

English Studies from Archives to Prospects. Vol. I: Literature and Cultural Studies. Edited by Stipe Grgas, Tihana Klepač, and Martina Domines Veliki. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016, pp. 118-33.

Jelena Šesnić

The Croatian Diaspora as an Unfinished Transdisciplinary Project

In a discussion involving 20th century Croatian emigrants, it is imperative to mention Boris Maruna. Maruna was not only one of the most astute commentators on the vicissitudes of an exilic and emigrant existence, but also one of its most gifted poets. Upon his return to the democratic Croatia in 1990—after 30 years in exile—as the newly elected president of the Croatian Heritage Foundation, he pointedly welcomed “the cancellation of artificially created divides in the diaspora between an economic and a political emigration.”¹ Ever since the closing of the wide ideological gap that was placed and then meticulously upheld between emigrants and their home country from the decades following the end of World War II until the fall of communism in 1989, the Croatian diaspora has found itself in uncharted waters, and between states, cultures, and disciplinary protocols both in the country of origin (i.e. Croatia), and in the host country. Taking as an example the traditionally strong and durable Croatian diaspora in the United States, this article will consider how changing geo-political conditions have affected the study of the Croatian diaspora in the latter half of the 20th century. It will then attempt to extrapolate the trends of the 21st century, which is already underway.

While various humanities and social science disciplines pay lip service to the formations and features of the diaspora, what is lacking is a sustained, trans- and interdisciplinary effort—to be undertaken primarily by scholars in Croatia—that would initiate a full-scale dialogue addressing the social potential, cultural and economic capital, symbolic grounding, anchors of continuity, and other facets of the Croatian diaspora, as it laterally and vertically connects and re-connects itself worldwide. Such connectivity need not take place exclusively through the mother country, but can also occur on the diasporic rims, as suggested by Vladimir Goss.² As this text will contend, in this venture it is beneficial and necessary to include not only Croatian Studies and American Studies (themselves already interdisciplinary orientations), but to seek active involvement from a number of other disciplinary ventures, including political science, sociology, cultural theory, history and cultural and social history, migration studies, and psychology, in order to enhance the critical yield from such an approach.

So, what is the Croatian diaspora? I will begin by quoting the words of Bogdan Raditsa, one of the diaspora’s most prominent intellectual exiles in the second half of the 20th century. In observations made in his memoirs in 1982—relatively late in his life, as he passed away in 1993—Raditsa praises our emigrants for their capability to plug into the American mainstream in one to two generations, in order to reap its benefits. Even when Raditsa ruefully notes the inevitability of emigrants’ succumbing to the “categorical imperative of the American economic way of life,”³ he still acknowledges the question of generations within the diaspora to such an extent that one generation—conveniently designated as old emigration, having emerged before WWII—is estranged from those that followed, including that which came between the wars, and, especially the one after WWII, which was to a considerable degree made up of (politically inclined) intellectuals. Raditsa claims that social and political problems posed by one generation are lost in the next, while he paints the accomplishments of the intellectuals of his own generation in broad strokes, effected mostly in the field of culture and as such superseding their other achievements.⁴ This is then a fruitful starting point for any analysis of that period. The striation of the diaspora in the United States is further addressed and modified by Vladimir Goss—a returnee after years of academic and intellectual work in the United States—who in his overview registers the different generational methods of the 1990s, which again puts us in mind of a complex, multi-layered phenomenon.⁵ So the answer to the somewhat off-hand question “what is our diaspora?” is, in brief, a living and breathing organism, an organic development that invites all sorts of engagements from scholarly to lay, and popular to intimate and personal. All of these come to the fore in the fact that the diasporic experience has been rampant, tenacious, and, one might add, almost continuous in some parts of Croatia for centuries.

I will clear the way by saying that it should no longer be a question of “why” but “how” to approach the diaspora, and fortunately this has been the case for a while. In Croatian Studies, though, there has been lamentably little work undertaken on this phenomenon, with few exceptions. Since 1989 or thereabouts there has been a seismic shift in certain disciplines of Croatian Studies with respect to discovering and researching the work done in and by the diaspora. We might presume that with time this work (produced both by and about the diaspora) will increase and become largely de-politicized and de-ideologized. These latter tendencies, however welcome and necessary to research, should not totally cleanse the term and its substance from either politics or ideology, since these were major accessories in the historical development of the diaspora in the 20th century, especially its second half.

Some work was also being done during the time of socialist Yugoslavia, as far as the domestic ideology warranted it. Researchers in this field should consult the classic account of Croatian emigration authored by Većeslav Holjevac

in 1967.⁶ Holjevac's great stature in the political realm and the enmeshing of his various political functions (member of the Croatian League of Communists Central Committee, the long-term mayor of Zagreb and for several terms the president of the Croatian Heritage Foundation) make this an all the more interesting and path-breaking endeavor, especially since it managed to bypass the ideological mandate of the times. Had it not been for Holjevac's untimely demise, it would have been interesting to see if and how this novel approach would have materialized in new policies towards the diaspora.

Holjevac paved the way, but it was only a matter of time before another major breakthrough would come, in the form of a systematic study of Croatian and other diasporas of the former Yugoslavia. It came at a large congress in Zagreb in 1976, which was hailed as "a momentous watershed."⁷ Entitled "The emigrants of the peoples and minorities of Yugoslavia and their mutual relations with the homeland," it was the first event of its kind to take place in Yugoslavia, and it theoretically opened up new perspectives on emigration. Apart from this, Ivan Čizmić has indubitably loomed large as a figure of authority and competence regarding issues relating to the Croatian diaspora since he first published in the early 1970s (for an extensive bibliography see the National and University Library catalogue), but here we have space to present only his latest formidable research effort, which will be discussed later in this paper.

The following brief overview of popular responses suggests that we view the diaspora through several lenses: as an economic, cultural or political phenomenon, or some mixture of the three. Recently our newspapers seized on the acquisition of a hotel chain in Istria by one of the leading Croatian Chilean business families, to comment on the nexus of their diasporic status and their sensible, if conspicuous, accumulation of wealth.⁸ Then there is the case of several well-known writers of Croatian origin, who have in recent years garnered public attention or were awarded respectable literary prizes, in particular Josip Novakovich in the United States and Canada, and Antonio Skármeta in Chile.⁹ Finally, in the political sphere, we have the infamous 2013 legal wrangling between Croatia—then a freshly-inducted member of the EU—and the European Commission and German courts, in an extradition case in the trial for the 1983 murder of Croatian political emigrant Stjepan Đureković. That this nearly "forgotten" topic should have caused friction between the new member state, Croatia, and its EU partners, points to the issues that relate to the way a segment of the Croatian diaspora was politicized in the socialist regime, although it seems that this was no less the case in post-socialist Croatia.¹⁰

So far, the work on the Croatian diaspora (especially the one that thrives in the United States) accessible in Croatia has exhibited several facets, which have been crucially linked to the geo-political and socio-historical spheres within which this research takes place. To continue with our disciplinary framework, part of the ongoing research is evolving within the fold of Croatian Studies, while part of it is nestled within American Studies. Both disciplinary ventures are interdisciplinary endeavors as such and, given our preceding comments, capable of attending to all the complexities of their object of study. Additionally, this specific research goal—a comprehensive study of emigration from Croatia, and, when applicable, from other state formations (notably the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and the two Yugoslavias), and the resulting Croatian diaspora—is even more explicitly espoused in a memorandum submitted by Professor Željko Bujas in 1986. This justified the need to implement a postgraduate, interdisciplinary program in American Studies (the only one of its kind in the former Yugoslavia) and is available in the Zagreb English Department's archive). To reiterate, it is my firm, pragmatic, and perhaps idealistic assumption that American Studies in Croatia should include some degree of investment in so-called diasporic themes. Otherwise, in its Croatian context, the discipline might lack currency and relevance for our social, political and cultural spheres.

I will attend for a moment to an archive of disciplinary interventions in this field, which evades strict disciplinary, national, linguistic and cultural barriers. A work exemplary of such crossovers is that by George (Jure) Prpić, historian and ethnic historian (the latter title makes sense in an American context) and U.S. academic, writing both in English and Croatian, who is the author of the first—and still relevant—monograph on Croats in the United States.¹¹ His work gained recognition after the 1990s, crossing the ocean to Croatia, where it was taken up by a string of researchers, most notably in Rijeka, by Branka Kalogjera, Estela Banov Depope and Vladimir Goss, (who was born in Zagreb, but has resided in Rijeka since his return to Croatia). Kalogjera moves strictly in the philological-cum-cultural domain, and does not stray far from a mixture of biography, cultural history and textual analysis.¹² Banov Depope hones her philological skills on a very interesting piece of diasporic cultural production, and has made tremendous efforts to retrieve it from material and spiritual oblivion—the pre-literary creations of the diaspora from the turn of the 20th century onwards.¹³

Banov Depope's method of flirting with the cultural studies protocol, however, is a nice introduction into what is consensually considered a methodological breakthrough in the study of the Croatian diaspora worldwide, making it applicable also to its American wing. Boris Škvorc, a diasporic scholar who himself migrates between Croatia and Australia, has raised the level of expertise usually required in such matters, and for the first time in the field articulated the idea of diasporic studies as inherently part of Croatian Studies, and thus comparable to disciplinary ventures in the vein of Irish Studies.¹⁴ Škvorc's approach is a breakthrough since it prompts scholars to take stock of valuable if scattered research done in the field, while providing theoretical grounding and a necessary degree of self-reflection, which it occasionally lacks.¹⁵ Since the publication of Škvorc's timely book and the synthesis attempted therein, one

might even say that a postmodernist consciousness permeates this research. In the remainder of this paper, I will try to present the rewards and challenges of this model of interdisciplinary inquiry.

To take as our object of interest the Croatian diaspora—especially its most durable and populous wing, located in the United States—means to contend with socio-historical and cultural processes of long duration, and indicative of modernity. It is thus the case that historian Ivan Čizmić and sociologist Ivan Rogić, in their recent comprehensive study on Croatian emigration, consider the problem of emigration under a larger heading—that of migratory flows as indicators of certain phases of modernity. It is impossible to summarize their entire complex, evolving and transdisciplinary work here, but a few remarks are in order. For brevity's sake, I will focus on the authors' remarks concerning 20th century emigration. Their arguments are framed, first, by their attention to the processes of modernity observed within the fold of the world-systems approach, wherein Croatia exhibits traits of “the double periphery.”¹⁶ In addition, they employ a temporal framing that encompasses three developments that have affected Croatia since the turn of the penultimate century: the first, second and third modernizations (1868–1940, 1941–1990, and 1991 to the present, respectively). To account for its changing features, Čizmić and Rogić read turn of the 20th century emigration as “an extended form of resistance to the strategy of pre-modernity”¹⁷, which enveloped Croatia, as a subordinate part of larger political structures. However, their approach, besides structural givens, attends to the notion of agency, while they render the account of an emotional and intentional undercurrent, “a specific imaginary set-up”, featuring America as a “super-ego” that, other necessities notwithstanding, fuels the desire to emigrate.¹⁸ This is the cultural aspect of an occasionally massive and continuous transfer of people. That this cultural dimension finds its place in an argumentative complex otherwise largely economic, demographic, political, geo-political, historical and sociological in nature brings me implicitly to the idea that the humanities' contribution to this endeavor should not be deprecated. Importantly, the book's interdisciplinary logic materializes from a crucial initial insight—that the dichotomy of diasporic and settled Croatia is not an incidental but, historically speaking, rather a constitutional feature of Croatia's national make-up, which warrants our sustained inter- and transdisciplinary attention.¹⁹

Case studies

In this second section, I will ask for the reader's patience as I take her on a (necessarily) short trip to consider a few representative cultural articulations of the diasporic imaginary. I will simultaneously ask indulgence for the fact that most of my examples will conveniently be taken from the field of culture and literature, this being my area of expertise. It could also be argued that literature and other cultural practices show the greatest crossover potential when compared to other sectors, such as politics, economics, geography or demography.

First, I will present a diasporic narrative occurring “after the divide”, which virtually regulated and assigned the home audience's access to texts, and effectively precluded their free circulation. When discussing the case of general diasporic non-fiction (political essays, memoirs, autobiographies) before 1989 or thereabouts, we should insist, according to Vinko Brešić, on the necessity to incorporate this strain of diasporic texts into the stable (national) corpus, since the latter is incomplete without it.²⁰ It is tempting to employ Benedict Anderson's perhaps overused concept of “imagining the nation” when approaching certain genres of diasporic writing,²¹ but my example will focus on Karlo Mirth's compelling memoir-cum-documentary, which recounts his more than 50 years as an emigrant, during which he evolves into a major cultural agent of the transnational Croatian diaspora, catering to its scattered branches. The story includes his determined and tenuous editorship, first of *Croatia Press*, an independent publication that has run continuously for several decades, and later by other single or joint cultural achievements, which testify to an ongoing diasporic engagement, allowing for an alternative, albeit “imaginary” Croatia, to employ Škvorc's term.²² Mirth's narrative is primarily a nostalgic invocation of a world that was doomed to perdition in the vortex of the two global wars, and in that sense his fate is an allegory of the 20th century's harrowing legacies of war and post-war excesses. It is set in Croatia, but could be equally applicable to any European country after the first and second world wars. His case does not rest on nostalgia, however, since at the point of his arrival in the States in 1952—after intermediary stays in the Fermo displaced persons camp (situated in Italy but operated by the British military), Rome, and Madrid—he embarks on his life's project: to construct and maintain the elusive but vital connections between the U.S. and worldwide Croatian diasporas. His motivation for launching *Croatia Press* was not only to record and comment on vital events in Croatia, but also to document cultural and political developments in the diaspora, creating on the page an imaginary dialogue and contestation that it could not obtain in reality.²³

Documentary and historical strains underlie his personal story, and act as a valuable source for a more sustained investigation into our 20th century cultural history. Mirth acts as a capable diasporic broker able to bring together the key actors of the sphere—for instance, we witness his vivid recollections of Ivan Meštrović, Vladko Maček, and Bogdan Raditsa. In retrospect, his assessment of Franjo Tuđman's interactions with the diaspora from his first visit to America in 1966—when Tuđman was director of the Institute of the History of Labor Movement and a member of the managing board of the Croatian Heritage Foundation—is certainly a valuable document.²⁴ Mirth is not stuck in the past, as he readily shows in a number of pieces observing U.S. Croats in the grip of the processes of the American melting pot. The point here is not to cast aspersions or sing praises but to assess, after due evaluation, the contribution of this recovered part of the literary corpus that is a necessary accompaniment to our 20th century cultural history. It is

certainly well worth imagining what the situation might have become if the avenues of dialogue had been kept open throughout the decades of the Cold War.

Mirth's major breakthrough happens in 1947, when he began publishing the "Croatian review and news bulletin" *Croatia Press*, a periodical that, until 1980, offered news and commentary as a counterpart to their official versions from Yugoslavia. The consensual view has pegged the periodical as having "intercontinental significance", comparable to the journal of *Hrvatska revija* (edited by Vinko Nikolić in various locations) and *Nova Hrvatska* (published in London by Jakša Kušan).²⁵ While *Hrvatska revija* has been recognized for its undeniable historical role as a cultural and political agent in the Cold War trenches, the recognition of *Croatia Press* still awaits a comparable critical intervention. This can also be said for *The Journal of Croatian Studies* (1960–), an organ attached to the non-partisan and non-political institution of the Croatian Academy of America (established in 1953), which could point to other conceptualizations of the diaspora.

Episodes suggesting an alternative approach were few and far between, but all the more intriguing for this. One such event occurred in 1966 on the 130th anniversary of the Croatian National Revival.²⁶ This celebration had the political and cultural pomp befitting the spirit of the occasion, with the major components of Croatian cultural life involved in the proceedings. At the same time, however, politics were never far away; behind the scenes of the event a slight hint of democracy could be felt, in the surprising invitation of some diasporic institutions (notably the Croatian Academy of America, co-founded by Mirth, among others) to join the celebrations. Mirth records his sincere sense of wonderment at having received any notice whatsoever from the homeland, but then noted that this crack in the otherwise steely attitude of the regime towards the emigrants was a sign of incipient democratization, soon to spread through Croatia and Yugoslavia.²⁷ This episode brought together, for the moment at least and in a virtual space, the figures of Miroslav Krleža, one of the key speakers at the event, Jakša Ravlić of *Matica hrvatska* (one of the organizers) and Mirth, emerging from the shadow of exile.

In the material presented by Mirth, one senses an inexhaustible and vital drive to keep the diasporic fire alight. This holds true not only in his case, but raises the idea of the need for a more systematic study of diasporic written sources (their sheer quantity is formidable in some fields), not in isolation, but as mirror texts for a comparable homeland topic. If we engage diasporic critical commentary on some aspects of life of the homeland as it was reconceived at various junctures of the 20th century, then we might be able to open up new avenues of research in a number of disciplines attending to our recent and more distant past.

We have shown how politicians and publicists have given way to writers in the latest phase of diasporic development. The writers that could be placed under the diasporic heading, however, don't tacitly assume this assigned role, since they continuously strive to break free from the presumed boundaries. To that end they not only switch camps (in terms of countries, languages, genres, or styles) but provide their own creative and experiential notion of diaspora, as expressed by Janko Deur, a Croatian American writer who resides in New York. Deur's works have been published in Croatia, and some years ago he was anthologized in a collection of American poetry. He doesn't see this as a problem; rather, he cherishes his literary bilingualism as a gesture of fierce, poignant nostalgia that has pushed him to create and write, and to imagine a world straddling the two states of imagination and reality. Even though he himself rejects the notion that the sole fact of physical displacement (by way of emigration) should erase a writer from the space of the homeland literature, this has nevertheless often been the case. After being "rejected" by the culture of his homeland, Deur turned to writing in English, which required of him a new artistic procedure. The spurned diasporic writer continued to explain the psychology of artistic creation in the diaspora and found himself in "limbo", leading him to conclude that the presumed marginality of the diaspora should be abolished both in spiritual and physical senses.²⁸

The next two authors, Neda Miranda Blažević-Krietzman and Josip Novakovich, show that Deur's appeal should be heeded, but at the same time expand on his existentially weighted notion of a diasporic malaise by turning it into a vital condition of their creative output and one of their thematic mainstays. These authors put into practice Deur's request for the dissolution of the mental blocks attributed to the diasporic situation when seen from the homeland, by showing among other things that the writer, especially if writing in English, begins to inhabit a global cultural sphere.

Neda Miranda Blažević-Krietzman is also Deur's literary sibling for the fact that she writes in Croatian more than in English. Hers is a more culturally challenging case, since she is a well-known practitioner of the women's writing that established itself as an offshoot of feminism in 1980s Yugoslavia. Her several collections of short stories, and particularly her well-received novel *Američka predigra* helped secure Blažević-Krietzman's status in Croatian/Yugoslav literature even before she became an emigrant to the United States via Germany.²⁹ The novel is an appropriate summation of the whole set of cultural and disciplinary concerns addressed here, but what makes it a particularly interesting read is the American backdrop, which allows the protagonist, a professor of literature and a creative writer on a year-long scholarship in the States, a way to dramatize the mode of self-inquiry in her life.

The questing thrust of the novel is sustained by the character's change of residence, compounded by her travels while in the U.S. The act of traveling and alternately settling in various locations (Minnesota, the Midwest and New

York) are destabilized at the beginning of each section in typical postmodernist fashion by the use of intertextual references, which are interchanged with the protagonist's "real" impressions. Minnesota and the Midwest stand out almost as a simulacrum, a collage of literary, musical and pop-culture references, including the home of Great Gatsby's narrator, the birthplace of Prince, and an evocation of an early Bruce Springsteen album.³⁰ The simulacrum effect is even more pronounced as the protagonist and her partner, a sculptor, move to New York, a hive of iconographic images of America. She becomes so overwhelmed that the exterior world becomes fully interiorized, dramatized by way of her alter-ego, sensitive, highly-strung art historian Bella, whose traumatic story of flight from post-1968 Czechoslovakia is embedded as a novel that the protagonist is writing during her stay in New York, but which in fact fully displaces the framing narrative.³¹ Bella's exile and her erratic movements through New York thus mirror the narrator's quest, which in late capitalist America, on the brink of the irruption of history (the end of the Cold War), leads to an endless fragmentation of identities that is not likely to be stayed even by her return "home". Diasporic writers, more so than any other group of cultural agents, have been able to attend to multiple meanings of the mobile experience.

Josip Novakovich in an interview from the mid-1990s, states simply that he is half-Croatian and half-American.³² In his essay collection *Plum Brandy* he playfully and strategically embodies both Croatian and American perspectives, invoking the position of contemporary ethnographer, as has been pointed out in earlier readings of his non-fiction. It has been suggested that Novakovich's narrative strategies be taken as illustrative of a new textual turn in ethnography that favors an involved, participant observer—both over an objective, all-knowing researcher and a too immersed native informant.³³ Novakovich can play this textual role precisely because he shuttles freely and competently between the two worlds, assuming a mediating role for both audiences, Croatian and Anglophone. In the vein of a textual turn in anthropology—riding the wave of similar developments in a number of humanities and social sciences disciplines—he doesn't presume full authority, since cultural, epistemic and generic restrictions intervene. In the first part of *Plum Brandy*, for instance, he debunks his own presumption to faithfully recall and tell his family history, thus assuming the role of failed memoirist.³⁴ This failure, however, is not simply due to his faulty memory or to the strategies of hiding or distorting the less palatable facts of his family history, but also lies in the fact that memory might be the only vehicle for retaining or retrieving history in our time.

The latest phase of Novakovich's search takes him to Canada, and turns him again into an immigrant, a state that he readily adapts to the subject of his creative non-fiction work *Shopping for a Better Country*.³⁵ His regular readers, however, will notice that as the geographic span widens, the themes of his work seem to contract, as the narratives turn towards his childhood and pre-emigration days; his deceased parents to whom he dedicated the two essays as eulogies; and (in a gesture of farewell to his adopted homeland America) assorted episodes of his ethnic life. Thus memory is once more his grand theme, as he provides Emersonian meditations on the ravages of death and the pain of survival and remembering. Still, even in this collection Novakovich retains his landmark black humor and grotesque touch, which comes to the fore as he navigates several different cultural systems. Due to globalization, the distance between these systems seems to be decreasing, as they fuse into a bland mass, with Canada, the United States, Croatia, Germany, and Russia becoming less distinguishable. Surprisingly, and as if in compliance with a certain wayward dynamic of memory, the past appears in greater relief, and assails the narrator with an urgency and poignancy that the present lacks.

Novakovich, after a number of years in the trade, still relies on migration, wandering, exile and travel (all of which are forms of mobility) as a master trope, inviting the reader to become cognizant of the way mobility fuels his writing. This might take more existential overtones, such as when he considers the already diasporic disposition of his maternal side of the family (his great-grandmother was an immigrant in the States, while both his grandmother and mother were born there, as were Novakovich's children), or come about as a ploy that will generate non-invidious misrecognitions—this works better if one is marketed as an exiled author from communist Yugoslavia, even though that wasn't Novakovich's case—or be used as a trigger for his creativity. His short story "The Burning Clog" mocks the young writer's pretensions to plug into an authentic store of oral lore that is miraculously lodged in and contained by his old time and old country acquaintances.³⁶ Having been exposed to American creative writing programs, the narrator comes to the old country seeking the pristine force of oral stories as his inspiration, only to learn that it is a false dichotomy. His narrative reinvention of home will have to rely on the force of (diasporic, nostalgic, and literary) imagination.

In conclusion, given the degree of social consensus attached to the need to systematically and comprehensively study the Croatian diaspora and its manifold manifestations, it would be reasonable to assume that various social, academic and institutional factors and agencies would be undertaking efforts in this respect. However, if we browse through their archives, libraries and programs, it can be seen that this is only partly the case. It is true that in the past 20 years a body of work has emerged that studies various aspects of the Croatian diaspora, past and present. This is visible in the archives and catalogues of the National and University Library—especially in their collection of *Inozemna Croatica*, which compiles various materials by and about the diaspora—and is only fair considering, as Mirth points out, that the diaspora amassed considerable funds for the building's construction and refurbishment.³⁷ Indicative in this respect are also projects undertaken at different research institutes in Croatia (Institut za društvena

istraživanja Ivo Pilar, Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku, Institut za migracije i narodnosti), and individual courses dedicated to specific aspects of the diaspora scattered across various university curricula (e.g. in Zagreb, in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, and Hrvatski studiji). However, as Boris Škvorc suggests, additional effort is needed to further institutionalize, strengthen and compile the research archive into a body of knowledge. Even if the current situation is far from desirable, this is no reason to give in to despair or defeatism; the phenomenon of the diaspora in Croatian cultural development will not go away, so we might as well learn to live with it and do our best to understand what it means for our past, present and future.

Notes

¹ Boris Maruna, "Hrvatska matica iseljenika—susretište iseljeničtva i domovine." *Hrvatski iseljenički zbornik* (1992): 24. Translation mine.

² Vladimir Goss, "Hrvatski duh u engleskome ruhu." *Hrvatski iseljenički zbornik* 2001. <<http://www.matis.hr/index.php/hr/aktivnosti/nakladnistvo/hrvatski-iseljenicki-zbornik>> (13 March 2015).

³ Bogdan Raditsa, *Živjeti-nedoživjeti, uspomene hrvatskog intelektualca kroz moralnu i ideološku krizu Zapada*. 1. i 2. dio (München, Barcelona: Knjižnica Hrvatske revije, 1982), 93. All translations are mine.

⁴ Raditsa, 548.

⁵ Vladimir Goss, "Dijaspora za 21. Stoljeće." *Matica* XLVII/ 6 (1997): 10-11.

⁶ For a contemporary assessment, cf. Većeslav Holjevac, "Svuda dobrodošli. Razgovor s predsjednikom Narodnog odbora grada Zagreba Većeslavom Holjevcem o njegovu boravku u Sjedinjenim Državama Amerike i susretima s našim iseljenicima," *Matica* XI/9 (rujan 1961): 258-60.

⁷ Ivan Čizmić et al, ur., *Iseljeničtvo naroda i narodnosti Jugoslavije i njegove uzajamne veze s domovinom*. Zbornik (Zagreb: Zavod za migracije i narodnosti, 1978), 5. Translation mine.

⁸ Radmila Kovačević i Lidija Kiseljak. "Lukšići za 120 milijuna eura kupili Istraturist: 'Iznimno smo ponosni'". *Večernji list*. 26 August 2014. <<http://www.vecernji.hr/kompanije-i-trzista/zaba-prodala-umaski-istraturist-plavoj-laguni-za-1201-milijun-eura-957485>> (17 September 2014).

⁹ "The Man Booker International Prize 2013." <<http://www.themanbookerprize.com/the-man-booker-international-prize-2013>> (12 September 2014); Iva Krtalić Muiesan, "Skármeta dobio čileansku Nacionalnu nagradu". *Vijenac*. 4. rujna 2014, 2.

¹⁰ Josip Jurčević, *Slučaj Perković: spašavanje zločinačke budućnosti* (Zagreb: DIS, Hrvatsko žrtvoslovno društvo, 2013); Orhidea Gaura Hodak, *Perković i Tuđman: istina o tajnoj vezi koja je formirala Hrvatsku* (Zagreb: Profil, 2014).

¹¹ Jure Prpić, *Hrvati u Americi*. Prev. Ksenija Horvat (Zagreb: Hrvatska matica iseljenika, 1997).

¹² Branka Kalogjera, *Pisci između dviju domovina* (Rijeka: HFD, Grafrade, 2003).

¹³ Estela Banov-Depope, *Hrvatske kalendarske knjige u Sjevernoj Americi* (Rijeka: HFD, 2001).

¹⁴ Boris Škvorc, *Australski Hrvati. Mitovi i stvarnost* (Zagreb: Hrvatska matica iseljenika, 2005), 7.

¹⁵ Škvorc, 8.

¹⁶ Ivan Rogić i Ivan Čizmić, *Modernizacija u Hrvatskoj i hrvatska odselidba* (Zagreb: Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar, 2011), 54. All translations are mine.

¹⁷ Rogić i Čizmić, 80.

¹⁸ Rogić i Čizmić, 86.

¹⁹ Rogić i Čizmić, 300.

²⁰ Škvorc, 91.

²¹ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. (London, New York: Verso, 1991).

²² Škvorc, 69.

²³ Karlo Mirth, *Život u emigraciji* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2003), 413. All translations are mine.

²⁴ Mirth, 341-47.

²⁵ Mirth, 82.

²⁶ Mirth, 337-39.

²⁷ Mirth, 338.

²⁸ Ivo Mladineo, "Pjesnik između domovine i tuđine." Razgovor s Jankom Deurom, hrvatskim pjesnikom u New Yorku. *Matica XL/ 6-7* (lipanj-srpanj 1990): 31.

²⁹ Neda Miranda Blažević, *Američka predigra* (Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske, 1989).

³⁰ Blažević, 7, 21, 37, 88.

³¹ Blažević, 117, 121.

³² Vladimir P. Goss, "Pisanje se najbolje uči od života." Razgovor s Josipom Novakovichem. *Matica XLVI/12* (1996): 30-31.

³³ Jelena Šesnić, "Croatian American Literature as a Transcultured Discourse." *East Central Europe in Exile*. Vol 2: Transatlantic Identities. (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), 13-29.

³⁴ Josip Novakovich, *Plum Brandy: Croatian Journeys* (Buffalo: White Pine Press, 2003), 34, 35, 43.

³⁵ Josip Novakovich, *Shopping for a Better Country: Essays* (Westland, MI: Dzanc Books, 2012).

³⁶ Josip Novakovich, *Yolk* (Saint, Minn.: Graywolf Press, 1995).

³⁷ Mirth, 81.

Bibliography

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London, New York: Verso, 1991.

Banov-Depope, Estela. *Hrvatske kalendarske knjige u Sjevernoj Americi*. Rijeka: HFD, 2001.

Blažević, Neda Miranda. *Američka predigra*. Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske, 1989.

Čizmić, Ivan et al., ur. *Iseljeničtvo naroda i narodnosti Jugoslavije i njegove uzajamne veze s domovinom*. Zbornik. Zagreb: Zavod za migracije i narodnosti, 1978.

Gaura Hodak, Orhidea. *Perković i Tuđman: istina o tajnoj vezi koja je formirala Hrvatsku*. Zagreb: Profil, 2014.

Goss, Vladimir P. "Pisanje se najbolje uči od života." Razgovor s Josipom Novakovichem. *Matica XLVI/12* (1996): 30-31.

---. "Dijaspora za 21. stoljeće." *Matica XLVII/ 6* (1997): 10-11.

- . "Hrvatski duh u engleskome ruhu." *Hrvatski iseljenički zbornik* 2001.
<<http://www.matis.hr/index.php/hr/aktivnosti/nakladnistvo/hrvatski-iseljenicki-zbornik>> (13 March 2015).
- Holjevac, Većeslav. *Hrvati izvan domovine*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1967.
- . "Svuda dobrodošli. Razgovor s predsjednikom Narodnog odbora grada Zagreba Većeslavom Holjevcem o njegovu boravku u Sjedinjenim Državama Amerike i susretima s našim iseljenicima" *Matica* XI/9 (rujan 1961): 258-60.
- Jurčević, Josip. *Slučaj Perković: spašavanje zločinačke budućnosti*. Zagreb: DIS, Hrvatsko žrtvoslovno društvo, 2013.
- Kalogjera, Branka. *Pisci između dviju domovina*. Rijeka: HFD, Grafrade, 2003.
- Kovačević, Radmila i Lidija Kiseljak. "Lukšići za 120 milijuna eura kupili Istraturist: 'Iznimno smo ponosni'". *Večernji list*. Aug. 26, 2014. Sept. 17, 2014. <<http://www.vecernji.hr/kompanije-i-trzista/zaba-prodala-umaski-istraturist-plavoj-laguni-za-1201-milijun-eura-957485>> (17 September 2014).
- Krtalić Muiesan, Iva. "Skármeta dobio čileansku Nacionalnu nagradu". *Vijenac*. 4. rujna 2014, 2.
- "The Man Booker International Prize 2013." <<http://www.themanbookerprize.com/the-man-booker-international-prize-2013>> (12 September 2014).
- Maruna, Boris. "Hrvatska matica iseljenika—susretište iseljeničtva i domovine." *Hrvatski iseljenički zbornik* (1992): 24-25.
- Mirth, Karlo. *Život u emigraciji*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2003.
- Mladineo, Ivo. „Pjesnik između domovine i tuđine“. Razgovor s Jankom Deurom, hrvatskim pjesnikom u New Yorku. *Matica* XL/ 6-7 (lipanj-srpanj 1990): 31.
- Novakovich, Josip. *Yolk*. Saint, Minn.: Graywolf Press, 1995.
- . *Plum Brandy: Croatian Journeys*. Buffalo: White Pine Press, 2003.
- . *Shopping for a Better Country: Essays*. Westland, MI: Dzanc Books, 2012.
- Prpić, Jure. *Hrvati u Americi*. Prev. Ksenija Horvat. Zagreb: Hrvatska matica iseljenika, 1997.
- Raditsa, Bogdan. *Živjeti-nedoživjeti, uspomene hrvatskog intelektualca kroz moralnu i ideološku krizu Zapada*. 1. i 2. dio. München, Barcelona: Knjižnica Hrvatske revije, 1982.
- Rogić, Ivan i Ivan Čizmić. *Modernizacija u Hrvatskoj i hrvatska odselidba*. Zagreb: Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar, 2011.
- Šesnić, Jelena. "Croatian American Literature as a Transculturated Discourse." *East Central Europe in Exile*. Vol 2: Transatlantic Identities. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013. 13-29.
- Škvorc, Boris. *Australski Hrvati. Mitovi i stvarnost*. Zagreb: Hrvatska matica iseljenika, 2005.