

MEMORY AND OBLIVION VERSUS THE YUGOSLAVIAN HERITAGE. THE CASE OF SERBIAN AND CROATIAN EMIGRANT LITERATURE – A PRELIMINARY DIAGNOSIS

In the German-language autobiographical novel by Saša Stanišić, a writer of Serbo-Bosnian extraction, the narrator-protagonist, a teenage boy, leaves war-torn Bosnia and moves with his parents to Germany. When after the war he comes back as a student to his hometown Višegrad seeking a girlfriend he knew in his (lost) childhood, he visits his father's friend, a music teacher. For a short moment he remembers him and reminisces on the time from before the disintegration of Yugoslavia. After a few minutes he loses touch with the past and introducing himself, asks the young man: "Petar Popović, who do I have the pleasure?". When this sequence is repeated a number of times during the visit, the teacher's wife observes: "Perhaps this is all for the better ... This way one can hide from memory and prevent the dreadful present slap you in the face day by day" (Stanišić 2008: 294).

The above scene registers two divergent types of experience: that of a narrator who **left his homeland** during the war and comes back to it to **be reminded** of the recent pre-war and wartime Yugoslav past as well as that of a music teacher who **stayed** in his home country but who does not want to **return** to the past, or rather who **would not remember** it. In both cases **memory** and **forgetting** are differently

functionalised and valorised; one is the protagonists' antidote, while the other is their poison, and vice versa.

The divergent valorisations of the past (in this particular instance) heritage of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia are a consequence of the strategies of remembering and forgetting, which this heritage is subject to at present. The interplay of memory and forgetting (an issue introduced by Friedrich Nietzsche in *Untimely Meditations* [Banasiak 2008], later interpreted insightfully by Derrida in his famous reading of Plato's *Pharmakon*), sets in motion various, sometimes mutually exclusive values, which make the SFRY a sign of social security, political independence, opposition against nationalism and isolationism, or otherwise linked to totalitarianism, cult of the individual, dominance of one nation, *uravnilovka*, restraining civil liberties and repressions; in a word, with the *ancien régime*. The above divergent meanings are implied by the fact that, as the Serbian sociologist Todor Kuljić observes, each mode of remembering Titoism is dominated by a different component: cognitive, symbolic or ideological (Kuljić 226). It should be moreover borne in mind that the coming to the fore of these different meanings is closely linked with the presence of various discursive practices, which have been emerging to this day after the collapse of Yugoslavia.

The issues under scrutiny here are, naturally, present also in the social sphere of the other countries of the former Eastern Bloc; however, the experience of the last wars had an indelible impact on the uniqueness (intensity and progress) of the processes of "coming to terms" with the pre/communist past of the nations of the former SFRY. Therefore, when examining post-Yugoslav "émigré" literatures, it is necessary to contextualise the actions of its authors. The dramatic circumstances in which these authors were forced to flee their homelands prevent us from seeing their biographies and texts as being motivated or underpinned by the same reaction, which would allow for a shared description of their texts. As a result, the departure from the traditional approach to emigrant literature (Bolecki 1999: 249), motivated by the socio-economic transition taking place after 1989, for the sake of treating this literature as an "intertext" (*międzytekst*) registering a most profound existential experience (not only autobiographic) of leaving one's country of origin and participating in two cultures, as put forth by Mieczysław Dąbrowski, may seem insufficient in reference to post-Yugoslav cases (Dąbrowski 93-105).

This situation arises primarily from the fact that the Yugoslav authors still prior to 1989, or rather prior to 1991, i.e. before the outbreak of the fratricidal war, had been immersed in the multicultural; many intellectuals built their Yugoslav identity on this cultural rather than (only) political community. The outbreak of the war annihilated the space of this community and became a catalyst of the longing for it, known as Yugo-nostalgia, as well as the need of coming to terms with the time of Tito¹, including the revaluation of those aspects of the social, political and cultural life which were taboo in Yugoslavia. One of them was emigrant literature.²

The untenability of describing post-Yugoslav literatures via e/migration, the category proposed by Mieczysław Dąbrowski, stems moreover from the problematic existence and status of emigrant literature in Yugoslavia in the traditional (i.e. politically-motivated) meaning of the term from before 1989. This is due to the fact that the notion of emigrant literature, based on categories of repression and exclusion, is easier to build in reference to the ideological and political totalitarian order in its pure form (e.g. nazism, fascism, communism). For various reasons, Titoism evades such pigeonholing, although its methods of fighting political opponents were in essence no different than those used in other totalitarian systems.

Since the late 1940s, i.e. after the exclusion of Yugoslavia from the Comintern in 1948, the Yugoslav model was considered a “soft” version of socialism. Apparently, as many believe, this was borne out by the fact that Yugoslavia did not join any military alliance (which was used by Tito for self-promotion in his allegedly “autonomous” foreign policy), as well as the opening of the borders, which facilitated a more unencumbered flow of ideas and people (Marković 2007: 28 ff).

Economy-wise, the situation of Yugoslavia was also different from that of the other socialist state because of social (cooperative), rather

¹ Referring to the need of “coming to terms”, I mean the political and ideological (nationalist, leftist or liberal) preferences of the authors of those revisions. One of the manifestations of it is e.g. the u-nostalgia, or a carving for an Independent Croatian State. (Baković 315-323)

² The publications of texts by authors doomed to oblivion in the SFRY for political reasons were made in Serbia e.g. by Gojko Tešić; earlier, in 1988 their names were made public by Predrag Palavestra (1988). The biographies and a lexicographic presentation of the works by Croatian writers doomed to oblivion after WWII were presented by Vinko Grubišić (Grubišić 1990).

than state ownership of means of production and enterprises. Titoism was moreover unique due to the official non-existence of censorship. At the same time, freedom of expression, although enshrined in the successive constitutions, first of the NFRY (Narodna Federativna Republika Jugoslavija, National Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) and the SFRY, was nowhere to be found, as it was curbed by another constitutional provision, prohibiting the use of the freedom of speech, e.g. "in order to topple the democratic socialist order" – See a comprehensive article accounting for the practice of censorship in the SFRY in the Bosnian media (Defderdarević 1998).

The objectives and tasks of Yugoslav literatures after World War Two and the role of the writer were clearly and precisely defined in the party directives or resolutions adopted during party plenary conferences, congresses and meetings; these documents in fact mapped out the writers' stomping ground. The existence of a narrow margin of liberty was based, as is claimed by the philosopher Nenad Dimitrijević, on a "tacit agreement" concluded between the regime and the writers preventing the questioning of the appropriacy of the road taken by the authorities (Dimitrijević 137-159). Supposedly, such an agreement sanctioned the impossibility of being an intellectual apart from the system of state-controlled institutions³, which in the circumstances of Yugoslavia led to widespread self-censorship, the practice of *ketman* or, in very rare instances, to authors becoming dissidents.

As a consequence of the above stance of Yugoslav intellectuals until 1980 (not the only one, even if definitely the most common), there was no organised opposition with structures of the "underground" state, second circulation of books and the press and institutionalised active dissident émigré community. We can thus safely say that the Yugoslav model of socialism proved more fateful for the intellectual circles than in Poland, the Soviet Union or Czechoslovakia. The belief in the "softness" of the Yugoslav mode of socialism and "creative liberties" of Yugoslav artists as opposed to the situation of those in the other socialist states contributed to what in hindsight can be called a "stifling" of intellectuals' alertness.

Another aspect of the complex situation is the question of dissident activity (political and literary) in Yugoslavia. The unique posi-

³ Slavenka Drakulić calls the intellectuals embroiled in the system "state" or "party" intellectuals (Drakulić 73).

tion of the country after World War Two was accountable for the fact that it had fewer dissidents than the other countries of the Socialist Bloc. The category itself is a bit dubious. On the one hand, doubts arise from the imprecise term “dissident” and its use in a broad, dictionary meaning (inclusive of opposing views), which implies its application to both legal and illegal actions, the latter being born of an opposition to, or rebellion against, the system.

As a consequence of its broad understanding, the term is applied by Nebojša Popov in an article discussing the chronicle of the Serbian dissident movement, e.g. to members of the Praxis group, **legally** active during the time of Yugoslavia and to Dobrica Ćosić, who despite a departure from Tito’s line **was never persecuted by the regime**⁴. Moreover, Jelka Kljajić-Imsirović applies the term “dissident” to all cases resulting from the authorities’ terror (Kljajić-Imsirović 1998). On the other hand, another famous Serbian opposition member Mihajlo Mihajlov, narrowing down the use of the term to people whose views differed from those of the regime, were illegal and triggered the regime’s reprisals, observes that there were only two dissidents in Tito’s Yugoslavia: Milovan Đilas (Đilas, persecuted and repeatedly incarcerated by the time of Tito’s death in 1980, his texts coming out until the 1990s solely in the West) and himself (Radović, Đorđević 1998). A similar view is espoused by Todor Kuljić, an author of a study on Josip Broz Tito. Furthermore, statements by Mihajlov and Kuljić might point out that the term “dissident” may refer to people who played a special, historic role and contributed to the collapse of the system.

The other aspect of this unique phenomenon in Yugoslavia is linked with the fact of an inconsistent approach of the Yugoslav authorities to certain questions (like e.g. a tacit approval of the leftist critics of socialism, active in the Zagreb-based *Praxis* magazine and in the Korčula School with a simultaneous harsh treatment by the communists of the black wave in the cinema (the way the regime crushed the “black wave” in the cinema is accounted for by Arsić-Ivkov 2002), a manifestation of selective terror used by the regime in Yugoslavia; in the other socialist states terror was widespread).

⁴ See a series of editorials by Mirko Kovač dedicated to the “false dissident” Dobrica Ćosić: Kovač, Mirko. “Otac nacije”, published in the Bosnian and Croat *Dani* weekly in 2005, part 1 – 3.06.2005, no. 416; part 2 – 10.06.2005, no. 417; part 3 – 17.06.2005, no. 418; part 4 – 24.06.2005, no. 419, part 5 – 1.07.2005, no. 420; part 6 – 8.07.2005, no. 421; part 7 – 15.07.2005, no. 422.

The above factors make any discussion of emigrant literature in the context of Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav literatures especially complicated. All of them contributed to the lack of an unequivocal and precise connection between the term "emigrant literature" and political pressure, prohibition and ban; the semantics of the term shifted towards metaphorical senses still before 1989 (after: Walas). Works by twentieth-century émigrés-classics, setting out a certain tradition, already then applied this term as a category registering an existential escape to artistic freedom (Danilo Kiš), foreignness as a choice (Borislav Pekić) or an existential exile (Miloš Crnjanski), a kind of existential experience (not necessarily confirmed by the autobiographic nature of the texts themselves; I cover this topic in depth in the text: Nowak-Bajcar 2009), a category which according to Mieczysław Dąbrowski is the distinguishing mark of e/migrant literature after 1989.

Problems with the term "emigrant literature" in Yugoslavia and after and with its tradition in literary history, arise then from the unique path of development of Yugoslav literatures. Vinko Brešić points out the following characteristics of Croatian literature: a lack of the possibility of continuous development and defragmentation as well as factors which to his mind stem from the long period of "inexistence of the Croat national state" and from the fact that "the ethnic borders of the Croatian people do not correspond to the political borders of" Croatia (Brešić 179). The above observations, founded on the controversial premise of ethnic "purity", at this level of generalisation, may be in fact applied to the historical situation of most counties, not only Slavic ones, in the twentieth century and before. However, it seems that it is not the above factors but rather a canonisation of a certain paradigm, status and scope of this phenomenon that determine the way of existence and viability of the emigration category in particular national literatures.

The literary paradigm under discussion developed in Polish literature in the nineteenth century and made its imprint on the treatment of this category after World War Two. Although all the Slav rebirth projects were developed in diasporas and in exile by emigrants (after: Dąbrowska-Partyka), an absence of a vibrant émigré community comparable to that of the Polish Grand Emigration whose legacy during Romanticism shaped both the model and the position of the "free" and patriotic paradigm of Polish emigrant literature, most likely affected the viability of this category in the twentieth-century literature in

Serbian and Croatian. Unlike for Poles, after World War Two emigration was not a consolidating factor, a potential pivot of a project of an image universe of each of the Slavic nations (as we know, for many Slavs this role was played by the myth of expulsion and displacement).

As a consequence, we cannot unambiguously identify the category of emigrant literature in post-war Yugoslavia with the “free” and patriotic paradigm. This was also due to the absence of the vibrant Serbian and Croat émigré movement with an impact comparable to that of the Paris-based *Kultura* magazine and of the Polish emigrants in London. However, in his article on the democratic opposition movement in Serbia, Nebojša Popov refers to the émigré union *Oslobođenje* (Liberation), set up in Geneva in 1949 and active in the United Kingdom until 1994. As of 1948 its members published in Paris, and as of 1958 in London, the *Naša reč* periodical. However, due to the limited scope of operation of this organisation, it cannot be compared to the activity of Polish emigrants (after: Radojević 2007: 118-135). Another factor which contributed to the fragmentation of the Serbian Diaspora was its political divisions.

We deal with a similar situation in Croatia. The magazine which consolidated the Croatian Diaspora after World War Two was *Hrvatska revija*, a periodical set up in 1928 as a monthly of the Croatian Motherland in Zagreb and continued its activity also during the fascist Independent Croat State (*Nezavisna Država Hrvatska*). While initially it was edited only by people connected with the fascist state (the reason why the activity of representative of the Croat Diaspora was taboo), it became more liberal as of 1954.⁵

There was also another factor which contributed to the lack of canonisation of the category of emigration in Yugoslav literatures. Although the Serbian and Croatian émigré communities attracted individuals of diverse political views, the stereotypical image of an emigrant as ingrained in the social consciousness of the time of Tito was negative. An emigrant was perceived as a nationalist: a Serbian

⁵ In 1941 the editors-in-chief of the periodical, coming out until 1941, were Vladimir Livadić and Blaž Jurišić. It resumed its operation in 1951 in Buenos Aires under the auspices of Antun Bonifačić and Vinko Nikolić, who took the effort to be its editors. After Bonifačić left for the United States, Nikolić, who had more liberal views, became the editor-in-chief. When in 1966 Nikolić moved to Europe, first to France and ultimately to Spain, the periodical published articles by representatives of many political circles and orientations, among whom there was e.g. Ivan Meštrović.

Chetnik and a Croatian Ustasha. After the wars ended, due to the mounting nationalist tendencies, the image was radically reversed: the emigrants were shown to be patriots, opponents of communism and its victims. Hence some political Croatian elites attempted to rehabilitate the Independent Croatian State, also by showing its duality. It was seen as a positively valorised implementation of the idea of independence to be set apart from fascism as the state's ideology and the manner of holding power in the country, which were considered as negative (after: Czerwiński 102ff).

The above facts, discussed in broad terms, prove that the activity of emigrant communities in both Serbia and Croatia calls for in-depth and detailed studies, free from simplifications and stereotypes, which will reveal the actual significance of these circles (and the individuals gathered in them) and their role (including that for Croatia's gaining independence).⁶ This applied not only to the emigration wave following World War Two, but also to the economic emigrations of the 1960s and emigrations following the reprisals after the so-called "Croatian Spring".⁷

The lack of canonisation of the notion of "emigrant literature" in Croatian and Serbian literature was also due to the fact that the accomplishments of the emigrant-authors following World War Two were not included into the canon of works ideologically and artistically relevant for these cultures.⁸

⁶ It is interesting to observe a statement of the Croatian writer Daša Drndić, who returned to Croatia during the last war after many years spent in Belgrade, although as she herself admits she did not experience anything unpleasant in Serbia and no one forced her to leave. In one of her interviews she observed: "I believe that if certain things had been accounted for in 1945, if questions connected with the Independent Croatian State and the Ustashas in Yugoslavia had been cleared up, they would not have raised their heads in the 1990s. I do not mean the Ustashas in the Croatian Republic, but those who were dispersed around the globe and began to return to their home country *en masse*. One should see, notice certain things and react. Naturally, this may take the form of an individual action but it should be supported by a certain project, the state, those in power [...]." (Drndić 2013).

⁷ According to Desimir Tosić, an activist of the *Oslobođenje* movement, the wave of economic emigration of qualified workers and intellectuals did not produce any political opposition; they were also under surveillance by the secret police and were under constant observation (Tosić 274-275).

⁸ The attempt to "restore" to the literary canon the writers excluded from it for political reasons was taken in Serbia by Gojko Tešić in the anthology *Utuljena baština* (Distin-

Yugoslav socialism, gradually transmogrifying since the 1980s into local nationalisms, led in the early 1990s to the disintegration of Yugoslavia. Having regained independence, the Yugoslav nations identified this nationalist change of course with “democracy”, while in Serbia and Croatia, additionally informed by the war, they were in fact other incarnations of totalitarianism. Since, as Slavenka Drakulić observes, “democracy knows no notion of a «dissident»,,, despite the guarantee of all civil liberties, full-fledged authors with an established position, although they never “had been” dissidents and although they officially “had not been persecuted”, were forced to leave the country among widespread nationalist zeal due to artistic isolation and the pressure of the community. I mean here Mirko Kovač, who as a 53-year-old left Belgrade in 1991 and settled down in Rovinj on Istria (he died in 2013). In 1992 the same step was taken by the 56-year-old Bora Ćosić, who now lives in Berlin and Rovinj, and Daša Drndić (b. 1946), a Croatian woman writer who left Belgrade during the war and returned to Croatia. Their departures were caused by the nationalist hysteria in Serbia, but was not limited to this country. The group of writers who left Croatia for similar reasons included: Dubravka Ugrešić (b. 1949), Slavenka Drakulić (b. 1949) and Predrag Matvejević (b. 1932).

The melancholy discourse of the Yugo-nostalgia emerging in the texts by the authors of this generation cannot naturally be perceived in terms of their naivety or unawareness of the oppressiveness of the

guished Legacy); the author indicated 23 names (after: Tešić 1990). Earlier, still in 1988, their names in a literary magazine were revealed by Predrag Palavestra (Palavestra 44). However, it is very telling that Mihajlo Pantić in a book dedicated to Serbian and Croatian short story of the 1920s and the 1930s supplements the “relevant bibliography” by only one author, Dragiša Vasić, a Chetnik activist. As to Tešić, he wrote as follows: “The «ideological purgatory» of the post-war years where the (extra)literary activity of those authors took place, had an impact on their biographies and their literature. [...] Therefore, *Utuljena baština* is not only a literary rehabilitation of a specific number of writers, but an invitation to what **should have followed it, i.e. the reading of these texts and the evaluation** (of the literary accomplishments – S.N.B.) of each of them” (emphasis – S.N.B.; Pantić 53). Biographies with a lexicographic presentation (also without an element of an artistic evaluation of the works) of Croatian writers doomed to oblivion earlier were presented by Vinko Grubišić. Although the activity of the authors connected with the Independent Croatian State was including into the history of Croatian literature by Dubravko Jelčić (Jelčić 1997), their selection, based on the criterion of ideology, is controversial (after: Kornhauser 133 ff).

Titoist system. A comparison may seem risky, yet I would call the above current of idealising Yugoslavia as the “country of childhood years”, a current that regards the collapse of the former homeland as an apocalyptic event, an end of a certain world of values whose image must be cherished and remembered, the “phantasm project”. In the case of texts by the above authors we deal with a return to the emigrant paradigm of the Enlightenment and Romanticism, implied by the situation of exile (or the place of domicile of the author or of the work’s origin) and charged with a system of certain civil, national and social liberties arising from the fact that the authors, by creating their microhistories, write in fact counter-discourses to the discourses of authority present in their homelands. In this function, as a symbol of resistance against the mounting nationalist hysteria of the states regaining or (as in the case of Macedonia gaining) independence after the collapse of Yugoslavia, the microhistories by post-Yugoslav writers involved a discourse of Yugonostalgia, which enveloped with oblivion all kinds of oppression generated by Titoism.

In this context, it is very much telling that the other, scary image of the SFRY was offered by authors who never decided to leave the country. They included, e.g. Dragoslav Mihailović, a former prisoner of Naked Island, a gulag set up by Tito, an author of publicist and documentary prose *Goli otok*, published since 1990, whose last part came out in 2012. These forms of remembering the trauma of the SFRY (their authors are, incidentally, closer in terms of ideology to the emigrants who did not return to their homeland following World War Two) depart from the vision of Yugoslavia cherished by those who were into Yugonostalgia. This “departure” should be seen rather tentatively, as both the literature by Bora Ćosić and that by Mirko Kovač (both given to the Yugonostalgia) still published in Yugoslavia in the 1960s included an element of a critique of Titoism, which the authors levelled by a variety of means: showing the tragicomic aspect of life in the SFRY (B. Ćosić) or its drama (M. Kovač). Therefore, the category of Yugonostalgia as a tool of accounting for the phenomena seen comprehensively and broadly, may spawn certain problems (after: Ślawska 2013).

We cannot disregard the fact that the game of remembering the homeland as a land of their youth and of forgetting the oppressiveness of the SFRY located these emigrants among those who used Yugonostalgia to further certain concrete political ends. One of them was Slobodan Milošević; his sentiment for Yugoslavia was evident e.g. in the

fact that after the regaining of independence by Slovenia, Montenegro, Macedonia and Bosnia, Montenegro and Serbia, as a joint state organism until 2003, was called the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Savezna Republika Jugoslavija⁹, which symbolically perpetuated the sense of continuance with the period before 1991, securing the position of Serbia as the follower of the Yugoslav project and – in the context of the last war – of the idea of Great Serbia.

Hence the overt abstention of the Yugo-nostalgic Croatian writers from the political aspect of Yugo-Slavism. The choices of the places of living were closely linked with the writers' profession and the chance to use their mother tongue. Having left Serbia or Croatia, they operate and "remain" in their old homeland, i.e. non-existent Yugoslavia. A departure is a kind of escape and a political gesture, allowing nonetheless contact with their own homeland and language, as can be seen in a statement made by Mirko Kovač, who explained his reasons for leaving Serbia as follows:

The circle of my friends in Belgrade was dwindling incredibly quickly. I avoided many of them, moving to the other side of the street. I no longer spiritually belonged to these circles. I could not possibly come to terms with the world of wartime phantasies and nationalist commotion. [...] I sought peace and quiet in a civilised spot **which would not sentence me to being an emigrant and to the experience of foreignness**. I needed some more solitude and an escape from politics but **not isolation, as it is deadly for the writer. I had to be close to all those dramatic events**. [emphasis – S.N.B.]

Not only does the above quote confirm that a departure from Serbia to Croatia (a transition within the space of the former Yugoslavia) was a manifestation of the rejection of the place of living but not of the homeland. It is also proof the "emigration", i.e. leaving for a place beyond the borders of non-existent Yugoslavia, would not be an experience of multiculturalism. On the contrary, to reiterate a statement by Kovač, it would be an "experience of foreignness", an "isolation that is deadly for a writer". Therefore, it is more justified to use my term the "phantasm project", which unambiguously comments on the nature of the attitude of those given to the Yugonostalgia to the SFRY.

An overt "abandonment" of readers and the community by renowned and recognised writers, for whom writing was a living, is the basic difference between the older literary generation of post-Yugoslav

⁹ Between 2003 and 2006 the joint state was known as Serbia and Montenegro (Srbija i Crna Gora).

emigrants¹⁰ and that of younger authors, including those who departed and were at the onset of their career trajectories (Vladimir Tasić born in 1965 and Nenad Jovanović b. 1973, both currently living in Canada, Mihajlo Spasojević b. 1974 living in the United States, Aleksandar Hemon b. 1964 – in the USA, Andrej Nikolaidis b. 1974 in Sarajevo, living in Montenegro and Saša Stanišić b. 1978 – in Germany). For them, departing from their home country was not a political gesture, although, similarly to the emigrations of older writers, they were provoked by the war. Rather than that, living abroad was underpinned by economic or psychological considerations (pursuit of stability and normality), a gesture of despair so that their writing should not be affected by any form of repression or stigmatisation.¹¹

¹⁰ This group included also David Albahari, b. 1948. In 1993 he left for Canada; this is what he said about the reasons for his decision: "When we left 15 years ago, always when I was asked about the motivation, I replied that this was because of my children. Such a decision was understandable; the kids were small and I felt the need to take them out of a place where it was not so good to be a child in. It was not good to be an adult there, either, but this applied especially to children. Our son completed his university studies in May, packed his things and returned to Belgrade. If my daughter returns as well, it would be absurd to let them live in Serbia while we continue living there (in Canada – S.N.B). When the kids finish their studies, my parental mission will be over and I see no reason why we should not come back to Belgrade, which I never left as a writer; I have never abandoned the language, either". Albahari, David. "Nisam više dečak, sad sam beba pisac". *Nezavisne novine* 07.11.2008, <http://www.nezavisne.com/umjetnost-zabava/pozornica/David-Albahari-Nisam-vise-decak-sad-sam-beba-pisac-31985.html> (access date: 11.05.2014).

¹¹ Studies of individual cases of selected authors referred to in this text can be found in the article by Giergiel (2009). The article tries to indicate categories conducive to describing emigrant literature. Its title correctly includes the term "problems". As early as in its introduction the author points to the "ontic status of the writer and literature itself" as one of the aspects of emigrant literature. This status is based on the "sensation of not being at home in a world, which necessitates a constant critical reflection on its bases, mistrust of any a priori judgments and the capacity for a constant undermining of one's own views. Such a deracination is an attribute of a thinking individual, a distinguishing mark of a true intellectual (not only of an emigrant, we should add)" (p. 67). The parenthetical inclusion at the end of the above quote indicates that the use of this category (naturally, not the only one used by the author) as a mark of emigrant literature (even narrowly-construed) is in fact impossible. If the discussion took into account texts written in emigration from totally different ideological positions, e.g. not cognitively sceptic, it might turn out that despite their being written outside the author's homeland, they do not meet the criterion of being emigrant literature. Naturally, the problem stems not only from the arbitrary nature of the cognitive tools, but from the attempts at classification and description on the basis of a limited set of texts by (selected) authors.

The younger authors of post-Yugoslav emigrant prose find registering the experience of emigration more important than a political, external factor. The multicultural world of the former SFRY is not, as for the generation of older authors drawn to the Yugonostalgia, a space they identify with and long for. Yugoslav reality, which they usually saw as children, after the experience of the last wars, calls for a description and explanation, just like the new world they inhabited as emigrants. Inherent in these projects is the need to understand the world they left as young adults from the perspective of a mature individual. Their action is an attempt to respond to the question: "Who am I?"

It is precisely in reference to the younger generation of writers that Mieczysław Dąbrowski's notion of the "intertext" seems fully legitimate. This (most often autobiographic) prose demonstrated the need for a constant revision of one's identity through being the Other, both from the perspective of the culture left behind and the new one. We may safely say that the most recent emigrant prose is a record of identity *in statu nascendi*, a mirror where the self watches itself as the Other, not only from the point of view of different cultures but also from that of different stages of life (young and adult).

My above general assumption calls for proof which would be rooted in literary texts, for a detailed discussion and elaboration, which I abstain from here because of the constraints of this text. I put it forth, however, since it is vital as an indication of the uniqueness of the category of emigration in post-Yugoslav literatures. On the one hand, the assumption allows us to account for the problem of periodisation of a shift of phenomena (naturally in reference to the post-communist states, for whom 1989 is a transformation caesura; not for all, however, as the example of Ukraine indicates) mirrored in literature. On the other hand, or rather first and foremost, it demonstrates the need for revising the strategy of memory and forgetting, which will contribute to the coming to terms with the sometimes painful legacy of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albahari, David. "Nisam više dečak, sad sam beba pisac". *Nezavisne novine* 07.11.2008. Web. 11.05.2014. <<http://www.nezavisne.com/umjetnost-zabava/pozornica/David-Albahari-Nisam-vise-decak-sad-sam-beba-pisac-31985.html>>

- Arsić-Ivkov, Marinko. "Pretpostavke krivične estetike". *Republika* 2002, no. 299 (16-31.12.2002). Web. 22.07.2014. <http://www.yuorpe.com/zines/republika/arhiva/2002/299/299_15.html>
- Banasiak, Bogdan. "(Aktywne) Zapomnienie". *Lamus. Pismo kulturalno-artystyczne* 2008, no. 2. P. 10-14.
- Bolecki, Włodzimierz. "'Emigracyjność' – 'polityczność' – historia literatury". In: Bolecki, Włodzimierz, *Polowanie na postmodernistów*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1999. P. 249-262.
- Brešić, Vinko. "Hrvatska emigrantska književnost". In: Brešić, Vinko. *Teme novije hrvatske književnosti*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, 2001. P. 179-212.
- Czerwiński, Maciej. "Iseljena Hrvatska, czyli o życiu na emigracji Karla Mirtha". In: *Słowiańskie diaspory. Studia o literaturze emigracyjnej*. Ed. Celina Juda. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2009. P. 95-105.
- Dąbrowska-Partyka, Maria. "Diaspory i peryferie. Kilka uwag o kulturze literackiej Słowian w XIX wieku". In: *Słowiańskie diaspory. Studia o literaturze emigracyjnej*. Ed. Celina Juda. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2009. P. 33-40.
- Dąbrowski, Mieczysław. "Międzytekst. Literatura między kulturami narodowymi". *Porównania* 2013, no. 13. P. 93-105.
- Defterdarević, Nadazdin. "Pravo i sloboda informisanja. Dometi i ograničenja". *Most. Časopis za obrazovanje, nauku i kulturu*, Mostar 1998, no. 105 (16 – nova serija). Web. 25.06.2013. <<http://www.most.ba/016/028.htm>>
- Derrida, Jacques. *The Pharmakon*. In: *Dissemination*. Transl. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1981. P. 98-118.
- "Dijalektika varvarizma", an interview with Mirko Kovač. *Ekonomist* 2003, no. 176 (6.10.2003). Web. 23.12.2003. <<http://www.arhiv.rs/novinska-clanak/ekonomist/2003/10/6/EBE506E2E7E4978AC1256DB7007D1099/dijalektika-varvarizma>>
- Dimitrijević, Nenad. "Reči i smrt. Nacionalistička konstrukcija stvarnosti". *Reč* 2000, no. 60 (5.12.2000). P. 137-159.
- Drakulić, Slavenka. "Intelektualci kao loši momci". *Sarajevske sveske* 2003, no. 4. P. 71-76.
- Drndić, Daša. *Dvadeset godina me je Beograd bolio*. Radio Free Europe, 6.01.2013. Web. 13.08.2014. <<http://www.slobodnaevropa.org/content/dasa-drndic-dvadeseg-godina-me-je-beograd-bolio/24811110.html>>
- Giergiel, Sabina. "Południowosłowiańskie kłopoty z 'emigracją'. Szkic wstępny". *Pamiętnik Słowiański* 2009, vol. 2. P. 63-86.
- Grubišić, Vinko. *Hrvatska književnost u egzilu*. München-Barcelona: Knjižnica Hrvatske revije, 1990.
- Jelčić, Dubravko. *Povijest hrvatske književnosti. Tisućljeće od Bašćanske ploče do postmoderne*. Zagreb: Naklada Pavičić, 1997.
- Kljajić-Imsirović, Jelka. "Disidenti i zatvor", *Republika* 1998, no. 196 (1-15.09.1998). Web. 22.07.2014. <http://www.yuorpe.com/zines/republika/arhiva/98/196/196_14.HTM>
- Kornhauser, Julian. *Nowa historia literatury chorwackiej*. In: Kornhauser, Julian. *Świadomość regionalna i mit odrębności*. Kraków: Scriptum, 2001. P. 131-142.
- Kovač, Mirko. "Otac nacije", *Bosnian and Croat Dani* weekly, part 1 – 3.06.2005, no. 416; part 2 – 10.06.2005, no. 417; part 3 – 17.06.2005, no. 418; part 4 – 24.06.2005, no. 419; part 5 – 1.07.2005, no. 420; part 6 – 8.07.2005, no. 421; part 7 – 15.07.2005, no. 422.

- Kuljić, Todor. *Tito – sociološkoistorijska studija*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije, 1998.
- Kuljić, Todor. "Sećanje na titoizam: hegemoni okviri". *Filozofija i društvo* 2010, no. 2. P. 225-250.
- Marković, Predrag J. "Sećanja na život i rad u jugoslovenskom socijalizmu: između kritike i mita o 'Zemlji dembeliji'" In: Marković Predrag J., *Trajnost i promena. Društvena istorija socijalističke i postsocijalističke svakodnevice u Jugoslaviji i Srbiji*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2007.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Untimely meditations*. Transl. Reginald John Hoollingdale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Nowak-Bajcar, Sylwia. "Dysydenci, emigranci i pisarze. Serbska literatura emigracyjna w XX wieku. O kosmopolitycznym nurcie serbskiej emigracji". In: *Słowiańskie diaspory. Studia o literaturze emigracyjnej*. Ed. Celina Juda. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2009. P. 117-132.
- Palavestra, Predrag. "Književnici na crnim listama". *Književne novine* 1988, no. 750. P. 1-15.
- Pantić, Mihajlo. *Modernističko pripovedanje. Srpska i hrvatska pripovetka/novela 1918-1930*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, 1999.
- Radojević, Mira. *Savez Oslobođenje (1949-1990)*. Web. 24.07.2014. <<http://www.cpi.hr/download/links/hr/7326.pdf>>
- Radojević, Mira. *Milovan Đilas i srpska politička emigracija 1954-1995. Tokovi istorije* 2007, no. 4. P. 118-135.
- Radović, Nastasja and Đorđević, Mirko "Disidentstvo – stvarnost i legenda". An interview with Mihajlo Mihajlov. *Republika* 1998, no. 181 (1-15.02.1998). Web. 22.07.2014. <http://www.yuope.com/zines/republika/arhiva/98/181/181_19.HTM>
- Stanišić, Saša. *Jak żołnierz gramofon reperował*. Transl. Alicja Rosenau. Wołowiec: Czarne, 2008.
- Ślawska, Magdalena. *Proza autobiograficzna pokolenia jugonostalgików*. Wrocław: Atut, 2013.
- Tešić, Gojko. *Utuljena baština*. Beograd: Dositej, 1990.
- Tosić, Desimir. "Iluzije o dijaspori". *Republika* 2001, no. 274-275 (1-31 December 2001). Web. 27.07.2014. <<http://www.yuope.com/zines/republika/arhiva/2001/274-275/index.html>>
- Walas, Teresa. *Zrozumieć swój czas. Kultura polska po komunizmie. Rekonesans*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2003.