelić 2011: 69.

<sup>15</sup> Radelić 2011: 112.



hrvatski emigranti djelovali otežano na području Austrije i Italije, izloženi stalnim opasnostima, zbog čega su daljnja istraživanja tih zbivanja neophodna radi utvrđivanja što cjelovitije istine. Delić inzistira na zaključku da je za početak intenzivnije djelatnosti nužna bila organiziranost i povezanost kojih u tom trenutku nije bilo. Čak je i Pavelić zagovarao strpljenje te je odgovarao Lisaka od povratka u zemlju u namjeri da stekne uvid u prilike u Hrvatskoj.<sup>16</sup>

Neovisno o Paveliću, do prve jasno formulirane ideje o obavještajno-propagandnom djelovanju dolazi tek u listopadu 1945. kada je general NDH Vilko Pečnikar ustvrdio da su uvjeti za emigrantsko političko djelovanje povoljniji u Italiji nego u Austriji, uključujući organiziranje obavještajne službe „za dobivanje podataka iz zemlje i slanje promidžbenog materijala u zemlju”.<sup>17</sup> Unatoč tome, Delić na temelju dostupnih izvjava zaključuje da tijekom 1946. godine još uvijek nije postojao nikakav razrađen plan o protujugoslavenskom gerilskom djelovanju.<sup>18</sup> Zapravo, u proljeće iste godine Vrban po Pavelićevu odobrenju po drugi put odlazi u Hrvatsku s ciljem da utvrdi „stanje i jakost oružanih skupina po šumama”.<sup>19</sup> U međuvremenu se u Jugoslaviju suprotno naredbama prebacio i Josip Duić koji je održavao kontakte među brojnim emigrantima u Italiji i Austriji, uključujući prenošenje pisama, paketa i materijala. Duić je blisko surađivao sa svećenikom Krunoslavom Draganovićem koji se također nalazio u emigraciji, a osim toga je povezivao emigrante iz Austrije s pristašama HSS-a u Rimu u nastojanju da se organizira zajednička akcija.<sup>20</sup> U tim trenucima Pavelić je još uvijek bio protiv vojne akcije u tadašnjoj Jugoslaviji upozoravajući „da prilike ni u Domovini ni u svijetu nisu takve, da bi pružale ikakve izgleda za uspjeh akcije”.<sup>21</sup> Sudeći prema izvješću doušnika „Karla” od 27. travnja 1946., sačuvanom u dosjeu Filipa Lukasa, unatoč ubacivanju manjih skupina „terorista” u Jugoslaviju Englezi sami nisu pridavali cijeloj stvari mnogo značenja.<sup>22</sup>

difficulties in their activities in Austria and Italy and were always in danger. Further research is therefore required for forming a clear picture of these events. Delić insists that an organized approach and interconnectedness – then non-existent – were needed for any intensive activity. Even Pavelić called for patience and tried to dissuade Lisak from returning to Croatia in order to become acquainted with the situation there.<sup>16</sup>

Independently from Pavelić, the first clear notion of the intelligence and propaganda activities was formulated not earlier than in October 1945, when NDH General Vilko Pečnikar alleged that the conditions for emigree political activities were more favorable in Italy than in Austria, including for organizing an intelligence service “for obtaining intelligence from Croatia and sending propaganda material there”.<sup>17</sup> Despite this, Delić concludes that, based on the accounts available, no elaborate plan for anti-Yugoslav guerilla activities was in place in 1946.<sup>18</sup> In fact, in the spring of that year, with Pavelić’s approval, Vrban goes to Croatia for the second time in order to assess “the situation and the strength of armed groups in the woods”.<sup>19</sup> In the meantime, disobeying his orders, Josip Duić also came to Yugoslavia. He was entrusted with maintaining contacts and delivering letters, parcels and material between numerous emigrees in Italy and Austria. He closely cooperated with the emigree priest Krunoslav Draganović, who liaised between emigrees in Austria and HSS supporters in Rome in order to organize joint actions.<sup>20</sup> At that moment, Pavelić still opposed military activities in the then Yugoslavia, warning that “current situation both in the homeland and in the world offers little chance for successful actions”.<sup>21</sup> Judging by informer “Karlo’s” report of 27 April 1946, found in Filip Lukas file, despite the infiltration of small “terrorist” groups in Yugoslavia, the “English do not consider the whole thing particularly relevant”.<sup>22</sup> This quote confirms Pavelić’s doubts that there was a real possibility of an uprising and possible overthrow in Yugoslavia at that moment.

<sup>16</sup> Delić 2016: 69–71.

<sup>17</sup> Delić 2016: 78.

<sup>18</sup> Delić 2016: 91.

<sup>19</sup> Delić 2016: 93–95.

<sup>20</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Filipa Lukasa, Izvješće „Marinka”, 1946.

<sup>21</sup> Delić 2016: 98.

<sup>22</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Filipa Lukasa, Izvješće suradnika „Karla”, 27. 4. 1946.

<sup>16</sup> Delić 2016: 69–71.

<sup>17</sup> Delić 2016: 78.

<sup>18</sup> Delić 2016: 91.

<sup>19</sup> Delić 2016: 93–95.

<sup>20</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Filip Lukas file, “Marinko” report, 1946.

<sup>21</sup> Delić 2016: 98.

<sup>22</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Filip Lukas file, informer “Karlo’s” report, 27 April 1946.

To potvrđuje Pavelićeve sumnje da u tom trenutku doista nije bilo značajnije mogućnosti za ustanak i eventualni prevrat u Jugoslaviji.

Vrban se vratio u Austriju u jesen 1946. izvjestivši da je proputovao Slavoniju i Bosnu i Hercegovinu „našavši posvuda manje ili veće grupe hrvatske vojske, koje su bile uglavnom međusobno još nepovezane i to napose radi pomanjkanja viših časnika“.<sup>23</sup> Stoga je zaključeno da je potrebno započeti sustavnu akciju u domovini s ciljem „povezivanja i jedinstvenog vojnopolitičkog organiziranja spomenutih grupa u svrhu vođenja hrvatskog narodnog otpora“.<sup>24</sup> Bio je to početak buduće akcije čije je službeno ime bilo „Deseti travnja“, a koja će zbog zime i potrebnih priprema započeti tek u svibnju 1947. godine.<sup>25</sup> Međutim, kako upozorava Katalinić, stanje u hrvatskim šumama 1947. bilo je znatno drugačije jer je zbog djelovanja jugoslavenskih represivnih organa i likvidacija broj križara do 1. ožujka 1947. pao na samo 337 u Hrvatskoj odnosno 643 u Bosni i Hercegovini.<sup>26</sup> Do dolaska Ante Vrbana, Ljube Miloša i Luke Grgića u zemlju stanje je bilo još gore pa su oni u lipnju 1947. izvjestili da „u šumama nema apsolutno nikoga“, „teror od strane partizana je ogroman“, a „narod je strašno razočaran“, „psuje po angloamerikancima“ te se „boje i pomisliti na emigraciju kad vide tolika izručenja“.<sup>27</sup>

U međuvremenu je vjera u Mačeka i zapadne saveznike održavana i u Hrvatskoj, posebno u područjima gdje se uspostavljanjem komunističke vlasti ponovo počeo širiti autoritet HSS-a čije su pristase zauzele značajno mjesto među „reakcionerima“. Tako se već u dvotjednom izvješću o radu oficira Odjeljenja za zaštitu naroda (OZNA) pri Komandi područja srednje Dalmacije od 28. siječnja 1945. ističe da su „mačekovci“ bacali letke u kojima u kojima je pisalo da su komunisti diktatori i „kako se ne smije ništa govoriti, jer ako šta kažeš da ćeš lako izgubit glavu“.<sup>28</sup> Istovremeno je na konavoskom području već djelovala križarska skupina istaknutog HSS-ovca Pere Bakića.

Vrban returned to Austria in autumn 1946 and reported that he had travelled through Slavonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and “found everywhere small or large groups of Croatian army members, most of them still not interconnected primarily due to lack of high-ranking officers”.<sup>23</sup> It was therefore concluded that a systematic action in the homeland was required in order to “connect, unite and organize these groups militarily and politically in order to put up Croatian national resistance”.<sup>24</sup> It was the beginning of the action that will formally be known as “10 April” and that will not begin before May 1947 due to delays caused by winter and the preparations required.<sup>25</sup> However, Katalinić warns that, in 1947, the situation in Croatian woods was rather different; by 1 March 1947, due to liquidations and other activities of Yugoslav repressive organs, there were only 337 Crusaders left in Croatia and 643 in Bosnia and Herzegovina.<sup>26</sup> When Ante Vrban, Ljubo Miloš and Luka Grgić arrived, the situation was even worse. In June 1947, they reported that “there is absolutely no one in the woods”, “the partisan terror is huge”, and “the people are terribly disappointed”, “cursing Anglo-Americans” and are “afraid even to think of emigrating when they see so many extraditions”.<sup>27</sup>

In the meantime, the faith in Maček and in Western Allies was also maintained in Croatia, particularly in the areas where the newly-established communist rule had caused reemergence of support for HSS. The HSS supporters thus became prominent among the “reactionaries”. For example, the biweekly report on officers’ activities, drafted on 28 January 1945 by the Department for Protection of the People (OZNA) for the Central Dalmatia Operational Zone HQ, notifies that “Maček’s followers” have been distributing leaflets in which they “claim that we are dictators and that everybody should keep their mouth shut – for if they don’t, they could lose their life”.<sup>28</sup> At the same time, a Crusader group led by Pero Bakić, a prominent HSS member, was active in the Konavle area. When describing the attempts to establish contact with the Dominican friar Dominik Barać

<sup>23</sup> Katalinić 2017: 60.

<sup>24</sup> Katalinić 2017: 61.

<sup>25</sup> Opširnije o ovoj operaciji v. Čolak 1989; Planinić 1994; Prusac 1967.

<sup>26</sup> Katalinić 2017: 62.

<sup>27</sup> Katalinić 2017: 62.

<sup>28</sup> HR HDA 1491, OZN-a za Hrvatsku, 11.28.1. Matković 2017b: 342–344; Matković & Pažanin 2011: 393–395; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 318–321.

<sup>23</sup> Katalinić 2017: 60.

<sup>24</sup> Katalinić 2017: 61.

<sup>25</sup> For more on this operation, see Čolak 1989; Planinić 1994; Prusac 1967.

<sup>26</sup> Katalinić 2017: 62.

<sup>27</sup> Katalinić 2017: 62.

<sup>28</sup> HR HDA 1491, OZNA – Croatian branch, 11.28.1. Matković 2017b: 342–344; Matković & Pažanin 2011: 393–395; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 318–321.

Govoreći o pokušajima uspostave kontakta s Bakićem, Jakov Andrijuci, jedan od uhićenih poznanika dominikanca fra Dominika Barača koji je krajem iste godine strijeljan u Trogiru, izjavio je da je skupina Dubrovčana povezana s Baračem razgovarala o Bakićevim navodnim vezama s Englezima koji su ga navodno uzdržavali i navodnom Bakićevu boravku u Italiji te je zaključeno da je potrebno provjeriti te tvrdnje i uspostaviti vezu s Bakićem zbog čega mu je upućeno pismo.<sup>29</sup> U međuvremenu je u izvješću OZNA-e za travanj 1945. zabilježeno da na području Splita i Solina „ustaških i četničkih elemenata ima u svim selima, grupišu se i ubacuju razne parole” te da su „najaktivniji, iako neobično oprezni popovi, koji na pametan način djeluju na narod”.<sup>30</sup> Krajem iste godine OZNA srednje Dalmacije izvijestila je: „(...) našom aktivnošću u saradnji sa Narodnom Obranom<sup>31</sup> i jedinicama XIX Divizije uspjeli pohvatati osam bandita na našem okrugu, i to: dva na kotaru Omiš (Čotić Vlade i Čotić Nedjeljko) koji su se skrivali u Mosoru i imali su vezu sa svojim familijama, a preko njih sa mačekovskim reacionerima u Omišu i Splitu“ koji su im „upućivali letke”.<sup>32</sup> Istovremeno se „na okruzima Zagreb, Varaždin, Daruvar, Osijek, Sl. Brod i Bjelovar ispoljavalo nastojanje klerikalnih, mačekovskih i ostalih protunarodnih elemenata za stvaranje oružanih bandi, te smo u tim okruzima umjesto brojnog opadanja banditizma, imali jačanje banditskih grupa“ uz širenje propagande o sukobu između Sovjetskog Saveza i Velike Britanije te o propasti Jugoslavije koju su posljedično povezivali s mogućim novim sukobom između istoka i zapada.<sup>33</sup>

Sudeći prema dostupnim dokumentima, dalmatinski prostor naročito podložan HSS-ovu utjecaju bio je Solin. Naime, u arhivi Sekretarijata za unutrašnje poslove (SUP) za Dalmaciju, koja se čuva u Državnom arhivu u Splitu, ostao je sačuvan zapis tadašnjih jugoslavenskih vlasti, vjerojatno Uprave

(who was executed later that year), one of Barač's arrested acquaintances Jakov Andrijuci stated that a few Dubrovnik citizens who had been in contact with Barač discussed Bakić's alleged connections with the English (who had allegedly supported him) and Bakić's alleged visit to Italy. This group concluded that these allegations should be verified and that contact with Bakić should be established, which is why they sent him a letter.<sup>29</sup> Meanwhile, in April 1945, OZNA reports that, in Split and Solin areas, "Ustasha and Chetnik elements are present in every village; they are bunching up and spreading various slogans", and, also, that "priests are the most active ones; they are very careful and exercise their influence on the people in a clever way".<sup>30</sup> At the end of that year, the Central Dalmatian branch of OZNA reported that "in cooperation with KNOJ"<sup>31</sup> and the units of the 19<sup>th</sup> Division, we managed to capture eight bandits in our area. Two of them (Vlade Čotić and Nedjeljko Čotić) were hiding on the Mosor Mountain in the Omiš area. Through their families they maintained contact with Maček reactionaries in Omiš and Split and "received leaflets from them".<sup>32</sup> At the same time, "in and around Zagreb, Varaždin, Daruvar, Osijek, Sl. Brod and Bjelovar, efforts of clericalists, Maček's followers and other subversive elements to form armed bands were observed. As a result, instead of decline of banditry, its buildup was recorded", together with propaganda about a conflict between the Soviet Union and Great Britain and a collapse of Yugoslavia that could result from a possible new conflict between the East and West.<sup>33</sup>

Judging by the available documents, of all Dalmatian regions, the influence of HSS was particularly strong in the Solin area. The files of the Department for Dalmatia of the Ministry of Interior (SUP), now kept in the State Archives in Split, contain a document likely made by the Directorate for State Security (UDBA), stating that "there is a very dangerous HSS group in the Solin area",

<sup>29</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava Jakova Andrijucija, 3. 6. 1945.

<sup>30</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Izvještaj OZNA-e za srednju Dalmaciju za travanj 1945. godine (prethodno kutija 168). Matković 2017b: 49; Matković & Pažanin 2011: 417–441.

<sup>31</sup> KNOJ – Korpus narodne obrane Jugoslavije.

<sup>32</sup> HR HDA 1491, OZN-a za Hrvatsku, 11.31.10. Matković 2017b: 416–423; Matković & Pažanin 2011: 538–546; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 631–638.

<sup>33</sup> HR HDA 1561, SDS RSUP RH, 015.26. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 171.

<sup>29</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač file, Jakov Andrijuci's testimony, 3 June 1945.

<sup>30</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, OZNA Central Dalmatian branch report for April 1945 (formerly box 168). Matković 2017b: 49; Matković & Pažanin 2011: 417–441.

<sup>31</sup> KNOJ – People's Defense Corps of Yugoslavia.

<sup>32</sup> HR HDA 1491, OZNA – Croatian branch, 11.31.10. Matković 2017b: 416–423; Matković & Pažanin 2011: 538–546; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 631–638.

<sup>33</sup> HR HDA 1561, SDS RSUP RH, 015.26. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 171.



državne bezbjednosti (UDBA), u kojem se navodi da „u solinskom bazenu postoji vrlo opasna grupa H.S.S.“ čiji je „duhovni vođa prije rata bio Marin Kljaković, kojega je tada dr. Krnjević smatrao najjače izgrađenim H.S.S.ovcem i pred sam početak rata počeo ga forsirati davajući mu razne stranačke uloge“.<sup>34</sup> „On je tada okupio grupu odvažnih mladih ljudi, stalno ih okupljao i već tada spremao za borbu protiv komunista i u 1940. i 1941. došli do raznih obračunavanja sa komunistima“, navodi se dalje u tom dokumentu.<sup>35</sup> U zapisu se također ističe da ni jedno mjesto u Dalmaciji nije imalo tako jaku i čvrstu organizaciju HSS-a na čelu s dvadesetak mladih ljudi koji su za vrijeme Drugog svjetskog rata ostali dosljedni politici te stranke, a sudeći prema sačuvanim dokumentima, s „reakcionarnim“ su radom nastavili i nakon završetka rata. Poslijeratnu situaciju na solinskom području možda najbolje oslikava napomena solinskog HSS-ovca Živka Grubića koji se početkom 50-ih godina 20. stoljeća u zatvorskoj ćeliji povjerio doušniku UDBA-e „Nevenu“ da mu je istražitelj UDBA-e rekao „da su Solinjani bili svi borci, a da su sada svi Mačekovci“.<sup>36</sup>

Solin nije bio izolirani slučaj jer je slična situacija zabilježena i u južnoj Dalmaciji u kojoj se u dokumentima upravo Dubrovnik ističe kao središte HSS-ove „reakcije“. Već je u pismu Oblasnog komiteta KPH za Dalmaciju Okružnom komitetu KPH za Dubrovnik od 3. lipnja 1944. istaknuta potreba stvaranja partijskih „uporišta“, vršenja mobilizacije i formiranja odreda, izvlačenja „masa“ ispod „neprijateljskog uticaja“, širenja „bratstva i jedinstva“ naročito u kotaru Dubrovnik te da je potrebno pojačati „budnost“ prema djelovanju HSS-a i raskrinkavati „njihov izdajnički stav“.<sup>37</sup> U letku koji je 5. lipnja 1944. tiskao Kotarski odbor Ujedinjenog saveza antifašističke omladine Hrvatske (USAOH) za Dubrovnik istaknuto je da „sve ove planove i sporazume Dr. Mačeka u našem kotaru sprovode u djelo njegovi agenti – izdajice: Dr. Roko Mišetić, Dr. Frano Dabrović, Ing. Frano Kolumbić, Dr.

whose “prewar spiritual leader was Marin Kljaković. Dr. Krnjević considered him the most complete HSS member and, on the eve of the war, backed him and entrusted him with various party functions”.<sup>34</sup> The document continues: “As early as then, he gathered around him a group of daring young men and prepared them for the fight against communists. As a result, the clashes with communists took place in 1940 and 1941.”<sup>35</sup> The document also points out that no other place in Dalmatia had such a strong and resilient HSS organization. It was led by some twenty young men who remained loyal to the party policy during World War II and, according to the documents, continued their “reactionary” activities even after the war. The postwar situation in the Solin area is perhaps best illustrated by what Živko Grubišić, a Solin HSS member, confided in the early 1950s to his cellmate (UDBA informer “Neven”) that his UDBA interrogator had told him that “all the Solin people used to be partisans, and now they are all followers of Maček”.<sup>36</sup>

Solin was not an isolated case. A similar situation was in Southern Dalmatia; documents also refer to Dubrovnik as a center of HSS “reactionaries”. In its letter to the District Committee of the Croatian Communist Party (KPH) for Dubrovnik of 3 June 1944, the Party’s Provincial Committee for Dalmatia underlines the need to create party “strongholds”, declare mobilization and form detachments, eliminate “enemy influence” on the “masses”, promote “brotherhood and unity” (particularly in and around Dubrovnik), increase “awareness” about HSS activities and expose “their treacherous attitude”.<sup>37</sup> In its leaflet printed on 5 June 1944, the Dubrovnik Committee of the Unified League of Anti-Fascist Youth of Croatia (USAOH) states that “in our area, all of these plans and agreements of Dr. Maček are carried out by his agents – traitors: Dr. Roko Mišetić, Dr. Frano Dabrović, Frano Kolumbić, Dr. Miho Škvrce, Dr. Niko Koprivica, Roko Aguzinović and Pero Bakić”. Allegedly under protection of German “bands”, they are organizing a “militia and, within this militia, a ‘Zaštita’ [‘Guard’], in order to cover the Germans’ withdrawal together with the Chetniks and to seize power with the help of Ustasha officers

<sup>34</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Jozo Bulja, Zabilješka. Matković 2018: 207–232.

<sup>35</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Jozo Bulja, Zabilješka. Matković 2018: 207–232.

<sup>36</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Živka Grubića, Izvještaj suradnika „Nevena“.

<sup>37</sup> HR DAS 262, IHRPD, kut. 60. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 198–200.

<sup>34</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Jozo Bulj file, note. Matković 2018: 207–232.

<sup>35</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Jozo Bulj file, note. Matković 2018: 207–232.

<sup>36</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Živko Grubić file, informer “Neven’s” report.

<sup>37</sup> HR DAS 262, IHRPD, box 60. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 198–200.

Miho Škvrce, Dr. Niko Koprivica, Roko Aguzinović i Pero Bakić“ koji navodno pod zaštitom njemačkih „banda“ organiziraju „miliciju, a unutar nje ‘Zaštitu’, da bi zajedno sa četnicima branili odstupnicu Nijemaca i uz pomoć ustaških oficira i domobranske vojske iza sloma Pavelića ‘Nezavisne’ zauzeli vlast i na taj način udarili u leđa NOV“.<sup>38</sup> Svega desetak dana kasnije, u dopisu Okružnog komiteta KPH Dubrovnik, poslanom 14. lipnja 1944. svim partijskim jedinicama u dubrovačkom kotaru, navedeno je da su napravile mnogo velikih propusta u radu zbog čega su narodu „dozvolili“ da padne pod utjecaj „reakcije“, a istoj „reakciji omogućili rad s time što glavešine te reakcije niste raskrinkavali u masama i pristupili njihovoj likvidaciji“. Da bi se takvo stanje „popravilo“, potrebno je bilo narod upoznavati između ostalog i s „izdajničkim radom Dr. Mačeka i svih mačekovaca u vašem kotaru, raskrinkavati ih kao izdajnike i otvorene sluge fašizma, te da se isto na vrijeme likvidira“. Preostali dio „pokvarenjaka, rukovodica i organizatora reakcije“ valjalo je brzo uhititi i zatvoriti da bi se time obezglavili ostali „reakcioneri“.<sup>39</sup> Ti dokumenti otkrivaju da je već nekoliko mjeseci prije zauzimanja dalmatinskih gradova KP itekako bio svjestan utjecaja HSS-a na dubrovačkom terenu te se aktivno pripremao za obračun s njegovim pristašama.

Zauzimanjem Dubrovnika u listopadu 1944. iz tog je grada Oblasnom komitetu KPH za Dalmaciju upućen dopis organizacijskog sekretara Ante Jurjevića zvanog Baja. Dana 25. listopada 1944. Jurjević javlja da je Dubrovnik „postao“, a ne posveti li mu se pozornost, također će i ostati „centar špijunaže“ i za južni dio Dalmacije i za veći dio Jugoslavije uz „reakciju“ koja se već „osvješćuje“.<sup>40</sup> U tim su trenutcima već vršene likvidacije na Daksi i drugdje na dubrovačkom prostoru, o čemu govori i sam Jurjević u spomenutom pismu. O tim je likvidacijama sačuvano i izvješće Drage Desputa, člana Sudskog odsjeka Glavnog štaba NOV-a i partizanskih odreda (PO) Hrvatske, upućeno Centralnom komitetu KPH 17. siječnja 1945. godine. Desput navodi da je tijekom

and Home Guard units, thus hitting NOV from behind”.<sup>38</sup> Some ten days later, in its letter of 14 June 1944, sent to all party chapters in the Dubrovnik area, the KPH District Committee for Dubrovnik concludes that major oversights have taken place, “allowing” the people to fall under the “reactionaries” influence and “enabling these reactionaries to operate by failing to unmask their leaders among the masses and to liquidate them”. In order to “fix” this situation, the people were supposed to be acquainted with, among other things, the “treacherous activities of Dr. Maček and all of his followers in your area, unmask them traitors and servant fascism and ensure their timely liquidation”. The remaining “reactionary reprobates, leaders and organizers” were to be arrested and put away quickly in order to deprive other “reactionaries” of their leaders.<sup>39</sup> These documents indicate that, months before taking Dalmatian cities, the Communist Party was fully aware of the HSS influence in the Dubrovnik area and was actively preparing for the showdown with its supporters.

When Dubrovnik was taken in October 1944, the Party’s organizing secretary Ante “Baja” Jurjević sent a letter to the KPH Provincial Committee for Dalmatia from there. On 25 October he notified them that the city “had become” (...) “a center of espionage” and, if attention was not paid to it, would “remain” that, not just for Southern Dalmatia, but also for most of Yugoslavia, because of the “growing awareness” (...) of the “reactionaries”.<sup>40</sup> In these moments, executions on the island of Daks and elsewhere in the Dubrovnik area had already been taking place. Jurjević confirms it in his letter. Another confirmation about the executions can be found in the report of Drago Desput, member of the Military Court of the Supreme Command of National Liberation Army and Partisan Detachments in Croatia, sent to the KPH Central Committee on 17 January 1945. Desput says he observed “certain irregularities” during his visit to Dalmatia, specifying that “OZNA commissioner for Knin sector, Comrade Ilija<sup>41</sup>,

<sup>38</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Izvadak iz letka USAOH, 5. 6. 1944.

<sup>39</sup> HR DAS 262, IHRPD, kut. 60. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 201–203.

<sup>40</sup> Matković & Pažanin 2011: 215–218. Prijepis spomenutog pisma objavljen je i na web-stranici [https://www.tomislavjonjic.iz.hr/III\\_Baja.html](https://www.tomislavjonjic.iz.hr/III_Baja.html) (pristupljeno 01/01/2024).

<sup>38</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, excerpt from USAOH leaflet, 5 June 1944.

<sup>39</sup> HR DAS 262, IHRPD, box 60. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 201–203. 40 Matković & Pažanin 2011: 215–218. A transcript of this letter was also published on web page [https://www.tomislavjonjic.iz.hr/III\\_Baja.html](https://www.tomislavjonjic.iz.hr/III_Baja.html) (accessed in January 2024).

<sup>41</sup> Grubić Ilija, born 134 February 1909 in Dubrovnik, Serb. Engine mechanic in Knin. Member of Knin County Committee of CPC since 1941. Joined National Liberation Army on 26 December 1942. Captured and imprisoned; later exchanged. Commissioner of OZNA for Knin since mid-1944. In charge of 1st Section

boravka u Dalmaciji zapazio „stanovite nepravilnosti“ te ističe da mu je „povjerenik OZN-e za kninski sektor drug Ilija<sup>41</sup> izjavio (...), da su oni dobili direktivu, da prilikom oslobađanja uhapsu što više ljudi, jedan dio od tih, koji ispunjavaju potrebne uslove, likvidiraju, a ostali dio puste na slobodu“. Štoviše, „u duhu te direktive od Dubrovnika – Knina pa do Zadra likvidiran je stanoviti broj ljudi“, a „za jedan dio od likvidiranih zatraženo je od naših vojnih sudova da se izrade presude u svrhu objavljivanja, što je i učinjeno“.<sup>42</sup> No ne samo da su presude pisane naknadno nego i „sama justifikacija likvidiranih vršena je bez potrebne opreznosti na vrlo nezgodan način“ pa su u Dubrovniku, na primjer, pripadnici Korpusa narodne obrane Jugoslavije (KNOJ) „justifikaciju“ vršili klanjem, a pri provođenju te „mjere“ bili su „površni“. Tako je, primjerice, u Dubrovniku u oglasu s popisom osuđenih na smrt, odnosno strijeljanih, svoje ime ugledao građanin koji se u tom trenutku nalazio na slobodi. Također, među likvidiranim je bilo onih koji se „nikako nisu smjeli likvidirati unutar četiri zida“ jer je njih trebalo „raskrinkati“ pred narodom, izvesti na javno suđenje i zatim osuditi, kao što je bio slučaj sa „20 popova u Dubrovniku“.<sup>43</sup> Čini se da su Desputove „nepravilnosti“ bile mnogo više od toga. Riječ je bila o doista bizarnim situacijama u kojima nije suđeno samo mrtvima nego čak i onima koji se pred sudom uopće nisu pojavili niti su o svojoj navodnoj likvidaciji išta znali.

No unatoč masovnoj represiji koja se u tim trenucima odvijala na prostoru čitave Dalmacije, Desput

<sup>41</sup> Grubić Ilija, rođen 13. veljače 1909. u Dubrovniku. Srbin. Strojomehaničar u Kninu. Član KK KPH Knin 1941. U NOV-u od 26. prosinca 1942. Uhvaćen i zatvoren te razmijenjen. Opunomoćenik Opunomoćstva OZNA-e kninskog područja od sredine 1944., zadužen i za poslove I. sekcije. Prema literaturi, bio je šef Opunomoćstva OZNA-e za šibensko područje. Vršitelj dužnosti načelnika Okružnog odjeljenja OZNA-e za Šibenik 1945. U činu kapetana zamjenik načelnika Odjeljenja UDBA-e za oblast Dalmacija 1946. Član Odjeljenja UDBA-e za grad Zagreb potkraj 40-ih god. 20. st. Član UDBA-e za Hrvatsku početkom 50-ih god. 20. st. Načelnik Opunomoćstva UDB-e za kotar i grad i Odjela unutrašnjih poslova Zadar sredinom 50-ih god. 20. st. Radelić 2019: 331.

<sup>42</sup> HR HDA 1220, CK SKH, Ratno gradivo, kut. 13, KP-42/2842. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 83–88; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 288–301; Matković 2017b: 312–325.

<sup>43</sup> HR HDA 1220, CK SKH, Ratno gradivo, kut. 13, KP-42/2842. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 83–88; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 288–301; Matković 2017b: 312–325.

said (...) that they had been given a directive to make as many arrests as possible upon liberating a town and do away with those meeting the criteria and release the rest”. Indeed, “in keeping with the directive, a number of people on the Dubrovnik–Knin–Zadar stretch were liquidated” and “our military courts were then requested to write down verdicts for some of those liquidated in order to have them published, which was carried out”.<sup>42</sup> So not only were the verdicts brought subsequently but the “executions themselves were carried out without necessary caution and very inappropriately”: in Dubrovnik, for example, members of People’s Defense Corps of Yugoslavia (KNOJ) “carried out executions by cutting throats”; in doing so, they were “desultory”. For example, one citizen who was not arrested at the moment saw his name on the list of those sentenced to death and executed. Also, the executed included those “who shouldn’t have been executed quietly” because they were supposed to be “unmasked” publicly, put to a show trial and then convicted, as had been the case with “20 priests in Dubrovnik”.<sup>43</sup> It seems that those Desput’s “irregularities” were much more than that. There were rather bizarre situations that included trials not only of dead people but also of those who had no idea they were being tried or even “executed”.

The fact that repression on a massive scale was taking place throughout Dalmatia at the moment did not prevent Desput from concluding that this number was not excessive – on the contrary, it was “by far too small in some sectors”. For instance, “only around 100 were executed” in Dubrovnik. Apparently, the number was “too small for Dubrovnik and its surrounds, where Ustashe, Chetniks, Italians and Germans had reigned all this time and a large majority of the local citizens had sided with them”. Desput asserts that the “comrades” have shown “excessive leniency” in the area where “ideas and plans were made for committing violence against

activities. According to sources, he was head of OZNA for Šibenik. Acting head of OZNA division for Šibenik County in 1945. Deputy head of UDBA – Dalmatian branch (commissioned as captain) in 1946. Member of UDBA Zagreb division in the late 1940s. Member of UDBA – Croatian branch in the early 1950s. Head of Zadar division of UDBA and Ministry of Interior in the mid-1950s. Radelić 2019: 331.

<sup>42</sup> HR HDA 1220, CK SKH, wartime documents, box 13, KP-42/2842. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 83–88; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 288–301; Matković 2017b: 312–325.

<sup>43</sup> HR HDA 1220, CK SKH, wartime documents, box 13, KP-42/2842. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 83–88; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 288–301; Matković 2017b: 312–325.



je zaključio da taj broj ipak nije bio prevelik, nego „na nekim sektorima mnogo premalen“. Tako je u Dubrovniku likvidirano „svega oko 100 ljudi“. Ipak, kaže da je to „premalen broj za Dubrovnik i okolice u kojem su za ovo čitavo vrijeme carevali i ustaše i četnici, Talijani i Nijemci, a ogromna većina Dubrovčana s njima se je povezala.“ Desput je ustvrdio da su „drugovi“ iskazali „pretjeranu blagost“ na području na kojem su se „rađale ideje i izgrađivali planovi vršenog nasilja nad čitavom Južnom Dalmacijom“ te su „petokolonaštvo i špijunaža bili u punom cvatu“. Komunistička „blagost“ i „premalni“ broj likvidiranih rezultirali su „reakcijom javnog mišljenja“.<sup>44</sup> Ovdje valja napomenuti i to da se Desputova brojka o oko 100 likvidiranih odnosi na prve dane nakon „oslobođenja“ što potvrđuje Izvadak iz izvanrednog izvještaja Vojnog suda VIII. Korpusne vojne oblasti NOVJ Vijeća pri Komandi dubrovačkog područja u kojem je također istaknuto da su „za oko polovinu od tih izvješeni oglasi s potpisom ‘Vojni sud’, što je u Dubrovniku ostavilo mučan utisak i ostavilo osjećaj pravne nesigurnosti“.<sup>45</sup> Da su spomenute brojke bile nezadovoljavajuće po novu komunističku vlast, dokazuje izjava Milovana Đilasa koji je posjetio Dubrovnik početkom studenoga 1944. i koji je, čuvši brojku likvidiranih, kazao: „Malo, malo.“<sup>46</sup> Likvidacije su svakako nastavljene i u kasnijem razdoblju što dokazuje oglas Vojnog suda dubrovačkog područja od 19. studenoga 1944. u kojem su navedena imena 12 osoba koje su na smrt strijeljanjem osuđene četiri dana ranije.<sup>47</sup> Među zatvorenima, puštenima i likvidiranim bilo je ljudi, uključujući žene, iz čitavog okruga, no uglavnom se radilo o Dubrovčanima i Konavljanima, „jer je tamo izroda najviše i bilo“. Iako je nastavljeno s uhićenjima u Dubrovniku te je politička situacija u okrugu bila „u znaku moralnog opadanja svih naših protivnika“, to ipak nije značilo da ih je nestalo „mnogo“, nego naprotiv „malo ih je nestalo“. Riječ je uglavnom bila o onim „neprijateljima“ koji su se tijekom rata znatno

entire Southern Dalmatia” and where “the fifth column and espionage activities were thriving”. This Communist “leniency” and the numbers that were “by far too small” resulted in “reactions of the public opinion”.<sup>44</sup> It should be noted here that Desput’s figure of “around 100” of those who were executed refers to the first days after the “liberation”. Evidence of this can be found in the Excerpt from the Extraordinary Report of the Military Court at the Dubrovnik Command in Charge of the Operational Zone of the 8th Corps of NOVJ, which also highlights that the “notices posted up for about half of these [executed] were signed by the Military Court, thus leaving an embarrassing impression and a feeling of legal insecurity in Dubrovnik”.<sup>45</sup> The alleged comment of Milovan Đilas, who visited Dubrovnik in the early November 1944, also proves that the communist authorities were not happy with these figures. Upon hearing the number of the executed, he commented: “Too few, too few”.<sup>46</sup> Evidence of continued executions can also be found in the public notice of Dubrovnik Military Court of 19 November 1944, listing the names of the 12 persons sentenced to be shot four days earlier.<sup>47</sup> While those detained, released and executed were people from the entire district – including women – they were mostly from Dubrovnik and Konavle, “because most of these degenerates came from there”. Although the campaign of arrests in Dubrovnik continued and the local political situation began to improve “as our opponents started losing morale”, the new authorities were still not happy with these numbers: “...too few of them have disappeared”. This mostly referred to those who had compromised themselves more than others during the war; as for these others, there were no sufficient “excuses” for their “elimination”. Nevertheless, it was noted that it was particularly these others that began working “against us” recently.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>44</sup> HR HDA 1220, CK SKH, Ratno gradivo, kut. 13, KP-42/2842. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 83–88; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 288–301; Matković 2017b: 312–325.

<sup>45</sup> HR HDA 1220, CK SKH, Ratno gradivo, kut. 13, KP-42/2842. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 83–88; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 288–301; Matković 2017b: 312–325.

<sup>46</sup> Glavina 1998: 52.

<sup>47</sup> HR HDA 1220, CK SKH, Ratno gradivo, kut. 13, KP-42/2842. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 83–88; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 288–301; Matković 2017b: 312–325.

<sup>44</sup> HR HDA 1220, CK SKH, wartime documents, box 13, KP-42/2842. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 83–88; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 288–301; Matković 2017b: 312–325.

<sup>45</sup> HR HDA 1220, CK SKH, wartime documents, box 13, KP-42/2842. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 83–88; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 288–301; Matković 2017b: 312–325.

<sup>46</sup> Glavina 1998: 52.

<sup>47</sup> HR HDA 1220, CK SKH, wartime documents, box 13, KP-42/2842. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 83–88; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 288–301; Matković 2017b: 312–325.

<sup>48</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, South Dalmatian OZNA report to OZNA division for the 8th Corps, 22 November 1944, no. 460/44 (formerly box 169). Matković & Pažanin 2011: 220–225.

više eksponirali, no za mnoge druge nije bilo dovoljno „aduta“ za njihovo „uklanjanje“. Ipak, već je u tom trenutku zabilježeno da su upravo takvi u posljednje vrijeme spremni raditi „protiv nas“.<sup>48</sup>

Ti dokumenti doista oslikavaju razmjere partizanske represije i komunističkih zločina u Dalmaciji, pa tako i na dubrovačkom području, u prvim tjednima po zauzimanju dalmatinskih gradova i sela. Već je u tim trenutcima, unatoč progonima i likvidacijama, HSS bio okarakteriziran kao jedan od najvećih problema nove vlasti o čemu svjedoči niz dokumenta nastalih nakon listopada 1944. godine. Naime, u izvješću OZNA-e južnodalmatinskog područja od 22. studenoga 1944. istaknuta je „reakcija HSS“ kao „glavni naš neprijatelj u okrugu“, a naročito dubrovačkom kotaru. Štoviše, Dubrovnik je identificiran kao „leglo svakakove reakcije“. S obzirom na to da su pojedini HSS-ovci pristupali Jedinostvenoj narodnooslobodilačkoj fronti (JNOF) i time sudjelovali u radu nove komunističke vlasti nastojeći pritom ojačati svoj utjecaj, OZNA im je zamjerila „nezdravost“ koja se očituje u situacijama kada „ispadaju kao neka zasebna partija“.<sup>49</sup> Navodno se „najreakcionarniji mačekovac“ u JNOF-u isticao dr. Niko Bjelovučić.<sup>50</sup> Stoga je predloženo „da se ovo ‘kolo’ razbije u zametku“ jer su počeli „hvatati korijena“ među narodom. HSS je naročiti problem predstavljao u Konavlima gdje je bio najjači, a među tamošnjim HSS-ovcima isticao se Pero Bakić, „aktivni naš protivnik, Mačekovac, iz Čilipa – Konavle“. Štoviše, „kada su otišle ustaše iz Konavala povukao se u ilegalstvo i danas se nalazi u šumi“, a s njime se nalazilo još nekoliko križara „pa su vjerojatno povezani i sa četnicima koji se ponekad viđaju na tom području“.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>48</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Izvješće OZN-e južnodalmatinskog područja Odsjeku OZN-e za oblast VIII. korpusa, 22. 11. 1944., Broj 460/44 (prethodno kutija 169). Matković & Pažanin 2011: 220–225.

<sup>49</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Izvješće OZN-e južnodalmatinskog područja Odsjeku OZN-e za oblast VIII. korpusa, 22. 11. 1944., Broj 460/44 (prethodno kutija 169). Matković & Pažanin 2011: 220–225.

<sup>50</sup> HR DAS 438, Pokrajinski/oblasni komitet KPH za Dalmaciju, kut. 26, KP-26/245. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 226–229; Rupiće & Geiger 2011: 336–338.

<sup>51</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Izvješće OZN-e južnodalmatinskog područja Odsjeku OZN-e za oblast VIII. korpusa, 22. 11. 1944., Broj 460/44 (prethodno kutija 169). Matković & Pažanin 2011: 220–225.

These documents indicate the true scale of the Partisan repression and Communist crimes in Dalmatia, including Dubrovnik area, in the first weeks upon Partisan seizure of Dalmatian towns and villages. As early as then, despite persecutions and liquidations, HSS was perceived as one of the biggest problems for the new authorities, as can be seen in a number of documents made after October 1944. South Dalmatian OZNA report of 22 November 1944 underlines that Croatian Peasants Party (HSS) “reactionaries” are “our major enemy in the area, particularly in and around Dubrovnik”. Indeed, Dubrovnik had been identified as a “hotbed of reactionaries of all sorts”. Some HSS members were joining the Unitary National Liberation Front (JNOF). While collaborating with the new communist authorities, they tried to strengthen their influence. OZNA resented their “unsoundness”, manifested in the situations when they “act as a separate party”.<sup>49</sup> Allegedly, Dr. Niko Bjelovučić was considered “the most reactionary among Maček’s followers” in JNOF.<sup>50</sup> It was therefore suggested that this “shady business should be cut off at the roots” because they began “striking root” among the people. HSS was perceived as most problematic in Konavle – its stronghold. Particularly prominent there was Pero Bakić, “our active adversary, a follower of Maček, from Čilipi – Konavle”. According to the report, “when Ustashe withdrew from Konavle, he went underground and is now hiding in the woods”. Accompanied by a few other Crusaders, he “probably created connections with the Chetniks who can sometimes be seen in that area”.<sup>51</sup>

However, despite the repression in Dubrovnik and the warnings of communist organs, in early December 1944 OZNA observed that “our organs” in that city were still inactive and that “Ustashe, Chetniks and Maček’s followers are doing what they want”, which is why “awareness” was to be raised there.<sup>52</sup> In mid-December that

<sup>49</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, South Dalmatian OZNA report to OZNA division for the 8th Corps, 22 November 1944, no. 460/44 (formerly box 169). Matković & Pažanin 2011: 220–225.

<sup>50</sup> HR DAS 438, KPH Provincial Committee for Dalmatia, box 26, KP-26/245. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 226–229; Rupiće & Geiger 2011: 336–338.

<sup>51</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, South Dalmatian OZNA report to OZNA division for the 8th Corps, 22 November 1944, no. 460/44 (formerly box 169). Matković & Pažanin 2011: 220–225.

<sup>52</sup> Matković & Pažanin 2011:128–149; Rupiće & Geiger 2011: 742. HR DAS 428, Main Intelligence Center of the 2nd Dalmatian Section (former Intelligence Service Collection, OZNA – Dalmatian branch, box 60).

No, unatoč represiji u Dubrovniku i upozorenjima komunističkih organa, OZNA je početkom prosinca 1944. zabilježila da su u Dubrovniku „naši organi“ još uvijek neaktivni, a „ustaše, četnici i mačekovci rade što hoće“ zbog čega je ondje bilo potrebno pojačati „budnost“.<sup>52</sup> Sredinom prosinca iste godine OZNA javlja da se u Dubrovniku jako osjećaju posljedice „našeg ranijeg slabog upliva“ zbog čega je tom terenu potrebno posvetiti veću pozornost, a u međuvremenu su nastavljena uhićenja pa je iz otkrivene „ustaške organizacije“ uhićeno sedam „omladinaca“.<sup>53</sup> Početkom 1945. OZNA također izvještava da u dubrovačkom kotaru ima odbornika koji nisu „raskrstili“ s Mačekom pa su poduzete mjere da se takvi „uklone“.<sup>54</sup> U Zapisniku savjetovanja oblasnih političkih sekretara KP Hrvatske za Dalmaciju od 6. veljače 1945. zabilježeno je da Dubrovnik „tek od oslobođenja otkriva svoje snove i učestvuje u borbi“, ali su „stari uticaju još dosta jaki, naročito popovi“ te se u narodu budi „težnja“ za oživljavanjem HSS-a.<sup>55</sup> Nakon proslave sv. Vlaha u Dubrovniku u veljači 1945., koja je prema navodima OZNA-e dopuštena radi izbjegavanja mjera koje „nas udaljavaju od naroda“<sup>56</sup>, pojavili su se letci u kojima su navodno „veličani“ Pavelić i Maček.<sup>57</sup> Štoviše, kako je istaknuto u Zapisniku savjetovanja Opunomoćstva OZNA-e III. odsjeka za oblast VIII. korpusa NOV od 1. i 2. ožujka 1945., „pitanje Mačeka“ postajalo je sve veći problem, naročito kod mobiliziranih osoba Konavala i Dubrovnika.<sup>58</sup> Dubrovačka je „mačekovština“ privukla i pažnju tadašnjeg tiska, pa je krajem ožujka 1945. dr. Niko Bjelovučić, koji je „za vrijeme okupacije i poslije oslobođenja zastupao politiku Mačeka“,

year, OZNA reported that effects of “our earlier mild influence” could be felt in Dubrovnik, instructing that more attention should therefore be paid to the area. Meanwhile, the arrests continued: seven young members of a recently exposed “Ustasha organization” were arrested.<sup>53</sup> In the early 1945, OZNA also reported that some National Liberation Committee members in the Dubrovnik area had not “broken up” with Maček and that measures were taken to “eliminate” them.<sup>54</sup> In the minutes from the conference of KPH provincial political secretaries for Dalmatia of 6 February 1945, it is said that Dubrovnik “found its soul and joined the fight only after the liberation”, but also that “the old influences are still very strong, particularly owing to clergy” and that there is a “tendency” among the people to revive HSS.<sup>55</sup> After the Festivity of St. Blaise in Dubrovnik in February 1945 which, according to OZNA, was allowed in order to avoid measures that would “alienate us from the people”<sup>56</sup>, leaflets were distributed that allegedly “glorified” Pavelić and Maček.<sup>57</sup> Indeed, as pointed out in the minutes from the conference of the 3rd Section of OZNA’s division for the 8<sup>th</sup> Corps Operational Zone of 1–2 March 1945, the “Maček issue” was becoming a growing problem, particularly among the troops raised in Konavle and Dubrovnik.<sup>58</sup> This *mačekovština* (affiliation with Maček’s ideas) in the Dubrovnik area received coverage in the press of the day. For example, in late March 1945, Dr. Niko Bjelovučić, who “supported Maček’s politics during occupation and after the liberation”, stepped down as vice-president of the District Committee of JNOF for Dubrovnik after his “Maček-style disunity policy” had been criticized in the article

<sup>52</sup> Matković & Pažanin 2011:128–149; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 742. HR DAS 428, Glavni obavještajni centar 2. odsjeka za Dalmaciju (bivša Zbirka Obavještajna služba, OZN-a za Dalmaciju, kut. 60).

<sup>53</sup> Matković & Pažanin 2011:128–149; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 742. HR DAS 428, Glavni obavještajni centar 2. odsjeka za Dalmaciju (bivša Zbirka Obavještajna služba, OZN-a za Dalmaciju, kut. 60).

<sup>54</sup> Matković & Pažanin 2011:128–149; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 742. HR DAS 428, Glavni obavještajni centar 2. odsjeka za Dalmaciju (bivša Zbirka Obavještajna služba, OZN-a za Dalmaciju, kut. 60).

<sup>55</sup> HR HDA 1222, Oblasni komitet KPH-a za Dalmaciju, kut. 6, KP-298/1014. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 88–94.

<sup>56</sup> Matković & Pažanin 2011: 128–149; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 742. HR DAS 428, Glavni obavještajni centar 2. odsjeka za Dalmaciju (bivša Zbirka Obavještajna služba, OZN-a za Dalmaciju, kut. 60).

<sup>57</sup> HR DAS 438, Pokrajinski/oblasni komitet KPH za Dalmaciju, kut. 26, KP-26/245. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 226–229; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 336–338.

<sup>58</sup> HR HDA 1491, OZN-a za Hrvatsku, kut. 35, 11.3.1, 30/65. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 97–109.

<sup>53</sup> Matković & Pažanin 2011:128–149; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 742. HR DAS 428, Main Intelligence Center of the 2nd Dalmatian Section (former Intelligence Service Collection, OZNA – Dalmatian branch, box 60).

<sup>54</sup> Matković & Pažanin 2011:128–149; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 742. HR DAS 428, Main Intelligence Center of the 2nd Dalmatian Section (former Intelligence Service Collection, OZNA – Dalmatian branch, box 60).

<sup>55</sup> HR HDA 1222, KPH Provincial Committee for Dalmatia, box 6, KP-298/1014. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 88–94.

<sup>56</sup> Matković & Pažanin 2011:128–149; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 742. HR DAS 428, Main Intelligence Center of the 2nd Dalmatian Section (former Intelligence Service Collection, OZNA – Dalmatian branch, box 60).

<sup>57</sup> HR DAS 438, Provincial Committee for Dalmatia, box 26, KP-26/245. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 226–229; Rupić & Geiger 2011: 336–338.

<sup>58</sup> HR HDA 1491, OZNA – Croatian branch, box 35, 11.3.1, 30/65. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 97–109.



dao ostavku na dužnost dopredsjednika Okružnog odbora JNOF-a Dubrovnik nakon što je u tekstu pod naslovom „Ne dozvolimo neprijateljima NOP-a uvlačenje u odbor JNOF-a“, objavljenom u *Slobodnoj Dalmaciji*, kritizirana njegova „Mačekova cjepačka politika“.<sup>59</sup>

Slično Solinu, utjecaj HSS-a će se na dubrovačkom prostoru održati znatno nakon završetka Drugog svjetskog rata. I ondje će upravo istaknuti pristaše HSS-a odigrati značajniju ulogu u održavanju hrvatske nacionalne svijesti i svijesti o protukomunističkom otporu koja će u tadašnjoj Jugoslaviji biti okarakterizirana kao „neprijateljski“ rad. O tome svjedoči i slučaj Frana Kolumbića čiji je osobni dosje sačuvan u fondu Sekretarijata za unutrašnje poslove za Dalmaciju koji je pohranjen u Državnom arhivu u Splitu, a o kojem će u narednom dijelu biti više riječi.

### **Frano Kolumbić – „Tipični demagog, ali sa svojim djelovanjem i istupanjima veoma opasan“<sup>60</sup>**

Kako je istaknuto u prethodnom dijelu ovog rada, slično Solinu, na dubrovačkom će se prostoru utjecaj nekadašnjih HSS-ovaca također održati do početka 50-ih godina 20. stoljeća o čemu svjedoči slučaj Frana Kolumbića. Kolumbić je rođen 12. lipnja 1896. u Sv. Nedjelji na Hvaru, u obitelji Nikole i Vinke rođene Lovrinčević, a živio je u Dubrovniku.<sup>61</sup> Školovao se u Kotoru gdje je završio osnovnu školu i šest razreda gimnazije nakon čega je školovanje nastavio u Dubrovniku. Nakon povratka iz vojske 1918. otišao je na studij u Zagreb te se 1923. vratio u Dubrovnik gdje se zaposlio na trgovačkoj akademiji na kojoj je proveo i veći dio svog radnog vijeka.<sup>62</sup> Bio je oženjen Viktorijom rođenom Svilokos i bio je otac dviju kćeri – Ksenije i Mire. Nakon završene Tehničke visoke

in *Slobodna Dalmacija* entitled *We Won't Have Enemies of NOP Infiltrate JNOF Committee*.<sup>59</sup>

Similarly as in Solin, the influence of HSS would linger on in the Dubrovnik area for quite a while after the end of World War II. And this is exactly where prominent HSS supporters would play an important role in maintaining Croatian national awareness and the awareness of the anticommunist resistance – something perceived by Yugoslav authorities as an “enemy” activity. The case of Frano Kolumbić can be seen as evidence of it. His personal file has been preserved in the files of the Department for Dalmatia of the Ministry of Interior, now kept in the State Archives in Split. More on his case will be said in the following chapter.

### **Frano Kolumbić – A “Typical Demagogue, but with Very Dangerous Influence on the People”<sup>60</sup>**

As has been said above, similarly as in Solin, the influence of former HSS members would linger on in the Dubrovnik area until the early 1950s. One such example is the case of Frano Kolumbić. Born to Nikola and Vinka nee Lovrinčević in Sv. Nedjelja on Hvar on 12 June 1896, Kolumbić lived in Dubrovnik.<sup>61</sup> He completed elementary school and six grades of secondary school in Kotor and the rest of the secondary school in Dubrovnik. Upon returning from the army in 1918, he studied in Zagreb. Then he returned to Dubrovnik and found a job at the Commercial Academy, where he spent most of his active life.<sup>62</sup> He married Viktorija nee Svilokos and they had two daughters – Ksenija and Mira. Having earned a degree from the Technical School, he started working as a professor at the secondary school of economics and secondary nautical school.

<sup>59</sup> Matković & Pažanin 2011:128–149; Rupiće & Geiger 2011: 742. HR DAS 428, Glavni obavještajni centar 2. odsjeka za Dalmaciju (bivša Zbirka Obavještajna služba, OZN-a za Dalmaciju, kut. 60). *Slobodna Dalmacija* 20. 3. 1945: 1.

<sup>60</sup> Ovim je riječima opisan Frano Kolumbić u elaboratu UDDBA-e s rekonstrukcijom „banditizma“ za bivši kotar Dubrovnik od 28. veljače 1962. godine. Radica 2003: 480. HR HDA 1561, SDS RSUP RH, 015.11. Rekonstrukcija banditizma za bivši kotar Dubrovnik, 28. 2. 1962.

<sup>61</sup> Radica 2003: 743.

<sup>62</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 12. 2. 1949.

<sup>59</sup> Matković & Pažanin 2011:128–149; Rupiće & Geiger 2011: 742. HR DAS 428, Main Intelligence Center of the 2nd Dalmatian Section (former Intelligence Service Collection, OZNA – Dalmatian branch, box 60). *Slobodna Dalmacija* of 20 March 1945: 1.

<sup>60</sup> These words were used to describe Frano Kolumbić in UDDBA report of 28 February 1962, which contained a “reconstruction of banditry” for the former Dubrovnik District. Radica 2003: 480. HR HDA 1561, SDS RSUP RH, 015.11. *Reconstruction of Banditry for the Former Dubrovnik District*, 28 February 1962.

<sup>61</sup> Radica 2003: 743.

<sup>62</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 12 February 1949.

škole zaposlio se kao profesor na srednjoj ekonomskoj i srednjoj pomorskoj školi.

Kao istaknuti član HSS-a, Kolumbić je između dva svjetska rata bio zatvaran i proganjan.<sup>63</sup> U knjizi *Dubrovačke žrtve, Jugokomunistički teror na hrvatskom jugu 1944. i poratnim godinama (početak Bleiburga)* Hrvoje Kačić navodi da je njegov otac Ante 1932. uhićen zajedno s Kolumbićem nakon čega su više od godinu dana proveli u zeničkom zatvoru te su pušteni nakon izbora 1935. godine.<sup>64</sup> No povjesničar Franko Mirošević navodi da je Kolumbić uhićen i interniran 1931. godine.<sup>65</sup> Osim toga je u dokumentima zabilježeno i Kolumbićevo uhićenje 1934. godine. Naime, početkom siječnja 1944. Kolumbić je uputio zamolbu Župskoj redarstvenoj oblasti u Dubrovniku zatraživši da mu se na temelju Zakonske odredbe od 6. kolovoza 1943. o uračunavanju vremena oduzete slobode hrvatskim političkim osuđenicima – državnim i samoupravnim službenicima – prizna razdoblje provedeno u zatvoru. U tom dopisu Kolumbić navodi da je zbog hrvatskog narodno-političkog rada u lipnju 1934. interniran u Bajinoj Bašti u Srbiji nakon čega je prebačen u kaznionicu u Zenici i zatim u zatvor Okružnog suda u Sarajevu gdje je ostao do kolovoza 1935. godine. „Internacija je uslijedila vjerojatno pod sumnjom da sam organizirao i proveo bijeg Tome Grgića, sadanjeg Velikog Župana u Mostaru, dok je redarstveni zatvor od jednog mjeseca i ostalo vrijeme sudskog zatvora uslijedilo radi optužbe drž. odvjetništva u Sarajevu radi istog razloga, a u kojem je slučaju bilo suoptuženo još 36 rodoljuba“, ističe Kolumbić u toj zamolbi.<sup>66</sup> Njegove je navode u veljači 1944. potvrdio jedan redarstveni izvidnik.<sup>67</sup> Uzevši u obzir Miroševićeve i Kačićeve navode, nejasno je radi li se o dvama različitim slučajevima, odnosno uhićenjima 1931./1932. i zatim 1934. godine. Sam Kolumbić u jednoj drugoj izjavi od 12. veljače 1949. iz predratnog razdoblja spominje samo uhićenje i internaciju 1934. godine.<sup>68</sup>

As a prominent HSS member, he was imprisoned and persecuted in the interwar period.<sup>63</sup> In his book *Dubrovačke žrtve, Jugokomunistički teror na hrvatskom jugu 1944. i poratnim godinama (početak Bleiburga)*, Hrvoje Kačić mentions that his father Ante and Kolumbić were arrested and imprisoned together in 1932 and that they spent four years in the Zenica prison, from where they were released after the 1935 election.<sup>64</sup> On the other hand, historian Franko Mirošević states that Kolumbić was arrested and interned in 1931.<sup>65</sup> Information on Kolumbić's arrest in 1934 can also be found in records. In early January 1944, Kolumbić submitted a request to Župa Police District in Dubrovnik that, based on the legal provision on deprivation of liberty for Croatian civil servants sentenced for political crimes of 6 August 1943, his jailtime be recognized. In this letter Kolumbić explains that, on account of his political activities on behalf and with the Croatian people, he was first interned in Bajina Bašta (Serbia), then in Zenica penitentiary and finally in the Sarajevo District Court prison, where he stayed until 1935. "I was interned most likely on the ground of suspicion that I organized and helped the escape of Tomo Grgić, now county executive in Mostar. As for the one-month imprisonment and the time spent in the District Court prison, that was because the state prosecutor in Sarajevo charged me for the same reason, together with 36 other patriots", says Kolumbić in his request.<sup>66</sup> In February 1944, his allegations were confirmed by a police officer.<sup>67</sup> Given Mirošević's and Kačić's allegations, it is not clear whether these were two different cases (the arrests in 1931/1932 and 1934). In another statement of his (given on 12 February 1949), Kolumbić, when referring to the prewar period, mentions only his arrest and internation that took place in 1934.<sup>68</sup>

During World War II, some members of HSS, like Marko Marojica, joined the Communist Party. But Marojica maintained friendly relations with many HSS

<sup>63</sup> Radica 2003: 480.

<sup>64</sup> Kačić 2017: 29.

<sup>65</sup> Mirošević 2011a: 162.

<sup>66</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zamolba upućena ŽRO-u Dubrovnik, 1944.

<sup>67</sup> Potpis nečitak. Čitljivo je ime Ivo, a prezime počinje slovom K. Moguće je da je riječ o prezimenu Korinčić ili nekom sličnom prezimenu.

<sup>68</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 12. 2. 1949.

<sup>63</sup> Radica 2003: 480.

<sup>64</sup> Kačić 2017: 29.

<sup>65</sup> Mirošević 2011a: 162.

<sup>66</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, request submitted to Župa Police District in Dubrovnik, 1944.

<sup>67</sup> Signature illegible. The first name – Ivo – can be discerned. The last name begins with K. Korinčić, perhaps, or something similar.

<sup>68</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 12 February 1949.

Tijekom razdoblja Drugog svjetskog rata pojedini članovi HSS-a poput Marka Marojice pristupili su KP-u. Marojica je ipak nastavio održavati prijateljske odnose s mnogim članovima HSS-a koji nisu podupirali KP. Kačić navodi da su se njihovi sastanci održavali u Župi, Dubrovniku ili Rijeci Dubrovačkoj, a prisustvovao im je i Kolumbić,<sup>69</sup> koji je neposredno pred početak Drugog svjetskog rata obnašao dužnost predsjednika dubrovačke podružnice stranke.<sup>70</sup> Ni tijekom razdoblja NDH Kolumbić nije bio pošteđen uhićenja pa je u 1941. godini zatvoren dvaput, i to 22. lipnja i 4. kolovoza.<sup>71</sup> Nadzirale su ga i talijanske vlasti koje su ga također dvaput zatvarale; posljednji put 20. kolovoza 1943. kada je zajedno s Kolumbićem uhićen i bivši narodni zastupnik HSS-a Roko Mišetić te Frano Dabrović, oba iz Dubrovnika, „kojima su Talijani uskratili pravo zadržavanja u njihovoj zoni, pa su ovi odmah otputovali za Zagreb“, gdje su ostali do kapitulacije Italije.<sup>72</sup> O tim je događajima ostala zabilješka u dokumentima iz 1945. o čemu će riječi biti nešto kasnije, a na te se događaje osvrnuo i Kolumbić u izjavi od 12. veljače 1949. u kojoj je naveo da je spomenuto razdoblje proveo kod brata u Sarajevu.<sup>73</sup>

Kako je objašnjeno u prethodnom dijelu ovog rada, KP je još početkom 1944. bio dobro upoznat s političkim okolnostima u Dubrovniku i potencijalnom budućom „reakcijom“. Tako se, primjerice, upravo Kolumbićevo ime spominje već u izvješću Elodija Akrapa, člana Okružnog komiteta (OK) KPH Dubrovnik, vjerojatno iz 1944., u kojem su Kolumbić i Mišetić opisani kao „opasni HSS-ovci“.<sup>74</sup> U letku koji se na dubrovačkom području širio u lipnju 1944., a koji je napisao Jozo Bačić, sekretar Okružnog komiteta SKOJ-a i član OK KPH Dubrovnik, Kolumbić i ostali istaknuti HSS-ovci nazvani su „otvorenim slugama okupatora, izdajnicima svog naroda, palikućama i ubojicama nevinog naroda“ uz upozorenje da se „bliži dan narodnog suda“, a žrtve „zovu na osvetu“ zbog čega „surovoj, ali pravednoj

members who did not support the Party. According to Kačić, they would meet in Župa, Dubrovnik or Rijeka Dubrovačka. Kolumbić would also attend.<sup>69</sup> On the eve of World War II, Kolumbić was the president of the HSS Dubrovnik chapter.<sup>70</sup> He could not escape being arrested not even during the NDH period: in 1941 alone, he was arrested twice – on 22 June and 4 August.<sup>71</sup> He was also under surveillance of the Italian authorities and was also arrested twice by them – last time on 20 August 1943, together with Roko Mišetić, former member of parliament (HSS), and Frano Dabrović. They were all from Dubrovnik and were “banned from the Italian-controlled zone and immediately left for Zagreb”, where they stayed until the capitulation of Italy.<sup>72</sup> A note on these events can be found in documents from 1945 and more on them will be said further in the text. In his statement from 12 February 1949, Kolumbić also comments on this, adding that he was staying at his brother’s place in Sarajevo at the time.<sup>73</sup>

As explained above, the Communist Party was familiar with the political situation in Dubrovnik and potential “reactionaries” as far back as early 1944. For example, in his report (most likely from 1944), Elodije Akrap, member of the KPH District Committee for Dubrovnik, mentions Kolumbić and describes him and Mišetić as “dangerous HSS members”.<sup>74</sup> In the leaflet written by Jozo Bačić, secretary of District Committee of SKOJ and member of KPH District Committee for Dubrovnik, that circulated in Dubrovnik in June 1944, Kolumbić and other prominent HSS members are called “undisguised lackeys of the occupiers, traitors of the people, arsonists and slayers of innocent people”. The leaflet also says that “they will soon face people’s justice” and that “they will not escape the harsh but just punishment by the agonized people” because the “victims are crying for revenge”.<sup>75</sup> Kolumbić is also mentioned in the May report of KPH District Committee for Dubrovnik sent to KPH Provincial Committee for Dalmatia on 18 June 1944. This report provides some

<sup>69</sup> Kačić 2017: 119.

<sup>70</sup> Mirošević 2011a: 178.

<sup>71</sup> Mirošević 2011b: 273–274; Mirošević 2011c: 889; Radica 2003: 480.

<sup>72</sup> Radica 2003: 480.

<sup>73</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 12. 2. 1949.

<sup>74</sup> Radica 2003: 274.

<sup>69</sup> Kačić 2017: 119.

<sup>70</sup> Mirošević 2011a: 178.

<sup>71</sup> Mirošević 2011b: 273–274; Mirošević 2011c: 889; Radica 2003: 480.

<sup>72</sup> Radica 2003: 480.

<sup>73</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 12 February 1949.

<sup>74</sup> Radica 2003: 274.

<sup>75</sup> Radica 2003: 277.



kazni napaćenog naroda neće izbjeći”.<sup>75</sup> Kolumbić je naveden i u izvješću Okružnog komiteta KPH Dubrovnik za svibanj 1944. koje je 18. lipnja 1944. upućeno Oblasnom komitetu KPH za Dalmaciju. Iz tog izvješća doznajemo nešto više o političkoj situaciji u tim trenucima, a naročito se ističe jačanje potpore narodnooslobodilačkom pokretu (NOP), iako ponajprije pod utjecajem vanjskopolitičkih događaja, a ne djelovanja partijskih organizacija. Štoviše, za njih je izričito navedeno da još uvijek nemaju „jakog uporišta u masama“ koje nastavljaju podlijevati „neprijateljskoj propagandi“. „Iz gledalo je da i sama naša Partija u Kotaru Dubrovnik paktira sa neprijateljem i njegovim slugama, jer se narodni neprijatelji nijesu raskrinkavali, uza sve to što su u narodu dobro poznati, a da ne govorimo o tome da se nije prešlo njihovoj likvidaciji, a niti se je preko akcija pokušalo zaoštriti odnose sa okupatorom“, ističe se u tom izvješću. Situacija se počela mijenjati dolaskom članova Komiteta u taj kotar, no unatoč tome „udruženi narodni neprijatelji“ nastaviti će raditi „punom parom“ što je navodno naročito došlo do izražaja „zajedničkom suradnjom četnika, ustaša i mačekovaca“. Štoviše, „najveću opasnost tamo predstavljaju mačekovci, koji se najviše nalaze u samom gradu“, a među kojima je bio naveden i Frano Kolumbić.<sup>76</sup>

Gledajući tu zabilješku u kontekstu prethodno citiranih dokumenata o „potrebi“ likvidacija istaknutih „reakcionera“, jasnije je da je Kolumbićevo ime mjesecima prije zauzimanja Dubrovnika po NOV-u bilo na listi potencijalnih žrtava komunističke represije. U svojoj knjizi *Sve naše Dakse* Joško Radica ističe da su članovi KP-a nastojali Kolumbića obuhvatiti kao suradnika NOP-a, ali on suradnju nije prihvatio. Po zauzimanju dubrovačkog područja, pokušali su ga angažirati u novim organima vlasti pa je Kolumbić uskoro preuzeo dužnost člana Gradskog odbora JNOF-a za Dubrovnik.<sup>77</sup> Uključivanje dijela dubrovačkog HSS-a u nove organizacije isti autor objašnjava njihovim pokušajem da utječu na stvaranje demokratskog ozračja u društvenom i političkom životu, ali i da jače istaknu hrvatski značaj dubrovačkog područja.<sup>78</sup>

details on current political situation and underlines the growing support to the National Liberation Movement (NOP), caused primarily by the international political developments and not by the Party activities. Indeed, the report expressly says that they are still not “deeply rooted among the masses”, who are still receptive to “enemy propaganda”. “It seemed as if our Party itself had been in collusion with the enemy and its lackeys in the Dubrovnik area: the enemies of the people were not being unmasked although they were well-known, not to mention the fact that no efforts had been made to liquidate them and to strain the relations with the occupiers,” says the report. Although the situation began to change with the arrival of the Committee members in the area, the “people’s enemies joined forces” and continued to operate “with great intensity”. Allegedly, this was particularly manifested by “cooperation of Chetniks, Ustashe and Maček’s followers”. Indeed, “the greatest danger comes from Maček’s followers, who are mostly based in the city itself”. The report mentions Kolumbić as one of them.<sup>76</sup>

If this report is observed in the context of the previously quoted documents emphasizing the “necessity” of liquidating prominent “reactionaries”, it becomes clear that Kolumbić’s name ended up on the list of potential victims of communist repression months before NOV took Dubrovnik. In his book *Sve naše Dakse*, Joško Radica points out that the members of the Communist Party tried to persuade Kolumbić to cooperate with NOP but that he refused the offer. Upon taking the Dubrovnik area, they tried to make him join the new authorities so he became member of the JNOF District Committee for Dubrovnik.<sup>77</sup> The author explains that, by including part of the Dubrovnik HSS chapter in the bodies of the new regime, the authorities tried to create an illusion of a democratic climate in social and political life and to underline the Croatian identity of the Dubrovnik area.<sup>78</sup>

However, these efforts were short-lived. In July 1945, the Dubrovnik public prosecutor was provided with documents that would help him launch an investigation against Kolumbić and enable passing a sentence against him by the Court for the Protection of National Honor. Only a few notes on this can be found in Kolumbić’s file, including the remarks of the District Committee of

<sup>75</sup> Radica 2003: 277.

<sup>76</sup> HR DAS 262, IHRPD, kut. 60. B. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 203–205; Radica 2003: 280.

<sup>77</sup> Radica 2003: 480.

<sup>78</sup> Radica 2003: 390.

<sup>76</sup> HR DAS 262, IHRPD, box 60. B. Matković & Pažanin 2011: 203–205; Radica 2003: 280.

<sup>77</sup> Radica 2003: 480.

<sup>78</sup> Radica 2003: 390.

No takvi pokušaji nisu bili dugog vijeka. U srpnju 1945. javnom tužitelju u Dubrovniku dostavljeni su materijali o Kolumbiću s ciljem da se pokrene istraga i da Sud za zaštitu nacionalne časti donese osuđujuću presudu. O tome je u njegovu dosjeu ostalo svega nekoliko zabilješki poput onih Mjesnog komiteta SKOJ-a koji se početkom ožujka iste godine požalio da Kolumbić, tada povjerenik Trgovačke akademije, svoje dopise vlastima ne završava pozdravom „Smrt fašizmu – Sloboda narodu“ te da uvijek prigovara vlastima jer „sve je gore nego prije, glad, nered, nepravda i slično“. „Svaka mu je rečenica ujedanje“, ističe se o navedenoj bilješci. Osim toga, navodno je gimnazijalce spriječio da u zidnim novinama objave članak u kojem je napadan Maček. SKOJ-evci su također izrazili sumnju u prave motive Kolumbićevih susreta s „ustašom“ prof. Matkovićem jer „mudre profesorske glave nisu se očito samo zato sastale, da govore o hrani“. Kolumbić je navodno štitio i „zakletog ustašu“ Ivu Kandića, vjenčanog kuma. Zabilješka završava opaskom da bi „mnogo interesantnih stvari“ o Kolumbiću mogao kazati Niko Prcanj, član Općinskog NOO-a u Orašcu.<sup>79</sup> Uz prijavu je sačuvan i veći broj opaski svjedoka Milana Gluhajića iz Lapada, Sime Opalića, oficira OZNA-e 29. divizije te neka dva brata Šurijana. U tom su dokumentu prethodne napomene o Kolumbiću proširene pa se tako već u uvodu ističe da je Kolumbić „kao rukovodioc HSS za vrijeme bivše Jugoslavije radio na razjedinjenju naših naroda i pripremao teren za okupaciju naše zemlje“. Tako je, primjerice, 1934. zajedno s Rokom Mišetićem i drugim osobama organizirao prebacivanje nekog Pavelića<sup>80</sup>, koji se nalazio u Dubrovniku „u fratarskoj mantiji“, na Lastovo tri ili četiri mjeseca prije atentata na kralja Aleksandra. Prebacivanje su navodno izvršila braća Šurijan koji su po uspostavi NDH pozvani da se jave „ustaškim vlastima“ da prime nagradu. Nedugo potom Kolumbić je interniran, o čemu je ranije bilo riječi. Simo Opalić teretio je Kolumbića da je 17. travnja 1941. pozdravljao „njemačkim pozdravom“ te nadgledao mladiće koji su se naoružavali oružjem oduzetim pripadnicima nekadašnje jugoslavenske vojske. Godine 1943. Kolumbiću je bio zabranjen boravak na prostoru talijanske

SKOJ. In early March that year, the Committee reported that Kolumbić, then commissioner of the Commercial Academy, never ended his letters to the authorities with the “Death to fascism – freedom to the people” salute and that he frequently complained that “everything is worse than before [and that there is] hunger, disorder, injustice and the like”. The report also says that “there is criticism in every sentence of his”. Also, he allegedly prevented the high-school students from publishing an article criticizing Maček in their bulletin-board newspaper. The SKOJ members also expressed doubts about Kolumbić’s real motives for meeting with the “Ustasha” Professor Matković, claiming that “these wise professors certainly did not meet just to discuss food”. Kolumbić was also allegedly protecting the “sworn Ustasha” Ivo Kandić, his marriage witness. The report ends with the comment that Niko Prcanj, member of the local people’s committee in Orašac, could say “many interesting things” about Kolumbić.<sup>79</sup> A number of remarks made by Milan Gluhajić, a witness from Lapad, Simo Opalić, OZNA officer at the 29th Division, and two Šurijan brothers, can also be found in the file. In this document, the earlier allegations on Kolumbić are extended and it begins with the allegation that, “as an HSS official in the former Yugoslavia, [Kolumbić] was actively involved in disuniting our people and paving the way for occupation of our country”. For example, in 1934, together with Roko Mišetić and some other persons, he organized the transfer of a person named Pavelić<sup>80</sup> (who was disguised as a monk) from Dubrovnik to Lastovo, three or four months before the assassination of King Alexander. This operation was allegedly carried out by the Šurijan brothers who, upon the establishment of the NDH, were invited by the “Ustasha authorities” to receive an award. Soon afterwards, Kolumbić was interned, as previously mentioned. Simo Opalić claimed that Kolumbić made a “German salute” on 17 April 1941 and that he supervised the arming of young men with the weapons seized from the former Yugoslav Army. In 1943, Kolumbić was banned from the Italian-controlled zone and he allegedly went to Mostar together with Frano Dabrović and Roko Mišetić. Frano Rendulić brought them some money and showed them a Partisan leaflet urging young people to join NOV. Kolumbić called

<sup>79</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zabilješke Mjesnog komiteta SKOJ-a, 6. 3. 1945.

<sup>80</sup> Na temelju dokumenata ne može se sa sigurnošću zaključiti o kojem je Paveliću riječ.

<sup>79</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, SKOJ District Committee report, 6 March 1945.

<sup>80</sup> There are no documents enabling positive identification of this “Pavelić”.

zone zbog čega je navodno boravio u Mostaru s Franom Dabrovićem i Rokom Mišetićem. Nešto novca odnio im je Frano Rendulić koji im je tom prilikom pokazao neki partizanski letak kojim se mladi pozivaju u NOV. Kolumbić je kazao da su „to sve ludosti i gluposti neozbiljne mlađarije“ i letak bacio.<sup>81</sup> Riječ je o događajima o kojima je, kako je prethodno istaknuto, govorio sam Kolumbić s napomenom da je spomenuto razdoblje zapravo proveo u Sarajevu. Možemo pretpostaviti da ostatak spisa koji se odnosi na pokretanje istrage protiv Kolumbića nije sačuvan jer ga u njegovu dosjeu nema ili je pohranjen na nekom drugom mjestu. Radica navodi da je upravo u drugoj polovini 1945. Kolumbić „uklonjen“ iz političkog života zajedno s ostalim istomišljenicima<sup>82</sup> te zaključuje da iz perspektive jugoslavenskih vlasti nije bilo potrebno povesti sudske ili druge postupke protiv istaknutijih HSS-ovaca „jer ih nisu više držali bitnima za razvoj političke situacije na širem dubrovačkom području“.<sup>83</sup>

Dokumenti u Kolumbićeveu dosjeu za razdoblje od 1945. do 1953. fragmentarno su očuvani iako je iz njih vidljivo da je Kolumbić bio pod paskom jugoslavenskih službi u čijim je očima bio i ostao neprijatelj. Naime, sredinom svibnja 1947. UDBA za grad Dubrovnik dostavila je UDBA-i za oblast Dalmacije u Splitu podatke o Kolumbiću, a njih je splitska UDBA prosljedila UDBA-i za grad Đakovo kamo je Kolumbić nešto ranije premješten na rad na trgovačkoj akademiji. U tim se dokumentima nalaze uobičajeni osobni podatci o Kolumbiću uz napomenu da je između dva svjetska rata bio „čisti nacionalno-šovinistički Hrvat, te je kao takav radio na razjedinjavanju naših naroda, a specijalno Srba“. U nastavku se nalaze prethodno citirani podatci iz prijave iz 1945. godine. Kolumbiću se zamjera i HSS-ova „politika čekanja“ te se ističe da mu je nekoliko puta nuđena suradnja s predstavnicima NOP-a, ali da je on to „kategorički“ odbijao te da se sasvim uvlačio u krug „reakcionarnih elemenata“. Nakon „oslobođenja“ Kolumbić je nastavio „trovati“ mlade o „nesnosnom stanju u zemlji“ te je navodno radio protiv interesa „nove“ naobrazbe mladih ljudi u duhu „današnjeg uređenja i poretka“. Tim je dokumentom zatraženo da se nad

it a “foolishness of flippant youngsters” and threw the leaflet away.<sup>81</sup> As mentioned before, Kolumbić himself spoke about these events, although he claimed that he was in Sarajevo during that period. The remaining part of the Kolumbić file – the one relating to the investigation against him – is either lost or kept elsewhere. According to Radica, Kolumbić and others who shared his views were “eliminated” from the political life in the second half of 1945.<sup>82</sup> Radica concludes that the Yugoslav authorities believed there was no need to institute criminal or other proceedings against prominent members of HSS “because they stopped considering them relevant for the development of the political situation in the greater Dubrovnik area”.<sup>83</sup>

The documents in the Kolumbić file that cover the period from 1945 to 1953 are only fragmentarily preserved, but they nevertheless indicate that Kolumbić was under surveillance of Yugoslav agencies and was considered an enemy. For example, in mid-May 1947, UDBA Dubrovnik sent the materials on Kolumbić to UDBA's Dalmatian branch in Split. The UDBA Split forwarded these materials to UDBA in Đakovo, where Kolumbić had been transferred to take a job at the Commercial Academy there. Besides usual personal data, the document includes a note that, between the two wars, Kolumbić was a “pure nationalist and chauvinist Croat who was stirring discontent among our people and was particularly anti-Serb oriented”. There are also details from the report made against him in 1945. Kolumbić is also criticized for HSS's “wait-and-see policy”. The document points out that he was repeatedly asked to cooperate with NOP, but that he “categorically” refused it and joined the “reactionary elements” instead. After the “liberation” Kolumbić continued to “poison” young people with the claims of “unbearable situation in the country”. He also allegedly worked against the “new” education based on the “new order”. This document requires permanent surveillance of Kolumbić as an “enemy of the people”.<sup>84</sup>

UDBA placed Kolumbić under surveillance in 1947, as can be seen from the partially preserved documents from the subsequent years. According to these reports,

<sup>81</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Podatci, 15. 7. 1945.

<sup>82</sup> Radica 2003: 480.

<sup>83</sup> Radica 2003: 390.

<sup>81</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, records, 15 July 1945.

<sup>82</sup> Radica 2003: 480.

<sup>83</sup> Radica 2003: 390.

<sup>84</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Letter of UDBA's Split division, 27 May 1947.



Kolumbićem kao „narodnim neprijateljem“ uspostavi stalna kontrola.<sup>84</sup>

Kontrola UDBA-e uspostavljena nad Kolumbićem 1947. rezultirala je djelomično sačuvanim agenturnim izvješćima u narednim godinama. Iz tih se izvješća doznaje da se Kolumbić u međuvremenu vratio u Dubrovnik gdje se tijekom 1948. sastajao s nekoliko osoba s kojima je slušao radio i komentirao vijesti. S Jovom Mirkovićem razgovarao je o navodnom bijegu nekih oficira Jugoslavenske armije u Italiju spomenuvši da se svi viši oficiri spremaju na bijeg u Sovjetski Savez. Kolumbić je predviđao da će se „stari“ komunisti podijeliti na „staljinovce“ i „žutokljunce“ koji će ostati uz Tita što bi moglo rezultirati građanskim ratom. Zaključio je da je „sve izazvelo“ pa „samo da treba potpaliti“.<sup>85</sup> Iz tih se opaski može zaključiti da je 1948. bila u znaku tada aktualne rezolucije Informbiroa koja je u Kolumbiću pobudila nadu u moguća previranja u Jugoslaviji. Istovremeno je iskazivao naklonost prema demokratskim zapadnim zemljama, pa je tako u narednom izvješću iz travnja 1949. zabilježeno da na radnom mjestu ističe Švicarsku kao primjer demokratičnosti, a da „kada je tumačio zemlje narodne demokracije uopće nije rekao kakve su to zemlje“.<sup>86</sup>

Upravo su iz tog razdoblja sačuvane i dvije izjave o Kolumbiću koje upotpunjavaju ranije bilješke o njegovu životu i djelovanju. Dana 29. siječnja 1949. Mario Golušić iz Slanog, predsjednik Gradskog narodnog odbora (GNO) u Dubrovniku, naveo je da Kolumbića poznaje od 1934. kao jednog od rukovoditelja HSS-a u Dubrovniku koji „od ustaša nije bio dobro gledan“. Golušić je pojasnio da je Kolumbić odbijao suradnju s NOP-om jer „da je on čovjek bolestan, da se više neće baviti politikom, jer da je zbog nje stradao“. Nakon uspostave komunističke vlasti u Dubrovniku Kolumbić je prema istoj izjavi odbijao surađivati s omladinskim organizacijama te je umjesto toga surađivao s „neprijateljski raspoloženom omladinom“ zbog čega je smijenjen s dužnosti ravnatelja Trgovačke akademije i premješten u unutrašnjost zemlje gdje je ostao godinu dana. Nakon

Kolumbić returned to Dubrovnik. There, in 1948, he and several persons would meet, listen to radio news and comment on them. He and Jovo Mirković discussed an alleged flight of some Yugoslav Army officers to Italy. Kolumbić said that all high-ranking officers were preparing to flee to the Soviet Union. He predicted that the “old” communists would divide in two groups, the “Stalinists”, and the “greenhorns” who would support Tito and that this could lead to a civil war. He concluded that “the time is ripe” and that “only a spark is needed”.<sup>85</sup> All this reflects the burning issue in 1948 – the Cominform Resolution – which raised Kolumbić’s hopes that an upheaval in Yugoslavia was possible. But Kolumbić also sympathized Western democracies: according to an April 1949 report, Kolumbić said at his workplace that Switzerland was a role model for democracy and, “when talking about the countries of people’s democracy, he did not specify what countries were those”.<sup>86</sup>

Two testimonies about Kolumbić from this period supplement the earlier notes about his life and activities. On 29 January 1949, Mario Golušić from Slano, president of the local People’s Committee in Dubrovnik, stated that he had known Kolumbić since 1934 as one of HSS officials in Dubrovnik and that the “Ustashe were not fond of him”. Golušić explained that Kolumbić refused to cooperate with NOP because “he was sick and did not want to be involved in politics any more because he had suffered because of it”. Golušić also said that, when communist authorities were established in Dubrovnik, Kolumbić refused to cooperate with youth organizations. Instead, he cooperated with “subversive youth” and was therefore replaced as principal of the Commercial Academy and transferred to the continental part of the country where he stayed for one year. Upon returning to Dubrovnik, he maintained his attitude and kept refusing to cooperate with the youth organization and the local union chapter. When attending their meetings, he kept his distance and, according to Golušić, had a “negative” influence on others. “That man is very hostile towards us and should come under increased surveillance,” concludes Golušić.<sup>87</sup> Martin Klarić from Bileća, commissioner of Labor Department

<sup>84</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frano Kolumbić, Dopis Opunomoćstva UDB-e za Split, 27. 5. 1947.

<sup>85</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frano Kolumbić, Prijepis agenturnih izvješća, 1948. – 1949.

<sup>86</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frano Kolumbić, Prijepis agenturnih izvješća, 1948. – 1949.

<sup>85</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, transcript of agents’ reports, 1948–1949.

<sup>86</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, transcript of agents’ reports, 1948–1949.

<sup>87</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, testimony of Mario Golušić, 29 January 1949.

povratka u Dubrovnik zadržao je isti stav odbijajući surađivati s omladinskom organizacijom i sindikalnom podružnicom na čijim se sastancima drži po strani i, po mišljenju Golušića, „negativno“ utječe na ostale. „On je čovjek koji je do kraja neprijateljski raspoložen prema nama i trebalo bi nad istim pojačati kontrolu“, zaključuje Golušić.<sup>87</sup> Istog je dana o Kolumbiću izjavu dao i Martin Klarić, rodom iz Bileće, tadašnji povjerenik Odsjeka rada GNO-a u Dubrovniku, koji je ustvrdio da su Mišetić i Kolumbić 1940. pokušavali odvratiti radnike od demonstracija, „ali im je rabota ostala bezuspješna“.<sup>88</sup>

Dva tjedna kasnije, odnosno 12. veljače 1949., u prostorijama UDBA-e za Dubrovnik pred isljednikom Jakovom Bozanićem preslušan je i Frano Kolumbić. To je ujedno, kronološki gledano, i prvi njegov zapisnik sa saslušanja. Osim osobnih podataka i životopisa, izjava je relativno kratka. Kolumbić je upitan upravo o demonstracijama 1940. o kojima je u svojoj izjavi govorio Klarić. Naveo je da Mišetića uopće nije vidio te da je s jednim mladićem pošao predstojniku policije radi utvrđivanja činjenica o policajcu koji je tukao okupljene, a usprotivio se i zatvaranju spomenutog mladića. Utjecaj u tadašnjoj policiji Kolumbić je objasnio svojim položajem u stranci istaknuvši da je ondje smatran „skrajnjim ljevičarom“ koji je navodno trebao biti izbačen. Prema vlastitim tvrdnjama, na Trojni pakt gledao je negativno, a ostao je član HSS-a jer nije bio u potpunosti upoznat s Mačekovim namjerama. Pri dolasku Nijemaca u Dubrovnik pomogao je uputiti nekog poručnika prema lučkom uredu, vojnoj akademiji i mostu jer je govorio njemački jezik, no nije vidio nikakvo razoružavanje koje je spomenuto u prijavi iz 1945. godine. Potvrdio je da poznaje Vicka Kisića i Frana Dabrovića, ali je rekao da se s njima ne druži.<sup>89</sup> Kolumbićevo priznanje o upućivanju spomenutog poručnika 1941. u kasnijim je podacima UDBA-e iz 1950. opisano kao „dočekivanje“.<sup>90</sup>

Nejasno je što se događalo nakon te Kolumbićeve izjave i je li bilo kakvih daljnjih postupanja prema

of the Dubrovnik People's Committee, gave a testimony about Kolumbić on the same day. He said that, in 1940, Mišetić and Kolumbić tried to dissuade workers from joining protests, "but their efforts were futile".<sup>88</sup>

Two weeks later, on 12 February 1949, Frano Kolumbić himself was interrogated in Dubrovnik by UDBA investigator Jakov Bozanić. Chronologically, these are the first interrogation minutes in his file. They include his personal data, biography and a relatively short statement. Kolumbić was asked about the 1940 protests mentioned by Klarić in his testimony. He said that had not seen Mišetić at all. He explained that he escorted a young man to the police superintendent in order to establish the facts about a policeman who had beaten the protesters. He also pleaded against detaining of the young man. As for his connections with the pre-war police, he said it was due to his position in HSS. He added that they had considered him an "extreme leftist" and were allegedly about to oust him from their ranks. Kolumbić said that he had a negative attitude about the Tripartite Pact and that he remained in HSS because he had not been fully informed about Maček's intentions. When Germans entered Dubrovnik, he merely helped a German lieutenant to find the port authority, military academy and a bridge because he spoke German language, but he had never witnessed the seizure of weapons mentioned in the 1945 report against him. He confirmed that he knew Vicko Kisić and Frano Dabrović, but he claimed that he had "never associated with them".<sup>89</sup> In UDBA records from 1950, Kolumbić's admission about helping the German lieutenant in 1941 was interpreted as "welcoming" [the Germans].<sup>90</sup>

It is not clear whether Kolumbić's statement had any consequences or whether there were any actions against him because no pre-1950 documents can be found in his file. From that year, transcripts of several personal letters sent to him have been preserved. In a letter to Kolumbić, his nephew Ante Plenković from Hvar complains about high taxes, low income and lack of food.<sup>91</sup> In his second letter, "nephew Anton" from Hvar explains there is no

<sup>87</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frano Kolumbić, Izjava Marija Golušića, 29. 1. 1949.

<sup>88</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frano Kolumbić, Izjava Martina Klarića, 29. 1. 1949.

<sup>89</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 12. 2. 1949.

<sup>90</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Podaci o Franu Kolumbiću, 15. 7. 1950.

<sup>88</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, testimony of Martin Klarić, 29 January 1949.

<sup>89</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 12 February 1949.

<sup>90</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, records on Frano Kolumbić, 15 July 1950.

<sup>91</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, transcript of Ante Plenković's letter, 27 January 1950.

njemu jer naredni dokumenti u njegovu dosjeu datiraju tek iz 1950. godine. Iz tog je razdoblja sačuvan prijepis nekoliko osobnih pisama upućenih Kolumbiću. Među njima je i pismo Ante Plenkovića s Hvara, inače Kolumbićeva nećaka. Plenković se požalio na visinu poreza, slabe prihode i manjak hrane.<sup>91</sup> U drugom pismu „nećak Anton“ s Hvara piše da ne pita kako je Kolumbić i kako živi jer zna da su svi u istoj mreži, a izražava i vjeru u to da će biti gore.<sup>92</sup> Sačuvan je i prijepis pisma Ive Randa iz travnja 1950. u kojem Rand Kolumbiću čestita Uskrs i bodri ga da ne klonе.<sup>93</sup> Osim toga dostupan je i prijepis pisma Kolumbićeve kćeri Ksenije od 10. studenoga 1950. koja je od oca zatražila pomoć oko preporuke za Matu Ujevića, zamjenika ravnatelja u novoosnovanom Leksikografskom zavodu FNRJ<sup>94</sup> u Zagrebu u kojem se ona željela zaposliti.<sup>95</sup> Iz podataka UDBA-e za grad Dubrovnik od 31. ožujka 1950. doznaje se da je u tim trenutcima i druga Kolumbićeva kći, Mira, studirala u Zagrebu te da su obje bile „neprijateljski raspoložene“ i da su se kretale „samo u društvu neprijateljskih elemenata“.<sup>96</sup>

Sačuvani podatci potvrđuju da je nad Kolumbićem doista bila uspostavljena potpuna kontrola koja je obuhvaćala i članove njegove uže obitelji iako su agenturna izvješća iz tog razdoblja oskudna. Kolumbić je posebno bio nadziran na radnom mjestu s kojeg je suradnik UDBA-e „Rade“ izvijestio da Kolumbić prilikom ispitivanja „zeza“ učenike, a negoduje i u vezi slanja karakteristika poduzećima o učenicima koji su završili školu smatrajući da je to „najgora i najpodlija stvar“. Đacima je navodno gradivo tumačio „vrlo komplicirano“ zbog čega su pojedinci ostali u uvjerenju da „on kao neprijatelj i reakcioner to radi namjerno samo kako bi iz škole izašao lošiji kadar“. U međuvremenu je od Ministarstva pomorstva zatraženo da se Kolumbiću nađe zamjena.<sup>97</sup> U podacima

<sup>91</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Prijepis pisma Ante Plenkovića, 27. 1. 1950.

<sup>92</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Prijepis pisma Ive Randa, 11. 4. 1950.

<sup>93</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Prijepis pisma „nećaka Antona“, 28. 11. 1950.

<sup>94</sup> Od 1962. do 1991. Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod. Danas Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža.

<sup>95</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Prijepis pisma Ksenije Kolumbić, 10. 11. 1950.

<sup>96</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Podaci UDB-e za grad Dubrovnik, 31. 3. 1950.

<sup>97</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Agenturni materijal, 1950. – 1951.

need to ask his uncle “how are you and how do you live because we are all in the same boat and things will surely get worse”.<sup>92</sup> The transcript of Ivo Rand’s letter from April 1950 has also been preserved. In it, Rand sends Kolumbić his best wishes for Christmas and tries to boost his spirits.<sup>93</sup> There is also the transcript of Kolumbić’s daughter Ksenija’s letter of 10 November 1950. She asks her father to intervene with Mate Ujević, deputy director of the newly established Institute of Lexicography<sup>94</sup> in Zagreb where she wanted to find employment.<sup>95</sup> The report of UDBA for City of Dubrovnik of 31 March 1950 reveals that the other Kolumbić’s daughter, Mira, studied in Zagreb at the time and that both daughters had a “hostile attitude” and “kept company of subversive elements only”.<sup>96</sup>

Despite the fact that agents’ reports from this period are scarce, it is evident that Kolumbić really came under extensive surveillance which also included his family members. He was particularly scrutinized at his workplace. UDBA informer “Rade” reports that Kolumbić “mocks” his students when examining them and that he also complains about the practice of sending graduates’ character references to state enterprises, calling it “the worst and meanest thing”. When teaching them, he allegedly did it in a “very complicated way”, which made some people think that, “being subversive and reactionary, he is doing it on purpose in order to ensure that they leave school poorly educated”. Meanwhile, a request had been made to the Ministry of Maritime Affairs to find a replacement for Kolumbić.<sup>97</sup> In UDBA records from mid-1950, it is said that, deep down, Kolumbić is still a “Maček follower” and, allegedly, an Anglophile who dislikes “our new social system”. Indeed, in the opinion of UDBA, the former HSS official still had an influence on “Maček’s followers”.<sup>98</sup> It is

<sup>92</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, transcript of Ivo Rand’s letter, 11 April 1950.

<sup>93</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, transcript of “nephew Anton’s” letter, 28 November 1950.

<sup>94</sup> From 1962 to 1991, Yugoslav Institute of Lexicography. Now Miroslav Krleža Institute of Lexicography.

<sup>95</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, transcript of Ksenija Kolumbić’s letter, 10 November 1950.

<sup>96</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, UDBA records for City of Dubrovnik, 31 March 1950.

<sup>97</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, agents’ reports, 1950–1951.

<sup>98</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, records on Frano Kolumbić, 15 July 1950. HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, records on Frano Kolumbić, 2 November 1950.



UDBA-e iz sredine iste godine ističe se da je Kolumbić ostao u duši „mačekovac“ i navodno anglofil kojemu se „današnji društveni sistem“ ne sviđa. Štoviše, kao nekadašnji dužnosnik HSS-a, prema mišljenju UDBA-e, zadržao je utjecaj na „mačekove pristalice“.<sup>98</sup> U istom je dokumentu zatraženo da se Kolumbića uvede u kartoteku UDBA-e nakon čega je registriran u kategoriju IIc pod brojem 33591.<sup>99</sup>

Većina materijala iz 1951. odnosi se na agenturna izvješća uz jedan zapisnik s Kolumbićeva saslušanja. Veći dio izvješća odnosi se tek na manje zabilježbe različitih suradnika UDBA-e koji se u tim bilješkama uglavnom osvrću na Kolumbićeve navode i komentare izrečene tijekom predavanja ili u zbornici. Ti su se navodi uglavnom odnosili na kvalitetu i dostupnost proizvoda između dva svjetska rata s usporedbom proizvoda u komunističkoj Jugoslaviji. Žalio se i na izričaj, odnosno upotrebu „iskrivljenih“ riječi kod đaka istaknuvši da su to riječi koje mogu govoriti na svojim sastancima i zasjedanjima.<sup>100</sup> Duže izvješće ostavio je suradnik „Marko“ koji je osvrnuo na Kolumbićevo tumačenje Švedske, „zemlje s najdemokratskijom upravom“. Kolumbić je napose isticao švedski i švicarski napredak, a kad su ga đaci pitali da im govori o Sovjetskom Savezu, odgovarao im je da su to morali ranije učiti. Pozitivno se izjašnjavao o Engleskoj i drugim zapadnim zemljama naglašavajući da je riječ o „kulturnim zemljama“. Kada ga je nadređeni upozorio zbog podučavanja po njemačkom „Maurevom leksikonu“, naljutio se na učenike jer su ga „špijunirali“. Svoju korespondenciju Kolumbić je završavao riječima: „sa velepoštovanjem“, umjesto: „Smrt fašizmu – sloboda narodu“. Nije se htio prihvatiti nikakve dužnosti u sindikatu zbog čega je kritiziran na otvorenom partijskom sastanku. Također je održavao kontakte s nekim fratrima iz Franjevačkog samostana Male braće i s jednim dominikancem.<sup>101</sup>

Iz prosinca 1951. ostala su sačuvana dva znatno opširnija izvješća suradnika UDBA-e. Tako je 5. prosinca suradnik „Jugo“ dostavio izvješće o razgovoru koji

therefore required in the same document that a file on him be opened in UDBA. Soon afterwards it was done and he was entered under the number 33591, category IIc.<sup>99</sup>

Agents' reports account for most of the records from 1951. Kolumbić interrogation minutes are also there. As regards the reports, these are mostly minor notes made by various UDBA informers, recording Kolumbić's statements and comments made in the classroom or staffroom. Most of his comments concerned the quality and availability of products in the interwar period and their comparison with those in communist Yugoslavia. He also criticized his students for using "distorted" words and told them to "leave these words for your meetings and conferences".<sup>100</sup> The report of informer "Marko" is somewhat longer. According to him, Kolumbić singled out Sweden as the "country with the most democratic government" and praised Sweden's and Switzerland's progress. When asked by the students to tell them about the Soviet Union, he replied that they should have learned about it earlier. He made positive comments about England and other Western countries, noting that they were "civilized countries". When his superior reprimanded him for using the "Mauerov leksikon" in his classes, Kolumbić became angry with his students for "spying on him". Also, he would finish his letters with "Yours respectfully" instead of "Death to fascism – freedom to the people". He refused to accept any duty in the union and was criticized for it at a Party meeting. Also, he maintained contact with some Franciscan friars from the Monastery of Friars Minor and with one Dominican friar.<sup>101</sup>

Two rather extensive reports of UDBA informers from December 1951 have been preserved. On 5 December, the informer "Jugo" reported about the conversation he had had with Kolumbić. As it took place during fishing, the informer must have been someone close to him. Complaining about decline in living standards, Kolumbić said that "life was better with [NDH currency] kuna", which was "easier to earn" He also commented on "our progressive politics" and said that "nowadays you can't even go to toilet without a permit". He considered the United State "the land of ideals". He wondered how could

<sup>98</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Podaci o Franu Kolumbiću, 15. 7. 1950. HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Podaci o Franu Kolumbiću, 2. 11. 1950.

<sup>99</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Podaci o Franu Kolumbiću, 2. 11. 1950.

<sup>100</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Agenturna materijal 1951. – 1952.

<sup>101</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Izvješće suradnika „Marka“, 19. 3. 1951.

<sup>99</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, records on Frano Kolumbić, 2 November 1950.

<sup>100</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, agents (records for 1951–1952).

<sup>101</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, informer "Marko's" report, 19 March 1951.

je vodio dok je s Kolumbićem bio u ribolovu iz čega proizlazi da je riječ bila o Kolumbiću bliskoj osobi. Kolumbić se tom prilikom požalio na pogoršavanje životnog standarda govoreći da se bolje živjelo s kunama koje je bilo „lako zaraditi“. Osim toga, „Jugo“ se osvrnuo na „našu progresivnu politiku“ napomenuvši da „danas ne možeš na zahod ako nemaš dozvolu“. Sjedinjene Američke Države smatrao je „zemljom ideala“. Zapitao se kako u Jugoslaviji uopće govoriti o demokraciji ako vlast ne dopušta „naoko malom postotku“ da formira rukovodstvo svoje opozicije koja bi sudjelovala u raspravama u skupštini. Vlastima je zamjerao i „falsificiranje“ znanosti ustvrdivši da oni kažu da je materija primarna i da duša ne postoji.<sup>102</sup> Dva tjedna kasnije „Jugo“ je dostavio novo izvješće u kojem je naveo da se Kolumbić žalio na sve slabiju kvalitetu proizvoda zbog čega je zaključio da se ne može govoriti o boljem životu, nego samo o „pljački“. Negodovao je da učenici premalo uče o hrvatskoj povijesti istaknuvši da „nema veće sramote za jedan narod nego tajiti ili falsifikovati prošlost“. Upozorio je i na uporabu tuđica u hrvatskom jeziku, odnosno „srbizaciju“. Kolumbić se zalagao za očuvanje hrvatskog jezika ističući da dok „oni“ govore o nekom srpsko-hrvatskom jeziku, knjige se tiskaju na srpskom.<sup>103</sup> U izvješću od 31. prosinca 1951. suradnik „Jugo“ javlja da mu se Kolumbić povjerio o saslušanju u UDBA-i 1948. kada su ga teretili jer je u školi rekao da SAD ima jaču čeličnu industriju od Sovjetskog Saveza jer je to „činjenica“. Na narednom saslušanju teretili su ga jer je učenicima napomenuo da je Norveška „država sa parlamentom gdje se voljom naroda istinski zastupljeni njihovi predstavnici, socijal-demokrati, komunisti itd.“ Kolumbić je ustvrdio da se ne čudi „onim prljavim ljudima“ u njegovoj školi pred kojima se nije smjelo ništa kazati, ali se čudio agentima UDBA-e za koje je mislio da su „inteligentni ljudi“. Po povratku na posao Kolumbić je jednom svom kolegi rekao zbog čega je bio na saslušanju pokazavši mu nastavni program iz geografije, na što se njegov kolega složio s njim. Kolumbić je zaključio da „oni“, misleći pritom na tadašnji jugoslavenski režim, vode „lažnu politiku“ jer govore da u Sovjetskom Savezu nema nikakve čelične industrije,

anyone talk about democracy in Yugoslavia when the government will not allow “the seemingly small percentage [of the population]” to form the opposition leadership that would participate in discussions at the assembly. He resented the government “forging” of science because they claimed that matter was of primary importance and that soul did not exist.<sup>102</sup> Two weeks later, “Jugo” submitted another report in which he said that Kolumbić complained about the ever-degrading quality of products and concluded that there could be no talk about better life – there was just “robbery”. He complained that students had too few lectures on Croatian history in school and that “there is no greater shame for a people than concealing or forging their own past”. He also warned that too many Serb words had penetrated Croatian language. Kolumbić had argued for preservation of Croatian language, pointing out that, while “they” talk about some Serbo-Croatian language, books were actually being printed in Serbian.<sup>103</sup> In his report of 31 December 1951, the informer “Jugo” says that Kolumbić told him about his interrogation by UDBA in 1948, when he was asked about the comment he had made in class – that the U.S. steel industry is stronger than the one in the Soviet Union and that “it is a fact”. At the subsequent interrogation they attacked him for telling his students that in Norway, “members of parliament – social democrats, communists etc. – are true representatives of the people”. Kolumbić also said that “those filthy people in our school” in the company of whom one had to keep his mouth shut did not surprise him at all, but that he was surprised at UDBA agents, whom he believed to be “intelligent people”. Back at his workplace, he told one of his colleagues why he was interrogated and showed him the geography syllabus, adding that his colleague “agreed with me”. Kolumbić concluded that “they” – the then Yugoslav regime – pursued “false politics” because they said that the Soviet steel industry was non-existent, which meant that “they are now saying what I was saying back in 1948”.<sup>104</sup> This can be seen as evidence that Kolumbić had been interrogated even before the date of the first preserved interrogation minutes from (1949), indicating that the documents in his file have only been partially preserved.

<sup>102</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Izvješće suradnika „Juga“, 6. 12. 1951.

<sup>103</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Izvješće suradnika „Juga“, 19. 12. 1951.

<sup>102</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, informer “Jugo’s” report, 6 December 1951.

<sup>103</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, informer “Jugo’s” report, 19 December 1951.

<sup>104</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, informer “Jugo’s” report, 2 January 1952.

pa zaključuje: „(...) oni danas govore ono što sam ja još 1948. godine govorio“.<sup>104</sup> Ti navodi otkrivaju da je Kolumbić ipak bio saslušan i prije prvog sačuvanog zapisnika sa saslušanja u 1949. godini što potvrđuje sumnje da su dokumenti u njegovu dosjeu tek fragmentarno očuvani.

Nadalje se na temelju istog izvješća „Juga“ može zaključiti da je Kolumbić vrlo kritički promišljao o tadašnjem Sovjetskom Savezu istaknuvši da su „oni prvi izmislili Sibir“ i da su bili prvi koji su „počeli uništavati sve što je napredno, a od njih su izvesnoga i ovi naši poprimili“. Kolumbić je posebno naglasio: „(...) današnja javnost ima mišljenje i da se takva mišljenja silom nameću od rukovodstva, kakva sam ja vazda imao prema Rusima, pa danas, kad ja čujem gdje uvjereni komunisti kažu ovo, od SSSR-a, ja u sebi kažem bijedni automati.“ Zaključio je da bi za njega bila izmišljena „najsivrepija mučenja“ da je prije nekoliko godina govorio ono što „oni“ danas govore i pišu o Sovjetskom Savezu. Zasmatala mu je i vijest objavljena na švicarskoj radijskoj postaji o navodno veličanstveno proslavljenju božićnoj proslavi u Jugoslaviji nakon „oslobođenja“ napomenuvši da ne zna kakav je to „bolji život“ kad čovjek mora i na Božić raditi. Osvrnuo se i na glasine da u SAD-u vlada anarhija proizvodnje jer je tamo zapravo „blagostanje“ te je kritizirao uvjerenja o smanjenju cijena: „(...) ti sa Nove godine smanju plate i oni mjesto da govore da snižavaju standard kažu obratno“.<sup>105</sup> Izvješće suradnika „Katica“ od 9. veljače 1951. potvrđuje da je Kolumbić tijekom te godine bio stalno praćen.<sup>106</sup>

U međuvremenu je Kolumbić 8. lipnja 1951. ponovno saslušan u prostorijama dubrovačke UDBA-e, i to pred isljednikom Augustinom Blaškovićem. Naveo je svoje opće podatke i ustvrdio da je tijekom rata bio neaktivan iako se nije slagao s ustašama. Naveo je da mu je nepoznato tko je i po čijem naređenju 1941. razoružavao vojnike tadašnje jugoslavenske vojske. Protjerivanje iz Dubrovnika 1943. povezo je s organiziranjem „zaštite“ i bojazni Talijana zbog Krnjevićeve poruke putem Radio Londona: „Bacite Talijane u more.“ Iz Dubrovnika

Another thing that can be inferred from “Jugo’s” report is that Kolumbić was very critical about the then Soviet Union, pointing out that “they were the first ones to invent Siberia” and the first ones who “began destroying everything progressive, and our [communists] then imitated them”. Kolumbić underlined that “our leaders are forcing such views on our public – the same views that I always had of Russians. So, when I hear staunch communists talking like this about the USSR, I think to myself: poor automatons”. He concluded that he would be put to the “cruellest torture” if, few years earlier, he would dare say what “they” are now saying and writing about the Soviet Union. He also resented a news story aired on a Swiss radio station, about an alleged magnificent Christmas celebration organized in Yugoslavia after “liberation”. He wondered what “better life” were they talking about when one had to work even on Christmas Day. He also commented on the rumor that there was anarchy in the U.S. economy; he said that, on the contrary, it was a country of “prosperity”. He criticized the claims that the prices were going down. He said, “they reduce wages at New Year and then, instead of admitting that living standards are declining, they claim that they are rising”.<sup>105</sup> The report of the informer “Katica” of 9 February 1951 confirms that Kolumbić had been under surveillance throughout that year.<sup>106</sup>

On 8 June 1951, Kolumbić was once again interrogated in the UDBA Dubrovnik headquarters, this time by Augustin Blašković. Having given his personal data, Kolumbić said that he had not been active during the war and that he had not been on good terms with the Ustashe. He also said he did not know who, and by whose order, was disarming the former Yugoslav troops in 1941. He explained that the Italians expelled him from Dubrovnik in 1943 because he had organized “protection” and because they were concerned with Krnjević’s message on Radio London to “throw the Italians to the sea”. Together with Mišetić and Dabrović, he left Dubrovnik for Mostar. They stayed there together for a few days and then they went separate ways. Upon taking of Dubrovnik by NOV, he was admitted to the National Front (NF) and was offered to become president. However, he was publicly criticized by some “members of youth organization” and Dabrović was

<sup>104</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Izvješće suradnika „Juga“, 2. 1. 1952.

<sup>105</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Izvješće suradnika „Juga“, 2. 1. 1952.

<sup>106</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Agenturni materijal 1951. – 1952.

<sup>105</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, informer “Jugo’s” report, 2 January 1952.

<sup>106</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, agents (records for 1951 – 1952).



je tada otišao zajedno s Mišetićem i Dabrovićem u Mostar gdje su se zadržali nekoliko dana i zatim razišli. Naveo je da je nakon zauzimanja Dubrovnika po NOV-u bio primljen u Narodnu frontu (NF) gdje mu je ponuđeno mjesto predsjednika, ali je javno bio izvrnut kritici nekih „omladinaca“ zbog čega je na to mjesto izabran Dabrović. Isljednika UDBA-e zanimali su detalji o „kongresu križara“ u Dubrovniku, no Kolumbiću to nije bilo poznato. Također je ispitivan o interniraju 1934. o čemu je rekao da ne zna zbog čega je bio uhićen jer mu nikad u vezi toga nisu ništa rekli. Ipak, pretpostavio je da se razlog krio u pomaganju Petru<sup>107</sup> Grgiću da ilegalno prijeđe u Italiju, što je učinio na zamolbu jednog člana HSS-a. Upitan o zatvaranju 1941., Kolumbić je odgovorio da je uhićen s većim brojem Dubrovčana dok se nalazio u Sarajevu, no nikad nije ispitivan, zbog čega nije ni znao zašto je zatvoren, i pušten je nekoliko dana kasnije. Potvrdio je prethodne navode da je tijekom dolaska Nijemaca u Dubrovnik 1941. uputio neke osobe prema vojnoj akademiji, luci i željezničkoj postaji jer je govorio njemački jezik. Naknadno je dolazio u kontakt s Nijemcima kada je tražio dozvolu za ribolov uz napomenu da se dobar dio ribe morao prodavati njihovoj vojsci. Zapisnik završava napomenom da će biti nastavljen, no nastavak nije sačuvan u Kolumbićevu dosjeu.<sup>108</sup>

Svi dokumenti iz 1952. u Kolumbićevu dosjeu odnose se na agenturni materijal. Tako je ondje sačuvano izvješće suradnika „Martinovića“ koji je obavijestio da je 12. ožujka susreo Kolumbića na Stradunu i pristupio mu je ne bi li doznao nešto više o njegovim razmišljanjima o dolasku nekog norveškog broda s američkim turistima. Kolumbić ga je upitao je li vidio kako su se odrasli i djeca okupljali oko turista što je izgledalo kao da žive u šumama, i to zato što su „odsječeni od svijeta“.<sup>109</sup> Sredinom travnja 1952. suradnik „Rafo“ javio je da je u razgovoru pitao Kolumbića što misli o tadašnjoj situaciji na što mu je on odgovorio da misli da će se tadašnja vlast još održati jer iako ljudi koji predstavljaju vlast

appointed president in his stead. The UDBA investigator then inquired him about the “Crusader congress” in Dubrovnik, but Kolumbić knew nothing about it. he was also asked about his internment in 1934. He replied he did not know the reasons for his arrest because “they never told me why”. He believed, however, that it could have been because he had helped Petar<sup>107</sup> Grgić to cross the Italian border illegally. He did that at the request of one HSS member. When asked about his incarceration in 1941, Kolumbić said he was arrested in Sarajevo together with a number of other people from Dubrovnik. He was released a few days later. As they never interrogated him, he had no idea why he was arrested. He confirmed the allegations that, when Germans entered Dubrovnik, he told some of them how to find the military academy, city port and railway station because he spoke German. He would later get in touch with Germans when applying for fishing permit. He explained that “we had to sell to their troops a large portion of the fish that we caught”. At the end of the interrogation minutes there is a note that the interrogation was to be continued, but there is no trace of it in Kolumbić’s file.<sup>108</sup>

Agents’ reports account for all of the Kolumbić file documents originating from 1952. For example, in his report of 12 March, the informer “Martinović” says that he met Kolumbić in Dubrovnik’s Old Town and approached him in order to hear his opinion about the recent arrival of a Norwegian ship with American tourists. Kolumbić commented that the scene of adults and children besieging the tourists gave the impression as if “we live in a forest” and that this was because “we are isolated from the world”.<sup>109</sup> In mid-April 1952, the informer “Rafo” asked for Kolumbić’s opinion on the current situation, to which Kolumbić replied that he thought the regime would persist for the time being because “they may try everything” but “they can only do so much”.<sup>110</sup> Most of the reports from this year concern Kolumbić’s comments at his workplace. In early April 1952, “Južnjak” reported on conversations in the

<sup>107</sup> U dokumentu iz 1944. navodi se ime Toma Grgić, kako je ranije navedeno u ovom radu.

<sup>108</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 8. 6. 1951.

<sup>109</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Izvješće suradnika „Juga“, 19. 12. 1951.

<sup>107</sup> A 1944 document mentions the name Toma Grgić, as specified further in this paper.

<sup>108</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 8 June 1951.

<sup>109</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, informer “Jugo’s” report, 19 December 1951.

<sup>110</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, informer “Rafo’s” report, 16 April 1952.

„mogu pokušavati sve“, ono „što ne ide – ne ide“.<sup>110</sup> Veći dio izvješća iz te godine ponovo se odnosi na Kolumbićeve komentare na radnom mjestu. Početkom travnja 1952. „Južnjak“ javlja o razgovorima u školskoj zbornici.<sup>111</sup> Suradnik „Petrašić“ izvijestio je da je Kolumbić tijekom nastave fizike izjavio da „njemu nijesu mogli ništa ni žandari ni UDB-a ni đaci koji su dizali pištolj na njega“. Suradnik „Južnjak“ naknadno je javio da je nastojao s Kolumbićem povesti razgovor u zbornici, što otkriva da je riječ bila o Kolumbićevu kolegi na radnom mjestu. U svojoj zabilješci napomenuo je da je Kolumbić veoma oprezan i ignorirao je „Južnjakove“ pokušaje razgovora o primirju u Koreji.<sup>112</sup> U međuvremenu je u učionici Kolumbić kritizirao Sovjetski Savez istaknuvši da ondje vlada tiranija.<sup>113</sup> Da su Kolumbića doista nadzirale i neke njegove kolege, dokazuje „dnevni raport“ jednog suradnika koji, spominjući nekoliko političkih i stručnih predavanja za prosvjetne radnike, održanih u veljači 1953., ističe da je na jednom takvom seminaru Kolumbić sjedio iza suradnika „Tota“.<sup>114</sup>

Iz proljeća i ljeta 1953. sačuvano je tek nekoliko kraćih zabilješki suradnika UDBA-e. Tako je 25. travnja „Lovrijenac“ javio da Kolumbić dolazi često „kod nas u radnju“ u kojoj mu je poslovođa bio prijatelj, a ondje je nabavljao hranu za kokoši. Poslovođu je pitao može li pred „Lovrijencem“ slobodno govoriti, a on mu je odgovorio da može jer je i on „okusio kakav je život u zatvoru“. Suradnik je istaknuo da Kolumbić često negoduje zbog skupoće uz opasku da je primijetio da je i „zagrijani velikohrvat“. U svibnju je isti suradnik UDBA-e izvijestio da je Kolumbić, „pun nekog zanosa“, ispričao vic o „drugu“ Titu i njegovoj ženi Jovanki. Posljednja agenturna zabilješka iz te godine jest ona suradnika „Južnjaka“ koji je 17. srpnja 1953. dostavio podatke o Kolumbićevu „neozbiljnom“ ponašanju pred maturantima kada je navodno

staffroom.<sup>111</sup> The informer “Petrašić” reports that, at a science class, Kolumbić said that “neither gendarmes nor UDBA nor the students who pointed a gun at him could not touch him”. Later on, “Južnjak” reported that he tried to initiate a conversation with Kolumbić in the staffroom, which indicates that he – “Južnjak” – was Kolumbić’s colleague from work. The informer reports that Kolumbić was very cautious and that he ignored his attempts to strike up a conversation on armistice in Korea.<sup>112</sup> In the meantime, Kolumbić criticized the Soviet Union in class, saying that there was “tyranny” there.<sup>113</sup> The “daily report” of one informer can be seen as evidence that some Kolumbić’s colleagues indeed spied on him at work. This informer mentions some political and technical courses for teachers held in February 1953, specifying that, at one such seminar, Kolumbić sat behind the informer “Tot”.<sup>114</sup>

From the spring and summer of 1953, only a few brief reports of UDBA informers have been preserved. On 25 April, for example, “Lovrijenac” reports that Kolumbić often comes “to our shop”, where the chief clerk is his friend and where he often comes to buy chicken feed. Kolumbić asked the clerk if he could speak freely in “Lovrijenac’s” presence, to which he replied that he can because he – “Lovrijenac” – had also “tasted what’s it like in prison”. The informer said that Kolumbić often complained about the high cost of living and that he was a “dedicated Croatian chauvinist”. In May, the same UDBA informer reported that Kolumbić, “in ecstasy of a sort”, told a joke about “Comrade Tito” and his wife Jovanka. The last agent report from 1953 is the one submitted by “Južnjak” on 17 July. He reported on Kolumbić’s “frivolous” behavior in front of high-school seniors. On this occasion he allegedly expressed his hatred against Serbs and the students were afraid to react because of the school-leaving examination that they were about to take.<sup>115</sup>

Despite their fragmentary condition, it is clear that the documents from the period between 1947 and 1953

<sup>110</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Izvješće suradnika „Rafe“, 16. 4. 1952.

<sup>111</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Izvješće suradnika „Južnjaka“, 2. 4. 1952.

<sup>112</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Izvješće suradnika „Juga“, 19. 12. 1951.

<sup>113</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Agenturni materijal 1951. – 1952.

<sup>114</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Dnevni raport načelniku Opuomoćstva UDB-e u Dubrovniku, nedatirano.

<sup>111</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, informer “Južnjak’s” report, 2 April 1952.

<sup>112</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, informer “Jugo’s” report, 19 December 1951.

<sup>113</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, agents (records for 1951 – 1952).

<sup>114</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, daily report to head of UDBA division for Dubrovnik, undated.

<sup>115</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, agents (records for 1953 – 1954).

iskazivao mržnju prema Srbima, a učenici zbog straha od mature nisu reagirali.<sup>115</sup>

Unatoč fragmentarnosti, većina se dokumenata iz razdoblja od 1947. do 1953. odnosi na zabilješke o Kolumbiću koje su bile posljedica stalne kontrole koja je nad njim uspostavljena 1947. godine. U tim je dokumentima portretiran kao izuzetno sklon zapadnim demokracijama uz izrazito negativne stavove prema Sovjetskom Savezu i Titovoj Jugoslaviji. Prikazan je i kao čovjek koji je izuzetno držao do hrvatske povijesti, jezika i tradicija zbog čega su mu smetale promjene u nastavnom programu i upotreba tuđica, naročito srbizama, u hrvatskom jeziku. Njegove zamjerke Titovu režimu često su se svodile na pitanja iz svakodnevnog života, primjerice skupoću i kvalitetu dostupnih proizvoda. Svoje je stavove znao otvorenije iskazivati pred učenicima i kolegama čime je privlačio pažnju, da bi se zatim povlačio i bivao oprezniji. Uпитno je, naravno, je li Kolumbić bio svjestan razgranate agenturne mreže koja je nad njim uspostavljena, ali je zahvaljujući saslušanjima na koje je pozivan u drugoj polovini 40-ih godina 20. stoljeća svakako morao znati da se pod neakvom kontrolom ipak nalazi. U jednoj nedatiranoj bilješci OZNA-e ili UDBA-e zapisano je da se o Kolumbiću malo govori i on se malo viđa, no da „on zna malo govoriti i dosta raditi“ zbog čega „o njemu treba dosta misliti i voditi nad njim radikalnu kontrolu“. Kolumbićeva inteligencija, naobrazba i sposobnosti na komunističke represivne organe ostavili su takav dojam da su Kolumbića opisali kao „najozbiljniju zvijer“.<sup>116</sup> Stoga ostaje nejasno zbog čega je UDBA tek 1954. godine uhićenjem jedne zagrebačke grupe studenata uspjela rekonstruirati i pojedina zbivanja u Dubrovniku, uključujući i navodno kompromitirajuće susrete i izjave samog Frana Kolumbića, o čemu će više riječi biti u narednom dijelu ovog rada.

### „Izviđajne radnje“: srpanj 1954.

U Kolumbićevu dosjeu ostao je sačuvan veći broj dokumenata iz srpnja i kolovoza 1954., nekoliko nedatiranih spisa te jedan dokument iz studenoga iste

<sup>115</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Agenturni materijal, 1953. – 1954.

<sup>116</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Izvještaj – Pojedinačna kontrola kontrarevolucionarnih i sumnjivih elemenata, nedatirano.

mostly consist of the notes made during permanent surveillance Kolumbić had been placed under in 1947. They portray him as one who is very inclined towards Western democracies and has a very negative attitude towards the Soviet Union and Tito's Yugoslavia. He is also described as a person who cherishes Croatian history, language and tradition and therefore resents changes in the curriculum and introduction of loan-words – Serbianisms in particular – in Croatian language. His criticism of Tito's regime was often focused on everyday life – e.g. high cost of living and quality of available products. He would often talk freely in front of his students and colleagues but, having drawn their attention, he would then retreat to himself and become more cautious. It is questionable whether Kolumbić was fully aware of the extent of the agent network woven around him. However, after all the interrogations in the second half of the 1940s, he must have known he had been put under some sort of surveillance. An undated note made by OZNA or UDBA concludes that Kolumbić keeps a low profile and, “while not talking too much, he is very active” and therefore “deserves much attention and radical control”. Communist repressive organs were so impressed with Kolumbić's intelligence, education and skills that they described him as “the most serious bigwig”.<sup>116</sup> However, it remains unclear why it took UDBA so long – not earlier than in 1954, when a group of students was arrested in Zagreb – to investigate certain developments in Dubrovnik, including the allegedly compromising encounters and comments of Frano Kolumbić, more of which will be said further in this paper.

### “Investigative Actions”: July 1954

The Kolumbić file also includes a number of documents from July and August 1954, some undated documents and one from November of the same year. They mostly deal with the investigation of the group of Dubrovnik university students arrested together with Kolumbić. There are minutes of his interrogations that took place on 20 July, 22 July, 4 August, 5 August, 7 August, 9 August, 11 September, 15 October and 26 November, the testimony of crown witness Ivo Đenero, and two minutes of Kolumbić's confrontation with Đenero on 16 October 1954.

<sup>116</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, report on individual surveillance of counterrevolutionary and subversive elements, undated.



godine. Ti se dokumenti mahom odnose na istražni postupak protiv grupe dubrovačkih sveučilištaraca koji su uhićeni s Kolumbićem. Tako je, primjerice, dostupan veći broj zapisnika s njegovih saslušanja, i to od 20. srpnja, 22. srpnja, 4. kolovoza, 5. kolovoza, 7. kolovoza, 9. kolovoza, 11. rujna, 15. listopada i 26. studenoga, te jedna izjava kruskog svjedoka Ive Đenera i dva zapisnika o Kolumbićevu sučavanju s Đenerom 16. listopada 1954. godine.

U ranim jutarnjim satima 20. srpnja 1954. na zahtjev javnog tužitelja okruga Dubrovnik dubrovačka je UDBA pokrenula „izviđaj“ protiv Frana Kolumbića zbog krivičnog djela iz članka 119<sup>117</sup>, stavka 3, Kaznenog zakona. Doneseno je i rješenje o pritvoru zbog bojazni da bi Kolumbić sa slobode mogao otežati provođenje istrage i utjecati na svjedoke. Naređen je i pretres njegova stana te saslušanje svjedoka.<sup>118</sup> Pretres Kolumbićeva stana, koji je trajao od 6.30 do 9, izvršio je Stevo Pecarević<sup>119</sup>, a pronađene su knjige: *Ideologija HSS, Politička povijest Hrvatske, Dr. Ante Starčević i Srbi* itd. te časopisi poput *Hrvatske revije* i *Hrvatske smotre*. Pronađeno je i jedno pismo, zatim HSS-ove potvrde o zimskoj pomoći i dvije fotografije pod naslovom „Žrtve senjskih žandara u Senju“.<sup>120</sup> U zasebnom rješenju o pritvoru istaknuto je da je potrebno ispitati osobe kojima je poznata Kolumbićeva „neprijateljska djelatnost“<sup>121</sup>, no ovdje je potrebno istaknuti da izjave svjedoka nisu pronađene u njegovu dosjeu.

Kolumbić je ispitan istog jutra u prostorijama Opućenosti UDBA-e za Dubrovnik. U tom prvom iskazu naveo je da nikad nije imao nekog određenog kontakta sa srednjoškolicima i studentima koji bi imao svrhu propagandnog i neprijateljskog stava prema državnom poretku. No nije nijekao slučajne susrete i razgovore na ulici koji su imali svrhu općeg informiranja o životu studenata i njihovim uspjesima. Naveo je da je pet dana prije uhićenja sreo Augustina Franića s kojim je nekoliko minuta razgovarao na Stradunu i zanimao se za studentsku grupu uhićenu

Early in the morning of 20 July 1954, at the request of the district state prosecutor in Dubrovnik, the local division of UDBA launched an “investigation” against Frano Kolumbić on the grounds of the criminal offence from Article 119<sup>117</sup>, subsection 3 of the Penal Code. Arrest warrant was also issued to prevent Kolumbić from hindering the investigation and influencing witnesses if he were at large. His apartment was searched and witnesses were examined.<sup>118</sup> The search that was supervised by Stevo Pecarević<sup>119</sup> lasted from 6.30 am to 9.00 am. The books found on that occasion included *Ideologija HSS, Politička povijest Hrvatske, Dr. Ante Starčević i Srbi* and others. There were also magazines such as *Hrvatska revija* and *Hrvatska smotra*. A letter was also found, as well as winter support receipts issued by HSS and two photographs entitled *Žrtve senjskih žandara u Senju*.<sup>120</sup> Although the arrest warrant instructed that those familiar with Kolumbić’s “subversive activities” should also be interrogated<sup>121</sup>, such testimonies were not found in his file.

That morning, Kolumbić was interrogated in the premises of the UDBA division for Dubrovnik. He said that, when contacting high-school or university students, he “never spread any propaganda, particularly not of subversive nature”. However, he did not deny accidental encounters and conversations in the street, on which occasions he inquired them about their life and achievements. He said that, five days before he was arrested, he met Augustin Franić in the Old Town and talked to him for a few minutes. He asked him about a group of students arrested in Zagreb. As he knew one of them – Ivo Đenero – personally, and as he considered him gifted mathematician and physicist, he wondered why he was arrested and not released yet. Franić told him that “he did nothing that would be liable to punishment” and that no charges had been raised against him yet, although the hearing was supposed to take place in August. Kolumbić said that he met Đenero in the street only two or three times. He could not remember what were they talking about but was certain that it was not

<sup>117</sup> Rukom ispravljeno na 118.

<sup>118</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Rješenje o pokretanju istrage, 20. 7. 1954.

<sup>119</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Naredba o pretresu, 20. 7. 1954.

<sup>120</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik o pretresu, 20. 7. 1954.

<sup>121</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Rješenje o pritvoru, 20. 7. 1954.

<sup>117</sup> Corrected manually into 118.

<sup>118</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, investigation order, 20 July 1954.

<sup>119</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, search warrant, 20 July 1954.

<sup>120</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, search report, 20 July 1954.

<sup>121</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, arrest warrant, 20 July 1954.

u Zagrebu. Među tim je uhićenima osobno poznao Ivu Đenera, po Kolumbićevu mišljenju vrijednog matematičara i fizičara, pa ga je zanimalo zašto je zatvoren i zašto još nije pušten. Franić mu je odgovorio da „nema nikakova čina koji bi povlačio kaznu“ istaknuvši da optužnica navodno još nije bila podignuta iako je rasprava trebala biti održana u kolovozu. Kolumbić je napomenuo da se s Đenerom susreo svega dva ili tri puta, i to na ulici, no iako se nije mogao sjetiti o čemu je s njim razgovarao, bio je uvjeren da to nije bilo o političkim stvarima jer ga je smatrao „neozbiljnim“. Poznato mu je bilo da je Đenero bio uhićivan i ranije, no nije znao zbog čega. Ipak je osjećao potrebu voditi računa o njegovoj dobrobiti jer je bio dugogodišnji prijatelj pokojnog Đenerova oca. Đenerova je majka nakon muževe smrti živjela siromašno, stoga je Kolumbić nastojao potaknuti Đenera na učenje ne bi li sebi osigurao bolji život. Drugih kontakata s njime navodno nije imao.<sup>122</sup>

Ni s drugim srednjoškolicima i studentima Kolumbić nije dolazio u direktni kontakt osim jednog susreta s „malim“ Dragojevićem iz Korčule kojem je posudio literaturu o Stjepanu Radiću o kojem je u školi trebao održati referat. Budući da je spomenuti Danijel Dragojević tada bio pred maturom, Kolumbića je zanimalo kako mu ide te ga je pitao o nekim raspravama između učenika i nastavnika „u vezi hrvatske zadaće“. Jednom je na ulici razgovarao i s Nikolom Curićem i pitao ga o maturalnoj večeri na kojoj je došlo do neke prepirke. Također je dolazio u kontakt i s pojedinim đacima kojima je davao instrukcije spomenuvši Viktora Bondjija i Mira Batišića. Posjećivao je obitelj Valjalo s kojom je bio u kumskim vezama. Miši Valjalu davao je instrukcije iz fizike, a povremeno je pomagao i njegovoj sestri. Nakon Mišina odlaska na studij rijetko ga je viđao, odnosno samo kad je Valjalo dolazio kući za praznike. Priznao je da je Valjalu posuđivao na čitanje literaturu o Stjepanu Radiću, Tomi Arhiđakonu i druga povijesna djela koja je imao u svojoj knjižnici. Kolumbić je u tom iskazu spomenuo i Peru Pokovića s kojim je razgovarao iako se nije mogao sjetiti o čemu, a prisjetio se i susreta s nekim Franušićem te zatim Hrvojem Kačićem<sup>123</sup> koji je bio njegov đak, ali

about politics because he – Kolumbić – considered him “unserious”. He knew that Đenero had been arrested before but did not know why. Still, he cared about Đenero’s well-being on account of his longtime friendship with Đenero’s late father after whose demise Đenero’s mother lived in poverty. This is why Kolumbić tried to encourage him to study hard in order to ensure a better life for himself. Allegedly, that was his only contact with Đenero.<sup>122</sup>

Kolumbić also never had any direct contact with other high-school and university students, except one time with Danijel Dragojević from Korčula, when he lent him some books on Stjepan Radić for his school paper. As Dragojević was just about to take the school-leaving examination, Kolumbić wanted to know how the preparations were going and asked him about some discussions “about the Croatian language assignment” that had taken place between the students and teachers. Once, also in the street, he spoke with Nikola Curić and asked him about the prom night and an altercation that took place there. He was also in touch with some students that he had tutored – specifically, Viktor Bondji and Miro Batišić. He had been visiting the Valjalo family, who were confirmation sponsors of his daughter. He had been giving private lessons in physics to Mišo Valjalo before he went to college. On occasion, he also helped his sister. Kolumbić rarely saw Mišo after he had enrolled college, only when he would come home for vacation. He admitted that he had been lending various literature to Valjalo – books on Stjepan Radić, Thomas the Archdeacon and other history-related books from his own library. In his testimony, Kolumbić also mentioned his encounters with Pero Poković, but could not remember what did they talk about. He also remembered encounters with a certain Franušić and with Hrvoje Kačić<sup>123</sup>. The latter was his student but they never discussed anything. He also mentioned his acquaintance with Stefi Vojvodić and a certain Rihter. He had lent literature to no one else but Dragojević and Valjalo. The last thing in Kolumbić’s testimony concerned the private company he kept. The only ones he could think of included Dr. Zvonko Pohović and his wife, whom he would meet in town on occasion, Pero Kanajet, Professor Tabor and Ćiro Carić. Kolumbić also remembered an encounter with Niko Pusić, with whom he discussed the

<sup>122</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik s jutarnjeg saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 20. 7. 1954.

<sup>123</sup> Kasnije istaknuti vaterpolist i stručnjak u području pomorskog prava.

<sup>122</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, morning interrogation of Frano Kolumbić – minutes, 20 July 1954.

<sup>123</sup> Later a prominent water polo player and maritime law expert.

s kojim nikad nije vodio nikakve razgovore. Spomenuo je i poznanstvo s Stefijem Vojvodićem i nekim Rihterom. Osim Dragojeviću i Valjalu, literaturu nikome nije posuđivao. Kolumbić je taj iskaz završio napomenuvši da u privatnom životu nije imao određeno društvo, ali se u gradu znao susresti s dr. Zvonkom Pohovićem i njegovom suprugom, Perom Kanajetom, profesorom Taborom i Ćirom Carićem. Prisjetio se i susreta s Nikom Pusićem s kojim je razgovarao o stanju na selu.<sup>124</sup> Tijekom saslušanja Kolumbić je svoje kontakte sa studentima sveo na obrazovne svrhe, odnosno davanje instrukcija, posuđivanje literature i općenito zanimanje za njihov napredak. Saslušanje je prekinuto u 12.30, a nastavljeno je istog dana u popodnevnim satima.

U nastavku saslušanja Kolumbić je priznao da se iz vlastite znatiželje zanimao o stanju na Sveučilištu u Zagrebu, o ponašanju mladih te o eventualnim političkim trzavicama i političkim grupacijama. U razgovorima je doznao da se na sveučilištu ne osjeća politički život, osim službenog studentskog udruženja, no nije se mogao sjetiti tko mu je o tome govorio. Prisjetio se da je 1952. ili 1953. otišao čestitati Božić obitelji Valjalo i da je ondje zatekao grupu sveučilištaraca među kojima su bili Valjalo, Rihter, Franušić te vjerojatno Kačić. Ostale nije poznao, a s grupom se zadržao 15-20 minuta. Sveučilištarci su se veselili i pjevali domoljubne hrvatske pjesme među kojima je Kolumbić spomenuo „Glasna, jasna“. On im je čestitao Božić i savjetovao da uče i da se „oboružaju“ znanjem ako žele uspjeti u životu. Pričao im je kako je 1923., kada se on vratio u Dubrovnik sa studija u Zagrebu, u gradu bilo malo akademske mladeži, a nitko se nije deklarirao Hrvatom. „Danas se vidi da se je raščistilo sa polutanstvom i da omladina nacionalno osjeća“, ustvrdio je Kolumbić tom prilikom. Izričito je naveo da drugih razgovora sa sveučilištarcima nije bilo osim ako im je pripovijedao koju dogodovštinu iz prošlog političkog života. Oni mu nisu postavljali nikakva politička pitanja „osobite važnosti“. Otpjevali su zdravicu nakon čega je Kolumbić otišao. Na pitanje isljednika UDBA-e o Meštovićevim političkim memoarima Kolumbić je tvrdio da mu takvo djelo nije poznato iako je znao da se u Dubrovniku svojevremeno vodila istraga o nekom Meštovićevu pismu. Upitan je i o napadu na

situation in rural regions.<sup>124</sup> During this interrogation, he insisted that his contacts with his students were related to their education, tutoring them, lending literature to them and following their progress in general. The interrogation was discontinued at 12:30am, to be resumed later in the afternoon.

During the afternoon session, Kolumbić admitted that, out of curiosity, he inquired about the situation at the University of Zagreb, young people's behavior and their political disputes and groupings, if any. He was told that there was no political life at the university other than the activities of the official student organization, but he could not remember who told him that. He remembered that, in 1952 or 1953, he paid a visit to the Valjalo family to wish them well for Christmas and that he found a group of students there, including Valjalo, Rihter, Franušić and, possibly, Kačić. Others he did not know. He stayed with them for 15 or 20 minutes. The students were having a good time and singing patriotic songs such as *Glasna, jasna*. He wished them a Merry Christmas and advised them to "arm up" with knowledge if they want to succeed in life. He told them how, when he returned to Dubrovnik from his studies in Zagreb in 1923, there were very few young people with university degrees there and that none of them declared themselves as Croats. "Nowadays, however, it is clear that the custom of declaring oneself as being of mixed ethnicity has been abandoned and that young people have reassumed their ethnic identity again," said Kolumbić on this occasion. He insisted that he had discussed nothing else with them, save, perhaps, for telling them a few episodes from his former political life. They did not ask any "particularly relevant" political questions. The students then sang a toast, after which Kolumbić left. Asked by the UDBA investigator about Meštović's political memoirs, he said he knew nothing about that book. He only remembered that, at some time past, there had been an investigation in Dubrovnik about some letter written by Meštović. He was also asked about the attack on the bishop's secretary. Kolumbić replied that he had heard others talk about the incident and that he himself might have commented on it, but he said he neither knew the attacked priest personally nor could he remember he discussed it with the students. The UDBA investigator also wanted him

<sup>124</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik s jutarnjeg saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 20. 7. 1954.

<sup>124</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, morning interrogation of Frano Kolumbić – minutes, 20 July 1954.



biskupova tajnika o čemu je naveo da je čuo da se o tome pripovijeda pa je vjerojatno i sam drugima o tome govorio, no napadnutog svećenika nije poznao niti se sjećao da je o tom događaju razgovarao sa sveučilištarcima. Isljednika UDBA-e zanimalo je i detaljnije objašnjenje Kolumbićevih veza s obitelji Valjalo zbog čega je naveo da ih poznaje možda i oko 25 godina te da je supruga pokojnog Mihe Valjala, imućnog pristaše HSS-a koji je financijski pomagao stranci, krizmana kuma Kolumbićevoj kćeri. Zbog tih dugotrajnih prijateljskih kontakata obitelji su se često međusobno posjećivale. Ponovio je da je Miši Valjalu davao instrukcije iz fizike te mu posuđivao povijesna djela ne bi li mu tako pomogao da proširi opću naobrazbu. Iznova je upitan i o studentima s kojima je dolazio u kontakt te o njihovim političkim nazorima. Kolumbić je spomenuo studenta prava Franušića, no nije se mogao sjetiti kako ga je upoznao. Budući da je s njime razgovarao svega dva ili tri puta, nije mogao procijeniti njegova politička uvjerenja. Studenta prava i svog bivšeg učenika Hrvoja Kačića rijetko je susretao. Kolumbić je naveo da se Kačić osjeća Hrvatima, ali nije mogao reći pripada li kakvoj grupi. Spomenuo je ponovno i Stefija Vojvodića, no rekao je da se s njime „uopće teško može i razgovarati, jer je konfuzan“. Poznao je još Đeneru, Franića i Rihtera za koje je naveo da se osjećaju Hrvatima, no nije znao više o njihovu političkom djelovanju.<sup>125</sup> Iz nastavka Kolumbićeva saslušanja u popodnevnim satima 20. srpnja 1954. može se uočiti da su njegove prethodne izjave o studentima s kojima je dolazio u kontakt djelomično proširene pa je, primjerice, naveo da se u razgovorima s njima zanimalo za politički život studenata te ga uspoređivao s vlastitim studentskim danima. UDBA-u su naročito zanimali detalji o političkim uvjerenjima pojedinih sveučilištaraca o čemu je Kolumbić odbijao bilo što otkriti pravdajući se rijetkim susretima, slabim poznanstvima i razgovorima koji su se svodili na rasprave o povijesti. No Kolumbić je u tom iskazu možda i nehotice otkrio detalj koji će UDBA-i kasnije ipak biti važan. Riječ je o pjesmi „Glasna, jasna“ koja je poznata i kao „Živila Hrvatska“, a koju je pod naslovom „Hrvatska pjesma“ 1873. u *Vienca* objavio August Šenoa nakon čega ju

to specify his relations with the Valjalo family. Kolumbić said he had known them maybe even for 25 years and that the wife of the late Miho Valjalo, a wealthy man who had financially supported HSS, was the confirmation sponsor of his daughter. It was due to these long-time friendly relations that the families frequently visited each other. He reiterated that he had been giving private lessons in physics to Mišo Valjalo and that he had been lending books to him in order to extend his general education. Once again, they asked him about the students he had been in touch with and about their political views. Kolumbić mentioned Franušić, a law student, but he could not remember the circumstances of their first encounter. As he spoke to him only a couple of times, he could not form an opinion about his political views. His encounters with Hrvoje Kačić, his former high-school student, now in college, were infrequent. Kolumbić stated that Kačić declared himself as Croat but could not say if he was a member of any group. He mentioned Stefi Vojvodić once again, adding that “he is generally hard to talk to because he is confused”. He also knew Đenero, Franić and Rihter. He said they declared themselves as Croats but knew nothing about their political activities.<sup>125</sup> In the afternoon session of the 20 July interrogation he somewhat amplified his earlier statements about the students he had been in touch with. For example, he said he asked them about their political life and compared it with own student days. UDBA was particularly interested in their political convictions but Kolumbić refused to elaborate on this, explaining that he met them infrequently, that he did not know them well and that their conversations were mostly confined to discussions on history. However, he, perhaps unwillingly, said something that UDBA would later consider important. He mentioned the song *Glasna jasna*, also known as *Živila Hrvatska (Long Live Croatia)*, first published in *Vienac* in 1873 by August Šenoa under the title *Hrvatska pjesma*. Composer Ivan Zajc later wrote music for it. This detail will later be used as evidence of “Ustasha affiliation” of the Kolumbić group.

The interrogation of Kolumbić was continued two days later, on 22 July. It was much shorter and they only asked him two questions. The first was about the persons who called on him at his home. He remembered a visit that they asked him about during an

<sup>125</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik s poslijepodnevnog saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 20. 7. 1954.

<sup>125</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, afternoon interrogation of Frano Kolumbić – minutes, 20 July 1954.

je uglazbio Ivan Zajc. Upravo će taj detalj postati jedan od dokaza „ustaštva“ Kolumbićeve grupe.

Kolumbićevo saslušanje nastavljeno je dva dana kasnije, 22. srpnja. Riječ je o znatno kraćem saslušanju tijekom kojeg su Kolumbiću postavljena svega dva pitanja. Prvo se pitanje odnosilo na osobe koje su ga posjećivale u njegovu domu. Odgovorio je da se sjetio sastanka o kojem je upitan na ranijem saslušanju, a radilo se o događaju iz 1953. kada su ga posjetili Mišo Valjalo, Augustin Franić i Pero Poković. Kolumbić se nije mogao sjetiti tko je bio četvrti gost, ali je dopustio mogućnost da se radilo o Đeneru. Pozvao ih je na kavu, a razgovarali su o raznim temama, iako se nije mogao sjetiti o kojim, pa tako i o politici. Drugim pitanjem tijekom istog saslušanja od njega je zatraženo da se osvrne i na ostale koji su ga posjećivali. Kolumbić je naveo da su ga jednom posjetili Dragojević i Curić s kojima nije razgovarao o političkim temama. Dragojević ga je posjetio još dvaput kad mu je vratio literaturu o braći Radić. Spomenuo je i srednjoškolu kojima je davao instrukcije, a među kojima su bili Viktor Bondji, braća Guska, neka učenica Kovačević te Ivo Ljubomir. Dodao je da je u dijelu izjave o Miši Valjalu nehotice ispustio susret kada je u domu obitelji Valjalo zatekao Mišu u društvu Đenera s kojim je razgovarao o nepolitičkim temama jer mu je ostavio dojam neozbiljnog mladića, a vidio je i po držanju ukućana „da im je nemio i neprijatan gost“. Kolumbić je spomenuo i susret sa Stefijem Vojvodićem s kojim nikad nije započinjao političke razgovore iako je Vojvodić znao govoriti o „svemu i svačemu“, a Kolumbić ga je iz pristojnosti slušao.<sup>126</sup> Tom izjavom Kolumbić je uglavnom potvrdio prethodne navode iako pitanje isljednika UDBA-e ostavlja dojam da je potvrda posjeta pojedinih sveučilištaraca Kolumbićevu domu trebala implicirati znatno bliskije veze od onih koje je Kolumbić bio voljan potvrditi.

Istog dana, dakle 22. srpnja 1954., Marko Radišić, šef Okružne istražne grupe Odjela za unutrašnje poslove u Dubrovniku, Okružnom je javnom tužioštvu prosljedio dopis u kojem je naveo da je „prije izvjesnog vremena u Zagrebu uhapšena grupa studenata radi proustaške aktivnosti, među kojima se nalazi DJENERO IVO, student filozofije iz Dubrovnika.“ Istragom nad Đenerom otkrivene su osobe iz Dubrovnika koje su, kako piše u Dosjeu

earlier interrogation – when Mišo Valjalo, Augustin Franić and Pero Poković came to see him in 1953. He could not remember who the fourth guest was, but he said that it could have been Đenero. Over a cup of coffee, they discussed various topics, including politics (although he could not remember which topics were those). The second question was about other visitors that he received. Kolumbić said that Dragojević and Curić once came to him but that they did not discuss politics then. Dragojević paid him a visit two more times to return the literature on the Radić brothers he had borrowed from him. The visitors also included high-school students taking private lessons from him. Among them were Viktor Bondji, the Guska brothers, a female student named Kovačević, and Ivo Ljubomir. Kolumbić added that, in his earlier statement concerning Mišo Valjalo, he forgot to mention that, during one of his visits to the Valjalo family residence, he saw Đenero there. He only discussed non-political topics with him “because I was of an impression that he was a frivolous young man. I also realized by the behavior of the family members that he was an unpleasant and unwanted guest in their home.” He also mentioned his encounter with Stefi Vojvodić, with whom he never initiated political conversations, although Vojvodić had a tendency to talk about “all kinds of things” and Kolumbić would listen to him out of politeness.<sup>126</sup> With this statement Kolumbić mostly confirmed his earlier allegations. The UDBA investigator’s question leaves the impression that Kolumbić’s confirmation of the students’ visits was supposed to imply that his relations with them were much closer than he was willing to admit.

That same day, 22 July 1954, Marko Radišić, head of the District Investigative Group of the Department of Interior in Dubrovnik, sent to the District Public Prosecutor a letter notifying them that, “some time ago, a group of students in Zagreb were arrested on account of pro-Ustasha activities. Among them is IVO DJENERO, a philosophy student from Dubrovnik”. The investigation of Đenero exposed some persons from Dubrovnik who “carried out subversive activities in collaboration with the students arrested in Zagreb”. Based on Đenero’s testimony, Frano Kolumbić, Petar Žuvela, Mišo Valjalo, Damjan Pavlović, Augustin

<sup>126</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 22. 7. 1954.

<sup>126</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 22 July 1954.

Frana Kolumbića, „vršile neprijateljski rad u vezi sa pripadnicima uhapšenih studenata u Zagrebu“. Stoga su temeljem Đenerova iskaza 20. srpnja 1954. u 7 sati uhićeni i pritvoreni Frano Kolumbić, Petar Žuvela, Mišo Valjalo, Damjan Pavlović, Augustin Franić i Trpimir Macan. S obzirom na to da u roku od tri dana nije bilo moguće izvršiti „sve izviđajne radnje“ zbog saslušanja velikog broja svjedoka u Dubrovniku i izvan njega, predloženo je da se navedenim osobama produži pritvor. Uz dopis je priložen sažetak ključnih Đenerovih navoda o dubrovačkoj grupi te prva zapisnička saslušanja za sve pritvorenike.<sup>127</sup> Prema sačuvanom spisu, zagrebačka skupina kojoj je pripadao i Đenero organizirano je posjetila grob Ante Starčevića u Šestinama noseći vijence i cvijeće te su povodom 10. travnja palili svijeće na grobovima „ustaških funkcionera“. Ista je skupina na Starčevićevu grobu od trobojnog cvijeća izradila hrvatsku zastavu u obliku slova „U“. Pripadnici te grupe navodno su u svojim rodnim mjestima djelovali na „omladinu politički neopredijeljenu ili prema porodičnim prilikama (kome je netko iz porodice bio proganjan od Narodne vlasti) bili skloni nacionalističkim osjećajima“. Tako je, primjerice, Đenero tijekom posljednje dvije godine djelovao „u zajednici sa uhapšenima“ na prostoru Dubrovnika i okolice. Aktivnost dubrovačke skupine navodno se sastojala u odabiru mladih ljudi, prvenstveno gimnazijalaca i studenata, koje su tijekom vremena „direktnim usmenim kontaktom i preko literature odgajali u šovinističkom duhu, pripremajući ih kako bi sačuvali nacionalističke težnje i na svojim mjestima borili se za stvaranje samostalne Hrvatske države“. Prema istom zapisu, uhićenici su se međusobno sastajali na ulici ili u privatnim stanovima, razgovarali o pisanju emigrantskog tiska, primjerice tiskovine *Drina*, o Meštrovićevu pismu i govoru Branka Jelića te su međusobno odabirali mlade na koje je trebalo djelovati u smjeru „nacionalističkog odgoja“. Takvima su davali literaturu iz privatnih knjižnica, primjerice Kolumbićeve i Macanove, te usmena objašnjenja. Literatura je uglavnom bila iz „vremena okupacije“ te je uključivala djela Ive Pilara, Filipa Lukasa, Mile Budaka, časopis *Hrvatska smotra* te druge naslove. Skupina je navodno

<sup>127</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Dopis Okružne istražne grupe Okružnom javnom tužioštvu, 22. 7. 1954.

Franić and Trpimir Macan were arrested at 7:00am on 20 July 1954 and detained. As a large number of witnesses had to be examined in and around Dubrovnik, it was not possible to carry out “all investigative actions” within the statutory time-limit of three days. It was therefore recommended that custody be extended for the abovementioned persons. Enclosed with the letter were a summary of Đenero’s key allegations about the Dubrovnik group and the minutes of the first hearings of all detainees.<sup>127</sup> According to a preserved document, the Zagreb group – including Đenero – placed wreaths and flowers at the grave of Ante Starčević in Šestine and, marking the 10 April, lit candles on the graves of “Ustasha functionaries”. They also made a U-shaped floral display in the colors of Croatian flag on Starčević Square. Also, in their respective places of origin, they allegedly exercised their influence on “local youth – those who were politically uncommitted and those inclined to nationalist sentiments because their family members had been prosecuted by the People’s Government”. For example, in the past two years, Đenero was involved in such activities in and around Dubrovnik “in collusion with those who have been arrested”. “Both through direct contact and through literature,” the Dubrovnik group allegedly recruited young people – primarily high-school and university students – “educating them in a spirit of chauvinism and instigating them to spread nationalist tendencies in their places of origin and fight for the creation of independent Croatian state”. According to the same document, all those arrested regularly met in the street or in apartments, commented the emigrant publications such as *Drina*, Meštrović’s letter and Branko Jelić’s speech, and targeted young people suitable for “nationalist education”. They supplied such young people with literature from private libraries, like Kolumbić’s and Macan’s, and gave them oral explanations. The literature, mostly from the “occupation period”, included the works by Ivo Pilar, Filip Lukas and Mile Budak, *Hrvatska smotra* review and other publications. The group would allegedly meet on religious holidays and “vented their nationalist sentiments by singing pro-Ustasha songs” such as *Glasna, jasna, Još Hrvatska nij propala, U boj, u boj* and others. For example, on Christmas Day in 1953, they visited several families that were reportedly “known” as

<sup>127</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, letter of District Investigative Group to District Public Prosecutor, 22 July 1954.



koristila vjerske blagdane za sastajanje i „davanje oduška svom nacionalističkom raspoloženju proustaškim pjesmama“, primjerice „Glasna, jasna“, „Još Hrvatska ni propala“, „U boj, u boj“ itd. Tako su za Božić 1953. posjetili nekoliko obitelji koje su navodno bile „poznate“ kao „ustaške“, a nakon rata su ostale „neprijateljski raspoložene“ ne bi li im dali poticaj u držanju i pridobili nekog mlađeg člana obitelji za svoju aktivnost. Tijekom razgovora uveličavali su ulogu i aktivnost hrvatske emigracije te dogovarali planove o stvaranju „slobodne“ Hrvatske, raspravljajući o teritorijalnim granicama i unutrašnjem uređenju. „Njihova je oštrica bila uperena uglavnom na Srbe i komuniste, a saveznika su nalazili u katoličkom kleru“, zaključuje se u ovom sažetku uz napomenu da su uhićenici na dubrovačkom terenu djelovali na dvadesetak mlađih osoba.<sup>128</sup>

Navode u tom dopisu teško je prosuđivati isključivo kroz Kolumbićev dosje jer je za detaljniju analizu potreban uvid u zapisnike sa saslušanja svih osumnjičenih. Pozornost u dopisu svakako privlače dva navoda koja se mogu povezati s Kolumbićevim iskazima. Prvi se odnosi na posuđivanje literature čime je, prema optužbi UDBA-e, Kolumbićeva knjižnica, zajedno s Macanovom, postala izvor na kojem su se sveučilištarci upoznavali s djelima i autorima koje je tadašnja vlast smatrala neprijateljskima. S obzirom na svoj profesorski status, tim je Kolumbić potencijalno mogao biti označen kao intelektualni vođa te skupine. Drugi se navod odnosi na detalj o pjesmama koji je u svom iskazu potvrdio i Kolumbić. Primjetno je da su „proustaškim“ pjesmama opisane one koje su nastale u 19. stoljeću, dakle znatno prije nastanka ustaškog pokreta, odnosno u vrijeme buđenja nacionalne svijesti i formiranja hrvatskih političkih stranaka. Tako je, primjerice, budnicu „Još Hrvatska ni propala“ napisao Ljudevit Gaj još 1832. zbog čega se ona vezuje za djelovanje ilirskog pokreta, dok je „U boj, u boj“ napisao Franjo Marković 1866., a uglazbio Ivan Zajc nakon čega je pjesma uvrštena u njegovu operu „Nikola Šubić Zrinski“. Obje pjesme ističu ljubav prema hrvatskoj domovini i jeziku uz iskazivanje spremnosti na smrt u obrani Hrvatske.

Istog je dana, dakle 22. srpnja 1954., sudac Okružnog suda u Dubrovniku dr. Ante Babić prihvatio

“having pro-Ustasha leanings” and that remained “hostile” after the war in order to encourage them and win their younger members over for their cause. In conversations with them they glorified the role and activities of Croatian emigrees and made plans on creation of a “free” Croatia and discussed its boundaries and its system of government. “Their fight was mostly against Serbs and communists and their allies were Catholic priests”, suggests the document. It is also mentioned that those arrested in Dubrovnik area had exercised their influence on some twenty young persons.<sup>128</sup>

The allegations in this document are hard to judge on the basis of the Kolumbić file alone, because a more detailed analysis would require access to the minutes of the interrogations of all suspects. Certainly, drawing attention in this document are two allegations that can be connected with Kolumbić’s testimony. The first one concerns the lending of literature because, according to the incrimination by UDBA, Kolumbić’s private library, together with Macan’s, became the students’ source of the works and authors considered hostile by the regime. Being a professor, Kolumbić could have been identified as the intellectual leader of the group. The second allegation, confirmed by Kolumbić himself in his testimony, refers to the “pro-Ustasha” songs that they had sung, regardless of the fact that these songs were written in the 19th century, in the period of awakening of national consciousness and forming of political parties in Croatia, long before the founding of the Ustasha movement. For example, the patriotic song *Još Hrvatska ni propala* was written by Ljudevit Gaj back in 1832, during the Illyrian Movement. The text for *U boj, u boj* was written by Franjo Marković in 1866 and the music by Ivan Zajc, who included it in his opera *Nikola Šubić Zrinski*. Both songs celebrate love for Croatian homeland and language and manifest the readiness for laying down one’s life for the homeland.

That same day, 22 July 1954, Dr. Ante Babić, a judge of the District Court in Dubrovnik, accepted the recommendation and extended custody for 18 more days for the six abovementioned detainees (court case no. 37/54) and Danijel Dragojević (court case no. 33/54).<sup>129</sup> Two days later, on 24 July 1954, UDBA division for Dubrovnik informed the State Secretariat of Interior

<sup>128</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Izvadak iz zapisnika Djenero Iva, koji se odnosi na uhapšene u Dubrovniku, nedatirano.

<sup>128</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, excerpt from the minutes of interrogation of Ivo Djenero, relating to those arrested in Dubrovnik, undated.

<sup>129</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Decision of Dubrovnik District Court, 22 July 1954.

prijedlog kao osnovan i donio rješenje o produženju pritvora za 18 dana za šestoricu spomenutih pritvo- renika čiji se predmet vodio pod brojem 37/54 te Da- nijela Dragojevića koji je uhićen 19. srpnja 1954. i čiji je predmet bio označen brojem 33/54.<sup>129</sup> Dva dana kasnije, 24. srpnja 1954., UDBA za Dubrovnik dostavila je Državnom sekretarijatu za unutrašnje poslo- ve NRH, odnosno II. Odjeljenju UDBA-e u Zagrebu obavijest o uhićenju Frana Kolumbića i drugih. Do- pis je potpisao načelnik Opunomoćstva dubrovačke UDBA-e Mijo Rilje, a u njemu je istaknuo sažetak ve- zan za predmet sljedećeg sadržaja:<sup>130</sup>

„Neprijateljska aktivnost po liniji ustaštva i HSS očitovala se je na našem terenu u različitim formama, što je najbolje došlo do izražaja u toku izbora sa Saveznu i republičku narodnu skupštinu. (...) Ti elementi su se svakim danom aktivirali i njihov se je utjecaj naročito osjećao u redovima omladine. Gradski komitet SKH-a Dubrovnik je na svojem sastanku konstatirao da od početka prošle godine na ovamo, gradsko omladinsko rukovodstvo ima vrlo slab utjecaj i rad među omladinom. To je bio uzrok da su srednjoškolci i studenti skloni ustaštvu iskoristi- li tu slabost našeg omladinskog rukovodstva, pa su otpočeli sa okupljanjem omladine i širenjem nacionalističkih hrvatskih ideja među njima. Zapaženo je također da su prošlogodišnji i ovo- godišnji maturanti ispoljili javno svoj negativan stav prema našem društvenom sistemu. Izvjesni profesori su, mada neaktivno, radili, ali mirnim posmatranjem i smješkanjem na pojedine nepri- jateljske postupke omladine pomagali takovu ak- tivnost. Na pr. Ispitna komisija je imala sjednicu kojoj je prisustvovalo osam profesora s direkto- rom gimnazije Ivanković Lukom. Ivanković je na sastanku izjavio da je Djenero Miro – maturant, politički negativan /od ustaške familije/, a netko od profesora je to imenovanom saopćio i ovaj se je htio fizički obračunati sa direktorom gimna- zije. Tokom istrage nastojati ćemo rasvijetliti o kojem se profesoru radi. Među prosvjetnim rad- nicima u gradu je vrlo loša situacija, te se i rani- je sugeriralo prosvjetnom savjetu, da poduzme izvjesne korake za premještaj i rošadu u pojedini- m školama, ali do sada nije ništa učinjeno. Ima slučajeva da su negativni profesori kao Kolumbić Frano i Matić Vera vršili i politički utjecaj na po- jedince. Tako je Matić Vera radi svog djelovanja bila raskrinkavana preko organizacije SSRN-a i u

of the People's Republic of Croatia and UDBA's Sec- ond Division in Zagreb that Kolumbić and others had been arrested. In the letter, signed by Mijo Rilje, head of UDBA Dubrovnik, the following summary of the case is given:<sup>130</sup>

“Various forms of subversive pro-Ustasha and pro-HSS activities have been observed in our area. This was best manifested during the federal and re- public parliamentary election. (...) These elements have been active on a daily basis and their influence has been particularly pronounced among the mem- bers of the youth organization. The CPC Committee for Dubrovnik concluded at its meeting that, since the beginning of the year, the leaders of the city youth organization have performed poorly in their work with the youth. Using this fault of the youth leaders, the high-school and university students with Ustasha leanings began rallying the youth and spreading Croatian nationalist ideas among them. It was also observed that, last year and this year, high- school graduates publicly manifested their negative attitude towards our social system. Some profes- sors, although not actively involved in such subver- sive activities, supported them by not reacting and merely smiling at them. For example, at a session of the gymnasium examination board attended by headmaster Luka Ivanović and eight professors, the headmaster said that the graduate Miro Djenero was politically negative /from a family with Ustasha leanings/. Upon hearing about this from one profes- sor, Djenero wanted to beat the headmaster up. The investigation will try to identify this professor. The situation with the educational workers in the city is very bad. The education board has been suggested to take action and carry out reshuffle in some schools and transfer some staff members to other schools. however, nothing has been done yet. In some cases, negative professors such as Frano Kolumbić and Vera Matić exerted political influence on some in- dividuals. For instance, Vera Matić's activities in her school were unmasked by the Socialist Alliance of Working People. Until a few months ago, the edu- cation board was headed by professor Baldo Kojak- ović, a negative element with pro-Ustasha views.

Upon their release from the penitentiary, members of the Ustasha terrorist organization HOP resumed their activities and meetings and began exerting their influence on passive youth. Some prominent HSS members established con- tact with former convicts and with this youth. Local Party members also failed to acquit them- selves well; they just looked on, not interfering in the activities of these young men who had been

<sup>129</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Odluka Okružnog suda u Dubrovniku, 22. 7. 1954.

<sup>130</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Dopis UDB-e za Dubrovnik, 24. 7. 1954.

<sup>130</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, letter of UDBA's Dubrovnik division, 24 July 1954.

školi. Do prije par mjeseci je načelnik prosvjetnog savjeta bio Kojaković Baldo, profesor, inače negativan i proustaški raspoložen.

Nakon povratka iz KPD-a pripadnika ustaške terorističke organizacije 'HOP' počeo se je osjećati njihov rad, sastajanje i međusobno posjećivanje, a kasnije i utjecaj na dotad pasivnu omladinu. Istaknutiji HSS-ovci su počeli dolaziti u kontakt sa bivšim osuđenicima, a i ovim omladincima. Osjećala se je slabost i kod organizacije SK-a, koje su mirno posmatrale djelovanje ovih mladića, ma da se je očigledno osjetilo, da koriste širinu naše demokracije. To je također ocjena i Gradskog komiteta SK-a.

Nakon povratka iz Zagreba našeg službenika Lucić<sup>131</sup> Mirka<sup>132</sup>, razgovarano je sa njim i on nam je rekao da mu je drug Rajković Mato naglasio, neka mi u Dubrovniku stvar pokrenemo na osnovu podataka Djenero Iva, te da je mišljenja kako bi stvar trebalo pokrenuti prije dolaska Gosta<sup>133</sup> u zemlju. Zapisnik Djereno Iva i druge materijale je pregledao Javni Tužioc okruga Apolonio Aco i saglasili smo se, da ćemo izvršiti hapšenje nad odredjenom šestoricom.

Odobrenje za hapšenje nijesmo tražili, baš radi dolaska Gosta u zemlju. Dalekopisac i specijalna telefonska linija bile su loše i ne bi se moglo objasniti razloge i materijal za hapšenje. Ići u Zagreb radi kratkoće vremena nije bilo moguće, a smatrao sam radi političke situacije kakova je momentalno u gradu i kotaru, te na osnovu materijala s kojima smo raspolagali, da je materijal dovoljan za hapšenje. Mišljenje sam, a s tim su se u razgovoru složili i sekretari Kotarskog i Gradskog komiteta SKH-a, da je bilo potrebno napraviti odlučan presjek djelovanja neprijateljskih elemenata, te da je ova mjera bila nužna i potrebna.

Na sam dan hapšenja imali smo sastanak u Javnom Tužioštvu, kojemu je prisustvovao i Javni Tužioc Hrvatske Dr. Milivoj Rukavina. Javni Tužioc okruga i ja smo mu ispričali materijal, upoznali ga sa situacijom, te se je i on složio, da je trebalo presjeći neprijateljsko djelovanje, a pritome je naglasio, da pri izvođenju na sud ne dajemo oblik neke organizacije ukoliko ona već to nije, te da na sud ne izvodimo mnogo lica.

abusing the tolerance of our democracy. The CPC City Committee also came to this conclusion.

When our official Lucić<sup>131</sup> Mirko<sup>132</sup> returned from Zagreb, he told us that Comrade Mato Rajković emphasized that we in Dubrovnik should take action on the basis of Ivo Djenero's testimony and that, in his opinion, the action should be taken before the Guest<sup>133</sup> arrives to our country. The minutes of Djenero's interrogation were analyzed by the district public prosecutor Aco Apolonio and we agreed that those six individuals would be arrested.

We did not ask for approval for the arrest because of this very reason – the Guest's arrival. The telex machine and special telephone line were not good enough for explaining the reasons and evidence for the arrest and there was no time to go to Zagreb. In my opinion, current political situation in the city and its environs and the evidence in our possession were sufficient for making arrest. I was also of the opinion that severe measures, including this one, were required for terminating the activities of the subversive elements. When I spoke to the secretaries of the CPC District and City Committees, they agreed with it.

On the day of the arrest, we had a meeting at public prosecutor's office. Dr. Milivoj Rukavina, State Prosecutor of the People's Republic of Croatia, was also present. When district public prosecutor and I submitted evidence to him and informed him about the situation, he agreed that a crackdown on the subversive activities was indeed required. He pointed out that, when taking the arrested to the court, we should not present them as members of an organization if possible, and that not many people should be tried.

As the investigation of Djenero established a continuity of activities of subversive evidence – also supported by evidence – and taking into account the situation in Dubrovnik, I believe that the number of those arrested (six of them) is not excessive. Depending on further investigation, some other persons might be arrested, of which we will inform you on time.

The investigation will be used for creating a network of agents, both in the city and in the district."

This letter indicates that Kolumbić's arrest should be perceived in a much broader context broader context of the political life of young people in those days. UDBA

<sup>131</sup> Nečitko. Lučić ili Lucić.

<sup>132</sup> Zasigurno je riječ o Mirku Lučiću, članu UDBA-e za Dubrovnik 1952. i 1953. Radelić 2019: 541.

<sup>133</sup> Iako se u dokumentu ne navodi o kojemu je „gostu“ riječ, izgledno je da se radi o etiopskom caru Haile Selassiju koji je u Beograd doputovao upravo 20. srpnja 1954. i o čemu je izvijestila *Slobodna Dalmacija* u 2937. broju od 21. srpnja 1954.

<sup>131</sup> Illegible. Lučić or Lucić.

<sup>132</sup> Undoubtedly Mirko Lučić, member of UDBA division for Dubrovnik in 1952 and 1953. Radelić 2019: 541.

<sup>133</sup> Although the document does not specify who the "guest" was, it is very likely that it was the Ethiopian emperor Haile Selassie, who arrived in Belgrade on 20 July 1954, as was reported in *Slobodna Dalmacija* No. 2937 of 21 July 1954.



Obzirom, da se je istragom nad Djenerom, a i na osnovu materijala, koje smo od ranije posjedovali, utvrdila konstanta aktivnost neprijateljskih elemenata, te uzimajući u obzir situaciju kakova je u Dubrovniku, mišljenja sam da broj – šestorica – uhapšenih nije prevelik. Obzirom na razvoj istrage, možda će se ukazati potreba za hapšenje još nekih lica, o čemu ćemo Vas pravodobno obavijestiti.

Istragu ćemo koristiti za stvaranje agenture, kako u gradu, tako i na terenu kotara.“

Iz tog se dopisa primjećuje da je Kolumbićevo uhićenje potrebno sagledati u znatno širem kontekstu političkog života mladih tog vremena. Širenje „nacionalističkih ideja“ UDBA i Savez komunista (SK) direktno su povezivali sa znatno lošijim radom i utjecajem partijskih omladinskih organizacija. Čini se da su barem neki nastavnici blagonaklono gledali na širenje takvih ideja među srednjoškolicima zbog čega je tražen njihov premještaj. Pristup je to koji podsjeća na nekadašnji prijedlog OZNA-e da je „kolo“ potrebno „razbiti u zametku“. <sup>134</sup> Zapažanje povezivanja HSS-ovaca i pripadnika HOP-a zasigurno je navelo UDBA-u na „odlučan presjek djelovanja neprijateljskih elemenata“ koji je uz manji broj privedenih ipak trebao djelovati kao snažna poruka ostalima te ujedno omogućiti stvaranje veće agenturne mreže u gradu. Spomenuti dopis potvrđuje i to da je krunski svjedok zbog kojeg je razotkrivena dubrovačka grupa bio tadašnji student Ivo Đenero.

Nekoliko dana kasnije, 29. srpnja, Kolumbićeva supruga Jelka angažirala je odvjetnika Vicka Kisića o čemu je on obavijestio Okružni sud u Dubrovniku i zatražio da mu se dopusti uvid u zapisnike i druge dokumente „ukoliko ne postoje opravdani razlozi za uskraćivanje uvida u spise“ te da mu se omogući razgovor s Franom Kolumbićem u prisutnosti određenog službenika. <sup>135</sup> Kolumbić će do daljnega biti zadržan u zatvoru gdje će tijekom kolovoza 1954. biti ispitivan još četiri puta, o čemu će više riječi biti u narednom dijelu rada.

<sup>134</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Izvješće OZN-e južnodalmatinskog područja Odsjeku OZN-e za oblast VIII. korpusa, 22. 11. 1944., broj 460/44 (prethodno kutija 169). Matković & Pažanin 2011: 220–225.

<sup>135</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Dopis Vicka Kisića Okružnom sudu u Dubrovniku, 29. 7. 1954.

and League of Communists believed that the propagation of “nationalist ideas” was a direct consequence of poor performance and influence of communist youth organization. It seems that at least some teachers were receptive to the propagation of such ideas among high-school students, which is why instructions for their transfer were issued. This approach reminds of the earlier OZNA’s recommendation that such groups should be “nipped in the bud”. <sup>134</sup> It was certainly the realization that HSS and HOP members had started contacting each other that made UDBA “strike a decisive blow to the activities of subversive elements”. Although not many were to be arrested, it would still be a strong message to the others. Also, the network of agents in the city would be expanded in the process. This letter confirms that student Ivo Djenero was the crown witness whose testimony had helped expose the Dubrovnik group.

Several days later, on 29 July, Kolumbić’s wife Jelka hired a lawyer, Vicko Kisić. The lawyer approached the Dubrovnik District Court and requested access to the interrogation minutes and other documents, “unless there are justified reasons for denying access to these documents”. He also made a request to talk to Frano Kolumbić in the presence of an official person. <sup>135</sup> Kolumbić will remain in prison. In August alone, he will be interrogated four more times. More on this will be said further in this paper.

### Initiation of the Investigation: August 1954

In early August 1954, head of the District Investigative Group Marko Radišić notified the Dubrovnik Public Prosecutor that the investigation would not be completed within 21 days (maximum remand in custody) and requested that, for this reason, a recommendation for initiation of investigation and approval of pre-trial prison be submitted to the Dubrovnik District Court. In this letter, Radišić points out that some of the arrestees have admitted their “guilt” during their final days in custody – unlike the accused Pavlović, who refuses to admit anything despite the fact that others have incriminated him. Besides, as names of some other persons

<sup>134</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, South Dalmatian OZNA report to OZNA division for the 8th Corps, 22 November 1944, no. 460/44 (formerly box 169). Matković & Pažanin 2011: 220–225.

<sup>135</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Vicko Kisić’s letter to Dubrovnik District Court, 29 July 1954.

## Otvaranje istrage: kolovoz 1954.

Početak kolovoza 1954. Marko Radišić u svojstvu šefa Okružne istražne grupe obavijestio je Okružno javno tužništvo u Dubrovniku da istraga neće moći biti završena u roku maksimalnog trajanja pritvora od 21 dana zbog čega je zatražio da se Okružnom sudu u Dubrovniku podnese prijedlog za otvaranje istrage i istražnog zatvora. U tom dopisu Radišić je istaknuo da su pojedini uhićenici svoju „krivicu“ priznali posljednjih dana trajanja pritvora, dok okrivljeni Pavlović još ništa nije htio priznati iako su ga ostali teretili. Osim toga su se u materijalima spominjale i neke druge osobe zbog čega je postojala sumnja da će se broj okrivljenih povećati. Također je prikupljeni materijal navodno sadržavao elemente drugih kaznenih djela osim onog zbog kojeg je „izviđaj“ i pokrenut. Stoga je po Radišićevoj ocjeni bilo neophodno otvoriti istragu kojom bi se utvrdile sve činjenice. Uz njegov dopis priloženi su nastavci zapisničkih saslušanja svih okrivljenih te rukopis Trpimira Macana koji je pronađen pri pretresu stana. Tužilstvu je dostavljena i literatura pronađena pri pretresu domova okrivljenih. Istaknuto je da su roditelji Trpimira Macana također angažirali odvjetnika Vicka Kisića,<sup>136</sup> koji je branio i Kolumbića. Sudeći prema jednoj kratkoj bilješci pod brojem 1410, čini se da je istog dana iz Zagreba zatraženo da se iz Dubrovnika hitno pošalje izvješće o istrazi protiv Kolumbića i ostalih, „te što su sve priznali od podataka koje je dao Đenero“.<sup>137</sup>

Između 4. i 9. kolovoza Kolumbić je preslušavan četiri puta, a pitanja isljednika UDBA-e uglavnom su se odnosila na pojašnjenja i proširenja Kolumbićevih navoda izrečenih tijekom saslušanja u srpnju. Tako se tijekom prvog kolovoškog saslušanja, dakle 4. kolovoza, od Kolumbića tražilo da pojašni dio izjave u kojoj se referirao na svoje doživljaje Dubrovnika 1923. te da definira što smatra „nacionalnim osjećajem“. Kolumbić je u svom odgovoru ponovio popis studenata koje je zatekao u situaciji koju je spomenuo u ranijoj izjavi navevši da je o njihovih nacionalnim osjećajima zaključio jer su pjevali hrvatske budnice. Čuo je da se ista skupina sastaje kod drugih kolega

were mentioned in the testimonies, it was possible that the number of the accused would grow. Also, the testimonies contained elements of other criminal actions in addition to the one for which the criminal inquest had been launched. In Radišić's opinion, it was therefore necessary to initiate a fact-finding investigation. Enclosed with his letter are the minutes from interrogations of all the accused and a manuscript by Trpimir Macan found during the search of his apartment. The literature found in the homes of the accused was also submitted to the Prosecutor. The letter also notifies that Macan's parents hired Vicko Kisić,<sup>136</sup> the lawyer who also defended Kolumbić. Judging by the brief note no. 1410, it seems that, the same day, Zagreb instructed Dubrovnik to urgently send them a report on the investigation of Kolumbić and others, "together with all the Djenero's allegations they have confessed".<sup>137</sup>

Between 4–9 August, Kolumbić was interrogated four times. His UDBA investigators wanted him to elaborate on his allegations made during July interrogations. At the first interrogation – the one of 4 August – they wanted him to expound on his impressions of Dubrovnik in 1923 and to define what he meant by "national sentiment". Once again Kolumbić gave them a list of the students he had encountered in the circumstances described in his earlier testimony. He said he had concluded that they nurtured national sentiments because they sang Croatian patriotic songs. He had also heard that the same group celebrated religious and other holidays at the places of some other colleagues, having a good time and singing. The songs he heard them singing made Kolumbić draw conclusions about their national sentiments. As for the episodes from political life that he might have told the students about, Kolumbić said that he thought he had told them about HSS's failure to come up with their slate for the 1926 local election in Dubrovnik because locals were either afraid or belonged to ORJUNA or other pro-regime parties. By telling them about this episode, Kolumbić wanted to illustrate how the Croatian national sentiment had prevailed since then and explain why the current situation in Dubrovnik differed from the one during King Alexander's dictatorship, when only a few

<sup>136</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Dopis Okružne istražne grupe Okružnom javnom tužilstvu, 5. 8. 1954.

<sup>137</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Dopis broj 1410, 5. 8. 1954.

<sup>136</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, letter of District Investigative Group to District Public Prosecutor, 5 August 1954.

<sup>137</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, note no. 1410, 5 August 1954.

povodom vjerskih blagdana i drugih praznika te se vesele i pjevaju. Kolumbiću su pjesme koje ih je čuo pjevati bile dovoljne da donese zaključak o njihovim nacionalnim osjećajima. Na upit o dogodovštinama iz političkog života koje je možda pričao studentima, kazao je da misli da im je pripovijedao kako 1926. HSS nije bio u stanju sastaviti listu za općinske izbore u Dubrovniku jer su se ljudi bojali ili su pripadali orjunaškim i drugim režimskim strankama. Pripovijedajući o toj epizodi, Kolumbić je htio studentima pokazati kako je od tada hrvatska svijest prevladala zbog čega je tadašnja situacija u Dubrovniku znatno drugačija od one iz vremena Aleksandrove diktature, kada se nije moglo na privatnim kućama ili trgovinama vidjeti nego nekoliko hrvatskih zastava. Kolumbićevo je uvjerenje bilo da je riječ o znatno izražajnijim hrvatskim osjećajima u odnosu na vremena kada su se ljudi zvali „Slovinci, Našinci, Jugoslaveni već prema tome kako im je konveniralo“.<sup>138</sup>

Isljednika UDBA-e je također zanimalo kakav je po Kolumbićevo mišljenju „dobar Hrvat“, na što je on odgovorio da „dobrim Hrvatom“ smatra svakog onog čovjeka koji se ne srami javno priznati Hrvatom i kao takav nikad neće zatajiti svoju narodnost niti će svoja politička načela mijenjati radi materijalnih probitaka te svakog onog koji voli prošlost i poštuje nacionalne tradicije, kadar je braniti svoje nacionalne osjećaje te se svojim dičiti, a tuđe poštovati. Upitan o političkoj i društvenoj aktivnosti „dobrih Hrvata“ u odnosu na državnu zajednicu, Kolumbić je naveo da će svaki razuman čovjek biti lojalan državljanin i vršiti svoje građanske dužnosti, a zbog straha se neće odricati vjere. Prema ostalim je narodnostima zauzeo stav o jednim pravima uz poštovanje njihovih nacionalnih i vjerskih osjećaja. Na to je isljednik UDBA-e Kolumbića pitao jesu li Đenero, Franić, Valjalo, Dragojević i Žuvela „dobri Hrvati“, no Kolumbić je odbio dati odgovor na to pitanje ustvrdivši da ih je susreo svega nekoliko puta zbog čega o njima ne može imati „jasan sud“. Osim tog dijela saslušanja o nacionalnim osjećajima, Kolumbić je nadalje potvrdio Žuveline navode o upoznavanju na Stradunu preko Djenera, ali se nije mogao sjetiti tko je tom prilikom još bio prisutan niti je prema vlastitom kazivanju Žuvelu više susreo. Priznao je da je vrlo vjerojatno da je Žuvelu

Croatian flags could be seen on private homes and shops. In Kolumbić's opinion, Croatian national sentiments had evolved since those times, when [Croats] declared themselves as "Slavs, 'our people,' Yugoslavs or whatever was their individual preference".<sup>138</sup>

The UDBA investigator also wanted to know what does it mean to be a "good Croat" in Kolumbić's opinion. Kolumbić replied that, in his opinion, a "good Croat" is every person who is not ashamed to publicly declares himself or herself as a Croat, who does not trade their political principles for material gains, who loves and respects their national history and traditions, who is willing to defend their national affiliation, and who takes pride in their own legacy and respects that of others. When asked about the "good Croats'" political and social activities in the context of the state they lived in, Kolumbić explained that every decent man should be a loyal citizen and carry out their civic duties, and should not renounce their faith out of fear. He added that other nationalities should have the same rights and that national and religious affiliations should also be respected. The investigator then asked Kolumbić if Đenero, Franić, Valjalo, Dragojević and Žuvela were "good Croats. Kolumbić said he could not answer this question because he had only met them a few times and could not form a "clear opinion" about them. In addition to this elaboration on national sentiments, Kolumbić confirmed Žuvela's allegations that he was introduced to him by Djenero in the Old Town. He could not remember who else was present at the occasion and said that he never met Žuvela again. He admitted that it was very likely that he advised Žuvela to study and to "come to his senses".<sup>139</sup> Based on the above, it can be concluded that new no subjects were tackled during this interrogation, other than Kolumbić's confirmation that he had been introduced to Žuvela. The UDBA investigator was focused on Kolumbić's explanations about national sentiments manifested by unequivocal declaration of one's ethnic affiliation, singing Croatian songs and flying Croatian flags. It seems that the investigator was particularly interested whether, in Kolumbić's opinion, those whose political convictions were not in line with the ideology of the then Yugoslav regime could be

<sup>138</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 4. 8. 1954.

<sup>138</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 4 August 1954.

<sup>139</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 4 August 1954.



savjetovao da uči i da se „opameti“.<sup>139</sup> Na temelju navedenog može se zaključiti da tijekom tog saslušanja nije bilo razgovora o novim temama osim potvrde o upoznavanju sa Žuvelom. Isljednik UDBA-e bio je usredotočen na Kolumbićeva pojašnjenja nacionalnih osjećaja koji su se manifestirali u jasnom nacionalnom opredjeljenju, pjevanju hrvatskih pjesama i vješanju hrvatskih zastava. Čini se da je isljednika napose zanimalo mogu li prema Kolumbićevu mišljenju „dobri Hrvati“ biti oni čija politička uvjerenja nisu bila u skladu s ideologijom tadašnjeg jugoslavenskog režima. Pitanja isljednika ostavljaju dojam da se Kolumbiću željelo imputirati da „dobrim Hrvatima“ smatra one koji su protujugoslavenski orijentirani i koji su, kako je ranije objašnjeno, bili osumnjičeni za pjevanje „proustaških“ pjesama, odnosno širenje ustaštva.

Saslušanje je nastavljeno narednog dana, a UDBA-a je nastavila s pitanjima o hrvatstvu i jugoslavenstvu. Stoga je Kolumbić trebao pojasniti zbog čega je na Šubašićev komentar o tome „kako je on najprije evropejac, jugoslaven, a onda Hrvat“ Kolumbić Đeneru i drugim studentima odgovorio da mu je onda bilo odmah jasno s kime ima posla. Naime, UDBA je iz spomenutog komentara koji je Đenero spomenuo tijekom saslušanja zaključila da je Kolumbić osuđivao Hrvate koji su se osjećali i Jugoslavenima. Kolumbić se branio da je Šubašića smatrao čovjekom „dvorske kamarile“, što je mogao zaključiti iz jednog njegova izlaganja. Pozivajući se opet na Đenerov iskaz, isljednik je upitao Kolumbića o njegovu negativnom stavu o književniku Vojnoviću s kakvim se nije složio nekadašnji prvak HSS-a August Košutić. Kolumbić je pojasnio da s Košutićem nije razgovarao o Ivi Vojnoviću, nego o njegovu bratu Luji koji je za vrijeme Aleksandrove diktature na francuskom jeziku napisao djelo u kojem je tvrdio da u Dalmaciji nema Hrvata, no nikakva sukoba s Košutićem nije bilo. Isljednika UDBA-e zanimalo je Đenerov navod da je studentima Kolumbić govorio o važnom utjecaju Crkve na hrvatski nacionalizam, ističući pritom moral, jaz između istoka i zapada i neke druge teme. Kolumbić je negirao da je studentima mogao reći išta što bi nekog od njih navelo na takav zaključak istaknuvši svoj stav da su svu staru hrvatsku srednjovjekovnu

“good Croats”. The investigator seemed to imply that, to Kolumbić, “good Croats” were those with anti-Yugoslav leanings and those who, as explained above, were suspect of singing “pro-Ustasha” songs and spreading Ustasha views.

The interrogation was continued the following day, with more questions about Croatian and Yugoslav leanings. In this context, the investigator wanted to know why did Kolumbić, upon learning of Šubašić’s comment that he was “first of all a European, then a Yugoslav, and then a Croat”, tell Đenero and other students that he realized at once what kind of a person Šubašić was. This allegation, made by Đenero during his interrogation, made UDBA conclude that Kolumbić was condemning those Croats that also nurtured Yugoslav affiliation. Kolumbić tried to fend off this criticism by explaining that he wanted to say that Šubašić had belonged to the “king’s clique” – which he (Kolumbić) had concluded from one of his public speeches. Referring to Đenero’s testimony again, the investigator asked Kolumbić about his negative attitude towards the writer Vojnović – the attitude that August Košutić, the former HSS leader, had not shared with him. Kolumbić explained that it was not Ivo Vojnović that the two of them had discussed; it was his brother Lujo Vojnović who, in the days of King Alexander’s dictatorship, wrote a text in French language in which he claimed that no Croats were living in Dalmatia. Anyhow, no argument between Košutić and him (Kolumbić) ever took place. The UDBA investigator also asked him to comment on Đenero’s claim that Kolumbić had been telling the students how important the Church was for Croatian nationalism, while emphasizing morality, the gap between East and West and some other topics. Kolumbić denied that he had told them anything that would make them draw such conclusions. He added here that, in his opinion, monasteries deserved credit for preserving Croatian medieval literature and the oldest official charters.<sup>140</sup>

Kolumbić was then asked about Đenero’s claim that, when they discussed literature, Kolumbić drew his attention to Pilar’s work on the South Slavic question and the “term that every nationalist must look into”. Kolumbić said that “it is possible that I recommended to them or brought their attention to this historically relevant encyclopedic source that deals with the migratory, economic

<sup>139</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 4. 8. 1954.

<sup>140</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 5 August 1954.

književnost te najstarije državne isprave sačuvali samostani.<sup>140</sup>

Kolumbić je dalje upitan i o Đenerovu navodu da ga je tijekom razgovora o čitanju literature Kolumbić upozorio na Pilarovo južnoslavensko pitanje i „termin koji svaki nacionalista mora proučiti“. Pojasnio je da je moguće da im je preporučio ili da ih je „upozorio na vrelo povijesnog značenja u kojemu je enciklopedijski obrađen razvoj na balkanskom poluotoku, migracioni, ekonomski i politički i to sve od najstarijih vremena“, no njegova je namjera bila uputiti studente na što opsežnije i solidnije obrazovanje, odnosno nije imala, kako Kolumbić kaže, „onaj smisao koji bi se možda mogao naslućivati“. Kolumbić je opovrgnuo Đenerove navode da je sa studentima čitavo popodne razgovarao o političkim strujanjima na sveučilištu od vremena njegova studiranja do „danas“ navevši da je u svojim studentskim danima bio „izvan svih političkih natezanja“. Đenero je u svom iskazu teretio Kolumbića da je Valjalu davao na čitanje literaturu o „razlikama između Hrvata i Srba“ te HSS-ovu brošuru o komunizmu kao hrvatskom neprijatelju. Kolumbić je ponovio da je Valjalu posuđivao literaturu o Radiću, Tomi Arhiđakonu te jednu brošuru o hrvatstvu bosanskih muslimana i starih Dubrovčana, no demantirao je da je posjedovao nekakvu brošuru o komunizmu. Demantirao je i Đenerovu tvrdnju da mu je govorio o razlikama u proračunu u Hrvatskoj i Srbiji te navodne zaključke o političkim razmišljanjima nekog „popa Čučkovića“. Kolumbić je istaknuo da dotičnog nije sreo možda i tri godine te da uopće nije upoznat s Čučkovićevim političkim razmišljanjima. Odbio je i Đenerov zaključak da je bio jedan od „najautoritativnijih nacionalista“ u Dubrovniku navevši da se nikad nije smatrao „nacionalistom“, nego pristašom HSS-a.<sup>141</sup>

Tijekom tog saslušanja Kolumbić je također odbio navod da je neki profesor Bilić surađivao s partizanima istaknuvši da mu o tome ništa nije poznato iako mu je jednom prilikom upravo Bilić predložio da se angažira. Kolumbić je pojasnio da su mu „ustaška policija“ i Gestapo već bili „za petama“ te je u lipnju 1941. bio i uhićen zbog čega se suradnji nije ni mogao odazvati, a s Bilićem je ostao u

and political developments in the Balkans since the earliest times”, but he explained that his intention was to encourage the students to receive extensive and solid education and not “what might be implied”. He disputed Đenero’s allegations that he spent a whole afternoon discussing with them about the political developments at the university during their studies and “today”, adding that he was not “part of any political debate” when he was a student. In his testimony, Đenero accused Kolumbić that he lent Valjalo books on “differences between Croats and Serbs” and a HSS brochure on communism as an enemy of the Croats. Kolumbić reiterated that he lent Valjalo books on Radić and Thomas the Archdean and a brochure about Croatian origin of Bosnian Moslems and the citizens of the Republic of Ragusa, but he denied that he had in his possession any brochure about communism. He also denied Đenero’s claim that he was telling him about differences in budgets allocated to Croatia and Serbia, respectively, and that he commented the political opinions of some “priest named Čučković”. Kolumbić insisted that he had not seen him for as long as three years and that he knew nothing about Čučković’s political views. He also rejected Đenero’s conclusion that he (Kolumbić) had been one of the “most authoritative nationalists” in Dubrovnik. He explained that he never considered himself to be a “nationalist”, but merely an HSS supporter.<sup>141</sup>

During the same interrogation, Kolumbić denied that one Professor Bilić allegedly collaborated with the partisans; Kolumbić said that he knew nothing about it, but that Professor Bilić once suggested to him to get involved. Kolumbić explained that, since the “Ustasha police” and Gestapo were “after him” and since he was arrested in June 1941, he could not accept Bilić’s suggestion but he nevertheless remained friends with Bilić. Although Kolumbić denied some Đenero’s allegations, the UDBA investigator said that Đenero could not have heard most of these allegations from anyone else but Kolumbić. The investigator therefore wondered what would make the students defame him. Kolumbić replied that it was a “subjective” conclusion and that he was not familiar with other people’s motives – he could merely speculate about them. Answering the next question – about the motives for getting together with the “persons who are not your equals, either by their social functions or by their age”, Kolumbić reiterated

<sup>140</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 5. 8. 1954.

<sup>141</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 5. 8. 1954.

<sup>141</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 5 August 1954.

prijateljskim odnosima. S obzirom na Kolumbićevo negiranje pojedinih Đenerovih navoda, isljednik UDBA-e zaključio je da Đenero većinu navoda ipak nije mogao doznati od drugih, nego isključivo od Kolumbića zbog čega ga je zanimalo što bi studente moglo navesti da Kolumbića kleveću. Na to je Kolumbić odgovorio da je takav zaključak „subjektivan“ te da o motivima drugih osoba ne može ništa tvrditi, iako može sumnjati. Na naredno pitanje o motivima sastajanja s, kako isljednik kaže, licima koja Kolumbiću „ni po društvenoj funkciji a niti po godinama nisu par“, Kolumbić je ponovio da je studente prvi put susreo kod Valjala, a uglavnom ih je poznavao kao svoje bivše učenike. Ustvrdio je da nije imao nikakve osobite namjere osim što ih je htio upoznati s razvojem društvenog života u gradu.<sup>142</sup>

Tijekom tog saslušanja provlačilo se nekoliko tema. Isljednik UDBA-e prvo se usredotočio na Kolumbićevo razumijevanje hrvatstva, naročito s poveznicom na ugled Katoličke Crkve u hrvatskom narodu, a u tom kontekstu i njegove negativne stavove prema onima koji su jugoslavenstvo stavljali ispred hrvatstva. U drugom dijelu saslušanja Kolumbić je bio suočen s nekoliko Đenerovih navoda za koje se čini da im je svrha bila dokazati Kolumbićevo „nacionalističku“, pa samim tim i protusrpsku i protujugoslavensku misao. Đenerovi navodi naročito su ga teretili u kontekstu navodnih razgovora sa studentima o političkoj situaciji na sveučilištu, a koji bi potencijalno implicirali da je Kolumbić organizator koji je tu grupu sveučilištaraca nastojao usmjeravati u skladu s drugim političkim gibanjima i eventualnim djelovanjem drugih skupina. No i tijekom tog iskaza Kolumbić je zadržao suzdržanost odbijajući govoriti o tuđim mišljenjima i motivima i držeći se ranijeg dijela iskaza o povezanosti sa studentima isključivo u obrazovne svrhe.

U nastavku saslušanja 7. kolovoza 1954. riječ je bila o Kolumbićevo poznanstvu s Danom Dragojevićem. Tom je prilikom Kolumbić ispričao da je prema njegovu sjećanju Dragojević k njemu dolazio četiri puta. Između ostalog, došao je posuditi knjige koje su mu trebale za referat o Stjepanu Radiću. Drugom je prilikom došao u pratnji Nikole Curića, a u Kolumbićevo su dom svratili profesor Tabor Gaston i dominikanac

that he met for the first time at Valjalo's place and most of them were his former students. He insisted that his only intention was to inform them about the social developments in the city.<sup>142</sup>

A number of topics were tackled during this particular interrogation. The investigator first focused on Kolumbić's understanding of Croatian national consciousness and, in this context, the prestige of the Catholic Church among the Croatian people and his criticism of those to whom their Yugoslav affiliation was more important than their Croatian affiliation. Later during the interrogation, Kolumbić was presented with some Đenero's allegations the obvious intention of which was to prove Kolumbić's "nationalistic" – and thus alleged anti-Serb and anti-Yugoslav – views. Đenero's allegations that were particularly incriminating for Kolumbić were the ones concerning his alleged discussions with the students about the political situation at the university because these could potentially implicate him as an organizer trying to steer them towards certain political developments and activities of other groups. But Kolumbić showed restraint once again, refusing to comment on other people's opinions and motivations and sticking to his earlier statement that he had maintained contact with the students for educational purposes only.

The interrogation that took place on 7 August 1954 was focused on Kolumbić's acquaintance with Dane Dragojević. As he recalled, Dragojević came to his place four times, among other reasons, to borrow the books on Stjepan Radić that he needed for his paper. The second time he came to him he was accompanied by Nikola Curić. Professor Gaston Tabor and Dominican friar Jordan Kuničić also happened to drop by.<sup>143</sup> The visit took place on Easter 1954, as Kolumbić confirmed in his 11 August testimony (while denying Dragojević's version of the conversation that took place then).<sup>144</sup> Kolumbić claims that no political subjects were discussed during those visits. He said that Ivo Petković, former headmaster of the boarding-school for students

<sup>142</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 5. 8. 1954.

<sup>142</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 5 August 1954.

<sup>143</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 7 August 1954.

<sup>144</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 11 August 1954.



Jordan Kuničić.<sup>143</sup> Riječ je o posjetu do kojeg je došlo na Uskrs 1954., što je Kolumbić potvrdio u izjavi od 11. kolovoza iako je tom prilikom demantirao Dragojevićeve navode o dijelu razgovora koji je tada navodno vođen.<sup>144</sup> Kolumbić navodi da tijekom tih susreta nije bilo razgovora o političkim temama. Naveo je da ga je u svibnju 1954. s Dragojevićem upoznao Ivo Petković, bivši upravitelj internata za učenike u privredi, koji ga je upozorio da Dragojeviću prijete nedovoljna ocjena iz matematike zbog čega ga je zamolio da mu pomogne naći nekoga tko bi mu mogao davati instrukcije. Kolumbić je Dragojevića povezo s profesorom Cvjetkovićem koji je pristao dati mu nekoliko sati besplatnih instrukcija.<sup>145</sup> Razlozi UDBA-ina zanimanja za to poznanstvo otkrit će se tijekom narednog saslušanja.

Do tog je saslušanja došlo već 9. kolovoza 1954. godine. Tom je prilikom isljednika UDBA-e naročito zanimao Kolumbićev komentar na navode Dane Dragojevića. Dragojević je naveo da je u školi napisao zadaću o Prvom srpskom ustanku zbog čega je vjerovao da je došao u sukob s profesorom Jovanom Krivokućom, „jer je i sam on Srbin“. Dragojević se pobojavao da bi mu se Krivokuća mogao pokušati osvetiti preko supruge koja mu je predavala matematiku, a iz koje je on ionako imao lošu ocjenu. Stoga se obratio Ivi Petkoviću zatraživši pomoć. On ga je predstavio Kolumbiću kojem je objasnio situaciju u kojoj se zatekao nakon pisanja zadaće. U svom odgovoru Kolumbić se ispravio da je Dragojevića upoznao ranije, odnosno u travnju 1954., ali se nije sjećao da je s njim uopće razgovarao o navedenoj zadaći, nego je, štoviše, vjerovao da mu je to istom prilikom zapravo spomenuo Petković. Kolumbić je opovrgnuo da je pred Dragojevićem govorio da se „kod Srba osjećala tendencija da budu jugoslavenski Pijemont i da Hrvate podčine“ te da „Srbi i u Hrvatskoj zauzimaju neka viša mjesta“. Demantirao je i to da je Dragojevićev problem sa spomenutom zadaćom prokomentirao riječima: „Drago mi je da si tako postupio, da je bar netko pokazao zube na velikosrpsku megalomaniju, da se ni jedan hrvatski

of secondary business schools, was the one who introduced him to Dragojević in May 1954. He told him that Dragojević was facing a failing grade in Mathematics and asked him to find someone who could tutor him. Kolumbić then connected him with Professor Cvjetković, who agreed to give a few free private lessons to Dragojević.<sup>145</sup> UDBA's interest in this acquaintance will become clear at the next interrogation.

The next interrogation took place very soon – on 9 August 1954. This time, the investigator was particularly keen to hear Kolumbić's comments on Dragojević's allegations. Dragojević had said that, when he wrote a school homework assignment on the First Serbian Uprising, he believed he provoked Professor Jovan Krivokuća “because he himself is a Serb”. Dragojević was afraid that Krivokuća could have his revenge on him through his wife, who was Dragojević's math teacher (and Dragojević had already had bad grades in her class). This is why he approached Ivo Petković and asked him for help. When Petković introduced him to Kolumbić, he explained to him the predicament he had ended up in because of his assignment. When explaining this, Kolumbić said that he now remembered he had met Dragojević somewhat earlier, in April 1954. However, he did not remember that he discussed the homework assignment with him; on the contrary, he believed that it was Petković who told him about it at that occasion. Kolumbić denied that he told Dragojević that “the Serbs have a tendency to become a Yugoslav Piedmont and to subdue the Croats” and that “the Serbs occupy some high-level positions in Croatia”. He also denied that he commented Dragojević's homework assignment problem by saying: “I'm glad that you reacted this way and that someone finally showed teeth at the Greater-Serbian megalomania; no Croatian historiographic event or figure are ever celebrated or homework assignments about them are ever given” and “We are being presented as a people without a past and everything Serbian is glorified excessively”. Kolumbić said that most of this allegation was a fabrication, although it was true that he had said that important events from Croatian history were insufficiently covered in schools. At the end of this interrogation, the UDBA investigator quoted Dragojević's claim that, in the book on Radić he had borrowed from Kolumbić, the lines in which it is said that Radić accepted Yugoslav affiliation were crossed out. Kolumbić

<sup>143</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 7. 8. 1954.

<sup>144</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 11. 8. 1954.

<sup>145</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 7. 8. 1954.

<sup>145</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 7 August 1954.

historiografski događaj ili ličnost ne slavi i ne pišu se o njima zadaće“, odnosno „da nas se prikazuje kao narod bez prošlosti, a sve se srpsko preuveličava“. Kolumbić je istaknuo da je veći dio navoda izmišljotina iako stoji njegova primjedba da se nedovoljno uči o važnijim događajima iz hrvatske povijesti. Na kraju tog saslušanja isljednik UDBA-e naveo je Dragojevićev osvrt na literaturu koju je posudio od Kolumbića, a u kojoj su navodno bili precrtani dijelovi koji su se odnosili na Radićevo prihvaćanje jugoslavenstva. Kolumbić je odgovorio da vjeruje da nije bila riječ o precrtavanju, nego da su neki odlomci bili podvučeni.<sup>146</sup> Dakle, tijekom tog saslušanja naglasak je opet bio na Kolumbićevu odbijanju velikosrpstva i jugoslavenstva te težnji da u hrvatskim školama učenici što više uče o događajima iz hrvatske povijesti. Iz Kolumbićeva dosjea ne može se doznati o čemu je točno pisao Dragojević, odnosno kakav je stav zauzeo prema Prvom srpskom ustanku kojem je UDBA posvetila veću pozornost.

Istog dana, dakle 9. kolovoza 1954., UDBA za Dubrovnik dostavila je Državnom sekretarijatu za unutrašnje poslove NRH, odnosno II. Odjeljenju UDBA-e u Zagrebu novu obavijest o tijeku istrage protiv Frana Kolumbića i drugih. Dopis je potpisao načelnik Oponomoćstva dubrovačke UDBA-e Mijo Rilje, a dokument je iznimno vrijedan izvor, posebno zbog činjenice da u Kolumbićevu dosjeu nisu sačuvani zapisnici sa saslušanja drugih uhićenika kao ni izjave svjedoka. Zbog toga se ovdje taj dokument donosi u cijelosti:<sup>147</sup>

„U vezi Vaše depeše br. 1410 od 5. VIII. 1954. godine dostavljamo Vam izvještaj o dosadašnjim rezultatima istrage nad grupom KOLUMBIĆ ing. FRANA.

U dosadašnjoj istrazi je potvrđena istinitosti iskaza DJENERO IVA u svim bitnim stvarima. Utvrđeno je, da nisu postojale grupe sa svim karakteristikama organizacije, ali su postojale grupice istomišljenika, koji su se gotovo svakodnevno sastajali i vodili razgovore o pojedinim političkim problemima. Tako su međusobno razgovarali o stvaranju samostalne Hrvatske u njenim 'etničkim' granicama, naime koja bi obuhvatila područje NRH i NR Bosne i Hercegovine. Prepričavali su sadržaj govora Branka

said that he believed they were not crossed out but merely underlined.<sup>146</sup> Obviously, during this interrogation, the focus was once again on Kolumbić's rejection of Serbian chauvinism and Yugoslav affiliation and his aspiration that more events from Croatian history be included in the curricula of Croatian schools. As the Kolumbić file does not include details about Dragojević's homework assignment, we know nothing about his exact attitude towards the First Serbian Uprising, that was of UDBA's interest.

That same day, on 9 August 1954, the UDBA division for Dubrovnik sent to the State Secretariat of Interior of the People's Republic of Croatia and UDBA's Second Division in Zagreb another notification about the ongoing investigation of Frano Kolumbić and others. The letter, signed by head of UDBA Dubrovnik Mijo Rilje, is a valuable source, particularly because the Kolumbić file contains no minutes of interrogations of other persons arrested or witness testimonies. This is why this document is quoted here in its entirety:<sup>147</sup>

“As regards your communication no. 1410 of 5 August 1954, we are submitting to you the report on the results obtained so far in the investigation of the FRANO KOLUMBIĆ group.

The ongoing investigation has confirmed that IVO DJENERO's testimony can be seen as competent evidence in all relevant aspects. It was established that, while there were no groups that could be characterized as organizations, there were small groups of like-minded persons who would meet almost on a daily basis and discuss political problems. For instance, they discussed the creation of an independent Croatia within its 'ethnic boundaries', comprising the territories of People's Republic of Croatia and People's republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina. They commented on Branko Jelić's speech and talked about high-school students from families with Ustasha leanings or those whose family members had been prosecuted by the People's Government and discussed how to win them over and educate them in the spirit of nationalism. They also talked about how Serbs had infiltrated Croatian regions such as Gulf of Kotor etc. and thus Serbianized them. They were reading and spreading Ustasha literature and talking about the necessity of ideological education and learning the Croatian

<sup>146</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 9. 8. 1954.

<sup>147</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Dopis UDB-e za Dubrovnik, 9. 8. 1954.

<sup>146</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 9 August 1954.

<sup>147</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, letter of UDBA's Dubrovnik division, 9 August 1954.

Jelića, diskutovali o pojedinim srednjoškolicima iz ustaških porodica ili porodica čiji je član progonjen od Narodnih vlasti, te pridobijanju tih mladića i odgajanju u nacionalističkom duhu. Govorili su međusobno dalje o infiltraciji Srba u Hrvatske krajeve i time vršenje srbizacije hrvatskih pokrajina, kao Boke Kotorske itd. Međusobno su širili i čitali ustašku literaturu, govorili o potrebi ideološke izgradnje i upoznavanja istorije hrvatskog naroda, naglašavali su da treba izbjegavati otvorene akcije koje bi mogle izazivati reakciju vlasti, nego se treba međusobno povezivati i ideološki izgrađivati. Po povratku sa izdržavanja kazne bivših HOP-ovaca, ta aktivnost je bila nešto intenzivnija. U dosadašnjoj istrazi nastao je prelom kod svih uhapšenika osim kod Kolumbić ing. Frana, te je istraga dobrim djelom pri završetku. Preko pojedinaca utvrđeno je da su od aktivnijih u Dubrovniku bili Katić Ivo, seljak iz Plata, ranije suđen kao pripadnik HOP-a, Bjele Vlaho, bivši zastavnik, suđen također kao HOP-ovac, Radica Joško, student, bio suđen kao HOP-ovac<sup>148</sup>, te uz njih još nekolicina manje aktivnih.

KOLUMBIĆ ing. FRANO, profesor na pom. Tehnikumu u Dubrovniku, pristaša HSS-a, a jedno vrijeme predsjednik gradske organizacije u Dubrovniku. U toku istrage priznao je veze sa svim licima, koje je Djenero naveo u svom zapisniku, otkrivajući još dvojicu i to: Dragojević Danu, svršenog maturanta gimnazije koji je povodom pisanja na temu 'Prvi srpski ustanak' usprotivio se, zašto da se u Hrvatskoj uči i piše o srpskom ustanku i svršenog maturanta Curića, koji mu je govorio o sukobu između profesora i đaka na maturlnoj zabavi. Obrazlažući te svoje veze navodi da se je on sa njima najčešće slučajno sreo i razgovarao o uspjesima, podvlačio im da trebaju čitati literaturu iz istorije hrvatskog naroda, pa im među ostalim preporučio i 'Južnoslavensko pitanje' od Südlanda. Priznao je da je iz svoje knjižnice davao Valjalu Miši neke knjige, kao: 'Hrvatstvo bosansko-hercegovačkih muslimana i stari Dubrovčani' kao i još neke brošure čiji se naziva ne sjeća. Priznao je da se je na Božić 1952. ili 53. godine našao u stanu Valjala Miše sa grupom omladinaca, kojima je među ostalim rekao: 'Sjećam se kako 1923. godine, kada sam ja stigao u Dubrovnik nije bilo mnogo akademske mladeži, a i ono malo nije se deklariralo Hrvatima, a sada vidim da se je raščistilo sa polutanstvom i da omladina nacionalno osjeća.' Tom prilikom su ovi omladinci

history. They pointed out that the right course of action was to strengthen mutual contacts and ideological education, while avoiding direct action that could trigger reaction of the authorities. These activities were intensified after former Hop members had been released from prison. All the arrested except Frano Kolumbić have made their confessions, which is why the investigation is almost finished. Based on the confessions of some individuals, it is clear that the most active in Dubrovnik area were Ivo Katić, a peasant from Plat, Vlaho Bjele, former ensign, and Joško Radica, student, all of whom had been tried as former HOP members.<sup>148</sup> There were a few others, who were somewhat less active.

KOLUMBIĆ, FRANO, professor at Technical School in Dubrovnik, HSS supporter, former president of HSS Dubrovnik chapter. During the investigation he admitted having contacts with all the persons mentioned by Djenero in his testimony and named two more names: Dane Dragojević, gymnasium graduate who, when assigned to write about the *First Serbian Uprising* for his homework, complained about having to learn and write about Serbian uprisings in Croatian schools; and Curić, gymnasium graduate who told him about the altercation between professors and high-school students that took place at a prom night. Explaining these connections, he claims that his encounters with them were mostly accidental. He would ask them about their achievements and tell them about importance of reading literature on Croatian history. Among other things, he recommended them to read *South Slavic Question* by Südland. He admitted that he lent several books from his private collection to Mišo Valjalo. He also gave him *Croatian Origin of Bosnian Moslems and Citizens of the Republic of Ragusa* and some other brochures the titles of which he could not remember. He also admitted that, on Christmas Day 1952 or 1953, he was in Valjalo's apartment together with a group of young people and that he told them (among other things): 'I remember, back in 1923, when I came to Dubrovnik, there were very few young people with university degrees there and that none of them declared themselves as Croats. Nowadays, however, I can see that the custom of declaring oneself as being of mixed ethnicity has been abandoned and that young people have reassumed their ethnic identity again.' At the occasion, these young people sang Croatian patriotic songs. He admitted that, one Sunday in autumn 1953, Ivo Djenero, Mišo Valjalo, Augustin Franić and Pero Pohović<sup>149</sup> visited him at his invitation. However, he

<sup>148</sup> Riječ je o suđenju u srpnju 1947. kada su uz Radicu također osuđeni Augustin Franić i drugi. Jonjić 2007: 16.

<sup>148</sup> A reference to the 1947 trial, when Joško Radica was sentenced together with Augustin Franić and others. Jonjić 2007: 16.

<sup>149</sup> Other documents in the Kolumbić file mention him as Poković.



pjevali hrvatske budnice. Priznao je, da su ga na njegov poziv posjetili jedne nedjelje u jesen 1953. godine Djenero Ivo, Valjalo Mišo, Franić Augustin i Pohović<sup>149</sup> Pero. Razgovore koje je naveo Djenero u svom zapisniku ne priznaje u cijelosti. Potvrdio je razgovor o Šubašiću, o Košutiću i njegovoj posjeti 1953. godine, dok ostale razgovore koje je naveo Djenero ne priznaje. Navodi da im je pripovijedao kako HSS nije bila u stanju 1926. godine sastaviti listu za općinske izbore, jer su ljudi bili 'Orjunaši', a kako je od toga vremena Hrvatska svijest prevladala, te da i danas stoji stvar u Dubrovniku sasvim drugačija nego onih godina. Navodi nadalje, da se je kod pojedinih studenata interesirao o političkom životu na sveučilištu, govoreći im o polit. borbama u vrijeme njegovog studiranja. U danju odgovora na postavljena pitanja izbjegava govorenje imena, braneći se da mu je memorija popustila i da se ne može sjetiti što je sa kime razgovarao. Kada mu se konkretno pročitao navod iz zapisnika bilo kojeg uhapšenika, u odgovoru dozvoljava mogućnost da je tako bilo, ali se on točno ne može sjetiti. U navodima iz kojih izbija šovinistički stav, daje kategoriske odgovore, da to tako nije bilo. Tako je na istrazi izjavio Žuvela, kada je predstavljen Kolumbiću po povratku iz KPD-a, da mu je ovaj odgovorio 'A to je taj naš Žuvela'. Kolumbić kategorički tvrdi da nije rekao 'naš'. Ma da on sve stvari ne priznaje, ali se iz izjava ostalih uhapšenika utvrđuje istinitost Djenerovih navoda, a u nekim stvarima materijali i proširuju.

VALJALO MIŠE, student prava, rođen 1932. godine u Dubrovniku. Porodica Valjala je u kumovskim vezama sa porodicom Kolumbić, te ju je ovaj posljednji često posjećivao, a i davao repeticije Miši i njegovoj sestri. Tim posjetama Kolumbić je vršio jako utjecaj na nacionalistički odgoj Valjala, govoreći mu o Anti Starčeviću, HSS-u, o političkim zbivanjima u novijoj našoj prošlosti itd. Taj utjecaj pomogao je Valjalu da se aktivira u neprijateljskom radu nakon poznanstva sa Djenerom. Djenero ga je uveo u društvo Pavlović Damjana, Franić Augustina, Macan Trpimira, a i ostalih koji se spominju u Djenerinu zapisniku. Prilikom njihovih sastanaka razgovori su vođeni u nacionalističkom duhu, govorilo se o potrebi ideološke izgradnje, pa su u tom smislu tražili i čitali literaturu ustaških pisaca. On navodi da je od Kolumbića dobivao neke knjige i brošure, od Djenera 'Hrvatske smotre'. Izjavljuje dalje, da je i Franiću davao na čitanje takove knjige, a od Franića dobivao dru-

does not admit all of the allegations from Djenero's interrogation. He confirms the conversations about Šubašić and Košutić and his 1953 visit, but denies other conversations mentioned by Djenero. He says that he told them about HSS's failure to come up with their slate for the 1926 local election because local people supported ORJUNA but that the Croatian national sentiment had prevailed since and that the current situation in Dubrovnik is much different than in those days. He also says that he discussed political life at the university with some students and that he told them about the political struggles in the days when he was student. When answering the questions, he avoids giving names, claiming that his memory does not serve him well and that he cannot remember what exactly did he talk with each of them. When confronted with quotes from the testimonies of other members of the arrested group, he allows the possibility that it was so, but that he does not remember well. When confronted with chauvinist-sounding quotes, he categorically denies that he ever said that. For example, Žuvela testifies that, when he was introduced to Kolumbić upon releasing from prison, Kolumbić said: 'So, this is our Žuvela.' Kolumbić categorically denies that he said 'our'. Despite his denials, it is evident from the testimonies of other arrested persons that Djenero's claims are true. Some of these testimonies are even more extensive than Djenero's.

VALJALO MIŠE, law student, born in Dubrovnik in 1932. The Valjalo family were confirmation sponsors of Kolumbić's daughter and he visited them often. He was also giving private lessons to Mišo and his sister. During these visits, Kolumbić exerted a strong nationalist influence on Valjalo by telling him about Ante Starčević, HSS, political developments in our recent past etc. This influence encouraged Valjalo to become involved in subversive activities after making acquaintance with Djenero. Djenero introduced him to Damjan Pavlović, Augustin Franić, Trpimir Macan and others mentioned in Djenero's testimonies. Their conversations were in a spirit of nationalism; underlining the importance of ideological education, they shared and read the books by Ustasha-leaning authors. He claims that Kolumbić gave him some books and brochures and that Djenero gave him copies of *Hrvatska smotra* review. He says that he himself gave Franić such books. In return, Franić gave him books, too. He admits that, at Christmas time, he and some other students would visit Ustasha-leaning families and families hostile to the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia (FNRY) and that they would sing patriotic songs such as *U boj, u boj*, *Oj, ti vilo, vilo Velebita*, *Još Hrvatska nij propala*, *Glasna, jasna* etc. He admitted having participated in the discussions on winning younger generations over to nationalist ideology, on infiltration of Serbs into Croatian regions, and on the reduction of

<sup>149</sup> U drugim spisima u Kolumbićevu dosjeu upisano kao Poković.

ge. Priznaje da je sa grupom studenata posjećivao prilikom božićnih praznika kuće ustaških porodica i porodica koje se neprijateljski odnose prema FNRJ, te su tom prilikom pjevane pjesme 'U boj, u boj', 'Oj, ti vilo, vilo Velebita', 'Još Hrvatska nij propala', 'Glasna, jasna' itd. Priznao je razgovore o privlačenju mladih u svoj krug, radi odgajanja u nacionalističkom duhu, o infiltriranju Srba u Hrvatske krajeve, govorilo se o Boki i Hrvatskom življu, koje je tamo bilo u većini, a sada ga skoro i nema. Govorili su o istrebljenju Hrvata u etničkim čistim hrvatskim krajevima, o uspostavljanju samostalne Hrvatske tokom trećeg rata, koja će tada obuhvaćati Hrvatsku, Bosnu i Hercegovinu, Boku i Istru. U svom zapisniku je potvrdio gotovo sve iskaze Djenera, ali se brani da je inicijator aktivnosti i pokretač svih diskusija bio Djenero. U zapisnicima je naveo i sva lica koja su učestvovala u razgovorima i posjetama prilikom božićnih blagdana, a također i lica koja su posjetili.

MACAN TRPIMIR, student povijesti, sin je bivšeg učitelja klero-fašiste, koji je kao takav nabavljao gotovo svu ustašku i klerikalnu literaturu ranije, a i danas je sačuvao u svojoj knjižnici. Macan je priznao svoje prisustvo razgovorima navedenim u rezimeu Valjala Miše. Priznao je nadalje, da je iz knjižnice svoga oca davao na čitanje knjige licima s kojima se je družio. U zapisnik je naveo da je davao slijedeće knjige: Mijo Bzik – 'Ustaška borba' i 'Ustaška pobjeda', Seitz 'Hrvatska u borbi', 'Junaštvo srbijanske vojske', 'Poglavnik govori', 'Usmene novine', zbirku govora Budaka, Sušića, Čovića, Bonefačića i drugih. Naveo je da je od Djenera dobio tri primjerka 'Hrvatske smotre' izdanje 1941. godine, koje je u tom krugu kolalo. Prilikom pretresa pronađen je u njegovom stanu u rukopisu njegov članak pisan u ekstremnom nacionalističkom duhu.

FRANIĆ AUGUSTIN, student ekonomije, bio je suđen kao pripadnik grupe HOP-a i vratio se 1952. godine sa izdržavanja kazne. U prvo vrijeme bio je povučen, a kasnije dolazi u kontakt sa Djenerom i on ga uvodi u svoju grupu, te učestvuje u razgovorima i posjetama nekih porodica prilikom božićnih blagdana. Priznao je da je iz Zagreba donio jedan primjerak govora Branka Jelića održanog u Minhenu povodom 12-godišnjice NDH-a. Taj govor da je dao Žuveli na čitanje, a potom ga spalio. Navode Djenera Ive i Valjala Miše priznaje.

ŽUVELA PETAR, bio je suđen kao HOP-ovac i iz KPD-a došao početkom decembra 1953. godine. Priznao je sve navode iz zapisnika Djenero Iva upotpunjavajući priznanjem da je od Franić Augustina dobio na čitanje letak od Branka Jelića. U ostalom zapisniku naveo je lica za koja

the Croat population in Gulf of Kotor from majority to small minority. They also conversed about the uprooting of Croats from the once ethnically pure Croatian regions, and on the creation of an independent Croatia in the next war that would comprise Croatia, Bosnia–Herzegovina, Gulf of Kotor and Istria. In his testimony he confirmed almost all Djenero's allegations but, in his defense, he says that it was Djenero who initiated all activities and discussions. He also gave the names of all persons who participated in these Christmas visits and discussions, as well as the persons who they themselves visited.

MACAN, TRPIMIR, history student, son of former clerical-fascist teacher. As such, he provided all the Ustasha and clerical literature, which he still keeps in his private library. Macan admitted his participation in the conversations mentioned in Mišo Valjalo's testimony. He also admitted lending his father's books to the persons he associated with, specifically: *Ustaška borba* and *Ustaška pobjeda* by Mijo Bzik, *Hrvatska u borbi*, *Junaštvo srbijanske vojske*, *Poglavnik govori* and *Usmene novine* by Seitz, as well as collected speeches by Budak, Sušić, Čović, Bonefačić and others. He said that he received three copies of *Hrvatska smotra* (edition 1941) by Djenero and that this review had been circulating among them. When his apartment was searched, his manuscript imbued with extreme nationalism was found.

FRANIĆ, AUGUSTIN, student of economy, sentenced for membership in HOP; released from prison in 1952. Inactive at first, then meets Djenero who introduces him to his circle. Participates in Christmas visits to some families and in the discussions there. He admits that he brought from Zagreb a copy of Branko Jelić's speech held in Munich on the 12th anniversary of the Independent State of Croatia. He first gave the speech to Žuvela to read and then he burnt it. He confirms Ivo Djenero's and Mišo Valjalo's allegations.

ŽUVELA, PETAR, sentenced for membership in HOP; released from prison in early December 1953. He admitted to all allegations from Ivo Djenero's testimony, adding that he had been given a Branko Jelić's leaflet by Augustin Franić. He also gave the names of the persons known to him as having taken part in the abovementioned discussions.

PAVLOVIĆ, DAMJAN, civil servant, sentenced to four years in prison for membership in HOP. Tough at the onset of the investigation, but recently broke down and started to talk. Has confirmed Ivo Djenero's allegations but is trying to present the whole thing as harmless and naïve. He admits that he received and read *Ustaška borba* and *Hrvatska smotra*. His investigation is at an early stage.

Most of the persons visited by them during Christmas holidays have Ustasha leanings. For instance, the family of Miljenko Crnjak, former

je znao da su učestvovala u ranije spomenutim razgovorima.

PAVLOVIĆ DAMJAN, namještenik, bio suđen kao HOP-ovac četiri godine. U početku je na istrazi bio tvrd, ali je posljednjih dana i kod njega došlo do preloma, te je počeo pričati. U dosadašnjim priznanjima potvrđuje iskaze Djenera Iva, mada nastoji sve to prikazati kao naivnu i bezazlenu stvar. Priznaje da je dobio i čitao 'Ustašku borbu' i 'Hrvatsku smotru'. Nad njime je istraga u početnoj fazi.

Osobe koje su posjetili prilikom božićnih blagdana su mahom ustaški elementi. Tako su posjetili porodicu Miljenka Crnjak, ranije pripadnika ustaških jedinica, koji je bio u KPD 6 i pol godina, Tutman Antu, koji je bio suđen kao pripadnik HOP-a i nedavno se vratio sa izdržavanja kazne, Žuvelu Petra, bivšeg HOP-ovca i sada uhapšenog, Franić Augustina, bivšeg HOP-ovca i sada uhapšenog, Skaramuca Djuru i sada neprekidno u društvu Crnjak Miljenka, inače ustaški elemenat, kod svećenika Gugića, proustaškog elementa, učitelja Katić Marka, poznatog u Dubrovniku kao veliko-Hrvata, Kerner Srećka, fotografa, ustaškog elementa, koji se i danas ističe neprijateljski, povezuje sa strancima, a bio je i na izdržavanju kazne, kod Dabrović Ivica, koji pripada poznatoj porodici Dabrovića u Dubrovniku. Ranije su bili HSS-ovci, ali se sada ističu kao nacionalisti. Pored ovih posjetili su i porodicu gotovo svih studenata sa kojima su se družili.

Rezimirajući na kraju rezultate istrage, utvrdili smo, da su u Dubrovniku postojale grupe studenata međusobno povezanih, čiji se je rad sastojao u širenju šovinističkih osjećaja kod omladine. Mi smo i ranije preko agenture imali signala da se među omladinom osjeća nacionalistički duh, a i vidilo smo po pasivnosti omladinskih organizacija, da stanje kod omladine nije u redu. Obzirom da su oni bili oprezni, jer su u svojim krugovima imali ljude već ranije hapšenih, nismo uspjeli unjedriti saradnike. Ovom istragom smo u priličnoj mjeri raščistili situaciju i otkrili uglavnom aktivnije omladince. Pred nas se postavlja da istragom nad još nekima u potpunosti razjasnimo situaciju u Dubrovniku. Iz iskaza Franić Augustina, vidljivo je da je Radica Joško još za vrijeme izdržavanja kazne pao pod utjecaj Dr. Srdjana Markovića. Vama je poznato da se Marković nalazi pod razradom radi stvaranja neke organizacije u Rijeci. Mi raspoložemo agenturnim materijalima iz kojih se vidi, da je Grabušić Darko pričao saradniku UDB-e za grad Zagreb 'Viktoru' o postojanju organizacije u Dubrovniku i održavanju nekog kongresa tih omladinaca u Zagrebu. Tokom istrage utvrdilo se je, da je postojala i grupa oko Radice i Kačića, koju su prvi smatrali pomirljivijom, pa se na

Ustasha, who spent six and a half years in prison; Ante Tutman, sentenced for membership in HOP and recently released from prison; Petar Žuvela, former member of HOP, now arrested; Augustin Franić, former member of HOP, now arrested; Djuro Skaramuca, still regularly in company of Miljenko Crnjak, with Ustasha leanings; priest Gugić, with Ustasha leanings; teacher Marko Katić, known in Dubrovnik as Croatian chauvinist; Srećko Kerner, photographer with Ustasha leanings, still with hostile attitude, in touch with foreigners, also served time; Ivica Dabrović of the Dabrović family, well-known in Dubrovnik, formerly HSS and now nationalists. Besides these persons, they also visited the families of almost every student they were friends with.

When summing up the results of the investigation, we realized that there were small interconnected groups of students in Dubrovnik who had been spreading chauvinist ideas among young people. We had already been warned by our agents about the growing nationalist spirit among the local youth; the passive attitude of the local youth organizations had also contributed to this. The members of these groups were very cautious because some of them had served time, so it was not possible to plant informers in their ranks. However, owing to this investigation, the situation in Dubrovnik has been cleared up significantly. To clear it up completely, we need to investigate a few more individuals. Augustin Franić's testimony indicates that Joško Radica came under the influence of Dr. Srdjan Marković while serving time. As you know, Marković is currently under investigation for setting up an organization in Rijeka. 'Viktor', UDBA's informer in Zagreb, reported that Darko Grabušić had told him about a Dubrovnik-based organization and a congress that these young people had organized in Zagreb. The investigation established that there was also a group led by Radica and Kačić. This latter group was considered more conciliatory by the former group, which is why it is possible that the latter might be under Marković's influence. It was also established that Joško Radica, Vlaho Bjele (former member of HOP), Damjan Pavlović, Stefi Vojvodić and his brother Drago made frequent visits to Ivan Katić in Župa Dubrovačka. There they had the earlier-mentioned discussions. On one occasion, Katić asked Žuvela if Radica had arrived because he was to bring important messages from Zagreb to him.

Based on these reports and in order to establish facts about Srdjan Marković's organization, we intend to arrest Joško Radica, Vlaho Bjele and Ivan Katić. We discussed this with the public prosecutor and obtained his consent. When the investigation of those arrested is over, we intend to interrogate other persons. We will do so without arresting



osnovu ovoga postavlja sumnja, nisu li oni pod utjecajem Markovića. Istragom je također utvrđeno da su kod Katić Ivana u Dubrovačku Župu često odlazili Radica, Bjele Vlaho, bivši HOP-ovac, Pavlović Damjan, Vojvodić Stefi i njegov brat Drago. Tim prilikama vodili su se razgovori već ranije citirani, a jednom prilikom je se Katić interesirao kod Žuvele da li je stigao Radica, jer mu ima donijeti važne poruke iz Zagreba.

Na osnovu tih materijala, a i radi provjeravanja podataka o organizaciji Srdjana Markovića, namjeravamo izvršiti hapšenje još Radice Joška, Bjele Vlahe i Katić Ivana. O tome smo razgovarali sa Javnim Tužiocem i dobili njegovu suglasnost. Ostala lica namjeravamo nakon završene istrage nad uhapšenima saslušavati iz slobode, ukoliko se ne bi dobili materijali, koji bi zahtijevali hapšenje. Iz razgovora s Tužiocem i sekretarom komiteta vidi se potreba, da se ovaj proces iskoristi za oštiri napad na šovinističke elemente u Dubrovniku. O toku istrage i daljnjim rezultatima ćemo Vas obavijestiti.

Molimo, za Vašu suglasnost u vezi hapšenja Radice, Katića i Bjele.“

Kako je vidljivo iz tog dokumenta, Kolumbićevi su navodi sažeti, uz isticanje nekoliko onih koji su trebali potkrijepiti tezu o njegovim navodnim nastojanjima da širi „nacionalističku misao“ uz iskazivanje negativnih osjećaja prema velikosrpstvu, orjunaštvu i jugoslavenstvu. Sažetci iskaza drugih okrivljenika potvrđuju da su njihovi glavni „zločini“ bili čitanje „neprijateljske“ literature i pjevanje hrvatskih pjesama iz 19. stoljeća, a takvim se argumentima nastojalo potvrditi tezu o hrvatskom nacionalizmu i navodnom šovinizmu te skupine. Osim razgovora i kritiziranja pojedinih događaja u Jugoslaviji, prikupljeni iskazi nisu otkrivali nikakve druge aktivnosti te grupe što potvrđuje uvodni dio citiranog dopisa u kojem se izričito ističe da riječ nije bila o organizaciji, nego „grupicama istomišljenika“ koji su se sastajali i razgovarali u svrhu „ideološke izgradnje“.

Sudeći prema dostupnim dokumentima, uhićenoj je šestorki doista određen istražni zatvor i pokrenuta je istraga. Na takvu su odluku žalbe uložili Macan, Franić, Pavlović i Žuvela, no njihov je prigovor na sjednici održanoj 11. kolovoza 1954. odbilo Vijeće Okružnog suda u Dubrovniku, na čelu s predsjednikom Jožom Engelom. U sudskom Rješenju ističe se da „iz priznanja okrivljenih i međusobnih terećenja proizlazi da su i pojedinačno i zajedno vodili političke razgovore o političkom i društvenom stanju u FNRJ, a posebno u N.R. Hrvatskoj, da su ocjenjivali položaj Hrvata i potrebu političke preorijentacije Hrvata, a

them, unless evidence requiring otherwise occurs. The prosecutor and the secretary of the Committee are of the opinion that this process be used for intensifying the action against chauvinist elements in Dubrovnik. We will notify you of the future results of the ongoing investigation.

We kindly request your approval for making arrests of Radica, Katić and Bjele.”

This document sums up Kolumbić's testimony and gives the examples of several persons supposed to corroborate the thesis of Kolumbić's alleged spreading of “nationalist views” and manifesting negative feelings about Greater-Serbianism, ORJUNA leanings and Yugoslav affiliation. Summaries of the testimonies of other indicted confirm that their principal “crimes” were reading “subversive” literature and singing Croatian 19th-century patriotic songs. These arguments were supposed to support the thesis about Croatian nationalism and alleged chauvinism of this group. Apart from discussions and criticism of certain developments in Yugoslavia, the testimonies contained no evidence of any other activity of the group. This conclusion is confirmed in the introductory part of the above quoted letter, which expressly says that these individuals were not organized – they were merely “small groups of like-minded persons” getting together in order to discuss “ideological education”.

Judging by the available documents, the six arrested men were detained and an investigation was initiated against them. Macan, Franić, Pavlović and Žuvela filed an appeal against this decision, but the Council of the Dubrovnik District Court presided by Joža Engel rejected their appeal at its session of 11 August 1954. According to the court decision, “it is clear from the testimonies and mutual incriminations of the accused that, individually and jointly, they were discussing political and social conditions in the FNRJ – in the People's Republic of Croatia in particular – and assessing the position of the Croats while underlining the need for a shift of their political focus. They did all this from the position of exclusive Croatian nationalism and chauvinism. They read and shared Ustasha propaganda literature and organized meetings at which Ustasha and chauvinist songs were sung etc.” The court concluded that not all the accused were in the same position, because: “The accused Franić reads and shares the speech of Branko Jelić, well-known Ustasha emigree, which celebrated the former NDH. The accused Pavlović maintains regular contacts with the accused Ivo Djenero and discusses with him and others the raising of awareness of Croatian national consciousness, on the grounds

sve to sa platforme ekskluzivnog šovinističkog hrvatskog nacionalizma i da su čitali ili davali na čitanje ustašku političko-propagandnu literaturu i održavali prigodne sastanke na kojima su se pjevale ustaške i šovinističke pjesme i sl.“ Sud je zaključio da u takvim aktivnostima položaj svakog od okrivljenika nije identičan jer „okrivljeni Franić čita i daje na čitanje govor Branka Jelića, poznatog ustaškog emigranta, u kojem se slavi bivša NDH, okr. Pavlović održava stalnu vezu sa okr. Djenero Ivom, te s njima i sa drugim licima vodi razgovore o podizanju i učvršćivanju hrvatske nacionalne svijesti, jer da je hrvatski narod zapostavljen, s obzirom da su Srbi zauzeli sve važnije položaje, prima na čitanje knjigu ‘Ustaška borba’ i daje isti na poslugu drugim licima, okr. Žuvela u političkim razgovorima razmatra pitanje izdvajanja N.R. Hrvatske u zasebnu državu koja bi obuhvatila uz sadašnji teritorij Hrvatske i teritorij Bosne i Hercegovine.“ Štoviše, „u ovim razgovorima učestvuju više lica, prima na čitanje šovinističku literaturu, a od okr. Franića posebno govor Branka Jelića“. Stoga je sud zaključio da postoji osnovana sumnja o počinjenju inkriminiranih djela, a složenost Franićeva, Pavlovićeva i Žuvelina djelovanja nametnula je potrebu temeljitijeg ispitivanja, odnosno otvaranje istrage. Macanova je žalba odbačena jer je tijekom saslušanja priznao da je kontaktirao s većim brojem osoba u Dubrovniku i Zagrebu te da je davao na čitanje knjige *Ustaška borba*, *Ustaška pobjeda*, *Hrvatska u borbi*, *Junaštvo srbijanske vojske* i *Poglavnik govori*.<sup>150</sup>

### Istraga: kolovoz – studeni 1954.

Tjedan dana kasnije, odnosno 18. kolovoza 1954., Radišić je u ime Okružne istražne grupe obavijestio Okružno javno tužništvo u Dubrovniku da su temeljem prikupljenih podataka 16. kolovoza 1954. uhićeni i pritvoreni Ivan Katić, zemljoradnik iz Župe dubrovačke, Joško Radica, student prava u Zagrebu te Vlaho Bijeje, radnik zaposlen u komunalnom odjelu u Dubrovniku. Zatraženo je otvaranje istrage i istražnog zatvora uz napomenu da je spomenuta trojka ranije bila suđena zbog sudjelovanja u organizaciji HOP-a.<sup>151</sup> U međuvremenu je nastavljen nadzor nad

that the Croatian people have been under-represented because Serbs have occupied all the relevant positions; he borrows the book *Ustaška borba* and lends it to others. When participating in political discussions, the accused Žuvela advocates separation of the People’s Republic of Croatia and creation of an independent state that would include the territory of the present-day Croatia and the territory of Bosnia–Herzegovina.” What is more, “these discussions were led by a number of persons. He borrows chauvinist literature, including Branko Jelić’s speech, which he borrowed from the accused Franić”. The court therefore concluded there was a reasonable suspicion that the acts the accused were charged with had actually been committed and that the complexity of Franić’s, Pavlović’s and Žuvela’s actions required more thorough examination – in other words, initiating an investigation. Macan’s appeal was dismissed on the grounds that, during the interrogation, he had admitted having had contacts with a number of persons in Dubrovnik and Zagreb and lending the books *Ustaška borba*, *Ustaška pobjeda*, *Hrvatska u borbi*, *Junaštvo srbijanske vojske* and *Poglavnik govori*.<sup>150</sup>

### Investigation: August–November 1954

A week later, on 18 August 1954, head of the District Investigative Group Marko Radišić notified the District Public Prosecutor in Dubrovnik that, based on evidence obtained, Ivan Katić, farmer from Župa Dubrovačka, Joško Radica, law student from Zagreb, and Vlaho Bijeje, employee of Dubrovnik utility company, were arrested on 16 August 1954. A request for pre-trial prison and an investigation against the accused was submitted, with a note that the three arrestees had already been sentenced for their membership in HOP.<sup>151</sup> In the meantime, having continued the surveillance of the Kolumbić’s family, UDBA came into possession of his daughter Ksenija’s letter to Zlatan Plenković, a Dominican friar serving in Rijeka.<sup>152</sup> Documents from the subsequent period are missing in the Kolumbić file –

<sup>150</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Rješenje Okružnog suda u Dubrovniku, 11. 8. 1954.

<sup>151</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Dopis Okružne istražne grupe Okružnom javnom tužilstvu, 18. 8. 1954.

<sup>150</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Decision of Dubrovnik District Court, 11 August 1954.

<sup>151</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, letter of District Investigative Group to District Public Prosecutor, 18 August 1954.

<sup>152</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, UDBA Rijeka division’s letter to UDBA Dubrovnik division, 12 August 1954.

Kolumbićevom obitelji pa je tako UDBA došla u posjed pisma njegove kćeri Ksenije upućenog dominikancu Zlatanu Plenkoviću koji se nalazio na službi u Rijeci.<sup>152</sup> U Kolumbićevu dosjeu nedostaju dokumenti iz narednog razdoblja, odnosno sačuvano je svega nekoliko zapisnika sa saslušanja i suočavanja s Ivom Đenerom. Iz dostupnih spisa doznaje se da je 27. studenoga 1954. šef Okružne istražne grupe Marko Radišić obavijestio Okružni sud u Dubrovniku da je završena istraga protiv Kolumbića i ostalih, a sudu je dostavljen ostatak istražnog materijala.<sup>153</sup>

U razdoblju između rujna i kraja studenoga Kolumbić je saslušan odnosno suočavan s drugim osobama još najmanje četiri puta s tim da je posljednje saslušanje bilo dan prije slanja spomenutog dopisa Marka Radišića. Tijekom saslušanja 11. rujna 1954. Kolumbić je iznova upitan o svom poznanstvu s Ivom Petkovićem<sup>154</sup> i susretu u travnju iste godine. Za razliku od prethodnog iskaza, Kolumbić je tijekom ovog saslušanja kazivao da se ne sjeća da mu je Petković govorio o Dragojevićevu problemu sa zadaćom o Prvom srpskom ustanku, nego je inzistirao na tome da je razgovor bio isključivo o instrukcijama iz matematike. Kolumbić je još jednom istaknuo da s Dragojevićem o toj temi također nije razgovarao iako je Petković, koji je u međuvremenu saslušan kao svjedok, tvrdio da je istom prilikom kada je Dragojevića upoznao s Kolumbićem Dragojević prepričavao svoj problem sa zadaćom istaknuvši da „on nije klimavac i da je napisano onako kako misli i osjeća“. Petković je Kolumbića teretio da je istom prilikom Dragojevićev potez okarakterizirao kao pozitivan, što je Kolumbić također opovrgnuo. Upitan o svojim simpatijama prema Dragojeviću, Kolumbić odgovara da prema njemu nije imao nikakvih simpatija zbog njegova „ispada“, nego je riječ isključivo bila o pokušaju da mu pomogne na Petkovićev zahtjev. Osim toga, primijetio je Dragojevićevo siromaštvo, stoga ga je pozvao u goste za Uskrs, naročito jer se Dragojević zanimao za Radića, a govorio je da će u školi pripremiti i predavanje o Antunu Gustavu Matošu.<sup>155</sup>

<sup>152</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Dopis UDB-e za Rijeku upućen UDBA-i za kotar Dubrovnik, 12. 8. 1954.

<sup>153</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Dopis Okružne istražne grupe Okružnom sudu u Dubrovniku, 27. 11. 1954.

<sup>154</sup> Na jednom mjestu u dokumentu pogrešno napisano Cvjetković.

<sup>155</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 11. 9. 1954.

only a few minutes of Ivo Đenero's interrogations and the of the confrontation of the two of them have been preserved. It is evident from the available documents that, on 27 November 1954, head of District Investigative Group Marko Radišić notified the District Court in Dubrovnik that the investigation against Kolumbić and others had been completed and that the remaining investigation documents had been sent to the Court.<sup>153</sup>

Between September and late November, Kolumbić was interrogated and confronted with other persons not less than four times, the last interrogation having taken place the day before the abovementioned Radišić's communication was sent to the Court. During the interrogation of 11 September 1954, Kolumbić was once again asked about his acquaintance with Ivo Petković<sup>154</sup> and their encounter in April that year. Unlike in his earlier testimony, Kolumbić said that he did not recall Petković telling him about Dragojević's problem with his homework assignment on the First Serbian Uprising. He insisted that they only discussed private mathematics lessons. Kolumbić reiterated that he had never discussed this subject with Dragojević. He thus challenged the claim made by Petković – who had been examined as a witness in the meantime – that, when he introduced Dragojević to Kolumbić, the former told to the latter about his homework problem, saying that “he is not a weak person and that he wrote it just the way he thinks and feels”. According to Petković, Kolumbić commended Dragojević's stand. Kolumbić denied this, too. When asked about his sympathy for Dragojević, Kolumbić replied that had not manifested any sympathies towards him because of his “provocation”; he merely tried to help him at Petković's request. He said he also noticed Dragojević's poverty, which is why he invited him to his place for Easter, all the more so because Dragojević had shown his interest in Stjepan Radić and said that he was planning a paper on Antun Gustav Matoš in school.<sup>155</sup>

In the same testimony, Kolumbić confirmed that he was also introduced to Nikola Curić on that occasion and that Curić, together with Dragojević, visited him for Easter. However, he denied Curić's claim that he told that “Catholicism taught us Croats to not be cruel and not

<sup>153</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file letter of District Investigative Group to Dubrovnik District Court, 27 November 1954.

<sup>154</sup> In one place in the document, a wrong name – Cvjetković – is used.

<sup>155</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 11 September 1954.



U istom je iskazu Kolumbić potvrdio poznanstvo s Nikolom Curićem kojeg je upoznao istom prilikom, a on ga je zajedno s Dragojevićem posjetio za Uskrs. Ipak je demantirao Curićeve navode da je pred njim govorio da je „(...) Hrvate katolicizam prevaspitao“ pa ne mogu „biti surovi i služiti se sredstvima kojima su se služili drugi“ te je rekao da je religija u opasnosti, a to nalaže upotrebu „bilo kakovih sredstava u samoobrani“. Nadalje je Kolumbić potvrdio da poznaje Niku Maslaća koji ga je posjetio nekoliko puta, ali da s njime nije vodio nikakve političke razgovore. Suočen s navodima iz Maslaćeve izjave od 7. rujna 1954. da je „(...) Hrvate katolicizam produhovio“ te da nisu „kadri činiti barbarska djela“, Kolumbić je odgovorio da se ne sjeća da je Maslać o tome uopće govorio. Potvrdio je i poznanstvo s Antom Miličićem koji mu je govorio da je izgubio velik dio svoje imovine zbog čega ga je uzdržavao sin koji je radio u inozemstvu. Isljednik UDBA-e pitao je Kolumbića je li tijekom tog razgovora kazao da nema više onog vremena kada su ga „Hrvati na rukama preko Straduna nosili“ i da će doći „ono vrijeme kada će možda ne mene nosit, jer sam ja već starac“, što je Kolumbić demantirao.<sup>156</sup>

Kao i u prethodnim saslušanjima, tijekom davanja citiranog iskaza naglasak isljednika UDBA-e zadržao se na hrvatskim nacionalnim osjećajima i odnosu hrvatstva s katoličanstvom uz ponovljenu raspravu o Dragojevićevoj zadaći u kojoj se nepovoljno izjašnjavao o Prvom srpskom ustanku zbog čega ga je Kolumbić, kako se to ovdje implicira, podupirao. Kolumbić je zadržao prethodni stav o pomaganju studentima i poticanju na što temeljitiju izobrazbu uz nastojanje da pojedine iskaze drugih osumnjičenika odbije objašnjavajući da ih se ne sjeća ili da ih pokuša prezentirati u drugačijem kontekstu.

Naredno saslušanje održano je 15. listopada 1954., a Kolumbić je tom prilikom suočen s navodima Pere Pokovića. Nijekao je Pokovićev navod da je tijekom razgovora s Đenerom govorio o hrvatskim granicama u prošlosti i o sukobima između Srba i Hrvata između dva svjetska rata. Također nije priznao da je istom prilikom navodno rekao „kako ‘naši’ ljudi“, odnosno Hrvati, „ostaju bez posla, a Srbi ga dobivaju odmah i da je sve veći priliv Srba u Dubrovnik“. Nijekao je i da je Đenero pred njim govorio da hrvatska emigracija radi na stvaranju hrvatske države

use the means others have been using”, pointing out that the religion was endangered, which called for “using any possible means in self-defense”. Kolumbić also confirmed that he knew Niko Maslać, who had paid him a visit a few times, but said that he had never had any political conversations with him. Confronted with Maslać’s allegation of 7 September 1954 that he heard Kolumbić say that “us Croats have been refined by Catholicism and are incapable of committing barbaric deeds”, Kolumbić replied that he did not remember Maslać even mentioning that. He also confirmed his acquaintance with Ante Miličić, who told him how he had lost most of his possessions and was now being supported by his son working abroad. The investigator asked Kolumbić to confirm whether he said during that conversation that “the days when the Croats carried me on their shoulders through the streets of Dubrovnik are now gone”, but that “the time will come when they will do it again – well, perhaps they will not carry me, because I’m an old man”. Kolumbić denied this allegation.<sup>156</sup>

As in earlier interrogations, the UDBA investigator was focused on Croatian national sentiments and the relation between Croatian affiliation and Catholicism. Once again, he returned to Dragojević’s homework assignment on the First Serbian Uprising and his negative comments on it, implying that Kolumbić supported him in this. Kolumbić stuck to his earlier statement that he merely tried to help the students and encourage them to receive a thorough education. As for some allegations of the other accused, he tried to refute them either by claiming he did not remember them or by trying to present them in a different context.

The following interrogation took place on 15 October 1954. Kolumbić was then confronted with Pero Poković’s allegations. He denied Poković’s claim that he was talking to Đenero about Croatia’s boundaries in the past and about the Serb–Croat conflicts in the period between the two wars. Also, he would not admit that, on the same occasion, he said that “our people” – meaning Croats – “are losing jobs while Serbs get them at once and that there is a growing influx of Serbs in Dubrovnik”. He also denied Đenero saying that Croatian emigrees had been working on the creation of a Croatian state and him saying to Đenero that “Bosnians are pure Croats”. Kolumbić also denied every other allegation the investigator confronted

<sup>156</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 11. 9. 1954.

<sup>156</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 11 September 1954.

kao i da je on pred Đenerom spominjao da su „bo-sanci čisti Hrvati“. Kolumbić nije priznao ni ostale navode s kojima ga je suočio isljednik UDBA-e, uključujući navodno djelomično slaganje s Đenerovom primjedbom o „iskrivljavanju hrvatskog jezika unošenjem srbizama“ te vlastitu navodnu napomenu da je „dubrovačka akademska omladina nacionalistički orijentirana“. Kolumbić je ostavio mogućom opciju da je doista rekao „da mu je drago da nas vidi na okupu, jer vidi da još ima omladine koja čuva i svetkuje hrvatske katoličke praznike“, iako se toga nije mogao sjetiti. Priznao je da je studentima preporučivao da čitaju Pilarovo djelo *Južnoslavensko pitanje* jer je u njemu analizirana povijest srednjeg istoka, Balkana, migracija i stvaranja država na Balkanu, ali je negirao da im je spominjao i roman *Ognjište* Mile Budaka koji nije pročitao niti ga je imao u svojoj knjižnici.<sup>157</sup> Tijekom tog saslušanja nastojanja isljednika UDBA-e išla su za inkriminirajućim detaljima koji su Kolumbića portretirali kao „velikohrvata“, nastojeći time poduprijeti navode suradnika UDBA-e koji su do istog zaključka došli u agenturnom materijalu iz 1953. godine, kako je ranije prezentirano. Primjetno je da je svojim držanjem Kolumbić nastojao izbjeći bilo kakve detalje koje bi potencijalno inkriminirali druge sudionike tih događaja, pa čak i kad je bila riječ o Đeneru čiji su ga iskazi teretili. Upravo je takvo držanje zapazila i UDBA zbog čega je još u dopisu od 9. kolovoza 1954. istaknuto da je kod svih uhićenika došlo do „preloma“ osim kod Kolumbića.<sup>158</sup>

Narednog dana, 16. listopada 1954. u prostorijama okružnog zatvora u Dubrovniku izvršeno je suočavanje Frana Kolumbića, „okrivljenog“, i Ive Đenera, „svjedoka“, jer je Kolumbić negirao „činjenice iz njihovih međusobnih neprijateljskih razgovora vršenih u cilju neprijateljske propagande protiv državnog uređenja u FNRJ“.<sup>159</sup> Ovdje je potrebno istaknuti da su sačuvana dva zapisnika sa suočavanja s istim nadnevkom. Uz prvi je istaknuto da je suočavanje dovršeno u 12 sati istog dana, a u drugome je navedeno da je to bilo u 11 sati. Možemo pretpostaviti da

him with – like his alleged partial agreement with Đenero's remark about “corruption of Croatian language by introduction of Serbianisms” and his own alleged comment that the “youth with university degrees in Dubrovnik have nationalist leanings”. Kolumbić allowed the possibility that he really said that “he is pleased to see us all gathered here because he realizes there are still young people who nurture and celebrate Croatian Catholic holydays”, although he could not remember it. He admitted having recommended Pilar's book *Južnoslavensko pitanje* to the students because it analyzed the history of the Middle East, Balkans, migrations and creation of states in the Balkans. However, he denied having mentioned Mile Budak's novel *Ognjište*, because he neither had read it nor had it in his library.<sup>157</sup> During this interrogation, the investigator was focused on the incriminating details that portrayed Kolumbić as a “Croatian chauvinist”, trying to support the allegations of UDBA's informers who had come to the same conclusion in their reports in 1953, as presented above. Kolumbić clearly adopted a conduct that would help him avoid any details that might incriminate other participants of these events, even in the case of Đenero, whose allegations had incriminated him. This conduct was not lost on UDBA. In a letter of 9 August 1954, it is said that all those arrested “broke down”, except Kolumbić.<sup>158</sup>

The following day, 16 October 1954, Frano Kolumbić as “the accused” and Ivo Đenero as “a witness” were confronted in the district prison in Dubrovnik. This was done because Kolumbić had denied “the facts from their subversive conversations led as part of their hostile propaganda against the system of government in the FNRJ”.<sup>159</sup> It should be noted that there are two confrontation minutes with the same date. The first minutes specify that the confrontation ended at 12am and the second that it ended at 11am on the same day. Presumably, the first part ended at 11am and, after a short break, was continued until 12am. But if so, what remains unclear is the fact that the note that Kolumbić and Đenero confirmed that they knew each other was

<sup>157</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 15. 10. 1954.

<sup>158</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Dopis UDB-e za Dubrovnik, 9. 8. 1954.

<sup>159</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik o suočavanju s Ivom Đenerom završeno u 11 sati, 16. 10. 1954.

<sup>157</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 15 October 1954.

<sup>158</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, letter of UDBA's Dubrovnik division, 9 August 1954.

<sup>159</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, minutes on confrontation with Ivo Đenero, terminated at 11am, 16 October 1954.

je prvi dio suočavanja završen u 11 sati te je nakon kratke pauze nastavljeno do 12 sati. No, ako je to točno, ostaje ipak nejasno zbog čega je tek u zapisniku o suočavanju koje je okončano u 12 sati evidentirano da su Kolumbić i Đenero potvrdili da se međusobno poznaju s obzirom na to da bi bilo očekivano da bi takvo pitanje bilo postavljeno na početku suočavanja. Moguće je također da je suočavanje započeto prethodnog dana nakon čega je u prijepisu prvog dijela pogreškom upisan datum drugog dijela saslušanja koje je održano 16. listopada 1954. godine. Na ta pitanja nije moguće sa sigurnošću odgovoriti zbog čega će ovdje biti predstavljena oba zapisnika uz navođenje vremena završetka suočavanja u bilješkama.

U prvom i znatno dužem zapisniku sa suočavanja koje je okončano u 12 sati, Đenero je naveo da je Kolumbića upoznao na Stradunu u ljeto 1953. godine, ali se nije mogao sjetiti je li ih upoznao Augustin Franić ili Mišo Valjalo. U rujnu 1953. su on, Valjalo, Franić i Poković posjetili Kolumbića, a zatim su se susreli i u stanu Miše Valjala u zimu 1953./1954. godine. Osim toga su se susreli nekoliko puta na ulici. Kolumbić je na to odgovorio da je prema vlastitom sjećanju Đenera upoznao u stanu Miše Valjala za Božić 1952. što je Đenero opisao kao „nemoguće“ jer se on u to vrijeme nalazio u Ljubljani, dopustivši da ga je Kolumbić zamijenio s Matom Đenerom koji je tom prilikom doista bio prisutan, s čime se Kolumbić složio.<sup>160</sup>

Đenero je upitan o Kolumbićevim pripovijedanjima o posjetima Šubašića i Košutića Dubrovniku na što je odgovorio da je riječ o razgovoru koji se u rujnu 1953. vodio u Kolumbićevu domu, a nazočili su mu Franić, Valjalo i Poković. Tom je prilikom Kolumbić navodno kazivao da je Košutić u ljeto 1952. posjetio Dubrovnik pa su zajedno otišli na Vojnovićev grob. Košutić je primijetio da je grob loše održavan i nedostojan jednog Vojnovića na što mu je Kolumbić odgovorio: „(...) kakav je netko za života takav je poslije smrti“. Franić i Đenero pitali su ga o dočeku koji su dubrovački HSS-ovci priredili Šubašiću kada je 1940. posjetio grad, smatrajući ga „otpadnikom od Hrvatske državne ideje“. Kolumbić im je odgovorio da je Šubašić došao u svojstvu bana zbog čega su ga predstavili kao predstavnika hrvatskog suvereniteta, a ne kao Ivana Šubašića. Šubašić je pred Kolumbićem

entered in this second part of the interrogation – the one that was terminated at 12am. It would be logical that they would have been asked this question at the beginning of the confrontation. It is possible that the confrontation began the day before and that, when the transcript of it was being made, it was mistakenly dated the same as the second part of the confrontation that took place on 16 October 1954. As it is not possible to offer a positive answer to this question, both minutes are presented in this paper and the times when they ended are specified in the notes.

The minutes of the first – and the longer – confrontation, terminated at 12am, contain Đenero’s allegation that he first met Kolumbić in Dubrovnik’s Old Town in summer 1953 but that he cannot remember if they were introduced by Augustin Franić or Mišo Valjalo. He visited Kolumbić in September 1953, together with Valjalo, Franić and Poković and then he met him again at Mišo Valjalo’s place in the winter of 1953/1954. He also met him in the street a few times. Commenting on this, Kolumbić said he remembered he first met Đenero in Mišo Valjalo’s apartment on Christmas Day in 1952. Đenero dismissed this claim as “impossible”, explaining that he was in Ljubljana at the time. He suggested that Kolumbić may have mixed him with Mato Đenero, who was present at the occasion. Kolumbić agreed with this.<sup>160</sup>

Asked about Kolumbić’s account of Šubašić’s and Košutić’s visits to Dubrovnik, Đenero said that he heard it from him in September 1953, during a conversation in Kolumbić’s home, and that Franić, Valjalo and Poković were also present. At that occasion, Kolumbić allegedly told them that, when Košutić came to Dubrovnik in summer 1952, the two of them went to see Vojnović’s grave. When Košutić observed that the grave was in poor condition and unworthy of a figure of Vojnović’s status, Kolumbić replied that “one’s reputation in one’s lifetime shall follow one after one’s death”. Franić and Đenero inquired him about the reception that Šubašić received in Dubrovnik in 1940 by the local HSS members, who considered him an “apostate of the idea of Croatian statehood”. Kolumbić explained that Šubašić visited the city in the capacity of *Ban* and was therefore announced as a representative of Croatian sovereignty, not as Ivan Šubašić. During the visit, Kolumbić heard him say that he was “first of all a human, then a European, then a Yugoslav,

<sup>160</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Suočavanje s Ivom Đenerom završeno u 12 sati, 16. 10. 1954.

<sup>160</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, confrontation with Ivo Đenero, terminated at 12am, 16 October 1954.



tada izjavio da je on „najprije čovjek, pa evropejac pa Slaven pa jugoslaven pa onda Hrvat“, a takav je stav Kolumbić napadao. Kolumbić je na to odgovorio da je točno da je pripovijedao o Vojnoviću, ali ne o pjesniku, nego o njegovu bratu Luji. Naime, Košutić se začudio da na grobu nema spomenika Ivi Vojnoviću, nego samo jedna mala pločica, a Kolumbić mu je odgovorio da je tu pločicu postavio jedan konobar iz hotela u kojem se pokojni pjesnik hranio. Kazao je da od obitelji više nema nikoga, a posljednji pokopan u obiteljsku grobnicu je Lujo koji je između 1930. i 1934. na francuskom jeziku napisao „Povijest Dalmacije“ u kojoj je tvrdio da u Dalmaciji nema Hrvata. Kolumbić je potvrdio ostale Đenerove navode.<sup>161</sup>

O ulozi Crkve u Hrvatskoj, prema Đenerovu sjećanju, Kolumbić je govorio da je Katolička Crkva odigrala i još uvijek igra važnu ulogu u povijesti hrvatskog naroda navevši kao primjer obranu od Osmanlija. Štoviše, isticao je da su „prve iskre svih nacionalnih i nacionalističkih pokreta nicali u samostanima“ te da je hrvatstvo ondje uvijek nalazilo utočište kad je bilo zgaženo i porobljeno. Posebno se to odnosilo na najteža razdoblja hrvatske povijesti, primjerice od 1918. do 1941. te od 1945. zbog čega su Đenero i Franić zaključili da Kolumbić na razdoblje između 1941. i 1945. ne gleda na isti način, odnosno „da su njegovi pogledi slični našim nacionalističkim“. Kolumbić je priznao da je govorio o crkvi, ali je negirao da je to činio u „nacionalističkom smislu“, odnosno govorio je općenito, a ne o pojedinim razdobljima. Đenero je odgovorio da je upravo lučenje perioda, odnosno netretiranje razdoblja od 1941. do 1945. kao „teškog u hrvatskoj povijesti“ bio glavni kriterij po kojem su studenti donijeli zaključak o Kolumbićevim razmišljanjima te je bio uvjeren da je njegovo sjećanje točno.<sup>162</sup>

Upitan o Ivanu Meštroviću Đenero je odgovorio da im je Kolumbić pripovijedao da je Meštrović napisao „neku vrstu svoje političke ispovijesti“ pod naslovom *Obračun sa zabludama moje mladosti*. U toj je knjizi Meštrović navodno temeljito raščistio s jugoslaventvom i prihvatio starčevićansku ideju. Kolumbić je navodno naglasio da je Meštrovićev stav važan zbog njegova autoriteta kao najpriznatijeg kipara tadašnjeg

and then a Croat”. This was an attitude that Kolumbić criticized. Kolumbić said it was true that he was telling them about Vojnović but explained that it was not about the poet – it was about the poet’s brother Lujo. When Košutić expressed his surprise upon realizing that there was no monument dedicated to Ivo Vojnović on the grave, just a small plaque, Kolumbić told him that the plaque installed there by a waiter from the hotel where the late poet used to dine. There were no surviving family members left; the last one to be buried in the family tomb was the poet’s brother Lujo. Between 1930 and 1943 he wrote *History of Dalmatia* in the French language, in which he claimed that no Croats had been living in Dalmatia. As for other Đenero’s allegations, Kolumbić confirmed them.<sup>161</sup>

As regards the role of Church in Croatia, Đenero remembered that, according to Kolumbić, the Catholic Church had played and was still playing an important role in the history of Croatian people. Kolumbić mentioned the fight against the Ottomans as one such example. He also said that “the first sparks to ignite all national and nationalistic movements were always kindled in monasteries” and that Croatianhood would always find shelter there when it was defeated and enslaved. This was particularly true in the most difficult periods of Croatian history – e.g. from 1918 to 1941 and after 1945. This made Đenero and Franić conclude that Kolumbić perceived the period from 1941 to 1945 in a different way – in other words, that “his views were similar to our nationalistic views”. Kolumbić admitted that he spoke about the Church, but not in a “nationalist sense”. He said he spoke about it in general, not about specific periods. Đenero replied that, on the contrary, it was primarily the singling out of specific periods – including the failure to include the 1941–1945 period among the “most difficult periods of Croatian history” – that made the students form their opinion about Kolumbić’s views. Đenero added that he was certain that his memory served him well.<sup>162</sup>

When asked about Ivan Meštrović, Đenero replied that, according to Kolumbić, Meštrović wrote “his political confession of a sort”, entitled *Obračun sa zabludama moje mladosti*. In this book, Meštrović allegedly made a clean break with the Yugoslav idea and adopted

<sup>161</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Suočavanje s Ivom Đenerom završeno u 12 sati, 16. 10. 1954.

<sup>162</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Suočavanje s Ivom Đenerom završeno u 12 sati, 16. 10. 1954.

<sup>161</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, confrontation with Ivo Đenero, terminated at 12am, 16 October 1954.

<sup>162</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, confrontation with Ivo Đenero, terminated at 12am, 16 October 1954.

vremena. Kolumbić je komentirao da se tog razgovora uopće ne sjeća. Đenero je upitan i da komentira Kolumbićevu reakciju kad su se on i Franić požalili da „neki nacionalisti kao na primjer Burdjelez i Franušić hodaju sa srpskim djevojkama“. On je odgovorio da im je Kolumbić kazao da ne znaju što čine, da se tako pasiviziraju i da od njihove djece nikad više neće biti Hrvati. Kolumbić je i taj navod negirao. Upitan o razgovorima o literaturi, Đenero je izjavio da je Kolumbić jednom prilikom njemu i Valjalu preporučio temeljito proučavanje hrvatske povijesti te im sugerirao da svakako pročitaju knjigu Ive Pilara o južnoslavenskom pitanju jer je to „temeljna stvar za raščišćavanje problema odnosa Srba i Hrvata“. U ljeto 1953. Valjalo je Đeneru dao neke prijeratne HSS-ove brošure, a koje je Valjalu posudio Kolumbić. Kolumbić je taj dio navoda potvrdio nadodavši da im je doista preporučio Pilarovo djelo iako ne zbog motiva koji Đenero ističe. Isljednika UDBA-e zanimala su i Kolumbićeva razmišljanja o napadu na biskupova tajnika u Gružu. O tome je Đenero naveo da im je Kolumbić ispričao detalje događaja zaključivši da je incident, koji je opisao barbarskim, „sa službene strane organiziran“. Kolumbić je odgovorio da je taj incident doista osuđivao, ali se nije mogao sjetiti detalja razgovora.<sup>163</sup>

Primjetno je da ni tijekom tog suočavanja Kolumbić nije htio teretiti Đenera ni druge sudionike tih događaja iako mu se za to ukazala još jedna prilika. Nejasno je što je tim suočavanjem UDBA ustvari htjela postići s obzirom na to da se o postavljenim pitanjima vezanima za hrvatstvo, katoličanstvo i protujugoslavenstvo Kolumbić već očitavao tijekom ranijih saslušanja te je potvrdio odnosno opovrgao pojedine navode. Moguće je da su se isljednici UDBA-e nadali da će i kod Kolumbića konačno doći do „preloma“, no to se nije dogodilo.

Drugi zapisnik sa suočavanja koje je završeno istog dana u 11 sati znatno je kraći. Tom je prilikom Đenero izjavio da se u rujnu 1953. u Kolumbićevu stanu vodio razgovor o „prodiranju hrvatske državotvorne ideje u nacionalističkom smislu“ i zabudama jugoslavenske ideje. Kolumbić je navodno pričao o političkim previranjima u vrijeme njegova studiranja te je spomenuo da su u to vrijeme „lansirane“ parole: „Zlatna Praha“, „Sveta Moskva“, „Crna

Starčević's ideas. Kolumbić allegedly pointed out the importance of Meštrović's views, given his authority of the most celebrated sculptor of the day. He said he could not remember this conversation at all. Đenero was also asked to comment on Kolumbić's reaction to his and Franić's complaint that "some nationalists, such as Burdjelez and Franušić, are dating Serbian girls". He says Kolumbić remarked that they did not know what they were doing, that this was a passive behavior and that their children would never be Croats. Kolumbić denied this allegation, too. As regards discussions about literature, Đenero said Kolumbić once suggested to him and Valjalo to read Ivo Pilar's book on the South Slavic question because it was "fundamental for throwing light on the relationship between Serbs and Croats". In the summer of 1953, Valjalo gave Đenero some prewar HSS brochures that he had borrowed from Kolumbić. Kolumbić confirmed that he really suggested to them to read Pilar's book, but that his motives for this were not the ones stated by Đenero. The investigator also wanted to hear Kolumbić's opinion about the attack on the bishop's secretary in Gruž. According to Đenero, Kolumbić described the incident as "barbaric", gave them a detailed account of the it and concluded that "it was organized by the authorities". Kolumbić replied that he really condemned the incident but could not remember the details of the conversation.<sup>163</sup>

Clearly, Kolumbić once again tried to avoid incriminating Đenero and other participants of these events, although he had yet another chance to do so. What is not so clear is what did UDBA actually want to achieve with this confrontation. Kolumbić had already given his answers concerning Croatian national feelings, Catholicism and anti-Yugoslav leanings during earlier interrogations, confirming some allegations and denying others. Perhaps UDBA investigators hoped that Kolumbić, too, would finally "break down". However, it did not happen.

The second minutes from the confrontation terminated the same day at 11 am are much shorter. They include Đenero's statement that, in September 1953, in Kolumbić's apartment, he and Đenero discussed the "advancement of Croatian statehood idea in the nationalist sense" and the delusions of the Yugoslav idea. Kolumbić allegedly told him about the political turmoil when he was student and about the slogans in those days

<sup>163</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Suočavanje s Ivom Đenerom završeno u 12 sati, 16. 10. 1954.

<sup>163</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, confrontation with Ivo Đenero, terminated at 12am, 16 October 1954.

ruka“ i „Piemont Beograd“. Spominjao je da su hrvatski političari u svojoj naivnosti nasjeli na te parole i doveli do stvaranja prve Jugoslavije naglasivši da je upravo ta prva zajednica sa Srbima negativno djelovala na hrvatski narod u političkom, kulturnom, privrednom, a nadasve moralnom smislu. Prema Kolumbićevim razmišljanjima Hrvatska se u to vrijeme balkanizirala i „azijatizirala“ te smatra da 1941. ni 1945. ne bi bile „onako krvave“ da im nije prethodilo takvo razdoblje. Franić i Đenero povlađivali su i nadopunjavali Kolumbićeve izjave. Kolumbić je priznao da je izjava djelomična točna jer je doista govorio da je hrvatska narodna svijest u narodnim masama jako kasno bila probuđena jer su se hrvatski političari zanosili idejama sveslavenstva smetnuvši pritom s uma da je veoma mali broj ljudi u Hrvatskoj bio nacionalno osviješten. Đenero je na to dao primjedbu da je Kolumbić osuđivao ideju jugoslavenstva kao „formu zajedničkog života“, no Kolumbić je to negirao rekavši da je istom prilikom studentima kazao da je zaključak hrvatskog sabora iz 1918. izigran jer su umjesto federativnog uređenja Hrvati dobili batine, progone i varanje na izborima. Također je izjavio da se ne sjeća da je bilo govora o balkaniziranju i „azijatiziranju“ Hrvatske. Đenero je izričito tvrdio da je Kolumbić govorio o velikosrpstvu, mistifikacijama povijesti, penetraciji Srba u Hrvatsku, o balkaniziranju Hrvatske i drugim temama, a Srbe je nazivao „azijatima“. Kolumbić je u potpunosti demantirao te navode istaknuvši da pred studentima nikad nije izgovorio riječ „velikosrbin“, iako je ostavio mogućnost da je spominjao mistifikaciju povijesti i balkanizaciju Hrvatske zbog metoda koje je primjenjivao Svetozar Pribičević. Đenero je dalje naveo da je tijekom posjeta u rujnu 1953. govora bilo i o profesorici Matić čiji sin na ispitu nije znao da je Vladimir Nazor napisao ciklus pjesama *Hrvatski kraljevi* što je naljutilo Kolumbića. Kolumbić je priznao da je Matić prigovorio jer s đacima nije obradila spomenutu temu.<sup>164</sup>

Tijekom istog suočavanja isljednik UDBA-e upitao je Đenera o razgovoru o Hrvoju Kačiću na što je Đenero odgovorio da su 1953. na Stradunu on i Stjepan Vojvodić sreli Kolumbića i tom mu prilikom govorili „kako ono društvo Radica, Kačić i kolege

like “Golden Prague”, “Sacred Moscow”, “Black Hand” and “Belgrade–Piedmont”. He also said that naïve Croatian politicians fell for these slogans, which resulted in creation of the first Yugoslavia. He pointed out that it was this first union with the Serbs that affected the Croatian people politically, culturally, economically and, above all, morally. In Kolumbić’s opinion, Croatia was then Balkanized and “Asiatized” and neither 1941 nor 1945 would be “soaked in blood that much” had they not been preceded by such a period. Franić and Đenero approved Kolumbić’s statements and complemented them. Kolumbić admitted that this allegation was partly true and that he really did say that the Croatian national awareness of the masses had been aroused very late because Croatian politicians had had illusions about pan-Slavism while forgetting that very few people in Croatia had had national consciousness at the time. Đenero said that Kolumbić denounced Yugoslavianism as a “form of living together”. Kolumbić denied this, explaining that he only told the students that the Croats had been outwitted because, contrary to their Parliament’s decision of 1918, they only obtained violence, persecution and election frauds instead of a federal system. He also said he could not remember that Balkanization and “Asiatization” of Croatia had been mentioned. Đenero was adamant in claiming that Kolumbić was talking about Serbian chauvinism, mystifications of history, penetration of Serbs into Croatia, Balkanization of Croatia and other subjects and that he called Serbs “Asians”. Kolumbić strongly denied these allegations. He insisted that he had never uttered the words “Serbian chauvinist”, but he allowed the possibility that he had mentioned mystification of history and Balkanization of Croatia in reference to the methods used by Svetozar Pribičević. Đenero also said that, during his September 1953 visit, Kolumbić criticized certain Professor Matić, whose son did not know at his school exam that Vladimir Nazor authored the poem cycle entitled *Hrvatski kraljevi*, which annoyed Kolumbić. Kolumbić admitted criticizing Matić for failing to cover this subject in her class.<sup>164</sup>

During this confrontation, the UDBA investigator asked Đenero about their discussion on Hrvoje Kačić. Đenero replied that, when he and Stjepan Vojvodić met Kolumbić in the street in 1953, they told him that “Radica, Kačić and other colleagues from their circle are not

<sup>164</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik o suočavanju s Ivom Đenerom završeno u 11 sati, 16. 10. 1954.

<sup>164</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, minutes on confrontation with Ivo Đenero, terminated at 11am, 16 October 1954.



koji su s njima nisu više tako gorljivi nacionalisti da malo čitaju našu literaturu i da se više zanimaju sportom i da izgleda da Joško Radica negativno djeluje na tu sredinu". Kolumbić je navodno odgovorio da bi te mladiće trebalo uputiti i pravilno orijentirati. Kolumbić se pak tog susreta uopće nije mogao sjetiti iako se sjećao da je Đenero nekoliko puta doista susreo na Stradunu. O posjetu Kolumbiću u rujnu 1953. Đenero je naveo da su on i Franić otišli uvjeriti se u Kolumbićeva politička razmišljanja iako su željeli čuti i ponešto iz hrvatske povijesti. Njihov je cilj bio steći iskustvo i izmijeniti s Kolumbićem razmišljanja. Na osnovi razgovora zaključili su da Kolumbić stoji na istim, odnosno „nacionalističkim“ pozicijama. Đenero je upitan je li im Kolumbić „barem i najmanjom sitnicom“ dao do znanja da su njihovi stavovi „nepravilni i da su štetni po današnje državno i društveno uređenje“, na što je Đenero odgovorio da Kolumbić nikad nije kritizirao njihove stavove niti im preporučivao literaturu iz koje bi upoznali „put nove Jugoslavije“. Te je navode potvrdio i sam Kolumbić nakon čega je u 11 sati suočavanje završilo.<sup>165</sup> Kao i u drugom zapisniku sa suočavanja te dostupnim zapisnicima sa saslušanja, i u ovom zapisniku isljednik UDBA-e ostaje usredotočen na „dokazni materijal“ o Kolumbićevu hrvatstvu i protujugoslavenstvu uz ljubav prema hrvatskoj povijesti i stalno poticanje mladih na daljnje obrazovanje i čitanje literature.

Posljednji zapisnik iz Kolumbićeva dosjea odnosi se na kratko saslušanje 26. studenoga 1954. kada je upitan želi li još nešto izjaviti. Odgovorio je da je tijekom jednog saslušanja govorio o posjetu obitelji Valjalo za Božić 1952., no da je bio u „posebnom duševnom raspoloženju, koje je nastalo kao posljedica tih događaja ali nije izazvana bilo fizičkim bilo psihičkim pritiskom“ na njega i iznio i neke stvari koje tom prilikom nije govorio.<sup>166</sup> Time završavaju spisi u Kolumbićevu dosjeu koji ostaje svjedočanstvo o slabo poznatom hrvatskom HSS-ovcu kojeg su proganjali svi režimi pod kojima je u svom odraslom životu živio.

Podignuta je optužnica koju je pripremio tadašnji okružni javni tužilac Aleksandar Apolonio i, nakon

such eager nationalist anymore, that they do not read our literature, that they are more interested in sports and that it seems that Joško Radica has a negative effect on them". Kolumbić allegedly told them that these young men needed guidance and proper education. Kolumbić said he could not remember this encounter, although he did remember he had met Đenero in the street a few times. As regards their September 1953 visit to Kolumbić, Đenero said that he and Franić went to see him in order to find out about his political views and to learn something about Croatian history. Their goal was to gain some experience and exchange opinions with Kolumbić. The conversation with him made them conclude that Kolumbić shared their "nationalist" views. When asked if Kolumbić had ever given them "even the slightest hint" that their views were "wrong and harmful to our current social system and system of government", Đenero replied that Kolumbić never criticized their views or recommended literature about "the new Yugoslav path". Kolumbić confirmed these allegations. The confrontation was concluded at 11am.<sup>165</sup> Same as in the other confrontation minutes and in the available interrogation minutes, the investigator remained focused on the "evidence" of Kolumbić's Croatian affiliation and anti-Yugoslav leanings, his love for Croatian history, and his constant inspiring of young people to educate themselves and read.

The final minutes in the Kolumbić file are the ones from a short interrogation of 26 November 1954, when he was asked if there was anything else he wanted to add. He said that, when he talked about his Christmas 1952 visit to the Valjalo family during one earlier interrogation, he was in a "specific state of mind that was a consequence of these events but was not a result of any physical or psychological pressure on me" and that he then admitted some things that "I had not said at that occasion".<sup>166</sup> This is the final document in the Kolumbić file. This file can be seen as a testimony of a little-known Croatian HSS member who had been persecuted by all the regimes under which he had spent his adult life.

Charges against him were raised by the then district public prosecutor Aleksandar Apolonio. On 5 February 1955, after a 20-day-long presentation of

<sup>165</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik o suočavanju s Ivom Đenerom završeno u 11 sati, 16. 10. 1954.

<sup>166</sup> HR DAS 409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Frana Kolumbića, Zapisnik sa saslušanja Frana Kolumbića, 26. 11. 1954.

<sup>165</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, minutes on confrontation with Ivo Đenero, terminated at 11am, 16 October 1954.

<sup>166</sup> HR DAS 409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Frano Kolumbić file, Frano Kolumbić interrogation minutes, 26 November 1954.

dokaznog postupka koji je trajao 20 dana<sup>167</sup>, Okružni sud u Dubrovniku, u vijeću sastavljenom od predsjednika suda Jože Engela kao predsjednika vijeća u krivičnom predmetu protiv optuženika ing. Frana Kolumbića i drugih, donio je 5. veljače 1955. presudu. Kolumbić je osuđen na tri godine strogog zatvora s objašnjenjem da je „u namjeri da razbije bratstvo i jedinstvo FNRJ i potkopa ekonomsku osnovicu socijalističke izgradnje vršio propagandu protiv državnog i društvenog uređenja i privrednih mjera narodne vlasti“, „čime je počinio produženo krivično djelo protiv naroda i države neprijateljskom propagandom iz stavka 1. čl. 118. Krivičnog zakonika“. Pri odmjerenju kazne sud mu je uzeo kao otegotne okolnosti „kvalitet profesora i vaspitača školske omladine, ugled i autoritet optuženog koji proističe iz toga svojstva, bogato političko iskustvo, smišljenost djelovanja usmjeravanjem na političku i kulturnu prošlost, a posebno na politički rad i život biv. HSS i preživjele ideološke poglede braće Radića itd. pomanjkanje svake kritičke ocjene i kajanja.“<sup>168</sup>

O suđenju i presudi izvijestila je tadašnja *Slobodna Dalmacija* u broju 3106 od 8. veljače 1955. godine. U tom se tekstu navodi da je nakon 20 dana sudskog procesa, „koji je u Dubrovniku praćen s interesom od strane građana“, izrečena presuda grupi optuženoj zbog „krivične djelatnosti protiv naroda i države“. Na optuženičkoj klupi našli su se ing. Frano Kolumbić, Niko Pušić, Augustin Franić, Damjan Pavlović, Trpimir Macan, Miho Valjalo, Petar Žuvela i Ante Jelavić. Optužnica ih je teretila da „njihova krivična djelatnost proističe iz negativnih i neprijateljskih idejnih stavova prema državnom i društvenom uređenju socijalističke Jugoslavije, zatim da ta djelatnost ima za sobom i utvrđeni vremenski kontinuitet, pa se i ranije izražavala na razne načine i u raznim vanjskim formama, te da je ona rezultat jedne smišljene neprijateljske propagande u Dubrovniku i okolici, koju su optuženi razvijali i pronosili.“ Svi optuženi, osim Jelavića koji je priznao djela, pokušali su, kako piše u *Slobodnoj Dalmaciji*, predstaviti svoje „neprijateljsko djelovanje protiv postojećeg državnog i društvenog uređenja“ kao neke „sasvim slučajne, spontane i naivne razgovore među prijateljima“. U istom se tekstu naglašava „sračunatost“ i „neistinitost“ takve obrane te je vijeće Okružnog suda u Dubrovniku donijelo

evidence<sup>167</sup>, the panel of judges at the District Court in Dubrovnik, presided by chief justice Joža Engel, passed a judgement in the case of Frano Kolumbić and others. Kolumbić was sentenced to three years in a maximum-security prison in the opinion of the court, “in order to break the brotherhood and unity of the FNRJ and undermine the economic base of the socialist development, [Kolumbić] conducted a campaign against our social system and system of government and against the economic measures of the People’s Government” (...) “thus committing the crime of enemy propaganda against the people and the state under subsection 1 of Article 118 of the Penal Code”. When dealing out the punishment, the court qualified as aggravated circumstances “his position of professor and educator of students and the status and authority arising from it, his rich political experience, his premeditated activities of focusing on political and cultural history (particularly on the politics of former HSS and the obsolete ideological views of the Radić brothers etc.) and lack of any self-criticism and remorse”.<sup>168</sup>

*Slobodna Dalmacija* No. 3106 of 8 February 1955 reported on the trial and sentence. According to the article, after a 20-day-long trial “that aroused interest of the citizens of Dubrovnik”, the sentence was passed to a group charged with “crimes against the people and the state”. The accused included Frano Kolumbić, Niko Pušić, Augustin Franić, Damjan Pavlović, Trpimir Macan, Miho Valjalo, Petar Žuvela and Ante Jelavić. According to the indictment, “their criminal actions arise from their negative and subversive attitudes towards the social system and system of government of the Socialist Yugoslavia. Their actions were carried out over a longer period of time and were manifested in various ways and in various forms. They were a result of the deliberate enemy propaganda in Dubrovnik and its environs that the accused had adopted and distributed”. All the accused except Jelavić, who confessed all counts of the indictment, tried, according to *Slobodna Dalmacija*, to present their “subversive activities against current social system and system of government” as some “purely accidental, spontaneous and naïve conversations among friend”. The article underlines the “calculated nature” and “falseness” of such defense. The panel of judges of the District Court in Dubrovnik delivered the following judgement: Franić was sentenced

<sup>167</sup> Kačić 2017: 267.

<sup>168</sup> Radica 2003: 480.

<sup>167</sup> Kačić 2017: 267.

<sup>168</sup> Radica 2003: 480.

presudu kojom je Franić osuđen na četiri godine zatvora s gubitkom građanskih prava u trajanju od dvije godine, Kolumbić na tri godine zatvora, Pavlović, Pušić i Žuvela na dvije godine zatvora, Valjalo na godinu i devet mjeseci zatvora, Macan na godinu dana zatvora te Jelavić na godinu dana zatvora, odnosno uvjetno na tri godine. Nakon izrečene presude javni se tužitelj žalio na visinu kazne izrečene Pavloviću i Macanu izjavivši da je „stroga“ i dodavši da je kazna Žuveli „blaga“ jer je zbog istog kaznenog djela jednom već bio suđen i zbog njegova držanja pred sudom tijekom trajanja rasprave.<sup>169</sup> Vrhovni sud NRH Kolumbićevo je prvostupanjsku presudu u pogledu odluke o kazni promijenio, pa je osuđen na kaznu strogog zatvora u trajanju od dvije godine.<sup>170</sup>

## Zaključak

Analizirani dokumenti predstavljaju tek jedan dio slagalice o „Kolumbićevoj grupi“ jer je za daljnje analize i rekonstrukciju njezina djelovanja potrebno osvrnuti se na izjave drugih sudionika tih događaja. Osim toga, Hrvoje Kačić, istaknuti hrvatski vaterpolist, odvjetnik i sveučilišni profesor, upozorava da je u sagleđavanju tih zbivanja potrebno istaknuti vremensku podudarnost krivičnog postupka protiv Kolumbića i ostalih s kaznenom inkriminacijom studenata pred Okružnim sudom u Zagrebu protiv Velimira Terzića i drugih jer je glavni svjedok optužbe i tijekom oba postupka bila ista osoba, odnosno Ivo Đenero, student iz Dubrovnika, koji je nakon tromjesečnog boravka u istražnom zatvoru u Zagrebu od optuženika prerastao u krunskog svjedoka.<sup>171</sup>

Osim toga, valja istaknuti da je Macan, koji je tada imao svega osamnaest godina i koji je kasnije postao istaknuti hrvatski povjesničar, u svojoj kasnijoj izjavi naveo da neke osuđene osobe, poput Kolumbića i Pušića, uopće nije poznavao<sup>172</sup> te je smatrao da je skupina osuđena „u kontekstu Đilasovih članaka i njegove osude“ s ciljem da se preplaši stanovništvo iz različitih generacija i slojeva. Dio optužnice o razgovorima o stanju u Jugoslaviji te nepovoljnom položaju Hrvata i njihovoj potrebi da stvore vlastitu državu bili su točni iako su, prema Macanovu kazivanju, pripadnici te „skupine“ bili

to four years' imprisonment and the loss of civil rights for a period of two years. Kolumbić was sentenced to three years' imprisonment, Pavlović, Pušić and Žuvela to two years, Valjalo to one year and nine months, Macan to one year, and Jelavić conditionally to one year with a three years' probationary period. After the sentencing, the public prosecutor appealed against the sentences for Pavlović and Macan, claiming they were “harsh”. He also commented that Žuvela's sentence was “lenient” because he had already been tried for an identical crime and because of his attitude before the court during the trial.<sup>169</sup> Later on, the Supreme Court of the People's Republic of Croatia commuted Kolumbić's first-instance judgement to two years' imprisonment in a maximum-security prison.<sup>170</sup>

## Conclusions

The documents analyzed here are but one piece in the “Kolumbić group” puzzle. For further reconstruction of the activities of the group, testimonies of some other participants of these events should be analyzed. In addition to this, Hrvoje Kačić, a prominent Croatian water polo player, lawyer and university professor, points out that, when analyzing these events, one should note that the criminal trial of Kolumbić and others took place at the same time when Velimir Terzić and others were incriminated before the District Court in Zagreb, because the material witness for the prosecution in both trials was the same person – Ivo Đenero, student from Dubrovnik whose status was changed from defendant to crown witness after he had spent three months in the pre-trial prison in Zagreb.<sup>171</sup>

It should also be pointed out that Macan, who was only eighteen years old then and who later became a prominent Croatian historian, said much later that he had never met some of those sentenced, like Kolumbić and Pušić,<sup>172</sup> and that, in his opinion, the group was sentenced “in the context of Đilas's articles and judgement” in order to instill fear in the people of various generations and from all walks of life. Some counts of the indictment – the conversations about the situation in Yugoslavia and the unfavorable position of the Croats and their need to create their own state – were true,

<sup>169</sup> *Slobodna Dalmacija* 8. 2. 1955: 2.

<sup>170</sup> *Radica* 2003: 480.

<sup>171</sup> Kačić 2017: 268. Jonjić 2007: 21.

<sup>172</sup> Krašić 2018: 87.

<sup>169</sup> *Slobodna Dalmacija* of 8 February 1955: 2.

<sup>170</sup> *Radica* 2003: 480.

<sup>171</sup> Kačić 2017: 268. Jonjić 2007: 21.

<sup>172</sup> Krašić 2018: 87.



svjesni da Jugoslaviju ne mogu srušiti niti su to pokušavali učiniti. O Kolumbiću je Macan naveo da je bio uvjereni Hrvat, predratni HSS-ovac i katolički vjernik koji je „volio razgovarati s mladima“.<sup>173</sup> Ta Macanova razmišljanja potvrđuju i prezentirani materijali iz Kolumbićeva dosjea iz kojih je razvidno da je doista bila riječ o istinskom hrvatskom domoljubu koji se u svojim razgovorima često osvrtao na primjere iz hrvatske povijesti i upozoravao na opasnost jugoslavenske i velikosrpske ideje. Kao dugogodišnji nastavnik, rado je razgovarao s mladima te ih poticao na daljnju izobrazbu, iščitavanje literature i razvijanje poštovanja prema hrvatskim, napose katoličkim tradicijama.

Osobni dosje Frana Kolumbića predstavlja vrijedan izvor podataka o djelovanju i razmišljanjima prijeratnih pristaša HSS-a u prvim godinama nakon završetka Drugog svjetskog rata. Vodeći se navedenim razmišljanjima Hrvoja Kačića i Trpimira Macana, dakle ljudi koji su osobno bili povezani s tim slučajem, te podacima prezentiranima u ovom radu, može se zaključiti da je u daljnjim istraživanjima Kolumbićev slučaj potrebno pozicionirati u širi kontekst hrvatskog političkog protukomunističkog otpora tijekom 50-ih godina 20. stoljeća, naročito iz perspektive „ideološke izgradnje“ poslijeratne generacije sveučilištaraca u kojoj su značajnu ulogu mogli odigrati nekadašnji HSS-ovci.

although, according to Macan, the members of the “group” were aware that they could not bring Yugoslavia down and they never tried to do that. Macan described Kolumbić as a dedicated Croat, a prewar HSS member and a Catholic who “liked to talk to young people”.<sup>173</sup> The documents from the Kolumbić file corroborate these Macan’s reflections. It is evident from them that Kolumbić was a true Croatian patriot who often referred to Croatian history in his speeches and who warned about the threats posed by the Yugoslav and Greater-Serbian ideas. As a long-time teacher, he often talked to young people and encouraged them to educate themselves, read a lot and respect Croatian – particularly Catholic – traditions.

The personal file of Frano Kolumbić is a valuable source of information about the activities and reflections of prewar HSS members in the first years after the World War II. Based on these reflections of Hrvoje Kačić and Trpimir Macan, who were personally connected with this case, as well as the information presented in this paper, it can be concluded that further research should place Kolumbić’s case in a broader context of Croatian anticommunist resistance in the 1950s, particularly from the perspective of the “ideological education” of the postwar generation of university students, in which former HSS members could play an important role.

<sup>173</sup> Krašić 2018: 87.

<sup>173</sup> Krašić 2018: 87.

## Bibliografija / *Bibliography*

### Popis skraćenica / *Abbreviations*

- CK - centralni komitet / *Central Committee*
- NDH - Nezavisna Država Hrvatska / *Independent State of Croatia*
- FNRJ - Federativna Narodna Republika Jugoslavija / *Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia*
- GNO – gradski narodni odbor / *municipal people's committee*
- HOP – Hrvatski oslobodilački pokret / *Croatian Liberation Movement*
- HSS – Hrvatska seljačka stranka / *Croatian Peasants Party*
- JNOF – Jedinstvena narodnooslobodilačka fronta / *United National Liberation Front*
- KK – Kotarski komitet / *District Committee*
- KNOJ – Korpus narodne obrane Jugoslavije / *Croatian Division of the National Defence Corps of Yugoslavia*
- KPD – kazneno-popravni dom / *penal and correctional institution*
- KP; KPH; KPJ – Komunistička partija; Komunistička partija Hrvatske; Komunistička partija Jugoslavije / *Communist party; / Communist party of Croatia; Communist Party of Yugoslavia*
- NOO – narodnooslobodilački odbor / *National Liberation District Committee*
- NOP – Narodnooslobodilački pokret / *National Liberation Movement*
- NOV; NOVJ – Narodnooslobodilačka vojska; Narodnooslobodilačka vojska Jugoslavije / *National Liberation Army; / National Liberation Army of Yugoslavia*
- NR; NRH – Narodna Republika; Narodna Republika Hrvatska / *People's Republic; People's Republic of Croatia*
- OK – okružni komitet / *District Committee*
- OZNA – Odjeljenje za zaštitu naroda / *Department for Protection of the People*
- PO – partizanski odred / *Partisan Detachment*
- SK; SKH – Savez komunista; Savez komunista Hrvatske / *Communists' League; Communists' League of Croatia*
- SKOJ – Savez komunističke omladine Jugoslavije / *League of Communist Youth of Yugoslavia*

SUP – Sekretarijat za unutrašnje poslove / *Secretariat for Internal Affairs*

UDBA – Uprava državne bezbjednosti / *Directorate for State Security*

USAOH – Ujedinjeni savez antifašističke omladine Hrvatske / *United League of Anti-Fascist Youth of Croatia*

ŽRO – Župska redarstvena oblast / *County Police Authorities*

### Arhivska građa / *Archive material*

a) Hrvatski državni arhiv (HDA) / *Croatian State Archives (HDA)*

HR-HDA-1220, CK SKH, Ratno gradivo / *HR-HDA-1220, CPC Central Committee, wartime documents*

HR-HDA-1222, Oblasni komitet KPH za Dalmaciju / *HR-HDA-1222, KPH District Committee for Dalmatia*

HR-HDA-1491, OZN-a za Hrvatsku / *HR-HDA-1491, OZNA - Croatian branch*

HR HDA1561, SDS RSUP RH / *HR HDA1561, SDS RSUP RH*

b) Državni arhiv u Splitu (DAS) / *State Archives in Split (DAS)*

HR DAS 262, IHRPD / *HR DAS 262, IHRPD*

HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju / *HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia*

HR-DAS-428, Glavni obavještajni centar 2. odsjeka za Dalmaciju (bivša Zbirka Obavještajna služba, OZN-a za Dalmaciju, kut. 60) / *HR-DAS-428, Chief Operation Centre of the 2nd Division for Dalmatia (former Intelligence Servicer collection, OZNA – Dalmatian branch, box 60)*

HR-DAS-438, Pokrajinski/oblasni komitet KPH za Dalmaciju / *HR-DAS-438, KPH Regional Committee for Dalmatia*

### Popis literature / *Literature*

Čolak 1989 – Nikola Čolak, *Akcija deseti travanj u svijetlu krnskog svjedočanstva Ivana Prusca i dokumentacije*, Padova, 1989.

Delić 2016 – Ante Delić, *Djelovanje Ante Pavelića od 1945. do 1953.*, doktorska disertacija (rukopis) / Ph.D. dissertation (manuscript), Sveučilište u Zadru / University of Zadar, Zadar, 2016.

- Glavina 1998 – Frano Glavina, Dubrovačke ratne slike i prilike 1941.-1944. u svjetlu povijesnih izvora, u / in: *Crveni teror u Dubrovniku*, ed. V. Benković, Dubrovnik: Matica hrvatska Dubrovnik, 1998, 33–66.
- Jonjić 2007 – Tomislav Jonjić, Organizirani otpor jugoslavenskom komunističkom režimu u Hrvatskoj 1945.-1953. [https://www.tomislavjonjic.iz.hr/knjige\\_otpor.pdf](https://www.tomislavjonjic.iz.hr/knjige_otpor.pdf) (pristupljeno / accessed 15/11/2022)
- Kačić 2017 – Hrvoje Kačić, *Dubrovačke žrtve, Jugokomunistički teror na hrvatskom jugu 1944. i poratnih godina (početak Bleiburga)*, Zagreb, 2017.
- Katalinić 2017 – Kazimir Katalinić, *Od poraza do pobjede. Povijest hrvatske političke emigracije 1945.-1990.*, I. sv., Zagreb, 2017.
- Krašić 2018 – Wollfy Krašić, *Hrvatski pokret otpora*, Zagreb, 2018.
- Matković 2017a – Blanka Matković, Prilog poznavanju povijesti grada Splita i okolice u poratnom razdoblju (1946.-1947.): nepoznati detalji iz dosjea Frane Tente, *Tusculum: časopis za solinske teme*, 10/1, 2017, 145–160.
- Matković 2017b – Blanka Matković, *Split i Srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e 1944.-1962., Zarobljenički logori i likvidacije*, Zagreb – Trilj, 2017.
- Matković 2018 – Blanka Matković, Iz povijesti solinskog područja u Drugom svjetskom ratu i poraću: Hrvatska seljačka stranka kroz dosje Joze Bulja (1945.-1961.), *Tusculum: časopis za solinske teme*, 11, 2018, 207–232.
- Matković 2023 – Blanka Matković, Poslijeratni protukomunistički otpor: djelovanje ‘bande’ duvanjskog križara Mirka Kapulice na prostoru Cetinske krajine kroz arhiv opunomoćstva UDB-e za kotar Sinj, *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU*, 65, 2023, 355–402.
- Matković & Pažanin 2011 – Blanka Matković & Ivan Pažanin, *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji 1943.-1948., počinjeni od pripadnika NOV, JA, OZN-e i UDB-e, Dokumenti*, online izdanje, 2011, [https://www.academia.edu/1773275/ZLO%C4%8CINI\\_I\\_TEROR\\_U\\_DALMACIJI\\_1943.-1948.\\_PO%C4%8CINJENI\\_OD\\_PRIPADNIKA\\_NOV\\_JA\\_OZN-e\\_i\\_UDB-e\\_DOKUMENTI\\_War\\_Crimes\\_and\\_Terror\\_in\\_Dalmatia\\_Between\\_1943\\_and\\_1948...-Documents\\_](https://www.academia.edu/1773275/ZLO%C4%8CINI_I_TEROR_U_DALMACIJI_1943.-1948._PO%C4%8CINJENI_OD_PRIPADNIKA_NOV_JA_OZN-e_i_UDB-e_DOKUMENTI_War_Crimes_and_Terror_in_Dalmatia_Between_1943_and_1948...-Documents_) (pristupljeno / accessed 08/08/2022)
- Mirošević 2011a – Franko Mirošević, Političko opredjeljivanje birača kotara Dubrovnik 1931.-1940., *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, 43/1, 2011, 155–182.
- Mirošević 2011b – Franko Mirošević, Dubrovnik i dubrovački kotar od Banovine Hrvatske do talijanske reokupacije (od rujna 1939. do rujna 1941.), *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru*, 53, 2011, 243–279.
- Mirošević 2011c – Franko Mirošević, Hrvatska seljačka stranka u dubrovačkom kotaru 1941. godine, *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, 43/3, 2011, 881–893.
- Planinić 1994 – Fra Martin Planinić, *Tko je izdao Kavrana*, Zagreb, 1994.
- Prusac 1967 – Ivan Prusac, *Tragedija Kavrana i drugova. Svjedočanstvo preživjelog*, Salzburg, 1967.
- Radelić 2002 – Zdenko Radelić, *Križari – gerila u Hrvatskoj: 1945.-1950.*, Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest – Dom i svijet, 2002.
- Radelić 2011 – Zdenko Radelić, *Križari – gerila u Hrvatskoj: 1945.-1950.*, drugo izmijenjeno i dopunjeno izdanje, Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest – Alfa, 2011.
- Radelić 2019 – Zdenko Radelić, *Obavještajni centri, Ozna i Udba u Hrvatskoj (1942.-1954.)*, Kadrovi, Zagreb, 2019.
- Radica 2003 – Joško Radica, *Sve naše Dakse, Hrvatski jug u vrtlogu Drugog svjetskog rata i jugokomunističke strahovlade*, Dubrovnik, 2003.
- Rupić & Geiger 2011 – Mate Rupić & Vladimir Geiger, *Partizanska i komunistička represija i zločini u Hrvatskoj 1944.-1946., Dokumenti, Dalmacija*, Slavonski Brod – Zagreb, 2011.
- Utovac 2022 – Darko Utovac, Tajna organizacija Hrvatski oslobodilački pokret (HOP) u Vidu kod Metkovića 1963. godine, *Politički zatvorenik*, No. 292, 2022, 5–10.

#### Mrežni izvori / Internet Sources

- Slobodna Dalmacija* 20. 3. 1945 – Ne dozvolimo neprijateljima NOP-a uvlačenje u odbor JNOF-a, *Slobodna Dalmacija*, 20. 3. 1945., 1. (pristupljeno / accessed 05/01/2024)
- Slobodna Dalmacija* 8. 2. 1955 – Osuđeni zbog neprijateljskog djelovanja, *Slobodna Dalmacija*, 8. 2. 1955., 2. (pristupljeno / accessed 03/01/2024)