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Life Writing between Fact and Fiction: Croatian World War II Women Diarists

“Women’s” war has its own colors, its own smells, its own lighting, and its own range of feelings. Its own words.

Svetlana Alexievich, *The Unwomanly Face of War*.

This article initiates the discussion of intellectual women’s experiences of the Second World War in Croatia/Yugoslavia with the introduction of the recently discovered war diaries of Jewish intellectual Ina Juhn Broda (1899–1983) and journalist Vinka Bulić (1884–1965), along with the war diary of the nurse Luža Janović Wagner (1907–1945). These scattered examples of intellectual women’s life-writing and their role in women’s transition from one to another totalitarian regime lack a thorough analysis and theoretical interpretation. This article therefore analyses how World War II represented a major shift in women’s rethinking of war and peace, but also of the Yugoslav future as a socialist project. It also discusses the very nature of the genre and sees the act of writing (about) oneself as a substitution for abruptly discontinued intellectual activity and the public presence of these women intellectuals.

The jury is still out on whether the diaristic form of writing is a genre of the belles-lettres, however the latter may be defined, or whether it even belongs to the realm of historiography. Some may focus on the author’s intentions, while others prefer the intertextual framework of the diary itself. Historians may be more interested in detecting and comparing well-known assessments of the past to layer in their own interpretations. Literary theorists might prefer to explore the adroitness and artistic value of such experiments in writing (about) the self. Even when following one’s disciplinary restrictions, a diary presents a challenge. Times of war, especially global ones such as World War II, can further blur the elusive boundaries between fact and fiction.

When approaching and interpreting the women’s (war) diaries from various angles in my previous research, I have found Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson’s work on various (auto)biographical forms of writing especially useful. In fact,

1 For further theoretical elaboration about life writing, see the works of Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson, namely their *Reading Autobiography. A Guide for Interpreting Life Narratives*.
the authors use the terms life narrative and life writing to include “the heterogeneity of self-referential practices.” Life narrative is “a general term for acts of self-presentation of all kinds and in diverse media.” The form of life writing best suits the occasionally genre-fluid form of diaristic discourse, as they define the term as a general one “for writing that takes a life, one’s own or another’s, as its subject.” As the authors have also counted dozens of genres of life narrative, for efficiency this article uses life writing and diary as sufficiently broad terms for the act and result of self-writing.

In this article, I will introduce three women intellectuals with different backgrounds, interests, and aspirations, who all happened to write diaries of World War Two, which broke out in Yugoslavia in 1941 and raged until 1945. In Croatia’s war-torn coastal province of Dalmatia in 1943, leftist poet Ina Juhn (later Juhn Broda, 1899–1983) of the wealthy Jewish Ehrlich family, Vinka Bulić (1884–1965), a journalist and women’s rights activist with close ties to the Dalmatian intellectual and political elite, and Lujza Janović Wagner (1907–1945), a Zagreb-based nurse, the ‘Croatian Florence Nightingale’ as she was sometimes called, all lived and wrote in close proximity to each other. Dalmatia and its major city Split had been under fascist occupation since 1941, while Partisan resistance formed around the Yugoslav Communists grew slowly but steadily. In the latter half of 1943, following the capitulation of Italy and the brief Partisan seizure of Split, the Nazi occupation signalled yet another totalitarian regime change. The article’s starting point will be set precisely within this context of political and ideological power struggles, local animosities and negotiations in the bloodiest of wars.

The article offers a different perspective on the study of intellectual networks, as the intellectuals in question created complex sets of relationships that resisted the typical classification of an easily distinguishable political or intellectual cohort. Moreover, the diaristic genre places a diarist at the heart of many networks consisting of — as the examples of the chosen intellectuals suggest — countless patients and interlocutors, women and children in need, medical, military and other professionals, representatives of governing bodies, whether legally or illegally organized, and so forth.

For the most part, women in Croatia/Yugoslavia were excluded from political decision-making processes in the interwar period, largely due to the fact that they were still not enfranchised. Focusing on this chronological and spatial framework, the paper includes elaborations of specific preconditions that in many ways shaped the discourses of these women’s life writings. Its main purpose is to show different
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2 SMITH, WATSON 2010: 4.
3 SMITH, WATSON 2010: 253–287.
4 OGRAJŠEK GORENJAK 2020: 722–744. For an overview of the complexities regarding the legal aspects of the position of women in Yugoslavia, see OGRAJŠEK GORENJAK 2014.
forms, not necessarily paradigms, of the engagement of these selected Croatian intellectual women in exercising full political and civil rights under circumstances of meagre political, ideological and civic alternatives. The diaristic form of life-writing not only served the purpose of recording activities and thought processes that might help in grasping the roles and positions of women in war. Rather, the activity itself compensated for this scarcity of opportunities to (re)act.

While Lujza Janović Wagner’s diary was published, even though it has yet to undergo thorough scrutiny and theoretical assessment, the other two are completely unknown. They are both manuscripts, in their original form, as they were when the authors left them to the institutions that now hold them. Aside from the distinctive characteristics that these archival sources have for a historian or literary theorist, the analysis of (war) diaries also requires a presence of a sort by the researcher, expressed as the texts continue a life of their own, without their authors present or even alive for decades (Vinka Bulić died in 1965 and Ina Juhn Broda in 1983). Vinka Bulić’s diary is a manuscript written with a fountain pen, thousands of pages long, and it requires long-term dedication on the researcher’s part due to its length and the special conditions in which it is stored. No analysis of this diary has been published, aside from my own.

Around the time I was reading Bulić’s diary for the first time, more than half a dozen years ago, I discovered Ina Juhn Broda’s diary, possibly only because her sister’s personal possessions were held in the same place as Bulić’s, and this led me to broaden my search for as-yet undiscovered women’s life-writing. The notorious title of Juhn’s diary, ‘The Black Notebook’, spurred my interest as the text was typewritten with notes added by hand, presumably more than fifty years ago, but left unpublished. With Bulić’s diary kept out of the reach of readers for
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5 When quoting Lujza Wagner’s war diary in this article I use the published version (GRKOVIĆ JANOVIC 2008). For quotes from the diaries of Vinka Bulić and Ina Juhn, I use their surnames to signal that the excerpts are from the manuscripts/primary sources (BULIĆ and JUHN).

6 To avoid confusion, it is important to note that Vinka Bulić’s granddaughter Tea Dalmas translated and published her grandmother’s diary in Italy, which is different from this one. Bulić wrote that “parallel private diary” (as I have called it) for her daughter Puse from 1919 to 1953. See DALMAS 2014 and 2015. I differentiated between all of Vinka Bulić’s diaries that I know of here: KARDUM 2021: 178. There may be more “parallel private diaries” that she might have written for her sons as well.

7 My research results were first publicly discussed at the international conference “Testimony – Truth or Politics: The Concept of Testimony in the Commemoration of the Yugoslav Wars” held in Belgrade and Sarajevo in April 2018. I focused solely on Juhn’s diary in a presentation and paper submitted to the organizers of the 13th Annual Graduate Conference in European History, held at the CEU, in Budapest, Hungary in April 2019. KARDUM 2019.

8 Yet, something was published. Based on my research into her personal archives, I concluded that Ina Juhn Broda wanted to publish her war diary during the 1960s. Presumably, due to Juhn’s criticism of Party policies in the establishment of the communist order during World War II in Yugoslavia, the publication of the complete diary was impossible roughly twenty years after
almost the same duration to protect the protagonists and their families, and Juhn’s never read nor published and possibly even (self-)censored, this joint reading had a thorough impact on my understanding of both writers. Whether due to the “same” time and space of writing or the mere fact that I was reading them simultaneously, these diaries became internally connected in my analysis. Over time, the superficial similarities dissipated and more complex phenomena became prevalent in my understanding of women’s wartime diaries, necessitating this rather lengthy digression about the researcher’s role.

In sharp contrast to Ina Juhn, who fled Zagreb, the capital of the Axis collaborationist Independent State of Croatia, to avoid persecution as both a Jew and leftist intellectual, Vinka Bulić was a native of Dalmatia. The eldest of the three examined intellectuals, Bulić was born in 1884 and by 1941, when World War II began, she had extensive experience in journalism and participation in women’s movements in Croatia, as of 1918 a part of Yugoslavia. While having the equivalent of secondary school education, she was a stay-at-home mother, the wife of a Dalmatian politician and a trusted secretary to the internationally renowned historian and archaeologist, Don Frane Bulić, to whom she was related by marriage. Even prior to the end of World War I, she had already become interested in the international women’s movement in its struggle for the civil and political rights of women, their history and education.

When she was not writing, publishing articles in newspapers and magazines, or devoting herself to the endless tasks of maintaining the reputable public standing of the men in her family, Bulić used her societal engagement to actively help the underprivileged in the Dalmatian hinterland. Rarely was this solely to provide for the needy with the food and clothing that they desperately lacked. It was more about providing an enlightened alternative, that of more hygienic, productive, or simply less miserable ways of living. It had much to do with raising awareness of their specific problems among those able to help, those detached from the reality of the peasantry. Her humanitarian and social work, as was the case with her intellectual endeavours, did not fit into the socially recognized or accepted employment categories of the 1920s and 1930s. As was often the case with other socially active women before the mid-20th century, the most suitable term

10 On women’s movements prior to and after World War I, see KARDUM 2020: 223–230.
11 KARDUM 2023.
to describe their diverse activities (frequently outside of the workplace) should be *modern women thinkers* (in Croatian *moderne misleće žene*).\(^{12}\)

It was at the same time that Lujza Janović Wagner struggled to bring to life and recognition a new career category – that of a nurse (in Croatian, the term at the time was *sestra pomoćnica* – nursing assistant, literally ‘sister helper’). Before the early 1920s, women in Croatia could not follow a clear career path to nursing, although the job description ranged from caring for the sick to activities today recognized as those performed by social workers.\(^{13}\) Professionalization came with the broad-based public health movement under Andrija Štampar, an internationally recognized social medicine expert and promoter of health education.\(^{14}\) Both Wagner and Bulić had a keen interest in helping to educate the socially needy and raise their standard of living. However, they used different tools to fill the void in a broader, not yet fully institutionalized public health care system. In this sense, these two intellectuals could be seen as examples of different paradigms of social engagement in the public health of interwar Croatia. Wagner, as a pioneering modern public health professional, focused on the sick and poor city dwellers in Zagreb.\(^{15}\) Furthermore, as of 1930 Wagner led an entirely new institution – the Central Bureau of Social-Medical Work for Nursing Assistants (Nursing Assistant Centre) [*Središnji ured za socijalno-medicinski rad sestara pomoćnica* (*Središte sestara pomoćnica*)] – designed to coordinate all activities, both medical and social, of professional nurses in the wider Zagreb area.\(^{16}\) On the other hand, Bulić was a charismatic leader of a group of well-to-do Split “ladies” who frequently visited the Dalmatian hinterland and coordinated deliveries of food and other necessities, while providing much-needed counselling in the region’s many isolated villages.\(^ {17}\)

Like Lujza Wagner, before nursing education was established in Zagreb, Ina Juhn was educated abroad. She studied music, rhythmic gymnastics and preventive orthopaedics in Berlin, Dresden, Prague and Geneva. In the interwar period, along with her sister, anthropologist and sociologist Vera Ehrlich,\(^ {18}\) Juhn was a member of a leftist intellectual circle that found in psychology the relevant tools that could improve social and cultural conditions. Leftist ideas sharply opposed to
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\(^{12}\) For further elaboration, see Andrea Feldman and Ida Ograjšek Gorenjak’s introduction to this issue.

\(^{13}\) GRKOVIĆ JANOVić 2003: 101–113.

\(^{14}\) On Andrija Štampar and his public health efforts, see Željko Dugac’s works, especially DUGAC 2010.

\(^{15}\) DUGAC 2015, 7-8, 93–219.

\(^{16}\) DUGAC 2015, 41; GRKOVIĆ-JANOVić 2003, 166.

\(^{17}\) KARDUM 2023.

\(^{18}\) For more on Vera Ehrlich, see Andrea Feldman’s work, such as FELDMAN 2022: 221–230 and FELDMAN 2024a.
the rising appeal of Nazism to many and support for then illegal Communist Party provided Jewish intellectuals with a means to engage and actively pursue desired societal changes in predominately agrarian and underdeveloped Yugoslavia. The idea of women’s equality with men resonated with Juhn in a manner similar to Bulić, who did not share the former’s ideological zeal for communism. This was partly due to a generational difference and partly because of Juhn’s Jewish origin and her orientation toward German cultural circles. “Intellectual emigration” from the German-speaking lands after 1933 came to Zagreb and the Ehrlich sisters’ circle was frequented by, among others, psychologist Manès Sperber, who would later become a communist renegade.19

In many ways, the outbreak of World War II abruptly ended the public presence of each of these women intellectuals. Along with forced relocation to escape immediate danger, the drastic restrictions to their freedom of expression followed. Yet, Dalmatia under Italian fascist occupation after 1941 proved to be a safer option for Croatian Jews, the majority of whom, but certainly not all, resided in the Croatian capital, Zagreb, prior to the war. Ina Juhn first went to Split and then, after she joined the Partisan resistance, the nearby Dalmatian islands to avoid the Holocaust. She might have even met Bulić while in Split in the summer of 1943, as could have been the case with Lujza Janović Wagner, who moved there in 1940, for all three shared mutual friends. Living in occupied Split in the first two war years, Wagner witnessed the gruelling reality of silent protest against the fascist regime. Moreover, she was keen to help illegal Partisan guerrillas. Therefore, the diary entries from the initial war years were more abstract as she tried to make sense of the nature and meaning of the war itself.20

Later she would go into much greater detail when describing everyday life. Even before Wagner moved to the island of Brač in 1943, where her husband’s family lived and had an ancestral house, her home became a shelter and “way station from dusk to dawn” for unfortunate exiles from Zagreb, but also Split. It was during this peculiar experience that she met and befriended both Ehrlich sisters, Ina and Vera. She wrote in her diary that she “especially fell in love with Ina.” In a similar vein, Wagner wrote about Vinka Bulić’s son Ivo and his wife Zdenka and also their first cousins as her dear friends with whom she found common ground during the war. Zdenka Bulić was a part of Lujza’s illegal courses on nursing in anticipation of like-minded women joining the Partisan movement. By 1943, with the capitulation of Italy, that was exactly what happened to many of Lujza’s Split friends – they went to the mountains to join the guerrilla units and later landed on the central Dalmatian islands (from Brač to Vis).21

19 KARDUM 2024a; SPERBER 1994.
21 GRKOVIĆ JANOVIĆ 2008: 37, 199.
For many women, the shifting of traditional gender roles happened swiftly and not necessarily for the better. It was in the summer of 1943 that Juhn wrote a poem dedicated to the Antifascist Front of Women (AWF; Antifašistički front žena, AFŽ) in front of the notorious fascist prison in Split: “(...) Woman! Once the currents rise from the sea, / When torrents descend from the mountains / They will clear the land all the way to [Mt.] Mosor / Then a woman will be a woman again / They won’t have to kill and shoot / They will again be allowed to love and give birth, / To work and make order / (...) Only these [fascists] / We will not spare you!”

Years later, in early 1945, Vinka Bulić wrote in her diary: “We just have to see if this way of liberating a woman will be personally beneficial to her.”

In the beginning, the AWF/AFŽ was a relatively autonomous women’s political organization, established in Croatia in 1941 and not yet fully integrated into the rigid and hierarchical communist apparatus. In a sense, the desired world for all women as depicted in Juhn’s poem was to come with the AWF’s victory, aligned with that of the communist-led resistance movement. The AWF’s primary role was to mobilize women to support this movement. Lujza Janović Wagner also aided the AWF’s efforts, which brought unnecessary and potentially dangerous attention to her in the midst of German occupation. If joining the Partisan troops had ever been the desire of any of them, they could have not done so, for Bulić was rather old, being almost sixty, while Wagner was married with small children.

Still, more or less covert political activities could not satisfy the intellectual needs of these women. Unable to publish, and years after she had discontinued her interwar diary, Bulić began writing her war diary at the onset of the war in Yugoslavia, in early April of 1941. Lujza Janović Wagner wrote her first diary entry shortly thereafter, in the mid-May. The unbearable gravity of the unprecedented global conflict must have prompted their first reactions. Bulić’s war diary is extensive, divided into five notebooks, with a fair number of entries for each war year. As the war dragged on and its consequences proved detrimental to the jovial Mediterranean city of Split, she wrote with less enthusiasm. Near the war’s end, many shorter and simpler entries reflected her exhausted and starved body and spirit. In contrast, Wagner’s diary extensively covers 1943 and most of 1944. As the war separated her from her brother and later, her husband, she shifted to an epistolary form of letters she could not send them. The differences in structure, obviously, had to do with the changes in the harsh conditions in which they both lived. Also, Wagner was much more sympathetic to the Partisan movement and its increasing political power in the last phases of the war. Ina Juhn’s diary is
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22 JUHN: [7].

23 BULIĆ: V/127.

24 Still relevant to the topic is Lydia Sklevicky’s work. See SKLEVICKY 2020.

entirely dedicated to 1943 and her allegiance was always with the communists, as she joined the troops as a medical assistant and physical therapist. Predictably, all this was well reflected in the total lengths of their diaries.26

The role of public intellectuals in the midst of war was not only the underlying topic of these diaries. This was at the core of this very practice of life-writing and also openly discussed. Meta-narrative comments appear occasionally in the diaries to express the opaque nature of war. In essence, the war was anti-intellectual. Juhn wrote: “It was especially difficult for a city dweller, particularly a woman, a former so-called ‘salon woman’” to become accustomed to the “nomadic life” that reigned on the so-called “liberated” islands of central Dalmatia under Partisan rule, which on the heels of communist propaganda established yet another totalitarian form of government.27 In her everyday wartime experiences in Split, Bulić witnessed a cacophony of colourful interpretations from her “sources”: peasants in the Dalmatian hinterland, city gossip and members of the political and intellectual elite with whom she conversed. Her journalistic trade came in handy when she needed to grasp intentions beyond various agendas, brought to her via radio broadcasts or newspapers.28

Juhn’s brief introduction on the reasons for starting a diary contains an almost self-critically intoned – in the fashion of Party rhetoric – review of the status of intellectuals in the war. This “former salon woman” wrote about many problems with unhygienic living conditions on the Dalmatian islands and the scarcity in which borrowing things often turned into theft.29 All three intellectuals wrote about the lack of writing essentials, as this need became almost an urge to them. There was a shortage of pens, ink and paper. Bulić’s diaristic practice needed to be discontinued for a time until she could finally find a new notebook to write in. Juhn traded cigarettes to buy a notebook from a schoolboy. Wagner wrote in a trade ledger her father used to record the cost of her upbringing. Living in a hostile environment, Wagner and Bulić needed to hide their diaries, in case of possible unannounced searches that included seizure of compromising evidence. Wagner went as far as burying it behind her house.30

The war also put significant pressure on family dynamics, whether people were separated or stayed together. Vera Ehrlich was, according to her sister’s interpretation preserved in her diary, far too intellectual for the modest and uneducated Partisans on the Dalmatian islands. A sociologist was, as was the case to some
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26 KARDUM 2021, 179; GRKOVIĆ JANOVIĆ 2008: 25, 34—; KARDUM 2024a and 2024b.
27 JUHN: [2].
29 JUHN: [1–5].
degree with Ina, far more interested in ideology and theory than in the practicalities of building socialism. This was true even on the level of her engagement, as Vera dedicated herself to lengthy discussions and lectures rather than the banalities of any sort, however necessary they may have been to endure the challenges presented by wartime circumstances. If anything, this signalled her reservations about the prospects of socialism in the local context. Moreover, this suggests the irreparable widening of the gap between the left-wing non-Party intellectuals of the interwar era and the new more or less intellectually inclined elites among the Partisans. The latter tended to organize “cultural-educational” work with “the masses” in the spirit of “Partisan practicality,” without much discussion.31

Lujza Wagner wrote about senseless accusations and denunciations spread by local communist/Partisan sympathizers and officials levelled at people of wealth or higher social status prior to the war. Wagner herself was a victim of various accusations, mostly due to her activities in support of the Partisan movement, as “there was no means that I did not employ to serve the cause [helping Partisan efforts] and yet not lose my head.”32 The irony was that aid to the wrongly accused in certain cases came from the Nazi officials posted there. The vicious rumours even labelled her “the most dangerous woman on [the island of] Brač” and demanded her imprisonment. She did spend some time in jail but avoided harsher treatment mostly due to her good relationship with a Nazi lieutenant who respected her work with the sick across the island.33 Wagner also successfully exploited her education and knowledge of languages to communicate effectively with military personnel. She was no less respected for being outspoken and brave when being questioned; “Die Deutschen werden als Feinde betrachtet [Germans are considered our enemies],” she replied when asked about popular sentiment regarding these “allies of the Independent State of Croatia.”34 By the spring of 1944, she was “tired of everything, including daily overflights, guerrillas, fear, theft, interventions, patients and advice.”35

Back in Split, Vinka Bulić was not at all certain that the younger generation’s sympathies, including those of her adult children, toward leftist and communist ideas would bring about the desired world order. Even before she witnessed the early signs of the on-the-ground shortcomings of the “ideal communist society” in the Croatian “liberated territories,” she was sceptical of the propaganda and “delusions” disseminated on the airwaves of the BBC’s Radio London. There was no place for utopias in her understanding of politics and governance. After

31 JUHN: [68–70].
32 GRKOVIĆ JANOVIĆ 2008: 108.
34 GRKOVIĆ JANOVIĆ 2008: 81.
35 GRKOVIĆ JANOVIĆ 2008: 91.
the end of the Italian fascist occupation, her only daughter Jelena (nicknamed Puse) was forced to emigrate to Bari, Italy, due to her wartime marriage to an Italian (originally from Split) and her employment in the fascist administration of occupied Split (soon after she graduated in Italy), which made Bulić even more concerned and bitter. The bitterness came in part from her inability to act. Her appeal to justice fell on barren ground, as it ought to since it only reached the pages of a diary nobody had read. The new system was already unfolding, with its own sets of rules and worldviews. She wrote about young women who were far behind Puse in terms of education but had assumed public posts based on their ideological compatibility with and devotion to the new, communist-led regime. At the same time, her oldest son began to climb the ladder in this very same socialist hierarchy. It was at this point that her diary took a turn toward more abstract themes, to the mechanisms and patterns that operated below, beyond the supposedly universally accepted notions of fairness and righteousness.36

As Ina Juhn and Lujza Wagner found comfort in the ideology they deemed morally superior and worthwhile, Vinka Bulić fought hard to catch her breath in the chaos of war. She in no way supported fascist regimes, as she wrote many pages about their brutality, let alone dwelling on their imminent failures, but she sensed the totalitarian nature beyond the collective utopia the new communist regime kept promoting to hide “its own particular goals.”37 When sham elections were held in the spring of 1945, Bulić wrote about the widespread talk that the “‘peasants should go to work in the fields, women should go home to cook (but what?), what are they even going to do in offices!’ […] But this is happening because they appointed barbers, peasants and workers as political commissars,” she concluded.38 Even Juhn, who was much more prepared to roll up her sleeves and certainly more open to expressing her authentic support for communism, recorded her concerns about the ways in which the communist system was being created. Criticism on the part of supporters – especially pre-war leftist intellectuals – came as communist propaganda on the “liberated” islands intensified.39

From an enthusiastic left-leaning intellectual linked to illegal communist activity in the interwar period, Juhn was actually, more or less subtly, critical of the way in which the Communist Party of Yugoslavia established the socialist system. A certain departure and intolerance of the Party toward the interwar educated left intelligentsia’s criticism can be read between the lines of the ‘Black Notebook’. From the initially permitted freer expression and active participation of individuals (that is, non-Party members) in the creation of the Partisan movement’s policy and

36 BULIĆ: IV/185–6; V/48, 72.
38 BULIĆ: V/129–130.
39 JUHN: 60a; 65–66.
ideology under communist leadership, the lyrically conscious subject of Juhn’s
diary illustrates the premature ossification of the regime in the partisan-controlled
territories, the platitudes and simplifications of “political lessons,” the dryness of
political rituals and the complete indoctrination of the Party which gained many
illiterate members and lost many interwar intellectuals.\(^{40}\)

As proof of her open-mindedness, Bulić briefly joined the regime’s cultural
department in Split at the very end of the war, only to leave convinced of the ir-
reparable damage already done to the freedom of individuals and expression.\(^{41}\)
Lujza Wagner did not live to see the end of the war, as she escaped Dalmatia in
the summer of 1944 and died of typhoid in Zagreb in early 1945: “In my soul,
I am sad over leaving Dalmatia. (...) Thrown out of the struggle, the danger, the
beauty, I feel that I am mired down and suffocating.”\(^{42}\) When the war came to a
perceived end, Bulić wrote: “8/V. Victory Day! Is it a Pyrrhic victory? Europe is in
ruins, millions of dead, the gap of hatred deeper than ever! (…) The saddest thing
is that every day we are more and more slaves... slaves of spirit, thoughts, words
– slaves of vanity, movements, of decisions – almost brilliant automatons...!”\(^{43}\)

Ultimately, the war diaries of these women not only preserve the specific ex-
periences of their gender. They channel historical people who would otherwise
in many cases most certainly have been forgotten. As shown in the analyzed
examples, the act of writing oneself was concurrently the act of writing women
into history, starting first with oneself. Fortunately, these processes also included
information about the lives of numerous other women: some who were modest in
their appearance or education, social standing or authenticity, and others whose
courageous spirit, profound wisdom and joie de vivre prevailed against all odds.
Soldiers and teachers, poets and nurses, tragic and comic characters fill the pages
of these diaries, which offer unique cross-societal insight into the question of how
women lived and persevered through the war.

\(^{40}\) JUHN: 23–25.
\(^{41}\) BULIĆ: V/65–69; 83; 108.
\(^{42}\) GRKOVIĆ JANOVIĆ 2008: 11, 92.
\(^{43}\) BULIĆ: V/148. Vinka Bulić’s war diary ends on 18 June 1945. The reasons behind the dates
being the last are arbitrary and frequently mundane, such as the lack of paper – no pages were
left in Bulić’s or Wagner’s diaries.
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Ispisivanje života između zbilje i fikcije: Hrvatske dnevničarke Drugoga svjetskog rata

Rad se bavi istraživanjem nepoznatih i neistraženih ratnih dnevnika triju intelektualki koje su istovremeno vodile svoje dnevničke zapisove u Dalmaciji za vrijeme Drugoga svjetskog rata. Zabilježena ratna iskustva nedavno otkrivenoga dnevnika židovske intellektualke Ine Juhn Broda (1899–1983), novinarke i borkinje za ženska prava Vinke Bulić (1884–1965) te objavljenoga dnevnika sestre pomoćnice Lujze Janović Wagner (1907–1945) govore o ulozi žena u dinamici otpora fašističkim režimima i sudjelovanju u procesima promišljanja te uspostave socijalističkoga poretku u Jugoslaviji. U radu se analiza značaj rata kao prijelomnice u zamišljanju jugoslavenske budućnosti za žene, kojima su još nedostajala politička i društvena prava. Interpretira se uloga dnevnika kao zapisa o životu u nastavljanju intelektualne djelatnosti žena u razdoblju koje je obustavilo njihovu javnu prisutnost i mogućnosti intelektualnoga angažmana. Kako bi se razumjela specifična uloga zapisivanja života u nadomještanju intelektualnoga djelovanja ovih intelektualki, analizira se njihova aktivnost koja je prethodila Drugomu svjetskom ratu. Članak donosi izvode iz dnevnika kako bi se ne samo predstavilo intelektualke i njihove dnevnike pisane sredinom rata već kako bi se u historijska istraživanja uključili autentični glasovi intelektualki čija su svjedočanstva isključena iz službenih interpretacija ratne stvarnosti.

Ključne riječi: Drugi svjetski rat, intelektualke, Jugoslavija, ispisivanje života / zapisi o životu, ženska povijest, ženski ratni dnevničarci.

Keywords: life writing, women intellectuals, women’s history, women’s war diaries, World War Two, Yugoslavia.
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