

Dragomir Bondžić, PhD  
Principal Research Fellow  
Institute for Contemporary History, Belgrade  
dragomirbondzic@yahoo.com

UDK 378.4(497.11)"1945/1960"  
37.014.5:378(497.11)"1945/1960"  
378.147:316.75(497.11)"1945/1960"  
DOI 10.29362/2024.2961.bon.151-174

## **BELGRADE UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS AFTER WORLD WAR II – “ENEMIES OF THE PEOPLE” AND “HONEST INTELLIGENTSIA”**

**Abstract:** *The paper examines the relationship between the Yugoslav communist government and the professors of the University of Belgrade during the first decades after World War II. In the center of attention is the control over the life and work of senior professors who belonged to the “bourgeois” pre-war intelligentsia and the pressure exerted by state and party bodies on them to change their ideological-political orientation, attitudes and habits. They were expected to accept the new political and socio-economic order, to abandon the methodology of “bourgeois”, “capitalist” science and adopt and apply the method of Marxism-Leninism in science. In such conditions, a significant part of the teaching staff resisted in various ways, but an equally significant number “gave in” over time, adapted to new conditions, and often changed their position and accepted and advocated the policies of the communist authorities. With the consolidation of the new government and the state, that process gained strength. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, a generational change took place at the University, the older “bourgeois” professors retired as well, and younger teachers who were formed in the new order came to the University in increasing numbers.*

**Keywords:** University of Belgrade, professors, “bourgeois” intelligentsia, Communist Party of Yugoslavia, ideology, Marxism-Leninism, identity, generational change

### **Introduction – professors of the University of Belgrade until the end of World War II**

The University of Belgrade was founded in 1905 on the foundations of a long cultural, educational and scientific development during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Since its foundation, it has represented the highest educational and scientific institution of the Serbian, and then the Yugoslav state, and the main support and driver of its social, economic, cultural, educational and scientific progress. The

engine of the University was the teaching staff, who represented the very top of the Serbian intellectual elite from the beginning. Initially, the Serbian intellectual elite was formed mainly from educated Serbs from the Habsburg Monarchy, and from the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, an increasing number of intellectuals came from Serbia. During the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, they were mostly trained in the most important European university centers, in Austria, Germany, France, Switzerland. After returning to Belgrade, they were engaged at the Great School, later at the University, founding new scientific disciplines and subjects, based on the knowledge and methods of European science, and later engaged in the work of the Serbian Royal Academy. At the same time, they played a significant role in the political and social life of the country and strongly contributed to its progress.<sup>1</sup>

Among the first eight full-time professors who were appointed on the same day when the Law on the University was passed on 27 February 1905 were: chemist Sima Lozanić, geologist Jovan Žujović, historian Dragoljub Pavlović, historian Ljubomir Jovanović, geographer Jovan Cvijić, mathematician Mihailo Petrović Alas at the Faculty of Philosophy; economist Milić Radovanović at the Faculty of Law; and architect Andra Stevanović at the Technical Faculty.<sup>2</sup> On the University opening day, 2 October 1905, 52 teachers worked at the University, 28 at the Faculty of Philosophy, nine at the Faculty of Law and 15 at the Technical Faculty. In addition to those mentioned, there were Đorđe Stanojević, Bogdan Popović, Pavle Popović, Živojin Đorđević, Nikola Vulić, Branislav Petronijević, Stanoje Stanojević, Aleksandar Belić, Jovan Skerlić, Miloje Vasić, Radovan Košutić, Dragiša Đurić and others at the Faculty of Philosophy; Slobodan Jovanović, Božidar Marković, Živojin Perić, Čedomilj Mitrović, Kosta Kumanudi, Velimir Bajkić and others at the Faculty of Law; and Bogdan Gavrilović, Svetozar Zorić, Stevan Marković, Jefta Stefanović, Nikola Nestorović and others at the Technical Faculty. Apart from Belgrade, they were educated at the most prestigious universities and high technical schools throughout Europe, in Vienna, Paris, Berlin, Zurich, Geneva, Lausanne, Freiburg, Tübingen, Leipzig,

---

<sup>1</sup> Радован Самарџић, „Наука код Срба у XIX и XX веку“, у: *Историја српског народа*, VI/2, ур. Андреј Митровић (Београд: СКЗ, 1994), 462–505; Љубинка Трговчевић, *Планирана елита. О студентима из Србије на европским универзитетима у 19. веку*, (Београд: Историјски институт, 2003); Александар Белић, *Педесетогодишњица Српске краљевске академије 1886–1936*, књ. 1, (Београд: СКА, 1939–1941).

<sup>2</sup> Владета Тешић, „Школе и настава“, у: *Историја српског народа*, VI/2, 539–540; Снежана Бојовић, *200 година Београдског универзитета 1808–2008*, (Београд: Принцип, 2008), 88–95; *Зборник закона и уредаба о Лицеју, Великој школи и Универзитету у Београду*, прир. Драгољуб Т. Баралић, (Београд: Научна књига, 1967), 178–180.

Munich, Heidelberg, Karlsruhe, Dresden, Aachen, Liège, Graz, London, Prague, Budapest, Krakow, Lviv, Moscow, Saint Petersburg, etc.<sup>3</sup> The number of teaching staff of the University of Belgrade grew after its establishment and on the eve of the First World War, in 1914, it reached the number of 89 teachers (about 120 teachers and assistants). The teaching staff was supplemented by the arrival of young experts from various fields, also trained in prestigious European scientific centers: Milutin Milanković, Ivan Đaja, Pavle Vujević, Jovan Radonić and others at the Faculty of Philosophy; Toma Živanović, Lazar Marković, Živan Spasojević, Đorđe Đurić, and others at the Faculty of Law; Ivan Arnovljević, Aćim Stevović, Đorđe Mijović, Petar Bajalović, and others at the Technical Faculty.<sup>4</sup>

In the First World War, Belgrade university teachers fully put themselves at the service of the state and the army and played a significant role in formulating and then representing the Serbian war goals in the allied countries and propagating the unification of the South Slavic peoples and the creation of the Yugoslav state. They were engaged in drafting the program for the creation and organization of the future state, determining its borders, propagating unification through brochures, monographs, scientific and newspaper articles, professional and popular lectures, participating in diplomatic propaganda missions (Rome, Paris, London, Bucharest, Saint Petersburg, Washington). Ten teachers participated in the work of the delegation of the Kingdom of SCS at the Peace Conference in Paris and contributed to decision-making. Among the most active professors during the First World War in promoting the unification and creation of the Yugoslav state were Jovan Cvijić, Slobodan Jovanović, Aleksandar Belić, Bogdan and Pavle Popović, Nikola Vulić, Božidar Marković, Stanoje Stanojević, Lazar Marković, Jovan Žujović, Jovan Radonić, Tihomir Đorđević, and others.<sup>5</sup>

In the period between the two world wars, new faculties (Medicine, Agriculture and Forestry, Theology, Veterinary) were founded and the number of Belgrade university professors increased. Before World War II, there were 310 teachers and 239 assistants.<sup>6</sup> Young teachers were educated and trained

<sup>3</sup> *Споменица о отварању Универзитета* (Београд: Државна штампарија Краљевине Србије, 1906), 90–154; *Сто година Филозофског факултета у Београду 1863–1963*, ур. Радован Самарџић. (Београд: Филозофски факултет, 1963), 55–89.

<sup>4</sup> *Универзитетске власти и преглед предавања за други (летњи) семестар 1913/14. школске године*, (Београд: Нова штампарија „Давидовић“, 1914).

<sup>5</sup> Љубинка Трговчевић, *Научници Србије и стварање југословенске државе 1914–1920*. (Београд: СКЗ, 1986).

<sup>6</sup> *Преглед предавања за летњи семестар школске 1940/41. године*, (Београд: Универзитет, 1941).

more and more in Belgrade, but still to a large extent abroad, primarily in France. They continued to be the top of the intellectual elite and contributed, above all, to the teaching and research work and development of the University and faculties, but also to the general socio-political and cultural-educational development of the state, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes/Yugoslavia.<sup>7</sup> The university elite came primarily from Serbia, then from Vojvodina and to a lesser extent from other Yugoslav provinces, but the overwhelming majority was of Serbian nationality. Only Russian emigrants, of whom there were 74 in teaching positions until World War II, were found in greater numbers at the University of Belgrade.<sup>8</sup> In the interwar period, the professors of Belgrade University shaped their political attitudes and viewpoints in relation to basic national and social issues in accordance with the dynamic and complex development of the socio-political situation in the country. They were faced with issues of national unity, organization of the state, solving the Serbo-Croatian issue. They were both in power and in the opposition; among them there were radicals, democrats, republicans, socialists, supporters of the agricultural movement; most were supporters of unitary centralism and, much less, of federalism or giving autonomy to historical provinces. Some of them accepted the concept of integral Yugoslavia in the early 1930s, while others at the end of that decade, in new historical conditions, strove to put the Serbian national question and its solution first, primarily through activities in the Serbian Cultural Club. From an ideological point of view, the Serbian university elite in the interwar period belonged to one of three ideological circles: liberal-democratic, socialist or conservative. All three circles had their prominent representatives among Belgrade university professors, and belonging to a certain circle in the interwar period largely determined their behavior and destinies during World War II and after it.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Љубодраг Димић, „Универзитет у Београду као научни и културни чинилац 1929–1941“, у: *Универзитет у Београду 1838–1988, зборник радова*, ур. Душан Татић и Ђорђевић Ускоковић, (Београд: Универзитет, 1988), 209–240; Љубодраг Димић, *Културна политика Краљевине Југославије 1918–1941, III* (Београд: Стубови културе, 1996), 339–371; *Историја Београда, III*, ур. Васа Чубриловић, (Београд: Просвета, 1974), 320–336; Milutin Milanković, *Sećanja* (Beograd: Dereta, 2020), 358–375; Васа Чубриловић, *Сећања*, (Београд: Vukotić Media, 2022), 310–334, 410–436.

<sup>8</sup> Драгомир Бонџић, *Руски емигранти професори Београдског универзитета*, (Београд: Архипелаг-Институт за савремену историју, 2023), 75–100, 111.

<sup>9</sup> Milosav Janićijević, *Stvaralačka inteligencija međuratne Jugoslavije*, (Beograd: Institut društvenih nauka, 1984); В. Чубриловић, *н. д.*, 437–488; Љ. Димић, *Културна политика Краљевине Југославије 1918–1941, III*, 506–560.

The development of the University and the university elite was suddenly and tragically interrupted by World War II and the occupation of the country. During the war years, many university professors were arrested, imprisoned in camps in Germany or in Serbia where some were executed; individuals collaborated with one of the conflicting parties in the civil war (the partisan movement or the Ravna Gora movement) or with the Germans and the Serbian administration under occupation; most of them were passive and faced the hardships of life under occupation. A number of senior teachers, among them some of the founders of the University from 1905, died before or during the war (Stanoje Stanojević, Dragoslav Jovanović, Vladimir Ćorović, Vasilj Popović, Dragiša Đurić, Mihailo Petrović Alas, Bogdan Popović, Pavle Popović, Mihailo Ilić, Đorđe Tasić, Nikola Vulić, etc.).<sup>10</sup> While during the First World War they had played a major role in defining war goals and creating a new state, during World War II the professors of the University of Belgrade did not stand out significantly in the creation of a new socialist federation. The number of university professors in the ranks of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and the People's Liberation Movement was small, and their ideological and political convictions were mostly incompatible with the revolutionary takeover of power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the one-party Soviet state and other political and socio-economic phenomena and processes after the end of World War II.

### **Communist rule, the University and the intelligentsia**

The end of World War II, the liberation of the country from the occupiers and the coming to power of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia brought radical political and socio-economic changes and placed the University and university professors in completely new conditions of life and activity. After the victory in the war and the revolution, the Communist Party took power and started building a new state and socio-economic system based on its program and political and ideological settings. The party took all the levers of power into its own hands and established the “dictatorship of the proletariat”, a one-party system in which, through its bodies, state institutions, army, police, propaganda and mass

---

<sup>10</sup> Dragomir Bondžić, „Serbian Intellectual Elite in 1941“, in: *Repeating History 1941–1991? Two break-ups of Yugoslavia as repeated history? Serbian perspectives*, editors Predrag J. Marković and Bojan B. Dimitrijević, (Belgrade: Institute for Contemporary History, 2021), 171–192 doi:10.29362/2589.bon.171-192; Dragomir Bondžić, „The Fate of the Professors of Belgrade University under German Occupation, 1941–1944“, *Totalitarian and 20th Century Studies*, Tom 2/vol. 2, Warsaw (2018), 170–184.

organizations, it managed, directed and supervised all state, political, social, economic, cultural-educational, scientific and everyday activities, events and movements.<sup>11</sup>

Even before the end of the war, at the end of 1944 and during 1945, control over the University was taken over and its reconstruction and preparations for the start of work were supervised. The basic tasks of this old institution in the new political and socio-economic system were immediately formulated, and were later elaborated more concretely and adapted to the domestic and foreign political movements and needs of the ruling party, the introduction of a planned economy, the conflict with the Soviet Union, etc. In the new society, the university was viewed primarily as a “factory of cadres” that was necessary for its construction and functioning and for the realization of the party's ambitious plans in reforming the state, society, economy, and cultural and scientific work. The university had to be “cleansed” of the “bourgeois tradition” that had been developed for several decades and of the “objectivist” science characteristic of the “reactionary” systems of the Western capitalist countries and the pre-war Kingdom of Yugoslavia. In the “new time” and at the “new socialist University” there was no place for autonomy, which was immediately suppressed and neglected. On the contrary, the University, teaching and science were to be imbued with the politics and ideology of the ruling party, the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, which was considered the “only correct” scientific method, and shaped after the model that existed in the first country of socialism, the Soviet Union. The “new socialist intelligentsia”, which was necessary for the construction of a new state and the economic and cultural-educational development foreseen in the first five-year plan and the construction of socialism in general, had to be educated on those bases.<sup>12</sup>

However, it was precisely for the construction of the “new intelligentsia” that the new authorities needed the old teaching staff, formed on the basis of “bourgeois”, “objectivist” science and educated in the large European scientific centers of Central and Western Europe. The Party distrust towards those teachers, stemmed from the very essence of the communist ideology, which was not inclined to intellectuals who were considered hesitant, insecure, subject to individualism and skepticism, and incapable of unquestioningly implementing party directives

---

<sup>11</sup> Branko Petranović, *Istorija Jugoslavije, III knjiga*, (Beograd: Nolit, 1988), 29–58, 67–78.

<sup>12</sup> Dragomir Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944–1952*, (Beograd: Institut za savremenu istoriju, 2004), 103–136, 207–216; Ljubodrag Dimić, *Agitprop kultura. Agitpropovska faza kulturne politike u Srbiji 1945–1952*. (Beograd: Rad, 1988), 95–119.

and positions. Their origin, education in the West, belonging to the middle class and predominantly political orientation towards Serbian civil parties and liberal capitalism and parliamentary democracy in the interwar period, additionally fueled distrust and suspicion of the new government.<sup>13</sup> The ideology of Marxism-Leninism opposed the view that the intelligentsia was a separate social stratum and considered that it had to be divided into those who remained in the “positions of the bourgeoisie” and those who approached the working class. Therefore, the Party took measures to eliminate or win over the “inherited intelligentsia”, while its primary goal was to create a “new socialist intelligentsia”.<sup>14</sup>

Such policy of the Communist Party led to a detailed re-examination of the attitudes and actions of old university teachers in the political life of interwar Yugoslavia, especially during World War II and the occupation and the attitude towards the revolution, the new regime and socialist construction in the first post-war years. Comprehensive control was carried out through the party bodies, the student organization, the teachers themselves who supported of the regime, as well as through the secret police, the State Security Administration (UDB). Based on detailed supervision, the party and state educational authorities formulated and implemented their policy at the University and their attitude towards each individual teacher, adapting that policy to the objective circumstances and needs of building a new state and society. That policy ranged from conflict and “elimination” (removal from the University), through mutual tolerance and compromise, to pressure and change of ideological-political attitudes (ideological-political identity) of individual teachers and their transition, real or only apparent, to positions of power Communist parties and ideologies of Marxism-Leninism.<sup>15</sup>

### **University professors – number, structure and attitude towards the new government**

The issue of teaching staff was one of the most important after World War II and caused great concern to the management of all Belgrade University faculties. The gap in professional staff caused by the war was especially felt among

---

<sup>13</sup> Коста Николић, *Бољшевиизација КПЈ 1919–1929. Историјске последице* (Београд: Институт за савремену историју, 1994), 35, 69–72, 166.

<sup>14</sup> Živorad Đorđević, *Za i protiv inteligencije* (Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1979).

<sup>15</sup> D. Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944–1952*, 238–282; Драгомир Бонџић, *Универзитет у социјализму. Високо школство у Србији 1950–1960*, (Београд: Институт за савремену историју, 2010), 314–318.

younger research associates, from which new university teachers had to evolve. During the war years, a number of teachers were killed in hostilities or died of natural causes. In addition, after the liberation of Belgrade at the end of 1944, the new government, in a revolutionary frenzy, shot four teachers of the University of Belgrade, and then in May 1945, by the decision of the Court of Honor, 37 teachers and assistants were removed from the University, 19 of whom had already left the country. Later, already during the first post-war academic year, several teachers were retired due to old age or for ideological reasons.<sup>16</sup> Many departments had vacancies, and the job announcements for teachers and assistants remained without results, because often there were no registered candidates or they did not meet the set requirements. Experts from the economy are engaged in teaching (with great resistance from companies and problems), and assistant teaching staff are engaged among the more successful students.<sup>17</sup>

Nevertheless, the number of teaching and assistant teaching staff of the University of Belgrade was constantly increasing in the post-war years. From 395 teachers and assistants in the 1945/46 school year, that number rose to 458 in the following school year, to 1,863 in 1950/51 school year, and to 2,250 in 1959/60. Despite the constant increase, the number of teachers and assistants still did not manage to keep up with the rapid increase in the number of students, so the lack of teaching staff was a constant problem of the University.

Year	Number
1945/6	395
1946/7	458
1947/8	594
1948/9	689
1949/50	1,266
1950/1	1,863
1951/2	1,061
1952/3	1,483
1953/4	1,689
1954/5	1,898
1955/6	2,193
1956/7	2,272
1957/8	2,537
1958/9	1,746
1959/60	2,250

*Number of teachers and assistants at the University of Belgrade 1945-1960.*<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup> D. Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944–1952*, 82–85; Д. Бонџић, *Универзитет у социјализму*. 318–319; Момчило Митровић, *Изгубљене илузије. Прилози за друштвену историју Србије 1944–1952*. (Београд: Институт за новију историју Србије, 1997), 114–138.

<sup>17</sup> Државни архив Србије (ДАС), фонд Универзитет у Београду (УБ), архивска књига 58, Извештај о раду Универзитета 1946/47; Исто, Стање на катедрама, 14. 5. 1946.

<sup>18</sup> *Fakulteti, visoke i više škole–studenti i nastavnici u zimskom semestru šk. 1954/55. god. (sa retrospektivom od 1845)*, Bilten, (Beograd: Zavod za statistiku NRS, 1956), 2–3, 17–18;

In the first post-war years, among the University teachers there were still people born in the 1860s, 1870s and 1880s, but those born in the last decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the first decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century prevailed. Among the professors there were still several “founding fathers”, teachers who were among the first at the University in 1905 (Aleksandar Belić, Miloje Vasić) as well as teachers who worked at the University before the First World War (Milutin Milanković, Ivan Đaja, Pavle Vujević, Milivoje Lozanić, Dragomir Andonović, and others). The vast majority of teachers came to the University in the interwar period (Viktor Novak, Vladeta Popović, Miloš Đurić, Stevan Jakovljević, Aleksandar Kostić, Kosta Todorović, Đorđe Nešić, Ksenofon Šahović, Siniša Stanković, Jovan Karamata, Tadija Pejović, Dragoljub Jovanović, Jovan Đorđević, Mihailo Konstantinović, Milan Bartoš, Radivoje Kašanin, Aleksandar Deroko, Bogdan Nestorović, Aleksandar Leko, etc.).<sup>19</sup> The largest number of teachers were born in Serbia, and significantly fewer in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Vojvodina and Russia. The ethnic composition was quite uniform. According to data from the school year 1948/49, there were 427 teachers and 247 assistants at Belgrade University. Among the teachers were 396 Serbs (92.74%), five Croats, five Montenegrins, three Slovenians, three Macedonians, 12 Russians and three “others”; among the assistants were 220 Serbs (89.06%), three Croats, eight Montenegrins, three Slovenians, three Macedonians, seven Russians and three “others”.<sup>20</sup> Therefore, persons of Serbian ethnicity prevailed, and a large group were also the remnants of the pre-war Russian emigration, which slowly decreased in number, although it was supplemented by younger emigrants educated at Yugoslav universities in the interwar period.<sup>21</sup>

In the assessments written for all teachers and assistants of the University of Belgrade for Russian professors, the important ideological and political disqualifications “Russian emigrant by nationality” and “left Russia as a White

---

*Извештај о раду Универзитета у школској 1957/58. години*, (Београд: Универзитет у Београду, 1958), 30; *Извештај о раду Универзитета у школској 1960/61. години*, (Београд: Универзитет у Београду, 1961), 60–61, 79.

<sup>19</sup> *Преглед предавања за летњи семестар школске 1947/1948*, (Београд: Научна књига, 1948); *Универзитет и високе школе у ФНРЈ*, (Београд: Савет за науку и културу Владе ФНРЈ, 1950).

<sup>20</sup> Архив Југославије (АЈ), фонд Министарство за науку и културу Владе ФНРЈ, 316-60, Национални састав наставног и помоћног наставног особља на Београдском универзитету 1948. In this source, the total number of teachers is different compared to the previously presented statistical review (674 versus 689). The sources often contain different data depending on whether the beginning or the end of the year, the calendar year or the academic year, part-time staff, etc. is taken into account.

<sup>21</sup> Д. Бонџић, *Руски емигранти професори Београдског универзитета*, 104–118.

Guardsmen” were always emphasized.<sup>22</sup> Besides, the characteristics of other teachers also contained information about their nationality, so that, in addition to the vast majority of Serbs, for Viktor Novak, a professor at the Faculty of Philosophy, it was stated that he was “a Croat by nationality” but also “a typical idealistic propagandist of Yugoslav nationalism before the war, who is looking for a way to adapt to the new circumstances that arose after liberation”. He adapted well to those circumstances, regularly participated in the Marxism-Leninism course and followed the development of historical sciences in the Soviet Union. Regardless, it was considered that he was a Freemason and that “reactionaries” who resisted the party's views gathered around him in the Faculty Council.<sup>23</sup> Jorjo Tadić, assistant professor of the History of the New Century at the Faculty of Philosophy, was also a Croat, while Petar Kolendić from the same faculty, a native of Dubrovnik, declared himself a Serb of the Catholic faith. It was estimated that Tadić is a freemason, an “opportunist” and that he does not make an effort to “get to know” and apply Marxism-Leninism, as well as Kolendić, who, however, “completely adopted our policy and took the correct position in matters of country building”.<sup>24</sup> Novak, Kolendić and Tadić were distinctly Yugoslav oriented, and at the end of the 1960s, towards the end of his life, Tadić even strongly opposed the strengthening of Croatian nationalism, openly considered himself a Yugoslav, and Serbs and Croats as one nation, “regardless of what is being thought, written and prescribed about it today”.<sup>25</sup>

Much more significant and dynamic was the structure of Belgrade university teachers according to their political orientation. As mentioned, among them there were individuals of different political and ideological orientations. Most of them advocated liberal democratic views and the preservation of the capitalist system, with smaller or larger social reforms and interventions in the

---

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid*, 244-245.

<sup>23</sup> АЈ, фонд Савет за науку и културу Владе ФНРЈ, 317-67-92, Карактеристика Виктора Новака, 1949. About Novak see: Драгољуб Јовановић, *Медаљони*, књ. I, (Београд: Службени гласник, 2008), 402–405.

<sup>24</sup> АЈ, 317-67-92, Карактеристике Јорја Тадића и Петра Колендића, 1949. At the Faculty of Philosophy, Radosav Bošković, Vido Latković, and Vlado Drašković declared themselves Montenegrins, while Fanula Papazoglu declared herself Macedonian (*Ibid*, Карактеристике наставника Филозофског факултета, 1949). Information on the nationality of teachers can also be found in biographies in the fund of the Ministry of Science and Culture of the FNRJ (folders 60-63)) in the Archives of Yugoslavia and files in the funds of the University of Belgrade and the Ministry of Education of Serbia in the State Archives of Serbia.

<sup>25</sup> Јоржо Тадић, „Сабласти круже Југославијом”, *Историјски часопис*, књ. XVIII, (1971), 45–52.

development of the state and society. In any case, those who were members of the Communist Party or who had publicly expressed closeness to its ideology and agreed with radical political changes before the war, the revolutionary seizure of power and the introduction of the one-party system and the “dictatorship of the proletariat” were rare. According to party records, at the end of World War II there were only two full-time professors who were pre-war members of the Party (Pavle Savić and Dušan Nedeljković, participants of the National Liberation Movement, after the war full-time professors and members of the Serbian Academy of Sciences).<sup>26</sup> Back in November 1946, the University Committee of the Communist Party of Serbia complained in a report to the City Committee that “we have great difficulties in the work of the professors' cell, considering that we have few Party members and that most of them are younger Party members, and also younger in age, so they do not have enough authority among the others teachers”.<sup>27</sup>

The situation, from the party's point of view, did not improve even later. Party authorities closely monitored the political situation at individual faculties and faculty councils and assessed and categorized the political commitment of each teacher, especially the senior ones who had great authority. Among the numerous reports and analyses, the study on the political composition of full-time professors and assistants at the University of Belgrade from 1945 to 1949 stands out. According to this document, the number of full-time professors who were members of the KPJ in 1946 was 2, and the same number was in 1949 (while the total number of full-time professors in that period increased from 48 to 82). Number of assistants who were members and candidates of the KP in 1945/46 was 11, 17 in 1946/7, 35 in 1947/8, and 74 in 1948/9; the total number of assistants in that period increased from 85 to 290, so that in 1945/6 there were 9% Communists, and 25.5% in 1948/9.<sup>28</sup>

At the end of the 1940s, apart from the pre-war communists full-time professors Pavle Savić and Dušan Nedeljković, prominent members of the Party at the University were also associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers, part-time teachers and assistants: Siniša Stanković, Vlado Vidović, Simeon Grozdanić, Ernest Stipanić, Dimitrije Vučenov, Radovan Lalić, Krešimir Georgijević, Svetozar

<sup>26</sup> D. Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944–1952*, 238–241.

<sup>27</sup> „Univerzitetski komitet KPS–Gradskom komitetu, br. 1743, 5. 11. 1946”, u: *Zapisnici i izveštaji univerzitetskog komiteta KPS 1945–1948*, prir. Momčilo Mitrović i Đorđe Stanković (Beograd: Centar za marksizam Univerziteta, 1985), 119.

<sup>28</sup> ДАС, фонд Министарство за науку и културу НРС (МНК), фасц. 9, Пораст и састав наставног и помоћног наставног кадра по факултетима, 1950.

Brkić, Dragoslav Janković, Dragiša Ivanović, Radivoj Uvalić, Mirko Marković, Đuro Mikijelj, Dušan Dohčević, Borislav Božović, Julijana Bogičević, Božica Okrajnov, Dragomir Malić, Rajko Tomović, Borislav Lilić, Đurđe Bošković, Toma Bunuševac, Jovan Drakulić, Ružica Guzina, Kosovka Kostić, and others.<sup>29</sup>

Apart from the communists, since the end of the war, party politics at the University was systematically represented by a number of teachers of different titles and positions, but of great influence at the University and in society: Aleksandar Belić, Stevan Jakovljević, Stefan Đelineo, Milan Bartoš, Jovan Đorđević, Viktor Novak, Vasa Čubrilović, Sreten Vukosavljević, Kirilo Savić, etc. They were sincere or calculated, loyal “companions” or “sympathizers” of the Party from the beginning. On the other hand, most of the teachers were passive, while there were a certain number of “enemies” or “irreversible enemies” in all faculties. In June 1949, the percentage of Party members and candidates among teachers was 12.3%, and among assistants 18.3%, which was to be expected considering that these were younger people closer to the Party and more susceptible to its propaganda; “sympathizers” and “passives” made up about one third of both teaching and assistant staff; “enemies” of the Party and the new regime made up about 18% of the number of teaching staff and about 16% of the number of assistants, which in both cases was a significant percentage.<sup>30</sup>

	Teachers		Assistants	
KP members and candidates	60	12,3%	50	18,2%
Sympathizers	172	35,3%	93	33,6%
Passives	165	33,9%	88	31,8%
Enemies	89	18,3%	45	16,3%
Total	486	100%	276	100%

*Political structure of teachers and assistants of the University  
and large schools in Belgrade in June 1949*<sup>31</sup>

<sup>29</sup> „Zapisnik sa pretkongresne konferencije Partijske ćelije nastavnika i administratora Beogradskog univerziteta, 10. 6. 1948”, u: *Zapisnici i izveštaji univerzitetskog komiteta KPS 1945–1948*, 375–379; „Zapisnik sa sastanka osnovne organizacije nastavnika članova KPS, 1. 9. 1948”, u: *Zapisnici i izveštaji univerzitetskog komiteta KPS 1948–1952*, prir. Momčilo Mitrović i Đorđe Stanković (Beograd: Centar za marksizam Univerziteta, 1987), 45–51.

<sup>30</sup> AJ, 317–21, Структура наставног и помоћног наставног особља на Универзитету и великим школама по политичком опредељењу, јун 1949.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.* From 1948 to 1954, the University of Belgrade was divided into the University (Faculties of Philosophy, Sciences and Mathematics, Law, Agriculture, Forestry, Veterinary Medicine and

### “Enemies” – “removal” of university professors

All the mentioned groups were carefully registered by the party authorities who made reviews of the political situation, and based on them they performed “differentiation” and acted through the student organization, university and state bodies, and sometimes through the police. “Enemies” had to be kept under control and, as a last resort, removed from the University if they represented a threat and if they could be replaced in classes. The majority of passive teachers, who did not belong to the category of “irreparable enemies”, had to be won over, “re-educated”, their ideological-political attitudes changed and classified as “honest intelligentsia” (or at least kept under control).

In the new socio-political circumstances, the university intelligentsia could decide to resist or to adapt to the new society and change fundamental political and ideological positions. After the “purge” at the University immediately after the liberation (the decision of the Court of Honor), a few teachers openly showed their disagreement with the political changes and policies of the ruling party. Some of them were removed from the University by the end of the 1940s: Dragoljub Jovanović, Miodrag Aćimović, Dušan Pantelić, Đorđe Mirković, Milan Vladislavljević and Milivoje Marković from the Faculty of Law; Đura Filipović from the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine; Kajica Milanov, Tatomir Vukanović, Momčilo Žeravčić, from the Faculty of Philosophy; Radoje Tadić, Tihomir Simić, Svetislav Vujović from the Faculty of Medicine. After the conflict with the Cominform in 1948, several KPJ teachers were arrested and expelled from the University: Mirko Marković, Dušan Dohčević, Obren Blagojević, Predrag Vlasinić, Đorđe Pejić, Jovan Drakulić, Jelena Bogdanović, Milovan Bogdanović, Vladimir Spasojević, Markov Vranješević, Dimitrije Pejović, Milena Janković, Borislav Božović, and Dr. Vojislav Zađina from the Technical Great School was arrested in 1949 for “sabotage”, but was soon released. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, a number of teachers of the Faculty of Medicine who were considered “enemies” were excluded from teaching (Dušan Borić, Vojislav Arnovljević and Svetislav Barjaktarović 1949; Aleksandar Kostić and Jevrem Nedeljковиć 1952; Ilija Dimitrijević, Milan Prica, Milan Fotić, Milivoje Milošević,

---

Theology), the Medical Great School (Faculty of Medicine, Pharmacy and Dentistry) and the Technical Great School (Faculties of Architecture, Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Technology, Geology and Mining). (D. Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944–1952*, 114–117).

Vandel Tasić, Nikola Mirjanić, Nikola Maksimović 1953; Smilja Kostić-Joksić, Laza Stanojević, Mitar Mitrović, Slobodan Đorđević 1954.<sup>32</sup>

However, the removal of teachers from the University was proposed only in extreme cases and was not always implemented. And when a particular teacher was characterized as an “irreconcilable enemy”, “enemy of today”, “reactionary”, “freemason”, “idealist”, “passive”, “apolitical”, “leader of the opposing clique”, “pro-Western oriented”, “collaborator of foreign services”, and even when he was accused of “sins” from the interwar period and the time of occupation, and a note was made that he “should be removed from the University”, not everything was over. We have seen that such teachers were numerous at all faculties and necessary for the construction of a new elite, and thus also for the “construction of socialism”, and their removal would certainly endanger teaching and scientific work. The basic condition for the unfit teacher to be removed was to find an

<sup>32</sup> ДАС, УБ, фасц. 84, Уклањање наставног особља; ДАС, МНК, фасц. 15, Број искључених професора са Београдског универзитета, 20. 9. 1949; Списак искључених наставника Београдског универзитета, 1949; ДАС, фонд Медицинска велика школа (МВШ), фасц. 28, 29, 33, Персонална питања; ДАС, БИА, II, 111, Годишњи извештај Универзитета и великих школа 1949; АЈ, фонд ЦК СКЈ, 507, VIII, VII-5, к-38, Извештај УДБ-е о стању на факултетима, 10. 11. 1951; Историјски архив Београда (ИАБ), фонд Градски комитет (ГК), фасц. 516, Информације о проучавању писма ЦК КПЈ и спровођењу одлука на Београдском универзитету, 22. 3. 1952; D. Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944–1952*, 256–263; Драгомир Бонџић, „Комунистичка власт и наставници Медицинског факултета у Београду 1945–1955”, у: *Историја медицине, фармације и народне медицине. Зборник радова*, ур. Момчило Павловић (Београд–Зајечар: Институт за савремену историју – Историјски архив „Тимочка крајина”, 2007), 117–120; Војислав Костић, *Живот са непреболним болом у души (Проф. др Александар Костић 1893–1983)*, (Београд: Драганић, 2004); Драгомир Бонџић, „Драгољуб Јовановић и Београдски универзитет”, *Друштвено-политичка и научна мисао и делатност Драгољуба Јовановића*, ур. Александар Костић (Београд: САНУ, 2019), 169–186; Ivana Pantelić i Dragomir Bondžić, „Život i rad Smilje Kostić-Joksić (1895–1981) profesorke Medicinskog fakulteta u Beogradu”, у: *Naučnice u društvu, Radovi sa konferencije*, ур. Lada Stevanović, Mladena Prelić Miroslava Lukić Krstanović (Beograd: Etnografski institut SANU, 2020), 351–360; Dragomir Bondžić, „The Repercussions of the Tito–Stalin Split in 1948 on the University of Belgrade”, in: *The Tito–Stalin Split 70 Years After*, Tvrtko Jakovina & Martin Previšić (eds), (Zagreb–Ljubljana: University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences–University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts, 2020), 75–86 doi:10.17234/9789531758031; On repression in Serbia see: Srđan Cvetković, *Između srpa i čekića. Represija u Srbiji 1944–1953* (Beograd: Institut za savremenu istoriju, 2006); Наташа Милићевић, „Комунистичка стратегија према српској интелигенцији 1944–1950”, у: *Срби и Југославија. Држава, друштво, политика. Зборник радова*, ур. Момчило Исић (Београд: Институт за новију историју Србије, 2007), 293–297; Наташа Милићевић, *Југословенска власт и српско грађанство 1944–1950* (Београд: Институт за новију историју Србије, 2009), 237–406.

adequate professional replacement, which was not easy, sometimes impossible. Only in the case when a teacher was openly and publicly hostile and represented a political danger (for example, Dragoljub Jovanović), no consideration was given to replacing him, and repression was resorted to so that such person would not “corrupt the student youth”. In the meantime, unfit teachers were tolerated and monitored, and their characteristics usually ended with the statements “usable”, “usable for now”, “should be used”, etc.<sup>33</sup>

Such an example is the characteristic of the prominent scientist, professor and academician Milutin Milanković from 1949: “By political orientation, he belongs to a well-known mathematical clique. He does not know Marxism-Leninism at all, nor is he interested in it. He is not felt at all in the teachers' council. We consider him to be our political enemy and that he will die as such. We think he can be used until it dies.” (underlined by D. B.).<sup>34</sup> Prominent professor and academician, biologist Ivan Đaja was considered a “politically incorrigible reactionary”, who came from a “grand-bourgeois family” and opposed Soviet science as “semi-barbaric”. Because of all this, in the report on 16 March 1949, it was pointed out that “he should be removed from the faculty”, but a little later it was added that “as a teacher he is good and popular” and “in this respect he can be used, which is the only reason why he should still be kept at the university”.<sup>35</sup>

The biggest supporters of radical measures at the University and the removal of teaching staff were the bodies of the State Security Administration (UDB) in charge of the University and the party organization at the University. Officials at UDB were convinced that the repressive measures had a positive effect and calmed the “enemies” at the faculties. Thus, the 1949 report on the work at the Medical College (MVŠ) said that “the hostile work among the teachers was weakened” and there were no hostile outbursts, and that was since the time when Dr. Vojislav Arnovljević, Dr. Dušan Borić and Dr. Svetislav Barjaktarević were expelled from the faculty (January 1949), as they were the main obstacle to the implementation of the political line at the MVŠ. It was recorded that since then

<sup>33</sup> AJ, фонд Комитет за школе и науку ФНРЈ, 315-14-31, Карактеристике; AJ, 316-61, Карактеристике наставника, 1949; AJ, СНК, 317-67-92, Идеолошко политичке карактеристике професора Универзитета, 1949; ДАС, МНК, фасц. 15, 16, 17, Карактеристике наставника 1949–1950; ДАС, фонд Комитет за научне установе, универзитет и велике школе НР Србије (КНУУВШ), фасц. 104, Карактеристике радника научних установа 1949–1950.

<sup>34</sup> AJ, 316-70, Карактеристика др Милутина Миланковића.

<sup>35</sup> AJ, 316-70, Карактеристика др Ивана Ђаје, 16. 3. 1949. и друга недатирана.

“the work of one of the most pronounced enemies among teachers, Professor Aleksandar Kostić, has weakened considerably.” Kostić, however, was still intensively monitored, it was noted that he was gathering “reactionary-minded doctors” around him, and it was considered that his removal from the faculty “would give positive results”. Also under surveillance was Kostić’s wife, Smilja Kostić-Joksić, who “often acted in a hostile manner”, and by wiretapping the phone it was established that she “maintains some dubious connections with the Americans”. In general, UDB considered that the hostile orientation of the teaching staff was a big problem even when there were no significant hostile outbursts.<sup>36</sup> The removal of Assistant Professor Milivoje Marković in 1949, according to the UDB reporter, also “significantly contributed to the improvement of the political situation” at the Faculty of Law because “an insolent and open enemy” who “exposed many of our institutions to ridicule” during lectures was expelled.<sup>37</sup> At the end of October 1950, the University party organization submitted a proposal for the removal (or retirement and transfer to another institution) of over 40 teachers from the University and large schools with a proposal for an adequate replacement. The list included members of the Party and associates of the new government (Baja Bajić, Svetozar Brkić, Sreten Vukosavljević, etc.). However, higher authorities insisted that teachers and assistants who did not have a replacement provided, but were useful at the faculty as experts, should not be removed until an adequate replacement was found, and in some cases they did not agree with the removal proposal even if there was a replacement.<sup>38</sup>

### **“Associates” and “companions” - surveillance and distrust**

On the other hand, the views of the vast majority of teachers, even when they were considered “hostile”, were not dangerous to the ruling party and were not severely sanctioned. The Party closely monitored and recorded, but also tolerated, the obvious mistrust, reticence, skepticism and criticism that were

<sup>36</sup> ДАС, фонд БИА, II, 111, Годишњи извештај 1949. Медицинска велика школа. As mentioned, A. Kostić was removed from the faculty in 1952, and S. Kostić-Joksić in 1954.

<sup>37</sup> ДАС, БИА, II, 111, Годишњи извештај 1949. Правни факултет.

<sup>38</sup> ДАС, МНК, фасц. 9, Предлог за удаљење наставника и асистената са Београдског универзитета и Техничке велике школе, 25. 10. 1950; Исто, Мишљење Комитета о предлогу партијске организације Универзитета за удаљење наставника и асистената и замене. From the list of over 40 teachers and assistants, only Aleksandar Kostić and Smilja Kostić-Joksić were later removed.

present among a large number of teachers. It considered some as “passive”, “critics”, “opportunists”, criticized them harshly and exerted political, ideological and propaganda pressure on them. However, it tolerated them in certain departments, realizing that it could not find a replacement for them in scientific and teaching work; it controlled them in detail and strove to exploit their knowledge and work. The special activity of state and party authorities was aimed at winning over and “re-educating” professors who were not complete “enemies” and who were wavering. The university teachers themselves were forced to adapt to the new reality and circumstances, as it quickly became clear that they would not be temporary. They kept their ideological and political attitudes and determinations to themselves or occasionally expressed them through mild criticism, irony and ridicule towards the new authorities and their efforts.

Of course, constant and numerous complaints were made against these teachers, starting with their origin, behavior in the interwar period or during the occupation, up to the sincerity of their attitude towards the Party and the construction of socialism. Many were reproached for not attending dialectic materialism courses organized at faculties, for not adopting the ideology of Marxism-Leninism and not applying it in teaching, for not following the development of science in the Soviet Union, especially in the social sciences, but also in others, above all Lysenkoism in biology.<sup>39</sup> In addition to the criticism that a certain teacher “does not know Marxism”, the bigger accusation was that he “does not want to know it”. For George Ostrogorsky, a Russian emigrant and famous Byzantine scholar, it was written that his “political stance is anti-communist”, that “he is not interested in the construction of socialism in our country out of cowardly opportunism”, that “he reads the works of Marxism-Leninism in the original, but does not seem to be adopting anything”, that he behaves “passively” and “opportunistically”, but “occasionally makes hostile outbursts”.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>39</sup> See: Предраг Ј. Марковић, *Београд између Истока и Запада 1948–1965* (Београд: Службени лист СРЈ, 1996), 3347–355; D. Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944–1952*, 212–216; Vedran Duančić, „Lysenko in Yugoslavia 1945–1950s: How to De-Stalinize Stalinist Science”, *Journal of the History of Biology*, vol. 53 (2020), 159–194 doi: 10.1007/s10739-020-09598-2.

<sup>40</sup> АЈ, СНК, 317-67-92, Карактеристике наставника Универзитета и великих школа, 1949; ДАС, МНК, фасц. 15, Карактеристика Георгија Острогорског, март 1949. It should be noted that the version of “Marxism-Leninism” that was imposed on the professors and students of the University of Belgrade at that time was significantly simplified and deviated from the real doctrine, which was “complex, difficult, rooted in European philosophy” [Миодраг Б. Протић, *Нојева барка, поглед с краја века (1900–1965)*, I, (Београд: СКЗ, 1992), 294].

A special “flaw” of certain scientists was sarcasm, irony and ridicule towards the construction of socialism. Thus, Radosav Bošković was repeatedly “frivolous”, “anarchistic” and “undisciplined”.<sup>41</sup> “The main source of the slogans of irony” according to Marxism-Leninism was Milan Budimir, a professor of classical languages, who was surprised that the Soviet Greek scholar had not instructed Stalin on the correct interpretation of the word dialectics; similar comments were made by professor Miloš Đurić, a “politically incurable nationalist and Yugoslav racist”, who claimed that “the Serbian people were Marxists long before Marx and, together with Filip Višnjić, set up the First Serbian Uprising exactly according to Marxism”.<sup>42</sup> The professors of all faculties made caustic comments and allusions: Ivan Đaja at the Faculty of Philosophy, Aleksandar Kostić at the Faculty of Medicine, and Radivoje Kašanin at the Technical College, where Danilo Rašković made allusions about the “red color of the dictatorship”, and Aleksandar Leko told jokes with hostile content.<sup>43</sup>

Even the teachers who cooperated with the new government and represented its views at the University and in the public did not gain the full trust of the party authorities, especially not the UDB authorities. The state and the party were not completely satisfied even with those teachers who accepted “ideality in teaching”, considering that it remained “foreign and inaccessible” to them. It was concluded that many pre-war professors “made progress in their work on their reorientation in the ideological sense in science, and especially in teaching” and this was positive for all of them, but the question was raised “how much further they can go”, i.e. to what extent their reorientation was sincere. One example is Jovan Lovčević, a professor at the Faculty of Law, whom the UDB thought was “working very diligently on personal development in the new ideological spirit of teaching finance”, he learned the Russian language and followed Soviet literature, “but despite considerable achievements, his complete reorientation is almost impossible, because he was formed in a different spirit after all”. At the same faculty, there were others who could not “shake off the burdensome legacy of the past.” This was especially important for subjects that were “expressly political” and were taught by old teachers “formalists in the conceptual sense”, for whom the question was raised “whether they can be reoriented at all given their constitution”, even though they were excellent experts on the subject matter.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> AJ, СНК, 317-67-92, Карактеристика Радосава Бошковића, 1949.

<sup>42</sup> AJ, СНК, 317-67-92, Карактеристике Милана Будимира и Милоша Ђурића, 1949.

<sup>43</sup> AJ, СНК, 317-67-92, Карактеристике наставника Универзитета и великих школа, 1949.

<sup>44</sup> ДАС, БИА, II, 111, Годишњи извештај 1949. Правни факултет.

Even some pre-war professors who became the closest collaborators of the new government faced harsh criticism and accusations. Thus, already in the summer of 1945, several communists from the Ministry submitted reports against Professor Vasa Čubrilović as Minister of Agriculture of the DFJ that he was acting against the party line and demanded his removal; Čubrilović nevertheless remained at the federal level of government until his retirement from politics in 1951.<sup>45</sup> Professors of the Faculty of Law, Mihailo Konstantinović and Jovan Đorđević, who were considered excellent experts and who after the liberation “progressed ideologically and politically”, “understood and even accepted our social reality” and adapted their lectures and publications to it, were under the constant control of the UDB and accused of “disguised hostility”. It was considered that Konstantinović, although he “did not show any signs of hostility”, should be evaluated as a “disguised enemy due to his past” and certainly controlled, and Jovan Đorđević was suspicious because he had married “a woman who works for a foreign service”.<sup>46</sup>

The new government was also suspicious of the teachers who were first punished, and then managed to rehabilitate themselves by working in teaching at the University and in the economy. Such an example was Branislav Milovanović, who as a professor of paleontology at the Faculty of Philosophy was removed from the University by the decision of the Court of Honor in May 1945 due to economic cooperation with the occupier during the war. As early as July 1945, Milovanović was engaged in the Scientific Research Institute of the Ministry of Mining of the FNRJ, and in June 1949, due to a lack of staff, he was appointed as a professor at the Faculty of Mining. At the university, he excelled in his work, taught as many as six subjects, “did his best”, attended trade union meetings, came to conferences; his right to vote was restored and he was judged to be a “supporter of the ruling regime”, although he “keeps himself politically aloof and does not stand out anywhere”.<sup>47</sup> However, despite several assessments and reports

<sup>45</sup> Драгомир Бонџић, „Критике комуниста на рад министра пољопривреде ДФЈ Васа Чубриловића августа 1945”, *Токови историје*, бр. 1, (2015), 187–202.

<sup>46</sup> Приватна збирка Ђорђа Станковића, Извештаји УДБ-е за НР Србију по факултетима, 7. 9. 1948.

<sup>47</sup> ДАС, МНК, фасц. 23, Карактеристике Бранислава Миловановића, без датума; ДАС, фонд КНУУВШ, фасц. 26, Извештај комитета КПС Рударског факултета, 9. 4. 1949. В. Milovanović was not an exception because most of the teachers punished by the decision of the Court of Honor (not counting those who left the country) were somehow rehabilitated [Slobodan Selinić i Dragomir Bondžić, „Prećutna rehabilitacija”. Vraćanje na Beogradski univerzitet nastavnika uklonjenih odlukom Suda časti posle Drugog svetskog rata”, u: *Desničini susreti 2009. Zbornik radova*, sv. 4, ur. Drago Roksandić, Magdalena Najbar-Agičić, Ivana Cvijović Javorina (Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, 2011), 188–198].

in which it was considered that Milovanović had been rehabilitated, on 25 March 1948, the secretary of the party cell of university teachers, Dragiša Ivanović, gave him a harsh negative assessment, in which he pointed out that he was a good expert and lecturer, but that he was removed from the University “as a traitor”, “a wretched servant of the occupier” and that he was “a man without character” who was a bitter enemy of the national liberation struggle during the war; he believed that he was committed to work not out of love for the country but because of his past and to rehabilitate himself, that “it is not excluded that he belongs to some enemy group” and “that he would be able to shamefully betray any state secret at every opportunity”.<sup>48</sup>

A newspaper article from the mid-1950s also showed the problem of mistrust towards old “bourgeois” teachers. The journalist asked himself and answered: “What can we demand from the old teachers? Can we ask them for a complete re-formation of the scientific world? That process is impossible. Even among those who sincerely want to become dialecticians. They cannot demolish what they have been building for a whole century, and those attempts remain in occasionally pasted quotes from Marx or Lenin, in some paper the foundations of which have only formally moved away from bourgeois ideology”.<sup>49</sup>

All teachers, both “enemies” and those who compromised and cooperated with the new government, were aware of the distrust and control they were subjected to, but not all tolerated it in the same way. Constant pressures and multiple control of the Party, mass organizations and UDB not only led to political changes among individual teachers, but also affected their awareness and health. In some cases, such attitude towards them would bother them and they offered at least symbolic resistance. The case of Vladimir Vujić, professor of the Faculty of Medicine and director of the Neurology Clinic, who, according to the UDB report for December 1949, submitted a written resignation from further service, citing as the reason “that he is prevented from working, because his assistant is persecuting him”. In the report, it was stated that “there has been intolerance between professor Vujić and the treatment assistant Dr. Draginja Mitić for a long time”, and in the opinion of the UDB official, such relations came about “primarily because Dr. Mitić, as a member of the party committee, rigidly understood her duty at the Clinic, and then also Dr. Vujić is a nervous and eccentric man, it seems to him that someone is persecuting him, that Dr. Mitić is

---

<sup>48</sup> ДАС, МНК, фасц. 23, Карактеристика Бранислава Миловановића, 25. 3. 1948.

<sup>49</sup> Владимир Колар, „Универзитетска дилема. О процесу који крије у себи сукобе смене једне генерације“, *НИН*, бр. 269, 24. 2. 1956, 5.

preparing his imprisonment”. The party leader at the Clinic held a meeting with Vujić in the presence of several other influential doctors, where he agreed to withdraw his resignation “after a long push and pull”.<sup>50</sup>

It can be assumed that other teachers also felt constant surveillance and noticed “followers” who were always on their heels, but they put up with it and did not react. And those professors who accepted the cooperation “had a constant fear of whether they would set certain things from their profession in the conceptually correct way”, and that is why they rarely wrote textbooks or spoke publicly. A contemporary student wrote about the reaction of senior professors: “At the Faculty of Philosophy, the thinned-out pre-war professors, shocked by the new regime, looked around and within themselves in confusion. Confronted in the classrooms with newly appointed Marxist colleagues, and in the lecture halls with student warriors and committee members – both of whom hunted their ideological mistakes – they were on constant alert. In order to avoid possible difficulties, those with stronger integrity restrained the enthusiasm and originality of their own ideas and hid behind the rigor of data and expertise, while those with less integrity often made awkward compromises with the new ideology. They brought to the lectures their depression, already visible on their faces, which quickly turned into grumpiness and procrastination”.<sup>51</sup>

### **Compromises, “re-education” and the generation change**

Despite mistrust and constant surveillance, at the end of the 1940s and especially during the 1950s, a process of mutual tolerance, compromise and cooperation between the new government and the old professorial elite developed at Belgrade University. Since the Yugoslav government survived after the conflict with the Soviet Union in 1948 and then made certain changes in foreign, internal, and cultural and educational policy, during the 1950s the compromise between the Party and the intellectual elite at the University of Belgrade was increasingly prominent. “In search of wider support and legitimacy”, the party partially liberalized its policy at the University, made concessions to older teachers, tried to win them over to its positions through ideological-political pressure, propaganda and various privileges, “reeducate” them and bring them to the positions of “honest intelligentsia”, that is, to integrate them into the “new

<sup>50</sup> ДАС, БИА, II, 111, Рапорт за месец децембар 1949.

<sup>51</sup> Borislav Mihajlović Mihiz, *Autobiografija o drugima* (Beograd: Kontrast, 2019), 154.

society”.<sup>52</sup> Even when such efforts did not produce concrete results among older teachers, they were tolerated and used in teaching while it was possible and were becoming accepted elite. Many of the older teachers, sincerely or out of necessity, accepted the compromise, became companions of the regime and cooperated with it, adapted themselves and their ideological-political identity to the new circumstances, aware that the new regime was not going to quickly disappear from the historical scene.<sup>53</sup>

Over time, in order to win over professors, in addition to exerting ideological and political pressure, the government increased its efforts to improve working conditions, increase affiliation, give various allowances, honorariums, privileges and awards, improve housing conditions (additional room for the library) and conditions at faculties, supplies, vacations, etc. All that produced certain results.<sup>54</sup>

The main goal of the new authorities was to create and bring to the University younger Marxist teachers, professionally qualified, but “progressive”, loyal to the party and the ideology of Marxism. It was about the creation of a new socialist university intelligentsia, which was supposed to replace the old “bourgeois” one. However, this was not easy either. There was resistance from “older reactionary teachers”, and the quality of the new staff was often not satisfactory, either professionally, or sometimes ideologically-politically.<sup>55</sup> A contemporary wrote: “The new professors, pre-war or newly minted post-war Marxists, taught science that looked like a cake: a layer of data and facts, then the wafer of Marxist phrases and quotations appropriate or inappropriate, it did not matter much. Everything was painted red or at least pink, some with conviction, some shamelessly, others a little ashamed”.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>52</sup> See: Н. Милићевић, „Комунистичка стратегија према српској интелигенцији 1944–1950“, 298–310; Н. Милићевић, *Југословенска власт и српско грађанство 1944–1950*, 461–560.

<sup>53</sup> Д. Бондић, *Универзитет у социјализму*, 69–71, 337–356. About the behavior and fate of certain professors of the University of Belgrade after World War II (Nedeljko Divac, Živojin Perić, Slobodan Jovanović, Kosta Kumanudi, Boža Marković, Milan Žujović, Viktor Novak, Ivan Đaja, Mihailo Konstantinović, Vasa Čubrilović, Sreten Vukosavljević, Mladen Josifović, Milan Bartoš, Jovan Đorđević, Borislav Blagojević, Milivoje Marković, and others) see: Д. Јовановић, *Медальони*, I, 311–315, 359–409; II, 18–21, 231–234; III, 65–68, 315–317; IV 148–157, 169–171.

<sup>54</sup> ДАС, БИА, II, 111, Годишњи извештај 1949. Правни факултет; Исто, Медицинска велика школа; D. Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944–1952*, 270–282; Ђорђе Станковић, Љубодраг Димић, *Историографија под надзором. Прилози историји историографије*, I, (Београд: Службени лист СРЈ, 1996), 199–205.

<sup>55</sup> ДАС, БИА, II, 111, Годишњи извештај 1949. Медицинска велика школа; Техничка велика школа.

<sup>56</sup> В. Милајловић Милић, *op. cit.*, 154. Students also, unless they were sincere followers of the new government and ideology, accepted the imposed game and adapted to the new conditions

In any case, at the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s, a generational change was gradually taking place at the University of Belgrade, due to biological and political reasons. Until then, older teachers educated and ideologically formed at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, “Europeans, of different beliefs but of undoubted knowledge and culture – pressed by state ideology” already accepted the new social reality (“converts”) or adapted to it without changing basic beliefs (“companions”). They were already at the end of their careers, retiring or dying. New, young staff, educated in the new system, came to the University in increasing numbers, mostly Marxists loyal to the Party and representatives of the first generations of the “new socialist intelligentsia”, although not always according to the party's expectations. The process led to the loss of autonomy and submission to the state party ideology, i.e., “replacing the status of an intellectual with the status of a knowledge technician” and the creation of “apparatus intellectuals”, mostly “fed by the regime's ideology”.<sup>57</sup>

Thus, at the beginning of the 1960s, the basic goals of the party policy at the University set after the war were achieved: “re-education” and “rewiring” of the old “bourgeois” intelligentsia and the creation of a new socialist intelligentsia. While the realization of the second goal gave only the first results, the first was already completed, with more or less success. What kind of success it was is perhaps best illustrated by the example of Aleksandar Belić, a linguist and philologist, who was a professor at the Belgrade Great School, from 1905 an associate professor, and from 1906 a full professor at the University of Belgrade, from 1905 a corresponding member, and from 1906 a full member Serbian Royal Academy; from 1923 he was the chief secretary, and from 1937 the president of the Academy; he remained at the University and at the head of the Academy during World War II and during the post-war years in the new socio-political system and, as noted by his colleague Milutin Milanković, “enriched by that long-term experience, and a man of extraordinary abilities, he saw it through all the adversities which shook the world, even between Scylla and Charybdis.”<sup>58</sup> Belić, out of fear or realism, honestly or out of opportunism, approached the newly imposed regime already in 1945, “sacrificed himself”, “bent and improvised” and

---

“according to the infallible student instinct” - although the process was not simple: “Ideological unification took place in two directions, one of which led to enthusiastic acceptance or simple acceptance, and the other to defense and resistance” (*Ibid*, 154–155, 158).

<sup>57</sup> М. Прогић, *н. д.*, 273–275; П. Марковић, *Београд између Истока и Запада 1948–1965*, 341; Д. Бонџић, *Универзитет у социјализму*, 355–356.

<sup>58</sup> М. Milanković, *op. cit.*, 449.

“saved himself and the Academy, whose survival was in question, and he also directed the work of the University. The nature of Belić’s “change of mind” is best reflected in the fact that after his death in 1960, he had a double funeral: the first, in the morning, at which Patriarch German officiated, in the presence of his family, who carried out his will to be buried according to the rites of the Serbian Orthodox Church to which he belonged, and the second, in the afternoon, the solemn state funeral that he was entitled to as the president of the Academy with appropriate speeches by communist dignitaries. As the historian and Belić’s cousin Dimitrije Đorđević concludes, this double burial indicated “the double life of a great scientist and the crucified Serbian people with him”.<sup>59</sup> This conclusion could stand for a large number of old professors of the University of Belgrade in the new system after World War II.

---

<sup>59</sup> Димитрије Ђорђевић, *Ожигљци и опомене III* (Београд: СКЗ, 2001), 41–43. About Belić’s funeral and the deployment of the guards of honor, which consisted of members of the Executive Council of the NR of Serbia, the People’s Committee of the City of Belgrade, the Council for Scientific Work of the NR Serbia and representatives of the Academy, the University, the Faculty of Philosophy, various institutes, students, the Association of Writers of Serbia, Kolarac University and others institution and organization, see: Архив САНУ, Заоставштина Александра Белића, IV-3913.