

## Renata Jambrešić Kirin



## Preodgoj žena na Svetom Grguru i Golom otoku – moralna korupcija i ideološka indoktrinacija

Goli otok i Sveti Grgur najkraće možemo opisati kao mjesta represivne destalinizacije. Nastali su 1949. kao odgovor KPJ na raskid Tita i Staljina s namjerom „preodgoja“ nelojalnih i kritici novog režima sklonih članova. Kako staljinistička narav i silina represivnog djelovanja jugoslavenskih službi sigurnosti prema vlastitim građanima nisu otkriveni sve do raspada socijalističke Jugoslavije početkom 1990-ih, značenje tog raskola ostaje ambivalentno, negirano ili potiskivano u zajedničkoj kolektivnoj svijesti. Naime, Titovo NE Rezoluciji Informbiroa u ljetu 1948. godine čin je iznimne hrabrosti i suprotstavljanja Staljinovoj hegemoniji, ali i okidač kampanji političkog terora uz pomoć kojeg su sigurnosne službe kršile zakone, oduzimale građanska prava i negirale etičke principe komunističkog djelovanja koje društvo mijenja nabolje tako što mijenja i emancipira individuu. Ni sedamdeset godina poslije ovo razdoblje represije nije valorizirano, kao što ne postoji konsenzus o potrebi spomeničke zaštite Golog otoka niti o memorijalnoj gesti kojom bi se obilježilo postojanje komunističkog logora za preodgoj neistomišljenika (1949.-1956.).

Titova ideja kako ibeovce<sup>1</sup> treba slomiti, a ne ubiti,<sup>2</sup> otvara, osim ustaljenih logorskih metoda, uvođenje niza golotočkih specifičnosti, pogotovo prema ženama. Kao penološki sustav sa

## The Reeducation of Women on the islands Grgur and Goli – Moral Corruption and Ideological Indoctrination

We can best describe Goli Otok and Sveti Grgur as sites of repressive destalinisation. They were created in 1949, as the Yugoslav Communist Party's answer to the break between Tito and Stalin, with the intention of "re-educating" those members who were politically disloyal or critical. As the Stalinist nature and the vehemence of the repressive activities of the Yugoslav security apparatus against their own citizens remained concealed until the dissolution of Socialist Yugoslavia a few decades later, the meaning of this break had remained ambivalent, denied or repressed in the common collective consciousness. Tito's "NO" to the 1948 Cominform Resolution was an act of exceptional courage and opposition to Stalin's hegemony, yet it also triggered a campaign of political terror in which the state's secret services broke laws, stripped people of their civil rights and denied the ethical principles of Communist action, which claims to change the society for the better by changing and emancipating the individual. Even seventy years later, there is still no consensus neither on the need to protect Goli Otok as a landmark, nor on a memorial gesture to mark the existence of a Communist camp for re-educating dissidents (1949-1956).

Tito's idea, that Cominformists<sup>1</sup> should be broken, not killed,<sup>2</sup> opened the path not only for the tried and tested methods of internment in camps, but also for the introduction of a series of elements specific

svrhom izolacije i neutralizacije („psihičkog slamanja“) političkih neistomišljenika i osoba sklonih kritičkom pristupu novoj vlasti, imao je niz poveznica s fašističkim logorima na talijanskim otocima, s nacističkim radnim logorima i stalinističkim gulazima, ali i logorima za društveno-korisni rad i preodgoj kakve poslije nalazimo u Kini, prije i poslije proleterske kulturne revolucije, kao i u drugim zemljama istočnog bloka.<sup>3</sup> Na Svetom Grguru i na Golom otoku (Radilište V) naizmjenično se od 1950. do 1956. godine nalazio politički logor kroz koji je prošlo oko 860 žena optuženih za povezanost s Informbiroom u okviru „provizornog pravnog okvira kažnjavanja i suđenja“.4 Struktura kažnjavnica pokazuje da nije riječ tek o oponašanju stalinističkih metoda i ruskih *logora za srodnice*, „*izdajica Domovine*“<sup>5</sup> nego o kažnjavanju mahom politički izgrađenih i samosvjesnih žena, među kojima su prednjačile komunistkinje<sup>6</sup> koje su povjerovala da su doista ravnopravne (moćnim) drugovima u polugama vlasti.

Žene su same morale izgraditi staze i brojne objekte koji su danas vidljivi u tragovima. S iznimno okrutnim sistemom kažnjavanja, u kojemu su logorašice bile prisiljene biti i vršiteljice torture, logor je bio mjesto patnje i poniženja. Šikaniranje optuženih žena i policijski nadzor nastavljani su i nakon izlaska iz logora.

U ženskim logorima na oba lokaliteta nalazimo bunkere i stražarnice s čuvarima, ograde od bodljikave žice, iznošene uniforme, glad i žeđ kao oblik prisile, fizičku torturu i rituale kažnjavanja, prisilni rad i „preodgoj“ batinama. Dočim je sustav nadziranja i organizacije preuzet iz pobrojanih logorskih sustava, a načini kažnjavanja i ponižavanja uvelike posuđeni iz duge memorije balkanskog tamnovanja i podjarmljivanja obespravljenih po rodnoj, klasnoj i ideološkoj osi, politička je indoktrinacija bila proizvod novog doba i novih sredstava masovne komunikacije. Rituali i kulturne prakse kojima

to Goli Otok, especially when it came to the camps' female inmates. As a penal system with the objective of isolating and neutralising (“psychologically breaking”) political opponents and people with a penchant towards taking critical view of the new authorities, it had a number of similarities to the Fascist camps on Italian islands, Nazi labour camps, and Stalinist gulags, as well as camps for socially beneficial labour and re-education of the sort we would encounter before and during the Chinese cultural revolution and in other Eastern Bloc countries.<sup>3</sup> Between 1950 and 1956, a political camp was situated by turns on the islands of Sveti Grgur and Goli Otok (Worksite V). Some 860 women were interned there at one time or another, accused of connections to the Cominform in the framework of the “provisional legal framework for penalising and the trial process”.<sup>4</sup> The structure of the convicts shows that this was not merely an aping of Stalinist methods and *Russian camps for relatives of “traitors of the Homeland”*<sup>5</sup> but the punishment, by and large, of politically fully fledged and self-aware women, chief among whom were the Communists,<sup>6</sup> who believed that they really were equal to their (powerful) comrades in their hold on the levers of power.

The female inmates had to build the paths and the many buildings, only traces of which remain today, on their own. With an exceptionally cruel system of punishment, where the inmates were forced to themselves perpetrate torture, the camp was a site of suffering and humiliation. The harassment of the accused women and police surveillance continued even after they had left the camp.

On both sites where the women's camps were, we find bunkers and guardhouses with guards, barbed wire fences, worn out uniforms, hunger and thirst as means of coercion, physical torture and punishment rituals, forced labour and “re-education” by beatings. While the system of surveillance and organisation had been adopted from the camp systems listed above, while modes of punishment and humiliation were largely borrowed from the long memory of

se oblikovalo kolektivističko društvo samo su se prilagodili logorskim uvjetima. Obrasci agitpropovske kulture („politički časovi, čitalačke grupe, mitinzi, igranke, parole“)7 bili su usmjereni na normiranje socijalističkog čovjeka uz pomoć autocenzure, autokorekcije i autoregulacije tjelesnog ponašanja i mišljenja, jednako kao i poticanjem na zajedništvo i ponos pobjednika iz Drugog svjetskog rata. U logorima je, baš kao i na radnim akcijama, težak rad pratilo marširanje do radilišta, neprekidno skandiranje, pisanje transparenta i pjevanje revolucionarnih pjesama – kako bi kolektiv postao *jedno* tijelo, *s jednim* srcem koje se zaklinje na odanost vođi.

Ako imamo na umu ozračje afektivne egzaltacije poratnog razdoblja, lakše je razumjeti zašto je kažnjenički život i prisilni rad na Golom i Sv. Grguru pratilo cjelodnevno skandiranje slogana (*Tko s nama nije, bolje da ga nije!, Ubit ćemo svakog skota ko je protiv KaPeJota!, Za koga? Za Tita! Za Partiju! Svi! Svi! Svi!* i dr.), pjevanje revolucionarnih pjesama, pisanje parola (žene su komadićima svjetlucavog kalcita upisale Titovo ime na jednoj uzvisini), i zašto su samo povlaštene aktivistkinje i brigadirke sudjelovale u folklornoj i kazališnoj sekciji te pratile povremene kinoprojekcije. Kako svjedoči Natalija Petrović, „kulturni programi“ čija se sadržina svodila na međusobna ponižavanja i ismejavanja logoraša, neprekidno izvikivanje parola i pevanje glupih pesama od kojih bi se i divljaci grozili – sve je to imalo samo jedan cilj: da se zatvorenik telesno iznuri i moralno samelje, pa da bude spreman da izjavi, potpiše i uradi sve, ama baš sve, što god da se od njega traži“.8 Supostojanje fizičkog i psihičkog nasilja kao odrednicu logorskog života spominje i Eva Grlić: „potpuno drobljenje ličnosti i fizički, stalnim napornim radom, ne-normalnim uvjetima života, a zatim i moralno i psihički kroz stalno ponavljanje kako smo svi koji smo ovamo dospjeli ‘izdajnici’ zemlje, partije, naroda i Tita“.9 Partijske fantazme o „ženskoj izdaji“,10 o „zločinu separacije“ od očinske figure

incarceration and subjugation in the Balkans of those who are weaker along gender, class and ideological lines, political indoctrination was the product of a new era and new means of mass communication. The rituals and cultural practices that were used to shape the collectivist society were merely adapted to camp conditions. The patterns of agitprop culture (“political lessons, reading groups, meetings, dance parties, songs”)7 aimed at creating a normative Socialist man with the help of self-censorship, self-correction and the self-regulation of one's physical behaviour and thought, while also at encouraging togetherness and World War II victors' pride. Just like labour actions, in the camps, hard labour was accompanied by marching to the worksites, the ceaseless chanting of slogans, creating banners and singing revolutionary songs, all in order for the collective to become *one* body, with one heart pledging allegiance to the leader.

If we keep in mind the atmosphere of affective exaltation of the post-war period, it becomes easier to understand why convict life and forced labour on Goli Otok and Sveti Grgur were accompanied by the daily chanting of slogans (*Who isn't with us better not be at all!, We'll kill all dogs who are against the C-P-Y!, For who? For Tito! For the Party! Everyone! Everyone! Everyone!*, and so on), the singing of revolutionary songs, writing slogans (women used pieces of glittering calcite to write Tito's name on an elevation), and why only privileged *activists* and *brigadists* participated in the folk arts and theatre groups, and saw the occasional film screening. As Natalija Petrović has testified, ‘cultural programmes’, whose substance boiled down to humiliating and ridiculing the inmates, the constant shouting of slogans and singing stupid songs that even savages would balk at – it all had one sole aim: to physically wear out and morally grind down the convict, until they were willing to state, sign or do anything, really anything, whatever they were asked to.8 The coexistence of physical and psychological violence as a determinant of camp life is also mentioned by Eva Grlić: “the absolute grinding down of the personality, both physically, by continuous hard labour, abnormal living conditions,

vođe bile su razlogom domišljanja rodno specifičnog zlostavljanja, vrijeđanja, poružnjivanja i posramljivanja.

### „Onaj tko je tukao jače, brže je izlazio van“

Uz surove klimatske uvjete i žeđ, kažnjenice najdulje pamte poticanje na agresiju i sadizam te bezočno nasilje u kojem su bile prisiljene sudjelovati. To je bio uvjet da novopridošla kažnjenica prijeđe iz statusa „bande“, izolirane pojedinke izložene šikaniranju svake vrste, u status „revidirke“, članice logorskog kolektiva ili „brigade“, s pravom da govori, spava, održava higijenu, javlja se povremeno obitelji, piše duge izvještaje o svojoj krivnji, ali prije svega s obavezom da tuče, ponižava, denuncira, nazire „bojkotirane“ kažnjenice. Povjesničari ističu da je za razliku od drugih primjera iznuđene suradnje manjeg (povlaštenog ili kriminalnog) dijela logorske populacije s upravom, golootočki sustav gotovo u potpunosti isključio čuvare i upravu logora iz žicom ograđenog prostora logora.<sup>11</sup> Svaka je baraka imala „starješinu barake“ (jer jezik ne poznaje ime za ženu s autoritetom) s obavezom da organizira način „preodgoja bande“ i gotovo svakovečernje rituale javnog ispovijedanja vlastitih „grijeha“ prema Partiji i/ili novoj vlasti: „Sećam se, sednemo u krug. Napolju proleće, lepo vreme. Sede i *banda* i *nebanda*, iako smo uvek odvojene, da ih ne zarazimo. I sad izvode u sredinu kruga jednu po jednu ženu koje su morale da se *raskritikuju*, ali i da pričaju o svom najintimnijem životu, o odnosu sa mužem, momkom. To se znalo jer ‘Udba sve zna’. Svrha je bila sledeća: pokazati da ibeovac, da neprijatelj, da je to obavezno najgori čovek, da je ološ, da je pokvaren, da je unakažena ličnost“.<sup>12</sup>

Na čelu unutarnje uprave logora bila je „komandantica radilišta“ koja je postrojavala i prebrojavala kažnjenice, predavala *raport* miliciji, komunicirala s upravom logora, određivala koje kažnjenice rade koju vrstu poslova, kome je

and also morally and mentally, through the constant repetition of the statement that all of us who found ourselves here are ‘traitors’ of the country, the Party, the people and Tito”.<sup>9</sup> Party phantasms about “women’s betrayal”,<sup>10</sup> about the “crime of separation” from the fatherly figure of the leader were the reason for coming up with the gender-specific forms of maltreatment, verbal abuse, uglifying and shaming.

### “Whoever beat more fiercely, got out more quickly”

Along with the harsh weather conditions and the thirst, the incitement to aggression and sadism, and the ruthless violence in which they were forced to take part, have remained longest in the convicts’ memories. This was the condition for a newly arrived convict to move from being part of the “mob”, an isolated individual exposed to every kind of harassment, to a “reformed”,\* a member of the camp collective, or to a “brigade”, where an inmate gained the right to speak, sleep, maintain hygiene, occasionally contact her family, while still forced to write long reports about her guilt, and, above all, she gained the obligation to beat, humiliate, denounce, and surveil the “boycotted” convicts. Historians have highlighted that unlike other examples of the coerced cooperation of a smaller (privileged or criminal) segment of the camp population with the administration, the Goli Otok system almost completely excluded the guards and the camp administration from the wire-enclosed space of the camp.<sup>11</sup> Each barrack had its “barrack prefect”,\* in charge of organising a mode of “re-educating the mob”, and the nearly nightly rituals of public confessions of one’s “sins” towards the Party and/or the new authorities: “I remember, we’d sit in a circle. Outside it’s spring, nice weather. Both the mob and the unmob are there, although we are always separated, so that we don’t infect them. They guide the women one by one into the centre of the circle, where they have to criticise\* themselves, but also to talk about their most intimate lives, their relationships to their husbands, their boyfriends. This was to be known, because ‘the UDBA knew everything’. The

reducirana porcija hrane i vode, tko je u samici, a tko u izolaciji ili bojkotu. Ovakvo uvođenje *samoupravne* tehnologije kažnjavanja gdje žrtva „kolaborira s egzekutorima“ izazvalo je „totalni moralni kolaps“<sup>13</sup> i pretvorilo golootočki režim u jedinstven lagerski eksperiment i efikasan način zastrašivanja ne samo bivših logoraša/ica nego i drugih građana. Prema ocjeni samih kažnjenica, ni težak rad ni ideološka indoktrinacija nisu ostavili tako teške psihičke posljedice na njihov daljnji život kao što je to učinila „moralna korupcija“ izazvana prisilom nanošenja boli drugim kažnjenicama: „Onaj tko je tukao jače, brže je izlazio van. Oni koji su se odupirali, ostajali su dulje, ali svi smo tučeni i svi smo mi tukli druge. Svi smo mi tamo spušteni na razinu egzekutora“.<sup>14</sup> Naime, začarani krug straha i prijetnji, gubitka samopoštovanja i empatije, međusobnog optuživanja, denuncijacija i isljeđivanja, vide kao onaj moment koji je priječio zajedništvo, solidarnost i međusobnu podršku među kažnjenicama, ključnu za preživljavanje u fašističkim logorima. Golootočki sustav je bio takav da logorašica muči i tuče drugu, to joj je bio uvjet da bude puštena. I to je bio razlog zašto su mnoge zauvijek šutjele o svom iskustvu: „Nigde ni u jednom logoru nisu tako nastojali da čoveka ponize, da ga učine krpom, moralnom nakazom, da ga iznutra unište i unakaze... Odavde si morao da izađeš kao duhovni invalid, da se gadiš samog sebe, da se stidiš, da ceo pretekli život patiš“, svjedočila je Novka Vuksanović, koja je preživjela Auschwitz i Ravensbrück.

Ženama koje su netom postale ravnopravne političke građanke, kažnjenički sustav jasno je postavio granice političkog djelovanja kao slipepe poslušnosti partijskom vrhu te je zatirao duh, individualnu volju i kritičko propitivanje vlasti. Ceremonijalni oblici degradacije<sup>15</sup> žena nisu samo predstavljali atak na njihovu čast, autonomiju, tjelesni integritet i samopouzdanje, nego su im poručivali da su nevrjedne privilegija koje su stekle svojim dotadašnjim revolucionarnim ili

aim was as follows: to show that the Cominformist, the enemy, are without exception the worst kind of person, that they are scum, rotten, a disfigured character”.<sup>12</sup>

A “worksite commander” headed the internal camp administration. She would line up the convicts and count them, hand her reports to the guards, communicate with the camp administration, determine which convicts were to do what kind of work, who would get reduced rations of food and water, who will be sent to solitary confinement, and who will be in isolation or boycott. Such an introduction of a *self-governing* technology of punishment, where the victim “collaborates with the oppressors” brought about a “total moral collapse”<sup>13</sup> and turned the Goli Otok regime into a singular internment camp experiment and an efficient way of striking fear not only into former inmates, but other citizens as well. In the estimations of the convicts themselves, neither the hard labour nor the ideological indoctrination inflicted such grievous psychological effects on their subsequent life as the “moral corruption” caused by the coercion to inflict pain on other prisoners: “Whoever beat more fiercely, got out more quickly. Those who resisted stayed there longer, but we were all beaten, and we all beat others. We were all reduced to the level of the executioners”.<sup>14</sup> The vicious circle of fear and threats, loss of self-respect and empathy, mutual accusations, denunciation and interrogation, are seen as the moment that prevented the togetherness, solidarity and mutual support among the convicts that were key to survival in Fascist camps. The Goli Otok system was such that an inmate’s conditions for release were based on torturing and beating another. This was the reason why many forever kept silent about their experience: “There was not a camp where they sought so hard to humiliate a person, to turn them into a rag, destroy from within and disfigure... You had to leave this place spiritually disabled, disgusted with yourself, ashamed, suffering your entire past life”, Novka Vuksanović, a survivor of Auschwitz and Ravensbrück, testified.

profesionalnim radom. A kao što nas uči feministička teorija, kad nekome uništimo samopouzdanje, potreban je dug proces zalječenja i ponovne izgradnje osobe. Izvore ovim „ceremonijama degradacije“ nalazimo u boljševičkoj praksi komunističke korektivne (samo)kritike i moralne procjene<sup>16</sup>, u „ceremonijama javnog optuživanja“ tijekom kineske kulturne revolucije te u patrijarhalnom odgoju i socijalizaciji žena kao manje vrijednih članova zajednice. Članovi patrijarhalne obitelji posramljuju ženu od malih nogu, za sve postupke i osjećaje koji odudaraju od norme, pa ona interiorizira osjećaj krivnje i srama, koji će je desetljećima poslije pratiti. Upravo na tu matricu nadovezala se destruktivna i mizogina biopolitika u logoru, koja je sustavno napadala moralni i tjelesni integritet te reproduktivno zdravlje kažnjenica, a ujedno isključivala njihove spolne specifičnosti, prisiljavajući zatvorenice da kažnjavaju jedna drugu i unište žensku mrežu podrške. To je rezultirala dubokom traumom i dugogodišnjom šutnjom žena o golootočkom iskustvu.

### Jesu li žene patile teže i duže?

Mučene, ponižavane i zaplašivane, bivše kažnjenice sa Sv. Grgura i Golog otoka desetljećima su šutjele. Njihove priče izlaze u javnost tek 1990., kad se socijalizam već ruši, jer odgovaraju tadašnjem antikomunističkom narativu. Dokumentarna serija *Goli život* emitirana je nakon smrti Danila Kiša 1990., te godine u Beogradu Dragoslav Simić i Boško Trifunović objavljaju ispovijesti kažnjenica i isljednice u knjizi *Ženski logor na Golom otoku*. Na nagovor Kiša, Ženi Lebl zapisuje i objavljuje svoja svjedočenja, nešto kasnije u Zagrebu Durieux objavljuje sjećanja Eve Grlić. Sjećanja su objavile i Rosa Dragović-Gašpar, Vera Cenić, Milka Žicina, a posljednjih godina snimljeno je nekoliko dokumentaraca o Evi Panić Nahir i priprema se dokumentarni film o crnogorskoj intelektualki Đini Markuš,<sup>17</sup> na temelju neobjavljenog rukopisa.

To women, who had just become equal political citizens, the inmate system clearly established the limits of political action, as blind obedience to the Party leadership, while individual spirit and will, and the critical questioning of the authorities were extinguished. Ceremonial forms of women's degradation<sup>15</sup> were not only an assault on their honour, autonomy, bodily integrity and self-confidence, but also informed them that they were unworthy of the privileges they had attained by their previous revolutionary or professional engagement. And as feminist theory teaches us, when we destroy someone's self-confidence, the process of recovery and rebuilding the person takes a long time. We find the sources for these "degradation ceremonies" in the Christian ritual of public confession as a public disclosure of one's own sins (*publicatio sui*), in the Soviet practice of Communist (self)criticism and accusatory meetings, in the Chinese Communist struggle sessions,<sup>16</sup> and in the patriarchal education and socialisation of women as less worthy members of a society. Women are shamed by members of a patriarchal family from their earliest years for any action or feeling that diverges from the norm, hence interiorizing the feelings of blame and shame that will haunt them for decades after. This was precisely the matrix on which the camp's destructive and misogynistic biopolitics was built, systematically attacking the convicts' moral and physical integrity, as well as their reproductive health, while at the same time banishing their sexual specificities, forcing the inmates to punish each other and destroy the women's network of support. This resulted in deep traumas and long-lasting silence among women about their experience of Goli Otok.

### Did women suffer more and longer?

Tortured, humiliated and intimidated, the former inmates of Sveti Grgur and Goli Otok kept silent for decades. Their stories only began to seep into the public domain in 1990, when socialism had already begun to cave in, as these stories fit the anti-Communist narrative of the period. A documentary series

Da su ženski gulazi u mnogim segmentima gori od muških, pisao je Aleksandar Solženjicin, a na temelju istraživanja svjedočenja o Golom to su potvrdili Dragan Marković i Giacomo Scotti.<sup>18</sup> Marković zaključuje da su muškarci drastičnije kažnjavani, ali su žene teže podnosile posljedice „preodgoja“ i daleko teže poslije istupale u javnost sa svojim iskustvom. Strah, nepovjerenje u vlastite sposobnosti, apatija, nesigurnost, moralna konfuzija koju je većina kažnjenih žena ponijela s otoka, priječili su ih da se reintegriraju u javni i politički život i ako im je bila pružena prilika za to. Za razliku od muškaraca, koji su se od kraja 1960-tih postupno izborili za javni diskurs o Golom otoku, kroz knjige svjedočenja, romansirane memoare, romane, predstave, filmove, žene su bile višestruko stigmatizirane i onemogućene u svom javnom angažmanu. Dublje potiskivanje osobne i političke traume uvjetovano je i činjenicom da su žene zbog svoje socijalizacije bile sklonije prisvojiti osjećaj krivnje i manje vrijednosti, ne samo zbog pretrpljene torture nego i moralne izdaje humanih načela, da su osjećale krivnju zbog patnji svoje djece i drugih članova obitelji, da su se teže vraćale u javni prostor i rekreirale nekadašnje društvene mreže podrške, da su rjeđe dobivale posao ekvivalentan njihovim profesionalnim sposobnostima i ambicijama. Za razliku od muških memoarista, bivše kažnjenice bile su spremnije priznati da „nevinih nema, svi smo mi bili žrtve i dželati Titove i Staljinove vojske podjednako“,<sup>19</sup> te preuzeti svoj dio povijesne odgovornosti za iznevjerenu komunističku utopiju o društvu po mjeri čovjeka. Kao svjedokinje češće su propitivale etičku granicu između hrabrosti i „fanatizma“, osobnog integriteta i poriva preživljavanja, tražile povijesne analogije i književne slike da bi nam razotkrile i približile stanje „pretpolitičke životinje“ u koje u bile dovedene.<sup>20</sup>

Sudbina političkih kažnjenica predstavljenih ovim projektom pokazuje da je fokus represivne državne politike bio upravo na obrazovanim

called *Goli Život – Naked Life* – was broadcast after the death of Danilo Kiš in 1990, the year Dragoslav Simić and Boško Trifunović published the testimonies of the convicts and an interrogator in their book, *Women's Camp on Goli Otok*. At Kiš's urging, Ženi Lebl wrote down and published her testimonies, and a little later, the Zagreb publisher Durieux published Eva Grlić's memories. Rosa Dragović-Gašpar, Vera Cenić and Milka Žicina also published their memories, while in recent years several documentaries were filmed about Eva Panić Nahir, and a documentary film about the Montenegrin intellectual Đina Markuš<sup>17</sup> is also in production, based on an unpublished manuscript. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn wrote that in many aspects, women's gulags were worse than men's, which was confirmed by Dragan Marković and Giacomo Scotti on the basis of their examinations of the testimonies about Goli Otok.<sup>18</sup> Marković concludes that men were punished more severely, but women found it more difficult to cope with the consequences of the "re-education", and found it much harder to bring their experiences out into the open. The fear, lack of trust in their own capabilities, apathy, insecurity, and moral confusion that most of the female convicts took with them from the island prevented them from reintegrating into public and political life even if they had the chance to do so. Unlike the men, who gradually won the right to speak publicly about Goli Otok in the late 1960s, through books of testimonies, fictionalised memoirs, novels, plays, and films, women suffered multiple levels of stigmatisation and were precluded from public engagement.

This deeper repression of personal and political trauma was also a product of the fact that due to their socialisation, women were more inclined to assume a feeling of guilt and inferiority, not only due to the torture suffered, but also the moral betrayal of humane principles; that they felt guilt over the suffering of their children and other family members; that they found it more difficult to return to the public sphere and recreate erstwhile social support networks; that they more rarely got jobs that suited their professional abilities and ambitions. Unlike



stručnjakinjama i kompetentnim komunistkinjama koje su konkurirale drugovima partijcima za položaje u medijima, državnim službama i administraciji. Među kažnjenicima najbrojniji su bili radnici, službenici i seljaci, a „političke kriminalke“ činile su u velikom broju intelektualke i studentice, novinarke, prevoditeljice s ruskog, ali i službenice sa završenom gimnazijom.<sup>21</sup> Podatak o pet do sedam posto žena u ukupnom broju političkih zatvorenika, korelira s činjenicom da su komunistkinje u socijalističkoj Jugoslaviji rijetko zauzimale više od pet ili sedam posto mjesta u najvišim tijelima izvršne vlasti.<sup>22</sup> Zaslugom antifašističkih borkinja žene su dobile pravo glasa, pravo nasljeđivanja, izjednačene su u plaći s muškarcima, no raskorak između proklamiranog i stvarnog bio je velik. Nepravdu su posebice osjetile predratne revolucionarke i komunistkinje<sup>23</sup> koje su umjesto zapaženih uloga u društvenom i političkom životu tavorile idućih pedeset godina u dubokoj anonimnosti. Time je Partija poslala jasnu poruku da su borbenost, autonomnost i nepoštivanje direktiva nepoželjne, a lojalnost i subordiniranost poželjne osobine drugarica često nazvanih *drug\_ce* – vrsta hipokoristika uz pomoć kojeg su komunisti iskazivali svoj podsmješljiv, patronizirajući odnos prema drugaricama kao „drugim“, „drugotnim“ partnericama. Etnologinja Miroslava Malešević komentirala je paternalistički i instrumentalistički odnos drugova iz borbe prema bivšim partizankama i udarnicama i zaključila da su one „mahnute s društvene pozornice jednako brzo kao što su se na njoj pojavile“,<sup>24</sup> a nakon što su ispunile svoju zadaću u izvanrednim povijesnim okolnostima. Energičan proboj žena u sve profesije, uključujući navise položaje u vladi, brzo je zaustavljeno, smatra Malešević. Dokaz umanjivanja ženske (revolucionarne i lijeve) povijesti jest i činjenica da u socijalističkoj Jugoslaviji nije osnovana ni jedna znanstvena institucija, arhiv i li muzej posvećen jugoslavenskim revolucionarkama i partizankama, od kojih je devedeset i jedna proglašena narodnim herojem.

male memoirists, the former female convicts were more willing to admit that “none were innocent, we were all both victims and executioners of Tito’s and Stalin’s army alike”,<sup>19</sup> and accept their share of the historic responsibility for the betrayed Communist utopia of a new socialist Man “with a human face”. As witnesses, they more frequently questioned the ethical line between bravery and “fanaticism”, personal integrity and the drive for survival, sought historical analogies and literary images to better reveal the state of the “pre-political animal” which they had been reduced to.<sup>20</sup>

The fates of the female political convicts this project presents show that the state’s repressive policies focussed precisely on educated, ambitious and competent women and professionals among the Communist ranks who competed with their comrades for positions in the media, the social services and the administrative apparatus. Among male convicts, factory workers, clerks and farmers outnumbered the rest, while “women political criminals” largely consisted of intellectuals and students, journalists, translators from Russian, as well as office workers who had graduated from secondary school.<sup>21</sup> The figure of up to seven percent of political convicts being women is correlated with the fact that in Socialist Yugoslavia, women Communists rarely held more than five to seven percent of the positions in the highest echelons of the executive branch.<sup>22</sup> It was the women antifascist fighters who won women the right to vote, the right to inherit property, and obtain pay equity with men; however, the discrepancy between the declared and the real was large.

The pre-war revolutionaries and Communists<sup>23</sup> felt the injustice particularly strongly, as instead of playing prominent roles in social and political life, they had to struggle on in deep anonymity for the next fifty years. Thus, the Party sent a clear message that combativeness, autonomy and not respecting directives were undesirable, while loyalty and subordination were the desirable characteristics of female comrades, frequently called “*drug\_ce*” (drug-ca – a

Dugogodišnje posljedice poratnog političkog terora na žensku emancipaciju i socijalnu mobilnost treba tražiti upravo u postupcima Udbe i policijskoj inkriminaciji žena na temelju moralnih osuda njihova privatnog života, karaktera, mobilnosti i postignuća. One su sugerirale građankama da je primarni kontekst njihova dokazivanja i samoostvarivanja – dom, radni kolektiv i društveni (volonterski) angažman. Sastavni dio promjene kursa rješavanja „ženskog pitanja“ predstavlja i raspuštanje Antifašističkog saveza žena 1953. godine, uz objašnjenje da je iscrpljen njegov politički i kulturni kapital, a izraz „afežejka“ počinje se koristiti pogrdno za žene koje su si uzele pravo da odlučno nastupaju u javnosti.

#### **Zašto se vraćamo ženama nestalim u žrvnju političkog nasilja?**

Ženama koje su stradale ili nestale kao javne ličnosti zbog sukoba Tita i Staljina ne vraćamo se radi produblivanja obiteljskih, društvenih ili političkih trauma, nego baš obratno, radi razvezivanja čvorova boli i traumatskih posljedica koje se prenose generacijama i ostavljaju (ne) vidljive tragove na biografijama potomaka političkih zatvorenica. Drugi poticaj svijest je o tome da borba za ljudska i ženska prava nikad nije dovršena i da nam u osnaživanju vlastitih potencijala za nju treba poznavanje ženske povijesti, a osobito povijesti onih žena koje su stradale zbog „političkog delikta“ slobodnog mišljenja i izražavanja kritičkih stavova. Svi policijski dosjei, intervjui, pisana sjećanja i drugi egodokumenti, kao i sjećanja nasljednica *Golootočanki*, koje smo prikupile u okviru projekta *Vi ste Partiju izdale onda kada je trebalo da joj pomognete*, služe nam da bismo sagledale mjesto žena u epizodama političkog terora, ali i da bismo izdvojile ono što je osnažujuće i pozitivno u tim svjedočenjima, što vraća vjeru u humanističke vrijednosti, slobodu izbora i moralnog djelovanja. Upravo je interes za „banalnost dobra“<sup>25</sup>,

hypocoristic name for female comrades that reflected the ridiculously patronizing attitude of male comrades; (drug, m., meaning comrade; druga, f., means other, second, “secondary partner”) – in the (non) sensitive meaning of “other”, “secondary” partners. The ethnologist Miroslava Malešević commented on this paternalistic and instrumentalist behaviour of former comrades, who concentrated on consolidating power: “Having fulfilled the task enforced by extraordinary circumstances, a former partisan woman and shock worker (*udarnice*) would (...) withdraw from the social scene as quickly as she emerged on it. Energetic breakthroughs into all professions, including the highest levels of government, were quickly halted”<sup>24</sup>. Evidence of the downplaying of women’s (revolutionary and leftist) history lies in the fact that socialist Yugoslavia never established a research institution, archive or museum dedicated to its world-famous women partisans and revolutionaries, among them ninety-one war heroines recognised as National Heroes, the most distinguished decoration in the country. The long-term consequences of political terror on women’s emancipation and social mobility should be sought precisely in these secret police procedures of the moral condemnation of women’s private lives, characters, mobility and achievements that suggested to women citizens that the primary context of their self-realisation was the home, the work collective and social (volunteer) work. The disbanding of the Women’s Antifascist Association in 1953, with the justification that its political and cultural capital had been depleted, was an integral element of the change of direction in solving the “women’s question”; the term “afežejka”<sup>25</sup> began to be used as a slur for women who claimed a right to decisively speak out in public.

#### **Why do we return to women who disappeared in the crush of political violence?**

We do not return to the women who perished or disappeared as public figures in order to deepen family, social or political traumas, but for precisely the opposite reason: to untie the knots of pain and

za napore kažnjena da održe minimalne, prividne normalnosti u logorskom univerzumu, ono što odskače od uobičajenog istraživačkog interesa za posljedice dehumanizacije mjerene gubitkom tipičnih maskulinih vrijednosti – čast, hrabrost, principijelnost. U središtu svih napora preživljavanja u ekstremnim uvjetima jest ono što često stereotipno nazivamo „ženskim vrednotama“ – izdržljivost, suosjećanje, potreba za povjerenjem i pomaganjem najslabijima. To su ujedno vrijednosti koje nam i danas mogu poslužiti da sukreiramo bolje društvo na temelju demokratske, pluralne, rodno osjetljive kulture sjećanja. Želimu promijeniti i kulturnu praksu unutar koje ženska svjedočenja o važnim povijesnim epizodama dolaze u fokus javnosti tek posredstvom interesa muških intelektualaca ili djela velikih književnika poput Danila Kiša i Davida Grossmana.<sup>26</sup>

Traumatske pri/povijesti žena nisu dobar izvor spoznaja o prirodi međuljudskih odnosa, ali nam mogu pružiti dragocjene uvide u snagu ljudskog duha i moć samoiscjeljivanja, u moć samopromjene. Tako Evgenija S. Ginzburg koja je u sibirskim gulazima provela dvadeset godina i Rosa Dragović-Gašpar, dugogodišnja zatvorenica na Sv. Grguru, Golom otoku, Stocu i Bileći, pripovijedaju da su nakon logora postale humanija bića, produbile svoja humanistička uvjerenja i oslobodile se slijepo vjere u dogmatске principe komunističke ideologije. Međutim, kao i niz drugih bivših političkih kažnjena, one nisu prestale vjerovati u ideale pravednog, egalitarnog, demokratskog, na humanističkim principima zasnovanog društva. Našavši se pred novim društvenim izazovima izvanrednog stanja uvjetovanog globalnom epidemijom, postajemo svjesniji da su visoko postavljeni humanistički ideali jedne zajednice uvijek u korelaciji s brojnim opasnostima njihova opovrgavanja i iznevjeravanja.

traumatic injuries that are transmitted across generations, leaving (in)visible traces on the biographies of the inmates' descendants. The second impetus comes from the awareness that the struggle for human and women's rights is never finished, and that to strengthen our own potentials for that struggle, we need knowledge of women's history, especially of those women who suffered for the "political offence" of free thinking and expressing critical views. All the police files, interviews, written memories and other ego-documents, as well as the memories of the female descendants of the women from Goli Otok that we collected in the framework of the *You Betrayed the Party Just When You Should Have Helped It* project will help us to comprehend the place of women in episodes of political terror, but also to single out what is empowering and positive about these testimonies, what restores belief in humanist values, in freedom of choice and moral action. The interest in the "banality of goodness"<sup>26</sup>, for the convicts' efforts to maintain minimal, ostensible normalcy in the world of the camp, is precisely what stands out in relation to regular scholarly interest in the consequences of dehumanisation, measured by the loss of typically masculine values – honour, bravery, and principle. What lies at the centre of all the efforts to survive in extreme conditions is what we often stereotypically call "female values" – resilience, compassion, the need to confide, and to help the weakest. These are also values that can help us today to co-create a better society based on a democratic, plural, gender-sensitive culture of memory. We also want to change the cultural practice within which women's testimonies about significant episodes in history only become the focus of public attention solely by virtue of interest on the part of male intellectuals or through works of great literary figures such as Danilo Kiš or David Grossman.<sup>27</sup>

Traumatic stories are not a good source of knowledge about the nature of human relations, but they can give us precious insights into the strength of the human spirit, the capacity for self-healing and the ability to change oneself. Thus Yevgenia S. Ginzburg, who

spent twenty years in the Siberian Gulag, and Rosa Dragović-Gašpar, long-term prisoner of Sveti Grgur, Goli Otok, Stolac and Bileća, speak of how after the camp, their humanistic views became deeper, and they freed themselves of the blind faith in the dogmatic principles of the Communist ideology. However, much like many other former political prisoners, they never ceased to believe in the ideals of a just, egalitarian, democratic society based on humanist principles. Facing the new social challenges of a state of emergency caused by the pandemic, we become more aware that setting a high bar of humanist ideals in a community is always in correlation to the numerous threats of their denial and betrayal.



1 — Ibeovci (engl. *Cominformists*) su prihvatili Rezoluciju IB-a i u njoj iznesene, uglavnom lažne, optužbe protiv Josipa Broza i Komunističke partije Jugoslavije.

2 — Titovo je geslo bilo „po glavi, ali ne glave“, usp. Božidar Jezer-  
nik, *Non cogito ergo sum*, Ljubljana, 1994, Borec 533/534, str. 686.

3 — Koncept popravno-radnih logora („gulaga“) uvodi SSSR uz pomoć Staljinova represivnog aparata 1929. godine. GULAG je zapravo kratica za Glavnu upravu popravno-radnih logora i kolonija koja je upravljala ogromnom mrežom logora (radnih, kažnjeničkih, tranzitnih, ženskih, dječjih, „materinskih“, logora za kriminalce i političke zatvorenike).

4 — Martin Previšić, *Povijest Golog otoka*, Zagreb, 2019, str. 164. Na temelju Udbine evidencije Previšić pokazuje da je kroz oba logo-  
ra prošlo „oko 550 do 570 žena, uz napomenu da ih u isto vrijeme nikada nije bilo više od 380 do 400“, str. 468.

5 — Ovi su logori poznati pod kraticom ČSIR (*Člyen sem'i izmennika Rodini*). Usp. Nensi Adler [Nanci Adler], *Preživjeli iz Gulaga*, Beograd, 2005.

6 — O tome svjedoči Kolet Smiljanić, novinarka i prevoditeljica na Radiju Beograd: „Kada su me udbovci hapsili, rekla sam – mene nije vaspitavala ulica nego Partija. Ona me je svemu ovome naučila. Učila me je da budem iskrena i da iskreno iskazujem svoje mišljenje“. Usp. Dragoslav Simić i Boško Trifunović, ur. *Ženski logor na Golom otoku – ispovesti kažnjena i islednice*, Beograd, 1990, str. 26.

7 — Simić i Trifunović, *Ženski logor na Golom otoku*, str. 9 (Svjedo-  
čenje Natalije Petrović).

8 — Op. cit., str. 13. Usporedi i opis srodnih „optuživalačkih sastanaka“ (engl. accusatory meetings) tijekom kineske kulturne revolucije: „Pažljivo pripremljeni i organizirani, masovni montirani procesi i optuživalački sastanci slijedili su jasne i dobro razrađene obrasce. Dramaturška sredstva poput pozornice, rekvizita, scena-  
rija, agitatora i momenti gradacije, bili su usmjereni na izazivanje emocija kod publike – kako bi se izazvalo negodovanje protiv ciljanih skupina i mobiliziralo publiku na podršku režimu“. Klaus Mühlhahn, *Criminal Justice in China: A History*, Cambridge, MA, 2009, str. 182–183.

9 — Eva Grlić, *Sjećanja*, Zagreb, 1997, str. 203.

10 — Upravnica Marija Zelić ovim je riječima dočekivala kažnjence: „Ovo što ste vi uradile to je izdaja zemlje. Izdale ste zemlju u najtežem momentu. (...) kad je Partija na vas najviše računala, vi ste u tom momentu toj Partiji zaboli nož u leđa“ (Simić i Trifunović, *Ženski logor na Golom otoku*, str. 228).

11 — Ivo Banac, *Sa Staljinom protiv Tita*, Zagreb, 1990, str. 235; Previšić, *Povijest Golog otoka*, str. 239–258.

12 — Simić i Trifunović, *Ženski logor na Golom otoku*, str. 33–34 (Caca).

13 — Shoshana Felman, *The Juridical Unconscious*, Cambridge – London, 2002, str. 20.

14 — Vera Winter. Iskaz iz videointervjua nastao 25. 8. 2013. u okviru projekta *Osobna sjećanja* Documente – Centra za suočavanje s prošlošću (<http://www.osobnasjecanja.hr/>).

1 — The Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties, commonly known as Cominform, was the official central organization of the International Communist Movement from 1947 to 1956. Cominformists, or *Ibeovci* in the Croatian and Serbian language, were those who opted for the 1948 Cominform Resolution and its, mostly false, accusations against Josip Broz Tito and the Yugoslav Communist Party.

2 — Tito's motto was “on their heads, but not off with them“, cf. Božo Jezer-  
nik *Non cogito ergo sum*, Ljubljana, 1994, Borec 533/534, p. 686.

3 — The concept of corrective labour camps (Gulags) was introduced by the USSR in 1929, with the aid of Stalin's repressive apparatus. The GULAG is actually an acronym for the Main Directorate of corrective labour camps and colonies (Glavnoe upravlenie lagerei), which administered the huge network of camps (labour, convicts' transit, women's children's, “maternal” camps and camps for criminals and political prisoners).

4 — Martin Previšić, *Povijest Golog otoka [The History of Goli Otok]*, Za-  
greb, 2019, p. 164. Based on UDBA records, Previšić shows that “around 550 to 570” passed through both camps, noting that there had never been more than 380 to 400 women inmates there at a single time“, p. 468.

5 — Such camps were known under the acronym ČSIR - *Člyen sem'i izmennika Rodini*. Cf. Nanci Adler, *The Gulag Survivor*, New Brunswick, 2002.

6 — Kolet Smiljanić, journalist and translator for Radio Belgrade, testified about this: “When the people from UDBA were apprehending me, I told them – I wasn't educated by the street, but by the Party. It taught me all this. It taught me to be honest and to honestly express my opinion“. Cf. Dragoslav Simić and Boško Trifunović, ed. *Ženski logor na Golom otoku – ispovesti kažnjena i islednice [Women's Camp on Goli Otok. Convicts' and Jailors' Testimonies]*, Belgrade, 1990, p. 26.

7 — Simić and Trifunović, *Ženski logor na Golom*, Belgrade, 1990, p. 9. (Natalija Petrović's testimony)

8 — Op. cit., p. 13. See, e.g., the description of similar “accusatory meetings“ during the Chinese cultural revolution: “Carefully arranged and organized, the mass trials and accusatory meetings followed clear and meticulously prearranged patterns. Dramatic devices such as staging, props, working scripts, agitators, and climactic moments were used to efficiently engage the emotions of the audience—to stir up resentment against the targeted groups and mobilize the audience to support the regime“. Klaus Mühlhahn, *Criminal Justice in China: A History*, Cambridge, MA, 2009, pp. 182–183.

9 — Eva Grlić, *Sjećanja [Memories]*, Zagreb, 1997, p. 203.

10 — Warden Marija Zelić used to welcome the convicts with the following words: “What you did was a betrayal of the country. You betrayed the country at the most difficult moment. (...) just when the Party counted upon you the most, you stabbed the Party in the back“ (Simić and Tri-  
funović, *Ženski logor na Golom otoku*, p. 228).

\* “Banda“ and “revidirka“, translator's note.

11 — Ivo Banac, *Sa Staljinom protiv Tita [With Stalin against Tito]*, Zagreb, 1990, p. 235; Previšić, *Povijest Golog otoka*, pp. 239–258.

\* “Starješina barake“ – a masculine noun meaning “elder“, a figure of authority – no feminine noun or variant exists in the Serbo-Croatian, *tn*. \* *Raskritikuju* – a non-standard use of the prefix “ras-“ that can denote a quality of vehemence, or deconstructiveness.

12 — Simić and Trifunović, *Ženski logor na Golom otoku*, pp. 33–34 (Caca).

13 — Shoshana Felman, *The Juridical Unconscious*, Cambridge – Lon-  
don, 2002, p. 20.

15 — Pojam „ceremonije degradacije“ definirao je sociolog Harold Garfinkel u studiji iz 1956. kao čin javne komunikacije čija je namjera prokazati pojedinca kao nevrjednog privilegija njegove dotadašnje uloge u društvu ili instituciji. Ona imaju najviše učinka u društvima koja nisu „sasvim demoralizirana ili dezorijentirana“.

16 — Usp. Michel Foucault, „Technologies of the Self“, u *Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth*, ur. Paul Rabinow, London, 1997 [1982], sv. 1, str. 244; Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New York – London, 1976 [1951], str. 353.

17 — Projekt Sare Stijović Dina dobio je potporu programa La Fabrique Cinema Francuskog instituta 2020. godine u okviru 73. Kanskog filmskog festivala. Svjedočenja crnogorskih kažnjenaica predstavio je i digitalni Muzej žena Crne Gore (<https://www.muzejzena.me/>).

18 — Dragan Marković, *Josip Broz i Goli otok*, Beograd, 1990; Gia-  
como Scotti, *Goli otok: Italiani nel gulag di Tito*, Trst, 2002.

19 — Rosa Dragović-Gašpar, *Let iznad Golog otoka*, Beograd, 1990, str. 251.

20 — „Ja nisam heroj, ja nisam heroína, ja sam zec, ja se plašim. Ja neću da kažem, ja neću da priznam, ja mogu da trpim batine, ali ja se tresem.“ Iskaz Jelke Zrnić u Simić i Trifunović, *Ženski logor na Golom otoku*, str. 155.

21 — Usp. Berislav Jandrić, „Nacionalna i socijalna struktura ibeo-  
vacca iz Hrvatske na Golom otoku u razdoblju 1949. – 1952.“, *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, 2/3 (25), 1993, str. 183–202.

22 — Povjesničarka Sabrina P. Ramet navodi podatak da su 1948. godine komunistkinje činile 20 % članova Komunističke partije Jugoslavije, ali je samo 9,7 % žena bilo zastupljeno na 5. kongresu KPJ održanom te iste godine, a svega tri žene (4,8 %) uključene u rad Centralnog komiteta KPJ. Usp. S. P. Ramet, *Gender Politics in the Western Balkans*, 1999, str. 99.

23 — Riječ je o Adeli Bohunicki, Jeleni Hadžikan, Branislavi Marko-  
vić, Kristini Kusovac, Dragici Srzentić, Simki Stanković i dr.

24 — Miroslava Malešević, „Osmi mart – od utopije do demagogi-  
je“, *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU*, 1988, br. 36-37, str. 53-80.

25 — S konceptom „banalnost dobra“, specifičnim za moralne postupke običnih ljudi koji su spašavali Židove i druge proganjane skupine te se suprotstavljali zlu u ekstremnim povijesnim momentima. Cvetan Todorov je parirao konceptu „banalnost zla“ H. Arendt. Usp. Todorov, *Voices from the Gulag: Life and Death in Communist Bulgaria*. University Park, Pennsylvania, 1999. Za primjere etičnog postupanja bivših političkih zatvorenica u socijalističkoj Jugoslaviji, usp. Renata Jambrešić Kirin. “Yugoslav Women Intellectuals: From a Party Cell to a Prison Cell“. *History of Communism in Europe*, 2014, vol. 5, str. 36-51.

26 — Jedna od sugovornica Danila Kiša u dokumentarnom serijalu Goli život (1990), Eva Nahir Panić, ispričala je Davidu Grossmanu svoju životnu priču na temelju koje je napisao izuzetan roman unu-  
tar književnosti svjedočenja – *Kad je Nina znala* (Zagreb, 2020).

14 — Vera Winter. Statement from a video interview made on 25 August 2013 as part of the *Personal Memories* project by Documenta – Centre for Dealing with the Past (<http://www.osobnasjecanja.hr/>).

15 — The term, “degradation ceremony“, was defined by sociologist Harold Garfinkel in a 1956 study as an act of public communication whose aim is to denounce an individual as unworthy of the privileges of their erstwhile role in the society or an institution. They were most effective in societies that were not “entirely demoralised or disorientated“.

16 — Cf. Michel Foucault, “Technologies of the self“, in *Ethics, Subje-  
ctivity and Truth*, ed. Paul Rabinow, London, 1997 [1982], vol. 1, p. 244; Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New York – London, 1976 [1951], p. 353.

17 — Sara Stijović's project, *Dina*, won the support of the La Fabrique Cinema programme of the French Institute in 2020, in the framework of the 73rd Cannes Film Festival. The testimonies of Montenegrin convicts were also presented by the digital Montenegrin Women's Museum (<https://www.muzejzena.me/>).

18 — Dragan Marković, *Josip Broz i Goli otok*, Belgrade, 1990; Giacomo Scotti, *Goli otok: Italiani nel gulag di Tito*, Trieste, 2002.

19 — Rosa Dragović-Gašpar, *Let iznad Golog otoka [One Flew over Goli Otok]*, Belgrade, 1990, p. 251.

20 — “I'm not a hero, I'm not a heroine, I'm a rabbit, I'm scared. I won't tell, I won't confess, I can take the beating, but I'm shaking“. Jelka Zrnić's statement in Simić and Trifunović, *Ženski logor na Golom otoku*, p. 155.

21 — Cf. Berislav Jandrić, „Nacionalna i socijalna struktura ibeovaca iz Hrvatske na Golom otoku u razdoblju 1949. – 1952.“ [National and Social Structure of Croatian Cominformists on Goli Otok], *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, 2/3 (25), 1993, pp. 183–202.

22 — The historian Sabrina P. Ramet cites the fact that in 1948, women Communist made up 20% of the members of the Communist Party of Yu-  
goslavia, but just 9.7% of the membership represented at the 5th Congress of the CPY held that year, while only three women (4.8%) were involved in the work of the Central Committee of the CPY. Cf. S. P. Ramet, *Gender Politics in the Western Balkans*, 1999, p. 99.

23 — The women in question were Adela Bohunicki, Jelena Hadžikan, Branislava Marković, Kristina Kusovac, Dragica Srzentić, Simka Stanković and others.

24 — Malešević, Miroslava, „Osmi mart – od utopije do demagogije“, *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU*, 1988, vol. 36-37, pp. 53-80.

25 — A member of the Women's Antifascist Front – initials AFŽ.

26 — With the concept of the “banality of goodness“, specific to the moral conduct of rescuers and other ordinary people who oppose evil in extreme historical situations, Tzvetan Todorov played on Hannah Arendt's searing ‘banality of evil‘. Cf. Todorov, *Voices from the Gulag: Life and Death in Communist Bulgaria*. University Park, Pennsylvania, 1999. For examples of the moral conduct of former female political prisoners in socialist Yu-  
goslavia, see Renata Jambrešić Kirin. “Yugoslav Women Intellectuals: From a Party Cell to a Prison Cell“. *History of Communism in Europe*, 2014, vol. 5, pp. 36-51.

27 — One of Danilo Kiš's interlocutors in the documentary series Goli Život (1990), Eva Nahir Panić, told David Grossman her life story, on the basis of which he wrote an exceptional novel in the genre of testimonial literature – *When Nina Knew* (Zagreb, 2020).