



**Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino**

**Mednarodna znanstvena konferenca / *International Scientific Conference***

**Represija med 2. svetovno vojno  
in v povojnem obdobju v Sloveniji  
in v sosednjih državah**

***Repression during World War II and in the  
post-war period in Slovenia and in the  
neighbouring countries***

**Povzetki / *Abstracts***

Ljubljana, 7. in 8. november 2012

Muzej novejšje zgodovine Slovenije,  
Celovška 23, Ljubljana

Izdal in založil:

Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino / Institute of Contemporary History  
Kongresni trg 1, SI-1000 Ljubljana

Zanj:

dr. Damijan Guštin

Uredila:

dr. Nevenka Troha

Prevodi:

Borut Praper, Studio S.U.R.

Računalniški prelom in tisk:

Medit d. o. o.

Naklada:

120 izvodov

Organizator:

Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino / Institute of Contemporary History

Finančna podpora:

Javna agencija za raziskovalno dejavnost Republike Slovenije /  
Slovenian Research Agency

Programski in organizacijski odbor:

Dr. Nevenka Troha, predsednica, dr. Andrej Pančur, dr. Dušan Nečak, dr. Gorazd Bajc, prof. Raoul Pupo, dr. Darko Dukovski, dr. Christian Promitzer

CIP - Kataložni zapis o publikaciji

Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Ljubljana

94(497.4)"1941/1960"(082)

94(4-191.2)"1938/1960"(082)

REPRESIJA med 2. svetovno vojno in v povojnem obdobju v Sloveniji in sosednjih državah : povzetki : mednarodna znanstvena konferenca = Repression during World War II and in the post-war period in Slovenia and in the neighbouring countries : abstracts : international scientific conference, Ljubljana, 7. in 8. november 2012 / [uredila Nevenka Troha ; prevodi Borut Praper]. - Ljubljana : Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 2012

ISBN 978-961-6386-38-8

1. Vzp. stv. nasl. 2. Troha, Nevenka

263875584

# Program

Sreda, 7. november 2012 / *Wednesday, 7. November 2012*

**9.30 – 10.00**

Otvoritveni nagovori / *Opening addresses*

*Kaja Širok*

*Damijan Guštin*

*Ljubo Bavcon*: Spoznanja zgodovine - nauk za boljše razumevanje ali sredstvo za politično obračunavanje? / *Realisations of History –Lessons in Better Understanding or the Means for Political Retaliation?*

**10.00 – 12.30**

*Nevenka Troha*: Pomen posvetovanja o represiji / *Importance of the conference about repression*

*Aleš Gabrič*: Totalitarizem in Slovenija ali zakaj za Slovenijo ni ustrezna terminologija, ki jo uporabljajo v tuji strokovni literaturi? / *Totalitarianism and Slovenia, or Why the Terminology Used in the Foreign Expert Literature is Inappropriate in Case of Slovenia*

*Boris Mlakar*: Poglavitne oblike in razsežnosti represije v povojni Evropi / *The Main Forms and Dimensions of Repression in the Post-war Europe*

*Christian Promitzer*: Represija nacističnega režima nad Slovenci na avstrijskem Štajerskem 1938–1945 / *Repression of the Nazi Regime against Slovenians in the Austrian Styria 1938–1941*

*Damijan Guštin*: »Pobija se premalo« : vloga represije v uvajanju in vzdrževanju okupacijskega »novega reda« na Slovenskem 1941–1945 / »There's Not Enough Killing«: the Role of Repression in Introducing and Maintaining the »New Order« during the Occupation of Slovenia 1941–1945

*Renato Podberšič*: Represija nad nasprotniki revolucije na Primorskem/ Repression Against the Opponents of the Revolution in the Slovenian Littoral

Razprava / *Discussion*

**14.00 – 17.30**

*Andrej Pančur*: Represija nad judovskim prebivalstvom okupiranih ozemelj Slovenije med drugo svetovno vojno / Repression against the Jewish Population at the Occupied Slovenian Territories During World War II

*Vida Deželak Barič*: Posledica represije : smrtne žrtve 2. svetovne vojne in zaradi nje na Slovenskem / Consequences of Repression: Fatalities during World War II and Deaths Caused by It in Slovenia

*Nevenka Troha*: Razmislek o usmrčitvah / A Deliberation on the Executions

*Dušan Nečak*: Posebnosti obračuna z »Nemci« na Slovenskem / Features of Retaliation against »Germans« in Slovenia

*Vladimir Geiger*: Represija nad pripadniki nemške manjšine na Hrvaškem, v Bosni in Hercegovini ter Vojvodini, 1944.–1948 / Repression against the Members of the German Minority in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Vojvodina 1944–1948

*Attila Kovács*: Represija v Prekmurju med drugo svetovno vojno in v povojnem obdobju – primer internacije v Sárvár in Hrastovec / Repression in Prekmurje During World War II and After the War: an Example of Internment into Sárvár and Hrastovec

Razprava / *Discussion*

**Četrtek, 8. november 2012 / Thursday, 8. November 2012**

**9.00 – 12.00**

*Darko Dukovski*: Represija, zločini in nezakonitosti vojaških in civilnih oblastnih organov v hrvaškem delu Istre 1945.–1950 / Repression, Crimes and Wrongful Acts of the Military and Civilian Authorities in the Croatian Part of Istria 1945–1950

*Raoul Pupo*: Eksodus iz cone B Svobodnega tržaškega ozemlja (1945–1958) /  
Exodus from Zone B of the Free Territory of Trieste (1945–1958)

*Avguštin Malle*: Avstrijski in britanski varnostni organi ter njihov odnos do ko-  
roških Slovencev v prvih povojnih letih / Austrian and British Security Bo-  
dies and Their Attitude to Carinthian Slovenians During the First Years After  
the War

*Gorazd Bajc*: Pogledi zahodnih zaveznikov na nasilje v Jugoslaviji med 2. sve-  
tovno vojno in po njej / Attitude of the Western Allies towards the Violence  
in Yugoslavia During World War II and in the Immediate Post-War Period

*Katalin Munda Hirnök*: Represija nad Slovenci v Porabju v času Rákosijevega  
režima (1948–1956) / Repression against Slovenians in the Rába Valley Du-  
ring Rákosi's Regime (1948–1956)

Razprava / *Discussion*

### **13.30 – 17.00**

*Zdenko Radelić*: Represija na Hrvaškem v času po 2. svetovni vojni / Repressi-  
on in Croatia after World War II

*Nataša Miličević*: Inteligenca v Srbiji med revolucionarno represijo in družbeno  
integracijo 1944–1950 / Serbian Intelligentsia between Revolutionary Re-  
pression and Social Integration 1944–1950

*Žiga Koncilja*: Posameznik v primežu treh različnih represivnih aparatov - Ivan  
Ranzinger in njegova življenjska pot / An Individual in the Clutches of Three  
Different Repression Apparatuses: Ivan Ranzinger and His Life

*Zdenko Čepič*: Zločin in kazen / Crime and Punishment

Razprava / *Discussion*



**Aleš Gabrič\***

## **Totalitarizem in Slovenija ali zakaj za Slovenijo ni ustrezna terminologija, ki jo uporabljajo v tuji strokovni literaturi?**

Pojem totalitarizem se je začel uporabljati po letu 1923 za oznako fašističnega gibanja v Italiji, kasneje pa se je razširil na sorodne pojave v drugih državah. Totalnost naj bi ponazarjala oblast, ki se ne zadovoljuje zgolj z obvladovanjem političnega življenja v državi, temveč poskuša v svojo mrežo oblasti ujeti prav vse pore življenja, vse družbene podsisteme, od gospodarstva, medijev, kulture, športa, posega pa tudi v zasebno sfero in skuša vplivati na človekov način mišljenja, odločanja in delovanja.

V znanstveno uporabo je pojem totalitarizem prišel po 2. svetovni vojni, po porazu fašizma in nacizma, ko je večji del vzhodne Evrope živel pod nadzorom Stalinove Sovjetske zveze. Hannah Arendt je leta 1951 izdala temeljno delo *Izvori totalitarizma*, v katerem je primerjala nemški nacizem in sovjetski stalinizem. Vzpon tovrstnih režimov je postavila v krog daljšega zgodovinskega razvoja in pojasnila načela, po katerih bi oblast v nekaterih državah lahko označevali kot totalitarno. Poudarila je, da to velja zlasti za Nemčijo pod Hitlerjem in Sovjetsko zvezo pod Stalinom, medtem ko je za Mussoolinijevo Italijo opozorila, da ni povsem primerljiva s prej omenjenima in da je ni moč brez zadržkov uvrščati v kategorijo totalitarne oblasti. V naslednjih desetletjih so bile raziskave pod vtisom hladne vojne, pozornost pa je bila pogosto usmerjena v primerjave Sovjetske zveze pod Stalinom in po njegovi smrti v času destalinizacije. Vprašanje, katere režime lahko označimo kot totalitarne, se je vlekel skozi desetletja, več pozornosti pa je v strokovnih razpravah vnovič dobilo po padcu berlinskega zidu in koncu hladne vojne v devetdesetih letih 20. stoletja.

**Aleš Gabrič**

## **Totalitarianism and Slovenia, or Why the Terminology Used in the Foreign Expert Literature is Inappropriate in Case of Slovenia**

The notion of totalitarianism began to be used after 1923 to mark a fascist movement in Italy, and it later spread to related phenomena in other countries. Totality was to be represented by authority which is not satisfied only by controlling the political life in the country, but it tries to spread its web to every pore of life, all social subsystems, from the economy, media, culture, sport, and

---

\* Dr. /PhD, znanstveni svetnik / scientific councillor, Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino / Institute of Contemporary History, Kongresni trg 1, SI-1000 Ljubljana. E-mail: ales.gabric@inz.si.

it also reaches into the private sphere and tries to influence a person's way of thinking, making decisions and acting.

The notion of totalitarianism started being used scientifically after the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War, when the majority of Eastern Europe lived under the supervision of Stalin's Soviet Union. Hannah Arendt published *The Origins of Totalitarianism* in 1951, a basis work in which she compared German Nazism and Soviet Stalinism. She placed the rise of such regimes in the circle of longer historical development and explained the principles according to which the authority in some countries could be marked as totalitarian. She emphasised that this is true mainly for Germany under Hitler and the Soviet Union under Stalin, and she warned that Mussolini's Italy is not completely comparable with the previously mentioned regimes and that it could not be classified into the category of totalitarian authority without hesitation. In the next decades research was under the effect of the Cold War, and attention was often oriented towards comparing the Soviet Union under Stalin and after his death at the time of de-Stalinization. The question of which regimes can be marked as totalitarian continued for decades and it received more attention in professional discussions again after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War in the 1990s.



**Boris Mlakar\***

## **Poglavitne oblike in razsežnosti represije v povojni Evropi**

Z zmago zavezniškega orožja nad nacističnim taborom naj bi se maja 1945 začela nova doba miru in ponovne vzpostavitve demokratičnega reda. Toda kot posledek medvojnih tragičnih oziroma zločinskih dogodkov je ob koncu vojne nastopilo tudi obdobje poravnave računov oziroma kaznovanja odgovornih za omenjene dogodke. Ker je med večletno okupacijo v teh izrednih razmerah prihajalo tudi do neenotnosti, kolaboracije ali celo do državljanskih vojn, je povojno prizadevanje za pravično (raz)sojenje dobilo še dodatne razsežnosti in imelo za posledico, da se za precejšen del prebivalstva izredno stanje in trpljenje takrat še ni končalo.

V zavezniškem ujetništvu se je ob koncu vojne znašlo skoraj enajst milijonov nemških in drugih vojakov, od tega dve tretjini na zahodni fronti. Večina le-teh se je kmalu vrnila domov, kar pa ni veljalo za tiste v sovjetskih taboriščih za vojne ujetnike, kjer jih je skoraj en milijon zaradi naporov in slabe oskrbe umrlo. Toda tudi v zahodnih ujetniških taboriščih je zaradi istih razlogov umrlo nekaj deset tisoč ujetnikov. Še slabše se je godilo s sovjetskimi državljani, ki so se ob koncu vojne znašli na Zahodu, a so jih zavezniki v skladu z jaltkim sporazumom vrnil v matično državo, kjer so povečini doživeli nemilo usodo. Podobno tragične posledice je imel zavezniški sklep o izgonu nemškega prebivalstva iz srednje in vzhodne Evrope v Nemčijo, kar je bilo tudi posledica dejstva, da so te manjšine ponekod imele vlogo pete kolone. Posebej nasilno z več deset tisoč mrtvimi je ta izgon potekal na Češkoslovaškem. Načelo kolektivne odgovornosti so sovjetske oblasti po vojni kot že prej uporabljale tudi v primeru manjših narodnostnih skupnosti, npr. krimskih Tatarov in Čečenov, ki so jih zaradi obtožbe o kolaboraciji z nacisti izgnale v Sibirijo.

Za celotni evropski prostor pa je bil tedaj predvsem značilen obračun s kolaboracijo. Ker so posamezni deli prebivalstva sodelovali z okupatorskimi oblastmi na zelo različne načine in tudi v kontekstu tedaj nastalih državljanskih vojn, je tudi povojno zadevno dogajanje večkrat – posebej v srednji in vzhodni Evropi pod sovjetskim vplivom – preseglo pravne okvire doseganja pravičnega kaznovanja in prešlo v obračun z dejanskimi ali potencialnimi nasprotniki novega režima v funkciji prevzema oblasti in spremembe družbenega sistema. V zahodni Evropi, posebej v Italiji in Franciji, je prišlo tudi do množičnega »divjega« obračuna s kolaboracionisti, pri čemer si je povojna oblast prizadevala tak razvoj zaustaviti in kaznovanje kolaboracionistov izvesti v okviru na novo vzpostavljenega sodnega sistema. Podobni procesi so tedaj potekali tudi v Jugoslaviji

---

\* Dr. /PhD, znanstveni svetnik / scientific councillor, Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino / Institute of Contemporary History, Kongresni trg 1, SI-1000 Ljubljana. E-mail: boris.mlakar@inz.si.

oziroma Sloveniji, čeprav na tem prostoru izstopa način obračuna s pripadniki kolaboracionističnih enot, ki so bili po koncu vojne s strani zavezniških oblasti vrnjeni iz Avstrije.

### **Boris Mlakar**

#### **The Main Forms and Dimensions of Repression in the Post-war Europe**

With the Allied victory against the Axis powers in May 1945 a new age of peace and restoration of democratic order supposedly began. However, as a consequence of tragic or criminal incidents during the war, at the end of the war retaliation against or punishment of those responsible for the aforementioned incidents began. As in these extraordinary circumstances disunity, collaboration or even civil wars took place during the years of occupation, the post-war efforts for fair arbitration gained additional dimensions. Consequently at that time the state of emergency and suffering had not yet ended for a significant percentage of the population.

Almost eleven million of German and other soldiers found themselves in the Allied captivity at the end of the war, two thirds of them at the Western Front. Most of these soldiers may have returned home soon, but this was not true of those imprisoned in the Soviet prisoner-of-war camps, where almost a million of them died due to exhaustion and mistreatment. However, even in the Western prisoner-of-war camps tens of thousands of prisoners died because of the same reasons. Soviet citizens who, at the end of the war, ended up in the West, were even worse off: in accordance with the Yalta Agreement they were returned to their homeland, where their fate was usually sealed. The Allied decision about the deportation of the German population from the Central and Eastern Europe to Germany, which was a consequence of the fact that sometimes these minorities collaborated with the Germans, had similarly tragic consequences. This extradition was especially violent in Czechoslovakia and resulted in tens of thousands of deaths. The Soviet authorities used the principle of collective responsibility, during and even before the war, in the case of smaller national communities, for example the Crimean Tatars and Chechens, deported to Siberia due to the accusations of collaborating with the Nazis.

At that time the retaliation against collaboration was characteristic of the whole European space. As individual segments of the population collaborated with the occupation authorities in various ways, also in the context of the civil wars that broke out at the time, the related post-war developments – especially in the Central and Eastern Europe under the Soviet influence – often exceeded the legal context of pursuing just penalties and transformed into vengeance against actual or potential opponents of the new regimes, supporting the takeover of

power and the changes of the social system. In Western Europe, especially in Italy and France, mass »uncontrolled« revenge against the collaborators also took place. The post-war authorities strived to put a stop to such developments and carry out the punishment of the collaborators in the context of the newly established judicial system. At the time similar processes also took place in Yugoslavia or Slovenia, although in this space the way of how the score was settled with the members of the collaborating units, extradited from Austria by the Allied authorities after the end of the war, was quite specific.

Christian Promitzer\*

## Represija nacističnega režima nad Slovenci na avstrijskem Štajerskem 1938–1941

Če govorimo o Slovencih na avstrijskem Štajerskem, pri tem mislimo:

1. na avtohtono slovensko govoreče prebivalstvo ob meji z Jugoslavijo, in sicer v petih vaseh Radgonskega kota, v občinah Klanjci (nem. Glanz) in Gradišče (Schlossberg) pri trgu Lučane ter v občinah Radvanje (Rothwein) in Mlake (Laaken) v okolici kraja Sobota (Soboth) na jugozahodu avstrijske Štajerske;
2. na slovenske priseljenke in priseljence v Gradcu, katerih korenine segajo nazaj do druge polovice 19. Stoletja.

Obe skupini sta bili že od konca prve svetovne vojne pod pritiskom nemško-nacionalnih obrambnih društev *Schulverein* in *Südmark*. V Gradcu je *Südmark* natančno opazoval delovanje slovenskega društva *Čitalnica*, ki je kot edino ostalo od nekoč številnih slovenskih organizacij v mestu. Nadzorovali so tudi slovensko govoreče prebivalstvo ob meji, kjer je žandarmerija že v dvajsetih letih izdelovala kataster o narodnem prepričanju posameznikov.

Ko so nacisti po Anšlusu marca 1938 prevzeli oblast, so bila tla že pripravljena za nadaljnje ukrepe za narodno homogenizacijo prebivalstva nekdanje avstrijske Štajerske., Preden je uporabila neposredno represijo, je nova oblast hotela zvedeti čim več o morebitnih sovražnikih. S tem namenom so nacistični študenti iz Gradca poleti 1938 v občini Klanjci raziskovali narodno sestavo lokalnega prebivalstva in njegov vpliv na morebitno osvajanje Spodnje Štajerske. Njihova ocena je bila negativna, in so zato zahtevali »umik manjvrednega ljudskega materiala« iz teh krajev. Tudi v Gradcu so nacisti najprej hoteli ugotoviti, koliko Slovencev živi v mestu in pri tem uporabili ljudsko štetje. *Čitalnico* so sprva pustili delovati, morala je samo prevzeti nov statut, ki je predpisoval strogo hierarhijo (»Führerprinzip«). Leta 1940 pa je Gestapo aretiral, zaslišal in izgnal tajnika društva študenta Danila Pirca, medtem ko je društvo prenehalo delovati malo pred napadom na Jugoslavijo. Morda je osvojitvev vzhodne Slovenije rešila lokalno slovensko govoreče prebivalstvo ob dotedanji meji pred tem, da bi ga izgnali, saj so nacisti našli na slovenskem (Spodnjem) Štajerskem bolj bogato področje delovanja za svojo raznarodovalno politiko.

---

\* Dr. /PhD, docent / associated professor, Institut für Geschichte - Südosteuropäische Geschichte Karl Franzens Universität Graz / Centre for Southeast European History, Karl-Franzens University of Graz, Mozartgasse 3, A-8010 Graz.  
E-mail: christian.promitzer@uni-graz.at.

## Christian Promitzer

### Repression of the Nazi Regime against Slovenians in the Austrian Styria 1938–1941

If we refer to Slovenians in the Austrian Styria, we have the following people in mind:

1. the autochthonous Slovenian-speaking population near the border with Yugoslavia in five villages in the Radgonski kot area – in the municipalities of Klanjci (German: Glanz) and Gradišče (Schlossberg), near the borough of Lučane, and in the municipalities of Radvanje (Rothwein) and Mlake (Laaken) near Sobota (Soboth) in the southeast of Austrian Styria;
2. Slovenian immigrants in Graz, whose roots date back to the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Both groups had been under the pressure of the German national defence societies *Schulverein* and *Südmark* ever since the end of World War I. In Graz *Südmark* watched closely the activities of the Slovenian society *Čitalnica*, which was the last of once numerous Slovenian organisations in this city that remained. The Slovenian-speaking population near the border was also monitored, and in the 1920s the gendarmerie already started drawing up a register on the national conviction of individual people.

By the time when the Nazis assumed the power after the Anschluss (annexation) of March 1938, the terrain had already been prepared for further measures for the national homogenisation of the former Austrian Styrian population. Before they resorted to direct repression, the new authorities wanted to find out as much as possible about the potential enemies. To this end, in the summer of 1938 in the Klanjci municipality the Nazi students from Graz researched the national structure of the local population and its influence on the potential conquest of Lower Styria. Their evaluation was negative, therefore they called for the »elimination of lesser human material« from these area. Also in Graz the Nazis initially wanted to establish how many Slovenians lived in the city, so they carried out a public census. The *Čitalnica* society could keep working at first. It only had to adopt a new statute, prescribing a strict hierarchy (»Führerprinzip«). However, in 1940 the Gestapo arrested, interrogated and deported the secretary of this society, student Danilo Pirc, while the society itself was abolished shortly before the attack against Yugoslavia began. Perhaps the conquest of the eastern Slovenia saved the local Slovenian-speaking population near what had until then been the border from exile, since in the Slovenian (Lower) Styria the Nazis came across a more fertile area for the implementation of their denationalisation policy.

**Damijan Guštin\***

**»Pobija se premalo« : vloga represije v uvajanju in vzdrževanju okupacijskega »novega reda« na Slovenskem 1941–1945**

Ko so okupatorji v kratki vojni kampanji Kraljevino Jugoslavijo – državo, v kateri je živela večina Slovencev – okupirali aprila 1941, je bilo vojno nasilje in represija v Evropi že splošno razširjeno dejstvo. Nasilje je bilo v mnogih oblikah sestavni del vojaških operacij, represija pa glavno sredstvo vzdrževanja okupacijskih režimov na območju od Francije do Poljske in Grčije.

Nameni okupatorjev s slovenskim prebivalstvom (in ozemljem) pa so bili še bolj daljnosežni, saj so z aneksijami in pripravljanim razmer za njeno čim bolj tekočo izvedbo že določali povojno ureditev Evrope. V ta krog sistemske represije sodijo izgoni prebivalstva, raznarodovanje kot najbolj viden del etničnega uničenja slovenskega naroda in njegovo prevedbo v etnično manjšino, razlastitve in ekonomska ekspropriacija, vpetost v vojne napore držav okupatorj in odstranitev lokalnih upravnih ter političnih struktur, pozneje še vsiljenje državljanstva okupiranih držav in prisilna mobilizacija v nemško in madžarsko vojsko. Ko je poleti 1941 nastopilo odporniško gibanje, se je vsaj deloma utemeljilo prav na aktivnem in takojšnjem boju zoper tovrstno nasilje.

V proti odporniškem delovanju okupatorjev je represija dobila osrednje mesto. Metode represije, namenjene zatrtju ali vsaj omejitvi širjenja odporniškega gibanja, so bile zelo grobe, od množičnih aretacij, zaščitnih in kazenskih internacij, odvedb v koncentracijska taborišča, množičnega pobijanja odpornikov in njihovih podpornikov v (kvazi) sodnih oblikah ali kot golo nasilje nad prebivalstvom v policijskih in vojaških akcijah. Represija se je mešala z vojskovanjem, ki pa je potekalo skoraj brez omejitev, ki jih je določalo vojno in humanitarno pravo.

Pritegnitev dela prebivalstva k sodelovanju v proti odporniškem delovanju je odprla nove razsežnosti represije, saj je okrepila opozicijo odporniškega gibanju. Vključitev ravni državljanske vojne v vojno nasilje, vključno z interpersonalnim nasiljem, je povečala in razširila oblike represije na obeh v spopadu udeleženih straneh.

Izjemno kompleksni vzroki in povodi nasilja so se med seboj prepletli v visoko smrtnost med prebivalstvom (6,5% prebivalstva, vsak petnajsti prebivalec), pa tudi močno gmotno in psihično prizadetost velikega dela preživelih prebivalcev Slovenije.

---

\* Dr. /PhD, docent / senior lecturer, Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino / Institute of Contemporary History, Kongresni trg 1, SI-1000 Ljubljana. E-mail: damijan.gustin@inz.si.

## **Damijan Guštin**

### **»There's Not Enough Killing«: the Role of Repression in Introducing and Maintaining the »New Order« during the Occupation of Slovenia 1941–1945**

When during the short military campaign in April 1941 the invaders occupied the Kingdom of Yugoslavia – a state where the majority of Slovenians lived – the war violence and repression in Europe was already a widespread fact. Violence in its many forms was an integral part of military operations, while repression was the main means of maintaining the occupation regimes in the area from France to Poland and Greece.

However, the intentions of the occupiers with regard to the Slovenian population (and territory) were even more specific and far-reaching, the annexations already outlining the post-war system in Europe and paving the way for its smooth implementation. The systematic repression of this sort includes deportation of the population, denationalisation as the most evident measure of the ethnic destruction of the Slovenian nation and its transformation into an ethnic minority, confiscation and economic expropriation, integration into the war efforts of the occupying countries, abolishment of the local administrative and political structures, and later also forced citizenship of the occupying states and forced mobilisation into the German and Hungarian armies. When in the summer of 1941 the resistance movement was established, it was at least partly based precisely on the active and immediate resistance against this sort of violence.

Repression was central to the counter insurgency activities of the occupiers. The methods of repression intended to suppress or at least hinder the spreading of the resistance movement were practiced in very severe forms, from mass arrests, preventive and punitive internments, deportations into the concentration camps, mass executions of the members and supporters of the resistance by means of (quasi) judicial proceedings, as well as raw police and military violence against the population. Repression blended with warfare, which took place almost without any restrictions set out by the military and humanitarian law.

Involving a segment of the population in the counter insurgency activities resulted in the repression gaining new dimensions, since this strengthened the opposition to the resistance movement. The inclusion of the level of the civil war in the wartime violence, including interpersonal violence, even strengthened and enhanced the forms of repression carried out by both sides involved in the conflict.

The extremely complex causes and reasons for violence resulted in a high mortality rate among the population (6.5% of the population, or every fifteenth person), as well as in severe material and psychological damage suffered by the majority of the surviving Slovenian population.

## **Renato Podberšič\***

### **Represija nad nasprotniki revolucije na Primorskem**

V uvodu je treba poudariti, da so bile razmere na Primorskem med drugo svetovno vojno drugačne kot v drugih pokrajinah Slovenije oz. predvojni Dravski banovini. Primorska je bila namreč mednarodno priznana ozemlje Kraljevine Italije, in oblasti nikoli niso dovolile, da bi tam delovale posebne neitalijanske vojaške formacije. Italijanska država je namreč že ob zasedbi slovenskih krajev ob koncu prve svetovne vojne jasno pokazala, da je to ozemlje dobila v trajno posest in začela tudi načrtno italijanizacijo.

Politične skupine na Primorskem so imele pred očmi razmere v t. i. Ljubljanski pokrajini pod italijansko zasedbo, kjer se je že leta 1942 vnel spopad med partizansko in protikomunistično stranjo. Zato so skušale narediti vse, da bi na Primorskem preprečile podobno bratomorno vojno. Njihovo gledanje na nastale razmere kot tudi gledanje posameznikov pa je bilo precej različno, še zlasti glede tega, kako se soočiti s partizanstvom oz. Osvobodilno fronto, ki je v končni posledici tudi na Primorsko prinašala komunizem. Primorci so partizansko delovanje čutili bolj posredno, predvsem kot maščevanje Italijanov za izvedene partizanske akcije.

O začetkih komunistične revolucije na Primorskem lahko rečemo, da so primeri neposrednega revolucionarnega nasilja do pomladi 1943 redki. Pred kapitulacijo Italije je na širšem goriškem območju najbolj odmeval umor Iva Brica, uglednega kristjana in predvojnega protifašista iz Dornberka. Po ukazu partizanskih oblasti sta ga v začetku junija 1943 med košnjo na travniku pokončala mladoletna fanta. Neposredno partizansko nasilje pa se je okrepilo sredi leta 1943, še zlasti po kapitulaciji Italije jeseni 1943. Zaostrila se je komunistična sestavina t. i. narodnoosvobodilnega gibanja, kar je s t. i. drugo fazo revolucije vodilo v uresničevanje revolucionarnega prevzema oblasti, in to z značilnostmi sovjetskega sistema, kar je posledično vodilo v vse večje revolucionarno nasilje tudi na (severnem) Primorskem, ki je jeseni leta 1943 in sredi leta 1944 doseglo vrhunec.

V zvezi s preučevanjem revolucionarnega nasilja na Slovenskem in posledično tudi na Primorskem je treba izpostaviti, da so se med drugo svetovno vojno na Slovenskem izvajali hkrati okupacija, upor proti okupatorju, kolaboracija, revolucija in protirevolucija. V posameznih konkretnih oblikah nasilja se je lahko prepletalo hkrati več prej omenjenih vidikov, zato je marsikdaj zelo težko razčleniti in ugotoviti natančno karakteristiko nasilja. V primerih revolucionarnega

---

\* Mag. /M.Sc., višji raziskovalec / senior researcher, Študijski center za narodno spravo / Study Centre for National Reconciliation, Tivolska 42, SI-1000 Ljubljana.  
E-mail: renato.podbersic@scnr.si.



nasilja na Primorskem, na primer aretacij in umorov ideoloških nasprotnikov, je bila med storilci široka in pisana združba: posamezne partizanske enote, terenci, vosovci, pripadniki Vojske državne varnosti (VDV) ali kar posamezniki, ki so si sami vzeli pravico nastopanja v imenu partizanskega gibanja. Treba je tudi razlikovati med usmrtitvami brez sodbe partizanskih vojaških sodišč, kjer je največkrat šlo za umore, in t. i. justifikacijami oz. usmrtitvami na podlagi sodb partizanskih vojaških sodišč, ki so začela delovati sredi leta 1943.

### **Renato Podberšič**

#### **Repression Against the Opponents of the Revolution in the Slovenian Littoral**

In the introduction we should emphasise that the situation in the Slovenian Littoral (Primorska) during World War II was different than in the other Slovenian provinces or the pre-war Drava Banate. Namely, Primorska was an internationally recognised territory of the Kingdom of Italy, and the authorities had never allowed any special non-Italian military formations to operate there. When the Italian state occupied the Slovenian territory at the end of World War I, it showed clearly that it intended to keep this territory permanently, thus it also started Italianising it systematically.

The political groups in Primorska knew the situation in the so-called Ljubljana Province under the Italian occupation, where the conflict between the partisan and the anti-communist side already started in 1942. Therefore they tried to do everything to prevent a similar war between brothers in Primorska. However, their outlook on the situation that arose, as well as the opinions of the individuals, were very dissimilar, especially with regard to how to face the partisans or the Liberation Front, which ultimately also brought communism to Primorska. The people of Primorska felt the activities of the partisans more indirectly, especially as revenge of the Italians for the actions carried out by the partisans.

As far as the communist revolution in Primorska is concerned, we can state that the examples of direct revolutionary violence had been rare until the spring of 1943. Before the Italian capitulation the most resounding event in the wider region of Gorizia was the murder of Ivo Bric, a respected Christian and pre-war anti-fascist from Dornberk. On the orders of the partisan authorities, in the beginning of June 1943 two underage boys killed him while mowing grass. However, direct partisan violence strengthened in the middle of 1943 and especially after the Italian capitulation in the autumn of 1943. The communist agenda of the so-called national liberation struggle intensified, and the so-called second stage of the revolution paved the way for the revolutionary takeover of power

with the characteristics of the Soviet system, consequently leading towards the ever increasing revolutionary violence also in the (northern) Primorska, culminating in the autumn of 1943 and in the middle of 1944.

As far as the research of the revolutionary violence in Slovenia and consequently also in Primorska is concerned, we should underline that during World War II the following processes took place simultaneously in Slovenia: occupation, resistance against the occupiers, collaboration, revolution, and anti-revolution. Individual concrete manifestations of violence could involve several of these aspects at the same time, therefore it is often very difficult to analyse and establish the precise characteristics of violence. In cases of revolutionary violence in Primorska, for example arrests and murders of ideological opponents, the perpetrators were numerous and diverse: individual partisan units, field units, members of the Security Intelligence Service, members of the National Security Army, or simply individuals who took it upon themselves to act in the name of the partisan movement. We should also distinguish between executions without the sentences of the partisan military courts, where murder was most often involved, and justifications or executions on the basis of the sentences of partisan military courts, which became operational in the middle of 1943.

**Andrej Pančur\***

## **Represija nad judovskim prebivalstvom okupiranih ozemelj Slovenije med drugo svetovno vojno**

Judje so bili ena prvih skupin prebivalstva, ki so bili podvrženi načrtni represivni politiki nacistične Nemčije, katera se je naposled končala s holokavstom. S širitvijo nacističnega vpliva po Evropi se je širila tudi represivna politika do judovskega prebivalstva. Najbolj očiten odraz te politike so bili judovski begunci, ki so se zatekli tudi na slovensko ozemlje. Naposled je leta 1940 tudi jugoslovanska država sprejela dve protijudovski uredbi. Toda do odločilnega preloma pri odnosu do judovskega prebivalstva je prišlo šele aprila 1941, ko so sile osi napadle Jugoslavijo in si jo med seboj razdelile. Usoda Judov iz Slovenije je bila tedaj v prvi vrsti odvisna od tega, na katerem okupacijskem ozemlju so živeli. Na nemških okupiranih ozemljih na t. i. Spodnjem Štajerskem in Gorenjskem so praktično vsi Judje že leta 1941 pobegnili proti Italiji ali pa so bili izgnani v Srbijo in na Hrvaško. Na italijanskem okupiranem ozemlju v t. i. Ljubljanski pokrajini jih je okupator večinoma interniral v Italijo, velik del tistih, ki so lahko ostali, pa je novi nemški okupator leta 1944 poslal v koncentracijska taborišča. Največja slovenska judovska skupnost je živela v Prekmurju, kjer jih je madžarski okupator obravnaval popolnoma v skladu s svojo protijudovsko politiko. Leta 1944 so tako tudi prekmurski Judje končali v nemških koncentracijskih taboriščih, od koder so se vrnil le redki.

Avtor v svojem prispevku ne bo predstavil le najbolj očitnih oblik represije nad judovskim prebivalstvom kot je bilo izganjanje, zapiranje in pobijanje, temveč bo predstavil tudi problematiko zaplemb premoženja ter odvzemanje in kršenje državljanskih in človekovih pravic. Pri tem bo opozoril na razlike in podobnosti teh procesov na različnih okupiranih ozemljih Slovenije med drugo svetovno vojno, jih umestil v širši kontekst represije med drugo svetovno vojno, hkrati pa bo te procese primerjal s politično represijo in zaplembami premoženja po drugi svetovni vojni.

---

\* Dr. /PhD, znanstveni sodelavec / scientific collaborator, Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino / Institute of Contemporary History, Kongresni trg 1, SI-1000 Ljubljana.  
E-mail: andrej.pancur@inz.si.

**Andrej Pančur**  
**Repression against the Jewish Population at the Occupied Slovenian Territories During World War II**

The Jews were one of the first groups of the population subject to the systematic repression policy of the Nazi Germany, which finally culminated in the Holocaust. As the Nazi influence spread across Europe, the policy of repression against the Jewish population also spread. It was most evidently reflected in the Jewish refugees, also seeking refuge in the Slovenian territory. Finally in 1940 the Yugoslav state also adopted two anti-Jewish decrees. However, the decisive turning point in the attitude towards the Jewish population had not occurred until April 1941, when the Axis powers invaded Yugoslavia and divided it between them. At that moment the fate of the Jews in Slovenia depended primarily on which occupied territory they lived at. As early as in 1941 virtually all Jews fled towards Italy or were deported to Serbia and Croatia from the territories occupied by the Germans – the so-called Spodnja Štajerska and Gorenjska regions. At the territory occupied by the Italians – in the so-called Ljubljana Province – the Jews were mostly interned to Italy by the occupier, while the majority of those who were allowed to stay were later sent to concentration camps by the new German occupiers in 1944. The largest Slovenian Jewish community lived in the Prekmurje region, where they were dealt with by the Hungarian occupiers in complete accordance with their anti-Jewish policy. Thus in 1944 the Prekmurje Jews also ended up in the German concentration camps, where but a few of them returned from.

In his contribution the author is not only going to present the most obvious forms of repression against the Jewish population like deportation, imprisonment and executions. He will also focus on the issues of confiscation of property, expropriation, and violation of human rights. He will also underline the differences and similarities between these processes at the various Slovenian occupied territories during World War II, place them into a wider context of the repression during World War II, and simultaneously compare them with the political repression and confiscation of property after World War II.

## Vida Deželak Barič\*

### Posledice represije: smrtne žrtve druge svetovne vojne in zaradi nje na Slovenskem

Vojne so v zgodovini človeštva najtesneje povezane z nasiljem. Njegova posledica so tudi smrtne žrtve kot najbolj skrajni in tragični vidik vojnega dogajanja. To velja še zlasti za drugo svetovno vojno, ki jo opredeljujemo kot totalno. Slovenija sodi v evropskem okviru glede izgub človeških življenj med drugo svetovno vojno in neposredno po njej z okoli 97.000 smrtnimi žrtvami med visoko prizadeta območja, v tedanjem v jugoslovanskem okviru pa dosega povprečno stopnjo prizadetosti.

Druga svetovna vojna je na Slovenskem vzpostavila prakso radikalnega nasilja, katerega dinamika je bila pogojena z uvedbo različnih okupacijskih sistemov in prepletanjem raznovrstnih nasilnih procesov, ki so temu sledili zaradi odpora okupatorjem, zaradi revolucije, protirevolucije, kolaboracije in državljanske vojne. Zlasti nemški okupator je na Štajerskem, Koroškem in Gorenjskem nemudoma odgovoril na odporiško akcijo predvsem z množičnimi streljanji talci ter z ukrepi proti družinam, kot je npr. internacija v koncentracijska taborišča, kjer so mnogi izgubili življenja. Italijansko nasilje v poskusih odstranitve partizanstva v Ljubljanski pokrajini in na Primorskem sprva ni doseglo razsežnosti nemškega nasilja, dokler ni v letu 1942 tudi to eskaliralo zlasti v Ljubljanski pokrajini (streljanja talcev, odgoni v koncentracijska taborišča itd.).

Partizanstvo je ob svoji temeljni usmeritvi nasproti okupacijskemu aparatu tudi nastopalo proti domačemu prebivalstvu v primerih njegovega dejanskega ali domnevnega sodelovanja z okupacijskimi oblastmi, pri čemer je zlasti v dogajanju v Ljubljanski pokrajini spomladi in poleti 1942 opazno revolucionarno ozadje. Procesi, ki so tekli v smer poglobljanja medslopevskega konflikta oziroma državljanske vojne predvsem v Ljubljanski pokrajini, ko je tudi protirevolucionarna stran izvajala raznovrstno nasilje proti domačim nasprotnikom, so imeli za posledico, da je ta pokrajina v času okupacije in neposredno po njej utrpela najvišjo populacijsko izgubo. Ob omenjenem medslopevskem nasilju, ki postoma, a v manjši meri zajame tudi nekatera območja v drugih pokrajinah, seveda okupacijske oblasti izvajajo najbolj nasilne ukrepe vse do konca okupacije, pri čemer je v t. i. očiščevalnih akcijah pogosto trpelo predvsem civilno prebivalstvo. Okupator se je tako vzpostavil kot dejavnik, ki je z ničemer izzvanim napadom na Jugoslavijo povzročil med drugo svetovno vojno največ smrtnih žrtev na Slovenskem; to prvenstvo ohranja tudi če upoštevamo nasilni

---

\* Dr. /PhD, znanstvena sodelavka / scientific collaborator, Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino / Institute of Contemporary History, Kongresni trg 1, SI-1000 Ljubljana.  
E-mail: vida.dezelak-baric@inz.si.

epilog druge svetovne vojne s povojnim obračunom zmagovitega partizansko-revolucionarnega tabora s protirevolucijo in kolaboracijo.

**Vida Deželak Barič**  
**Consequences of Repression: Fatalities during World War II and Deaths  
Caused by It in Slovenia**

Throughout human history, wars have been most closely related to violence. Fatalities as the most extreme and tragic aspect of wartime developments are one of the consequences of violence. This is especially true of World War II, which we refer to as total war. In the European context, with regard to the loss of human lives during World War II and in the immediate post-war period, Slovenia with its estimated 97,000 deaths belongs among the regions severely affected by the war, while in the former Yugoslav context it is average in terms of damage.

In Slovenia World War II established a practice of radical violence, whose dynamics depended on the introduction of various systems of occupation and on the combination of various violent processes, following as a result of the resistance against the occupiers, revolution, counter-revolution, collaboration, and civil war. Especially the German occupiers in the Štajerska, Koroška and Gorenjska regions immediately responded to any actions undertaken by the resistance, usually with mass executions of hostages and measures taken against families, for example, internment in the concentration camps, where many of them lost their lives. At first the Italian violence as an attempt to eliminate the partisan movement in the so-called Ljubljana Province and in the Slovenian littoral (Primorska) had not had the same dimensions as the German violence, until it escalated in 1942, especially in the Ljubljana Province (the shooting of hostages, deportations to the concentration camps, and so on).

The partisan movement, besides opposing the occupation apparatus, also retaliated against the Slovenian population in case of its actual or suspected collaboration with the occupation authorities. Revolutionary background is especially noticeable in the developments in the Ljubljana Province in the spring and summer of 1942. These processes, leading to the deepening of the internal Slovenian conflict or the civil war (as the counter-revolutionary side also perpetrated various forms of violence against its Slovenian opponents, especially in the Ljubljana Province) were the reason why this area suffered the greatest losses of the population during the occupation and immediately after it. Apart from the aforementioned violence among Slovenians, which gradually but to a lesser extent also engulfed certain other areas in other regions, the occupation authorities, of course, resorted to the most violent of measures until the very end

of the occupation. Especially the civilian population often suffered because of the so-called cleansing operations. Thus the occupiers are established as a factor causing the greatest number of fatalities in Slovenia with their completely unprovoked attack against Yugoslavia. This fact remains the same even if we take into account the violent epilogue of World War II with the post-war retaliation of the victorious partisan-revolutionary camp against the counter-revolution and collaboration.

## **Nevenka Troha\*** **Razmislek o usmrtitvah**

Avtoritarni in totalitarni režimi na različne načine obračunajo s posamezniki, skupinami, organizacijami, manjšinami, ki jim nasprotujejo in s tem ogrožajo njihovo oblast. Fašistični in nacistični režim sta represijo stopnjevala in ta je z agresijo ter okupacijo ozemlja drugih držav prerasla v množično ubijanje, v katerega so bile vpletene vse strani. To je po vojni »izzvenelo« v maščevanju zmagovalcev nad poraženci, pa tudi represiji, ki so jo proti dejanskim in domnevnim nasprotnikom izvajale nove jugoslovanske komunistične oblasti.

Iz tega obdobja je kar nekaj simbolnih prizorišč usmrtitev in pokopov, kot je Bazovica, strelišče na Opčinah pri Trstu, kaznilnici Stari pisker v Celju in Mariborski sodni zapor, pokopališče v Gradcu v Avstriji, Gramozna jama v Ljubljani, Teharje, Kočevski Rog, Huda jama.

Italijanski fašistični režim je oktobra 1929, sedem let po svojem prihodu na oblast, izvedel prvo smrtno kazen nad pripadnikom manjšine – članom organizacije TIGR v Istri Vladimirjem Gortanom. Nekaj manj kot leto dni kasneje, septembra 1930, so bili kot teroristi obsojeni in v Bazovici ustreljeni štirje člani Borbe, tržaške veje organizacije TIGR. Strelski vod so sestavljali pripadniki fašistične Prostovoljne milice za državno varnost (Milizia volontaria per la sicurezza nazionale, MVSN). Te usmrtitve so široko odmevale v evropski in svetovni demokratični javnosti, Bazovica pa je že leta 1930 postala simbol protifašističnega odpora, danes pa je simbol boja primorskih Slovencev proti raznarodovanju.

Po letu 1945 je Bazovica dobila še drug simbolni pomen. V t. i. bazoviško fojbo (jašek zapuščenega rudnika) naj bi bili domnevno vrženi mnogi od tistih, ki so jih maja 1945 na Tržaškem in Goriškem aretirale jugoslovanske oblasti in so bili nato usmrčeni ali so umrli v zaporih ter taboriščih za vojne ujetnike. Med pogrešanimi je veliko sodelavcev fašizma in kolaboracije, tudi pripadnikov prej omenjene MVSN, med njimi pripadnik strelskega voda, ki je leta 1930 izvršil smrtno kazen nad štirimi slovenskimi protifašisti. Vendar je med pogrešanimi tudi 93 pripadnikov finančne straže, ki so sodelovali v vstaji italijanskega Narodnoosvobodilnega odbora konec aprila 1945 v Trstu, in več protifašistov. Italijanska republika je leta 1992 bazoviško fojbo proglasila za državni spomenik.

Na obeh simbolnih krajih, ki sta po nekem čudnem naključju, zelo blizu drug drugemu, vsako leto prirejajo spominske slovesnosti, ki so množično obiskane.

---

\* Dr. /PhD, znanstvena svetnica / scientific councillor, Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino / Institute of Contemporary History, Kongresni trg 1, SI-1000 Ljubljana.  
E-mail: nevenka.troha@inz.si.



Spominske slovesnosti so tudi na krajih povojnih usmrtitev. Iz zgodovinskega spomina pa v luči polemik o državljanski vojni in povojnih usmrtitvah vse bolj izginja vedenje o tem, da so med vojno največ smrti povzročili okupatorji. Naj spomnim le na enega od vrhuncev medvojne represije, na represijo nemškega okupatorja na slovenskem Štajerskem v letu 1942, z množičnimi streljanji talcev in deportacijami v koncentracijska taborišča. Tu bi izpostavila Hrastnik, ki je imel takrat kakšnih 6000 prebivalcev, in kjer je poleti 1942 gestapo aretiral več kot petdeset aktivistov OF. Sledila so streljanja. V Celju so 22. julija ustrelili sedem Hrastničanov, 30. julija sedemnajst, 15. avgusta petnajst in nato v Mariboru 2. oktobra še pet, skupaj torej 44. Med njimi je bilo 27 mlajših od 25 let, eden je bil ustreljen deset dni pred 18 rojstnim dnevom. Med njimi je bilo šest žensk, le ena je bila stara več kot dvajset let. Nato je gestapo aretiral njihove sorodnike in jih poslal v uničevalno taborišče Auschwitz, mlajše od 18 let pa v otroška taborišča, kjer je umrla deklica, stara leto in pol. Že leta 1942 je v Auschwitzu umrlo 24 sorodnikov ustreljenih, leta 1943 pa še devet. Skupaj 76 žrtev.

### **Nevenka Troha** **A Deliberation on the Executions**

In various ways the authoritarian and totalitarian regimes retaliate against individuals, groups, organisations, and minorities, which might oppose them and thus endanger their power. The fascist and Nazi regimes intensified the repression, and with aggression and occupation of the territories of other countries the repression turned into mass killing, involving all the sides. After the war the killing resulted in the vengeance of the victors against the defeated, as well as in the repression of the new Yugoslav communist authorities against the real or imagined opponents.

Quite a few symbolic execution and burial sites date back to this period, for example Bazovica, the shooting range at Opicina near Trieste, the penitentiaries Stari pisker in Celje and the Maribor prison, the Graz cemetery in Austria, Gramozna jama in Ljubljana, Teharje, Kočevski Rog, Huda jama.

In October 1929, seven years after it had risen to power, the Italian fascist regime carried out the first death sentence, executing a member of the minority and the TIGR organisation in Istria, Vladimir Gortan. Less than a year later, in September 1930, four members of Borba, the Trieste branch of the TIGR organisation, were tried as terrorists and shot in Bazovica. The firing squad consisted of the members of the fascist National Security Volunteer Militia (Milizia volontaria per la sicurezza nazionale, MVSN). These deaths resounded far and wide in the European and worldwide democratic public, and already in 1930 Bazovica became a symbol of the resistance against fascism, while today it sym-

bolises the struggle of the Slovenian Littoral (Primorska) Slovenians against denationalisation.

After 1945, however, Bazovica also gained another symbolic meaning. Supposedly many of the people arrested by the Yugoslav authorities in May 1945 in the Trieste and Gorizia regions, who were later executed or died in prisons and prisoner-of-war camps, were thrown into the so-called Bazovica foiba (an abandoned mining shaft). The missing included many fascists and collaborators, also members of the aforementioned National Security Volunteer Militia, including a member of the firing squad which had executed the four Slovenian anti-fascists in 1930. However, the missing also included 93 members of the Financial Guard, who participated in the uprising of the Italian National Liberation Committee in the end of April 1945 in Trieste, and several anti-fascists. In 1992 the Republic of Italy declared the Bazovica foiba a national monument.

At both these symbolic places, by some strange coincidence located in close proximity of each other, memorial services attended by masses of people are organised every year. Memorial services are also held at the locations of post-war executions. However, in light of the debates about the civil war and post-war executions, the fact that during the war the largest number of deaths, by far, was caused by the occupiers is disappearing from the historical memory. Let me just underline one of the worst examples of wartime repression, the repression of the German occupiers in the Slovenian Štajerska region in 1942, where mass executions of hostages and deportations to concentration camps took place. I would like to bring the attention to Hrastnik with its population of about 6000 people at the time, where in the summer of 1942 the Gestapo arrested more than fifty activists of the Liberation Front. Shootings followed. On 22 July seven citizens of Hrastnik were shot in Celje, seventeen on 30 July, fifteen on 15 August, and then another five in Maribor on 2 October, altogether 44. 27 of these were younger than 25, and one boy was shot ten days before his eighteenth birthday. The victims also included six women, only one of whom was older than twenty. Then the Gestapo arrested the members of their families and sent them to the Auschwitz concentration camp, while those younger than 18 were sent into children's camps. There a girl, aged one year and a half, died. Already in 1942 twenty-four family members of those who had been shot died in Auschwitz, and another nine of them died in 1943. This makes 76 victims altogether.

**Dušan Nećak\***  
**Posebnosti obračuna z »Nemci« na Slovenskem**

Z umikom nemških enot iz jugovzhoda v jeseni 1944 se je začelo veliko begunsko gibanje nemškega civilnega prebivalstva iz nemškega naselitvenega prostora v Jugoslaviji. Težko je reči, koliko Nemcev se je v varstvu nemške vojske moglo podati na ozemlje tedanjega rajha. O tem so na voljo le ocene. Na posameznih delih naselitvenega območja ni bila povsod dana možnost za pravočasno evakuacijo nemškega civilnega prebivalstva.

»Tisti Nemci, ki niso mogli zbežati oz. jih ni bilo mogoče evakuirati, so bili po težkih preganjanjih in daljšem trpljenju, brez milosti izkoreninjeni.« S temi besedami so sestavljavci nemškega poročila o izgubah »folksdojčerjev« v Jugoslaviji začeli poglavje o izgonu Nemcev iz Jugoslavije.

Na Slovenskem imamo opraviti s številčno in gospodarsko močno, večinoma meščansko, nemško narodno manjšino, ki danes svoje korenine išče v Avstriji in ne v Nemčiji. Po opravljenih raziskavah lahko zapišem, da začetek obračuna z »Nemci« na Slovenskem – z aretacijami, njihovim zbiranjem v taborišča in izgonom kočevskih Nemcev –, zagotovo lahko postavimo že v prvo polovico maja 1945. O nekaterih posebnost slovenskega obračuna z »Nemci« bo govor v referatu. Prve aretacije so izvedli že nekaj dni po osvoboditvi 9. maja 1945. Po navedbah nemških virov naj bi v Sloveniji želeli kar najhitreje opraviti z nemško govorečim avtohtonim prebivalstvom in so zato »s prenačljeno vihravostjo« (in übersturtzter Hast) izvajali »velikanske množične likvidacije«. Isti viri trdijo, da so bile prav te hitre likvidacijske akcije **prva posebnost** slovenskega obračuna z »Nemci«

**Druga posebnost** slovenskega obračuna pa naj bi bile akcije izгона nemško govorečega prebivalstva, zlasti žensk in otrok, preko jugoslovansko-avstrijske meje. V manjših skupinah naj bi jih pošiljali tudi preko »zelene meje«, v večjih skupinah pa po železnici. Sistematično so začeli na Slovenskem z izgonom »Nemcev« v Avstrijo okoli božiča 1945. Zima 1945/46 je bila torej osrednji čas izganjanja »Nemcev« na Slovenskem, bodisi s transporti bodisi preko zelene meje.

**Tretja posebnost** slovenskega obračuna z »Nemci« naj bi bil njihov izgon v druge kraje (taborišča) Jugoslavije in na prisilno delo v Sovjetsko zvezo. Zadnje je bilo običajno za »folksdojčerje« iz Vojvodine in Slavonije in za razmere na Slovenskem tega nisem mogel dokončno dokazati.

---

\* Dr./PhD, redni profesor / full professor, Filozofska fakulteta Univerze v Ljubljani / Faculty of Arts of the University in Ljubljana, Aškerčeva cesta 2, SI-1000, Ljubljana. E-mail: dusan.necak@guest.arnes.si.

Nekako po letu 1948, ko so bila razpuščena taborišča za »Nemce«, se je začel njihov položaj vsaj deloma izboljševati. Vodja nemškega političnega predstavništva v Beogradu dr. Ulrich, je tako oktobra 1951 mogel poročati v Bonn, da more imeti izboljševanje položaja »Nemcev« dva vzroka: »Prvič, Titova vlada si očitno prizadeva, opustiti vse, kar bi lahko vplivalo na dobre odnose z Zvezno republiko, in drugič, v deželi ostale folksdojčerje želi ohraniti kot dragocene delovne moči, saj zaradi njihovega malega števila, politično za Jugoslavijo ne pomenijo več resničnega manjšinskega problema.« Vendar je trajalo še kar nekaj let, da so se tisti »Nemci«, ki so kot ostanki ostali v Sloveniji/Jugoslaviji, uspeli integrirati v novi jugoslovanski državi. Tako ostaja dejstvo, da imamo danes na Slovenskem opraviti le še minimalnim številom pripadnikov nekaj desetisočglave nemške narodne manjšine.

### **Dušan Nećak** **Features of Retaliation against »Germans« in Slovenia**

As in the autumn of 1944 the German units started retreating from the south-east, a large-scale refugee movement of the German civilian population from the territory settled by Germans in Yugoslavia began. It is difficult to say how many Germans had to retreat to the territory of what was then the Reich under the protection of the German army. Only estimates are available. At certain parts of the settled territory timely evacuation of the German civilian population was not possible.

»Those Germans who could not flee or could not be evacuated, were eliminated without mercy after severe persecution or prolonged suffering.« With these words the writers of the German report on the losses of the »Volksdeutsche« (ethnic Germans) in Yugoslavia opened the chapter on the exile of Germans from Yugoslavia.

Slovenia had to deal with a numerous and economically strong, mostly bourgeois, German ethnic minority originating from Austria, not Germany. On the basis of concluded research I can state that the retaliation against the »Germans« in Slovenia – arrests, internment in the camps, and deportation of the Gottschee Germans (the Germans from Kočevje region) – definitely began as soon as in the first half of May 1945. In the paper I will present certain peculiarities of the Slovenian retaliation against the »Germans«. The first arrests took place already a couple of days after the liberation on 9 May 1945. According to the German sources, Slovenia wanted to deal with the German-speaking autochthonous population as swiftly as possible, therefore it carried out »vast mass executions with excessive urgency« (in übersturtzter Hast). The same sources claim that these

very swift liquidation actions were **the first feature** of the Slovenian retaliation against »Germans«.

The **second feature** of the Slovenian measures supposedly involved the actions of deporting the German-speaking population, especially women and children, over the Yugoslav-Austrian border. Allegedly small groups were also ushered over the »green border«, while the larger groups were transported by trains. The systematic Slovenian banishment of the »Germans« to Austria began around Christmas 1945. Thus the winter of 1945/46 was the main period of the deportation of »Germans« from Slovenia, either by transports or over the green border.

Allegedly the **third feature** of the Slovenian retaliation against the »Germans« was their exile to other parts of Yugoslavia (camps) and forced labour in the Soviet Union. The latter was the usual fate of the »Volksdeutsche« from Vojvodina and Slavonia, and I was unable to demonstrate this in the context of the Slovenian situation.

Roughly after 1948, when the camps for »Germans« were abolished, the position of the ethnic Germans started improving, at least partly. Thus in October 1951 the head of the German political representation in Belgrade Dr. Ulrich could report to Bonn that the »German« situation had improved due to two reasons: »Firstly, Tito's government obviously strives to eliminate everything that could affect good relations with the Federal Republic; and, secondly, it wants to preserve the remaining Volksdeutsche as valuable workforce, since in the political sense they no longer represent a realistic minority problem for Yugoslavia.« However, it took several years before the »Germans« remaining in Slovenia/Yugoslavia managed to get integrated into the new Yugoslav state. It remains a fact that today a minimal number of members of what was once a German ethnic minority, numbered in tens of thousands, remains in Slovenia.

Vladimir Geiger\*

## Represija nad pripadnicima njemačke manjine u Hrvatskoj, Bosni i Hercegovini i Vojvodini, 1944.–1948.

Do potkraj Drugoga svjetskog rata većina hrvatskih, bosansko-hercegovačkih i vojvođanskih Nijemaca, uslijed ratnih događanja, izbjegla je ili je protjerana iz svojih domova, pretežito u Austriju i Njemačku, gdje su i dočekali završetak rata. U zavičaju su ostali mahom oni Nijemci koji nisu bili izloženi neposrednoj ratnoj opasnosti. No, potkraj 1944. i početkom 1945. počinje od strane partizanskog pokreta i novouspostavljenih narodnih vlasti sustavan progon preostalih folksdojčera u Jugoslaviji. Tome je napose pridonijela i odluka Predsjedništva AVNOJ-a od 21. studenoga 1944., koja je pripadnike njemačke manjine proglasila kolektivnim krivcima. Ratni zločini koje je dio jugoslavenskih folksdojčera počinio, te njihovo neloyalno držanje tijekom okupacije, poslužili su i kao razlog i kao opravdanje za neljudsko postupanje sa njemačkom manjinom potkraj i nakon rata.

Njemačko stanovništvo, koje nije izbjeglo, bilo je tijekom i neposredno nakon ratnih djelovanja prepušteno samovolji pobjednika. Nakon rata komunistička vlast u Jugoslaviji pripadnicima njemačke manjine konfiscirala je imovinu i oduzela nacionalna i građanska prava. Žrtve kolektivne odmazde nisu bili oni jugoslavenski Nijemci koji su mogli dokazati sudjelovanje u partizanskom pokretu ili njegovo potpomaganje. U neposrednom poraću jugoslavenske komunističke vlasti su zauzele stajalište o zabrani povratka izbjeglih i protjeranih folksdojčera, a one preostale u Jugoslaviji namjeravale su protjerati iz zemlje, te su ih internirali u logore za repatrijaciju. Kako je protjerivanje folksdojčera iz Jugoslavije zbog zatvaranja austrijsko-jugoslavenske granice od strane savezničkih okupacijskih vlasti u ljeto 1945., koje su iskazivale protivljenje jugoslavenskim nastojanjima, to onemogućilo za većinu folksdojčera slijede logori i višegodišnji prisilni rad. Nakon ukidanja logora i puštanja na slobodu, najveći broj hrvatskih, bosansko-hercegovačkih i vojvođanskih Nijemaca je zbog svoga položaja i bezperspektivnosti u Jugoslaviji, tijekom pedesetih godina 20. stoljeća iselio u Austriju i Njemačku. Odnos partizanskog pokreta i »narodnih« vlasti prema jugoslavenskim Nijemcima, kojima je pripisana i ozakonjena kolektivna krivnja, ogledni je primjer etničkoga čišćenja u Jugoslaviji potkraj Drugoga svjetskog rata i u neposrednom poraću.

---

\* Dr. /Phd, znanstveni svetni / scientific councillor, Hrvatski institut za povijest / Croatian Institute of History, Opatička 10, 10000 Zagreb. E-mai: geiger@isp.hr.

## Vladimir Geiger

### **Repression against the Members of the German Minority in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Vojvodina 1944–1948**

Due to the wartime developments, until the end of World War II the majority of Germans living in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Vojvodina had fled or been driven from their homes, mostly to Austria and Germany where they also awaited the end of the war. Only those Germans not in immediate danger because of the war remained home. However, at the end of 1944 and in the beginning of 1945 a systematic persecution of the remaining ethnic Germans (»Volksdeutsche«) in Yugoslavia was initiated by the partisan movement and the newly established people's authorities. In particular, the decision of the Presidency of AVNOJ (Anti-Fascist Council of National Liberation of Yugoslavia) of 21 November 1944, pronouncing the members of the German minority as collectively guilty, contributed to this. War crimes perpetrated by some of the Yugoslav ethnic Germans and their disloyalty during the occupation served as a reason and justification for the inhuman actions taken against the German minority at the end of the war and in the post-war period.

During the wartime operations and immediately after them the German inhabitants who failed to escape were at the mercy of the victors. After the war the Yugoslav communist authorities confiscated the property of the members of the German minority and took away their national and citizen rights. Those Yugoslav Germans who could prove that they had participated in the partisan movement or supported it were not among the victims of collective retaliation. Immediately after the war the Yugoslav communist authorities prohibited the return of ethnic Germans who had escaped or been exiled, while those of them still in Yugoslavia were to be deported from the country and were interned into the repatriation camps. As the deportation of the ethnic Germans from Yugoslavia was, in the summer of 1945, prevented by the closing of the Austrian-Yugoslav border by the Allied occupation authorities, who opposed the Yugoslav intentions, most of the Volksdeutsche ended up in the camps, condemned to several years of forced labour. After the camps had been abolished and the prisoners had been released, in the 1950s the majority of Germans from Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Vojvodina moved to Austria and Germany because of their difficult position and lack of any prospects in Yugoslavia. The attitude of the partisan movement and the »people's« authorities towards the Yugoslav Germans, legally declared as collectively guilty, is an evident example of ethnic cleansing in Yugoslavia at the end of World War II and in the immediate post-war period.

Attila Kovács\*

## Represija v Prekmurju med drugo svetovno vojno in v povojnem obdobju – primer internacije v Sárvár in Hrastovec

V Prekmurju, eni od narodnostno in religiozno najbolj pestrih pokrajin Slovenije, je represija med 2. svetovno vojno in po njej med drugim povzročila, da se je tako etnična kot verska podoba pokrajine delno spremenila. Zaradi holokavsta prekmurskega judovstva skorajda ni bilo več, zaradi nasilne izselitve v povojnem obdobju pa je izginila tudi tamkajšnja nemška manjšina. Dogajanja med vojno in po njej pa so imela posledice tudi na prekmurske Slovence in Madžare.

Medvojna represija v Prekmurju se v glavnem veže na obdobje madžarske oblasti, saj so vojaki Rdeče armade osvobodili pokrajino ob Muri mesec dni pred koncem 2. svetovne vojne. V času madžarske oblasti so bili, poleg že omejenih Judov, najmočnejše na udaru primorski kolonisti. Poleg izгона Nemcev pa je povojno obdobje zaznamovala tudi represija nove komunistične oblasti nad delom madžarske manjšine. Ker bo v sklopu konference predstavljena represija nad Judi in Nemci na Slovenskem, se bom v razpravi osredotočil le na represijo nad slovenskim in madžarskim življem v Prekmurju, oz. na internacijo primorskih Slovencev v Sárvár in pripadnikov madžarske manjšine v taborišče Hrastovec, kot na dogodka, ki sta med Slovenci in Madžari v Prekmurju najmočnejše označevala medvojno in povojno represijo.

V obdobju med obema vojnama so v naselja s pretežno madžarskim prebivalstvom v okolici Dolnje Lendave (danes Lendava-Lendva) jugoslovanske oblasti na razlaščno veleposestniško zemljo naselile predvsem Slovence in tudi nekaj Hrvatov s Primorske, iz Istre, notranjosti Slovenije in tudi Prekmurja. Po priključitvi Prekmurja k Madžarski leta 1941 so madžarske oblasti koloniste, ki pred 31. oktobrom 1918 niso živeli na področju Kraljevine Madžarske, internirali v taborišče Sárvár v Železni županiji. Za razliko od kolonistov iz Bačke in Baranje, ki so jih internirali že leta 1941, so koloniste iz Prekmurja tja odpeljali leta 1942. Madžarsko zunanje ministrstvo je namreč sredi leta 1941 navezalo stike z italijanskim zunanjim ministrstvom glede izročitve kolonistov Italiji kot državi, iz katere so prihajali. Ker pogajanja niso bila »uspešna«, so madžarske oblasti koloniste s Primorske in iz Istre 22. in 23. junija 1942 internirali v taborišče Sárvár, in to cele družine, po nekaterih podatkih 587 oseb, po drugih 589. Od teh je umrlo 35 oseb, približno ena tretjina (23 internirancev) v taborišču (zaradi lakote, mraza, bolezni), v drugih krajih Madžarske in NDH pa 12 oseb.

Kmalu po koncu 2. svetovne vojne, 9. in 10. julija 1945, je jugoslovanska (slovenska) komunistična oblast v koncentracijsko taborišče Hrastovec interni-

---

\* Dr. /PhD, docent / senior lecturer, Inštitut za narodnostna vprašanja / Institute for Ethnic Studies, Erjavčeva ulica 26, SI-1000 Ljubljana. E-mail: attila.kovacs@guest.arnes.si.



rala 558 prekmurskih Madžarov, tudi v tem primeru celotne družine. Po mnenju številnih prekmurskih Madžarov, predvsem internirancev, je bila to povračilna akcija jugoslovanskih (slovenskih) oblasti zaradi internacije kolonistov v Sárvar. Po treh tednih internacije so predvsem za delo sposobne prepeljali v taborišče Sterntal (Strnišče pri Ptuj). Konec julija so zaradi tifusa, ki je izbruhnil v taborišču Hrastovec, domov poslali 31 otrok. Ostali internirani prekmurski Madžari, tako tisti, ki so bili v Hrastovcu, kakor tudi tisti v Sterntalu, pa so domov odšli konec septembra. Pri njihovi izpustitvi je zelo pomembno vlogo odigral tedanji podžupan Budimpešte Kővágó (Küronya) József, ki je po mamini strani imel lendavske korenine. Na podlagi njegovih podatkov je madžarsko zunanje ministrstvo interveniralo, kar je privedlo do posredovanja jugoslovanskih oblasti. Izkazalo se je, da o internaciji prekmurskih Madžarov niso bili seznanjeni ne v Beogradu, ne v Ljubljani in ne v Mariboru in je verjetno šlo za lokalno akcijo. Natančno število umrlih Madžarov v internaciji oz. zaradi posledic internacije za enkrat še ni znano, na podlagi raziskav med družinami interniranih pa jih je bilo kakšnih deset.

### **Attila Kovács**

#### **Repression in Prekmurje During World War II and After the War: an Example of Internment into Sárvár and Hrastovec**

In Prekmurje, one of the most diverse Slovenian regions in terms of nationalities and religions, the ethnic as well as religious structure was changed by the violence of World War II and the post-war period. Due to the holocaust the Prekmurje Jews were virtually gone, and because of the forced relocation in the post-war period the local German minority also disappeared. The wartime and post-war developments also affected the Prekmurje Slovenians and Hungarians.

The interwar repression in the Prekmurje region had mostly been carried out during the period of the Hungarian authorities, as the soldiers of the Red Army had liberated the territory by the river Mura a month before World War II ended. During the rule of the Hungarian authorities, the colonists from the Slovenian littoral (Primorska), who had settled in Prekmurje after World War I, were, besides the aforementioned Jews, the primary target of the repression. However, the post-war period was also characterised by the repression of the communist authorities, involving, besides the deportation of the Germans, measures against a part of the Hungarian minority. While during World War II the victims of repression were Slovenians from the Primorska, region whom the Hungarian occupiers interned into the Sárvár camp, the post-war authorities in Prekmurje resorted to repression against Hungarians and interned them into the camp at the Hrastovec castle (near Lenart). These are the most characteristic examples

of wartime and post-war repression against Slovenians and Hungarians in Prekmurje.

In the period between both world wars the Yugoslav authorities populated the hamlets with predominantly Hungarian population in the vicinity of Dolnja Lendava (today Lendava-Lendva) with Slovenians and some Croatians from Primorska, Istria, the interior of Slovenia, and also from Prekmurje, who settled the expropriated lands of former landowning nobles. After the annexation of Prekmurje to Hungary in 1941, the Hungarian authorities interned these colonists, who had not lived in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary before 31 October 1918, into the Sárvár camp in Vas County. Unlike the colonists from Bačka and Baranja, who had already been interned in 1941, the colonists from Prekmurje were taken there in 1942. It was in the middle of 1941 that the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs contacted the Italian Foreign Ministry with the aim of extraditing these colonists to Italy as the state of their origin. However, as the negotiations were not »successful«, on 22 and 23 June 1942 the Hungarian authorities interned the colonists – whole families from Primorska and Istria, according to certain sources 587 people, and according to others 589 – to the Sárvár camp. Of these 35 people died: approximately one third (23 internees) in the camp (due to hunger, cold, disease), and 12 of them in the rest of Hungary and Independent State of Croatia.

Soon after World War II – on 9 and 10 July 1945 – the Yugoslav (Slovenian) communist authorities interned 558 Hungarians from the Prekmurje region into the Hrastovec concentration camp, once again whole families. According to the opinion of many Prekmurje Hungarians, especially internees, this was a retaliatory measure of the Yugoslav (Slovenian) authorities for the internment of the colonists into Sárvár. After three weeks of internment most of those who were capable to work were taken into the Sterntal camp (Strnišče pri Ptuj, today Kidričevo). Due to a breakout of typhus in Hrastovec, 31 children were sent home. The remaining Hungarian internees from Prekmurje (those located in Hrastovec as well as those in Sterntal) could return home in the end of September. The deputy mayor of Budapest at the time, Kővágó (Küronya) József, hailing from Lendava on his mother's side, played an instrumental role in their release. On the basis of his information the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs intervened, and this led to the intervention of the Yugoslav authorities. It turned out that neither Belgrade nor Ljubljana or Maribor had been informed about the internment of the Prekmurje Hungarians; so probably it was a local action. The precise number of Hungarians who died during internment or because of it is not yet known, but according to the research carried out among the families of the internees around ten of them died.

**Darko Dukovski \***

**Represija, zločini i nezakonitosti vojnih i civilnih organa vlasti u hrvatskom dijelu Istre 1945.–1950.**

Istra je u petogodišnjem poratnom razdoblju prolazila kroz procese državno-pravne tranzicije, odnosno procese sjedinjenja s Hrvatskom i Slovenijom u Jugoslaviji. Tijekom toga, vrlo osjetljivoga razdoblja, podvojenosti njezina teritorija, neizvjesnosti i društveno-političke preobrazbe, izrastanja nove vlasti, događale su se brojne nezakonitosti, represije i zločini nad svima koji su te procese pokušali usporiti ili zaustaviti.

Glavni politički procesi usmjereni su k uspostavi i učvršćenju nove narodne vlasti pod nadzorom Vojne uprave Jugoslavenske armije u prijelaznom razdoblju sjedinjenja Istre s Jugoslavijom, odnosno Slovenijom i Hrvatskom. u kojemu su se snažno osjećale vanjskopolitičke tenzije i nacionalno-ideološka podijeljenost stanovništva. Narodna vlast u kratkom poratnom razdoblju nije u cijelosti bila komunistička iako je djelovala pod nadzorom partijskih struktura. Kontrola Partije nije bila tada do kraja uspostavljena. U tom smislu ni represija nad političkom oporbom nije nosila isključivo komunistički pečat. Nedvojbeno je da se na području kontroliranom od VUJA-e odmah počelo s provođenjem revolucionarnih društvenih promjena koje su vrlo često nailazile na otpor stanovništva, kako talijanskog tako i hrvatskog i slovenskog.

Represija je bila usmjerena prema bivšem ratnom neprijatelju, ratnim zločincima, kolaboracionistima, fašistima, ideološko-političkim i nacionalnom neprijatelju, dojučerašnjim saveznicima i suborcima, svima onima koji su na bilo koji način sprječavali ili ometali provođenje političkih smjernica Partije.

**Darko Dukovski**

**Repression, Crimes and Wrongful Acts of the Military and Civilian Authorities in the Croatian Part of Istria 1945–1950**

In the five-year post-war period Istria went through processes of state-legal transition, that is, through the processes of unification with Croatia and Slovenia within Yugoslavia. During this very sensitive period, in the circumstances of the division of its territory, uncertainty, socio-political transformation, and formation of the new government, numerous wrongful acts, instances of repres-

---

\* Dr./PhD, redni profesor / full professor, Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta na Rijeci / Faculty of Arts of the University of Rijeka, Trg braće Mažuranića 10, 51000 Rijeka. E-mai: ddukovski@ffri.hr.

sion and crimes against anyone attempting to slow down or put a stop to these processes took place.

The goal of the main political processes was to establish and strengthen the new people's authorities under the supervision of the Military Administration of the Yugoslav Army in the transitional period of Istria's unification with Yugoslavia or Slovenia and Croatia. During this time the foreign-political tensions and national-ideological division of the people were quite evident. In the short post-war period the people's authorities were not completely communist, even though they acted under the supervision of the Party structures. The Party's control had not yet been completely established. In this sense the repression against political opposition was also not exclusively communist. Certainly in the area controlled by the Military Administration of the Yugoslav Army the revolutionary social changes were introduced immediately, very often encountering the resistance of the population – Italian as well as Croatian and Slovenian.

Thus the repression was aimed against the former wartime enemies, war criminals, collaborators, fascists, ideological-political and national enemies, recent allies and comrades in arms – all those who would in any way whatsoever hinder or interfere with the implementation of the political directives of the Party.

## Raoul Pupo\*

### Eksodus iz cone B Svobodnega tržaškega ozemlja (1945–1958)

Eksodus iz cone B Svobodnega tržaškega ozemlja je del širšega fenomena eksodusa prebivalcev Dalmacije in Julijske krajine. Avtor najprej na kratko pokaže na temeljne značilnosti migracijskega fenomena in pri tem izhaja iz razvoja, ki ga je koncept »eksodusa« naredil v zgodovinopisju. Sprva je bil to bojevit izraz, ki je bil usmerjen v to, da bi izrazil enopomenskost zgodovinske izkušnje, da bi v zadnjih zgodovinopisnih prispevkih postal splošna pojasnjevalna kategorija, ki je uporabljena za opisovanje posebne serije prisilnega preseljevanja evropskega prebivalstva, ki se začne sredi devetnajstega stoletja, in ki ga tako razločimo od bližnjih, a ne identičnih fenomenov kot so izgoni in deportacije.

V nadaljevanju avtor analizira glavna spodbude, ki so pripeljale do eksodusa skoraj vsega italijanskega prebivalstva z območij, ki so po drugi svetovni vojni prišla pod nadzor jugoslovanskih oblasti. Začne s politično, družbeno in nacionalno revolucijo in njenim vplivom na istrsko stvarnost. Posebna pozornost je namenjena »slovansko-italijanskem bratstvu«, ki je razumljeno kot selektivna strategija povezovanja, pa tudi delovanju organov ljudske oblasti. Mešanica notranjih omejitev politike »bratstva« in njenega propada je pri Italijanih rojevala občutek nezmožnosti preživetja, zaradi katerega je bila pravica do opcije dejansko odhod na varno. Uporabil jo je tudi precejšen del neitalijanskega prebivalstva, kar potrjuje trdoto pogojev takratnega tako materialnega kot političnega življenja v Istri.

Podobni pogoji so bili tudi v coni B STO, kjer pa se je tem pogojem pridružila negotovost glede nadaljnje državne pripadnosti cone, ki je segla vse do oktobra 1954. To je v določeni meri zaustavilo množično izseljevanje, do kakršnega je prišlo na območjih Istre, ki so bila z mirovno pogodbo že leta 1947 priključena k Jugoslaviji. Ob tem pa moramo upoštevati nekatere ključne trenutke v odnosih med italijanskim prebivalstvom in novimi oblastmi v coni B STO: epuracija, stavka v Kopru jeseni 1945, prihod mednarodne razmejitvene komisije pomladi 1946, zaostritev preganjanja Cerkve, resolucija Informbiroja 1948, volitve leta 1950.

Avtor nato pokaže na nekatera področja, ki jih je treba še raziskati, kot so odnos med vojaško upravo in ljudsko oblastjo, notranja členitev same ljudske oblasti in graditev novega vodilnega razreda, ki je oblast prevzel leta 1945. Ob tem bo predložil prve izsledke raziskave, ki teče glede drugega vidika, o katerem se je veliko razpravljalo, to je o ravnanju proitalijanskih sil na tem območju, ki so bile povezane tako z organizacijami v coni A, kot z italijansko vlado.

---

\* Izredni profesor / professor, Facoltà di Scienze politiche dell'Università degli Studi di Trieste / Piazzale Europa, 1, 34127 Trieste. E-mail: pupor@sp.univ.trieste.it.

Gre za Istrski narodnoosvobodilni odbor (Comitato di liberazione nazionale dell'Istria), ki je imel sedež v Trstu, in za radijsko postajo Radio Venezia Giulia, ki ga je italijanska vlada vodila neposredno. V obeh primerih so bile te raziskave mogoče zahvaljujoč novemu pomembnemu arhivskemu gradivu.

Na koncu se avtor ustavi na zadnji fazi tržaškega vprašanja, torej v letih 1953 in 1954, ki se je zaključila s podpisom Spomenice o soglasju oktobra 1954, in ki ji je sledila izselitev skoraj celotnega italijanskega prebivalstva cone B STO. Zadnje pojasnilo pa je namenjeno prisotnosti ezulov v tržaški vsakdanjosti.

### **Raoul Pupo**

#### **Exodus from Zone B of the Free Territory of Trieste (1945–1958)**

The exodus from the Zone B of the Free Territory of Trieste is a part of the wider phenomenon of the exodus of people from Dalmatia and Venezia Giulia. First the author outlines the basic characteristics of the migration phenomenon, basing his description on the historiographic development of the concept of »exodus«. Initially this was an expression aimed at conveying the unique concept of a historical experience, while in the more recent historiographic articles it developed into a general explanatory category used to describe the various examples of the forced relocation of the European population beginning in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Thus it can be distinguished from the similar but not identical phenomena like exile and deportation.

Then the author analyses the main incentives leading to the exodus of almost all of the Italian population from the areas which came under the control of the Yugoslav authorities after World War II. He looks at the political, social and national revolution and its influence of the Istrian reality. He also pays special attention to the »Slavic-Italian brotherhood«, which is understood as a selective strategy of establishing connections, and also to the activities of the people's authorities. The blend of the internal restrictions of the »brotherhood« policy and its demise made the Italian population feel afraid for its survival, therefore the right to choose was in fact an option to move to safety. This option was also chosen by a significant percentage of the non-Italian population, which confirms the severity of the conditions of the material as well as political life in Istria at the time.

Zone B of the Free Territory of Trieste was subject to similar conditions, but there the situation was additionally complicated by the uncertainty with regard to which state the Zone would subsequently be annexed to, lasting until as late as October 1954. This, to a certain extent, prevented mass emigration, which, however, did take place in the areas of Istria which had already been annexed to Yugoslavia with the Peace Treaty of 1947. Here we should also take into ac-

count some of the key moments in the relations between the Italian population and the new authorities in Zone B of the Free Territory of Trieste: the purge, the strike in Koper (Capodistria) in the autumn of 1945, the arrival of the international demarcation commission in the spring of 1946, the increasingly severe persecution of the Church, the Cominform Resolution of 1948, and the 1950 elections.

The author then points out certain issues which still need to be researched, like the relationship between the military administration and the people's authorities, the internal structure of the people's authorities themselves, and the development of the new ruling class which took over the power in 1945. He also submits the first findings of a research from another angle, which has been subject to lengthy discussions: the actions of the pro-Italian forces in this territory, which were connected to the organisations in Zone A as well as to the Italian government. These forces include the Istrian National Liberation Committee (Comitato di liberazione nazionale dell'Istria) registered in Trieste, and Radio Venezia Giulia, managed directly by the Italian government. In both cases the research was possible thanks to important new archive materials.

Towards the end the author looks at the final stage of the Trieste question, taking place in 1953 and 1954 and concluding with the signature of the London Memorandum of October 1954, followed by the emigration of almost all of the Italian population from Zone B of the Free Territory of Trieste. Finally the author explains the presence of exiles (the so-called ezuli) in the everyday life in Trieste.

**Avguštin Malle\***  
**Avstrijski in britanski varnostni organi in njihov odnos do koroških Slovencev v prvih povojnih letih**

Ko so 8. maja 1945 zavezniške sile – k tem silam so Britanci šteli tudi Jugoslovansko armado in partizanske odrede – dokončno osvobodile Avstrijo, je za prebivalstvo okrajev na avstrijskem Koroškem s slovenskim ali mešanim prebivalstvom nastala nov položaj. Po umiku Jugoslovanske armade, ki so ga zahtevale note Velike Britanije z dne 12. maja in Združenih držav Amerike z dne 15. maja 1945, so enote britanske 8. armade odnosno vzpostavljena vojaška vlada odločale o vseh vprašanih varnosti in uprave v deželi. Provizorična deželna vlada, ki so jo vojaške oblasti imele kot posvetovalni organ in ga za nekaj tednov tudi tako poimenovali, praktično ni imela nobenih pristojnosti. Vojaška vlada je vladala z ukazi, ki so zagotavljali najprej varnost pripadnikov njenih oboroženih sil in administrativnega osebja ter urejevali najvažnejša življenjska vprašanja kot na primer prehranjevalno.

V prvi kontrolni pogodbi, ki je stopila v veljavo 10. avgusta 1945, so zavezniške sile naznanile svoj namen, da postopno ustvarijo pogoje, kodo omogočili predajo pristojnosti centralni avstrijski administraciji in zagotovili vzpostavitev svobodno izvoljene avstrijske vlade. V preambuli druge kontrolne pogodbe, ki je stopila v veljavo 26. junija 1946, so se zavezniki navezali na moskovsko deklaracijo z dne 1. novembra 1943 in točno določili pristojnosti avstrijskih oblasti. Pridržali so si med drugimi te pristojnosti: oskrbo in repatriacijo vojnih ujetnikov in preseljenih oseb ter sojenje teh oseb, izsleditev, aretacijo in izročitev oseb, ki so zakrivile vojne zločine in zločine proti človečnosti.

Vojaška vlada je na Koroškem takoj vzpostavila vojaška sodišča. O njegovih obsodbah najdemo informacije v dnevniku Kärntner Nachrichten, pozneje tudi v tedniku Koroška kronika. Iz njih razberemo, da je sodišče ostro nastopalo zlasti proti tatvinam hrane iz zalog britanskih enot, proti osebam, ki niso oddale orožij ali drugega vojaškega materiala, in proti črnoborzijancem. Ko so Britanci uveljavili »zaporni pas«, so ta sodišča izrekala kazni osebam, ki so to notranje koroško mejo prestopile brez potrebnih dokumentov. V tem primeru naletimo na imena deloma znanih koroških Slovencev, pojavijo pa se tudi imena slovenskih beguncev odnosno slovenske politične emigracije. Zadnji so se skušali praviloma umakniti v Italijo. Ker britanska vojaška oblast seveda ni poznala razmer v deželi, je k sodelovanju kmalu pritegnila vrsto Avstrijcev, ki so pred marcem 1938 služili v sklopu avstrijskih varnostnih sil, deloma pa bili kot taki aktivni tudi v času nacizma.

---

\* Dr./PhD, direktor v. p. / director in retirement, Slovenski znanstveni inštitut / Slovenian Scientific Institute, Mikschallee 4, 9020 Celovec/Klagenfurt. E-mail: a.malle@szl.at.



Čeprav je Provizorična koroška deželna vlada napovedovala, da bo takoj popravila vse krivice, ki jih je nacizem povzročil koroškim Slovencem, je v soglasju z vojaško vlado in zatem s civilno upravo zavlačevala obnovo organizacij koroških Slovencev. Britanska oblast je sicer pospeševala revitalizacijo slovenskega jezika in nekaterih oblik kulturnega življenja, nikakor pa ni soglašala s političnim delom Slovencev, ki so bili zbrani v Pokrajinskem odboru Osvobodilne fronte. Z represijo je pripravila Osvobodilno fronto do tega, da se je odpovedala udeležbi pri državno- in deželnozborskih volitvah 25. novembra 1945. Medtem ko so stranke večine v volilnem boju neprestano govorile o mejnem vprašanju, tega slovenski strani ni bilo mogoče. Slovenci so sicer že avgusta začeli s kulturno dejavnostjo, Slovenska prosvetna zveza pa je uradno lahko začela z delom šele konec marca 1946. Represija britanskih in avstrijskih varnostnih organov je prizadela zlasti tisti krog oseb, ki so se zavemale za združitev koroških Slovencev s Slovenci v Jugoslaviji. Le redke koroške Slovence je vojaško sodišče obsodilo zaradi nespoštovanja ali žalitve pripadnikov vojaške vlade ali britanske civilne uprave. To se je zgodilo Karlu Prušniku – Gašperju, ki je novembra 1946 javno kritiziral nekega angleškega sodnika. Mladi koroški Slovenci so bili pogosto obsojeni zaradi trošenja letakov, ki so propagirali združitev z Jugoslavijo. Bili so kaznovani zaradi javnega nameščanja dvojezičnih krajevnih napisov in zaradi ilegalnega prehoda avstrijsko-jugoslovanske meje. Konice teh postopkov se ujemajo s časom pogajanj za avstrijsko državno pogodbo, višek pa zaznamo februarja 1947.

Britanska civilna oblast je pristojnosti postopno izročala v roke avstrijskih organov. Ti so proti koroškim Slovencem verbalno postopali radikalnejše, in med drugim zavirali ustanovitev Demokratične fronte delovnega ljudstva kot nasledstvene organizacije Osvobodilne fronte. Najdoslednejše pa so avstrijske deželne in zvezne oblasti zavirale obnovo slovenskega zadružništva.

### **Avguštin Malle**

#### **Austrian and British Security Bodies and Their Attitude to Carinthian Slovenians During the First Years After the War**

When the Allied forces – which included, in the opinion of the British, also the Yugoslav Army and the partisan detachments – finally liberated Austria, the people living in the Austrian Carinthian districts with Slovenian or mixed population found themselves in a new situation. After the retreat of the Yugoslav Army, demanded by the notes of Great Britain of 12 May and United States of America of 15 May 1945, the units of the British 8<sup>th</sup> Army or the established military authorities assumed the responsibility for all the issues of security and administration in the region. The provisional provincial government, serving as

a consultative body and even named as such by the military authorities for a few weeks, had practically no powers whatsoever. The military government ruled by means of orders, primarily aimed at providing security for its armed forces and administrative staff, and regulating the most important issues, like food, for example.

In the first control agreement, which entered into force on 10 August 1945, the Allied forces stated their purpose of gradually creating the conditions enabling the transfer of the jurisdiction to the central Austrian administration and ensuring the establishment of a freely elected Austrian government. In the preamble of the second control agreement, entering into force on 26 June 1946, the Allies referred to the Moscow Declaration of 1 November 1943 and precisely outlined the powers of the Austrian authorities. Among other things they retained the following responsibilities: maintenance and repatriation of prisoners of war and dislocated people and court proceedings initiated against these people; tracking down, arresting and extraditing those who had committed war crimes and crimes against humanity.

The military government in Carinthia established military courts immediately. Information about the sentences imposed by these courts can be found in the *Kärntner Nachrichten* daily newspaper, and later also in the *Koroška kronika* weekly. The articles reveal that military courts were strict, especially with regard to theft of food from the stock of the British units, persons failing to hand over weapons or other military materiel, and black marketeers. When the British established the internal Carinthian border, these courts punished people who crossed it without the necessary documents. In this case we come across names of partially known Carinthian Slovenians, and the names of Slovenian refugees or Slovenian political emigration also appear. The latter mostly attempted to retreat to Italy. Because the British military authorities did not know the situation in this country, naturally, they soon recruited many Austrians who had served in the Austrian security forces before March 1938. As such some of them had also been active during the Nazi regime.

Although the provisional Carinthian provincial government announced it would rectify any injustice caused to the Carinthian Slovenians by the Nazism, it then stalled the restoration of the organisations of Carinthian Slovenians in agreement with the military government and later the civilian administration. The British authorities may have promoted the revitalisation of the Slovenian language and some forms of cultural life, but they by no means agreed with the political efforts of Slovenians gathered in the Provincial Committee of the Liberation Front. They resorted to repression in order to stop the Liberation Front from taking part in the national and Provincial Assembly elections on 25 November 1945. While the parties of the majority constantly discussed the issue of the border during the election campaign, the Slovenian side was prevented from doing so. Slovenians

initiated their cultural activities already in August, but the Slovenian Education Association could not officially start operating until as late as the end of March 1946. The repression carried out by the British and Austrian security bodies especially affected the people arguing for the unification of the Carinthian Slovenians with Slovenians in Yugoslavia. Only a few Carinthian Slovenians were convicted by the military court because they disrespected or insulted the members of the military government or British civilian administration. However, that happened to Karel Prušnik – Gašper, who publicly criticised a certain English judge in November 1946. The Carinthian Slovenian youth was frequently punished because they spread leaflets promoting the unification with Yugoslavia. They were also punished for putting up bilingual signposts and for crossing the border between Austria and Yugoslavia illegally. The peaks of these proceedings correspond with the Austrian State Treaty, culminating in February 1947.

Gradually, the British civilian authorities handed the powers over to the Austrian bodies. Verbally these were more radical in their opposition towards Carinthian Slovenians. Among other things they hindered the establishment of the Democratic Front of the Working People as the organisation succeeding the Liberation Front. Furthermore, the Austrian provincial and federal authorities were most consistent in their obstruction of the restoration of Slovenian cooperatives.

**Gorazd Bajc\***

## **Pogledi zahodnih zaveznikov na nasilje v Jugoslaviji med drugo svetovno vojno in v prvem povojnem obdobju**

Pri obravnavi pogledov zahodnih zaveznikov na nasilje v Jugoslaviji med drugo svetovno vojno in v prvem povojnem obdobju moramo upoštevati splošni pogled in dojemanje tedanjih razmer v Veliki Britaniji in Združenih državah Amerike. O njihovi politiki do Jugoslavije je v zgodovinopisju že veliko znanega, nekoliko manj pa glede tematike nasilja. Avtor bo skušal predstaviti poglede Anglo-Američanov na najpomembnejše vidike te tematike, in sicer iz vsebinskega zornega kota na nasilje s strani okupatorjev ter »domačih« nasprotnih formacij in na povojno nasilje novih jugoslovanskih oblasti (izvensodne usmrtitve, deportacije, odnos do vojnih ujetnikov, politična represija ipd.). Pri tem bo izpostavil ključna metodološka vprašanja, npr. kolikšen naj bi bil dejanski interes zahodnih zaveznikov za nasilje – vseh povzročiteljev le-tega – v Jugoslaviji med vojno in po njej, kdo jim je posredoval informacije in kako jim je uspelo spremljati dogajanje. Poudaril bo, kolikšno vlogo so tu odigrale vojaške oziroma obveščevalne misije, razni informatorji in drugi načini zbiranja podatkov. Avtor je izhajal iz hipoteze, da je bil interes registrirati čim več nasilnih primerov, najbolj pa so jih zanimali tisti primeri, ko so nasilja neposredno zajela anglo-ameriške vojske in civiliste.

**Gorazd Bajc**

## **Attitude of the Western Allies towards the Violence in Yugoslavia During World War II and in the Immediate Post-War Period**

In our discussion of the attitude of the Western Allies towards the violence in Yugoslavia during World War II and in the immediate post-war period we should take into account the general outlook on and understanding of the contemporary circumstances in the United Kingdom and in the United States of America. Historiography has already thoroughly explored the Allied policy towards Yugoslavia, but not as much is known about the issue of violence. The author will try to present, from the substantive viewpoint, the Anglo-American outlook on the most important aspects of this issue: violence committed by the occupiers and the »national« opposing formations, as well as post-war violence of the new Yugoslav authorities (extrajudicial executions, deportations, attitude

---

\* Dr. /PhD, docent / senior lecturer, Fakulteta za humanistične študije Univerze na Primorskem / Faculty of Humanities of the University of Primorska, Titov trg 5, SI-6000 Koper. E-mail: gorazd.bajc@zrs-kp.si.

towards prisoners, political repression, etc.). He will also underline the key methodological questions, for example, what was supposedly the actual interest of the Western Allies in violence – and in all of its perpetrators – in Yugoslavia during and after the war, who informed them, and how they managed to follow the developments. He will emphasise the role of military or intelligence missions, various informants, and other means of gathering information. The author built his research on the hypothesis that the Western Allies were interested in registering as many examples of violence as possible, and they were most interested in cases where violence affected the Anglo-American soldiers and civilians directly.

## Katalin Munda Hirnök\*

### Represija nad Slovenci v Porabju v času Rákosijevega režima (1948–1956)

Porabje je bilo v času Rákosijevega režima zaradi geografsko politične lege (obmejni trikotnik med Avstrijo in Jugoslavijo) še posebej izpostavljeno območje, tam živeči Slovenci pa posebej izpostavljena družbena skupina. Zaradi izključitve Jugoslavije iz Informbiroja ter »vojne histerije«, usmerjene proti Titu, je bilo obmejno območje pogostokrat prizorišče terorja madžarskih oblasti. To se je pokazalo v številnih postopkih, ki so bili sproženi proti ljudem zaradi suma »vohunjenja«, »tihotapljenja ljudi«, izvajali so policijski nadzor nad prebivalstvom in prišlo je do izгона ljudi.

Na Madžarskem živeči Južni Slovani so postali potencialni sovražniki režima. Za odstranitev teh ljudi iz obmejnega pasu so v pokrajinah Hortobágy, Nagykovács és Hajdúság na vzhodu Madžarske ustanovili 12 zaprtih delovnih taborišč, ki so delovala med letoma 1950 in 1953. Do prvih večjih deportacij, »čistk« iz obmejnega pasu, tudi iz Porabja, je prišlo 23. junija 1950, sledili sta še dve: 6. decembra 1951 in 29. maja 1952. Po doslej zbranih podatkih so iz Porabja deportirali 68 družin oz. 210 oseb. Največ družin je bilo deportiranih iz tistih vasi, ki so neposredno mejile na Jugoslavijo (Gornji Senik, Števanovci, Verica). Deportacije sta Služba državne varnosti (Államvédelmi Hatóság – ÁVH) in policija običajno izvajali sredi noči. Družina je morala v kratkem času spakirati najnujnejše potrebščine. Odpeljali so jih do najbližje železniške postaje, stlačili v živinske vagone in odpeljali. Družinam so zaplenili celotno premoženje, hiše, stanovanja in zemljo. V taboriščih so bili nastanjeni v gospodarskih poslopih v nečloveških bivalnih razmerah. Dela, ki so jim bila dodeljena, so deportiranci opravljali pod policijskim nadzorom. V glavnem so opravljali kmetijska dela. Do zaprtja taborišč je prišlo po Stalinovi smrti. Po izpustitvi iz taborišč se deportiranci še tri leta niso smeli vrniti domov in so si morali novo življenje ustvariti drugje, izven obmejnega območja. Do danes Madžarska uradno še ni priznala deportirancev kot posebne skupine prebivalcev, katerim je režim v preteklosti povzročil veliko krivico.

Pri predstavitvi takratnega dogajanja se opiram na pričevanja še živečih deportirancev in na arhivske vire, ki se nahajajo v Arhivu Železne županije (Vas Megyei Levéltár) v Szombathelyu, v Zgodovinskem arhivu Službe državne varnosti (Állambiztonsági Szolgálatok Történeti Levéltára) ter v Državnem arhivu (Magyar Országos Levéltár) v Budimpešti.

\* Dr. /PhD, znanstvena svetnica / scientific councillor, Inštitut za narodnostna vprašanja / Institute for Ethnic Studies, Erjavčeva ulica 26, SI-1000 Ljubljana.  
E-mail: katalin.hirnok@guest.arnes.si.

## **Katalin Munda Hirnök**

### **Repression against Slovenians in the Rába Valley During Rákosi's Regime (1948–1956)**

During Rákosi's regime, the basin of the river Rába – the Rába Valley – was an especially sensitive region due to its geopolitical position (the border triangle between Austria and Yugoslavia), while the Slovenians living there were an especially vulnerable social group. Due to Yugoslavia's exclusion from Cominform and the »war hysteria« aimed against Tito, the territory near the border was often the focus of the terror carried out by the Hungarian authorities. This was also evident from the numerous procedures initiated against people due to suspicions of »spying« and »people smuggling«. Police surveillance of the population was in place and many people were exiled.

South Slavs living in Hungary became the potential enemies of the regime. In order to remove these people from the area near the border, twelve closed work camps, operating from 1950 to 1953, were established in the provinces of Hortobágy, Nagyikunág and Hajdúág in the east of Hungary. The first large-scale deportations, »cleansings« of the border area, including the Rába Valley, took place on 23 June 1950, and two more followed on 6 December 1951 and 29 May 1952. According to the information gathered to date, 68 families or 210 people were deported from the Rába Valley. Most families were exiled from the villages lying directly on the border with Yugoslavia (Gornji Senik, Števanovci, Verica). The deportations were usually carried out in the middle of the night by the State Security Service (Államvédelmi Hatóság – ÁVH) and the police. The families were only given a short time to pack their most basic necessities. Then they were taken to the nearest railway station, stuffed in cattle wagons, and transported away. The entire property of these families – their houses, apartments and land – was confiscated. In the camps they resided in outbuildings in inhuman conditions. Under police surveillance the deportees laboured on whatever work was assigned to them. This mostly involved agricultural labour. After Stalin's death the camps were closed. When they were released from the camps, the deportees were forbidden from returning home for another three years, and they had to get on with their lives elsewhere, outside the border area. To date Hungary had still failed to officially acknowledge the deportees as a special group of the population, suffering a great injustice in the past at the hands of the regime.

I based my presentation of the developments at the time on the testimonies of the deportees still alive today, as well as on the archive resources kept at the archives of Železna županija (Vas Megyei Levéltár) in Szombathely, in the Historical Archives of the State Security Service (Állambiztonsági Szolgálatok Történeti Levéltára), and in the State Archives in Budapest (Magyar Országos Levéltár).

## **Zdenko Radelić\***

### **Represija na Hrvaškem v času po 2. svetovni vojni**

Namen prispevka je predstaviti vzroke, ki so pripeljali do vzpostavitve represivnega sistema. Bistveni elementi, ki so vplivali na represivne postopke vojaških in državnih organov pod vodstvom Komunistične partije Jugoslavije (KPJ) v 2. svetovni vojni in po njej ter na izgraditev komunističnega represivnega sistema so bili različni in so med seboj povezani.

Po okupaciji Jugoslavije aprila 1941 je KPJ organizirala osvobodilno gibanje, ki je izvajalo revolucijo. Na Hrvaškem so bili med vzroki za upor jugoslovanska usmeritev mnogih prebivalcev, ustaški teror proti Srbom, rasistični pregoni, srbska množična zavrnitev hrvaške države, teror proti vsem nasprotnikom Neodvisne države Hrvaške in močna protiiitalijansko ter protinemško usmeritev. Vzroki za upor so medsebojno prepleteni, hkrati pa v sebi skrivajo vzroke za kasnejše usmrtitve nasprotnikov in povračilne ukrepe, torej za obsežno represijo, ki so jo izvajale povojne jugoslovanske oblasti.

Jugoslavija je bila po vojni obnovljena, kot način reševanja nacionalnih vprašanj je bil uveden federalizem, država je priključila obsežna območja, ki so bila dotlej del italijanske države. Na podlagi jugoslovanskega nacionalizma je novo državno vodstvo obračunalo s separatisti in z nemško manjšino. Novo družbeno ureditev je KPJ ustvarjala s taktično kombinacijo propagandnega delovanja in konkretnih ukrepov. Sklicevala se je na zasluge narodnoosvobodilnega gibanja za osvoboditev in poudarjala vlogo ljudstva ter njegove volje. Kljub ljudsko frontnim frazam je komunistična partija zavzela vse ključne pozicije v partizanskem gibanju in nastajajočem državnem aparatu. To je imelo drastične posledice za vse njene nasprotnike in tekmece. Veliko število žrtev na strani zmagovalcev je bilo seveda med pomembnimi razlogi za maščevanje nad premaganim vojnim sovražnikom. Toda to se je prepletalo z namenom KPJ, da vse prave in namišljene vojaške in politične nasprotnike onemogoči in družbeno marginalizira.

Represija je vključevala usmrtitve, zaporne kazni, izgone, odvzemanje lastnine, prepovedi političnega delovanja in družbeno marginalizacijo razoroženih sovražnikov ter političnih nasprotnikov.

Po razpadu zaveznitva med zmagovalci je obstajala nevarnost, da pride do vojne med državami t. i. zahodne parlamentarne demokracije in Vzhodom pod vodstvom komunistične Sovjetske zveze, v kateri bi se jugoslovanske protikomunistične sile zagotovo priključile zahodnim silam. V tej vojni bi imeli pomembno vlogo Hrvati, pripadniki protikomunističnih strank in gibanj, kakor tudi Srbi na Hrvaškem, pripadniki četniškega gibanja. Med prvimi so bili naj-

---

\* Dr. /Phd, znanstveni svetni / scientific councillor, Hrvatski institut za povijest / Croatian Institute of History, Opatička 10, 10000 Zagreb. E-mai: zdenko@radelic.com.



bolj vplivni tisti, ki so izhajali iz ustaškega gibanja, kakor tudi člani in pristaši Hrvaške kmečke stranke (Hrvatska seljačka stranka – HSS), doma in v tujini. V opciji ustaške emigracije in njenih pristašev v domovini je, poleg uničenja komunističnega sistema, bilo predvideno tudi izginotje Jugoslavije in vzpostavitev samostojne hrvaške države. Od sredine šestdesetih let 20. stoletja let je tudi HSS, ki je delovala v emigraciji, spremenila svojo projugoslovansko stališče in se zavzemala za samostojno Hrvaško. Vse to je vplivalo na to, da je KPJ izgradila čvrst represiven sistem.

### **Zdenko Radelić**

#### **Repression in Croatia after World War II**

The purpose of the following contribution is to present the reasons for the establishment of a repressive system. The key elements influencing the repressive measures of the military and state authorities under the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia during and after World War II and the establishment of the communist repressive system were various and interconnected.

After the occupation of Yugoslavia in April 1941, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia organised a liberation movement, which also carried out the revolution. In Croatia the reasons for the resistance were the Yugoslav orientation of a significant percentage of the population, the Ustashe terror against the Serbs, racist persecution, Serbian mass rejection of the Croatian state, terror against all the opponents of the Independent State of Croatia, as well as strong anti-Italian and anti-German sentiment. These reasons were interconnected, and at the same time they represented the causes of the subsequent liquidation of the opponents and retaliatory measures, namely, the extensive repression carried out by the Yugoslav communist authority.

After the war Yugoslavia was restored. Federalism was introduced as a way of addressing the national issues, and Yugoslavia annexed extensive territories which had until then belonged to Italy. On the basis of Yugoslav nationalism the new state leadership settled the score with separatists and the German minority. Communist Party of Yugoslavia created a new social system with a tactical combination of propaganda and concrete measures. It appealed to the contributions of the national liberation movement to the liberation and emphasised the role of the people and their will. Despite its references to the People's Front, the Communist Party took over all the key positions within the partisan movement and the nascent state apparatus. This had drastic consequences for all of its opponents and rivals. Naturally, a large number of casualties among the victors was among the important reasons for vengeance against the wartime enemies. However, this involved the intention of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia to

neutralise all the real and imaginary military and political opponents and marginalise them socially.

The repression involved death sentences, prison sentences, exile, confiscation of property, prohibition of political activities, and social marginalisation of the disarmed enemies and political opponents.

After the alliance between the victors had dissolved, a danger of a war between the states of the so-called Western parliamentary democracy and the East under the leadership of the communist Soviet Union became apparent, in which the Yugoslav anti-communist forces would surely support the West. In this potential war Croats, members of anti-communist parties and movements, would play an important part, and so would Serbs in Croatia, members of the Chetnik movement. Among the former those who stemmed from the Ustashe movement as well as the members and adherents of the Croatian Peasant's Party (Hrvatska seljačka stranka) at home and abroad had the greatest influence. The Ustashe emigration and its supporters at home had the goal – apart from destroying the communist system – of abolishing Yugoslavia and establishing an independent Croatian state. Since the 1960s the Croatian Peasant's Party, still active in emigration, changed its pro-Yugoslav standpoint and started arguing for an independent Croatia. All of this resulted in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia building a strong repressive system.

**Nataša Milićević\***

## **Inteligencija u Srbiji između revolucionarne represije i društvene integracije 1944–1950**

Inteligencija u Srbiji, kao i ostatku Jugoslavije, posle Drugog svetskog rata našla se u specifičnom položaju. On je proizlazio iz ambivalentnog odnosa Komunističke partije Jugoslavije, kao glavne snage revolucionarne vlasti, prema inteligenciji. Naime, Komunistička partija je bila svesna velike društvene važnosti i uloge inteligencije, ali je, istovremeno, prema njoj pokazivala nepoverenje i strah zbog njenog građanskog porekla, koji je nasledila iz predratnog i ratnog perioda. Zbog toga je ona inteligenciju isticala, pored seljaka i radnika, kao jedna od stubova društvenog preobražaja i izdvojila je građanstva kao klase na koju ne računa i koju želi da potisne. Iz istog razloga je uspostavila i razliku između »poželjne« i »nepoželjne« inteligencije odnosno »poštene, napredne i narodne« i »nepoštene, reakcionarne i nenarodne«. Ova druga je trebalo da podeli sudbinu kapitalista, ali je, za razliku od njih koje je revolucionarna vlast u procesu rušenja građanskog društva i njegovog nasleđa uništavala, »nepoželjnu« inteligenciju, zbog njene malobrojnosti i posedovanja kulturnog kapitala, bila prinuđena da u najvećem broju integriše u »novo društvo«.

Neposredno posle oslobođenja dominirala je nad inteligencijom u Srbiji, kao i u Jugoslaviji, revolucionarna represija. Ona je sadržavala čitav niz mera preko kojih se vlast obračunavala sa pripadnicima inteligencije i preko kojih ih je potiskivala i uklanjala iz javnog života, kulture i politike. Obuhvatala je proveru »ispravnosti« rada i ponašanja celokupne inteligencije u periodu okupacije. Neki od njih su trajno uklonjeni iz društva, pošto su streljani od vojnih sudova, drugi su duže ili kraće vreme robijali, treći su odlukama »sudova časti«, uklonjeni na izvesno vreme iz javnog života, dok su četvrti »javnim ukorom preko štampe« opomenuti za držanje pod okupacijom. Istovremeno je tako inteligencija podeljena na onu »nedostojnu« i na onu »dostojnu«, koja je mogla da se uključi u izgradnju novog društva. U odnosu na represiju, integraciju nije pratila dramatičnost. Izgledalo je da se odvija u »tišini«. Izuzetak su činili oni pripadnici inteligencije koje je sama revolucionarna vlast pozvala na saradnju ili oni koji su joj se sami preporučili. Većina intelektualaca je integrisana postepeno. Prvobitnu sumnjičavost i oštrinu u postupanju zamenila je politika »gipkijeg« odnosa, što je, sa liberalizacijom pedesetih godina 20. veka, omogućilo da, pored tehničke inteligencije, široko prihvaćena bude i humanistička inteligencija.

---

\* Mag. / M.Sc., raziskovalka / researcher, Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije / Institute for Recent History of Serbia, Trg Nikole Pašića 11, 11000 Beograd.  
E-mail: [natasa.milisevic@open.telekom.rs](mailto:natasa.milisevic@open.telekom.rs).

**Nataša Milićević**  
**Serbian Intelligentsia between Revolutionary Repression and Social  
Integration 1944–1950**

After World War II the Serbian intelligentsia, like intellectuals in the rest of Yugoslavia, found itself in a specific position. This position originated in the ambivalent attitude of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia as the main force of the revolutionary authorities towards intellectuals. Namely, the Communist Party was aware of a profound social significance and role of the intelligentsia, but simultaneously it was distrustful and afraid of it due to its bourgeois origins stemming from the pre-war and wartime period. Thus the Communist Party emphasised the intellectuals, besides peasants and workers, as one of the pillars of the social transformation, while it excluded the bourgeoisie as a class it did not count on and which it wanted to repress. For the same reason it also established a difference between the »wanted« and »unwanted« intelligentsia, or intellectuals who were »fair, progressive and of the people« and those who were »unfair, reactionary and not of the people«. The latter were supposed to share the fate of the capitalists. However, the Communist Party was forced to integrate most of the »unwanted« intellectuals into the »new society« due to their scarcity and cultural capital they possessed, unlike the capitalists who were destroyed by the revolutionary authorities in the process of demolishing the bourgeois society and its heritage.

Immediately after the liberation the revolutionary repression dominated the intelligentsia in Serbia as well as elsewhere in Yugoslavia. This repression involved a whole range of measures implemented by the authorities in order to settle the score with the intellectuals and to suppress and remove them from the public life, culture, and politics. It also entailed the verification of the «propriety» of work and behaviour of the whole intelligentsia during the period of the occupation. Some intellectuals were permanently removed from the society, as they were executed by the military courts. Others served lengthier or shorter prison sentences, were removed for a while from the public life by the decrees of the »honour courts«, or received «public reprimands in the press» due to their behaviour during the occupation. At the same time the intelligentsia was divided into »indecent« and »decent« intellectuals – those who could participate in the establishment of the new society. Unlike repression, integration was not accompanied by any drama. It looked like it took place in »silence«. The only exception were those members of the intelligentsia who were called upon to cooperate by the revolutionary authorities, or those who volunteered themselves. Most intellectuals were integrated gradually. The initial suspicions and severity of measures were replaced by the policy of more »flexible« relations, allowing for the humanist intelligentsia – besides the technical intelligentsia – being more widely accepted due to the liberalisation in the 1950s.

## Žiga Koncilija\*

### Posameznik v primežu treh različnih represivnih aparatov : Ivan Ranzinger in njegova življenjska pot

Zgodba Ivana Ranzingerja je v marsičem zgodba »represivnega« 20. stoletja. Rodil se je v avstro-ogrski monarhiji, odraščal in idejno nazorsko zorel v Kraljevini SHS/Jugoslaviji, bil priča nemški okupaciji, izgradnji in evoluciji socialistične Jugoslavije vse do njenega konca ter na koncu tudi neodvisnosti Republike Slovenije. V dveh družbeno-političnih in enem okupacijskem sistemu je izkusil značilnosti vsakokratne državne represije in tako večji del življenja preživel z etiketo političnega nasprotnika, ob nadzoru, številnih hišnih preiskavah in aretacijah s strani orožnikov, gestapovcev, udbovcev. Preživel je mnoga zasliševanja, mučenja, poniževanja, večkrat je sedel na zatožno klop in izkusil trdoto ležišča številnih zaporov in taborišč.

Ivan Ranzinger se je rodil v steklarski družini 9. septembra 1909 na Dunaju. Številčna družina se je v iskanju boljšega zaslužka večkrat selila, nazadnje ob začetku prve svetovne vojne v Zagorje. Od ranih let je spoznaval tegobe življenja delavskih družin in že kot osemletni otrok poprijel za steklarska dela ter se tako iz prve roke seznanil s položajem izkoriščanega delavstva. Ta izkušnja ga ni pustila ravnodušnega. S polnoletnostjo je vstopil v organizacijo SKOJ, v letu uvedbe Aleksandrove diktature (1929) pa je že postal član KPJ. Sodeloval je pri številnih akcijah za izboljšanje delavskega položaja (od prenašanja letakov in priprav za njihovo izdelovanje do organiziranja stavk), bil med drugim sindikalni funkcionar v steklarskem sindikatu in član okrožnega komiteja KPJ. V obdobju najostrejšega preganjanja komunistov je kmalu prišel v kolesje represivnega aparata Kraljevine Jugoslavije. Januarja in maja 1929 je bil aretiran zaradi suma širjenja komunističnih letakov, junija 1930 zaradi finančnega podpiranja komunističnega gibanja. Februarja 1933 je bil prvič obtožen in obsojen na sodnem procesu pred Okrožnim sodiščem v Celju na dve leti in pol robije, ki pa so se zaradi sodelovanja pri demonstraciji zapornikov v Sremski Mitrovici, podaljšala na pet let.

Služenje kazni in šolanja na »zaporniških univerzah« sta ga le še utrdila v prepričanju o pravilnosti izbire politične in življenjske usmeritve, kar pa je bila v medvojnih razmerah nemške okupacije slaba popotnica. Že 17. aprila 1941 ga je aretirala gestapo, decembra 1941 poslal v Auschwitz, marca 1943 pa v Buchenwald. Tam se je politično aktiviral kot član internacionalnega komiteja in organizator ilegalnega jugoslovanskega komiteja KP.

---

\* Univ. dipl. zgodovinar / University graduate historian, mladi raziskovalec / young researcher, Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino / Institute of Contemporary History, Kongresni trg 1, SI-1000 Ljubljana. E-mail: ziga.koncilija@inz.si.

V domovino se je vrnil 6. julija 1945. Ko se je v povojnem obdobju zanosno gradila nova socialistična Jugoslavija, se je odvijalo tudi intenzivno povojno sodno čiščenje domnevnih in dejanskih političnih nasprotnikov. V krogu teh so se iz različnih vzrokov znašli tudi nekateri nekdanji taboriščniki. Med njimi tudi Ivan Ranzinger. Aretiran je bil 3. septembra 1948. Znova je trepetal za svoje življenje na t. i. 8. dachauskem, natančneje rečeno buchenwaldskem sodnem procesu. Z obtožbo sodelovanja z gestapom mu je bila 29. junija 1949 dosojena 18 letna zaporna kazen; pomiloščen je bil in 17. aprila 1953 pogojno izpuščen. Dolgih 17 let pa je še moralo preteči, da je bil 9. januarja 1971 z razveljavitvijo sodbe rehabilitiran. Morda so se vsi pritiski in razočaranja manifestirali v srčnem infarktu, ki ga je doživel leta 1963, kljub temu pa je z močno življenjsko voljo vztrajal še nadaljnjih 24 let. Umrl je tri leta pred koncem 20. stoletja. Stoletja, ki mu je po kvaliteti in kvantiteti povzročeni gorja človeka nad sočlovkom težko najti ustrezno primerjavo.

### **Žiga Koncilija**

#### **An Individual in the Clutches of Three Different Repression Apparatuses: Ivan Ranzinger and His Life**

In many aspects, the story of Ivan Ranzinger is a story of the «repressive» 20<sup>th</sup> century. He was born in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, grew up and matured in terms of his ideas and views in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes / Yugoslavia, and witnessed the German occupation, the establishment and evolution of the Socialist Yugoslavia until its very end, and finally also the independence of the Republic of Slovenia. During two socio-political systems and a system of occupation he experienced the characteristics of state repression each time. He spent the majority of his life branded as a political opponent, supervised, subject to numerous house searches and arrests by the gendarmerie, the Gestapo, and members of the State Security Administration. He survived interrogations, torture, humiliation, was tried many times, and experienced life behind bars of many prisons and camps.

Ivan Ranzinger was born into the family of glassworkers on 9 September 1909 in Vienna. His large family moved often in search of a better life, finally settling in Zagorje when World War I broke out. Since his early years he has experienced the hardships of working-class families. Already as an eight-year-old child he started working as a glassworker, thus experiencing the situation of the exploited working class first hand. The experience had an influence on him. As he came of age, he enrolled into the Young Communist League of Yugoslavia (SKOJ), and in the year when King Alexander's Dictatorship was introduced (1929) he already became a member of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. He

took part in many actions aimed at improving the situation of the working class (disseminating leaflets, organising their printing, organising strikes). Among other things he was also a trade union official in the glassworkers' union and a member of the district committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. In the period when the communists were persecuted most severely, he soon experienced the repressive apparatus of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. In January and May 1929 he was arrested due to the suspicion of spreading communist leaflets, and in June 1930 he was arrested as a financial supporter of the communist movement. In February 1933 he was charged for the first time, tried at a judicial proceeding at the District Court of Celje, and sentenced to two years and a half in prison. The sentence was extended to five years because of his participation in the demonstration of the prisoners in Sremska Mitrovica.

His time in prison and the «education» he received at the «prison universities» only strengthened his convictions, political orientation and life views, which was, however, poor baggage in the interwar circumstances of the German occupation. As soon as on 17 April 1941 he was arrested by the Nazi Gestapo and sent to Auschwitz in December 1941, and to Buchenwald in March 1943. There he became politically active as a member of the international committee and organiser of the illegal Yugoslav committee of the Communist Party.

He returned to his homeland on 6 July 1945. As the new socialist Yugoslavia was being developed enthusiastically in the post-war period, the intense post-war judicial retaliation against certain suspected and actual political opponents was also taking place. Due to various reasons certain former concentration camp internees also ended up among these people, including Ivan Ranzinger. He was arrested on 3 September 1948. Once again he feared for his life at the so-called Eighth Dachau Trial, or, more precisely, the Buchenwald Trial. He was accused of cooperating with Gestapo and sentenced to eighteen years in prison on 29 June 1949. He was pardoned on 17 April 1953 and released on parole. However, it took as long as 17 years until his sentence was annulled on 9 January 1971. Perhaps all these pressures and disappointments manifested themselves in the heart attack he suffered in 1963. Nevertheless, with a strong will he persisted for another 24 years. He died three years before the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century – a century hardly comparable to any other period in history with regard to the quality and quantity of anguish caused and suffered by humankind.

## Zdenko Čepič\*

### Zločin in kazen

Represijo v državi ali represijo države oziroma njene oblasti razumemo običajno predvsem kot nasilje nad političnimi nasprotniki oblasti. Niso pa bila edina kazniva dejanja, ki jih je po drugi svetovni vojni državna oblast prek sodnega sistema preganjala. Storilci kaznivih dejanj, ki niso imela politične vsebine, namreč niso počivali. Glede »zločinov«, ki niso imeli s političnimi delikti ničesar skupnega, je življenje v Jugoslaviji kljub spremembi oblasti in političnega sistema teklo dalje. Prihajalo je do tudi povsem običajnih kaznivih dejanj, od takšnih zoper premoženje, pa naj je bilo državno ali zasebno, do kaznivih dejanj zoper življenje in telo, torej kraje in pretepi ter uboji ali umori. Oblast je, tako kot vsaka druga, takšna kaznovala kazniva dejanja preganjala, in to predvsem z namenom zaščite državljanov. Kaznivih dejanj, ki niso bila označena kot politična, je bilo namreč veliko več kot tistih zoper ljudstvo in državo.

Storjenemu zločinu običajno sledi kazen. Če je storilec kaznivega dejanja ujet in obsojen, je ta kazen določena v skladu z zakonodajo. Za dejanja, ki niso v skladu z družbenimi normami oziroma pravili, so kazni in tudi namen le-teh opredeljene v kazenskih zakonikih. Kaznovalna politika – kazni in izvrševanje kazni ter način prestajanja kazni odvzema prostosti – je eden od kazalnikov stopnje demokratičnosti oblasti v posamezni državi. Zakonodaja, ki je napisana, pa ne kaže, kakšen je bil način izvrševanje kazni v praksi. Tega ne kažejo niti uradna poročila, ki so jih o izvrševanju kazni pripravljali posamezni organi, pristojni za izvrševanje kazni. O kaznovalni politiki in načinu, kako se je ta izvajala, imajo seveda svoje mnenje vsi tisti, ki so iz lastnih izkušenj skusili življenje za zapahi.

Po drugi svetovni vojni je nova oblast v jugoslovanski državi zgradila tudi svoj pravni sistem in pravosodje. Kazenska zakonodaja zlasti za kazniva dejanja, ki niso imela neposredne povezave s politiko in uvajanjem novega političnega in gospodarskega sistema, se je spreminjala oziroma prilagajala novi ureditvi sorazmerno počasi. Ko je bila leta 1946 sprejeta ustava jugoslovanske federativne države, se je začel tudi na področju kazenskega pravosodja izgrajevati celovit pravni sistem. Zakon o vrstah kazni, ki so jih izrekala civilna in vojaška sodišča, je sicer sprejelo Predsedstvo AVNOJ julija 1945, kazenski zakonik pa je bil v jugoslovanski skupščini sprejet konec leta 1947 (veljati je začel 12. februarja 1948). Z njim so bile dosežene najosnovnejše zahteve po pravni urejenosti. Bil je pod vplivom sovjetskega kazenskega prava. Ta kazenski zakonik je doživel spremembo z novim kazenskim zakonikom že po dobrih treh

---

\* Dr. /PhD, znanstveni svetnik / scientific councillor, Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino / Institute of Contemporary History, Kongresni trg 1, SI-1000 Ljubljana. E-mail: zdenko.cepich@inz.si.



letih; konec februarja 1951 je jugoslovanska skupščina sprejela nov kazenski zakonik (veljati je začel 1. julijem 1951). V posebnem delu je bil seznam kaznivih oziroma dejanj in kazni zanje. V tem zakoniku so bile določene kazni tudi za kazniva dejanja s področja kriminalitete, za katere so do tedaj določali kazni po predvojnem kazenskem zakoniku. S tem kazenskim zakonikom se je kazenska zakonodaja Jugoslavije približala ravni kazenskih zakonodaj evropskih držav, v katerih je bil drugačen politični sistem, kot je bil takrat v Jugoslaviji. Zaradi napredka kazenskopravne znanosti in drugih znanosti o kriminaliteti se je pokazala potreba po dopolnitvi in popravku tega kazenskega zakonika. Konec junija 1959 je jugoslovanska skupščina sprejela novelo h kazenskemu zakoniku iz leta 1951, dejansko pa je bil to nov kazenski zakonik. Ta kazenski zakonik je doživel še nekaj sprememb in dopolnitev.

Kako so se kazni, na katere so storilce kaznivih dejanj obsojala sodišča, izvajale, je bilo določeno v zakonih o izvrševanju kazni, ki so sledili kazenskim zakonikom: zakon o izvršitvi kazni je bil sprejet oktobra 1948, nato oktobra 1951 in junija 1961. Razlike glede izvajanja kazni, zlasti glede prostostnih kazni, kako bo obsojenec kazen prestajal, kakšne so bile njegove pravice in kakšne dolžnosti, niso bile v teh zakonih velike.

### **Zdenko Čepič** **Crime and Punishment**

We usually understand repression carried out within or by a state or its authorities as violence against the political opponents of the authorities. However, these were not the only criminal offences persecuted through the judicial system by the state authorities after World War II. Namely, perpetrators of non-political crimes did not rest. As far as »crimes« unrelated to political offences were concerned, life in Yugoslavia went on despite the changes of the authorities and political system. Completely ordinary crimes took place as well: from crimes against property, either state or private, to those against life and physical integrity, meaning theft, assault, manslaughter or murder. The authorities – just like any others – persecuted such crimes with the primary goal of protecting the citizens. As it was, the number of crimes not described as »political« far exceeded the number of crimes against the people and the state.

Crime is usually followed by punishment. If a perpetrator of a criminal offence is caught and convicted, the punishment is imposed in accordance with the applicable legislation. Penalties for actions not in line with the social norms or rules as well as the aims of these punishments are provided for in the criminal codes. Punitive policy – penalties, enforcement of sentences and the ways of serving prison sentences – is one of the indicators of how democratic the

authorities in an individual country are. However, the legislation does not show how the sentences were enforced in practice, nor is this indicated in the official reports, written about the enforcement of sentences by the individual competent bodies. Naturally, all those who have experienced life behind bars hold their own opinions about the punitive policy and its implementation.

After World War II the new Yugoslav authorities developed their own legal system and justice administration. Criminal law, especially with regard to criminal offences not directly related to politics and the introduction of the new political and economic system, was relatively slow to change or adapt to the new regime. When the new constitution of the Yugoslav federal state was adopted in 1946, a comprehensive legal system also started developing in the field of criminal justice. The legislation with regard to the applicable penalties imposed by the civilian and military courts may have been adopted by the Presidency of AVNOJ (Anti-Fascist Council of National Liberation of Yugoslavia) in July 1945. However, the criminal code was adopted by the Yugoslav Assembly in the end of 1947 (and came into force on 12 February 1948). With it the basic demands for legal order were satisfied. The criminal code was under the influence of the Soviet criminal law and was first amended already after slightly more than three years – in the end of February 1951 the Yugoslav assembly adopted a new criminal code (in force as of 1 July 1951). The special section of this code contained a list of punishable offences and penalties for them. It also set out penalties for criminal offences, which had until then been defined in the pre-war criminal code. Thus the Yugoslav criminal law was approximated to the level of criminal laws of European countries with different political systems. As the criminal law and other sciences related to criminality developed, the need for changes and amendments became evident. In the end of June 1959 the Yugoslav Assembly adopted an act amending the criminal code of 1951. In fact this was a new criminal code, which later saw further changes and amendments.

The enforcement of sentences imposed on the offenders by the courts was set out in the acts on the enforcement of sentences, which followed the criminal codes. The Enforcement of Criminal Sanctions Act was adopted in 1948, then in October 1951, and finally in June 1961. These acts were quite similar with regard to how the sentences, especially prison sentences, were to be carried out, how the convicts would serve them, and what their rights and obligations were.

Beleške

Beleške