

# Protukomunistički otpor u Dubrovniku (1945.): fra Dominik Barač i križarski vođa Pero Bakić

# Anticommunist resistance in Dubrovnik (1945): Fr. Dominik Barač and Crusader leader Pero Bakić

**Blanka Matković**

blankamatkovic@gmail.com

Nezavisni istraživač / *Independent researcher*

GB – Coventry

UDK/UDC: 2-722.53(497.584 Dubrovnik) : 321.74  
doi: 10.15291/misc.4524

Izvorni znanstveni rad / *Original scientific paper*  
Primljeno / *Received*: 14. V. 2023.



Ključne riječi: Drugi svjetski rat;  
Dubrovnik; fra Dominik Barač;  
Konavle; križari; Pero Bakić;  
protukomunistički otpor; represija

Na osnovi izvornih arhivskih dokumenata iz Državnog arhiva u Splitu, u ovom se radu daje kratki prikaz poslijeratne komunističke represije, protukomunističkog otpora i progona svećenstva na području grada Dubrovnika. Poseban je naglasak na slučaju dominikanca fra Dominika Barača koji je u lipnju 1945. osuđen na kaznu smrti strijeljanjem koja je izvršena 17. studenoga iste godine u Trogiru. U ovom radu autorica se fokusira na djelovanje konavoskih križara pod vodstvom nekadašnjeg HSS-ovca Pere Bakića i njihove kontakte s Baračem zbog kojih je i formalno osuđen.

Key words: World War II;  
Dubrovnik; Fr. Dominik Barač;  
Konavle; Crusaders; Pero Bakić;  
anticommunist resistance;  
repression

Relying on the original documents from the Split State Archives, this paper offers a brief description of postwar Communist repression, anticommunist resistance and persecution of clergy in Dubrovnik area. Laying stress upon the case of Fr. Dominik Barač, a Dominican priest who was sentenced to be shot in 1945 and executed in Trogir on 17 November that year, the author focuses on the activities of the Konavle Crusaders led by the former HSS member Pero Bakić and their contacts with Barač that led to his formal sentence.

## Uvod

„Nakon patnji i stradanja u kojima je dubrovački okrug dao nebrojene žrtve u listopadu 1944. g. oslobođen je grad Dubrovnik i njegova okolica. Narod se oslobodio terora i strahota, četnika, ustaša i okupatora. Dok je narod jedva odahnuo i počeo da radi u miru na obnavljanju porušene zemlje u Dubrovniku, ostaci ustaških koljača i suradnika okupatora stvaraju tajnu ilegalnu organizaciju. Svrha ove organizacije bila je da potkopava rad narodnih vlasti i potpomogne ostatke ustaša koji su se nalazili u šumi, te vrši terorističke napadaje, propagira ustaštvo i povratak ustaša i okupatora u Dalmaciji. Na čelu ove organizacije nalazio se svećenik dominikanac dr. fra Dominik Barač, profesor bogoslovije u Dubrovniku. S njim je surađivao još jedan svećenik, dominikanac, bivši domobranski dušobrižnik fra Bertrand Paršić. Sastanci ove ilegalne terorističke grupe održavali su se u samostanu dominikanaca u Dubrovniku. Naročito je bila razvijena djelatnost ove organizacije tokom siječnja 1945. godine. Da bi bojkotirali proslavu sv. Vlaha, ilegalna teroristička grupa na čelu sa dr. Dominikom Baračem u to doba piše prijeteća pisma dubrovačkim građanima i samome biskupu kotorskome i administratoru dubrovačke biskupije dr. Pavlu Butorcu. Tako fra Dominik Barač za volju okupatora i ustaša poziva narod da ne sudjeluje u proslavi dubrovačkog zaštitnika sv. Vlaha. U jednom pismu upućenome dr. Frani Dabroviću on naziva ovoga biskupa 'biskup kukavica'. Iz tih razloga što je biskup Butorac dao pristanak da se proslava sv. Vlaha održi. Fra Dominik Barač stupa u vezu sa vođom ustaških odmetnika Perom Bakićem. On i svećenik Paršić sastavljaju pisma za njega u kome obavještavaju Bakića o ilegalnom radu u Dubrovniku, predpostavljajući da Bakić ima veze sa Mostarom u kojem je još tada bio okupator. U tim pismima oni traže pravac rada, i na taj način hoće da se povežu s okupatorom. Ova pisma napisana su po diktatu fra Barača u njegovoj sobi u dominikanskom samostanu u Dubrovniku. Fra Barač u službi ustaša i okupatora upotrebljavao je i same crkvene prostorije, odakle upućuje prijeteća pisma građanima Dubrovnika dajući ih u sakristiji dominikanske crkve Ivki Kristović. I pisma upućena vođi

## Introduction

“After immense suffering and untold victims, Dubrovnik and its environs were finally liberated in November 1944. The people broke free from the terror and atrocities inflicted upon them by Chetniks, Ustashe and the occupiers. No sooner were the people of Dubrovnik able to breathe freely again and start rebuilding their devastated country than the remains of the Ustasha butchers and collaborationists began forming their secret illegal organization. Its goal was to undermine the people’s government, help the remaining Ustashe still at large, engage in acts of terrorism, and promote the Ustasha and occupiers’ cause and restore their power in Dalmatia. The organization was headed by the Dominican priest Fr. Dominik Barač, professor at the divinity college in Dubrovnik. He had been in collusion with another Dominican priest, former Home Guard confessor Fr. Bertrand Paršić. This illegal terrorist group had its meetings at the Dominican monastery in Dubrovnik. They were particularly active in January 1945. In order to boycott the Festivity of St. Blaise, the illegal terrorist group led by Dr. Dominik Barač wrote threatening letters to the citizens of Dubrovnik and to Dr. Pavao Butorac, the bishop of Kotor and administrator of the Dubrovnik Diocese. For the sake of the occupiers and Ustashe, Fr. Dominik Barač urged the people not to take part in the Festivity of St. Blaise, Dubrovnik’s patron saint. In a letter to Dr. Frano Dabrović, he called Butorac a ‘cowardly bishop’ because he gave his approval for the festivity. Fr. Dominik Barač established a contact with Pero Bakić, the leader of the Ustasha outlaws. He and priest Paršić wrote letters to him, informing him about their illegal activities in Dubrovnik as they believed he had been in touch with Mostar, then still held by the occupiers. In their letters they sought guidance for establishing contacts with the occupiers. The letters were dictated by Fr. Barač in his chambers in the Dominican monastery in Dubrovnik. In service of the Ustashe and occupiers, Fr. Barač went as far as to use church premises. There he wrote the threatening letters to the citizens of Dubrovnik. He would then hand these letters over to Ivka Kristović in the sacristy of the Dominican church. He did the same with his letters to the Ustasha outlaw leader

ustaške bande Peri Bakiću također predaje u crkvenim prostorijama u ruke Pavi Radović.

Posljednji ostaci ustaške bande koji su se skrivali u Konavljima nedavno su likvidirani. Teroristička ilegalna grupa koja je bila slična i koju je organizirao fra Dominik Barač, došla je ovih dana u ruke suda da primi zasluženu kaznu.<sup>1</sup>

Ovaj tekst pod naslovom „Organizator ilegalnog terorističkog rada u Dubrovniku bio je dominikanac dr. fra Dominik Barač“ objavljen je u *Slobodnoj Dalmaciji* 9. siječnja 1946., odnosno gotovo dva mjeseca nakon što je Barač bio strijeljan, a članovi njegove „grupe“ već odavno neaktivni, odnosno zatvoreni ili ubijeni. Štoviše, tekst je objavljen na istoj stranici uz drugi pod naslovom „Osudjeni članovi ilegalne družine koja je pripremala bijeg logoraša“, a u kojem se autor osvrnuo na tada aktualno suđenje fra Petru Turkalju, Korneliju Filipiju i Dragutinu Homolki koji su u siječnju 1946. osudjeni u Splitu zbog navodnog organiziranja bijega logoraša iz splitskog logora Firule i njihova prebacivanja u križare na drniškom području.<sup>2</sup> Stoga je vrijeme objavljivanja teksta o „ilegalnom terorističkom radu“ u Dubrovniku potrebno gledati u širem kontekstu odnosa komunističke vlasti prema Katoličkoj Crkvi u prvim mjesecima nakon objavljivanja Pastirskog pisma u rujnu 1945. godine.

Naime, upravo je u istom broju *Slobodne Dalmacije* na naslovnoj stranici tiskana kratka „Izjava katoličkih svećenika povodom Pastirskog pisma“ prethodno objavljena u tiskovini *Naš list*, glasilu Narodne fronte (NF) jugoslavenskog zbjega u El Shattu. U toj izjavi koju potpisuju svećenici don Andro Štambuk, don Niko Ivanović, don Ivan Moškateo i don Jure Burić navedeno je da se potpisani „pridružuju ostaloj braći svećenicima, koji su odbili da u svojim crkvama pročitaju ‘Pastirsko pismo’ katoličkog episkopata, smatrajući njihov neposluš prema svojim starješinama patriotskim činom“. U izjavi se također ističe da je „historijski momenat, što ga je Jugoslavija proživljavala, imperativno nalaže svim iskrenim rodoljubima da se zbiju u narodne redove oko našeg omiljenog maršala Tita i da svi jednodušno pristupe izgradnji

Pero Bakić – he used church premises to hand them over to Pava Radović. The last remaining Ustasha bandits in Konavle have recently been liquidated. These days, a similar illegal terrorist group organized by Fr. Dominik Barač has also been brought to justice.”<sup>1</sup>

The above quoted text, headlined “Illegal Terrorist Activities in Dubrovnik Were Organized by Fr. Dominik Barač”, was published in *Slobodna Dalmacija* on 9 January 1946, almost two months after Barač had been shot. As for the members of his “group”, they had all been inactive by then – imprisoned or executed. Indeed, the text was published on the same page as the text headlined “Guilty Verdicts for Illegal Group That Helped Detainees Escape” that covered the then ongoing Split trial of Fr. Petar Turkalj, Kornelije Filipi and Dragutin Homolka, who would later in January that year be found guilty for allegedly organizing escape of the detainees of Firule prison camp in Split and helping them to join the Crusaders in Drniš area.<sup>2</sup> For this reason, the publishing of the text about the “illegal terrorist activities” in Dubrovnik should be perceived in the context of the day – the Communist regime’s treatment of the Catholic Church in the first months after the Pastoral Letter of September 1945.

On the front page of the very same issue of *Slobodna Dalmacija*, a brief “Catholic Priests’ Statement on the Occasion of Pastoral Letter” was published. Originally published in *Naš list*, the official organ of the National Front (NF) in the Yugoslav refugee camp in El Shatt, the statement signed by Fathers Andro Štambuk, Niko Ivanović, Ivan Moškateo and Jure Burić says that the undersigned priests “have joined their brother priests in refusing to read the Catholic bishops’ ‘Pastoral Letter’ in their churches, considering this disobedience towards their superiors as an act of patriotism”. The statement also asserts that “in this historical moment for Yugoslavia, it is an imperative for all true patriots to close ranks around our beloved Marshal Tito and unanimously join forces in building a new Democratic Federative Yugoslavia, a country where there will be justice for all, regardless of their faith or nationality.”<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> „Organizator ilegalnog terorističkog rada u Dubrovniku bio je dominikanac dr. fra Dominik Barač“, *Slobodna Dalmacija*, 9. siječnja 1946., 3.

<sup>2</sup> „Osudjeni članovi ilegalne družine koja je pripremala bijeg robijaša“, *Slobodna Dalmacija*, 9. siječnja 1946., 3.

<sup>1</sup> “Illegal Terrorist Activities in Dubrovnik Were Organized by Fr. Dominik Barač”, *Slobodna Dalmacija*, 9 January 1946, 3.

<sup>2</sup> “Guilty Verdicts for Illegal Group That Helped Detainees Escape”, *Slobodna Dalmacija*, 9 January 1946, 3.

<sup>3</sup> “Catholic Priests’ Statement on the Occasion of Pastoral Letter”, *Slobodna Dalmacija*, 9 January 1946, 1.

nove Demokratske Federativne Jugoslavije, u kojoj će biti pravde za svakog građanina, bez razlike vjere i narodnosti.“<sup>3</sup> Čini se da je nakana tadašnjih medija koje je kontrolirao komunistički režim bila ukazati na razjedinjenost Katoličke Crkve uz izričito isticanje navodnog „terorističkog“ karaktera onog „neprijateljskog“ dijela te institucije.

No, unatoč svojim zaslugama za rad u logorima u Egiptu, spomenuti don Andro Štambuk po povratku u Jugoslaviju pao je u nemilost režima jer nije htio prijeći u stalež narodnih svećenika kako mu je bilo predloženo iz redova Komunističke partije Jugoslavije (KPJ), nego je ostao vjeran papi i svom ordinariju.<sup>4</sup> Iz Biltena Udbe iz siječnja 1948. doznajemo da je „pred Okružnim sudom u Splitu završen proces protiv don Andre Štambuka, te je isti osuđen na 3 godine prisilna rada.“<sup>5</sup> Kaznu je izdržavao u KPD-u Stara Gradiška, a po njezinu okončanju vratio se na Hvar gdje su ga 1953. brutalno pretukli „nepoznati“ počinitelji. U proljeće 1955. papa Pio XII. imenovao ga je pomoćnim biskupom hvarsko-bračko-viškim. Upravo ga je na toj dužnosti zatekla iznenadna smrt sredinom kolovoza iste godine.<sup>6</sup>

Don Andro Štambuk tako je postao jedna u nizu žrtava komunističkog režima iz redova organizacije koja je već krajem Drugog svjetskog rata bila okvalificirana kao velika opasnost po komunistički poredak. Tako, primjerice, u izvješću za svibanj 1945. OZNA za srednju Dalmaciju javlja da „popovi sa svojim radom nastoje što više privezati mase uz vjeru i crkvu, kako bi na taj način što više razjedinili narod i omladinu stvarajući razna društva i organizacije /što će te vidjeti iz izvještaja/“, a „gledajući što aktivnije rad popova možemo reći da nam oni danas na našem sektoru predstavljaju najveću opasnost“.<sup>7</sup> Da je doista tako bilo i u praksi, pokazuje svjedočanstvo dubrovačkog svećenika don Ive Bjelokosića koji je naveo da mu je tijekom istražnog postupka 1945. isljednik zaprijetio: „Zar ti nije jasno da ćemo mi Crkvu uništiti...

Apparently, the media controlled by the Communist regime aimed at underlining the lack of unity in the Catholic Church while expressly pointing at the alleged “terrorist” nature of the “hostile” parts of that institution.

Although his merits for his work in the Egyptian refugee camps has been recognized, the abovementioned priest Andro Štambuk fell into disfavor of the regime upon returning to Yugoslavia because he refused to join the ranks of the “people’s priests” at the suggestion of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ) and remained loyal to the Pope and his ordinary.<sup>4</sup> The UDBA Bulletin from January 1948 reports that “the trial of Father Andro Štambuk at the Split District Court has been terminated and the said priest has been sentenced to 3 years of forced labor”.<sup>5</sup> Upon serving his sentence in Stara Gradiška Correctional Facility, he returned to Hvar where, in 1953, he was brutally beaten by “unknown perpetrators”. In the spring of 1955, Pope Pius XII appointed him auxiliary bishop of Hvar, Brač and Vis. It was on this duty that he met his sudden death in mid-August that same year.<sup>6</sup>

Father Andro Štambuk thus became but one of many members of the Church that fell victims to the Communist regime. Even before the end of the World War II, the Communists had begun to perceive the Church as a great threat to their new order. For example, in May 1945, OZNA’s Central Dalmatian branch reports that “the clergy have been actively trying to win the masses for religion and the Church in order to disunite the people and the youth by forming various associations and organizations /as can be seen from the report/. ... Active monitoring of the clergy indicates that they pose the biggest threat in our sector”.<sup>7</sup> Evidencing that it was really so is the testimony of father Ivo Bjelokosić from Dubrovnik, who said that his investigating judge told him in the pre-trial stage in 1945: “Can’t you understand that we will destroy the Church... Everyone who might pose a threat to us 20 years from now will be killed right away. The old priests will soon die off anyway and the young people will be prevented from

<sup>3</sup> „Izjava katoličkih svećenika povodom ‘Pastirskog pisma’“, *Slobodna Dalmacija*, 9. siječnja 1946., 1.

<sup>4</sup> Bratanić 2011: 150.

<sup>5</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, kut. 168, Bilten UDB-e s podacima o kleru, 22. veljače 1948.; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 168.

<sup>6</sup> Bezina 2000: 124.

<sup>7</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, kut. 168, Izvještaj OZNA-e za srednju Dalmaciju za svibanj 1945. godine, 3. lipnja 1945., br. 714/45; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 460–472.

<sup>4</sup> Bratanić 2011: 150.

<sup>5</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, box 168, UDBA Bulletin with information on clergy, 22 February 1948; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 168.

<sup>6</sup> Bezina 2000: 124.

<sup>7</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, box 168, OZNA Central Dalmatian branch’s report for May 1945, 3 June 1945, no. 714/45; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 460–472.

Svakoga onoga, koji bi nam za 20 godina mogao biti opasan, odmah ćemo ubiti. Stari će svećenici ionako uskoro umrijeti, mladima nećemo dati spremati se za svećenike i vi ste uskoro gotovi.“<sup>8</sup> U tim trenucima mnogi su svećenici već bili ubijeni.<sup>9</sup> Fra Dominik Barač nalazio se u zatvoru gdje je čekao suđenje koje je okončano 18. lipnja 1945. i na kojem ga je prijeki vojni sud osudio na kaznu smrti strijeljanjem i trajan gubitak građanskih prava.

U ovom radu osvrnut ću se na sačuvane dokumente u dosjeima fra Dominika Barača i konavoskog križarskog vođe Pere Bakića, na represiju u gradu Dubrovniku krajem 1944. i početkom 1945. te djelovanje križarskih skupina na konavoskom području s kojim se u OZNA-inim dokumentima povezuje i Barač.

## Komunistička represija u Dubrovniku krajem 1944. i početkom 1945. godine

Radi lakšeg razumijevanja poslijeratne komunističke represije, a samim tim i otpora prema novom režimu, potrebno je vratiti se nekoliko mjeseci unatrag, u vrijeme prije samog zauzimanja Dalmacije. Naime, tijekom ljeta 1944. lokalni narodnooslobodilački odbori (NOO), ogranci Komunističke partije Hrvatske (KPH) i Odjeljenja zaštite naroda (OZNA) pristupili su izradi tzv. „crnih knjiga“. OZNA VIII. korpusa poslala je 25. srpnja 1944. dopis opunomoćeniku OZNA-e Komande splitskog područja u kojem je zatraženo da težište rada bude usmjereno „najviše i uglavnom na sređivanje kartoteke narodnih neprijatelja, špijuna, agenata itd. u oslobođenim i neoslobođenim gradovima i selima, a naročito ovim posljednjim“.<sup>10</sup> Izvješće OZNA-e za oblast VIII. korpusa, upućeno 1. kolovoza 1944. OZNA-i za Hrvatsku, također potvrđuje da su takvi popisi pripremani i drugdje.<sup>11</sup> Takve pripreme bile su tek uvod u obračun s „narodnim neprijateljima“ koji će uslijediti nakon ulaska partizanskih postrojbi u dalmatinske gradove krajem 1944. godine.

receiving clerical training – so soon you will all be done with.”<sup>8</sup> By that time, many priests had already been murdered.<sup>9</sup> Fr. Dominik Barač was awaiting his trial in prison. The trial before a court martial was terminated on 18 June 1945 and Barač was sentenced to death and permanent loss of civil rights.

In this paper I will analyze the documents contained in the files of Fr. Dominik Barač and the Konavle Crusader leader Pero Bakić, the repression in Dubrovnik in the late 1944 and early 1945, and the activities of the Crusader groups in Konavle that Barač was implicated with in OZNA's documents.

## Communist repression in Dubrovnik in the late 1944 and early 1945

For easier understanding of the postwar Communist repression and, consequently, the resistance to the new regime, one should go back to the period a few months before the Partisan seizure of Dalmatia. In the summer of 1944, local National Liberation Committees (NOO) and sections of Communist Party of Croatia (KPH) and Department for Protection of the People (OZNA) began making the so-called “black books”. In its letter to its commissioner of the Split Operational Zone HQ of 25 July 1944, the OZNA division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone gave an instruction that their activities should “first and foremost be focused on keeping files on people's enemies, spies, agents etc. in liberated and still occupied towns and – particularly – villages”.<sup>10</sup> The report of OZNA division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone sent to OZNA's Croatian branch on 1 August 1944 also confirms that such lists were also made elsewhere.<sup>11</sup> These preparations were merely an introduction to the final dealing with “people's enemies” that would take place after the Partisan units had entered Dalmatian cities in the late 1944.

Military operations for capturing Dalmatia began in September 1944. According to Nikola Anić, the People's Liberation Army of Yugoslavia (NOVJ) had

<sup>8</sup> Kačić 2017: 198.

<sup>9</sup> Opširnije o ubojstvima svećenika, primjerice na otoku Daksu: Radica 2003.

<sup>10</sup> HR-DAS-431, Opunomoćstvo OZN-e pri Komandi splitskog područja, kut. 47, Dopis OZN-e VIII. korpusa, 25. srpnja 1944.

<sup>11</sup> HR-HDA-1491, OZN-a za Hrvatsku, kut. 35, 11.3.3., Izvješće OZN-e za Oblast VIII. korpusa, 1. kolovoza 1944.; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 318–324; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 126–132.

<sup>8</sup> Kačić 2017: 198.

<sup>9</sup> For more on murders of priests (e.g. on the island of Daksu), see Radica 2003.

<sup>10</sup> HR-DAS-431, OZNA for the Split Operational Zone HQ, box 47, letter from OZNA division for the 8th Corps, 25 July 1944.

<sup>11</sup> HR-HDA-1491, OZNA – Croatian branch, box 35, 11.3.3., OZNA division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone, 1 August 1944; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 318–324; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 126–132.

Vojne operacije za zauzimanje Dalmacije započele su u rujnu 1944. godine. Prema navodima Nikole Anića, Narodnooslobodilačka vojska Jugoslavije (NOVJ) među prvima je nastojala zauzeti upravo Dubrovnik gdje su „antihitlerovski saveznici“ planirali iskrcati postrojbe smještene u Italiji i povezati se s četnicima Draže Mihajlovića s namjerom da zadaju udarac Narodnooslobodilačkom pokretu (NOP) te stvore uvjete za povratak dinastije Karađorđevića na vlast. Dubrovnik se također nalazio na smjeru povlačenja njemačke vojske prema sjeveru, a brzo zauzimanje grada trebalo je omogućiti i lakše opskrbljivanje postrojbi NOV-a u Bosni, Crnoj Gori i Srbiji.<sup>12</sup>

Stoga je na sastanku Josipa Broza Tita s članovima Vrhovnog štaba izdana zapovijed da se razrade planovi za zauzimanje južne Dalmacije. Naređeno je da 26. dalmatinska divizija nakon zauzimanja srednjo-dalmatinskih i južnodalmatinskih otoka zajedno s 29. hercegovačkom divizijom zauzme Dubrovnik. Prema gradu je iz smjera Konavala krenula 2. dalmatinska proleterska brigada sastava Primorske operativne grupe 2. crnogorskog korpusa, a na dubrovačkom su području djelovali Dubrovački partizanski odred, Konavoski partizanski odred, postrojbe Zapovjedništva grada Dubrovnika i drugi manji borbeni sastavi.<sup>13</sup> Dubrovnik je zauzet 18. rujna 1944. godine nakon čega je uslijedila represija koju ilustrira pismo Ante Jurjevića Baje, organizacijskog sekretara Oblasnog komiteta KPH za Dalmaciju, od 25. listopada 1944. godine. U tom se pismu ističe da „bilo kako bilo ubit ih se mora“.<sup>14</sup>

Osim toga o likvidacijama zarobljenika na čitavom dalmatinskom području sačuvan je veći broj arhivskih izvora među kojima se ističe izvješće Dragge Desputa, člana Sudskog odsjeka Glavnog štaba NOV-a i partizanskih odreda (PO) Hrvatske upućeno Centralnom komitetu KPH 17. siječnja 1945. godine. Desput u njemu navodi da je tijekom boravka u Dalmaciji zapazio „stanovite nepravilnosti“ te ističe da mu je „povjerenik OZN-e za kninski sektor drug Ilija<sup>15</sup> izjavio (...), da su oni dobili direktivu, da

Dubrovnik as one of its primary objectives because it was there that the “Anti-Hitler coalition” planned to land their Italy-based troops and make contact with Draža Mihailović’s Chetniks in order to strike a blow to the National Liberation Movement (NOP) and create conditions for reinstating the Karađorđević dynasty. Dubrovnik was also on the route of German withdrawal to the north and its taking would facilitate sending supplies to the NOVJ troops in Bosnia, Montenegro and Serbia.<sup>12</sup>

This is why Josip Broz Tito and the Supreme Command ordered that the plans be made for taking the Southern Dalmatia. After taking the Central and Southern Dalmatian islands, the 26th Dalmatian Division was supposed to join forces with the 29th Herzegovina Division and take Dubrovnik. The 2nd Dalmatian Proletarian Brigade of the Littoral Operational Group of the 2nd Montenegrin Corps also moved towards Dubrovnik from Konavle. Dubrovnik and Konavle Partisan Detachments, Dubrovnik Command units and other smaller units had already been active in Dubrovnik area.<sup>13</sup> After the taking of Dubrovnik on 18 September 1944, a crackdown ensued. It is illustrated in organizational secretary of the KPH Committee for Dalmatia Ante Jurjević Bajić’s letter of 25 October 1944. In it he says that, “be it as it may, they must be killed”.<sup>14</sup>

There is a number of archival sources evidencing executions of prisoners throughout Dalmatia. Prominent among them is the report of Drago Desput, member of the Military Court of the Supreme Command of People’s Liberation Army and Partisan Detachments (PO) in Croatia, sent to the KPH Central Committee on 17 January 1945. Desput reports that, during his visit to Dalmatia, he observed “certain irregularities” and says that “Comrade Ilija,<sup>15</sup> OZNA’s commissioner for Knin

<sup>12</sup> Anić 2013: 132.

<sup>13</sup> Anić 2013: 132–133.

<sup>14</sup> *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 215–218; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 156–160.

<sup>15</sup> Grubić Ilija, born 134 February 1909 in Dubrovnik, Serb. Engine mechanic in Knin. Member of Knin County Committee of KPH since 1941. Joined People’s Liberation Army on 26 December 1942. Captured and imprisoned; later exchanged. Commissioner of OZNA for Knin since mid-1944. In charge of 1st Section activities. According to sources, he was head of OZNA for Šibenik. Acting head of OZNA division for Šibenik County in 1945. Deputy head of UDBA – Dalmatian branch (commissioned as captain) in 1946. Member of UDBA Zagreb division in the late 1940s. member of UDBA – Croatian branch in the early 1950s. Head of Zadar division of UDBA and Ministry of Interior in the mid-1950s. Radelić 2019: 331.

<sup>12</sup> Anić 2013: 132.

<sup>13</sup> Anić 2013: 132–133.

<sup>14</sup> *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 215–218; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 156–160.

<sup>15</sup> Grubić Ilija, rođen 13. veljače 1909. u Dubrovniku. Srbin. Strojomehaničar u Kninu. Član KK KPH Knin 1941. U NOV-u od 26. prosinca 1942. Uхваćen i zatvoren te razmijenjen. Opunomoćenik Opunomoćstva Ozne kninskoga područja od

prilikom oslobađanja uhapsu što više ljudi, jedan dio od tih, koji ispunjavaju potrebne uslove, likvidiraju, a ostali dio puste na slobodu“. Štoviše, „u duhu te direktive od Dubrovnika - Knina pa do Zadra likvidiran je stanovit broj ljudi“, a „za jedan dio od likvidiranih zatraženo je od naših vojnih sudova da se izrade presude u svrhu objavljivanja, što je i učinjeno“. <sup>16</sup> No ne samo da su presude pisane naknadno nego i „sama justifikacija likvidiranih vršena je bez potrebne opreznosti na vrlo nezgodan način“ pa su u Dubrovniku, na primjer, pripadnici KNOJ-a „justifikaciju“ vršili klanjem“, a pri provođenju te „mjere“ bili su „površni“. Tako je u Dubrovniku u oglasu s popisom osuđenih na smrt, odnosno strijeljanih, svoje ime ugledao građanin koji se u tom trenutku nalazio na slobodi. Također, među likvidiranimima je bilo onih koji se „nikako nisu smjeli likvidirati unutar četiri zida“ jer je njih trebalo „raskrinkati“ pred narodom, izvesti na javno suđenje i zatim osuditi, kao što je bio slučaj sa „20 popova u Dubrovniku“. <sup>17</sup> Čini se da su Desputove „nepravilnosti“ bile mnogo više od toga. Riječ je bila o doista bizarnim situacijama u kojima nije suđeno samo mrtvima nego čak i onima koji se pred sudom uopće nisu pojavili niti su o svojoj navodnoj likvidaciji išta znali.

No unatoč masovnoj represiji koja se u tim trenucima odvijala na prostoru čitave Dalmacije te nepoznatom broju likvidiranih, Desput je zaključio da taj broj ipak nije bio prevelik, nego „na nekim sektorima mnogo premalen“. Tako je u Dubrovniku likvidirano „svega oko 100 ljudi“. No „to je premalen broj za Dubrovnik i okolicu u kojem su za ovo čitavo vrijeme carevali i ustaše i četnici, Talijani i Nijemci, a ogromna većina Dubrovčana s njima se je povezala“. Desput je

District, told me [...] that they had been given a directive to make as many arrests as possible upon liberating a town and do away with those meeting the criteria and release the rest“. Indeed, “in keeping with the directive, “a number of people on the Dubrovnik–Knin–Zadar stretch were liquidated” and “our military courts were then requested to write down verdicts for some of those liquidate in order to have them published, which was carried out”. <sup>16</sup> So not only were the verdicts brought subsequently but the “executions themselves were carried out without necessary caution and very inappropriately”: in Dubrovnik, for example, members of KNOJ “carried out executions by cutting throats”; in doing so, they were “desultory”. For example, one citizen who was not arrested at the moment saw his name on the list of those sentenced to death and executed. Also, the executed included those “who shouldn’t have been executed quietly” because they were supposed to be “unmasked” publicly, put to a show trial and then convicted, as had been the case with “20 priests in Dubrovnik”. <sup>17</sup> It seems that those Desput’s “irregularities” were much more than that. There were rather bizarre situations that included trials not only of dead people but also of those who had no idea they were being tried or even “executed”.

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

sredine 1944., zadužen i za poslove I. sekcije. Prema navodima u literaturi, bio je šef Opunomoćstva Ozne za šibensko područje. Vršitelj dužnosti načelnika Okružnog odjeljenja Ozne za Šibenik 1945. U činu kapetana zamjenik načelnika Odjeljenja Udbe za Oblast Dalmacija 1946. Član Odjeljenja Udbe za grad Zagreb potkraj 40-ih god. 20. st. Član Udbe za Hrvatsku početkom 50-ih god. 20. st. Načelnik Opunomoćstva Udbe za kotar i grad i Odjela unutrašnjih poslova Zadar sredinom 50-ih god. 20. st. Radelić 2019: 331.

<sup>16</sup> HR-HDA-1220, CK SKH, Ratno gradivo, kut. 13, KP-42/2842; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 83–88; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 288–301; *Split i srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e...* 2017: 312–325.

<sup>17</sup> HR-HDA-1220, CK SKH, Ratno gradivo, kut. 13, KP-42/2842; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 83–88; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 288–301; *Split i srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e...* 2017: 312–325.

<sup>16</sup> HR-HDA-1220, KPH central committee, wartime documents, box 13, KP-42/2842; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 83–88; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 288–301; *Split i srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e...* 2017: 312–325.

<sup>17</sup> HR-HDA-1220, KPH central committee, wartime documents, box 13, KP-42/2842; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 83–88; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 288–301; *Split i srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e...* 2017: 312–325.

ustvrdio da su „drugovi“ iskazali „pretjeranu blagost“ na području na kojem su se „rađale ideje i izgrađivali planovi vršenog nasilja nad čitavom Južnom Dalmacijom“ te su „petokolonaštvo i špijunaža bili u punom cvatu“. Komunistička „blagost“ i „premali“ broj likvidiranih rezultirali su „reakcijom javnog mišljenja“.<sup>18</sup> Ipak, valja napomenuti i to da se Desputova brojka o oko 100 likvidiranih odnosi na prve dane nakon „oslobođenja“, što potvrđuje Izvadak iz izvanrednog izvještaja Vojnog suda VIII. Korpusne vojne oblasti NOVJ Vijeća pri Komandi dubrovačkog područja u kojem je također istaknuto da su „za oko polovinu od tih izvješeni oglasi s potpisom ‘Vojni sud’, što je u Dubrovniku ostavilo mučan utisak i ostavilo osjećaj pravne nesigurnosti“.<sup>19</sup> Da su spomenute brojke bile nezadovoljavajuće po novu komunističku vlast, upozorava navodna izjava Milovana Đilasa koji je posjetio Dubrovnik početkom studenoga 1944. i koji je, čuvši brojku likvidiranih, kazao: „Malo, malo.“<sup>20</sup>

Da je s likvidacijama nastavljeno i u kasnijem razdoblju, dokazuje Oglas Vojnog suda dubrovačkog područja od 19. studenoga 1944. u kojem su navedena imena 12 osoba koje su na smrt strijeljanjem osuđene četiri dana ranije.<sup>21</sup> Sačuvano je i izvješće OZNA-e južnodalmatinskog područja koje je 22. studenoga iste godine poslano Odsjeku OZNA-e za oblast VIII. korpusa.<sup>22</sup> S obzirom na to da nije bilo lokalnog bataljuna KNOJ-a, mobilizaciju za tu postrojbu izvršavale su komande mjesta, no novomobilizirane je trebalo „dnevno pročišćavati, dapače i ubijati kao narodne neprijatelje“. Tijekom prvih nekoliko

were “by far too small” resulted in “reactions of the public opinion”.<sup>18</sup> It should be noted here that Desput’s figure of “around 100” who were executed refers to the first days after the “liberation”. Evidence of this can be found in the Excerpt from the Extraordinary Report of the Military Court at the Dubrovnik Command in Charge of the Operational Zone of the 8th Corps of NOVJ, which also highlights that the “notices posted up for about half of these [executed] were signed by the Military Court, thus leaving an embarrassing impression and a feeling of legal insecurity in Dubrovnik”.<sup>19</sup> The alleged comment of Milovan Đilas, who visited Dubrovnik in the early November 1944, also suggests that the Communist authorities were not happy with these figures. Upon hearing the number of the executed, he allegedly said: “Too few, too few”.<sup>20</sup>

Evidence of continued executions can also be found in the public notice of Dubrovnik Military Court of 19 November 1944, listing the names of the 12 persons sentenced to be shot four days earlier.<sup>21</sup> The author had access to the South Dalmatian OZNA report to OZNA division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone of 22 November 1944.<sup>22</sup> As there was no local KNOJ battalion in the area, locals were mobilized in this unit by town commands. The newly mobilized had to be “purged and even killed on daily basis as people’s enemies”. In the first few days after Dubrovnik had been taken, “numerous irregularities took place in all units and institutions”, causing complaints from “various sides”. Looting and various “inhuman” actions had been recorded. Still, despite warnings about such actions, it was concluded that commanders of the units of the Herzegovina

<sup>18</sup> HR-HDA-1220, CK SKH, Ratno gradivo, kut. 13, KP-42/2842; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 83–88; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 288–301; *Split i srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e...* 2017: 312–325.

<sup>19</sup> HR-HDA-1220, CK SKH, Ratno gradivo, kut. 13, KP-42/2842; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 83–88; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 288–301; *Split i srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e...* 2017: 312–325.

<sup>20</sup> Glavina 1998: 52. Napomena: Autor se poziva na knjigu *Bolje je voljeti manje* autora Davora Jurišića, objavljenu 1997. godine. Prema tom izvoru, spomenutom je sastanku prisustvovao Baldo Milović koji je Jurišiću prenio Đilasove riječi. No, prema navodima Joška Radice, Marin Cetinić u razgovoru s njime 1995. tvrdio je da Đilas tada ipak nije bio u Dubrovniku zbog čega je ovaj citat potrebno uzeti s oprezom.

<sup>21</sup> *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 206–207.

<sup>22</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, kut. 169, Izvješće OZN-e južnodalmatinskog područja Odsjeku OZN-e za oblast VIII. korpusa, 22. studenoga 1944., broj 460/44; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 220–225.

<sup>18</sup> HR-HDA-1220, KPH central committee, wartime documents, box 13, KP-42/2842; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 83–88; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 288–301; *Split i srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e...* 2017: 312–325.

<sup>19</sup> HR-HDA-1220, KPH central committee, wartime documents, box 13, KP-42/2842; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 83–88; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 288–301; *Split i srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e...* 2017: 312–325.

<sup>20</sup> Glavina 1998: 52. Note: The author of this paper took this quote from Davor Jurišić’s book *Bolje je voljeti manje* (1997). According to this source, Baldo Milović, who had attended that meeting, told Jurišić what Đilas had said. However, Joško Radica claim s that Marin Cetinić told him in 1995 that Đilas was not in Dubrovnik at the time, which is why this quote should be taken with caution.

<sup>21</sup> *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 206–207.

<sup>22</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, box 169, South Dalmatian OZNA report to OZNA division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone, 22 November 1944, no. 460/44; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 220–225.



dana nakon zauzimanja Dubrovnika u gradu su se događale „mnoge nepravilnosti kod svih jedinica i ustanova“ zbog čega su sa „raznih strana“ upućene pritužbe. Tako su zabilježene pljačke i različiti „neljudski“ postupci, ali unatoč ukazivanjima na njih zapovjednici postrojbi u sastavu hercegovačke divizije nisu „dovoljno“ poduzimali. Uz pomoć jednog vođa hercegovačkog KNOJ-a u gradu je uhićeno oko 120 „najgorih gadova“ bez ikakva ispitivanja jer „to nije bilo u mogućnosti“, a navodno nisu ni likvidirani „da ne bismo i u tom pogledu pogriješili“. S obzirom na to da je vojna situacija ocjenjivana kao „kritična“, uhićeni su „najopasniji“ ne bi li ponovnim ulaskom „neprijatelja“ u grad ondje ostalo što manje „ološa“. Ipak, uhićenja su vršena „anarhistički“ pa je uhićivao „tko je htio i zašto je htio“. Takvo kaotično stanje omogućilo je i osobne obračune i pljačke prilikom pretresa stanova. „Obzirom na to da nas je masa počela smatrati prilično labavim, jer nismo uživali dovoljno autoriteta u narodu, trebalo je napraviti hitno neki oštriji potez – što je bilo mišljenje drugova iz Oblasnog komiteta koji su se tada nalazili u Dubrovniku“, ističe se u istom dokumentu. Stoga su „na brzinu“ ispitani „najgori zločinci“ i tijekom dvije noći likvidirano je oko 50 osoba, od kojih su objavljena imena za njih 36. Iz oglasa su izuzeti strijeljani stranci koji su živjeli u Dubrovniku jer su bili slabo poznati građanima. Javno suđenje nije bilo održano jer „masa ovdje tome nije dorasla“. Štoviše, zabilježeno je da nije „sve u redu“ ni s partijskim rukovoditeljima jer su za uhićenike dolazile intervenirati „kolone“ odbornika i rodoljuba, „tako da smo bili prisiljeni oštrije odbijati svaki pokušaj intervencije“. Nasuprot tome, prijave su bile veoma rijetke i previše „sitničave“. Bilo je potrebno sprječavati javno batinanje uhićenika u čemu su se isticali pripadnici hercegovačkih postrojbi, a „sve ovo je bacalo jednu ružnu sliku na nas“. Prvih dana pojedinci su bili zatvoreni unatoč gotovo nikakvim podacima zbog čega su u pomanjkanju dokaza bili pušteni. Po izlasku iz zatvora navodno su govorili o „lijepom i čovječanskom postupku“ što se „odgojno“ odrazilo na mase. Time „nam se digao autoritet u masama“, a nakon objavljivanja popisa strijeljanih navodno se govorilo da „nikome nije pala vlas s glave a da nije zato bilo utvrđeno dokazima u postupku“ jer da „mi nijesmo ubijali bez suda i preslušanja kao što su to radile ustaške bande“. Navodno su se mnogi „banditi“ i „sluge okupatora“ prvih dana uvukli u pozadinske položaje ili otišli u vojsku kao dobrovoljci, no za većinu je ustanovljeno gdje se nalaze pa „smo

Division had not done “enough”. With a help from a squad of the Herzegovina KNOJ, some 120 “worst bastards” were arrested in the city. However, none of them were interrogated because “it was not possible”. Allegedly, they were not even executed, “in order to avoid yet another mistake”. As the situation was assessed as “critical” from the military point of view, the “most dangerous [elements]” were arrested in order to reduce the local “scum” to minimum if the enemy retakes the city. But the wave of arrest was “anarchical” because those who made the arrests did that “at their own discretion”. Such a chaotic situation enabled personal vendettas and looting when searching premises. According to the same document, “the masses began to think of us as rather weak because we had not exerted enough authority on the people. The comrades from the Regional Committee who were in Dubrovnik at the time were of the opinion that a harsh measure was therefore required.” This is why the “worst criminals” were “offhandedly” interrogated: some 50 persons were executed in the course of two nights. The names of 36 of them were made public, excluding those of executed foreigners who were not particularly familiar to the citizens of Dubrovnik. There were no public trials because the “masses here are not up to it”. Indeed, it was also noted that “not everything is right” even with Party leaders: apparently, “columns” of aldermen and patriots had intervened for the captives, “so we had to reject adamantly all these intervention attempts”. Denunciations, on the other hand, were very few and they were too “petty”. Detainees were often beaten in public, primarily by members of Herzegovinian units. Efforts were made to prevent this because “it affected us unfavorably”. At first, some individuals were detained with almost no information against them, which is why they were soon released for insufficient evidence. Upon their release, they allegedly claimed they had been “treated nicely and humanely”. Such claims had an “educative effect” on the masses and “improved our authority among them”. After the list of executed individuals had been posted, people were allegedly saying that “no harm was done to those against whom no evidence had been found in investigation proceedings”. This was because “we have not killed anyone without trial and interrogation as the Ustasha bandits did”. Allegedly, in the first days, many “bandits” and “occupiers’ henchmen” lay low or joined the army as volunteers, but most of them were tracked down and “relocated or liquidated, by their just deserts”. The note that “there are neither inquest judges nor courts here so we had to

se pobrinuli da ih se premjesti ili likvidira prema tome kako je ko zaslužio“. Da nikakvih suđenja doista nije bilo, potvrđuje i navod da „ovdje uopće ne postoje sudski islednici ni sud pak smo bili prisiljeni svršavati sve sami“. U međuvremenu je oko 120 uhićenika prebačeno na Korčulu gdje je nakon ispitivanja likvidirano 30-ak osoba. Iako je među zatvorenicima, puštenima i likvidiranim bilo ljudi, uključujući žene, iz čitavog okruga, u najvećem dijelu radilo se o Dubrovčanima i Konavljanima, „jer je tamo izroda najviše i bilo“. Iako je nastavljeno s uhićenjima u Dubrovniku te je politička situacija u okrugu bila „u znaku moralnog opadanja svih naših protivnika“, to ipak nije značilo da ih je nestalo „mnogo“, nego naprotiv „malo ih je nestalo“. Riječ je uglavnom bila o onim „neprijateljima“ koji su se tijekom rata znatno više eksponirali, no za mnoge druge nije bilo dovoljno „aduta“ za njihovo „uklanjanje“. Ipak, već je u tom trenutku zabilježeno da su upravo takvi u posljednje vrijeme spremni raditi „protiv nas“.<sup>23</sup>

Ti dokumenti doista oslikavaju razmjere partizanske represije i komunističkih zločina u Dalmaciji, pa tako i na dubrovačkom području, u prvim tjednima po zauzimanju dalmatinskih gradova i sela. Odgovor na likvidacije i progone pojavit će se u obliku organiziranja različitih oblika protukomunističkog otpora, a u središtu partijskog obračuna s bilo kakvom reakcijom naći će se upravo Katolička Crkva. Tako je u Zapisniku sa savjetovanja oblasnih političkih sekretara KP Hrvatske za Dalmaciju od 6. veljače 1945. istaknuto: „Popovi su nam neprijatelji“. Štoviše, „Katolička crkva je pripremala i odgajala sve što je ustaško i nezdravo u narodu“. S obzirom na to da je Vatikan „moćna snaga“, u borbi s Crkvom „moramo biti oprezni“ jer „vanjska hajka protiv njih nije oportuna“. Ipak, to nije značilo da „ćemo dozvoliti pomirljivost prema njima“. Bilo je potrebno „budno paziti svaki njihov korak“ te poticati narod da „raskrinkava i udara po njihovim smicalicama, neka ih tjera kad dođu da unašaju nemir i ruše jedinstvo“. U zapisniku je istaknuto da svi navedeni problemi postoje i u dubrovačkom okrugu gdje su „stari uticaji još dosta jaki, naročito popovi“.<sup>24</sup> Da pomirljivosti doista

deal with all that ourselves” indicates that no trials took place indeed. Meanwhile, some 120 detainees were transported to Korčula where they were interrogated and where some 30 of them were then executed. While those detained, released and executed were people from the entire district – included women – they were mostly from Dubrovnik and Konavle, “because most of these degenerates came from there”. Although the campaign of arrests in Dubrovnik continued and the local political situation began to improve “as our opponents started losing morale”, the new authorities were still not happy with these numbers: “...too few of them have disappeared”. This mostly referred to those who had compromised themselves more than others during the war; as for these others, there were no sufficient “excuses” for their “elimination”. Nevertheless, it was noted that it was particularly these others that began working “against us” recently.<sup>23</sup>

These documents indicate the true scale of the Partisan repression and Communist crimes in Dalmatia, including Dubrovnik area, in the first weeks upon Partisan seizure of Dalmatian towns and villages. As a reaction to these executions and persecution, various forms of anticommunist resistance will occur and the Party’s crackdown on the “reactionaries” will focus on the Catholic Church. For example, the Minutes from the Meeting of the Political Secretaries of the KPH District Committee for Dalmatia of 6 February 1945 include the following comments: “Priests are our enemies.” [...] “Catholic Church is responsible for all the Ustaša-leanings and other unsound sentiments among the people.” [...] The Vatican being a “great power, we must be careful” in the fight against the Church” because “fighting them internationally is not opportune.” Still, it did not mean that “any conciliatory approach towards them will be allowed”. [...] “We should keep a watchful eye on every step they make” and encourage the people to “unmask and attack their tricks and chase them away when they come to agitate and subvert our unity”. According to the Minutes, all these problems were present in the Dubrovnik area, “where the old influences are still strong, especially those of the priests”.<sup>24</sup> The case of

<sup>23</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, kut. 169, Izvješće OZN-e južnodalmatinskog područja Odsjeku OZN-e za oblast VIII. korpusa, 22. studenoga 1944., broj 460/44; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji*... 2011: 220–225.

<sup>24</sup> HR-HDA-1222, Oblasni komitet KPH za Dalmaciju, kut. 6, KP-298/1014; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji*... 2011: 88–94; *Partizanska i komunistička represija*... 2011: 329–334.

<sup>23</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, box 169, South Dalmatian OZNA report to OZNA division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone, 22 November 1944, no. 460/44; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji*... 2011: 220–225.

<sup>24</sup> HR-HDA-1222, KPH District Committee for Dalmatia, box 6, KP-298/1014; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji*... 2011: 88–94; *Partizanska i komunistička represija*... 2011: 329–334.

nije bilo, pokazat će i slučaj fra Dominika Barača koji je uhićen nekoliko tjedana nakon održavanja spomenutog savjetovanja.

### „Reakcija“ na dubrovačkom području i osnivanje križarskih skupina

Do organiziranja protukomunističkog otpora na dubrovačkom području došlo je već u prvim danima nakon što su taj prostor zauzele postrojbe NOV-a. Anić ističe da su „najreakcionarnije snage, po direktivama iz Zagreba i Londona, organizirale vojne sustave, u narodu poznate kao škripari ili kamišari“, za čiju su se pripremu „neposredno“ pobrinuli „fašisti u Dubrovniku i okolici, koji su radi toga nakon oslobođenja i ostali na dubrovačkom području“. „Odabrali su Konavoska brda“ gdje su navodno dominirale „ustaše“ u suradnji s dubrovačkim i hercegovačkim četnicima.<sup>25</sup> No izvješće OZNA-e južnodalmatinskog područja o situaciji na dubrovačkom području upućeno 22. studenoga 1944. Odsjeku OZNA-e za oblast VIII. Korpusa otkriva da je „reakcija“ Hrvatske seljačke stranke (HSS) „glavni naš neprijatelj u okrugu, a naročito u dubrovačkom kotaru“, iako se u istom dokumentu implicira povezanost HSS-a s „umjerenijim“ četnicima. Jedan dio HSS-a sudjelovao je u radu novouspostavljene komunističke vlasti, nastojeći ojačati svoj utjecaj. Stoga im se zamjera „nezdravost“ koja se očituje u situacijama kada „ispadaju kao neka zasebna partija“. <sup>26</sup> Ti su navodi u skladu s izjavom istaknutog člana HSS-a i križarskog vođe Pere Bakića. Naime, govoreći o svojim susretima s vodstvom HSS-a u Zagrebu u mjesecima nakon kapitulacije Italije u rujnu 1943., Bakić je istaknuo da mu je Ljudevit Tomašić dao upute za odnos stranke prema NOP-u kazavši „da ne dozvolimo nikakove pretapanje sa NOP već da održavamo prijateljski stav“. Naknadno su ga na isto uputili HSS-ovci Tomo Jančiković i Roko Mišetić uz preporuku da se „držim uputa starih vodstava HSS, da držim stranku na okupu, da se ne pridruži ni jednoj drugoj stranci i da nastojim zadržati kod kuće, naročito mlađe ljude“. <sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Anić 2013: 142.

<sup>26</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, kut. 169, Izvješće OZN-e južnodalmatinskog područja Odsjeku OZN-e za oblast VIII. korpusa, 22. studenoga 1944., broj 460/44; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 220–225.

<sup>27</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

Fr. Dominik Barač, who was arrested weeks after this meeting, can be seen as evidence that indeed there was no conciliatory approach.

### “Reactionaries” in Dubrovnik area and the forming of Crusader groups

The anticommunist resistance in Dubrovnik area began to emerge days upon the arrival of the NOVJ units. According to Anić, “under directives from Zagreb and London, the most reactionary forces organized guerilla units known locally as *škripari* or *kamišari* (‘cavers’)”. It was done with a “direct backing” of the “Fascists from Dubrovnik and its environs, who had remained there after liberation for this reason”. “They made their base in the Konavle Hills”, allegedly dominated by the “Ustashe” who collaborated with the Dubrovnik and Herzegovina Chetniks.<sup>25</sup> However, South Dalmatian OZNA report of 22 November 1944 to OZNA division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone concerning the situation in Dubrovnik area reveals that the Croatian Peasants Party (HSS) “reactionaries” were “our major enemy in the area, particularly in and around Dubrovnik”, although the documents also implies HSS’ connections with “moderate” Chetniks. Some HSS members who were perceived as being “sympathetic” to the Communist cause collaborated with the newly established government and tried to strengthen their influence. The new authorities resented their “unsoundness”, manifested in their occasional attempts to “act as a separate party”.<sup>26</sup> These comments correspond with a statement made by Pero Bakić, a prominent HSS member and Crusader leader. In his account of his meetings with the HSS leadership in Zagreb months after the capitulation of Italy in September 1943, Bakić asserted that Ljudevit Tomašić had instructed him about what kind of attitude should their party maintain with NOP. Tomašić said that “we should not allow any merging with NOP but merely remain on friendly terms with them”. He later received the same instructions from HSS members Tomo Jančiković and Roko Mišetić, who suggested that he should “stick to the instructions of earlier HSS leaders, hold the party together, not join any other party

<sup>25</sup> Anić 2013: 142.

<sup>26</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, box 169, South Dalmatian OZNA report to OZNA division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone, 22 November 1944, no. 460/44; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 220–225.

S obzirom na to da se autoritet HSS-a doista nastavio širiti u narodnim masama, u spomenutom izvješću OZNA-e južnodalmatinskog područja od 22. studenoga 1944. predloženo je „da se ovo ‘kolo’ razbije u zametku“. HSS je naročiti problem predstavljao u Konavlima gdje je bio najjači, a među tamošnjim HSS-ovcima isticao se upravo Pero Bakić, „aktivni naš protivnik, Mečakovac, iz Čilipa – Konavle“. Štoviše, „kada su otišle ustaše iz Konavala povukao se u ilegalstvo i danas se nalazi u šumi“, a s njime se nalazilo još nekoliko križara „pa su vjerojatno povezani i sa četnicima koji se ponekad viđaju na tom području“.<sup>28</sup> No, iako prema navodima OZNA-e Bakić navodno nije uživao simpatije u narodu, upravo će on postati najistaknutiji konavoski križar. Rad ustaša kao „zasebne organizacije“ u tim se trenucima nije osjećao, iako su „u svemu spremni da potpomažu naše glavne neprijatelje mačekovce“. Iako je Dubrovnik naznačen kao „leglo svakojake reakcije: Mačekove, četničke, popovske i fašističkih ostataka“, u izvješću je istaknuto da se drugih političkih aktivnosti osim onih HSS-a ustvari nije moglo primijetiti. „Popovi se drže dosta rezervisano“, a sudjelovanje na jednom „učiteljskom kursu“, na kojem im se „rastumačilo ciljeve naše borbe i održalo referat o KP“, na njih je „dosta dobro djelovalo pak su im sada nekako smireniji živci uza sve što smo smakli 5 popova“.<sup>29</sup> Stoga se može zaključiti da je „reakcija“ na dubrovačkom području u tim trenucima bila ona HSS-ovska, a ne ustaška.

U trenucima pisanja spomenutog izvješća na dubrovačkom je području bilo zabilježeno „dvadesetak slučajeva dezerterstva /škriparenja/“, i to mahom upravo Konavljana i Dubrovčana.<sup>30</sup> Nepoznato je kojeg su se točno datuma te osobe „odmetnule“, no to je svakako bilo u prvim tjednima nove vlasti s obzirom na to da je citirano izvješće napisano otprilike

and try to keep people at their homes, particularly the young ones”.<sup>27</sup>

Since the HSS influence apparently kept growing among the masses, the abovementioned OZNA report of 22 November 1944 suggests that this “shady business should be cut off at the roots”. HSS was perceived as most problematic in Konavle – its stronghold. Particularly prominent there was Pero Bakić, “our active adversary, a follower of Maček, from Čilipi – Konavle”. According to the report, “when Ustashe withdrew from Konavle, he went underground and is now hiding in the woods”. Accompanied by a few other Crusaders, he “probably created connections with the Chetniks who can sometimes be seen in that area”.<sup>28</sup> Despite OZNA’s claims that the people did not develop a liking for him, he was to become the most prominent Konavle Crusader. The activities of Ustashe as a “separate organization” had not been noticed yet, although they were “ready to support our major adversaries – the followers of Maček – in every aspect”. Although Dubrovnik is identified as a “hotbed of reactionaries of all sorts – the followers of Maček, Chetniks, priests and remaining Fascists”, the report notes that no political activities save for those of HSS have actually been recorded there. “The priests are rather reserved” but at a “teacher-training course” organized for them “we explained to them the goals of our struggle and the history of the Communist Party”. This allegedly “had a rather good effect on them and their nerves are now settled despite the fact that we have executed five priests”.<sup>29</sup> This suggests that the “reactionaries” in Dubrovnik area in those days were the HSS members, not the Ustashe sympathizers.

When the report was made, “twenty or so deserters /’cavers’/ were recorded” in and around Dubrovnik, mostly people from Konavle and Dubrovnik.<sup>30</sup> It is not known when exactly did these persons “become outlaws”, but it

<sup>28</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, kut. 169, Izvješće OZN-e južnodalmatinskog područja Odsjeku OZN-e za oblast VIII. korpusa, 22. studenoga 1944., broj 460/44; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 220–225.

<sup>29</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, kut. 169, Izvješće OZN-e južnodalmatinskog područja Odsjeku OZN-e za oblast VIII. korpusa, 22. studenoga 1944., broj 460/44; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 220–225.

<sup>30</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, kut. 169, Izvješće OZN-e južnodalmatinskog područja Odsjeku OZN-e za oblast VIII. korpusa, 22. studenoga 1944., broj 460/44; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 220–225.

<sup>27</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

<sup>28</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, box 169, South Dalmatian OZNA report to OZNA division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone, 22 November 1944, no. 460/44; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 220–225.

<sup>29</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, box 169, South Dalmatian OZNA report to OZNA division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone, 22 November 1944, no. 460/44; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 220–225.

<sup>30</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, box 169, South Dalmatian OZNA report to OZNA division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone, 22 November 1944, no. 460/44; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 220–225.

mjesec dana nakon zauzimanja Dubrovnika. Križari, odnosno škripari u tim trenucima nisu bili nepoznata pojava što dokazuje dopis II. Sekcije Odsjeka za Oblast VIII. Korpusa OZNA-e za Hrvatsku Opunomoćstvu OZNA-e za južnodalmatinsko područje od 19. listopada 1944. godine. U njemu se spominju „pojedine oružane grupice sastavljene od svojih, naših dezertera i njima sličnog ološa“ koje se javno ne vezuju ni za jednu stranu, nego tvrde da su neutralne nazivajući se kamišarima, špiljarima i zelenim kadrom. Iz tog je dopisa nejasno na kojim su se terenima do tog trenutka pojavile takve grupe, no one su svakako već postojale u trenutku kada su partizanske postrojbe ulazile u Dubrovnik. Također se ističe da sva opunomoćstva trebaju raditi na razbijanju i onemogućavanju takvih grupa te hitno pristupiti izradi plana za „čišćenje“ svog područja u suradnji s postrojbama KNOJ-a.<sup>31</sup>

U narednim mjesecima, odnosno do ožujka 1945. broj križara u Konavlima drastično se povećao te je u proljeće te godine iznosio 126, uglavnom u selima Čilipi, Duba, Gabrili, Gruda, Jagnjilo, Kuna, Mihanići, Močići, Pridvorje, Stravča, Šilješki, Uskoplje, Zvekovića te u samom Dubrovniku. Pri jednoj četverodnevnoj blokadi špilje u selu Dubi u Konavlima u ožujku 1945. predala su se dva „dezertera“ i tri „bandita“, a u borbi je poginuo jedan partizan i potrošeno je više od 20 bombi, eksploziv ekrazit i plinske bombe.<sup>32</sup> Međutim, prema jednom izvješću, od „početka djelovanja“ KNOJ-a, a vjerojatno se misli na lokalnu jedinicu, do travnja 1945. u Konavlima „uhvaćeno je, ubijeno ili se predalo 105 bandita“, a ostao je još 81 „bandit“.<sup>33</sup> Nejasno je koliko su te brojke bile pouzdane, no čini se da su Konavle doista bilježile intenzivnu križarsku aktivnost.

Radelić ističe da je OZNA-a za cijelu Dalmaciju 1945., a posebno za okolicu Dubrovnika, ipak akutnijim procjenjivala „četničko-reakcionarni rad“ nego djelovanje križara, iako je nejasno na koje se točno mjesece 1945. ta opaska odnosi.<sup>34</sup> No čini se da se pojedini izvori ne slažu u toj ocjeni. Tako se

must have been in the first weeks of the new government because the report was made approximately one month after Dubrovnik had been taken. The new authorities had become familiar with the phenomenon of “cavers” by that time, as can be seen from the letter of 19 October 1944 sent by the 2nd Section of OZNA’s division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone to South Dalmatian OZNA. It mentions “some armed groups consisting of their and our deserters and such scum” who claim they are not affiliated with either side but are neutral and call themselves cavers or Green Corps. The letter does not specify where exactly did such groups occur but they must have already been there when the Partisan units entered Dubrovnik. It underlines that all regional divisions of OZNA should actively crush and neutralize these groups and urgently develop plans for carrying out mop-up operations in their respective areas, in cooperation with KNOJ units.<sup>31</sup>

In the following months, by March 1945, the number of Crusaders in Konavle substantially increased. In the spring of that year there were 126 of them, mostly in the villages of Čilipi, Duba, Gabrili, Gruda, Jagnjilo, Kuna, Mihanići, Močići, Pridvorje, Stravča, Šilješki, Uskoplje, Zvekovića and in the city of Dubrovnik. In March 1945, during a four-day siege of a cave in the Konavle village of Duba, two “deserters” and three “bandits” surrendered and one Partisan was killed in the fight. More than 20 grenades and some ecrasite and gas bombs were also used.<sup>32</sup> However, according to another report, “105 bandits have been arrested or killed or have surrendered” [...] “since KNOJ had been deployed” (it was probably a local KNOJ unit). The report says that “81 more bandits remain”.<sup>33</sup> While we cannot be certain about the reliability of these numbers, they do indicate that Konavle was the center of rather intensive Crusader activities.

Radelić points out that, in 1945, Dalmatian OZNA – its Dubrovnik division in particular – perceived “Chetnik reactionaries’ activities” as a more imminent threat than those of the Crusaders, although it is not clear to what months of that year does this note refer.<sup>34</sup> However, sources are not in agreement about this assessment.

<sup>31</sup> HR-HDA-1491, OZNA-a za Hrvatsku, kut. 35, 11.3.1., 30/65, Dopis II. Sekcije Odsjeka za Oblast VIII. korpusa OZNA-e za Hrvatsku Opunomoćstvu OZNA-e za južnodalmatinsko područje, 19. listopada 1944.; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 214–215.

<sup>32</sup> Radelić 2011: 455.

<sup>33</sup> Radelić 2011: 455.

<sup>34</sup> Radelić 2011: 456.

<sup>31</sup> HR-HDA-1491, OZNA – Croatian branch, box. 35, 11.3.1., 30/65, the 2nd Section of OZNA’s division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone to South Dalmatian OZNA, 19 October 1944; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 214–215.

<sup>32</sup> Radelić 2011: 455.

<sup>33</sup> Radelić 2011: 455.

<sup>34</sup> Radelić 2011: 456.

u izvješću koje je OZNA-a za oblast VIII. korpusa u veljači 1945. dostavila Oblasnom komitetu KP-a Hrvatske za Dalmaciju navodi da „u Dubrovniku ima ostataka ustaštva“ o čemu svjedoče letci „ustaškog karaktera“.<sup>35</sup> No „četnici rade konspirativno, ali ih van Dubrovnika nema, a kod onih u Dubrovniku ne može se primijetiti djelovanje.“<sup>36</sup> Opaska o letcima odnosi se između ostalog i na reakciju svećenstva u vezi proslave blagdana sv. Vlaha o čemu će više riječi biti u narednom poglavlju. Nekoliko dana nakon proslave blagdana sv. Vlaha letci su se pojavili i u Konavlima, ali se „nije uhvatilo nijednog, niti se znalo reći za karakter njihov“.<sup>37</sup> Nadalje, OZNA-a je doznala da su „mačekovci, četnici, ustaše i kler“ čak organizirali „odbor nacionalnog otpora“.<sup>38</sup> Na suđenju „terorističkoj organizaciji ‘Stožer’“ u Dubrovniku, uglavnom studentima i učenicima, otkrilo se da je njihov član Perica Žuvelja, koji je imao legitimaciju „škriparske organizacije“, dijelio letke u kojima se pozivaju „Srbi, Hrvati, ustaše, četnici, mačekovci antiboljševici“ na nasilno rušenje poretka.<sup>39</sup> Na temelju tih podataka može se zaključiti da je osim križarske aktivnosti u Konavlima zabilježena i pojačana djelatnost „reakcije“ u samom Dubrovniku.

Nakon likvidacije Bakićeve križarske skupine u proljeće 1945. „reakcija“ se još neko vrijeme održala na dubrovačkom području. Na temelju izvješća Opunomoćstva UDBA-e za grad Dubrovnik od 17. rujna 1946. može se zaključiti da je važna prepreka prema potpunoj eliminaciji „reakcije“ bilo nepostojanje agenturne mreže unutar klera, HSS-a i anglofila. UDBA je doduše raspolagala izvjesnim brojem povjerenika – informatora koji su dojavljivali kretanje, sastajanje i širenje parola „reakcije“. No „moramo prići, prvenstveno na osnovne neprijateljske grupe, svestranom provjeravanju i proučavanju ljudi iz tih sredina kako bi stvorili mogućnosti

For example, in a February 1945 report sent by the OZNA division for the 8th Corps Operational Zone to KPH District Committee for Dalmatia, it is said that “there are still Ustasha leanings in Dubrovnik”, manifested in distribution of “Ustasha leaflets”.<sup>35</sup> On the other hand, “Chetniks tend to work in conspiracy, but are not present outside Dubrovnik and those in the city do not seem to be active”.<sup>36</sup> The leaflet note refers also to the clergy’s reaction to the Festivity of St. Blaise (more of which will be said in the following chapter). A few days after the festivity, the leaflets also appeared in Konavle, but “we neither managed to get hold of one nor are we familiar with their content”.<sup>37</sup> OZNA also learned the “followers of Maček, Chetniks, Ustashe and clergy” even formed a “national resistance committee”.<sup>38</sup> During the Dubrovnik trial of the members of the “terrorist organization ‘Command’” – mostly college and high school students – it was established that one of them, Perica Žuvelja (on whose person a ‘cavers’ organization’ ID had been found), had been distributing leaflets inviting “Serbs, Croats, Ustashe, Chetniks and anti-Bolshevik Maček followers” to take part in toppling the new regime.<sup>39</sup> Based on this, it can be concluded that, in addition to the Crusaders’ activities in Konavle, increased activities of the “reactionaries” were also recorded in the city of Dubrovnik.

After the elimination of Bakić’s Crusader group in the spring of 1945, the “reactionaries” survived in Dubrovnik area for a while. Based on the report of UDBA division for Dubrovnik of 17 September 1946, it can be concluded that the lack of agents who would infiltrate the ranks of the clergy, HSS and Anglophiles was a major barrier to a complete elimination of the “reactionaries”, although UDBA did have a number of informers who reported on the movements and gatherings of the “reactionaries” and their propaganda. The report also says that “we should analyze thoroughly the members of the major enemy groups in order to make

<sup>35</sup> HR-DAS-438, Pokrajinski/oblasni komitet KPH za Dalmaciju, kut. 26, KP-26/245; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 226–229; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 336–338.

<sup>36</sup> HR-DAS-438, Pokrajinski/oblasni komitet KPH za Dalmaciju, kut. 26, KP-26/245; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 226–229; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 336–338.

<sup>37</sup> HR-DAS-438, Pokrajinski/oblasni komitet KPH za Dalmaciju, kut. 26, KP-26/245; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 226–229; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 336–338.

<sup>38</sup> Radelić 2011: 456.

<sup>39</sup> Radelić 2011: 456.

<sup>35</sup> HR-DAS-438, KPH Provincial/District Committee for Dalmatia, box 26, KP-26/245; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 226–229; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 336–338.

<sup>36</sup> HR-DAS-438, KPH Provincial/District Committee for Dalmatia, box 26, KP-26/245; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 226–229; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 336–338.

<sup>37</sup> HR-DAS-438, KPH Provincial/District Committee for Dalmatia, box 26, KP-26/245; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 226–229; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 336–338.

<sup>38</sup> Radelić 2011: 456.

<sup>39</sup> Radelić 2011: 456.

verbovke agenata za razrađivanje istih“, a naročitu pažnju valjalo je posvetiti vrbovanju na temelju „kompromitirajućeg“ materijala.<sup>40</sup>

U proljeće 1947. križarske su skupine još uvijek bile dovoljno jake za poduzimanje ozbiljnijih akcija pa su, osim „izvršenih pljački“, ubili tajnika mjesnog odbora Osojnik i aktivirali eksploziv pred vratima Mjesnog komiteta KPH Dubrovnik.<sup>41</sup> Potkraj 1947. godine pokrenute su akcije „čišćenja“ u Hercegovini zbog čega je zabilježeno prebacivanje križara u dubrovački kotar, a za njima su, ne obazirući se na republičke granice, došle i postrojbe bosanskohercegovačkog KNOJ-a koje su se bezobzirno odnosile prema stanovništvu. Pretresali su kuće, tukli seljake, otimali vino i rakiju te odveli 17 ovaca i „neki briački pribor i nešto novaca“.<sup>42</sup> Hercegovački gerilci i u kasnijem su se razdoblju prebacivali na područje Dubrovnika, a domaće su gerilske skupine 1948. uglavnom bile uništene, iako postoje podatci da je jedna „banda iz Dubrovnika“ nastavila djelovati, a njezini su suradnici kasnije bili izvedeni pred sud.<sup>43</sup> No time protukomunistički otpor neće nestati jer će u nadolazećim godinama biti nastavljen u drugim oblicima, poput ilegalne skupine u kojoj su sredinom 50-ih god. 20. st. djelovali istaknuti predratni HSS-ovac Frano Kolumbić i znameniti hrvatski povjesničar Trpimir Macan.<sup>44</sup>

## Djelovanje križarske skupine Pere Bakića

Kako je prethodno istaknuto, najeksponiranija križarska skupina na dubrovačkom prostoru bila je ona Pere Bakića, inače člana Hrvatske seljačke stranke, pukovnika Hrvatske seljačke zaštite (HSZ) i zapovjednika seoske milicije iz Čilipa pokraj Dubrovnika. Skupina je osnovana potkraj 1944. godine i djelovala je u Konavlima.<sup>45</sup> O samim počecima te organizacije Bakić govori u nedatiranoj izjavi u kojoj navodi da je pobjegao u križare jer mu je Tonko Borovinović prijetio da će ga ubiti, a neki su mu navodno prigovarali da je četnik. Po dolasku partizanskih postrojbi

possible recruitment of agents for their destruction”. In this, particular attention was to be paid to recruitment based on “compromising” material.<sup>40</sup>

In the spring of 1947, Crusader groups were still strong enough for undertaking serious actions: besides “looting”, they killed the secretary of the local people’s committee in Osojnik and planted explosive at the entrance to the District Committee of KPH in Dubrovnik.<sup>41</sup> In the late 1947, mop-up operations in Herzegovina forced the Crusaders to cross the Croatian border and move to Dubrovnik area. They were pursued by the Bosnian-Herzegovinian KNOJ units who, upon arriving in the area, ruthlessly treated the local population. They beat peasants, searched their homes, took their wine and schnapps, 17 sheep and “a shaving kit and some money”.<sup>42</sup> The Herzegovina guerillas kept crossing to Dubrovnik area even in the later period. By 1948, most of the local guerilla groups had been destroyed, although one “Dubrovnik band” apparently continued its activities. Its members were later taken to court.<sup>43</sup> But this was not the end of the anticommunist resistance; in the ensuing years it would continue in other forms, like the illegal group active until the mid-1950s which included the prominent prewar HSS member Frano Kolumbić and acclaimed Croatian historian Trpimir Macan.<sup>44</sup>

## Activities of Pero Bakić’s Crusader group

As had been said above, the most prominent Crusader group in Dubrovnik area was the one led by Pero Bakić, a member of Croatian Peasant Party, colonel of Croatian Peasant Guard and commander of Čilipi militia. Founded in the late 1944, the group was active in Konavle.<sup>45</sup> In his undated statement, Bakić tells us about the very beginnings of this organization, explaining that he joined the Crusaders after Tonko Borovinović had threatened to kill him. Some had also accused him of being a Chetnik. When the Partisans came, Bakić hid in his vineyard. When he saw them

<sup>40</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Izvješće Oponomoćstva UDB-e za grad Dubrovnik UDB-i za oblast Dalmacije, 17. rujna 1946.; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 234–235.

<sup>41</sup> Radelić 2011: 467.

<sup>42</sup> Radelić 2011: 468.

<sup>43</sup> Radelić 2011: 469.

<sup>44</sup> Krašić 2018: 87.

<sup>45</sup> Radelić 2011: 471–472.

<sup>40</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, report of UDBA’s Dubrovnik division to Dalmatian UDBA, 17 September 1946; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 234–235.

<sup>41</sup> Radelić 2011: 467.

<sup>42</sup> Radelić 2011: 468.

<sup>43</sup> Radelić 2011: 469.

<sup>44</sup> Krašić 2018: 87.

<sup>45</sup> Radelić 2011: 471–472.

Bakić se skrio u vinograd odakle je vidio da vojska ulazi u njegovu kuću i traži ga. To ga je učvrstilo u odluci da bježi, a priključili su mu se Mato Martinac i Božo Martinović. Sa sobom su ponijeli oružje. Neki željezničari pozvali su ih da im se pridruže čime je započelo stvaranje križarske skupine za čijeg je vođu izabran Bakić.<sup>46</sup>

O početcima formiranja Bakićeve skupine OZNA je doznala veoma rano, već početkom studenoga 1944., a do sredine tog mjeseca KP je izvijestio da je Bakić uspio okupiti oko 30 ljudi te je bilo poznato i njihovo kretanje. Već nekoliko tjedana kasnije skupina je znatno brojčano ojačala kad joj se pridružio veći broj Hercegovaca pa je donesena odluka o internaciji obitelji istaknutijih križara.<sup>47</sup> Unatoč tome, skupina je tijekom siječnja 1945. nastavila rasti uglavnom zahvaljujući novopridošlim Konavljanima pa je OZNA odgovorila vojničkim akcijama protiv križara s ciljem „čišćenja“ Konavala, i to uz potporu hercegovačkog KNOJ-a. U međuvremenu su internirani Bakićevi roditelji, sestra i nećakinja s još 30-ak članova križarskih obitelji.<sup>48</sup> U dopisu OZNA-e za Dubrovnik od 26. svibnja 1945., kojim se Bakić upućuje vojnom sudu, ističe se da je zadatak njegove organizacije bio izvući što veći broj ljudi iz partizanskih postrojbi, organizirati ih u borbi protiv NOP-a te pripremiti teren „okupatoru i ustašama“ za njihov navodni povratak u dubrovački kraj.<sup>49</sup>

Najviše detalja o djelovanju i organizaciji te skupine zabilježeno je u sačuvanim Bakićevim izjavama. Tako je poznato da su se pripadnici Bakićeve skupine povremeno skrivali u Primorju, a povremeno odlazili u brda gdje su zaklon pronalazili u stajama na području Dube Konavoske, što je ovisilo o vremenskim prilikama. Kretali su se u koloni po jedan s odgovarajućim razmakom i putom kojim se nitko drugi nije služio nastojeći tako izbjeći patrole.<sup>50</sup> Prema nekim procjenama Bakić je s vremenom uspio okupiti između 126 i 400 pripadnika, uključujući dezertere koji se nisu odazvali mobilizaciji

entering his house in order to find him, he decided to run. Mato Martinac and Božo Martinović, who had their weapons with them, joined him. Some railroad workers invited them all to join them and this is how this Crusader group was formed. They chose Bakić as their leader.<sup>46</sup>

OZNA found out about the forming of Bakić's group very soon – in the early November 1944. By the middle of that month, KPH reported that Bakić had gathered some 30 men and that their whereabouts were known. The group substantially grew in size after a number of Herzegovinians had joined it. It was therefore decided to intern the family members of the prominent Crusaders.<sup>47</sup> However, as the group kept growing in January 1945, mostly due to the newcomers from Konavle region, OZNA reacted by carrying out military operations against the Crusaders in order to “mop up” Konavle with support of the Herzegovinian KNOJ. In the meantime, Bakić's parents, sister and niece had been interned together with some 30 family members of other Crusaders.<sup>48</sup> OZNA's written order for Bakić's dispatch to the military court specifies that his organization planned to extract from Partisan units as many people as possible, organize them for fighting NOP and pave the way for the alleged return of the “occupiers and Ustashe” to Dubrovnik area.<sup>49</sup>

Most of the details on the activities and structure of this group can be found in Bakić's testimonies preserved to this day. We know from these that the members of his group would occasionally hide in the coastal region and would then move to the hills and find shelter in the stables around Duba Konavoska, depending on weather. They would move around in single file columns, keeping distance from one another and avoiding patrols by staying away from the beaten paths.<sup>50</sup> Some estimate that Bakić's group gradually became 126 – 400 strong; it mostly included those who dodged the draft to NOVJ.<sup>51</sup> The group was organized in squads, 4 to 5 men each, with three

<sup>46</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>47</sup> Radica 2003: 402–403.

<sup>48</sup> Radica 2003: 404–407.

<sup>49</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Dopis OZN-e za Dubrovnik, 26. svibnja 1945.

<sup>50</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>46</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

<sup>47</sup> Radica 2003: 402–403.

<sup>48</sup> Radica 2003: 404–407.

<sup>49</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, letter of OZNA division for Dubrovnik, 26 May 1945.

<sup>50</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

<sup>51</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, letter of OZNA division for Dubrovnik, 26 May 1945.



NOV-a.<sup>51</sup> Skupina je bila organizirana u desetine ili rojeve s četiri do pet vojnika, a tri roja činila su vod.<sup>52</sup> Koliko je brojno stanje konavoskih križara doista bilo, ostaje nejasno. Naime, sudeći prema Bakićevoj izjavi, čini se da je vjerojatniji bio broj od stotinjak križara<sup>53</sup>, iako Bakić na drugom mjestu govori i o oko 150-160 križara uz napomenu da je „bilo još i pojedinaca koji se meni nijesu ni kazali“.<sup>54</sup> Bakićev je stav bio da se križari ne mogu održati u velikim skupinama te je predložio stvaranje manjih grupa koje su boravile na područjima oko svojih sela zbog čega je moguće da je njihov točan broj doista bilo nemoguće ustanoviti. Iz jednog dijela njegove izjave u kojem govori o napadu hercegovačkih partizana na Staru godinu 1944. i pogibiji križara Pere Prokurice doznajemo da je u tom trenutku Bakićeva skupina brojala tridesetak križara koji su se zbog spomenutog napada odlučili prebaciti u Primorje nastavivši često mijenjati mjesto prebivanja.<sup>55</sup>

Prema nekim izvorima ta je skupina nazvana I. Hrvatska Križarska Bojna 'Konavoska' odnosno tzv. Hrvatski nacionalni pokret Konavle.<sup>56</sup> Ipak, o tome Bakić navodi tek to da su neki predlagali da uzmu naziv Hrvatski narodni pokret,<sup>57</sup> dok je naziv Hrvatski nacionalni pokret Konavle zabilježen u dopisu dubrovačke OZNA-e od 26. svibnja 1945. godine.<sup>58</sup> Pristupnici skupine raspoznavali su se prema znakovima na kapama koji su uključivali domobranske oznake ili križeve izrađene od aluminijske. Vladala je disciplina, a iz konspirativnih razloga i sumnje da pojedini križari rade za OZNA-u Bakić ističe da nikome nije bilo dopušteno znati sve. Križari su raspolagali barem nekakvom osnovnom arhivom što se da zaključiti iz Bakićeva navoda da je imao pisani materijal i da su

squads making up a platoon.<sup>52</sup> However, the real size of the Konavle Crusaders remains uncertain. According to one of Bakić's testimonies, their number probably never exceeded 100 men<sup>53</sup> but in another testimony of his 150 – 160 members are mentioned, although “there were individuals who had never reported to me.”<sup>54</sup> As Bakić was of the opinion that Crusaders could not survive in large groups, he proposed that smaller groups be formed. They would stick around their native villages which is why it is possible that the exact number of these groups was indeed hard to establish. In the testimony about the Herzegovinian Partisans' attack on New Year's Eve 1944 and Crusader Pero Prokurica's death, he says that his group had some 30 members at the time and that the attack forced them to withdraw to Primorje / the coastal region where they would frequently change their hideouts.<sup>55</sup>

According to some sources, this group was named the 1st Croatian Crusader Konavle Battalion or the so-called Croatian National Konavle Movement.<sup>56</sup> True, Bakić merely claims that some of them proposed the name Croatian National Movement,<sup>57</sup> while the name “Croatian National Konavle Movement” can be found in Dubrovnik OZNA's letter of 26 May 1945.<sup>58</sup> The symbols that the members of the group wore on their hats included Home Guard insignia or aluminum crosses. Discipline had been imposed and, explains Bakić, no one was informed about everything for conspiratorial reasons and due to suspicion that there were individuals in the group who were OZNA's informers. Crusaders kept some basic files, as can be inferred from the fact that Bakić had at his disposal some stationery and that they kept records about their numbers in order to organize sentries. “We resented those who had surrendered not because of them but because of the fact that they betrayed others,” says Bakić. They had no radio-station with them.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>51</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Dopis OZN-e za Dubrovnik, 26. svibnja 1945.

<sup>52</sup> Radelić 2011: 471–472.

<sup>53</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>54</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Razgovor Bakića s Rokom Aguzinovićem, nedatirano.

<sup>55</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>56</sup> Radelić 2011: 471–472.

<sup>57</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>58</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Dopis OZN-e za Dubrovnik, 26. svibnja 1945.

<sup>52</sup> Radelić 2011: 471–472.

<sup>53</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

<sup>54</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Bakić's conversation with Roko Aguzinović, undated.

<sup>55</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

<sup>56</sup> Radelić 2011: 471–472.

<sup>57</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

<sup>58</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, letter of OZNA division for Dubrovnik, 26 May 1945.

<sup>59</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

križari popisivali koliko ih ima s ciljem organizacije straža. „Krivo nam je bilo na one što se predaju, ne zato što se predaju već zato što odavaju druge“, ističe Bakić. Radiostanicom nisu raspolagali.<sup>59</sup>

Unatoč nastojanjima jugoslavenskih represivnih organa da u dokumentima uspostave što snažniju vezu između svećenstva i križara, čini se da u Bakićevu slučaju takvih kontakata gotovo nije ni bilo. Naime, u svojoj izjavi Bakić spominje tek jednog „crnog“ fratra koji ih je na Badnjak 1944. ispovjedio u šumi kod Dube. Fratar ih je pitao o brojčanom stanju i vezama s drugim križarima. Spomenuo je da je „škriparski pokret svuda u porastu, te da čim prije uspostavimo vezu sa Hrvatskom vojskom u Mostaru, te da se ne nadamo od nikoga pomoći osim njih“ jer je „ovo stanje pod partizanima privremeno i da će se hrvatska vojska ponovo povratiti u Dubrovnik“.<sup>60</sup> Osim toga, čini se da su jedina dva kontakta sa svećenstvom bila putem posrednika. Tako je „neko iz društva“ kazao da je „poručio pop Bošković da se čuvamo i da ne izazivamo“, a za nekoga fratra Buble Bakić se nije mogao sjetiti što je poručio.<sup>61</sup> Nasuprot Bakiću, križar je Bože Martinović u istrazi u lipnju 1945. tvrdio da je njegova skupina dobila potporu u samostanu Pridvorje.<sup>62</sup> Navod se vjerojatno odnosi na franjevački Samostan sv. Vlaha u Pridvorju.

Sa sigurnošću se može reći da je Bakić uspostavio kontakte s hercegovačkim četnicima. Tako je krajem prosinca 1944. Martinović Bakiću donio pismo od nekog Brnjasa iz Kremenog Dola, sela u današnjoj općini Trebinje. Bakić se sastao s četnicima na lokaciji sv. Lokusina. Razgovarali su o međusobnom nenapadanju uz dogovor da se križari mogu skriti u hercegovačka brda napadne li ih NOV i obrnuto. Četnici su se zanimali za brojno stanje križara i naoružanje kojim su raspolagali, ali Bakić te informacije nije bio voljan podijeliti. Četnici su otkrili da im je brojno stanje na razini jednog bataljuna, da raspolažu puškomitraljezom te nekoliko bacača i strojnica. Izrazili su želju za oružanim obračunom s partizanima te obećali uhvatiti vezu s Englezima. Također su

Despite Yugoslav repression organs' efforts to document a strong connection between clergy and Crusaders, it seems that, in Bakić's case, such contacts were almost nonexistent. Bakić only mentions one "black friar" who hear their confessions in the woods near Duba. The friar inquired them about their number and their contacts with other Crusaders. He also said that the "cavers' movement is in the upward trend everywhere and that we should establish contact with the Croatian Army in Mostar as soon as possible and not count on anybody's assistance but theirs" because "the Partisan occupation of Dubrovnik is only temporary and the Croatian Army will return to the city".<sup>60</sup> Besides, it seems the only two contacts they had with the clergy were through middlemen. For instance, "one of our members" said that "priest Bošković sends word to us to be careful and not provoke". One friar Buble had also sent them a message but Bakić could not remember what it was.<sup>61</sup> Unlike Bakić, Crusader Bože Martinović claimed in a statement to his investigators in June 1945 that his group had received support in the Pridvorje monastery.<sup>62</sup> This probably refers to the Franciscan monastery of St. Blaise in Pridvorje.

It is safe to say that Bakić established contacts with Herzegovinian Chetniks. For example, in the late December 1944, Martinović brought to Bakić a letter from one Brnjas from Kremen Dol, a village in the present-day municipality of Trebinje. Bakić met with the Chetniks at the Sv. Lokusina. They discussed mutual nonaggression and reached an agreement that the Crusaders can seek shelter in the Herzegovinian hills if attacked by NOVJ and vice versa. The Chetniks inquired about the Crusaders' numbers and the weapons they had, but Bakić was not willing to share such information with them. The Chetniks told him they were one battalion strong and had a machinegun and a few mortars and automatic rifles. They said they were eager to engage Partisans and make contact with the British. They had also tried to make contact with the Gacko and Bileća Chetniks. They claimed that the main Chetnik force was near Kalinovik at the time. Sometime in March 1945, Bakić met the Chetniks again. They informed him that "Draža had to stop engaging the occupiers for a moment in order to

<sup>59</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>60</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>61</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>62</sup> Radelić 2011: 471–472.

<sup>60</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

<sup>61</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

<sup>62</sup> Radelić 2011: 471–472.

pokušavali uspostaviti kontakt s gatačkim i bilečkim četnicima. Prema njihovim navodima, glavnina četničkih postrojbi u tom se trenutku nalazila oko Kalinovnika. Negdje u ožujku 1945. Bakić se ponovno susreo s četnicima koji su ga izvijestili da je „Draža morao trenutno da obustavi borbu protiv okupatora, da bi spasio narod“. Također su ustvrdili da „partizani ubijaju i da je svaki dan Trebišnjica puna lješeva“, a „za ustaše su rekli da su im to neprijatelj broj 1“. Prema navodima četničkog zapovjednika, četnici su se privremeno spuštali u Konavle, ali ondje nisu uspjeli dobiti pomoć mještana.<sup>63</sup>

Sudeći prema Bakićevoj izjavi, skupina nije imala drugih kontakata. Veza s križarima u Hercegovini i u Žabi nije bila uspostavljena, a nije bilo ni kontakata sa Zagrebom. Bakić je tek naknadno doznao da su osnovane čete križara u Primorju gdje je navodno bilo mrtvih.<sup>64</sup> Prema izjavi jednog uhvaćenog dezertera iz divizije „Garibaldi“, glasinu da ga potpomažu Englezi navodno je namjerno proširio Bakić da bi time prikrivio seljake koji su ga potpomagali.<sup>65</sup> Stoga se čini da je bila riječ o relativno izoliranoj križarskoj skupini koja je uspjela razviti odličnu mrežu jataka na području Konavala, ali bez značajnijih kontakata izvan tog prostora.

Osim ograničenog područja djelovanja, limitirano je bilo i samo djelovanje te skupine. Tako Radelić navodi da Bakićeva skupina nije izvela nijednu veću akciju osim napada na općinski odbor i policiju u Župi u veljači 1945., koja je završila bez većih posljedica. Provale nije izvodila jer je imala podršku stanovništva i organiziranu pozadinu za opskrbu.<sup>66</sup> Žitom su se opskrbili otkupom kod hercegovačkih četnika. U svojoj izjavi Bakić navodi da njegova skupina ustvari nije izvršila ni jednu akciju ili zločin, pa se čak nisu upuštali ni u oduzimanje streljiva, iako na drugom mjestu tvrdi da su hranu oduzimali od seljaka „prema njegovu imućnom stanju i to većinom kruha i krumpira“. Naročitu su podršku imali u selu Dubi iz kojeg se više od 20 osoba priključilo križarima. Štoviše, nisu nastojali čak ni poticati ljude da bježe iz vojnih postrojbi, no „kad

save the people“. They also said that the “Partisans are on a killing spree and that the Trebišnjica [River] has bodies floating”. They added that “they considered the Ustashe their enemy No. 1”. According to their commander, the Chetniks would occasionally come down to Konavle but they failed to get any assistance from the locals there.<sup>63</sup>

Judging by Bakić’s testimony, his group had no other contacts. No contacts with Zagreb or with Herzegovina or Žaba Crusaders had been established. Bakić would only later learn about Crusader units in the Dubrovnik coastal region, where they allegedly suffered losses.<sup>64</sup> According to the testimony of a deserter from the Garibaldi Division captured by the Partisans, Bakić intentionally spread rumor that he had support of the British in order to protect the villagers who had actually been helping him.<sup>65</sup> This suggests that Bakić’s group was a relatively isolated Crusader group with an excellent network of harborers in Konavle but with no relevant contacts outside that region.

Not just the territory where the group was active, but the activities themselves were limited. For example, Radelić says that Bakić’s group did not launch any major action other than the February 1945 attacks on the municipal people’s committee and police station in Župa that had no lasting aftereffects. No raids had been launched because they lacked support of the local population and logistics.<sup>66</sup> They purchased some grain from the Herzegovina Chetniks. In his testimony Bakić claims that, in fact, his group never actually carried out a single action, not to mention crime; they would not even seize ammunition from peasants (although he elsewhere claims they did take away food from peasants, “mostly bread and potatoes, depending on their wealth”). They received significant support from the villagers of Duba, 20 of whom had joined Crusaders. His group allegedly did not even encourage people to desert from NOVJ units; however, “when they learned about my whereabouts, they would run like crazy to join me”.<sup>67</sup> These quotes confirm the limited extent

<sup>63</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>64</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>65</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, zabilješka iz izjave Fratti Chitto.

<sup>66</sup> Radelić 2011: 471–472.

<sup>63</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

<sup>64</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

<sup>65</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, note from Fratti Chitto’s testimony.

<sup>66</sup> Radelić 2011: 471–472.

<sup>67</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

su znali gdje sam ja bježali su za mnom kao ljudi“.<sup>67</sup> Ti navodi potvrđuju ograničeno djelovanje Bakićeve skupine koje je onemogućeno onda kada je skupina počela učvršćivati kontakte u Dubrovniku preko kojeg se možda mogla nadati širenju veza na druga područja.

Početkom travnja 1945. Bakić se s dvije desetine križara nalazio u okolici Čilipa. Radilo se o posljednjim križarima od njih ukupno 70-ak na području Konavala koji su još uvijek živjeli „vojničkim životom“. Naoružani su bili s tri mitraljeza, tri parabele i 13 pušaka. Dana 5. travnja naišli su na partizansku stražu koja ih je pokušala zaustaviti. Kad su križari pokušali pobjeći, straža je zapucala i uspjela raniti Peru Bakića koji je prebačen u vojarnu partizanske straže na Zvekovici kraj Cavtata gdje mu je pružena prva pomoć. Utvrđeno je da je metak ušao pod lijevu ruku i dospio do desne lopatice prošavši kroz pluća. Iako jačeg krvarenja nije bilo, Bakiću je bila povrijeđena kralježnica zbog čega je izgubio osjet ispod prsnog koša. Na brzinu je ispitan i zatim bolničkim vozilom prebačen u dubrovačku bolnicu gdje je zadržan na liječenju i pod stražom.<sup>68</sup> Ondje je potvrđena teška ozljeda kralježnice s paralizom donjeg dijela tijela.<sup>69</sup> Unatoč tome iz bolnice je otpušten 14. svibnja 1945. kada je odveden u zatvor OZNA-e „Rašica“ u Lapadu, a nakon nekoliko dana premješten je u zatvor „Karmen“. Stoga je u njegovoj hapšenici kao datum uhićenja zabilježen upravo 14. svibnja. Prema sačuvanim svjedočanstvima u zatvoru je Bakić trpio strašne bolove.<sup>70</sup> Zbog nedostatka liječničke njege njegovo se stanje pogoršalo, a zakomplicirale su mu se i respiratorne funkcije zbog čega je 2. lipnja 1945. nastupila smrt.<sup>71</sup> Pokopan je na Vojnom groblju u Dubrovniku, na neobilježenom mjestu, a rodbini koja se tada nalazila u internaciji na Korčuli nije ništa priopćeno.<sup>72</sup> Unatoč pojedinim detaljima o kojima je Bakić tijekom istrage govorio, zaključak OZNA-e bio

of Bakić group's activities. These were thwarted just when the group began to consolidate its contacts in Dubrovnik, which could possibly help them establish contacts in other areas.

In early April of 1945, Bakić and two squads of Crusaders were stationed in the vicinity of Čilipi. They were the last remaining of some 70 Konavle Crusaders who were still under arms. They had three machineguns, three Parabellums and 13 rifles. On 5 April they ran into Partisan sentries who tried to stop them. When the Crusaders tried to flee, Pero Bakić was wounded in the ensuing skirmish. He was then transported to the Partisan sentry post at Zvekovica near Cavtat, where he received first aid. It was established that the bullet had entered his left armpit and then made its way to the right shoulder blade, having passed through the lungs, damaging the spine and causing paralysis underneath the abdomen. After quick interrogation, an ambulance took him to the Dubrovnik hospital where he received treatment under guard.<sup>68</sup> The severe damage to the spine and paralysis of the lower parts of his body were confirmed there.<sup>69</sup> Despite his condition, he was discharged from the hospital on 14 May 1945 and was taken to OZNA's Rašica prison in Lapad, only to be transferred to Karmen prison a few days later. This is why 14 May was entered in his file as the date when he was arrested. There are testimonies that Bakić was in severe pain in the prison.<sup>70</sup> Due to inadequate medical treatment his condition deteriorated and respiratory complications resulted in his death on 2 June 1945.<sup>71</sup> He was buried in an unmarked grave at the Military Cemetery in Dubrovnik. His family, then detained on the island of Korčula, was not even notified.<sup>72</sup> Despite certain details that Bakić had given away during the investigation, OZNA concluded that not much could be learned from him because he either did not know much or did not want to talk. As a result, Yugoslav repression organs failed to cast light on the connections

<sup>67</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>68</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Kako je uhvaćen Pero Bakić – vođa škripara u Konavlima, nedatirano.

<sup>69</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik sastavljen povodom smrti Bakić Pera Đurova iz Čilipa, 2. lipnja 1945.

<sup>70</sup> Radica 2003: 418–419.

<sup>71</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik sastavljen povodom smrti Bakić Pera Đurova iz Čilipa, 2. lipnja 1945.

<sup>72</sup> Radica 2003: 420.

<sup>68</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, *Kako je uhvaćen Pero Bakić – vođa škripara u Konavlima*, undated.

<sup>69</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Minutes on the death of Pero Bakić (father's name: Đuro) from Čilipi, 2 June 1945.

<sup>70</sup> Radica 2003: 418–419.

<sup>71</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Minutes on the death of Pero Bakić (father's name: Đuro) from Čilipi, 2 June 1945.

<sup>72</sup> Radica 2003: 420.

je da se mnogo toga ipak nije moglo doznati jer Bakić ili o tome nije znao ili nije htio govoriti. Tako jugoslavenski represivni organi nisu uspjeli rasvijetliti vezu „reakcionarnog“ HSS-a i ustaškog pokreta pred kraj Drugog svjetskog rata, kao ni veze između pojedinih „reakcionarnih“ političara dubrovačkog okruga i križarskih skupina.<sup>73</sup>

Upravo iz razdoblja uništenja Bakićeve skupine datira izvješće OZNA-e za grad Split OZNA-i za Dalmaciju od 17. travnja 1945. u kojem je istaknuto da se „u redovima omladine Mačeka“ često spominju križari uz pretjerivanje s brojkama, a neposredno nakon Bakićeva zarobljavanja u Konavlima su „odmah o tome znali i istoga žalili, pa se pretpostavlja da bi mogli imati neku vezu s Dubrovnikom“.<sup>74</sup> Nažalost, o tim potencijalnim vezama između Splita i Dubrovnika koje su se odnosile na djelovanje i eventualno pomaganje križarskih skupina zasad nije nađeno više podataka.

Radelić također navodi da je, sudeći prema javnim optužbama komunističkih vlasti, Bakićeva skupina bila povezana s dominikanskim samostanom iz kojeg je fra Dominik Barač poslao Bakiću pismo u kojem se navodi da će on i njegova braća raditi protiv boljševizma, a od njega su zatražili vezu i savjete.<sup>75</sup> Tim pismom isprepletene su sudbine Pere Bakića i fra Dominika Barača. O toj problematici više će riječi biti u narednom dijelu.

## Uhićenje Fra Dominika Barača i istraga protiv njega

Fra Dominik (Nedjeljko) Barač rođen je 14. srpnja 1912. u Slanom kraj Dubrovnika od oca Ivana i majke Vincenze rođ. Zelenić. Osnovnu školu pohađao je u rodnom mjestu, a Dominikansku klasičnu gimnaziju završio je u Bolu na Braču. U red braće propovjednika stupio je 1930. u Dubrovniku gdje je također odslušao šest semestara studija filozofije. Osam semestara studija teologije odslušao je u Walberbergu kraj Kölna. Zaređen je za svećenika 25. srpnja 1936., a dvije godine kasnije disertacijom

of the “reactionary” part of HSS and the Ustashe movement at the end of the World War II, as well as the connections between the Crusader groups and some “reactionary” politicians from Dubrovnik and its environs.<sup>73</sup>

The OZNA Split division’s report to the OZNA’s Dalmatian branch, made on 17 April 1945 – at the time when Bakić’s group was destroyed – points out that the “Maček youth” often talk about Crusaders, exaggerating their numbers. Upon Bakić’s capture in Konavle, “they immediately learned about it and felt sorry for him, which is why it is believed that they may have some contacts in Dubrovnik”.<sup>74</sup> Unfortunately, nothing more on these potential connections between Split and Dubrovnik in the context of Crusader activities and possible support to them has been established yet.

Radelić also claims that, judging by public accusations of the Communist authorities, Bakić’s group was connected with the Dominican monastery from which Fr. Dominik Barač had sent a letter to Bakić, informing him that he and his fellow friars would work against Bolshevism and asking him for contacts and advice.<sup>75</sup> This letter entwined the fates of Pero Bakić and Fr. Dominik Barač. This subject will be discussed further in the following section.

## The apprehension and investigation of Fr. Dominik Barač

Fr. Dominik (Nedjeljko) Barač was born in Slano near Dubrovnik on 14 July 1912 to Ivan and Vincenza nee Zelenić. Upon completing elementary school there, he finished the Dominican lyceum in Bol on the island of Brač. He joined the Order of Preachers in 1930 in Dubrovnik, where he also completed six semesters of philosophy. He continued his education in Walberberg near Cologne, where he attended eight semesters of theology. He was ordained on 25 July 1936. Two years later he was appointed to the teaching staff after defending his dissertation on social philosophy. He continued his studies at the University of Louvain (Belgium) where he earned his master’s degree. Upon returning to the homeland, he engaged in pastoral activity in Dubrovnik,

<sup>73</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Izvještaj o istragama, nedatirano.

<sup>74</sup> HR-HDA-1491, OZN-a za Hrvatsku, 11.26.02, Izvješće OZN-e za grad Split, 17. travnja 1945.; *Split i srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e...* 2017: 365–373.

<sup>75</sup> Radelić 2011: 471–472.

<sup>73</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Investigations Report, undated.

<sup>74</sup> HR-HDA-1491, OZNA - Croatian branch, 11.26.02, OZNA Split division report, 17 April 1945; *Split i srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e...* 2017: 365–373.

<sup>75</sup> Radelić 2011: 471–472.

o socijalnoj filozofiji položio je profesorski ispit. Komplementarne studije nastavio je na sveučilištu u Louvainu (Belgija) gdje je magistrirao. Nakon povratka u domovinu pastoralno je djelovao u Dubrovniku, Bolu i Splitu. Godine 1942. doktorirao je na Papinskom sveučilištu sv. Tome Akvinskog (Angelicum) u Rimu, a zatim je predavao sociologiju na Visokom dominikanskom filozofsko-teološkom učilištu u Dubrovniku. U kolovozu 1944. objavio je knjigu *Socijalna filozofija boljševizma* koja predstavlja prvi filozofski pristup boljševizmu s tomističkog gledišta na hrvatskom jeziku, a koja će ga prema navodima pojedinih autora uskoro koštati života.<sup>76</sup> Zbog navodne suradnje s konavoskim križarima uhićen je 18. ožujka 1945. i odveden u zatvor „Rašica“ u Lapadu gdje je tri mjeseca čekao suđenje. Na dan uhićenja izvršen je i pretres u dominikanskom samostanu. Optužen je 18. lipnja iste godine i osuđen na smrt strijeljanjem i trajan gubitak građanskih prava.<sup>77</sup> Na istu je kaznu osuđen Pero Mihaljević, a Vinko Filičić, Ivka Kristović, Sofija Plančić, o. Bertrand Paršić i Pave Radović osuđeni su na vremenske kazne robije ili teškog prisilnog rada od 15, 9, 6 i 4 godine te 15 mjeseci.<sup>78</sup> U zasebnom sudskom postupku istog su dana osuđeni na kaznu smrti Jakov Andrijuci i don Ivo Bjelokosić.<sup>79</sup> Čini se da okrivljenici nisu imali branitelja niti je proveden ikakav dokazni postupak.<sup>80</sup> Sačuvani dokumenti OZNA-e dokazuju da stvarnog postupka doista nije bilo jer su njezini dužnosnici unaprijed odlučili o rezultatu suđenja.<sup>81</sup>

U Baračevu dosjeu sačuvane su dvije izjave, i to jedna od 15. travnja 1945. i druga koja je nedatirana, ali se na temelju sadržaja može zaključiti da je napisana 8. ili 9. travnja 1945. godine. Upravo se na temelju nedatirane izjave također može zaključiti da je Baračevih izjava svakako moralo biti više. Naime, već u samom njezinu uvodu Barač navodi da je u vezi s njegovim „usmenim izjavama pri saslušanju“ slobodan dati „uz najveću garanciju točnosti“ i spomenutu „pismenu“ izjavu.<sup>82</sup> S obzirom na to da u izjavi

Bol and Split. After winning his doctor's degree at the University of St. Thomas Aquinas in Rome in 1942, he taught sociology at the Dominican College of Philosophy and Theology in Dubrovnik. In August 1944 he published the book *Social Philosophy of Bolshevism* – the first Thomasian philosophical approach to Bolshevism in the Croatian language. According to some authors, this book would soon cost him his life.<sup>76</sup> On 18 March 1945, on the ground of alleged collaboration with the Konavle Crusaders, he was arrested and taken to Rašica prison in Lapad where he would spend three months awaiting his trial. On the same day when he was arrested, search of premises in the Dominican monastery was carried out. Later that year, on 18 June, he was charged and sentenced to death and permanent loss of civil rights.<sup>77</sup> Pero Mihaljević received the same sentence and Vinko Filičić, Ivka Kristović, Sofija Plančić, Fr. Bertrand Paršić and Pave Radović were sentenced to 15, 9, 6 and 4 years, and 15 months of hard labor, respectively.<sup>78</sup> In a separate trial, Jakov Andrijuci and Father Ivo Bjelokosić were sentenced to death the same day.<sup>79</sup> It appears that neither counsels had been provided for the defendants nor had any presentation of evidence taken place.<sup>80</sup> Indeed, surviving OZNA's documents indicate that no real legal proceedings were carried out because the outcome of the trial had been decided upon by OZNA officials in advance.<sup>81</sup>

The Barač file includes two indicative testimonies – one of 15 April 1945 and the other undated but, based on its contents, clearly made on 8 or 9 April 1945. It is this undated testimony that suggests that there must have been other Barač's testimonies: in its introductory part, Barač says that he is willing to make the said “written” statement as an addition to his “oral testimonies given during the interrogation” and that he can “guarantee its full accuracy”.<sup>82</sup> As nowhere in the testimony of 15 April 1945 is it mentioned that it constitutes a part of interrogation minutes, it is more likely that the testimony in question was also a written one. However, as Barač claims in it that he already mentioned in a written statement that he

<sup>76</sup> Ribić 1994: 603; Radelj 1996: 30; Armanda 2006: 37.

<sup>77</sup> Radelj 1997: 22; Franić 1996: 12.

<sup>78</sup> Radica 2003: 457.

<sup>79</sup> Radica 2003: 458.

<sup>80</sup> Radica 2003: 460.

<sup>81</sup> Radica 2003: 461–462.

<sup>82</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava fra Dominika Barača, nedatirano.

<sup>76</sup> Ribić 1994: 603; Radelj 1996: 30; Armanda 2006: 37.

<sup>77</sup> Radelj 1997: 22; Franić 1996: 12.

<sup>78</sup> Radica 2003: 457.

<sup>79</sup> Radica 2003: 458.

<sup>80</sup> Radica 2003: 460.

<sup>81</sup> Radica 2003: 461–462.

<sup>82</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Fr. Dominik Barač, undated.

datiranoj 15. travnja 1945. nigdje nije navedeno da je riječ o zapisniku sa saslušanja, vjerojatnije je da se također radi o pisanoj izjavi. No, s obzirom na to da Barač u toj izjavi navodi da je o zauzimanju za partizane i Srbe već govorio u pismenoj izjavi, može se zaključiti da se spomenuti dio odnosi na navode iz nedatirane izjave od 8./9. travnja ili na neku drugu prethodnu izjavu. Sudeći prema tim napomenama u obje sačuvane izjave, također se može zaključiti da je Baračevih izjava morao biti znatno veći broj od onoga koji se čuva u njegovu osobnom dosjeu zbog čega je istraživanje njegova slučaja znatno ograničeno, a svi zaključci podložni daljnjoj reviziji u slučaju pronalaska zasad nepoznatih dokumenata.

Izjava od 15. travnja 1945. započinje Baračevim osobnim podacima i životopisom u kojem je detaljno opisao svoje odrastanje, školovanje i svećenički rad. Veći dio izjave koji se odnosi na razdoblje Drugog svjetskog rata također govori o Baračevu doktoratu u Rimu i kasnijem profesorskom radu u Dubrovniku. On ističe da u javnom životu nije sudjelovao, izuzevši crkveni rad. Progonjenim Židovima nastojao je pomoći, kao na primjer obitelji Sars iz Zagreba čija je korespondencija mogla dokazati njegove navode. „Kao Hrvat – Dalmatinac osuđivao sam sramotni mletački sporazum /aneksiju Dalmacije/ i fašiziranje naše zemlje“, navodi dalje Barač spomenuvši da nije bio politički angažiran niti je održavao poznanstva s dužnosnicima ustaškog pokreta. U ustaškom je stožeru bio dvaput kada je trebao „iznuditi“ potvrdu ispravnosti za Frana Grbešića koji se zbog partizanskog djelovanja našao pred prijekim sudom u Zagrebu. Barač je uspio dobiti traženu potvrdu jer je za Grbešića jamčio vlastitim životom. U svom profesorskom djelovanju Barač se isticao kao izraziti protivnik rasizma, a naveo je da je također najobjektivnije postavljao različita pitanja, pa tako i pitanje komunizma. „Pobijao sam mišljenja mnogih katoličkih uskogrudnih pisaca“, izjavljuje Barač kazavši da su mu studenti znali reći „pa velečasni, vi ste komunisti“. U objavljivanju doktorske disertacije nisu ga vodili politički motivi, nego akademski. „Međutim, ni u toj radnji nema ni jedna riječ ni najmanje protiv partizanskog pokreta, a na više mjesta izričito tvrdim da nijesam kompetentan govoriti o stvarnom stanju u Rusiji“, tvrdi Barač. Uostalom, „dubokog sam uvjerenja da će me svaki dobro upućeni boljševički ideolog priznati da je radnja lojalno pošteno napisana“. Po ulasku postrojbi NOV-a Barač je ostao u Dubrovniku ne miješajući se u političke prilike, a njegovo je držanje bilo „korektno“ i „lojalno“ sve do pred blagdan

had intervened for the Partisans and Serbs, we can conclude that he refers to his undated testimony of 8/9 April or some other, earlier testimony. Based on both of these testimonies, we can also conclude that there must have been many more testimonies of his besides those found in his personal file. This is what hinders the research on his case and makes all the conclusions subject to revision if new documents are found.

Barač's testimony of 15 April 1945 begins with his personal data and biography, with details about his formative years, schooling and priesthood. Most of the section covering the World War II period also provides details about Barač's doctoral thesis in Rome and subsequent professorship in Dubrovnik. Barač points out that he has never participated in public life, save for his clerical activities. He tried to help persecuted Jews and offered his correspondence with the Sars family from Zagreb as evidence of it. "As a Croat and Dalmatian, I condemned the shameful Venice Agreement /annexation of Dalmatia/ and fascistization of our country," continues Barač, adding that he neither was politically engaged nor had any acquaintances among the Ustashe officials. He visited the Ustashe headquarters on two occasions, when trying to intervene on behalf of Frano Grbešić who appeared before court-martial in Zagreb because of his Partisan activities. He managed to obtain exoneration for Grbešić because he vouched for him with his life. As a professor, Barač was a prominent opponent of racism. He pointed out that he had tackled various subjects – including Communism – as objectively as possible. "I challenged the opinions of many prejudiced Catholic authors," says Barač, adding that his students used to tell him, "But, reverend, you're a Communist". He also explains that the motives for his doctoral thesis were strictly academic, not political. "However, not a single word against the Partisan movement cannot be found in my thesis. Also, on several places, I expressly state that I am not competent to discuss the real situation in Russia," says Barač. In addition, "I am deeply convinced that every well-informed Bolshevik ideologue would admit that my paper is loyally and honestly written." When the NOVJ units entered Dubrovnik, Barač stayed in the city and did not interfere with politics. His attitude had been "politically correct" and "loyal" until immediately before the Festivity of St. Blaise, when he was approached by some "uninvited" people who "persuaded me to do a childish and foolish thing". Still, after this "recklessness", he backed out. "Clearly I am no threat to public order, least of all an opponent of a better and more just

svetog Vlaha kada su k njemu došli „nepozvani“ ljudi i „skrivali mi da napravim djetinjariju i ludost“. Ipak, poslije te „neopreznosti“ povukao se. „Kako iz svega jasno proizlazi, ja nijesam nikakav rušilac javnog reda, a najmanje protivnik boljeg i pravednijeg društveno-političkog uređenja naše zemlje“, zaključuje Barač istaknuvši i to da „stavljam sve moje sposobnosti i najširu suradnju zajedno sa narodnim vlastima isključivo za dobro našeg naroda i teško napaćene domovine.“<sup>83</sup> S obzirom na to da su okolnosti pisanja te izjave nepoznate, ne može se sa sigurnošću reći zbog čega je Barač posvetio naročitu pozornost objašnjenjima vezanima za svoju doktorsku disertaciju. Može se pretpostaviti da je o njoj bio upitan ili je zaključio da bi ta disertacija mogla otežati njegov trenutačni položaj.

U nedatiranoj izjavi koja je nastala 8. ili 9. travnja 1945. Barač otkriva znatno više detalja o događajima koji su doveli do njegova uhićenja i suđenja. Tako on priznaje da je prije blagdana sv. Vlaha prihvatio ponudu Jakova Andrijucija da napiše anonimno pismo i letke s ciljem osujećivanja proslave sv. Vlaha. Naime, Andrijuci mu je navodno kazao da je u nekom lokalu čuo da se javno govori protiv proslave, a osobito su napadani svećenici i biskup. Netko je predložio da bi bilo najbolje napisati letke i osujetiti svečanost, što je ostavilo dojam na Andrijucija koji je to spomenuo Baraču. Barač mu je odgovorio da će vidjeti, a u tom je trenutku već bio svjestan da se po gradu doista govorilo o onome što mu je spomenuo Andrijuci. Takvo javno iskazivanje otpora izazvalo je u Baraču raspoloženje koje ga je nagnalo da prihvati Andrijucijevu ponudu.

Andrijuci je k Baraču doveo Vinka Filičića, no Barač ističe da sastanak nije organizirao ni inicirao zbog čega je njegova „pogreška“ materijalna, a ne formalna. Na sastanku mu je rečeno da se u slučaju potrebe obrati za pomoć Sofiji Plančić te „Lucki“<sup>84</sup> i Ivki Kristović.<sup>85</sup> Barač ističe da nikad ranije nije razgovarao sa spomenutim djevojkama niti su mu one

social and political system in our country,” concludes Barač, adding that “I offer all of my abilities and my full cooperation to the people’s government for the sole benefit of our people and our agonized homeland.”<sup>83</sup> As the circumstances in which this testimony was written are not known, we cannot safely say why Barač tried so hard to explain his doctoral thesis. Perhaps he was questioned about it or he assumed that the thesis could aggravate his current position.

In the undated testimony made on 8 or 9 April 1945, Barač reveals much more details about the events that led to his apprehension. For example, he admits accepting Jakov Andrijuci’s suggestion to write an anonymous letter and some leaflets in order to forestall the Festivity of St. Blaise. Andrijuci allegedly told him he had heard people talking against the festivity and criticizing the bishop and other priests. Someone suggested that leaflets should be made in order to forestall the event. This made an impression on Andrijuci and he mentioned it to Barač. Barač replied that he would think about it, already having heard reports that this subject had been all over the town. Such public manifestation of resistance made Barač accept Andrijuci’s suggestion.

Andrijuci acquainted Barač with Vinko Filičić, but Barač claims that he himself neither organized nor initiated the meeting, which is why his “mistake” was of material nature, not formal. At the meeting, Barač was instructed to ask Sofija Plančić, “Lucka”<sup>84</sup> and Ivka Kristović<sup>85</sup> for help in case of an emergency. Barač claims that he has never contacted these girls and that they have never visited him. Filičić came to him once more, accompanied by Andrijuci. Both visits took place before the Festivity of St. Blaise. During these brief visits they mostly made jokes and discussed local events, but they also talked about “Bakić’s experience in the

<sup>83</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava fra Dominika Barača, 15. travnja 1945.

<sup>84</sup> Lucija Romić.

<sup>85</sup> Ivka Kristović osuđena je na zatvorsku kaznu od devet godina koja joj je naknadno smanjena na pet godina. Kaznu je služila u KPD-u Lepoglava. U studenome 1945. uprava KPD-a Lepoglava izvijestila je da je Kristović pobjegla, no o tome nisu podneseni nikakvu dokazi. Njezina sudbina ostaje nepoznata. Kačić 2017: 197. S Kristović su istom prilikom navodno pobjegli Božo Martinović, Sofija Plančić i još neki zatočenici. Plančić se predala vlastima u Zagrebu, odakle je upućena u KPD Stara Gradiška na daljnje izdržavanje kazne. Radica 2003: 568–569.

<sup>83</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Fr. Dominik Barač, 15. 4. 1945.

<sup>84</sup> Lucija Romić.

<sup>85</sup> Ivka Kristović as sentenced to nine years of imprisonment but the sentence was later reduced to five years. She served her term in Lepoglava penitentiary. In November 1945, the penitentiary administration reported that Kristović had escaped; however, no evidence of this had been produced. Her fate remains unknown. Kačić 2017: 197.

<sup>1</sup> In her escape, Kristović was allegedly accompanied by Božo Martinović, Sofija Plančić and some other inmates. Plančić turned herself in to the authorities in Zagreb, from where she was sent to Stara Gradiška penitentiary to serve the rest of her term. Radica 2003: 568–569.



dolazile u posjet. Filičić ga je s Andrijucijem posjetio još jednom, a do obje je posjete došlo prije proslave blagdana sv. Vlaha. Tijekom tih kratkih posjeta šalili su se, razgovarali o gradskim zbivanjima, ali i o „Bakićevoj šumi“. Sudeći prema Baračevoj izjavi, upravo se u tom razdoblju u gradu živo prepričavalo Bakićevo djelovanje pa se tako navodilo da su ga Englezi prebacili zrakoplovom u Italiju, da ima vezu s Mostarom, da je križara oko 2000, da ih organizira neki major Lilić i da ih Englezi opskrbljuju hranom. Na temelju tih informacija Filičić je sastavio pismo za Bakića želeći ga upitati o točnosti pojedinih informacija. „Stavit ćemo da se i drugi HSS-ovci zanimaju za njega i time ćemo mu polaskati i namamit ćemo ga da nam odgovori“, navodi Barač. Pismo je potpisano sa „F“ zbog čega Bakić navodno nije ni mogao znati Baračevo ime ili njegovu povezanost s pisanjem tog pisma. U Baračevu dosjeu sačuvan je prijepis ovog pisma:

„Poštovani gosp. Pero!

Ni najmanje se nemojte začuditi, da od mene u ovim vremenima primate pismo, te da sam uspio doći u dodir s vama preko ove osobe. Mislim i smatram suvišnim, da vas s ovim pismom idem uvjeravati o mojoj ideji i borbi protiv boljševizmu, nadajući se da sam vam još u svjesnoj uspomeni iz Čilipa.

Stvar stoji u ovome. Ovdje u Dubrovniku mi smo se uspjeli sakupiti i odlučili ilegalno raditi, protiv našim neprijateljima. Tim radom smo već počeli.

Raspoloženje građanstva u Dubrovniku vama je sigurno poznato pa prema tome već unapred računamo na podršku ogromne većine pučanstva.

Ovaj rad je još uvijek u začetku i bez stalnog programa, pa je to uzrok da mnogi naši intelektualci i vodeće osobe bivšeg HSS-a u Dubrovniku stoje po strani, te od nas traže da stupimo u vezu s vama i tada će oni odmah pristupiti radu.

Dakle nama treba, da nam odgovorite na slijedeće:

- 1/ imate li stalnu vezu sa Mostarom?
- 2/ radite li po njihovim uputama?
- 3/ tko vas opskrbljuje
- 4/ što naši u NDH-a misle o nama u južnoj Dalmaciji, imaju li namjeru ovo osloboditi.
- 5/ imate li vezu sa Žabom i Bojnikom Lilićem, te gdje je on sada.

woods”. Barač’s testimony indicates that his activities were talk of the town at the time: rumor had it that the British had flown him to Italy, that he was connected with Mostar, that there were around 2,000 Crusaders, organized by an army major named Lilić and supplied with food by the British. Having heard all this, Filičić wrote a letter for Bakić in order to find out whether these things were true. “We will put in it [the letter] that other HSS members are also interested in him; he will be flattered and will most likely reply to us,” quotes Barač. As the letter was signed with “F”, Bakić was allegedly neither familiar with Barač’s name nor had any idea that he had any connection with the letter. A transcript of this letter can be found in Barač’s file:

“Dear Mr. Pero!

The fact that I wrote you a letter in the times like these and that I have managed to contact you through this person should not come to you as a surprise. I believe there is no need to convince you here of my dedication to the fight against Bolshevism as I hope you still remember me from Čilipi.

This is the thing. We managed to rally here in Dubrovnik and decided to go underground and take action against our enemies. We have already started this.

As you are no doubt familiar with the public sentiment in Dubrovnik, we can count on the support of a large majority of the citizens.

Our activities are still in the initial stage and we have no program yet, which is why many of our intellectuals and leaders of former HSS in Dubrovnik are keeping aloof. They said they were willing to take action as soon as we got in touch with you.

We therefore need you to give us answers to the following questions:

- 1/ Are you maintaining regular contacts with Mostar?
- 2/ Do you follow their instructions?
- 3/ Who is supplying you?
- 4/ What do our people in NDH think of us in Southern Dalmatia? Are they planning to liberate these areas?
- 5/ Do you have contact with Žaba and Major Lilić and where is he now?
- 6/ Do you have contacts with any foreign power? Kindly instruct us about our future course of action in the city.

Again, send us your reply through tee bearer of

6/ da li s kojom vanjskom silom imate veze?  
 Dalje nam javite u kojemu pravcu bi se imao kretati naš rad u gradu.  
 Ponovno vas molim da odgovor date po donosiocu i to čim prije jer nestrpljivo očekujemo gornje.  
 S mnogo poštovanja i s vjerom i konačnu pobjedu primite iskreni pozdrav od odanog vam  
 F.<sup>86</sup>

Pismo je u Konavle odnijela Pave Radović rođena Bošković koja je u Dubrovnik došla platiti misu za svog bolesnog brata don Marka Boškovića te preuzeti neke vreće i boce od nekog fratra Šimetovića. Barač ju je zamolio da preuzme pismo za Bakića zbog čega se vratila dan kasnije. Budući da je Barač bio bolestan, pismo joj je prosljedio preko Šimetovića koji o sadržaju pisma nije znao ništa.<sup>87</sup> Spomenuta Pava Radović saslušana je pred vojnim istražiteljem Vojnog suda za Oblast Dalmacije, odnosno Vijeća kod Komande područja Južne Dalmacije 30. svibnja 1945. godine. U svojoj izjavi potvrđuje da ju je Barač upitao poznaje li Bakića te ju je zamolio da mu uruči jedno pismo uz napomenu da ga uništi ako Bakića ne uspije naći. Nakon povratka u Čilipe Radović je u šumi naišla na Bakića kojem je uručila pismo kazavši mu da joj ga je dao Barač. Taj detalj objašnjava zbog čega je Bakić znao Baračevo ime unatoč tome što je pismo bilo potpisano sa „F“. Osim toga pisma, Radović je u Konavle ponijela još jedno pismo koje joj je za njezina brata zajedno s novinama uručio novinar Pero Vukić. Sadržaj pisma ostao joj je nepoznat, a pismo je bilo naslovljeno „za komandanta Grude ili zamjeniku komandanta“. Umjesto bratu, Radović je i to pismo predala Bakiću.<sup>88</sup>

O vezama Pave Radović s križarima nešto je više zabilježeno u dosjeu Pere Bakića. Tako se iz zapisnika sa saslušanja križara Ive Matkovića od 12. ožujka 1945. doznaje da je Radović dolazila u Dubu kao veza križara, no osim nje iz Dubrovnika je vijesti donosila i Iva Kovač koja se sastajala s Bakićem.<sup>89</sup>

this letter as soon as possible because we are anxious to receive answers to the above questions.  
 With respect, compliments and faith in final victory  
 Yours faithfully,

F.<sup>86</sup>

The letter was brought to Konavle by Pave Radović nee Bošković, who came to Dubrovnik to pay for a mass for her ill brother, Father Marko Bošković, and take some bags and bottles from a friar Šimetović. Barač asked her to bring the letter to Bakić, for which reason she came back a day later. Being ill, Barač asked Šimetović to give her the letter. Šimetović knew nothing about the contents of the letter.<sup>87</sup> Pava Radović was examined by a military interrogation officer of the Military Court for Dalmatia at the South Dalmatia Command on 30 May 1945. She confirms in her testimony that Barač wanted to know if she knew Bakić and asked her to deliver a letter to him, pointing out that she should destroy the letter if she cannot find him. Upon returning to Čilipi, Radović found Bakić in the forest and told him it was from Barač. This explains the fact that Bakić knew Barač's name although the letter was signed with "F". Radović brought to Konavle another letter. It was from journalist Pero Vukić and she was supposed to deliver it to her brother together with some newspapers. The letter was addressed to "Commander of Gruda or Deputy Commander". Instead of handing it over to her brother, Radović gave it to Bakić together with the first letter.<sup>88</sup>

More details on Pave Radović's contacts with Crusaders can be found in the Pero Bakić file. For instance, the minutes of the interrogation of Crusader Ivo Matković of 12 March 1945 reveal that Radović used to come to Duba as the Crusaders' contact. Iva Kovač was another person that used to bring news from Dubrovnik and meet Bakić.<sup>89</sup> These Matković's allegations were confirmed by Crusader Niko Sarilo.<sup>90</sup> More on Filičić's

<sup>86</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Prijepis pisma upućenog Peri Bakiću, nedatirano.

<sup>87</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava fra Dominika Barača, nedatirano.

<sup>88</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava Pave Radović, 30. svibnja 1945.

<sup>89</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava Ive Matkovića, 12. ožujka 1945.

<sup>86</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, transcript of the letter sent to Pero Bakić, undated.

<sup>87</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Fr. Dominik Barač, undated.

<sup>88</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Pava Radović, 30.5.1945.

<sup>89</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Ivo Matković, 12.3.1945.

<sup>90</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Niko Sarilo, 14.3.1945.

Te Matkovićeve navode potvrdio je i križar Niko Sarilo.<sup>90</sup> No o samom Filičićevu pismu koje je preko Pave Radović Bakiću uputio fra Dominik Barač zabilježeno je više u Bakićevim izjavama. Tako Bakić navodi da mu je pismo predao križar Martinović, a „tko mi ga je poslao nije mi rekao“. Potvrdio je da je zajedno s njim dobio još jedno pismo nepoznatog pošiljatelja za kojeg je Bakić pretpostavio da je novinar Pero Vukić. U toj izjavi Bakić izričito tvrdi da se ne sjeća da mu je Martinović spominjao Barača. Filičića je poznavao iz Čilipa i često su razgovarali, posebno o Mačeku. Filičiću je navodno odgovorio da „izgleda da oni na Žabi imaju vezu sa Mostarom, a da mi preko Žabe možemo, za sada ništa nova“ te da hranu dobivaju od naroda. Bakić se nije mogao sjetiti po kome je u Dubrovnik poslao taj odgovor. Također je potvrdio da poznaje Pavu Radović, ali ju navodno nije vidio otkako je „u šumi“ te mu nije ništa poručivala ni nosila. „Ni jednog bijelog fratra u Dubrovniku ne poznajem“, izričito je ustvrdio Bakić. Osim toga, Bakić nije bio upućen ni u pokušaj sabotiranja proslave blagdana sv. Vlaha, a o situaciji u Dubrovniku zaključio je da križari ondje nisu očekivali prevrat.<sup>91</sup>

No u istoj izjavi Bakić mijenja dio svojih navoda. Analizirajući sadržaj izjave, može se zaključiti da je riječ o prepričavanju onoga što je Bakić izjavio i što se tijekom saslušavanja zbivalo. Čini se da je u jednom trenutku Bakiću rečeno da je Pave Radović priznala svoju ulogu pa stoga kaže: „Kad Pave Radović tako kaže onda je tako, jer ja ne želim nikoga upropastiti. Ona mi je dala pisma. Nije ništa ni ubacila ni ispustila.“<sup>92</sup> Ovdje je potrebno istaknuti da je ranije citirana izjava Pave Radović 30. svibnja 1945., a već tri dana kasnije Bakić je bio mrtav. Nepoznato je je li Radović prije tog datuma dala ikakvu izjavu ili je to doista jedina njezina izjava na temelju koje je Bakić suočen s novim podacima tek nekoliko sati prije smrti, u okolnostima u kojima je trpio iznimno teške bolove. Stoga je potrebno zapitati se i je li Bakić bio potpuno svjestan prilikom davanja te izjave i jesu li njegove riječi uopće točno zabilježene. U Radovićevoj izjavi

letter sent to Bakić by Fr. Dominik Barač through Pave Radović can be found in Bakić's statements. Bakić says the letter was given to him by Crusader Martinović, but “he did not tell me who was it from”. Bakić confirmed that, together with this letter, he received another letter from an unknown sender. He assumed it was from Pero Vukić, the journalist. Bakić insists he has no recollection of Martinović mentioning Barač to him. He says that he knew Filičić back from Čilipi and that they often conversed, particularly about Maček. He claims he told Filičić that “it seems that those in Žaba have contact with Mostar and that we too can have it through them; otherwise, there are no news”. He added that they were receiving food from the locals. Bakić could not remember whom he had used as a courier to take this reply to Dubrovnik. He confirmed he had known Pave Radović but claimed he had not seen her since he had been “in the woods” and that she had never brought any messages to or from him. Bakić insisted he had never met any White Friar in Dubrovnik. He also knew nothing about the attempt to forestall the Festivity of St. Blaise. As for the situation in Dubrovnik, Bakić had concluded that Crusaders had not expected an overthrow there.<sup>91</sup>

However, in the same testimony, Bakić changed some of his claims. By analyzing the testimony, one can conclude it contains a retold version of Bakić's statements and his interrogation as such. It seems that, at one point, Bakić was told that Pave Radović had admitted her role because he says: “If Pave Radović says so then it is so, because I don't want to bring ruin to anyone. She gave me the letters. She neither added to nor dropped out anything from them.”<sup>92</sup> It should be pointed out here that the above quoted testimony of Pave Radović was made on 30 May 1945 and Bakić would be dead only three days later. It is not known whether she had made any other testimony before this date or was this really her single testimony – the one Bakić was confronted with hours before his death, when he was in excruciating pain. It begs the question whether Bakić was fully conscious when giving the testimony and whether his words had been recorded correctly. Something Radović's testimony does not contain are the details of the reply that Bakić allegedly sent to Dubrovnik through Radović, with the instructions to deliver it to Barač.

<sup>90</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava Nike Sarila, 14. ožujka 1945.

<sup>91</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>92</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>91</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

<sup>92</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

nema detalja o navodnom odgovoru koji je Bakić navodno poslao u Dubrovnik upravo preko Radović, uz napomenu da pismo preda Baraču. U Bakićevoj je izjavi zabilježeno i to da je Radović taj dio Bakićeve izjave zanijekala.<sup>93</sup>

U Bakićevu su dosjeu sačuvani i zapisnici njegovih razgovora s Rokom Aguzinovićem. S obzirom na to da je Bakić od ranjavanja početkom travnja do sredine svibnja boravio u bolnici, a zatim u zatvoru, nejasno je na kojoj ga je točno lokaciji posjećivao Aguzinović. U jednom od zabilježenih razgovora Bakić mu se požalio da ga pitaju za imena ljudi koje on uopće nije poznavao te da s Dubrovnikom nije imao nikakve stvarne veze. Povjerio se da je vezu s križarima u Žabi, i to preko Gabele, imao neki Ljiljić. U istom razgovoru Bakić je otkrio da mu je Radović pričala o „nekom“ fratru Baraču te da je na Filičićevo pismo odgovorio da „ćemo kroz neki dan dobiti vezu sa škriparima u Žabi i da ćemo preko njih dobiti vezu sa Mostarom“. Aguzinovića je zamolio da kaže Vukiću „da on ne prizna kad ona nije priznala“, misleći pritom na Radović te da upozori i neke druge pojedince da ništa ne govore jer „ja ništa ne priznajem“.<sup>94</sup> Koja je uloga Roka Aguzinovića bila u tim trenucima, također ostaje nejasno. Njegovo je ime zabilježeno u knjigama primljenih i poslanih depesha OZNA-a gdje za datum 4. siječnja 1945. stoji zabilježeno da se Aguzinovića odmah povuče s prisilnog rada na Korčuli i ako ga obuhvati mobilizacija, uputi na peti sektor.<sup>95</sup> Upravo je Aguzinović u narednim tjednima surađivao s OZNA-om u pokušaju da Bakića nagovori na predaju.<sup>96</sup> Stoga se postavlja pitanje je li Aguzinović ciljano pušten s prisilnog rada s namjerom da se preko njega komunistički represivni organi približe Bakiću i okončaju djelovanje križara u Konavlima.

Četiri dana nakon saslušavanja Pave Radović, dakle 3. lipnja 1945., izjavu je pred istim istražiteljem dao i spomenuti Jakov Andrijuci. Iz njegove izjave doznajemo nešto više o okolnostima koje su ga potaknule na sastanak s Baračem. Andrijuci tako navodi da je sredinom siječnja 1945. susreo Peru Mihaljevića s kojim

Bakić's testimony also contains a note that Radović had denied this claim of his.<sup>93</sup>

Bakić's file also contains minutes of his conversations with Roko Aguzinović. As Bakić had been hospitalized from early-April, when he was wounded, until mid-May, and then imprisoned, it is not clear where exactly did Aguzinović visit him. In one of their conversations noted down for the file, Bakić complained to him that he had been asked about the people he had never met and that he had not had any real connections with Dubrovnik. He confided to Aguzinović that it was someone named Ljiljić who maintained the contact with the Crusaders in Žaba and that he did so through Gabela. At the same occasion, Bakić told him that Radović was telling him about "some" friar Barač. He also informed him that he had replied to Filičić's letter, explaining him that "we will get in touch with the 'cavers' in Žaba in a few days and that they will help us get in touch with Mostar through them". He asked Aguzinović to tell Vukić "not to confess anything because she [Radović] hadn't either" and to warn some other individuals not to say anything because "I am not confessing anything".<sup>94</sup> It also remains unknown what was Roko Aguzinović's role in all this. His name is mentioned in the files with OZNA's dispatches: a note made on 4 January 1945 instructs that Aguzinović should immediately be released from hard labor imprisonment on Korčula and, if mobilized, should be sent to the fifth sector.<sup>95</sup> It was Aguzinović who in the following weeks collaborated with OZNA in its attempts to persuade Bakić to surrender.<sup>96</sup> The question therefore arises was Aguzinović released from hard labor imprisonment so that the Communist repressive organs could use him to apprehend Bakić and put an end to Crusaders' activities in Konavle.

Four days after the interrogation of Pave Radović, on 3 June 1945, Jakov Andrijuci gave his testimony to the same interrogator. It contains some details of the circumstances that made him meet Barač. Andrijuci says that, in mid-January 1945, he met Pero Mihaljević and they talked

<sup>93</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Zapisnik o saslušanju Pere Bakića, nedatirano.

<sup>94</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje Pere Bakića, Razgovor Bakića s Rokom Aguzinovićem, nedatirano.

<sup>95</sup> HR-DAS-428, Zbirka Obavještajna služba, OZN-a za Dalmaciju, kut. 60, Depeshe OZN-e, 1944.-1945.; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 128-149; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 733-765.

<sup>96</sup> Radica 2003: 408.

<sup>93</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Pero Bakić interrogation minutes, undated.

<sup>94</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Pero Bakić File, Bakić's conversation with Roko Aguzinović, undated.

<sup>95</sup> HR-DAS-428, Intelligence Service collection, OZNA - Dalmatian branch, box 60, OZNA dispatches 1944-1945; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 128-149; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 733-765.

<sup>96</sup> Radica 2003: 408.

se upustio u razgovor o križarima. Dva dana kasnije Mihaljević ga je pozvao na sastanak na kojem je zatekao i Niku Jelića, Miru Skansi i Ivku Kristović. Razgovarali su o broju križara u Primorju navevši da ih je ondje oko 1200, a Jelić je zaključio da treba napadati partizanske kamione i izvršiti napad na Slano gdje se nalazila Komanda mjesta.

Mihaljević je kazao da je potrebno napisati letke u kojima će pozvati narod da ne prisustvuje proslavi sv. Vlaha. Mira Skansi rekla je da posjeduje pisaću mašinu i predložila da se naredni sastanak održi u njezinoj kući, što je prihvaćeno. Taj je sastanak održan nekoliko dana kasnije, a prisustvovali su mu Andrijuci, Kristović, Lucija Romić, Mihaljević, Skansi i Sofija Plančić. Mihaljević je opet predložio pisanje letaka, a Andrijuci je spomenuo da bi trebalo napisati i pismo za Dabrovića nakon čega su međusobno podijelili zadatke. Razgovarali su i o Bakiću, njegovim navodnim vezama s Englezima koji su ga navodno uzdržavali te navodnom Bakićevom boravku u Italiji. Zaključeno je da je potrebno provjeriti te navode i uspostaviti vezu s njim. Do narednog sastanka trebalo je doći po potrebi, odnosno kada letci i pismo budu sastavljeni.

Dan kasnije Andrijuci je svratio u Mihaljevićevo gostionicu gdje je saznao da je fra Barač napisao pismo biskupu u vezi s proslavom blagdana sv. Vlaha. U međuvremenu se u Mihaljevićevoj kući prikupljao materijal i novac za križare, a Andrijuci mu je dao i kutiju injekcija. Istog dana Andrijuci je na Stradunu susreo Barača i rekao mu da mu je Mihaljević rekao za pismo koje je Barač uputio biskupu. Prepričao mu je dogovor spomenute grupe o potrebi pripreme letaka s pozivom građanima da ne prisustvuju proslavi sv. Vlaha „koju pripremaju partizani“ i pisma za Dabrovića. Barač mu je odgovorio da će prvo pročitati oglas Gradskog NOO-a koji je potpisao Dabrović te je pozvao Andrijucija da ga posjeti za dva dana.<sup>97</sup>

Dva dana kasnije Andrijuci je s Filičićem doista posjetio Barača, a sastanku je navodno prisustvovao i fra Paršić.<sup>98</sup> Barač je izvadio i pročitao pismo

about Crusaders. Two days later, Mihaljević invited him for a meeting. There Andrijuci met Niko Jelić, Mira Skansi and Ivka Kristović. They discussed the number of the Crusaders in the Dubrovnik coastal area and the figure of 1,200 was mentioned. Jelić proposed that Partisan trucks and Partisan headquarters in Slano should be attacked.

Mihaljević suggested they should write leaflets inviting the people not to attend to the Festivity of St. Blaise. Mira Skansi said she owned a typewriter and proposed that the next meeting be held at her home, which was accepted. The meeting took place a few days later, with Andrijuci, Kristović, Lucija Romić, Mihaljević, Skansi and Sofija Plančić attending. Mihaljević suggested once again that leaflets should be written and Andrijuci said that a letter should be written to Dabrović. The group then assigned duties to each of them. They also talked about Bakić, his alleged contacts with the British who allegedly supported him, and his alleged stay in Italy. It was concluded that these allegations should be verified and that contact should be established with Bakić. The following meeting was to be held as necessary, when the leaflets and letter have been written.

Upon stopping at Mihaljević's tavern the following day, Andrijuci learned that Fr. Barač wrote a letter to the bishop concerning the Festivity of St. Blaise. Meanwhile, in Mihaljević's house, funds and materiel were collected for the Crusaders. Andrijuci donated a box of syringes. The same day, Andrijuci met Barač in Dubrovnik's Old Town. He told him that Mihaljević had informed him about Barač's letter to the bishop. He informed him about the group's decision to make leaflets inviting the citizens not to attend the Festivity of St. Blaise "organized by the Partisans" and to write a letter to Dabrović. Barač replied that he would first read the announcement of the local NOO signed by Dabrović and that he (Andrijuci) should come to see him in two days.<sup>97</sup>

Indeed, two days later, accompanied by Filičić, Andrijuci came to see Barač. Allegedly, Fr. Paršić was also present.<sup>98</sup> Barač produced the letter addressed to Dabrović

<sup>97</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava Jakova Andrijucija, 3. lipnja 1945.

<sup>98</sup> Fra Bertrand (Rando) Paršić uhićen je početkom lipnja 1945. te odveden u zatvor „Karmen“ gdje je čekao suđenje. Pred sud je izveden 18. lipnja 1945. i osuđen na četiri godine robije. Odveden je u Split, zatim u kaznionicu u Trogiru, a potom u Staru Gradišku iz koje je izišao 10. veljače 1948. godine. Godine 1956. ponovo je osuđen na deset mjeseci zatvora, a kaznu je služio na Golom otoku. Umro je na Korčuli 11. listopada 2004. godine. Bezina 2000: 177–180.

<sup>97</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Jakov Andrijuci, 3. 6. 1945.

<sup>98</sup> Fr. Bertrand (Rando) Paršić was arrested in early June 1945 and was taken to Karmen prison where he would await his trial. He appeared before the court on 18 June 1945 and was sentenced to four years at hard labor. He was transferred to Split, then to the Trogir penitentiary and finally to Stara Gradiška, from where he was released on 10 February 1948. In 1956 he was sentenced to ten more months in prison, which he served on Goli otok. He died on Korčula on 11 October 2004. Bezina 2000: 177–180.

adresirano na biskupa i Dabrovića. Filičić je korigirao pismo za Dabrovića nakon čega su se složili da dodatne izmjene nisu potrebne. Paršić je istaknuo da kao predsjednik gradskog NOO-a Dabrović najviše može utjecati na neuspjeh proslave, no da je također važno uputiti pismo i biskupu jer je „većina popova i fratara protiv proslave, te da će u tom slučaju posle primljenog pisma i biskup izmijeniti svoje mišljenje“.

Andrijuci je kasnije doznao da je Barač pismo za Dabrovića predao Sofiji Plančić zbog čega je zatražio da ga predaju njemu s namjerom da ga „ubaci“ Dabroviću, što je i učinjeno. Naknadno se Andrijuci susreo s don Ivom Bjelokosićem<sup>99</sup> koji je preko Pere Mihaljevića bio upućen u „naše predmete“. Zajedno su otišli kod Barača koji im je tada pročitao pismo koje je trebalo biti dostavljeno Dabroviću, nacrt pisma za biskupa te sadržaj letaka koji su već bili pripremljeni na pisačkoj mašini. Bjelokosić je bio „potpuno zadovoljan“ i zanimao se kakav je stav zauzeo biskup po primitku spomenutog pisma. Barač mu je odgovorio da se čini da biskup neće odustati od proslave, ali je predložio da se letci svejedno rasture s namjerom da se svečanost ipak osujeti. S time su se svi složili nakon čega je Barač Andrijuciju dao između 20 i 30 letaka te pismo za Dabrovića. U večernjim satima Andrijuci i Bjelokosić su se ponovo sastali u Mihaljevićevoj gostionici, a zatim u kući Mire Skansi gdje su im se pridružili Mihaljević, Mirin suprug Mato Skansi i Sofija Plančić. Razgovarali su o načinu raspačavanja letaka i dostavi pisma za Dabrovića. Bjelokosić je preuzeo tridesetak letaka koje je raspačao u gradu. Pismo za Dabrovića predano je Peri Romiću koji ga je dostavio i raspačao još letaka. U Baračevu je dosjeu ostao sačuvan i prijepis spomenutog letka sljedećeg sadržaja:

„Dubrovčani! Pokažite svoj ponos! Nemamo razloga da se veselimo, jer su nas partizani komunisti poubijali i poklali. Pošteni Dubrovčani ne smije učestvovati u njihovim priredbama. Dubrovnik je bio, jest i bit će sveti hrvatski

and the bishop and read it. Filičić intervened with some corrections in the letter for Dabrović, after which they all agreed no more changes in it were required. Paršić pointed out that Dabrović, being the president of the local NOO, can contribute the most the festivity's failure and that it is also important to send a letter to the bishop, because “most of the priests and friars oppose the festivity and the bishop will change his mind upon receiving the letter”.

Andrijuci later found out that the letter intended for Dabrović was handed over by Barač to Sofija Plančić. He then requested that the letter be given to him so that he could “slip it” in Dabrović's mail. They did so. Later on, Andrijuci met Father Ivo Bjelokosić,<sup>99</sup> who had been informed about “our cause” by Pero Mihaljević. Together they went to see Barač. He read them the letter for Dabrović, draft of the letter for the bishop, and text on the leaflets written on the typewriter. Bjelokosić was “quite pleased” and wanted to know what was the bishop's opinion upon receiving the letter. Barač's impression was that the bishop would persist that the festivity takes place, but he – Barač – proposed that the leaflets be distributed nevertheless in order to forestall it. When all those present agreed with it, Barač gave Andrijuci 20–30 leaflets and the letter for Dabrović. In the evening that day Andrijuci and Barač met again in Mihaljević's tavern, from where they went to Mira Skansi's place. They were joined there by Mihaljević, Mira's husband Mato Skansi and Sofija Plančić. They agreed on how to distribute the leaflets and how to deliver the letter to Dabrović. Bjelokosić took 30 or so leaflets and distributed them throughout the city. The letter for Dabrović was handed over to Pero Romić. He delivered the letter and also distributed some leaflets. The transcript of the leaflet can be found in the Barač file:

“Citizens of Dubrovnik! Show your pride! We have no reason for celebration when the Partisans are murdering and slaughtering us. No honest citizen of Dubrovnik should take part in their shows. Dubrovnik has been, is and will be a

<sup>99</sup> Don Ivo Bjelokosić uhićen je 17. ožujka 1945. i odveden u istražni zatvor u Dubrovniku. Zajedno s Jakovom Andrijucijem 18. lipnja 1945. osuđen je na kaznu smrti strijeljanjem. Odveden je u kaznionicu u Trogiru u kojoj je boravio i fra Dominik Barač. Krajem listopada iste godine don Ivo je pomilovan, a kazna mu je preinačena u 20 godina zatvora. Prebačen je u logor Firule u Splitu, a zatim u KPD Stara Gradiška gdje je stigao 2. prosinca 1945. godine. Nakon izdržane kazne od 12 godina, don Ivo se 17. ožujka 1957. vraća u Dubrovnik gdje nastavlja svećeničku dužnost. Umro je na Veliku subotu 14. travnja 2001. godine. Bezina 2000: 91–93.

<sup>99</sup> Don Ivo Bjelokosić was arrested on 17 March 1945 and detained in Dubrovnik. On 18 June he was sentenced to death together with Jakov Andrijuci. They moved him to the penitentiary in Trogir, where Fr. Dominik Barač had also been incarcerated. In late October that year Father Ivo's death sentence was commuted to 20 years of imprisonment. He was transferred to Firule prison camp in Split and then, on 2 December 1945, to Stara Gradiška penitentiary. After having served 12 years, Father Ivo returned to Dubrovnik on 17 March 1957. There he reassumed his priesthood. He passed away on Holy Saturday, on 14 April 2001. Bezina 2000: 91–93.

grad! Nećemo partizanskog Dubrovnika ni njihovog sv. Vlaha.  
SLAVA LISTOPADSKIM DUBROVAČKIM ŽRTVAMA!<sup>100</sup>

Prema Andrijucijevim navodima, čini se da je u tim događajima znatno veću ulogu imao don Ivo Bjelokosić nego fra Dominik Barač. Naime, Andrijuci navodi da se s Bjelokosićem upoznao upravo preko Mihaljevića koji mu je tvrdio da Bjelokosić zna mnogo o križarima u Primorju, a tijekom prvog susreta Bjelokosić mu je potvrdio da će im biti „pri ruci“ za sve što bude potrebno. Tijekom drugog posjeta Filičića i Andrijucija Baraču, Barač im je potvrdio da je dogovorio s „jednom ženskom koja će sutra ujutro poći direktno za Konavle“ da ponese pismo za Bakića, no Andrijuciju nije otkrio njezino ime. Upravo je tom prilikom sastavljeno pismo koje je Filičić potpisao sa „F“.<sup>101</sup>

O navedenim događajima OZNA-a je izvijestila već 10. veljače. U tom je dopisu ustvrdila da „za vrijeme proslave sv. Vlaha nije uopće bilo kroz sve priredbe, plakate, oglase, recitacije itd. spominjanja NOB-e, ni promjena u koju je Dubrovnik došao oslobođenjem“. Štoviše, „sve je teklo kao da se nije ništa dogodilo“, a „Dubrovčani to opravdavaju, da proslava mora biti u tradicionalnom duhu, bez trunke novoga“. Istaknuto je i to da su proslavu „sabotirali“ fratri, mala braća i dominikanci, kao i časne sestre, koje je u tom zahtjevu odbio podržati biskup. „Proslava je od organa naše vlasti organizovana i poslije iste izbila su reakcionarna tumačenja, naime, da su partizani ipak morali popustiti“ ili da gladan narod proslavama žele obmanuti. Narod je negodovao jer su u procesiji sudjelovali vojnici s petokrakom. Sporni su letci bačeni tri puta. Tako su uoči proslave bacani stari letci „Tko je tko“, i to na Stradunu. Drugi je dan bačeno oko 100 letaka u kojima se „napada partizanska proslava sv. Vlaha i prijeti se osvetom za ‘listopadske žrtve‘“. Letci u kojima su navodno veličani Ante Pavelić i Vlatko Maček bačeni su dva dana nakon proslave. Ujedno su brisane partizanske parole, a ispisivane su „ustaške“. Na partizanskoj umjetničkoj izložbi pokidane su 3-4 slike, a na jednoj je izderana petokraka i nacrtano slovo

sacred Croatian city! We renounce a Partisan-led Dubrovnik and a Partizan-organized St. Blaise.  
GLORY TO THE OCTOBER VICTIMS OF DUBROVNIK!<sup>100</sup>

Based on Andrijuci's account, it seems that Father Ivo Bjelokosić had a substantially more relevant role in these events than Fr. Dominik Barač. According to Andrijuci, it was Mihaljević who introduced him to Bjelokosić, claiming that the latter was well-informed about the Crusaders in the Dubrovnik coastal area. During their first meeting, Bjelokosić confirmed to him that he would be “at hand” to them for whatever they might need. During Filičić and Andrijuci's second visit to Barač, Barač confirmed that he had arranged that “a woman leaves for Konavle tomorrow morning” with a letter for Bakić. He did not, however, disclose the woman's name to them. It was then that the letter signed by Filičić with “F” was written.<sup>101</sup>

OZNA reported about these events as soon as on 10 February. According to the report, “during the Festivity of St. Blaise, neither the National Liberation Struggle nor the change that Dubrovnik saw after liberation was mentioned in any event, poster, announcement, recitation etc.”. Indeed, “everything proceeded as if nothing had happened” and “the citizens of Dubrovnik explain that the festivity must take place in the traditional way, without any novelties”. The report also says that the festivity was “sabotaged” by friars, Minorites and Dominicans, as well as nuns, although the bishop refused to support them. “After the festivity, organized by our authorities, there were reactionary interpretations of it, suggesting that the Partisans had been forced to back down” or that their plan had been to deceive the starved population with their celebrations. The people expressed their displeasure with the fact that soldiers with Partisan insignia participated in the procession. The controversial leaflets were distributed three times. On the eve of the festivity, the first version of the leaflets, entitled “Who Is Who”, was distributed in the Old Town. On the second day, some 100 leaflets were circulated, “condemning the Partisan-organized Festivity of St. Blaise and threatening to avenge the ‘October victims’”. Leaflets allegedly glorifying Ante Pavelić and Vlatko Maček were distributed two days after the festivity. Also, Partisan graffiti were

<sup>100</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Prijepis letka, veljača 1945.

<sup>101</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava Jakova Andrijucija, 3. lipnja 1945.

<sup>100</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, transcript of the leaflet, February 1945.

<sup>101</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Jakov Andrijuci, 3. 6. 1945.

„U“. U sporednim ulicama, gdje su visjele zastave s petokrakom, navodno je pokidano 30-ak zastava. „Sa popovima nitko nije do sada razgovarao, iako svi tvrde da sve neprijateljstvo u Dubrovniku dolazi od njih“, zaključuje se u ovom izvješću.<sup>102</sup> S obzirom na to da je do uhićenja fra Barača došlo pet tjedana nakon pisanja citiranog izvješća, čini se da su upravo detalji zabilježeni u vezi proslave sv. Vlaha inicirali OZNA-inu istragu iako ostaje nejasno na koji je način otkriven fra Barač.

U svakom slučaju istraga nije okončana Baračevim uhićenjem. U izvješću OZNA-e od 21. travnja 1945. istaknuto je da je organizacija koja je rukovodila tim akcijama bila „ustaškog“ karaktera i navodno su ju vodili fratri, dominikanci i svećenici. Otkriveno je i uhićeno oko 40 osoba koje su bacale letke, no „nije se uspjelo razbiti organizaciju, jer i nakon njihova hapšenja iskrslu su novi leci i nove parole, također ustaškog karaktera“.<sup>103</sup> O tim se letcima doznaje više iz izvješća OZNA-e južnodalmatinskog okruga od 13. travnja 1945. u kojem je navedeno da je 10. travnja 1945. u Dubrovniku otkriveno oko 50 „cedulja“ na kojima je pisalo „Živjela NDH, ŽAP, Živio veliki njemački Rajh, Slava Bakiću i Anti Starčeviću.“ Parole su bile ispisane na papiru istrgnutom iz školskih zadaćnica zbog čega je OZNA zaključila da su ih ispisali učenici srednjih škola. „Pretpostavljamo da su pisane od grupe Andrijuci i popa Barača, od onih koji se još nalaze na slobodi, sa namjerom da bi se istraga okrenula u drugom pravcu“, zaključeno je u tom izvješću.<sup>104</sup>

U tim je trenucima Bakić već bio zarobljen, a Barač ispitivan. Uspoređujući citirane izjave može se zaključiti da je Baračeva uloga u tim događajima doista bila izuzetno ograničena te se svela na pripremu pisama Dabroviću i biskupu te predaju Filičićeva pisma Pavi Radović. Nikakvi tragovi ne upućuju na to da je Barač imao ikakve veze s pripremom letaka kao ni s Bakićevim odgovorom Filičiću. Sudeći prema izjavi Sofije Plančić, Baračevi motivi vjerojatno su doista bili apolitični. Tako u svojoj izjavi ona navodi da je Barač doduše govorio

erased and “Ustasha” ones were written. At a Partisan art exhibition, 3 or 4 paintings were torn off, a Partisan red star was torn away from one of them and the letter “U” was written in its place. Some 30 flags with red stars were allegedly torn off in the back alleys. “No one has talked to the priests so far, although everyone says all the hostility in Dubrovnik comes from them,” concludes the report.<sup>102</sup> As Fr. Barač was arrested five weeks after the report had been written, it seems it was these details of the Festivity of St. Blaise that instigated OZNA’s investigation. Still, it remains unclear how Fr. Barač was betrayed.

In any case, the investigation was not terminated when Barač was arrested. OZNA’s report of 21 April 1945 points out that these actions were organized by those of “Ustasha affiliation”, led by friars, Dominicans and priests. Some forty circulators were identified and arrested but “we have failed to crush the organization because new leaflets and graffiti, also of Ustasha inclination, emerged after the arrests”.<sup>103</sup> More on these leaflets can be found in the 13 April report of OZNA’s branch for South Dalmatia. It says that some 50 “slips” were discovered in Dubrovnik on 10 April 1945, glorifying Independent State of Croatia (NDH), Ante Pavelić (“ŽAP”), Great German Reich, Bakić and Ante Starčević. As they were torn out from school notebooks, OZNA concluded they were written by high-school students. “We believe they were written by the members of the Andrijuci–Barač group – those who are still at large – in order to misdirect the investigation,” concludes the report.<sup>104</sup>

By that time, Bakić had already been captured and Barač had been interrogated. If the above testimonies are compared, it can be inferred that Barač indeed had only a minor role in these events – he merely prepared the letters to Dabrović and the bishop and delivered Filičić’s letter to Pave Radović. There are no indications that Barač had anything to do with the leaflets or with Bakić’s reply to Filičić. According to Sofija Plančić, Barač’s motives were very likely apolitical. She admits that Barač spoke out against Communism, but in the context of “the need to defend religion, because the new order renounces religion” and the need to encourage the

<sup>102</sup> HR-DAS-438, Pokrajinski/oblasni komitet KPH za Dalmaciju, kut. 26, KP-26/245; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 226–229; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 336–338.

<sup>103</sup> Glavina 1998: 60.

<sup>104</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, kut. 169, Izvješće OZN-e južnodalmatinskog okruga o pronađenim ceduljama, 13.4.1945.; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 229.

<sup>102</sup> HR-DAS-438, KPH Provincial/District Committee for Dalmatia, box 26, KP-26/245; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 226–229; *Partizanska i komunistička represija...* 2011: 336–338.

<sup>103</sup> Glavina 1998: 60.

<sup>104</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, box 169, South Dalmatian OZNA’s report on the slips found in Dubrovnik, 13 April 1945; *Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji...* 2011: 229.



protiv komunizma, ali uz napomenu da „treba braniti vjeru, jer da današnji poredak odbacuje vjeru“, da narod treba poticati da ne odbacuje vjeru i da u školama treba istupati protiv zabrane vjeronauka.<sup>105</sup> U svojoj drugoj izjavi Plančić izričito ističe da s Baračem nikad nije razgovarala o politici te zaključuje da „ne zna što je potaklo padra Barača da piše ta pisma“ i da se zamisao vjerojatno nije „rodila“ u njegovoj glavi.<sup>106</sup>

Sudeći prema njegovim izjavama, Barač je veoma brzo žalio sudjelovanje u spomenutim događajima. Tako navodi da je nekoliko tjedana kasnije spomenuo p. Vinku Kumičiću da je u Konavle trebao poslati pismo, ali ga je pokidao. Kumičić je navodno shvatio da je u pitanju bilo pismo Bakiću zbog čega je Barača upozorio da ne pravi gluposti. Isto je Barač spomenuo i Peri Mihaljeviću, no o sadržaju pisma nitko ništa nije znao i Barač je sugovornike ostavio u uvjerenju da je pismo doista uništio. Nastojeći zaštititi svoju subraću, izričito je istaknuo da nitko u samostanu nije sudjelovao u sastavljanju tog pisma. Osim toga, nakon proslave blagdana sv. Vlaha, Barač je sreo Filičića i u razgovoru su se navodno obojica pokajali za učinjeno. Barač mu je kazao da nije primio nikakav odgovor pa stoga „od onoga neće biti ništa“. Zaključili su da su napravili ludost na koju su nasjeli zbog govorkanja ulice pa su odlučili o tome više ne govoriti niti bilo što činiti. Naročito su bili ljutiti na „neozbiljnog“ Andrijucija. Nakon tog susreta, Filičić i Barač više se nisu susreli. Barač je upozorio Sofiju Plančić i Ivku Kristović da nikome ništa ne govore. Ako je Filičić doista primio Bakićev odgovor, čini se da Barač o tome nije znao ništa.<sup>107</sup>

U drugom dijelu ove izjave Barač još jednom ističe da nije bila riječ o nekakvoj organizaciji sa „smislenim“ planom te je riječ bila tek o skupini mladića i djevojaka „zavedenih iz ulice“ koji su potpali pod psihozu fešte sv. Vlaha. Štoviše, navodno su te događaje shvatili tek kao šalu, a pismo upućeno Bakiću bilo je motivirano zadovoljenjem mladenačke znatiželje. Barač odbija navodne Bakićeve navode s njegova saslušanja da je „pisao popu Baraču“ te ne

people to hold on to religion and to protest against banishing religious instruction from schools.<sup>105</sup> In her second testimony she insists that she has never discussed politics with Barač. She concludes that she “does not know what was it that made Father Barač write these letters” and that the idea [to write them] was probably not his own.<sup>106</sup>

Judging by his testimonies, Barač soon regretted taking part in these events. He says that, weeks later, he told Father Vinko Kumičić that he was supposed to send a letter to Konavle but he tore it to pieces instead. Allegedly, Kumičić realized the letter was for Bakić and warned Barač “not too do anything stupid”. Barač told the same thing to Pero Mihaljević but neither of them knew anything about the letter’s content. Barač had convinced them he had destroyed the letter. In order to protect his fellow friars, Barač insisted that no one in the monastery had taken part in the writing of the letter. Also, after the Festivity of St. Blaise, he met Filičić. Allegedly, they both expressed their regret for taking part in what had been done. Barač told him he had received no reply and concluded that “nothing will come out of that thing”. They concluded they had been foolish for acting upon rumors and decided not to mention it or act upon it ever again. They were particularly angry with “foolish” Andrijuci. After this meeting, Filičić and Barač never saw each other again. Barač warned Sofija Plančić and Ivka Kristović not to say anything to anyone. If Filičić did receive Bakić’s reply, it seems Barač knew nothing about it.<sup>107</sup>

In the second part of this testimony, Barač points out once again that it was not an organization with a “meaningful” plan but merely a group of “misguided” local young men and women who had succumbed to the St. Blaise Festivity psychosis. What is more, they allegedly took these events as a joke and the letter to Bakić was motivated by their adolescent curiosity. Barač denies Bakić’s claim (allegedly given during his interrogation) that he “wrote to priest Barač” and does not understand how could Barač even know his name. “If Bakić mentions a friar, could he really mean me?” wonders Barač, convinced that in no case could he know his

<sup>105</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava Sofije Plančić, nedatirano.

<sup>106</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava Sofije Plančić, nedatirano

<sup>107</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava fra Dominika Barača, nedatirano.

<sup>105</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Sofija Plančić, undated.

<sup>106</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Sofija Plančić, undated

<sup>107</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Fr. Dominik Barač, undated.

razumije odakle je Bakić uopće mogao znati njegovo ime. „Ako Bakić govori o fratru, zar sam ja taj?“ zapitao se Barač uvjeren da Bakić ni u kojem slučaju nije mogao znati njegovo ime.<sup>108</sup> Kako je prethodno objašnjeno na temelju Bakićevih izjava, Bakić je za Baračevu ulogu doznao od Pave Radović kojoj je naknadno predao odgovor za Filičića s napomenom da ga preda Baraču. Iako je Barač čak tražio suočavanje s Bakićem, nepoznato je je li do njega došlo jer o tome nema dokumenata. Osim toga, iz Baračeve izjave jasno je da se u njoj osvrće na navodne Bakićeve navode kojih u sačuvanim Bakićevim izjavama uopće nema pa se postavlja pitanje je li tijekom ispitivanja Barač prevaren i suočen s izmišljenim navodima koje je OZNA pripisala Bakiću. Nadalje, Barač također ističe da osim s Pavom Radović nije imao drugih kontakata s Konavljanima te navodi da Radović nikad više nije bila kod njega. U slučaju da Radović tvrdi da je Bakić Baraču poslao odgovor, Barač je tražio suočavanje s Radović bojeći se da „to nije neka osveta s njezine strane zato što sam rekao da je ona odnijela pismo.“<sup>109</sup> No u izjavi Pave Radović nema spomena o tome da je Baraču odnijela Bakićev odgovor pa ostaje mogućnost da je Barač i u ovom slučaju bio suočen s izmišljenim navodima. Ako su točni Bakićevi navodi o odgovoru upućenom Filičiću, ostaje nejasno što se s tim pismom dogodilo.

Barač je svakako bio pod dojmom da se krivci skrivaju smatrajući da svu odgovornost žele prebaciti na njega iako se usporedbom sačuvanih izjava to tako ne čini – što potkrjepljuje sumnju da se Barač suočio s izmišljenim riječima pripisanim drugim osumnjičenicima koje oni ustvari nikada nisu izgovorili, i to s ciljem da ga se primora na priznanje djela za koja uopće nije bio kriv i o kojima nije ni znao. U pokušaju da spasi vlastiti život Barač je u svojoj izjavi još jednom istaknuo svoju iznimnu apolitičnost i pomaganje svima potrebitima te navodi da su od svih redova dominikanci zacijelo najviše doprinijeli narodnoslobodilačkoj borbi. „Zar ćete onda prezreti sva moja pozitivna djela nacionalne svijesti?“ pita se Barač ustvrdivši da se u Njemačkoj pred sam početak Drugog svjetskog rata borio protiv germaniziranja „naše kolonije i ako su to bili Sloveni“, pa je štoviše

name.<sup>108</sup> As was previously mentioned, Bakić's statements suggest that he learned about Barač's role from Pave Radović, to whom he later gave his reply to Filičić, instructing her to hand it over to Barač. Barač even demanded to confront Bakić but it is not known if it ever happened because there are no documents substantiating this. Also, Barač's testimony contains references to alleged Bakić's claims that cannot be found in Bakić's file, indicating that OZNA could have double-crossed Barač during his interrogation by feeding him false Bakić's statements. Barač also insists that he had no contacts with anyone from the Konavle group save for Pave Radović, adding that he never met Radović again. Reacting to her claim that Bakić sent a reply to him, Barač requested a confrontation with Radović, fearing that “this could be her revenge of a sort because I said it was her who delivered the letter”.<sup>109</sup> However, as in her testimony Pave Radović does not mention delivering Bakić's reply to Barač, it is possible that Barač was once again fed fabricated statements. If Barač's claims about the reply to Filičić are true, it remains unknown what happened to the letter.

Barač was certainly under the impression that the culprits were trying to hide by shifting responsibility to him, although it does not seem to be the case when all the preserved testimonies are compared. This substantiates the suspicion that Barač faced fabricated statements allegedly made by other indictees in order to be forced to confess the illegal acts he had never committed or even heard of. In an attempt to save his own life, Barač underlined once again his total disinterest in politics and his tendency to help all those in need, adding that the Dominicans had probably made a greater contribution to the National Liberation Struggle than any other monastic order. “In this context, would you really despise all my good deeds arising from my national consciousness?” asks Barač. He explains that, on the eve of World War II, he resisted the Germanization of “our fellow countrymen and Slavs living abroad” and reminds that he was even proposed for the Order of St. Sava Fourth Class.<sup>110</sup> Of his merits for the National Liberation Movement, Barač says the following:

<sup>108</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava fra Dominika Barača, nedatirano.

<sup>109</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava fra Dominika Barača, nedatirano.

<sup>108</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Fr. Dominik Barač, undated.

<sup>109</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Fr. Dominik Barač, undated.

<sup>110</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Fr. Dominik Barač, undated.

bio predložen i za odlikovanje Ordenom sv. Save IV. reda.<sup>110</sup> O svojim zaslugama za NOP Barač kaže:

„Frana Grbešić koji je bio pod prijekim sudom u Zagrebu radi svoje izvanredne partizanske djelatnosti, spasio sam dobivši time same dokumente iz Dubrovnika, da je uvijek bio ispravan. Dr. M. Ivanović liječnik u Zagrebu to može najbolje potvrditi, koji je vodio cijelu stvar. U to je upućen i profesor Surić. Učiteljicu iz Lisca izbavio sam iz zatvora i nije imala nikakvih zakonskih posljedica. Također radi svoje partizanske djelatnosti. O tome neka ona govori. Pri masovnom hapšenju Srba protestirao sam na sve strane. Srbe poštene i čestite nemajući sa njima nikakvih naročitih veza ipak sam se za njih zalagao i oni su osjetili plodove mog zauzimanja. Nek svjedoči krojač Prvulović i njegova supruga, brijač Veselinović i njegova supruga, činovnik željeznice Sokolović i drugi tko sam ja.“<sup>111</sup>

No, kako će se pokazati, Baraču takva djela nisu pomogla, a njegov slučaj podsjeća na slučaj fra Petra Turkalja, gvardijana Samostana sv. Josipa u Splitu, na čijem je suđenju u siječnju 1946. svjedočio Židov čiju je obitelj fra Petar spasio, no sud je to ipak odbio uzeti u obzir kao olakotnu okolnost.

Nadalje, nakon proslave blagdana sv. Vlaha Barač je u svakoj prigodi osuđivao „konavosku Bakićevu šumu, kao najveću glupost i uništenje naroda“. Radio je to i zato što Bakić nije odgovorio na pitanja postavljena u poslanom pismu, pa je Barač zaključio da je „sve to njegov bluf i propaganda, ali s padom Mostara zaključio sam da se sve to približuje kraju“. Tu izjavu Barač zaključuje riječima kajanja istaknuvši da je sebi nanio sramotu te želi suradnju za dobro i izgradnju boljeg i pravednijeg društvenog poretka s ciljem da se njegove „konstruktivne snage“ iskoriste za dobro naroda. Založio se i za Vinca Filičića te spomenute djevojke Lucku, Sofiju i Ivku. Na kraju je zamolio da ga se, ako je sumnjiv, internira u samostan ili u njegovu kuću ili mu se dopusti da se vrati u župu u Lisac gdje je službovao.<sup>112</sup>

“When Fran Grbešić was to appear before the court martial in Zagreb for his outstanding pro-Partisan activities, I saved him by obtaining documents from Dubrovnik confirming that he had always been loyal. Dr. M. Ivanović, a physician from Zagreb, can corroborate this because he was deeply involved in the case. Professor Surić was also familiar with the whole thing. I arranged the release from prison of a teacher from Lisac – where she ended up because of her pro-Partisan activities – and she had no legal problems later. She can testify on this. When a mass arrest of Serbs took place, I protested wherever I could. I intervened for these honest Serbs although I didn’t know them personally. And these interventions of mine were fruitful. You can ask Prvulović the tailor and his wife, Veselinović the barber and his wife, railroad clerk Sokolović and others. They will tell you about me.”<sup>111</sup>

However, it will turn out that these interventions did not help Barač. Similar was the case of Fr. Petar Turkalj, the guardian of St. Joseph’s Monastery in Split. During his trial in January 1946, a Jew whose family had been saved by Fr. Turkalj testified on his behalf but the court refused to take it as a mitigating circumstance.

Also, after the Festivity of St. Blaise, Barač used every opportunity to criticize “Bakić’s Konavle woods episode as an utmost stupidity and disastrous for the people”. He also did that because Bakić had failed to reply to the questions in the letter, which made Barač conclude that it was “merely his bluff and propaganda; when Mostar fell, I realized the end was near”. Barač concludes his statement with remorse, pointing out that he brought shame on himself and that he wants to contribute to the building of a better and more just political system by offering his “constructive efforts” to the benefit of the people. He also pleaded for Vinko Filičić and the abovementioned girls Lucka, Sofija and Ivka. Finally, he requested that, if considered a suspect, he be interned in the monastery or at his home or be allowed to return to Lisac parish where he had worked as a priest.<sup>112</sup>

<sup>110</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava fra Dominika Barača, nedatirano.

<sup>111</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava fra Dominika Barača, nedatirano.

<sup>112</sup> HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju, Dosje fra Dominika Barača, Izjava fra Dominika Barača, nedatirano.

<sup>111</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Fr. Dominik Barač, undated.

<sup>112</sup> HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia, Fr. Dominik Barač File, testimony of Fr. Dominik Barač, undated.

## Presuda i smrt

Baračeva optužnica nije sačuvana, a u prijepisu presude okrivljuje ga se zbog „terorističkog protunardnog rada i organizovanja terorističkih oružanih banda“. A „kao uvjereni ustaša neistinitim prikazivanjem prilika u jednoj od savezničkih država koristio njemačkom okupatoru i ustaškoj ‘promičbi’ da bi zaravanjem neupućenog naroda pridobio ga za oružanu borbu protiv narodno-oslobodilačke vojske i naših saveznika, pak je u tu svrhu u 1944. godini dao štampati i rasturivati knjigu ‘Socijalna filozofija boljševizma.’“ Barača se također okrivljuje da je „kao izričiti neprijatelj naših naroda nakon oslobođenja stao na čelo ilegalne protudržavne grupe u Dubrovniku“ te je radi organizovanja i djelovanja te grupe održavao stalno sastanke u samostanu domenikanaca u Dubrovniku...<sup>113</sup> Prema navodima o. Randa Paršića, koji je na suđenju bio okrivljenik, Baračeva doktorska disertacija nije bila dio optužbe, ali je nesumnjivo imala važnu ideološku ulogu. Tako je, primjerice, sudac Kruno Mariani, rodom s Visa, na suđenju Baraču predbacio pojedine navode iz knjige iako je istaknuo da „vas ne sudimo zbog napisane knjige jer je svatko slobodan iznositi, pisati svoje mišljenje, svoj stav u našem demokratskom društvu.“<sup>114</sup>

Poslije suđenja Barač je s još nekim osuđenima prebačen u zatvor „Karmen“ gdje je ostao do kraja rujna kada je otpremljen u kaznionicu u Trogir gdje je strijeljan 17. studenoga 1945. godine.<sup>115</sup> O Baračevim posljednjim trenutcima ostao je sačuvan zapis njegova redovničkog subrata fra Bertranda (Rando) Paršića koji se s njim nalazio na robiji u kaznionici u Trogiru:

„Mi određeni za robiju (NB nije postojao termin zatvor nego samo robija ili strijeljanje), robijali smo na drugom katu, a osuđenici na smrt na drugom katu iznad nas. Tako je Barač bio točno iznad moje sobe, a to se kasnije pokazalo providonosno. Kad bi nastupila gluha noć i tama, tada je Barač na koncu spuštao ispisani papirić i dostavio svoje želje, opažanja, raspoloženja i pitanja. Slijedio bi naš odgovor te smo na taj način ulijevali jedan drugome nadu, snagu i izmjenične molitve... Točno mi se usjeko

## The sentence and death

Barač's bill of indictment has not been preserved. In the transcription of his sentence, he is charged with "terrorist activities against the people and organizing armed terrorist bands". Also, "as a dedicated Ustasha, he served the German occupiers and Ustasha propaganda by misrepresenting the conditions in one of the Allied countries in order to deceive the uninformed people and win them over for armed struggle against the National-Liberation Army and our allies, which is why, in 1944, he printed and distributed his book *Social Philosophy of Bolshevism*". He was also accused of "leading an illegal anti-government group in Dubrovnik and, in order to organize its activities, holding regular meetings in the Dominican monastery in Dubrovnik..."<sup>113</sup> According to father Rando Paršić, also a defendant at Barač's trial, Barač's doctoral thesis was not included in the indictment but there is no doubt that it played an important role from the ideological point of view. For instance, Kruno Marin, a Vis-born judge, reproached Barač during the trial for some quotes from the book, although he explained that "you are not being tried for the book you wrote, because our democratic society allows everyone to express and write down their opinions".<sup>114</sup>

After the trial, Barač and some other sentenced men were transferred to Karmen prison. He stayed there until late September and then they moved him the Trogir penitentiary, where he was shot on 17 November 1945.<sup>115</sup> His fellow friar Bertrand (Rando) Paršić, who served time with him in the Trogir penitentiary, left a note about Barač's last moments:

"Those of us who had been sentenced to hard labor (by the way, the term 'prison' was not used, only 'hard labor' and 'execution by firing squad') were imprisoned on the second floor and those awaiting execution were on the floor above. Barač happened to be right above my room, as if providence had arranged it. In the still of night, Barač would tie a small piece of paper to a thread and lower it down to me, with his desires, observations, moods and questions written on it. We would send him our answer, thus filling each other with hope and strength and exchanging

<sup>113</sup> Gavrić 2013: 623.

<sup>114</sup> Gavrić 2013: 624.

<sup>115</sup> Radelj 1997: 22; Franić 1996: 12; Armanda 2006: 37.

<sup>113</sup> Gavrić 2013: 623.

<sup>114</sup> Gavrić 2013: 624.

<sup>115</sup> Radelj 1997: 22; Franić 1996: 12; Armanda 2006: 37.

u pamćenje da je 15. studenoga u noći spustio pošire pisamce. Iznenadih se podužem pisamcu. Odmah ga pročitah i dadoh fra Milanu. Grozna vijest! Pisalo je nekako ovako: 'Sutra ili najdalje prekosutra bit ću strijeljan'. (...) Dana 16. studenog spustio je zadnje pisamce. 'Sutra rano jutrom vode me na strijeljanje. Molim te kada se sutra ujutro budem spuštao skalinama stani na malo 'okno' svoje sobe. Pogledat ću prema tebi, a ti mi udijeli odrješenje'. Tako je i bilo. Zadnji pogled i preporuka Bogu i Gospi i svetom ocu Dominiku. Isto je učinio i fra Milan.

Na robiji se za hranu brinuo neki ekonom, partizan, g. A. Bio je rodnom sa Šolte. Nije bio loš ni namrgoden gledajući pred sobom ni krive ni dužne osuđene svećenike koji uglavnom dan provode u molitvi i šutnji. Hranu bi nam dobacio u sobu jer cijelo vrijeme robovanja nismo smjeli izići iz sobe nego jedino na klozet u hodniku i to pod stražom i uz dobro zaključan hodnik. Tog dana strijeljanja došapnuo mi je da će Barač sutra biti strijeljan. Usudih se zamoliti ga da mi donese nešto od njega za uspomenu. Moram priznati da se opoštenio. Nakon strijeljanja 17. studenog donio mi je 12 zrna krunice koju su bjesomučno strgli s njegova pasa. Ostalo su razbacali i ukopali sa zemljom iznad njega. Tako je njegova krunica postala njegov najljepši spomenik! Pitao sam g. Anta da li je plakao, molio milost. Ne. Čuo ga je da je izgovorio riječi: 'Bože, oprosti im!' (dalje mi nije znao navesti, ali je sigurno izgovorio čitave Kristove riječi s križa).<sup>116</sup>

U tadašnjoj Dalmatinskoj dominikanskoj provinciji bio je običaj da se u Aktima izbornih provincijalnih kapitula objave nekrolozi preminulih, poginulih ili ubijenih redovnika. Stoga je u Aktima iz 1946. objavljen i Baračev nekrolog u kojem je između ostalog stajalo: „Ali istom pošto je stupio u arenu dana 17. mjeseca studenoga godine 1945. nasilnom smrću je napustio ovozemaljski život.“ Zbog te je rečenice komunistički režim zaplijenio Akte, no dominikanci su ipak uspjeli sačuvati nekoliko primjeraka.<sup>117</sup> Baračevi posmrtni ostatci ekshumirani su 1959. i položeni u novu dominikansku grobnicu na splitskom groblju

prayers... I remember particularly well that, on the night of 15 November, he lowered to me an extensive letter. I was surprised by its length. I read it at once and handed it over to Fr. Milan. Horrible news! It read something like this: 'Tomorrow – or not later than the day after tomorrow – I will be shot'. (...) On 16 November he lowered his last letter. 'They are taking me to execution tomorrow early in the morning. Please stand by the small window of your room while I'll be coming down the stairs. I will look up towards it and you give me absolution'. And so it was. His last gaze and a good word to God, Our Lady and St. Dominic. Friar Milan did the same. A partisan named A., a native of Šolta and the catering officer, was taking care about the detainees' food. He was kind to us, innocent imprisoned priests who were spending our days in prayers and silence. He would leave the food in our room because we were never allowed to leave the room except when going to the bathroom – and even that only under guard and through the locked corridor. He whispered to me that Barač was going to be executed the next day. I dared to ask him to bring some of Barač's belongings to me as a memory. I must admit he kept his promise. After Barač was executed on 17 November he brought to me 12 rosary beads that they had fiercely torn from his belt. The rest was buried with his body. His rosary thus became his most beautiful monument! I inquired Mr. Ante if Barač cried or begged for mercy. No. He heard him utter the words 'God, forgive them!' (he couldn't quote the rest but I am sure he uttered everything Christ said on the Cross).<sup>116</sup>

It was customary in the then Dalmatian Dominican province that obituaries of the monks who passed away or were killed or murdered be announced in the proceedings of provincial electoral conferences. The proceedings of the 1946 conference included Barač's obituary which, among other things, said: "No sooner had he stepped into the arena than he met violent death and left this life on 17 November 1945." The Communist regime confiscated the proceedings because of this sentence but the Dominicans managed to save a few copies.<sup>117</sup> Barač's remains were exhumed in 1959 and

<sup>116</sup> Gavrić 2013: 625–626.

<sup>117</sup> Armanda 2006: 39; Gavrić 2013: 626.

<sup>116</sup> Gavrić 2013: 625–626.

<sup>117</sup> Armanda 2006: 39; Gavrić 2013: 626.

Lovrinac. U ljetopisu dominikanskog Samostana sv. Katarine u Splitu ostalo je zabilježeno sljedeće: „Također spominjem da smo prenesli iz Trogira i kosti vel. o. Dominika Barača, koga su partizani poslije suđenja ubili na Trogirskom groblju metkom u potiljak.“<sup>118</sup> Posmrtni ostatci Pere Mihaljevića preneseni su iz Trogira u Dubrovnik gdje su pokopani na groblju Sv. Križa na Boninovu u obiteljsku grobnicu.<sup>119</sup> Godine 2009. pokrenut je proces za Baračevu beatifikaciju.<sup>120</sup>

## Zaključak

Fra Dominik Barač među rijetkima je iz te grupe suđenih osoba koji je osuđen na kaznu smrti strijeljanjem iako se na temelju dostupnih izjava i drugih dokumenata može zaključiti da je u spomenutim zbivanjima imao neznatniju ulogu od nekih drugih sudionika koji su osuđeni na zatvorske kazne. Iako je u ovom radu izvršena rekonstrukcija događaja na temelju dostupnih arhivskih dokumenata, pojedini detalji ostaju nejasni, primjerice kako je OZNA razotkrila ulogu pojedinih uhićenika te tko je jugoslavenskim represivnim organima otkrio povezanost navedenih osoba s Baračem, a što je dovelo do njegova uhićenja. U svakom slučaju to nije mogao biti Bakić koji je zarobljen dva tjedna nakon Baračeva uhićenja. Uvidom u dokumente i njihovom usporednom analizom također se može ustanoviti da veći broj izjava sa saslušanja nedostaje, odnosno nije predan arhivu ili je uništen. Upečatljivo je i da se u dijelovima svojih izjava Barač osvrće na navodne izjave drugih sudionika događaja iako takvih navoda u njihovim izjavama nema. Stoga se postavlja pitanje jesu li ti navodi izrečeni u izjavama koje nedostaju ili uopće nikad nisu izrečeni, ali su tijekom Baračeva saslušanja podmetnuti u nadi da će on priznati djela za koja uopće nije bio odgovoran. Također, s obzirom na to da se u dijelovima svojih izjava osvrće na svoju doktorsku disertaciju, moguće je da je o njoj bio upitan ili je osjećao da bi mu ona mogla ugroziti život. Posljedično se može zaključiti da su, iako ta disertacija načelno nije bila razlog njegova uhićenja i osude, autori koji upozoravaju da je to djelo utjecalo na slijed postupka i suđenja ipak djelomično u pravu.

<sup>118</sup> Gavrić 2013: 624.

<sup>119</sup> Radica 2003: 463.

<sup>120</sup> Radelj 1997: 22; Franić 1996: 12.

interred in the new Dominican tomb at Lovrinac cemetery in Split. The following note can be found in the annals of the Dominican St. Catherine's Monastery: "I also want to mention that the bones of Father Dominik Barač, shot by the Partisans in the back of his head at the Trogir cemetery after his trial, were moved from Trogir."<sup>118</sup> The remains of Pero Mihaljević were moved from Trogir to Dubrovnik and interred in the family tomb at the Cemetery of St. Cross in Boninovo.<sup>119</sup> The process of Barač's beatification was initiated in 2009.<sup>120</sup>

## Conclusion

Fr. Dominik Barač was among very few defendants from this group sentenced to death despite the fact that, based on testimonies and other documents, his role in the abovementioned events was much more insignificant than that of some other participants who were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. Although this paper attempts to reconstruct the events based on the available archival materials, some details remain unclear – for example, how did OZNA find out about the roles of individual detainees and who tipped off the connection of these persons with Barač, which eventually led to his apprehension. In any case, it could not have been Bakić, who was captured two weeks after Barač had been arrested. By analyzing and comparing the documents, it can be concluded that a number of testimonies made during interrogations is missing – they were either not archived or were destroyed. Quite indicative is also the fact that, in his testimonies, Barač makes references to alleged claims of other participants of the events, although such claims cannot be found in their testimonies. Therefore, one can ask whether such claims had actually been made in the missing testimonies or had never been made at all but were fed to Barač during his interrogation in the hope that he would confess the deeds he had nothing to do with. Also, as Barač makes references to his doctoral thesis in some of his testimonies, it is possible that he was either asked about it or felt it could put his life at risk. Consequently, while his thesis was not the principal reason for his apprehension and sentence, the authors who suggest that it did have an effect on his interrogation and trial have a point to an extent.

<sup>118</sup> Gavrić 2013: 624.

<sup>119</sup> Radica 2003: 463.

<sup>120</sup> Radelj 1997: 22; Franić 1996: 12.

Na temelju dostupnih dokumenata svakako se može zaključiti da Barač nije imao direktnu vezu s Bakićem ni drugim osobama koje su sudjelovale u oružanom otporu novim vlastima niti je u ratnom razdoblju imao ikakvu političku ulogu u tadašnjim zbivanjima. Riječ je o osobi koja je tijekom Drugog svjetskog rata bila posvećena svom studiju te crkvenom i znanstvenom radu, a u prvim mjesecima nakon zauzimanja Dubrovnika po NOV-u dolazila je u kontakt s osobama za koje se može zaključiti da su se aktivnije nastojale uključiti u protukomunistički otpor. Unatoč nedostatku pojedinih dokumenata, čini se da je Baračeva uloga bila sužena na nekoliko sastanaka s takvim osobama te sastavljanje pisma upućenog Bakiću. Nema naznaka da je bilo kakav daljnji kontakt uspostavljen između Barača i Bakića niti da je upućeno pismo rezultiralo konkretnijom suradnjom između križara i spomenute grupe. Stoga ostaje nejasno zbog čega je upravo Barač jedini osuđen na smrtnu kaznu iako se može pretpostaviti da se razlog krije u političkom obračunu s „neprijateljskim popovima“, na koje su se osvrnuli oblasni politički sekretari KP-a Hrvatske za Dalmaciju u prethodno citiranom savjetovanju od 6. veljače 1945. godine. Dakako, ako se pronađu dodatni dokumenti o ovom slučaju, naročito Baračeve izjave kojih nema u njegovu dosjeu, bit će potrebno još jednom analizirati dostupne podatke te tako pokušati do kraja razjasniti okolnosti Baračeve smrti.

Based on the available documents, it can be positively concluded that Barač had no direct contact with Bakić or other participants of the armed resistance against the new authorities or had played any political role in the wartime events. He spent the World War II focusing on his studies and his clerical and scientific work; only in the first months after NOVJ had taken Dubrovnik did he establish occasional contacts with the persons apparently actively involved in the anticommunist resistance. Despite the fact that some documents are missing, it seems that Barač's involvement does not go any further than meeting these persons a few times and writing the letter for Bakić. There are no indications of any other contact between Barač and Bakić or that this letter resulted in any concrete collaboration between the Crusaders and the abovementioned group. This is why it remains unclear why was Barač the only one sentenced to death, although it can be assumed that the reason was the squaring of accounts with the “hostile priests” referred to by the political secretaries of the KPH District Committee for Dalmatia at their earlier mentioned meeting on 6 February 1945. Of course, if other documents related to this case are found – particularly Barač's statements not present in his file – all the available information will have to be analyzed once again in order to clarify the circumstances of Barač's death.

## Bibliografija / Bibliography

### Popis skraćenica / Abbreviations

- HSS – Hrvatska seljačka stranka / *Croatian Peasants Party*
- KNOJ – Korpus narodne obrane Jugoslavije / *Croatian Division of the National Defence Corps of Yugoslavia*
- KPH – Komunistička partija Hrvatske / *Communist party of Croatia*
- KPJ – Komunistička partija Jugoslavije / *Communist Party of Yugoslavia*
- NOO – narodnooslobodilački odbor / *National Liberation District Committee*
- NOP – Narodnooslobodilački pokret / *National Liberation Movement*
- NOV; NOVJ - Narodnooslobodilačka vojska / *National Liberation Army*; Narodnooslobodilačka vojska Jugoslavije / *National Liberation Army of Yugoslavia*
- OZNA – Odjeljenje zaštite naroda / *The Department for People's Protection*
- PO – partizanski odred / *Partisan Detachment*
- UDBA - Uprava za državnu bezbjednost / *State Security Administration*

### Popis korištenih izvora / List of used sources

- Arhivska građa / *Archive material*
- a) Hrvatski državni arhiv (HDA) / *Croatian State Archives (HDA)*
- HR-HDA-1220, CK SKH, Ratno gradivo / *HR-HDA-1220, CPC Central Committee, wartime documents*
- HR-HDA-1222, Oblasni komitet KPH za Dalmaciju / *HR-HDA-1222, KPH District Committee for Dalmatia*
- HR-HDA-1491, OZN-a za Hrvatsku / *HR-HDA-1491, OZNA - Croatian branch*
- b) Državni arhiv u Splitu (DAS) / *State Archives in Split (DAS)*
- HR-DAS-409, SUP za Dalmaciju / *HR-DAS-409, Ministry of Interior, Department for Dalmatia*
- HR-DAS-428, Zbirka Obavještajna služba, OZN-a za Dalmaciju 7 HR-DAS-428, *Intelligence Services collection, OZNA – Dalmatian branch*

HR-DAS-431, Opunomoćstvo OZN-e pri Komandi splitskog područja / *HR-DAS-431, OZNA at the Split Operational Zone HQ*

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

### Novinski izvori / Press sources

*Slobodna Dalmacija*

### Priređeni izvori / Edited sources

- Partizanska i komunistička represija... 2011 – Partizanska i komunistička represija i zločini u Hrvatskoj 1944.-1946.: dokumenti, Dalmacija*, eds. Mate Rupić & Vladimir Geiger, Slavonski Brod – Zagreb, 2011.
- Split i srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e... 2017 – Split i srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e... 2017 – Split i srednja Dalmacija u dokumentima OZN-e i UDB-e (1944.-1962.): likvidacije i logori*, ed. Blanka Matković, Zagreb – Trilj, 2017.
- Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji... 2011 – Zločini i teror u Dalmaciji 1943.-1948., počinjani od pripadnika NOV, JA, OZN-e i UDB-e, Dokumenti I.*, eds. Blanka Matković & Ivan Pažanin, Zagreb, 2011. ([https://www.academia.edu/1773275/ZLO%C4%8CINI\\_I\\_TEROR\\_U\\_DALMACIJI\\_1943.-1948.\\_PO%C4%8CINJENI\\_OD\\_PRIPADNIKA\\_NOV\\_JA\\_OZN-e\\_i\\_UDB-e\\_DOKUMENTI\\_War\\_Crimes\\_and\\_Terror\\_in\\_Dalmatia\\_Between\\_1943\\_and\\_1948...-Documents\\_](https://www.academia.edu/1773275/ZLO%C4%8CINI_I_TEROR_U_DALMACIJI_1943.-1948._PO%C4%8CINJENI_OD_PRIPADNIKA_NOV_JA_OZN-e_i_UDB-e_DOKUMENTI_War_Crimes_and_Terror_in_Dalmatia_Between_1943_and_1948...-Documents_), pristupljeno / accessed 08/08/2022).

### Popis literature / Literature

- Anić 2013 – Nikola Anić, *Dubrovnik u Drugom svjetskom ratu (1941.-1945.), Od okupacije do oslobođenja, Knjiga I.*, Dubrovnik: Udruga antifašista Dubrovnik & Biblioteka „Da se ne zaboravi“, 2013.
- Armanda 2006 – Ivan Armanda, Dr. fr. Dominik Barač, O.P. – mučenik za istinu, *Marulić*, Vol. 39, No. 1, 2006., 28–40.
- Bezina 2000 – Petar Bezina, *Progona biskupa, svećenika i redovnika Splitske metropolije i Zadarske nadbiskupije 1941.-1992.*, Split: vlastita naklada, 2000.



- Bratanić 2011 – Mateo Bratanić, Vjera i vjerska praksa u hrvatskim zbjegovima u El Shattu (1944.-1946.), *Croatia Christiana Periodica*, Vol. 35, No. 68, 2011., 143–152.
- Gavrić 2013 – Anto Gavrić, Život za istinu u angažiranom prosuđivanju društvenih zbivanja: Dominik Barač, OP, in: *Hrvatski mučenici i žrtve iz vremena komunističke vladavine*, eds. Mile Bogović, Josip Dukić, Jure Krišto, Mate Rupić & Miljenko Stojić, Zagreb: Glas koncila, 2013., 611–634.
- Glavina 1998 – Frano Glavina, Dubrovačke ratne slike i prilike 1941.-1944. u svjetlu povijesnih izvora, in: *Crveni teror u Dubrovniku*, ed. Vlaho Benković, Dubrovnik: Matica hrvatska Dubrovnik, 1998., 33–66.
- Franić 1996 – Augustin Franić, *Svećenici mučenici svjedoci komunističkog progona*, Dubrovnik: Društvo hrvatskih katoličkih intelektualaca – Dubrovnik, 1996.
- Kačić 2017 – Hrvoje Kačić, *Dubrovačke žrtve; Jugokomunistički teror na hrvatskom jugu 1944. i poratnim godinama (početak Bleiburga)*, Zagreb: Tkanica d.o.o., 2017.
- Krašić 2018 – Wolffy Krašić, *Hrvatski pokret otpora – Hrvatske državotvorne organizacije i skupine 1945.-1966.*, Zagreb: AGM, 2018.
- Radelj 1996 – Petar Marija Radelj, Dominik Barač, *Hrvatsko slovo*, God. 2, No. 48, 30.
- Radelj 1997 – Petar Marija Radelj, Dominik Barač, in: *Tko je tko u NDH*, ed. Darko Stuparić, Zagreb: Minerva, 1997., 22.
- Radica 2003 – Joško Radica, *Sve naše Dakse, Hrvatski jug u vrtlogu Drugog svjetskog rata i jugokomunističke strahovlade*, Dubrovnik: Matica hrvatska Dubrovnik, 2003.
- Ribić 1994 – Krešimir Ribić, Socijalna filozofija boljševizma: disertacija koja je autora o. Dominika Barača, O.P. stajala života, *Hrvatska obzorja*, 1994., God. 2, No. 3, 603–606.
- Radelić 2011 – Zdenko Radelić, *Križari: gerila u Hrvatskoj 1945.-1950.*, Zagreb: Alfa, Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2011.
- Radelić 2019 – Zdenko Radelić, *Obavještajni centri, Ozna i Udba u Hrvatskoj (1942.-1954.)*, *Kadrovi*, Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2019.

